

## MOAB AREA LAND USE

### COMMENTS RECEIVED FOLLOWING PUBLIC WORKSHOP - PERSONAL INFORMATION HAS BEEN REDACTED

92 comments received from April 29 through May 24, 2019.

#### COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL

---

I was unable to attend the open houses in March, but have some comments and concerns to share with your group.

1. When you talk about urban infill, does that include the R2 zone in Moab even though the City Council voted to remove the R2 zone from the PAD ordinance?
2. If the R2 zone is to be included in any urban infill discussion, will you notify all the residents of the R2 zone of this intent and will you take into consideration our comments and concerns about infrastructure, roads, parking, and code enforcement?
3. Are you aware of the comments made by city officials and others portraying residents of R2 as greedy and fearful of “the other” and of change?
4. Has the city provided you with existing written comments received by them over the past several months from residents of R2?
5. As you formulate your plan, will you be able to articulate why the R2 zone must be included in the PAD ordinance when there are other zones whose intent and infrastructure was designed specifically for higher density construction?
6. Do you have any examples of other cities like Moab who have used urban infill in their existing residential zones?
7. Have you driven through the R2 zone in Moab to see the variety of homes that make up our neighborhoods?

Thank you for the time and effort you are putting forth to help Moab and Grand County develop a land use plan that reflects the vision of Moab’s residents and meets the needs of our changing community.

--

As a member of this community, I want to express my concern about water use in Moab Valley as our small town continues to grow. Below are a few points for helping to ensure our community has access to clean water in the future:

- I am grateful for the moratorium on all new overnight accommodations. We must use this time to get an accurate and up-to-date water availability analysis of the valley in order to make sure we have sufficient supplies and do not create demand hardening.
- Before development continues, we need to create a specific number of remaining Equivalent Residential Connections (ERC’s) in order to determine what amount of growth is best for our community based on the actual amount of water we have. This should include having a buffer capacity for climate change, which we know is here and already affecting the Southwest’s water supply. The Order of the UT State Engineer approving the transfer of water rights into our

watershed by the San Juan Spanish Valley Special Service District cites a study indicating the Colorado Plateau could experience up to a 30% reduction in runoff due to climate variability.

- “Adopt a green infrastructure ordinance for stormwater management to protect water quality, increase localized groundwater recharge and offset landscape irrigation through matching plantings with green infrastructure treatments.” A direct quote from the Moab City General Plan – Goal 4 Water Quality, Policy 1, Action step h. I for one want to support the city in meeting this goal, which supports our watershed and community resilience.
- While we are in this moratorium, I would love to see us set high standards for integrated water efficient landscape design and performance for all new development (including residential), while also promoting conservation by existing users.

Thank you for taking the time to read this. As we are talking about housing and development, we must not forget water. Without proper effort to conserve and protect our water resources, we put our entire community at risk.

--

Any proposed land use regulation must consider that we need to have a livable environment for the current residents. Traffic jams of the sort last Sunday are unacceptable. We do not have the infrastructure in place to accommodate such fast growth. Our surrounding public lands are being loved to death, and consequently trashed. Noise and light pollution need to be curtailed. All of these outcomes are a consequence of too many people in too restricted an area.

--

After all the public forums you’ve attended, I’m sure you are aware of the wishes of this community. Most want to see the growth of tourist accommodation (including campgrounds and RV parks) halted. Most feel that we have reached or exceeded capacity already. We have certainly reached capacity with the current infrastructure and resources needed to assure a quality experience for tourists. We have certainly reached a level of tourism that compromises our residents’ quality of life.

Our LUC needs to encourage the upgrading of infrastructure and the development of businesses that support our current level of tourism. Our roads need an upgrade and our downtown needs a by-pass. Our national parks need time to resolve overcrowding and access issues. We need more restaurants, more tour operators, more grocery stores, more housing for service workers, etc. Once we have dealt with these issues, and assured that visitors can have a safe, comfortable, quality experience, we can revisit the issue of more tourist accommodations.

No doubt many metropolitan citizens would not consider our community to be overly crowded, hectic, and noisy. However, the standard which needs to be applied in the Moab Area is not that of San Francisco, Denver, or even Salt Lake. This is a rural/small town community. Our citizens we are increasingly adamant about preserving the character of the Moab Area! We need to uphold the good planning principles of infill and compatibility. The current high-density overlay violates those principles.

The high-density overlay needs radical revision. There is little need for local densities that are more than double the housing densities of New York City! High density overlay use should be reserved for

100% affordable housing developments. Mid-rise and hi-rise buildings should be restricted to our future college campus.

Some will say that Grand County should build all the tourist lodging it can because San Juan County will build it if we don't. We cannot dictate to SJC, but we can negotiate and influence them to cooperate with us in controlling growth in our valley. So, Spanish Valley will continue to depend on Grand County for provision of essential services for some time to come. We are in this together. If our leaders are willing to undertake the task, we may see more homes and fewer tourist accommodations being built in SJC.

--

**My observations:**

It is especially important to avoid the pitfalls of segregating land use types. Creating monotypes of development can really create dead zones, which are not only unattractive, but also less safe. In addition, this approach can increase traffic problems. The movement for neo-traditional neighborhoods, also known as, New Urbanism, advocates promoting mixed land uses for maximum livability.

**My suggestions:**

Look at how other resort towns, such as, Telluride and Aspen and even Boulder (as a college town, it has some similar issues), manage their Venice problem and promote affordable housing.

From the toolbox, make use of an Inclusionary or Assured Housing Ordinance. Include how to manage Airbnbs along with hotels as you consider the tourism challenges.

Consider what we want to preserve, such as important view sheds and important landmarks, such as the scale of attractive streets. With regard to maintaining the look of our central streets, there is a notion of a reverse wedding cake approach to new development, i.e., place taller new development outside the smaller scale streets rather than permit tall developments on attractive streets with lower buildings.

Consider how we want things to look. That means bringing into use form-based codes (FBC), which are all about achieving this goal. With this zoning tool, you consider the scale and appearance of buildings in a district. While it is a fad/trend, this can also be a very helpful tool. As an example, Cincinnati has adopted form-based codes for its downtown.

My preferred option is a hybrid of Options 2 and 4 that slows the growth in overnight rentals, but still promotes mixed land uses.

--

I would like to provide input on the current moratorium and proposed changes to the Land Use Plan.

The City and County need to make changes very quickly, and very soon. The character and wonderful things about our town are being destroyed by too many tourists.

The land can't handle it and the town cannot manage it well. We have traffic jams most of the year now, and the B&B's, illegal rentals and very large out of town events encroach on our once quiet neighborhoods.

Housing is almost non-existent for the average person living here, and it is very frustrating to have so many out of town companies, corporations, and speculators taking over what little is left.

We need to put a stop to the out of control growth by extending the moratorium for a longer period of time - one, so we have more time to discuss and plan, and two, to prevent any more hotels and motels from building here.

There absolutely needs to be the option in the Land Use Plan that no more hotels or motels be built here. Monticello and Green River can take the overflow. The hotels are ruining this town and taking away precious land that could be used for local housing.

Most residents do not want to see any more hotels and motels going in. It is changing the character of the entire town, and benefits only the corporations that are building them. There is no benefit to the locals.

Enough is enough - this could have been prevented by careful planning a long time ago, so, it is crucial that this out of control development be stopped before this town loses its soul.

--

Hi, I live on Sunny Acres Lane, which borders on the San Juan and Grand county line.

Obviously (to me) options 1 and 5 are out. Of the remaining options, I'm not sure where some of the tools mentioned in the community examples fall into. Specifically, the tool where development can be 'sent' or traded to another property. When selecting one of the more restrictive options limiting development (my preference), by adding in the trading of development options, you could help prevent the resentment from undeveloped/under-developed owners.

I would like to see that tool Incorporated. It sounds like a cap and trade market tool. Though the implementation would be complex, I'm hoping it might be a solution to help one of the more restrictive development options to be implemented. Also, in the example, it sounded like it was more for agencies to use. I would like to see something like that available for private lands owners. That way, developers

could get behind a restrictive development option because they know they could essentially up-zone their projects by purchasing development rights from other Land owners.

It's going to take a solution like that to get greedy developers to back a restrictive option, which would help everyone, I think.

Feel free to contact me.

--

I support the option of no new nightly rentals. We are already over capacity now in almost all respects.

Two close friends, have or are planning on moving from Moab or out of the city. We are losing the heart and soul of our community. I moved here 25 years ago from the Roaring Fork Valley. I watched as Aspen became a town with one empty neighborhood after another during off season and then so jammed with cars and people during the high season that it could take an hour to get into or out of town and then there was no parking, exorbitant prices, tight reservations at restaurants, and one family after another moving down valley. I was director of Leadership ASPEN and most of our program participants worked in Aspen but lived down valley including the fire chief, police chief, head of the hospital etc. Eventually it became Leadership Roaring Fork as so many leaders lived in Carbondale or Basalt. If Moab continues at this pace, we will have more and more people moving from the city center to the county and to Green River and LaSal further contributing to traffic issues. We need a stop to TRT advertising, an imposition of a 6-month minimum lease restriction on all rentals, and a permanent moratorium on all new overnight accommodations.

--

Thank you for the public meetings you have hosted! Requests for our input gives us hope that our opinions are heard and might make a difference.

My personal leaning regarding the five options is more towards numbers four and five, with higher emphasis on five. No further growth would be ideal, in my opinion, as I feel that we have reached and exceeded tourist saturation. I know that many say that this option will just push the growth down into SJC, but I think SJC growth is going to happen regardless of what we do in Grand County. The same rumor blazed through about eight years ago when Walmart made rumblings about locating here, and many said that if we didn't snag them, they would just locate south of the county line. While that could be true, I don't think that a fear-based approach to city planning makes sense. Same thing regarding the fear of increased property taxes - we are paying, either way; it's a matter of what form our payments will take (more property tax, or further decrease in quality of life? Regret that the answer is likely "both.")

My main objection to option four is that it sacrifices the north corridor into Moab. We have enough hotels for the level of tourism that we should be seeking ~ the excessive continued promotion needs to be curtailed through local control of TRT funds, which I realize you have no influence over. Even with the

proposed highway 191 widening project, we are still doomed to long lines of vehicles coming into town - it's just going to be four lanes of them instead of two; road widening doesn't cut down on numbers, it just alters the configuration of the congestion. I doubt that concentrating hotels at the north side of town is going to cut down on through-traffic congestion in town; they will still be coming in for groceries, restaurants, gas, etc, and people on longer trips prefer to continue on down to the south rather than backtracking to the interstate, lured onward by Cedar Mesa, Monument Valley and other iconic destinations. Maybe a few of the SLC weekenders will avoid coming into town by bringing their own groceries, but I doubt that their numbers are sufficient enough to make a difference in town congestion.

My other objection to option four is that the form-based codes requirement is not included (although it reappears in option five - was that an oversight?)

So to recap, put me down as a vote for option 5, NO FURTHER GROWTH. Enough, already. We also need to quit turning long term rentals into nightly accommodations; our lower income residents have been pushed out of their housing by the greed of those fortunate enough to be landlords. I suppose one might view Moab's economy as booming, based on the number of service-based job opportunities, but the workers cannot afford to live here. We are turning into a commuter town, with the bedroom communities 25 - 65 miles away.

