GRAND COUNTY COUNCIL
REGULAR MEETING
Grand County Council Chambers
125 East Center Street, Moab, Utah

AGENDA
Tuesday, January 15, 2019

2:00 p.m.
- Workshop: High Density Housing Overlay

4:00 p.m.
- Thompson Springs Special Service Fire District (see separate Agenda)

4:05 p.m.

- Call to Order
- Pledge of Allegiance
- Approval of Minutes (Chris Baird, Clerk/Auditor)
  A. January 2, 2019 (County Council Meeting)
- Ratification of Payment of Bills
- General Council Reports and Future Considerations
- Elected Official Reports
- Council Administrator Report
- Department Reports
- Agency Reports
  B. 2018 Honey Bee Inspection Report (Jerry Shue, Grand County Bee Inspector)
- Citizens to Be Heard
- Presentations
  C. Presentation on Housing Rehab Program information for elderly, disabled, and low income households in Grand County (Barbara Fausett and Dawna Houskeeper, Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments (SEUALG))

- General Business- Action Items- Discussion and Consideration of:
  D. Adopting proposed resolution and a request for unbudgeted funding for the Rural Diversification Project, in the amount of $1,000 for the next three years totaling $3,000 (Geri Gamber, Executive Director, SEUALG)
  E. Approving additions to the 2018 Property Tax Abatements and Cancelations (Chris Kauffman, Treasurer)
  F. Approving the purchase buy back agreement between Grand County and Honnen Equipment for one new John Deere 544L Loader (Bill Jackson, Road Supervisor)
  G. Approving proposed amendment to the Cooperative Management Agreement with the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) providing Public Safety, Resource Protection and Recreation Management and Maintenance in the Sand Flats Recreation Area which authorizes Grand County to use a portion of the BLM facility located at 885 South Sand Flats Road as a storage facility (Andrea Brand, Sand Flats Recreation Area Program Director)
  H. Approving proposed contract award to Hudson Printing for the Moab Area Travel Council Travel Planner (Elaine Gizler, Moab Area Travel Council, Executive Director)
I. Approving proposed letter to Senator Hinkins and Representatives Albrecht & Watkins in support of requested budgeting in the amount of $100,000 for Utah Division of Forestry, Fire and State Lands- Sovereign Lands to plan and develop needed infrastructure, including vault toilet installations and camp site delineations, for the campground areas located at Dalton Wells and Willow Springs near Arches National Park (Council Member McGann)

J. Adopting proposed ordinance amending the Land Use Code for a High Density Housing overlay (Zacharia Levine, Community and Economic Development Director)

K. Approving Volunteer Appointments to District and County Boards and Commissions (Council Liaison to the Board or Ruth Dillon, Council Administrator):
   1. Airport Board (Postponed from January 2, 2019)
   2. Historical Preservation Commission
   3. Noxious Weed Control Board
   4. Transportation Special Service District Board (Postponed from January 2, 2019)

L. Approving assignments of County Council Representatives/Liaisons to District and County Boards, Commissions and Committees and other agencies (Chairman Clapper)

M. Approving volunteer appointment to the Budget Advisory Board for the Department Head position (Chairman Clapper)

☐ Consent Agenda- Action Items

N. Ratifying the Vice Chair’s signature on a letter of support sent to Congressman John Curtis regarding his proposed Rural Broadband Permitting Efficiency Act of 2019

O. Ratifying minor changes on Easement Agreement with San Juan County for the purpose of constructing a connector road to be used only for ingress, egress, utilities, and maintenance, previously approved on December 18, 2018

P. Approving proposed letter of support for Arches National Park as an International Dark Sky designation

Q. Approving proposed letter of support for Moab Area Community Land Trust for the New Market Tax Credit (NMTC) application

☐ Discussion Items

R. Discussion on calendar items and public notices (Bryony Hill, Council Office Coordinator)

S. Discussion on using Council Discretionary funds for the honey bee inspector budget (Council Member McGann)

T. Discussion and Report on the activities of the Moab Area Responsible Recreation and Tourism (MARRT) working group (Jaylyn Hawks, Liz Thomas, Walt Dabney)

U. Discussion on topics and issues to bring to the State during the Legislative Session (Council Member Morse)

V. Discussion on County Council pay raise approved December 18, 2018 (Council Member Paxman)

☐ Public Hearings- Possible Action Items (none)

☐ Closed Session(s) (if necessary)

☐ Adjourn

NOTICE OF SPECIAL ACCOMMODATION DURING PUBLIC MEETINGS. In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals with special needs requests wishing to attend County Council meetings are encouraged to contact the County two (2) business days in advance of these events. Specific accommodations necessary to allow participation of disabled persons will be provided to the maximum extent possible. T.D.D. (Telecommunication Device for the Deaf) calls can be answered at: (435) 259-1346. Individuals with speech and/or hearing impairments may also call the Relay Utah by dialing 711. Spanish Relay Utah: 1 (888) 346-3162

It is hereby the policy of Grand County that elected and appointed representatives, staff and members of Grand County Council may participate in meetings through electronic means. Any form of telecommunication may be used, as long as it allows for real time interaction in the way of discussions, questions and answers, and voting.
At the Grand County Council meetings/hearings any citizen, property owner, or public official may be heard on any agenda subject. The number of persons heard and the time allowed for each individual may be limited at the sole discretion of the Chair. On matters set for public hearings there is a three-minute time limit per person to allow maximum public participation. Upon being recognized by the Chair, please advance to the microphone, state your full name and address, whom you represent, and the subject matter. No person shall interrupt legislative proceedings.

Requests for inclusion on an agenda and supporting documentation must be received by 5:00 PM on the Wednesday prior to a regular Council Meeting and forty-eight (48) hours prior to any Special Council Meeting. Information relative to these meetings/hearings may be obtained at the Grand County Council’s Office, 125 East Center Street, Moab, Utah; (435) 259-1346.

A Council agenda packet is available at the local Library, 257 East Center St., Moab, Utah, (435) 259-1111 at least 24 hours in advance of the meeting.
Alternative HDHO Plan

(1) **Revised map.** The intention here is for a map that is more narrowly focused on the areas which are most appropriate for high density development. These are undeveloped parcels close to town and/or close to Highway 191. (The Arroyo Crossing parcel is also included, since higher density affordable development is already in the pipeline there.)

(2) **Stipulations for mixed use development in the Highway Commercial zone along 191.** Any HDHO development along Highway 191 shall make provision for commercial development along the front (highway-facing) side of the lot. Residential development shall be located behind commercial development or on upper floors above commercial development. The intention of this provision is to avoid loss of commercial development opportunities along Highway 191.

(3) **Zoning changes to discourage low density development.** Planning staff and the Planning Commission are directed to investigate setting minimum densities on certain parcels. The intention is to prohibit or strongly discourage low density development on parcels which are the most suitable for apartment buildings and similar high-density residential development.

(4) **Revised sunset clause.** HDHO plan will require reauthorization from County Council after 300 units have been built or after two years, which comes first. Because the HDHO contains a large number of new and innovative provisions, the County Council needs to closely monitor the HDHO policy to ensure that it is working as intended.

Other points for consideration:

A) **Sunset Clause:** It has been argued that the HDHO is designed for participation by the private sector in supplying more units and more affordable units to the housing mix in Grand County. As such the sunset clause should not include any ‘affordable’ or ‘workforce’ housing units built by non-profits such as Moab Area Community Land Trust, Community Rebuilds, and Housing Authority.

B) **Sunset Clause Time limit for re-evaluation:** 2 years? 18 months?

C) **Sunset Clause to establish a trigger number at which it is evaluated or goes away altogether:** 300 units has been suggested as a trigger number. Total estimated need for units by 2020 is 316 according to the Moab Area Housing Plan. With that in mind and considering the units already in the pipeline (estimated at just under 100 in the next two years – see below) we might set the trigger number at 200 units and then re-evaluate.

D) **Density:** Dark pink areas on the map represent a density of 35 units per acre. Dark pink areas with stripes indicate a density of 35/Acre with the added incentive to be able to build to 4 stories and 50 foot heights.
a. 4 stories and 50 foot heights are not compatible with the character of our neighborhoods and valley and such we should consider eliminating that incentive (remove the stripes; leave the area pink)

b. Keeping in mind the nearly 100 units in the pipeline, we should not be in a panic to increase density as high as possible. Let’s consider decreasing density in the pink areas to 25 per acre rather than 35.

**Workforce Housing Projects Already Underway**

**Housing Authority Past and In-the-Pipeline Projects:**

- **Previous completed projects last five years-**
  - 40-50 Mutual Self-Help homes built
  - Five 15 year rent restricted CROWN homes built (Desert Wind)
  - 60 units at Cinema Court

- **Housing Units Planned in the next two years:**
  - 36 units Low Income Tax Credit (LIHTC) senior units breaking ground this year 1 and 2 bdrm (awarded)
  - 22 units LIHTC townhomes 3 and 4 bdrm units (awarded)
  - 20 Mutual Self-Help homes
  - 5-10 single family homes utilizing Community Land Trust land
  - 5-10 CROWN Rent-to-own homes, possibly on CLT land
  - Possible rehab and adding unit to our Virginian Apartments (probably not in the next two years but I’m starting to look at this as our next possible LIHTC application)

  **So conservatively just shy of 100 units are in the pipeline for HASU during the next two years.**

As an aside, HASU is excited about the HDH proposal and the ability to develop at higher densities. These are already the clients they serve and anticipate being heavily involved in the administration of the deed restrictions and eligibility for HDHO.

**Moab City:** Approximately 60 units at Walnut Lane
Article 6.14
HIGH DENSITY HOUSING (HDH) OVERLAY DISTRICT

Sections:
4.7.1 Purpose.
4.7.2 Applicability.
4.7.3 Definitions.
4.7.4 Uses permitted with a development agreement.
4.7.5 Development incentives.
4.7.6 Assurance of primary residential occupancy.
4.7.7 Special Needs Emergency/Transitional Housing.
4.7.8 Pre-application procedure.
4.7.9 Application – Development plans and map required.
4.7.10 Findings.
4.7.11 Effect of High Density Housing Overlay approval.
4.7.12 Periodic Review of High Density Housing Ordinance.
4.7.13 Expiration of High Density Housing Ordinance
4.7.14 Enforcement.

4.7.1 Purpose.
A. Grand County has established High Density Housing (HDH) districts to facilitate the provision of new housing units used for primary residential occupancy by actively employed households. The HDH districts are intended to provide the opportunity and means for the County to meet its estimate of additional residential and workforce housing needs, to achieve the goals of the housing element of the County’s general plan, and to implement the policies and goals of the housing element of the County’s general plan.

B. These regulations are intended to encourage the development of new housing units by assisting both the public and private sector in making the provision of these units economically viable, while providing assurances to the County that these units will maintain a high degree of quality and will remain accessible to residents and local area workers.
C. These regulations are further intended to encourage the provision of primary residential housing through the combination of the HDH districts with multiple-family and single-family residential zoning districts within the County where the residential housing projects are determined to be feasible and are consistent with the County’s general plan.

D. The HDH districts are intended to provide a means of directing and simplifying the process for creating and maintaining primary residential housing.

E. The HDH districts are intended to provide a means of directing and simplifying the process for creating and maintaining affordable housing constructed to meet the Assured Housing requirements of Section 6.15.

F. The HDH districts are also intended to provide incentives to developers, whether in new or rehabilitated housing, to maintain primary residential rental and ownership units in perpetuity.

4.7.2 Applicability.

The regulations set forth in this Article may be applied to specific sites meeting the following criteria:

A. The site is located in one of the high density housing (HDH) districts;

B. The site is not located in a FEMA floodplain unless necessary site improvements are completed prior to site plan or subdivision approval;

4.7.3 Definitions.

A. “Active Employment” or “Actively Employed” means a household with at least one person who meets one of the following criteria:

(1) A full-time (aggregate of 30 hours of employment per week) employee of an entity or entities located within Grand County Boundaries; or

(2) An owner or owner’s representative of a business or entity with a primary place of business within Grand County Boundaries; or
(3) A full-time (aggregate of 30 hours of employment per week) worker who is self-employed or work out of their home must provide their entire list of clients/workload so that it can be verified that a minimum of 75% of their work/clients are based within Grand County Boundaries; or

(4) A retired person who was a full-time employee of an entity located within Grand County Boundaries for at least five continuous years immediately preceding his or her retirement; or

(45) A person who is unable to work or does not have a work history required under subsections (1) through (34) above due to a Disability.

(5) Where there are unrelated individuals living together in one household, at least fifty percent (50%) of all the adults comprising the household shall meet the Active Employment requirement of this section.

(6) [Placeholder: Intent is the following draft text recommended by PC on 9.25.18. See legal review.

A person who is legally responsible for a minor child who resides primarily with them, who is primarily responsible for the child’s safety and well-being for at least 60 hours per business week in their home, and can document that they or the child have resided in Grand County for at least five continuous years or the entirety of their lives preceding their occupancy of an HDH housing unit.]

B. “High density housing (HDH) overlay district” means a zoning district that applies in addition to an existing zoning designation where the County encourages the provision of new housing units used for primary residential occupancy as further described in this Article.

C. “High density housing (HDH) development” means a subdivision or site plan that exists within an HDH overlay district and complies with the regulations of this section.

D. “Household” means one (1) person living alone, two (2) or more individuals related to each other by blood, marriage, or another legally recognized relationship, or a maximum of five (5) unrelated individuals residing in the same residence.
E. “Primary resident” means a household that meets the “Primary residential occupancy” requirement.

F. “Primary residential housing” or “Primary residential development” shall have the same meaning as “High density housing development.”

G. “Primary residential occupancy” means the owner of record occupies the dwelling unit for a minimum of nine (9) months out of any twelve (12) month period or a renter occupies the dwelling unit through a lease term no shorter than six (6) months out of any twelve (12) month period.

H. “Special needs/transitional housing” means temporary housing that is made available to certain segments of the local population who face significant challenges in finding and retaining permanent housing. Special needs may include homelessness, substance abuse, domestic violence, or other similar needs.

4.7.4 Uses permitted with a development agreement.

The following uses are permitted with the execution of a development agreement by the County and the developer.

A. Residential developments at a density greater than normally permitted by the underlying zoning district as described in the table below, when the development provides a substantial level of housing units intended for primary residential occupancy by actively employed households. A substantial level is defined herein as a minimum of eighty percent (80%) of the units in the development being restricted to primary residential and actively employed residents. Deed restricted units may be owner-occupied or renter-occupied as long as the residents meet the requirements for primary residency and active employment. The maximum density (units/acre) limit shall be based on a calculation that includes all existing and all new units on the land area that is being included in the calculation. Residential development qualifying for greater density pursuant to the provisions of this ordinance shall be permitted to obtain such density by constructing residential housing types not otherwise allowed in the underlying zoning district. For example, multi-family units may be constructed in a single-family residential zone.
### High Density Housing (HDH) District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Maximum Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HDH 35a</td>
<td>35 units per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDH 35b</td>
<td>35 units per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDH 25</td>
<td>25 units per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDH 15</td>
<td>15 units per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDH 10</td>
<td>10 units per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDH 5</td>
<td>5 units per acre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Accessory uses or structures incidental to the principally permitted use pursuant to Section 3.3 of this LUC. Any accessory dwelling unit permitted under Section 3.3 in a HDH Development shall meet the occupancy and active employment requirements of subsection A of this Section.

**4.7.5 Development incentives.**

A. General. In order to reduce costs associated with the development and construction of primary residential housing, the property development standards set forth in subsection C of this section are established for the HDH districts. These property development standards represent a relaxation of standards normally applied to development in the County and are established in order to facilitate and promote the development of primary residential housing in the County and shall be extended upon issuance of a site plan or preliminary plat approval. As a further inducement to the development of primary residential housing beyond the relaxation and flexibility of development standards, the County, where appropriate, may also extend one or more of the development incentives set forth in subsection D, the selection of which shall depend on the quality, size, nature, and scope of the development being proposed. Incentives shall be targeted to improve the development design or to yield the greatest number of primary residential units, so as to permit the County to meet its estimate of additional housing needs and the goals of the housing element of the County’s general plan. It is also the intent of the County to facilitate primary residential housing by encouraging developer involvement with the Moab Area Housing Task Force, Community Reinvestment Agencies, and other public and private entities concerned with the provision of primary residential housing and by cooperating with such entities.
B. Eligibility. Eligibility for the property development standards set forth in subsection C of this section requires the developer to propose a housing development containing at least eighty percent (80%) primary residential units occupied by actively employed households.

C. Property Development Standards. The following development standards shall apply to primary residential housing units in the HDH district:

1. General Design Standards. The development shall be designed and developed in a manner compatible with and complementary to existing and potential development in the immediate vicinity of the development site. Site planning on the perimeter shall provide for protection of the property from adverse surrounding influences and shall protect surrounding areas from potentially adverse influences from the property. To the greatest extent possible, the design of the development shall promote privacy for residents and neighbors, security, and use of passive solar heating and cooling through proper placement of walls, windows, and landscaping.

2. Minimum Design Standards. Minimum design standards are included to ensure a high degree of quality in the development of HDH units. Unless modified by the County Council, the following design standards shall apply to a development that utilizes the density increases allowed by this Article.

   a. Sidewalks shall be installed along all street frontages where otherwise required by this LUC.

   b. HDH developments shall meet the landscaping and screening standards of Section 6.4.

   c. Screening Requirements
      
      i. **Outdoor Storage Screening.** All outdoor storage areas for materials, trash, mechanical equipment, vehicles, or other similar items shall follow the standards outlined in Section 6.4.3.

      ii. **Parking Lot Screening.** Parking lot screening must be provided between those portions of an off street parking area containing six (6) or more parking
spaces and a different zoning district or a public street and shall be designed according to the following:

a. Parking lot screening must be provided within ten feet (10’) of the perimeter of the parking lot to be screened, except for parking lots adjacent to rain gardens/bio-retention systems, other landscape features, or where screening may negatively impact the traffic sight distance (as defined by the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) and verified by the County Engineer).

b. Parking lot screening shall be not less than eighty percent (80%) opaque and be a minimum of three feet (3’) in height as measured from the highest finished adjacent grade of the parking area. When shrubs are used to provide the screen, such shrubs must be at least two feet (2’) tall at planting and anticipated to grow to at least three feet (3’) tall at maturity.

b.c No landscaping or screening shall interfere with driver or pedestrian visibility for vehicles entering or exiting the premises.

c.d. Screening for a parking lot may be comprised of plants found in Section 6.4.3.F.

d.e. Content: Parking lot screening must consist of at least two (2) of the following:

i. A compact hedge of evergreen or densely twigged deciduous shrubs spaced to ensure closure into a solid hedge at maturity;

ii. A berm with plantings as described above;

iii. Transit shelters, benches, bicycle racks, and similar features may be integrated as a part of the screen;
iv. Fencing may be integrated as part of the screen. All wood fencing shall be stained and sealed with a weatherproof product.

iii. Parking Island Design. Off-street parking areas with at least twenty-five (25) parking stalls shall contain interior landscaped islands. Such islands shall be bounded by a raised concrete curb, pervious curbing, or an approved equivalent and shall contain mulch to retain soil moisture. This provision shall not apply to parking structures. The standards for landscaped islands are as follows:

a. Landscaped parking lot islands shall be required at the beginning and end of each parking row and shall contain a minimum of one hundred eighty (180) square feet and a minimum width of nine feet (9’).

b. A minimum of one tree shall be provided for each island.

c. Shrubs, perennials or ornamental grass shall be incorporated in each landscaped island that does not contain a tree.

d. Islands shall be prepared with topsoil to a depth of two feet (2’) and improved to ensure adequate drainage, nutrient, and moisture retention levels for the establishment of plantings.

e. All perimeter and interior landscaped areas in parking lots shall be equipped with an irrigation system adequate for establishing and maintaining the plant materials within it.

c. To the maximum extent possible, building heights and locations shall minimize shading and interruption of solar access to adjacent properties with existing residential structures or commercial agricultural operations.
i. Exterior finishes may be of wood, masonry, stone, stucco, HDO board or other high quality material permitted by the building code, but shall not utilize vinyl siding; cedar or wood shakes; highly reflective, shiny, or mirror-like materials; or exposed plywood or particle board.

ii. Buildings shall utilize at least two (2) of the following design features to provide visual relief along the front of the residence:
   a. Projections, recessions, or reveals such as, but not limited to, columns, pilasters, cornices, and bay windows
   b. Dormers
   c. Gables
   d. Recessed entries, a minimum of three (3) feet deep
   e. Covered front porches
   f. Cupolas
   g. Architectural Pillars or Posts
   h. Quoins
   i. Corbeling on wall
   j. Decorative lintel
   k. Incorporation of brick or stone on at least 25% of front surface area

Planning staff shall have the authority to waive this requirement when the building is not visible from adjacent properties or the public right-of-way.

iii. Where primary residential housing units may be placed on the same lot as current or future temporary or short-term accommodations, dedicated primary residential housing units shall be clustered together so as to minimize the exposure of residents to temporary guests. In all other developments, where temporary or short-term accommodations units do not exist and cannot exist due to zoning restrictions, dedicated primary residential housing units shall be dispersed throughout the residential development.

e. The County Council may waive, or modify, any, or all, of these requirements when the Council finds it is infeasible to comply due to physical or other constraints on the lot.
3. Minimum Building Site Area and Lot Width. There shall be no minimum building site area, minimum lot width, or maximum lot coverage requirements for individual lots or individual dwelling sites in a HDH development. However, the building site area lot widths, and lot coverage percentages shall be designated on a site plan pursuant to Section 9.17 or preliminary plat pursuant to Section 9.4 approved by the Planning Commission.


5. Building Height.

   a. Maximum building heights shall not exceed the limits defined in the underlying zone district except that buildings constructed in the HDH 35b district shall not exceed four (4) stories or fifty (50) feet in height.

   b. To the maximum extent possible, building heights and locations shall minimize shading and interruption of solar access to adjacent properties with existing residential structures or commercial agricultural operations.

   c. All structures shall conform to the Ridgeline Standards of Section 6.9.8.

   d. Structures built under the HDH overlay must comply with the setback and buffer requirements of the underlying zone. The maximum height of the building at the exterior wall shall be the greater of:

      i. 20 feet

      ii. The building’s setback at that point

   e. From the exterior wall, the building’s height may increase to its maximum height at a rate not greater than a 45° angle from the maximum allowable height of the exterior wall.
Examples of HDH Height-Compliant Structures

28' Max. Height Examples

35' Max. Height Examples

50' Max. Height Examples
Maximum building heights shall not exceed the limits defined in the underlying zone district except that buildings constructed in the HDH 35b district shall not exceed four (4) stories or fifty (50) feet in height.

6. Setbacks. The minimum setbacks from the lot line of the development shall be determined by the buffer requirements of Section 5.4.1.B and the compatibility standards of Section 6.10.

7. Parking.

i. Number of spaces required

   a. For every single-family or two-family dwelling, there shall be provided at least two (2) off-street parking spaces for each unit. Parking spaces provided in a garage or carport may count towards the minimum requirement.

   b. For every attached multifamily dwelling, off-street parking spaces shall be provided in accordance with Section 6.1.4:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multi-family dwellings</th>
<th>Efficiency and one-bedroom</th>
<th>1.5 per dwelling unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two-bedroom</td>
<td>1.75 per dwelling unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Three-bedroom and Larger</td>
<td>2.0 per dwelling unit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ii. Parking design requirements

   c. Parking areas for single-family or two-family dwellings need not be paved.

   d. Parking areas for attached multifamily dwellings shall be subject to the off-street requirements outlined in Section 6.1.7.

   e. Uncovered surface parking may be permitted in the rear and side setbacks but is not permitted in the front or street-side setback.

   f. Garages, carports, and individual locking storage units are subject to the setback standards outlined in Section 5.4.1.
a. Required spaces for multifamily developments equal to or greater than five units shall be covered in a carport or a garage except that for multifamily dwellings with four or fewer units, parking spaces can be uncovered.

b. g.

8. Minimum Standards of Physical Condition. A primary residential housing unit is required to have and maintain those minimum standards of physical conditions set forth in Exhibit A - Minimum Standards.

9. Streets. All public streets within or abutting the proposed planned development shall be dedicated and improved to County specifications for the particular classification of street; all private streets shall meet fire code and access standards.

10. Signs. Signs shall be permitted only to the extent allowed under Section 6.5, Signs, and must be approved by the Planning and Zoning Administrator.

11. Construction Timing. The primary residential housing units shall be ready for occupancy no later than the date of the initial or temporary occupancy of any unrestricted units within the development or applicable phase thereof. If the unrestricted units are developed in phases, then the primary residential housing units may be developed in proportion to the phasing of the unrestricted units. For example, in an approved development that includes 100 units built in two 50-unit phases the first phase must include at least 40 primary residential units.

D. Additional Development Incentives. In addition to the relaxed and flexible development standards set forth in subsection C of this section, the County may offer other development incentives should the County Council determine that such incentives are warranted and in the best interest of the County. For example, the County may offer exceptions, waivers or modifications of other development standards that would otherwise inhibit density and achievement of affordable housing goals for the development site, including, but not limited to, placement of public works improvements. The County may also offer impact fee waivers, property tax abatements, or direct financial contributions.
4.7.6 Assurance of primary residency and occupancy.

Primary residential housing units developed under this Article shall remain available to persons and families who live and work in Grand County according to the standards set forth in Section 6.14.030 in perpetuity. The developer shall be required to enter into a development agreement with the County to ensure primary residential occupancy by actively employed households is maintained prior to recordation of final plat or issuance of a building permit for the applicable development. Each and every housing unit designated for primary residential occupancy by an actively employed household shall also include a deed restriction attached to its title in accordance with the standards set forth in this section. Grand County reserves the right to revoke, deny or suspend any permit, including a land development permit, conditional use permit, building permit, certificate of occupancy, or discretionary approval if the standards of this section are not met.

4.7.7 Special Needs Emergency/Transitional Housing.

Pursuant to the applicable County codes, a developer may, at the sole discretion of the County and subject to certain requirements, satisfy a portion of its primary residential housing requirements by provisioning special needs/transitional housing units through either direct construction, land donation or the donation of existing units. There must be a quantified, demonstrated need for the emergency/transitional housing within the Grand County boundaries. The housing must be developed in collaboration with a federally recognized, 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization. The housing must satisfy all requirements of the applicable local, state and federal requirements. Given the unique and varying characteristics of the population to be served, the rents for special needs/transitional housing must be approved in advance by the County Council or its designee.

4.7.8 Pre-application procedure.

Prior to submitting an application for a HDH development, the applicant or prospective developer should hold preliminary consultations with the Community and Economic Development Director and other County staff as may be desirable, to obtain information and guidance before entering into binding commitments or incurring substantial expense in the preparation of plans, surveys and other data. Such preliminary consultations should include
information on potential federal, state, and local affordable housing funding availability, and program requirements in guaranteeing the development’s consistency with the objectives of this overlay district.

4.7.9 Application – Development plans and map required.

An application for a HDH development must be for a parcel or parcels of land that is under the control of the person, corporation, or entity proposing the development. The application shall meet all requirements of and include all submission materials required in connection with an application for preliminary plat or site plan approval and shall be submitted with the County’s standard application form. In addition to the foregoing, the application shall include the following:

A. The proposed means for assuring the continuing existence, maintenance and operation of the development as a primary residential housing project; and

B. Such other information as may be required by the Community and Economic Development Director to allow for a complete analysis and appraisal of the planned development.

4.7.10 Findings.

In approving a development with respect to which the high density housing district zone is applicable, the County Council, upon the recommendation of the Planning Commission, shall make the following findings to ensure that the application is appropriate to the purpose and the location:

A. The concessions granted for density and deviation from design standards, are commensurate with the level of primary residential occupancy provided by the development. Specifically, the greater the extent of concessions and incentives, the greater the level of primary residential occupancy.

B. The developer enters into a development agreement to maintain the occupancy and employment restrictions of the development specific to the requirements of the County and any funding sources with greater or longer occupancy requirements.
4.7.11 Effect of High Density Housing Overlay approval.

A. Not Approval of Final Plat

Approval of plans submitted in conjunction with an application for the High Density Housing Overlay shall not constitute approval of the final plat. Rather, it shall be deemed an expression of approval to the layout submitted on the preliminary plat as a guide to the preparation of the final plat, compliance with all requirements of Section 4.7, and the development agreement required under Section 4.7.6.

B. Lapse of Approval

The High Density Housing Overlay shall be valid for a period of 24 months from the date of approval and the general terms and conditions under which the approval was granted will not be changed. The HDH Overlay approval shall be deemed voided unless a final plat approval is granted within the 24-month period or unless the 24-month period is extended by the County Council at the request of the developer. The County Council may extend the approval period for one or more times for good cause.

4.7.12 Periodic Review of High Density Housing Ordinance.

The County Council shall review this Article at least biennially to determine what adjustments, if any, are advisable to meet the housing needs of the residents of the County.

4.7.13 Expiration of High Density Housing Ordinance.

This ordinance shall automatically expire after 500 HDH units have received certificates of occupancy. A record of the number and location of HDH units in receipt of certificates of occupancy shall be kept on file within the Community and Economic Development Department at all times.

4.7.14 Enforcement.
A. It shall be a misdemeanor to violate any provision of this Article. Without limiting the
generality of the foregoing, it shall also be a misdemeanor for any person to sell or rent to
another person a primary residential housing unit under this Article who does not meet the
residency and occupancy requirements of this Article or to sell or rent a primary residential
housing unit to a household not qualified under this Article. It shall further be a misdemeanor for
any person to provide false or materially incomplete information to the County or its designee or
to a seller or lessor of a primary residential housing unit to obtain occupancy of housing for
which the person is not eligible.

B. The County may institute any appropriate legal actions or proceedings necessary to ensure
compliance with this Article, including: (i) actions to revoke, deny or suspend any permit,
including a land development permit, conditional use permit, building permit, certificate of
occupancy, or discretionary approval; (ii) actions to recover from any violator of this Article civil
fines, restitution to prevent unjust enrichment from a violation of this Article, and/or enforcement
costs, including attorney fees; (iii) eviction or foreclosure; and (iv) any other appropriate action
for injunctive relief or damages. Failure of any official or agency to fulfill the requirements of this
Article shall not excuse any person, owner, household or other party from the requirements of
this Article.
Minimum Standards for Physical Conditions of Primary Residential Housing Units

• Clean unit
• Carpets steam-cleaned two or three days prior to closing
• All scratches, holes, burned marks repaired in hardwood floors, linoleum, tile, and counter tops, etc.
• No broken or foggy windows
• All screens in windows (if screens were originally provided)
• All doors will be in working order with no holes
• All locks on doors will work
• All keys will be provided; e.g., door, mail box, garage
• All mechanical systems shall be in working order
• Walls paint ready
• Normal wear and tear on carpet; if carpet has holes, stains, etc., the carpet and padding shall be replaced or escrow funds at current market value per square foot for a comparable product shall be held at the time of closing to be used by the new buyer
• No leaks from plumbing fixtures
• Any safety hazard remedied prior to closing
• Satisfaction of radon issue if found at time of inspection
• All light fixtures shall be in working order
• All appliances that existed in the original Unit, remain and are in good working order and good condition

DEFINITIONS

• Clean Unit: All rooms will be cleaned as stated below:
• Kitchen:
  o Range - Inner and outer services will be cleaned.
  o Range hood and Exhaust Fan
- Refrigerator and Freezer - Inner and outer surfaces of refrigerator and freezer will be clean. Freezer will be defrosted.
- Cabinets and Countertops - Exterior and interior surfaces of cabinets and drawers will be clean. Door and drawer handles, if provided, shall be clean and in place.
- Sink and Garbage Disposal - Sink and plumbing fixtures will be clean. Garbage disposal must be in working order.
- Dishwasher - Must be in working order and inner and outer surfaces shall be clean.
- Blinds, Windows, Screens:
  - Windows - All window surfaces, inside and outside of the window glass, shall be clean.
  - Screens - Screens will be clean and in place with no holes or tears.
- Closets: Closets, including floors, walls, hanger rod, shelves and doors, shall be clean.
- Light Fixtures: Light fixtures will be clean and shall have functioning bulbs/fluorescent tubes.
- Bathrooms:
  - Bathtub, Shower Walls, Sinks - Bathtubs, shower walls and sinks shall be clean.
  - Toilet and Water Closet - Water closets, toilet bowls and toilet seats will be clean. If the toilet seat is broken or peeling, the seat shall be replaced.
  - Tile - All tile and grout will be clean.
  - Mirrors and Medicine Cabinets - Mirrors and medicine cabinets shall be cleaned inside and out.
  - Shelves and/or Other Cabinetry - All other shelving or cabinetry shall be cleaned inside and out.
- Walls, Ceilings, Painted Doors and Baseboards: Painted surfaces must be cleaned with care to ensure the surface is clean without damaging the paint.
- Floors: Floor cleaning includes sweeping and mopping and could include stripping, waxing and buffing. Types of floor surfaces include bamboo and marmoleum.
- Interior Storage/Utility Rooms: Storage/utility rooms shall be cleaned. Properly cleaned storage/utility rooms will be free from odors, removable stains, grease marks or accumulations.
- Washer/Dryer - Must be in working order and inner and outer surfaces shall be clean
- Safety Hazard: Any item that provides a safety hazard shall be fixed. This would include, but is not limited to, exposed electrical wiring, satisfaction of any radon issue found, ventilation for gas hot water system, etc.
• Walls Paint-Ready: All holes shall be patched; all posters, pictures, etc., shall be removed from all walls; all nails, tacks, tape, etc., shall be removed from all walls; and all walls shall be clean and ready for the new buyer to paint. If wallpaper has been placed on the wall and in good condition, the wallpaper can remain; if the wallpaper is peeling off, the wallpaper must be removed.

• Windows: If a window is broken, including the locking mechanism, the window shall be replaced. If the window has a fog residue in the inside, it shall be replaced.
HDH - December 2018 Revisions

Legend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Color</th>
<th>HDH35</th>
<th>HDH35b</th>
<th>HDH25</th>
<th>HDH15</th>
<th>HDH10</th>
<th>HDH5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- 8 SVD-adjacent properties converted from HDH15 to HDH5
- 2 parcels added to HDH
- Single lot was mistakenly split between HDH15 and HDH25, converted to fully HDH25
- Landlocked parcel is owned by same owner as Spanish Valley Drive frontage, requested inclusion
- Adjacent property by same property owner added to HDH
GRAND COUNTY, UTAH
ORDINANCE ________ (2018)

ORDINANCE ADOPTING NEW CHAPTER 4.7 HIGH DENSITY HOUSING (HDH)
OVERLAY DISTRICTS TO THE GRAND COUNTY LAND USE CODE

WHEREAS, the purpose of this ordinance is to:

A. Encourage the development and availability of housing that is accessible and affordable to a broad range of households with varying income levels within the County;

B. Promote the County’s goal to add housing units to the County’s housing stock that may be owned or rented by households actively employed within the County;

C. Facilitate new development in a compact and orderly manner;

D. Minimize the impacts of new development on existing neighborhoods and residents within HDH districts;

E. Reduce the cost of constructing and maintaining infrastructure associated with new development;

F. Actualize the affordable housing goals and policies identified in the Grand County General Plan, which includes incentives for increasing density in strategically identified areas throughout the County;

WHEREAS, the County Council finds and determines:

A. The Moab Area, which includes the City of Moab, Town of Castle Valley, and unincorporated areas of Grand County, faces a serious housing problem that threatens its economic security, quality of life, and environment. The extreme lack of access to affordable housing has a direct impact upon the health, safety, and welfare of residents of the County. While no single housing program will solve all of the Area’s needs, the High Density Housing (HDH) Overlay has been identified as one solution among a broader set of solutions;

B. Population in the Moab Area has increased rapidly, reflecting overall trends in the State of Utah. Between 2000 and 2017, the population in Grand County rose from 9,225 to 10,292, equivalent to a 11.6 percent increase, and similar to the Utah growth rate of 12.6 percent. This rapid population increase is expected to continue, driving demand for housing. The fastest growing demographic is the population over the age of 65, followed by young adults between the ages of 18 to 24;

C. More homeownership and rental housing will be needed to accommodate future growth. Between 2010 and 2017, the number of family and non-family households expanded, although non-family households experienced a somewhat higher rate of increase. This pace is expected to continue, which means more homeownership and rental housing will be needed;

________________________

1 US Census Bureau 2010; ESRI 2017
D. Real estate prices have escalated across all residential product types. In 2017, the median sales price for a single-family home was $325,000, $352,000 for a townhouse, and $275,000 for a condominium. Between 2014 and 2017, the median price increased by 30 percent for townhomes, and 42 percent for single-family homes and condominiums;

E. Despite a high proportion of renter households (35 percent in Grand County\textsuperscript{2}), there is a limited inventory of multifamily apartments. Higher density workforce housing products that could be more affordable to the workforce, such as apartments and condominiums, must compete with visitor accommodations, such as hotels and nightly rental units, for land. The economics of visitor accommodations allow them to pay more for land, making it difficult to build housing affordable to the workforce;

F. The area’s rapidly appreciating home prices has made housing out-of-reach for many working families. Housing costs have increased rapidly, substantially outpacing increases in household incomes. In general, no homes sold in 2017 were affordable to households earning up to 80 percent of Area Median Income, which is equivalent to a family of four earning $54,150 annually. Households at 100 percent of median income ($67,700 for a family of four) had limited homeownership options. Rental housing may be priced such that it is more within reach of moderate-income households, although there is a shortage of units available for rent.

G. Tourism-related industries are the fastest growing employment sector in Grand County, accounting for approximately 43% of all employment\textsuperscript{3}. Employment in accommodation and food services account for one out of every three jobs in Grand County. The next largest industries are retail and arts, entertainment, and recreation;

H. Jobs in tourism-related industries tend to be relatively low-paying, with some positions offering only seasonal or part-time employment with limited wage growth. The 2017 median household income in Grand County ($46,070) was lower than the statewide median of $62,902\textsuperscript{4};

I. Because affordable housing is in short supply within the Moab Area, lower-income households may be forced to live in less than adequate housing, pay a disproportionate share of their incomes to live in adequate housing, or commute ever-increasing distances to their jobs from housing located outside the Moab Area. These circumstances harm the County’s ability to provide high levels of service, attain goals articulated in the General Plan, and preserve a high quality of life for residents;

J. State and federal funds for the construction of new affordable housing are insufficient to fully address the current and projected shortages of affordable housing within the County. While the County has repeatedly amended its Land Use Code (LUC) to spur additional housing development, the private market has not provided adequate housing opportunities to extremely low-, very low-, low-, and moderate-income households;

\textsuperscript{2} Grand County Assured Housing Feasibility Study completed by BAE Urban Economics in 2018.
\textsuperscript{3} Grand County Assured Housing Feasibility Study completed by BAE Urban Economics in 2018.
\textsuperscript{4} The 2017 median household income data is taken from ESRI. This is different from the HUD Area Median Family Income (HAMFI), which is based on a four-person family household and was $56,700 in 2017. The median household income described here accounts for all households of all different sizes, including non-family households.
K. The HDH Overlay was developed over a two-year period that involved dozens of public meetings, workshops, open houses, and public hearings; Public input greatly informed the overlay regulations and map boundaries.

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission is statutorily responsible for making recommendations to the County Council regarding textual amendments to the LUC;

WHEREAS, the Grand County Planning Commission held a public hearing on September 25, 2018 to solicit public comment on a draft high density housing (HDH) overlay ordinance and recommended approval to the County Council; and,

WHEREAS, the Grand County Council held a public hearing on November 7, 2018 to solicit public comment on a draft assured housing ordinance and voted to approve said ordinance;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, Section 4.7 of the Grand County LUC shall read:

See attached Section 4.7 High Density Housing (HDH) Overlay Districts in Appendix A.

PASSED, ADOPTED, AND APPROVED by Grand County Council in a regular public meeting on December 18, 2018 by the following vote:

Those voting aye: ________________________________

Those voting nay: ________________________________

Those absent: __________________________________

ATTEST: GRAND COUNTY COUNCIL

______________________________________________

Diana Carroll, Clerk/Auditor

______________________________________________

Mary McGann, Chair
Appendix A
Section 6.15 High Density Housing (HDH) Overlay Districts

Insert adopted version of regulations and map here following Council action.
### 2018 GRAND COUNTY HONEY BEE INSPECTION SUMMARY

- I made about 20 inspection/assist calls to 12 beekeepers and dealt with countless email and phone inquiries in 2018.

- Losses were fairly heavy over the summer due to a parasitic mite and the viruses it transmits and I expect more over the winter.

- Two cases of highly contagious American Foulbrood were found among migratory colonies brought into Green River for melon pollination. The colonies were removed by the beekeeper to be incinerated in Salt Lake City. Follow-up inspections of hives in Green River owned by a Grand County beekeeper did not reveal any contamination from the diseased hives. (Grand County Ordinance 531 from 2015 prohibits migratory colonies in the county south of I-70 but allows them north of I-70 for pre-existing melon pollination. (The ordinance does not prohibit bringing individual colonies or queens into the county.)

- I continue to collect samples of wild honey bees in Grand and San Juan Counties and to date about half of the colonies from Grand and San Juan Counties have tested positive for African genes, BUT none of those colonies have tested have exhibited the extreme defensive behavior that corresponds with the so-called “African Killer Bee.”

  It appears that interbreeding with our domestic European stock, climate and/or altitude may be moderating their behavior. At this point, Africanized bees in Grand County do not appear to be a concern, but they should continue to be monitored.

- The consensus among honey bee scientists is that colony loses are the result of four interacting factors (the “Four P’s”) – Parasites (a mite is clearly number one), Pathogens (viruses carried by the mites), Pesticides (both agricultural and household), and Poor Nutrition (loss of flowering habitat).
AGENDA SUMMARY

GRAND COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING

JANUARY 15th, 2019

Title: Presentation on Housing Rehab Program information for elderly, disabled, and low income households in Grand County

Fiscal Impact: None

Presenter(s): Barbara Fausett and Dawna Houskeeper, Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments.

Prepared By:
Barbara Fausett
SEUALG
Housing Rehab Program Manager
375 So Carbon Avenue
Price, UT 84501
bfausett@seualg.utah.gov
435-613-0026

For Office Use Only:
Attorney Review:
NA

Background:
Housing Rehab Program assists the elderly, disabled and low income households with children under 10 to remain in their homes in a decent, safe and sanitary manner. Many households are unable to maintain their home due to being elderly and disabled or have to ability to afford to hire someone to make there home a safe place to live. Many of the households we have assisted have roofs that leak and may have received a letter from their insurance company cancelling them due to the deferred maintenance on their home, where they no longer can physically do the work themselves or don't have the ability to afford these costly repairs. Some have expensive utilities because the windows in their home have outlived their useful life and need replaced. Some are homebound and need a walk-in shower because they can no longer get in and out of a bathtub without the risk of falling. They may need a wheelchair ramp to get in and out of their home.

Attachment(s):
Housing Rehab Flyer
# Housing Rehab Program

The Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments offers 3 housing rehab programs to income qualified households. The basic requirements for both programs are:

- Applicant's household must be income qualified. All household members’ income must be included in the income determination.
- Applicant(s) must own the home & the property’s title must be in the name of the applicants.
- Mobile homes must be permanently affixed to the property. Mobile homes in mobile home parks are not eligible for these programs.
- Mobile/manufactured homes must be built after 1976 to be eligible for the Housing Rehab Program.
- The home must meet basic housing codes and HUD standards.
- Applicants do not have to have perfect credit ratings but cannot have active any outstanding unpaid judgments on their credit reports & all property taxes must be current.
- The SEUALG provides free start-to-finish assistance in the rehab project
- Funding from all sources can be combined to complete your rehabilitation project.

## CDBG Housing Repair Program

- Applicants may receive a grant of up to $10,000 (the underwriting process determines the amount needed).
- Applicant's income must be 60% or less of area median income.
- One or more of the following situations must apply:
  1. Applicant and spouse are over 62yrs old, or:
  2. Applicant has dependent children 10yrs of age or younger living permanently in the home, or:
  3. A permanent household member has a diagnosed disability that requires minor modifications to the home to accommodate the disability.

- Rehabilitation is targeted to health, safety, and code violation concerns such as minor electrical, heating, roofing, hot water heaters, sewer/water lines, septic cleanout & repair, broken windows, ADA modifications, etc.
- A client may participate in this program only once in a lifetime.
- If more extensive work is required the client may participate in the OWHLF program described in the next column along with the CDBG grant.

## OWHLF Rehab Program

- Applicants may receive funding for major home rehabilitation in the form of a low-interest loan.
- Applicant applies to the Olen Walker Housing Loan Fund (State) through the SEUALG.
- Interest rate is based on income, currently from 1% to 3%
- Mortgage terms have a monthly payment under 30% of household income, allowing for a mortgage payment, taxes & insurance.
- The maximum mortgage, must not exceed 95% of the improved value of the property.
- A grant up to $10,000 in CDBG funds for clients using the Olen Walker Housing Loan Fund - Housing Rehabilitation Program. The amount of the grant will depend on income & the extent of the repairs. The grant must be used for the repairs of code violations, health & safety needs, & disability adaptations.
- In order to comply with federal regulations the grant will be in the form of a declining value silent lien (no interest, no payments required) over a period of up to 5 years, at which point is forgiven. This lien is also forgiven upon death of the homeowners.

The SEUALG, along with the OWHLF and CDBG are partnering with USDA Rural Development’s 504 Grant/Loan, to expand housing rehabilitation program availability for district residents. Housing rehabilitation funds are also available through Rural Development and be applied for through the SEUALG. All technical assistance is available to Rural Development clients.

- Clients must be at or below 60% of area median income
- Low interest loans (1% - 3%) are available up to 95% Loan to Value
- Under certain circumstances partial grants (including the District's CDBG program) may be available.

Further information and/or an application for either program can be obtained by contacting:

Dawna Houskeeper, Program Coordinator at: Phone-435-613-0031  
Barbara Fausett, Program Manager at: Phone-435 613-0026  
E-mail: bfausett@seualg.utah.gov or dhouskeeper@seualg.utah.gov
### Agenda Item: D

**Title:** Adopting proposed resolution and a request for unbudgeted funding for the Rural Diversification Project, in the amount of $1,000 for the next three years totaling $3,000

**Fiscal Impact:** $1,000.00, for the next 3 years (total $3,000.00)

**Presenter(s):** Geri Gamber, Executive Director, SEUALG

**Recommendation:**
I move to adopt proposed resolution and a request for unbudgeted funding for the Rural Diversification Project, in the amount of $1,000 for the next three years totaling $3,000, and authorize the Chair to sign all associated documents.

**Background:**
- **Phase 1: Program Development and Outreach**—Activities to include; identifying businesses in the 4 Counties, developing and distributing informational material, and determining the interest of business participation.
- **Phase 2: Conduct Introductory Training on Diversification**—Activities to include; preliminary training in ISO9001 & AS9100, NIST 800-171, Global Marketing, Online Sales, and Government Contracting.
- **Phase 3: Certification Obtainment**—Activities to include; Attainment of certification in ISO9001 & AS9100 (MEP), Global Business Management Certificate, and Web Business Certification of Proficiency.

**Attachment(s):**
1. Proposed letter of support
2. Proposed Resolution (to be provided)
December 21, 2018

Councilman Curtis Wells
Grand County
125 East Center Street
Moab, UT 84532

Dear Councilman Wells:

On behalf of the Uintah, Duchesne, Carbon, Emery, Grand and San Juan Counties, SEU EDD is submitting a request for EDA funding for the Rural Diversification Project, which will aid in the effort to support the rural economies by offering local training for manufacturing certifications and online instruction for E-commerce and global marketing. Partnering with industry, the project will execute viable and impactful activities to address the following needs to increase economic development in rural Utah:

1. Reduce unemployment
2. Support and expand capabilities in local existing businesses
3. Connect industry with outreach activities / services
4. Measure the supported activities to quantify success

The scope of work for The Rural Diversification Project will consist of three phases to assist the region in the diversification process.

**Phase 1: Program Development and Outreach**—Activities to include; identifying businesses in the 4 Counties, developing and distributing informational material, and determining the interest of business participation.

**Phase 2: Conduct Introductory Training on Diversification**—Activities to include; preliminary training in ISO9001 & AS9100, NIST 800-171, Global Marketing, Online Sales, and Government Contracting.

**Phase 3: Certification Obtainment**—Activities to include; Attainment of certification in ISO9001 & AS9100 (MEP), Global Business Management Certificate SLCC, and Web Business Certification of Proficiency (USU). Other activities will involve efforts to identify best practices to be replicated in other counties, determine a reporting mechanism for data on program success, establish a framework for future funds, and plan other rural tours depending on success outcomes.

In order to qualify for EDA funds the project must show 50% matching funds. The estimated cost of the project is $100,000, which requires $100,000 to come from non-EDA monies. We would appreciate a $1,000 commitment from each partner per year for three year total. Below is a place to sign in lieu of a formal letter of commitment. Please consider any and all assistance you can provide. The counties in this region are fortunate to have supportive and proactive partners and we highly value these relationships. SEUALG commits to using approved EDA funding to ensure that the Rural Diversification Project will be the impetus to bringing long term economic growth to the region.

Sincerely,

Geri Gamber
Executive Director

Grand County will contribute $1,000 for the next three years (2018, 2019, 2020) for Rural Diversification Project.
AGENDA SUMMARY
GRAND COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING
JANUARY 15th, 2019

Agenda Item: E

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE:</th>
<th>Approving additions to the 2018 Property Tax Abatements and Cancelations.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FISCAL IMPACT:</td>
<td>The impact, spread across all taxing entities, is $25,046.40 of which $6,122.48 will be reimbursed by the State for a final impact of $18,923.92.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESENTER(S):</td>
<td>Chris Kauffman, Grand County Treasurer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RECOMMENDATION:**
I move to approve the additional 2018 property tax abatements and cancellations as presented, and authorize the Chair to sign all associated documents.

**BACKGROUND:**
The Council approved abatements and cancellations during the October 2nd meeting prior to tax bills being mailed. The additional abatements and cancellations will cover everything from 9-26-2018 to 12/31/2018.

A handful of additional real and personal property abatements for disabled veterans, disabled low income individuals and low income seniors were accepted. Real property amounts totaled $13,751.94. $5,931.30, of which will be reimbursed by the State. Personal property amounts totaled $191.18, all of which will be reimbursed.

Cancelations totaled $11,103.28. The cancelations are detailed in the attachments and include $3,707.40 in recommended penalty cancelation (not shown on the District/Entity report), $15.83 in Personal Property write offs, $0.02 in prior year cancelations and $7380.03 in various other cancelations.

**ATTACHMENT(S):**
- Grand County Auditor’s District/Entity Abatement Report (Real Property covering all of 2018)
- Grand County Auditor’s District/Entity Abatement Report (Personal Property covering all of 2018)
- 2018 Additional Cancelations Summary
- Grand County Redemption Tax Receipts – showing only cancelations made for prior years from 9-26-18 to 12-31-18.
# GRAND COUNTY
## Auditor's District/Entity Abatement Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Code &amp; Name</th>
<th>District Rate</th>
<th>Abatement Name</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Taxes Abated</th>
<th>Market Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001 MOAB CITY</td>
<td>0.010532</td>
<td>CIRCUIT BREAKER</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>37,197.67</td>
<td>3,531,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>COMMISSION ADJUSTMENT</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>INDIGENT</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>7,532.33</td>
<td>715,182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20% CIRCUIT BREAKER</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>20,833.68</td>
<td>1,978,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VETERANS</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30,604.57</td>
<td>2,905,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>District Totals:</strong></td>
<td>189</td>
<td><strong>96,170.86</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,131,298</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002 SPANISH VALLEY</td>
<td>0.010532</td>
<td>BLIND</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>363.36</td>
<td>34,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CIRCUIT BREAKER</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>21,424.06</td>
<td>2,034,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>COMMISSION ADJUSTMENT</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5,242.07</td>
<td>497,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>INDIGENT</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5,551.58</td>
<td>527,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20% CIRCUIT BREAKER</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11,189.82</td>
<td>1,062,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VETERANS</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26,770.16</td>
<td>2,541,793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>District Totals:</strong></td>
<td>158</td>
<td><strong>70,541.05</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,697,777</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003 MOAB CITY MMA</td>
<td>0.010532</td>
<td>BLIND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>121.12</td>
<td>11,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CIRCUIT BREAKER</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>860.00</td>
<td>81,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20% CIRCUIT BREAKER</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>343.94</td>
<td>32,657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>District Totals:</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>1,325.06</strong></td>
<td><strong>125,813</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004 COUNTY GENERAL</td>
<td>0.009900</td>
<td>CIRCUIT BREAKER</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,153.38</td>
<td>116,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>COMMISSION ADJUSTMENT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,714.39</td>
<td>173,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20% CIRCUIT BREAKER</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>278.02</td>
<td>28,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VETERANS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,903.55</td>
<td>192,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>District Totals:</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td><strong>5,049.34</strong></td>
<td><strong>510,035</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>005 ELGIN MOSQUITO ABATEMENT</td>
<td>0.009900</td>
<td>CIRCUIT BREAKER</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>481.00</td>
<td>48,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>District Totals:</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>481.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>48,586</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006 CASTLE VALLEY FIRE</td>
<td>0.010313</td>
<td>COMMISSION ADJUSTMENT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007 THOMPSON WATER DISTRICT</td>
<td>0.009900</td>
<td>VETERANS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>150.15</td>
<td>15,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>District Totals:</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>152.23</strong></td>
<td><strong>15,377</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008 GREEN RIVER CITY</td>
<td>0.009812</td>
<td>CIRCUIT BREAKER</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8,005.03</td>
<td>645,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>009 TOWN OF CASTLE VALLEY</td>
<td>0.012410</td>
<td>COMMISSION ADJUSTMENT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>426.92</td>
<td>34,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>INDIGENT</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>835.61</td>
<td>67,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20% CIRCUIT BREAKER</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2,758.40</td>
<td>222,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VETERANS</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13,503.08</td>
<td>1,088,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>District Totals:</strong></td>
<td>40</td>
<td><strong>25,529.04</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,057,135</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

011 ARCHES SPECIAL SERVICE DIST 0.010532
021 DIST 21 | 0.010532
022 DIST 22 | 0.010532
023 DIST 23 | 0.010532
024 DIST 24 | 0.009900
025 DIST 25 | 0.009900
026 DIST 26 | 0.010313
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Code &amp; Name</th>
<th>District Rate</th>
<th>Abatement Name</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Taxes Abated</th>
<th>Market Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>027 DIST 27</td>
<td>0.009900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>028 DIST 28</td>
<td>0.009812</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>029 DIST 29</td>
<td>0.012410</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>031 STATE ASSESSED &amp; SVWS &amp; MC</td>
<td>0.010532</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>034 STATE ASSESSED &amp; SVWS</td>
<td>0.009900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>038 STATE ASSESSED &amp; GRC &amp; EMA</td>
<td>0.009812</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>048 STATE ASSESSED &amp; GRC</td>
<td>0.009812</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLIND</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>484.48</td>
<td></td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIRCUIT BREAKER</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>69,121.14</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,457,848</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMISSION ADJUSTMENT</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7,388.07</td>
<td></td>
<td>705,755</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIGENT</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>13,919.52</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,309,633</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% CIRCUIT BREAKER</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>35,403.86</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,323,601</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VETERANS</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>72,931.51</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,743,184</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Totals:</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>199,248.58</td>
<td></td>
<td>18,586,021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entity Code &amp; Name</td>
<td>Entity Rate</td>
<td>Abatement Name</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Taxes Abated</td>
<td>Market Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 CASTLE VALLEY FIRE</td>
<td>0.000413</td>
<td>CIRCUIT BREAKER</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>266.40</td>
<td>645,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>COMMISSION ADJUSTMENT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.21</td>
<td>34,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>INDIGENT</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27.81</td>
<td>67,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20% CIRCUIT BREAKER</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>91.80</td>
<td>222,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VETERANS</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>449.38</td>
<td>1,088,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Entity Totals:</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>849.60</td>
<td>2,057,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07 TOWN OF CASTLE VALLEY</td>
<td>0.002097</td>
<td>CIRCUIT BREAKER</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1,352.66</td>
<td>645,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>COMMISSION ADJUSTMENT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>72.14</td>
<td>34,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>INDIGENT</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>141.20</td>
<td>67,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20% CIRCUIT BREAKER</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>466.11</td>
<td>222,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VETERANS</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2,281.70</td>
<td>1,088,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Entity Totals:</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4,313.81</td>
<td>2,057,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 GRAND COUNTY GENERAL</td>
<td>0.001512</td>
<td>BLIND</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>69.55</td>
<td>46,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CIRCUIT BREAKER</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>9,764.26</td>
<td>6,457,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>COMMISSION ADJUSTMENT</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1,067.09</td>
<td>705,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>INDIGENT</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1,980.17</td>
<td>1,309,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20% CIRCUIT BREAKER</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>5,025.29</td>
<td>3,323,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VETERANS</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>10,195.69</td>
<td>6,743,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Entity Totals:</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>28,102.05</td>
<td>18,586,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 SCHOOL - GENERAL</td>
<td>0.005510</td>
<td>BLIND</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>253.47</td>
<td>46,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CIRCUIT BREAKER</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>35,582.75</td>
<td>6,457,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>COMMISSION ADJUSTMENT</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3,888.73</td>
<td>705,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>INDIGENT</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>7,216.09</td>
<td>1,309,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20% CIRCUIT BREAKER</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>18,313.05</td>
<td>3,323,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VETERANS</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>37,154.94</td>
<td>6,743,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Entity Totals:</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>102,409.03</td>
<td>18,586,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 SCHOOL - STATE BASIC LEVY</td>
<td>0.001666</td>
<td>BLIND</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>76.64</td>
<td>46,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CIRCUIT BREAKER</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>10,758.78</td>
<td>6,457,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>COMMISSION ADJUSTMENT</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1,175.78</td>
<td>705,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>INDIGENT</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2,181.85</td>
<td>1,309,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20% CIRCUIT BREAKER</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>5,537.14</td>
<td>3,323,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VETERANS</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>11,234.14</td>
<td>6,743,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Entity Totals:</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>30,964.33</td>
<td>18,586,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 GRAND COUNTY - DEBT</td>
<td>0.000103</td>
<td>BLIND</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>46,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CIRCUIT BREAKER</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>665.15</td>
<td>6,457,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>COMMISSION ADJUSTMENT</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>72.70</td>
<td>705,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>INDIGENT</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>134.89</td>
<td>1,309,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20% CIRCUIT BREAKER</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>342.32</td>
<td>3,323,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VETERANS</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>694.53</td>
<td>6,743,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Entity Totals:</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>1,914.32</td>
<td>18,586,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 MULTICOUNTY ASSESSING &amp; CO</td>
<td>0.000009</td>
<td>BLIND</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>46,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CIRCUIT BREAKER</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>58.13</td>
<td>6,457,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>COMMISSION ADJUSTMENT</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>705,755</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## GRAND COUNTY

**Auditor's District/Entity Abatement Report**

### Entity Totals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity Code &amp; Name</th>
<th>Entity Rate</th>
<th>Abatement Name</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Taxes Abated</th>
<th>Market Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INDIGENT</td>
<td>11.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,309,633</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% CIRCUIT BREAKER</td>
<td>29.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,323,601</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VETERANS</td>
<td>60.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,743,184</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entity Totals:</strong></td>
<td><strong>167.27</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>403</strong></td>
<td><strong>18,586,021</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15 COUNTY A&C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity Code &amp; Name</th>
<th>Entity Rate</th>
<th>Abatement Name</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Taxes Abated</th>
<th>Market Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BLIND</td>
<td>17.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIRCUIT BREAKER</td>
<td>2,466.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,457,848</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMISSION ADJUSTMENT</td>
<td>269.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>705,755</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIGENT</td>
<td>500.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,309,633</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% CIRCUIT BREAKER</td>
<td>1,269.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,323,601</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VETERANS</td>
<td>2,575.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,743,184</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entity Totals:</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,099.84</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>403</strong></td>
<td><strong>18,586,021</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16 LIBRARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity Code &amp; Name</th>
<th>Entity Rate</th>
<th>Abatement Name</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Taxes Abated</th>
<th>Market Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BLIND</td>
<td>17.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIRCUIT BREAKER</td>
<td>2,479.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,457,848</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMISSION ADJUSTMENT</td>
<td>271.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>705,755</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIGENT</td>
<td>502.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,309,633</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% CIRCUIT BREAKER</td>
<td>1,276.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,323,601</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VETERANS</td>
<td>2,589.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,743,184</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entity Totals:</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,137.04</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>403</strong></td>
<td><strong>18,586,021</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17 GRAND COUNTY CEMETERY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity Code &amp; Name</th>
<th>Entity Rate</th>
<th>Abatement Name</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Taxes Abated</th>
<th>Market Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BLIND</td>
<td>8.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIRCUIT BREAKER</td>
<td>1,207.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,457,848</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMISSION ADJUSTMENT</td>
<td>244.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>705,755</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIGENT</td>
<td>621.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,309,633</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% CIRCUIT BREAKER</td>
<td>1,260.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,323,601</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VETERANS</td>
<td>2,589.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,743,184</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entity Totals:</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,475.60</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>403</strong></td>
<td><strong>18,586,021</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20 MOAB MOSQUITO ABATEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity Code &amp; Name</th>
<th>Entity Rate</th>
<th>Abatement Name</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Taxes Abated</th>
<th>Market Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BLIND</td>
<td>8.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIRCUIT BREAKER</td>
<td>1,033.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,647,712</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMISSION ADJUSTMENT</td>
<td>91.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>497,973</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIGENT</td>
<td>227.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,242,299</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% CIRCUIT BREAKER</td>
<td>562.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,073,246</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VETERANS</td>
<td>996.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,447,658</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entity Totals:</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,919.74</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>350</strong></td>
<td><strong>15,954,888</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21 MOAB VALLEY FIRE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity Code &amp; Name</th>
<th>Entity Rate</th>
<th>Abatement Name</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Taxes Abated</th>
<th>Market Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BLIND</td>
<td>20.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIRCUIT BREAKER</td>
<td>2,535.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,647,712</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMISSION ADJUSTMENT</td>
<td>223.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>497,973</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIGENT</td>
<td>557.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,242,299</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% CIRCUIT BREAKER</td>
<td>1,379.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,073,246</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VETERANS</td>
<td>2,445.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,447,658</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entity Totals:</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,163.72</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>350</strong></td>
<td><strong>15,954,888</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23 CHARTER SCHOOL STATE LEVY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity Code &amp; Name</th>
<th>Entity Rate</th>
<th>Abatement Name</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Taxes Abated</th>
<th>Market Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BLIND</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIRCUIT BREAKER</td>
<td>381.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,457,848</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMISSION ADJUSTMENT</td>
<td>41.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>705,755</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIGENT</td>
<td>77.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,309,633</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% CIRCUIT BREAKER</td>
<td>196.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,323,601</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### GRAND COUNTY

Audit's District/Entity Abatement Report

**01/10/2019 06:11PM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity Code &amp; Name</th>
<th>Entity Rate</th>
<th>Abatement Name</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Taxes Abated</th>
<th>Market Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VETERANS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>397.85</td>
<td>6,743,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entity Totals:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>403</td>
<td>1,096.60</td>
<td>18,586,021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25 LIBRARY - DEBT 0.000088

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity Code &amp; Name</th>
<th>Entity Rate</th>
<th>Abatement Name</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Taxes Abated</th>
<th>Market Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BLIND</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>46,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIRCUIT BREAKER</td>
<td>124</td>
<td></td>
<td>568.29</td>
<td>6,457,848</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMISSION ADJUSTMENT</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>62.11</td>
<td>705,755</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIGENT</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td>115.26</td>
<td>1,309,633</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% CIRCUIT BREAKER</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td>292.48</td>
<td>3,323,601</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VETERANS</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td>593.40</td>
<td>6,743,184</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entity Totals:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>403</td>
<td>1,635.59</td>
<td>18,586,021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity Code &amp; Name</th>
<th>Entity Rate</th>
<th>Abatement Name</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Taxes Abated</th>
<th>Market Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BLIND</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td>484.47</td>
<td>552,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIRCUIT BREAKER</td>
<td>1,482</td>
<td></td>
<td>69,121.13</td>
<td>77,163,998</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMISSION ADJUSTMENT</td>
<td>410</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,388.06</td>
<td>8,122,298</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIGENT</td>
<td>912</td>
<td></td>
<td>13,919.54</td>
<td>15,715,596</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% CIRCUIT BREAKER</td>
<td>1,186</td>
<td></td>
<td>35,403.86</td>
<td>39,827,046</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VETERANS</td>
<td>772</td>
<td></td>
<td>72,931.48</td>
<td>80,503,318</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Totals:</td>
<td>4,810</td>
<td></td>
<td>199,248.54</td>
<td>221,884,256</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## GRAND COUNTY
### Auditor's District/Entity Abatement Report

**01/10/2019 04:13PM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Code &amp; Name</th>
<th>District Rate</th>
<th>Abatement Name</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Taxes Abated</th>
<th>Market Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001 MOAB CITY</td>
<td>0.010909</td>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>279.98</td>
<td>25,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indigent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55.20</td>
<td>5,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Circuit Breaker</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1,398.30</td>
<td>128,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Write Off</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>32.07</td>
<td>2,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>District Totals:</strong></td>
<td>73</td>
<td><strong>1,765.55</strong></td>
<td><strong>161,846</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002 SPANISH VALLEY</td>
<td>0.010909</td>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>280.14</td>
<td>25,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Circuit Breaker</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>61.80</td>
<td>5,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Write Off</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14.11</td>
<td>1,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>District Totals:</strong></td>
<td>37</td>
<td><strong>356.05</strong></td>
<td><strong>32,644</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003 MOAB CITY MMA</td>
<td>0.010909</td>
<td>Write Off</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>District Totals:</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>0.03</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004 COUNTY GENERAL</td>
<td>0.010162</td>
<td>Write Off</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>District Totals:</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>1.37</strong></td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>005 ELGIN MOSQUITO ABATEMENT</td>
<td>0.010162</td>
<td>Write Off</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006 CASTLE VALLEY FIRE</td>
<td>0.010594</td>
<td><strong>District Totals:</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>0.04</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007 THOMPSON WATER DISTRICT</td>
<td>0.010162</td>
<td>Write Off</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>District Totals:</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>2.08</strong></td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008 GREEN RIVER CITY</td>
<td>0.010054</td>
<td>Write Off</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>009 TOWN OF CASTLE VALLEY</td>
<td>0.012676</td>
<td><strong>District Totals:</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>4.70</strong></td>
<td><strong>371</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>011 ARCHES SPECIAL SERVICE DIST</td>
<td>0.010909</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>021 DIST 21</td>
<td>0.010909</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>022 DIST 22</td>
<td>0.010909</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>023 DIST 23</td>
<td>0.010909</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>024 DIST 24</td>
<td>0.010162</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>025 DIST 25</td>
<td>0.010162</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>026 DIST 26</td>
<td>0.010594</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>027 DIST 27</td>
<td>0.010162</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>028 DIST 28</td>
<td>0.010054</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>029 DIST 29</td>
<td>0.012676</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>031 STATE ASSESSED &amp; SVWS &amp; MC</td>
<td>0.010909</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>034 STATE ASSESSED &amp; SVWS</td>
<td>0.010162</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>038 STATE ASSESSED &amp; GRC &amp; EMA</td>
<td>0.010054</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>048 STATE ASSESSED &amp; GRC</td>
<td>0.010054</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Blind</th>
<th>Veteran</th>
<th>Indigent</th>
<th>Cancellation Tax</th>
<th>Cancellation Penalty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>560.12</td>
<td>55.20</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### GRAND COUNTY

#### Auditor's District/Entity Abatement Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Code &amp; Name</th>
<th>District Rate</th>
<th>Abatement Name</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Taxes Abated</th>
<th>Market Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cancellation Interest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% Home Owner Credit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circuit Breaker</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1,460.10</td>
<td>133,843</td>
<td>1,460.10</td>
<td>133,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write Off</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>54.40</td>
<td>4,959</td>
<td>54.40</td>
<td>4,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Totals:</strong></td>
<td><strong>120</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,129.82</strong></td>
<td><strong>195,207</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,129.82</strong></td>
<td><strong>195,207</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entity Code &amp; Name</td>
<td>Entity Rate</td>
<td>Abatement Name</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Taxes Abated</td>
<td>Market Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 CASTLE VALLEY FIRE</td>
<td>0.000432</td>
<td>Write Off</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Entity Totals:</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07 TOWN OF CASTLE VALLEY</td>
<td>0.002082</td>
<td>Write Off</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Entity Totals:</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 GRAND COUNTY GENERAL</td>
<td>0.001785</td>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>91.65</td>
<td>51,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indigent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.03</td>
<td>5,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Circuit Breaker</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>238.91</td>
<td>133,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Write Off</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>8.84</td>
<td>4,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Entity Totals:</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>348.43</td>
<td>195,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 SCHOOL - GENERAL</td>
<td>0.005310</td>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>272.64</td>
<td>51,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indigent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26.87</td>
<td>5,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Circuit Breaker</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>710.71</td>
<td>133,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Write Off</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>26.29</td>
<td>4,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Entity Totals:</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1,036.51</td>
<td>195,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 SCHOOL - STATE BASIC LEVY</td>
<td>0.001568</td>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80.51</td>
<td>51,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indigent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.93</td>
<td>5,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Circuit Breaker</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>209.86</td>
<td>133,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Write Off</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>7.76</td>
<td>4,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Entity Totals:</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>306.06</td>
<td>195,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 GRAND COUNTY - DEBT</td>
<td>0.000125</td>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>51,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indigent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>5,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Circuit Breaker</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.73</td>
<td>133,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Write Off</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>4,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Entity Totals:</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>24.41</td>
<td>195,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 STATE A&amp;C</td>
<td>0.000010</td>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>51,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indigent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>5,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Circuit Breaker</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>133,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Write Off</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>4,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Entity Totals:</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>195,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 COUNTY A&amp;C</td>
<td>0.000451</td>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23.15</td>
<td>51,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indigent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>5,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Circuit Breaker</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>60.36</td>
<td>133,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Write Off</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>4,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Entity Totals:</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>88.02</td>
<td>195,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 LIBRARY</td>
<td>0.000453</td>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23.26</td>
<td>51,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indigent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>5,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Circuit Breaker</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>60.63</td>
<td>133,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Write Off</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>4,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entity Code &amp; Name</td>
<td>Entity Rate</td>
<td>Abatement Name</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Taxes Abated</td>
<td>Market Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entity Totals:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
<td>88.42</td>
<td>195,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 GRAND COUNTY CEMETERY</td>
<td>0.000221</td>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.35</td>
<td>51,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indigent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>5,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Circuit Breaker</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29.58</td>
<td>133,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Write Off</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>4,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Entity Totals:</strong></td>
<td>120</td>
<td>43.15</td>
<td>195,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 WATER CONSERVANCY</td>
<td>0.000064</td>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>51,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indigent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>5,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Circuit Breaker</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.56</td>
<td>133,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Write Off</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>4,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Entity Totals:</strong></td>
<td>120</td>
<td>12.47</td>
<td>195,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 MOAB MOSQUITO ABATEMENT</td>
<td>0.000216</td>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.09</td>
<td>51,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indigent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>5,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Circuit Breaker</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28.91</td>
<td>133,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Write Off</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>4,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Entity Totals:</strong></td>
<td>111</td>
<td>42.00</td>
<td>194,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 MOAB VALLEY FIRE</td>
<td>0.000531</td>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27.27</td>
<td>51,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indigent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>5,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Circuit Breaker</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>71.07</td>
<td>133,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Write Off</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>4,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Entity Totals:</strong></td>
<td>111</td>
<td>103.28</td>
<td>194,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 CHARTER SCHOOL STATE LEVY</td>
<td>0.000067</td>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>51,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indigent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>5,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Circuit Breaker</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.97</td>
<td>133,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Write Off</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>4,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Entity Totals:</strong></td>
<td>120</td>
<td>13.08</td>
<td>195,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 LIBRARY - DEBT</td>
<td>0.000108</td>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>51,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indigent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>5,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Circuit Breaker</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14.45</td>
<td>133,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Write Off</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>4,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Entity Totals:</strong></td>
<td>120</td>
<td>21.07</td>
<td>195,207</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                  |         | Blind         | 0     | 0.00         | 0            |
|                  |         | Veteran       | 52    | 560.12       | 667,485      |
|                  |         | Indigent      | 13    | 55.19        | 65,780       |
|                  |         | Cancellation Tax| 0   | 0.00         | 0            |
|                  |         | Cancellation Penalty| 0 | 0.00        | 0            |
|                  |         | Cancellation Interest| 0 | 0.00        | 0            |
|                  |         | 20% Home Owner Credit| 0 | 0.00        | 0            |
|                  |         | Circuit Breaker| 143   | 1,460.08     | 1,739,959    |
|                  |         | Write Off     | 1,341 | 54.39       | 63,785       |
|                  |         | **Grand Totals:** | 1,549 | 2,129.78  | 2,537,009   |
### 2018 Additional Cancelations Summary
9-26-2018 to 12-31-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Current Amount</th>
<th>Prior Year Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Redemptions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-OJAC-0001</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$ 0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Current Amount</th>
<th>Prior Year Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Year</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09-0000-0283</td>
<td>$ 0.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0SGV-0072</td>
<td>$ 0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09-0000-0013</td>
<td>$ 426.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0SGV-0045</td>
<td>$ 87.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0SGV-0044</td>
<td>$ 341.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0SGV-0042</td>
<td>$ 286.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-OLAN-0001</td>
<td>$ 295.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0SGV-0033</td>
<td>$ 307.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0SGV-0031</td>
<td>$ 85.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0007-0141</td>
<td>$ 170.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0SGV-0041</td>
<td>$ 267.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0SGV-0032</td>
<td>$ 419.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-OCLR-0002</td>
<td>$ 1,390.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-0006-0039</td>
<td>$ 0.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09-0000-0218</td>
<td>$ 0.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-0021-0140</td>
<td>$ 2.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0022-0083</td>
<td>$ 0.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0088</td>
<td>$ 3.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0130</td>
<td>$ 0.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-0MOV-0041</td>
<td>$ 0.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-0b05-0001</td>
<td>$ 1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04-0023-0145</td>
<td>$ 0.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-0035-0006</td>
<td>$ 0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0021-0050</td>
<td>$ 1,465.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-0012-0031</td>
<td>$ 0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-Osce-0009</td>
<td>$ 0.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-0021-0120</td>
<td>$ 0.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04-0025-0088</td>
<td>$ 1,712.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-ORDC-0033</td>
<td>$ 13.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-ORIM-0063</td>
<td>$ 85.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-OTIE-0002</td>
<td>$ 16.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 7,380.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Penalty**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02-0020-0102</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-0XST-0037</td>
<td>$2,948.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-0XST-0135</td>
<td>$372.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-0002-0018</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0015-0026</td>
<td>$12.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04-0025-0088</td>
<td>$13.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09-0000-0324</td>
<td>$12.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-0MBW-0001</td>
<td>$26.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-0SOU-0005</td>
<td>$29.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0020-0116</td>
<td>$21.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0PE6-0002</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-0001-0069</td>
<td>$85.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-0001-0070</td>
<td>$24.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0008-0025</td>
<td>$19.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0008-0026</td>
<td>$15.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0018-0002</td>
<td>$25.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0RMV-0013</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-0017-0006</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-0020-0010</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-0020-0013</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-0021-0098</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-0020-0030</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-0020-0049</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,707.40</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>short</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Owed less than $4.50 before tax bills sent. |
| short |

| Property sold to Castle Valley Fire District, prorated cancelation. |
| Entered after presentation - CINEMA COURT FIRE |
| Entered after presentation - CINEMA COURT FIRE |
| Entered after presentation - CINEMA COURT FIRE |
| Entered after presentation - CINEMA COURT FIRE |
| Entered after presentation - CINEMA COURT FIRE |
| Entered after presentation - CINEMA COURT FIRE |
| Entered after presentation - CINEMA COURT FIRE |
| Entered after presentation - CINEMA COURT FIRE |
| Tax Exempt entity purchased property May 11th. |
| short |
| short |
| short |
| short |
| short |
| short |
| short |
| short |
| short |
| short |
| Error in acreage and valuation per Assessor |
| short |
| short |
| short |

<p>| Valuation error per Assessor, not commercial property |
| Software error, incorrectly added personal property value |
| Software error, incorrectly added personal property value |
| Software error, incorrectly added personal property value |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Check error, transposed numbers on 11/29 pmt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court ordered, payments are in an escrow account pending settlement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court ordered, payments are in an escrow account pending settlement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Abatement after settlement of parcel mix up.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortgage didn't pay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuation error per Assessor, not commercial property</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error in mailing address, per Recorder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortgage did not pay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortgage did not pay full amount</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortgage did not pay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error in mailing address, per Recorder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Bill Pay got lost in mail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Bill Pay got lost in mail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error in mailing address, per Recorder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error in penalty/interest notice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost in the mail, received proof of check sent timely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost in the mail, received proof of check sent timely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost in the mail, received proof of check sent timely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost in the mail, received proof of check sent timely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost in the mail, received proof of check sent timely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost in the mail, received proof of check sent timely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Parcel Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/15/2018</td>
<td>02-JAC-0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Receipt Totals:**

- Taxes: 0.02
- Penalty: 0.00
- Interest: 0.00
- Total Paid: 0.02

**Grand Total Collected:**

0.02

**Money Breakdown**

- Cash: 0.00
- Check: 0.02
- Charge/ACH: 0.00
- Money Total: 0.02
# AGENDA SUMMARY

## GRAND COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING

**January 15, 2019**

**AGENDA ITEM:** F

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approving the purchase buy back agreement between Grand County and Honnen equipment for one new John Deere 544L Loader.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

- $134,943 (within budget)
- Buy Back amount $134,944

**PRESENTER(S):** Bill Jackson Road Supervisor

---

**RECOMMENDATION:**

I move to approve the purchase buy back agreement between Grand County and Honnen equipment for one new John Deere 544L Loader in the amount of $134,943, and authorize Chair to sign all associated documents.

**BACKGROUND:**

The Council approved the 2019 Road Department budget which included the purchase of one new Loader. Honnen Equipment holds the Utah State buyback agreement under contract # PD929. Under this contract Honnen will buy back the loader one year after date of delivery for $134,944 less any repairs needed other than normal wear.

**Attachment(s):**

1. Honnen 544L Loader quote.
Customer Purchase Order for John Deere  
Construction and Forestry Products - USA  

PURCHASER NAME AND ADDRESS (First Signer)  

NAME (First, Middle, Last)  
GRAND COUNTY GOVERNMENT  
125 E CENTER ST  
CITY  
MOAB  
PHONE NUMBER  
435-260-2204  

DEALER NAME AND ADDRESS  

DEALER NAME  
Honnen Equipment Co.  
STREET or RR  
2358 I-70 Frontage Road  
CITY  
Grand  
STATE  
CO  
ZIP CODE  
81505  
PHONE NUMBER  
970-243-7090  

PURCHASER NAME AND ADDRESS (Second Signer)  

NAME (First, Middle, Last)  

PURCHASER TYPE:  I MARKET USE CODE:  
4 Use County 49 Highways & Streets  
Add Purchaser to Mailing List (Check One or More)  
[ ] Construction [ ] Utility [ ] Forestry [ ] Government  

PHOTO NUMBER  
CITY  
State  
ZIP CODE  
COUNTY  
MOAB  
GRAND  
81505  
19  

EXTENDED WARRANTY IS:  [ ] Accept [ ] Decline  
LOCATION OF FIRST WORKING USE :  
Use County GRAND  
Use State/Province UT  
COUNTY CODE 19  

Ultimate Uptime Package Purchase:  [ ] Yes [ ] No  

QTY TRADE-IN (Model, Size, Description)  
1  
JOHN DEERE 544L WHEEL LOADER  
+ John Deere Extended Warranty: 24 M / 1000 Hr PTH Gov  

EQUIPMENT (Model, Size, Description)  

HOURS OF USE  
PIN or Serial Number  
Delivered Cash Price  

$134,943.00  

(1) TOTAL CASH PRICE  
$134,943.00  

COMMENTS:  
1 Year Guarantee Buyback $134,944.00  

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS: Purchaser offers to sell, transfer, and convey the item(s) listed as “Trade In” to the Dealer at or prior to the time of delivery of the above product(s), as a “trade-in” to be applied against the cash price. Purchaser represents that each “trade-in” item shall be free and clear of all security interests, liens, and encumbrances at the time of transfer to the Dealer except to the extent shown below. The price to be allowed for each “trade-in” item is listed on this document. The Purchaser promises to pay the balance due (line 8) shown herein in cash, or to execute a Time Sale Agreement (Retail Installment Contract), or a Loan Agreement for the purchase price of the Product(s), plus additional charges shown thereon, or to execute a Lease Agreement, on or before delivery of the equipment ordered herein. Despite delivery of the Product(s) to the Purchaser, title shall remain with the Seller until one of the foregoing is accomplished. The Purchaser and the Dealer agree that this Purchase Order is not a security agreement and that delivery of the Product(s) to the Purchaser pursuant to this Purchase Order will not constitute possession of the Product(s) by the Purchaser, as a debtor, for the purposes of the purchase money security provisions in any statutes relating to personal property security or its equivalent. Purchaser understands that its rights in connection with this purchase are limited as set forth in this Purchase Order.

DISCLOSURE OF REGULATION APPLICABILITY: When operated in California, any off-road diesel vehicle may be subject to the California Air Resources Board In-Use Off-Road Diesel Vehicle Regulation. It therefore could be subject to retrofit or accelerated turnover requirements to reduce emissions of air pollutants. More information is available on the California Air Resources Board website at  
http://www.arb.ca.gov/msprog/ordiesel(ordiesel.htm) .

IMPORTANT WARRANTY NOTICE: The Standard Warranty for new John Deere construction and forestry products is set forth in a separate document provided by the dealer. Please read the Standard Warranty carefully before signing. No express warranty is made unless specified in the Warranty Statement. PURCHASER’S RIGHTS AND REMEDIES PERTAINING TO THIS PURCHASE ARE LIMITED AS INDICATED IN THE STANDARD WARRANTY AND PURCHASE ORDER. WHERE PERMITTED BY LAW, NO IMPLIED WARRANTY OF MERCHANTABILITY, CONDITIONS OR FITNESS IS MADE.
The undersigned purchaser(s) (the "Purchaser") hereby orders the product(s) (the "Product") described above from the Dealer. The Dealer shall not be liable for failure to provide the Product or for any delay in delivery if such failure or delay is due to the Dealer's inability to obtain such Product from the manufacturer or supplier or other cause beyond the Dealer's control. The cash price shown above is subject to the Dealer receiving the Product from the manufacturer or supplier prior to any change in price by the manufacturer or supplier and is also subject to any new or increased taxes being imposed upon the sale of the Product after the date of this Purchase Order.

TERMS & CONDITIONS VERIFICATION STATEMENT: Use of John Deere Data Services, if applicable, and all rights and obligations of John Deere and the Purchaser (or "Customer" as identified in the applicable agreement), are governed by the terms and conditions outlined in the Warranty Statement and the applicable John Deere Construction & Forestry Company Subscriptions & Data Services Dealer Agreement and/or Customer Data Services agreements available at www.JohnDeere.com/Agreements. Purchaser agrees to be bound by these terms and conditions if Purchaser activates or otherwise uses any of the Data Services. If Purchaser does not agree to these terms and conditions, Purchaser must not activate or otherwise use the Data Services.

Purchaser's signature below acknowledges the Purchaser has received a copy of the Standard Warranty, Version [ ] and understands its terms and conditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purchaser (First Signer)</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EVAN CLAPPER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purchaser (Second Signer)</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dealer Representative</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hoenen Equipment Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salesperson</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRADSHAW, TONY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DELIVERY ACKNOWLEDGEST Delivered with Operator's Manual On: [ ]

Purchaser Signature [ ]
STANDARD WARRANTY FOR NEW JOHN DEERE
CONSTRUCTION, UTILITY, AND FORESTRY PRODUCTS – US & Canada

- Construction, Forestry & Commercial Worksite Products*: 12 months Full Machine Standard Warranty
- * Commercial Worksite Products Delivered and settled on or after 01 June 2018: 24 months or 2000 hours (whichever comes first) Full Machine Standard Warranty
- C&E Series Pull-Type Scrapers: 6 months Full Machine Standard Warranty
- DC & DE Series Pull-Type Scrapers: 12 months Full Machine Standard Warranty
- Scraper Tractors: 24 Months or 2000 Hours (whichever occurs first) Full Machine Standard Warranty
- Forestry Attachments: 12 Months or 2000 Hours (whichever occurs first) Full Machine Standard Warranty
- Frontier Equipment: 6 months Full Machine Standard Warranty (90 days in rental applications)

The "Standard Warranty" is part of the warranty protection package available from John Deere Construction & Forestry Company (John Deere Limited in Canada) ("John Deere") to purchasers of new John Deere products ("product"):

STANDARD Warranty is John Deere’s standard new product warranty, described in this document, provided at no additional charge to the purchaser.

EXTENDED Warranty is a separate repair contract made available by John Deere for purchasers who wish to complement their Standard Warranty coverage. Complete Extended Warranty details, including coverage options and limitations, are set forth in the Application for Extended Warranty, which is available from authorized John Deere dealers.

STRUCTURAL Warranty applies to certain structural components as listed below and as described in this document.

FACTORY-INSTALLED UNDERCARRIAGE Warranty applies to certain undercarriage components as listed below and as described in this document.

A. STANDARD WARRANTY - GENERAL PROVISIONS
John Deere will repair or replace, at its option, any parts (except those specified below) of a new John Deere product that, as delivered to the original retail purchaser(s), are defective in material or workmanship. Performance of this warranty will be free of charge for parts and labor, except as otherwise stated below. Standard Warranty applies only to purchases from John Deere and authorized John Deere dealers and, except as otherwise provided in the next sentence and section L below, is extended only to the original retail purchaser of the product. Remaining Standard Warranty applicable to a used John Deere product is transferred to a subsequent purchaser of the product only if the subsequent purchaser requests a transfer from an authorized John Deere dealer before the product's Standard Warranty expires. Coverage begins on the date of delivery of the product to the original retail purchaser. For purposes of this warranty, a product that has been rented, used for demonstration purposes for 150 or more hours, or otherwise used prior to its original retail purchase has been "used" for the total duration of such use. Warranty statements required by law covering engine emissions-related parts and components are found on a separate written warranty certificate provided to the purchaser at the time of the original retail purchase.

B. WHAT IS COVERED BY STANDARD WARRANTY -
All parts of a new John Deere product (except those noted in Sections D and E below) are covered during the Standard Warranty period set out above.

C. EXCLUSIVE REMEDY -
The repair or replacement of covered parts or components that are defective, as provided in Sections A, B, D.2 and D.3 herein, shall be the purchaser's exclusive remedy for any defect in the product. However, if after repeated attempts such repair or replacement fails to correct the performance problem caused by the defect, the purchaser's sole remedy shall be a refund of the amount paid for the product (in exchange for a return of the product), excluding any transportation charges, license fees, taxes and insurance premiums, and less a reasonable allowance for use of the product prior to its return. In no event will the dealer, John Deere or any company affiliated with John Deere be liable for any incidental or consequential damages, including but not limited to loss of profits, rental of substitute equipment or other commercial loss. Correction of defects in the manner provided above shall constitute fulfillment of all liabilities of the Dealer, John Deere, or any company affiliated with John Deere to the purchaser or any other person, whether based upon contract, tort, strict liability, or otherwise. This limitation does not apply to claims for personal injury.
D. ITEMS COVERED SEPARATELY -

1. **Standard Warranty** does not apply to batteries, radios, tires, cameras, or to Cummins, MTU or Detroit Diesel Engines installed in John Deere products, which are covered by separate written warranties.

2. **Factory-Installed Undercarriage Warranty** covers all non-rubberized factory-installed undercarriage wear components for 3 years or 4,000 hours from the date of delivery to the original retail purchaser, whichever occurs first (unless terminated earlier under Section F, below). For purposes of this warranty, a product that has been used, rented, or for demonstration purposes for 150 or more hours, or otherwise used prior to its original retail purchase has been “used” for the total duration of such use. In addition to the items listed in section E below, Factory-Installed Undercarriage Warranty does not cover: failures due to wear, machine application, maintenance practices, or improper machine configuration; removal and installation labor; transportation or hauling costs; unauthorized or non-wear items; and rubberized undercarriage components such as rubber tracks. Warranty claims will be pro-rated based upon wear of the failed component and whether track shoe width is approved by John Deere. Factory-Installed Undercarriage Warranty does not apply to Scraper Tractors.

3. **StructurALL Warranty** for new John Deere Products (except Compact Excavators & Loaders, Skid-Steer Loaders, Compact Track Loaders, Scraper Tractors, Pull-Type Scrapers, and Forestry Attachments, which are not eligible for StructurALL Warranty) begins at the date of delivery to the original retail purchaser and ends (unless terminated earlier under Section F, below) after three (3) years, or 10,000 hours (whichever occurs first). For purposes of this warranty, a product that has been rented, used for demonstration purposes for 150 or more hours, or otherwise used prior to its original retail purchase has been “used” for the total duration of such use. StructurALL Warranty applies only to the following structural components listed below as installed on the product at the time of original manufacture. If a particular component is not listed below it is not covered by StructurALL Warranty.

- Arm; Articulation Joint (incl. pins & bushings); Bin Frame; Boom; Carbody; C-Frame*; Circle Frame; Coupler (John Deere built ONLY); Dipperstick; Draft Frame; Engine Frame; Equipment Frame; Grapple Arch and Grapple Boom; Loader Arm; Loader Frame; Mainframe; Moldboard Lift Arm; NeverGrease™ Pin Joints [Includes steering pin and bushing joints (standard equipment), roller elements (roller bearings) in bucket to boom joints and sliding elements (bushing) for boom and linkage joints (optional equipment)]; Rollover Protection Structure (ROPS); Side Frame; Swing Frame; Track Frame; Undercarriage Frame; X-Frame; Z-bar loader linkage (including bell crank and bucket driver link); Specialty booms and arms marketed as “heavy duty” by John Deere.

*Items Covered by StructurALL for Cut-to-Length Forestry Machines: Front frame (welded assembly); Rear frame (welded assembly); Crane king post with basement; Middle joint frame; Cabin swing frame; Main Boom

StructurALL Warranty does not apply to:

1. Any product used primarily in extreme duty or severe duty applications such as but not limited to: demolition and wrecking, chemical plant (including fertilizer plants), salt mines, steel mill, land fill and transfer stations, scrap handling, scarifying and other applications that are similarly destructive or similarly heavy duty except specialty booms and arms as stated in Section D.3 above.

2. C-Frames on H-Series & J-Series Crawlers equipped with root rakes or used in forestry applications unless equipped with an “extreme duty” reinforcement package.

3. Cut-to-Length Forestry Heads and Slash Bundler Units.

4. Crawlers equipped with optional side booms.


6. Motor Graders equipped with front- or rear-mounted snow wings.
E. ITEMS NOT COVERED -
John Deere is NOT responsible for the following:
1. Freight
2. Adjustments to compensate for wear, for periodic maintenance or adjustments that result from normal wear and tear.
3. Damage caused by unapproved adjustments (electronic or mechanical) to machine or machine components outside of published specifications including but not limited to engine, hydraulic components and relief valves.
4. Program updates, calibrations, and pressure adjustments.
5. Diagnostic Time
6. Additional Labor/Labour Time - Above SPG/Labor/Labour Rate
7. Additional Cleaning - Above SPG/Labor/Labour Rate
8. Rental Fees
9. Depreciation or damage caused by normal wear or application, lack of reasonable and proper maintenance, failure to follow operating instructions, misuse, negligence, collision or other accidents.
10. Premiums charged for Overtime Labor/Labour
11. Transportation to and from the dealership.
12. Travel time, mileage or service calls by the dealer.
13. Non-John Deere components or modifications, Rotobec grapples, and attachments installed aftermarket.
14. Shop supplies and maintenance items such as, but not limited to: filters, fuels, oil, hydraulic fluid, lubricants, coolants, conditioners, shop towels, cleaners and degreasers. Note: Reimbursement for refills of oils/coolants lost due to a warrantable failure is covered when a system failure occurs outside the boundaries of a normal oil change (within 25% of specified change interval as provided in the Operator's Manual).
15. Torn, cut, or worn hoses.
16. Wear items, such as, but not limited to: body liner, belts, blades, bulbs, lubricated joints (including pins and bushings), dry brakes, brake linings, dry clutch linings, saw blades, chains, skidder grapple shocks, color marking nozzles, and articulation bumpers.
17. Items such as cutting edge parts, delimbing knives, bucket teeth and rubber track are not warranted for depreciation or damage caused by normal wear, lack of proper maintenance, misuse, failure to follow operating instructions, the elements or accident.
18. Any defect in a non-covered component, or damage to or failure of a covered component caused by a defect in a non-covered component.
19. Secondary damage which occurs from continued operation of a product after recognition of the occurrence of a failure.
20. Parts supplied or modifications done by third party suppliers.
21. Topping off fluids when fluid levels fall in the range between low and full
22. Parts/Kits not ordered on machine and installed aftermarket. These parts will be covered by any applicable parts warranty.
23. Attachments installed aftermarket – i.e. Winch not installed at factory.
24. Custom options installed outside the factory – i.e. G.R. Manufacturing option packages.
25. Used Products (except as otherwise provided in section L below).

F. TERMINATION OF WARRANTY -
John Deere is relieved of its obligations under Standard Warranty, StructurALL Warranty, Factory-Installed Undercarriage Warranty and/or Extended Warranty if:
1. Service (other than normal maintenance and replacement of service items) is performed by someone other than an authorized John Deere dealer; or
2. The product is modified or altered in ways not approved by John Deere; or
3. Any unapproved or improperly sized attachment is installed on the product. Approval and attachment size shall be at John Deere's sole discretion. (Consult dealer prior to installing attachments or product modification).
4. The product is moved outside the US and/or Canada.

G. PARTS REPLACED UNDER WARRANTY -
Only new or remanufactured parts or components furnished or approved by John Deere, will be used if John Deere elects to repair the product. If any such part or component is defective in material or workmanship when installed in the product, John Deere will repair or replace, as it elects, such defective part or component, provided the defect is reported to an authorized John Deere dealer within 90 days of installation or before expiration of the applicable
Standard Warranty, Factory-Installed Undercarriage Warranty and/or StructurALL Warranty whichever is later.

H. TELEMATICS

NOTICE: Products may be equipped with telematics hardware and software ("Telematics") that transmit data to John Deere/Dealer. Purchaser may deactivate Telematics at www.jdlink.com.

Notwithstanding Purchaser's right, title or interest in the Products, Purchaser agrees that John Deere and Dealer (their affiliates, successors and assigns), without further notice to Purchaser have the right to:
1. Access, use, collect and disclose any data generated by, collected by, or stored in, Products or any hardware or devices interfacing with Products ("Machine Data");
2. Access Machine Data directly through data reporting devices integrated within, or attached to, Products, including Telematics ("Data Reporting Systems"); and

I. OBTAINING WARRANTY SERVICE -

To obtain warranty service, the purchaser must request warranty service from a John Deere dealer authorized to sell the product to be serviced. When making such a request, the purchaser must present evidence of the product's delivery date, make the product available at the dealer's place of business, and inform the dealer in what way the purchaser believes the product to be defective. Standard Warranty, Factory-Installed Undercarriage Warranty and/or StructurALL Warranty repairs may be made in the field if the purchaser and servicing dealer so desire. However, John Deere will not be responsible for any charges (such as dealer travel time, mileage or extra labor/labour) that would not have been incurred had the product been repaired at the dealer's place of business.

J. NO IMPLIED WARRANTY, CONDITIONS OR OTHER REPRESENTATION -

Where permitted by law, neither John Deere nor any company affiliated with it makes any warranties, representations, conditions or promises, express or implied, as to the quality, performance, or freedom from defect of its products, other than those set forth in this document and NO IMPLIED WARRANTY OF MERCHANTABILITY, CONDITIONS OR FITNESS IS MADE.

K. NO DEALER WARRANTY -

The selling dealer makes no warranty of its own on any item covered by this warranty, and makes no warranty on other items unless the dealer delivers to the purchaser a separate written warranty certificate specifically warranting the item. The dealer has no authority to make any representation or promise on behalf of John Deere, or to modify the terms or limitations of this warranty in any way.

L. USED JOHN DEERE PRODUCTS ONLY -

John Deere will transfer remaining Standard Warranty, Factory-Installed Undercarriage Warranty and/or StructurALL Warranty to the purchaser of a used John Deere construction and/or forestry product that has been used for less than the full warranty period provided at the product's original retail purchase. This transfer is not effective until change of ownership is registered by a John Deere dealer. ALL THE TERMS, INCLUDING LIMITATIONS AND EXCLUSIONS, OF THE JOHN DEERE STANDARD WARRANTY, FACTORY-INSTALLED UNDERCARRIAGE WARRANTY, AND/OR STRUCTURALL WARRANTY ORI GINALLY PROVIDED FOR THE PRODUCT REMAIN IN EFFECT AND APPLICABLE.
**Grand County**

**County Council Meeting**

**January 15th, 2019**

**Agenda Item:** G

| **Title:** | Approving proposed amendment to the Cooperative Management Agreement with the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) providing Public Safety, Resource Protection and Recreation Management and Maintenance in the Sand Flats Recreation Area which authorizes Grand County to use a portion of the BLM facility located at 885 South Sand Flats Road as a storage facility |
| **Fiscal Impact:** | N/A |
| **Presenter:** | Andrea Brand, Director, Sand Flats Recreation Area (SFRA) |

**Recommendation:**

Approve revised amendment 4 of the “Cooperative Management Agreement Between the U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management and Grand County, Utah Providing for Public Safety, Resource Protection and Recreation Management and Maintenance in the Sand Flats Recreation Area” and authorize the Chair to sign the amendment.

**Background:**

This amendment authorizes Grand County to use a portion of the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) facility located at 885 South Sand Flats Road as a storage facility to further the purpose of the Sand Flats Cooperative Management Agreement. The BLM retains ownership and primary use of the facility and grounds.

The BLM agrees to allow the County to utilize a portion of the south bay at the above-described facilities without charge. The BLM will pay the electricity for this space. The BLM will provide parking space for one trailer in the northern most parking area.

The County recognizes that BLM retains primary use of the facility and grounds. The County is responsible for the cleaning of the assigned space and will request BLM approval before under-taking any repairs or maintenance The County assumes all risks for the County materials and equipment stored in this facility

The County and the BLM have a mutual interest in maintaining the security of the facility to protect public property, staff and the facility itself. Recognizing the facility is federal property, both the County and the BLM will be subject to BLM safety and hazardous material evaluations and will seek to maintain safe working environments and remediate unsafe conditions.
conditions within their respective work areas. This amendment is valid for a period of five years and may be modified or terminated by either party subject to 4-month notification.

**Attachment(s):** Amendment 4 of the Cooperative Management Agreement between the Bureau of Land Management and Grand County, Utah Providing for Public Safety, Resource Protection and Recreation Management and Maintenance in the Sand Flats Recreation Area
COOPERATIVE MANAGEMENT AGREEMENT

BETWEEN

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

AND

GRAND COUNTY, UTAH

Providing for Public Safety, Resource Protection and Recreation Management and Maintenance in the Sand Flats Recreation Area

Amendment 4

Purpose: This Amendment 4 to the Sand Flats Cooperative Management Agreement ("CMA") between the Parties dated June 27, 1994 authorizes Grand County (the "County") to use a portion of the Bureau of Land Management (the "BLM") facility located at 885 South Sand Flats Road (the "Facility") as a storage facility to further the purpose of the Sand Flats CMA. This authorization and license includes access to and use of the southernmost room of the Facility warehouse known as the "Storage Area”.

Grant of License: The BLM hereby grants to the County a license to utilize the Storage Area for the storage of certain County equipment without charge to assist and improve efficiency of the County operation of the Sand Flats Recreation Area. The remainder of the Facility shall remain fully available to the BLM for its use. The BLM retains ownership and primary use of the Facility and grounds.

BLM Responsibilities. The BLM shall pay the electricity for the Storage Area. The BLM shall provide Grand County Sand Flats Recreation Area Staff with access to the security gate for the Facility and the south bay of the Facility only. The BLM shall provide to the County parking space for one (1) trailer in the northernmost parking area of the Facility.

County Responsibilities: The County recognizes that BLM retains primary use of the Facility and grounds. The County shall be responsible for the cleaning of the Storage Area and shall provide the BLM with advanced written notice before undertaking any repairs or maintenance. No alterations shall be allowed without written approval from the Moab Field Manager or the Canyon Country District Manager. The County shall limit use of the Storage Area to storage and use in connection with the Sand Flats Recreation Area Program. The County shall further prohibit its employees/staff from using the Storage Area overnight. The County shall be responsible for locking and securing the Facility when its employees/staff leave the Facility. The County assumes all risks for the County’s materials and equipment stored in the Storage Area.

Mutual Responsibilities: The County and the BLM have a mutual interest in maintaining the security of the Facility to protect public property, staff and the Facility itself. Both parties shall keep the gate to the Facility locked when staff members of either party are not present and to watch over each other party’s property stored in the Facility to reduce the opportunity for theft or vandalism. Recognizing the Facility
is federal property, both the County and the BLM will be subject to BLM safety and hazardous material evaluations and will seek to maintain safe working environments and remediate unsafe conditions within their respective work areas.

Term: This Amendment 4 shall be valid for a period of five years from the date hereof. It may be modified by the mutual written agreement of the Parties, or it may be terminated by either party upon four months’ advanced written notice.

GRAND COUNTY

ATTEST:

___________________________  ____________________________
Evan Clapper, Chair          Chris Baird, Clerk
Grand County Council
Date: _________              Date: _________

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

____________________________________
By:
Canyon Country District Manager
Date: _________
## Agenda Summary

### Grand County Council Meeting

**January 15, 2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item: H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| **Title:** | Approving proposed contract award to Hudson Printing for the Moab Area Travel Council Travel Planner |
| **Fiscal Impact:** | $43,500 that has been included in the current 2019 budget approved by the County Council. |
| **Presenter(s):** | Elaine Gizler, Executive Director, Moab Area Travel Council |

### Recommendation:

I move to approve the proposed contract award to Hudson Printing for the 150,000 Moab Area Travel Council Planners, and authorize the Chair to sign all associated documents.

### Background:

The Moab Travel Planner is an essential part of marketing in Grand County. The 150,000 units are estimated to last through fall 2020. These planners are distributed to the Moab Information Center, The Thompson Welcome Center, Capitol Reef, Garfield County, San Juan County, Uinta County, Salt Lake County, Grand Junction, Fruita, and Emery County, Visitor Welcome Centers for distribution to visitors. The Travel Council also mails the Travel Planner to website requests that can be as many as 35,000 per year around the world. We have also kept the Travel Planner the same size and weight so as not to increase the postage. The planners are also taken to Sales Missions, Travel Shows, given to local businesses for distribution to their guests, and to Grand County Middle School Students for the Tourism presentation. This year, we also included a page for the Economic Development Department in hopes we can entice businesses to Grand County.

The Clerk Auditors Office received three replies/bids to the Travel Council RFP that were opened on 12/19/18 at 10:56 by Renee Baker, Kelli Day, and Elaine Gizler.

### Attachment(s):

1. Request for Proposals (RFP)
2. Bid Summary (2)
3. Bids Received:
   - Hudson Printing
   - Relic Printing
   - Transcript Bulletin
**SHIPPING:** Proposal must include a bid for printing and shipping.

**Proposal must be submitted to:**

Grand County Clerk Auditor  
Moab Area Travel Council  
ATTN: Travel Planner Printing RFP  
125 E Center St  
Moab, UT 84532

Faxed and email proposals cannot be accepted as this is a sealed bid process. For additional information contact Elaine Gizler at 435-259-1370 or director@discovermoab.com.
# RFP Response for Travel Planner Printing

**December 12/19/2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Name</th>
<th>100,000</th>
<th>125,000</th>
<th>150,000</th>
<th>Tabbing</th>
<th>Shipping</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relic Printing</td>
<td>41,950</td>
<td>52,500</td>
<td>$56,875</td>
<td>$46 per 1000 units</td>
<td>$1,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcript Bulletin</td>
<td>31,513</td>
<td>38,219</td>
<td>$44,895</td>
<td>Inc</td>
<td>Inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson Printing</td>
<td>28,775</td>
<td>35,250</td>
<td>$41,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson Shipping</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hudson Total</strong></td>
<td>30,175</td>
<td>36,950</td>
<td>43,500</td>
<td>Inc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hudson Printing is the Travel Council Recommendation as we have used them in the past for printing, and their pricing works within the budget.
Travel Planner Printing  BID OPEN: 12/17
10:56 am

1. Relic Printing
   $41,950 (100,000) ppu 0.42
   $52,500 (125,000) ppu 0.42
   $56,187.5 (150,000) ppu 0.38
   Tabbing - $4/1000 units
   Shipping - $1375

2. Transcript Bulletin
   $31,513 (100,000) w/ tabbing & shipping
   $38,249 (125,000) w/ tabbing & shipping
   $44,189 (150,000) w/ tabbing & shipping

3. Hudson Printing
   $28,175 (100,000) 60,000 tab + 1,400 ship
   $35,250 (125,000) 75,000 tab + 1,700 ship
   $41,500 (150,000) 10,000 tab + 2,000 ship

Elaine Gilzer
Kelli Day
Renee Baker
Moab Area Travel Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION:</th>
<th>Moab Travel Planner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PAGE COUNT:</td>
<td>64 + Cover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINISHED SIZE:</td>
<td>5 3/8 x 8 3/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INK:</td>
<td>4/4 process + Dull UV Coating on outside Covers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAPER:</td>
<td>Cover: 80# Dull Cover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Body: 50# Matte Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINISHING:</td>
<td>Saddle Bind (specific portion to be 3-side tabbed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACKAGING:</td>
<td>Box in 25 pounds or less and skid pack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QTY:</td>
<td>100,000 (60,000 tabbed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRICE:</td>
<td>$28,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREIGHT:</td>
<td>$1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QTY:</td>
<td>125,000 (75,000 tabbed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRICE:</td>
<td>$35,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREIGHT:</td>
<td>$1,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QTY:</td>
<td>150,000 (90,000 tabbed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRICE:</td>
<td>$41,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREIGHT:</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Michael McEvoy/Vice-President of Business Development
Direct Line: 801.461.3207  Cellular: 801.652.6999  Email: mmcevoy@hudsonprinting.com

Mike Corbit/Account Manager
Direct Line: 801.461.3217  Email: mcorbit@hudsonprinting.com

Notes: Paper prices contained in this proposal are based on current prices in effect as of this date. Paper pricing is subject to the price and availability at the time of order. Pre-press corrections after initial proofs are $30 per page.

HUDSON PRINTING COMPANY reserves the right to reject any material considered to be offensive in nature. In particular, pornographic material is not permissible. There will be no over-runs or under-runs. Quoted price does not include any applicable sales, use, or other direct taxes, which will be added at the time of invoicing. If exempt from tax, customer shall furnish seller with a valid tax exemption certificate.
2019 Travel Planner Printing
MOAB // DECEMBER 2019

RELIC
Printing 2019 Moab Travel Planner

In response to "Request for Proposal: Printing 2019 Moab Travel Planner", Reali has prepared the following quote:

MOAB TRAVEL PLANNER DESCRIPTION:

- 64 pages & 4 page cover
- 5 3/8" w x 8 3/8" h
- 4 color process throughout
- Cover stock: Opus 80# Dull Cover with Dull UV Coating
- Inside stock: 50# Coated Matte
- Final piece must weigh less than 3.0 ounces with 3 tabs and a mailing label
- Text ink 4/4 (process color throughout)
- Saddle Stitch/Trim
- A portion of the total quantity will be tabbed on three open sides at printer (1.5" tabs approved by MATC)
- With booklet spine at the bottom, tabs should be positioned on the leading and trailing edges within 1" from the top.
  One additional tab should be positioned on the lower leading edge .5" from the bottom.
- Boxed 25 lbs per box or less/Skid Pack

QUANTITIES & PRICING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>$41,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>$52,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>$56,875</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Price per unit: $0.42

Tabbing: $46 per 1,000
Shipping: $1,375
Dec. 12, 2018

Moab Area Travel Council
Attn: Travel Planner Printing RFP
125 E. Center St.
Moab, Utah 84532

To whom it may concern:

Thank you for giving Transcript Bulletin Publishing an opportunity to bid on printing the 2019 Moab Travel Planner. The bid document is included for your consideration.


Please review the bid and let me know if you have questions. I look forward to working with you and Grand County on this project and many others in the future.

Sincerely,

Keith Bird
Account Executive
Transcript Bulletin Publishing
Dear Elaine,

Transcript Bulletin is pleased to provide you with the following quotation. For customers that do not have an established account in good standing, 50% down and remainder upon delivery will be required. If you have any questions please call 435-882-0050 or in Salt Lake 355-6525, Toll Free 866-721-9992.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Qty A</th>
<th>Qty B</th>
<th>Qty C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49153</td>
<td>Job Name: Moab Travel Planner</td>
<td></td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item: Booklet - 64 Pg + 4 Pg Cover</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$28,813.00</td>
<td>$35,069.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finished Size: 5.375 x 8.375</td>
<td></td>
<td>Per Each</td>
<td>$0.2881</td>
<td>$0.2806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paper: Cover: #2 80# Matte Cover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guts: #3 50# Matte Book</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inks: Cover: 4/4+Flood Semi-Matte UV-Front Side</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guts: 4/4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finishing: Saddle Stitch and Trim, Boxing, Skid Pack.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,800.00</td>
<td>$2,250.00</td>
<td>$2,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-Wafer Seal Tabs</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$900.00</td>
<td>$900.00</td>
<td>$900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total $31,513.00 $38,219.00 $44,895.00

Prices quoted are good for 30 days from above date. Electronic files with no manipulation required. Should the files require manipulation of any kind, this work will be performed at $70 Hour. Price does not include Utah State sales tax of 6.6% if applicable. Tax will be added at the time of invoicing. If exempt from tax, customer shall furnish seller with a valid tax exemption certificate.
## Agenda Summary

**Grand County Council Meeting**  
**January 15, 2019**

### Agenda Item 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title:</th>
<th>Approving proposed letter to Senator Hinkins and Representatives Albrecht &amp; Watkins in support of requested budgeting in the amount of $100,000 by Utah Division of Forestry, Fire and State Lands- Sovereign Lands to plan and develop needed infrastructure, including vault toilet installations and camp site delineations, for the campground areas located at Dalton Wells and Willow Springs near Arches National Park</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Impact:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenter(s):</td>
<td>Council Member McGann</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Recommended Motion:

I move to approve the proposed letter to Senator Hinkins and Representatives Albrecht & Watkins in support of requested budgeting in the amount of $100,000 by Utah Division of Forestry, Fire and State Lands- Sovereign Lands to plan and develop needed infrastructure, including vault toilet installations and camp site delineations, for the campground areas located at Dalton Wells and Willow Springs near Arches National Park.

### Background:

At the request of Sovereign Lands, Grand County officials have met several times with Sovereign Lands staff over the last year to consider possibilities for solutions at Dalton Wells and Willow Springs campgrounds, areas that are currently unmanaged that make available free camping for up to two weeks at a time. One possibility being explored, if there is a successful land exchange between SITLA and Sovereign Lands for Sovereign Lands to receive approximately 2,400 acres in the area, is for Grand County to enter into a Cooperative Management Agreement with Forestry, Fire and State Lands- Sovereign Lands to manage the areas once Sovereign Lands is able to provide infrastructure and planning.

The Council Members involved in the meetings are contemplating an arrangement with Sovereign Lands that is similar to the Sand Flats Recreation Area-BLM arrangement which is sustained without General Fund monies mainly through collection of camping and day use fees.

Currently, FFSL- Sovereign Lands has a budget request in the Governor’s Budget for $100,000 for development of these campground areas.

### Attachment(s):

1. Proposed letter
January 15, 2019

Dear Senator Hinkins and Representatives Albrecht and Watkins,

The Grand County Council writes to support a requested budget in the amount of $100,000 by Utah Division of Forestry, Fire and State Lands- Sovereign Lands. This funding is to plan and develop needed infrastructure, including vault toilet installations and camp site delineations, for the campground areas located at Dalton Wells and Willow Springs near Arches National Park.

Grand County officials have met several times with Sovereign Lands staff over the last year to consider possibilities for solutions at Dalton Wells and Willow Springs campgrounds, areas that are currently unmanaged that make available free camping for up to two weeks at a time. One possibility being explored, if there is a successful land exchange between SITLA and Sovereign Lands for Sovereign Lands to receive approximately 2,400 acres in the area, is for Grand County to enter into a Cooperative Management Agreement with Forestry, Fire and State Lands- Sovereign Lands to manage the areas once Sovereign Lands is able to provide infrastructure and planning.

The Council Members involved in the meetings are contemplating an arrangement with Sovereign Lands that is similar to the successful Sand Flats Recreation Area-BLM arrangement which is sustained without General Fund monies mainly through collection of camping and day use fees.

Currently, FFSL- Sovereign Lands has a budget request in the Governor’s Budget for $100,000 for development of these campground areas. Following is helpful information to better understand the areas and the need for infrastructure:

- Site Background:
  - The DWMU is home to one of the richest paleontological sites in North America.
  - The DWMU was used as a CCC camp during the New Deal, and again as an internment camp during WWII.
  - The DWMU was transferred to the State in exchange for state lands included in the creation of Canyonlands Nat'l Park. Is currently managed by the Division of Forestry, Fire & State Lands (FFSL)
  - No-fee camping and absence of enforcement and infrastructure has made the area one of the most congested and negatively impacted recreation areas in Grand County.
  - The DWMU hosts 30mi+ of trail riding opportunities
• FFSL's Management Considerations:
  o FFSL typically manages submerged lands in the state. The DWMU is a rare outlier in our management portfolio. FFSL does not reserve the capacity to administer a fee area in the DWMU.
  o FFSL manages all of its lands according to the multiple use sustained-yield principles and the Public Trust Doctrine, considering the premise for any proposed or current use against potential impacts to that Public Trust.
  o Recreational impacts to the DWMU have created a condition that puts the well-being of said public resource at risk.

FFSL's Management Intention:
  o Recognizing the deteriorating conditions of the public resource at the DWMU, FFSL has approached Grant County in the hopes that a cooperative agreement could be reached which would provide for necessary physical, administrative, and legal framework to preserve the delicate paleontological, cultural, and recreational resources at the DWMU.
  o Given the success of the cooperative agreement that created the Sand Flats Recreation Area, we are optimistic about the enduring quality of the DWMU as a public trust resource, and are committed to pursuing a partnership with Grand County for the protection of this remarkable area.

We support the funding request because our intention is to continue collaborating with Sovereign Lands on possible development of infrastructure for the two existing campground areas, and ultimately to manage the two areas as a controlled fee area. Your support is requested by the Grand County Council.

Sincerely,

Evan Clapper, Chair
Grand County Council

cc: Representative Susan Duckworth
Title: Adopting proposed ordinance amending the Land Use Code for a High Density Housing Overlay

Fiscal Impact: N/A

Presenter(s): Zacharia Levine, Community and Economic Development Director

Stated Motion:
Move to adopt proposed ordinance amending the Land Use Code for a High Density Housing Overlay, and authorize the Chair to sign all associated documents.

Planning Commission Recommendation:
Planning commission forwarded a favorable recommendation for the HDH Overlay following a public hearing on September 25, 2018.

Staff has processed multiple changes to the recommended HDH overlay boundaries and regulations as discussed and requested by Council in workshops and public hearings on October 16th, November 7th, 20th, and 27th, and December 4th.

Staff Recommendation:
Staff recommends approval of the proposed HDH overlay map and regulations as amended to date.

Background:
Staff encourages citizens to contact the Community and Economic Development Department via phone or e-mail with questions about the two-year process of developing the HDH Overlay.

The amendments noted below represent changes made to the HDH Overlay that planning commission forwarded to the county council. Council discussed these changes over the course of multiple meetings. The attached documents also reflect these changes as redlined text in the code language and map callouts in the overlay boundary map.

Staff has not received any additional public comment not already received by the council.

The HDH Overlay includes the following amendments:

- 4.7.1(E) Additional statement clarifying the legislative intent for
coordination between the Assured Housing ordinance and HDH Overlay.

- 4.7.2 (B) Reference to FEMA floodplain removed due to redundancy with regulations elsewhere in the land use code (LUC).
- 4.7.3 (A) Exceptions to the active employment requirement for retirees and unemployed single parents removed due to legal review; additional requirement added to households with unrelated individuals for meeting the active employment requirement.
- 4.7.5 (C)(2) Addition of statement clarifying the legislative intent behind establishing Minimum Design Standards.
- 4.7.11 Additional text to clarify the effect of an HDH Overlay approval
- 4.7.13 Unit-based sunset (i.e. expiration) clause: After 500 units are constructed through the HDH Overlay, the ordinance will automatically terminate.
- The code language was renumbered to reflect inclusion in chapter 4 of the LUC, Overlay Districts
- Staff amended the HDH district boundaries to reflect the inclusion of some parcels not included in the version recommended by the planning commission. Eight parcels along Spanish Valley Dr. near Plateau Dr. switched from HDH 15 to HDH 5.

In addition to the above, Staff encourages Council to consider the value of requiring all new development to meet some of the proposed performance standards, especially related to height, exterior finishes, and architectural design. These are common design (or form-based) standards used by many jurisdictions throughout the country. Many jurisdictions go much further in their design/form-based standards; the standards proposed above are quite moderate. Staff did not include more rigorous low-impact design (LID)/ecologically sensitive landscaping standards, but recommends the County consider adopting such standards countywide.

**Attachment(s):**
1. Redlined HDH Ordinance
2. Amended HDH Map
3. Proposed Ordinance
4. Citizen comments can be found in the electronic packet ([www.grandcountyutah.net/Agendacenter](http://www.grandcountyutah.net/Agendacenter))
Article 6.14
HIGH DENSITY HOUSING (HDH) OVERLAY DISTRICT

Sections:
4.7.1 Purpose.
4.7.2 Applicability.
4.7.3 Definitions.
4.7.4 Uses permitted with a development agreement.
4.7.5 Development incentives.
4.7.6 Assurance of primary residential occupancy.
4.7.7 Special Needs Emergency/Transitional Housing.
4.7.8 Pre-application procedure.
4.7.9 Application – Development plans and map required.
4.7.10 Findings.
4.7.11 Effect of High Density Housing Overlay approval.
4.7.12 Periodic Review of High Density Housing Ordinance.
4.7.13 Expiration of High Density Housing Ordinance.
4.7.14 Enforcement.

4.7.1 Purpose.

A. Grand County has established High Density Housing (HDH) districts to facilitate the provision of new housing units used for primary residential occupancy by actively employed households. The HDH districts are intended to provide the opportunity and means for the County to meet its estimate of additional residential and workforce housing needs, to achieve the goals of the housing element of the County’s general plan, and to implement the policies and goals of the housing element of the County’s general plan.

B. These regulations are intended to encourage the development of new housing units by assisting both the public and private sector in making the provision of these units economically viable, while providing assurances to the County that these units will maintain a high degree of quality and will remain accessible to residents and local area workers.
C. These regulations are further intended to encourage the provision of primary residential housing through the combination of the HDH districts with multiple-family and single-family residential zoning districts within the County where the residential housing projects are determined to be feasible and are consistent with the County’s general plan.

D. The HDH districts are intended to provide a means of directing and simplifying the process for creating and maintaining primary residential housing.

E. The HDH districts are intended to provide a means of directing and simplifying the process for creating and maintaining affordable housing constructed to meet the Assured Housing requirements of Section 6.15.

F. The HDH districts are also intended to provide incentives to developers, whether in new or rehabilitated housing, to maintain primary residential rental and ownership units in perpetuity.

4.7.2 Applicability.

The regulations set forth in this Article may be applied to specific sites meeting the following criteria:

A. The site is located in one of the high density housing (HDH) districts;

B. The site is not located in a FEMA floodplain unless necessary site improvements are completed prior to site plan or subdivision approval;

4.7.3 Definitions.

A. “Active Employment” or “Actively Employed” means a household with at least one person who meets one of the following criteria:

(1) A full-time (aggregate of 30 hours of employment per week) employee of an entity or entities located within Grand County Boundaries; or

(2) An owner or owner’s representative of a business or entity with a primary place of business within Grand County Boundaries; or
(3) A full-time (aggregate of 30 hours of employment per week) worker who is self-employed or work out of their home must provide their entire list of clients/workload so that it can be verified that a minimum of 75% of their work/clients are based within Grand County Boundaries; or

(4) A retired person who was a full-time employee of an entity located within Grand County Boundaries for at least five continuous years immediately preceding his or her retirement; or

(45) A person who is unable to work or does not have a work history required under subsections (1) through (34) above due to a Disability.

(5) Where there are unrelated individuals living together in one household, at least fifty percent (50%) of all the adults comprising the household shall meet the Active Employment requirement of this section.

(6) [Placeholder: Intent is the following draft text recommended by PC on 9.25.18. See legal review.]

A person who is legally responsible for a minor child who resides primarily with them, who is primarily responsible for the child’s safety and well-being for at least 60 hours per business week in their home, and can document that they or the child have resided in Grand County for at least five continuous years or the entirety of their lives preceding their occupancy of an HDH housing unit.]

B. “High density housing (HDH) overlay district” means a zoning district that applies in addition to an existing zoning designation where the County encourages the provision of new housing units used for primary residential occupancy as further described in this Article.

C. “High density housing (HDH) development” means a subdivision or site plan that exists within an HDH overlay district and complies with the regulations of this section.

D. “Household” means one (1) person living alone, two (2) or more individuals related to each other by blood, marriage, or another legally recognized relationship, or a maximum of five (5) unrelated individuals residing in the same residence.
E. “Primary resident” means a household that meets the “Primary residential occupancy” requirement.

F. “Primary residential housing” or “Primary residential development” shall have the same meaning as “High density housing development.”

G. “Primary residential occupancy” means the owner of record occupies the dwelling unit for a minimum of nine (9) months out of any twelve (12) month period or a renter occupies the dwelling unit through a lease term no shorter than six (6) months out of any twelve (12) month period.

H. “Special needs/transitional housing” means temporary housing that is made available to certain segments of the local population who face significant challenges in finding and retaining permanent housing. Special needs may include homelessness, substance abuse, domestic violence, or other similar needs.

4.7.4 Uses permitted with a development agreement.

The following uses are permitted with the execution of a development agreement by the County and the developer.

A. Residential developments at a density greater than normally permitted by the underlying zoning district as described in the table below, when the development provides a substantial level of housing units intended for primary residential occupancy by actively employed households. A substantial level is defined herein as a minimum of eighty percent (80%) of the units in the development being restricted to primary residential and actively employed residents. Deed restricted units may be owner-occupied or renter-occupied as long as the residents meet the requirements for primary residency and active employment. The maximum density (units/acre) limit shall be based on a calculation that includes all existing and all new units on the land area that is being included in the calculation. Residential development qualifying for greater density pursuant to the provisions of this ordinance shall be permitted to obtain such density by constructing residential housing types not otherwise allowed in the underlying zoning district. For example, multi-family units may be constructed in a single-family residential zone.
B. Accessory uses or structures incidental to the principally permitted use pursuant to Section 3.3 of this LUC. Any accessory dwelling unit permitted under Section 3.3 in a HDH Development shall meet the occupancy and active employment requirements of subsection A of this Section.

4.7.5 Development incentives.

A. General. In order to reduce costs associated with the development and construction of primary residential housing, the property development standards set forth in subsection C of this section are established for the HDH districts. These property development standards represent a relaxation of standards normally applied to development in the County and are established in order to facilitate and promote the development of primary residential housing in the County and shall be extended upon issuance of a site plan or preliminary plat approval. As a further inducement to the development of primary residential housing beyond the relaxation and flexibility of development standards, the County, where appropriate, may also extend one or more of the development incentives set forth in subsection D, the selection of which shall depend on the quality, size, nature, and scope of the development being proposed. Incentives shall be targeted to improve the development design or to yield the greatest number of primary residential units, so as to permit the County to meet its estimate of additional housing needs and the goals of the housing element of the County’s general plan. It is also the intent of the County to facilitate primary residential housing by encouraging developer involvement with the Moab Area Housing Task Force, Community Reinvestment Agencies, and other public and private entities concerned with the provision of primary residential housing and by cooperating with such entities.
B. Eligibility. Eligibility for the property development standards set forth in subsection C of this section requires the developer to propose a housing development containing at least eighty percent (80%) primary residential units occupied by actively employed households.

C. Property Development Standards. The following development standards shall apply to primary residential housing units in the HDH district:

1. General Design Standards. The development shall be designed and developed in a manner compatible with and complementary to existing and potential development in the immediate vicinity of the development site. Site planning on the perimeter shall provide for protection of the property from adverse surrounding influences and shall protect surrounding areas from potentially adverse influences from the property. To the greatest extent possible, the design of the development shall promote privacy for residents and neighbors, security, and use of passive solar heating and cooling through proper placement of walls, windows, and landscaping.

2. Minimum Design Standards. Minimum design standards are included to ensure a high degree of quality in the development of HDH units. Unless modified by the County Council, the following design standards shall apply to a development that utilizes the density increases allowed by this Article.
   a. Sidewalks shall be installed along all street frontages where otherwise required by this LUC.
   b. HDH developments shall meet the landscaping and screening standards of Section 6.4.

   c. Screening Requirements

   i. Outdoor Storage Screening. All outdoor storage areas for materials, trash, mechanical equipment, vehicles, or other similar items shall follow the standards outlined in Section 6.4.3.

   ii. Parking Lot Screening. Parking lot screening must be provided between those portions of an off street parking area containing six (6) or more parking
spaces and a different zoning district or a public street and shall be designed according to the following:

a. Parking lot screening must be provided within ten feet (10’) of the perimeter of the parking lot to be screened, except for parking lots adjacent to rain gardens/bio-retention systems, other landscape features, or where screening may negatively impact the traffic sight distance (as defined by the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) and verified by the County Engineer).

b. Parking lot screening shall be not less than eighty percent (80%) opaque and be a minimum of three feet (3’) in height as measured from the highest finished adjacent grade of the parking area. When shrubs are used to provide the screen, such shrubs must be at least two feet (2’) tall at planting and anticipated to grow to at least three feet (3’) tall at maturity.

b.c. No landscaping or screening shall interfere with driver or pedestrian visibility for vehicles entering or exiting the premises.

c.d. Screening for a parking lot may be comprised of plants found in Section 6.4.3.F.

d.e. Content: Parking lot screening must consist of at least two (2) of the following:

   i. A compact hedge of evergreen or densely twigged deciduous shrubs spaced to ensure closure into a solid hedge at maturity;

   ii. A berm with plantings as described above;

   iii. Transit shelters, benches, bicycle racks, and similar features may be integrated as a part of the screen;
iv. Fencing may be integrated as part of the screen. All wood fencing shall be stained and sealed with a weatherproof product.

iii. Parking Island Design. Off-street parking areas with at least twenty-five (25) parking stalls shall contain interior landscaped islands. Such islands shall be bounded by a raised concrete curb, pervious curbing, or an approved equivalent and shall contain mulch to retain soil moisture. This provision shall not apply to parking structures. The standards for landscaped islands are as follows:

a. Landscaped parking lot islands shall be required at the beginning and end of each parking row and shall contain a minimum of one hundred eighty (180) square feet and a minimum width of nine feet (9’).

b. A minimum of one tree shall be provided for each island.

c. Shrubs, perennials or ornamental grass shall be incorporated in each landscaped island that does not contain a tree.

d. Islands shall be prepared with topsoil to a depth of two feet (2’) and improved to ensure adequate drainage, nutrient, and moisture retention levels for the establishment of plantings.

e. All perimeter and interior landscaped areas in parking lots shall be equipped with an irrigation system adequate for establishing and maintaining the plant materials within it.

c. To the maximum extent possible, building heights and locations shall minimize shading and interruption of solar access to adjacent properties with existing residential structures or commercial agricultural operations.
i. Exterior finishes may be of wood, masonry, stone, stucco, HDO board or other high quality material permitted by the building code, but shall not utilize vinyl siding; cedar or wood shakes; highly reflective, shiny, or mirror-like materials; or exposed plywood or particle board.

ii. Buildings shall utilize at least two (2) of the following design features to provide visual relief along the front of the residence:
   a. Projections, recessions, or reveals such as, but not limited to, columns, pilasters, cornices, and bay windows
   b. Dormers.
   c. Gables.
   d. Recessed entries, a minimum of three (3) feet deep.
   e. Covered front porches.
   f. Cupolas.
   g. Architectural Pillars or Posts.
   h. Quoins.
   i. Corbeling on wall.
   j. Decorative lintel.
   k. Incorporation of brick or stone on at least 25% of front surface area

Planning staff shall have the authority to waive this requirement when the building is not visible from adjacent properties or the public right-of-way.

d. Where primary residential housing units may be placed on the same lot as current or future temporary or short-term accommodations, dedicated primary residential housing units shall be clustered together so as to minimize the exposure of residents to temporary guests. In all other developments, where temporary or short-term accommodations units do not exist and cannot exist due to zoning restrictions, dedicated primary residential housing units shall be dispersed throughout the residential development.

e. The County Council may waive, or modify, any, or all, of these requirements when the Council finds it is infeasible to comply due to physical or other constraints on the lot.
3. Minimum Building Site Area and Lot Width. There shall be no minimum building site area, minimum lot width, or maximum lot coverage requirements for individual lots or individual dwelling sites in a HDH development. However, the building site area lot widths, and lot coverage percentages shall be designated on a site plan pursuant to Section 9.17 or preliminary plat pursuant to Section 9.4 approved by the Planning Commission.


5. Building Height.

   a. Maximum building heights shall not exceed the limits defined in the underlying zone district except that buildings constructed in the HDH 35b district shall not exceed four (4) stories or fifty (50) feet in height.

   b. To the maximum extent possible, building heights and locations shall minimize shading and interruption of solar access to adjacent properties with existing residential structures or commercial agricultural operations.

   c. All structures shall conform to the Ridgeline Standards of Section 6.9.8.

   d. Structures built under the HDH overlay must comply with the setback and buffer requirements of the underlying zone. The maximum height of the building at the exterior wall shall be the greater of:

      i. 20 feet

      ii. The building’s setback at that point

   e. From the exterior wall, the building’s height may increase to its maximum height at a rate not greater than a 45° angle from the maximum allowable height of the exterior wall.
Examples of HDH Height-Compliant Structures

28' Max. Height Examples

35' Max. Height Examples

50' Max. Height Examples
Maximum building heights shall not exceed the limits defined in the underlying zone
district except that buildings constructed in the HDH 35b district shall not exceed four (4)
stories or fifty (50) feet in height.

6. Setbacks. The minimum setbacks from the lot line of the development shall be
determined by the buffer requirements of Section 5.4.1.B and the compatibility standards
of Section 6.10.

7. Parking.

i. Number of spaces required

a. For every single-family or two-family dwelling, there shall be provided at
least two (2) off-street parking spaces for each unit. Parking spaces provided
in a garage or carport may count towards the minimum requirement.

b. For every attached multifamily dwelling, off-street parking spaces shall be
provided in accordance with Section 6.1.4:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multi-family dwellings</th>
<th>Efficiency and one-bedroom</th>
<th>1.5 per dwelling unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two-bedroom</td>
<td>1.75 per dwelling unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Three-bedroom and Larger</td>
<td>2.0 per dwelling unit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ii. Parking design requirements

c. Parking areas for single-family or two-family dwellings need not be paved.

d. Parking areas for attached multifamily dwellings shall be subject to the
off-street requirements outlined in Section 6.1.7.

e. Uncovered surface parking may be permitted in the rear and side
setbacks but is not permitted in the front or street-side setback.

f. Garages, carports, and individual locking storage units are subject to the
setback standards outlined in Section 5.4.1.
a. Required spaces for multifamily developments equal to or greater than five units shall be covered in a carport or a garage except that for multifamily dwellings with four or fewer units, parking spaces can be uncovered.

b. g.

8. Minimum Standards of Physical Condition. A primary residential housing unit is required to have and maintain those minimum standards of physical conditions set forth in Exhibit A - Minimum Standards.

9. Streets. All public streets within or abutting the proposed planned development shall be dedicated and improved to County specifications for the particular classification of street; all private streets shall meet fire code and access standards.

10. Signs. Signs shall be permitted only to the extent allowed under Section 6.5, Signs, and must be approved by the Planning and Zoning Administrator.

11. Construction Timing. The primary residential housing units shall be ready for occupancy no later than the date of the initial or temporary occupancy of any unrestricted units within the development or applicable phase thereof. If the unrestricted units are developed in phases, then the primary residential housing units may be developed in proportion to the phasing of the unrestricted units. For example, in an approved development that includes 100 units built in two 50-unit phases the first phase must include at least 40 primary residential units.

D. Additional Development Incentives. In addition to the relaxed and flexible development standards set forth in subsection C of this section, the County may offer other development incentives should the County Council determine that such incentives are warranted and in the best interest of the County. For example, the County may offer exceptions, waivers or modifications of other development standards that would otherwise inhibit density and achievement of affordable housing goals for the development site, including, but not limited to, placement of public works improvements. The County may also offer impact fee waivers, property tax abatements, or direct financial contributions.
4.7.6 Assurance of primary residency and occupancy.

Primary residential housing units developed under this Article shall remain available to persons and families who live and work in Grand County according to the standards set forth in Section 6.14.030 in perpetuity. The developer shall be required to enter into a development agreement with the County to ensure primary residential occupancy by actively employed households is maintained prior to recordation of final plat or issuance of a building permit for the applicable development. Each and every housing unit designated for primary residential occupancy by an actively employed household shall also include a deed restriction attached to its title in accordance with the standards set forth in this section. Grand County reserves the right to revoke, deny or suspend any permit, including a land development permit, conditional use permit, building permit, certificate of occupancy, or discretionary approval if the standards of this section are not met.

4.7.7 Special Needs Emergency/Transitional Housing.

Pursuant to the applicable County codes, a developer may, at the sole discretion of the County and subject to certain requirements, satisfy a portion of its primary residential housing requirements by provisioning special needs/transitional housing units through either direct construction, land donation or the donation of existing units. There must be a quantified, demonstrated need for the emergency/transitional housing within the Grand County boundaries. The housing must be developed in collaboration with a federally recognized, 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization. The housing must satisfy all requirements of the applicable local, state and federal requirements. Given the unique and varying characteristics of the population to be served, the rents for special needs/transitional housing must be approved in advance by the County Council or its designee.

4.7.8 Pre-application procedure.

Prior to submitting an application for a HDH development, the applicant or prospective developer should hold preliminary consultations with the Community and Economic Development Director and other County staff as may be desirable, to obtain information and guidance before entering into binding commitments or incurring substantial expense in the preparation of plans, surveys and other data. Such preliminary consultations should include
information on potential federal, state, and local affordable housing funding availability, and program requirements in guaranteeing the development’s consistency with the objectives of this overlay district.

4.7.9 Application – Development plans and map required.

An application for a HDH development must be for a parcel or parcels of land that is under the control of the person, corporation, or entity proposing the development. The application shall meet all requirements of and include all submission materials required in connection with an application for preliminary plat or site plan approval and shall be submitted with the County’s standard application form. In addition to the foregoing, the application shall include the following:

A. The proposed means for assuring the continuing existence, maintenance and operation of the development as a primary residential housing project; and

B. Such other information as may be required by the Community and Economic Development Director to allow for a complete analysis and appraisal of the planned development.

4.7.10 Findings.

In approving a development with respect to which the high density housing district zone is applicable, the County Council, upon the recommendation of the Planning Commission, shall make the following findings to ensure that the application is appropriate to the purpose and the location:

A. The concessions granted for density and deviation from design standards, are commensurate with the level of primary residential occupancy provided by the development. Specifically, the greater the extent of concessions and incentives, the greater the level of primary residential occupancy.

B. The developer enters into a development agreement to maintain the occupancy and employment restrictions of the development specific to the requirements of the County and any funding sources with greater or longer occupancy requirements.
4.7.11 Effect of High Density Housing Overlay approval.

A. Not Approval of Final Plat

Approval of plans submitted in conjunction with an application for the High Density Housing Overlay shall not constitute approval of the final plat. Rather, it shall be deemed an expression of approval to the layout submitted on the preliminary plat as a guide to the preparation of the final plat, compliance with all requirements of Section 4.7, and the development agreement required under Section 4.7.6.

B. Lapse of Approval

The High Density Housing Overlay shall be valid for a period of 24 months from the date of approval and the general terms and conditions under which the approval was granted will not be changed. The HDH Overlay approval shall be deemed voided unless a final plat approval is granted within the 24-month period or unless the 24-month period is extended by the County Council at the request of the developer. The County Council may extend the approval period for one or more times for good cause.

4.7.12 Periodic Review of High Density Housing Ordinance.

The County Council shall review this Article at least biennially to determine what adjustments, if any, are advisable to meet the housing needs of the residents of the County.

4.7.13 Expiration of High Density Housing Ordinance.

This ordinance shall automatically expire after 500 HDH units have received certificates of occupancy. A record of the number and location of HDH units in receipt of certificates of occupancy shall be kept on file within the Community and Economic Development Department at all times.

4.7.14 Enforcement.
A. It shall be a misdemeanor to violate any provision of this Article. Without limiting the generality of the foregoing, it shall also be a misdemeanor for any person to sell or rent to another person a primary residential housing unit under this Article who does not meet the residency and occupancy requirements of this Article or to sell or rent a primary residential housing unit to a household not qualified under this Article. It shall further be a misdemeanor for any person to provide false or materially incomplete information to the County or its designee or to a seller or lessor of a primary residential housing unit to obtain occupancy of housing for which the person is not eligible.

B. The County may institute any appropriate legal actions or proceedings necessary to ensure compliance with this Article, including: (i) actions to revoke, deny or suspend any permit, including a land development permit, conditional use permit, building permit, certificate of occupancy, or discretionary approval; (ii) actions to recover from any violator of this Article civil fines, restitution to prevent unjust enrichment from a violation of this Article, and/or enforcement costs, including attorney fees; (iii) eviction or foreclosure; and (iv) any other appropriate action for injunctive relief or damages. Failure of any official or agency to fulfill the requirements of this Article shall not excuse any person, owner, household or other party from the requirements of this Article.
Exhibit A
To
HDH District

Minimum Standards for Physical Conditions of Primary Residential Housing Units

- Clean unit
- Carpets steam-cleaned two or three days prior to closing
- All scratches, holes, burned marks repaired in hardwood floors, linoleum, tile, and counter tops, etc.
- No broken or foggy windows
- All screens in windows (if screens were originally provided)
- All doors will be in working order with no holes
- All locks on doors will work
- All keys will be provided; e.g., door, mail box, garage
- All mechanical systems shall be in working order
- Walls paint ready
- Normal wear and tear on carpet; if carpet has holes, stains, etc., the carpet and padding shall be replaced or escrow funds at current market value per square foot for a comparable product shall be held at the time of closing to be used by the new buyer
- No leaks from plumbing fixtures
- Any safety hazard remedied prior to closing
- Satisfaction of radon issue if found at time of inspection
- All light fixtures shall be in working order
- All appliances that existed in the original Unit, remain and are in good working order and good condition

DEFINITIONS
- Clean Unit: All rooms will be cleaned as stated below:
  - Kitchen:
    - Range - Inner and outer services will be cleaned.
    - Range hood and Exhaust Fan
- Refrigerator and Freezer - Inner and outer surfaces of refrigerator and freezer will be clean. Freezer will be defrosted.
- Cabinets and Countertops - Exterior and interior surfaces of cabinets and drawers will be clean. Door and drawer handles, if provided, shall be clean and in place.
- Sink and Garbage Disposal - Sink and plumbing fixtures will be clean. Garbage disposal must be in working order.
- Dishwasher - Must be in working order and inner and outer surfaces shall be clean.
- Blinds, Windows, Screens:
  - Windows - All window surfaces, inside and outside of the window glass, shall be clean.
  - Screens - Screens will be clean and in place with no holes or tears.
- Closets: Closets, including floors, walls, hanger rod, shelves and doors, shall be clean.
- Light Fixtures: Light fixtures will be clean and shall have functioning bulbs/florescent tubes.
- Bathrooms:
  - Bathtub, Shower Walls, Sinks - Bathtubs, shower walls and sinks shall be clean.
  - Toilet and Water Closet - Water closets, toilet bowls and toilet seats will be clean. If the toilet seat is broken or peeling, the seat shall be replaced.
  - Tile - All tile and grout will be clean.
  - Mirrors and Medicine Cabinets - Mirrors and medicine cabinets shall be cleaned inside and out.
  - Shelves and/or Other Cabinetry - All other shelving or cabinetry shall be cleaned inside and out.
- Walls, Ceilings, Painted Doors and Baseboards: Painted surfaces must be cleaned with care to ensure the surface is clean without damaging the paint.
- Floors: Floor cleaning includes sweeping and mopping and could include stripping, waxing and buffing. Types of floor surfaces include bamboo and marmoleum.
- Interior Storage/Utility Rooms: Storage/utility rooms shall be cleaned. Properly cleaned storage/utility rooms will be free from odors, removable stains, grease marks or accumulations.
- Washer/Dryer- Must be in working order and inner and outer surfaces shall be clean
- Safety Hazard: Any item that provides a safety hazard shall be fixed. This would include, but is not limited to, exposed electrical wiring, satisfaction of any radon issue found, ventilation for gas hot water system, etc.
• Walls Paint-Ready: All holes shall be patched; all posters, pictures, etc., shall be removed from all walls; all nails, tacks, tape, etc., shall be removed from all walls; and all walls shall be clean and ready for the new buyer to paint. If wallpaper has been placed on the wall and in good condition, the wallpaper can remain; if the wallpaper is peeling off, the wallpaper must be removed.

• Windows: If a window is broken, including the locking mechanism, the window shall be replaced. If the window has a fog residue in the inside, it shall be replaced.
HDH - December 2018 Revisions

Legend
- HDH35
- HDH35b
- HDH25
- HDH15
- HDH10
- HDH5

- 2 parcels added to HDH
- 8 SVD-adjacent properties converted from HDH15 to HDH5
- Single lot was mistakingly split between HDH15 and HDH25, converted to fully HDH25
- Landlocked parcel is owned by same owner as Spanish Valley Drive frontage, requested inclusion
- Adjacent property by same property owner added to HDH

8 SVD-adjacent properties converted from HDH15 to HDH5
Adjacent property by same property owner added to HDH
2 parcels added to HDH
Single lot was mistakingly split between HDH15 and HDH25, converted to fully HDH25
Landlocked parcel is owned by same owner as Spanish Valley Drive frontage, requested inclusion
Adjacency property by same property owner added to HDH
GRAND COUNTY, UTAH
ORDINANCE ________ (2018)

ORDINANCE ADOPTING NEW CHAPTER 4.7 HIGH DENSITY HOUSING (HDH) OVERLAY DISTRICTS TO THE GRAND COUNTY LAND USE CODE

WHEREAS, the purpose of this ordinance is to:

A. Encourage the development and availability of housing that is accessible and affordable to a broad range of households with varying income levels within the County;

B. Promote the County’s goal to add housing units to the County’s housing stock that may be owned or rented by households actively employed within the County;

C. Facilitate new development in a compact and orderly manner;

D. Minimize the impacts of new development on existing neighborhoods and residents within HDH districts;

E. Reduce the cost of constructing and maintaining infrastructure associated with new development;

F. Actualize the affordable housing goals and policies identified in the Grand County General Plan, which includes incentives for increasing density in strategically identified areas throughout the County;

WHEREAS, the County Council finds and determines:

A. The Moab Area, which includes the City of Moab, Town of Castle Valley, and unincorporated areas of Grand County, faces a serious housing problem that threatens its economic security, quality of life, and environment. The extreme lack of access to affordable housing has a direct impact upon the health, safety, and welfare of residents of the County. While no single housing program will solve all of the Area’s needs, the High Density Housing (HDH) Overlay has been identified as one solution among a broader set of solutions;

B. Population in the Moab Area has increased rapidly, reflecting overall trends in the State of Utah. Between 2000 and 2017, the population in Grand County rose from 9,225 to 10,292, equivalent to a 11.6 percent increase, and similar to the Utah growth rate of 12.6 percent1. This rapid population increase is expected to continue, driving demand for housing. The fastest growing demographic is the population over the age of 65, followed by young adults between the ages of 18 to 24;

C. More homeownership and rental housing will be needed to accommodate future growth. Between 2010 and 2017, the number of family and non-family households expanded, although non-family households experienced a somewhat higher rate of increase. This pace is expected to continue, which means more homeownership and rental housing will be needed;

1 US Census Bureau 2010; ESRI 2017
D. Real estate prices have escalated across all residential product types. In 2017, the median sales price for a single-family home was $325,000, $352,000 for a townhouse, and $275,000 for a condominium. Between 2014 and 2017, the median price increased by 30 percent for townhomes, and 42 percent for single-family homes and condominiums;

E. Despite a high proportion of renter households (35 percent in Grand County\(^2\)), there is a limited inventory of multifamily apartments. Higher density workforce housing products that could be more affordable to the workforce, such as apartments and condominiums, must compete with visitor accommodations, such as hotels and nightly rental units, for land. The economics of visitor accommodations allow them to pay more for land, making it difficult to build housing affordable to the workforce;

F. The area’s rapidly appreciating home prices has made housing out-of-reach for many working families. Housing costs have increased rapidly, substantially outpacing increases in household incomes. In general, no homes sold in 2017 were affordable to households earning up to 80 percent of Area Median Income, which is equivalent to a family of four earning $54,150 annually. Households at 100 percent of median income ($67,700 for a family of four) had limited homeownership options. Rental housing may be priced such that it is more within reach of moderate-income households, although there is a shortage of units available for rent.

G. Tourism-related industries are the fastest growing employment sector in Grand County, accounting for approximately 43% of all employment\(^3\). Employment in accommodation and food services account for one out of every three jobs in Grand County. The next largest industries are retail and arts, entertainment, and recreation;

H. Jobs in tourism-related industries tend to be relatively low-paying, with some positions offering only seasonal or part-time employment with limited wage growth. The 2017 median household income in Grand County ($46,070) was lower than the statewide median of $62,902\(^4\);

I. Because affordable housing is in short supply within the Moab Area, lower-income households may be forced to live in less than adequate housing, pay a disproportionate share of their incomes to live in adequate housing, or commute ever-increasing distances to their jobs from housing located outside the Moab Area. These circumstances harm the County’s ability to provide high levels of service, attain goals articulated in the General Plan, and preserve a high quality of life for residents;

J. State and federal funds for the construction of new affordable housing are insufficient to fully address the current and projected shortages of affordable housing within the County. While the County has repeatedly amended its Land Use Code (LUC) to spur additional housing development, the private market has not provided adequate housing opportunities to extremely low-, very low-, low-, and moderate-income households;

\(^2\) Grand County Assured Housing Feasibility Study completed by BAE Urban Economics in 2018.
\(^3\) Grand County Assured Housing Feasibility Study completed by BAE Urban Economics in 2018.
\(^4\) The 2017 median household income data is taken from ESRI. This is different from the HUD Area Median Family Income (HAMFI), which is based on a four-person family household and was $56,700 in 2017. The median household income described here accounts for all households of all different sizes, including non-family households.
K. The HDH Overlay was developed over a two-year period that involved dozens of public meetings, workshops, open houses, and public hearings; Public input greatly informed the overlay regulations and map boundaries.

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission is statutorily responsible for making recommendations to the County Council regarding textual amendments to the LUC;

WHEREAS, the Grand County Planning Commission held a public hearing on September 25, 2018 to solicit public comment on a draft high density housing (HDH) overlay ordinance and recommended approval to the County Council; and,

WHEREAS, the Grand County Council held a public hearing on November 7, 2018 to solicit public comment on a draft assured housing ordinance and voted to approve said ordinance;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, Section 4.7 of the Grand County LUC shall read:

See attached Section 4.7 High Density Housing (HDH) Overlay Districts in Appendix A.

PASSED, ADOPTED, AND APPROVED by Grand County Council in a regular public meeting on December 18, 2018 by the following vote:

Those voting aye: ____________________________________________

Those voting nay: ____________________________________________

Those absent: _______________________________________________

ATTEST: GRAND COUNTY COUNCIL

Diana Carroll, Clerk/Auditor

Mary McGann, Chair
Insert adopted version of regulations and map here following Council action.
HDH Concerns:

1. Water- How much water do we have to sustain what amount of development? USGS numbers coming out at about 11,000-13,000 A/Ft/Yr. Ken Kolm indicates that the diversion of water to Ken’s lake has an impact on City’s water supply re-charge. County and City have a substantial difference in the per person per day water usage. City of Moab puts it as follows: (2016 Moab Water Conservation Plan Update 2016)
   - 146 GPD/PP Culinary (2015)
   - 282 GPD/PP Culinary + Commercial
   - 395 GPD/PP Culinary + Commercial + Winter Overflow (2013)

   Don’t know what the winter overflow is presently.

   County puts Culinary at 400 GPD/Household Unit. Using a factor of 2.5 people per household the usage is 160 GPD/PP. Culinary + Commercial has a 2.6 multiplier factor. (GBWSSA Culinary Water Systems Masterplan 2016). Thus, the average consumption is approximately 323 GPD/PP for all uses.

   This GPP/PP equates to: (Moab Water Facts published by City of Moab Water Conservation and Drought Management Advisory Board)

   City of Moab and Grand County collectively using 7,796 Acre Feet/Yr. of groundwater. Using the Number of Acre feet/year coming through the aquifers this means we can support, in the greater Moab Valley with no conservation measures:

   - 13,000 A/FT = a possible additional population growth of 5,164 people
   - 11,000 A/FT = 3,164 people

   At 10% conservation:
   - 13,000 A/FT = Additional 3,864 people
   - 11,000 A/FT = Additional 2,064 people

   Carrying number of the Valley decreases substantially with the increased conservation percentage. At 30% 11,000 A/FT drops to a deficit of 136 people.

   We have adequate paper water rights and adequate delivery systems which outstrip the water we have available coming through our aquifers. (See all literature on water rights and delivery systems.)

2. Storm Water- What is our infra-structure solution for the storm water flow that could be increased by the roofing and paving over of open lands? In 2011 (Spanish Valley Storm Drain Master Plan Update) the estimate to accommodate storm water drainage was approx. $38.5 million. What has been done? What is the cost in today’s dollars?
3. Winter and summer overflow- What are the “quality of life” impacts of diverting most or all of the water flow from Mill Creek and Pack Creek if we over-sell our water and must capture all summer and winter over-flow from these two sources?

4. There should be no consideration of getting water from the Colorado River. Processing the water is extremely expensive (water treatment plant) and water rights uncertain based on what is happening currently with the Colorado River Compact and the Federal Government vis a vis Lake Powell and Lake Mead. High probability there will be no water available for small communities like Moab.

5. Sewer Plant Capacity-What number of residents and visitors will put our system on overload? Current Usage 1.75 MGPD average, with a 3.4 MGPD Max. What are the population capacities?


7. Fire protection? How many new fire fighters will be needed for fire protection? Cost? Aspen-9 Paid firefighters-pop 7359=1:817; Telluride-12 Paid firefighters-pop 2426=1:202 (Also provide EMS); Steamboat- 33 Paid firefighters-pop 12,965=1:392 (Also provide EMS); Park City unavailable until call back. Summit County CO 74 Paid-pop 30,585=1:413. Moab 4 Paid- pop 5,253= 1:1313.

8. Roads and Trails- What will be needed for upgrades and new roads and trails? Cost?

9. Quality of life considerations: How much is too much? How do we retain the rural nature of the valley?

10. Social Services- What will be needed in terms of increased social services with higher population?

11. Assured Housing- If the underlying tax base is all we have to work with because the “new tax money” from the new assessment of properties is all going to affordable housing how will we be able to meet the costs of the increased demand for infrastructure improvements, social services, police protection, fire protection?

12. Leapfrogging and having increased housing in areas that do not want them? How can this be handled?
13. What happens to the HC Zone when it is build out with hotels? How do other businesses get a seat on HWY 191?

14. Do we want more hotels and rental properties strung up and down HWY 191?

15. Why are we not involving other entities who have a stake in this conversation? What about GWSSD? Fire Dept. Police Dept, Hospital, Four Corners, Roads Dept., Sewer and Waste water entities? Do we need their input? They are the ones who know what is needed in their realms.

Conclusions:
Love this, thank you! It still feels like the light pink high density way out in SV is a mistake. I may be missing something, but why just because the county made a mistake (in my opinion) and built high density far out in the valley in the '90's should we continue that far out today? The high infrastructure and water costs as well as vehicle trips to town are inefficient and smoggy. Could we just leave those in low development until 20 years from now, to see where we are then? By then we may have more commercial out there.. more places to work NOT in town, etc. Why not "save" this area for future dev? This seems designed for SITLA development, or something. I mean everything south of the Arena...thanks!

I am concerned about the large amount of area being considered for the maximum density and particularly the potential height of buildings. With so much of these areas currently built with 1-story houses and roads that are insufficient for much higher density, 45 ft. buildings could seriously impact adjacent properties and entire neighborhoods in terms of increased traffic, parking issues, sunlight loss & privacy issues.

I would rather see many of these dark pink areas dropped down to the blue category where you already have smaller lots and higher density as well as maintaining the rural character in our valley further from Hwy 191 that so many people value.

As an owner of real estate in Grand County, and someone who hopes to help create solutions to affordable housing, I am excited about this proposal. My only request is that we provide higher density opportunities in certain areas. For instance, I own .5 acres of Highway commercial property. Under the 25 units/acre proposal, it is still more profitable for me to develop short term nightly rental units (which is not my desire). To get to a point where equal profits are available, and still provide "affordable" housing (condos at a price of sub $155,000) I would need to get to 36 units/acre. I would suggest a density of this amount to incentive developers to move forward with these types of developments.

Convey deed restrictions to public!!

NO more than one story houses on SITLA square/rectangle. Access concerns off and onto Hwy 191

Need a road to extend Rimrock to town??

Also NEED more East/West connections on east side of hwy in SV Drive to access hwy

Emphasize required set backs, and buffers when going from low density to higher

What about water? Biggest question and concern code enforcement and water restrictions required for overlay? No lawns etc.

What about stepping it all down one notch?? Move all bright light, all light pink into blue? Maybe a bit less to swallow at once?

Planning Commission

Thank you...

Consider SOLAR ACCESS in your consideration for building heights on RIMROCK RD.
30' max?? Would not be a major infringement on our 18 SOLAR PANELS
What about overall energy increases (please address)
Lighting issues - night sky is already affected
Water is an issue - enough?
Bought here (on Lemon Ln) because rural and remote
No more than 1 story houses. 3 Story condos are causing houses rather than cliff walls to be obscured
Nobody monitors light ordinances now! This will get out of hand.
Need to have higher density in area HDH25a

1) Water is already a critical problem.
2) We already need traffic lights at the junction of Lemon Lane and 191 to turn left toward Moab
3) Residents of Lemon Lane value their privacy and were required to maintain 1 acre lots. Will these proposed homes be 1 acre lots?

Thank you for all your work. I truly think you are on the right track, and think the east side of the valley needs more MFR.