If you haven't seen it already, please watch the YouTube video taken on 28 April showing the gridlock on 500 West / Kane Creek Blvd from the highway intersection almost back to McDonald's:  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?feature=youtu.be&v=xwG1TQyo9Ug&app=desktop>

Also of note is the recently released statistic that there are 2.4 visitors per resident on any day. How are we supposed to support that much influx? And where are they supposed to park their triple rigs? Utah state regs allow 65' commercial rigs, and apparently regs are relaxed for private rigs (according to the RZR forum, where one post mentions being ok'd by a UHP officer for his 79' double-trailer rig, as it was being pulled by an RV which does not get included in total rig length.) Since a city lot is only 65' wide, one tourist can manage to block two driveways by parking on the street. Please keep in mind that the majority of people who visit Moab are pulling trailers, so each tourist vehicle is taking up multiple parking spots.

Again, thanks for your efforts and requests for public input. Best of luck in meeting the moratorium deadline. Your recommendations greatly influence our future.

--

Thank you so much for all of your work on the current Moab Area Land Use planning project. It is difficult but so important. I've attended the two planning events with Landmark. Following are my comments.

I fully support option 5, called “No Growth” in Landmark planning documents. I think this title is quite misleading, and scared some people away from supporting it at the April 30 planning workshop. It is actually an option for no new overnight rentals, other than the 1100 or so new rooms already permitted but not yet built. It does not impact other types of growth, and in fact encourages other commercial, residential and community services growth. This was unclear, especially as the voluminous information on the growth options was not available to read before the workshop. I don’t think there were bad intentions, and I don’t want to look backwards, but I think it might have really skewed the opinions stated in the workshop. Everyone I’ve talked to in town thinks there are too many hotels, and that is without those already permitted and not built (which many people are not aware of). Traffic is horrid. Water use may be depleting our groundwater supply, but not all the information is in. I urge the Councils to not permit even one more overnight rental, whether hotel, motel, condo, campground, air b&b, or bed and breakfast. (And we need to stop advertising, but that may be a later discussion.)

Water availability is vital. Just how much water is used by overnight rentals, with showers, toilets, and landscaping, as well as sheets and blankets washed daily? We need to pause to more fully understand this and other factors relating to our water supply.

The compromises to option 5 that I would find most palatable would be to potentially allow very limited new overnight rentals sometime in the future. Because of the recent (and upcoming) overbuilding, I think there should be some number of years of no new overnight rental permits, perhaps with review of that policy every x number of years. The review could look at visitation trends, water supply, tourist impacts, traffic, etc., before deciding whether they would potentially allow some permits in the following years, until the next review.

I’m a little concerned about putting all new potential hotels on the north end of town. I don’t really understand that strategy. It does nothing to improve traffic where it is worst on the north end of town, all of those visitors in the hotels will drive to breakfast and dinner downtown anyway, and it makes an ugly entrance to town. This strategy will drive up land prices in that zone, so no one will start restaurants or any other business there, as overnight rentals are most lucrative.

If any future overnight rentals are eventually allowed, I would be in favor of prioritizing smaller campgrounds or motels with a limited number of units, which would encourage and support local ownership.

If option 5 is not adopted, at the least the current “use by right” must be eliminated, with any future overnight rental permits only allowed by vote of the city or county councils.

Thank you for considering my comments.

--

No growth is a loaded term but there are already too many overnight spaces in this town and not enough long term housing.

--

Thank you so much for all of your work on the current Moab Area Land Use planning project, I support Option 5.

--

Thank you, Grand County Council, Economic Development Office staff and Grand County Planning Commission for your work in this process. Thank you, Moab City Council and the Mayor and your planning staff for your work in this process as well. Thank you, Landmark Design for professional consultation.

The April 30th workshop may have helped gain the public's perspective on future city/county overnight rental development. It may be biased considerably right now due to the heading on Option #5.

There are hundreds of additional rooms about to be started or completed soon. To me labeling option #5 as "No Growth" lead the public to perceive that option as rather radical and unreasonable. I don't think it is at all. I hope #5 option could be presented differently in the future.

I don't know how many overnight accommodation rooms will be completed soon or are already approved. However, I think when we are considering option #5 it should be clarified how many additional overnight accommodation rooms are already approved and how many residential and other commercial projects are approved.

I would hope in any newly adopted land use codes the city and county councils would be required to vote on any new overnight rental or hotel development proposal and the use by right in the commercial zone for hotels and overnight accommodations is changed.

If a version of option #4 were to be adopted the northern corridor commercial development could be limited to shops and restaurants, not new overnight accommodations. We could extend the walking traffic from the current downtown all the way to the river (wouldn't that be cool?), eliminate the overnight tractor trailer parking that occurs there now, and slow the traffic down immediately south of the Colorado River bridge. (A traffic bypass is being considered by UDOT for vehicles wishing to get around our slowed traffic through town; if this happens, we can be creative.)

As well, I hope the public will be made aware of the approximate additional water use that will occur with the current approved development (overnight accommodations and residential/commercial).

Thank you all very much. I am proud to have you as my representatives as staff, elected officials and commission members.

--

I attended the meeting Tuesday night and will comment more on the meeting format below, but want to advocate clearly for adoption of Option 5.

Option 5 has been titled 'No Growth' which is a very inaccurate and misleading title. Option 5 will still allow a 20% increase in overnight rental/hotel rooms due to those projects approved prior to the moratorium but have not yet broken ground.

Option 5 **does** encourage residential, commercial, and public growth that is beneficial for our county. This "No Growth" option should have a title something like 'slower growth' or 'responsible growth'.

Following are reasons why I & most people I have spoken with have chosen Option 5.

**\*\*Jobs!** We have enough low paying, low skilled hotel and overnight rental jobs. We do not need any more of these types of employment. Allowing more hotels and overnight rentals to be constructed creates more of these low paying jobs and inflates the cost of land as these huge out of town corporations can afford to pay big bucks to buy up Grand County's land. We need a diversity of jobs that will only be created if we are encouraging and incentivizing new businesses and commercial ventures.

**\*\*Water, water, water!** We don't even know if we have enough water to sustainably support the growth currently occurring and the 20% increase in overnight rentals soon to hit Moab's market. Water studies are in the works and it's only responsible to delay any more growth until we know how much water we really have to **sustainably** use yearly. Overnight rentals/hotels use a tremendous amount of water. Our neighbor's B&B not only washes all sheets and towels after each visitor leaves, but they also wash all of the blankets. We need to quantify exactly how much water is used per hotel/B&B/overnight rental room and compare this with the available water. Again it's a matter of responsibility both for the environment and for all of us who already live here and are expecting to have clean, affordable water to drink for the rest of our lives.

**\*\*Traffic and noise:** I'm sure you have seen the video that was taken of the exit last weekend. Traffic was backed up on 5th W. all the way to Saint Francis Church. At the same time, traffic on Main Street was backed up all the way to the south Maverick. And we want 20% more growth on top of that? And Options 1 through 4 allow even more overnight rental traffic on top of what's already too much? How is it that our little town with one main street and two side streets can handle this kind of traffic? We need to stop growth until we have a traffic plan. We need to stop growth until we have a parking plan.

With traffic comes noise and unfortunately we already have way too many Razor type vehicles zipping up and down our residential roads. The increase in noise is astounding already. I don't think we can tolerate much more without a significant degradation of quality of life.

If option 4.5 (as our small breakout group termed it) is chosen, it can only be chosen after clear restrictions on development in overlay zones are deeply discussed and approved. I strongly advocate that a 4.5 option would restrict all new not allow any new hotels/overnight rentals for a period of say five years. This allows time to determine the impacts of this yet to be seen/experienced 20% growth in new hotels/overnight rentals.

Again it would be responsible that Option 4.5 completely disallow any hotels/overnight rental growth until we have a water study completed and a clear understanding of how much water we have left that we want to allocate to more low income jobs. Growth must be limited until we have an idea of how to handle the increase in traffic. Growth must be limited until we have adequate parking to support all of the tourists visiting and allow for residents to access our downtown.

Restrictions for any new hotels/overnight rental construction will require a lot of discussion, research and foresight. We need time to create adequate new restrictions/zoning/incentivization

Height restrictions and density need to be considered.

Housing for employees must be a part of any new overlay restriction.

Fees taxes, etc. must incentivize local ownership so that the money stays in our county. Projects should be favoring or only including small campgrounds and very small mom-and-pop hotels. Every time a huge corporation builds a big motel/overnight rental facility money goes out of our town and out of our state. We need to encourage local ownership for a strong local economy and community.

No matter what option is chosen **Use by Right** must be completely **eliminated**. All new overnight rental/hotels need to be subject to the review and approval of both city and county councils and planning commissions as appropriate.

Thank you for all of the effort and concern you are putting into these decisions. I'm grateful for the opportunity to have a voice.

PS I will send an email later about the format and process of the meeting Tuesday night. But want to get these comments in the mail to you as soon as possible.

--

A permanent moratorium to stop or slow down growth. Limit the number of overnight accommodation units allowed. NO MORE HUGE HOTELS!

What residents want? We want to be sustainable. We have concerns about WATER USAGE, this is #1 and still not addressed.

--

Respectfully,

My husband and I have lived in Moab for about 12 years now. We've watched the slow and steady growth for Moab occur. These last few years have been way over the top. The traffic, the noise from all the ATV's, the inability to walk into City Market and get the groceries we need, the concern about water resources have all detracted from what used to be a really nice community to live in.

This growth has been reckless, for example look how long it took to get an updated water treatment system. And what is the capacity of the water treatment system. The other day, I was smelling foul smells from it again, which makes me think it's already above capacity as it had been.

What about WATER. We are crazy to think we can go on like this and won't run into a water crisis in the coming decades.

The ATV's aren't even required to have noise restrictions....It's crazy.

Please, I Urge you No More Development!!

--

My vote would be for option 5 - no new overnight accommodations in or near Moab.

--

Thanks for having the public-input meetings. I would like to make a couple of further comments.

First, I hope that community interests can be balanced with (cash) economy growth. Perhaps an ideal percentage could be developed. (And in fact 'economy' is defined as how a COMMUNITY manages its resources.) Let's do that.

Say 30%-70%. Though percentages could be a bit tricky to determine. But just having the concept of a balance could be useful.

Next, the idea of concentrating any further overnight housing between the northern 'edge' of town and the river, makes sense to me on a number of levels. Of course, there has been approval for a significant amount of projects that have not broken ground yet. Where that development will happen is a great unknown to many of us. But you get the idea. Let's concentrate it where it least effects the community.

--

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the land use planning options Landmark presented at the recent public workshop. Of these options, I prefer Option 5.

Despite being titled "No Growth," **Option 5 will still allow a 20% increase in overnight rental/hotel rooms** due to those projects approved prior to the moratorium. This option does in fact allow growth, limiting only **new** projects that are tourist accommodations. It would encourage a more diversified economy with better paying jobs by making commercial space more readily available for a variety of businesses. It would also slow the rapid inflation of real estate prices, making housing more affordable for our residents and workers.

We need to put the brakes on until we see the effects of this projected 20% growth in tourist accommodations. Do we really have enough water to sustain even that? Until we see the results of the water study it is premature to permit even more growth. And what about traffic? We can't even handle

what we have (last Sunday's gridlock, which spilled over onto residential streets, was unbelievable and intolerable!) Why set ourselves up for even more of this?

We need to stop increased growth until we know our water budget and have a realistic traffic plan. It would be reasonable to not allow any additional new hotels or overnight rentals for a period of 4 -5 years to see the impacts of a 20% growth in tourist accommodations. During this period the city and county need to develop zoning regulations/overlays that assure employee housing, a critical need for our community.

No matter which option is chosen, Use by Right should be completely eliminated. All new overnight rental/hotels need to be subject to the review and approval of city or county councils and planning commissions.

Thank you for considering my concerns.