It was a pleasure meeting you yesterday at the High Density Overlay Open House yesterday. I just wanted to tell you again how impressed I am by the work you have done on this proposal to date. You have thoughtfully combined all of the information at hand into a feasible first step to solutions for the housing crisis in Moab. Yesterday was a great move toward getting the approval that will be required to get it passed.

We do hope to be one of the small local developers to provide some of the essential housing that we need. In particular, my father, fiancé and I are under contract on a 1.4 Acre property at 1187 & 1189 Murphy Lane. Per this screenshot, we are currently JUST outside the proposed overlay. Although this property has challenges (don’t they all?), we believe that the site has strong potential for a small housing project. I hope you will take into consideration adding us, and the property just below us, into the overlay so we may further pursue a local housing development and approvals in the future.

As I mentioned, I am more than happy to help with your efforts in any way possible. I hope you will contact me if there is anything I can do.

While I understand affordable housing is a nationwide problem (not just isolated to Moab), I find that having a 45-ft height limit in much of the south end of town and along the highway to be unacceptable. Having grown up in a large city, and being an architect and having studied urban planning, I know that building "canyons" will be detrimental towards views, solar rights, and will lead to an unfortunate "ghettoization" in those areas. Even in places like Chicago, three floors above grade is the usual limit for neighborhoods. Please look at some studies of "projects" in Chicago and elsewhere that show that the further above the ground the residence, the less control parents and others have with what happens at ground level. Most low-rise (three stories only) are more successful than high-rise projects (which a building of 45 feet would be considered). Please eliminate the 25a option from your consideration.

40 foot tall buildings should not be allowed next to regular residential neighbors. People can have no yards, if they so choose, but putting these monstrosities in next to established homes is just wrong. There IS plenty of land further up the valley. Let San Juan County have the density. (12 likes)
There’s plenty of room at the south end of the valley, stacking people on top of each other, will not help the quality of life in Grand county! (8 likes)

We already live in crowded subdivision that is next to businesses along the 191. PLEASE no more! There is too much noise and traffic. When planning future homes, not sure where they will go but our experience here is that the Holyoak road is being used (and abused) by people trying to pass through to Hyway, VIA Holyoak so ACCESS ROADS and BUFFERS NEED TO BE INCORPORATED WHERE BUSINESSES ARE CLOSE TO RESIDENTIAL, and they need to COMPLY with CODES about lighting/ noise! MAKE TRAFFIC GO AROUND HOUSING NOT THROUGH IT! The roads are affected, the sewers, the normal access is being pushed to limit, without INSIGHT and CARE in PLANNING! PLANT LOTS & LOTS OF TREES FOR EVERY NEW DEVELOPMENT!

I find this study to be admirable in effort but I have some reservations. I appreciate looking at areas where increased density in residential buildings would promote affordable housing for local residents. However, I am troubled that there is no reference to improving the infrastructure to support the increased density. There is no mention to improvements to Spanish Valley Drive as a lot of the increased density would be using that road. I realize that once some of the development is in place, that future commercial development could happen, such as a grocery store, elementary school, parks, restaurants, etc. so locals don't have to travel to downtown Moab for services. There needs to be a “South Moab” developed. And, with San Juan County's plans on developing the south end of Spanish Valley, what about the additional traffic on Hwy 191? To me this study is only half of what is needed to have a bigger picture of the future of Spanish Valley.

Stay out of San Juan County Spanish Valley clean up the mess you've created in Grand County most of the 191 is a filthy looking embarrassing junkyard getting worse daily clean that up! Build affordable housing not low income that just brings more crime. Invest in cleanliness and organization in your county don't tread on my county to line your pockets $$$$$

Holyoak area is dense enough as it is. Housing has sprung all around the Holyoak area for years. The argument that the mass of HD’s should be located no more than 4.3 miles from the heart of downtown doesn’t make sense to me. Hdh should be located on the south highway. Holyoak is already a very dense neighborhood, perhaps more than any other area. Bus service is coming to Moab. That will help with congestion somewhat but it’s a mess anyway we do it now.

Stages of development with areas that would entail the least impact on existing neighborhoods being highest priority, would honor the intentions of those who desire the R1 A1 space. Without prioritizing with stages of development that can play out, making projections into future needs is all theoretical and not based upon reality.

Several parcels in the proposal are SITLA parcels, have they indicated if they'll participate or not? Many parcels backup to existing residences and neighborhoods...will there be larger setbacks, open space, view restrictions to protect current residents? Maximum/limited dwelling prices should be used for some parcels
Nice to develop 191 instead of Murphy?

I appreciate the locations of your selected densities. I question the potential of oversupply of deeded primary residences. That requirement may need to be flexible in time.
I attended the open house last night and wanted to share my comments with you. I am not against creating more affordable housing. We need affordable housing. I just feel that the overlay the way it is currently presented is way too much. Meaning first step might to look at developing the HDH along the 191 corridor where there is currently infrastructure to support it and it would bring minimal impact to existing neighborhoods... I feel that the County council needs to first change the land use code to stop all development of Nightly rentals, condo’s, and hotels along the corridor which would open the way to support the development of affordable housing. Also, We don’t have a handle on how much water is available in our valley. The HDH was developed before San Juan County dropped their bomb of building a 6000 person town in South Valley, before there were 16 new hotels planned, and before a 320 acre University campus was approved. Plus we are in a severe drought. Also In the proposed HDH I also do not like the way of building up with high story structures and how that would impact existing neighbors. I just moved from Orchard Villa, and the Entrada development has blocked the sun on the town house where I had lived.

Thank you for letting me give voice to my concerns.

We are writing in support of the overall HDH overlay plan. We think that the goals of the overlay are important and could help to alleviate the housing shortage in our county. We also applaud the plan’s attempt to maintain neighborhood characteristics and believe it has done a good job of this on the whole. However, we do feel that there is one neighborhood that has been missed in these considerations.

We hope that the Commission will consider the merits of our suggestion despite the fact that it is arriving late in the process. We acknowledge the months of work that have been put into the overlay and the numerous opportunities for public input. We had planned to become involved in the process earlier this year but sadly some difficult life circumstances prevented us from doing so. Just past Rocky Road, Spanish Valley Drive (SVD) goes up a hill and then levels out remaining mostly flat through the rest of the valley. Just as you crest the hill you enter a neighborhood formed by the Plateau Estates subdivision plus 5 other parcels on the West side of SVD and by the Hillcrest subdivision on the East side. On this area of the map, only the West side of SVD is included in the overlay and a small strip of seven parcels have a proposed overlay density of 15/acre. All of the adjacent parcels to the West are at 5/acre density and the other neighboring parcels are 2/acre. A list of the specific parcels, addresses, and acreages is included on page two. They all have primary residences on the parcel.

We own and rent one of the parcels in the Hillcrest subdivision and our home is located on another adjacent property. While our properties are not included in the overlay map, we and our neighbors are very concerned about the future character of the neighborhood if 15/acre density is developed in the middle of it.

Planning Department staff told us that during the Commission’s process of developing the overlay, parcel size was a strong consideration for determining what areas had neighborhood characteristics. The average parcel size of the neighborhood described above is about ¾ an acre. This section of SVD is unique in that the parcels are much smaller, homes are closer together, homes are closer to SVD and the neighborhood feels like a cohesive community.

We are respectfully asking the Planning Commission to consider a change of density for the seven parcels in the neighborhood on the West side of SVD from 15/acre to 5/acre. In addition to maintaining the character of the neighborhood this will also be consistent with the densities allowed on the adjacent parcels to the south. These seven parcels represent the narrowest band of 15/acre density along SVD. There is one other section of SVD with a strip of parcels at 15/acre, no overlay on the East side of SVD and 5/acre density on adjacent parcels to the West. However, the average
size of these five parcels is almost 1.5 acres, the homes are not as close together and the homes are
not as close to SVD. Additionally there are not any residences on the East side of SVD because the
cemetery is located there.
In summary, we are in favor of density increases to alleviate the shortage of housing for Grand
County’s workers. We are not asking for a reduction in the overlay boundaries but instead for a
change of density on seven parcels to maintain the character of a unique neighborhood. Thank you
for your consideration.
Maps are attached. Please also find a list of neighborhood residents below that we have contacted
and who agree with our proposal and wanted their names included. We did not receive any negative
feedback regarding our proposed changes from any of the neighborhood residents who we were
able to contact.
I have known and respected you since meeting you several years ago and appreciate the work you
are currently doing for the county. My husband and I write you today as director of the county
planning commission. Please know that we are in favor of the work you all have done to find ways to
create more housing for local workers. However, we feel sad and threatened by the new plan to
create an overlay zone in our neighborhood, three miles from town. When we see all the empty land
much closer to Moab and within walking distance, we wonder why the county would consider
disturbing a lovely rural residential area where we have lived for 22 years, by bringing the city to us!? We purchased our property with the thought in mind that we wanted a site for a happy home. We
were not interested in using it as investment property. When we subdivided our property a few
years ago from a 2 acre to two 1 acre lots so that we could sell our house to our daughter and her family and build our own home on the other acre, we ended up having to grant setbacks to the
county on both the Spanish Valley Drive side and the Plateau Circle side so that we lost almost 1/2
acre total of our property with no compensation. (This means that we each own less than an acre
now.) At that time, even permission for building a small, “grandmother-type” dwelling on our
properties was opposed by the county – although eventually permission to build a structure of 1000
square feet was passed.
Also, when we bought our property in 1996, we were told that when this property was developed by
Bill Boulden, he received a waiver that released him from having to provide curb and gutter. If there
is development within the new overlay dwelling limits in the Plateau subdivision, will the expenses
for any required curb and gutter installation be borne by individual land owners?
This area is still a peaceful, mostly one residence per acre area, with much of the original native
plantings. Although Spanish Valley Drive has become a thoroughfare for mostly locals as an
alternative to taking 191 South to residences, it does become a noisy thoroughfare during peak
season with many jeeps and ORVs buzzing by. Further, we anticipate it becoming a far busier road
once the Arroyo Canyon development has become a reality. It is just unconscionable that even more
people will be encouraged to build out and rent or sell condos or apartments in our neighborhood,
bringing increased traffic to this area.
So, because we 1) want to keep our neighborhood characteristics intact, maintaining the quiet and
privacy we currently enjoy, 2) limit the use of Spanish Valley Drive to local residents as much as
possible, 3) prevent an increase in numbers of units per acre in this area, and 4) keep the rural
residential zone in which we live, we request that the area above the hill south of Rocky Road and
the Packard Distributing plant which encompasses the Plateau Circle area and further south, be
removed from the overlay zone plan. Even 5 dwellings per acre is too much for this precious piece of
the county.
Please consider our urgent request.
I am a long time resident of District 3. I have also been a lifelong visitor to and resident of Moab. My father, an attorney for Utah League of Cities and Towns, acted as Moab's attorney and would combine work and vacation. I grew up convinced that the river by Moab was paradise. In 1972 nearly all of my friends who were just graduating from the U of U moved here and became miners, boatmen, cowboys, cooks or road bike enthusiasts. In 1984 I finally escaped SLC with a job offer from Four Corners Mental Health. That same year I searched for a place to settle and desiring the remoteness of the edge of town and the unparalleled view bought in "Angel Heights" just below Disappearing Angel.

My plan was to create a small homestead (with my 3 and now 4 acres) and transform the barren, scraped area and the rolling blackbrush, into garden, orchard, animal habitat and oxygen replenishing "forest". All of my accumulated “retirement“ and any windfall wealth from work on a movie filming or a disaster relief deployment has gone into creating my home. This is the community to which I have envisioned my future. You might say that all my eggs are in one basket.

Moab has grown and my neighborhood developed. But still, living on the edge of town (Rimrock Road), has allowed a sense of space and distance from the onslaught of humanity. Walking the infrequently used trails in the adjacent BLM and the rarer moment of calm in the early and late hours, have been the cornerstones of my rural-as-possible lifestyle.

Now to the point..... I am terrified at the prospects of the High Density Overlay that is being spearheaded by Mr. Levine, et.al.

Already my neighborhood, Roberts Road and above are zoned agracultural/residential 1. This is 1 residence per acre with the allowance of an accessory home. (So basically 2 homes per acre.) Most of the lots, on average, are 2 acres. That would allow an increased density of 4 X or approximately a home every 1/2 acre. In my standards that is crowded. I moved to the edge of town to allow space, privacy and occasional calm. I believe that if the neighbors with a vested interest in the neighborhood wanted to subdivide into still somewhat spacious housing, it would be done,in a more integrate respectful manner. Currently interspersed in the area are virtual junkyards, mobile homes that are decrepit and abandoned, owned now or soon by children who’ve settled elsewhere and a few large undeveloped lots. The money that might be made by selling out to a High Density developer would be a compelling reason to sell with no regard for the neighborhood. The prospects of increased traffic, noise (to include unattended barking dogs), light pollution and the disruption of the fallow habitat of animal life, all seem horrifying. The whole quality of my future seems at stake.

As soon as we neighbors became aware of the proposal we attended P&Z meetins to express our fears. The earlier public notices were not effective in warning us and since we weren't present the "stakeholders" who had been instrumental in the plans early formation had already laid the groundwork for the HDO. During the numerous P&Z meeting I, or my wife, Joanne Savoie, have attended the stakeholders have been absent. I would surmise that their primary economic incentive (the committment to creating the HDO in areas with existing infrastructure) had already been achieved.

When distilled down to the reality of this proposal, it appears that the creation of more accessible housing, for those current residents of Moab, that may still not either afford or desire it, as well as those non-existent, hypothetical persons, will come at the expense of those here and now residences who, in large part, have committed themselves to the community. This is to be done by the allowance of builders and developer to maximise the money saved by upgrading existing infrastructure in lieu of working from scratch. This is largely planning for the welfare of hypothetical persons while degrading the living conditions of we who are current residence and neighbors.

Since only 20% of the proposed housing is to be “affordable” anyway why not let the additional expense go to the buyer. Put the high density areas where there are either compatible neighbors or
in some of the many undeveloped acres that exist in the county. Additionally crowding the HDO along the highway or Spanish Valley Drive assumes that these prospective new residents won’t just as easily be able to drive to work as the rest of us.

In my chosen profession as a Psychologist, one axiom, shared by all of the medical community is “first do no harm”. When people enter into an agreement well informed of the stipulations there are expected outcomes. Where people choose a given lifestyle and living conditions, and then these elements are put in jeopardy, especially by governmental agencies, there is a disheartening alienation from the democratic process. We are in an age of extreme pessimism toward the national and state government. People are trying to salvage the connection to a democratically influenced local government. We neighbors who live right here and right now.

I am a member of the local community, board member for the Housing Authority of Southeastern Utah, and small business owner that has a strong and vested interest in creating housing in Grand County. My friends, my colleagues and I all struggle with the high cost of housing, barriers to ownership and low inventory that plagues this region. As an architect, I have an opportunity to create a housing project for the benefit of our local citizens, but I need your help to pave a pathway to make that dream a reality. My family and I are under contract on a 1.4 acre piece of property at 1187 & 1189 Murphy Lane, currently zoned Rural Residential. Our hope is to use the proposed HDH 15 incentive to create a small housing project tailored to the needs of our long-term residents. We will follow the process as outlined:
1. Work with the Community & Economic Development staff to fully understand how the overlay would pertain to this specific site.
2. Submit a standard development application form, associated documents and plans to demonstrate the use of the property for primary residential housing.
3. Sign development agreement confirming the use of the property for only primary residential housing.
4. Work with HASU to determine the required deed restrictions for the project. One item that has been discussed frequently in planning sessions for the HDH Overlay is that it does not provide blanket approval for development. However, it does provide the opportunity for approval for development. I am asking that I be given the opportunity to propose a responsible, sensitive and well-designed housing option for our community on a piece of land that I view as having strong potential for several reasons:
   • PROXIMITY TO CURRENT ZONING - The property is currently zoned Rural Residential but is directly adjacent to Large Lot Residential Properties. The current size of the property (1.4 acres) is underutilized under the current zoning designation.
   • PROXIMITY TO PROPOSED OVERLAY - The property is directly adjacent, to the West and across Murphy Lane, to properties already slated for the HDH15 overlay district.
   • PROXIMITY TO MOAB - The property is less than 1 mile from Moab City Limits. This creates an ideal situation for pedestrian and bicycle access to local amenities and the city center.
   • PROXIMITY TO MULTI FAMILY RESIDENTIAL OVERLAY - The property is .5 miles away from the current 20 unit/acre Multi Family Residential Overlay. Thus, current, dense multifamily projects are already nearby.
   • PRESERVATION OF EXISTING NEIGHBORHOODS - The property is nestled against the hills East of town. There are no existing neighborhoods surrounding
the lot whose character would be disrupted by development of the property. There are no neighboring properties whose views or solar access would be impeded by development of the lot.

- LOT SIZE - Current properties in the close vicinity are far more densely developed than the lot. There are few lots in this area of this size remaining (1.4 acres).
- SLOPE - The average slope of the property does not prohibit complying fire or emergency vehicle access from Murphy Lane. The average slope of the lot does not prohibit architectural development. The variation in slope allows for multiple base elevations within the project for vertical design interest.
- SERVICES - Municipal services are already in place to the site.

I sincerely appreciate your consideration of our request. If given the opportunity by inclusion in the HDH 15 Overlay district, my family and I hope to be among the first applications for a project. We are eager to work with the Community and Economic Development Department, the Planning Commission & the County Council to create a plan that benefits as many Grand County residents as possible.

I am representing [the owner of 1187 & 1189 Murphy Lane] on her request to be included in the high density overlay zoning. She is unable to be here at this time. I am a supporter of Tiny Home concepts and have agreed to volunteer to assist. OMA and I have no financial involvement in this project. We are volunteers only. I have talked with Mr. Levine and he has expressed a positive response.

Thank you for your consideration.
Density

I am concerned about the large amount of area being considered for the maximum density and particularly the potential height of buildings. With so much of these areas currently built with 1-story houses and roads that are insufficient for much higher density, 45 ft. buildings could seriously impact adjacent properties and entire neighborhoods in terms of increased traffic, parking issues, sunlight loss & privacy issues. I would rather see many of these dark pink areas dropped down to the blue category where you already have smaller lots and higher density as well as maintaining the rural character in our valley further from Hwy 191 that so many people value.

Good afternoon JD. As an owner of real estate in Grand County, and someone who hopes to help create solutions to affordable housing, I am excited about this proposal. My only request is that we provide higher density opportunities in certain areas. For instance, I own .5 acres of Highway commercial property. Under the 25 units/acre proposal, it is still more profitable for me to develop short term nightly rental units (which is not my desire). To get to a point where equal profits are available, and still provide "affordable" housing (condos at a price of sub $155,000) I would need to get to 36 units/acre. I would suggest a density of this amount to incentive developers to move forward with these types of developments.

Convey deed restrictions to public!!
NO more than one story houses on SITLA square/rectangle. Access concerns off and onto Hwy 191
Need a road to extend Rimrock to town??
Also NEED more East/West connections on east side of hwy in SV Drive to access hwy
Emphasize required setbacks, and buffers when going from low density to higher
What about water? Biggest question and concern code enforcement and water restrictions required
for overlay? No lawns etc.
What about stepping it all down one notch?? Move all bright light, all light pink into blue? Maybe a bit less to swallow at once?
Need to have higher density in area HDH25a
1) Water is already a critical problem.
2) We already need traffic lights at the junction of Lemon Lane and 191 to turn left toward Moab
3) Residents of Lemon Lane value their privacy and were required to maintain 1 acre lots. Will these proposed homes be 1 acre lots?
While I understand affordable housing is a nationwide problem (not just isolated to Moab), I find that having a 45-ft height limit in much of the south end of town and along the highway to be unacceptable. Having grown up in a large city, and being an architect and having studied urban planning, I know that he building "canyons" will be detrimental towards views, solar rights, and will lead to an unfortunate "ghettoization" in those areas. Even in places like Chicago, three floors above grade is the usual limit for neighborhoods. Please look at some studies of "projects" in Chicago and elsewhere that show that the further above the ground the residence, the less control parents and others have with what happens at ground level. Most low-rise (three stories only) are more successful than high-rise projects (which a building of 45 feet would be considered). Please eliminate the 25a option from your consideration.
There’s plenty of room at the south end of the valley, stacking people on top of each other, will not help the quality of life in Grand county! (8 likes)
We already live in crowded subdivision that is next to businesses along the 191. PLEASE no more! There is too much noise and traffic. When planning future homes, not sure where they will go but our experience here is that the Holyoak road is being used (and abused) by people trying to pass through to Hyway, VIA Holyoak so ACCESS ROADS and BUFFERS NEED TO BE INCORPORATED WHERE BUSINESSES ARE CLOSE TO RESIDENTIAL, and they need to COMPLY with CODES about lighting/noise! MAKE TRAFFIC GO AROUND HOUSING NOT THROUGH IT! The roads are affected, the sewers, the normal access is being pushed to limit, without INSIGHT and CARE in PLANNING! PLANT LOTS & LOTS OF TREES FOR EVERY NEW DEVELOPMENT!

Holyoak area is dense enough as it is. Housing has sprung all around the Holyoak area for years. The argument that the mass of HD’s should be located no more than 4.3 miles from the heart of downtown doesn’t make sense to me. Hdh should be located on the south highway Holyoak is already a very dense neighborhood, perhaps more than any other area. Bus service is coming to Moab. That will help with congestion somewhat but it’s a mess anyway we do it now.

You may have problems trying to get the lower density product (5-10 u/ac) work. At 5 u/ac you would be doing single family homes/ lots. A developer would need to be careful with “spec” inventory homes if they are building them out. If they are selling lots, they should probably be OK assuming the demand is there for custom builds and self-builds. If you go to 10-15 u/ac you would more than likely be doing an attached product which may involve additional risk of needing to construct “buildings” at a time, but if they got in a pinch could use the 20% if they couldn’t sell a unit or two in a 6-plex.

I am not in favor of the High Density Housing proposal. If you have ever been in Eastern U.S. cities, you may have noticed that high density housing tends to create slums. That is never the plan, but it is almost inevitable. Human beings in close concentration create waste and chaos. When there is no open/green space, there is seldom pride of ownership, at least in our current society. Those of us who weren’t born here, chose Moab in great part because of its open, rural feel.

I originally favored the plan because it seemed a way to possibly get a handle on our low-income housing shortage, but as I read the current proposal, I don’t see that aspect presented. This just feels like another cave-in to developers without consideration of our quality of life: pack as many people as possible into the space in order to maximize profits. If the trade-off was affordable housing, it might be worth it, but as it is, I would appreciate the council considering rejecting this proposition.

Nice "slideshow"! One of your slides summed up the philosophy rather well: "a voluntary, incentive-based program, the high density residential overlay will not be used on every eligible parcel, and likely will not be used on the vast majority of eligible parcels. With this in mind, the focus in drawing the overlay is to allow as many areas as it is appropriate the opportunity to construct more housing." Although it may not seem likely now, I'm concerned that if we do such extensive high density zoning, with no sideboards for maximum allowable houses in each zone, that we could end up with a very crowded valley eventually. I am also very concerned about over-allocating our limited water with development (especially with hotels! Although that's another topic...) but I suppose the water issue is something that would be addressed through approval/ denial of specific building permits?
Change density in phases  
Reduce heights all around  
Where are the open space set-asides?  
Hotel and nightly rental high-rise MORATORIUM  

With high density there needs to be some open spaces for children to play, to keep them from playing in the streets  
As a born and raised local I think higher density is overdue.  
We can't have a thriving economy/workforce if we have no housing. This is a must do!! Thank you.  

1) Water is already a critical resource in Grand County. Development should be calibrated to water resources in drought year.  
2) Increased density will create dangerous traffic conditions on Hwy 191. Can only occur if frequent traffic lights on Hwy 191 are placed  
3) High density increases noise and decreases security. It will destroy the ability to enjoy the homes we have created.  

Due to the limited supply of water, I am greatly concerned about the proposal to increase density in unincorporated Grand County. The current density levels are not sustainable as we move toward buildout. I can only support an increase in density in certain zones when there is a corresponding "down zone" of other areas to ensure the County does not over-build beyond what our water supply can support. I believe it will also be found that the burgeoning growth in the number of nightly accommodations has and will sap our water supply. No growth without proof of water. The end result will likely mean less density overall across the county to accommodate a few blocks of tight density. Any increased density should only be in the highway commercial zone and not in the existing residential neighborhoods.  

Everyone should go and support this!  
It needs to pass. The only way we get affordable housing is with high density. If you can only build one house per $100,000 acre. The valley will never be affordable. (3 Likes)  

I believe that 80/20 for locals will prevent quality development. Lots of the primary rental houses in Moab are bought as investments by non-locals. I'm a believer in incentives for locals to buy, not deed restrictions for owners. We have empty nesters in too large of houses in Grand County that would like smaller homes, less overhead. Which would free up large family homes. This is a good process to try to help local, working, county people. I would prefer valley wide up zoning, 1 acre zoning does not work for the anyone except the high end property owner. Most of the 1 acre lots in Spanish Valley could accommodate another home or two.  

We support the county's direction in applying the higher density to properties in Spanish Valley. The higher density provides lower income housing possibilities that are needed for many living in the Moab area. We do feel the zoning should be geared toward primary residential homes, not rentals or second homes.
I can't help but reflect upon efforts by the community (in past years' General Plans) to state a strong preference for preserving the rural character and agricultural element of Moab. I remember when ridge line development was frowned upon, even regulated. The quality of the air and access to public lands have been seen as assets for choosing to retire here. None of the numerous citizen efforts to maintain local community quality of life seem to gain traction with regard to developing this special place beyond carrying capacity. The density increase as proposed is way overdone, invasive to neighborhoods, and heavily reliant on developer incentives.

Aside from overtaxing aging sewer trunk lines, this plan, together with plans to build out Southern Spanish Valley, is entirely optimistic about future water resources, given the likelihood of increasing periods of drought. This year's prolonged drought should be a good reminder of that issue.

So, rather than criticize, let me ask why we need to beg developers to do something we could do for ourselves. I envision incentivizing a contractual arrangement between those looking for housing and current year round residents with enough property to add an additional structure, such as the type currently popping up for overnight rental, or a TRAILER. The incoming county attorney will certainly be able to craft language waiving impact fees, assuring that no short term rentals occur, and imposing fees for violating the intent to provide affordable housing for local workers. Rent control may sound like government overreach, but not when contractually agreed to. No developers would be required. Separate contracts for landowner-owned structures and renter-owned structures would be required, as well as verification of adequate utilities and sewer connection. I know trailer parks are out of favor, but in the above context, I'm reminded that no one would get away with overnight rentals, because their neighbors would certainly notice!

Thank you for the opportunity to express an alternative to the current plan, and for taking the time to consider it. I've read the current plan is only one of the "tools in the box" referring to providing affordable housing. Maybe other tools would better serve the community.

Whoever came up with this idea must not understand what it cost to build in this town. If I add a dwelling to my property, the cost to build it would not justify me being able to rent it at a low cost to a local. Especially since most of us have a hard time paying our own mortgages, trying to find a way to qualify for more money or a bigger loan is not a possibility for most of us to add 1 to 4 more units to our properties. We have looked into it. People already can add 1,000 ft extra dwelling to their property and most people don’t even do that. So obviously people are not interested in this. If the empty lot next to us ends up with 4 or 5 units on it. We are leaving this town.

Write letters to the city and county councils and to the newspaper editors. This is a terrific forum and there is realistic opposition to the proposed huge density changes but we MUST make our feelings known to those we elected to represent us.

I am a life-long local of Moab. Properties affected by this proposal are directly across the street from my home. I will be very affected by this, and I fully support it!

Simply put: without density, we can't have affordability. We all have to sacrifice.
I think density is a great idea, especially since Moab has historically had a boom/bust economy. Bringing in people/businesses would increase the longevity of the town. ADUs might be a great way to increase density and increase rental opportunities too. I think design requirements would be good for new commercial buildings to keep the character of the town, but I think residential design requirements would be incredibly limiting. With a housing crisis we need innovation and creativity so I would be careful not to put too many restrictions. Also have you considered a different way to present a plan like this? I think the word density scares some people but can be a really good thing. Just food for thought. :) 

Dear Community Development Staff and Planning Commission members, 

First, I thank staff for their often under-appreciated work, a thankless job. And I thank Planning Commission members for their volunteer service as well. I'm a Moab City Council member, a past member of the county Planning Commission and a member of the city's Water Advisory Board [Finite culinary water supply is a related problem which is exacerbated by both the accessory dwelling ordinance and the High Density Housing Overlay. But that is another issue on another front. ] However, I write here as a city and county resident. 

Re the proposed High Density Housing Overlay, my opinion is that in its present form, its downsides outweigh its upsides. 

The downsides are well known. As always, county residents like their rural character, elbow room, peace and quiet, manageable traffic and so on. 

The upside is that the county needs less expensive housing for its "workforce," for example teachers, policemen, firemen (and women), local government employees and our kids when they finish school. If HDH assured the latter, it might be worthwhile. But it doesn't. 

The problem is that in its present form, in particular its single restriction to deed restrict only to "primary" residents, defined as "... the owner of record occupies the dwelling unit for a minimum of 9 months per year and or a renter occupies the dwelling unit through a lease term no shorter than 6 months within a single calendar year," it leaves the door open to many people who are not the sort of "workforce" members who need housing assistance. This includes retirees (in full disclosure, I admit my wife and I are good examples), part-time residents who will game the system, people who will soon retire, and young and old people who are independently wealthy. 

Further, enforcement tools are far too weak. Primary residency is checked once at building permit time - then what? The developer isn't going to enforce deed restrictions - he'll disappear. And even if the county can revoke permits, what is there to revoke? Once the first resident is in, the ball is rolling. And current experience with tracking deed restrictions in other venues around the country demonstrate how easy it is to lose track of deed restrictions and primary resident qualification when property is resold. 

Because of this "unwanted" demand, lot prices will remain high, giving the developer his wildest wishes of wealth, but doing little for the people for whom HDH was intended.
I think it is important for Moab to approve some form of the High Density overlay in that there is a very limited number of locations that can build the type of housing most needed in Moab right now. Moab has out grown the "One Mansion per Acre" zoning and needs to address the fact that we need "houses that people can afford" and not necessarily "Affordable Housing".

Sorry I have not been able to attend any open house meetings as of yet. I hope to remedy that in September. Meanwhile I have some questions and some feedback from myself and our neighborhood group. Have you had feedback from any local developers indicating willingness to build with the limitations involved? I assume you are trusting that the homes build would be more reasonably priced due to the smaller lot size. Is that correct? If the developer decided to set the price higher than expected, what recourse would there be if any? Would there be any rent controls applied to apartments build under this plan? If your intent is to "flood" the market with units so that prices fall, how many units do you suppose it would take to achieve that effect? How quickly would they need to appear? It seems to me that this plan would have to be extremely effective in order to impact the entire market. You should have developers lined up in anticipation! If the response from developers is as limited as we have seen in the past, the impact on the local market will be non-existent or insignificant. If a few high density units are built, chances are the existing neighborhoods surrounding them will have sacrificed a degree of their quality of life as a result. Many neighbors I've spoken with have indicated their extreme dissatisfaction with the idea of such a sacrifice for housing that is not "affordable". Probably the least accepted element of this proposal is the 45 foot buildings it allows. The combination of VERY high densities and mid-rise buildings have left many county residents shell shocked. Combine that with the county build out numbers over 70,000 and people in my area are dismayed. Issues raised are the usual- water and other infrastructures. While county officials may not have control over these elements, they must take them into account. If you cannot assure the public that the resources to support such growth are available, that growth should not be encouraged. Many would like to see action such as Moab City is undertaking: reexamination of build out numbers in light of water resources and quality of life for residents and building affordable housing with public funds. A Grand County affordable housing fund needs to be built and utilized. Wouldn't the current County Council support some level of required fee from developers? Why not while the sitting council remains? I believe that Spanish Valley residents would support affordable housing developments and the necessary densities involved, if these communities are built to be reasonably compatible with existing neighborhoods and the needed infrastructure is in place to support quality of life for all.

We hope that the Commission will consider the merits of our suggestion despite the fact that it is arriving late in the process. We acknowledge the months of work that have been put into the overlay and the numerous opportunities for public input. We had planned to become involved in the process earlier this year but sadly some difficult life circumstances prevented us from doing so.

Just past Rocky Road, Spanish Valley Drive (SVD) goes up a hill and then levels out remaining mostly flat through the rest of the valley. Just as you crest the hill you enter a neighborhood formed by the Plateau Estates subdivision plus 5 other parcels on the West side of SVD and by the Hillcrest subdivision on the East side. On this area of the map, only the West side of SVD is included in the overlay and a small strip of seven parcels have a proposed overlay density of 15/acre. All of the adjacent parcels to the West are at 5/acre density and the other neighboring parcels are 2/acre. A list of the specific parcels, addresses, and acreages is included on page two. They all have primary residences on the parcel.

We own and rent one of the parcels in the Hillcrest subdivision and our home is located on another adjacent property. While our properties are not included in the overlay map, we and our neighbors are very concerned about the future character of the neighborhood if 15/acre density is developed in the middle of it.
Planning Department staff told us that during the Commission’s process of developing the overlay, parcel size was a strong consideration for determining what areas had neighborhood characteristics. The average parcel size of the neighborhood described above is about ½ an acre. This section of SVD is unique in that the parcels are much smaller, homes are closer together, homes are closer to SVD and the neighborhood feels like a cohesive community.

We are respectfully asking the Planning Commission to consider a change of density for the seven parcels in the neighborhood on the West side of SVD from 15/acre to 5/acre. In addition to maintaining the character of the neighborhood this will also be consistent with the densities allowed on the adjacent parcels to the south. These seven parcels represent the narrowest band of 15/acre density along SVD. There is one other section of SVD with a strip of parcels at 15/acre, no overlay on the East side of SVD and 5/acre density on adjacent parcels to the West. However, the average size of these five parcels is almost 1.5 acres, the homes are not as close together and the homes are not as close to SVD. Additionally there are not any residences on the East side of SVD because the cemetery is located there.

In summary, we are in favor of density increases to alleviate the shortage of housing for Grand County’s workers. We are not asking for a reduction in the overlay boundaries but instead for a change of density on seven parcels to maintain the character of a unique neighborhood. Thank you for your consideration.

Maps are attached. Please also find a list of neighborhood residents below that we have contacted and who agree with our proposal and wanted their names included. We did not receive any negative feedback regarding our proposed changes from any of the neighborhood residents who we were able to contact.

My husband and I write you today as director of the county planning commission. Please know that we are in favor of the work you all have done to find ways to create more housing for local workers. However, we feel sad and threatened by the new plan to create an overlay zone in our neighborhood, three miles from town. When we see all the empty land much closer to Moab and within walking distance, we wonder why the county would consider disturbing a lovely rural residential area where we have lived for 22 years, by bringing the city to us?!

We purchased our property with the thought in mind that we wanted a site for a happy home. We were not interested in using it as investment property. When we subdivided our property a few years ago from a 2 acre to two 1 acre lots so that we could sell our house to our daughter and her family and build our own home on the other acre, we ended up having to grant setbacks to the county on both the Spanish Valley Drive side and the Plateau Circle side so that we lost almost 1/2 acre total of our property with no compensation. (This means that we each own less than an acre now.) At that time, even permission for building a small, “grandmother-type” dwelling on our properties was opposed by the county – although eventually permission to build a structure of 1000 square feet was passed. Also, when we bought our property in 1996, we were told that when this property was developed by Bill Boulden, he received a waiver that released him from having to provide curb and gutter. If there is development within the new overlay dwelling limits in the Plateau subdivision, will the expenses for any required curb and gutter installation be borne by individual land owners?

This area is still a peaceful, mostly one residence per acre area, with much of the original native plantings. Although Spanish Valley Drive has become a thoroughfare for mostly locals as an alternative to taking 191 South to residences, it does become a noisy thoroughfare during peak season with many jeeps and ORVs buzzing by. Further, we anticipate it becoming a far busier road once the Arroyo Canyon development has become a reality. It is just unconscionable that even more people will be encouraged to build out and rent or sell condos or apartments in our neighborhood, bringing increased traffic to this area.
So, because we 1) want to keep our neighborhood characteristics intact, maintaining the quiet and privacy we currently enjoy, 2) limit the use of Spanish Valley Drive to local residents as much as possible, 3) prevent an increase in numbers of units per acre in this area, and 4) keep the rural residential zone in which we live, we request that the area above the hill south of Rocky Road and the Packard Distributing plant which encompasses the Plateau Circle area and further south, be removed from the overlay zone plan. Even 5 dwellings per acre is too much for this precious piece of the county. Please consider our urgent request.

I am a long time resident of District 3. I have also been a lifelong visitor to and resident of Moab. My father, an attorney for Utah League of /Cities and Towns, acted as Moab's attorney and would combine work and vacation. I grew up convinced that the river by Moab was paradise. In 1972 nearly all of my friends who were just graduating from the U of U moved here and became miners, boatmen, cowboys, cooks or road bike enthusiasts. In 1984 I finally escaped SLC with a job offer from Four Corners Mental Health. That same year I searched for a place to settle and desiring the remoteness of the edge of town and the unparalleled view bought in "Angel Heights" just below Disappearing Angel.

My plan was to create a small homestead (with my 3 and now 4 acres) and transform the barren, scraped area and the rolling blackbrush, into garden, orchard, animal habitat and oxygen replenishing "forest". All of my accumulated “retirement” and any windfall wealth from work on a movie filming or a disaster relief deployment has gone into creating my home. This is the community to which I have envisioned my future. You might say that all my eggs are in one basket.

Moab has grown and my neighborhood developed. But still, living on the edge of town (Rimrock Road), has allowed a sense of space and distance from the onslaught of humanity. Walking the infrequently used trails in the adjacent BLM and the rarer moment of calm in the early and late hours, have been the cornerstones of my rural-as-possible lifestyle.

Now to the point..... I am terrified at the prospects of the High Density Overlay that is being spearheaded by Mr. Levine, et.al.

Already my neighborhood, Roberts Road and above are zoned agracultural/residentil 1. This is 1 residence per acre with the allowance of an accessory home. (So basically 2 homes per acre.) Most of the lots, on average, are 2 acres. That would allow an increased density of 4 X or approximately a home every 1/2 acre. In my standards that is crowded. I moved to the edge of town to allow space, privacy and occasional calm. I believe that if the neighbors with a vested interest in the neighborhood wanted to subdivide into still somewhat spacious housing, it would be done in a more integrate respectful manner. Currently interspersed in the area are virtual junkyards, mobile homes that are decrepit and abandoned, owned now or soon by children who've settled elsewhere and a few large undeveloped lots. The money that might be made by selling out to a High Density developer would be a compelling reason to sell with no regard for the neighborhood. The prospects of increased traffic, noise (to include unattended barking dogs), light pollution and the disruption of the fallow habitat of animal life, all seem horrifying. The whole quality of my future seems at stake.

As soon as we neighbors became aware of the proposal we attended P&Z meetings to express our fears. The earlier public notices were not effective in warning us and since we weren't present the "stakeholders" who had been instrumental in the plans early formation had already laid the groundwork for the HDO. During the numerous P&Z meetings, I, or my wife, Joanne Savoie, have attended the stakeholders have been absent. I would surmise that their primary economic incentive (the commitment to creating the HDO in areas with existing infrastructure) had already been achieved.

When distilled down to the reality of this proposal, it appears that the creation of more accessible housing, for those current residents of Moab, that may still not either afford or desire it, as well as those non-existent, hypothetical persons, will come at the expense of those here and now residences who, in large part, have committed themselves to the community. This is to be done by the allowance...
of builders and developer to maximise the money saved by upgrading existing infrastructure in lieu of working from scratch. This is largely planning for the welfare of hypothetical persons while degrading the living conditions of we who are current residence and neighbors.

Since only 20% of the proposed housing is to be “affordable” anyway why not let the additional expense go to the buyer. Put the high density areas where there are either compatible neighbors or in some of the many undeveloped acres that exist in the county. Additionally crowding the HDO along the highway or Spanish Valley Drive assumes that these prospective new residents won’t just as easily be able to drive to work as the rest of us.

In my chosen profession as a Psychologist, one axiom, shared by all of the medical community is “first do no harm”. When people enter into an agreement well informed of the stipulations there are expected outcomes. Where people choose a given lifestyle and living conditions, and then these elements are put in jeopardy, especially by governmental agencies, there is a disheartening alienation from the democratic process. We are in an age of extreme pessimism toward the national and state government. People are trying to salvage the connection to a democratically influenced local government. We neighbors who live right here and right now.
Design

Convey deed restrictions to public!!
NO more than one story houses on SITLA square/rectangle. Access concerns off and onto Hwy 191
Need a road to extend Rimrock to town??
Also NEED more East/West connections on east side of hwy in SV Drive to access hwy
Emphasize required setbacks, and buffers when going from low density to higher
What about water? Biggest question and concern code enforcement and water restrictions required for
overlay? No lawns etc.
What about stepping it all down one notch?? Move all bright light, all light pink into blue? Maybe a bit
less to swallow at once?

While I understand affordable housing is a nationwide problem (not just isolated to Moab), I find that
having a 45-ft height limit in much of the south end of town and along the highway to be unacceptable.
Having grown up in a large city, and being an architect and having studied urban planning, I know that he
building "canyons" will be detrimental towards views, solar rights, and will lead to an unfortunate
"ghettoization" in those areas. Even in places like Chicago, three floors above grade is the usual limit for
neighborhoods. Please look at some studies of "projects" in Chicago and elsewhere that show that the
further above the ground the residence, the less control parents and others have with what happens at
ground level. Most low-rise (three stories only) are more successful than high-rise projects (which a
building of 45 feet would be considered). Please eliminate the 25a option from your consideration.
We already live in crowded subdivision that is next to businesses along the 191. PLEASE no more! There
is too much noise and traffic. When planning future homes, not sure where they will go but our
experience here is that the Holyoak road is being used (and abused) by people trying to pass through to
Hyway, VIA Holyoak so ACCESS ROADS and BUFFERS NEED TO BE INCORPORATED WHERE BUSINESSES
ARE CLOSE TO RESIDENTIAL, and they need to COMPLY with CODES about lighting/noise! MAKE TRAFFIC
GO AROUND HOUSING NOT THROUGH IT! The roads are affected, the sewers, the normal access is being
pushed to limit, without INSIGHT and CARE in PLANNING! PLANT LOTS & LOTS OF TREES FOR EVERY NEW
DEVELOPMENT!
I am not in favor of the High Density Housing proposal. If you have ever been in Eastern U.S. cities, you
may have noticed that high density housing tends to create slums. That is never the plan, but it is almost
inevitable. Human beings in close concentration create waste and chaos. When there is no open/green
space, there is seldom pride of ownership, at least in our current society. Those of us who weren't born
here, chose Moab in great part because of its open, rural feel.

I originally favored the plan because it seemed a way to possibly get a handle on our low-income housing
shortage, but as I read the current proposal, I don't see that aspect presented. This just feels like another
cave-in to developers without consideration of our quality of life: pack as many people as possible into
the space in order to maximize profits. If the trade-off was affordable housing, it might be worth it, but
as it is, I would appreciate the council considering rejecting this proposition.

Change density in phases
Reduce heights all around
Where are the open space set-asides?
Hotel and nightly rental high-rise MORATORIUM

18
With high density there needs to be some open spaces for children to play, to keep them from playing in the streets.

I think density is a great idea, especially since Moab has historically had a boom/bust economy. Bringing in people/businesses would increase the longevity of the town. ADUs might be a great way to increase density and increase rental opportunities too. I think design requirements would be good for new commercial buildings to keep the character of the town, but I think residential design requirements would be incredibly limiting. With a housing crisis we need innovation and creativity so I would be careful not to put too many restrictions. Also have you considered a different way to present a plan like this? I think the word density scares some people but can be a really good thing. Just food for thought. :)  

Planning Commission  
Thank you...  
Consider SOLAR ACCESS in your consideration for building heights on RIMROCK RD.  
30' max?? Would not be a major infringement on our 18 SOLAR PANELS  

40 foot tall buildings should not be allowed next to regular residential neighbors. People can have no yards, if they so choose, but putting these monstrosities in next to established homes is just wrong. There IS plenty of land further up the valley. Let San Juan County have the density. *(12 likes)*  

Several parcels in the proposal are SITLA parcels, have they indicated if they'll participate or not? Many parcels backup to existing residences and neighborhoods...will there be larger setbacks, open space, view restrictions to protect current residents? Maximum/limited dwelling prices should be used for some parcels  

Please make this proposal more visual for those who aren't able to see:  
1) What does 1 biggest allowed house look like in 1, 1/2 house per acre?  
2) Take same lot and show what 5 units per acre HDH development that is 35' high  
3) Same lot with 10 then 15 then 25 units per acre w/ heights of 35' and 45' maximums  

Thank you  

Thank you for your impressive work, JD especially. I'm excited about this work and need to spend more time reviewing. Initially, I appreciate you've taking into account solar access. If you haven't already, to the extent these would be applicable, please also consider viewshed and lighting (night sky) protections, and thinking ahead to providing for wildlife and transit corridor (especially bikes). Thanks!  

It’s a good idea if you don’t mind having no yard. *(2 likes)*  

*(Reply to above)* Many people don’t want a yard to tend. Moab definitely needs more diversity in housing options. *(3 Likes)*  

There needs to be an architectural code first.  

Too many ugly metal buildings here already. *(6 likes)*
Thanks for all your work to make our little valley a better place to live.

My main comment in regards to the proposed high density housing overlay proposition is that WE NEED A COUNTY WIDE ARCHITECTURAL CODE very first. Please do all you can to make that happen soon.

Why can’t we be the “Atomic Architecture” capital of the world? After all, we were the Uranium Capital of the World.

p.s. enough metal buildings already. Please NO more.

I am in support of the proposal. Higher density encourages walking and biking for smaller trips which will help mitigated traffic in the long run.
Developers should be required to contribute to bike infrastructure.
Design guidelines should be introduced in order to preserve the character of this special place.

Dark night Sky
Bike Lane
Traffic
191 Corridor
Gas Line Easements for bike lanes
Thank you

Has there been any design functions done to see the impact 45’ height restrictions on the hwy would impose? Important to "see" what impact that will have to the surroundings. However, I support increased height restrictions.
While I understand affordable housing is a nationwide problem (not just isolated to Moab), I find that having a 45-ft height limit in much of the south end of town and along the highway to be unacceptable. Having grown up in a large city, and being an architect and having studied urban planning, I know that building "canyons" will be detrimental towards views, solar rights, and will lead to an unfortunate "ghettoization" in those areas. Even in places like Chicago, three floors above grade is the usual limit for neighborhoods. Please look at some studies of "projects" in Chicago and elsewhere that show that the further above the ground the residence, the less control parents and others have with what happens at ground level. Most low-rise (three stories only) are more successful than high-rise projects (which a building of 45 feet would be considered). Please eliminate the 25a option from your consideration.

Change density in phases
Reduce heights all around
Where are the open space set-asides?
Hotel and nightly rental high-rise MORATORIUM

Planning Commission
Thank you...
Consider SOLAR ACCESS in your consideration for building heights on RIMROCK RD.
30' max?? Would not be a major infringement on our 18 SOLAR PANELS

40 foot tall buildings should not be allowed next to regular residential neighbors. People can have no yards, if they so choose, but putting these monstrosities in next to established homes is just wrong. There IS plenty of land further up the valley. Let San Juan County have the density. (12 likes)

Please make this proposal more visual for those who aren't able to see:
1) What does 1 biggest allowed house look like in 1, 1/2 house per acre?
2) Take same lot and show what 5 units per acre HDH development that is 35' high
3) Same lot with 10 then 15 then 25 units per acre w/ heights of 35' and 45' maximums
Thank you

Has there been any design functions done to see the impact 45' height restrictions on the hwy wou8ld impose? Important to "see" what impact that will have to the surroundings. However, I support increased height restrictions.

I am concerned about the large amount of area being considered for the maximum density and particularly the potential height of buildings. With so much of these areas currently built with 1-story houses and roads that are insufficient for much higher density, 45 ft. buildings could seriously impact adjacent properties and entire neighborhoods in terms of increased traffic, parking issues, sunlight loss & privacy issues.
I would rather see many of these dark pink areas dropped down to the blue category where you already have smaller lots and higher density as well as maintaining the rural character in our valley further from Hwy 191 that so many people value.

What about overall energy increases (please address)
Lighting issues - night sky is already affected
Water is an issue - enough?
Bought here (on Lemon Ln) because rural and remote
No more than 1 story houses. 3 Story condos are causing houses rather than cliff walls to be obscured
Nobody monitors light ordinances now! This will get out of hand.
I attended the open house last night and wanted to share my comments with you. I am not against creating more affordable housing. We need affordable housing. I just feel that the overlay the way it is currently presented is way too much. Meaning first step might to look at developing the HDH along the 191 corridor where there is currently infrastructure to support it and it would bring minimal impact to existing neighborhoods. I feel that the County council needs to first change the land use code to stop all development of Nightly rentals, condo's, and hotels along the corridor which would the open the way to support the development of affordable housing. Also, We don't have a handle on how much water is available in our valley. The HDH was developed before San Juan County dropped their bomb of building a 6000 person town in South Valley, before there were 16 new hotels planned, and before a 320 acre University campus was approved. Plus we are in a severe drought. Also in the proposed HDH I also do not like the way of building up with high story structures and how that would impact existing neighbors. I just moved from Orchard Villa, and the Entrada development has blocked the sun on the town house where I had lived. Thank you for letting me give voice to my concerns.

I support the idea of higher density in some of the currently undeveloped areas. I would like to see the height restrictions decreased to 3 story max in the highest density areas. Deed restrictions to ensure that housing is for full time workers/residents I do support. Sorry I have not been able to attend any open house meetings as of yet. I hope to remedy that in September. Meanwhile I have some questions and some feedback from myself and our neighborhood group. Have you had feedback from any local developers indicating willingness to build with the limitations involved? I assume you are trusting that the homes build would be more reasonably priced due to the smaller lot size. Is that correct? If the developer decided to set the price higher than expected, what recourse would there be if any? Would there be any rent controls applied to apartments build under this plan? If your intent is to "flood" the market with units so that prices fall, how many units do you suppose it would take to achieve that effect? How quickly would they need to appear? It seems to me that this plan would have to be extremely effective in order to impact the entire market. You should have developers lined up in anticipation! If the response from developers is as limited as we have seen in the past, the impact on the local market will be non-existent or insignificant. If a few high density units are built, chances are the existing neighborhoods surrounding them will have sacrificed a degree of their quality of life as a result. Many neighbors I've spoken with have indicated their extreme dissatisfaction with the idea of such a sacrifice for housing that is not "affordable". Probably the least accepted element of this proposal is the 45 foot buildings it allows. The combination of VERY high densities and mid-rise buildings have left many county residents shell shocked. Combine that with the county build out numbers over 70,000 and people in my area are dismayed. Issues raised are the usual - water and other infrastructures. While county officials may not have control over these elements, they must take them into account. If you cannot assure the public that the resources to support such growth are available, that growth should not be encouraged. Many would like to see action such as Moab City is undertaking: reexamination of build out numbers in light of water resources and quality of life for residents and building affordable housing with public funds. A Grand County affordable housing fund needs to be built and utilized. Wouldn't the current County Council support some level of required fee from developers? Why not now while the sitting council remains? I believe that Spanish Valley residents would support affordable housing developments and the necessary densities involved, If these communities are built to be reasonably compatible with existing neighborhoods and the needed infrastructure is in place to support quality of life for all.
Infrastructure

I am concerned about the large amount of area being considered for the maximum density and particularly the potential height of buildings. With so much of these areas currently built with 1-story houses and roads that are insufficient for much higher density, 45 ft. buildings could seriously impact adjacent properties and entire neighborhoods in terms of increased traffic, parking issues, sunlight loss & privacy issues.

I would rather see many of these dark pink areas dropped down to the blue category where you already have smaller lots and higher density as well as maintaining the rural character in our valley further from Hwy 191 that so many people value.

What about overall energy increases (please address)
Lighting issues - night sky is already affected
Water is an issue - enough?
Bought here (on Lemon Ln) because rural and remote
No more than 1 story houses. 3 Story condos are causing houses rather than cliff walls to be obscured
Nobody monitors light ordinances now! This will get out of hand.
I attended the open house last night and wanted to share my comments with you. I am not against creating more affordable housing. We need affordable housing. I just feel that the overlay the way it is currently presented is way too much. Meaning first step might to look at developing the HDH along the 191 corridor where there is currently infrastructure to support it and it would bring minimal impact to existing neighborhoods... I feel that the County council needs to first change the land use code to stop all development of Nightly rentals, condo’s, and hotels along the corridor which would the open the way to support the development of affordable housing. Also, We don’t have a handle on how much water is available in our valley. The HDH was developed before San Juan County dropped their bomb of building a 6000 person town in South Valley, before there were 16 new hotels planned, and before a 320 acre University campus was approved. Plus we are in a severe drought. Also In the proposed HDH I also do not like the way of building up with high story structures and how that would impact existing neighbors. I just moved from Orchard Villa, and the Entrada development has blocked the sun on the town house where I had lived.

Thank you for letting me give voice to my concerns.

Convey deed restrictions to public!!
NO more than one story houses on SITLA square/rectangle. Access concerns off and onto Hwy 191
Need a road to extend Rimrock to town??
Also NEED more East/West connections on east side of hwy in SV Drive to access hwy
Emphasize required setbacks, and buffers when going from low density to higher
What about water? Biggest question and concern code enforcement and water restrictions required for overlay? No lawns etc.
What about stepping it all down one notch?? Move all bright light, all light pink into blue? Maybe a bit less to swallow at once?
We already live in crowded subdivision that is next to businesses along the 191. PLEASE no more! There is too much noise and traffic. When planning future homes, not sure where they will go but our experience here is that the Holyoak road is being used (and abused) by people trying to pass through to Hyway, VIA Holyoak so ACCESS ROADS and BUFFERS NEED TO BE INCORPORATED WHERE BUSINESSES ARE CLOSE TO RESIDENTIAL, and they need to COMPLY with CODES about lighting/noise! MAKE TRAFFIC GO AROUND HOUSING NOT THROUGH IT! The roads are affected, the sewers, the normal access is being pushed to limit, without INSIGHT and CARE in PLANNING! PLANT LOTS & LOTS OF TREES FOR EVERY NEW DEVELOPMENT!

Thank you for your impressive work, JD especially. I’m excited about this work and need to spend more time reviewing. Initially, I appreciate you’ve taking into account solar access. If you haven’t already, to the extent these would be applicable, please also consider viewshed and lighting (night sky) protections, and thinking ahead to providing for wildlife and transit corridor (especially bikes). Thanks!

I am in support of the proposal. Higher density encourages walking and biking for smaller trips which will help mitigated traffic in the long run. Developers should be required to contribute to bike infrastructure. Design guidelines should be introduced in order to preserve the character of this special place.

Dark night Sky
Bike Lane
Traffic
191 Corridor
Gas Line Easements for bike lanes
Thank you

1) Water is already a critical problem.
2) We already need traffic lights at the junction of Lemon Lane and 191 to turn left toward Moab
3) Residents of Lemon Lane value their privacy and were required to maintain 1 acre lots. Will these proposed homes be 1 acre lots?

Holyoak area is dense enough as it is. Housing has sprung all around the Holyoak area for years. The argument that the mass of HD’s should be located no more than 4.3 miles from the heart of downtown doesn’t make sense to me. Hdh should be located on the south highway

Holyoak is already a very dense neighborhood, perhaps more than any other area. Bus service is coming to Moab. That will help with congestion somewhat but it’s a mess anyway we do it now. Nice "slideshow"! One of your slides summed up the philosophy rather well: "a voluntary, incentive-based program, the high density residential overlay will not be used on every eligible parcel, and likely will not be used on the vast majority of eligible parcels. With this in mind, the focus in drawing the overlay is to allow as many areas as it is appropriate the opportunity to construct more housing."

Although it may not seem likely now, I’m concerned that if we do such extensive high density zoning, with no sideboards for maximum allowable houses in each zone, that we could end up with a very crowded valley eventually. I am also very concerned about over-allocating our limited water with development (especially with hotels! Although that's another topic...) but I suppose the water issue is something that would be addressed through approval/ denial of specific building permits?

1) Water is already a critical resource in Grand County. Development should be calibrated to water resources in drought year.
2) Increased density will create dangerous traffic conditions on Hwy 191. Can only occur if frequent traffic lights on Hwy 191 are placed
3) High density increases noise and decreases security. It will destroy the ability to enjoy the homes we have created.

Due to the limited supply of water, I am greatly concerned about the proposal to increase density in unincorporated Grand County. The current density levels are not sustainable as we move toward buildout. I can only support an increase in density in certain zones when there is a corresponding "down zone" of other areas to ensure the County does not over-build beyond what our water supply can support. I believe it will also be found that the burgeoning growth in the number of nightly accommodations has and will sap our water supply. No growth without proof of water. The end result will likely mean less density overall across the county to accommodate a few blocks of tight density. Any increased density should only be in the highway commercial zone and not in the existing residential neighborhoods.

I can't help but reflect upon efforts by the community (in past years' General Plans) to state a strong preference for preserving the rural character and agricultural element of Moab. I remember when ridge line development was frowned upon, even regulated. The quality of the air and access to public lands have been seen as assets for choosing to retire here. None of the numerous citizen efforts to maintain local community quality of life seem to gain traction with regard to developing this special place beyond carrying capacity. The density increase as proposed is way overdone, invasive to neighborhoods, and heavily reliant on developer incentives. Aside from overtaxing aging sewer trunk lines, this plan, together with plans to build out Southern Spanish Valley, is entirely optimistic about future water resources, given the likelihood of increasing periods of drought. This year's prolonged drought should be a good reminder of that issue. So, rather than criticize, let me ask why we need to beg developers to do something we could do for ourselves. I envision incentivizing a contractual arrangement between those looking for housing and current year round residents with enough property to add an additional structure, such as the type currently popping up for overnight rental, or a TRAILER. The incoming county attorney will certainly be able to craft language waiving impact fees, assuring that no short term rentals occur, and imposing fees for violating the intent to provide affordable housing for local workers. Rent control may sound like government overreach, but not when contractually agreed to. No developers would be required. Separate contracts for landowner-owned structures and renter-owned structures would be required, as well as verification of adequate utilities and sewer connection. I know trailer parks are out of favor, but in the above context, I'm reminded that no one would get away with overnight rentals, because their neighbors would certainly notice! Thank you for the opportunity to express an alternative to the current plan, and for taking the time to consider it. I've read the current plan is only one of the "tools in the box" referring to providing affordable housing. Maybe other tools would better serve the community. Love this, thank you! It still feels like the light pink high density way out in SV is a mistake. I may be missing something, but why just because the county made a mistake (in my opinion) and built high density far out in the valley in the '90's should we continue that far out today? The high infrastructure and water costs as well as vehicle trips to town are inefficient and smoggy. Could we just leave those in low development until 20 years from now, to see where we are then? By then we may have more commercial out there.. more places to work NOT in town, etc. Why not "save" this area for future dev? This seems designed for SITLA development, or something. I mean everything south of the Arena...thanks!
I find this study to be admirable in effort but I have some reservations. I appreciate looking at areas where increased density in residential buildings would promote affordable housing for local residents. However, I am troubled that there is no reference to improving the infrastructure to support the increased density. There is no mention to improvements to Spanish Valley Drive as a lot of the increased density would be using that road. I realize that once some of the development is in place, that future commercial development could happen, such as a grocery store, elementary school, parks, restaurants, etc. so locals don't have to travel to downtown Moab for services. There needs to be a "South Moab" developed. And, with San Juan County’s plans on developing the south end of Spanish Valley, what about the additional traffic on Hwy 191? To me this study is only half of what is needed to have a bigger picture of the future of Spanish Valley.

Nice to develop 191 instead of Murphy?

The following topics need to be presented to the public at the open houses before adding more high density overlays for development in Grand County.

1. Success of approximately 10-year-old “High Density Overlays” around Government Building near Resource Blvd north to Moab City. Has the approximately 10-year-old overlay for increased density in the Resource Blvd. area of Grand County been successful in providing affordable housing? A. If successful in providing affordable house, why do we you need more overlays. B. If not successful in providing affordable housing why will the new proposal be an improvement?

1. Available Water for High Density Development

GWSSA was given their second or third allocation of 500-acre feet of water by the Utah Division of Water Rights over 5 years ago. GWSSA will have to apply for approval of a third allocation in the near future. The water is available in the Glen Canyon Aquifer per the USGS study. However!!!!!!! A. How many more equivalent housing units can be built before GWSSA has to apply to the state for another water allocation? GWSSA needs to include in this analysis of available water the approximate 300 ERUs sold to SITLA when the water system was completed and the projected water requirements of our new University. B. The USGS study says we have approximately 6000-acre feet of water available in the Glen Canyon Aquifer. GWSSA has water rights for a small part of the available water. Moab City has much older water rights and owns the largest portion of available water. Moab City will certainly protest any request by GWSSA for another allocation. How much of the 6000 acre does GWSSA owned based on the age of their current water rights. ? How many ERUs can the county approve based on their share of the available 6000 acre feet? What will GWSSA do if Moab City prevents future allocations of water? C. The available 6000-acre feet of water from the USGS study will not build out the Moab Valley if we increase density of construction. The county needs to look at alternative sources of water for development before increasing the density of housing in the valley. Alternative sources are available but will cost an unknown millions of dollars. Approving high density development without water sources for other land owners means many land owners will not be able to develop their property in the future or the cost of water for the future developments will be very high. How many acres in the valley will not have water for development in the future if we increase the density today based on current water rights and sources?
The increase in density proposal does not require that affordable housing is constructed. The proposal assumes that building house for only primary residents will result in affordable housing. This assumption has several problems. The following questions need to be answered or this proposal is the dream of every outside or local developer.

1. Who in the county will be responsible to guarantee that the housing will not be resold five or ten years later as second or third homes to wealthy people?
2. Who in the county will be responsible to verify that the first buyers are not buying a second home?
3. Where in the western US has this assumption proven to provide affordable housing to a community?

The website prepared for the public by the people making the proposal has very little concrete facts. There is absolutely no concern for the quantity of available water. There are no details about where their assumption has been proven to work. There is no detail on who will monitor sales of the new housing.

Do we have enough water??

We need to consider the future availability of water to support this kind of density without destroying the resource for all of us who live here.

If this zoning is approved how many units will be added, total? At what point will all the water be gone?

Why do we need to cater to the bikers for a bike lane. They don't bring much revenue to the community and makes it so roads have to be much wider.

The City needs to send a letter to the County that the proposed increase in density needs to be tabled until the state completes the adjudication of the valley and ownership of the available water is established.

Moab City should by now realize that SITLA is a very poor development partner. Please remember the fiasco with SITLA during the Cloudrock and Lionsback developments. SITLA will take water, sewer, and infrastructure and when there are no more gifts tell you they will not follow the Land Use Code. The public needs to know your plan to work with SITLA? How will the city prevent another fiasco with SITLA?

GWSSA does not have sufficient water for development of the University in the current state allocation. When GWSSA asks for another 500 acre foot allotment in the future, will the city protest the allocation? Will the city have a contract with GWSSA that guarantees the new allocation will go to the university and not to more density in the county?

GWSSA has very few old water rights and the city owns most of the available water in the aquifer. GWSSA is probably using city water for the university.

Not enough water to supply that many people, think about it, a water study was done and Spanish Valley and Moab came up short (5 likes)

Yeah enough with the "flexible zoning" too!! Mixing business with residential is no good! They blast you with their lights at night, traffic increases, some idiot businesses have live bands and point their amplifiers towards the neighborhood, tear up the streets and sewers and YES, the WATER!!! Council needs to SLOW roll and start by changing all outdated street lights to warm LED's OR with shield (NO glare everywhere). THEN FIX OUR ROADS we already have! Kudos to more AFFORDABLE housing for all; not just the PT workers imported in. (2 likes)

STOP BUILDING SO MUCH OUR LITTLE VALLEY WILL NOT SURVIVE!
Regarding Stocks Dr., I'm concerned about the ability of that Road to handle increased traffic. I'm not opposed to the increased density but the road would need upgrades. Also, an acceleration lane onto Hwy 191 is desperately needed.

I think we need a thorough water study for GC before continuing with any development. SJ County - 6000 residents - 320 acre USU campus - 16 more hotels - we don't know where we are at on water - 50-100 years from now!

Development should be mixed-use in order to encourage walking, biking; to foster spontaneous social interactions; to mitigate traffic and improve the environment.

Water study
Sewer study
San Juan County population increase

Thank you

I am concerned that there is not a longer term vision in Grand County. We are being hit with over the top visitation - hotels - new university - we don't have a good water study yet - and it is important to have a collective vision first, otherwise we stay in a reactive stance.

Dear Community Development Staff and Planning Commission members,

First, I thank staff for their often under-appreciated work, a thankless job. And I thank Planning Commission members for their volunteer service as well.

I'm a Moab City Council member, a past member of the county Planning Commission and a member of the city's Water Advisory Board [ Finite culinary water supply is a related problem which is exacerbated by both the accessory dwelling ordinance and the High Density Housing Overlay. But that is another issue on another front. ] However, I write here as a city and county resident.

Re the proposed High Density Housing Overlay, my opinion is that in its present form, its downsides outweigh its upsides.

The downsides are well known. As always, county residents like their rural character, elbow room, peace and quiet, manageable traffic and so on.

The upside is that the county needs less expensive housing for its "workforce," for example teachers, policemen, firemen (and women), local government employees and our kids when they finish school. If HDH assured the latter, it might be worthwhile. But it doesn’t.

The problem is that in its present form, in particular its single restriction to deed restrict only to "primary" residents, defined as "... the owner of record occupies the dwelling unit for a minimum of 9 months per year and or a renter occupies the dwelling unit through a lease term no shorter than 6 months within a single calendar year," , it leaves the door open to many people who are not the sort of "workforce" members who need housing assistance. This includes retirees (in full disclosure, I admit my wife and I are good examples), part-time residents who will game the system, people who will soon retire, and young and old people who are independently wealthy.

Further, enforcement tools are far too weak. Primary residency is checked once at building permit time - then what? The developer isn't going to enforce deed restrictions - he'll disappear. And even if the county can revoke permits, what is there to revoke? Once the first resident is in, the ball is rolling. And current experience with tracking deed restrictions in other venues around the country demonstrate
how easy it is to lose track of deed restrictions and primary resident qualification when property is resold.

Because of this "unwanted" demand, lot prices will remain high, giving the developer his wildest wishes of wealth, but doing little for the people for whom HDH was intended.

Sorry I have not been able to attend any open house meetings as of yet. I hope to remedy that in September. Meanwhile I have some questions and some feedback from myself and our neighborhood group. Have you had feedback from any local developers indicating willingness to build with the limitations involved? I assume you are trusting that the homes build would be more reasonably priced due to the smaller lot size. Is that correct? If the developer decided to set the price higher than expected, what recourse would there be if any? Would there be any rent controls applied to apartments build under this plan? If your intent is to "flood" the market with units so that prices fall, how many units do you suppose it would take to achieve that effect? How quickly would they need to appear? It seems to me that this plan would have to be extremely effective in order to impact the entire market. You should have developers lined up in anticipation! If the response from developers is as limited as we have seen in the past, the impact on the local market will be non-existent or insignificant. If a few high density units are built, chances are the existing neighborhoods surrounding them will have sacrificed a degree of their quality of life as a result. Many neighbors I've spoken with have indicated their extreme dissatisfaction with the idea of such a sacrifice for housing that is not "affordable". Probably the least accepted element of this proposal is the 45 foot buildings it allows. The combination of VERY high densities and mid-rise buildings have left many county residents shell shocked. Combine that with the county build out numbers over 70,000 and people in my area are dismayed. Issues raised are the usual- water and other infrastructures. While county officials may not have control over these elements, they must take them into account. If you cannot assure the public that the resources to support such growth are available, that growth should not be encouraged. Many would like to see action such as Moab City is undertaking: reexamination of build out numbers in light of water resources and quality of life for residents and building affordable housing with public funds. A Grand County affordable housing fund needs to be built and utilized. Wouldn't the current County Council support some level of required fee from developers? Why not now while the sitting council remains? I believe that Spanish Valley residents would support affordable housing developments and the necessary densities involved, if these communities are built to be reasonably compatible with existing neighborhoods and the needed infrastructure is in place to support quality of life for all.

My husband and I write you today as director of the county planning commission. Please know that we are in favor of the work you all have done to find ways to create more housing for local workers. However, we feel sad and threatened by the new plan to create an overlay zone in our neighborhood, three miles from town. When we see all the empty land much closer to Moab and within walking distance, we wonder why the county would consider disturbing a lovely rural residential area where we have lived for 22 years, by bringing the city to us!?

We purchased our property with the thought in mind that we wanted a site for a happy home. We were not interested in using it as investment property. When we subdivided our property a few years ago from a 2 acre to two 1 acre lots so that we could sell our house to our daughter and her family and build our own home on the other acre, we ended up having to grant setbacks to the county on both the Spanish Valley Drive side and the Plateau Circle side so that we lost almost 1/2 acre total of our property with no compensation. (This means that we each own less than an acre now.) At that time, even permission for building a small, “grandmother-type” dwelling on our properties was opposed by the county – although eventually permission to build a structure of 1000 square feet was passed.

Also, when we bought our property in 1996, we were told that when this property was developed by Bill Boulden, he received a waiver that released him from having to provide curb and gutter. If there is
development within the new overlay dwelling limits in the Plateau subdivision, will the expenses for any required curb and gutter installation be borne by individual land owners?

This area is still a peaceful, mostly one residence per acre area, with much of the original native plantings. Although Spanish Valley Drive has become a thoroughfare for mostly locals as an alternative to taking 191 South to residences, it does become a noisy thoroughfare during peak season with many jeeps and ORVs buzzing by. Further, we anticipate it becoming a far busier road once the Arroyo Canyon development has become a reality. It is just unconscionable that even more people will be encouraged to build out and rent or sell condos or apartments in our neighborhood, bringing increased traffic to this area.

So, because we 1) want to keep our neighborhood characteristics intact, maintaining the quiet and privacy we currently enjoy, 2) limit the use of Spanish Valley Drive to local residents as much as possible, 3) prevent an increase in numbers of units per acre in this area, and 4) keep the rural residential zone in which we live, we request that the area above the hill south of Rocky Road and the Packard Distributing plant which encompasses the Plateau Circle area and further south, be removed from the overlay zone plan. Even 5 dwellings per acre is too much for this precious piece of the county. Please consider our urgent request.

I am a long time resident of District 3. I have also been a lifelong visitor to and resident of Moab. My father, an attorney for Utah League of Cities and Towns, acted as Moab's attorney and would combine work and vacation. I grew up convinced that the river by Moab was paradise. In 1972 nearly all of my friends who were just graduating from the U of U moved here and became miners, boatmen, cowboys, cooks or road bike enthusiasts. In 1984 I finally escaped SLC with a job offer from Four Corners Mental Health. That same year I searched for a place to settle and desiring the remoteness of the edge of town and the unparalleled view bought in "Angel Heights" just below Disappearing Angel.

My plan was to create a small homestead (with my 3 and now 4 acres) and transform the barren, scraped area and the rolling blackbrush, into garden, orchard, animal habitat and oxygen replenishing "forest". All of my accumulated “retirement” and any windfall wealth from work on a movie filming or a disaster relief deployment has gone into creating my home. This is the community to which I have envisioned my future. You might say that all my eggs are in one basket.

Moab has grown and my neighborhood developed. But still, living on the edge of town (Rimrock Road), has allowed a sense of space and distance from the onslaught of humanity. Walking the infrequently used trails in the adjacent BLM and the rarer moment of calm in the early and late hours, have been the cornerstones of my rural-as-possible lifestyle.

Now to the point..... I am terrified at the prospects of the High Density Overlay that is being spearheaded by Mr. Levine, et.al.

Already my neighborhood, Roberts Road and above are zoned agracultural/residentil 1. This is 1 residence per acre with the allowance of an accessory home. (So basically 2 homes per acre.) Most of the lots, on average, are 2 acres. That would allow an increased density of 4 X or approximately a home every 1/2 acre. In my standards that is crowded. I moved to the edge of town to allow space, privacy and occasional calm. I believe that if the neighbors with a vested interest in the neighborhood wanted to subdivide into still somewhat spacious housing, it would be done, in a more integrate respectful manner. Currently interspersed in the area are virtual junkyards, mobile homes that are decrepit and abandoned, owned now or soon by children who’ve settled elsewhere and a few large undeveloped lots. The money that might be made by selling out to a High Density developer would be a compelling reason to sell with no regard for the neighborhood. The prospects of increased traffic, noise (to include unattended barking dogs), light pollution and the disruption of the fallow habitat of animal life, all seem horrifying. The whole quality of my future seems at stake.

As soon as we neighbors became aware of the proposal we attended P&Z meetins to express our fears. The earlier public notices were not effective in warning us and since we weren't present the
"stakeholders" who had been instrumental in the plans early formation had already laid the groundwork for the HDO. During the numerous P&Z meeting I, or my wife, Joanne Savoie, have attended the stakeholders have been absent. I would surmise that their primary economic incentive (the commitment to creating the HDO in areas with existing infrastructure) had already been achieved.

When distilled down to the reality of this proposal, it appears that the creation of more accessible housing, for those current residents of Moab, that may still not either afford or desire it, as well as those non-existent, hypothetical persons, will come at the expense of those here and now residences who, in large part, have committed themselves to the community. This is to be done by the allowance of builders and developer to maximise the money saved by upgrading existing infrastructure in lieu of working from scratch. This is largely planning for the welfare of hypothetical persons while degrading the living conditions of we who are current residence and neighbors.

Since only 20% of the proposed housing is to be “affordable” anyway why not let the additional expense go to the buyer. Put the high density areas where there are either compatible neighbors or in some of the many undeveloped acres that exist in the county. Additionally crowding the HDO along the highway or Spanish Valley Drive assumes that these prospective new residents won’t just as easily be able to drive to work as the rest of us.

In my chosen profession as a Psychologist, one axiom, shared by all of the medical community is “first do no harm”. When people enter into an agreement well informed of the stipulations there are expected outcomes. Where people choose a given lifestyle and living conditions, and then these elements are put in jeopardy, especially by governmental agencies, there is a disheartening alienation from the democratic process. We are in an age of extreme pessimism toward the national and state government. People are trying to salvage the connection to a democratically influenced local government. We neighbors who live right here and right now.
I attended the open house last night and wanted to share my comments with you. I am not against creating more affordable housing. We need affordable housing. I just feel that the overlay the way it is currently presented is way too much. Meaning first step might to look at developing the HDH along the 191 corridor where there is currently infrastructure to support it and it would bring minimal impact to existing neighborhoods. I feel that the County council needs to first change the land use code to stop all development of Nightly rentals, condo’s, and hotels along the corridor which would open the way to support the development of affordable housing. Also, We don’t have a handle on how much water is available in our valley. The HDH was developed before San Juan County dropped their bomb of building a 6000 person town in South Valley, before there were 16 new hotels planned, and before a 320 acre University campus was approved. Plus we are in a severe drought. Also In the proposed HDH I also do not like the way of building up with high story structures and how that would impact existing neighbors. I just moved from Orchard Villa, and the Entrada development has blocked the sun on the town house where I had lived.

Thank you for letting me give voice to my concerns.

Convey deed restrictions to public!!
NO more than one story houses on SITLA square/rectangle. Access concerns off and onto Hwy 191
Need a road to extend Rimrock to town??
Also NEED more East/West connections on east side of hwy in SV Drive to access hwy
Emphasize required setbacks, and buffers when going from low density to higher
What about water? Biggest question and concern code enforcement and water restrictions required for overlay? No lawns etc.
What about stepping it all down one notch?? Move all bright light, all light pink into blue? Maybe a bit less to swallow at once?
I can't help but reflect upon efforts by the community (in past years' General Plans) to state a strong preference for preserving the rural character and agricultural element of Moab. I remember when ridge line development was frowned upon, even regulated. The quality of the air and access to public lands have been seen as assets for choosing to retire here. None of the numerous citizen efforts to maintain local community quality of life seem to gain traction with regard to developing this special place beyond carrying capacity. The density increase as proposed is way overdone, invasive to neighborhoods, and heavily reliant on developer incentives. Aside from overtaxing aging sewer trunk lines, this plan, together with plans to build out Southern Spanish Valley, is entirely optimistic about future water resources, given the likelihood of increasing periods of drought. This year's prolonged drought should be a good reminder of that issue. So, rather than criticize, let me ask why we need to beg developers to do something we could do for ourselves. I envision incentivizing a contractual arrangement between those looking for housing and current year round residents with enough property to add an additional structure, such as the type currently popping up for overnight rental, or a TRAILER. The incoming county attorney will certainly be able to craft language waiving impact fees, assuring that no short term rentals occur, and imposing fees for violating the intent to provide affordable housing for local workers. Rent control may sound like government overreach, but not when contractually agreed to. No developers would be required. Separate contracts for landowner-owned structures and renter-owned structures would be required, as well as verification of adequate utilities and sewer connection. I know trailer parks are out of favor, but in the above context, I'm reminded that no one would get away with overnight rentals, because their neighbors would certainly notice! Thank you for the opportunity to express an alternative to the current plan, and for taking the time to consider it. I've read the current plan is only one of the "tools in the box" referring to providing affordable housing. Maybe other" tools "would better serve the community.

The increase in density proposal does not require that affordable housing is constructed. The proposal assumes that building house for only primary residents will result in affordable housing. This assumption has several problems. The following questions need to be answered or this proposal is the dream of every outside or local developer.
1. Who in the county will be responsible to guarantee that the housing will not be resold five or ten years later as second or third homes to wealthy people?
2. Who in the county will be responsible to verify that the first buyers are not buying a second home?
3. Where in the western US has this assumption proven to provide affordable housing to a community?