--

The other day, as I was waiting in a long line of cars to get into Arches, I thought back to the mid-1980s. Then, cows ran rampant in Arches – even though they were not supposed to. Sullen, slow-witted, and utterly un-charismatic, these silly animals shamelessly spoiled the scenery and brought in precious little financial gain. Such heartbreaking under-use of the land could not stand! As President of the Chamber of Phynance I felt it my sacred duty to transform this intolerable situation. So, the Chamber teamed up with various Ecomodernist groups to usher in a new era. Scenery – not grass – was to be consumed. Those pitiful bovines were sternly banished and replaced by an eager young Cash Cow. That Cash Cow has now grown and matured way beyond our wildest dreams. Visitation to Arches has beefed up beyond belief - and our bottom line has ballooned!!!

Now, tragically, there is talk of curtailing the perpetual augmentation of our profits by limiting visitation and development. Clearly, these proposals are guided by the outdated notion that our Cash Cow should graze on scenery in open pastures. What backward thinking! Arches National Park and Grand County must evolve – must become a feed lot. Feed lots are far more efficient. Just go to Greely and see for yourself how far the science of cramming mammals together has advanced. Enlightened Ecomodernists now know we can keep cramming more and more tourists into the area, indefinitely, indefatigably, and they in turn will keep cramming more and more cash into our exalted coffers!

As I continued waiting to get into the park, I also contemplated with supreme self-satisfaction the Cash Calves to which our industrial-tourism Cash Cow has given birth; the real estate Cash Cow, the Construction Cash Cow, and now, thanks to Ecomodernist selective breeding, a sleek, new, Fat-Cat Cash Cow; a hybrid, *Feliobovinus dividendus*. Now, if only those pesky, less than affluent locals would go the way of the heifers; if they would just sell their properties and quietly depart. Then their land could be properly developed; the valley could be filled to capacity, and then some, with a handsome hybrid herd of Ecomodernist mansions. That way Moab could triumphantly come into its own; could realize its divine destiny, could become the Cash Cow Capitol of the west.

Visions of grandeur began so clouding my mind that when I finally reached the Entrance Station I forgot to thank the Ranger there for kicking the heifers out of the park back in 1989

--

First, thank you for wrestling with the difficult issues in developing an ordinance to address new overnight rentals in Moab (aka the hotel moratorium). I also appreciate you soliciting input from and listening to the ideas of Moab valley residents on these critical issues. I'm writing to express full support for "Option 5," aka "no growth," (which would be better named "no new overnight rentals," to avoid scaring off support from people who may mistake this option for no economic growth, or growth of Moab in other respects.)

Option 5 is the only option that will begin to address the myriad concerns that the quite vocal majority of Moab valley residents have about our "runaway tourism/ tourist economy." Allowing additional overnight rentals to be built at this time, ANYwhere in the Moab Valley (including north of town or south of town) is NOT going to help. The occupants of those rentals will still drive into town and overrun the Moab infrastructure, parks, and public lands. They will still take away resources for other future development that supports a more diverse and sustainable economy—quite literally in the case of land and water resources. It is the use of our limited water supply for development of overnight rentals that worries me most—bringing in more tourists using water, flushing toilets, more linens washed daily, etc. Is this how we want our precious water to be used up? Before we even understand how much we really have??

What I'm hearing regarding the five options proposed is that most residents (including many of you!) prefer Option 5 but are worried about potential litigation from the state. So, you believe a more "realistic" option is needed. REALLY?? So, we're willing to further sacrifice Moab and our community just in case we get sued? We're going to continue allowing runaway tourism growth so the almighty state can further pimp us out to make money?? C'mon Moab, take a stand! What will future generations of Moabites think of us if we don't? If we miss this one golden opportunity while we stand at this particular crossroad? Moab has never been afraid to be different in spite of the state it occupies. That's why we held on to our unique form of government for so long! That's why we passed a plastic bag ban, we're passing dark sky ordinances, etc. That's why I've been proud to live here! And I want to us to be able to look at ourselves in the mirror and know we did everything we possibly could to change the trajectory of runaway tourism and improve the quality of life for Moab valley residents, before it's too late.

Council members, Planners, all: Please do what's best for our community—focus only on this—and figure out a way to make Option 5 as bullet proof as possible. Don't be influenced by the what if's, maybe's, and hypothetical reactions of our Great State of Utah. Moab Valley residents do not deserve to live with an option that is shaped by fear.

And obviously, Option 5 does not have to be forever—ordinances can be revisited and revised as times change. But if for whatever reason Option 5 is not selected, please at least put a ton more restrictions on the types of accommodations that can be built. For instance, buildings no greater than two stories, less than 100 rooms, etc. Or perhaps only allow development of overnight rentals by local residents (defined as those having lived here X years)? Just a crazy idea.

Again, thanks for your hard work on this, and for taking our ideas under consideration!

P.S. If you haven't already seen this video taken last weekend of the "Sunday exodus," on Kane Creek backed up to the Aspen Road junction, please check it out—this video is worth a thousand words.

Enough (tourists) is enough!! We don't need to keep growing the tourist economy!

--

I want to start by saying you are off to an awesome start! What you have already compiled in such a short time is very impressive. Thank you for all of your hard work.

After the meeting last week, I do have a few comments of input:

1. **COMMUNITY COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT:** I am very pleased that everyone I spoke with seemed to be on the same page about development for our community: housing (of course), local commercial, professional office space, etc. I am so glad that even those against overnight rental development were still on board with this.
2. **OVERNIGHT DEVELOPMENT DISTRICTS:** However, part of the comments that people have been mentioning is the impact tourists are having on our natural landscape. We have only limited opportunities for camping which forces people who come here to go off into the desert and make their own paths for camping. I think the only way to combat this very concerning issue is to be sure that we are keeping up with legal means of overnight accommodations for the people who are coming here. We can't stop them from coming to our town, but we CAN help them to be responsible. As word continues to get out about how great it is to visit Moab, I worry that avoiding any future development will only exacerbate this issue.
3. **CAMPGROUNDS:** I DO think it is very important that we pinpoint particular areas for that kind of development. North of town seems like a very obvious choice that, when coupled with a public transportation option, could keep some number of tourist vehicles out of the city center. This does not, unfortunately, help with the camping issue. This may be a more palatable course of overnight development for those against hotel growth. The area near the dinosaur museum seems like a good option for this type of overnight growth.
4. **\*\*\*TINY HOME COMMUNITIES:** Currently, these type of wheeled housing units, tiny homes, etc are only allowed in highway commercial / overnight zoning district. THIS is of the utmost importance. We must have the opportunity for small / tiny communities in residential districts. More so than anything else, I think this would be the most useful piece of change that could be made to our land use code. Also, adoption of IRC Appendix Q would greatly benefit this effort. <https://codes.iccsafe.org/content/IRC2018/appendix-q-tiny-houses>

I appreciate your help and thank you for including my thoughts in your analysis. Have a nice remainder of your weekend!

--

In case my earlier comments were not specific enough... I prefer option 5- no new overnight rentals. I'm also in favor of curtailing special events, frankly. They seem to bring with them problems (already existing) on hyperdrive.

--

Yesterday at 11:30 am I tried to get home from a hike in Seven Mile Canyon. I turned right at Denny's on 500 W and it. It was stop and go, backed up all the way back to Kane Creek Rd. I followed it south to Kane Creek Rd. and turned out toward Main St. but turned around when I got out there. Traffic on Main St. was backed up through town south thru the intersection. This is what has happened to the town I have chosen to make my home. There are three large hotels which will come on-stream in the next few months, and plans are approved for substantially more overnight occupancy.

We have received multiple notices asking us not to use our garbage disposal. Really? We are supposed to make further compromises on basic day-to-day home living stuff so that more business development can be done for hundreds more tourists who will take long showers each night. Really?

What are you people thinking?

During Jeep Safari, I was walking across the painted, protected, pedestrian crossway between the two stop signs in front of the store. I had to jump out of the way of a vehicle which did not stop for me. The driver got out and yelled at me "I had the right of way". When I pointed at the painted marks for the walkway, he got out of his vehicle and screamed at me "I'm going to kick your F\$%ing ass." I'm a small business owner, own three properties in Moab (none of them overnight rentals, am a USMC vet, and I don't deserve this in the town where I have made my home.

Moab is now a bad place to live. My wife and I were at a pot-luck last night with 14 other friends, some who grew up here. We all got into a conversation about where should we go. It was a serious discussion. This conversation happens all the time now. Haven't you heard it?

Local government has done an awful job considering how to manage the high level of growth in town. There is disfunction everywhere.

I can't believe you are even considering any level of growth until past problems are resolved; most important is the construction of a bypass route through town.

Option 5 will continue to compromise us all, but it is the least worst option on the table right now. Are you so caught up on the process not to see what has happened to the quality of life for people who live and pay taxes here in Grand County?

--

I'm writing to support Option 5- No Growth for future overnight development in Grand County. The number of overnight rental units/beds currently exceeds the community's carrying capacity for infrastructure and quality of life. Bold action is necessary to begin to manage the out-of-control development and tourism influx that is plaguing this community in all respects. Furthermore, due to the pricing of available commercial property based on development as overnight rentals, we're experiencing a dire lack of commercial property for use by new business and manufacturing. Curbing new overnight rentals will hopefully decrease the costs of commercial property and encourage investment/development of those properties for other business uses.

--

I'd like to provide some follow up comments to the April 30th workshop. Some of these comments/suggestions come from other community members I've spoken to since the workshop.

- 1) Trailer parking - Provide trailer lots at the north and south ends of town and limit trailer parking and excess sized vehicles to these lots.
- 2) If any new hotels are allowed, require them to be locally-owned and provide restaurants, employee housing and adequate parking.
- 3) Implement a Moab area license, kind of like a fishing license, to utilize Moab trails and surrounding lands that would then pay for additional resource staff - e.g. trailhead greeters/rangers (similar to Duck Creek Recreation Area). These greeters/rangers would explain the trail systems and rules and also ticket people for infractions.
- 4) Need for a focus on Moab being a livable city. Currently traffic, noise, pollution, crime, trash, off-road/off-trail damage and speeding are out of control, and services (EMS, search and rescue and law enforcement) infrastructure (e.g. roads) are stretched beyond capacity. People I've spoken to are weary of the number of people descending on Moab. They're tired of the traffic, of the clueless drivers, of the disrespect and damage to our trails from illegal, off-road use, people parking their trucks and trailers in angled parking, speeding, noise, etc. It's all too much and making Moab unlivable for many.
- 5) Currently I'm in favor of Option 5, until Moab gets a handle on the current, compounded negative impacts from excessive tourism, with the possibility of transitioning to some version of Option 4 but with smaller, dispersed overlay zones for overnight accommodations. Also with Option 4, any overnight accommodations should be small scale/scale appropriate, form-based, and locally owned.
- 6) Allow commercial on the bottom story and residential above in commercial zones.
- 7) Consider offering incentives such as property tax rebates to residents for building (long-term) rental housing on their land.
- 8) Require B&Bs to be owner occupied.
- 9) Require new overnight accommodations to have onsite/local managers (physically available to address impacts to residential neighbors).
- 10) I know some folks would like to be able to make additional income by renting out a room in their house on Airbnb. If considering allowing Airbnb, take a look at Fairbnb, and restrict the allowance to one room per house and require the house be owner occupied.

[https://www.theguardian.com/cities/2019/apr/30/sinking-city-how-venice-is-managing-europes-worst-tourism-crisis?utm\\_term=RWRpdG9yaWFsX0d1YXJkaWFuVG9kYXIVUy0xOTA0MzA%3D&utm\\_source=esp&utm\\_medium=Email&utm\\_campaign=GuardianTodayUS&CMP=GTUS\\_email](https://www.theguardian.com/cities/2019/apr/30/sinking-city-how-venice-is-managing-europes-worst-tourism-crisis?utm_term=RWRpdG9yaWFsX0d1YXJkaWFuVG9kYXIVUy0xOTA0MzA%3D&utm_source=esp&utm_medium=Email&utm_campaign=GuardianTodayUS&CMP=GTUS_email)

Thanks for your efforts.

--

Moab is a community in crisis, with residents in an uproar over the overwhelming impacts of tourism. Escalation of this reaction from locals has really occurred within the last 2-3 years and the rate at which these reactions are intensifying is alarming. Many really long-term residents, even some of those born here are now feeling pressured to leave a community they once relished. This is not only sad; it is appalling. Issues that are impacting locals will also start to impact the best of our visitors (i.e. those contributing most to the community economically, behaving respectfully, etc.), and likely drive them away.

Issues that come with increased tourism such as noise, lower safety on roads, etc. need to be dealt with separately. In the meantime, the lack of resources and services to support significant growth of the overnight accommodations, a segment of the economy that serves just a few, must be addressed now with this moratorium. Limited resources include (a) water and (b) space for future development of services that will serve a greater portion of the community.

We don't yet know the level of impacts from future overnight accommodations that have already been approved and I would argue that for this reason, a complete moratorium (option 5) is in order, at least for 2-3 years, a period as long as it took for living in Moab to become barely tolerable. We can always revisit this decision at a future time, once we have a better idea of how much more growth we can allow.

My biggest concerns now include:

(a) traffic flow on the north end of town, south of the bridge,

(b) traffic safety on Hwy 191 on the south end of the County for residents in the high-density overlay zone on the west side of the highway

For both of these areas, I believe we need a frontage road, with traffic lights where the frontage road accesses Hwy 191. While I gather that UDOT is slated to start the widening project this summer, this may not be enough to prevent traffic backing up, particularly as people make left turns across traffic into the new developments. It may be too late to add the new timeshare complex under construction to the frontage road between Holiday Inn and Archway, but this would be a place to start.

In summary, although we may already have permanently impacted quality of life in Moab, we need to extend the moratorium (Option 5) and give us time to gain control over tourism impacts.

Thank you.

--

I was at your workshop last week at the Grand Center - thanks for making that happen. And, for making it a smooth event that seemed to be quite constructive.

As I stated in my small group get-together, at this point I favor “no growth” (and, yes, I know that is a misleading title). Things will continue to grow. Given that there are already so many approved overnight accommodation projects in the pipeline it seems to me that we can go with no more motel/hotel type accommodations for several years. Maybe, allow some more camp grounds (they can more easily be changed to another use). Perhaps make a sunset clause for 5 or 7 years out. The pendulum has swung so far toward overbuilding, let’s swing it back just as far the other way for a while.

Mostly, I want to ask that you please include in the updated code some guidelines about architectural codes for Moab and Grand County. I am so repulsed by the number of “Butler” buildings created here. Why can’t we become the place known for mid-century/ATOMIC architecture? There are a few fine examples in Moab, one being the former gas station/present auto sales on South Main near one of our many dollar stores: ALCO. Another being the beautiful Uranium Building on Main, near Center.

Thanks for all your work and best of luck, I look forward to you next public event.

--

I have attended the two main public meetings that were held to provide information about the “Hotel Moratorium” and would like to add my views to the many others you have received on this subject.

I appreciate the extensive work that Landmark Consultants has done and wish that the option descriptions and maps had been available well in advance of this last meeting. Most everyone I have talked with who attended that meeting felt that the maps, in particular, were incomplete (many B & B’s were not shown, for example—particular south of Moab and even in town) and most of us felt that the only options that really focused on Moab’s problems are Options 4 and 5. The time the planners spent on the other three was a wasted effort in my opinion—those didn’t address our concerns in any significant way.

I know that many who have or will offer responses to you have addressed the water and traffic concerns. Those are certainly of paramount importance. However, very few have brought up the real possibility that the high volume of visitors that Moab is currently experiencing will wane and we will wind up with some big, ugly, empty hotel buildings. Of course, the national parks will always be a draw, but unless the National Park Service is allowed to implement their proposed reservation plans for Arches NP, I am confident we will see a drop in their figures within just a few years. The concept of a shuttle system for Arches is neither practical nor desirable, and I think we are wasting our time studying its feasibility.

There is no way Moab needs even one more hotel, and our current system of approving B & B’s—even when the City KNOWS about them—is appalling. It is no wonder we have no affordable housing, when anyone (residents or out-of-town “entrepreneurs”) can buy up a modest home and turn it into a B & B. The old ordinance which required that B & B owners had to live on their property got tossed out along the way, as did the former requirement that home business (including B&B’s) had to provide a sheet with the approval of the six closest neighbors before getting a permit.

We have lost control of our city and county, and it will be an uphill battle to gain that back, but

approving Option 5—with some appropriate modifications that aren't designed to benefit the developers—would be a good start.

--

1. Thank you for your efforts on behalf of Moab and Grand County:
2. I believe that Moab and Grand County need to have a collective plan on how to move forward with future economic development, residential density and zoning codes. If San Juan will participate, that would be amazing.
3. Mixed use needs to be encouraged, if not required. The city is dire need of more restaurant space, retail frontages, entrepreneurial space, office space and recreational storage.
4. Pedestrian friendly from the river to the University--- how can we make this happen with UDOT? We need concurrent paths on both sides of the highway through this section of town, possibly all the way to San Juan County--- at least planned for future growth.
5. We need architectural standards that are protective to a future vision, yet not overly intrusive to development bottom line.
6. I believe the historic buildings on Main Street/downtown need to be protected.
7. The downtown area should have in depth planning- frontages need to provide retail and/or restaurant space. I do not believe that residential should be allowed on the ground floor frontages of C3 or C4. Lodging and/or residential shall be on the second story or back lots.
8. I believe in protecting neighborhood retail areas. Spanish Valley is in dire need of small retail opportunities. HC should allow retail and grocery.
9. No to status quo and no to 'no growth' in lodging. I believe you can take a measured approach and determine the appropriate areas for lodging growth; the 'no growth' is too risky and may trigger dire impacts to the community through State Legislation. I fear losing our local control on Short Term Rentals through the State Legislature and would like to make sure the powers that be in Moab and Grand County keep this in mind as they make future decisions. Loss of local control will equal loss of our community.
10. I would like to know what is planned for the Resort Special areas near 313/191. These areas have always been in the County's vision for resort/commercial endeavors.
11. All things water. When we get our water studies back; all growth hinders on our water plan. We need the data to truly plan.

My two cents. Thanks!

--

Option 5. No growth.

--

Having attended the meeting on April 30<sup>th</sup> as well as the Landmark Public Scoping Meeting on March 27<sup>th</sup>, I write now to express my concern regarding the options under consideration during the moratorium. First of all, I object to the use of 'cons' listed for each of the options which threaten that with each option other than number 1, we are to worry about "sending development down the road to

Spanish Valley". That seems to be a fear tactic used to influence any decision being made for the health of Moab and Grand County and I resent that being given such a priority of consideration!

Given the options presented, I am convinced that Option 5 is the only possibility for keeping a lid on the tourism currently inundating Moab and Grand County. I think it is inaccurate to term Option 5 "No Growth" as we all know that there are at least 20% more overnight rental/hotel rooms in the pipeline, or, as Zachariah Levine was quoted, "about 1200 new overnight lodging rooms are vested but not yet completed"!

My reasons for supporting this Option 5 follow:

1. Water usage - with increased tourists we have a huge increase in water use from showers, toilets, linens laundered, etc. Water studies are in the works and we don't yet know how much water we really have for sustainable yearly use. There are also water demands coming from the cry for development in the San Juan County portion of Spanish Valley. And there is certainly the reality of climate change to factor in!
2. Traffic congestion, noise, increased use of Razor type vehicles that should not even be allowed on our public highway, and the desecration of the beautiful lands surrounding our town. With only one route in and out of town, our weekend traffic is out of control, with traffic backing up on Main and 5<sup>th</sup> West for almost two hours! There is really no remedy for that.
3. Threats to a sense of community – an overemphasis on the economic baseline leads to a bottom line which underestimates the importance of the need for diversity of housing options, for jobs that pay a decent wage, and disregards the sense of shared interest by our unique inhabitants who love and respect the town and its environs and work to keep it protected and sacred.
4. Hopefully, the large-scale commercial hotels already in the pipeline have been vetted and are legally required to limit how many units can be built, what kind of height and density are possible, if they will need to provide adequate parking, open space, housing for employees, and possibly restricted to provide for ground floor local retail shops, businesses and restaurants.
5. Local residential, commercial and community services growth would be encouraged.

Thank you for the 11 Guiding Principles. I would laud their consideration as you move ahead with pondering possible options. I would order them a bit differently, putting Guiding Principle 6 as the primary one, next 8, and then 1, 2, and on. Those principles are quite wonderful and if they were truly guiding your process, I would think they might lead to finding other options!

Thank you for soliciting input from the Moab valley residents. I am grateful for the intentional work you are doing, spending time on these difficult issues. May we all work together to improve the quality of life for our community.

--

After attending the land use planning workshop last week, I just wanted to express my thoughts on the matter. I've lived in Moab for the last 2.5 years and definitely feel that the current situation with tourists and overnight accommodations isn't working. My first big thought is why does Moab need more

overnight accommodations? It seems so busy and full of people everywhere, City Market, restaurants, National Parks...wherever you go you will find a crowd during the busy time of year (which I'm sure people have noticed is getting to be a larger portion of the year). In the summarized comments I think this one says it all:

*Multiple individuals reported anecdotes from tourists/visitors that overcrowding in Moab negatively impacted their experience and may not or will not return, with one of those individuals saying that a recent guest at their condo/rental said, "This is a great place you have here, but there are too many people. We may or may not come back."*

Adding more rooms doesn't add more infrastructure to handle more visitors. I also strongly agree with the idea of the land having a carrying capacity of visitation. Which in my opinion is reaching its limits in certain high use areas. This topic is so nuanced and multifaceted I feel like I could write a novel about my concerns. Generally though I agreed with the majority of the ones already summarized and just want to highlight a few ideas:

- 1) I'm for having no growth in overnight accommodations (I realize this may not be feasible and seem to far a step to some, especially people making money in the tourist business) It's better for a smaller number of people to have a better visit to Moab than have a large number have a negative one...which is unavoidable if growth in tourism continues. Less is more.
- 2) As far as guiding principles go, the most important one to me by far is #6, To recognize limited resources available to the area. Whether that is land, water, delicate habitat to plants and animals or space to eat at Milt's. Determine whatever resource is most limited and plan growth around that. It is far easier to not do something than it is to undo it in the future.
- 3) An idea of how our typical ideas of economy are flawed from Bill McKibben's book *Deep Economy* that I think is worth thinking about: McKibben thinks we need another kind of bottom line that doesn't just measure profit, but also measures **fulfillment** and a sense of connection. He notes in his first chapter that two birds named More and Better used to roost together on the same tree branch. But these days, McKibben writes, Better has flown a few trees over to make her nest.

I don't know the history of what Moab has been like but it's certainly feels unbalanced now. It is a great place to live and visit but I hope a plan to keep it that way (and fix some of our current issues) can be made. I look forward to hearing more about this topic in the future and especially hearing what the plan moving forward is.

--

Thank you for the opportunity to respond.

I could not find the summary of last week's meeting? I had to leave after the initial presentation. Based on what I found on-line and heard in the first hour of the meeting here are my thoughts.

- The economic presentation was extremely narrow. Maybe that was as it should be but economics are but a very small portion of the big picture. If more visitors want to and would come if the community kept up with the demand DOES NOT mean it would be good for the community or the environment or even for the tourist experience.