The website prepared for the public by the people making the proposal has very little concrete facts. There is absolutely no concern for the quantity of available water. There are no details about where their assumption has been proven to work. There is no detail on who will monitor sales of the new housing.
I support the idea of higher density in some of the currently undeveloped areas. I would like to see the height restrictions decreased to 3 story max in the highest density areas. Deed restrictions to ensure that housing is for full time workers/residents I do support.

I am not in favor of the High Density Housing proposal. If you have ever been in Eastern U.S. cities, you may have noticed that high density housing tends to create slums. That is never the plan, but it is almost inevitable. Human beings in close concentration create waste and chaos. When there is no open/green space, there is seldom pride of ownership, at least in our current society. Those of us who weren't born here, chose Moab in great part because of its open, rural feel. I originally favored the plan because it seemed a way to possibly get a handle on our low-income housing shortage, but as I read the current proposal, I don't see that aspect presented. This just feels like another cave-in to developers without consideration of our quality of life: pack as many people as possible into the space in order to maximize profits. If the trade-off was affordable housing, it might be worth it, but as it is, I would appreciate the council considering rejecting this proposition.

Several parcels in the proposal are SITLA parcels, have they indicated if they'll participate or not? Many parcels backup to existing residences and neighborhoods...will there be larger setbacks, open space, view restrictions to protect current residents? Maximum/limited dwelling prices should be used for some parcels

You may have problems trying to get the lower density product (5-10 u/ac) work. At 5 u/ac you would be doing single family homes/ lots. A developer would need to be careful with “spec” inventory homes if they are building them out. If they are selling lots, they should probably be OK assuming the demand is there for custom builds and self-builds. If you go to 10-15 u/ac you would more than likely be doing an attached product which may involve additional risk of needing to construct “buildings” at a time, but if they got in a pinch could use the 20% if they couldn’t sell a unit or two in a 6-plex.

As a born and raised local I think higher density is overdue. We can’t have a thriving economy/workforce if we have no housing. This is a must do!! Thank you.

Everyone should go and support this! It needs to pass. The only way we get affordable housing is with high density. If you can only build one house per $100,000 acre. The valley will never be affordable. (3 Likes)

I believe that 80/20 for locals will prevent quality development. Lots of the primary rental houses in Moab are bought as investments by non-locals. I’m a believer in incentives for locals to buy, not deed restrictions for owners. We have empty nesters in too large of houses in Grand County, that would like smaller homes, less overhead. Which would free up large family homes. This is a good process to try to help local, working, county people. I would prefer valley wide up zoning, 1 acre zoning does not work for the anyone except the high end property owner. Most of the 1 acre lots in Spanish Valley could accommodate another home or two.
We support the county's direction in applying the higher density to properties in Spanish Valley. The higher density provides lower income housing possibilities that are needed for many living in the Moab area. We do feel the zoning should be geared toward primary residential homes, not rentals or second homes.

Whoever came up with this idea must not understand what it cost to build in this town. If I add a dwelling to my property, the cost to build it would not justify me being able to rent it at a low cost to a local. Especially since most of us have a hard time paying our own mortgages, trying to find a way to qualify for more money or a bigger loan is not a possibility for most of us to add 1 to 4 more units to our properties. We have looked into it. People already can add 1,000 ft extra dwelling to their property and most people don't even do that. So obviously people are not interested in this. If the empty lot next to us ends up with 4 or 5 units on it. We are leaving this town.

Stay out of San Juan County Spanish Valley clean up the mess you've created in Grand County most of the 191 is a filthy looking embarrassing junkyard getting worse daily clean that up! Build affordable housing not low income that just brings more crime. Invest in cleanliness and organization in your county don't tread on my county to line your pockets $$$$$

I appreciate the locations of your selected densities. I question the potential of oversupply of deeded primary residences. That requirement may need to be flexible in time.

What measures are being taken to assure that the land parcels will be "affordable".

I am a developer and have done incentive-based housing predicated on additional density and here are my observations. I think the premise for your ambitions are great. I hope you find success. There are many keys to finding success in addition to increased density. Entitlements must be streamlined. As they say, time is money. The goal of a developer is to limit as much risk as possible, knowing that you will never completely eliminate it. If what I am reading is right, 80% of any units will be required to be primary residents. This scares me without a provision that allows you to either rent or sell those units to anyone after a certain "offering" period of time. Everyone is assuming the demand is there but until the end-user has to write out a check, it is yet to be seen. I hope this helps and I wish you the best of luck.

A few more thoughts...What type of restrictions will be on the 20%? If these were allowed to do shorter-term rentals that would be a definite plus. Nightly rentals would certainly sweeten the deal for developers. However, what about season-workers, students, construction workers that might not be considered “residents”, where would they fit? Maybe these groups of people could be considered residents if they are “working” in the area or maybe they would fit in the 20%. The simplest solution (and probably most effective) would be to not place any restriction on these.
The assumption that building only for primarily full time residents will provide affordable housing needs to be proven. Where in the west has the above assumption been proven to provide affordable housing? Building expensive apartments for wealth retired people will not increase affordable housing.

We can restrict overnight rentals in the valley and have almost the same results as building housing for only primary residents.

Do you plan to do an analyses of the available water based on the USGS study?

Great work on putting this plan and story map together!! It's great that this is voluntary for property owners, this could potentially open up a lot of new options for new affordable housing in Grand County. Great work!!

Brilliant way to allow 80% locals to benefit from county growth and not be hindered by AMI. Way to move this local need forward and enhance local moral and community spirit.

What keeps the owner of property from raising their land prices which would increase cost to build - thus not being able to keep it affordable!

we need diversity that is affordable. (5 likes)

Allowing for higher density without also requiring that there be an ‘affordable’ component seems to be missing the point.... (7 like)

From what I understand, there are restrictions to rent monthly only to locals. No overnight rentals. Seems reasonable to be able to develop for that reason. Housing, local housing. (6 likes)

If you want affordable housing, build some trailer parks. Otherwise let’s call it what is is, subsidized housing!

Don’t base on income
1. My income is not county business
2. If I get a better job, do I have to sell my home?
3. Will inflation cause me to have to sell?
4. If require active employment what happens when I retire?
5. If I lose my job, do I have to sell?

YES - Primary residence

This is a great idea, a necessary starting point. It’s important for those who work in Moab to be able to live in the area. This zoning change will act as a point to jump off of.

Sage Creek what about that place it certainly is not affordable!! I assume they will be rentals???

Any development per this plan is by people with $ for people with $ - several references have been made at every meeting about "low wages" and not having workers who could afford housing - certainly as condos and townhomes get "sold" they are not to service seasonal workers.

Is there any discussion on requiring developers to perform any sort of economic study to prove their price point?
Affordable housing should be started with a focus for our community's most vulnerable; the elderly and those on disability, followed by single person housing. Rather than building down from the top. "Primary residences" can still be owned by "out of towners" as long as it is rented to locals by a "6 mo or more lease." With expensive homes who will rent them?

Hello HDH Team-

I am writing to express my support for the inclusion of section 6.14.70 - "Special Needs Emergency/Transitional Housing".

[Local housing availability has placed a significant strain on the capacity of organizations working with vulnerable groups in need of such housing. Increasing the ability to develop these housing types provides more options for victims and reduces the need for local organizations to turn down those seeking help.]

Your work on this project is appreciated.

Dear Community Development Staff and Planning Commission members,

First, I thank staff for their often under-appreciated work, a thankless job. And I thank Planning Commission members for their volunteer service as well.

I'm a Moab City Council member, a past member of the county Planning Commission and a member of the city's Water Advisory Board [ Finite culinary water supply is a related problem which is exacerbated by both the accessory dwelling ordinance and the High Density Housing Overlay. But that is another issue on another front. ] However, I write here as a city and county resident.

Re the proposed High Density Housing Overlay, my opinion is that in its present form, its downsides outweigh its upsides.

The downsides are well known. As always, county residents like their rural character, elbow room, peace and quiet, manageable traffic and so on.

The upside is that the county needs less expensive housing for its "workforce," for example teachers, policemen, firemen (and women), local government employees and our kids when they finish school. If HDH assured the latter, it might be worthwhile. But it doesn't.

The problem is that in its present form, in particular its single restriction to deed restrict only to "primary" residents, defined as "... the owner of record occupies the dwelling unit for a minimum of 9 months per year and or a renter occupies the dwelling unit through a lease term no shorter than 6 months within a single calendar year, " , it leaves the door open to many people who are not the sort of "workforce" members who need housing assistance. This includes retirees (in full disclosure, I admit my wife and I are good examples), part-time residents who will game the system, people who will soon retire, and young and old people who are independently wealthy.

Further, enforcement tools are far too weak. Primary residency is checked once at building permit time - then what? The developer isn't going to enforce deed restrictions - he'll disappear. And even if the county can revoke permits, what is there to revoke? Once the first resident is in, the ball is
rolling. And current experience with tracking deed restrictions in other venues around the country demonstrate how easy it is to lose track of deed restrictions and primary resident qualification when property is resold.

Because of this "unwanted" demand, lot prices will remain high, giving the developer his wildest wishes of wealth, but doing little for the people for whom HDH was intended.

I think it is important for Moab to approve some form of the High Density overlay in that there is a very limited number of locations that can build the type of housing most needed in Moab right now. Moab has out grown the "One Mansion per Acre" zoning and needs to address the fact that we need "houses that people can afford" and not necessarily "Affordable Housing"

Sorry I have not been able to attend any open house meetings as of yet. I hope to remedy that in September. Meanwhile I have some questions and some feedback from myself and our neighborhood group. Have you had feedback from any local developers indicating willingness to build with the limitations involved? I assume you are trusting that the homes build would be more reasonably priced due to the smaller lot size. Is that correct? If the developer decided to set the price higher than expected, what recourse would there be if any? Would there be any rent controls applied to apartments build under this plan? If your intent is to "flood" the market with units so that prices fall, how many units do you suppose it would take to achieve that effect? How quickly would they need to appear? It seems to me that this plan would have to be extremely effective in order to impact the entire market. You should have developers lined up in anticipation! If the response from developers is as limited as we have seen in the past, the impact on the local market will be non-existent or insignificant. If a few high density units are built, chances are the existing neighborhoods surrounding them will have sacrificed a degree of their quality of life as a result.

Many neighbors I've spoken with have indicated their extreme dissatisfaction with the idea of such a sacrifice for housing that is not "affordable". Probably the least accepted element of this proposal is the 45 foot buildings it allows. The combination of VERY high densities and mid-rise buildings have left many county residents shell shocked. Combine that with the county build out numbers over 70,000 and people in my area are dismayed. Issues raised are the usual- water and other infrastructures. While county officials may not have control over these elements, they must take them into account. If you cannot assure the public that the resources to support such growth are available, that growth should not be encouraged. Many would like to see action such as Moab City is undertaking: reexamination of build out numbers in light of water resources and quality of life for residents and building affordable housing with public funds. A Grand County affordable housing fund needs to be built and utilized. Wouldn't the current County Council support some level of required fee from developers? Why not now while the sitting council remains? I believe that Spanish Valley residents would support affordable housing developments and the necessary densities involved. If these communities are built to be reasonably compatible with existing neighborhoods and the needed infrastructure is in place to support quality of life for all.
Financing/Cost to Developers

You may have problems trying to get the lower density product (5-10 u/ac) work. At 5 u/ac you would be doing single family homes/lots. A developer would need to be careful with “spec” inventory homes if they are building them out. If they are selling lots, they should probably be OK assuming the demand is there for custom builds and self-builds. If you go to 10-15 u/ac you would more than likely be doing an attached product which may involve additional risk of needing to construct “buildings” at a time, but if they got in a pinch could use the 20% if they couldn’t sell a unit or two in a 6-plex.

Whoever came up with this idea must not understand what it cost to build in this town. If I add a dwelling to my property, the cost to build it would not justify me being able to rent it at a low cost to a local. Especially since most of us have a hard time paying our own mortgages, trying to find a way to qualify for more money or a bigger loan is not a possibility for most of us to add 1 to 4 more units to our properties. We have looked into it. People already can add 1,000 ft extra dwelling to their property and most people don’t even do that. So obviously people are not interested in this. If the empty lot next to us ends up with 4 or 5 units on it. We are leaving this town.

I am a developer and have done incentive-based housing predicated on additional density and here are my observations. I think the premise for your ambitions are great. I hope you find success. There are many keys to finding success in addition to increased density. Entitlements must be streamlined. As they say, time is money. The goal of a developer is to limit as much risk as possible, knowing that you will never completely eliminate it. If what I am reading is right, 80% of any units will be required to be primary residents. This scares me without a provision that allows you to either rent or sell those units to anyone after a certain "offering" period of time. Everyone is assuming the demand is there but until the end-user has to write out a check, it is yet to be seen. I hope this helps and I wish you the best of luck.

A few more thoughts…What type of restrictions will be on the 20%? If these were allowed to do shorter-term rentals that would be a definite plus. Nightly rentals would certainly sweeten the deal for developers. However, what about season-workers, students, construction workers that might not be considered “residents”, where would they fit? Maybe these groups of people could be considered residents if they are “working” in the area or maybe they would fit in the 20%. The simplest solution (and probably most effective) would be to not place any restriction on these.

Great work on putting this plan and story map together!! It’s great that this is voluntary for property owners, this could potentially open up a lot of new options for new affordable housing in Grand County. Great work!!

What keeps the owner of property from raising their land prices which would increase cost to build - thus not being able to keep it affordable!

Is there any discussion on requiring developers to perform any sort of economic study to prove their price point?
I am in support of the proposal. Higher density encourages walking and biking for smaller trips which will help mitigate traffic in the long run.

Developers should be required to contribute to bike infrastructure.

Design guidelines should be introduced in order to preserve the character of this special place.

As a owner of real estate in Grand County, and someone who hopes to help create solutions to affordable housing, I am excited about this proposal. My only request is that we provide higher density opportunities in certain areas. For instance, I own .5 acres of Highway commercial property. Under the 25 units/acre proposal, it is still more profitable for me to develop short term nightly rental units (which is not my desire). To get to a point where equal profits are available, and still provide "affordable" housing (condos at a price of sub $155,000) I would need to get to 36 units/acre. I would suggest a density of this amount to incent developers to move forward with these types of developments.

Apartment builders need to fill their buildings as soon as possible and certainly wouldn’t be able to wait two or three years to fill them. I don’t know that they would be willing to make an initial investment of $10-$20 million with those kinds of restrictions.

No way for developers to sell with that many restrictions. It is a business it has to make profits to continue. Developing is not a non profit. Its a business.

Sorry I have not been able to attend any open house meetings as of yet. I hope to remedy that in September. Meanwhile I have some questions and some feedback from myself and our neighborhood group. Have you had feedback from any local developers indicating willingness to build with the limitations involved? I assume you are trusting that the homes build would be more reasonably priced due to the smaller lot size. Is that correct? If the developer decided to set the price higher than expected, what recourse would there be if any? Would there be any rent controls applied to apartments build under this plan? If your intent is to "flood" the market with units so that prices fall, how many units do you suppose it would take to achieve that effect? How quickly would they need to appear? It seems to me that this plan would have to be extremely effective in order to impact the entire market. You should have developers lined up in anticipation! If the response from developers is as limited as we have seen in the past, the impact on the local market will be non-existent or insignificant. If a few high density units are built, chances are the existing neighborhoods surrounding them will have sacrificed a degree of their quality of life as a result. Many neighbors I’ve spoken with have indicated their extreme dissatisfaction with the idea of such a sacrifice for housing that is not "affordable". Probably the least accepted element of this proposal is the 45 foot buildings it allows. The combination of VERY high densities and mid-rise buildings have left many county residents shell shocked. Combine that with the county build out numbers over 70,000 and people in my area are dismayed. Issues raised are the usual- water and other infrastructures. While county officials may not have control over these elements, they must take them into account. If you cannot assure the public that the resources to support such growth are available, that growth should not be encouraged. Many would like to see action such as Moab City is undertaking: reexamination of build out numbers in light of water resources and quality of life for residents and building affordable housing with public funds. A Grand County affordable housing fund needs to be built and utilized. Wouldn't the current County Council support some level of required fee from developers? Why not now while the sitting council remains? I believe that Spanish Valley residents would support affordable housing developments and the necessary densities involved, If these communities are
built to be reasonably compatible with existing neighborhoods and the needed infrastructure is in place to support quality of life for all.
**Dark Skies**

What about overall energy increases (please address)
Lighting issues - night sky is already affected
Water is an issue - enough?
Bought here (on Lemon Ln) because rural and remote
No more than 1 story houses. 3 Story condos are causing houses rather than cliff walls to be obscured
Nobody monitors light ordinances now! This will get out of hand.

We already live in crowded subdivision that is next to businesses along the 191. PLEASE no more! There is too much noise and traffic. When planning future homes, not sure where they will go but our experience here is that the Holyoak road is being used (and abused) by people trying to pass through to Hyway, VIA Holyoak so ACCESS ROADS and BUFFERS NEED TO BE INCORPORATED WHERE BUSINESSES ARE CLOSE TO RESIDENTIAL, and they need to COMPLY with CODES about lighting/noise! MAKE TRAFFIC GO AROUND HOUSING NOT THROUGH IT!
The roads are affected, the sewers, the normal access is being pushed to limit, without INSIGHT and CARE in PLANNING! PLANT LOTS & LOTS OF TREES FOR EVERY NEW DEVELOPMENT!

Thank you for your impressive work, JD especially. I’m excited about this work and need to spend more time reviewing. Initially, I appreciate you’ve taking into account solar access. If you haven’t already, to the extent these would be applicable, please also consider viewshed and lighting (night sky) protections, and thinking ahead to providing for wildlife and transit corridor (especially bikes). Thanks!

Dark night Sky
Bike Lane
Traffic
191 Corridor
Gas Line Easements for bike lanes
Thank you

Yeah enough with the "flexible zoning" too!! Mixing business with residential is no good! They blast you with their lights at night, traffic increases, some idiot businesses have live bands and point their amplifiers towards the neighborhood, tear up the streets and sewers and YES, the WATER!!! Council needs to SLOW roll and start by changing all outdated street lights to warm LED's OR with shield (NO glare everywhere). THEN FIX OUR ROADS we already have! Kudos to more AFFORDABLE housing for all; not just the PT workers imported in. *(2 likes)*

Planning Commission
Thank you...
Consider SOLAR ACCESS in your consideration for building heights on RIMROCK RD.
30' max?? Would not be a major infringement on our 18 SOLAR PANELS
What about light pollution. DARK SKY

Please keep in mind the night skies of Spanish Valley. We’re already seeing the "glow" of Moab and would hate to see future impacts.
I am a long time resident of District 3. I have also been a lifelong visitor to and resident of Moab. My father, an attorney for Utah League of Cities and Towns, acted as Moab's attorney and would combine work and vacation. I grew up convinced that the river by Moab was paradise. In 1972 nearly all of my friends who were just graduating from the U of U moved here and became miners, boatmen, cowboys, cooks or road bike enthusiasts. In 1984 I finally escaped SLC with a job offer from Four Corners Mental Health. That same year I searched for a place to settle and desiring the remoteness of the edge of town and the unparalleled view bought in "Angel Heights" just below Disappearing Angel.

My plan was to create a small homestead (with my 3 and now 4 acres) and transform the barren, scraped area and the rolling blackbrush, into garden, orchard, animal habitat and oxygen replenishing "forest". All of my accumulated "retirement" and any windfall wealth from work on a movie filming or a disaster relief deployment has gone into creating my home. This is the community to which I have envisioned my future. You might say that all my eggs are in one basket.

Moab has grown and my neighborhood developed. But still, living on the edge of town (Rimrock Road), has allowed a sense of space and distance from the onslaught of humanity. Walking the infrequently used trails in the adjacent BLM and the rarer moment of calm in the early and late hours, have been the cornerstones of my rural-as-possible lifestyle.

Now to the point..... I am terrified at the prospects of the High Density Overlay that is being spearheaded by Mr. Levine, et.al.

Already my neighborhood, Roberts Road and above are zoned agricultural/residential 1. This is 1 residence per acre with the allowance of an accessory home. (So basically 2 homes per acre.) Most of the lots, on average, are 2 acres. That would allow an increased density of 4 X or approximately a home every 1/2 acre. In my standards that is crowded. I moved to the edge of town to allow space, privacy and occasional calm. I believe that if the neighbors with a vested interest in the neighborhood wanted to subdivide into still somewhat spacious housing, it would be done, in a more integrate respectful manner. Currently interspersed in the area are virtual junkyards, mobile homes that are decrepit and abandoned, owned now or soon by children who’ve settled elsewhere and a few large undeveloped lots. The money that might be made by selling out to a High Density developer would be a compelling reason to sell with no regard for the neighborhood. The prospects of increased traffic, noise (to include unattended barking dogs), light pollution and the disruption of the fallow habitat of animal life, all seem horrifying. The whole quality of my future seems at stake.

As soon as we neighbors became aware of the proposal we attended P&Z meetings to express our fears. The earlier public notices were not effective in warning us and since we weren't present the "stakeholders" who had been instrumental in the plans early formation had already laid the groundwork for the HDO. During the numerous P&Z meetings, I, or my wife, Joanne Savoie, have attended the stakeholders have been absent. I would surmise that their primary economic incentive (the commitment to creating the HDO in areas with existing infrastructure) had already been achieved.

When distilled down to the reality of this proposal, it appears that the creation of more accessible housing, for those current residents of Moab, that may still not either afford or desire it, as well as those non-existent, hypothetical persons, will come at the expense of those here and now residences who, in large part, have committed themselves to the community. This is to be done by the allowance of builders and developer to maximize the money saved by upgrading existing infrastructure in lieu of working from scratch. This is largely planning for the welfare of hypothetical persons while degrading the living conditions of we who are current residence and neighbors...
...Since only 20% of the proposed housing is to be “affordable” anyway why not let the additional expense go to the buyer. Put the high density areas where there are either compatible neighbors or in some of the many undeveloped acres that exist in the county. Additionally crowding the HDO along the highway or Spanish Valley Drive assumes that these prospective new residents won’t just as easily be able to drive to work as the rest of us.

In my chosen profession as a Psychologist, one axiom, shared by all of the medical community is “first do no harm”. When people enter into an agreement well informed of the stipulations there are expected outcomes. Where people choose a given lifestyle and living conditions, and then these elements are put in jeopardy, especially by governmental agencies, there is a disheartening alienation from the democratic process. We are in an age of extreme pessimism toward the national and state government. People are trying to salvage the connection to a democratically influenced local government. We neighbors who live right here and right now.
Process

Yeah enough with the "flexible zoning" too!! Mixing business with residential is no good! They blast you with their lights at night, traffic increases, some idiot businesses have live bands and point their amplifiers towards the neighborhood, tear up the streets and sewers and YES, the WATER!!! Council needs to SLOW roll and start by changing all outdated street lights to warm LED's OR with shield (NO glare everywhere). THEN FIX OUR ROADS we already have! Kudos to more AFFORDABLE housing for all; not just the PT workers imported in. (2 likes)

I am a developer and have done incentive-based housing predicated on additional density and here are my observations. I think the premise for your ambitions are great. I hope you find success. There are many keys to finding success in addition to increased density. Entitlements must be streamlined. As they say, time is money. The goal of a developer is to limit as much risk as possible, knowing that you will never completely eliminate it. If what I am reading is right, 80% of any units will be required to be primary residents. This scares me without a provision that allows you to either rent or sell those units to anyone after a certain "offering" period of time. Everyone is assuming the demand is there but until the end-user has to write out a check, it is yet to be seen. I hope this helps and I wish you the best of luck.

Is there any discussion on requiring developers to perform any sort of economic study to prove their price point?

Convey deed restrictions to public!!
NO more than one story houses on SITLA square/rectangle. Access concerns off and onto Hwy 191
Need a road to extend Rimrock to town??
Also NEED more East/West connections on east side of hwy in SV Drive to access hwy
Emphasize required setbacks, and buffers when going from low density to higher
What about water? Biggest question and concern code enforcement and water restrictions required for overlay? No lawns etc.
What about stepping it all down one notch?? Move all bright light, all light pink into blue? Maybe a bit less to swallow at once?
I can't help but reflect upon efforts by the community (in past years' General Plans) to state a strong preference for preserving the rural character and agricultural element of Moab. I remember when ridge line development was frowned upon, even regulated. The quality of the air and access to public lands have been seen as assets for choosing to retire here. None of the numerous citizen efforts to maintain local community quality of life seem to gain traction with regard to developing this special place beyond carrying capacity. The density increase as proposed is way overdone, invasive to neighborhoods, and heavily reliant on developer incentives. Aside from overtaxing aging sewer trunk lines, this plan, together with plans to build out Southern Spanish Valley, is entirely optimistic about future water resources, given the likelihood of increasing periods of drought. This year's prolonged drought should be a good reminder of that issue. So, rather than criticize, let me ask why we need to beg developers to do something we could do for ourselves. I envision incentivizing a contractual arrangement between those looking for housing and current year round residents with enough property to add an additional structure, such as the type currently popping up for overnight rental, or a TRAILER. The incoming county attorney will certainly be able to craft language waiving impact fees, assuring that no short term rentals occur, and imposing fees for violating the intent to provide affordable housing for local workers. Rent control may sound like government overreach, but not when contractually agreed to. No developers would be required. Separate contracts for landowner-owned structures and renter-owned structures would be required, as well as verification of adequate utilities and sewer connection. I know trailer parks are out of favor, but in the above context, I'm reminded that no one would get away with overnight rentals, because their neighbors would certainly notice! Thank you for the opportunity to express an alternative to the current plan, and for taking the time to consider it. I've read the current plan is only one of the "tools in the box" referring to providing affordable housing. Maybe other tools would better serve the community.

The increase in density proposal does not require that affordable housing is constructed. The proposal assumes that building house for only primary residents will result in affordable housing. This assumption has several problems. The following questions need to be answered or this proposal is the dream of every outside or local developer.
1. Who in the county will be responsible to guarantee that the housing will not be resold five or ten years later as second or third homes to wealthy people?
2. Who in the county will be responsible to verify that the first buyers are not buying a second home?
3. Where in the western US has this assumption proven to provide affordable housing to a community?
The website prepared for the public by the people making the proposal has very little concrete facts. There is absolutely no concern for the quantity of available water. There are no details about where their assumption has been proven to work. There is no detail on who will monitor sales of the new housing.

Allowing for higher density without also requiring that there be an ‘affordable’ component seems to be missing the point.... (7 like)

Any development per this plan is by people with $ for people with $ - several references have been made at every meeting about "low wages" and not having workers who could afford housing - certainly as condos and townhomes get "sold" they are not to service seasonal workers.

Affordable housing should be started with a focus for our community's most vulnerable; the elderly and those on disability, followed by single person housing. Rather than building down from the top.
Nice "slideshow"! One of your slides summed up the philosophy rather well: "a voluntary, incentive-based program, the high density residential overlay will not be used on every eligible parcel, and likely will not be used on the vast majority of eligible parcels. With this in mind, the focus in drawing the overlay is to allow as many areas as it is appropriate the opportunity to construct more housing." Although it may not seem likely now, I'm concerned that if we do such extensive high density zoning, with no sideboards for maximum allowable houses in each zone, that we could end up with a very crowded valley eventually. I am also very concerned about over-allocating our limited water with development (especially with hotels! Although that's another topic...) but I suppose the water issue is something that would be addressed through approval/denial of specific building permits?

Change density in phases
Reduce heights all around
Where are the open space set-asides?
Hotel and nightly rental high-rise MORATORIUM

I think density is a great idea, especially since Moab has historically had a boom/bust economy. Bringing in people/businesses would increase the longevity of the town. ADUs might be a great way to increase density and increase rental opportunities too. I think design requirements would be good for new commercial buildings to keep the character of the town, but I think residential design requirements would be incredibly limiting. With a housing crisis we need innovation and creativity so I would be careful not to put too many restrictions. Also have you considered a different way to present a plan like this? I think the word density scares some people but can be a really good thing. Just food for thought. :)

It does not matter whether you attend or not they are going to do whatever they please and it will turn into daily rentals the new aspen is here (4 likes)

Hello HDH Team-

I am writing to express my support for the inclusion of section 6.14.70 - "Special Needs Emergency/Transitional Housing".

[Local housing availability has placed a significant strain on the capacity of organizations working with vulnerable groups in need of such housing. Increasing the ability to develop these housing types provides more options for victims and reduces the need for local organizations to turn down those seeking help.]

Your work on this project is appreciated.
Dear Community Development Staff and Planning Commission members,

First, I thank staff for their often under-appreciated work, a thankless job. And I thank Planning Commission members for their volunteer service as well. I'm a Moab City Council member, a past member of the county Planning Commission and a member of the city's Water Advisory Board [Finite culinary water supply is a related problem which is exacerbated by both the accessory dwelling ordinance and the High Density Housing Overlay. But that is another issue on another front. ] However, I write here as a city and county resident.

Re the proposed High Density Housing Overlay, my opinion is that in its present form, its downsides outweigh its upsides.

The downsides are well known. As always, county residents like their rural character, elbow room, peace and quiet, manageable traffic and so on.

The upside is that the county needs less expensive housing for its "workforce," for example teachers, policemen, firemen (and women), local government employees and our kids when they finish school. If HDH assured the latter, it might be worthwhile. But it doesn't.

The problem is that in its present form, in particular its single restriction to deed restrict only to "primary" residents, defined as "... the owner of record occupies the dwelling unit for a minimum of 9 months per year and or a renter occupies the dwelling unit through a lease term no shorter than 6 months within a single calendar year, ", it leaves the door open to many people who are not the sort of "workforce" members who need housing assistance. This includes retirees (in full disclosure, I admit my wife and I are good examples), part-time residents who will game the system, people who will soon retire, and young and old people who are independently wealthy.

Further, enforcement tools are far too weak. Primary residency is checked once at building permit time - then what? The developer isn't going to enforce deed restrictions - he'll disappear. And even if the county can revoke permits, what is there to revoke? Once the first resident is in, the ball is rolling. And current experience with tracking deed restrictions in other venues around the country demonstrate how easy it is to lose track of deed restrictions and primary resident qualification when property is resold.

Because of this "unwanted" demand, lot prices will remain high, giving the developer his wildest wishes of wealth, but doing little for the people for whom HDH was intended.
Other Policies/General Plan/Etc

Yeah enough with the "flexible zoning" too!! Mixing business with residential is no good! They blast you with their lights at night, traffic increases, some idiot businesses have live bands and point their amplifiers towards the neighborhood, tear up the streets and sewers and YES, the WATER!!! Council needs to SLOW roll and start by changing all outdated street lights to warm LED's OR with shield (NO glare everywhere). THEN FIX OUR ROADS we already have! Kudos to more AFFORDABLE housing for all; not just the PT workers imported in. (2 likes)

I can't help but reflect upon efforts by the community (in past years' General Plans) to state a strong preference for preserving the rural character and agricultural element of Moab. I remember when ridge line development was frowned upon, even regulated. The quality of the air and access to public lands have been seen as assets for choosing to retire here. None of the numerous citizen efforts to maintain local community quality of life seem to gain traction with regard to developing this special place beyond carrying capacity. The density increase as proposed is way overdone, invasive to neighborhoods, and heavily reliant on developer incentives.

Aside from overtaxing aging sewer trunk lines, this plan, together with plans to build out Southern Spanish Valley, is entirely optimistic about future water resources, given the likelihood of increasing periods of drought. This year's prolonged drought should be a good reminder of that issue. So, rather than criticize, let me ask why we need to beg developers to do something we could do for ourselves. I envision incentivizing a contractual arrangement between those looking for housing and current year round residents with enough property to add an additional structure, such as the type currently popping up for overnight rental, or a TRAILER. The incoming county attorney will certainly be able to craft language waiving impact fees, assuring that no short term rentals occur, and imposing fees for violating the intent to provide affordable housing for local workers. Rent control may sound like government overreach, but not when contractually agreed to. No developers would be required. Separate contracts for landowner-owned structures and renter-owned structures would be required, as well as verification of adequate utilities and sewer connection. I know trailer parks are out of favor, but in the above context, I'm reminded that no one would get away with overnight rentals, because their neighbors would certainly notice!

Thank you for the opportunity to express an alternative to the current plan, and for taking the time to consider it. I've read the current plan is only one of the "tools in the box" referring to providing affordable housing. Maybe other" tools " would better serve the community.

Change density in phases
Reduce heights all around
Where are the open space set-asides?
Hotel and nightly rental high-rise MORATORIUM

Stay out of San Juan County Spanish Valley clean up the mess you've created in Grand County most of the 191 is a filthy looking embarrassing junkyard getting worse daily clean that up! Build affordable housing not low income that just brings more crime. Invest in cleanliness and organization in your county don't tread on my county to line your pockets $$$$$
The assumption that building only for primarily full time residents will provide affordable housing needs to be proven. Where in the west has the above assumption been proven to provide affordable housing? Building expensive apartments for wealth retired people will not increase affordable housing. We can restrict overnight rentals in the valley and have almost the same results as building housing for only primary residents. Do you plan to do an analyses of the available water based on the USGS study?

I find this study to be admirable in effort but I have some reservations. I appreciate looking at areas where increased density in residential buildings would promote affordable housing for local residents. However, I am troubled that there is no reference to improving the infrastructure to support the increased density. There is no mention to improvements to Spanish Valley Drive as a lot of the increased density would be using that road. I realize that once some of the development is in place, that future commercial development could happen, such as a grocery store, elementary school, parks, restaurants, etc. so locals don't have to travel to downtown Moab for services. There needs to be a "South Moab" developed. And, with San Juan County’s plans on developing the south end of Spanish Valley, what about the additional traffic on Hwy 191? To me this study is only half of what is needed to have a bigger picture of the future of Spanish Valley.
The following topics need to be presented to the public at the open houses before adding more high density overlays for development in Grand County.


Has the approximately 10-year-old overlay for increased density in the Resource Blvd. area of Grand County been successful in providing affordable housing?
A. If successful in providing affordable house, why do we you need more overlays.
B. If not successful in providing affordable housing why will the new proposal be an improvement?

1. Available Water for High Density Development

GWSSA was given their second or third allocation of 500-acre feet of water by the Utah Division of Water Rights over 5 years ago. GWSSA will have to apply for approval of a third allocation in the near future. The water is available in the Glen Canyon Aquifer per the USGS study. However!!!!!!

A. How many more equivalent housing units can be built before GWSSA has to apply to the state for another water allocation? GWSSA needs to include in this analysis of available water the approximate 300 ERUs sold to SITLA when the water system was completed and the projected water requirements of our new University.
B. The USGS study says we have approximately 6000-acre feet of water available in the Glen Canyon Aquifer. GWSSA has water rights for a small part of the available water. Moab City has much older water rights and owns the largest portion of available water. Moab City will certainly protest any request by GWSSA for another allocation. How much of the 6000 acre does GWSSA owned based on the age of their current water rights. How many ERUs can the county approve based on their share of the available 6000 acre feet? What will GWSSA do if Moab City prevents future allocations of water?
C. The available 6000-acre feet of water from the USGS study will not build out the Moab Valley if we increase density of construction. The county needs to look at alternative sources of water for development before increasing the density of housing in the valley. Alternative sources are available but will cost an unknown millions of dollars. Approving high density development without water sources for other land owners means many land owners will not be able to develop their property in the future or the cost of water for the future developments will be very high.

How many acres in the valley will not have water for development in the future if we increase the density today based on current water rights and sources?

Moab City should by now realize that SITLA is a very poor development partner. Please remember the fiasco with SITLA during the Cloudrock and Lionsback developments. SITLA will take water, sewer, and infrastructure and when there are no more gifts tell you they will not follow the Land Use Code. The public needs to know your plan to work with SITLA? How will the city prevent another fiasco with SITLA? GWSSA does not have sufficient water for development of the University in the current state allocation. When GWSSA asks for another 500 acre foot allotment in the future, will the city protest the allocation? Will the city have a contract with GWSSA that guarantees the new allocation will go to the university and not to more density in the county?

GWSSA has very few old water rights and the city owns most of the available water in the aquifer. GWSSA is probably using city water for the university.

I think we need a thorough water study for GC before continuing with any development. SJ County - 6000 residents - 320 acre USU campus - 16 more hotels - we don't know where we are at on water - 50-100 years from now!

Development should be mixed-use in order to encourage walking, biking; to foster spontaneous social interactions; to mitigate traffic and improve the environment
I am concerned that there is not a longer term vision in Grand County. We are being hit with over the top visitation - hotels - new university - we don't have a good water study yet - and it is important to have a collective vision first, otherwise we stay in a reactive stance.

Stages of development with areas that would entail the least impact on existing neighborhoods being highest priority, would honor the intentions of those who desire the R1 A1 space. Without prioritizing with stages of development that can play out, making projections into future needs is all theoretical and not based upon reality.

Sorry I have not been able to attend any open house meetings as of yet. I hope to remedy that in September. Meanwhile I have some questions and some feedback from myself and our neighborhood group. Have you had feedback from any local developers indicating willingness to build with the limitations involved? I assume you are trusting that the homes build would be more reasonably priced due to the smaller lot size. Is that correct? If the developer decided to set the price higher than expected, what recourse would there be if any? Would there be any rent controls applied to apartments build under this plan? If your intent is to "flood" the market with units so that prices fall, how many units do you suppose it would take to achieve that effect? How quickly would they need to appear? It seems to me that this plan would have to be extremely effective in order to impact the entire market. You should have developers lined up in anticipation! If the response from developers is as limited as we have seen in the past, the impact on the local market will be non-existent or insignificant. If a few high density units are built, chances are the existing neighborhoods surrounding them will have sacrificed a degree of their quality of life as a result. Many neighbors I've spoken with have indicated their extreme dissatisfaction with the idea of such a sacrifice for housing that is not "affordable". Probably the least accepted element of this proposal is the 45 foot buildings it allows. The combination of VERY high densities and mid-rise buildings have left many county residents shell shocked. Combine that with the county build out numbers over 70,000 and people in my area are dismayed. Issues raised are the usual - water and other infrastructures. While county officials may not have control over these elements, they must take them into account. If you cannot assure the public that the resources to support such growth are available, that growth should not be encouraged. Many would like to see action such as Moab City is undertaking: reexamination of build out numbers in light of water resources and quality of life for residents and building affordable housing with public funds. A Grand County affordable housing fund needs to be built and utilized. Wouldn't the current County Council support some level of required fee from developers? Why not now while the sitting council remains? I believe that Spanish Valley residents would support affordable housing developments and the necessary densities involved. If these communities are built to be reasonably compatible with existing neighborhoods and the needed infrastructure is in place to support quality of life for all.
Please make this proposal more visual for those who aren't able to see:
1) What does 1 biggest allowed house look like in 1, 1/2 house per acre?
2) Take same lot and show what 5 units per acre HDH development that is 35' high
3) Same lot with 10 then 15 then 25 units per acre w/ heights of 35' and 45' maximums

Thank you

Great webpage, very informative. We have a big problem in Moab and this proposal is a big solution. Bravo, I hope it happens.

I think this is the best plan yet for helping to solve the housing shortage. I fully support this. Can you send me info regarding the next community involvement meeting for this plan?

Very good idea! Have to do something - this will help.

Stop this madness (8 likes)
[thumbs down emoji] (4 likes)

People already can't sleep at night in that town money hungry greed. people that made my home town have to move because it's outrageous to live in a sad town

Hello HDH Team-

I am writing to express my support for the inclusion of section 6.14.70 - "Special Needs Emergency/Transitional Housing".

[Local housing availability has placed a significant strain on the capacity of organizations working with vulnerable groups in need of such housing. Increasing the ability to develop these housing types provides more options for victims and reduces the need for local organizations to turn down those seeking help.]

Your work on this project is appreciated.
Love this, thank you! It still feels like the light pink high density way out in SV is a mistake. I may be
missing something, but why just because the county made a mistake (in my opinion) and built high
density far out in the valley in the '90's should we continue that far out today? The high
infrastructure and water costs as well as vehicle trips to town are inefficient and smoggy. Could we
just leave those in low development until 20 years from now, to see where we are then? By then we
may have more commercial out there.. more places to work NOT in town, etc. Why not "save" this
area for future dev? This seems designed for SITLA development, or something. I mean everything
south of the Arena... thanks!

I am concerned about the large amount of area being considered for the maximum density and
particularly the potential height of buildings. With so much of these areas currently built with 1-
story houses and roads that are insufficient for much higher density, 45 ft. buildings could seriously
impact adjacent properties and entire neighborhoods in terms of increased traffic, parking issues,
sunlight loss & privacy issues.
I would rather see many of these dark pink areas dropped down to the blue category where you
already have smaller lots and higher density as well as maintaining the rural character in our valley
further from Hwy 191 that so many people value.

As an owner of real estate in Grand County, and someone who hopes to help create solutions to
affordable housing, I am excited about this proposal. My only request is that we provide higher
density opportunities in certain areas. For instance, I own .5 acres of Highway commercial property.
Under the 25 units/acre proposal, it is still more profitable for me to develop short term nightly
rental units (which is not my desire). To get to a point where equal profits are available, and still
provide "affordable" housing (condos at a price of sub $155,000) I would need to get to 36
units/acre. I would suggest a density of this amount to incentive developers to move forward with
these types of developments.

Convey deed restrictions to public!!
NO more than one story houses on SITLA square/rectangle. Access concerns off and onto Hwy 191
Need a road to extend Rimrock to town??
Also NEED more East/West connections on east side of hwy in SV Drive to access hwy
Emphasize required set backs, and buffers when going from low density to higher
What about water? Biggest question and concern code enforcement and water restrictions required
for overlay? No lawns etc.
What about stepping it all down one notch?? Move all bright light, all light pink into blue? Maybe a
bit less to swallow at once?

Planning Commission
Thank you...
Consider SOLAR ACCESS in your consideration for building heights on RIMROCK RD.
30' max?? Would not be a major infringement on our 18 SOLAR PANELS
What about overall energy increases (please address)
Lighting issues - night sky is already affected
Water is an issue - enough?
Bought here (on Lemon Ln) because rural and remote
No more than 1 story houses. 3 Story condos are causing houses rather than cliff walls to be obscured
Nobody monitors light ordinances now! This will get out of hand.

Need to have higher density in area HDH25a

1) Water is already a critical problem.
2) We already need traffic lights at the junction of Lemon Lane and 191 to turn left toward Moab
3) Residents of Lemon Lane value their privacy and were required to maintain 1 acre lots. Will these proposed homes be 1 acre lots?

Thank you for all your work. I truly think you are on the right track, and think the east side of the valley needs more MFR.

It was a pleasure meeting you yesterday at the High Density Overlay Open House yesterday. I just wanted to tell you again how impressed I am by the work you have done on this proposal to date. You have thoughtfully combined all of the information at hand into a feasible first step to solutions for the housing crisis in Moab. Yesterday was a great move toward getting the approval that will be required to get it passed.

We do hope to be one of the small local developers to provide some of the essential housing that we need. In particular, my father, fiancé and I are under contract on a 1.4 Acre property at 1187 & 1189 Murphy Lane. Per this screenshot, we are currently JUST outside the proposed overlay. Although this property has challenges (don’t they all?), we believe that the site has strong potential for a small housing project. I hope you will take into consideration adding us, and the property just below us, into the overlay so we may further pursue a local housing development and approvals in the future.

As I mentioned, I am more than happy to help with your efforts in any way possible. I hope you will contact me if there is anything I can do.

While I understand affordable housing is a nationwide problem (not just isolated to Moab), I find that having a 45-ft height limit in much of the south end of town and along the highway to be unacceptable. Having grown up in a large city, and being an architect and having studied urban planning, I know that building “canyons” will be detrimental towards views, solar rights, and will lead to an unfortunate “ghettoization” in those areas. Even in places like Chicago, three floors above grade is the usual limit for neighborhoods. Please look at some studies of “projects” in Chicago and elsewhere that show that the further above the ground the residence, the less control parents and others have with what happens at ground level. Most low-rise (three stories only) are more successful than high-rise projects (which a building of 45 feet would be considered). Please eliminate the 25a option from your consideration.

40 foot tall buildings should not be allowed next to regular residential neighbors. People can have no yards, if they so choose, but putting these monstrosities in next to established homes is just wrong. There IS plenty of land further up the valley. Let San Juan County have the density. (12 likes)
There's plenty of room at the south end of the valley, stacking people on top of each other, will not help the quality of life in Grand county! (8 likes)

We already live in crowded subdivision that is next to businesses along the 191. PLEASE no more! There is too much noise and traffic. When planning future homes, not sure where they will go but our experience here is that the Holyoak road is being used (and abused) by people trying to pass through to Hyway, VIA Holyoak so ACCESS ROADS and BUFFERS NEED TO BE INCORPORATED WHERE BUSINESSES ARE CLOSE TO RESIDENTIAL, and they need to COMPLY with CODES about lighting/noise! MAKE TRAFFIC GO AROUND HOUSING NOT THROUGH IT! The roads are affected, the sewers, the normal access is being pushed to limit, without INSIGHT and CARE in PLANNING! PLANT LOTS & LOTS OF TREES FOR EVERY NEW DEVELOPMENT!

I find this study to be admirable in effort but I have some reservations. I appreciate looking at areas where increased density in residential buildings would promote affordable housing for local residents. However, I am troubled that there is no reference to improving the infrastructure to support the increased density. There is no mention to improvements to Spanish Valley Drive as a lot of the increased density would be using that road. I realize that once some of the development is in place, that future commercial development could happen, such as a grocery store, elementary school, parks, restaurants, etc. so locals don't have to travel to downtown Moab for services. There needs to be a "South Moab" developed. And, with San Juan County's plans on developing the south end of Spanish Valley, what about the additional traffic on Hwy 191? To me this study is only half of what is needed to have a bigger picture of the future of Spanish Valley.

Stay out of San Juan County Spanish Valley clean up the mess you've created in Grand County most of the 191 is a filthy looking embarrassing junkyard getting worse daily clean that up! Build affordable housing not low income that just brings more crime. Invest in cleanliness and organization in your county don't tread on my county to line your pockets $$$$$

Holyoak area is dense enough as it is. Housing has sprung all around the Holyoak area for years. The argument that the mass of HD's should be located no more than 4.3 miles from the heart of downtown doesn't make sense to me. Hdh should be located on the south highway. Holyoak is already a very dense neighborhood, perhaps more than any other area. Bus service is coming to Moab. That will help with congestion somewhat but it's a mess anyway we do it now.

Stages of development with areas that would entail the least impact on existing neighborhoods being highest priority, would honor the intentions of those who desire the R1 A1 space. Without prioritizing with stages of development that can play out, making projections into future needs is all theoretical and not based upon reality.

Several parcels in the proposal are SITLA parcels, have they indicated if they'll participate or not? Many parcels backup to existing residences and neighborhoods...will there be larger setbacks, open space, view restrictions to protect current residents? Maximum/limited dwelling prices should be used for some parcels

Nice to develop 191 instead of Murphy?

I appreciate the locations of your selected densities. I question the potential of oversupply of deeded primary residences. That requirement may need to be flexible in time.
I attended the open house last night and wanted to share my comments with you. I am not against creating more affordable housing. We need affordable housing. I just feel that the overlay the way it is currently presented is way too much. Meaning first step might to look at developing the HDH along the 191 corridor where there is currently infrastructure to support it and it would bring minimal impact to existing neighborhoods... I feel that the County council needs to first change the land use code to stop all development of Nightly rentals, condo's, and hotels along the corridor which would the open the way to support the development of affordable housing. Also, We don't have a handle on how much water is available in our valley. The HDH was developed before San Juan County dropped their bomb of building a 6000 person town in South Valley, before there were 16 new hotels planned, and before a 320 acre University campus was approved. Plus we are in a severe drought. Also in the proposed HDH I also do not like the way of building up with high story structures and how that would impact existing neighbors. I just moved from Orchard Villa, and the Entrada development has blocked the sun on the town house where I had lived.

Thank you for letting me give voice to my concerns.

We are writing in support of the overall HDH overlay plan. We think that the goals of the overlay are important and could help to alleviate the housing shortage in our county. We also applaud the plan’s attempt to maintain neighborhood characteristics and believe it has done a good job of this on the whole. However, we do feel that there is one neighborhood that has been missed in these considerations.

We hope that the Commission will consider the merits of our suggestion despite the fact that it is arriving late in the process. We acknowledge the months of work that have been put into the overlay and the numerous opportunities for public input. We had planned to become involved in the process earlier this year but sadly some difficult life circumstances prevented us from doing so.

Just past Rocky Road, Spanish Valley Drive (SVD) goes up a hill and then levels out remaining mostly flat through the rest of the valley. Just as you crest the hill you enter a neighborhood formed by the Plateau Estates subdivision plus 5 other parcels on the West side of SVD and by the Hillcrest subdivision on the East side. On this area of the map, only the West side of SVD is included in the overlay and a small strip of seven parcels have a proposed overlay density of 15/acre. All of the adjacent parcels to the West are at 5/acre density and the other neighboring parcels are 2/acre. A list of the specific parcels, addresses, and acreages is included on page two. They all have primary residences on the parcel.

We own and rent one of the parcels in the Hillcrest subdivision and our home is located on another adjacent property. While our properties are not included in the overlay map, we and our neighbors are very concerned about the future character of the neighborhood if 15/acre density is developed in the middle of it.

Planning Department staff told us that during the Commission’s process of developing the overlay, parcel size was a strong consideration for determining what areas had neighborhood characteristics. The average parcel size of the neighborhood described above is about ½ an acre. This section of SVD is unique in that the parcels are much smaller, homes are closer together, homes are closer to SVD and the neighborhood feels like a cohesive community.

We are respectfully asking the Planning Commission to consider a change of density for the seven parcels in the neighborhood on the West side of SVD from 15/acre to 5/acre. In addition to maintaining the character of the neighborhood this will also be consistent with the densities allowed on the adjacent parcels to the south. These seven parcels represent the narrowest band of 15/acre density along SVD. There is one other section of SVD with a strip of parcels at 15/acre, no overlay on the East side of SVD and 5/acre density on adjacent parcels to the West. However, the average
size of these five parcels is almost 1.5 acres, the homes are not as close together and the homes are not as close to SVD. Additionally there are not any residences on the East side of SVD because the cemetery is located there.

In summary, we are in favor of density increases to alleviate the shortage of housing for Grand County's workers. We are not asking for a reduction in the overlay boundaries but instead for a change of density on seven parcels to maintain the character of a unique neighborhood. Thank you for your consideration.

Maps are attached. Please also find a list of neighborhood residents below that we have contacted and who agree with our proposal and wanted their names included. We did not receive any negative feedback regarding our proposed changes from any of the neighborhood residents who we were able to contact.

I have known and respected you since meeting you several years ago and appreciate the work you are currently doing for the county. My husband and I write you today as director of the county planning commission. Please know that we are in favor of the work you all have done to find ways to create more housing for local workers. However, we feel sad and threatened by the new plan to create an overlay zone in our neighborhood, three miles from town. When we see all the empty land much closer to Moab and within walking distance, we wonder why the county would consider disturbing a lovely rural residential area where we have lived for 22 years, by bringing the city to us!? We purchased our property with the thought in mind that we wanted a site for a happy home. We were not interested in using it as investment property. When we subdivided our property a few years ago from a 2 acre to two 1 acre lots so that we could sell our house to our daughter and her family and build our own home on the other acre, we ended up having to grant setbacks to the county on both the Spanish Valley Drive side and the Plateau Circle side so that we lost almost 1/2 acre total of our property with no compensation. (This means that we each own less than an acre now.) At that time, even permission for building a small, "grandmother-type" dwelling on our properties was opposed by the county — although eventually permission to build a structure of 1000 square feet was passed.

Also, when we bought our property in 1996, we were told that when this property was developed by Bill Boulden, he received a waiver that released him from having to provide curb and gutter. If there is development within the new overlay dwelling limits in the Plateau subdivision, will the expenses for any required curb and gutter installation be borne by individual land owners?

This area is still a peaceful, mostly one residence per acre area, with much of the original native plantings. Although Spanish Valley Drive has become a thoroughfare for mostly locals as an alternative to taking 191 South to residences, it does become a noisy thoroughfare during peak season with many jeeps and ORVs buzzing by. Further, we anticipate it becoming a far busier road once the Arroyo Canyon development has become a reality. It is just unconscionable that even more people will be encouraged to build out and rent or sell condos or apartments in our neighborhood, bringing increased traffic to this area.

So, because we 1) want to keep our neighborhood characteristics intact, maintaining the quiet and privacy we currently enjoy, 2) limit the use of Spanish Valley Drive to local residents as much as possible, 3) prevent an increase in numbers of units per acre in this area, and 4) keep the rural residential zone in which we live, we request that the area above the hill south of Rocky Road and the Packard Distributing plant which encompasses the Plateau Circle area and further south, be removed from the overlay zone plan. Even 5 dwellings per acre is too much for this precious piece of the county.

Please consider our urgent request.
I am a long time resident of District 3. I have also been a lifelong visitor to and resident of Moab. My father, an attorney for Utah League of Cities and Towns, acted as Moab's attorney and would combine work and vacation. I grew up convinced that the river by Moab was paradise. In 1972 nearly all of my friends who were just graduating from the U of U moved here and became miners, boatmen, cowboys, cooks or road bike enthusiasts. In 1984 I finally escaped SLC with a job offer from Four Corners Mental Health. That same year I searched for a place to settle and desiring the remoteness of the edge of town and the unparalleled view bought in "Angel Heights" just below Disappearing Angel.

My plan was to create a small homestead (with my 3 and now 4 acres) and transform the barren, scraped area and the rolling blackbrush, into garden, orchard, animal habitat and oxygen replenishing "forest". All of my accumulated "retirement" and any windfall wealth from work on a movie filming or a disaster relief deployment has gone into creating my home. This is the community to which I have envisioned my future. You might say that all my eggs are in one basket.

Moab has grown and my neighborhood developed. But still, living on the edge of town (Rimrock Road), has allowed a sense of space and distance from the onslaught of humanity. Walking the infrequently used trails in the adjacent BLM and the rarer moment of calm in the early and late hours, have been the cornerstones of my rural-as-possible lifestyle.

Now to the point..... I am terrified at the prospects of the High Density Overlay that is being spearheaded by Mr. Levine, et.al.

Already my neighborhood, Roberts Road and above are zoned agrcultural/residential 1. This is 1 residence per acre with the allowance of an accessory home. (So basically 2 homes per acre.) Most of the lots, on average, are 2 acres. That would allow an increased density of 4 X or approximately a home every 1/2 acre. In my standards that is crowded. I moved to the edge of town to allow space, privacy and occasional calm. I believe that if the neighbors with a vested interest in the neighborhood wanted to subdivide into still somewhat spacious housing, it would be done, in a more integrate respectful manner. Currently interspersed in the area are virtual junkyards, mobile homes that are decrepit and abandoned, owned now or soon by children who've settled elsewhere and a few large undeveloped lots. The money that might be made by selling out to a High Density developer would be a compelling reason to sell with no regard for the neighborhood. The prospects of increased traffic, noise (to include unattended barking dogs), light pollution and the disruption of the fallow habitat of animal life, all seem horrifying. The whole quality of my future seems at stake.

As soon as we neighbors became aware of the proposal we attended P&Z meetings to express our fears. The earlier public notices were not effective in warning us and since we weren't present the "stakeholders" who had been instrumental in the plans early formation had already laid the groundwork for the HDO. During the numerous P&Z meeting I, or my wife, Joanne Savoie, have attended the stakeholders have been absent. I would surmise that their primary economic incentive (the commitment to creating the HDO in areas with existing infrastructure) had already been achieved.

When distilled down to the reality of this proposal, it appears that the creation of more accessible housing, for those current residents of Moab, that may still not either afford or desire it, as well as those non-existent, hypothetical persons, will come at the expense of those here and now residences who, in large part, have committed themselves to the community. This is to be done by the allowance of builders and developer to maximise the money saved by upgrading existing infrastructure in lieu of working from scratch. This is largely planning for the welfare of hypothetical persons while degrading the living conditions of we who are current residence and neighbors.

Since only 20% of the proposed housing is to be "affordable" anyway why not let the additonal expense go to the buyer. Put the high density areas where there are either compatible neighbors or
in some of the many undeveloped acres that exist in the county. Additionally crowding the HDO along the highway or Spanish Valley Drive assumes that these prospective new residents won’t just as easily be able to drive to work as the rest of us.

In my chosen profession as a Psychologist, one axiom, shared by all of the medical community is “first do no harm”. When people enter into an agreement well informed of the stipulations there are expected outcomes. Where people choose a given lifestyle and living conditions, and then these elements are put in jeopardy, especially by governmental agencies, there is a disheartening alienation from the democratic process. We are in an age of extreme pessimism toward the national and state government. People are trying to salvage the connection to a democratically influenced local government. We neighbors who live right here and right now.

I am a member of the local community, board member for the Housing Authority of Southeastern Utah, and small business owner that has a strong and vested interest in creating housing in Grand County. My friends, my colleagues and I all struggle with the high cost of housing, barriers to ownership and low inventory that plagues this region. As an architect, I have an opportunity to create a housing project for the benefit of our local citizens, but I need your help to pave a pathway to make that dream a reality. My family and I are under contract on a 1.4 acre piece of property at 1187 & 1189 Murphy Lane, currently zoned Rural Residential. Our hope is to use the proposed HDH 15 incentive to create a small housing project tailored to the needs of our long-term residents. We will follow the process as outlined:

1. Work with the Community & Economic Development staff to fully understand how the overlay would pertain to this specific site.
2. Submit a standard development application form, associated documents and plans to demonstrate the use of the property for primary residential housing.
3. Sign development agreement confirming the use of the property for only primary residential housing.
4. Work with HASU to determine the required deed restrictions for the project.

One item that has been discussed frequently in planning sessions for the HDH Overlay is that it does not provide blanket approval for development. However, it does provide the opportunity for approval for development. I am asking that I be given the opportunity to propose a responsible, sensitive and well-designed housing option for our community on a piece of land that I view as having strong potential for several reasons:

- PROXIMITY TO CURRENT ZONING - The property is currently zoned Rural Residential but is directly adjacent to Large Lot Residential Properties. The current size of the property (1.4 acres) is underutilized under the current zoning designation.
- PROXIMITY TO PROPOSED OVERLAY - The property is directly adjacent, to the West and across Murphy Lane, to properties already slated for the HDH15 overlay district.
- PROXIMITY TO MOAB - The property is less than 1 mile from Moab City Limits. This creates an ideal situation for pedestrian and bicycle access to local amenities and the city center.
- PROXIMITY TO MULTI FAMILY RESIDENTIAL OVERLAY - The property is .5 miles away from the current 20 unit/acre Multi Family Residential Overlay. Thus, current, dense multifamily projects are already nearby.
- PRESERVATION OF EXISTING NEIGHBORHOODS - The property is nestled against the hills East of town. There are no existing neighborhoods surrounding
the lot whose character would be disrupted by development of the property. There are no neighboring properties whose views or solar access would be impeded by development of the lot.

• LOT SIZE - Current properties in the close vicinity are far more densely developed than the lot. There are few lots in this area of this size remaining (1.4 acres).
• SLOPE - The average slope of the property does not prohibit complying fire or emergency vehicle access from Murphy Lane. The average slope of the lot does not prohibit architectural development. The variation in slope allows for multiple base elevations within the project for vertical design interest.
• SERVICES - Municipal services are already in place to the site.

I sincerely appreciate your consideration of our request. If given the opportunity by inclusion in the HDH 15 Overlay district, my family and I hope to be among the first applications for a project. We are eager to work with the Community and Economic Development Department, the Planning Commission & the County Council to create a plan that benefits as many Grand County residents as possible.

I am representing [the owner of 1187 & 1189 Murphy Lane] on her request to be included in the high density overlay zoning. She is unable to be here at this time.
I am a supporter of Tiny Home concepts and have agreed to volunteer to assist. OMA and I have no financial involvement in this project. We are volunteers only.
I have talked with Mr. Levine and he has expressed a positive response.

Thank you for your consideration.
Density

I am concerned about the large amount of area being considered for the maximum density and particularly the potential height of buildings. With so much of these areas currently built with 1-story houses and roads that are insufficient for much higher density, 45 ft. buildings could seriously impact adjacent properties and entire neighborhoods in terms of increased traffic, parking issues, sunlight loss & privacy issues. I would rather see many of these dark pink areas dropped down to the blue category where you already have smaller lots and higher density as well as maintaining the rural character in our valley further from Hwy 191 that so many people value.

Good afternoon JD. As an owner of real estate in Grand County, and someone who hopes to help create solutions to affordable housing, I am excited about this proposal. My only request is that we provide higher density opportunities in certain areas. For instance, I own .5 acres of Highway commercial property. Under the 25 units/acre proposal, it is still more profitable for me to develop short term nightly rental units (which is not my desire). To get to a point where equal profits are available, and still provide "affordable" housing (condos at a price of sub $155,000) I would need to get to 36 units/acre. I would suggest a density of this amount to incentive developers to move forward with these types of developments.

Convey deed restrictions to public!!
NO more than one story houses on SITLA square/rectangle. Access concerns off and onto Hwy 191
Need a road to extend Rimrock to town??
Also NEED more East/West connections on east side of hwy in SV Drive to access hwy
Emphasize required setbacks, and buffers when going from low density to higher
What about water? Biggest question and concern code enforcement and water restrictions required for overlay? No lawns etc.
What about stepping it all down one notch?? Move all bright light, all light pink into blue? Maybe a bit less to swallow at once?

Need to have higher density in area HDH25a

1) Water is already a critical problem.
2) We already need traffic lights at the junction of Lemon Lane and 191 to turn left toward Moab
3) Residents of Lemon Lane value their privacy and were required to maintain 1 acre lots. Will these proposed homes be 1 acre lots?

While I understand affordable housing is a nationwide problem (not just isolated to Moab), I find that having a 45-ft height limit in much of the south end of town and along the highway to be unacceptable. Having grown up in a large city, and being an architect and having studied urban planning, I know that building "canyons" will be detrimental towards views, solar rights, and will lead to an unfortunate "ghettoization" in those areas. Even in places like Chicago, three floors above grade is the usual limit for neighborhoods. Please look at some studies of "projects" in Chicago and elsewhere that show that the further above the ground the residence, the less control parents and others have with what happens at ground level. Most low-rise (three stories only) are more successful than high-rise projects (which a building of 45 feet would be considered). Please eliminate the 25a option from your consideration.

There's plenty of room at the south end of the valley, stacking people on top of each other, will not help the quality of life in Grand county! (8 likes)

HDH Feedback
We already live in crowded subdivision that is next to businesses along the 191. PLEASE no more! There is too much noise and traffic. When planning future homes, not sure where they will go but our experience here is that the Holyoak road is being used (and abused) by people trying to pass through to Hyway, VIA Holyoak so ACCESS ROADS and BUFFERS NEED TO BE INCORPORATED WHERE BUSINESSES ARE CLOSE TO RESIDENTIAL, and they need to COMPLY with CODES about lighting/noise! MAKE TRAFFIC GO AROUND HOUSING NOT THROUGH IT! The roads are affected, the sewers, the normal access is being pushed to limit, without INSIGHT and CARE in PLANNING! PLANT LOTS & LOTS OF TREES FOR EVERY NEW DEVELOPMENT!

Holyoak area is dense enough as it is. Housing has sprung all around the Holyoak area for years. The argument that the mass of HD's should be located no more than 4.3 miles from the heart of downtown doesn't make sense to me. Hdh should be located on the south highway Holyoak is already a very dense neighborhood, perhaps more than any other area. Bus service is coming to Moab. That will help with congestion somewhat but it's a mess anyway we do it now.

You may have problems trying to get the lower density product (5-10 u/ac) work. At 5 u/ac you would be doing single family homes/ lots. A developer would need to be careful with "spec" inventory homes if they are building them out. If they are selling lots, they should probably be OK assuming the demand is there for custom builds and self-buils. If you go to 10-15 u/ac you would more than likely be doing an attached product which may involve additional risk of needing to construct "buildings" at a time, but if they got in a pinch could use the 20% if they couldn't sell a unit or two in a 6-plex.

I am not in favor of the High Density Housing proposal. If you have ever been in Eastern U.S. cities, you may have noticed that high density housing tends to create slums. That is never the plan, but it is almost inevitable. Human beings in close concentration create waste and chaos. When there is no open/green space, there is seldom pride of ownership, at least in our current society. Those of us who weren't born here, chose Moab in great part because of its open, rural feel.

I originally favored the plan because it seemed a way to possibly get a handle on our low-income housing shortage, but as I read the current proposal, I don't see that aspect presented. This just feels like another cave-in to developers without consideration of our quality of life: pack as many people as possible into the space in order to maximize profits. If the trade-off was affordable housing, it might be worth it, but as it is, I would appreciate the council considering rejecting this proposition.

Nice "slideshow"! One of your slides summed up the philosophy rather well: "a voluntary, incentive-based program, the high density residential overlay will not be used on every eligible parcel, and likely will not be used on the vast majority of eligible parcels. With this in mind, the focus in drawing the overlay is to allow as many areas as it is appropriate the opportunity to construct more housing." Although it may not seem likely now, I'm concerned that if we do such extensive high density zoning, with no sideboards for maximum allowable houses in each zone, that we could end up with a very crowded valley eventually. I am also very concerned about over-allocating our limited water with development (especially with hotels! Although that's another topic...) but I suppose the water issue is something that would be addressed through approval/ denial of specific building permits?
Change density in phases
Reduce heights all around
Where are the open space set-asides?
Hotel and nightly rental high-rise MORATORIUM

With high density there needs to be some open spaces for children to play, to keep them from playing in the streets

As a born and raised local I think higher density is overdue.
We can't have a thriving economy/workforce if we have no housing. This is a must do!! Thank you.

1) Water is already a critical resource in Grand County. Development should be calibrated to water resources in drought year.
2) Increased density will create dangerous traffic conditions on Hwy 191. Can only occur if frequent traffic lights on Hwy 191 are placed
3) High density increases noise and decreases security. It will destroy the ability to enjoy the homes we have created.

Due to the limited supply of water, I am greatly concerned about the proposal to increase density in unincorporated Grand County. The current density levels are not sustainable as we move toward buildout. I can only support an increase in density in certain zones when there is a corresponding "down zone" of other areas to ensure the County does not over-build beyond what our water supply can support. I believe it will also be found that the burgeoning growth in the number of nightly accommodations has and will sap our water supply. No growth without proof of water. The end result will likely mean less density overall across the county to accommodate a few blocks of tight density. Any increased density should only be in the highway commercial zone and not in the existing residential neighborhoods.

Everyone should go and support this!
It needs to pass. The only way we get affordable housing is with high density. If you can only build one house per $100,000 acre. The valley will never be affordable. (3 Likes)

I believe that 80/20 for locals will prevent quality development. Lots of the primary rental houses in Moab are bought as investments by non-locals. I'm a believer in incentives for locals to buy, not deed restrictions for owners. We have empty nesters in too large of houses in Grand County that would like smaller homes, less overhead. Which would free up large family homes. This is a good process to try to help local, working, county people. I would prefer valley wide up zoning, 1 acre zoning does not work for the anyone except the high end property owner. Most of the 1 acre lots in Spanish Valley could accommodate another home or two.

We support the county's direction in applying the higher density to properties in Spanish Valley. The higher density provides lower income housing possibilities that are needed for many living in the Moab area. We do feel the zoning should be geared toward primary residential homes, not rentals or second homes.
I can't help but reflect upon efforts by the community (in past years' General Plans) to state a strong preference for preserving the rural character and agricultural element of Moab. I remember when ridge line development was frowned upon, even regulated. The quality of the air and access to public lands have been seen as assets for choosing to retire here. None of the numerous citizen efforts to maintain local community quality of life seem to gain traction with regard to developing this special place beyond carrying capacity. The density increase as proposed is way overdone, invasive to neighborhoods, and heavily reliant on developer incentives.

Aside from overtaxing aging sewer trunk lines, this plan, together with plans to build out Southern Spanish Valley, is entirely optimistic about future water resources, given the likelihood of increasing periods of drought. This year's prolonged drought should be a good reminder of that issue.

So, rather than criticize, let me ask why we need to beg developers to do something we could do for ourselves. I envision incentivizing a contractual arrangement between those looking for housing and current year round residents with enough property to add an additional structure, such as the type currently popping up for overnight rental, or a TRAILER. The incoming county attorney will certainly be able to craft language waiving impact fees, assuring that no short term rentals occur, and imposing fees for violating the intent to provide affordable housing for local workers. Rent control may sound like government overreach, but not when contractually agreed to. No developers would be required. Separate contracts for landowner-owned structures and renter-owned structures would be required, as well as verification of adequate utilities and sewer connection. I know trailer parks are out of favor, but in the above context, I'm reminded that no one would get away with overnight rentals, because their neighbors would certainly notice!

Thank you for the opportunity to express an alternative to the current plan, and for taking the time to consider it. I've read the current plan is only one of the "tools in the box" referring to providing affordable housing. Maybe other "tools" would better serve the community.

Whoever came up with this idea must not understand what it cost to build in this town. If I add a dwelling to my property, the cost to build it would not justify me being able to rent it at a low cost to a local. Especially since most of us have a hard time paying our own mortgages, trying to find a way to qualify for more money or a bigger loan is not a possibility for most of us to add 1 to 4 more units to our properties. We have looked into it. People already can add 1,000 extra dwelling to their property and most people don't even do that. So obviously people are not interested in this. If the empty lot next to us ends up with 4 or 5 units on it. We are leaving this town.

Write letters to the city and county councils and to the newspaper editors. This is a terrific forum and there is realistic opposition to the proposed huge density changes but we MUST make our feelings known to those we elected to represent us.

I am a life-long local of Moab. Properties affected by this proposal are directly across the street from my home. I will be very affected by this, and I fully support it!

Simply put: without density, we can't have affordability. We all have to sacrifice.
I think density is a great idea, especially since Moab has historically had a boom/bust economy. Bringing in people/businesses would increase the longevity of the town. ADUs might be a great way to increase density and increase rental opportunities too. I think design requirements would be good for new commercial buildings to keep the character of the town, but I think residential design requirements would be incredibly limiting. With a housing crisis we need innovation and creativity so I would be careful not to put too many restrictions. Also have you considered a different way to present a plan like this? I think the word density scares some people but can be a really good thing. Just food for thought. :)

Dear Community Development Staff and Planning Commission members,

First, I thank staff for their often under-appreciated work, a thankless job. And I thank Planning Commission members for their volunteer service as well. I'm a Moab City Council member, a past member of the county Planning Commission and a member of the city's Water Advisory Board [Finite culinary water supply is a related problem which is exacerbated by both the accessory dwelling ordinance and the High Density Housing Overlay. But that is another issue on another front.] However, I write here as a city and county resident.

Re the proposed High Density Housing Overlay, my opinion is that in its present form, its downsides outweigh its upsides.

The downsides are well known. As always, county residents like their rural character, elbow room, peace and quiet, manageable traffic and so on.

The upside is that the county needs less expensive housing for its "workforce," for example teachers, policemen, firemen (and women), local government employees and our kids when they finish school. If HDH assured the latter, it might be worthwhile. But it doesn't.

The problem is that in its present form, in particular its single restriction to deed restrict only to "primary" residents, defined as "... the owner of record occupies the dwelling unit for a minimum of 9 months per year and or a renter occupies the dwelling unit through a lease term no shorter than 6 months within a single calendar year," it leaves the door open to many people who are not the sort of "workforce" members who need housing assistance. This includes retirees (in full disclosure, I admit my wife and I are good examples), part-time residents who will game the system, people who will soon retire, and young and old people who are independently wealthy.

Further, enforcement tools are far too weak. Primary residency is checked once at building permit time - then what? The developer isn't going to enforce deed restrictions - he'll disappear. And even if the county can revoke permits, what is there to revoke? Once the first resident is in, the ball is rolling. And current experience with tracking deed restrictions in other venues around the country demonstrate how easy it is to lose track of deed restrictions and primary resident qualification when property is resold.

Because of this "unwanted" demand, lot prices will remain high, giving the developer his wildest wishes of wealth, but doing little for the people for whom HDH was intended.
I think it is important for Moab to approve some form of the High Density overlay in that there is a very limited number of locations that can build the type of housing most needed in Moab right now. Moab has outgrown the "One Mansion per Acre" zoning and needs to address the fact that we need "houses that people can afford" and not necessarily "Affordable Housing".

Sorry I have not been able to attend any open house meetings as of yet. I hope to remedy that in September. Meanwhile I have some questions and some feedback from myself and our neighborhood group. Have you had feedback from any local developers indicating willingness to build with the limitations involved? I assume you are trusting that the homes build would be more reasonably priced due to the smaller lot size. Is that correct? If the developer decided to set the price higher than expected, what recourse would there be if any? Would there be any rent controls applied to apartments build under this plan? If your intent is to "flood" the market with units so that prices fall, how many units do you suppose it would take to achieve that effect? How quickly would they need to appear? It seems to me that this plan would have to be extremely effective in order to impact the entire market. You should have developers lined up in anticipation! If the response from developers is as limited as we have seen in the past, the impact on the local market will be non-existent or insignificant. If a few high density units are built, chances are the existing neighborhoods surrounding them will have sacrificed a degree of their quality of life as a result. Many neighbors I’ve spoken with have indicated their extreme dissatisfaction with the idea of such a sacrifice for housing that is not "affordable". Probably the least accepted element of this proposal is the 45 foot buildings it allows. The combination of VERY high densities and mid-rise buildings have left many county residents shell shocked. Combine that with the county build out numbers over 70,000 and people in my area are dismayed. Issues raised are the usual- water and other infrastructures. While county officials may not have control over these elements, they must take them into account. If you cannot assure the public that the resources to support such growth are available, that growth should not be encouraged. Many would like to see action such as Moab City is undertaking: reexamination of build out numbers in light of water resources and quality of life for residents and building affordable housing with public funds. A Grand County affordable housing fund needs to be built and utilized. Wouldn't the current County Council support some level of required fee from developers? Why not now while the sitting council remains? I believe that Spanish Valley residents would support affordable housing developments and the necessary densities involved. If these communities are built to be reasonably compatible with existing neighborhoods and the needed infrastructure is in place to support quality of life for all.

We hope that the Commission will consider the merits of our suggestion despite the fact that it is arriving late in the process. We acknowledge the months of work that have been put into the overlay and the numerous opportunities for public input. We had planned to become involved in the process earlier this year but sadly some difficult life circumstances prevented us from doing so.

Just past Rocky Road, Spanish Valley Drive (SVD) goes up a hill and then levels out remaining mostly flat through the rest of the valley. Just as you crest the hill you enter a neighborhood formed by the Plateau Estates subdivision plus 5 other parcels on the West side of SVD and by the Hillcrest subdivision on the East side. On this area of the map, only the West side of SVD is included in the overlay and a small strip of seven parcels have a proposed overlay density of 15/acre. All of the adjacent parcels to the West are at 5/acre density and the other neighboring parcels are 2/acre. A list of the specific parcels, addresses, and acreages is included on page two. They all have primary residences on the parcel.

We own and rent one of the parcels in the Hillcrest subdivision and our home is located on another adjacent property. While our properties are not included in the overlay map, we and our neighbors are very concerned about the future character of the neighborhood if 15/acre density is developed in the middle of it.
Planning Department staff told us that during the Commission's process of developing the overlay, parcel size was a strong consideration for determining what areas had neighborhood characteristics. The average parcel size of the neighborhood described above is about \( \frac{2}{3} \) an acre. This section of SVD is unique in that the parcels are much smaller, homes are closer together, homes are closer to SVD and the neighborhood feels like a cohesive community.

We are respectfully asking the Planning Commission to consider a change of density for the seven parcels in the neighborhood on the West side of SVD from 15/acre to 5/acre. In addition to maintaining the character of the neighborhood this will also be consistent with the densities allowed on the adjacent parcels to the south. These seven parcels represent the narrowest band of 15/acre density along SVD. There is one other section of SVD with a strip of parcels at 15/acre, no overlay on the East side of SVD and 5/acre density on adjacent parcels to the West. However, the average size of these five parcels is almost 1.5 acres, the homes are not as close together and the homes are not as close to SVD. Additionally there are not any residences on the East side of SVD because the cemetery is located there.

In summary, we are in favor of density increases to alleviate the shortage of housing for Grand County's workers. We are not asking for a reduction in the overlay boundaries but instead for a change of density on seven parcels to maintain the character of a unique neighborhood. Thank you for your consideration.

Maps are attached. Please also find a list of neighborhood residents below that we have contacted and who agree with our proposal and wanted their names included. We did not receive any negative feedback regarding our proposed changes from any of the neighborhood residents who we were able to contact.

My husband and I write you today as director of the county planning commission. Please know that we are in favor of the work you all have done to find ways to create more housing for local workers. However, we feel sad and threatened by the new plan to create an overlay zone in our neighborhood, three miles from town. When we see all the empty land much closer to Moab and within walking distance, we wonder why the county would consider disturbing a lovely rural residential area where we have lived for 22 years, by bringing the city to us?!

We purchased our property with the thought in mind that we wanted a site for a happy home. We were not interested in using it as investment property. When we subdivided our property a few years ago from a 2 acre to two 1 acre lots so that we could sell our house to our daughter and her family and build our own home on the other acre, we ended up having to grant setbacks to the county on both the Spanish Valley Drive side and the Plateau Circle side so that we lost almost 1/2 acre total of our property with no compensation. (This means that we each own less than an acre now.) At that time, even permission for building a small, “grandmother-type” dwelling on our properties was opposed by the county – although eventually permission to build a structure of 1000 square feet was passed.

Also, when we bought our property in 1996, we were told that when this property was developed by Bill Boulden, he received a waiver that released him from having to provide curb and gutter. If there is development within the new overlay dwelling limits in the Plateau subdivision, will the expenses for any required curb and gutter installation be borne by individual land owners?