- I have not heard any mention of the consideration for air quality in the valley with continued growth???? Are we naive enough to think that air quality will stay the same with more growth?
- As for the choice of proposals - I would ultimately like to say “5” no growth, but as that is not likely to happen then I would vote for “4” with provisions for new growth to include mitigation for air quality, assured water sustainability, infrastructure to roads and nonmotorized pathways, adequate labor and housing, and traffic movement.

--

I attended the March 27 public scoping meeting and participated in the April 30 public workshop. My comments follow:

### General Comments

Important impact fact: Additional overnight accommodations will reduce available water. I anticipate that water restrictions will be implemented in Moab’s future, just as they have been in many towns and cities throughout the western U.S. It is just a matter of time. The more overnight accommodations we approve, the sooner water use restrictions will be forced upon residents. Additionally, the more hotels, the more infrastructure for water storage is required to fight structure fires.

The people who are living here should have priority over visitors. When water restrictions for residents are implemented, all overnight accommodations should also be restricted by the same amount per individual. For example, it has been reported (Moab Sun News 8/6/2014) that an average home in Moab uses 500 gallons/day. City-data.com reports that an average of 2.4 people per household live in Moab. Therefore, an average Moab resident uses about 200 gallons/day. If water use were restricted by 10% this would allow residents 180 gallons/day. This same restriction should be applied to an individual staying in an overnight accommodation. After all, they are guests and do not own property here. How far would 180 gallons/day go per visitor? Would they have enough water to take a shower, let the faucet run while they brush their teeth, buy coffee, have dishes washed at a restaurant after a meal, wash their muddy vehicles, and do their laundry?

Water quantity is a major consideration in choosing an option. For each of the 5 options, the estimated number of rooms (or range of the number of rooms) that could be added should be calculated. Along with that, it would be essential to know the estimated water use per room and total additional water use for each option. I know that these will be estimates, but it is a critical piece of information in making a decision. Additionally, we need to know how many additional vehicles would be associated with each option. Thus far, not enough detail is provided for residents to make an informed decision on the differences among options with respect to water use, noise, congestion, off street parking for ATV and UTV trailers, as well as the number of additional employees required.

I believe that the term “Growth” used in all 5 options is a misnomer which infers overarching economic repercussions which do not necessarily exist. For many residents, the term “No growth” likely implies economic decline. The options discuss overnight accommodations, not growth per se. Suggestion: replace “growth” with “overnight accommodation” because that is what is being debated. I believe that continued growth is possible without additional overnight accommodations.

“Does not go far enough” is stated in the cons section for Options 2 and 3. “Goes too far” is stated in cons section for Option 5. This implies that Options 1 and 4 are more acceptable than Options 2, 3 and 5. Value judgements such as these have no place in this document.

Please let the public know if the regulatory tools implemented in the chosen option will allow for public comments at a public meeting that will be considered by elected officials (vs. public opinion termed public clamor). The public likely expects to be able to comment on proposed developments in fulfilling particular performance standards.

#### Specific comments on Options 1-5

Options 1 and 2 are unacceptable to me. Option 3 would help to maintain downtown residential neighborhoods but traffic from additional overnight accommodations north of town would end up in Moab and these businesses would add to congestion. Limiting overnight accommodations to north of town does not alleviate the downtown traffic congestion, noise, or water use.

Options 4 or 5 are my preferred alternatives. I’ve lived here since 1976, when you could buy clothing other than t-shirts and businesses had enough qualified employees to serve their customers. Moab is no longer offering a quality experience for either visitors or residents. We need to maintain Moab as a place both residents and visitors enjoy.

Thank you for your engagement with our community. We appreciate it.

--

I am writing about the “five options” presented by Landmark Design regarding overnight lodging. I support option 5. Moab should entirely stop new overnight lodging for a period of time. That time limit should be 2 or more years, and then reassessed. At the absolute minimum, **“use by right” and/or “permitted use” should absolutely be eliminated** in favor of some strict approval process regarding location, type of buildings, tourism growth rate, population, land availability, and affordable housing space. Also, Option 4 is a terrible idea to allow new overnight accommodations only in the north part of town which will result in a (more) hideous overbuilt area as the entrance to our town.

--

I would like to see option 5 happen. No growth. More than 1200 rooms are already approved and enough is enough. There is a caring capacity and I believe we are well above that. I am also concerned about water. I think Moab needs to protect what is left of the integrity of a small tourist town.

--

I am writing to express my thoughts about the moratorium and development of new ordinances/overlays for creating a more thoughtful approach to overnight accommodations in the Moab area.

First, I would like to commend all of you for taking on this issue! It’s a difficult one, and has been put off so long that it’s been made even more difficult to deal with. Since it hasn’t been dealt with, the town is

reeling from the consequences of a lack of planning and I'm happy to see steps being taken to remedy that.

I firmly believe that Option #5 is the only solution that works for what Moab is experiencing right now. There are so many reasons to institute Option 5, but primarily it's **water**. We are in a desert with limited water, so must permit building accordingly, and it seems to me that the last 20 years of uncontrolled growth in overnight lodging has been more than enough. We must be smart about water use, and reining in hotel growth will help.

I was also very disappointed that in every other option, all growth was concentrated in the north corridor. That seems like the first place to halt development! There has been no effort to make that a "community" or part of Moab. All those folks must get into town to eat, shop, have a cup of coffee etc., adding to the traffic and parking problems in town. It seems like the perfect place to have employee or other "affordable" housing options, with one/some of your "community nodes" there.

If some type of lodging growth must be accommodated, it must be very restrictive. No more large 3-story box hotels--they need to be small businesses (not corporations). All must go through not only the planning commission but appropriate councils as well. No more "use by right."

Thank you for considering my comments.

--

Hello, I'm a resident of Moab, and strongly believe in the option 5, so city may retain as much power as possible for our land use. I believe we need to restrict hotel use so that much need other services and business can be built. I believe our highways and roads cannot sustain current development and certainly not more. I really believe the city should purchase the land for park lol.

--

I am writing in support of Option 5, no new overnight accommodations. Some are afraid of being too restrictive, but it makes sense to keep things as tight as we can while we have the chance. Once the floodgates have been opened again there is no going back. We can always loosen restrictions down the road as needed, but if we do nothing and applications for 10 more hotels come in as soon as the moratorium is lifted, what recourse will we have?

I would strongly argue that Option 5 is NOT a "no growth" option. This would allow for and incentivize growth of other aspects of the tourism economy besides accommodation (restaurants, gear stores, guiding businesses etc), and other parts of our economy that could serve the local community (daycares, office spaces, markets, etc). This would strengthen and diversify our local economy and help build a more diverse tax base that is less dependent on TRT revenue.

Currently the people who benefit the most from tourism dollars in Moab are the landowners, developers, investors (many from out of town) who already have the resources to build big hotels, but what about the rest of us who don't have these huge resources? If we remove the option to make building overnight rentals and hotels the "highest and best use", we are providing an opportunity for

MORE people in our community to get a slice of this pie. We should restrict the ability to build hotels on all commercial properties so that other locals can have a greater opportunity to build their own small businesses, whether tourism based or not.

Also you can hardly say that option 5 is a "no growth" option when you look at the projects already underway that will lead to a 25% increase in accommodations, that is definitely growth! Using the "no growth" phrasing is misleading and should be corrected. Also, these numbers of how many new hotels and rooms that are already in the works (over 1,000 new rooms!) should be made public through this process. Our community deserves to know what's already coming, and this information is currently hard to find.

We have been told by local experts that we are maxing out our water resources. Why and to whom does it make sense in this case to build even more 100 room hotels?? How much water does one of these hotels use every day? And how does that compare to what other businesses might consume? What is our carrying capacity for this valley, and if we have reached it, why are we continuing to cram more people in?? These questions also apply to our other resources and infrastructure: roads, sewer, waste management, trails, etc.

Finally, many who choose to live here have chosen Moab for the quality of life our valley provides: the landscape, the night sky, the small town feel, the well-loved institutions, the community. If we continue on a path of rampant "growth" we will be seriously undermining our own quality of life.

--

I have lived here for 30 years. I am very concerned about our community with the amount of tourists coming here and hotels being built. Please stop building hotels. I vote for option 5!

--

I attended the Land Use Workshop last week. Prior to that, I had not been following the lodging discussion well. I tried to keep an open mind, and understand each of the proposals. I realized once we got into our smaller groups how many different ways there are to see this issue - economics, individual property "rights", quality of life, etc. Such a monumental task!! I found myself attaching to the concept of scale - i.e., don't allow these monstrosities that dwarf our little town. But after letting the issue settle in me over the last week, I've come to realize any sort of "compromise" isn't a compromise at all, it's still allowing too much. Moab is full. Moab has reached capacity. Our water, our infrastructure, our traffic - all at capacity. And there are 1200 more rooms to come! Yet most of all, residents can't take MORE. It is the first topic in virtually every personal conversation here: something akin to "Moab used to be a nice place to live." People feel trapped and unhappy and that they have no control. It's a collective mental health issue! (I suppose quality of life would be a more professional term.)

I realize No Lodging Growth is not a panacea, but it sure is a start. THEN we can reign in this explosive growth and regain some control, and make educated, deliberate decisions.

--

Lodging aside, it is becoming clearer each year that Moab cannot handle the growing number of visitors to our area (i.e. major traffic jams, food running out at City Market, massive visitation at Arches National

Park, not enough campsites to handle the number of campers, stress on Search and Rescue/EMS, and other public services, etc.).

I recommend putting a HOLD on further lodging development until our existing problems relating to the load of visitation can be defined and addressed. This could take years, but so be it.

I support tourist development. However, I want to welcome tourists to a place that can accommodate their needs and expectations. I also want restrictions in place that will protect the quality of life for locals as well as for the environment. Currently, we are in the process of destroying and 'crowding out' the beauty that is the very reason tourists are attracted to our area.

A couple of ideas: Put a hold on lodging development until -

- a) an alternative traffic corridor or by-pass is established to handle the existing congestion;
- b) more restaurants can be built to handle everyone simply trying to have a meal; and,
- c) existing problems are defined and addressed (overload for Search and Rescue, EMS, Police, etc.; do we really have enough water to sustain the local community AND the increasing number of visitors?; etc.)

The main idea is to put on the breaks for a few years and PLAN further healthy, logical, systematic and attractive growth. In addition to this planning, it is important to continue to refine our scheduling of local festivals, conferences and events so as to create a smooth and compatible flow of ... turbulence.

Thank you for this input opportunity.

--

I am a concerned citizen who wants to see Moab develop in a healthy sustainable way.

I am sure you are receiving all kinds of feedback from locals, so I will try and make this e-mail brief.

I am a small business owner who has worked in the service industry in Moab for 14 years. I have seen the business I work for part time grow every year. Because of the high cost of living I have to work a part time job and run my small business, even though my husband has a good government job.

Hotels are increasing, nightly rentals are increasing, housing prices are increasing, traffic is increasing, while local wages are stagnant.

I own and operate a small catering business and have had to turn down many jobs, because I cannot afford to rent a larger kitchen or retail space that will allow me to expand.

Economic diversity is a key part of a sustainable economy. Where can new restaurants and services go in Moab, when the "highest and best use" to make money continues to be hotels? This isn't about restricting growth or economic development, it is about making it sustainable and useful for everyone in Moab, tourists included. Additionally, this will actually increase the number of people, locals, and

families who can make money from tourism; that right now only landowners who sell or build for hotel development can have.

Lastly, our little town cannot currently support the amount of people that are recreating here. I live off 500 West, and work on Main Street. This spring it has been a regular weekend occurrence for traffic to be backed up to Kane creek, from the intersection of 191 and 500 West. And traffic heading north on 191 to be backed up all the way through town, to 400 East. As I bike by all these people sitting in their cars (because its faster for me to bike to work than drive on the weekends) I can tell you they do not look happy.