This area is still a peaceful, mostly one residence per acre area, with much of the original native plantings. Although Spanish Valley Drive has become a thoroughfare for mostly locals as an alternative to taking 191 South to residences, it does become a noisy thoroughfare during peak season with many jeeps and ORVs buzzing by. Further, we anticipate it becoming a far busier road once the Arroyo Canyon development has become a reality. It is just unconscionable that even more people will be encouraged to build out and rent or sell condos or apartments in our neighborhood, bringing increased traffic to this area.
So, because we 1) want to keep our neighborhood characteristics intact, maintaining the quiet and privacy we currently enjoy, 2) limit the use of Spanish Valley Drive to local residents as much as possible, 3) prevent an increase in numbers of units per acre in this area, and 4) keep the rural residential zone in which we live, we request that the area above the hill south of Rocky Road and the Packard Distributing plant which encompasses the Plateau Circle area and further south, be removed from the overlay zone plan. Even 5 dwellings per acre is too much for this precious piece of the county. Please consider our urgent request.

I am a long time resident of District 3. I have also been a lifelong visitor to and resident of Moab. My father, an attorney for Utah League of Cities and Towns, acted as Moab's attorney and would combine work and vacation. I grew up convinced that the river by Moab was paradise. In 1972 nearly all of my friends who were just graduating from the U of U moved here and became miners, boatmen, cowboys, cooks or road bike enthusiasts. In 1984 I finally escaped SLC with a job offer from Four Corners Mental Health. That same year I searched for a place to settle and desiring the remoteness of the edge of town and the unparalleled view bought in "Angel Heights" just below Disappearing Angel.

My plan was to create a small homestead (with my 3 and now 4 acres) and transform the barren, scraped area and the rolling blackbrush, into garden, orchard, animal habitat and oxygen replenishing "forest". All of my accumulated "retirement" and any windfall wealth from work on a movie filming or a disaster relief deployment has gone into creating my home. This is the community to which I have envisioned my future. You might say that all my eggs are in one basket.

Moab has grown and my neighborhood developed. But still, living on the edge of town (Rim Rock Road), has allowed a sense of space and distance from the onslaught of humanity. Walking the infrequently used trails in the adjacent BLM and the rarer moment of calm in the early and late hours, have been the cornerstones of my rural-as-possible lifestyle.

Now to the point..... I am terrified at the prospects of the High Density Overlay that is being spearheaded by Mr. Levine, et al.

Already my neighborhood, Roberts Road and above are zoned agracultural/residential 1. This is 1 residence per acre with the allowance of an accessory home. (So basically 2 homes per acre.) Most of the lots, on average, are 2 acres. That would allow an increased density of 4 X or approximately a home every 1/2 acre. In my standards that is crowded. I moved to the edge of town to allow space, privacy and occasional calm. I believe that if the neighbors with a vested interest in the neighborhood wanted to subdivide into still somewhat spacious housing, it would be done, in a more integrate respectful manner. Currently interspersed in the area are virtual junkyards, mobile homes that are decrepit and abandoned, owned now or soon by children who've settled elsewhere and a few large undeveloped lots. The money that might be made by selling out to a High Density developer would be a compelling reason to sell with no regard for the neighborhood. The prospects of increased traffic, noise (to include unattended barking dogs), light pollution and the disruption of the fallow habitat of animal life, all seem horrifying. The whole quality of my future seems at stake.

As soon as we neighbors became aware of the proposal we attended P&Z meetings to express our fears. The earlier public notices were not effective in warning us and since we weren't present the "stakeholders" who had been instrumental in the plans early formation had already laid the groundwork for the HDO. During the numerous P&Z meetings I, or my wife, Joanne Savoie, have attended the stakeholders have been absent. I would surmise that their primary economic incentive (the commitment to creating the HDO in areas with existing infrastructure) had already been achieved.

When distilled down to the reality of this proposal, it appears that the creation of more accessible housing, for those current residents of Moab, that may still not either afford or desire it, as well as those non-existent, hypothetical persons, will come at the expense of those here and now residences who, in large part, have committed themselves to the community. This is to be done by the allowance
of builders and developer to maximise the money saved by upgrading existing infrastructure in lieu of working from scratch. This is largely planning for the welfare of hypothetical persons while degrading the living conditions of we who are current residence and neighbors.

Since only 20% of the proposed housing is to be “affordable” anyway why not let the additional expense go to the buyer. Put the high density areas where there are either compatible neighbors or in some of the many undeveloped acres that exist in the county. Additionally crowding the HDO along the highway or Spanish Valley Drive assumes that these prospective new residents won’t just as easily be able to drive to work as the rest of us.

In my chosen profession as a Psychologist, one axiom, shared by all of the medical community is “first do no harm”. When people enter into an agreement well informed of the stipulations there are expected outcomes. Where people choose a given lifestyle and living conditions, and then these elements are put in jeopardy, especially by governmental agencies, there is a disheartening alienation from the democratic process. We are in an age of extreme pessimism toward the national and state government. People are trying to salvage the connection to a democratically influenced local government. We neighbors who live right here and right now.
Design
Convey deed restrictions to public!!
NO more than one story houses on SITLA square/rectangle. Access concerns off and onto Hwy 191
Need a road to extend Rimrock to town??
Also NEED more East/West connections on east side of hwy in SV Drive to access hwy
Emphasize required setbacks, and buffers when going from low density to higher
What about water? Biggest question and concern code enforcement and water restrictions required for
overlay? No lawns etc.
What about stepping it all down one notch?? Move all bright light, all light pink into blue? Maybe a bit
less to swallow at once?

While I understand affordable housing is a nationwide problem (not just isolated to Moab), I find that
having a 45-ft height limit in much of the south end of town and along the highway to be unacceptable.
Having grown up in a large city, and being an architect and having studied urban planning, I know that he
building "canyons" will be detrimental towards views, solar rights, and will lead to an unfortunate "ghettoization" in those areas. Even in places like Chicago, three floors above grade is the usual limit for
neighborhoods. Please look at some studies of "projects" in Chicago and elsewhere that show that the
further above the ground the residence, the less control parents and others have with what happens at
ground level. Most low-rise (three stories only) are more successful than high-rise projects (which a
building of 45 feet would be considered). Please eliminate the 25a option from your consideration.

We already live in crowded subdivision that is next to businesses along the 191. PLEASE no more! There
is too much noise and traffic. When planning future homes, not sure where they will go but our
experience here is that the Holyoak road is being used (and abused) by people trying to pass through to
Hyway, VIA Holyoak so ACCESS ROADS and BUFFERS NEED TO BE INCORPORATED WHERE BUSINESSES
ARE CLOSE TO RESIDENTIAL, and they need to COMPLY with CODES about lighting/noise! MAKE TRAFFIC
GO AROUND HOUSING NOT THROUGH IT! The roads are affected, the sewers, the normal access is being
pushed to limit, without INSIGHT and CARE in PLANNING! PLANT LOTS & LOTS OF TREES FOR EVERY NEW
DEVELOPMENT!

I am not in favor of the High Density Housing proposal. If you have ever been in Eastern U.S. cities, you
may have noticed that high density housing tends to create slums. That is never the plan, but it is almost
inevitable. Human beings in close concentration create waste and chaos. When there is no open/green
space, there is seldom pride of ownership, at least in our current society. Those of us who weren't born
here, chose Moab in great part because of its open, rural feel.

I originally favored the plan because it seemed a way to possibly get a handle on our low-income housing
shortage, but as I read the current proposal, I don't see that aspect presented. This just feels like another
cave-in to developers without consideration of our quality of life: pack as many people as possible into
the space in order to maximize profits. If the trade-off was affordable housing, it might be worth it, but
as it is, I would appreciate the council considering rejecting this proposition.

Change density in phases
Reduce heights all around
Where are the open space set-asides?
Hotel and nightly rental high-rise MORATORIUM
With high density there needs to be some open spaces for children to play, to keep them from playing in the streets.

I think density is a great idea, especially since Moab has historically had a boom/bust economy. Bringing in people/businesses would increase the longevity of the town. ADUs might be a great way to increase density and increase rental opportunities too. I think design requirements would be good for new commercial buildings to keep the character of the town, but I think residential design requirements would be incredibly limiting. With a housing crisis we need innovation and creativity so I would be careful not to put too many restrictions. Also have you considered a different way to present a plan like this? I think the word density scares some people but can be a really good thing. Just food for thought. :)

Planning Commission
Thank you...
Consider SOLAR ACCESS in your consideration for building heights on RIMROCK RD.
30' max?? Would not be a major infringement on our 18 SOLAR PANELS

40 foot tall buildings should not be allowed next to regular residential neighbors. People can have no yards, if they so choose, but putting these monstrosities in next to established homes is just wrong. There is plenty of land further up the valley. Let San Juan County have the density. (12 likes)

Several parcels in the proposal are SITLA parcels, have they indicated if they’ll participate or not? Many parcels backup to existing residences and neighborhoods...will there be larger setbacks, open space, view restrictions to protect current residents?
Maximum/limited dwelling prices should be used for some parcels

Please make this proposal more visual for those who aren’t able to see:
1) What does 1 biggest allowed house look like in 1, 1/2 house per acre?
2) Take same lot and show what 5 units per acre HDH development that is 35' high
3) Same lot with 10 then 15 then 25 units per acre w/ heights of 35' and 45' maximums

Thank you

Thank you for your impressive work, JD especially. I’m excited about this work and need to spend more time reviewing. Initially, I appreciate you’ve taking into account solar access. If you haven’t already, to the extent these would be applicable, please also consider viewsnesh and lighting (night sky) protections, and thinking ahead to providing for wildlife and transit corridor (especially bikes). Thanks!

It’s a good idea if you don’t mind having no yard. (2 likes)

(Reply to above) Many people don’t want a yard to tend. Moab definitely needs more diversity in housing options. (3 Likes)

There needs to be an architectural code first.

Too many ugly metal buildings here already. (6 likes)
Thanks for all your work to make our little valley a better place to live.

My main comment in regards to the proposed high density housing overlay proposition is that WE NEED A COUNTY WIDE ARCHITECTURAL CODE very first. Please do all you can to make that happen soon.

Why can't we be the “Atomic Architecture” capital of the world? After all, we were the Uranium Capital of the World.

p.s. enough metal buildings already. Please NO more.

I am in support of the proposal. Higher density encourages walking and biking for smaller trips which will help mitigated traffic in the long run. Developers should be required to contribute to bike infrastructure. Design guidelines should be introduced in order to preserve the character of this special place.

Dark night Sky
Bike Lane
Traffic
191 Corridor
Gas Line Easements for bike lanes
Thank you

Has there been any design functions done to see the impact 45' height restrictions on the hwy would impose? Important to "see" what impact that will have to the surroundings. However, I support increased height restrictions.
Height

While I understand affordable housing is a nationwide problem (not just isolated to Moab), I find that having a 45-ft height limit in much of the south end of town and along the highway to be unacceptable. Having grown up in a large city, and being an architect and having studied urban planning, I know that the building "canyons" will be detrimental towards views, solar rights, and will lead to an unfortunate "ghettoization" in those areas. Even in places like Chicago, three floors above grade is the usual limit for neighborhoods. Please look at some studies of "projects" in Chicago and elsewhere that show that the further above the ground the residence, the less control parents and others have with what happens at ground level. Most low-rise (three stories only) are more successful than high-rise projects (which a building of 45 feet would be considered). Please eliminate the 25a option from your consideration.

Change density in phases
Reduce heights all around
Where are the open space set-asides?
Hotel and nightly rental high-rise MORATORIUM

Planning Commission
Thank you...
Consider SOLAR ACCESS in your consideration for building heights on RIMROCK RD.
30' max?? Would not be a major infringement on our 18 SOLAR PANELS

40 foot tall buildings should not be allowed next to regular residential neighbors. People can have no yards, if they so choose, but putting these monstrosities in next to established homes is just wrong. There IS plenty of land further up the valley. Let San Juan County have the density. (12 likes)

Please make this proposal more visual for those who aren't able to see:
1) What does 1 biggest allowed house look like in 1, 1/2 house per acre?
2) Take same lot and show what 5 units per acre HOH development that is 35' high
3) Same lot with 10 then 15 then 25 units per acre w/ heights of 35' and 45' maximums

Thank you

Has there been any design functions done to see the impact 45' height restrictions on the hwy would impose? Important to "see" what impact that will have to the surroundings. However, I support increased height restrictions.

I am concerned about the large amount of area being considered for the maximum density and particularly the potential height of buildings. With so much of these areas currently built with 1-story houses and roads that are insufficient for much higher density, 45 ft. buildings could seriously impact adjacent properties and entire neighborhoods in terms of increased traffic, parking issues, sunlight loss & privacy issues.
I would rather see many of these dark pink areas dropped down to the blue category where you already have smaller lots and higher density as well as maintaining the rural character in our valley further from Hwy 191 that so many people value.

What about overall energy increases (please address)
Lighting issues - night sky is already affected
Water is an issue - enough?
Bought here (on Lemon Ln) because rural and remote
No more than 1 story houses. 3 Story condos are causing houses rather than cliff walls to be obscured
Nobody monitors light ordinances now! This will get out of hand.
I attended the open house last night and wanted to share my comments with you. I am not against creating more affordable housing. We need affordable housing. I just feel that the overlay way it is currently presented is way too much. Meaning first step might to look at developing the HDH along the 191 corridor where there is currently infrastructure to support it and it would bring minimal impact to existing neighborhoods... I feel that the County council needs to first change the land use code to stop all development of Nightly rentals, condo's, and hotels along the corridor which would open the way to support the development of affordable housing. Also, We don't have a handle on how much water is available in our valley. The HDH was developed before San Juan County dropped their bomb of building a 6000 person town in South Valley, before there were 16 new hotels planned, and before a 320 acre University campus was approved. Plus we are in a severe drought. Also In the proposed HDH I also do not like the way of building up with high story structures and how that would impact existing neighbors. I just moved from Orchard Villa, and the Entrada development has blocked the sun on the town house where I had lived. Thank you for letting me give voice to my concerns.

I support the idea of higher density in some of the currently undeveloped areas. I would like to see the height restrictions decreased to 3 story max in the highest density areas. Deed restrictions to ensure that housing is for full time workers/residents I do support.

Sorry I have not been able to attend any open house meetings as of yet. I hope to remedy that in September. Meanwhile I have some questions and some feedback from myself and our neighborhood group. Have you had feedback from any local developers indicating willingness to build with the limitations involved? I assume you are trusting that the homes build would be more reasonably priced due to the smaller lot size. Is that correct? If the developer decided to set the price higher than expected, what recourse would there be if any? Would there be any rent controls applied to apartments build under this plan? If your intent is to "flood" the market with units so that prices fall, how many units do you suppose it would take to achieve that effect? How quickly would they need to appear? It seems to me that this plan would have to be extremely effective in order to impact the entire market. You should have developers lined up in anticipation! If the response from developers is as limited as we have seen in the past, the impact on the local market will be non-existent or insignificant. If a few high density units are built, chances are the existing neighborhoods surrounding them will have sacrificed a degree of their quality of life as a result. Many neighbors I've spoken with have indicated their extreme dissatisfaction with the idea of such a sacrifice for housing that is not "affordable". Probably the least accepted element of this proposal is the 45 foot buildings it allows. The combination of VERY high densities and mid-rise buildings have left many county residents shell shocked. Combine that with the county build out numbers over 70,000 and people in my area are dismayed. Issues raised are the usual - water and other infrastructures. While county officials may not have control over these elements, they must take them into account. If you cannot assure the public that the resources to support such growth are available, that growth should not be encouraged. Many would like to see action such as Moab City is undertaking: reexamination of build out numbers in light of water resources and quality of life for residents and building affordable housing with public funds. A Grand County affordable housing fund needs to be built and utilized. Wouldn't the current County Council support some level of required fee from developers? Why not now while the sitting council remains? I believe that Spanish Valley residents would support affordable housing developments and the necessary densities involved, If these communities are built to be reasonably compatible with existing neighborhoods and the needed infrastructure is in place to support quality of life for all.
Infrastructure

I am concerned about the large amount of area being considered for the maximum density and particularly the potential height of buildings. With so much of these areas currently built with 1-story houses and roads that are insufficient for much higher density, 45 ft. buildings could seriously impact adjacent properties and entire neighborhoods in terms of increased traffic, parking issues, sunlight loss & privacy issues.

I would rather see many of these dark pink areas dropped down to the blue category where you already have smaller lots and higher density as well as maintaining the rural character in our valley further from Hwy 191 that so many people value.

What about overall energy increases (please address)
Lighting issues - night sky is already affected
Water is an issue - enough?
Bought here (on Lemon Ln) because rural and remote
No more than 1 story houses. 3 Story condos are causing houses rather than cliff walls to be obscured
Nobody monitors light ordinances now! This will get out of hand.

I attended the open house last night and wanted to share my comments with you. I am not against creating more affordable housing. We need affordable housing. I just feel that the overlay the way it is currently presented is way too much. Meaning first step might to look at developing the HDH along the 191 corridor where there is currently infrastructure to support it and it would bring minimal impact to existing neighborhoods... I feel that the County council needs to first change the land use code to stop all development of Nightly rentals, condo's, and hotels along the corridor which would the open the way to support the development of affordable housing. Also, We don't have a handle on how much water is available in our valley. The HDH was developed before San Juan County dropped their bomb of building a 6000 person town in South Valley, before there were 16 new hotels planned, and before a 320 acre University campus was approved. Plus we are in a severe drought. Also In the proposed HDH I also do not like the way of building up with high story structures and how that would impact existing neighbors. I just moved from Orchard Villa, and the Entrada development has blocked the sun on the town house where I had lived.

Thank you for letting me give voice to my concerns.

Convey deed restrictions to public!!
NO more than one story houses on SITLA square/rectangle. Access concerns off and onto Hwy 191
Need a road to extend Rimrock to town??
Also NEED more East/West connections on east side of hwy in SV Drive to access hwy
Emphasize required setbacks, and buffers when going from low density to higher
What about water? Biggest question and concern code enforcement and water restrictions required for overlay? No lawns etc.
What about stepping it all down one notch?? Move all bright light, all light pink into blue? Maybe a bit less to swallow at once?
We already live in crowded subdivision that is next to businesses along the 191. PLEASE no more! There is too much noise and traffic. When planning future homes, not sure where they will go but our experience here is that the Holyoak road is being used (and abused) by people trying to pass through to Hyway, VIA Holyoak so ACCESS ROADS and BUFFERS NEED TO BE INCORPORATED WHERE BUSINESSES ARE CLOSE TO RESIDENTIAL, and they need to COMPLY with CODES about lighting/noise! MAKE TRAFFIC GO AROUND HOUSING NOT THROUGH IT! The roads are affected, the sewers, the normal access is being pushed to limit, without INSIGHT and CARE in PLANNING! PLANT LOTS & LOTS OF TREES FOR EVERY NEW DEVELOPMENT!

Thank you for your impressive work, JD especially. I'm excited about this work and need to spend more time reviewing. Initially, I appreciate you've taking into account solar access. If you haven't already, to the extent these would be applicable, please also consider viewshed and lighting (night sky) protections, and thinking ahead to providing for wildlife and transit corridor (especially bikes). Thanks!

I am in support of the proposal. Higher density encourages walking and biking for smaller trips which will help mitigated traffic in the long run. Developers should be required to contribute to bike infrastructure. Design guidelines should be introduced in order to preserve the character of this special place.

Dark night Sky
Bike Lane
Traffic
191 Corridor
Gas Line Easements for bike lanes
Thank you

1) Water is already a critical problem.
2) We already need traffic lights at the junction of Lemon Lane and 191 to turn left toward Moab
3) Residents of Lemon Lane value their privacy and were required to maintain 1 acre lots. Will these proposed homes be 1 acre lots?

Holyoak area is dense enough as it is. Housing has sprung all around the Holyoak area for years. The argument that the mass of HD's should be located no more than 4.3 miles from the heart of downtown doesn't make sense to me. Hdh should be located on the south highway
Holyoak is already a very dense neighborhood, perhaps more than any other area. Bus service is coming to Moab. That will help with congestion somewhat but it's a mess anyway we do it now.

Nice "slideshow"! One of your slides summed up the philosophy rather well: "a voluntary, incentive-based program, the high density residential overlay will not be used on every eligible parcel, and likely will not be used on the vast majority of eligible parcels. With this in mind, the focus in drawing the overlay is to allow as many areas as it is appropriate the opportunity to construct more housing."
Although it may not seem likely now, I'm concerned that if we do such extensive high density zoning, with no sideboards for maximum allowable houses in each zone, that we could end up with a very crowded valley eventually. I am also very concerned about over-allocating our limited water with development (especially with hotels! Although that's another topic...) but I suppose the water issue is something that would be addressed through approval/ denial of specific building permits?

1) Water is already a critical resource in Grand County. Development should be calibrated to water resources in drought year.
2) Increased density will create dangerous traffic conditions on Hwy 191. Can only occur if frequent traffic lights on Hwy 191 are placed
3) High density increases noise and decreases security. It will destroy the ability to enjoy the homes we have created.

Due to the limited supply of water, I am greatly concerned about the proposal to increase density in unincorporated Grand County. The current density levels are not sustainable as we move toward buildout. I can only support an increase in density in certain zones when there is a corresponding "down zone" of other areas to ensure the County does not over-build beyond what our water supply can support. I believe it will also be found that the burgeoning growth in the number of nightly accommodations has and will sap our water supply. No growth without proof of water. The end result will likely mean less density overall across the county to accommodate a few blocks of tight density. Any increased density should only be in the highway commercial zone and not in the existing residential neighborhoods.

I can't help but reflect upon efforts by the community (in past years' General Plans) to state a strong preference for preserving the rural character and agricultural element of Moab. I remember when ridge line development was frowned upon, even regulated. The quality of the air and access to public lands have been seen as assets for choosing to retire here. None of the numerous citizen efforts to maintain local community quality of life seem to gain traction with regard to developing this special place beyond carrying capacity. The density increase as proposed is way overdone, invasive to neighborhoods, and heavily reliant on developer incentives. Aside from overtaxing aging sewer trunk lines, this plan, together with plans to build out Southern Spanish Valley, is entirely optimistic about future water resources, given the likelihood of increasing periods of drought. This year's prolonged drought should be a good reminder of that issue. So, rather than criticize, let me ask why we need to beg developers to do something we could do for ourselves. I envision incentivizing a contractual arrangement between those looking for housing and current year round residents with enough property to add an additional structure, such as the type currently popping up for overnight rental, or a TRAILER. The incoming county attorney will certainly be able to craft language waiving impact fees, assuring that no short term rentals occur, and imposing fees for violating the intent to provide affordable housing for local workers. Rent control may sound like government overreach, but not when contractually agreed to. No developers would be required. Separate contracts for landowner-owned structures and renter-owned structures would be required, as well as verification of adequate utilities and sewer connection. I know trailer parks are out of favor, but in the above context, I'm reminded that no one would get away with overnight rentals, because their neighbors would certainly notice! Thank you for the opportunity to express an alternative to the current plan, and for taking the time to consider it. I've read the current plan is only one of the "tools in the box" referring to providing affordable housing. Maybe other tools would better serve the community.

Love this, thank you! It still feels like the light pink high density way out in SV is a mistake. I may be missing something, but why just because the county made a mistake (in my opinion) and built high density far out in the valley in the '90's should we continue that far out today? The high infrastructure and water costs as well as vehicle trips to town are inefficient and smoggy. Could we just leave those in low development until 20 years from now, to see where we are then? By then we may have more commercial out there. more places to work NOT in town, etc. Why not "save" this area for future dev? This seems designed for SITLA development, or something. I mean everything south of the Arena...thanks!
I find this study to be admirable in effort but I have some reservations. I appreciate looking at areas where increased density in residential buildings would promote affordable housing for local residents. However, I am troubled that there is no reference to improving the infrastructure to support the increased density. There is no mention to improvements to Spanish Valley Drive as a lot of the increased density would be using that road. I realize that once some of the development is in place, that future commercial development could happen, such as a grocery store, elementary school, parks, restaurants, etc. so locals don't have to travel to downtown Moab for services. There needs to be a “South Moab” developed. And, with San Juan County’s plans on developing the south end of Spanish Valley, what about the additional traffic on Hwy 191? To me this study is only half of what is needed to have a bigger picture of the future of Spanish Valley.

Nice to develop 191 instead of Murphy?

The following topics need to be presented to the public at the open houses before adding more high density overlays for development in Grand County. 1. Success of approximately 10-year-old “High Density Overlays” around Government Building near Resource Blvd north to Moab City. Has the approximately 10-year-old overlay for increased density in the Resource Blvd. area of Grand County been successful in providing affordable housing? A. If successful in providing affordable house, why do we need more overlays. B. If not successful in providing affordable housing why will the new proposal be an improvement? 1. Available Water for High Density DevelopmentGWSSA was given their second or third allocation of 500-acre feet of water by the Utah Division of Water Rights over 5 years ago. GWSSA will have to apply for approval of a third allocation in the near future. The water is available in the Glen Canyon Aquifer per the USGS study. However! ! ! ! ! ! How many more equivalent housing units can be built before GWSSA has to apply to the state for another water allocation? GWSSA needs to include in this analysis of available water the approximate 300 ERUs sold to SITLA when the water system was completed and the projected water requirements of our new University. B. The USGS study says we have approximately 6000-acre feet of water available in the Glen Canyon Aquifer. GWSSA has water rights for a small part of the available water. Moab City has much older water rights and owns the largest portion of available water. Moab City will certainly protest any request by GWSSA for another allocation. How much of the 6000 acre does GWSSA owned based on the age of their current water rights? How many ERUs can the county approve based on their share of the available 6000 acre feet? What will GWSSA do if Moab City prevents future allocations of water? C. The available 6000-acre feet of water from the USGS study will not build out the Moab Valley if we increase density of construction. The county needs to look at alternative sources of water for development before increasing the density of housing in the valley. Alternative sources are available but will cost an unknown millions of dollars. Approving high density development without water sources for other land owners means many land owners will not be able to develop their property in the future or the cost of water for the future developments will be very high. How many acres in the valley will not have water for development in the future if we increase the density today based on current water rights and sources?
The increase in density proposal does not require that affordable housing is constructed. The proposal assumes that building house for only primary residents will result in affordable housing. This assumption has several problems. The following questions need to be answered or this proposal is the dream of every outside or local developer.

1. Who in the county will be responsible to guarantee that the housing will not be resold five or ten years later as second or third homes to wealthy people?
2. Who in the county will be responsible to verify that the first buyers are not buying a second home?
3. Where in the western US has this assumption proven to provide affordable housing to a community?

The website prepared for the public by the people making the proposal has very little concrete facts. There is absolutely no concern for the quantity of available water. There are no details about where their assumption has been proven to work. There is no detail on who will monitor sales of the new housing.

Do we have enough water??

We need to consider the future availability of water to support this kind of density without destroying the resource for all of us who live here.

If this zoning is approved how many units will be added, total? At what point will all the water be gone?

Why do we need to cater to the bikers for a bike lane. They don't bring much revenue to the community and makes it so roads have to be much wider.

The City needs to send a letter to the County that the proposed increase in density needs to be tabled until the state completes the adjudication of the valley and ownership of the available water is established.

Moab City should by now realize that SITLA is a very poor development partner. Please remember the fiasco with SITLA during the Cloudrock and Lionsback developments. SITLA will take water, sewer, and infrastructure and when there are no more gifts tell you they will not follow the Land Use Code. The public needs to know your plan to work with SITLA? How will the city prevent another fiasco with SITLA?

GWSSA does not have sufficient water for development of the University in the current state allocation. When GWSSA asks for another 500 acre foot allotment in the future, will the city protest the allocation? Will the city have a contract with GWSSA that guarantees the new allocation will go to the university and not to more density in the county?

GWSSA has very few old water rights and the city owns most of the available water in the aquifer. GWSSA is probably using city water for the university.

Not enough water to supply that many people, think about it, a water study was done and Spanish Valley and Moab came up short (5 likes)

Yeah enough with the "flexible zoning" too!! Mixing business with residential is no good! They blast you with their lights at night, traffic increases, some idiot businesses have live bands and point their amplifiers towards the neighborhood, tear up the streets and sewers and YES, the WATER!!! Council needs to SLOW roll and start by changing all outdated street lights to warm LED's OR with shield (NO glare everywhere). THEN FIX OUR ROADS we already have! Kudos to more AFFORDABLE housing for all; not just the PT workers imported in. (2 likes)

STOP BUILDING SO MUCH OUR LITTLE VALLEY WILL NOT SURVIVE!
Regarding Stocks Dr., I'm concerned about the ability of that Road to handle increased traffic. I'm not opposed to the increased density but the road would need upgrades. Also, an acceleration lane onto Hwy 191 is desperately needed.

I think we need a thorough water study for GC before continuing with any development. SJ County - 6000 residents - 320 acre USU campus - 16 more hotels - we don't know where we are at on water - 50-100 years from now!

Development should be mixed-use in order to encourage walking, biking; to foster spontaneous social interactions; to mitigate traffic and improve the environment

Water study
Sewer study
San Juan County population increase

Thank you

I am concerned that there is not a longer term vision in Grand County. We are being hit with over the top visitation - hotels - new university - we don't have a good water study yet - and it is important to have a collective vision first, otherwise we stay in a reactive stance.

Dear Community Development Staff and Planning Commission members,

First, I thank staff for their often under-appreciated work, a thankless job. And I thank Planning Commission members for their volunteer service as well.

I'm a Moab City Council member, a past member of the county Planning Commission and a member of the city's Water Advisory Board [Finite culinary water supply is a related problem which is exacerbated by both the accessory dwelling ordinance and the High Density Housing Overlay. But that is another issue on another front.] However, I write here as a city and county resident.

Re the proposed High Density Housing Overlay, my opinion is that in its present form, its downsides outweigh its upsides.

The downsides are well known. As always, county residents like their rural character, elbow room, peace and quiet, manageable traffic and so on.

The upside is that the county needs less expensive housing for its "workforce," for example teachers, policemen, firemen (and women), local government employees and our kids when they finish school. If HDH assured the latter, it might be worthwhile. But it doesn't.

The problem is that in its present form, in particular its single restriction to deed restrict only to "primary" residents, defined as "... the owner of record occupies the dwelling unit for a minimum of 9 months per year and or a renter occupies the dwelling unit through a lease term no shorter than 6 months within a single calendar year," it leaves the door open to many people who are not the sort of "workforce" members who need housing assistance. This includes retirees (in full disclosure, I admit my wife and I are good examples), part-time residents who will game the system, people who will soon retire, and young and old people who are independently wealthy.

Further, enforcement tools are far too weak. Primary residency is checked once at building permit time - then what? The developer isn't going to enforce deed restrictions - he'll disappear. And even if the county can revoke permits, what is there to revoke? Once the first resident is in, the ball is rolling. And current experience with tracking deed restrictions in other venues around the country demonstrate
how easy it is to lose track of deed restrictions and primary resident qualification when property is resold.

Because of this "unwanted" demand, lot prices will remain high, giving the developer his wildest wishes of wealth, but doing little for the people for whom HDH was intended.

Sorry I have not been able to attend any open house meetings as of yet. I hope to remedy that in September. Meanwhile I have some questions and some feedback from myself and our neighborhood group. Have you had feedback from any local developers indicating willingness to build with the limitations involved? I assume you are trusting that the homes build would be more reasonably priced due to the smaller lot size. Is that correct? If the developer decided to set the price higher than expected, what recourse would there be if any? Would there be any rent controls applied to apartments build under this plan? If your intent is to "flood" the market with units so that prices fall, how many units do you suppose it would take to achieve that effect? How quickly would they need to appear? It seems to me that this plan would have to be extremely effective in order to impact the entire market. You should have developers lined up in anticipation! If the response from developers is as limited as we have seen in the past, the impact on the local market will be non-existent or insignificant. If a few high density units are built, chances are the existing neighborhoods surrounding them will have sacrificed a degree of their quality of life as a result. Many neighbors I've spoken with have indicated their extreme dissatisfaction with the idea of such a sacrifice for housing that is not "affordable". Probably the least accepted element of this proposal is the 45 foot buildings it allows. The combination of VERY high densities and mid-rise buildings have left many county residents shell shocked. Combine that with the county build out numbers over 70,000 and people in my area are dismayed. Issues raised are the usual- water and other infrastructures. While county officials may not have control over these elements, they must take them into account. If you cannot assure the public that the resources to support such growth are available, that growth should not be encouraged. Many would like to see action such as Moab City is undertaking: reexamination of build out numbers in light of water resources and quality of life for residents and building affordable housing with public funds. A Grand County affordable housing fund needs to be built and utilized. Wouldn't the current County Council support some level of required fee from developers? Why not now while the sitting council remains? I believe that Spanish Valley residents would support affordable housing developments and the necessary densities involved, if these communities are built to be reasonably compatible with existing neighborhoods and the needed infrastructure is in place to support quality of life for all.

My husband and I write you today as director of the county planning commission. Please know that we are in favor of the work you all have done to find ways to create more housing for local workers. However, we feel sad and threatened by the new plan to create an overlay zone in our neighborhood, three miles from town. When we see all the empty land much closer to Moab and within walking distance, we wonder why the county would consider disturbing a lovely rural residential area where we have lived for 22 years, by bringing the city to us?

We purchased our property with the thought in mind that we wanted a site for a happy home. We were not interested in using it as investment property. When we subdivided our property a few years ago from a 2 acre to two 1 acre lots so that we could sell our house to our daughter and her family and build our own home on the other acre, we ended up having to grant setbacks to the county on both the Spanish Valley Drive side and the Plateau Circle side so that we lost almost 1/2 acre total of our property with no compensation. (This means that we each own less than an acre now.) At that time, even permission for building a small, "grandmother-type" dwelling on our properties was opposed by the county – although eventually permission to build a structure of 1000 square feet was passed. Also, when we bought our property in 1996, we were told that when this property was developed by Bill Boulden, he received a waiver that released him from having to provide curb and gutter. If there is
development within the new overlay dwelling limits in the Plateau subdivision, will the expenses for any required curb and gutter installation be borne by individual land owners?
This area is still a peaceful, mostly one residence per acre area, with much of the original native plantings. Although Spanish Valley Drive has become a thoroughfare for mostly locals as an alternative to taking 191 South to residences, it does become a noisy thoroughfare during peak season with many jeeps and ORVs buzzing by. Further, we anticipate it becoming a far busier road once the Arroyo Canyon development has become a reality. It is just unconscionable that even more people will be encouraged to build out and rent or sell condos or apartments in our neighborhood, bringing increased traffic to this area.
So, because we 1) want to keep our neighborhood characteristics intact, maintaining the quiet and privacy we currently enjoy, 2) limit the use of Spanish Valley Drive to local residents as much as possible, 3) prevent an increase in numbers of units per acre in this area, and 4) keep the rural residential zone in which we live, we request that the area above the hill south of Rocky Road and the Packard Distributing plant which encompasses the Plateau Circle area and further south, be removed from the overlay zone plan. Even 5 dwellings per acre is too much for this precious piece of the county. Please consider our urgent request.

I am a long time resident of District 3. I have also been a lifelong visitor to and resident of Moab. My father, an attorney for Utah League of Cities and Towns, acted as Moab's attorney and would combine work and vacation. I grew up convinced that the river by Moab was paradise. In 1972 nearly all of my friends who were just graduating from the U of U moved here and became miners, boatmen, cowboys, cooks or road bike enthusiasts. In 1984 I finally escaped SLC with a job offer from Four Corners Mental Health. That same year I searched for a place to settle and desiring the remoteness of the edge of town and the unparalleled view bought in "Angel Heights" just below Disappearing Angel.

My plan was to create a small homestead (with my 3 and now 4 acres) and transform the barren, scraped area and the rolling blackbrush, into garden, orchard, animal habitat and oxygen replenishing "forest". All of my accumulated "retirement" and any windfall wealth from work on a movie filming or a disaster relief deployment has gone into creating my home. This is the community to which I have envisioned my future. You might say that all my eggs are in one basket.

Moab has grown and my neighborhood developed. But still, living on the edge of town (Rimrock Road), has allowed a sense of space and distance from the onslaught of humanity. Walking the infrequently used trails in the adjacent BLM and the rarer moment of calm in the early and late hours, have been the cornerstones of my rural-as-possible lifestyle.

Now to the point..... I am terrified at the prospects of the High Density Overlay that is being spearheaded by Mr. Levine, et.al.

Already my neighborhood, Roberts Road and above are zoned agracultural/residential 1. This is 1 residence per acre with the allowance of an accessory home. (So basically 2 homes per acre.) Most of the lots, on average, are 2 acres. That would allow an increased density of 4 X or approximately a home every 1/2 acre. In my standards that is crowded. I moved to the edge of town to allow space, privacy and occasional calm. I believe that if the neighbors with a vested interest in the neighborhood wanted to subdivide into still somewhat spacious housing, it would be done, in a more integrate respectful manner. Currently interspersed in the area are virtual junkyards, mobile homes that are decrepit and abandoned, owned now or soon by children who've settled elsewhere and a few large undeveloped lots. The money that might be made by selling out to a High Density developer would be a compelling reason to sell with no regard for the neighborhood. The prospects of increased traffic, noise (to include unattended barking dogs), light pollution and the disruption of the fallow habitat of animal life, all seem horrifying. The whole quality of my future seems at stake.

As soon as we neighbors became aware of the proposal we attended P&Z meetings to express our fears. The earlier public notices were not effective in warning us and since we weren't present the
"stakeholders" who had been instrumental in the plans early formation had already laid the groundwork for the HDO. During the numerous P&Z meeting I, or my wife, Joanne Savoie, have attended the stakeholders have been absent. I would surmise that their primary economic incentive (the commitment to creating the HDO in areas with existing infrastructure) had already been achieved.

When distilled down to the reality of this proposal, it appears that the creation of more accessible housing, for those current residents of Moab, that may still not either afford or desire it, as well as those non-existent, hypothetical persons, will come at the expense of those here and now residences who, in large part, have committed themselves to the community. This is to be done by the allowance of builders and developer to maximise the money saved by upgrading existing infrastructure in lieu of working from scratch. This is largely planning for the welfare of hypothetical persons while degrading the living conditions of we who are current residence and neighbors.

Since only 20% of the proposed housing is to be “affordable” anyway why not let the additional expense go to the buyer. Put the high density areas where there are either compatible neighbors or in some of the many undeveloped acres that exist in the county. Additionally crowding the HDO along the highway or Spanish Valley Drive assumes that these prospective new residents won’t just as easily be able to drive to work as the rest of us.

In my chosen profession as a Psychologist, one axiom, shared by all of the medical community is “first do no harm”. When people enter into an agreement well informed of the stipulations there are expected outcomes. Where people choose a given lifestyle and living conditions, and then these elements are put in jeopardy, especially by governmental agencies, there is a disheartening alienation from the democratic process. We are in an age of extreme pessimism toward the national and state government. People are trying to salvage the connection to a democratically influenced local government. We neighbors who live right here and right now.
I attended the open house last night and wanted to share my comments with you. I am not against creating more affordable housing. We need affordable housing. I just feel that the overlay the way it is currently presented is way too much. Meaning first step might to look at developing the HDH along the 191 corridor where there is currently infrastructure to support it and it would bring minimal impact to existing neighborhoods... I feel that the County council needs to first change the land use code to stop all development of Nightly rentals, condo’s, and hotels along the corridor which would the open the way to support the development of affordable housing. Also, We don’t have a handle on how much water is available in our valley. The HDH was developed before San juan County dropped their bomb of building a 6000 person town in South Valley, before there were 16 new hotels planned, and before a 320 acre University campus was approved. Plus we are in a severe drought. Also in the proposed HDH I also do not like the way of building up with high story structures and how that would impact existing neighbors. I just moved from Orchard Villa, and the Entrada development has blocked the sun on the town house where I had lived.

Thank you for letting me give voice to my concerns.

Convey deed restrictions to public!!
NO more than one story houses on SITLA square/rectangle. Access concerns off and onto Hwy 191
Need a road to extend Rimrock to town??
Also NEED more East/West connections on east side of hwy in SV Drive to access hwy
Emphasize required setbacks, and buffers when going from low density to higher
What about water? Biggest question and concern code enforcement and water restrictions required for overlay? No lawns etc.
What about stepping it all down one notch?? Move all bright light, all light pink into blue? Maybe a bit less to swallow at once?
I can't help but reflect upon efforts by the community (in past years' General Plans) to state a strong preference for preserving the rural character and agricultural element of Moab. I remember when ridge line development was frowned upon, even regulated. The quality of the air and access to public lands have been seen as assets for choosing to retire here. None of the numerous citizen efforts to maintain local community quality of life seem to gain traction with regard to developing this special place beyond carrying capacity. The density increase as proposed is way overdone, invasive to neighborhoods, and heavily reliant on developer incentives. Aside from overtaxing aging sewer trunk lines, this plan, together with plans to build out Southern Spanish Valley, is entirely optimistic about future water resources, given the likelihood of increasing periods of drought. This year's prolonged drought should be a good reminder of that issue. So, rather than criticize, let me ask why we need to beg developers to do something we could do for ourselves. I envision incentivizing a contractual arrangement between those looking for housing and current year round residents with enough property to add an additional structure, such as the type currently popping up for overnight rental, or a TRAILER. The incoming county attorney will certainly be able to craft language waiving impact fees, assuring that no short term rentals occur, and imposing fees for violating the intent to provide affordable housing for local workers. Rent control may sound like government overreach, but not when contractually agreed to. No developers would be required. Separate contracts for landowner-owned structures and renter-owned structures would be required, as well as verification of adequate utilities and sewer connection. I know trailer parks are out of favor, but in the above context, I'm reminded that no one would get away with overnight rentals, because their neighbors would certainly notice! Thank you for the opportunity to express an alternative to the current plan, and for taking the time to consider it. I've read the current plan is only one of the "tools in the box" referring to providing affordable housing. Maybe other "tools" would better serve the community.

The increase in density proposal does not require that affordable housing is constructed. The proposal assumes that building house for only primary residents will result in affordable housing. This assumption has several problems. The following questions need to be answered or this proposal is the dream of every outside or local developer.

1. Who in the county will be responsible to guarantee that the housing will not be resold five or ten years later as second or third homes to wealthy people?
2. Who in the county will be responsible to verify that the first buyers are not buying a second home?
3. Where in the western US has this assumption proven to provide affordable housing to a community?

The website prepared for the public by the people making the proposal has very little concrete facts. There is absolutely no concern for the quantity of available water. There are no details about where their assumption has been proven to work. There is no detail on who will monitor sales of the new housing.
I support the idea of higher density in some of the currently undeveloped areas. I would like to see the height restrictions decreased to 3 story max in the highest density areas. Deed restrictions to ensure that housing is for full time workers/residents I do support.

I am not in favor of the High Density Housing proposal. If you have ever been in Eastern U.S. cities, you may have noticed that high density housing tends to create slums. That is never the plan, but it is almost inevitable. Human beings in close concentration create waste and chaos. When there is no open/green space, there is seldom pride of ownership, at least in our current society. Those of us who weren't born here, chose Moab in great part because of its open, rural feel. I originally favored the plan because it seemed a way to possibly get a handle on our low-income housing shortage, but as I read the current proposal, I don't see that aspect presented. This just feels like another cave-in to developers without consideration of our quality of life: pack as many people as possible into the space in order to maximize profits. If the trade-off was affordable housing, it might be worth it, but as it is, I would appreciate the council considering rejecting this proposition.

Several parcels in the proposal are SITLA parcels, have they indicated if they'll participate or not? Many parcels backup to existing residences and neighborhoods...will there be larger setbacks, open space, view restrictions to protect current residents?

Maximum/limited dwelling prices should be used for some parcels

You may have problems trying to get the lower density product (5-10 u/ac) work. At 5 u/ac you would be doing single family homes/LOTS. A developer would need to be careful with "spec" inventory homes if they are building them out. If they are selling lots, they should probably be OK assuming the demand is there for custom builds and self-buil ds. If you go to 10-15 u/ac you would more than likely be doing an attached product which may involve additional risk of needing to construct "buildings" at a time, but if they got in a pinch could use the 20% if they couldn't sell a unit or two in a 6-plex.

As a born and raised local I think higher density is overdue.

We can't have a thriving economy/workforce if we have no housing. This is a must do!! Thank you.

Everyone should go and support this!

It needs to pass. The only way we get affordable housing is with high density. If you can only build one house per $100,000 acre. The valley will never be affordable. (3 Likes)

I believe that 80/20 for locals will prevent quality development. Lots of the primary rental houses in Moab are bought as investments by non-locals. I'm a believer in incentives for locals to buy, not deed restrictions for owners. We have empty nesters in too large of houses in Grand County, that would like smaller homes, less overhead. Which would free up large family homes. This is a good process to try to help local, working, county people. I would prefer valley wide up zoning, 1 acre zoning does not work for the anyone except the high end property owner. Most of the 1 acre lots in Spanish Valley could accommodate another home or two.
We support the county's direction in applying the higher density to properties in Spanish Valley. The higher density provides lower income housing possibilities that are needed for many living in the Moab area. We do feel the zoning should be geared toward primary residential homes, not rentals or second homes.

Whoever came up with this idea must not understand what it cost to build in this town. If I add a dwelling to my property, the cost to build it would not justify me being able to rent it at a low cost to a local. Especially since most of us have a hard time paying our own mortgages, trying to find a way to qualify for more money or a bigger loan is not a possibility for most of us to add 1 to 4 more units to our properties. We have looked into it. People already can add 1,000 ft extra dwelling to their property and most people don’t even do that. So obviously people are not interested in this. If the empty lot next to us ends up with 4 or 5 units on it. We are leaving this town.

Stay out of San Juan County Spanish Valley clean up the mess you've created in Grand County most of the 191 is a filthy looking embarrassing junkyard getting worse daily clean that up! Build affordable housing not low income that just brings more crime. Invest in cleanliness and organization in your county don't tread on my county to line your pockets $$$$$

I appreciate the locations of your selected densities. I question the potential of oversupply of deeded primary residences. That requirement may need to be flexible in time.

What measures are being taken to assure that the land parcels will be "affordable".

I am a developer and have done incentive-based housing predicated on additional density and here are my observations. I think the premise for your ambitions are great. I hope you find success. There are many keys to finding success in addition to increased density. Entitlements must be streamlined. As they say, time is money. The goal of a developer is to limit as much risk as possible, knowing that you will never completely eliminate it. If what I am reading is right, 80% of any units will be required to be primary residents. This scares me without a provision that allows you to either rent or sell those units to anyone after a certain "offering" period of time. Everyone is assuming the demand is there but until the end-user has to write out a check, it is yet to be seen. I hope this helps and I wish you the best of luck.

A few more thoughts...What type of restrictions will be on the 20%? If these were allowed to do shorter-term rentals that would be a definite plus. Nightly rentals would certainly sweeten the deal for developers. However, what about season-workers, students, construction workers that might not be considered "residents", where would they fit? Maybe these groups of people could be considered residents if they are "working" in the area or maybe they would fit in the 20%. The simplest solution (and probably most effective) would be to not place any restriction on these.
The assumption that building only for primarily full-time residents will provide affordable housing needs to be proven. Where in the west has the above assumption been proven to provide affordable housing? Building expensive apartments for wealth retired people will not increase affordable housing.

We can restrict overnight rentals in the valley and have almost the same results as building housing for only primary residents.

Do you plan to do an analyses of the available water based on the USGS study?

Great work on putting this plan and story map together!! It's great that this is voluntary for property owners, this could potentially open up a lot of new options for new affordable housing in Grand County. Great work!!

Brilliant way to allow 80% locals to benefit from county growth and not be hindered by AMI. Way to move this local need forward and enhance local moral and community spirit.

What keeps the owner of property from raising their land prices which would increase cost to build - thus not being able to keep it affordable!

we need diversity that is affordable. (5 likes)

Allowing for higher density without also requiring that there be an 'affordable' component seems to be missing the point.... (7 likes)

From what I understand, there are restrictions to rent monthly only to locals. No overnight rentals. Seems reasonable to be able to develop for that reason. Housing, local housing. (6 likes)

If you want affordable housing, build some trailer parks. Otherwise let's call it what is is, subsidized housing!

Don't base on income
1. My income is not county business
2. If I get a better job, do I have to sell my home?
3. Will inflation cause me to have to sell?
4. If require active employment what happens when I retire?
5. If I lose my job, do I have to sell?

YES - Primary residence

This is a great idea, a necessary starting point. It's important for those who work in Moab to be able to live in the area. This zoning change will act as a point to jump off of.

Sage Creek: what about that place it certainly is not affordable!
I assume they will be rentals???

Any development per this plan is by people with $ for people with $ - several references have been made at every meeting about "low wages" and not having workers who could afford housing - certainly as condos and townhomes get "sold" they are not to service seasonal workers.

Is there any discussion on requiring developers to perform any sort of economic study to prove their price point?
Affordable housing should be started with a focus for our community’s most vulnerable; the elderly and those on disability, followed by single person housing. Rather than building down from the top. “Primary residences” can still be owned by “out of towners” as long as it is rented to locals by a “6 mo or more lease.” With expensive homes who will rent them?

Hello HDH Team-

I am writing to express my support for the inclusion of section 6.14.70 - "Special Needs Emergency/Transitional Housing".

[Local housing availability has placed a significant strain on the capacity of organizations working with vulnerable groups in need of such housing. Increasing the ability to develop these housing types provides more options for victims and reduces the need for local organizations to turn down those seeking help.]

Your work on this project is appreciated.

Dear Community Development Staff and Planning Commission members,

First, I thank staff for their often under-appreciated work, a thankless job. And I thank Planning Commission members for their volunteer service as well.

I'm a Moab City Council member, a past member of the county Planning Commission and a member of the city's Water Advisory Board [Finite culinary water supply is a related problem which is exacerbated by both the accessory dwelling ordinance and the High Density Housing Overlay. But that is another issue on another front.] However, I write here as a city and county resident.

Re the proposed High Density Housing Overlay, my opinion is that in its present form, its downsides outweigh its upsides.

The downsides are well known. As always, county residents like their rural character, elbow room, peace and quiet, manageable traffic and so on.

The upside is that the county needs less expensive housing for its "workforce," for example teachers, policemen, firemen (and women), local government employees and our kids when they finish school. If HDH assured the latter, it might be worthwhile. But it doesn't.

The problem is that in its present form, in particular its single restriction to deed restrict only to "primary" residents, defined as "... the owner of record occupies the dwelling unit for a minimum of 9 months per year and or a renter occupies the dwelling unit through a lease term no shorter than 6 months within a single calendar year," it leaves the door open to many people who are not the sort of "workforce" members who need housing assistance. This includes retirees (in full disclosure, I admit my wife and I are good examples), part-time residents who will game the system, people who will soon retire, and young and old people who are independently wealthy.

Further, enforcement tools are far too weak. Primary residency is checked once at building permit time - then what? The developer isn't going to enforce deed restrictions - he'll disappear. And even if the county can revoke permits, what is there to revoke? Once the first resident is in, the ball is
And current experience with tracking deed restrictions in other venues around the country demonstrate how easy it is to lose track of deed restrictions and primary resident qualification when property is resold.

Because of this "unwanted" demand, lot prices will remain high, giving the developer his wildest wishes of wealth, but doing little for the people for whom HDH was intended.

I think it is important for Moab to approve some form of the High Density overlay in that there is a very limited number of locations that can build the type of housing most needed in Moab right now. Moab has outgrown the "One Mansion per Acre" zoning and needs to address the fact that we need "houses that people can afford" and not necessarily "Affordable Housing".

Sorry I have not been able to attend any open house meetings as of yet. I hope to remedy that in September. Meanwhile I have some questions and some feedback from myself and our neighborhood group. Have you had feedback from any local developers indicating willingness to build with the limitations involved? I assume you are trusting that the homes build would be more reasonably priced due to the smaller lot size. Is that correct? If the developer decided to set the price higher than expected, what recourse would there be if any? Would there be any rent controls applied to apartments build under this plan? If your intent is to "flood" the market with units so that prices fall, how many units do you suppose it would take to achieve that effect? How quickly would they need to appear? It seems to me that this plan would have to be extremely effective in order to impact the entire market. You should have developers lined up in anticipation! If the response from developers is as limited as we have seen in the past, the impact on the local market will be non-existent or insignificant. If a few high density units are built, chances are the existing neighborhoods surrounding them will have sacrificed a degree of their quality of life as a result.

Many neighbors I've spoken with have indicated their extreme dissatisfaction with the idea of such a sacrifice for housing that is not "affordable". Probably the least accepted element of this proposal is the 45 foot buildings it allows. The combination of VERY high densities and mid-rise buildings have left many county residents shell shocked. Combine that with the county build out numbers over 70,000 and people in my area are dismayed. Issues raised are the usual- water and other infrastructures. While county officials may not have control over these elements, they must take them into account. If you cannot assure the public that the resources to support such growth are available, that growth should not be encouraged. Many would like to see action such as Moab City is undertaking: reexamination of build out numbers in light of water resources and quality of life for residents and building affordable housing with public funds. A Grand County affordable housing fund needs to be built and utilized. Wouldn't the current County Council support some level of required fee from developers? Why not now while the sitting council remains? I believe that Spanish Valley residents would support affordable housing developments and the necessary densities involved. If these communities are built to be reasonably compatible with existing neighborhoods and the needed infrastructure is in place to support quality of life for all.
Financing/Cost to Developers

You may have problems trying to get the lower density product (5-10 u/ac) work. At 5 u/ac you would be doing single family homes/ lots. A developer would need to be careful with "spec" inventory homes if they are building them out. If they are selling lots, they should probably be OK assuming the demand is there for custom builds and self-builds. If you go to 10-15 u/ac you would more than likely be doing an attached product which may involve additional risk of needing to construct "buildings" at a time, but if they got in a pinch could use the 20% if they couldn't sell a unit or two in a 6-plex.

Whoever came up with this idea must not understand what it cost to build in this town. If I add a dwelling to my property, the cost to build it would not justify me being able to rent it at a low cost to a local. Especially since most of us have a hard time paying our own mortgages, trying to find a way to qualify for more money or a bigger loan is not a possibility for most of us to add 1 to 4 more units to our properties. We have looked into it. People already can add 1,000 ft extra dwelling to their property and most people don't even do that. So obviously people are not interested in this. If the empty lot next to us ends up with 4 or 5 units on it. We are leaving this town.

I am a developer and have done incentive-based housing predicated on additional density and here are my observations. I think the premise for your ambitions are great. I hope you find success. There are many keys to finding success in addition to increased density. Entitlements must be streamlined. As they say, time is money. The goal of a developer is to limit as much risk as possible, knowing that you will never completely eliminate it. If what I am reading is right, 80% of any units will be required to be primary residents. This scares me without a provision that allows you to either rent or sell those units to anyone after a certain "offering" period of time. Everyone is assuming the demand is there but until the end-user has to write out a check, it is yet to be seen. I hope this helps and I wish you the best of luck.

A few more thoughts...What type of restrictions will be on the 20%? If these were allowed to do shorter-term rentals that would be a definite plus. Nightly rentals would certainly sweeten the deal for developers. However, what about season-workers, students, construction workers that might not be considered "residents", where would they fit? Maybe these groups of people could be considered residents if they are "working" in the area or maybe they would fit in the 20%. The simplest solution (and probably most effective) would be to not place any restriction on these.

Great work on putting this plan and story map together!! It's great that this is voluntary for property owners, this could potentially open up a lot of new options for new affordable housing in Grand County. Great work!!

What keeps the owner of property from raising their land prices which would increase cost to build - thus not being able to keep it affordable?

Is there any discussion on requiring developers to perform any sort of economic study to prove their price point?
I am in support of the proposal. Higher density encourages walking and biking for smaller trips which will help mitigate traffic in the long run.

Developers should be required to contribute to bike infrastructure.

Design guidelines should be introduced in order to preserve the character of this special place.

As a owner of real estate in Grand County, and someone who hopes to help create solutions to affordable housing, I am excited about this proposal. My only request is that we provide higher density opportunities in certain areas. For instance, I own .5 acres of Highway commercial property. Under the 25 units/acre proposal, it is still more profitable for me to develop short term nightly rental units (which is not my desire). To get to a point where equal profits are available, and still provide "affordable" housing (condos at a price of sub $155,000) I would need to get to 36 units/acre. I would suggest a density of this amount to incentive developers to move forward with these types of developments.

Apartment builders need to fill their buildings as soon as possible and certainly wouldn’t be able to wait two or three years to fill them. I don’t know that they would be willing to make an initial investment of $10-$20 million with those kinds of restrictions.

No way for developers to sell with that many restrictions. It is a business it has to make profits to continue. Developing is not a non profit. Its a business.

Sorry I have not been able to attend any open house meetings as of yet. I hope to remedy that in September. Meanwhile I have some questions and some feedback from myself and our neighborhood group. Have you had feedback from any local developers indicating willingness to build with the limitations involved? I assume you are trusting that the homes build would be more reasonably priced due to the smaller lot size. Is that correct? If the developer decided to set the price higher than expected, what recourse would there be if any? Would there be any rent controls applied to apartments build under this plan? If your intent is to "flood" the market with units so that prices fall, how many units do you suppose it would take to achieve that effect? How quickly would they need to appear? It seems to me that this plan would have to be extremely effective in order to impact the entire market. You should have developers lined up in anticipation! If the response from developers is as limited as we have seen in the past, the impact on the local market will be nonexistent or insignificant. If a few high density units are built, chances are the existing neighborhoods surrounding them will have sacrificed a degree of their quality of life as a result. Many neighbors I’ve spoken with have indicated their extreme dissatisfaction with the idea of such a sacrifice for housing that is not "affordable". Probably the least accepted element of this proposal is the 45 foot buildings it allows. The combination of VERY high densities and mid-rise buildings have left many county residents shell shocked. Combine that with the county build out numbers over 70,000 and people in my area are dismayed. Issues raised are the usual - water and other infrastructures. While county officials may not have control over these elements, they must take them into account. If you cannot assure the public that the resources to support such growth are available, that growth should not be encouraged. Many would like to see action such as Moab City is undertaking: reexamination of build out numbers in light of water resources and quality of life for residents and building affordable housing with public funds. A Grand County affordable housing fund needs to be built and utilized. Wouldn’t the current County Council support some level of required fee from developers? Why not now while the sitting council remains? I believe that Spanish Valley residents would support affordable housing developments and the necessary densities involved, if these communities are
built to be reasonably compatible with existing neighborhoods and the needed infrastructure is in place to support quality of life for all.
Dark Skies

What about overall energy increases (please address)
Lighting issues - night sky is already affected
Water is an issue - enough?
Bought here (on Lemon Ln) because rural and remote
No more than 1 story houses. 3 Story condos are causing houses rather than cliff walls to be obscured
Nobody monitors light ordinances now! This will get out of hand.

We already live in crowded subdivision that is next to businesses along the 191. PLEASE no more! There is too much noise and traffic. When planning future homes, not sure where they will go but our experience here is that the Holyoak road is being used (and abused) by people trying to pass through to Hyway, VIA Holyoak so ACCESS ROADS and BUFFERS NEED TO BE INCORPORATED WHERE BUSINESSES ARE CLOSE TO RESIDENTIAL, and they need to COMPLY with CODES about lighting/noise! MAKE TRAFFIC GO AROUND HOUSING NOT THROUGH IT!
The roads are affected, the sewers, the normal access is being pushed to limit, without INSIGHT and CARE in PLANNING! PLANT LOTS & LOTS OF TREES FOR EVERY NEW DEVELOPMENT!

Thank you for your impressive work, JD especially. I'm excited about this work and need to spend more time reviewing. Initially, I appreciate you've taking into account solar access. If you haven't already, to the extent these would be applicable, please also consider viewshed and lighting (night sky) protections, and thinking ahead to providing for wildlife and transit corridor (especially bikes). Thanks!

Dark night Sky
Bike Lane
Traffic
191 Corridor
Gas Line Easements for bike lanes
Thank you

Yeah enough with the "flexible zoning" too!! Mixing business with residential is no good! They blast you with their lights at night, traffic increases, some idiot businesses have live bands and point their amplifiers towards the neighborhood, tear up the streets and sewers and YES, the WATER!!! Council needs to SLOW roll and start by changing all outdated street lights to warm LED's OR with shield (NO glare everywhere). THEN FIX OUR ROADS we already have! Kudos to more AFFORDABLE housing for all; not just the PT workers imported in. (2 likes)

Planning Commission
Thank you...
Consider SOLAR ACCESS in your consideration for building heights on RIMROCK RD.
30' max?? Would not be a major infringement on our 18 SOLAR PANELS

What about light pollution. DARK SKY

Please keep in mind the night skies of Spanish Valley. We're already seeing the "glow" of Moab and would hate to see future impacts.
I am a long time resident of District 3. I have also been a lifelong visitor to and resident of Moab. My father, an attorney for Utah League of/Cities and Towns, acted as Moab’s attorney and would combine work and vacation. I grew up convinced that the river by Moab was paradise. In 1972 nearly all of my friends who were just graduating from the U of U moved here and became miners, boatmen, cowboys, cooks or road bike enthusiasts. In 1984 I finally escaped SLC with a job offer from Four Corners Mental Health. That same year I searched for a place to settle and desiring the remoteness of the edge of town and the unparalleled view bought in "Angel Heights" just below Disappearing Angel.

My plan was to create a small homestead (with my 3 and now 4 acres) and transform the barren, scraped area and the rolling blackbrush, into garden, orchard, animal habitat and oxygen replenishing "forest". All of my accumulated "retirement" and any windfall wealth from work on a movie filming or a disaster relief deployment has gone into creating my home. This is the community to which I have envisioned my future. You might say that all my eggs are in one basket.

Moab has grown and my neighborhood developed. But still, living on the edge of town (Rimrock Road), has allowed a sense of space and distance from the onslaught of humanity. Walking the infrequently used trails in the adjacent BLM and the rarer moment of calm in the early and late hours, have been the cornerstones of my rural-as-possible lifestyle.

Now to the point.... I am terrified at the prospects of the High Density Overlay that is being spearheaded by Mr. Levine, et.al.

Already my neighborhood, Roberts Road and above are zoned agracultural/residentil 1. This is 1 residence per acre with the allowance of an accessory home. (So basically 2 homes per acre.) Most of the lots, on average, are 2 acres. That would allow an increased density of 4 X or approximately a home every 1/2 acre. In my standards that is crowded. I moved to the edge of town to allow space, privacy and occasional calm. I believe that if the neighbors with a vested interest in the neighborhood wanted to subdivide into still somewhat spacious housing, it would be done, in a more integrate respectful manner. Currently interspersed in the area are virtual junkyards, mobile homes that are decrepit and abandoned, owned now or soon by children who’ve settled elsewhere and a few large undeveloped lots. The money that might be made by selling out to a High Density developer would be a compelling reason to sell with no regard for the neighborhood. The prospects of increased traffic, noise (to include unattended barking dogs), light pollution and the disruption of the fallow habitat of animal life, all seem horrifying. The whole quality of my future seems at stake.

As soon as we neighbors became aware of the proposal we attended P&Z meetins to express our fears. The earlier public notices were not effective in warning us and since we weren't present the "stakeholders" who had been instrumental in the plans early formation had already laid the groundwork for the HDO. During the numerous P&Z meeting I, or my wife, Joanne Savoie, have attended the stakeholders have been absent. I would surmise that their primary economic incentive (the commitment to creating the HDO in areas with existing infrastructure) had already been achieved.

When distilled down to the reality of this proposal, it appears that the creation of more accessible housing, for those current residents of Moab, that may still not either afford or desire it, as well as those non-existent, hypothetical persons, will come at the expense of those here and now residences who, in large part, have committed themselves to the community. This is to be done by the allowance of builders and developer to maximise the money saved by upgrading existing infrastructure in lieu of working from scratch. This is largely planning for the welfare of hypothetical persons while degrading the living conditions of we who are current residence and neighbors...
...Since only 20% of the proposed housing is to be “affordable” anyway why not let the additional expense go to the buyer. Put the high density areas where there are either compatible neighbors or in some of the many undeveloped acres that exist in the county. Additionally crowding the HDO along the highway or Spanish Valley Drive assumes that these prospective new residents won’t just as easily be able to drive to work as the rest of us.

In my chosen profession as a Psychologist, one axiom, shared by all of the medical community is “first do no harm”. When people enter into an agreement well informed of the stipulations there are expected outcomes. Where people choose a given lifestyle and living conditions, and then these elements are put in jeopardy, especially by governmental agencies, there is a disheartening alienation from the democratic process. We are in an age of extreme pessimism toward the national and state government. People are trying to salvage the connection to a democratically influenced local government. We neighbors who live right here and right now.
Process

Yeah enough with the "flexible zoning" too!! Mixing business with residential is no good! They blast you with their lights at night, traffic increases, some idiot businesses have live bands and point their amplifiers towards the neighborhood, tear up the streets and sewers and YES, the WATER!! Council needs to SLOW roll and start by changing all outdated street lights to warm LED's OR with shield (NO glare everywhere). THEN FIX OUR ROADS we already have! Kudos to more AFFORDABLE housing for all; not just the PT workers imported in. (2 likes)

I am a developer and have done incentive-based housing predicated on additional density and here are my observations. I think the premise for your ambitions are great. I hope you find success. There are many keys to finding success in addition to increased density. Entitlements must be streamlined. As they say, time is money. The goal of a developer is to limit as much risk as possible, knowing that you will never completely eliminate it. If what I am reading is right, 80% of any units will be required to be primary residents. This scares me without a provision that allows you to either rent or sell those units to anyone after a certain "offering" period of time. Everyone is assuming the demand is there but until the end-user has to write out a check, it is yet to be seen. I hope this helps and I wish you the best of luck.

Is there any discussion on requiring developers to perform any sort of economic study to prove their price point?

Convey deed restrictions to public!!
NO more than one story houses on SITLA square/rectangle. Access concerns off and onto Hwy 191
Need a road to extend Rimrock to town??
Also NEED more East/West connections on east side of hwy in SV Drive to access hwy
Emphasize required setbacks, and buffers when going from low density to higher
What about water? Biggest question and concern code enforcement and water restrictions required for overlay? No lawns etc.
What about stepping it all down one notch?? Move all bright light, all light pink into blue? Maybe a bit less to swallow at once?
I can't help but reflect upon efforts by the community (in past years' General Plans) to state a strong preference for preserving the rural character and agricultural element of Moab. I remember when ridge line development was frowned upon, even regulated. The quality of the air and access to public lands have been seen as assets for choosing to retire here. None of the numerous citizen efforts to maintain local community quality of life seem to gain traction with regard to developing this special place beyond carrying capacity. The density increase as proposed is way overdone, invasive to neighborhoods, and heavily reliant on developer incentives. Aside from overtaxing aging sewer trunk lines, this plan, together with plans to build out Southern Spanish Valley, is entirely optimistic about future water resources, given the likelihood of increasing periods of drought. This year's prolonged drought should be a good reminder of that issue. So, rather than criticize, let me ask why we need to beg developers to do something we could do for ourselves. I envision incentivizing a contractual arrangement between those looking for housing and current year round residents with enough property to add an additional structure, such as the type currently popping up for overnight rental, or a TRAILER. The incoming county attorney will certainly be able to craft language waiving impact fees, assuring that no short term rentals occur, and imposing fees for violating the intent to provide affordable housing for local workers. Rent control may sound like government overreach, but not when contractually agreed to. No developers would be required. Separate contracts for landowner-owned structures and renter-owned structures would be required, as well as verification of adequate utilities and sewer connection. I know trailer parks are out of favor, but in the above context, I’m reminded that no one would get away with overnight rentals, because their neighbors would certainly notice! Thank you for the opportunity to express an alternative to the current plan, and for taking the time to consider it. I’ve read the current plan is only one of the "tools in the box" referring to providing affordable housing. Maybe other "tools" would better serve the community.

The increase in density proposal does not require that affordable housing is constructed. The proposal assumes that building house for only primary residents will result in affordable housing. This assumption has several problems. The following questions need to be answered or this proposal is the dream of every outside or local developer.

1. Who in the county will be responsible to guarantee that the housing will not be resold five or ten years later as second or third homes to wealthy people?
2. Who in the county will be responsible to verify that the first buyers are not buying a second home?
3. Where in the western US has this assumption proven to provide affordable housing to a community?

The website prepared for the public by the people making the proposal has very little concrete facts. There is absolutely no concern for the quantity of available water. There are no details about where their assumption has been proven to work. There is no detail on who will monitor sales of the new housing.

Allowing for higher density without also requiring that there be an 'affordable' component seems to be missing the point.... (7 like)

Any development per this plan is by people with $ for people with $ - several references have been made at every meeting about "low wages" and not having workers who could afford housing - certainly as condos and townhomes get "sold" they are not to service seasonal workers.

Affordable housing should be started with a focus for our community's most vulnerable; the elderly and those on disability, followed by single person housing. Rather than building down from the top.
Nice "slideshow"! One of your slides summed up the philosophy rather well: "a voluntary, incentive-based program, the high density residential overlay will not be used on every eligible parcel, and likely will not be used on the vast majority of eligible parcels. With this in mind, the focus in drawing the overlay is to allow as many areas as it is appropriate the opportunity to construct more housing." Although it may not seem likely now, I'm concerned that if we do such extensive high density zoning, with no sideboards for maximum allowable houses in each zone, that we could end up with a very crowded valley eventually. I am also very concerned about over-allocating our limited water with development (especially with hotels! Although that's another topic...) but I suppose the water issue is something that would be addressed through approval/denial of specific building permits?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change density in phases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduce heights all around</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where are the open space set-asides?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel and nightly rental high-rise MORATORIUM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I think density is a great idea, especially since Moab has historically had a boom/bust economy. Bringing in people/businesses would increase the longevity of the town. ADUs might be a great way to increase density and increase rental opportunities too. I think design requirements would be good for new commercial buildings to keep the character of the town, but I think residential design requirements would be incredibly limiting. With a housing crisis we need innovation and creativity so I would be careful not to put too many restrictions. Also have you considered a different way to present a plan like this? I think the word density scares some people but can be a really good thing. Just food for thought. :)

It does not matter whether you attend or not they are going to do whatever they please and it will turn into daily rentals the new aspen is here (4 likes)

Hello HDH Team-

I am writing to express my support for the inclusion of section 6.14.70 - "Special Needs Emergency/Transitional Housing".

[Local housing availability has placed a significant strain on the capacity of organizations working with vulnerable groups in need of such housing. Increasing the ability to develop these housing types provides more options for victims and reduces the need for local organizations to turn down those seeking help.]

Your work on this project is appreciated.
Dear Community Development Staff and Planning Commission members,

First, I thank staff for their often under-appreciated work, a thankless job. And I thank Planning Commission members for their volunteer service as well.

I'm a Moab City Council member, a past member of the county Planning Commission and a member of the city's Water Advisory Board [Finite culinary water supply is a related problem which is exacerbated by both the accessory dwelling ordinance and the High Density Housing Overlay. But that is another issue on another front.] However, I write here as a city and county resident.

Re the proposed High Density Housing Overlay, my opinion is that in its present form, its downsides outweigh its upsides.

The downsides are well known. As always, county residents like their rural character, elbow room, peace and quiet, manageable traffic and so on.

The upside is that the county needs less expensive housing for its "workforce," for example teachers, policemen, firemen (and women), local government employees and our kids when they finish school. If HDH assured the latter, it might be worthwhile. But it doesn't.

The problem is that in its present form, in particular its single restriction to deed restrict only to "primary" residents, defined as "... the owner of record occupies the dwelling unit for a minimum of 9 months per year and or a renter occupies the dwelling unit through a lease term no shorter than 6 months within a single calendar year," it leaves the door open to many people who are not the sort of "workforce" members who need housing assistance. This includes retirees (in full disclosure, I admit my wife and I are good examples), part-time residents who will game the system, people who will soon retire, and young and old people who are independently wealthy.

Further, enforcement tools are far too weak. Primary residency is checked once at building permit time - then what? The developer isn't going to enforce deed restrictions - he'll disappear. And even if the county can revoke permits, what is there to revoke? Once the first resident is in, the ball is rolling. And current experience with tracking deed restrictions in other venues around the country demonstrate how easy it is to lose track of deed restrictions and primary resident qualification when property is resold.

Because of this "unwanted" demand, lot prices will remain high, giving the developer his wildest wishes of wealth, but doing little for the people for whom HDH was intended.
Yeah enough with the "flexible zoning" too!! Mixing business with residential is no good! They blast you with their lights at night, traffic increases, some idiot businesses have live bands and point their amplifiers towards the neighborhood, tear up the streets and sewers and YES, the WATER!!! Council needs to SLOW roll and start by changing all outdated street lights to warm LED's OR with shield (NO glare everywhere). THEN FIX OUR ROADS we already have! Kudos to more AFFORDABLE housing for all; not just the PT workers imported in. (2 likes)

I can't help but reflect upon efforts by the community (in past years' General Plans) to state a strong preference for preserving the rural character and agricultural element of Moab. I remember when ridge line development was frowned upon, even regulated. The quality of the air and access to public lands have been seen as assets for choosing to retire here. None of the numerous citizen efforts to maintain local community quality of life seem to gain traction with regard to developing this special place beyond carrying capacity. The density increase as proposed is way overdone, invasive to neighborhoods, and heavily reliant on developer incentives.

Aside from overtaxing aging sewer trunk lines, this plan, together with plans to build out Southern Spanish Valley, is entirely optimistic about future water resources, given the likelihood of increasing periods of drought. This year's prolonged drought should be a good reminder of that issue. So, rather than criticize, let me ask why we need to beg developers to do something we could do for ourselves. I envision incentivizing a contractual arrangement between those looking for housing and current year round residents with enough property to add an additional structure, such as the type currently popping up for overnight rental, or a TRAILER. The incoming county attorney will certainly be able to craft language waiving impact fees, assuring that no short term rentals occur, and imposing fees for violating the intent to provide affordable housing for local workers. Rent control may sound like government overreach, but not when contractually agreed to. No developers would be required.

Separate contracts for landowner-owned structures and renter-owned structures would be required, as well as verification of adequate utilities and sewer connection. I know trailer parks are out of favor, but in the above context, I'm reminded that no one would get away with overnight rentals, because their neighbors would certainly notice!

Thank you for the opportunity to express an alternative to the current plan, and for taking the time to consider it. I've read the current plan is only one of the "tools in the box" referring to providing affordable housing. Maybe other "tools" would better serve the community.

Change density in phases
Reduce heights all around
Where are the open space set-asides?
Hotel and nightly rental high-rise MORATORIUM

Stay out of San Juan County Spanish Valley clean up the mess you've created in Grand County most of the 191 is a filthy looking embarrassing junkyard getting worse daily clean that up! Build affordable housing not low income that just brings more crime. Invest in cleanliness and organization in your county don't tread on my county to line your pockets $$$$$

HDH Feedback
The assumption that building only for primarily full time residents will provide affordable housing needs to be proven. Where in the west has the above assumption been proven to provide affordable housing? Building expensive apartments for wealth retired people will not increase affordable housing. We can restrict overnight rentals in the valley and have almost the same results as building housing for only primary residents. Do you plan to do an analyses of the available water based on the USGS study?

I find this study to be admirable in effort but I have some reservations. I appreciate looking at areas where increased density in residential buildings would promote affordable housing for local residents. However, I am troubled that there is no reference to improving the infrastructure to support the increased density. There is no mention to improvements to Spanish Valley Drive as a lot of the increased density would be using that road. I realize that once some of the development is in place, that future commercial development could happen, such as a grocery store, elementary school, parks, restaurants, etc. so locals don't have to travel to downtown Moab for services. There needs to be a "South Moab" developed. And, with San Juan County's plans on developing the south end of Spanish Valley, what about the additional traffic on Hwy 191? To me this study is only half of what is needed to have a bigger picture of the future of Spanish Valley.
The following topics need to be presented to the public at the open houses before adding more high density overlays for development in Grand County.
Has the approximately 10-year-old overlay for increased density in the Resource Blvd area of Grand County been successful in providing affordable housing?
A. If successful in providing affordable house, why do we need more overlays.
B. If not successful in providing affordable housing why will the new proposal be an improvement?
1. Available Water for High Density Development
GWSSA was given their second or third allocation of 500-acre feet of water by the Utah Division of Water Rights over 5 years ago. GWSSA will have to apply for approval of a third allocation in the near future. The water is available in the Glen Canyon Aquifer per the USGS study. However!!!!!!
A. How many more equivalent housing units can be built before GWSSA has to apply to the state for another water allocation? GWSSA needs to include in this analysis of available water the approximate 300 ERUs sold to SITLA when the water system was completed and the projected water requirements of our new University.
B. The USGS study says we have approximately 6000-acre feet of water available in the Glen Canyon Aquifer. GWSSA has water rights for a small part of the available water. Moab City has much older water rights and owns the largest portion of available water. Moab City will certainly protest any request by GWSSA for another allocation. How much of the 6000 acre does GWSSA owned based on the age of their current water rights? How many ERUs can the county approve based on their share of the available 6000 acre feet? What will GWSSA do if Moab City prevents future allocations of water?
C. The available 6000-acre feet of water from the USGS study will not build out the Moab Valley if we increase density of construction. The county needs to look at alternative sources of water for development before increasing the density of housing in the valley. Alternative sources are available but will cost an unknown millions of dollars. Approving high density development without water sources for other land owners means many land owners will not be able to develop their property in the future or the cost of water for the future developments will be very high.
How many acres in the valley will not have water for development in the future if we increase the density today based on current water rights and sources?

Moab City should by now realize that SITLA is a very poor development partner. Please remember the fiasco with SITLA during the Cloudrock and Lionsback developments. SITLA will take water, sewer, and infrastructure and when there are no more gifts tell you they will not follow the Land Use Code. The public needs to know your plan to work with SITLA? How will the city prevent another fiasco with SITLA? GWSSA does not have sufficient water for development of the University in the current state allocation. When GWSSA asks for another 500 acre foot allotment in the future, will the city protest the allocation? Will the city have a contract with GWSSA that guarantees the new allocation will go to the university and not to more density in the county?
GWSSA has very few old water rights and the city owns most of the available water in the aquifer.
GWSSA is probably using city water for the university.