I do not know what the best solution is to our complex problems, but I am sure it involves balancing nightly rentals, with affordable housing, developing infrastructure to support all of us and the visitors. People will not want to keep coming to Moab and staying in all of these hotels if it takes them 30 minutes to go 1 mile on Main Street, or have to wait over 90 minutes to eat dinner.

Thank you for your time.

--

I would like to give my input for the direction that the Land Use Plan takes during this much-needed moratorium (thank you!) I am a Moab resident of 14 years, and work in both the service industry and in the non-profit realm of the community. My opinions are based on great love and pride for the heart of this community and a fierce desire to protect both our human community and our ecological community from getting completely drowned in unchecked development, which has already begun happening at a rate that is alarming to me.

I believe it is in the Moab Valley's best interest to draft a plan in the vision of option 5, the NO GROWTH option. Below I will outline my reasons:

1) "No Growth" is still growth! Even with this option, we will still see the momentum play out on already-slated projects, a roughly 20% additional increase of overnight lodging in Moab. More importantly, the "No Growth" option would transition the TYPE of growth promoted in Moab from accommodations, currently the most lucrative, to more needed development: restaurants, shops, small businesses, community development. By choosing this option, I believe we can continue to have economic growth which truly benefits the community and strengthens the core and quality of Moab, rather than just assist in getting higher visitation rates. We would begin to see much-needed economic diversity in non-lodging businesses, and can focus on creating incentives for small business owners who live and work in Moab.

2) Maybe we should take a cue from Venice. Existing rooms are filling up during the on-season. But perhaps, rather than indicating that we need more rooms, this is simply indicating that we are AT CAPACITY. There is only so much this town and this valley can accommodate, and as already stated, we can continue to economically grow in other aspects of our community, and strengthen the QUALITY of our tourist revenue rather than just focus on QUANTITY. In my experience working at a small restaurant in Moab, more visitors does not necessarily mean more money, just more stress. All over Moab, I see businesses, even City Market, maxed out on how many people they can provide service to. This creates an often-miserable experience for visitors and a completely untenable experience for locals just trying to get through the day-to-day.

3) Our resources are finite! In addition to local businesses feeling at capacity, I have serious concerns about our natural resources being at capacity. We need to definitively and unequivocally understand the capacity of our watershed, and be completely confident that we have water to spare (and will continue to have water to spare!) before opening the possibility for more overnight accommodations. This too goes for air quality and waste stream management. More dollars coming in with increased visitation has many hidden costs of the immense impacts that people on vacation, even the most conscientious people, have on local resources and infrastructure.

4) Our roads are finite. About 4 years ago, it felt like someone flipped a switch in Moab. Suddenly springtime means traffic jams and the new normal for locals is to not even think about venturing north of town during peak hours unless you want a Bay Area-style traffic jam on your way home. We need to focus on traffic management solutions, increasing pedestrian and bike-friendly people spaces, and establishing public transportation before thinking about adding more rooms and therefore more cars to town.

5) Quality of Life. I remember when you could find quiet in Moab! But the current amplitude of visitation has brought with it a constant hum of motors and activity that is increasingly impossible to escape as a resident of this valley. I moved here to get away from the woes of the city, and I know many others who are of the same mindset. What good is economic growth if none of us are enjoying it? By shifting focus from number of beds in town to creating green spaces and strengthening neighborhood hubs, we can take agency in maintaining a robust quality of life for locals, and by doing these things I guarantee we will also have the ability to provide visitors with greater quality of experience.

6) Overnight accommodations development is increasingly only going to benefit the already-wealthy. With hotel development, I have seen a marked shift from locally owned modest hotels to large-scale corporate chains. For smaller overnight rentals, the increasing disparity between local wages and real estate prices (the worst in Utah, as discussed in a recent KZMU news feature) means that future development even on the smaller scale will likely be only accessible to outside money, those who already have money, and second homeowners. Let's redirect our development into small businesses that are more likely to be an option for working people in Moab, and make sure that commercial properties can be developed toward that potential, rather than bought up by the highest bidder, likely to be more corporate hotel chains. Small locally-owned businesses keep their money local. I am skeptical that revenue dollars from large hotel chains spend any time circulating in Moab before escaping this valley completely.

7) Finally, option 5 still holds potential for other options, but in choosing a less conservative option, we will never be able to revert to the "No Growth" option. This is simply the smartest approach at this point in time, and leaves room for the most available alternatives down the road. Moab can always crank things back to 11 in the future. But if we choose restraint at this crucial moment, we have the luxury to explore all the areas listed above, and take a full, measured look at all the realities of our valley. Sometimes a rapid is just too dicey to read-and-run while in motion. Sometimes the smartest thing to do is eddy out, get a still, long view at what lies ahead, and take the time to plot your course.

It is my hope that those guiding this process will have the prudence and courage to take this approach. I do believe the future of our community really hinges on what happens here.

Thank you for your time!

--

My wife and I own a residential lot just north of Old City Park. Currently there is no structure on the property, but we hope to build our future home there within the next year or so. We plan to live in Moab year-round, now that we are both retired. We've been visiting Moab for a number of decades (myself, since 1978) and have seen how things have changed over the years. Unfortunately, we would have to agree that in general, the changes have not been positive. We thought we should express our feelings about the future course of the city, since we are planning on being future full-time residents and will have to live with the consequences of your impending decisions for the rest of our lives.

First, when you're in a hole, the first thing to do is to stop digging. The current situation that Moab finds itself in is the result of the overwhelming success of its advertising campaign. Stop advertising southern Utah! By this point, word of mouth will continue to bring in additional visitors. Advertising just turbo charges the influx. Stop it!

Second, there should not be any more overnight residential accommodations. Right now there are three overnight residential accommodations within a quarter mile of our future home. And this area is supposed to be residential! If someone wants to rent out their home to others, it should not be for less than three months; better yet, six months. Something of this nature could conceivably alleviate some of the housing shortages that plague seasonal workers trying to find a place to stay.

Third, there should not be any more new hotels, RV parks, or campgrounds built in Moab. We believe a more practical approach to house the ever-increasing number of visitors is have new hotels, motels, RV parks, and campgrounds built at Crescent Junction. There is plenty of land there to accommodate this growth, unlike in Moab. This solution is a win/win approach for everyone. These newly built accommodations would still fill with the tourists that visit Moab. They would also receive additional business from people who are just passing through on I-70. Crescent Junction is close enough that people can still drive into Moab. As an additional bonus, it's even closer to Green River, Utah. This could bring additional money and business to Green River, providing economic stimulus to that town. This would alleviate some of the congestion in Moab. With new accommodations at Crescent Junction, it's a good bet that restaurants would follow suit. Again, alleviating some of the congestion in Moab at dining establishments

Furthermore, logistics might be practical that a shuttle service could be initiated between Crescent Junction and Moab, thus diminishing the necessity for visitors to drive into town. Once again, alleviating congestion.

We believe that this solution is a good fit for the community of Moab, as well as that of Green River. It would free up some housing for the residents of Moab. It would increase the accommodations for the visitors (albeit, not in town) and it will alleviate some of the congestion by creating a new hub of activity by I-70.

We hope that you give our suggestions serious consideration. Moab is a beautiful place! We shouldn't allow it to get ruined by no holds barred development. Although we can't change the past, we do have the power to change the future. Please do the right thing. Thank you!

--

I am in support of Option 5, the most restrictive option for further overnight accommodations. I don't actually think it is restrictive enough. The quality of life in town has diminished over the past few years, with so many beds in this town that our capacity is overflowing. Our local residents can't escape the hustle anymore, and it is the talk of the town throughout all demographics.

We should continue to seek diversity in our local economy, and allowing more of this one kind of development makes that increasingly difficult. We should also strive to support our local economy by supporting local businesses, not chains and conglomerates of industry hotels.

Thank you for your consideration.

--

I am a born and raised Moab local, and over the years I have watched my hometown change remarkably. Notably in the last few, the amount of hotels along the 191 corridor is particularly striking. I'm writing this email to express my concern about the unprecedented growth in overnight rentals which has been temporarily suspended by the moratorium, and to express support for the "no growth" option to continue, until a more sustainable, comprehensive, and diversified economic model can be adopted.

First, I don't feel that "no growth" is an accurate description. Primarily because over 1,000 more rooms are approved to be added to the nightly rental pool. This is over a 20% increase compared to what we already have, so it's not as if the growth in the lodging sector will be stopped cold. If the council chooses to adopt a no growth model for the time being, it will be much easier to permit growth again further down the line. At this point, it seems very unclear to me how many hotel rooms Moab actually needs, and letting the free market be the sole determiner of this number and letting it play out in that way seems short-sighted. As a community, we can see where we stand after the new rooms are built, and decide the needs of the town at that point.

I firmly believe that the quantity of services in this town needs to be diversified, not only to improve the quality of life for local residents, but also for tourists visiting a town that simply cannot keep up with the demands for food, entertainment and other services. I believe that local government policy can nudge the economy towards diversification by incentivizing other types of businesses. I also believe that potential developers will consider other forms of businesses once nightly rentals are taken off the table because of the economic potential of the town. So "no growth" really is a misnomer; it's more like "diversified growth."

Thank you for taking the time to read my comments and concerns.

--

Growth in Moab is deceptive. Our resident population is growing slowly but aspects of our economy do not follow that growth. We are experiencing a large rate of growth in short term rentals and this distorts our community in many ways. For background we need to keep in mind the Moab General Plan which states,

"While the City is growing, there is an increasing desire to keep our small-town atmosphere. The people that live here choose to reside here because of the amenities of the area. The character of Moab is also important to people looking to relocate in the area. Preserving small-town values is of the highest priority for many Moab residents, and anything that affects local neighborhoods or Moab's atmosphere has heightened importance to those who live in the community."

Additionally, a goal of our General Plan states, "Maintain Moab's small-town character." Moab also recognizes the need for economic sustainability by stating the elements for a good general plan which includes, "Element 2 - Environmental Sustainability Outlines the role of the City in addressing impacts on the environment and the quality of life for current and future residents."

The presentation by Landmark Design noted that construction of overnight lodging continues because the demand continues to increase. Currently this is true but it is the result of a taxpayer funded drive to increase the number of visitors. Yet current experience also indicates that the growth negatively impacts our community. I have personally experienced this with stop-and-go traffic starting near the Potash Road when returning to Moab more than once this year. With my brother and his family, we experienced a thirty-minute wait time to enter Arches NP. I have exited US 191 at 500 West to avoid traffic jams on Main Street with varying levels of success.

As part of this land use plan, we should also consider the relationship of Moab and Grand County with Arches NP. Both of our governments should be an active partner in helping Arches NP maintain its purposes. The Organic Act for the National Park Service gives the following direction to the NPS.

"The service thus established shall promote and regulate the use of the Federal areas known as national parks, monuments, and reservations hereinafter specified by such means and measures as conform to the fundamental purpose of the said parks, monuments, and reservations, which purpose is to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

Anyone who has visited Arches NP multiple times over several decades cannot ignore the changes that have happened within the Park. Values such as solitude or even minimal presence of others has largely disappeared in the last twenty years. Yet we continue to advertise Delicate Arch with photographs showing no one there. Parking lots have increased in size yet parking can be difficult to find at times. Personally, I would love to have kept my first experience at Arches around sixty years ago the same for current visitors. I feel we have in fact seen the opposite of "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." Perhaps we cannot return to the past but we have no good reason to continue the trend away from a natural landscape to an increasingly crowded landscape.

Visitors now experience traffic jams, long waiting lines to enter Arches, long wait times to get into restaurants, and crowded sidewalks.

In 1958 John Kenneth Galbraith published *The Affluent Society*. For this long we have known that our economic growth has not resulted from the meeting of needs for survival and wellbeing but rather the satisfaction of manufactured or created needs. In our unfortunate situation we have created the desire to visit the Mighty Five, our most prominent National Parks. Our success created problems many did not anticipate. Instead of damping the process of attracting visitors we doubled down on pushing for increased tourism. We have done this with tax dollars. We have a kind of socialized tourist industry. I

sense in some a feeling of powerlessness in the face of this ever increasing and impactful industry. Our local newspapers headline the problems frequently. We do not need to continue manufacturing an ever-increasing level of visitation.

Our community needs to bring some control to our destiny. While cannot prohibit visitors, we do not need to press for ever more visitors. We are distorting our community in a single direction which makes living here more expensive and more difficult.

In reviewing the options presented by Landmark Design the fifth option seems clearly the one that could stop the economic distortion towards what is likely unsustainable. The fourth option with a small overlay zone on the north end of Moab could be helpful. Overlay zones are one tool that could be useful to keep visitation within reasonable bounds.

There are other tools available.

Size of overnight rentals could be restricted by height codes, number of rooms constructed, and restrictions on the number of rooms in a structure with requirements for open space and landscaping.

We also need to make sure our lighting code is adequate to retain our dark skies.

Our community should create event free weekends perhaps as often as each month. Preference should be given to locally organized events. Depending on the kind of event the number of participants may need to be restricted. Events with a long history of local organizing should be recognized and accommodated.

--

I would like to urge that you choose option number 5, no growth. This spring has proven that our infrastructure is subpar. Specifically, the main road in and out of town. I would like to see a second highway or bypass put in that went around Moab. This would be helpful for people passing through on business and not stopping to play here. Secondly, South of the river bridge just past the light where 4 lanes choke down to 2 is the stupidest thing I've ever seen. Please make the whole stretch 4 lanes. Spanish valley drive could also use sidewalks for safer biking.

Thank you for your time and considering my request.

--

I believe the City of Moab and Grand County should adopt option #5, the no growth model with a focus on developing community nodes. We desperately need more community services, and we simply do not need more accommodations for tourists. Several hotels, the massive conference center in town, and the USU campus are already in the pipeline. Any additional growth would suffocate our City/County and further push locals away from the idea of establishing a sustainable, engaged community. We can adapt to tourism in different ways.

Our advertising through the Travel Council should be focused on reducing impact on our area and educating tourists about cryptobiotic soil, water scarcity, and other delicate aspects of our unique environment. Continuing to build any more accommodations, even if they are limited to a particular

area, is not a priority for me as a 25-year-old considering staying in Moab long term if the tourism doesn't continue to drown the character of our community.

Thank you for all of the hard work you all are doing! It warms my heart to know that the City and County do really care about the voices in our community.

--

I am a lifelong resident of Moab. I wanted to let you know I appreciate the opportunity you have given us to have our input heard regarding land use at this time. I support "No Growth" for overnight accommodations. I feel like we continue to build and rezone and offer licenses to these establishments and we are drowning.

People know about Moab, and they are coming what we need is a little balance. We need to provide quality services instead of just mass services. We need our other services both for locals and tourists to catch up. We need to make sure that Moab is enjoyable for tourists and also not forget our citizens. Life in Moab amidst the chaos is currently not pleasant. There are several properties in my neighborhood that keep trying to push large overnight rentals and it will have a negative impact on my family's lives. We already have to hide on Sundays and wait out the "mass exodus" what happens when we cannot even escape in our own neighborhood.

Please no new growth. It doesn't have to be forever, but we need to regroup. Moab can provide quality for our visitors and locals but we need a big pause.

Thank you for your time.

--

I am writing to emphasize my desire for no more growth in Moab!! We have hit a tipping point here, and the result is disastrous for locals, and often not so enjoyable for tourists, as well.

This is, in my opinion, the most beautiful spot in the world, and one could not expect it to stay untouched by tourism. But a threshold has been surpassed, and I am not alone in my cry for "enough is enough"!!

I have lived in Moab for over 22 years. I am raising my children here, and have been a local small business owner for 15. For most of this time, I have been madly in love with Moab and didn't want to be anywhere else. In the last year or two, I have thought about leaving. The impact of the Mighty 5 campaign, the mega advertising with TRT monies & UTVs being street legal has changed the feel of this town (for most of the year).

I speak to a lot of people on a day to day basis at my place of business. People are grumbling. And it's not just locals. We have signs on the outskirts of town that say "Moab. Again and Again", but tourists are not going to return if they get stuck in traffic coming into town, pay over \$250/night to stay at a subpar hotel, wait for over an hour for a meal, get gridlocked going into Arches, and then stuck in traffic again trying to leave town! So many times, this year already, I've had a tourist ask me "What is going on?" (and not during an event weekend). This winter I heard from many, many tourists that they will only

come to Moab in the winter now. And I spoke to many, many locals who said they only shop downtown in the winter now because navigating downtown much of the year is a nightmare. Locals have joked about not taking left hand turns during the season for years...but now it's becoming dangerous.

There are enough places for people to stay here! We don't need any more! We don't need more people with more vehicles. It's taxing our infrastructure, our traffic, our water supply, our fragile desert.... The overcrowding of Moab produces an unenjoyable experience for tourists, and a major downturn in quality of life for residents. It's loud.... almost everywhere...almost all of the time. It's crazy (I liken Moab these days to Disneyworld meets Mad Max). It's hard to enjoy the natural beauty and amazing hiking, with the constant hum of motors.

In addition to no more hotels, I would say that we need to use our TRT monies differently. Can we save them for a time when they might be more helpful? (Moab and social media advertise itself. The word is out. We don't need more help with advertising!) Can we use them to teach tourists about our fragile ecosystem, and to encourage them that people actually live here (and we'd like to keep it nice)?

If we cap the growth at the rooms already available (plus the ones in the works), we will still get plenty of visitors. It's time to focus on the people who make up this community, while also providing a better-quality experience for our guests. Packing more people and vehicles into this small community will not benefit anyone.

Thank you for your time & consideration.

--

I would prefer to not have much growth in Moab. I realize that is unrealistic however so very controlled growth with a focus on residents' quality of life would be preferred.

Stop advertising our small town. We have enough growth without it.

Listen to your residents, not the money to be made by a few.

--

I so appreciate the job you all do and thank you for the moratorium and for engaging with the community to figure out how to best chart the course for Moab and Spanish Valley over the next few decades!

I am writing to say that I fully support option 5, called "No Growth" in the Landmark Planning documents. I believe we have reached our limit here in Moab for hotels and nightly rentals and the signs are all around us. Not only is our infrastructure overloaded, our public lands overrun, but we are gambling on an unknown water supply in the face of climate change and predictions of long-term drought. It is the use of our limited water supply for development of overnight rentals or hotels that worries me most and it is the WATER supply that should be the primary data point that you draw on when making your decision. Do we have the water now and into the future (in the face of depleted aquifers) to support X number of flushing toilets per day, X number of loads of linens and other laundry washed per day, X number of showers per day? It seems like poor planning to build first and then find out what we can support with our aquifers later.

After water, I think you should make your decision based on the quality of life for the majority of Moab residents. The majority of whom do not see their pay go up with the increased traffic but who do see their streets overcrowded, their favorite places overrun, their neighborhood character degraded, their grocery store shelves depleted, who can't find quiet in their own backyard or even inside their house with their windows open.

If option 5 is not adopted, at least the current "use by right" zoning must be eliminated, with any future overnight rental permits only allowed by vote of the city or county councils.

Thank you for considering my comments.

--

I prefer plan 2. Thank you.

--

I do not have anything enlightening to add to this educational process that has not already been said! Given the congestion of the last four weeks, I would like to encourage option number five. I Believe it is imperative that we develop a plan to improve our infrastructure before we commit to any more nightly rental accommodations of any classification. I am aware that option 5 may seem improbable and unconventional, but drastic times take drastic solutions. Make Moab unconventional!

--

Moab is my chosen home. A beloved community nestled in a gorgeous valley at the foot of water giving mountains. I have traveled all over the country and this is the place where I want to continue raising my family, volunteering, teaching, and growing.

These dreams are disturbed by over development, abuse of natural resources, and a cultural climate that is beginning to leak excellent people from our community because of these reasons and others.

Please help preserve our home. Option 5, No growth, is the best options for the Moab Valley.

We really should wait to make such big decisions until after the final USGS and independent water studies have been published. We are close to reaching water supply capacity and we need to proceed with extreme caution in permitting new large-scale developments. With climate change, increasing water needs, and an unstable future, we must secure our water for the people who live in our community. Please make the wise choice to move towards a resilient community. Please choose option 5.

Thank you for your time and efforts for our community.

--

I am a single father and a longtime Moab resident. I work and have worked in this service industry for 20 or so years. I have concerns about the future of our community.

The area will continue to see growth, this is not even a question anymore. What I would like to have all persons consider is this:

When an individual comes here and spends \$400 a night at a Hilton or some other brand-name hotel, where did the actual profits go? A small portion stays, but where does the big chunk go?

If a person with a home in Moab is allowed to rent out a room or an area of their home to provide for this lodging need, then when we ask where did the money go, we actually know that it went right here! We could probably reconstruct where almost all of the dollars went.

The people of this town work the jobs that make all of this possible. We are the ones that are making huge profits possible for these businesses and large chains, and that is the free market and in most cases a beautiful thing.

But the actual people who ARE this town, the people who created and worked and loved this place for years are taking a backseat to this wonderful opportunity. We could be allowed to host more in our homes, we could be allowed to have a piece of this pie.

Not to the exclusion of the hotels, and not making every home a bed and breakfast. I would like to see an ability for some, possibly most home owners a chance to become business men and women, to become hosts, so people who come here meet a person and have an experience, instead of coming through on a sort of conveyor belt..

We deserve to realize some the profits made on providing of these needs! But when relegated to the roles of maid, server, cook, driver, guide, all the support services etc, we find ourselves supporting the furtherance of someone else's dream, maybe someone that doesn't even live here, or in Utah, maybe even not this country.

The local government many years ago elected to have a big-box ordinance, because the thought of a Walmart here would have changed the character of our community...

In the years since the inception of the big-box ordinance, we have slowly scene the proliferation of many big box hotels!

So county government, I have this question for you?

Would one Walmart anywhere in this town have changed the character more than the 30 or so hotels??

This town has been rampantly overbuilt by these big box hotels. Can we agree that a portion of the future growth, the future lodging needs that will have to be provided by this town, can and should be provided by the people who live in this town? Those people, who will then benefit will upgrade their homes or buy a new car, they will invest in landscaping, they will spend some of that money right here, and to the extent they improve their lives or their land or their position in life, we will all benefit as a community...

Thank you!

--

I am submitting these comments on the last day for public comment because I have tried my best over the last week to think of many different aspects to this situation that we are in here in Moab. I hope that I can cover all my thoughts and not leave anything out.

I believe that we need to do something to monitor the nightly rental growth in this town. I believe that major restrictions are going to hurt us on many fronts though. I have attended every meeting so far for the moratorium and it baffles me the sheer amount of people that want all the tourists and growth to go away. I think we all know that Moab is never going to be like it was 10 years ago and we need to embrace the growth and critic it in the best way for us residents and for the coming visitors.

I personally believe that supply and demand is what is causing the current hotel boom here in Moab. The demand is currently at a growing pace which creates a profit to be made. Unfortunately, due to the rapid pace of growth, the price of land has skyrocketed for commercial over-night-rental valuable land. Due to this the only people that can take advantage of it are wealthy out of town chain motel owners. I think in the big picture, this trend will reach a peak and the hotel industry will level out and we will see a slowdown of development. This may not be for a few years but it has to hit a peak. Once there is a smaller margin for profit, people will stop investing so much.