I think we need a thorough water study for GC before continuing with any development. SJ County - 6000 residents - 320 acre USU campus - 16 more hotels - we don’t know where we are at on water - 50-100 years from now!

Development should be mixed-use in order to encourage walking, biking; to foster spontaneous social interactions; to mitigate traffic and improve the environment.
I am concerned that there is not a longer term vision in Grand County. We are being hit with over the top visitation - hotels - new university - we don’t have a good water study yet - and it is important to have a collective vision first, otherwise we stay in a reactive stance.

Stages of development with areas that would entail the least impact on existing neighborhoods being highest priority, would honor the intentions of those who desire the R1 A1 space. Without prioritizing with stages of development that can play out, making projections into future needs is all theoretical and not based upon reality.

Sorry I have not been able to attend any open house meetings as of yet. I hope to remedy that in September. Meanwhile I have some questions and some feedback from myself and our neighborhood group. Have you had feedback from any local developers indicating willingness to build with the limitations involved? I assume you are trusting that the homes build would be more reasonably priced due to the smaller lot size. Is that correct? If the developer decided to set the price higher than expected, what recourse would there be if any? Would there be any rent controls applied to apartments build under this plan? If your intent is to "flood" the market with units so that prices fall, how many units do you suppose it would take to achieve that effect? How quickly would they need to appear? It seems to me that this plan would have to be extremely effective in order to impact the entire market. You should have developers lined up in anticipation! If the response from developers is as limited as we have seen in the past, the impact on the local market will be non-existent or insignificant. If a few high density units are built, chances are the existing neighborhoods surrounding them will have sacrificed a degree of their quality of life as a result. Many neighbors I’ve spoken with have indicated their extreme dissatisfaction with the idea of such a sacrifice for housing that is not "affordable". Probably the least accepted element of this proposal is the 45 foot buildings it allows. The combination of VERY high densities and mid-rise buildings have left many county residents shell shocked. Combine that with the county build out numbers over 70,000 and people in my area are dismayed. Issues raised are the usual-water and other infrastructures. While county officials may not have control over these elements, they must take them into account. If you cannot assure the public that the resources to support such growth are available, that growth should not be encouraged. Many would like to see action such as Moab City is undertaking: reexamination of build out numbers in light of water resources and quality of life for residents and building affordable housing with public funds. A Grand County affordable housing fund needs to be built and utilized. Wouldn’t the current County Council support some level of required fee from developers? Why not now while the sitting council remains? I believe that Spanish Valley residents would support affordable housing developments and the necessary densities involved, if these communities are built to be reasonably compatible with existing neighborhoods and the needed infrastructure is in place to support quality of life for all.
Please make this proposal more visual for those who aren't able to see:
1) What does 1 biggest allowed house look like in 1, 1/2 house per acre?
2) Take same lot and show what 5 units per acre HDH development that is 35' high
3) Same lot with 10 then 15 then 25 units per acre w/ heights of 35' and 45' maximums
Thank you

Great webpage, very informative. We have a big problem in Moab and this proposal is a big solution. Bravo, I hope it happens.

I think this is the best plan yet for helping to solve the housing shortage. I fully support this. Can you send me info regarding the next community involvement meeting for this plan?

Very good idea! Have to do something - this will help.

Stop this madness (8 likes)

[thumbs down emoji] (4 likes)

People already can't sleep at night in that town money hungry greed. people that made my he town have to move because it's outrageous to live sad town

Hello HDH Team-

I am writing to express my support for the inclusion of section 6.14.70 - "Special Needs Emergency/Transitional Housing".

[Local housing availability has placed a significant strain on the capacity of organizations working with vulnerable groups in need of such housing. Increasing the ability to develop these housing types provides more options for victims and reduces the need for local organizations to turn down those seeking help.]

Your work on this project is appreciated.
From: savole joanne [savoleferro@yahoo.com]  
Sent: Wednesday, June 20, 2018 3:30 PM  
To: Jaylyn Hawks  
Subject: Citizen Concerns

Dear Jaylyn, First of all, thank you for your informative emails regarding all the work that council has been doing. Secondly, thank you for giving county employees a pay raise.

The reason for this letter is to share how we, my husband Jimmy Ferro and I, feel about the plans underfoot to increase the density of housing in our neighborhood. We live in the Roberts Rd. neighborhood, and the current zoning allows for one home per acre with agriculture and animal allowances. That is a big draw for some of my neighbors. There are many horses/dogs/chickens/grapes/fruit trees/ and of course vegetable gardens as well as vacant and/or junky acres. It is semi-rural. We chose that 34 years ago with no plans to sell out or move away someday. Perhaps you feel the same. Now we must argue in favor of maintaining that character against the tide of developer greed and short term housing lust.

When we became aware of the HDH Overlay, it was all about creating opportunities for affordable housing. With a heartstring-plucking plea to give up my neighborhood for affordable housing for "teachers and police officers", a plan was hatched to create incentives for property owners and/or developers to "buy up and build up", but "make some affordable". We attended meetings, scheduled our own with Zacharia, and the plan has changed. But we are still not ok with it. Hence the following objections.

1. Increasing the density of an acre will be in direct conflict with animal and agricultural usage of that acre. Once built there will be no going back to current zoning allowances.
2. Our neighbors drive around our corner respectfully and with caution. We know each other's patterns of coming and going, dogs, children, horses etc. We recently witnessed an increase of visiting ATV's zipping around these streets with no interest in who lives here or who might be sharing the road. Increasing the density will only encourage that activity.
3. We do not want to see curb/ gutter/ streetlights. Increased density will erode the existing infrastructure and lead down the road towards that.
4. Our water pressure is currently wholly inadequate. There have been stated promises to rectify that but when will it happen and is there really enough water to keep this up?
5. We have seen news about plans to create affordable/mixed density housing (Arroyo Crossing), which is excellent news so why the push to fracture our existing neighborhoods?

We are in favor of maintaining the highway corridor for local housing and local business. It's distressing to see what is happening where High Desert Gardens used to be. Sure won't be locals living there! We are in favor of an Assured Housing Policy. Perhaps the behemoths who come with very deep pockets to build should be required to do a "workforce analysis" before signing up to build. Thank you for listening. Our time is up. sincerely Joanne Savole and Jimmy Ferro
Dear Ms. Hawks, and other members of the Grand County Counsel.

I am a long time resident of District 3. I have also been a lifelong visitor to and resident of Moab. My father, an attorney for Utah League of Cities and Towns, acted as Moab's attorney and would combine work and vacation. I grew up convinced that the river by Moab was paradise. In 1972 nearly all of my friends who were just graduating from the U of U moved here and became miners, boatmen, cowboys, cooks or road bike enthusiasts. In 1984 I finally escaped SLC with a job offer from Four Corners Mental Health. That same year I searched for a place to settle and desiring the remoteness of the edge of town and the unparalleled view bought in "Angel Heights" just below Disappearing Angel.

My plan was to create a small homestead (with my 3 and now 4 acres) and transform the barren, scraped area and the rolling blackbrush, into garden, orchard, animal habitat and oxygen replenishing "forest". All of my accumulated "retirement" and any windfall wealth from work on a movie filming or a disaster relief deployment has gone into creating my home. This is the community to which I have envisioned my future. You might say that all my eggs are in one basket.

Moab has grown and my neighborhood developed. But still, living on the edge of town (Rimrock Road), has allowed a sense of space and distance from the onslaught of humanity. Walking the infrequently used trails in the adjacent BLM and the rarer moment of calm in the early and late hours, have been the cornerstones of my rural-as-possible lifestyle.

Now to the point..... I am terrified at the prospects of the High Density Overlay that is being spearheaded by Mr. Levine, et.al.

Already my neighborhood, Roberts Road and above are zoned agracultural/residential. This is 1 residence per acre with the allowance of an accessory home. (So basically 2 homes per acre.) Most of the lots, on average, are 2 acres. That would allow an increased density of 4 X or approximately a home every 1/2 acre. In my standards that is crowded. I moved to the edge of town to allow space, privacy and occasional calm. I believe that if the neighbors with a vested interest in the neighborhood wanted to subdivide into still somewhat spacious housing, it would be done in a more integrative respectful manner. Currently interspersed in the area are virtual junkyards, mobile homes that are decrepit and abandoned, owned now or soon by children who've settled elsewhere and a few large undeveloped lots. The money that might be made by selling out to a High Density developer would be a compelling reason to sell with no regard for the neighborhood. The prospects of increased traffic, noise (to include unattended barking dogs), light pollution and the disruption of the fallow habitat of animal life, all seem horrifying. The whole quality of my future seems at stake.

As soon as we neighbors became aware of the proposal we attended P&Z meetings to express our fears. The earlier public notices were not effective in warning us and since we weren't present the "stakeholders" who had been instrumental in the plans early formation had already laid the groundwork for the HDO. During the numerous P&Z meetings I, or my wife, Joanne Savoie, have attended the stakeholders have been absent. I would surmise that their primary economic incentive (the commitment to creating the HDO in areas with existing infrastructure) had already been achieved.

When distilled down to the reality of this proposal, it appears that the creation of more accessible housing, for those current residents of Moab, that may still not either afford or desire it, as well as those non-existent, hypothetical persons, will come at the expense of those here and now residences who, in large part, have committed themselves to the community. This is to be done by the allowance of builders and developer to maximise the money saved by upgrading existing infrastructure in lieu of working from scratch. This is largely planning for the welfare of hypothetical persons while degrading the living conditions of we who are current residence and neighbors.

Since only 20% of the proposed housing is to be "affordable" anyway why not let the additional expense go to the buyer. Put the high density areas where there are either compatible neighbors or in some of the many undeveloped acres that exist in the county. Additionally crowding the HDO along
DATE 9 October 2018
TO Grand County Planning Commission
FROM Michael Liss
RE High Density Overlay does not conform with the General Plan

DOES THE HIGH DENSITY OVERLAY CONFORM WITH THE GENERAL PLAN?
No.

Does the “Seven Neighborhood Plan” I submitted to the Planning Commission which (1) creates Rural Centers along Spanish Valley Drive, (2) places new housing density along Spanish Valley Drive, and (3) establishes direct connector roads from Rural Centers to US191, conform with General Plan?
Yes.

QUALITY OF LIFE, HEALTH AND HAPPINESS?

Does the High Density Overlay encourage new housing that results in a good quality of life, health for the citizens, a great place to raise families, and promote overall happiness?
No.

Does the “Seven Neighborhood Plan” encourage new housing that results in a good quality of life, health for the citizens, a great place to raise families, and promote overall happiness?
Yes.

GUESS WHAT?

Every idea I presented in the “Seven Neighborhood Plan”, which was inspired by the San Juan County Plan for South Spanish Valley, is already included in the Grand County General Plan. That’s weird, did San Juan County read our General Plan and we didn’t?

The Grand County General Plan 2012 is an excellent planning document. I come before the Planning Commission today to encourage you to amend the High Density Overlay Map you previously approved so that it conforms with the excellent planning principles outlined in the General Plan.

THE MOST IMPORTANT PLANNING DECISION THIS COMMISSION WILL MAKE

The High Density Overlay is the most important decision this Planning Commission will make, and will determine the development pattern of Grand County for the next 50 years.

The granting of higher density is the most important tool planning authorities have to leverage the creation of civic amenities for the public good. This High Density Overlay squanders this density tool, placing housing where no one wants to live, with no benefits.

A decision of this magnitude cannot be made without full consideration of the civic benefits we believe are important for a happy, healthy life. Considerations discussed in great detail in the General Plan. Where do you place parks and playgrounds? Where do you place neighborhood commercial like coffee shops, convenience stores, restaurants, hair salons, barber shops, yoga studios, crossfit, and wouldn’t an old-fashioned soda fountain be fun?
THE GRAND COUNTY GENERAL PLAN

In the remainder of this memo I excerpt specific sections of the General Plan, then comment on how the High Density Overlay (HDO) and the Seven Neighborhood Plan (SNP) either DO, or DO NOT conform with Grand County General Plan.

All regular text is directly from the General Plan.

All Commentary in Italics.

GRAND COUNTY GENERAL PLAN 2012
CHAPTER 3: VISION, GOALS AND STRATEGIES
3.2 VISION: DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS

GOALS AND STRATEGIES

Goal 1- Support and participate in the implementation of the Grand County and City of Moab Housing Study and Affordable Housing Plan.

Strategy B - Support rezoning to multi-family residential (MFR) within the MFR overlay and in Rural Centers when there is an affordable housing component in a proposed project.

**HDO:** The HDO does not even address the Rural Centers. Nowhere. The Spanish Valley Drive Rural Center has minimal additional density on the west side of the street, and NO additional density on the east side. The only way to promote a Rural Center is with density. I spoke with Ben Riley of the Housing Authority, and Tracy Dutson of the Moab City Housing, and both were enthusiastic about this location for high density affordable housing. The HDO completely ignores the General Plan for Rural Centers.

**SNP:** The SNP creates Seven Neighborhoods along Spanish Valley Drive. My term “Neighborhood Center” is called a “Rural Center” in the General Plan.

Goal 2- Focus future development in centers where existing and planned infrastructure can accommodate it so that people can live close to where they work and obtain goods and services.

Strategy B - Designate rural centers that can be served efficiently by existing and planned infrastructure where future non-residential and residential development will be encouraged.

**HDO:** The HDO does not address Rural Centers. The HDO makes the FALSE assumption that everyone works downtown. They don’t. People work along US191. And if we are successful in our goal to diversity our economy, diverse businesses will thrive all along US191, so the objective is actually to place housing easily accessible to US191. A primary attribute of every proposed Rural Center is a DIRECT CONNECTOR road to US191.

**SNP:** One of the main benefits of Rural Centers is neighborhood commercial, so that, as stated above “people can ... obtain goods and services” close to where they live.
3.2 VISION: TRANSPORTATION
GOALS AND STRATEGIES

Goal 1- Continue to focus county transportation infrastructure improvements on Moab as the heart of the community.

Strategy B - Prioritize improvements to existing east-west roads and intersections which connect Spanish Valley neighborhoods to US 191 (Spanish Trail Road, Mill Creek Drive, San Jose Road, Sage Avenue, Resource Blvd., and Beeman Road).

Strategy C - Improve the north-south collector roads and intersections: Spanish Valley Drive, Mill Creek Drive, and Murphy Lane.

Strategy E - Once existing infrastructure is improved, plan for and build additional east-west roads to connect Murphy Lane, Spanish Valley Drive, and US 191.

HDO: The HDO makes only one assumption about transportation: be near US191. The problem is NOBODY WANTS TO LIVE NEAR US191. Most important, living along a highway is a proven public health catastrophe, resulting in respiratory ailments, allergies, heart disease, asthma, pre-term births, childhood leukemia, and certain types of cancer.

HDO: The HDO does not understand the importance of existing and new east-west roads (Strategy B & E) to move commuters efficiently to US191, so they do not have to travel on County Roads.

SNP: The key consideration of the SNP is that you can only establish a Rural Center on Spanish Valley Drive if you have a direct east-west road to US191. The General Plan encourages traffic to be directed to US191, to save on the 20% of the County budget we spend on roads.

Goal 2- Continue to work in partnership with the Utah Department of Transportation and the City of Moab to improve US Highway 191 and its intersections south of Moab to balance the need for safe local access with the need to accommodate through traffic.

Strategy A - Work in partnership with the Utah Department of Transportation and the City of Moab to develop multi-modal pathways and related improvements parallel to US 191.

Strategy B - Work in partnership with the Utah Department of Transportation and the City of Moab to fund and develop an access management plan for the US 191 south corridor.

Strategy C - Preserve the internal circulation of existing subdivisions as US Highway 191 and its accesses are improved and plan for connectivity and multimodal transportation between future developments to reduce need to enter the highway.

HDO: The HDO does not "balance the need for safe local access with the need to accommodate through traffic." The HDO places 6 miles of high density residential squished up against the highway. This will require numerous entrances to US191, and will slow down thru-traffic considerably. Strategy C requires us to "reduce the need to enter the highway" which can be achieved through Rural Centers, not the six miles of endless highway adjacent suburban sprawl advocated by the HDO.
SNP: The SNP places density along Spanish Valley Drive, and creates a limited number of east-west collector roads that intersect US191. This is what you want. In the long term, we should establish Frontage Roads on both sides of US191 (Strategy A "parallel improvements"), with access to US191 limited (Strategy C "reduce need to enter highway"). This is important for both locals and thru traffic. Local want a choice: (1) either I will relax and meander along the beautiful Spanish Valley Drive, or (2) get me to US191 so I can hightail it to Moab in 5 minutes. We need to encourage BOTH. The HDO will make both Spanish Valley Drive AND US191 slow, and nobody wants that. We need a US191 “access management plan” as stipulated in Strategy B.

SNP: One of the primary reasons I focused on Spanish Valley Drive is that the County has already proposed this multimodal bike/walk/equestrian path along this road. What better anchor for new residential development than that potential to be able to bike or walk or ride your horse everywhere?

SNP: I also include the trails discussion here, because it is important to consider both trail access to places out in nature AND trails WITHIN the community. The trail along Mill Creek is a good example of an urban trail that the community enjoys. We need to look at Spanish Valley and ask ourselves if there are any important multimodal public trail corridors we should identify and encourage NOW with the High Density Overlay. I propose one very important trail: a multimodal public corridor that runs north-south through Spanish Valley on the land between US191 and Spanish Valley Drive. Why here? I thought of this because the Grand County School District already has a future site on this potential public corridor, so our objective would be to give neighborhood school kids the option to bike or walk to school. These kinds of trails must be thought of now, before development crowds them out. The new Housing Authority Wingate Village Project, which seems perfect, actually cuts off access to this potential school corridor, illustrating the need to think of these things in advance. I am sure the Housing Authority will agree to a trail corridor if the community expresses a desire for one soon, before the project is fully designed and breaks ground.
High Density Overlay does not conform with the General Plan

GRAND COUNTY GENERAL PLAN 2012

4.4 Future Land Use Plan Designations and Map

Figure 4.2 - FLUP Designation Summary: Opportunities for Economic Vitality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Parameters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural Center</td>
<td>Ranges in size from 5 to 30 acres and includes neighborhood scale retail, small businesses, local commercial, local tourism, on-site renewable energy and residential neighborhoods. Residential density of up to 3.2 units per acre if it includes (a) 50% open space set-aside area or fee-in-lieu, (b) 25% affordable housing units or a fee-in-lieu, (c) multi-modal options (pedestrian/bicycle, at minimum), and (d) no more than one-half of the total dwelling units are multi-family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Mixed Use</td>
<td>A highly accessible and visible land base for business in the unincorporated county.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HDO: The HDO totally ignores encouraging Rural Centers, an “opportunity for economic vitality”. The HDO totally obliterates the Highway Mixed Use zone, which was specifically designated as a “highly accessible and visible land base for business in the unincorporated county.”

SNP: The primary idea of the SNP is to promote and create Rural Centers. Rural Centers will become a nexus for “opportunities for economic vitality.” Why does all business have to be geared to tourists and downtown? Let’s create opportunities for local entrepreneurs to create small businesses throughout the valley, near their homes, and local customers.

SNP: The SNP leaves the “Highway Mixed Use” zone for highway mixed use. Nuff said.

GRAND COUNTY GENERAL PLAN 2012

4.4 FUTURE LAND USE PLAN DESIGNATIONS AND MAP

Opportunities for Economic Vitality

The planning process showed strong support for diversifying and expanding the economy. The vision, goals and strategies (Chapter 3) list a range of actions the county can take to help build a sustainable economy. A top priority is to ensure that the FLUP allows opportunities for businesses and organizations to locate, relocate, or expand in the unincorporated county. The following six land use designations combined with the Future Land Use Plan map work together to lay the groundwork for opportunities for economic growth.

HDO: The HDO TOTALLY CROWDS OUT “opportunities for businesses and organizations to locate, relocate, or expand in the unincorporated county” by designating ALL LAND ALONG US191 the HIGHEST DENSITY residential. Are we interested in opportunities for economic vitality and diversity, or not?

SNP: The SNP put people in neighborhoods away from the highway, so the highway can support “diversifying and expanding the economy.”
High Density Overlay does not conform with the General Plan
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Rural Center, North Corridor Recreation and Industry Resource encourage changes to the existing zoning and development patterns in order to create opportunities for economic activity.

**SNP:** Note that the designation of the "Rural Center" was done to specifically "encourage changes to the existing zoning and development patterns in order to create opportunities for economic activity." Let's do it.

**Rural Center**
These can be existing rural centers, or new centers, which typically have public gathering places or community facilities with a mix of land uses associated with them, such as neighborhood scale retail, small businesses, local commercial, local tourism, on-site renewable energy and residential neighborhoods with a diversity of housing types. The total developed area of a new rural center ranges in size from 5 to 30 acres and non-residential elements cover no more than 10 acres. Rural Centers should be located within a travel distance of a half-mile of state or federal highways or municipal streets to minimize travel on county roads.

**SNP:** I could not have described a Rural Center better myself.

**Highway Mixed Use**
The highway mixed use corridor is an integral component of the economy providing a highly accessible and visible land base for business in the unincorporated county (Figures 4.8 and 4.15). The historic mixed use pattern along US 191 South of Moab is comprised of businesses that depend on highways for customers as well as mixed use businesses that may or may not depend on highway traffic for customers but need easily accessible, large commercial lots with sewer and water. Limitations on retail uses in this designation direct sales tax generating activities into Moab or rural centers while maintaining the mixed use land base and avoiding a retail strip development pattern. The highway mixed use corridor abuts mostly residential property, meaning that the industrial uses are limited to those that are not a nuisance to residents with more intensive uses subject to land use review.

**HDO:** Note that when "highway mixed use corridor abuts mostly residential" there are limits to some uses. That's why the General Plan says we should look for future opportunities for "Business Park / Light Industrial" locations. We have one such location at the southern end of Spanish Valley along US191 where there is no housing, except that the HDO creates a little strip of high density along the entire west side of US191, precluding the only obvious location for Business Park / Light Industrial. This makes no sense at all.

**Business Park/Light Industrial**
This designation should be used to mark the location for future opportunities of employment-generating activities including light industrial, light manufacturing, business park, small businesses, renewable energy production, and institutional/civic uses that serve the region. Typically this designation will range from 20 to 100 acres. The Future Land Use Plan does not include areas designated as Business Park/Light Industrial, but this designation may be utilized in future land use code and General Plan amendments.

**HDO:** The HDO places high density residential in the only obvious location for Business Park / Light Industrial, along our southern most stretch of US191.
RESIDENTIAL
Transition Residential
This single-family residential designation is intended to provide a transition from the Residential Infill designation to the Rural Residential designation (two units per acre base density and up to 3.2 dwelling units per acre with a 50% open-space set-aside or fee in lieu of open space and 25% affordable housing units or fee-in-lieu). See Figure 4.12.

SNP: You will note on the plan attached, an update of the General Plan Future Land Use Plan, that I have simply extended the Transition Neighborhood logically along the Spanish Valley Drive corridor, and placed high density here.

THANK YOU

Thank you for listening. Thank you for being open-minded to the idea that maybe we haven't hit upon the right answers yet.

The Grand County General Plan should be our primary guiding document in planning decisions.

ATTACHMENTS

VISUAL PRESENTATION

Attached is a presentation on how to update the FUTURE LAND USE PLAN based on all the concepts described in this memo.

The Future Land Use Plan is the part of the Grand County General Plan 2012 with all of the planning and zoning diagrams. It's the same document.

Once you have updated the Future Land Use Plan, you simply overlay the High Density where it is appropriate to achieve the agreed upon civic objectives of the General Plan.

SEVEN NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN

Attached is my original presentation on the Seven Neighborhood Plan, written before Gerrish Willis let me know that there even was a Future Land Use Plan. Thank you Gerrish.
UPDATE THE FUTURE LAND USE PLAN IN FOUR EASY STEPS
Step One: Continue Highway Commercial along US191
Step Two: Continue Transitional Residential along Spanish Valley Drive
Figure 4.15

Future Land Use Plan - Spanish Valley

Step Three: Encourage Rural Centers

Grand County, Utah - General Plan 2012
Figure 4.15

**Future Land Use Plan - Spanish Valley**

Step Four: Build additional East-West Roads to connect Spanish Valley Drive to US191
Step Four: Build additional East-West Roads to connect Spanish Valley Drive to US191
Economic Diversification

Creative Healthy

Zones for traffic

Keeps neighborhoods safe new

Quiet Healthy

Creates beautiful

FUTURE LAND USE PLAN

The updated
STEP ONE
Update Future Land Use Plan (see below)

NEXT STEP
Overlay the High Density over Residential
**Focus on creating great neighborhoods**

Keep the highway corridor available for Economic Diversification

FUTURE LAND USE PLAN *UPDATED*

GUIDING PRINCIPLES OF UPDATE

- TRANSITIONAL RESIDENTIAL south to the County Line
- RURAL NEIGHBORHOOD CENTERS all along Spanish Valley Drive
- HIGHWAY MIXED USE south to the County Line
- US191 limited access with Direct Connectors to Rural Centers
OBJECTIVE

Create walkable neighborhoods along Spanish Valley Drive, each with a neighborhood center, easily served by public transportation.

DESIGN PRINCIPLE

Traditional Neighborhood Design says neighborhood centers should be located within a 10-minute walk, or ½ mile. Therefore, we create Neighborhood Centers every 1-mile along Spanish Valley Drive, each with a park, playground and commercial serving daily needs.

SPANISH VALLEY DESIGN CONCEPT

Think of US191 as our long distance travel route.
Think of Spanish Valley Drive as our MAIN STREET in Spanish Valley, ideal for local travel.
Therefore, place Neighborhood Centers every mile on Spanish Valley Drive.
From North to South, we create 7 Neighborhood Centers with direct connectors to US191.
1. Mill Creek / Pear Tree Lane / Power House Lane Intersection
2. Mill Creek / Kalina Heights Connector
3. Arroyo Crossing at Budweiser Blvd (Land Trust Housing Initiative)
4. Spanish Valley Trail (currently designated a Commercial Center)
5. Old Spanish Valley Arena Connector / Kerby Lane
6. Beaman Lane Connector
7. Sunny Acres Connector

Each Neighborhood Center includes:
1. Each Neighborhood Center must have a Direct Connector Road to US191; long distance travel (>1 mile) is therefore naturally diverted to US191.
2. Park and Playground, so families & kids can meet & play in the neighborhood.
4. Places of Worship adjacent to commercial to maximize parking efficiency.
5. High Density Residential concentrated around the Neighborhood Center.
6. Step Down Residential Density in concentric circles around the Center.

PLANNING PRECEDENTS

1. Bike Route along Spanish Valley Drive. Creating Neighborhood Centers along Spanish Valley Drive reinforces the ability to bike everywhere you need to go.
2. San Juan County South Spanish Valley Plan is brilliant. Limits residential along US191, which is unsafe and unhealthy. Instead, considers Spanish Valley Drive Main Street, and places here two commercial centers one mile apart. Our SEVEN NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN simply continues this concept all the way to Moab.
3. LDS Traditional Urban Development Pattern creating Wards (neighborhoods) throughout Spanish Valley. LDS understands importance of building community.
Grand County Council
Attn: Grand County Council Members
125 E. Center Street
Moab, UT 84532

REF: High Density Housing Overlay at 1187 & 1189 Murphy Lane

To the members of the Grand County Council -

I am a member of the local community, board member for the Housing Authority of Southeastern Utah, and small business owner that has a strong and vested interest in creating housing in Grand County. My friends, my colleagues and I all struggle with the high cost of housing, barriers to ownership and low inventory that plagues this region. As an architect, I have an opportunity to create a housing project for the benefit of our local citizens, but I need your help to pave a pathway to make that dream a reality.

My family and I are under contract on a 1.4 acre piece of property at 1187 & 1189 Murphy Lane, currently zoned Rural Residential. Our hope is to use the proposed HDH15 incentive to create a small housing project tailored to the needs of our long-term residents. We will follow the process as outlined:

1. Work with the Community & Economic Development staff to fully understand how the overlay would pertain to this specific site.
2. Submit a standard development application form, associated documents and plans to demonstrate the use of the property for primary residential housing.
3. Sign development agreement confirming the use of the property for only primary residential housing.
4. Work with HASU to determine the required deed restrictions for the project.

One item that has been discussed frequently in planning sessions for the HDH Overlay is that it does not provide blanket approval for development. However, it does provide the opportunity for approval for development. I am asking that I be given the opportunity to propose a responsible, sensitive and well-designed housing option for our community on a piece of land that I view as having strong potential for several reasons:

- **PROXIMITY TO CURRENT ZONING** - The property is currently zoned Rural Residential but is directly adjacent to Large Lot Residential Properties. The current size of the property (1.4 acres) is underutilized under the current zoning designation.
- **PROXIMITY TO PROPOSED OVERLAY** - The property is directly adjacent, to the West and across Murphy Lane, to properties already slated for the HDH15 overlay district.
- **PROXIMITY TO MOAB** - The property is less than 1 mile from Moab City Limits. This creates an ideal situation for pedestrian and bicycle access to local amenities and the city center.
• PROXIMITY TO MULTI FAMILY RESIDENTIAL OVERLAY - The property is .5 miles away from the current 20 unit/acre Multi Family Residential Overlay. Thus, current, dense multifamily projects are already nearby.

• PRESERVATION OF EXISTING NEIGHBORHOODS - The property is nestled against the hills East of town. There are no existing neighborhoods surrounding the lot whose character would be disrupted by development of the property. There are no neighboring properties whose views or solar access would be impeded by development of the lot.

• LOT SIZE - Current properties in the close vicinity are far more densely developed than the lot. There are few lots in this area of this size remaining (1.4 acres).

• SLOPE - The average slope of the property does not prohibit complying fire or emergency vehicle access from Murphy Lane. The average slope of the lot does not prohibit architectural development. The variation in slope allows for multiple base elevations within the project for vertical design interest.

• SERVICES - Municipal services are already in place to the site.

I sincerely appreciate your consideration of our request. If given the opportunity by inclusion in the HDH 15 Overlay district, my family and I hope to be among the first applications for a project. We are eager to work with the Community and Economic Development Department, the Planning Commission & the County Council to create a plan that benefits as many Grand County residents as possible.

Yours Truly,

Courtney Kizer
HASU Board Member
Grand County Resident
Principal at Architectural Squared
Dear Grand County Council, Grand County Planning and Zoning.

I am extremely concerned about the new High Density Housing Overlay proposal. Though I had to be out of town for every one of the three Open Houses, I have followed this issue carefully over the last several months, and have searched the website and tried to understand when and how it is appropriate to weigh in.

My beloved home is going to be impacted drastically and I feel there are better options. I also feel that the Public Hearing component that is tacked on at the end of these processes is severely hamstrung, as opinions and decisions are a long way down the road to approval by then.

I have sent the following "My View" piece to the Times Independent this morning. I wanted to give you the heads up.

Thank you for your time and service.

Page Holland
1460 Overlook Rd.
Moab
Grand County's High Density Overlay Zone Proposal.

I have spent months studying the new density overlay proposal with increasing dread. I think we can all agree that Moab needs more primary housing, and the High Density Housing Overlay Zone Proposal is touted as the solution to the problem. I hear, "Yay, Grand County is finally taking concrete steps to plan for affordable housing."

I've lived 40 years in a beloved neighborhood where the highest density (35 units per acre) is proposed. My home is currently RR, a density of 1 house per acre. I am freaking out envisioning the future, this plan would wreak havoc all through the valley.

Likely scenario: 8 to 10 modest homes were built in an area zoned for two houses per acre. A few on 1/2 acre lots, most 1 acre, some are on lots as big as 3. All are family homes with great views, great yards, xeric spaces, lots of elbow room, and are comfortable with the fact that even if neighbors decide to divide off an acre or half acre for new houses, the neighborhood will still retain its character. Then, without any consent from property owners an overlay zone of 35 units per acre is imposed.

One house goes on the market, on a nice one acre lot. A developer decides that dozing the house, constructing a big new complex to sell as second homes is a great investment. Grand County goes along because, hey, Moab will have five more small apartments to be rented to seasonal help. Never mind that all this profit from sales and rent is going out of town. Suddenly several residents' best views are gone: they are looking at a 50' high wall instead of the La Sal Mountains. Windows look down into their yards. Thirty to fifty more cars are on their street daily, the stars are no longer visible because of light shine. Noise levels are shocking, privacy gone. Then one more neighbor decides to sell to find a more peaceful place to live.....

I remember the late '80s when Moab City just started promoting tourism. During the mining booms and busts, Grand County zoning was pretty willy nilly, also fairly easy to get a zoning variance for any kind of construction. Realtors, developers and potential new residents complained mightily that unless Grand County tightened up its zoning, few would want to invest for the long term. Investors needed assurance that zoning wouldn't be a moving target. Well guess what? The new overlay zone creates a HUGE target on virtually all housing anywhere near Highway 191 and Spanish Valley Drive. Forget restrictive covenants, the County has no mandate to enforce them. Forget neighborhood cohesiveness. Forget peace of mind that it won't happen to you.

At regular intervals Grand County spends a huge amount of money, time and volunteer effort to draft an updated General Plan, including a Future Land Use Plan. The first page of the recent 2012 GP describes its purpose and summarizes: "The General Plan is written to provide general policy direction while also providing enough detail to guide decision making and set priorities." It is a 20 year vision, 113 pages and "provides general guidance on where and how growth and various land uses should occur". To create it, a broad range of residents were surveyed for input, and it clearly summarizes the results. For instance, views are important to the populace. Green space and neighborhood character is extremely
important. I'd venture that to most, the value of our home and neighborhood is much, much more than dollars!

The Grand County General Plan addresses future Spanish Valley build-out. To protect the character of neighborhoods, the 2012 General Plan recommends a graduated density infill where larger lots are gradually transitioned to higher density properties, transitioning further to denser light commercial zones. The plan cites 3.2 units per acre as the highest level for housing. This is a far cry from the High Density Housing Overlay recommendations, blanket zones of 4, 10, 15, 25 and 35 per acre. This infill can fall anywhere within the overlay, no transitions required.

Why is the county ignoring the General Plan? The General Plan's stated purpose is to guide development consistent with residents' values. The bones are there: it specifies areas of residential density infill and includes recommendations for small commercial development clusters, smoother highway traffic patterns, integrated neighborhoods. The Planning and Zoning department should start here to plan infill. Instead, the General Plan is basically garbage to them, residents' hard work and opinions completely tossed aside. I am left wondering who exactly is Planning and Zoning and the County Council working for?
Bryony Chamberlain

From: Sarah LaBrec <sflabrec@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 22, 2018 2:50 PM
To: Grand County Council
Subject: High Density Overlay

I know that we have a housing problem and I know that everyone says "not in my back yard" but please keep Spanish Valley "rural" and look for solutions in the "urban area"--in Moab, which is already a "city." It isn't just the housing, it is the commuting, noise and pollution resulting from the travel into town that will be an issue!
Thank you.
Sarah LaBrec
Dear County Council Members,

I have grave concerns about the proposed High Density Overlay (HDO) ordinance which is currently under consideration. In specific they are:

1. **The build out under this plan could be as large as 78,000.** If we use an estimate of .27 acre feet of water (per person per year) then 21,060 acre feet annually would be required. Keep in mind safe withdrawal estimates from our aquifer top out at 13,000 acre feet annually. And that safe level has to supply the ENTIRE Moab valley. USGS estimates a likely 20% decrease in run off by 2050. Many experts think this could happen within the next 15-20 years. Are we going to drink Ken’s Lake and/or the Colorado? Please CAREFULLY INVESTIGATE the water issue. It would be highly irresponsible for our local government to lead us down a path that denies the existence of climate change when state government has officially recognized its validity and seriousness. Please do not settle for the superficial phrase we often hear: *We recognize that water will be a limiting factor to growth.*

   Good planning means beginning with an attainable end in mind. We must plan and zone for a realistic build-out. What if we really can only hope to support double or triple the Moab Area’s current population? Would we be considering this type of radical urbanization if that were the case?

2. **This ordinance does not conform to the FLUP.** In fact it has abandoned several key principles of professional planning- Infill and Compatibility. Neighborhoods closest to the city line are increased in density 3 to 7 fold. Many areas near the San Juan County line are increased 11 – 25 fold over existing densities. Look at the Density Overlay map and you will see the highest residential densities are clustered around Rim Village. These rural residential areas are very far indeed from areas which might be annexed by the City in the near future. Call this urban sprawl or spot zoning. Either term could apply. The narrow roads, and lack of traffic control in Spanish Valley will create safety issues galore and dramatically decrease the quality of life for current residents.

3. **The success of this VERY ambitious plan depends on volume.** If the utilization of this plan is modest, then unfortunate neighborhoods will have to make huge sacrifices so that a few developers and land speculators can reap windfall profits while our housing market remains largely unchanged. Keep in mind this plan does not prevent developers from charging market rate rents and increasing those rents over time to whatever the market will bear. Homes can be priced as the developer wishes. Attempting to manipulate the entire housing market, and placing the risks of failure on the backs of random homeowners is not a gamble that should be undertaken by government. If you were to put this proposal to a vote, I believe it would fail and I urge you not to pass the HDO ordinance.

What kind of community do the majority of people in Grand County want?
You have gotten lots of input from those who have a vested interest in unlimited growth- Realtors, Tourist Business Owners, Developers, and Land Speculators. You have gotten input from some citizens who want to roll back the clock to 1980. But these “special interest” groups represent a minority of citizens. What about our large “silent majority”? Public Hearings and Public Workshops are productive but not sufficient to reach the citizenry at large.
Putting these issues on a ballot would be great, but perhaps cumbersome. My suggestion is that you create an anonymous Grand County survey website. Add an icon that can be scanned by any smart phone. Publicize it thoroughly, and use it on an on-going basis to put issues of this sort before the whole community. Start out by asking citizens how much they would like to see the Moab Area grow.

I believe it is time to stop dragging our feet and do something practical about affordable housing- SUBSIDIZE IT! Pass an assured housing ordinance. Devote County funds to building affordable housing. Build using local contractors. Take possession of the process! Move commercial forces & profit motive out of the way. I feel certain that citizens would be willing to make sacrifices for the sake of affordable housing if that housing is a public not a commercial project.

Yes, we understand that we must increase density to create essential housing. Yes, we understand that this community will grow. But how much growth is desirable? The answer to this question must guide our decisions re: residential densities. The answer to this question must come from the citizenry at large not from a small minority of interested citizens, not from County staff, no matter how well-meaning these individuals may be. Much time and money has been spent seeking consultants’ opinions about our housing and growth challenges. Shouldn’t we spend the necessary time and effort to discover what the majority of our citizens think? Shouldn’t we do this BEFORE we make decisions that could radically and permanently alter our community?

Thank-you for your service to our community.

Bonita Kolb
3649 Kerby Lane
Moab, Utah
Dear Grand County Council, I cannot attend the Open house this coming Nov. 7th. I felt it important to share my thoughts on the HDH and some of my story.

During this past year, I met with the Community Development office to better understand this proposal. Since that time, I have attended P&Z meetings, had further meetings with the Community Development Office, have attended County Council meetings and have written letters. I also helped to rally our neighborhood to get involved with ideas and concerns.

My broad sweep is that since the HDH was proposed, there now is a 320 acre University campus being developed, 10 more hotels, and San Juan County is developing our South Valley. Water concerns are becoming center stage. The Great Salt lake has shrunk by 50% since the 1800’s. There is now significant discussion about releasing lake Powell so Meade can increase its water levels as we are seeing a record low CFS flow in the Colorado river this year. With climate change, we just had our hottest year summer on record.

Specifically my concerns of the HDH include an unknown amount of water usage and the disruption of existing neighborhoods from; additional noise, lights, safety concerns, and the cost of additional infrastructure of curbs, lights, signal lights, traffic issues, and potential conflict between neighbors. Ultimately this would significantly effect the rural character of my neighborhood and my home.

Since the original HDH proposal, that there are several affordable housing projects on the table. The language in the HDH changed this summer from "affordable housing" to "primary residence." It seems that the original intent of this proposal has shifted AND The Community Development office has not been able to answer my question on how many affordable units do we actually need? It seems that this noble intent to create affordable housing may not be as essential as when it was originally created with these other projects on the arise. It seems that the focus has changed to increasing the development in Moab. The idea that more building more homes will bring down the real estate costs making Moab more affordable is unlikely. Have anyone of you seen this to be true anywhere??

Where I am going with all this is, that any development, no matter how large or small will have long term irreversible effects in our community. I just REALLY ask you to consider “going slow to go fast”. Please consider simplifying the HDH and developing it in stages so it can be tested and refined during each step. The more refined application of the HDH takes into account existing neighborhoods would likely be met with less opposition, and could be supported by residents if we weren’t afraid our existing neighborhood would be negatively impacted by the high-density housing overlay. A Blanket sweep of a 90,000 build out is just crazy.

A year ago April, my husband and I moved from Orchard Villa Townhomes to an acre on Rimrock Road. We were leaving behind the building of a 70 unit nightly rental development called Entrada. Before and during its development, I attended several Moab City meetings to raise my concerns. At that time, with immense frustration, I found all was falling on deaf ears. When I mention the development even now, there is not one
person who suggests that this was a good thing for our community. Here is an example of moving too quickly with irreversible impact on a neighborhood.

Along with your careful consideration of the HDH. I have another suggestion.

A couple of years ago the County P&Z passed an ordinance on to the County Council that would have outlawed new nightly rentals in the Highway Commercial zone. It would have included prohibiting all nightly rentals, condos, hotels, campgrounds. Mary McGann presented it to the Council but it died from lack of a second. Please consider a change in the land use code so overnight rentals and hotels could no longer be developed along the 191 corridor. This would also support and give more options for the HDH.

Thank you hearing ideas and for all for your efforts to keep the wellbeing of Grand County on track. Its a huge job.

Sincerely, Catherine Leathers
Grand County Council members,

Attached is my comment regarding the high density housing overlay proposed for portions of Spanish Valley Drive. I live on the corner of Spanish Valley Drive and Plateau Circle and have concerns about the density zoning proposed for my property. Please consider the larger neighborhood we are a part of when making these changes.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Sincerely,

Amy Tendick
Grand County Council Members,

Please accept these comments regarding the High Density Housing Overlay (HDHO). I am writing as a member of a group of concerned citizens that live in a neighborhood along Plateau Circle and Spanish Valley Drive (SVD). I am respectfully asking that you consider a density change for 8 parcels along SVD (see list below) from 15/acre to 5/acre for the following reasons.

1. Maintaining contiguous density - These 8 parcels represent a narrow strip of 15/acre density that is sandwiched between 5/acre proposed density and 2/acre current density. It is clear that one of the HDHO goals is to maintain large contiguous areas with the same density. This narrow strip is out of line with the rest of the map.

2. Disruptive to neighborhood characteristics - This section of SVD is a cohesive neighborhood with relatively small lot sizes, homes close to the road and close to one another. 15/acre density dropped in the middle of this neighborhood would significantly disrupt its character. Lot size and neighborhood characteristics were an important factor in many other density reductions made to the HDHO map.

3. Area is unique on SVD - A narrow strip of 15/acre density like this one is not found anywhere else on the map. Approving a change here will not necessitate changes to other areas of the map out of fairness. The most similar area is on SVD near Spanish Trail Rd. However those parcels are larger and across SVD is the cemetery not a residential area with small parcels.

4. Would be a small extension of changes already made - All of the Plateau Rd, Plateau Circle, Starbuck Ln, and other neighborhoods adjacent to these parcels started off at 15/acre but were reduced to 5/acre to protect neighborhood characteristics. Reducing density on these 8 parcels is just a small extension of the changes already made in this area of the map.

5. Proximity to SVD not the only factor - The reason these parcels were left at 15/acre is their proximity to SVD. While creating high density along SVD is a goal of the HDHO, there should be flexibility to consider real world conditions. Maintaining contiguous density, protecting neighborhood characteristics and considering public input should be given equal weight.

6. Current map is a result of many changes driven by public comment - Almost 500 parcels and over 30 neighborhoods have received density reductions during the public input process so far. 274 of those density reductions happened very recently and were driven by input from residents.

7. Public comment is still open and change should still be possible - Some Planning Commission members voted against this change, not on its merits, but because they feared a slippery slope of other changes. It may be tempting to reject all proposed changes so that you don't have to wrestle with any of these issues. Local leaders should be open to reasonable and appropriate change based on good arguments. When public comment is over and a final map is approved, then the time for change has ended.

8. Changes are minor and reasonable - In this area we have a conflict between higher density along SVD and maintaining contiguous density/neighborhood character. Please consider the input of those who will be affected. 5/acre density is still more than doubling the current density and allows for infill developments and additional housing. This small change is reasonable, in line with existing changes and does not reduce the effectiveness of the overlay.

Amy Tendick
Name
1927 E Plateau Cir.
Street Address

Amy Tendick
Signature
11/5/2018
Date

Please see additional comments and parcel list on back
Just because our property falls on Spanish Drive Valley does not mean we are not part of the whole Plateau Dr. neighborhood, characterized by larger lots, more open space, maintained desert habitat, and wonderful dark night skies!

### List of suggested density reductions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel Number</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Density Now</th>
<th>HDHO Proposed Density</th>
<th>Requested Density Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0035</td>
<td>1900 SVD</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0036</td>
<td>1910 SVD</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0038</td>
<td>1880 SVD</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0148</td>
<td>2010 E Plateau Cir</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0188</td>
<td>2111 E Plateau Cir</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0SPE-0001</td>
<td>1832 SVD</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0SPE-0002</td>
<td>1968 Plateau Cir</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0187</td>
<td>1927 Plateau Cir</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Grand County Council

Thank you for your time working on the sticky issue of affordable housing. By now you know that I am extremely nervous about the HDHO. My purpose with this letter is not over emphasis of that point but to turn the conversation to a suggestions for better solutions.

I am writing to implore you to slow the decision on adopting the High Density Housing Overlay. The High Density Housing Overlay feels heavy handed and as written sets the stage for contentious meetings with every single project...that is IF any developers are actually enticed to develop low income housing under the overlay plan.

I could support an overlay that gives neighborhoods a better way to buy in. I think densities of 5, or 8 or at the outside 10 times the current underlying zoning is much more palatable. My neighborhood of RR zoning is roughly the area from the new Millcreek Drive intersection with Hwy 191 to just west of Geezers Market, and South of Hwy 191. Except for the strip that is HC (200' deep next to the highway) this area is zoned RR, one house per acre. There are around a dozen houses in this area, most have been there many years. They are built on hills and have amazing views of the mountains, valley ridges, Moab City, Spanish Valley and even the river. To shoehorn 35/acre or even 25/acre housing developments into this area is sickening to contemplate. I can envision some acreage in the area that could be developed at higher density without negative impacts, but it would take some cooperation among neighbors.

The HDHO is focused on DEVELOPER driven planning, and that puts a boogeyman under the bed. We all know developers are looking for maximum profits, neighborhoods be damned. (Hi, Mike Toninelli!) So what if we put neighbors in the drivers seat? Most residents want to help our full time populace, we just can’t begin to fathom how to help. Nor do we have the time or resources to pull the pieces together.

The first step is to loosely define a neighborhood that has some undeveloped potential properties. (I think this is what Zach Levine did to put his HDHO examples together for the Council and P&Z.) Next gather a little data: who owns the land? Ask what their vision for the property is. Can the county help pull a vision together that incorporates primary housing? What are the biggest challenges? Financing, architectural plans, site plans, engineering, excavation, building contractors? The professionals who walk into the P&Z offices all day long have this expertise. Not many residents could even come up with a list of first steps, much less who to contact to help. Nor does this help come cheap.

Perhaps instead of incentivizing just developers, work on getting a variety of professionals on board for planning stages, and beyond. ("So, mr developer, You want a commercial property in Moab...will your architect/engineer/surveyor do some hours of pro-bono, does your financier have a short term low interest loan for primary housing, how else can you help us with some pieces of the puzzle?") Instead of, or in addition to hitting developers with the big hammer of providing low income housing, enlist their help.

To summarize:
1. Identify land best suited to higher density. (I don't think it is a blanket zone) 2. Ask "What sort of development challenges are unique to that parcel?" Terrain, size, highway/connector road access, street planning, utility corridors, neighbor's views, aesthetic considerations, parking, building heights, density, financing,...these are all topics to discuss with engaged landowners and neighbors. Ask what their concerns are.
3. Who are the professionals to contact? In what order? Can the county provide planning help?
4. Present plans for tweaking. Help people who are challenged with 2-D to 3-D see the vision.
5. Help put a cost figure to the plan. How can it be financed?
6. Who are the contractors to tap for the job?

A big job, to be sure, but better than putting countless hours into plans that rile up a hornets nest. Often once a good plan is in place, all kinds of positive energy converge to create the reality. Let's focus on good, neighborhood specific plans.

Page Holland
1460 Overlook Rd
Moab, UT. 84532

801-201-4748 cell
November 1, 2018

Zacharia Levine
Community and Economic Development Director
Grand County

RE: High Density Housing Overlay District Boundary

Dear Zacharia-

This letter is to express our overall support of the proposed HDH Overlay District. Business Resolutions and its partners have a number of properties that could potentially benefit from the overlay. We do however have one concern with the boundary of the proposed HDH35b in the area of Jackson Street. There are four properties under joint ownership and only two of the four are currently proposed to be in the overlay. We respectfully request that the two properties listed below and shown on the attached map are included in the overlay. Only a portion of the 5.5 acre parcel can be developed due to steep slopes.

Parcel Number - 020070084
Address - 1212 S JACKSON
Area (acres) - 1.48

Parcel Number - 02MAY0010
Address - MADISON WAY 1267 S
Area (acres) - 5.50

This will give us the opportunity to design a more cohesive development on a larger tract of land, resulting in more housing units.

Sincerely,

Amy Weiser, Project Manager
Business Resolutions, LLC.
Grand County Council Members,

Please accept these comments regarding the High Density Housing Overlay (HDHO). I am writing as a member of a group of concerned citizens that live in a neighborhood along Plateau Circle and Spanish Valley Drive (SVD). I am respectfully asking that you consider a density change for 8 parcels along SVD (see list below) from 15/acre to 5/acre for the following reasons.

1. **Maintaining contiguous density** - These 8 parcels represent a narrow strip of 15/acre density that is sandwiched between 5/acre proposed density and 2/acre current density. It is clear that one of the HDHO goals is to maintain large contiguous areas with the same density. This narrow strip is out of line with the rest of the map.

2. **Disruptive to neighborhood characteristics** – This section of SVD is a cohesive neighborhood with relatively small lot sizes, homes close to the road and close to one another. 15/acre density dropped in the middle of this neighborhood would significantly disrupt its character. Lot size and neighborhood characteristics were an important factor in many other density reductions made to the HDHO map.

3. **Area is unique on SVD** – A narrow strip of 15/acre density like this one is not found anywhere else on the map. Approving a change here will not necessitate changes to other areas of the map out of fairness. The most similar area is on SVD near Spanish Trail Rd. However those parcels are larger and across SVD is the cemetery not a residential area with small parcels.

4. **Would be a small extension of changes already made** – All of the Plateau Rd, Plateau Circle, Starbuck Ln, and other neighborhoods adjacent to these parcels started off at 15/acre but were reduced to 5/acre to protect neighborhood characteristics. Reducing density on these 8 parcels is just a small extension of the changes already made in this area of the map.

5. **Proximity to SVD not the only factor** – The reason these parcels were left at 15/acre is their proximity to SVD. While creating high density along SVD is a goal of the HDHO, there should be flexibility to consider real world conditions. Maintaining contiguous density, protecting neighborhood characteristics and considering public input should be given equal weight.

6. **Current map is a result of many changes driven by public comment** – Almost 500 parcels and over 30 neighborhoods have received density reductions during the public input process so far. 274 of those density reductions happened very recently and were driven by input from residents.

7. **Public comment is still open and change should still be possible** – Some Planning Commission members voted against this change, not on its merits, but because they feared a slippery slope of other changes. It may be tempting to reject all proposed changes so that you don’t have to wrestle with any of these issues. Local leaders should be open to reasonable and appropriate change based on good arguments. When public comment is over and a final map is approved, then the time for change has ended.

8. **Changes are minor and reasonable** – In this area we have a conflict between higher density along SVD and maintaining contiguous density/neighborhood character. Please consider the input of those who will be affected. 5/acre density is still more than doubling the current density and allows for infill developments and additional housing. This small change is reasonable, in line with existing changes and does not reduce the effectiveness of the overlay.

Christopher Kauffman

1851 Spanish Valley Dr.

Name

Signature

11/6/18

Date

Please see additional comments and parcel list on back
Please consider these comments and allow them an equal chance to be heard. Many density reductions were made based on comments at the open houses. Just because these are coming later doesn't mean they have less merit.

List of suggested density reductions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel Number</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Density Now</th>
<th>HDHO Proposed Density</th>
<th>Requested Density Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0035</td>
<td>1900 SVD</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0036</td>
<td>1910 SVD</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0038</td>
<td>1880 SVD</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0148</td>
<td>2010 E Plateau Cir</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0188</td>
<td>2111 E Plateau Cir</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-05PE-0001</td>
<td>1832 SVD</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-05PE-0002</td>
<td>1968 Plateau Cir</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0187</td>
<td>1927 Plateau Cir</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average = 0.78
Grand County Council Members,

Please accept these comments regarding the High Density Housing Overlay (HDHO). I am writing as a member of a group of concerned citizens that live in a neighborhood along Plateau Circle and Spanish Valley Drive (SVD). I am respectfully asking that you consider a density change for 8 parcels along SVD (see list below) from 15/acre to 5/acre for the following reasons.

1. **Maintaining contiguous density** - These 8 parcels represent a narrow strip of 15/acre density that is sandwiched between 5/acre proposed density and 2/acre current density. It is clear that one of the HDHO goals is to maintain large contiguous areas with the same density. This narrow strip is out of line with the rest of the map.

2. **Disruptive to neighborhood characteristics** – This section of SVD is a cohesive neighborhood with relatively small lot sizes, homes close to the road and close to one another. 15/acre density dropped in the middle of this neighborhood would significantly disrupt its character. Lot size and neighborhood characteristics were an important factor in many other density reductions made to the HDHO map.

3. **Area is unique on SVD** – A narrow strip of 15/acre density like this one is not found anywhere else on the map. Approving a change here will not necessitate changes to other areas of the map out of fairness. The most similar area is on SVD near Spanish Trail Rd. However those parcels are larger and across SVD is the cemetery not a residential area with small parcels.

4. **Would be a small extension of changes already made** – All of the Plateau Rd, Plateau Circle, Starbuck Ln, and other neighborhoods adjacent to these parcels started off at 15/acre but were reduced to 5/acre to protect neighborhood characteristics. Reducing density on these 8 parcels is just a small extension of the changes already made in this area of the map.

5. **Proximity to SVD not the only factor** – The reason these parcels were left at 15/acre is their proximity to SVD. While creating high density along SVD is a goal of the HDHO, there should be flexibility to consider real world conditions. Maintaining contiguous density, protecting neighborhood characteristics and considering public input should be given equal weight.

6. **Current map is a result of many changes driven by public comment** – Almost 500 parcels and over 30 neighborhoods have received density reductions during the public input process so far. 274 of those density reductions happened very recently and were driven by input from residents.

7. **Public comment is still open and change should still be possible** – Some Planning Commission members voted against this change, not on its merits, but because they feared a slippery slope of other changes. It may be tempting to reject all proposed changes so that you don’t have to wrestle with any of these issues. Local leaders should be open to reasonable and appropriate change based on good arguments. When public comment is over and a final map is approved, then the time for change has ended.

8. **Changes are minor and reasonable** – In this area we have a conflict between higher density along SVD and maintaining contiguous density/neighborhood character. Please consider the input of those who will be affected. 5/acre density is still more than doubling the current density and allows for infill developments and additional housing. This small change is reasonable, in line with existing changes and does not reduce the effectiveness of the overlay.

**Name**

**Signature**

**Date**

**Street Address**

Please see additional comments and parcel list on back.
**Additional Comments**

I am 68 years old, live alone on a fixed income and am bipolar. Therefore, I have no plans of leaving this address. 15 units per acre in our neighborhood is realistically simply wrong and not-feasible. We've already experienced an increase in noise pollution from those horrible little razor-back cars. Don’t make it worse. Driving up the Hill on S.V.D. coming to our neighborhood, is something you can tangibly feel - a sense of calm, peacefulness and ease. It shows too. We all “keep up” our places. I believe in higher density, but only where it is deemed appropriate. Please, keep the integrity of our neighborhood intact! We deserve intelligent decision-making by those in power; our small request needs to be recognized, acknowledged & acted upon reasonably.

---

Table: List of suggested density reductions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel Number</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Density Now</th>
<th>HDHO Proposed Density</th>
<th>Requested Density Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0035</td>
<td>1900 SVD</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0036</td>
<td>1910 SVD</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0038</td>
<td>1880 SVD</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0148</td>
<td>2010 E Plateau Cir</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0188</td>
<td>2111 E Plateau Cir</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-05PE-0001</td>
<td>1832 SVD</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-05PE-0002</td>
<td>1968 Plateau Cir</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0187</td>
<td>1927 Plateau Cir</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average =</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Grand County Council Members,

Please accept these comments regarding the High Density Housing Overlay (HDHO). I am writing as a member of a group of concerned citizens that live in a neighborhood along Plateau Circle and Spanish Valley Drive (SVD). I am respectfully asking that you consider a density change for 8 parcels along SVD (see list below) from 15/acre to 5/acre for the following reasons.

1. **Maintaining contiguous density** - These 8 parcels represent a narrow strip of 15/acre density that is sandwiched between 5/acre proposed density and 2/acre current density. It is clear that one of the HDHO goals is to maintain large contiguous areas with the same density. This narrow strip is out of line with the rest of the map.

2. **Disruptive to neighborhood characteristics** – This section of SVD is a cohesive neighborhood with relatively small lot sizes, homes close to the road and close to one another. 15/acre density dropped in the middle of this neighborhood would significantly disrupt its character. Lot size and neighborhood characteristics were an important factor in many other density reductions made to the HDHO map.

3. **Area is unique on SVD** – A narrow strip of 15/acre density like this one is not found anywhere else on the map. Approving a change here will not necessitate changes to other areas of the map out of fairness. The most similar area is on SVD near Spanish Trail Rd. However those parcels are larger and across SVD is the cemetery not a residential area with small parcels.

4. **Would be a small extension of changes already made** – All of the Plateau Rd, Plateau Circle, Starbuck Ln, and other neighborhoods adjacent to these parcels started off at 15/acre but were reduced to 5/acre to protect neighborhood characteristics. Reducing density on these 8 parcels is just a small extension of the changes already made in this area of the map.

5. **Proximity to SVD not the only factor** – The reason these parcels were left at 15/acre is their proximity to SVD. While creating high density along SVD is a goal of the HDHO, there should be flexibility to consider real world conditions. Maintaining contiguous density, protecting neighborhood characteristics and considering public input should be given equal weight.

6. **Current map is a result of many changes driven by public comment** – Almost 500 parcels and over 30 neighborhoods have received density reductions during the public input process so far. 274 of those density reductions happened very recently and were driven by input from residents.

7. **Public comment is still open and change should still be possible** – Some Planning Commission members voted against this change, not on its merits, but because they feared a slippery slope of other changes. It may be tempting to reject all proposed changes so that you don’t have to wrestle with any of these issues. Local leaders should be open to reasonable and appropriate change based on good arguments. When public comment is over and a final map is approved, then the time for change has ended.

8. **Changes are minor and reasonable** – In this area we have a conflict between higher density along SVD and maintaining contiguous density/neighborhood character. Please consider the input of those who will be affected. 5/acre density is still more than doubling the current density and allows for infill developments and additional housing. This small change is reasonable, in line with existing changes and does not reduce the effectiveness of the overlay.

**Name**: Sarah Ball  
**Street Address**: 2095 Plateau Cir  
**Signature**:  
**Date**: 11/4/18

Please see additional comments and parcel list on back.
Additional Comments

I completely agree with the contents of this letter and sincerely appreciate my neighbor's organization of our efforts in this endeavor. I also sincerely hope that you will consider and support our request to change the density for these parcels. Thank you!

[Signature]

List of suggested density reductions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel Number</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Density Now</th>
<th>HDHO Proposed Density</th>
<th>Requested Density Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0035</td>
<td>1900 SVD</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0036</td>
<td>1910 SVD</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0038</td>
<td>1880 SVD</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0148</td>
<td>2010 E Plateau Cir</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0188</td>
<td>2111 E Plateau Cir</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0SPE-0001</td>
<td>1832 SVD</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0SPE-0002</td>
<td>1968 Plateau Cir</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0187</td>
<td>1927 Plateau Cir</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average = 0.78
Grand County Council Members,

Please accept these comments regarding the High Density Housing Overlay (HDHO). I am writing as a member of a group of concerned citizens that live in a neighborhood along Plateau Circle and Spanish Valley Drive (SVD). I am respectfully asking that you consider a density change for 8 parcels along SVD (see list below) from 15/acre to 5/acre for the following reasons.

1. **Maintaining contiguous density** - These 8 parcels represent a narrow strip of 15/acre density that is sandwiched between 5/acre proposed density and 2/acre current density. It is clear that one of the HDHO goals is to maintain large contiguous areas with the same density. This narrow strip is out of line with the rest of the map.

2. **Disruptive to neighborhood characteristics** – This section of SVD is a cohesive neighborhood with relatively small lot sizes, homes close to the road and close to one another. 15/acre density dropped in the middle of this neighborhood would significantly disrupt its character. Lot size and neighborhood characteristics were an important factor in many other density reductions made to the HDHO map.

3. **Area is unique on SVD** – A narrow strip of 15/acre density like this one is not found anywhere else on the map. Approving a change here will not necessitate changes to other areas of the map out of fairness. The most similar area is on SVD near Spanish Trail Rd. However those parcels are larger and across SVD is the cemetery not a residential area with small parcels.

4. **Would be a small extension of changes already made** – All of the Plateau Rd, Plateau Circle, Starbuck Ln, and other neighborhoods adjacent to these parcels started off at 15/acre but were reduced to 5/acre to protect neighborhood characteristics. Reducing density on these 8 parcels is just a small extension of the changes already made in this area of the map.

5. **Proximity to SVD not the only factor** – The reason these parcels were left at 15/acre is their proximity to SVD. While creating high density along SVD is a goal of the HDHO, there should be flexibility to consider real world conditions. Maintaining contiguous density, protecting neighborhood characteristics and considering public input should be given equal weight.

6. **Current map is a result of many changes driven by public comment** – Almost 500 parcels and over 30 neighborhoods have received density reductions during the public input process so far. 274 of those density reductions happened very recently and were driven by input from residents.

7. **Public comment is still open and change should still be possible** – Some Planning Commission members voted against this change, not on its merits, but because they feared a slippery slope of other changes. It may be tempting to reject all proposed changes so that you don't have to wrestle with any of these issues. Local leaders should be open to reasonable and appropriate change based on good arguments. When public comment is over and a final map is approved, then the time for change has ended.

8. **Changes are minor and reasonable** – In this area we have a conflict between higher density along SVD and maintaining contiguous density/neighborhood character. Please consider the input of those who will be affected. 5/acre density is still more than doubling the current density and allows for infill developments and additional housing. This small change is reasonable, in line with existing changes and does not reduce the effectiveness of the overlay.

Charlie Knowles
Name

1895 Spanish Valley Dr.
Street Address

11/5/18
Date

Please see additional comments and parcel list on back
List of suggested density reductions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel Number</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Density Now</th>
<th>HDHO Proposed Density</th>
<th>Requested Density Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0035</td>
<td>1900 SVD</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0036</td>
<td>1910 SVD</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0038</td>
<td>1880 SVD</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0148</td>
<td>2010 E Plateau Cir</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/ acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0188</td>
<td>2111 E Plateau Cir</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-05PE-0001</td>
<td>1832 SVD</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-05PE-0002</td>
<td>1968 Plateau Cir</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0187</td>
<td>1927 Plateau Cir</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average =</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Grand County Council Members,

Please accept these comments regarding the High Density Housing Overlay (HDHO). I am writing as a member of a group of concerned citizens that live in a neighborhood along Plateau Circle and Spanish Valley Drive (SVD). I am respectfully asking that you consider a density change for 8 parcels along SVD (see list below) from 15/acre to 5/acre for the following reasons.

1. **Maintaining contiguous density** - These 8 parcels represent a narrow strip of 15/acre density that is sandwiched between 5/acre proposed density and 2/acre current density. It is clear that one of the HDHO goals is to maintain large contiguous areas with the same density. This narrow strip is out of line with the rest of the map.

2. **Disruptive to neighborhood characteristics** - This section of SVD is a cohesive neighborhood with relatively small lot sizes, homes close to the road and close to one another. 15/acre density dropped in the middle of this neighborhood would significantly disrupt its character. Lot size and neighborhood characteristics were an important factor in many other density reductions made to the HDHO map.

3. **Area is unique on SVD** - A narrow strip of 15/acre density like this one is not found anywhere else on the map. Approving a change here will not necessitate changes to other areas of the map out of fairness. The most similar area is on SVD near Spanish Trail Rd. However those parcels are larger and across SVD is the cemetery not a residential area with small parcels.

4. **Would be a small extension of changes already made** - All of the Plateau Rd, Plateau Circle, Starbuck Ln, and other neighborhoods adjacent to these parcels started off at 15/acre but were reduced to 5/acre to protect neighborhood characteristics. Reducing density on these 8 parcels is just a small extension of the changes already made in this area of the map.

5. **Proximity to SVD not the only factor** - The reason these parcels were left at 15/acre is their proximity to SVD. While creating high density along SVD is a goal of the HDHO, there should be flexibility to consider real world conditions. Maintaining contiguous density, protecting neighborhood characteristics and considering public input should be given equal weight.

6. **Current map is a result of many changes driven by public comment** - Almost 500 parcels and over 30 neighborhoods have received density reductions during the public input process so far. 274 of those density reductions happened very recently and were driven by input from residents.

7. **Public comment is still open and change should still be possible** - Some Planning Commission members voted against this change, not on its merits, but because they feared a slippery slope of other changes. It may be tempting to reject all proposed changes so that you don't have to wrestle with any of these issues. Local leaders should be open to reasonable and appropriate change based on good arguments. When public comment is over and a final map is approved, then the time for change has ended.

8. **Changes are minor and reasonable** - In this area we have a conflict between higher density along SVD and maintaining contiguous density/neighborhood character. Please consider the input of those who will be affected. 5/acre density is still more than doubling the current density and allows for infill developments and additional housing. This small change is reasonable, in line with existing changes and does not reduce the effectiveness of the overlay.

Name

Signature

Street Address

Date

Please see additional comments and parcel list on back
### List of suggested density reductions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel Number</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Density Now</th>
<th>HDHO Proposed Density</th>
<th>Requested Density Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0035</td>
<td>1900 SVD</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0036</td>
<td>1910 SVD</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0038</td>
<td>1880 SVD</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0148</td>
<td>2010 E Plateau Cir</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0188</td>
<td>2111 E Plateau Cir</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-05PE-0001</td>
<td>1832 SVD</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-05PE-0002</td>
<td>1968 Plateau Cir</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0187</td>
<td>1927 Plateau Cir</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average =</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Grand County Council Members,

Please accept these comments regarding the High Density Housing Overlay (HDHO). I am writing as a member of a group of concerned citizens that live in a neighborhood along Plateau Circle and Spanish Valley Drive (SVD). I am respectfully asking that you consider a density change for 8 parcels along SVD (see list below) from 15/acre to 5/acre for the following reasons.

1. **Maintaining contiguous density** - These 8 parcels represent a narrow strip of 15/acre density that is sandwiched between 5/acre proposed density and 2/acre current density. It is clear that one of the HDHO goals is to maintain large contiguous areas with the same density. This narrow strip is out of line with the rest of the map.

2. **Disruptive to neighborhood characteristics** – This section of SVD is a cohesive neighborhood with relatively small lot sizes, homes close to the road and close to one another. 15/acre density dropped in the middle of this neighborhood would significantly disrupt its character. Lot size and neighborhood characteristics were an important factor in many other density reductions made to the HDHO map.

3. **Area is unique on SVD** – A narrow strip of 15/acre density like this one is not found anywhere else on the map. Approving a change here will not necessitate changes to other areas of the map out of fairness. The most similar area is on SVD near Spanish Trail Rd. However those parcels are larger and across SVD is the cemetery not a residential area with small parcels.

4. **Would be a small extension of changes already made** – All of the Plateau Rd, Plateau Circle, Starbuck Ln, and other neighborhoods adjacent to these parcels started off at 15/acre but were reduced to 5/acre to protect neighborhood characteristics. Reducing density on these 8 parcels is just a small extension of the changes already made in this area of the map.

5. **Proximity to SVD not the only factor** – The reason these parcels were left at 15/acre is their proximity to SVD. While creating high density along SVD is a goal of the HDHO, there should be flexibility to consider real world conditions. Maintaining contiguous density, protecting neighborhood characteristics and considering public input should be given equal weight.

6. **Current map is a result of many changes driven by public comment** – Almost 500 parcels and over 30 neighborhoods have received density reductions during the public input process so far. 274 of those density reductions happened very recently and were driven by input from residents.

7. **Public comment is still open and change should still be possible** – Some Planning Commission members voted against this change, not on its merits, but because they feared a slippery slope of other changes. It may be tempting to reject all proposed changes so that you don’t have to wrestle with any of these issues. Local leaders should be open to reasonable and appropriate change based on good arguments. When public comment is over and a final map is approved, then the time for change has ended.

8. **Changes are minor and reasonable** – In this area we have a conflict between higher density along SVD and maintaining contiguous density/neighborhood character. Please consider the input of those who will be affected. 5/acre density is still more than doubling the current density and allows for infill developments and additional housing. This small change is reasonable, in line with existing changes and does not reduce the effectiveness of the overlay.

Name: Naylene Dalton  
Street Address: 1891 Spanish Valley Dr.

Signature: Naylene Dalton  
Date: 11-5-18

Please see additional comments and parcel list on back.
### List of suggested density reductions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel Number</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Density Now</th>
<th>HDHO Proposed Density</th>
<th>Requested Density Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0035</td>
<td>1900 SVD</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0036</td>
<td>1910 SVD</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0038</td>
<td>1880 SVD</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0148</td>
<td>2010 E Plateau Cir</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0188</td>
<td>2111 E Plateau Cir</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-OSPE-0001</td>
<td>1832 SVD</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-OSPE-0002</td>
<td>1968 Plateau Cir</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0187</td>
<td>1927 Plateau Cir</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>0.78</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Grand County Council Members,

Please accept these comments regarding the High Density Housing Overlay (HDHO). I am writing as a member of a group of concerned citizens that live in a neighborhood along Plateau Circle and Spanish Valley Drive (SVD). I am respectfully asking that you consider a density change for 8 parcels along SVD (see list below) from 15/acre to 5/acre for the following reasons.

1. **Maintaining contiguous density** - These 8 parcels represent a narrow strip of 15/acre density that is sandwiched between 5/acre proposed density and 2/acre current density. It is clear that one of the HDHO goals is to maintain large contiguous areas with the same density. This narrow strip is out of line with the rest of the map.

2. **Disruptive to neighborhood characteristics** - This section of SVD is a cohesive neighborhood with relatively small lot sizes, homes close to the road and close to one another. 15/acre density dropped in the middle of this neighborhood would significantly disrupt its character. Lot size and neighborhood characteristics were an important factor in many other density reductions made to the HDHO map.

3. **Area is unique on SVD** - A narrow strip of 15/acre density like this one is not found anywhere else on the map. Approving a change here will not necessitate changes to other areas of the map out of fairness. The most similar area is on SVD near Spanish Trail Rd. However those parcels are larger and across SVD is the cemetery not a residential area with small parcels.

4. **Would be a small extension of changes already made** - All of the Plateau Rd, Plateau Circle, Starbuck Ln, and other neighborhoods adjacent to these parcels started off at 15/acre but were reduced to 5/acre to protect neighborhood characteristics. Reducing density on these 8 parcels is just a small extension of the changes already made in this area of the map.

5. **Proximity to SVD not the only factor** - The reason these parcels were left at 15/acre is their proximity to SVD. While creating high density along SVD is a goal of the HDHO, there should be flexibility to consider real world conditions. Maintaining contiguous density, protecting neighborhood characteristics and considering public input should be given equal weight.

6. **Current map is a result of many changes driven by public comment** - Almost 500 parcels and over 30 neighborhoods have received density reductions during the public input process so far. 274 of those density reductions happened very recently and were driven by input from residents.

7. **Public comment is still open and change should still be possible** - Some Planning Commission members voted against this change, not on its merits, but because they feared a slippery slope of other changes. It may be tempting to reject all proposed changes so that you don’t have to wrestle with any of these issues. Local leaders should be open to reasonable and appropriate change based on good arguments. When public comment is over and a final map is approved, then the time for change has ended.

8. **Changes are minor and reasonable** - In this area we have a conflict between higher density along SVD and maintaining contiguous density/neighborhood character. Please consider the input of those who will be affected. 5/acre density is still more than doubling the current density and allows for infill developments and additional housing. This small change is reasonable, in line with existing changes and does not reduce the effectiveness of the overlay.

_Grand County Council Members,

Please see additional comments and parcel list on back
Additional Comments

When I moved here 40 years ago, the neighborhood is much like it is now. I would ask that you not so drastically change it. With such small lots if one is developed to 15/acre there is no room to creatively deal with the negative impacts of such density. I strongly agree that changes can still be made to the plan, since I think many residents did not realize what this plan was actually proposing. No individual notices were sent to affected parties or signs in the area announcing the proposed changes as I have seen with other 2nd density changes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel Number</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Density Now</th>
<th>HDHO Proposed Density</th>
<th>Requested Density Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0035</td>
<td>1900 SVD</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0036</td>
<td>1910 SVD</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0038</td>
<td>1880 SVD</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0148</td>
<td>2010 E Plateau Cir</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0188</td>
<td>2111 E Plateau Cir</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-05PE-0001</td>
<td>1832 SVD</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-05PE-0002</td>
<td>1968 Plateau Cir</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0187</td>
<td>1927 Plateau Cir</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average =</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Grand County Council Members,

Please accept these comments regarding the High Density Housing Overlay (HDHO). I am writing as a member of a group of concerned citizens that live in a neighborhood along Plateau Circle and Spanish Valley Drive (SVD). I am respectfully asking that you consider a density change for 8 parcels along SVD (see list below) from 15/acre to 5/acre for the following reasons.

1. **Maintaining contiguous density** - These 8 parcels represent a narrow strip of 15/acre density that is sandwiched between 5/acre proposed density and 2/acre current density. It is clear that one of the HDHO goals is to maintain large contiguous areas with the same density. This narrow strip is out of line with the rest of the map.

2. **Disruptive to neighborhood characteristics** - This section of SVD is a cohesive neighborhood with relatively small lot sizes, homes close to the road and close to one another. 15/acre density dropped in the middle of this neighborhood would significantly disrupt its character. Lot size and neighborhood characteristics were an important factor in many other density reductions made to the HDHO map.

3. **Area is unique on SVD** - A narrow strip of 15/acre density like this one is not found anywhere else on the map. Approving a change here will not necessitate changes to other areas of the map out of fairness. The most similar area is on SVD near Spanish Trail Rd. However those parcels are larger and across SVD is the cemetery not a residential area with small parcels.

4. **Would be a small extension of changes already made** - All of the Plateau Rd, Plateau Circle, Starbuck Ln, and other neighborhoods adjacent to these parcels started off at 15/acre but were reduced to 5/acre to protect neighborhood characteristics. Reducing density on these 8 parcels is just a small extension of the changes already made in this area of the map.

5. **Proximity to SVD not the only factor** - The reason these parcels were left at 15/acre is their proximity to SVO. While creating high density along SVD is a goal of the HDHO, there should be flexibility to consider real world conditions. Maintaining contiguous density, protecting neighborhood characteristics and considering public input should be given equal weight.

6. **Current map is a result of many changes driven by public comment** - Almost 500 parcels and over 30 neighborhoods have received density reductions during the public input process so far. 274 of those density reductions happened very recently and were driven by input from residents.

7. **Public comment is still open and change should still be possible** - Some Planning Commission members voted against this change, not on its merits, but because they feared a slippery slope of other changes. It may be tempting to reject all proposed changes so that you don’t have to wrestle with any of these issues. Local leaders should be open to reasonable and appropriate change based on good arguments. When public comment is over and a final map is approved, then the time for change has ended.

8. **Changes are minor and reasonable** - In this area we have a conflict between higher density along SVD and maintaining contiguous density/neighborhood character. Please consider the input of those who will be affected. 5/acre density is still more than doubling the current density and allows for infill developments and additional housing. This small change is reasonable, in line with existing changes and does not reduce the effectiveness of the overlay.

__________________________
Name

__________________________
Street Address

__________________________
Signature

__________________________
Date

Please see additional comments and parcel list on back
Additional Comments

1. When are all these houses going to get water/sewer/power?

2. Who will pay for the infrastructure for this expansion?

List of suggested density reductions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel Number</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Density Now</th>
<th>HDHO Proposed Density</th>
<th>Requested Density Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0035</td>
<td>1900 SVD</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0036</td>
<td>1910 SVD</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0038</td>
<td>1880 SVD</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0148</td>
<td>2010 E Plateau Cir</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0188</td>
<td>2111 E Plateau Cir</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-OSPE-0001</td>
<td>1832 SVD</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-OSPE-0002</td>
<td>1968 Plateau Cir</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0187</td>
<td>1927 Plateau Cir</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Grand County Council Members,

Please accept these comments regarding the High Density Housing Overlay (HDHO). I am writing as a member of a group of concerned citizens that live in a neighborhood along Plateau Circle and Spanish Valley Drive (SVD). I am respectfully asking that you consider a density change for 8 parcels along SVD (see list below) from 15/acre to 5/acre for the following reasons.

1. **Maintaining contiguous density** - These 8 parcels represent a narrow strip of 15/acre density that is sandwiched between 5/acre proposed density and 2/acre current density. It is clear that one of the HDHO goals is to maintain large contiguous areas with the same density. This narrow strip is out of line with the rest of the map.

2. **Disruptive to neighborhood characteristics** - This section of SVD is a cohesive neighborhood with relatively small lot sizes, homes close to the road and close to one another. 15/acre density dropped in the middle of this neighborhood would significantly disrupt its character. Lot size and neighborhood characteristics were an important factor in many other density reductions made to the HDHO map.

3. **Area is unique on SVD** - A narrow strip of 15/acre density like this one is not found anywhere else on the map. Approving a change here will not necessitate changes to other areas of the map out of fairness. The most similar area is on SVD near Spanish Trail Rd. However those parcels are larger and across SVD is the cemetery not a residential area with small parcels.

4. **Would be a small extension of changes already made** - All of the Plateau Rd, Plateau Circle, Starbuck Ln, and other neighborhoods adjacent to these parcels started off at 15/acre but were reduced to 5/acre to protect neighborhood characteristics. Reducing density on these 8 parcels is just a small extension of the changes already made in this area of the map.

5. **Proximity to SVD not the only factor** - The reason these parcels were left at 15/acre is their proximity to SVD. While creating high density along SVD is a goal of the HDHO, there should be flexibility to consider real world conditions. Maintaining contiguous density, protecting neighborhood characteristics and considering public input should be given equal weight.

6. **Current map is a result of many changes driven by public comment** - Almost 500 parcels and over 30 neighborhoods have received density reductions during the public input process so far. 274 of those density reductions happened very recently and were driven by input from residents.

7. **Public comment is still open and change should still be possible** - Some Planning Commission members voted against this change, not on its merits, but because they feared a slippery slope of other changes. It may be tempting to reject all proposed changes so that you don’t have to wrestle with any of these issues. Local leaders should be open to reasonable and appropriate change based on good arguments. When public comment is over and a final map is approved, then the time for change has ended.

8. **Changes are minor and reasonable** - In this area we have a conflict between higher density along SVD and maintaining contiguous density/neighborhood character. Please consider the input of those who will be affected. 5/acre density is still more than doubling the current density and allows for infill developments and additional housing. This small change is reasonable, in line with existing changes and does not reduce the effectiveness of the overlay.

---

*Steven Budelier*

1968 Plateau Circle

*Signature*  

*Date*

Please see additional comments and parcel list on back
### List of suggested density reductions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel Number</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Density Now</th>
<th>HDHO Proposed Density</th>
<th>Requested Density Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0035</td>
<td>1900 SVD</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0036</td>
<td>1910 SVD</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0038</td>
<td>1880 SVD</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0148</td>
<td>2010 E Plateau Cir</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0188</td>
<td>2111 E Plateau Cir</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0SPE-0001</td>
<td>1832 SVD</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0SPE-0002</td>
<td>1968 Plateau Cir</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0187</td>
<td>1927 Plateau Cir</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average =</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Grand County Council Members,

Please accept these comments regarding the High Density Housing Overlay (HDHO). I am writing as a member of a group of concerned citizens that live in a neighborhood along Plateau Circle and Spanish Valley Drive (SVD). I am respectfully asking that you consider a density change for 8 parcels along SVD (see list below) from 15/acre to 5/acre for the following reasons.

1. **Maintaining contiguous density** - These 8 parcels represent a narrow strip of 15/acre density that is sandwiched between 5/acre proposed density and 2/acre current density. It is clear that one of the HDHO goals is to maintain large contiguous areas with the same density. This narrow strip is out of line with the rest of the map.

2. **Disruptive to neighborhood characteristics** - This section of SVD is a cohesive neighborhood with relatively small lot sizes, homes close to the road and close to one another. 15/acre density dropped in the middle of this neighborhood would significantly disrupt its character. Lot size and neighborhood characteristics were an important factor in many other density reductions made to the HDHO map.

3. **Area is unique on SVD** - A narrow strip of 15/acre density like this one is not found anywhere else on the map. Approving a change here will not necessitate changes to other areas of the map out of fairness. The most similar area is on SVD near Spanish Trail Rd. However those parcels are larger and across SVD is the cemetery not a residential area with small parcels.

4. **Would be a small extension of changes already made** - All of the Plateau Rd, Plateau Circle, Starbuck Ln, and other neighborhoods adjacent to these parcels started off at 15/acre but were reduced to 5/acre to protect neighborhood characteristics. Reducing density on these 8 parcels is just a small extension of the changes already made in this area of the map.

5. **Proximity to SVD not the only factor** - The reason these parcels were left at 15/acre is their proximity to SVD. While creating high density along SVD is a goal of the HDHO, there should be flexibility to consider real world conditions. Maintaining contiguous density, protecting neighborhood characteristics and considering public input should be given equal weight.

6. **Current map is a result of many changes driven by public comment** - Almost 500 parcels and over 30 neighborhoods have received density reductions during the public input process so far. 274 of those density reductions happened very recently and were driven by input from residents.

7. **Public comment is still open and change should still be possible** - Some Planning Commission members voted against this change, not on its merits, but because they feared a slippery slope of other changes. It may be tempting to reject all proposed changes so that you don't have to wrestle with any of these issues. Local leaders should be open to reasonable and appropriate change based on good arguments. When public comment is over and a final map is approved, then the time for change has ended.

8. **Changes are minor and reasonable** - In this area we have a conflict between higher density along SVD and maintaining contiguous density/neighborhood character. Please consider the input of those who will be affected. 5/acre density is still more than doubling the current density and allows for infill developments and additional housing. This small change is reasonable, in line with existing changes and does not reduce the effectiveness of the overlay.

**SONNY D. ROOP**

Name

**1854 PLATEAU CIRCLE**

Street Address

**Sonny D. Roop**

Signature

**11-3-2018**

Date

Please see additional comments and parcel list on back.
Additional Comments

"Pleez... be reasonable... this is my neighborhood... do your best!

Our future is in this balance!

Namaste

We're in this together!

List of suggested density reductions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel Number</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Density Now</th>
<th>HDHO Proposed Density</th>
<th>Requested Density Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0035</td>
<td>1900 SVD</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0036</td>
<td>1910 SVD</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0038</td>
<td>1880 SVD</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0148</td>
<td>2010 E Plateau Cir</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0188</td>
<td>2111 E Plateau Cir</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0SPE-0001</td>
<td>1832 SVD</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0SPE-0002</td>
<td>1968 Plateau Cir</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0187</td>
<td>1927 Plateau Cir</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average = 0.78
Grand County Council Members,

Please accept these comments regarding the High Density Housing Overlay (HDHO). I am writing as a member of a group of concerned citizens that live in a neighborhood along Plateau Circle and Spanish Valley Drive (SVD). I am respectfully asking that you consider a density change for 8 parcels along SVD (see list below) from 15/acre to 5/acre for the following reasons.

1. **Maintaining contiguous density** - These 8 parcels represent a narrow strip of 15/acre density that is sandwiched between 5/acre proposed density and 2/acre current density. It is clear that one of the HDHO goals is to maintain large contiguous areas with the same density. This narrow strip is out of line with the rest of the map.

2. **Disruptive to neighborhood characteristics** - This section of SVD is a cohesive neighborhood with relatively small lot sizes, homes close to the road and close to one another. 15/acre density dropped in the middle of this neighborhood would significantly disrupt its character. Lot size and neighborhood characteristics were an important factor in many other density reductions made to the HDHO map.

3. **Area is unique on SVD** - A narrow strip of 15/acre density like this one is not found anywhere else on the map. Approving a change here will not necessitate changes to other areas of the map out of fairness. The most similar area is on SVD near Spanish Trail Rd. However those parcels are larger and across SVD is the cemetery not a residential area with small parcels.

4. **Would be a small extension of changes already made** - All of the Plateau Rd, Plateau Circle, Starbuck Ln, and other neighborhoods adjacent to these parcels started off at 15/acre but were reduced to 5/acre to protect neighborhood characteristics. Reducing density on these 8 parcels is just a small extension of the changes already made in this area of the map.

5. **Proximity to SVD not the only factor** - The reason these parcels were left at 15/acre is their proximity to SVD. While creating high density along SVD is a goal of the HDHO, there should be flexibility to consider real world conditions. Maintaining contiguous density, protecting neighborhood characteristics and considering public input should be given equal weight.

6. **Current map is a result of many changes driven by public comment** - Almost 500 parcels and over 30 neighborhoods have received density reductions during the public input process so far. 274 of those density reductions happened very recently and were driven by input from residents.

7. **Public comment is still open and change should still be possible** - Some Planning Commission members voted against this change, not on its merits, but because they feared a slippery slope of other changes. It may be tempting to reject all proposed changes so that you don't have to wrestle with any of these issues. Local leaders should be open to reasonable and appropriate change based on good arguments. When public comment is over and a final map is approved, then the time for change has ended.

8. **Changes are minor and reasonable** - In this area we have a conflict between higher density along SVD and maintaining contiguous density/neighborhood character. Please consider the input of those who will be affected. 5/acre density is still more than doubling the current density and allows for infill developments and additional housing. This small change is reasonable, in line with existing changes and does not reduce the effectiveness of the overlay.

Please see additional comments and parcel list on back.
Additional Comments

When we bought our land we were told there would only be 1 house per acre and then it was changed to 1 house per ½ acre and now it is 5 houses/acre per acre. This has taken place in a span of 15 years. Please let us keep a small portion of our neighborhood and stay at 5 per acre in our little area. I used to know all my neighbors by name but that is no longer the case anymore.

List of suggested density reductions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel Number</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Density Now</th>
<th>HDHO Proposed Density</th>
<th>Requested Density Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0035</td>
<td>1900 SVD</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0036</td>
<td>1910 SVD</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0038</td>
<td>1880 SVD</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0148</td>
<td>2010 E Plateau Cir</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0188</td>
<td>2111 E Plateau Cir</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-05PE-0001</td>
<td>1832 SVD</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-05PE-0002</td>
<td>1968 Plateau Cir</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0187</td>
<td>1927 Plateau Cir</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average =</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Grand County Council Members,

Please accept these comments regarding the High Density Housing Overlay (HDHO). I am writing as a member of a group of concerned citizens that live in a neighborhood along Plateau Circle and Spanish Valley Drive (SVD). I am respectfully asking that you consider a density change for 8 parcels along SVD (see list below) from 15/acre to 5/acre for the following reasons.

1. **Maintaining contiguous density** - These 8 parcels represent a narrow strip of 15/acre density that is sandwiched between 5/acre proposed density and 2/acre current density. It is clear that one of the HDHO goals is to maintain large contiguous areas with the same density. This narrow strip is out of line with the rest of the map.

2. **Disruptive to neighborhood characteristics** - This section of SVD is a cohesive neighborhood with relatively small lot sizes, homes close to the road and close to one another. 15/acre density dropped in the middle of this neighborhood would significantly disrupt its character. Lot size and neighborhood characteristics were an important factor in many other density reductions made to the HDHO map.

3. **Area is unique on SVD** - A narrow strip of 15/acre density like this one is not found anywhere else on the map. Approving a change here will not necessitate changes to other areas of the map out of fairness. The most similar area is on SVD near Spanish Trail Rd. However those parcels are larger and across SVD is the cemetery not a residential area with small parcels.

4. **Would be a small extension of changes already made** - All of the Plateau Rd, Plateau Circle, Starbuck Ln, and other neighborhoods adjacent to these parcels started off at 15/acre but were reduced to 5/acre to protect neighborhood characteristics. Reducing density on these 8 parcels is just a small extension of the changes already made in this area of the map.

5. **Proximity to SVD not the only factor** - The reason these parcels were left at 15/acre is their proximity to SVD. While creating high density along SVD is a goal of the HDHO, there should be flexibility to consider real world conditions. Maintaining contiguous density, protecting neighborhood characteristics and considering public input should be given equal weight.

6. **Current map is a result of many changes driven by public comment** - Almost 500 parcels and over 30 neighborhoods have received density reductions during the public input process so far. 274 of those density reductions happened very recently and were driven by input from residents.

7. **Public comment is still open and change should still be possible** - Some Planning Commission members voted against this change, not on its merits, but because they feared a slippery slope of other changes. It may be tempting to reject all proposed changes so that you don’t have to wrestle with any of these issues. Local leaders should be open to reasonable and appropriate change based on good arguments. When public comment is over and a final map is approved, then the time for change has ended.

8. **Changes are minor and reasonable** - In this area we have a conflict between higher density along SVD and maintaining contiguous density/neighborhood character. Please consider the input of those who will be affected. 5/acre density is still more than doubling the current density and allows for infill developments and additional housing. This small change is reasonable, in line with existing changes and does not reduce the effectiveness of the overlay.

Laura Lee Houck - Co-owner, 1900 Spanish Valley Dr.

Name

Signature

Street Address

4 Nov 2018

Date

Please see additional comments and parcel list on back.
Grand County Council Members,

Please accept these comments regarding the High Density Housing Overlay (HDHO). I am writing as a member of a group of concerned citizens that live in a neighborhood along Plateau Circle and Spanish Valley Drive (SVD). I am respectfully asking that you consider a density change for 8 parcels along SVD (see list below) from 15/acre to 5/acre for the following reasons.

1. **Maintaining contiguous density** - These 8 parcels represent a narrow strip of 15/acre density that is sandwiched between 5/acre proposed density and 2/acre current density. It is clear that one of the HDHO goals is to maintain large contiguous areas with the same density. This narrow strip is out of line with the rest of the map.

2. **Disruptive to neighborhood characteristics** - This section of SVD is a cohesive neighborhood with relatively small lot sizes, homes close to the road and close to one another. 15/acre density dropped in the middle of this neighborhood would significantly disrupt its character. Lot size and neighborhood characteristics were an important factor in many other density reductions made to the HDHO map.

3. **Area is unique on SVD** - A narrow strip of 15/acre density like this one is not found anywhere else on the map. Approving a change here will not necessitate changes to other areas of the map out of fairness. The most similar area is on SVD near Spanish Trail Rd. However those parcels are larger and across SVD is the cemetery not a residential area with small parcels.

4. **Would be a small extension of changes already made** - All of the Plateau Rd, Plateau Circle, Starbuck Ln, and other neighborhoods adjacent to these parcels started off at 15/acre but were reduced to 5/acre to protect neighborhood characteristics. Reducing density on these 8 parcels is just a small extension of the changes already made in this area of the map.

5. **Proximity to SVD not the only factor** - The reason these parcels were left at 15/acre is their proximity to SVD. While creating high density along SVD is a goal of the HDHO, there should be flexibility to consider real world conditions. Maintaining contiguous density, protecting neighborhood characteristics and considering public input should be given equal weight.

6. **Current map is a result of many changes driven by public comment** - Almost 500 parcels and over 30 neighborhoods have received density reductions during the public input process so far. 274 of those density reductions happened very recently and were driven by input from residents.

7. **Public comment is still open and change should still be possible** - Some Planning Commission members voted against this change, not on its merits, but because they feared a slippery slope of other changes. It may be tempting to reject all proposed changes so that you don’t have to wrestle with any of these issues. Local leaders should be open to reasonable and appropriate change based on good arguments. When public comment is over and a final map is approved, then the time for change has ended.

8. **Changes are minor and reasonable** - In this area we have a conflict between higher density along SVD and maintaining contiguous density/neighborhood character. Please consider the input of those who will be affected. 5/acre density is still more than doubling the current density and allows for infill developments and additional housing. This small change is reasonable, in line with existing changes and does not reduce the effectiveness of the overlay.

Please see additional comments and parcel list on back.

I enjoy the rural character of the community.

\[Signature\]

\[Date\]

\[1900 Spanish Valley Drive\]
Grand County Council Members,

Please accept these comments regarding the High Density Housing Overlay (HDHO). I am writing as a member of a group of concerned citizens that live in a neighborhood along Plateau Circle and Spanish Valley Drive (SVD). I am respectfully asking that you consider a density change for 8 parcels along SVD (see list below) from 15/acre to 5/acre for the following reasons.

1. **Maintaining contiguous density** - These 8 parcels represent a narrow strip of 15/acre density that is sandwiched between 5/acre proposed density and 2/acre current density. It is clear that one of the HDHO goals is to maintain large contiguous areas with the same density. This narrow strip is out of line with the rest of the map.

2. **Disruptive to neighborhood characteristics** – This section of SVD is a cohesive neighborhood with relatively small lot sizes, homes close to the road and close to one another. 15/acre density dropped in the middle of this neighborhood would significantly disrupt its character. Lot size and neighborhood characteristics were an important factor in many other density reductions made to the HDHO map.

3. **Area is unique on SVD** – A narrow strip of 15/acre density like this one is not found anywhere else on the map. Approving a change here will not necessitate changes to other areas of the map out of fairness. The most similar area is on SVD near Spanish Trail Rd. However those parcels are larger and across SVD is the cemetery not a residential area with small parcels.

4. **Would be a small extension of changes already made** – All of the Plateau Rd, Plateau Circle, Starbuck Ln, and other neighborhoods adjacent to these parcels started off at 15/acre but were reduced to 5/acre to protect neighborhood characteristics. Reducing density on these 8 parcels is just a small extension of the changes already made in this area of the map.

5. **Proximity to SVD not the only factor** – The reason these parcels were left at 15/acre is their proximity to SVD. While creating high density along SVD is a goal of the HDHO, there should be flexibility to consider real world conditions. Maintaining contiguous density, protecting neighborhood characteristics and considering public input should be given equal weight.

6. **Current map is a result of many changes driven by public comment** – Almost 500 parcels and over 30 neighborhoods have received density reductions during the public input process so far. 274 of those density reductions happened very recently and were driven by input from residents.

7. **Public comment is still open and change should still be possible** – Some Planning Commission members voted against this change, not on its merits, but because they feared a slippery slope of other changes. It may be tempting to reject all proposed changes so that you don’t have to wrestle with any of these issues. Local leaders should be open to reasonable and appropriate change based on good arguments. When public comment is over and a final map is approved, then the time for change has ended.

8. **Changes are minor and reasonable** – In this area we have a conflict between higher density along SVD and maintaining contiguous density/neighborhood character. Please consider the input of those who will be affected. 5/acre density is still more than doubling the current density and allows for infill developments and additional housing. This small change is reasonable, in line with existing changes and does not reduce the effectiveness of the overlay.

Please see additional comments and parcel list on back.
### List of suggested density reductions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel Number</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Density Now</th>
<th>HDHO Proposed Density</th>
<th>Requested Density Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0035</td>
<td>1900 SVD</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0036</td>
<td>1910 SVD</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0038</td>
<td>1880 SVD</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0148</td>
<td>2010 E Plateau Cir</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0188</td>
<td>2111 E Plateau Cir</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0SPE-0001</td>
<td>1832 SVD</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0SPE-0002</td>
<td>1968 Plateau Cir</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0187</td>
<td>1927 Plateau Cir</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average =** 0.78
Grand County Council Members,

Please accept these comments regarding the High Density Housing Overlay (HDHO). I am writing as a member of a group of concerned citizens that live in a neighborhood along Plateau Circle and Spanish Valley Drive (SVD). I am respectfully asking that you consider a density change for 8 parcels along SVD (see list below) from 15/acre to 5/acre for the following reasons.

1. **Maintaining contiguous density** - These 8 parcels represent a narrow strip of 15/acre density that is sandwiched between 5/acre proposed density and 2/acre current density. It is clear that one of the HDHO goals is to maintain large contiguous areas with the same density. This narrow strip is out of line with the rest of the map.

2. **Disruptive to neighborhood characteristics** - This section of SVD is a cohesive neighborhood with relatively small lot sizes, homes close to the road and close to one another. 15/acre density dropped in the middle of this neighborhood would significantly disrupt its character. Lot size and neighborhood characteristics were an important factor in many other density reductions made to the HDHO map.

3. **Area is unique on SVD** - A narrow strip of 15/acre density like this one is not found anywhere else on the map. Approving a change here will not necessitate changes to other areas of the map out of fairness. The most similar area is on SVD near Spanish Trail Rd. However those parcels are larger and across SVD is the cemetery not a residential area with small parcels.

4. **Would be a small extension of changes already made** - All of the Plateau Rd, Plateau Circle, Starbuck Ln, and other neighborhoods adjacent to these parcels started off at 15/acre but were reduced to 5/acre to protect neighborhood characteristics. Reducing density on these 8 parcels is just a small extension of the changes already made in this area of the map.

5. **Proximity to SVD not the only factor** - The reason these parcels were left at 15/acre is their proximity to SVD. While creating high density along SVD is a goal of the HDHO, there should be flexibility to consider real world conditions. Maintaining contiguous density, protecting neighborhood characteristics and considering public input should be given equal weight.

6. **Current map is a result of many changes driven by public comment** - Almost 500 parcels and over 30 neighborhoods have received density reductions during the public input process so far. 274 of those density reductions happened very recently and were driven by input from residents.

7. **Public comment is still open and change should still be possible** - Some Planning Commission members voted against this change, not on its merits, but because they feared a slippery slope of other changes. It may be tempting to reject all proposed changes so that you don’t have to wrestle with any of these issues. Local leaders should be open to reasonable and appropriate change based on good arguments. When public comment is over and a final map is approved, then the time for change has ended.

8. **Changes are minor and reasonable** - In this area we have a conflict between higher density along SVD and maintaining contiguous density/neighborhood character. Please consider the input of those who will be affected. 5/acre density is still more than doubling the current density and allows for infill developments and additional housing. This small change is reasonable, in line with existing changes and does not reduce the effectiveness of the overlay.

**Donna Rivette**

Name

1860 Plateau Circle

Street Address

11/6/18

Date

Please see additional comments and parcel list on back
**List of suggested density reductions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel Number</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Density Now</th>
<th>HDHO Proposed Density</th>
<th>Requested Density Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0035</td>
<td>1900 SVD</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0036</td>
<td>1910 SVD</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0038</td>
<td>1880 SVD</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0148</td>
<td>2010 E Plateau Cir</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0188</td>
<td>2111 E Plateau Cir</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0SPE-0001</td>
<td>1832 SVD</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0SPE-0002</td>
<td>1968 Plateau Cir</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0187</td>
<td>1927 Plateau Cir</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Additional Comments**

Even at 5 units/acre, the neighborhood is profoundly changed as the traffic on SVD (and Plateau Circle as a cut-through to the highway) increases yearly as it is now, and the high-density south of this narrow "strip" of lots will increase it further anyway. Please consider this change... it makes sense in the overall plan.
Dear Council Members,

I am writing as an organizer of a group of concerned citizens that live in a neighborhood along Plateau Circle and Spanish Valley Drive (SVD). I support many of the goals of the High Density Housing Overlay (HDHO). I agree that we have an affordable housing shortage in our county that needs to be addressed. One of the goals of the HDHO is to increase housing density while maintaining current neighborhood characteristics for property owners and residents. I am writing because my neighbors and I feel that our neighborhood has been missed in these considerations.

Just past Rocky Road, Spanish Valley Drive (SVD) goes up a hill and then levels out remaining mostly flat through the rest of the valley. Just as you crest the hill you enter a neighborhood formed by the Plateau Estates subdivision plus 5 other parcels on the West side of SVD and by the Hillcrest subdivision on the East side. On this area of the map, only the West side of SVD is included in the overlay and a small strip of eight parcels have a proposed overlay density of 15/acre. All of the adjacent parcels to the West have a proposed density of 5/acre and the other neighboring parcels are unchanged at 2/acre (see maps pgs. 5-6). They all have primary residences on the parcels. I am respectfully asking that you consider a density change for the 8 parcels along SVD (see list pg. 4) from 15/acre to 5/acre. This is the same proposal that was brought before the Planning Commission at their meeting on 9/25/18 except that one additional parcel has been added to the request. Please consider this proposal for the following reasons.

**Maintaining contiguous density**

When you look at the map you don't see small pockets of different densities scattered throughout. Instead there are generally large areas with contiguous density. It is clear that one of the HDHO goals is to maintain large contiguous areas with the same density. These 8 parcels represent a narrow strip of 15/acre density that is sandwiched between 5/acre proposed density and 2/acre current density. This narrow strip is out of line with the rest of the map.

**Disruptive to neighborhood characteristics**

This section of SVD is a cohesive neighborhood with relatively small lot sizes, homes close to the road and close to one another (see pictures on pgs. 6-8). 15/acre density dropped in the middle of this neighborhood would significantly disrupt its character. In conversation with Community and Economic Development Department (CEDD) staff we learned that lot size and neighborhood characteristics were an important factor in many other density reductions made to the HDHO map (see list of reductions on pages 4-5). The average parcel size of the eight parcels I'm recommending for change is only about ¼ of an acre. Our neighborhood also deserves protection from excessive housing density changes in an attempt to better maintain neighborhood characteristics for current property owners.

**Area is unique on SVD**

This section of SVD is unique and unlike any other part of the overlay. Approving a change here will not necessitate changes to other areas of the map out of fairness. There is one other section of SVD with a strip of parcels at 15/acre, no overlay on the East side of SVD and 5/acre density on adjacent parcels to the West. However, the average size of these five parcels is almost 1.5 acres, the homes are not as close together and the homes are not as close to SVD. Additionally there are not any residences...
on the East side of SVD because the cemetery is located there. Therefore these parcels at 15/acres are not as disruptive because they are on the edge of a neighborhood not right in the middle of it.

Would be a small extension of changes already made
These eight parcels and the adjacent parcels across SVD deserve the same protection that has been afforded to the other 50 parcels to the West which have already been changed to prevent excessive density. All of the Plateau Rd, Plateau Circle, Starbuck Ln, and other neighborhoods adjacent to these parcels started off at 15/acre but were reduced to 5/acre to protect neighborhood characteristics. Reducing density on these 8 parcels is just a small extension of the changes already made in this area of the map.

Proximity to SVD not the only factor
According to CEDD staff, the reason these parcels were left at 15/acre is their proximity to SVD. While creating high density along SVD is a goal of the HDHO, there should be flexibility to consider real world conditions. Maintaining contiguous density, protecting neighborhood characteristics and considering public input should be given equal weight. Just to the North along SVD are the neighborhoods along Kalina Heights and Rocky Road. They were originally at 25/acre but were reduced to 15/acre. When this change was made, continuity was maintained and all of the parcels were reduced. The parcels right along SVD were not left at 25/acre but were instead reduced to 15/acre along with the rest of the neighborhood.

Current map is a result of many changes driven by public comment
The process that has created the map has been one of constant change driven by public input. Throughout the process neighborhoods have received protection from the disruptive effects of housing density that is too high. The first neighborhoods that were protected were the ones that met the initial criteria but were not included on the map. At almost every step along the way, more neighborhoods have been protected. Please see the list on pages 4-5 of all of the protections that have occurred since the original HDHO map was presented. Almost 600 parcels and over 40 neighborhoods have received density reductions or were not included in the original plan. Many of these density reductions (274 parcels) happened recently between July and September of 2018.

Changes are minor and reasonable
This small change to eight parcels is reasonable, in line with existing changes and does not reduce the effectiveness of the overlay. In this neighborhood we have a conflict between higher density along SVD and maintaining contiguous density/neighborhood character. Please consider the input of those who will be affected. 5/acre density is still more than doubling the current density and allows for infill developments and additional housing.

Public comment is still open and change should still be possible
Despite the fact that the HDHO process has been one of constant change, some Planning Commission members seemed to have decided that the opportunity for changes to be made to the map ended sometime in August 2018. This proposed density reduction was voted down (3-4) by some Planning Commission members on 9/25/18, not on its merits, but because they feared a slippery slope of other changes. This left the appearance that major changes behind the scenes are acceptable but not
changes proposed in a public meeting. I believe that changes should be possible as long as the public comment period is still open. Local leaders should be open to reasonable and appropriate change based on good arguments. Deciding what proposed changes have merit is the difficult work of local leaders. When public comment is over and a final map is approved, then the time for change has ended.

Please note that in the Staff Recommendation section of the Agenda Summary there is a heading called “Edge Parcels” that states in part, “Council may consider adding, removing, or changing parcel designations located at the edges of the proposed overlay boundaries.” This section specifically references the change suggested in this comment. Making a small, reasonable change to the map is entirely within the scope of what you are being asked to consider.

Public comments made now should be heard

I was basically told by CEDD staff that my comments had come in too late and if I had been able to attend the open houses that there would have been a better chance that the change would have been incorporated in the map. While CEDD staff did public outreach through newspapers, Facebook and the radio they failed to inform many of my neighbors about the proposed housing density increases in our neighborhood. As I talked with my neighbors over the last month and a half, many were completely unaware of the proposed HDHO density changes. I think it is unacceptable that such widespread changes be enacted without signage in the impacted neighborhoods. I do not think that small lawn signs at major intersections within the impacted neighborhoods would be prohibitively expensive. I also think that the best way to insure transparency would be to send a postcard to all the parcels and neighboring parcels impacted by the proposed housing density increases. My comments and those of my neighbors are coming in after the open houses, but that shouldn’t mean that they are less worthy of consideration on their merits.

Other members of the neighborhood support this change

My husband and I have talked with many of our neighbors and everyone we have contacted has voiced support for the changes I am proposing. This includes 6 of the 8 parcel owners/residents for whom we are suggesting a density decrease (we haven’t been in contact yet with the other two). Many neighbors are planning to submit comments to the Council. When I submitted comments regarding this suggested change to the Planning Commission the following people agreed to add their names to that comment:

Charlie Knowles of 1925 SVD
Christine Calnan of 1931 SVD
Brenden and Mary Mitchel McGann of 2111 Plateau Circle
Cynthia Smith and Al Mcleod of 1939 SVD
Sarah Ball of 2095 Plateau Circle

Naylene Dalton of 1929 SVD
Bonnie Anderson of 1880 SVD
Jay Johnson of 1980 Plateau Circle
Karen Feary of 2033 Plateau Circle

The only difference between what the Planning Commission voted on and what we are proposing now is that one additional parcel has been added bringing the total from 7 to 8. This parcel (the northern most along SVD, 1927 Plateau Cir) was added because it is also part of the narrow strip of parcels now proposed for 15/acre and because the parcel owner wanted to be included.

Thank you very much for your consideration.
Respectfully, Adrea Lund
List of density reductions that I am suggesting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel Number</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Density Now</th>
<th>HDHO Proposed Density</th>
<th>Requested Density Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0035</td>
<td>1900 SVD</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0036</td>
<td>1910 SVD</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0038</td>
<td>1880 SVD</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0148</td>
<td>2010 E Plateau Cir</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0188</td>
<td>2111 E Plateau Cir</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-OSPE-0001</td>
<td>1832 SVD</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-OSPE-0002</td>
<td>1968 Plateau Cir</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-0017-0187</td>
<td>1927 Plateau Cir</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>2/acre</td>
<td>15/acre</td>
<td>5/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average =</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List of Neighborhoods Already Protected in HDHO Process to Date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>Number of Parcels</th>
<th>Type of Protection</th>
<th>When Protection Occurred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buena Vista</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Not included in overlay</td>
<td>Prior to Aug 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchard Way</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Not included in overlay</td>
<td>Prior to Aug 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaSal Road</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Not included in overlay</td>
<td>Prior to Aug 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Buren</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Not included in overlay</td>
<td>Prior to Aug 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Not included in overlay</td>
<td>Prior to Aug 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinda Ct.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Not included in overlay</td>
<td>Prior to Aug 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder Ave</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Not included in overlay</td>
<td>Prior to Aug 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison Way</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Not included in overlay</td>
<td>Prior to Aug 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Side Rim Rock</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Removed from overlay</td>
<td>Between Aug 17 and Mar 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemon Ln</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Removed from overlay</td>
<td>Between Aug 17 and Mar 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. side Red Cliff</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Removed from overlay</td>
<td>Between Aug 17 and Mar 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocky Rd</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Reduced density 25 to 15</td>
<td>Between Aug 17 and Mar 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalina Heights</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Reduced density 25 to 15</td>
<td>Between Aug 17 and Mar 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rim Rock</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Reduced density 10 to 5</td>
<td>Between Mar 18 and Jul 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts Rd</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Reduced density 10 to 5</td>
<td>Between Mar 18 and Jul 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arroyo Rd</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reduced density 10 to 5</td>
<td>Between Mar 18 and Jul 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angel Rock Rd</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Reduced density 10 to 5</td>
<td>Between Mar 18 and Jul 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reduced density 10 to 5</td>
<td>Between Mar 18 and Jul 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrace</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reduced density 10 to 5</td>
<td>Between Mar 18 and Jul 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Cliff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reduced density 10 to 5</td>
<td>Between Mar 18 and Jul 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plateau Dr</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Reduced density 15 to 5</td>
<td>Between Mar 18 and Jul 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starbucks Ln</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Reduced density 15 to 5</td>
<td>Between Mar 18 and Jul 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plateau Cir</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Reduced density 15 to 5</td>
<td>Between Mar 18 and Jul 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simpatica Ct</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Reduced density 15 to 5</td>
<td>Between Mar 18 and Jul 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wagner</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Reduced density 25 to 15</td>
<td>Between Jul 18 and Sep 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Parcels</td>
<td>Reduction</td>
<td>Dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holyoak</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25 to 15</td>
<td>Jul 18 and Sep 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lance</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25 to 15</td>
<td>Jul 18 and Sep 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin Dr</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25 to 15</td>
<td>Jul 18 and Sep 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canyon Vista</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25 to 15</td>
<td>Jul 18 and Sep 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duchene</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25 to 15</td>
<td>Jul 18 and Sep 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Miguel</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25 to 15</td>
<td>Jul 18 and Sep 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Sal Ave</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25 to 15</td>
<td>Jul 18 and Sep 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasatch</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25 to 15</td>
<td>Jul 18 and Sep 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnel Ln</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25 to 15</td>
<td>Jul 18 and Sep 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Valley Ct</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25 to 15</td>
<td>Jul 18 and Sep 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sage Valley Cr</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25 to 15</td>
<td>Jul 18 and Sep 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Juan</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25 to 15</td>
<td>Jul 18 and Sep 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murphy Ln</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25 to 15</td>
<td>Jul 18 and Sep 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millcreek Dr</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25 to 15</td>
<td>Jul 18 and Sep 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Valley Dr</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25 to 15</td>
<td>Jul 18 and Sep 18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Parcels: 591  
Total Neighborhoods: 40

The yellow arrow points toward the neighborhood.
Closeup - The parcels proposed to change from 1/2 acre to 5 acres are outlined in yellow.
Dear County Council Members,

Please accept my deep gratitude for the work and thought you have put into actually solving our housing crisis. The two housing ordinances before you are an exciting culmination of over 12 years of research and work by the county. I feel that the money spent hiring skilled and knowledgeable staff to address this problem has paid huge dividends, and we are FINALLY ready to move forward from endless meetings and hand-wringing, to actual solutions!

I know that you are feeling pressure from concerned individuals to water-down some of the details of these solutions. While some tweaks will be needed, I fully support the gist of both the Overlay and Essential Workforce Housing Ordinances and hope that each of you will too.

In addition, please know that the Housing Authority and other mission-driven non-profit organizations, such as the Moab Area Community Land Trust (moabclt.org), stand ready to partner with the county to ensure that you do NOT need to re-invent the wheel or become a housing agency in order to have these plans work for our residents. These solutions will also allow private developers to provide dedicated lower cost units for our workforce, with accountability built in.

Again, thank you. If we don’t change something, nothing will change, and that is a huge danger to our economy!

Audrey Graham
435-220-0185

P.S. I am speaking as a citizen and do not represent either the Housing Authority or MACTL in my statements above.
Grand County Council Members,

Please accept these comments regarding the High Density Housing Overlay (HDHO). I am writing as a member of a group of concerned citizens that live in a neighborhood along Plateau Circle and Spanish Valley Drive (SVD). I am respectfully asking that you consider a density change for 8 parcels along SVD (see list below) from 15/acre to 5/acre for the following reasons.

1. **Maintaining contiguous density** - These 8 parcels represent a narrow strip of 15/acre density that is sandwiched between 5/acre proposed density and 2/acre current density. It is clear that one of the HDHO goals is to maintain large contiguous areas with the same density. This narrow strip is out of line with the rest of the map.

2. **Disruptive to neighborhood characteristics** – This section of SVD is a cohesive neighborhood with relatively small lot sizes, homes close to the road and close to one another. 15/acre density dropped in the middle of this neighborhood would significantly disrupt its character. Lot size and neighborhood characteristics were an important factor in many other density reductions made to the HDHO map.

3. **Area is unique on SVD** – A narrow strip of 15/acre density like this one is not found anywhere else on the map. Approving a change here will not necessitate changes to other areas of the map out of fairness. The most similar area is on SVD near Spanish Trail Rd. However those parcels are larger and across SVD is the cemetery not a residential area with small parcels.

4. **Would be a small extension of changes already made** – All of the Plateau Rd, Plateau Circle, Starbuck Ln, and other neighborhoods adjacent to these parcels started off at 15/acre but were reduced to 5/acre to protect neighborhood characteristics. Reducing density on these 8 parcels is just a small extension of the changes already made in this area of the map.

5. **Proximity to SVD not the only factor** – The reason these parcels were left at 15/acre is their proximity to SVD. While creating high density along SVD is a goal of the HDHO, there should be flexibility to consider real world conditions. Maintaining contiguous density, protecting neighborhood characteristics and considering public input should be given equal weight.

6. **Current map is a result of many changes driven by public comment** – Almost 500 parcels and over 30 neighborhoods have received density reductions during the public input process so far. 274 of those density reductions happened very recently and were driven by input from residents.

7. **Public comment is still open and change should still be possible** – Some Planning Commission members voted against this change, not on its merits, but because they feared a slippery slope of other changes. It may be tempting to reject all proposed changes so that you don’t have to wrestle with any of these issues. Local leaders should be open to reasonable and appropriate change based on good arguments. When public comment is over and a final map is approved, then the time for change has ended.

8. **Changes are minor and reasonable** – In this area we have a conflict between higher density along SVD and maintaining contiguous density/neighborhood character. Please consider the input of those who will be affected. 5/acre density is still more than doubling the current density and allows for infill developments and additional housing. This small change is reasonable, in line with existing changes and does not reduce the effectiveness of the overlay.


**VINCENT J. BATTAGLIA**  

**1940 PLATEAU CIR**  

**Date**

Please see additional comments and parcel list on back
To All,

I Ryan Holyoak would like to officially express my opposition to the proposed high density overlay of the properties including and surrounding the properties that I own and represent for my families. This includes a substantial portion of the HD-35 allowing these oversized buildings. I understand the longshot efforts of committees\individuals that wish to create affordable housing, but sacrificing adjacent properties by encouraging and allowing a 50 foot tall building within the minimal setbacks to our homes would be irresponsible to us. We believe the rural character we have protected is in jeopardy and feel it could be just another loosening of the protection that you have been charged with to protect as our representatives. Keep in mind that setting these kind of precedents will ultimately within time effect the homes you live in also. We know that affordable housing for resort communities needs to be outside the community. Tourists do not come here to visit the same places that require regular attendance of law enforcement 24 hrs a day. I appreciate your time to represent me and my family in opposing this proposal. Thank you.
Dear Grand County Council

I just finished reading Sunnie Holland Sheff and Sand Sheff's letter written today, November 14. I agree with the letter 100 percent. I would just like to add one or two things.

For the group wanting to build on Jackson Street who wanted a parcel added to the overlay, I say please do so. Jackson Street feeds into highway 191 at a traffic light, which makes sense. The subdivision in that area is fairly dense, but even in that case I don't find 35 units, 3 to 4 stories as sensible for Moab. It sounded to me that the 35 units per acre might be problematic even there. If, however that type of density is possible, 4.5 acres at 35 units/acre is 157 units...a big step to solving the problem! However, I suggest a little more dialog with that party. I suspect that parking plus 35 units/acre are too much without the fourth story, which requires much more expensive design standards, which is counterintuitive to low cost building. Please clarify that point with P&Z: Mary Hofhine was who told me 4th stories added a big cost jump in building standards.

As Sunnie said, our family is interested in building primary housing on more of our vacant properties, including on some acreage in the Overlook Road area, but not the density that is proposed. I don't want to have ongoing anxiety about what might be built near my house. I would like to feel that our concerns are heard and that we can work with Grand County instead of feeling we are in an adversarial relationship. I am honestly starting to wonder if a conservation easement is more appealing.

Again, I believe the density overlay should use the underlying existing zoning as a base multiple everywhere in the valley.

I want to be at the November 20 meeting, but will most likely be taking my mother in law to medical appointments in GJ. Please call me if you would like to discuss this further.

Thank you.
Page Holland
1460 Overlook Rd
801-201-4748
Dear Council Member,

I am writing in response to the proposed High Density Overlay. While I am generally in support of the idea, I have major concerns with the higher densities proposed in certain areas. And of course, in particular, my neighborhood.

I live in a Rural Residential neighborhood close to town. Overlook Road to be exact (the steep hill behind Canyonlands Field Institute). It has been a quiet, rural neighborhood with 6 houses, and some undeveloped land adjacent. We have lived there for over 40 years, and have always expected the adjacent land to be developed with the same rural residential characteristics in mind. The proposed overlay plan could potentially change that forever. I feel sick imagining a 3 or 4 story building next to our modest one family home on 1 acre, blocking views and ruining any thought of privacy.

First, an overlay with potential of 35 units/acre set over a current zoning of 1 unit per acre seems outright ridiculous, and a major insult. I am aware that this area may seem like a good spot for high density because of the relatively few numbers of residential people it will affect, and that in itself feels like an attack. I am not sure if there IS an appropriate place for these kinds of densities anywhere in the valley, and feel strongly that the added height allowance (of 4 stories) would be a real mistake in this desert environment (as stated by Michael List in the November 7 public hearing). It seems like if this type of density is necessary, it should be on low ground, out of sight from the rest of the valley, with already developed roads to access, and near higher density areas.

The area of Overlook Road and the rural neighborhood to the east of Overlook road is not the appropriate place for high densities. It is located on high ground (just as high as Highland drive area – which is not included on the High Density Overlay Map). Overlook Road is steep, and sits well above the valley, and is even higher than much of the extended Spanish Valley. A large development would be an eyesore for the entire community. It is unique and difficult to access, and should be treated as a special area like Kayenta Heights. It is not a “sacrifice zone” as I have heard the HD35b zone described to be. I would like to see the future land in that area to maintain a neighborhood characteristic of 1 or 2 homes per acre, but could possibly see an overlay of up to 5 homes per acre with the appropriate deed restrictions to accommodate family housing.

That being said, we still have the issue, and growing problem, of traffic. With Highway traffic from the south coming down the hill at 65 MPH, and traffic from Holyoak Lane subdivision area, we
already have a difficult and often dangerous time accessing HWY 191 to go to town. Turning left can be nearly impossible, sometimes forcing us to turn right and utilize the over busy Millcreek Drive to go into town. Now with the added hotel near the bottom of Overlook Road, it is hard to imagine how much worse this problem is going to be! There are no other alternative roads nearby. There are major gullies to the west of Overlook Road, and around the rural neighborhood to the east. This is not an appropriate place to wish for high densities. If allowed, it will create a dangerous traffic nightmare.

Finally, on a personal level, I do not think that it is fair nor ethical for residents and homeowners to feel anxious every time a piece of land comes up for sale. Wondering who, or if, a big developer will buy the adjacent house or land, level it and put in a 3 or 4 story high rise. This isn’t fair to the people who have made these places their home and hope to do so for many more years. I have heard the comment several times that it would be “highly unlikely that these lands would be developed”, or that “only a handful may be built” in the valley, but these types of thinking do not remove the potential for it to happen. I find it extremely inconsiderate of our valuable community members, who have called Moab home for years, and plan on staying. I especially find the notion of “just leave if you don’t like it, because our property values are up” to be extremely offensive. I was born and raised here, as were my parents. My ancestors were among the first settlers. We are dedicated to keeping this as our community.

My family also provides 5 additional homes in Moab for affordable housing. We are actively working on developing more land into affordable housing. We feel that the high densities (25 and 35/acre) are way, way out of line. But, if that is necessary, we ask that you at least remove our neighborhood from the map, or reduce the density to 5 per acre.

In summary, our neighborhood area is not the place for the HD35, HD35b, HD25 or HD15 zones. We feel that the hillside is NOT an appropriate place for high densities. There are not adequate roads to service these type of developments. They would be an eyesore for the entire valley, and a slap in the face to the families who are already established in that zone. With all due respect to the work, research and thought put into this proposal, it is NOT too late to make changes to this map before a major mistake is made. Thank you for taking the time to consider our concerns, and we hope to have your support of maintaining the integrity of traditional rural neighborhoods.

With Respect and Sincerely,

Sunnie and Sand Sheff
Longtime Moab Resident (Grand County) and Homeowners.
HDH Workshop Thoughts – December 4, 2018

HDH Overlay:

- Too much too fast
- Need a vision for the valley
  - More hotels = more tourists = more wear and tear on resources
  - Work on getting a handle and a vision for that issue
- Slow down
  - Arroyo Crossing 300 units
  - City Walnut Lane 60-ish units
  - MAPS project 36 units
  - Community Redevelopment Agency – mandatory affordable housing $
  - SITLA housing project in conjunction with USU campus
  - Not to mention San Juan end of Spanish Valley
- For locals?
  - HDH might not be what local residents would take advantage of
  - Very high density wasn’t taken advantage of when 80 percent could be market rate
  - Now that we’ve essentially decreased the profitability of the HD, why would developers suddenly seize on the opportunity?
- This needs to happen in concert with reducing/eliminating more hotels and overnight rentals. Otherwise, we are continuing to subsidize that industry. First, by spending 3 million dollars per year to bring visitors here, thus creating an increased demand for accommodations; second (and this is not my original idea – many constituents have voiced this concern), we subsidize the same accommodations industry by housing the staff that they have created an escalating demand for.
- WE NEED A VISION! One that includes, not only what we want the valley to look and feel like, but also one which includes the idea of carrying capacity. When is enough enough? I suspect that we may have reached that carrying capacity quite some time ago.
- We’re talking about sacrificing quality of life for the chance to further subsidize an industry that most residents have had enough of.
I appreciate the diligence you exhibit as you heard and discussed Ordinance 2018-1, and will continue to examine Proposed Ordinance 2018-19.

I imagine are going to think I am kidding but I would like to suggest (prior to voting on each and every ordinance or proposed idea that could possibly change the last remaining R-2 neighborhoods in Moab) that some form of a “worst Case Scenario” committee be established. Perhaps city employees, the members of the planning commission and city council could brainstorm all the negative possibilities that might result from housing proposals. That way the planning commission and city council members could better discuss all sides of a proposal, mitigation strategies, enforcement options, etc. and prepare solution-based scenarios that are in place before ordinance language is formalized.

Also if I understand correctly, there is no way for interested parties to correct poor design ideas in PAD projects? Unless the developer chooses to listen to neighbors as to how their design might affect the neighborhood and make changes if and when problems arise, those neighbors have no voice in the layout or design. You will remember that I and a few neighbors had serious issues with a proposed development slated to be built across the street from me if an up zone was granted. I am assuming that development could possibly resurface as a PAD and I can only hope the developer is still aware of, and willing to mitigate, our serious concerns. Not all my neighbors had the same issues that a few of us did so all PAD projects need to be looked at from ground zero, next to ground zero, down the street from ground zero and across town from ground zero. Perhaps if a “Worst Case Scenario” committee was inaugurated, a few of the committee members could be tasked as ‘neighbors’ and look at all projects with those eyes. Those ears. And those hearts. Why, from the developer’s standpoint, must projects be “all or nothing”? I think I know the answer to that one.

The city and county seem to be constantly behind the proverbial 8-ball as our formerly intimate community experiences growing pains in every sector. At the Highway Overlay Zone open houses, I asked county officials 1) Why were the densities so high, the buildings so tall and the scope of the project so large, and 2) Have they examined all potential loopholes to their best laid plans as to how it all would roll out. The answer to my first question was, “Not everyone was going to develop their land to the higher allowable densities.” That was not an answer, it was an unrealistic justification for the newest, freakishly urban changes to what used to be a cozy, rural community. There was no answer to my second question and I don’t know if those kinds of increased population topics (water, traffic, schools, professional recruitment, health care needs…etc,) were discussed and recorded for posterity.

As much as I love Moab, I think it needs a sub-title. “Moab… the City of Unintended Consequences”. Every decision made by city and county officials now needs to pass through many filters of intuitive and scientific FORESIGHT. Regretful HINDSIGHT is what we experience when we are denied access to our local National Parks because of attendance issues, stuck in mile-long lines going in to Sand Flats, overwhelmed by partying BnB tourists in every corner of the city, not knowing the absence of noisy ORVs on city streets until after 10 or 11 PM during 10 months of the year, stranded in gridlock on Main St, dwarfed by hotels
that fit better in giant cities than in our quaint, smallish downtown, and last but not least, having the heart and soul of Moab… the safety and solidarity of R-2 neighborhoods, forever changed by not examining worst case scenarios first. Please let us stop creating two problems by trying to fix one and chasing the almighty dollar. Please start listening with intention to the wants, needs and desires of ALL residents.

Thank you again for serving all of us as you navigate through the issues before you.

Carol Mayer
444 Rosetree
Dear County Council,

The High Density Overlay Map proposes the MAJORITY of ALL FUTURE DEVELOPMENT in Grand County along US Highway 191. The complete overlay allows for 78,000 new residents.

LIVING ALONG A HIGHWAY IS HAZARDOUS TO YOUR HEALTH, causing respiratory disease, asthma, cancer, preterm births, childhood leukemia, among many other health hazards.

Please review the attached sample of articles and scientific papers on the health hazards of living next to a highway.

Currently, almost no one in Grand County chooses to live along US191. Where do you live?

Ask yourself one basic question: "Do you want to live along US191?" and the answer will be crystal clear.

I include samples of scientific research in this official comment to the Grand County Council, so that in 25 years when our population begins to suffer the effects of promoting growth in the most aggressive way ever in our history with 25 to 35 units per acre along US191, we will remember that we were fully aware of the health hazards, and held liable for the consequences.

Let's not go down this road. There are better places to encourage density.

Thank you.

Most Sincerely,
Michael Liss
Concerned Citizen

NOTE TO STAFF: Please print out all articles are include hard copies in the Office County Council Comments Package on the High Density Overlay. Thank you for you attention to this important issue.

https://www.lung.org/our-initiatives/healthy-air/outdoor/air-pollution/highways.html

Residential Proximity to Major Highways — United States, 2010
Diesel Exhaust and Cancer

Exposure to diesel exhaust is widespread in the modern world. Exhaust from diesel engines brings a complex mixtu...

https://www.medicinenet.com/air_pollution_and_allergies__connection/views.htm

Silicosis: Silica and Road Construction

Information on Silicosis: Silica and Road Construction

Respiratory Health Effects of Air Pollution: Update on Biomass Smoke and Traffic Pollution

Mounting evidence suggests that air pollution contributes to the large...
Living Near A Highway Affects Lung Development In Children, Study Shows

Researchers at the University of Southern California found that children who lived within 500 meters of a freewa...


The risk of breathing polluted air from freeways and high-traffic areas: Research brief - Journalist's Resource

The risk of breathing polluted air from freeways and high-traffic areas:...

2013 research overview on the impact of automotive pollution on human health, by Doug Brugge of Tufts Medical Sc...

https://www.webmd.com/lung/features/outdoor-pollution-and-lung-function-effects#1

Asthma Rates Higher Near Busy Highway - MedicineNet
Asthma Rates Higher Near Busy Highway - MedicineNet
Residents of homes that are located near congested highways have higher rates of asthma, new research finds.

Study looks at health risks in neighborhoods near highways
Diesel exhaust fumes cause lung cancer, WHO says

Kate Kelland
Diesel engine fumes can cause lung cancer and belong in the same potentially dea...

CDC: Higher cancer risk for kids living near busy roads

A CDC review of previous studies suggests a link between childhood leukemia and exposure to elevated levels of t...

Near-highway pollutants in motor vehicle exhaust: A review of epidemiologic evidence of cardiac and pulmonary health risks
Near-highway pollutants in motor vehicle exhaust: A review of epidemiology...
Doug Brugge
There is growing evidence of a distinct set of freshly-emitted air pollutants downwind from major highways, moto...

ET 06/03: Key studies on air pollution and health effects near high-traffic areas.

How healthy is the air you breathe?

Two types of air pollution dominate in the U.S.: ozone and particle pollution. These two pollutants threaten the...
Michael Liss
Keeper of the Rock
THE SPIRIT OF CLOUD ROCK
Moab, Utah
Agenda Item: K-1

Title: Approving Volunteer Appointment(s) to District and County Boards and Commissions:
1. Airport Board (Postponed from January 2, 2019)

Fiscal Impact: None

Presenter(s): Rory Paxman, Council Liaison for the Board

Recommendation:
I move to approve the appointment of Robert Greenberg, with term expiring 12/31/2022, to serve on the Airport Board and authorize the Chair to sign all associated documents.

Background:
The Airport Board met in an open meeting and reviewed two applications submitted for one open vacancy as of 12/31/2018. The Board voted to forward the recommendation of applicant Robert Greenburg to County Council for appointment, with terms expiring 12/31/2022.

Other application received:
Roger Stone

Resolution No. 3007 established a board appointment process and requirements of board members, commissioners, and committees. Board Members agree, in signing the application, to abide by Conflict of Interest Ordinance No. 462.

Upon appointment, the Council’s Office will mail the appointees a letter congratulating them and inviting them to a training/orientation to be scheduled for 2019.

Attachment(s):
1. Board Recommendation
2. Applications Received
3. Resolution 3007
4. Ordinance 462
December 4th, 2018

Grand County Council
125 E. Center Street
Moab, UT 84532

Re: Airport Board Recommendation Letter

Dear Grand County Council Members:

The Airport Board received two (2) applications for one (1) open vacancy; one application (Greenberg) was received 5 days after the deadline, but prior to the board meeting. The Airport Board met on December 3rd, 2018 and interviewed both candidates, Roger Stone and Robert Greenberg.

On December 3rd, 2018 the Airport Board met in an open meeting and voted unanimously (3-0-1, Greenberg abstained) to recommend to Council Robert Greenberg to a term ending 12/31/2022.

Thank you,

[Signature]

Judd Hill
Instructions: Complete and sign this form and return it to Grand County Council Office, 125 E. Center St., Moab, UT 84532; fax: 435-259-2574; or council@grandcountyutah.net

Board or Commission Position Applied For: **Airport Board**

Name: **Bob Greenberg**

Mailing Address: **453 E Center**

City: **Moab** State: **UT** ZIP Code: **84532**

Day Phone: **260 9665** Email Address: **bobgmoab@gmail.com**

In what year did you establish your current residency in Grand County? **1978**

(residency is required for all Boards; some District boards require residency within the District, which may not include Moab City limits; **two years' residency prior to assuming board membership is required for Planning Commission**)

If not Grand County, which county do you reside in? (applicable for Historical Preservation Commission and Housing Authority of Southeastern Utah) __________________________

Occupation or professional training: **Retired**

List your work experience that is relevant to your application for a position on the Board or Commission for which you are applying (if needed, attach a separate page):

- Many terms on airport board including serving as chair or vice chair.
List your non-work experience that is relevant to your application for a position on the Board or Commission for which you are applying:


Grand County Resolution 3007 (December 2013) contains the following Board Member requirements:

- Must be a Grand County resident (unless otherwise noted);
- Terms shall be for four years, unless a shorter period is required by law, or unless a mid-term vacancy is being filled;
- All terms shall end December 31st with the new member taking office the first meeting in January of the following year;
- Board Members shall have the appropriate expertise when required by law;
- Submit applications to the Council’s Office in accordance with the requirements contained in the notice;
- Agree to abide by the County’s Conflict of Interest Ordinance.

Additionally, the State Code has the following requirements for Special Service Districts in Grand County:

- No appointed member of the Board may be a full or part-time employee of the District while serving on the Board;
- No person employed by a Special Service District as a full-time or part-time employee may serve on the Governing Board of the District;
- A Board Member may not be compensated separately as a Board Member and as an employee for providing the same service;
- Each Trustee/Board Member appointed by the County legislative body shall be an elector (registered voter) of the District.

I have read, and I certify, that all the information on this form is true and correct and I meet the requirements listed above. Furthermore, if appointed, I agree to faithfully attend the meetings and adhere to the State laws, County ordinances, and adopted Bylaws that govern the Board or Commission on which I am appointed to serve. Additionally, I have read the County’s Conflict of Interest Ordinance (No. 482, November 2007) and do not have any inherent conflicts in serving on the Board or Commission to which I have applied. I agree to abide by this Ordinance.

Signature: [Signature] Date: [Date]

Council’s Office · 125 E. Center St. · Moab, UT 84532 · (435) 259-1346 · www.grandcountyutah.net
Board and Commission Application
and Certification Form

Instructions: Complete and sign this form and return it to Grand County Council Office, 125 E. Center St., Moab, UT 84532; fax: 435-259-2574; or council@grandcountyutah.net

Board or Commission Position Applied For: Grand County Airport Board

Name: Roger Stone

Mailing Address: PO Box 963

City: Moab State: UT ZIP Code: 84532

Day Phone: 435-259-2921 Email Address: roger@flyredtail.com

In what year did you establish your current residency in Grand County? 1983 1st time

(residency is required for all Boards; some District boards require residency within the District, which may not include Moab City limits; two years’ residency prior to assuming board membership is required for Planning Commission)

If not Grand County, which county do you reside in? (applicable for Historical Preservation Commission and Housing Authority of Southeastern Utah)

Occupation or professional training: Aircraft Mechanic + Painter

List your work experience that is relevant to your application for a position on the Board or Commission for which you are applying (if needed, attach a separate page):

Line man at Imperial Flying Service, Imperial, Ca

Mechanic, Line man, Tanker Operator at Post Flying Service, Imperial California - 260 353 1182 Reference Larry Rose 260 355 0404 Reference

KCNY as mechanic - Nick Lamsouvre Reference

Lead Mechanic, Wildwood Auto Shop, Wildwood, Ca

Council’s Office · 125 E. Center St. · Moab, UT 84532 · (435) 259-1346 · www.grandcountyutah.net
List your non-work experience that is relevant to your application for a position on the Board or Commission for which you are applying:

- Self-employed, Owner/operator KDL Transport, Shelley, UT
- Lead Mechanic & Foreman - Eden Valley Automotive, Love, Land, Co
- Currently employed at Redtail Air, KCNY, Moab
- John Ramsey - Co-owner
- Mike Ramsey - Co-owner

I have other character & work references if needed.

Grand County Resolution 3007 (December 2013) contains the following Board Member requirements:

- Must be a Grand County resident (unless otherwise noted);
- Terms shall be for four years, unless a shorter period is required by law, or unless a mid-term vacancy is being filled;
- All terms shall end December 31st with the new member taking office the first meeting in January of the following year;
- Board Members shall have the appropriate expertise when required by law;
- Submit applications to the Council’s Office in accordance with the requirements contained in the notice;
- Agree to abide by the County’s Conflict of Interest Ordinance.

Additionally, the State Code has the following requirements for Special Service Districts in Grand County:

- No appointed member of the Board may be a full or part-time employee of the District while serving on the Board;
- No person employed by a Special Service District as a full-time or part-time employee may serve on the Governing Board of the District;
- A Board Member may not be compensated separately as a Board Member and as an employee for providing the same service;
- Each Trustee/Board Member appointed by the County legislative body shall be an elector (registered voter) of the District.

I have read, and I certify, that all the information on this form is true and correct and I meet the requirements listed above. Furthermore, if appointed, I agree to faithfully attend the meetings and adhere to the State laws, County ordinances, and adopted Bylaws that govern the Board or Commission on which I am appointed to serve. Additionally, I have read the County’s Conflict of Interest Ordinance (No. 462, November 2007) and do not have any inherent conflicts in serving on the Board or Commission to which I have applied. I agree to abide by this Ordinance.

Signature: __________________________ Date: 10-2-18
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WHEREAS, The Grand County Council recognizes there is a need to create an appointment process for appointing volunteer board members and commissioners to the various boards and commissions serving Grand County, as well as Local District and Special Service District non-elected boards, the Housing Authority of Southeastern Utah board and the Southeastern Utah District Health Department board ("Boards"), and

WHEREAS, The Grand County Council recognizes there is a need for all Boards to have the same general requirements for board members and commissioners including those required by law, and

WHEREAS, The Grand County Council shall approve all appointments to Boards that are under the authority of the Grand County Council supported by ordinance, resolution, or ordered by state law, and

WHEREAS, The Boundary Commission, under the authority of the Grand County Council, is authorized to make appointments to their Commission as specified in the enabling documents, and

WHEREAS, The County Committees established by resolution under the authority of the Grand County Council are each authorized to make appointments to their committees, if needed, as specified in each such enabling resolution, or as amended. County volunteer committees include Moab Tailings Project Steering Committee, Old Spanish Trail Arena Advisory Committee (with terms), Sand Flats Stewardship Committee, Star Hall Advisory Committee, and Trail Mix Committee and other committees as they may be established by the County Council from time to time.

NOW THEREFORE, THE GRAND COUNTY COUNCIL RESOLVES AS FOLLOWS:

All Board appointments shall be selected in the following manner:

1. By October 1st the Council Office shall notify the current Board of those members whose terms will expire at the end of the calendar year. In cases where a vacancy is created during the middle of a board member's term (mid-term vacancy), the Council Office shall notify the respective Board of the vacancy and post a notice of the vacancy as soon as practically possible.

2. The Grand County Council Office shall post a notice of Board vacancies, including mid-term vacancies, in a local newspaper of record, bulletin boards within the County Courthouse, and on the County's website. The published notice shall list general requirements for serving on the
Board(s) and shall be open until filled, unless the board member whose term expires at year-end expresses in writing their desire to remain on the Board until the vacancy is filled, beyond year-end. The notice shall identify an application due date, after which the Council Office shall forward all submitted applications for review and consideration, including interview of new applicants, by the respective Board for recommendation to the County Council.

3. Interested residents shall submit an official Board, Commission, and Committee Certification and Application Form ("Application") contained in Exhibit 1 of this Resolution to the Council Office. The Application may be utilized by Committees yet does not apply to those Committees in which membership is attained without appointment.

4. The Council Office shall receive by personal delivery, mail or email all Applications which shall be stamped with the date received. The Council Office shall review that the Applications have been completed and that the applicants meet the requirements for service to the requested Board, and forward all Applications that appear to meet the requirements for service to the appropriate Board Chair and/or staff liaison to the Board for verification of meeting the requirements and consideration for appointment.

5. Boards shall interview all new qualified applicants (Council may be invited to interviews).

6. During the interview process the Board Members are encouraged to ask questions that verify an applicant's eligibility of meeting requirements for service contained in this Resolution and other adopted documents including but not limited to: state law, county ordinance, and adopted bylaws of the Board to ascertain an applicant's qualifications for appointment. The Boards forward recommendation(s) by motions which contain findings as to their recommendation to the County Council; such affirmative Board recommendations shall be in writing from the Board Chair or staff liaison, addressed to the County Council, and provided to the Council Office within seven (7) days of the adopted motion and within ninety (90) days' receipt of applications.

7. The County Council, at the next regular meeting in which appointments may be considered shall appoint a recommended applicant, or an applicant of the Council's choice, or keep the position open to consider additional applicants. Year-end appointments shall be considered by the County Council after January 1st of the following year.

8. Since the County Council will not have appointed a new member to the Board at the expiration of term, the current board member, if willing and able to continue to serve, shall express in writing their desire to remain on the Board until they are replaced. If such board member is unwilling or unable to remain on the Board, or if such board member does not timely express in writing their desire to remain on the Board until they
are replaced, then the position is considered vacant at the expiration of term, until filled.

9. In the event that an ordinance is in conflict with this resolution, the ordinance shall prevail.

General Board Member Requirements:

- Must be a Grand County Resident unless otherwise indicated by Ordinance, Land Use Code, or Board Bylaws approved by the County Council.
- Terms shall be for four years, unless a shorter or longer period is required by law; a mid-term vacancy is a partial term.
- All terms shall end December 31st with the new member taking office the first meeting following appointment by the County Council. Upon Council Office receipt of affirmative written Board member recommendation(s), annual year-end appointments shall be made in the first January County Council meeting of the following year.
- Board Members shall have the appropriate expertise when required by law.
- Submit applications to the Council Office in accordance with the requirements contained in the notice.
- Agree to abide by the County’s Conflict of Interest Ordinance.

Special Service District Board Member Requirements:

Special Service District Board Members shall meet the requirements of this section and the current applicable state code requirements.

- No appointed member of the Board may be a full or part-time employee of the district while serving on the Board.
- No person employed by a special service district as a full-time or part-time employee may serve on the governing Board of the district.
- A board member may not be compensated separately as a board member and as an employee for providing the same service.
- Each trustee/board member appointed by the County legislative body shall be an elector of the district.
- Some districts require board member residency within the district’s geographical boundaries.

IT IS FURTHER RESOLVED THAT:

Boards are encouraged to amend their Bylaws to reflect the established appointment process and requirements.

Members who are currently serving on Boards who do not meet the requirements stated in this document shall be replaced once their term is completed.
APPROVED THIS 17th DAY OF DECEMBER, 2013, BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

Those voting aye: Ciarus, Holyoak, Paxman, Jackson, Tubbs, Ballantyne, Nyland
Those voting nay: _____________________
Absent: ________________________________

ATTEST: GRAND COUNTY COUNCIL

Diana Carroll, Clerk/Auditor

Gene Ciarus, Chair
EXHIBIT 1: APPLICATION
Instructions: Complete and sign this form and return it to Grand County Council Office, 125 E. Center St., Moab, UT 84532; fax: 435-259-2574; or council@grandcountyutah.net

Board or Commission Applied For: ____________________________

Name: ____________________________________________________

Mailing Address: __________________________________________________________________________

City: ___________________ State: ___________ ZIP Code: ______

Day Phone: _______________ Email Address: ______________________

In what year did you establish your current residency in Grand County? ______ (residency is required for all Boards; some District boards require residency within the District, which may not include Moab City limits; two years’ residency prior to assuming board membership is required for Planning Commission)

If not Grand County, which county do you reside in? (applicable for Historical Preservation Commission and Housing Authority of Southeastern Utah) __________________________________________

Occupation or professional training: ________________________________

List your work experience that is relevant to your application for a position on the Board or Commission for which you are applying (if needed, attach a separate page):

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
List your non-work experience that is relevant to your application for a position on the Board or Commission for which you are applying:

________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

Grand County Resolution 3007 (December 2013) contains the following Board Member requirements:

- Must be a Grand County resident unless otherwise indicated in Board Bylaws or Ordinance approved by the County Council;
- Terms shall be for four years, unless a shorter period is required by law, or unless a mid-term vacancy is being filled;
- All terms shall end December 31st with the new member taking office the first meeting following appointment by the County Council. Such year-end appointments shall be made in the first January County Council meeting of the following year;
- Board Members shall have the appropriate expertise when required by law;
- Submit applications to the Council’s Office in accordance with the requirements contained in the notice;
- Agree to abide by the County’s Conflict of Interest Ordinance.

Additionally, the State Code has the following requirements for Special Service Districts in Grand County:

- No appointed member of the Board may be a full or part-time employee of the District while serving on the Board;
- No person employed by a Special Service District as a full-time or part-time employee may serve on the Governing Board of the District;
- A Board Member may not be compensated separately as a Board Member and as an employee for providing the same service;
- Each Trustee/Board Member appointed by the County legislative body shall be an elector (registered voter) of the District.

I have read, and I certify, that all the information on this form is true and correct and I meet the requirements listed above. Furthermore, if appointed, I agree to faithfully attend the meetings and adhere to the State laws, County ordinances, and adopted Bylaws that govern the Board or Commission on which I am appointed to serve. Additionally, I have read the County’s Conflict of Interest Ordinance (No. 462, November 2007) and do not have any inherent conflicts in serving on the Board or Commission to which I have applied. I agree to abide by this Ordinance.

Signature: __________________________ Date: ___________________
ORDINANCE NO. 462

AN ORDINANCE ESTABLISHING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR CONFLICTS OF INTERESTS OF GRAND COUNTY OFFICERS

WHEREAS, it is the intent of Grand County Government to promote confidence in County government and ensure that citizens of the community are represented in a fair and impartial manner by public officers who do not have a personal financial interest in items under consideration before the County.

WHEREAS, Grand County also desires that County officers adhere to standards of conduct and ethics higher than those minimums set forth in the County Officers and Employees Disclosure Act (hereinafter the “Act”), under Utah Code Ann. § 17-16a-1 et seq.

BE IT THEREFORE ORDAINED, by the County Council of Grand County, Utah, that the following provisions are enacted to establish rules of procedure for the conduct of County elected and appointed County officers.

1. Each officer who is a member of the County Council, Planning Commission, Service District, or any other public body of Grand County, including all Boards and Commissions is required to disclose to that body a conflict of interest prior to consideration, in any public meeting or hearing before such public body, of any action on a matter in which the officer has a conflict of interest. For the purposes of this ordinance a conflict of interest exists if the officer or his or her: parent, sibling, other member of the same household, a client, or employer meets one or more of the following criteria:

   A. Is required to disclose a conflict of interest as required and defined by the Act in Utah Code Ann. § 17-16a-3; however, notwithstanding the provisions of said Act, the following provisions shall also apply.
   B. Has an ownership interest in a business having matters under proper consideration before the public body.
   C. Has an ownership interest in a piece of property for which zoning, conditional use or development approvals are under consideration.
   D. Represents as an agent, provides a professional service, or is a paid advisor to an individual or organization with matters under consideration before the public body.

Each officer with a conflict of interest as defined above shall be required to disclose such conflict to the public body on which that officer participates prior to consideration of the matter. Officers with a conflict of interest may not attempt to influence other public officers or appointed staff outside of the meeting.

2. An officer of the County Council, Planning Commission or other public body of Grand County who is required by Paragraph 1 above to disclose a conflict of interest shall recuse himself or herself from participating in, commenting on, or voting on the matter in which such conflict exists. If the officer insists on voting, his or her vote shall be recorded in the minutes as
Ordinance No. 462

an abstention. In determining whether a vote is tied or a matter is adopted, the abstention vote shall be treated as if the member were absent from the meeting.

3. A public officer with a conflict of interest as defined above may attend meetings of other public bodies of which he or she is not a member and at which the matter creating the conflict is considered. Such an officer may speak on the matter under consideration, only after first declaring a conflict of interest and explaining the nature of the conflict.

4. Any provisions of this ordinance that are more restrictive than the those of the Act may be suspended by the County Council, Planning Commission, or other Board, Commission, or Committee of Grand County if the body hears the nature of the conflict of interest and a 2/3 majority of the remaining body assembled agree by affirmative vote that said conflict of interest under this Ordinance should not prohibit conflicted officer from participating, commenting and voting during the meeting, and such a vote shall suspend the prohibiting provision.

5. Any officer who shall intentionally fail to disclose a potential conflict as defined in Paragraph 1 shall be guilty of a misdemeanor offense in accordance with Utah Code Ann. § 17-16a-10, for which violation that officer shall be subject to removal from office and/or dismissal from county employment pursuant to the Act.

6. This ordinance shall take effect immediately upon passage by majority affirmative vote.

PASSED, ADOPTED, AND APPROVED by the Grand County Council in open session this 20th day of November, 2007, by the following vote:

Those voting aye: Lewis, Holyoak, Ciarus, Greenberg, McNeely, Graham
Those voting nay: ________________________________
Those voting absent: Langianese__________________________

GRAND COUNTY

Jim Lewis, County Council Chair

ATTEST

Diana Carroll, Clerk Auditor
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE:</th>
<th>Approving Volunteer Appointment(s) to District and County Boards and Commissions: 2. Historical Preservation Commission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FISCAL IMPACT:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESENTER(S):</td>
<td>Council Member Halliday, Council Liaison for the Board</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RECOMMENDATION:**
I move to approve the appointment of Resford Rouzer with term expiring 12/31/2022, to serve on the Historical Preservation Commission and authorize the Chair to sign all associated documents.

**BACKGROUND:**
The Historical Preservation Commission met in an open meeting and interviewed one application submitted for two open vacancies as of 12/31/2018. The Board voted to forward the recommendation of applicant Resford Rouzer to County Council for appointment, with term expiring 12/31/2022.

No other applications have been received.

Resolution No. 3007 established a board appointment process and requirements of board members, commissioners, and committees. Board Members agree, in signing the application, to abide by Conflict of Interest Ordinance No. 462.

**ATTACHMENT(S):**
1. Board recommendation (To be provided)
2. Applications received
Board, Commission, Committee & Special Service District Application & Certification From

Board, Commission, Committee & Special Service District Application & Certification From

*Instructions: Complete and sign this form and return it to Grand County Council Office, 125 E. Center St., Moab, UT 84532; fax: 435-259-2574; or council@grandcountyutah.net*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board, Commission, Committee or Special Service District Applied For:</th>
<th>Historical Preservation Commission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Name: | Resford Victor Rouzer |
| Mailing Address: | 270 Stewart Lane |
| City: | Moab |
| State: | UT |
| Zip Code: | 84532 |
| Day Phone: | 4352601902 |
| Email Address: | resford1@gmail.com |

**In what year did you establish your current residency in Grand County?**

I was born in Moab and lived here until 2005. I returned and established my current residency in October 2015.

**If not Grand County, which county do you reside in?**

UT

**Occupation or professional training:**

I am the recruitment coordinator at Canyonlands Field Institute. I have bachelor degrees in Anthropology and Environmental Studies and in 2014 completed a masters degree in Environmental Humanities. All my degrees were earned at the University of Utah.

**List your work**

In December of 2014 I completed a masters degree from the University of Utah in Environmental Humanities. The focus of
my thesis was to look closely at the history and opinions of local Moabites and how they felt about the possibility of the Greater Canyonlands Monument Proposal. To do this I conducted a series of nine oral histories of individuals throughout the community of Moab for my primary resources.

Listening has been one of my primary ways of learning about the history of Grand County. Throughout my life I have been lucky to have known many folks in Moab that have shared their history with me in both a personal and professional level. I have also spent a great deal of time going through the Museum of Moab’s oral history collection for my own research.

Grand County Resolution 3007 (December 2013) contains the following Board Member requirements:

- Must be a Grand County resident (unless otherwise noted);
- Terms shall be for four years, unless a shorter period is required by law, or unless a mid-term vacancy is being filled;
- All terms shall end December 31st with the new member taking office the first meeting in January of the following year;
- Board Members shall have the appropriate expertise when required by law;
- Submit applications to the Council’s Office in accordance with the requirements contained in the notice;
- Agree to abide by the County’s Conflict of Interest Ordinance.

Additionally, the State Code has the following requirements for Special Service Districts in Grand County:

- No appointed member of the Board may be a full or part-time employee of the District while serving on the Board;
- No person employed by a Special Service District as a full-time or part-time employee may serve on the Governing Board of the District;
- A Board Member may not be compensated separately as a Board Member and as an employee for providing the same service;
- Each Trustee/Board Member appointed by the County legislative body shall be an elector (registered voter) of the District.

I have read, and I certify, that all the information on this form is true and correct and I meet the requirements listed above. Furthermore, if appointed, I agree to faithfully attend the meetings and adhere to the State laws, County ordinances,
and adopted Bylaws that govern the Board or Commission on which I am appointed to serve. Additionally, I have read the County’s Conflict of Interest Ordinance (No. 462, November 2007) and do not have any inherent conflicts in serving on the Board or Commission to which I have applied. I agree to abide by this Ordinance.

Applicant Certification

By checking this box and typing my name below, I am electronically signing my application.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Resford</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middle Initial</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Rouzer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>9/13/2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Email not displaying correctly? View it in your browser.
AGENDA SUMMARY
GRAND COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING
JANUARY 15, 2019

Agenda Item: K-3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE:</th>
<th>Approving Volunteer Appointment(s) to District and County Boards and Commissions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Noxious Weed Control Board</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| FISCAL IMPACT: | None |

| PRESENTER(S): | Council Member Paxman, Council Liaison to the Board |

RECOMMENDATION:
I move to approve the appointment of Sena Hauer to serve on the Noxious Weed Control Board, with term expiring 12/31/2022 and authorize the Chair to sign all associated documents.

BACKGROUND:
The Noxious Weed Control Board met in an open meeting and reviewed one application submitted for one open vacancy. The Board voted to forward the recommendations of applicant Sena Hauer to the County Council for appointment, with terms expiring 12/31/2021.

No other applications were received.

Resolution No. 3007 establishes a board appointment process and requirements of board members, commissioners, and committees. Board Members agree, in signing the application, to abide by Conflict of Interest Ordinance No. 462.

Upon appointment, the Council’s Office will mail the appointees a letter congratulating them and inviting them to a training/orientation to be scheduled for 2019.

ATTACHMENT(S):
1. Board recommendation
2. Applications received
January 7, 2018

Grand County Council
125 E. Center Street
Moab, UT 84532

Re: Weed Board Recommendation Letter

Dear Grand County Council Members:

The Weed Board received one application for one open vacancy. The Weed Board met on January 7, 2019 and interviewed the one candidates, Sena Hauer.

On January the Weed Board met in an open meeting and voted unanimously to recommend to Council Sena Hauer term ending December 31, 2022.

Thank you,

Tony Mancuso, Vice chair
Board and Commission Application and Certification Form

Instructions: Complete and sign this form and return it to Grand County Council Office, 125 E. Center St., Moab, UT 84532; fax: 435-259-2574; or council@grandcountyutah.net

Board or Commission Position Applied For: Weed Board

Name: Sena Hauer

Mailing Address: PO Box 696

City: Moab  State: UT  ZIP Code: 84532

Day Phone: 435-260-1582  Email Address: sena@ymail.com

In what year did you establish your current residency in Grand County? 1963
(residency is required for all Boards; some District boards require residency within the District, which may not include Moab City limits; two years' residency prior to assuming board membership is required for Planning Commission)

If not Grand County, which county do you reside in? (applicable for Historical Preservation Commission and Housing Authority of Southeastern Utah) __________

Occupation or professional training: Journalist  Ranch owner

List your work experience that is relevant to your application for a position on the Board or Commission for which you are applying (if needed, attach a separate page):

Land owner where weeds are prevalent.

________________________
________________________
________________________
________________________
________________________
________________________

Council’s Office · 125 E. Center St. · Moab, UT 84532 · (435) 259-1346 · www.grandcountyutah.net
List your non-work experience that is relevant to your application for a position on the Board or Commission for which you are applying:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Grand County Resolution 3007 (December 2013) contains the following Board Member requirements:

- Must be a Grand County resident (unless otherwise noted);
- Terms shall be for four years, unless a shorter period is required by law, or unless a mid-term vacancy is being filled;
- All terms shall end December 31st with the new member taking office the first meeting in January of the following year;
- Board Members shall have the appropriate expertise when required by law;
- Submit applications to the Council's Office in accordance with the requirements contained in the notice;
- Agree to abide by the County's Conflict of Interest Ordinance.

Additionally, the State Code has the following requirements for Special Service Districts in Grand County:

- No appointed member of the Board may be a full or part-time employee of the District while serving on the Board;
- No person employed by a Special Service District as a full-time or part-time employee may serve on the Governing Board of the District;
- A Board Member may not be compensated separately as a Board Member and as an employee for providing the same service;
- Each Trustee/Board Member appointed by the County legislative body shall be an elector (registered voter) of the District.

I have read, and I certify, that all the information on this form is true and correct and I meet the requirements listed above. Furthermore, if appointed, I agree to faithfully attend the meetings and adhere to the State laws, County ordinances, and adopted Bylaws that govern the Board or Commission on which I am appointed to serve. Additionally, I have read the County's Conflict of Interest Ordinance (No. 462, November 2007) and do not have any inherent conflicts in serving on the Board or Commission to which I have applied. I agree to abide by this Ordinance.

Signature: ___________________________ Date: 1/2/19
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSIGNMENT</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Rep/Liaison</th>
<th>Meeting Dates &amp; Times</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Airport Board</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Rory (Alt.- Jaylyn)</td>
<td>1st Mon @ 5pm (if the Monday falls on a Holiday, it will be the following Monday)</td>
<td>Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arches SSD Board</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Evan</td>
<td>3rd Thurs; monthly @ 4pm</td>
<td>Fairfield Inn &amp; Suites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mary, Jaylyn, Curtis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary Commission</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Jaylyn</td>
<td>as needed, at least once a year</td>
<td>Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Advisory Board</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Jaylyn</td>
<td>as needed</td>
<td>Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Codes Board of Appeals</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Evan</td>
<td>as needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canyonlands Healthcare SSD Board (CHCSSD)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Jaylyn</td>
<td>1st Thurs monthly @ 5:30pm, except for Jan &amp; July will be 2nd Thursday</td>
<td>Hospital room 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catastrophic Wildfire Initiative, Governor's</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Greg</td>
<td>as needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCP (Canyon Country Partnership)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>All day: Mar 21, Apr 25, Jun 27, Aug 22, Oct 24, Dec 5</td>
<td>Regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery Maintenance District Board</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Evan</td>
<td>2nd Tues @ 6pm, &amp; Dec, Mtg @ 5:30pm</td>
<td>Dist Ofc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Rory</td>
<td>last wed. @ 8:30am</td>
<td>Zions Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Justice Center (CJC) Advisory Board</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Semi-annually 3rd Wed of Feb 21 &amp; Aug 15 @ 12pm</td>
<td>Fire Dept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation District, Grand County</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>2nd Tues @ 2pm</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council on Aging Board</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Terry</td>
<td>2nd Mon every other month, starting Feb @ 12:30pm</td>
<td>Grand Ctr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development Corporation of Utah</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Curtis</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Medical Services SSD</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Evan</td>
<td>1st Monday of every month. September meeting will be 2nd Monday. 9am</td>
<td>EMS trg Rm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Agencies Liaison</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Curtis (Alt. Greg)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>BLM Field Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film Commission Committee</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Curtis</td>
<td>as needed</td>
<td>City Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Preservation Commission (HPC)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Greg (Alt.- Mary)</td>
<td>2nd Fri @ 10:00am every other month beginning in January</td>
<td>Grand Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless Coordinating Committee</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>2nd Wed @1:00pm; monthly</td>
<td>Zions Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Authority Board (HASU)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Jaylyn</td>
<td>3rd Thur @ 12PM</td>
<td>City Chmbrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Task Force, Interlocal</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Terry</td>
<td>First Thurs @ 11AM every month</td>
<td>Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Leader Board (GC School District)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jaylyn</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Board</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Evan</td>
<td>2nd Thurs @ 5:30pm every other month, beginning January</td>
<td>Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Emergency Planning Committee (LEPC)/HAZ</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Greg</td>
<td>11:30 am quarterly on Mar 19, Jun 21, Sep 20, except Dec 19 mtg @ 3:30pm</td>
<td>Fire Dept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health Board (Four Corners)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Jaylyn</td>
<td>4th Wed @ 2:45pm every other month; Jan, Mar, May, Jul, Sep, Nov</td>
<td>Green Rvr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moab Tailings Project Steering Committee (MTP)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Mary, (Alt.- rory)</td>
<td>4th Tues @ 3PM Jan 22, April 23, July 23, &amp; Oct 29</td>
<td>Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosquito Abatement District Board (MMAD)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Terry</td>
<td>1st Monday @ 5:30pm except no mtg in Jan</td>
<td>Dist Ofc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum of Moab</td>
<td></td>
<td>Greg</td>
<td>3rd Wed of the month @ 5:30 pm</td>
<td>Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSTA Advisory Committee</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Rory</td>
<td>2nd Tues @ 5:30pm</td>
<td>OSTA Conf Rm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Review Committee</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Rotating</td>
<td>Monthly (typically 3rd Thurs @ 1:30pm)</td>
<td>Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Commission</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Terry</td>
<td>2nd &amp; 4th Thurs @ 5pm; monthly</td>
<td>Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health Board (Health Department)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Jaylyn</td>
<td>4th Tuesday; every other month beg. Jan; 5-7pm</td>
<td>Green Rvr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Name</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Frequency and Details</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation SSD Board</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Terry</td>
<td>3rd Wed @ 7PM, except Nov. &amp; Dec. are 2nd Wed.</td>
<td>City Chmbrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand Flats Stewardship Committee</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Evan</td>
<td>2nd Thurs @ 3pm quarterly beginning in March</td>
<td>EMS trg Rm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEUALG (Southeastern Utah Association of Local Govt)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Jaylyn</td>
<td>4th Thurs @ 1pm with occasional date changes</td>
<td>Price/Moab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste Management SSD Board</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>2nd Thurs @ 4pm, No meeting in July and December's meeting will start at 5pm</td>
<td>District Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Service Water District Board (GWSSA)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Terry</td>
<td>1st &amp; 3rd Thurs @ 7pm</td>
<td>Water Dist Ofc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Star Hall Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>as needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson Springs Fire District Board</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Greg</td>
<td>3rd Tuesday of the month, 4pm</td>
<td>Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson SSD (Water) Board (Elected)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Greg</td>
<td>2nd Thurs @ 7pm</td>
<td>Thompson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail Mix Committee</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Evan</td>
<td>2nd Tues @ 11am</td>
<td>Grand Ctr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation SSD Board</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Greg</td>
<td>2nd Tues @ 6:00pm</td>
<td>Road Shed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Council Advisory Board, Moab Area</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Jaylyn, Rory</td>
<td>2nd Tues @ 3:00pm - no July meeting</td>
<td>Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USU - Moab Dean’s Advisory Board</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Curtis</td>
<td>2nd Thursday Monthly, 3-4PM</td>
<td>USU Moab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watershed Partnership, Moab Area</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>3rd Wed @ 1-3pm every other month; Jan, Mar, May, July, Sept &amp; Nov</td>
<td>Grand Ctr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weed Control Board, Noxious</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Rory</td>
<td>1st Mon @ 4pm every other month; Jan 7, March 4, May 6, July 1, Sept 9, Nov 4</td>
<td>Grand Ctr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AGENDA SUMMARY
GRAND COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING
JANUARY 15, 2019

Agenda Item: M

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE:</th>
<th>Approving volunteer appointment to the Budget Advisory Board for the Department Head position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FISCAL IMPACT:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESENTER(S):</td>
<td>Chairman Clapper</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ReCOMMENDATION:
I move to approve the appointment of Elaine Gizler, with term expiring 12/31/2020, to serve on the Budget Advisory Board, and authorize the Chair to sign all associated documents.

BACKGROUND:
The Budget Advisory Board was created by Ordinance, which was adopted on February 6, 2018.

The Board consists of seven persons:
- The County’s Auditor shall be a permanent member of the Board.
- The Board shall contain one additional County Elected Official who is not a Council member and not the Grand County Attorney.
- The Board shall contain two County Council members.
- The Board shall contain one non-elected County Department Head.
- The balance of the Board shall be comprised of the designated Grand County Budget Officer (if not one of the persons listed above) and any other registered Grand County voter(s) with a demonstrated interest in, or professional knowledge of budgeting and finance.

On December 7, 2018 and January 3, 2019, emails were sent out seeking applicants for the (one) Department Head vacancy. At this time, one application (Elaine Gizler) has been received.

ATTACHMENT(S):
1. Applicant Email/Application
I would like to apply for the open position on the Budget Advisory Board, having served on the first and most recent term, I have a better understanding of the process.

Best,

Elaine

Elaine Gizler
Executive Director
Moab Area Travel Council
P.O. Box 550
Moab, Utah 84532
435-259-1370
www.discovermoab.com
Facebook.com /discovermoab

"Yesterday is History ... Tomorrow is Mystery ... Today is a Gift"
Eleanor Roosevelt
| **Title:** | N. Ratifying the Vice Chair’s signature on a letter of support sent to Congressman John Curtis regarding his proposed Rural Broadband Permitting Efficiency Act of 2019  
O. Ratifying minor changes on Easement Agreement with San Juan County for the purpose of constructing a connector road to be used only for ingress, egress, utilities, and maintenance, previously approved on December 18, 2018  
P. Approving proposed letter of support for Arches National Park as an International Dark Sky designation  
Q. Approving proposed letter of support for Moab Area Community Land Trust for the New Market Tax Credit (NMTC) application |
| **Fiscal Impact:** | See Corresponding Agenda Summary, if any |
| **Presenter(s):** | None |

**Recommendation:**
I move to adopt the consent agenda as presented and authorize the Chair to sign all associated documents.

**Background:**
See corresponding agenda summary, if any, and related attachments.

**Attachment(s):**
See corresponding agenda summary, if any, and related attachments.
January 15, 2019

Honorable John Curtis  
US Congress  
Washington, DC 20585  
email: ryan.leavitt@mail.house.gov

Dear Congressman Curtis:

The Grand County Council recently received a summary of your proposed Rural Broadband Permitting Efficiency Act of 2019. After some discussion, the County Council expressed support of your efforts to streamline the deployment of broadband infrastructure in highway rights-of-way. We believe this will save time and money, driving efficiencies into the current permitting process.

Please consider this as a letter of support and gratitude from the Grand County Council located in Moab, Utah.

Sincerely,

[Terry Morse's signature]

Terry Morse, Vice Chair  
Grand County Council
Constitutional Authority Statement

To accompany:
Rural Broadband Permitting Efficiency Act of 2019

Pursuant to clause 7 of Rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statement is submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution
To allow certain State and tribal permitting authority to encourage expansion of broadband service to rural and tribal communities, and for other purposes.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. introduced the following bill, which was referred to the

A BILL

To allow certain State and tribal permitting authority to encourage expansion of broadband service to rural and tribal communities, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Rural Broadband Permitting Efficiency Act of 2019”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:
(1) BROADBAND PROJECT.—The term “broadband project” means an installation by a broadband provider of wireless or broadband infrastructure, including but not limited to, copper lines, fiber optic lines, communications towers, buildings, or other improvements on Federal land.

(2) BROADBAND PROVIDER.—The term “broadband provider” means a provider of wireless or broadband infrastructure that enables a user to originate and receive high-quality voice, data, graphics, and video telecommunications.

(3) INDIAN LANDS.—The term “Indian Lands” means—

(A) any land owned by an Indian Tribe, located within the boundaries of an Indian reservation, pueblo, or rancheria; or

(B) any land located within the boundaries of an Indian reservation, pueblo, or rancheria, the title to which is held—

(i) in trust by the United States for the benefit of an Indian Tribe or an individual Indian;

(ii) by an Indian Tribe or an individual Indian, subject to restriction against
alienation under laws of the United States;
or
(iii) by a dependent Indian community.

(4) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term "Indian Tribe" means a federally recognized Indian Tribe.

(5) OPERATIONAL RIGHT-OF-WAY.—The term "operational right-of-way" means all real property interests (including easements) acquired for the construction or operation of a project, including the locations of the roadway, bridges, interchanges, culverts, drainage, clear zone, traffic control signage, landscaping, copper and fiber optic lines, utility shelters, and broadband infrastructure as installed by broadband providers, and any rest areas with direct access to a controlled access highway or the National Highway System.

(6) SECRETARY CONCERNED.—The term "Secretary concerned" means—

(A) the Secretary of Agriculture (acting through the Chief of the Forest Service), with respect to National Forest System land; and

(B) the Secretary of the Interior, with respect to land managed by the Department of
the Interior (including land held in trust for an Indian Tribe).

3 SEC. 3. STATE OR TRIBAL PERMITTING AUTHORITY.

4 (a) In General.—The Secretary concerned shall est-
5ablish (or in the case where both Department of the Inte-
6rior and National Forest System land would be affected,
7shall jointly establish) a voluntary program under which
8any State or Indian Tribe may offer, and the Secretary
9concerned may agree, to enter into a memorandum of un-
10derstanding to allow for the State or Indian Tribe to pre-
11pare environmental analyses required under the National
12Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et
13seq.) for the permitting of broadband projects within an
14operational right-of-way on National Forest System land,
15land managed by the Department of the Interior, and In-
16dian Lands. Under such a memorandum of understanding,
17an Indian Tribe or State may volunteer to cooperate with
18the signatories to the memorandum in the preparation of
19the analyses required under the National Environmental

21(b) Assumption of Responsibilities.—

22(1) In General.—In entering into a memo-
23randum of understanding under this section, the
24Secretary concerned may assign to the State or In-
25dian Tribe, and the State or Indian Tribe may agree
to assume, all or part of the responsibilities of the
Secretary concerned for environmental analyses
under the National Environmental Policy Act of
1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

(2) STATE OR INDIAN TRIBE RESPONSIBILITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A State or Indian
Tribe that assumes any responsibility under
paragraph (1) shall be subject to the same pro-
cedural and substantive requirements as would
apply if the responsibility were carried out by
the Secretary concerned.

(B) EFFECT OF ASSUMPTION OF RESPONS-
IBILITY.—A State or Indian Tribe that as-
sumes any responsibility, including financial re-
ponsibility, under paragraph (1) shall be solely
responsible and solely liable for carrying out, in
lieu of the Secretary concerned, the responsibil-
ities assumed under that paragraph until the
date on which the program is terminated under
subsection (g).

(C) ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW.—A State
or Indian Tribe that assumes any responsibility
under paragraph (1) shall comply with the envi-
ronmental review procedures under parts 1500–
1508 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations), and the regulations of the Secretary concerned.

(3) FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY.—Any responsibility of the Secretary concerned described in paragraph (1) that is not explicitly assumed by the State or Indian Tribe in the memorandum of understanding shall remain the responsibility of the Secretary concerned.

c) OFFER AND NOTIFICATION.—A State or Indian Tribe that intends to offer to enter into a memorandum of understanding under this section shall provide to the Secretary concerned notice of the intent of the State or Indian Tribe not later than 90 days before the date on which the State or Indian Tribe submits a formal written offer to the Secretary concerned.

d) TRIBAL CONSULTATION.—Within 90 days of entering into any memorandum of understanding with a State, the Secretary concerned shall initiate consultation with relevant Indian Tribes.

e) MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING.—A memorandum of understanding entered into under this section shall—

(1) be executed by the Governor or the Governor's designee, or in the case of an Indian Tribe,
by an officer designated by the governing body of
the Indian Tribe;

(2) be for a term not to exceed 10 years;
(3) be in such form as the Secretary concerned
may prescribe;
(4) provide that the State or Indian Tribe—

(A) agrees to assume all or part of the re-
sponsibilities of the Secretary concerned de-
scribed in subsection (b)(1);

(B) expressly consents, including through
the adoption of express waivers of sovereign im-
munity, on behalf of the State or Indian Tribe,
to accept the jurisdiction of the Federal courts
for the compliance, discharge, and enforcement
of any responsibility of the Secretary concerned
assumed by the State or Indian Tribe;

(C) certify that State laws and regulations,
with respect to States, or Tribal laws and regu-
lations, with respect to Indian Tribes, are in ef-
fect that—

(i) authorize the State or Indian Tribe
to take the actions necessary to carry out
the responsibilities being assumed; and

(ii) are comparable to section 552 of
title 5, United States Code, including pro-
viding that any decision regarding the public availability of a document under the State laws is reviewable by a court of competent jurisdiction;

(D) agrees to maintain the financial resources necessary to carry out the responsibilities being assumed;

(E) agrees to provide to the Secretary concerned any information the Secretary concerned considers necessary to ensure that the State or Indian Tribe is adequately carrying out the responsibilities assigned to and assumed by the State or Indian Tribe;

(F) agrees to return revenues generated from the use of public lands authorized under this section to the United States annually, in accordance with the Federal Land Policy Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.); and

(G) agrees to send a copy of all authorizing documents to the United States for proper notation and recordkeeping;

(5) prioritize and expedite any analyses under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42
U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) under the memorandum of understanding;

(6) not be granted to a State on Indian Lands without the consent of the relevant Indian Tribe; and

(7) not be granted to an Indian Tribe on State lands without the consent of the relevant State.

(f) LIMITATION.—Nothing in this section permits a State or Indian Tribe to assume—

(1) any rulemaking authority of the Secretary concerned under any Federal law; and

(2) Federal Government responsibilities for government-to-government consultation with Indian Tribes.

(g) TERMINATION.—

(1) TERMINATION BY THE SECRETARY.—The Secretary concerned may terminate the participation of any State or Indian Tribe in the program established under this section if—

(A) the Secretary concerned determines that the State or Indian Tribe is not adequately carrying out the responsibilities assigned to and assumed by the State or Indian Tribe;

(B) the Secretary concerned provides to the State or Indian Tribe—
(i) notification of the determination of noncompliance; and

(ii) a period of at least 30 days during which to take such corrective action as the Secretary concerned determines is necessary to comply with the applicable agreement; and

(C) the State or Indian Tribe, after the notification and period provided under subparagraph (B), fails to take satisfactory corrective action, as determined by the Secretary concerned.

(2) TERMINATION BY THE STATE OR INDIAN TRIBE.—A State or Indian Tribe may terminate the participation of the State or Indian Tribe in the program established under this section at any time by providing to the Secretary concerned a notice of intent to terminate by not later than the date that is 90 days before the date of termination.

(3) TERMINATION OF MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING WITH STATE OR INDIAN TRIBE.—A State or an Indian Tribe may terminate a joint memorandum of understanding under this section at any time by providing to the Secretary concerned a
notice of intent to terminate by no later than the
date that is 90 days before the date of termination.

SEC. 4. FEDERAL BROADBAND PERMIT COORDINATION.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary concerned
shall establish a broadband permit streamlining team com-
prised of qualified staff under subsection (b)(4) in each
State or regional office that has been delegated responsi-

(b) MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after
the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary con-
cerned, in consultation with the National Conference
of State Historic Preservation Officers and the Na-
tional Tribal Historic Preservation Officers Associa-
tion, shall enter into a memorandum of under-
standing to carry out this section with—

(A) the Secretary of Agriculture or of the
Interior, as appropriate;

(B) the Director of the Bureau of Indian
Affairs; and

(C) the Director of the United States Fish
and Wildlife Service.

(2) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the memo-
randum of understanding under paragraph (1) is to
coordinate and expedite permitting decisions for broadband projects.

(3) STATE OR TRIBAL PARTICIPATION.—The Secretary concerned may request that the Governor of any State or the officer designated by the governing body of the Indian Tribe with one or more broadband projects be a party to the memorandum of understanding under paragraph (1).

(4) DESIGNATION OF QUALIFIED STAFF.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of entrance into the memorandum of understanding under paragraph (1), the head of each Federal agency that is a party to the memorandum of understanding (other than the Secretary concerned) may, if the head of the Federal agency determines it to be appropriate, designate to each State or regional office an employee of that Federal agency with expertise in regulatory issues relating to that Federal agency, including, as applicable, particular expertise in—

(i) planning under the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1600 et seq.) and planning under the Federal Land Policy
Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.);

(ii) the preparation of analyses under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.); or


(B) DUTIES.—Each employee designated under subparagraph (A) shall—

(i) be responsible for any issue relating to any broadband project within the jurisdiction of the State or regional office under the authority of the Federal agency from which the employee is assigned;

(ii) participate as part of the team of personnel working on one or more proposed broadband projects, including planning and environmental analyses; and

(iii) serve as the designated point of contact with any applicable State or Indian Tribe that assumes any responsibility under section 3(b)(1) relating to any issue described in clause (i).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE:</th>
<th>Ratifying minor changes on Easement Agreement with San Juan County for the purpose of constructing a connector road to be used only for ingress, egress, utilities, and maintenance, previously approved on December 18, 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FISCAL IMPACT:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESENTER(S):</td>
<td>Consent Agenda</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RECOMMENDATION:**
I move to approve the minor changes on Easement Agreement with San Juan County that were made on page 1 of the document, and authorize the Chair to sign all associated documents.

**BACKGROUND:**
Changes made:

1. Under Recitals, it should be “Whereas Grand County owns real property in San Juan County” (rather than the other way around). Both are true, but this agreement is referring to Grand County-owned property.
2. 3rd paragraph, the word “promises” is screwed up a bit, missing an “s.”
3. Paragraph 2C: Record of Survey Number: 1100 (instead of 1082). This is an update from SJ County Recorder’s Office.

**ATTACHMENT(S):**
1. Updated Easement Agreement
EASEMENT AGREEMENT

THIS AGREEMENT made and entered into this 18th day of December 2018, by and between SAN JUAN COUNTY, UTAH, a Utah Body Politic (hereinafter, "SAN JUAN") and GRAND COUNTY, UTAH, a Utah Body Politic (hereinafter, "GRAND").

RECITALS

WHEREAS, GRAND COUNTY owns certain real property within San Juan County, referred to as the Subject Area;

WHEREAS, SAN JUAN seeks a permanent easement for ingress and egress, utilities and the maintenance thereof, burdening the Subject Area, for the purpose of constructing a connector road to be used only for ingress, egress, utilities and the maintenance thereof, and shall be intended for public use.

In consideration of the mutual promises and obligations contained herein, GRAND and SAN JUAN hereby covenant and agree as follows:

1. Grant of Easement.

FOR GOOD AND VALUABLE CONSIDERATION, the receipt and sufficiency of which is hereby acknowledged, GRAND hereby grants to SAN JUAN, a permanent easement through and within the Subject Area, for the purpose of constructing a connector road to be used only for ingress, egress, utilities and the maintenance thereof, and shall be intended for public use.

The perpetual easement is hereby given for the purpose of constructing a connector road across the Subject Area owned by GRAND described as:

SE1/4NW1/4 of Section 1, T27S, R22E, SLM and more particularly described as: the southerly 100 feet of the SE1/4NW1/4 of Section 1, T27S, R22E, SLM, containing 3.03 acres.


A. GRAND shall maintain title and ownership while granting SAN JUAN the perpetual easement for the purpose of constructing a connector road.

B. Subject to any applicable costs or fees, GRAND shall have the right and option to connect to the easement for ingress, egress and utilities. As will future title holders of the parent parcel shall GRAND develop or sell the parent parcel.

C. Easement shall be evidenced by "Exhibit A" - "Grand to San Juan County Road/Utility Easement" Record of Survey Number: 1100 attached hereto and recorded in the office of the San Juan County Surveyor.
3. **Indemnity.**

SAN JUAN hereby agrees to indemnify, defend, save or hold harmless GRAND from any and all liability, loss or damage, GRAND may suffer as a result of any and all activities, claims, damages, costs, and expenses on account of, or in any way arising out of from this Agreement. This indemnity shall continue so long as this Easement Agreement is in effect.

4. **Attorneys Fees.**

In the event of any action between the GRAND and SAN JUAN for a breach of or to enforce any provision or right hereunder, the non-prevailing party in such action shall pay the prevailing party all costs and expenses, expressly including, but not limited to, reasonable attorneys fees and costs incurred by the successful party in connection with such action, including without limitation all fees and costs incurred on any appeal from such action or proceeding.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties enter into this Easement Agreement this 20th day of December, 2018.

GRANTOR:

GRAND COUNTY UTAH

ATTEST:

By: [Signature]

By: [Signature]

STATE OF UTAH )
) ss.
COUNTY of Grand )

ON THIS 20 day of December, 2018, before me, Bryony C. Hill, a notary public in and for said state, personally appeared [Signature], known or identified to me to be the Chairperson of [Grand County Council], and acknowledged to me that he/she executed the same.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my seal the day and year in this certificate first written above.

Bryony Hill

Notary Public in and for Utah

Notary Public Seal
Residing at: ______________________
Commission Expires: ________________

GRANTEE:
SAN JUAN COUNTY UTAH

ATTEST:

By: _______________________________

STATE OF UTAH )
COUNTY of San Juan )

ON THIS ___ day of _____________, 2018, before me,
____________________________________, a notary public in and for said state, personally
appeared ____________________________, known or identified to me to be the Chairperson
of ____________________________, and acknowledged to me that he/she executed the
same.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my seal the day and
year in this certificate first written above.

___________________________________________
Notary Public in and for Utah
Residing at: ______________________
Commission Expires: ________________
A Proposed Easement For Ingress, Egress, Utilities And The Maintenance Thereof
Within
SE1/4NW1/4 Section 1 - T27S, R22E, SLM

Surveyor's Narrative:
This survey was conducted at the request of the San Juan County Administrator. The purpose was to grant an easement for ingress and egress, utilities and the maintenance thereof.

Surveyor's Notes:
This parcel of land was previously surveyed by Kelvin Land Surveying in 2008 for an association of water districts in Grand County, Utah. The easement agreement is between Grand and San Juan Counties. The proposed easement would be for the construction and maintenance of a corridor used only for ingress, egress, utilities and the maintenance thereof.

Bearing Statement:
The bounds of bearing for this survey is the North line of the SE1/4NW1/4 of Section 1, T27S, R22E SLM as determined by Global Navigation Satellite System observations to bear North 89 degrees 55 minutes 16 seconds East.

Supporting Elements and Documents:
- Roll of Survey by Kelvin Land Surveying as recorded in Entry #102171 and filed in the office of the San Juan County Recorder.
- Grand County Resolution #293 as recorded in Entry #405171 and filed in the office of the San Juan County Recorder.
- San Juan County Resolution #337 as recorded in Entry #401303 and filed in the office of the San Juan County Recorder.
- San Juan County Road Easement recorded in Entry #101283 and filed in the office of the San Juan County Recorder.

Monument Notes:
All monuments found or set during the course of this survey are herein listed and are depicted in the legend.

Easement Description:
An easement to property for ingress, egress, utilities and the maintenance thereof, located within the SE1/4NW1/4 of Section 1, T27S, R22E SLM as shown on the attached map for use only for ingress, egress, utilities and the maintenance thereof.

Surveyor's Certificate:
I, Kent B. Carroll, do hereby certify that I am a Professional Land Surveyor as certified by the laws of the State of Utah and hold Utah Land Surveyor #437905-2201 in good standing. I further certify that this plat correctly represents a survey conducted by me and under my direction in the disengagement of my profession as the San Juan County Surveyor, and conforms with all the laws and accepted methods and procedures of land surveying.

Date: 12/04/17

Kent B. Carroll
Utah License Number: 437905-2201
January 15, 2019

To Whom It May Concern:

Please accept this letter of support for Arches National Park in conjunction with its application for International Dark Sky Park designation. As you are probably well aware, Arches National Park is the most iconic land area within Grand County and unique to southeastern Utah. It is a fundamental component of our local history, culture, lifestyle, and economy. The Grand County Council is proud to have Arches National Park as a partner, and wholeheartedly supports its effort to achieve IDA Dark Sky Park status.

Grand County is also working to implement changes that preserve dark skies in the Park and surrounding region. Our staff has participated in the Moab Dark Skies Working Group, which produces educational material, community events, primary data collection and research, and policy advice. The Grand County Planning Commission will soon review draft changes to our outdoor lighting and sign illumination codes as a way to protect dark skies in the Colorado Plateau. The National Park Service, Bureau of Land Management, Utah State Parks, City of Moab, Grand County, and other governmental agencies, with help from our businesses and citizens, are collectively working to enhance southeast Utah’s status as a high quality dark sky region.

We encourage the IDA to approve Arches National Park’s request for dark sky status. Alongside their request, we too commit to supporting the policies, programs, and activities that accompany the designation.

Sincerely,

Evan Clapper, Chair
Grand County Council
January 15, 2019

To whom it may concern,

Access to attainable, affordable housing is one of the Grand County Council’s highest priorities. It is inexplicably linked to community infrastructure, economic development, public health, and safety, yet housing affordability continues to decline. The imbalance between supply and demand in our local housing market has resulted in extremely high housing costs that continue to rise. Currently, more than half of households earning eighty percent (80%) of the Area Median Income (AMI) are cost burdened, meaning they spend more than thirty percent (30%) of their monthly income on housing expenses. The median housing sales price has increased by more than $100,000 in the past ten years, yet local wages have remained stagnant.

To meet local population growth, the County’s 2017 Affordable Housing Plan identifies the need for more than a thousand new units by 2030 across all income levels. This number does not include the additional need for units for families tripled and quadrupled up in homes, living out of vehicles, or in extremely unaffordable housing conditions. The Plan outlines a myriad of strategies and actions to mitigate our current housing crisis, provide these necessary units, and reach our community vision by 2050 – to be a community that includes an affordable housing opportunity available to each resident of the Moab Area.

Thus, Grand County is pleased to support the New Market Tax Credit (NMTC) proposal submitted by the Moab Area Community Land Trust (MACLT). The Housing Plan explicitly prioritizes supporting and utilizing MACLT, and this development project of approximately three hundred units will bring the community substantially closer to reaching several of the goals outlined in the Plan, including, but limited to: creating and protecting enough affordable housing in the Moab Area so it is not a limiting factor for the community’s evolution; constructing a wider range of housing and development types, including attached dwellings and apartments; and providing a mix of ownership, rental, and seasonal housing opportunities.

Ensuring sufficient housing opportunities is critical to the health, wealth, and safety of our citizens. By fully funding this NMTC project, you are assisting our efforts to develop attainable, affordable housing opportunities for our local workforce across all price points, which will foster a stronger local economy and support a more vibrant, healthy, and safe community in Moab, Utah.

Sincerely,

Evan Clapper
Chair, Grand County Council
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sunday</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1    New Years Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:00AM EMS SSD (EMS Training Center)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11:00AM Trail Mix (Grand Center)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11:00AM Trail Mix (Grand Center)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1:00PM Homeless Coordinating Committee Meeting (Zions Bank)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5:30PM CHCSSD (Hospital)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10:00AM Historical Preservation Commission (Grand Center)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5:30PM Library Board Meeting (Library)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12:00PM Thompson Springs Special Service Fire District Mtg (Chambers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4:00PM Homeless Coordinating Committee Meeting (Zions Bank)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5:30PM CHCSSD (Hospital)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10:00AM Historical Preservation Commission (Grand Center)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1:00PM Library Board Meeting (Library)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12:00PM Thompson Springs Special Service Fire District Mtg (Chambers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4:00PM Homeless Coordinating Committee Meeting (Zions Bank)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5:30PM CHCSSD (Hospital)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10:00AM Historical Preservation Commission (Grand Center)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1:00PM Library Board Meeting (Library)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12:00PM Thompson Springs Special Service Fire District Mtg (Chambers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4:00PM Homeless Coordinating Committee Meeting (Zions Bank)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5:30PM CHCSSD (Hospital)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10:00AM Historical Preservation Commission (Grand Center)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1:00PM Library Board Meeting (Library)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12:00PM Thompson Springs Special Service Fire District Mtg (Chambers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4:00PM Homeless Coordinating Committee Meeting (Zions Bank)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5:30PM CHCSSD (Hospital)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10:00AM Historical Preservation Commission (Grand Center)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MLK day**

- 8:00AM County Offices Closed
- 2:45PM Mental Health Board (Four Corners) (Green River)
- 3:30PM Moab Tailings Project Steering Committee Meeting (Chambers)
- 5:00PM Health Board Meeting (Green River)
- 5:30PM Planning Commission (Chambers)
- 5:30PM Planning Commission (Chambers)

**New Years Day**

- 8:00AM County Offices Closed
- 9:00AM Swearing in New Elected Officials (Chambers)
- 4:00PM County Council Meeting (Chambers)
- 5:00PM Planning Commission (Chambers)
- 5:00PM Planning Commission (Chambers)
- 5:00PM Planning Commission (Chambers)
- 5:30PM OSTA Advisory Committee (OSTA Conference)
- 6:00PM Cemetery Maintenance District (Su...
- 6:00PM Cemetery Maintenance (District Office)
- 6:00PM Transportation S...

**2019 Calendar Summary**

- January 2019: 31 days
- February 2019: 28 days
- March 2019: 31 days
- April 2019: 30 days
- May 2019: 31 days
- June 2019: 30 days
- July 2019: 31 days
- August 2019: 31 days
- September 2019: 30 days
- October 2019: 31 days
- November 2019: 30 days
- December 2019: 31 days

**2020 Calendar Summary**

- January 2020: 31 days
- February 2020: 29 days (leap year)
- March 2020: 31 days
- April 2020: 30 days
- May 2020: 31 days
- June 2020: 30 days
- July 2020: 31 days
- August 2020: 31 days
- September 2020: 30 days
- October 2020: 31 days
- November 2020: 30 days
- December 2020: 31 days

**2021 Calendar Summary**

- January 2021: 31 days
- February 2021: 28 days (leap year)
- March 2021: 31 days
- April 2021: 30 days
- May 2021: 31 days
- June 2021: 30 days
- July 2021: 31 days
- August 2021: 31 days
- September 2021: 30 days
- October 2021: 31 days
- November 2021: 30 days
- December 2021: 31 days
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sunday</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **February 2019**
- **January 2019**
- **March 2019**
Employment Opportunities

**GCSO Corrections Officer**
Posted August 1, 2017 8:00 AM | Closes January 31, 2019 5:00 PM
Must Complete Sheriff's Office Application Click Here to Download Job Summary Under the supervision of the Assistant Jail Commander the Corrections Officer is a... [Full Description]

**GCSO Patrol Deputy**
Posted August 1, 2017 8:00 AM | Closes January 31, 2019 5:00 PM
Must Complete Sheriff's Office Application Click Here to Download Job Summary Under the direct supervision of the Patrol Supervisor the Deputy Sheriff... [Full Description]

**GCSO Victim Advocate**
Posted March 21, 2018 8:00 AM | Closes January 31, 2019 5:00 PM
Must Complete Sheriff's Office Application Click Here to Download Job Summary Under the supervision of the Sheriff the Victim Advocate will act as advocate... [Full Description]

**GCSO-Communications/Dispatch**
Posted January 26, 2018 8:00 AM | Closes January 31, 2019 5:00 PM
Must Complete Sheriff's Office Application Click Here to Download Job Summary Under the direct supervision of the Jail Commander the... [Full Description]

**Sand Flats Recreation Area - Technician I**
Posted January 10, 2019 8:00 AM | Closes January 25, 2019 5:00 PM
GENERAL PURPOSE Performs a variety of working level, skilled and semi-skilled duties related to visitor orientation and safety, resource protection, and facility... [Full Description] [Apply Online]

**Social Media Specialist (part-time) with Travel Council**
Posted January 10, 2019 8:00 AM | Closes January 25, 2019 5:00 PM
GENERAL PURPOSE Performs a variety of technical and creative duties related to designing, updating, and managing the Moab Area Travel Council social media platforms. ... [Full Description] [Apply Online]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Name</th>
<th>Permit Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JANUARY</td>
<td>26 Arches Ultra by Mad Moose Events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEBRUARY</td>
<td>16 Red Hot by Grass Roots Events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hi Ruth,

Thanks for following up on the prospect of reimbursement for the expenses and time involved with filling the Grand County Honey Bee Inspector position.

As you know counties in Utah are mandated by the state to provide a honey bee inspector if five or more beekeepers so request. The origins of inspection go back over 100 years, when the prevalence of a bee disease threatened the successful pollination of orchards and gardens.

In 2009 there were three beekeepers in Grand County and abundant evidence that American Foulbrood (AFB) disease and Varroa mites had wiped out many hives in the valley. It appears there was no bee inspector in Grand County for the previous several decades. Today that infected equipment has been destroyed, there is no evidence of AFB in Grand County, and there are roughly 50 beekeepers. Varroa mites are still very much a problem that demands education and outreach.

I am concerned that when I retire as inspector it will be difficult to find a replacement if the position remains voluntary and expenses continue to be incurred by the inspector.

Typical annual expenses

Annual state inspector conference mileage - 200-300 miles @ .54.5/mile - $100-$200
Annual inspection mileage - 200-300 miles @ .54.5/mile - $100-$200
Misc. expenses (alcohol, towels, postage, phone) - $100

Volunteer hours (travel, inspection, phone, education, outreach) – not recorded, easily >200

To my knowledge the average current county reimbursement for county bee inspectors in Utah is $1000-$2000.

Attached is my Annual Report for 2018.

Thank you,
Jerry

Jerry Shue
867 Rainbow Drive
On Thu, Oct 18, 2018 at 9:54 AM Ruth Dillon <rdillon@grandcountyutah.net> wrote:

Jerry,
We’re winding down on Council budget items. Chris Baird is the new Budget Officer (instead of Diana) and I’ve just remembered to ask him whether there is anything budgeted for it. He is planning to ask Diana. In the meantime, since you had made the case to Council to have a budget, can you provide a brief itemized list of what is needed? (schooling/conference registrations; travel; supplies; etc.). If needed, I can pull whatever document you had presented to Council.

Ruth

Ruth Dillon
Council Administrator
Grand County Council
125 E. Center St.
Moab, UT 84532
(435) 259-1347 work
(303) 949-6006 cell
New email: rdillon@grandcountyutah.net

The smallest act of kindness is worth more than the grandest intention. Transform intentions into acts. -Oscar Wilde
### AGENDA SUMMARY

**GRAND COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING**  
**JANUARY 15, 2019**

**Agenda Item: T**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>TITLE:</strong></th>
<th>Report on the activities of the Moab Area Responsible Recreation and Tourism (MARRT) working group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FISCAL IMPACT:</strong></td>
<td>N/A at this point in time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRESENTER(S):</strong></td>
<td>Liz Thomas – citizen appointee to the group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PREPARED BY:**  
COUNCILMEMBER  
JAYLYN HAWKS

**FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:**  
Attorney Review:  
N/A

**BACKGROUND:**

The Moab Area Responsible Recreation and Tourism (MARRT) working group serves as an ad hoc committee to research and propose a plan that utilizes transient room tax promotional money to promote responsible and sustainable recreation and tourism in Grand County.

By conservative estimates, Grand County hosts roughly 2.5 million visitors annually from around the globe. Unfortunately, this is placing our lands, our infrastructure, and our communities at a point that is beyond carrying capacity. Continued advertising at the currently escalating levels is detrimental to the quality of life for our residents. Simply stated: more advertising means more visitors, which leads to stressing our lands and our infrastructure to the breaking point, and unfortunately also necessitates more hotels and overnight rentals, which requires more workers, working at non-living wage jobs, competing for already scarce affordable workforce housing…perpetuating an ever-escalating cycle and its accompanying negative impacts for residents and visitors alike.

Addressing these issues requires a multi-pronged approach. This study group and the recommendations they will make are important facets of a strategy that will promote responsible and sustainable recreation and tourism in Grand County.
Funding to deal with homelessness in rural counties

Greater percent of TRT going to dealing with the impacts of tourism rather than promotion

Funding for protection of Dalton Springs and Willow Springs

Local Control of zoning

Local Control over OHV and UTV

Removal of restrictions on using internet advertising to determine if an overnight rental are properly licensed

Removing the box allowing for straight party vote on the ballot

Allowing for deed retraction on sweat equality
AGENDA SUMMARY
GRAND COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING
JANUARY 15, 2019

Agenda Item: V

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title:</th>
<th>Discussion on County Council pay raise approved December 18, 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Impact:</td>
<td>Savings of $139,237 in 2019 and an additional $139,237 in 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenter(s):</td>
<td>Council Member Paxman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BACKGROUND:**
The Grand County Council voted 5-0 on December 18, 2019 to raise their yearly compensation from $11,651 per year to $31,000 per year, and $36,425 per year for the Chair.

This pay raise was out of compliance with Title 2 of the Grand County code, (copy attached) established in 1992, which defined the operating principles and concepts of Grand County’s current form of government. That code states in part:

2.04.090 Role of the council.
Consistent with this plan’s provisions increasing the size and reducing the compensation of the council, it is the intent of this plan to establish the council as a citizen body whose members serve on a part-time basis primarily in a legislative, policy-making role, and membership on the council is not intended to be a full-time positions involving extensive day-to-day administrative oversight of county operations and functions.

Accordingly, it is expected that the council will implement this plan by using its power under Title 17, Utah Statutes, and other applicable general laws, to maintain and fully utilize an adequate, competent professional county staff to perform, administer and have day-to-day oversight over the county’s operations and functions, pursuant to general policies and directives promulgated by the council.

Previous Councils have known for years that their compensation was one of the lowest in the state, but as a result of the code establishing this current form of government, choose to limit any compensation adjustments to nothing more than Cost of Living adjustments to the original salary established in Title 2 of $700 per month.

The Grand County Budget Committee did not operate within the terms of Ordinance No. 572 (copy attached) that established its duties and functions as established on February 6, 2018 when it recommended this salary increase in its meeting on October 4, 2018. The Budget Advisory Committee was charged with providing budgetary advice while still being in full compliance with the duties and responsibilities of the Grand County Council as established and identified in Title 2 of Grand County code. This Charter Resolution states in part:

WHEREAS, the Grand County Council was established as a citizen body whose members are increased and compensation is reduced, and whose members serve on a part-time basis primarily in a legislative, policy making role per Grand County Code Ann Sec 02-04-09
The Grand County Council raised its compensation under the pretext of Resolution No XXX, (copy attached) dated August 16, 2016, which was not intended to apply to elected officials and was intended solely for the purposes of conducting a County employee salary compensation survey. That Resolution states in part:

A RESOLUTION OF THE GRAND COUNTY COUNCIL ESTABLISHING A MARKET BASED COMPENSATION EVALUATION PROCESS FOR WAGE ADJUSTMENTS AND RECLASSIFICATION OF POSITIONS.

WHEREAS, The Grand County Council recognizes the need to periodically evaluate and adjust wages and grade levels on a job by job basis in order to remain competitive in the labor market;

The Chair of the County Budget Advisory Committee re-iterated this position to the committee on September 5, 2018. From the minutes as follows (copy attached):

"Chairperson Baird explained that Elected Officials are not included in the Proposed Pay Pan. Evan inquired about the plan for reviewing Elected Officials salaries to address compensation issues. Chairperson Baird explained the typical process for reviewing Elected Officials salaries, which requires a public hearing."

This form of Grand County’s legislative body will only be in effect until the end of 2020, less than two years. At that point, under the provisions of HB 224, Grand County will embark on a new form of government compliant with Utah Statute. As part of the process for developing that new form of compliant government, a citizens committee of seven registered Grand County voters and citizens will be selected in the coming weeks to study and develop that form of government which will then be presented to the County voters this November for approval or rejection.

Part of that study committee’s role will be to determine what level of compensation the citizens of this county feel reasonable for the members of their new legislative body.

The actions of this Council on December 18, 2018 preclude the citizens of this county in making that determination for themselves, and it needs to be rescinded and put in the hands of citizens.

ATTACHMENT(S):
1. All emails sent to the Council regarding the approved pay raise
2. Copy of Title 2, Section 2.04.090 Role of the council
3. Copy of Ordinance 572: AN ORDINANCE FORMALLY ESTABLISHING THE GRAND COUNTY BUDGET ADVISORY BOARD AND DEFINING ITS DUTIES AND FUNCTIONS February 6, 2018
5. Copy of minutes from September 5, 2018 meeting of Budget Advisory Committee
I am disgusted and outraged by the vote to increase your own salaries by that much. Everyone who voted yes should be fired immediately and that's what I will be pushing for.
Dear County Council Members;

Imagine the surprise of Grand County residents when you recently voted yourselves pay raises that nearly tripled your yearly salaries. Perhaps a little perspective might be in order to point out the sheer audaciousness, capriciousness and arrogance of such an action, done at the end of the year, during the Christmas holiday season, and with a pathetic attempt at public notice or input.

Let’s start with the concept and resolution that created this current form of government you’re serving in. According to the resolution that set this form of government in place in 1992, as codified in Title 2 of the Grand County Code:

Section 2.04.090:
Role of the council
Consistent with this plan’s provisions increasing the size and reducing the compensation of the council, it is the intent of this plan to establish the council as a citizen body whose members serve on a part-time basis primarily in a legislative, policy-making role, and membership on the council is not intended to be a full-time positions involving extensive day-to-day administrative oversight of county operations and functions. Accordingly, it is expected that the council will implement this plan ... to maintain and fully utilize an adequate, competent professional county staff to perform, administer and have day-to-day oversight over the county’s operations and functions, pursuant to general policies and directives promulgated by the council. (Emphasis added)

Perhaps you should all read this resolution. It’s easily accessible on the County website. This resolution established the rate of pay at that time of $6000 per year. In January of 2017 you gave yourself a pay raise to $11,500 per year to compensate for cost-of-living since that time. That seemed reasonable to citizens and voters in the County. The pay raise you just unanimously approved for yourselves does not meet that reasonable standard by any stretch of the imagination.

According to the latest information for Grand County jobs from the Utah Department of Workforce Services web site:
Leisure and Hospitality: 38% of our jobs, average monthly wage of $2019.
Education Health and Social Service: 8% of jobs, average monthly wage of $2500.
Professional/Business: 7% of our jobs, average monthly wage of $2620.
Information Service: 1% of our jobs, average monthly wage of $2410.
So good work, you now make more money for your part-time jobs than 56% of our workers in Grand County do, most of them full-time jobs.

Now let’s talk about the citizen committee about to be formed to develop the Counties new form of government as required by HB224, passed by the Legislature this past March. Regardless of how we got there, and regardless of the outcome of the current lawsuit, a citizens committee is about to be formed, tasked with determining what Grand County’s new form of government will be, along with what the citizens believe to be a reasonable level of compensation for their new elected legislative body. So, what would possibly possess you to triple your salaries without any type of reasonable notice to the residents and voters of this county in lieu of what is about to happen with full citizen participation and notice? What possible motives were there to “gift” yourselves (as headlined in the recent Times-Independent front-page story), with such an enormous salary increase for what will essentially be your last two years in office?

And here is a new flash – you don’t work any harder than the 50-60 people who choose to serve their county on this Council in the past, who all knew you didn’t serve your community for profit. We served for our community, not for compensation. We all knew what the job paid before we ran for office. I worked 40+ hour weeks as Chair, I saw Gene Ciarus and Liz Tubbs work the same schedule as Chairs. I also saw us, and other members of the Council routinely work 20-30 hours per week when they weren’t chairing the Council. To suggest you somehow work any harder than past Councils is and insult to those who served before you.

Complete lack of transparency. You may choose to continue to deceive yourselves that this process was open to the public, but let’s look at that. I suppose some citizens may have been aware that for the past couple of years there has been an ongoing survey of comparative salaries for elected officials throughout the state, and how that corresponds to compensation for Grand County elected officials. I would guess something less than 5% of the residents were however aware of this. Most residents cast their ballots and then trust the elected officials to reach out to them if they are considering action as consequential as tripling their salaries! As near as I can tell you put one public notice, buried in the public notice section of the TI, that there would be a public hearing to consider compensation for elected officials. There was then one line, on page 4, of the TI’s article on the 2019 budget that simply indicated the Council was considering this type of pay raise. That was it as far as I know. No public news release with specific details, no reaching out by any of you on any social media platforms. Nothing. This, by any measure, and considering the magnitude of what you were doing, is perhaps as lacking in transparency as anything I’ve seen in the 26-year history of this form of government.

What do you do at this point? I strongly suggest you need to immediately apologize to the voters and residents of this county, much as the City Council did with their non-transparent changing of city planning and zoning regulations recently, and rescind this outrageous pay raise at your next regularly scheduled meeting. Leave it the upcoming citizens study committee to determine what level of compensation the citizens of this county should pay the members of whatever new legislative body they determine to be correct for Grand County residents. Honor what this current form of government was established to do. Anything less would be disgraceful and shameful. We’ll all be watching.

Lynn Jackson
Grand county taxpayer and resident and former County Council member
From: Ashley pedersen <ashleydawnpedersen@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 20, 2018 9:26 PM
To: Grand County Council <council@grandcountyutah.net>
Subject: Raise in wages for county council members

First I would like to say that I think you all deserve a raise for serving in this council... but I'm sorry I can't support a pay raise of this magnitude for a part time position that you've all chosen to do, knowing beforehand what the pay rate was. I thought serving in the council was more of a public service position? Not a full time salary career. I would also say that the lack of transparency is very troubling. Why wasn't there a much bigger, and more public conversation about this? Don't any of you care what the citizens think about this? I would suggest you rescind this outrageous amount of pay and agree on something closer to the $16,000 to $18,000 range. Use that money for something else that we desperately need.

Thank you for your time,

Ashley Oliver
Bryony Chamberlain

From: Heather Dowd <heather.dowd@jmmech.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 20, 2018 11:23 PM
To: Grand County Council <council@grandcountyutah.net>
Subject: Salary increase

-----Original Message-----
From: Heather Dowd <heather.dowd@jmmech.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 20, 2018 11:23 PM
To: Grand County Council <council@grandcountyutah.net>
Subject: Salary increase

I just wanted to voice my objection to the salary increase. I do feel you deserve a raise, but even doubling your salary would be a crazy. This much of an increase is just absurd. You were elected at a certain salary, and agreed to this job at that salary. Why now do you feel you deserve triple? Give yourself a raise sure, after all it’s a tough job, but be fair.

Heather Dowd
Bryony Chamberlain

From: Grand County Council
Sent: Wednesday, December 26, 2018 12:09 PM
To: Curtis Wells; Evan Clapper; Greg Halliday; 'Jaylyn Hawks (jhawks@grandcountyutah.net)'; 'Mary McGann (mmcgann@grandcountyutah.net)'; 'Rory Paxman (rpaxman@grandcountyutah.net)'; Terry Morse
Cc: Ruth Dillon; Diana Carroll; Chris Baird
Subject: FW: Pay Raise

From: cherrie dolphin <dolphinc61@hotmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, December 22, 2018 10:02 AM
To: Grand County Council <council@grandcountyutah.net>
Subject: Pay Raise

Dear Council,
I am appalled at your recent vote to increase your salary by an exorbitant amount. I and others have been blindsided by this. Please recede your vote at the next meeting and then if a raise is needed make it a reasonable one. Cherrie Dolphin
From: Belal Alkadimi <utahbelal@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, December 23, 2018 7:15 AM
To: Grand County Council <council@grandcountyutah.net>
Subject: Pay raise?

I would like to give myself one too

Belal (435) 259-2526
www.fencesandwelding.com
Gene Ciarus <glciarus@gmail.com>

Wednesday, December 26, 2018 4:02 PM
To: Grand County Council <council@grandcountyutah.net>
Subject: Letter to Council--Pay Raises

I have attached my concerns that address the pay increase approved for the council member. I had severed 8 on the council and have not seen such appalling action taken without taking it to the voters. The raises should be rescinded and if a raise is given it should be a modest one in line with cost of live adjusted. Please review the attachment.
I was shocked to see that you gave yourselves a triple raise for the county council. I as a small business owner cannot do that for my employees and I am sure you could not do it either if you were an employer, so why do it for yourselves? So much is literally milking us to death, as property owners, with our property taxes, that this is almost unmanageable! But it happened. My property taxes went up at least 4 thousand dollars this last year! Only about 6% of us even own property in Grand County. Look at the numbers. It is always stating that fact in the Times Independent. You should rescind this pay raise and make it at least tolerable to those of us who are going to have to pay for it!!!! I am really shocked and saddened that you would do this. Please reconsider.

Katherine F. Holyoak Grand County tax payer who is being bled to death with taxes!
From: Matthew Smith <mlssapphire@msn.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 27, 2018 8:27 PM
To: Grand County Council <council@grandcountyutah.net>
Subject: Your salary increase

Hello,
For the 2nd week in a row, Lynn Jackson has published some interesting observations concerning the recent pay increase that applies to you folks...do you have any thoughts/explanations to share with me???

Thanks, Matt

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone
I know that many past and present council members work their asses off for this community. I have no problem with council members getting raises, it's about time.

Kiley Miller
Grand County Council Members:

It never ceases to amaze me how this county/city gives "themselves" "raises" and not just a small percentage but over and above a "normal" increase! Do you guys think we have "money trees" growing in our yards?! Get a grip!

My opinion,
Susan Fedele
Dear County Council,

Lynn Jackson recently wrote an ill-tempered and foolish letter to the Tl, and prompted by that letter I'm writing you to say that I think the recent council pay increase was necessary and appropriate.

I've talked with many people about a possible County Council pay raise over the past five years. Over those many conversations, I've talked with exactly zero people who think a pay raise is not deserved. The one slightly negative comment I've heard is that council members who do little work will receive the same salary as council members who do a lot of work. This problem is inevitable, applies to all elected offices, and does not constitute a reason to keep pay low for public officials. (For example, incompetent County Clerks receive the same salary as competent County Clerks, but no one would argue that all County Clerks should receive a low salary because of this.)

Kevin Walker
Dear Chairwoman and Grand County Council,

I am responding to Lynn Jackson’s request to let you know how I feel about your recent raise.

NO ONE does what you are doing for the money. Each of you, whether I always agree with you or not :) , is doing it out of love and concern for Grand County and the town where we live. Aside from all the hours you put in outside the meetings, as a county council member in a very small town, your life is often not your own, whether you’re in a check out line at City Market, gassing up your car, walking your dog or whatever, and a citizen takes the opportunity to “share” their opinions with you. I know because I’m one of them.

So thank you for all you do, know that we are grateful ahead of time for all the decisions you will make to PROTECT what we have here in Grand in the coming year during this challenging growth spurt. Try to keep the partisanship to a minimum, maybe even inspire other counties to follow our lead. And forge ahead.

And the raise? You absolutely deserve it. I’d have written the check myself if I could have.

Feel free to share this with Mr. Jackson.

All the best in 2019,
Elizabeth Gore
Spanish Valley
Grand County
From: Sam Cushing <distanceproductions@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 31, 2018 1:13 PM
To: Grand County Council <council@grandcountyutah.net>
Subject: Nice pay raise

Can you please tell me what you all did over the last 2 years for the citizens of Moab to warrant a 280% self-voted pay raise?

-Sam C.
tax payer and workforce contributor
See attached

Bryony Hill
Council Office Coordinator
125 E. Center Street
Moab, UT 84532
435-259-1346
Dear County Council Members,

I want to first state my disclaimer- I am not currently living in Grand County. I have lived in Grand County off and on since 1992. I plan to live in Grand County again full time starting in June. I own a home in Grand County and pay taxes on it as a second home even though some years it is my primary residence. I have never rented out my home.

With disclaimers out of the way, I am writing to you concerning your recent pay raise approval. I am troubled to learn you nearly tripled your salaries. I know the State of Utah lays out minimal requirements for Cities and Counties to maintain a certain level of transparency. I understand that Grand County has fulfilled their State mandated transparency requirement in this pay raise proposal, vote and approval. I also know that the bar is pretty low and I have come to expect far better from Grand County.

I understand that Grand County Council members are not compensated your worth. I also understand other counties of similar size pay their representatives more than Grand County. That said, trying to equalize the pay gap in one fell swoop is more than the taxpayers are prepared to handle. Tripling your salaries may seem, to many of your constituents, egregious. Would you consider starting over on the pay raise issue? I understand you need a raise. And frankly, a raise is long overdue. We can start over and try an annual raise on a schedule to match your counterparts in other counties over a 10-year period.

Your tax paying constituents are already overly burdened. Grand County residents are forced to pay for public services (medical, police, roads and highways, sewer and water etc.) for a town 100 times our size when consideration is given to the number of visitors we experience. Furthermore, a disproportionate amount of Grand County residence are employed by the Federal government and are currently furloughed. Now is not the time for a modest raise, let alone a 250% raise. Now is the time for tax relief for residence effected by the government shut down. Citizens watch you as you vehemently debate transit room tax beneficiaries or the naming of Grandstaff/Negro Bill Canyon while our taxes continue to rise and 1 in 4 of our kids face food insecurity daily. When you give yourselves such a large raise in such a short amount of time, you lose the trust and confidence of your constituents. Please let’s not go down the path of non-disclosure, rushed and quieted
meetings and non-transparent fast-tracked pay raises. Let's do a better job of communicating. We can renegotiate your pay raise with many more voices included in the conversation. We as a community have overcome so much. Let this pay raise issue go down in our history as a little mistake that was quickly remedied by a very approachable and diligent Council.

Respectfully,
Annie Payne
Anniepayne@comcast.net
Dear members of the Grand County Council,

I see that you have given yourselves a pay raise which is roughly 250% more than you were making.

I find this very disingenuous and frankly arrogant on your part. Very few of the people that live here make that amount of money and they work 2 jobs.

I believe it is now in your best interest to rescind this pay raise and offer an apology to the citizens of this town!

Sincerely,
George O. Patterson

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android
I am not at all happy about you giving yourselves a pay raise without any input from the folks who pay for it!!!

Yvette Mallon

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android
I am writing this short note to let you know that I think that voting yourselves a raise is an affront to all residents in the area - especially a raise so large. I am still in the process of researching this information, so I do not as yet have all of the facts, but I feel that you need to know how many folks are not happy about this... Please count me among those who are not pleased with your actions. More to follow....

Linda Grawet
Bryony Chamberlain

From: Kathy D. Key <kathydkey@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, January 07, 2019 9:01 PM
To: Grand County Council
Subject: Recent pay increases :(

I am writing this let you know that I am not only appalled but also opposed to the recent 170% pay increases. ANY pay raises need to be voted/approved by the people paying for those raises. What employee ever gets to issue their own pay raises?

Kathy Key
registered voter in Grand County, Utah
Good evening
I am writing in response to the pay raise the council decided to give themselves. I am in opposition to this pay raise and would ask that you do the right things for county citizens and rescind the pay raise. Also it would be wise to issue an apology to grand county.

Thank you for doing the right thing
Dan E Young
To the Council in Grand County....

In our cash strapped county, I'm disappointed that the Grand County Council would vote themselves a pay raise. And without consulting your constituents! It's not ethical nor honest to grab taxpayer monies without asking for it. And, no, your selection to the council is not a mandate that you can engage in this kind of taxation without representation.

Reconsider your action and rescind the payraise.

Kim Call
Sent from my iPhone
Grand County Council,

The latest surprising pay raise for the Grand County Council took me and many aback, especially since just a few months earlier many HARDWORKING employees of Grand County were denied raises and had to scratch and claw for even a cost of living raise. The Council is not meant to be a full-time job for those on it. The Council is meant to serve and council our County with current events and looking toward future possibilities or problems/issues that may be before us while guiding us all through it with a mind for the best of the people and the County as a whole and to be compensated in a small way for their efforts.

What we have is a Council with it's own agenda, not the people's.

I guess when it comes down to it I'm disappointed with this decision and just don't feel it's deserved and should have been put to better use elsewhere in the budget.
Absolutely against this kind of pay raise...to triple one's salary is ridiculous. And with no more hours than you put in...shame on you....
2.04.090 Role of the Council

Consistent with this plan’s provisions increasing the size and reducing the compensation of the Council, it is the intent of this plan to establish the Council as a citizen body whose members serve on a part-time basis primarily in a legislative, policy-making role, and membership on the Council is not intended to be a full-time positions involving extensive day-to-day administrative oversight of County operations and functions. Accordingly, it is expected that the Council will implement this plan by using its power under Title 17, Utah Statutes, and other applicable general laws, to maintain and fully utilize an adequate, competent professional County staff to perform, administer and have day-to-day oversight over the County’s operations and functions, pursuant to general policies and directives promulgated by the Council. Pursuant to and invoking the full authority granted by Article XI, Section 4, Utah Constitution, and the Optional Plan Statute, particularly Section 17-35a-7(2), Utah Statutes, it is determined and declared that the foregoing provisions of this section as to the role of the Council are necessary and desirable to achieve the best and most effective operation of this plan; but, like all other provisions of this plan, the foregoing provisions are subject to Section 2.04.150. The Council is encouraged to cooperate with and fully utilize the County’s appointed boards and commissions, and to give full consideration to information and recommendations communicated by such boards and commissions, in order to maximize citizen participation in County government. The Council is also encouraged to fully cooperate with the city of Moab and other government entities and to fully utilize all mechanisms legally and practically available to consolidate and share governmental services, functions and facilities, in order to maximize governmental efficiency and economy. (Optional Plan §2.7)
ORDINANCE No. 572
AN ORDINANCE FORMALLY ESTABLISHING THE GRAND COUNTY BUDGET ADVISORY BOARD AND DEFINING ITS DUTIES AND FUNCTIONS

WHEREAS, the Grand County Council, as the legislative authority and governing body of Grand County, Utah, is responsible to adopt the budget for Grand County by resolution as per Utah Code Ann. § 17-36-15;

WHEREAS, the Grand County Council was established as a citizen body whose members are increased and compensation is reduced, and whose members serve on a part-time basis primarily in a legislative, policy-making role per Grand County Code Ann. § 02-04-09;

WHEREAS, the Grand County Council is encouraged to cooperate with and fully utilize the county’s appointed boards and commissions, and to give full consideration to information and recommendations communicated by such boards and commissions, in order to maximize citizen participation in county government per Grand County Code Ann. § 02-04-09;

WHEREAS, the Grand County’s optional form of government establishes a citizen body and a subsequent need for the Grand County Council to maintain and fully utilize an adequate, competent professional county staff to perform, administer and have day-to-day oversight over the county’s operations and functions, pursuant to general policies and directives promulgated by the council per Grand County Code Ann. § 02-04-09;

WHEREAS, the Grand County Council is also encouraged to fully cooperate with the city of Moab and other government entities and to fully utilize all mechanisms legally and practically available to consolidate and share governmental services, functions and facilities, in order to maximize governmental efficiency and economy per Grand County Code Ann. § 02-04-09;

WHEREAS, an informative, transparent, and collaborative tentative budget process between the Grand County Council, County Elected Officials, Grand County Department Heads, and the Budget Officer is essential to provide quality services to the citizens of Grand County and to maintain and enhance economic efficiency of Grand County resources;

WHEREAS, a Budget Advisory Board providing fiscal analysis and planning to the Grand County Council in an advisory capacity will enhance, vastly improve, and increase transparency in the financial decision making process for Grand County;
NOW THEREFORE, be it ordained that the Grand County Council formalizes and establishes the Grand County Budget Advisory Board defining the duties and functions of the Board as contained in Exhibit A.

COUNTY COUNCIL OF GRAND COUNTY, UTAH

This Ordinance was duly and regularly introduced and passed at a regular meeting of the Grand County Council, State of Utah on the 6th day of February, 2018 by the following vote:

AYES: Clapper, Halliday, Hawks, McGann, Paxman, Trim, Wells

NAYS: 

ABSENT: 

Attest: 
Diana Carroll, Clerk/Auditor

Mary McGann, Chair
EXHIBIT A
THE GRAND COUNTY BUDGET ADVISORY BOARD DUTIES AND FUNCTIONS

Establishment and Purpose.

Section 1. Hereby established is the Grand County Budget Advisory Board (hereafter referred to as the “Board”) for the purpose of advising the Grand County Council on matters pertaining to fiscal policies and procedures, and assisting the Grand County Council in fulfilling the statutory responsibilities contained in the Uniform Fiscal Procedures Act for Counties, Utah Code Ann. § 17-36-1 et seq., and as amended.

Board Organization.

Section 1. The Board shall consist of seven voting members and have the following composition.

The Board consists of seven persons:
- The County’s Auditor shall be a permanent member of the Board.
- The Board shall contain one additional County Elected Official who is not a Council member and not the Grand County Attorney.
- The Board shall contain two County Council members.
- The Board shall contain one non-elected County Department Head.
- The balance of the Board shall be comprised of the designated Grand County Budget Officer (if not one of the persons listed above) and any other registered Grand County voter(s) with a demonstrated interest in, or professional knowledge of budgeting and finance.

Board Responsibilities.

Section 1. Specifically, the Board performs the following advisory functions on an ongoing basis:

- Serves the Grand County Council in an advisory capacity;
- Provides any other budgetary or financial reports required by the Council;
- Reviews county fiscal policies and procedures and advises the Council as to whether they reflect the Council’s goals, expectations and priorities;
- Reviews proposed departmental budgets;
- Helps the Council understand and interpret the financial statements and audit reports;
- Advises the Council on the selection, qualifications, independence and performance of the County’s external auditor;
• Oversees proper external review of the County’s audited statements, as well as the organization's financial risk management to include monitoring the internal control environment (17-36-45);
• After the first year in which the Board is formed, review the internal control environment of at least two County Departments or Elected Offices in the County each year, giving highest priority to those handling financial transactions;
• Establish a schedule to ensure that all County Departments and Elected Offices are reviewed at least once every 8 years;
• Report review findings to the County Council and, if appropriate, recommends investigation into potential violations of policies or laws.

Responsibilities Beyond Board’s Purview.

Section 1. The Board shall not have supervisory responsibility over and shall have no authority to hire, fire, or discipline Grand County employees or interpret or administer Grand County Employment Policies and Procedures.

Section 2. The Board shall not have responsibility for or authority to make decisions regarding any appropriation of County funds, which shall reside with the County Council and the County employee or supervisor who administers the budget.

Officers of the Board.

Officers elected by the Board shall be elected at the first meeting of every year and serve a term of one year or until a successor is elected from the Board. The officers shall consist of the following positions with their associated duties:

Section 1. Chairperson: The Board shall elect from its members a Chairperson who shall be the presiding officer of the Board. The Chairperson shall be an Elected Official of the County, or the designated Budget Officer. The Chairperson shall be responsible to call meetings, set the agenda, and conduct the meetings.

Section 2. Vice Chairperson: The Board shall elect from its members a Vice Chairperson who shall fulfill the responsibilities in the absence of the Chairperson. The Vice Chairperson shall be an Elected Official of the County, the designated Budget Officer, or a County Employee.

Section 3. Secretary: The Board shall appoint a Secretary to keep all minutes of the meetings and send copies to all Board Members. The Secretary shall assist the Chairperson or Vice Chairperson in preparing an agenda for the meetings, post notices and approved minutes of all Board Meetings and keep records to help the Board perform its function. Once the Board has approved the minutes, the official signed copy of the minutes shall be forwarded to the County Clerk/Auditor for retention. Administrative duties of the Secretary may be delegated to the County Council Administrator or a member of their staff.
**Meeting and Business Activities.**

Section 1. Four of the seven voting members of the Board shall constitute a quorum.

Section 2. The Board shall hold regular meetings the date and time of which will be advertised at the beginning of each year within the County and noticed to the local newspaper of record. Meetings shall be in compliance with the Open and Public Meetings Act, Utah Code Ann. § 52-4-101 et seq., and as amended.

Section 3. If the Board is reviewing the internal control environment of a Department or Elected Office of one of the Board members, a separate sub-committee shall be formed consisting of at least 5 of the other Board members to conduct the review. The Board member whose Office or Department is being reviewed shall recuse themselves from any votes regarding the review or recommendations stemming from it.

Section 4. The Board shall use *Robert's Rules of Order* in conducting business at its meetings.

**Board Member Appointments.**

Section 1. The appointment process for Board Members shall be according to the prescribed process approved by Ordinance or Resolution by the Grand County Council. The appointment of members shall be for a term of two years.

Section 2. The members of the Board, except the County Auditor and the designated Budget Officer, are appointed by the Council at the beginning of each year to serve a term of two years. Terms should be staggered so that approximately half of the terms are completed each year. Board members, except the County Auditor and designated Budget Officer, whom are permanent members, may serve up to two consecutive two-year terms.

**Vacancies.**

Section 1. Vacancies occurring by reason of death, resignation or other cause shall be filled to the date of expiration of the unexpired term by appointment of another person by the County Council.

**Removal of Members.**

Section 1. The Grand County Council may remove any member of the Board at any time and without cause.
Section 2. The Grand County Council shall consider a recommendation for removing a Board Member if four members of the Board approves such a motion. Any motion from the Board recommending removal should contain findings of facts that support the recommendation.

Reporting

The Board reports directly to the Grand County Council, as communicated by the designated Budget Officer of Grand County.

Adoption of Bylaws.

The Board shall adopt and amend Bylaws for the conduct of their meetings and the management of the Board, as they deem proper, but not inconsistent with Grand County Ordinances and the laws of the State of Utah. Proposed Bylaws shall be adopted in accordance with Grand County Ordinance No. 472 (Chapter 2.18 of the codified Grand County Ordinances).

Compensation and Reimbursement.

Section 1. No compensation shall be paid to Board Members for their services. Expenses may be reimbursed to Board Members when all the following criteria have been met:

- Expense is associated with the Board’s business;
- The Grand County Council has appropriated funds for said expense;
- The expense is authorized by the Grand County Council Administrator; and
- The Board Member submits the necessary paperwork required by the County for reimbursement.
RESOLUTION NO. 3079

A RESOLUTION OF THE GRAND COUNTY COUNCIL ESTABLISHING A MARKET BASED COMPENSATION EVALUATION PROCESS FOR WAGE ADJUSTMENTS AND RECLASSIFICATION OF POSITIONS.

WHEREAS, The Grand County Council recognizes the need to periodically evaluate and adjust wages and grade levels on a job by job basis in order to remain competitive in the labor market; and

WHEREAS, The Grand County Council further recognizes the need for reliable compensation data to support the evaluation process that is used for this purpose,

NOW THEREFORE, THE GRAND COUNTY COUNCIL RESOLVES THAT:

1. The compensation factors used in said evaluations shall be based on data found in the labor markets from which the County recruit employees.

2. The practice of using averages of wage levels found in the 4th, 5th and 6th class counties of Utah will be abandoned due to the lack of reliable data.

3. All adjustments to wages and job grades will be considered in light of the compensation paid to existing employees, so as to mitigate inequities.

4. Following each evaluation, the HR Director will present the recommended actions to the County Council for approval.

5. Following Council approval, the HR Director will implement the changes per established administrative procedures.

PASSED, ADOPTED, AND APPROVED by the Grand County Council in open session this 16th day of August 2016 by the following vote:

Those voting aye: Ballantyne, Hawks, Jackson, McGann, Tubbs

Those voting nay: Baird

Absent: Paxman

ATTEST: GRAND COUNTY COUNCIL

Diana Carroll, Clerk/Auditor

Elizabeth Tubbs, Chair
The Grand County Budget Advisory Board met in Regular Session on the above date in the County Council Chambers. The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Chris Baird at 8:34 a.m. with a quorum present. In attendance at the call to order were Board Members Chris Baird (Budget Officer), Jaylyn Hawks (Council Member), Diana Carroll (County Clerk/Auditor), Elaine Gizler (Moab Area Travel Council Executive Director), and Zach Wojcieszek (Citizen). Absent from the meeting was Chris Kauffman (Treasurer). Also in attendance was Ruth Dillon (County Council Administrator) to take minutes.

A. Action Items
A1. Approving minutes of August 29, 2018 meeting—
MOTION: Motion by Diana to approve the minutes of August 29, 2018 as corrected for the location of the meeting. Motion was seconded by Elaine and it carried 5-0.

Evan Clapper (Council Member) arrived at 8:35 a.m.

A2. Position and Employee Pay Plans Review, continued from August 29, 2018—
Chairperson Baird provided the Proposed Position Pay Plan draft on-screen, explaining that it is drafted for comparison purposes as if all employees were full-time. Throughout the meeting he explained differences between market study and proposed internal adjustments, as well as the rationale for the proposed internal adjustments.

Chairperson Baird suggested that a decision will need to be made as to whether to include high school apprentices on the Grade and Step chart (proposed at Grade 1, Step 1).

Chairperson Baird emphasized the need to be fair, stating that applying a single methodology would not work fairly across the county. He also made note of the limitations of the market data. He indicated that it is possible to amend the Grade and Step Chart for finer resolution between grade and step, noting that the chart through Step 15 is fairly typical. He stated that there is also the option to do away with the chart in place of having minimum and maximum salaries, stating that this would require policy changes since the county’s merit programs rely on the Grade and Step Chart.

Diana brought up the fact that the unfilled position of Cartographer in the Recorder’s Office is missing from the chart, and Chairperson Baird made note of it. He stated that the Proposed Position Pay Plan includes vacant positions.

Chairperson Baird explained how he arrived at the proposed steps, stating that there is no proposal to cut pay for any employee.

Ruth informed the Board for their consideration that there are several exempt direct reports (Department Heads) who consistently work significantly more than 80 hours per two-week pay period, including frequent holidays, without additional compensation.

Zach reminded the Board that Chris Kauffman had provided an email to them yesterday in his anticipated absence from today’s meeting requesting that the Board, in its recommendation to County Council, present one-offs separately, and with justification, from the compensation data. Chairperson Baird clarified that he is the messenger to the Board with the various one-off requests in order for the Board to consider and ultimately make informed recommendations to the County Council.
Ruth suggested that the Employee Handbook needs to be revised with respect to the requirement for eight years of relevant job experience from outside the organization to earn one step upon hiring (versus four years from inside the organization). Ruth agreed to work with the Human Resources Director on amending the policy, and Jaylyn agreed to co-present the matter with the Human Resources Director at a future County Council meeting.

Chairperson Baird illustrated differences on-screen between the proposed 2% COLA versus the countywide salary adjustment.

Diana explained that anomalies with some positions will resolve when the employee in the position terminates.

Chairperson Baird inquired as to whether any Board member has an issue with any of the anomalies that had been itemized and explained by him. Board members discussed the fact that various library job descriptions currently require a college degree, yet the market data does not reflect same for these positions. He explained that if there is no property tax increase, the salary increases may require a workforce reduction in the library if all pooled hours were to be used. Diana stated that the hours are seldom used up, and Chairperson Baird stated that he has a report with the exact number of hours used in 2017.

Jaylyn addressed the fact that there were two directors who received, by County Council decisions made last year, significant increases due to extenuating circumstances, which also involved extensive job requirement increases.

Ruth pointed out to the Board that positions of the Emergency Medical Services Department are not included in the Proposed Pay Plan, even though the staff were part of the compensation study, stating that this is likely due to the fact that the department is transitioning to the EMS Special Services District as early as January 1, 2019. Chairperson Baird stated that the market data provided by the study was minimal in any case.

Ruth requested, since two of the Board members were not present last week, to display the chart showing the ratio of the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) employees to the individual supervisor’s salary. Chairperson Baird was unable to display it but stated that, in essence, the more employees that an Elected Official, Council Administrator, or Department Head have in their offices/departments, the less they are paid for the amount of the personnel responsibility for which they carry.

Chairperson Baird explained that Elected Officials are not included in the Proposed Pay Plan. Evan inquired about the plan for reviewing Elected Officials’ salaries to address compression issues. Chairperson Baird explained the typical process for reviewing Elected Official salaries, which requires a public hearing.

MOTION: Motion by Evan to move forward using the Proposed Position Pay Plan and corresponding grades for the 2019 budgeting process. Jaylyn seconded and the motion carried 6-0 without further discussion. Chairperson Baird stated that he will plug in the “Annual Proposed” figures per position into Caselle.

Diana left the meeting for another commitment at 10:37 a.m.

Board members reviewed total cost of proposed salary increases, with and without a 2% Cost of Living Adjustment, and Chairperson Baird stated that currently a true COLA would be closer to 2.8% or 2.9%. He reviewed the bottomline for the General Fund stating that a property tax increase will likely be necessary assuming the County Council will want to set aside funds for stormwater drainage and other capital projects, as well as a significantly increased request for Transient Room Tax funds for the new Emergency Medical Services Special Service District.

Chairperson Baird stated that the remaining revised job descriptions will need to be approved by County Council before having the County Council consider adopting the compensation adjustments. Ruth agreed to inform the Human Resources Director of this need.

Elaine inquired as to what will happen with the proposed salary adjustments countywide if the tax increase is not approved. Chairperson Baird explained that it is possible to budget to take money out of fund balance of the General Fund, stating that revenue and expense must balance.
MOTION: Motion by Evan to move forward using the Proposed Employee Pay Plan with the salary adjustment and 2% COLA for the 2019 budgeting process. Jaylyn seconded and the motion carried 5-0 without further discussion.

Future Considerations- Evan inquired about freezing the tax rate, and Board members discussed the matter.

Chairperson Baird announced that Moab Mosquito Abatement District and Castle Valley Fire Protection District plan to see about raising taxes, and possibly Cemetery Maintenance District as well.

Adjourn
The meeting was adjourned by acclamation at 11:06 a.m. by Chairperson Baird.

Chris Baird  
Chairperson

Christopher Kauffman  
Secretary