I feel like the more restrictive we get in this moratorium solution, the more harmful it will be for those of us entrepreneurs that are not millionaire hotel owners. The more restrictive in the amount of property available will mean only the rich can afford them. It won't stop them from coming, just make it harder for smaller businesses to establish. I am one for these small business owners that has had a plan of expansion for 4 years. The last 6 months I have had a light at the end of the tunnel that showed me I may be able to expand and now I am nervously sitting on the sidelines for 3 more months to see if my dreams get smashed by new ordinances and regulations that may prevent me from ever doing anything.

I think that both meetings had majority displeasure for out of town investors that take all the money and never care or invest in the town itself or the people. Local small business owners are the lifeblood of this town and I believe we are going to crush these small entrepreneurs who have a dream of nightly rental businesses (hotels, campgrounds, AirBnB homes, condos, bed and breakfasts, etc).

It was also brought up in several groups about the differentiation of the types of nightly rentals. I think most people are complaining about the mass numbers of hotels that are coming to town. I don't think people are necessarily opposed to condos, campground, nightly rental homes, and bed and breakfasts coming in to town in the right locations. Some concern has been what happens if Moab goes into a recession again and the business owners leave, then we would be left with large abandoned hotel buildings and town would lose its appeal. We talked in my group at the workshop about how condos, bed and breakfasts, nightly rental homes, and even campgrounds have secondary purposes in this case as long term viable places to live. They wouldn't be as much of a burden and eye sore as an abandoned hotel on main street.

I don't know if it is possible to address these types of nightly rental businesses separately or not. They are extremely different businesses so it seems unfair to lump them all together in my opinion.

Another concern that came up between several groups were the unrepresented land owners who sit outside the Moab Valley. How are they going to be affected? This moratorium affects the entire county but we have failed to address land in other areas the county in the first three months of talks. I think the main issue for this moratorium lies within the Moab Valley. The complaints are centered around where the growth and development is going on right now. Many of these lands outside the valley already have their own hurdles like utility availability, water, water rights, etc. (I consider Moab Valley for this purpose to be from the Potash Road south to the county line and including Kane Creek. Basically, the lands that have been presented in the workshop). For this current moratorium and proposals coming forth, I think it would be fair to exclude those properties that lie outside of this boundary. Let's address those property owners and development down the road when things come up.

I voted for proposal #2 in my group while most everyone else was a #4/#5. I even think a #3 would be a reasonable compromise at this point if the feelings are that down town is losing its appeal due to the hotels. We already know that there are several properties purchased up in the last few years that are awaiting hotel development. What happens to them? Millions of dollars have been invested to further develop Moab so what do they do now. What happens to all of us that are going to lose property values if our properties are excluded from the nightly rental property boom? My property taxes went way up last year when I was re-evaluated due to the commercial property boom and now my property may lose all that value but my taxes are sure to not go down.

I truly believe that restricting or limited the development of Moab commercial property will drive all that business down to San Juan County. All this does is drive every single person coming to Moab through the town of Moab to spend their money and sales tax in San Juan County where the growth and development will occur. We are going to shoot ourselves in the foot while trying to protect our town from a few silly hotels. And let's be honest here, the entire reason that we have this moratorium is to prevent a few more hotels from being built.....

I know you guys have a big task at hand but what you decide to do will forever shape the growth and development of the town. The area North of 400 North is only a small section of space available for nightly rental type businesses and will not help solve the problem. We need to spread development on both side of the town especially as town continues to grow more and more south. I hope that you can create a positive solution for this and I urge you to lean more towards options #2 or #3 and let the locals and county/city governments have a voice in each new proposed business that wants to come in to town.

Thank you for your time.

--

Please continue the hold on new construction until we can gain control again! Let's do this right with growth and have all the roads, parking areas, water, sewer, police, etc.in place for a controlled growth that is well managed. We have already had grid lock numerous times this year, people parked everywhere and lines are getting longer everyday. This is a bad experience for locals and visitors alike. Slow it down!

--

I wish to express my support for Proposal #5, No new overnight accommodations. We have plenty of hotels, and I believe that more lodging options will bring in more people to crowd an already busy town/park/federal lands, and that we do not have the fresh water available to support such high levels of lodging. It will also increase the struggle to find affordable housing for the employees of the lodges/additional rentals.

Please, no more lodging in Moab.

--

Thank you for engaging in this important process and for taking the time to slow things down and consider where we need to go at this point.

I think I have very little to add to points that have already been made to you, so I will be brief.

I am strongly for the, I believe it is the #5 option, which is to put a stop to new permitting save for those already grandfathered in - so I cast my vote for the most extreme measures to put a stop to the madness.

I am also for lengthening this process if need be. Our situation in Moab has reached a point that, I think most would agree, is so critical that any time spent holding up further development to work out the many ins and outs of the problem is very well spent. If there is any problem with extending or renewing the process, I encourage all involved to deal with that and make a strong case for giving it the time it needs.

I think that is crucial. Another thought that occurs to me is that there are other counties and cities in the state with similar problems. I think some cross-pollination is already occurring, and I would also encourage that. We are not the only ones dealing with the effects of too much advertising, too much growth, too much caving and kowtowing to corporate chains rather than supporting our own local business people and the like. I feel one of the solutions to this problem is to gear any plans Moab and Grand County make from here on in to what works best for local business people and citizens.

This process has only just begun. There is so much to take in.

Thank you for being willing - and go for the prize. No more overnight lodging granted until we get our #5% together!

--

I would like to see no more new overnight accommodations until the infrastructure in this town has room for growth. Affordable housing like apartment complexes needs to be a priority. Not everyone wants to purchase a home.

There needs to be more places to eat, the road widened so traffic isn't backed up leaving town for hours on busy weekends!

--

Please NO MORE NEW GROWTH! The resources in this town can't handle more overnight accommodations. Some Moab businesses can't even find enough employees to run day to day because employees can't find affordable places to live!

When it takes 3 hours of bumper to bumper traffic to leave town on a Sunday - we have too many people staying here.

--

I would like to give my input for the direction that the Land Use Plan takes during this much-needed moratorium (thank you!) We are Moab residents of 12 and 25 years and live and work in the community. My opinions are based on great love and pride for the heart of this community and a fierce desire to protect both our human community and our ecological community from getting completely drowned in unchecked development, which has already begun happening at a rate that is alarming to me.

I believe it is in the Moab Valley's best interest to draft a plan in the vision of option 5, the NO GROWTH option. Below I will outline my reasons:

- 1) "No Growth" is still growth! Even with this option, we will still see the momentum play out on already-slated projects, a roughly 20% additional increase of overnight lodging in Moab. More importantly, the "No Growth" option would transition the TYPE of growth promoted in Moab from accommodations, currently the most lucrative, to more needed development: restaurants, shops, small businesses, community development. By choosing this option, I believe we can continue to have economic growth which truly benefits the community and strengthens the core and quality of Moab, rather than just assist in getting higher visitation rates. We would begin to see much-needed economic diversity in non-lodging businesses, and can focus on creating incentives for small business owners who live and work in Moab.
- 2) Maybe we should take a cue from Venice. Existing rooms are filling up during the on-season. But perhaps, rather than indicating that we need more rooms, this is simply indicating that we are AT CAPACITY. There is only so much this town and this valley can accommodate, and as already stated, we can continue to economically grow in other aspects of our community, and strengthen the QUALITY of our tourist revenue rather than just focus on QUANTITY. In my experience working at a small restaurant in Moab, more visitors does not necessarily mean more money, just more stress. All over Moab, I see businesses, even City Market, maxed out on how many people they can provide service to. This creates an often miserable experience for visitors and a completely untenable experience for locals just trying to get through the day-to-day.
- 3) Our resources are finite! In addition to local businesses feeling at capacity, I have serious concerns about our natural resources being at capacity. We need to definitively and unequivocally understand the capacity of our watershed, and be completely confident that we have water to spare (and will continue to have water to spare!) before opening the possibility for more overnight accommodations. This too goes for air quality and wastestream management. More dollars coming in with increased visitation has many hidden costs of the immense impacts that people on vacation, even the most conscientious people, have on local resources and infrastructure.

4) Our roads are finite. About 4 years ago, it felt like someone flipped a switch in Moab. Suddenly springtime means traffic jams and the new normal for locals is to not even think about venturing north of town during peak hours unless you want a Bay Area-style traffic jam on your way home. We need to focus on traffic management solutions, increasing pedestrian and bike-friendly people spaces, and establishing public transportation before thinking about adding more rooms and therefore more cars to town.

5) Quality of Life. I remember when you could find quiet in Moab! But the current amplitude of visitation has brought with it a constant hum of motors and activity that is increasingly impossible to escape as a resident of this valley. I moved here to get away from the woes of the city, and I know many others who are of the same mindset. What good is economic growth if none of us are enjoying it? By shifting focus from number of beds in town to creating green spaces and strengthening neighborhood hubs, we can take agency in maintaining a robust quality of life for locals, and by doing these things I guarantee we will also have the ability to provide visitors with greater quality of experience.

6) Overnight accommodations development is increasingly only going to benefit the already-wealthy. With hotel development, I have seen a marked shift from locally owned modest hotels to large-scale corporate chains. For smaller overnight rentals, the increasing disparity between local wages and real estate prices (the worst in Utah, as discussed in a recent KZMU news feature) means that future development even on the smaller scale will likely be only accessible to outside money, those who already have money, and second homeowners. Let's redirect our development into small businesses that are more likely to be an option for working people in Moab, and make sure that commercial properties can be developed toward that potential, rather than bought up by the highest bidder, likely to be more corporate hotel chains. Small locally-owned businesses keep their money local. I am skeptical that revenue dollars from large hotel chains spend any time circulating in Moab before escaping this valley completely.

7) Finally, option 5 still holds potential for other options, but in choosing a less conservative option, we will never be able to revert to the "No Growth" option. This is simply the smartest approach at this point in time, and leaves room for the most available alternatives down the road. Moab can always crank things back to 11 in the future. But if we choose restraint at this crucial moment, we have the luxury to explore all the areas listed above, and take a full, measured look at all the realities of our valley. Sometimes a rapid is just to dicey to read-and-run while in motion. Sometimes the smartest thing to do is eddy out, get a still, long view at what lies ahead, and take the time to plot your course.

It is my hope that those guiding this process will have the prudence and courage to take this approach. I do believe the future of our community really hinges on what happens here.

Thank you for your time!

--

I am a Moab resident of the past four years, and want to express my support for the "No Growth" option in the current future land use planning process. I am not intrinsically opposed to new hotels and overnight rentals moving into town, but I don't think it would be responsible for growth to continue until tourism-related impacts to our quality of life are adequately addressed.

I currently rent a room in a house, and I would submit as evidence this video of the traffic congestion in town from a couple of weekends ago: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xwG1TQyo9Ug> While I don't necessarily agree with all of the comments by the video's narrator, I think the traffic congestion is an illustrative example of how we have allowed the tourism industry to run roughshod over our neighborhoods. Until we can improve our infrastructure capacity, and work to mitigate these tourism impacts, I think we need to continue the hotel moratorium.

Thank you for facilitating a community discussion on this vital issue.

--

I'm writing to support the "No Growth" Option 5.

I have been a resident of Moab for 18 years, with a hiatus from 2012-2017 to earn my Masters degree and conduct my PhD research. With my nonprofit organization, based in Moab, I support development projects in climate resilience and sustainable tourism. My husband and I built our strawbale house here in 2017, and plan to raise our daughter in Moab.

I support Option 5 for the following reasons:

**1. Economic diversification:** If Moab is a farm, we're a sea of corn. This is great for right now: there's a huge demand for corn, and corn prices are high. It's tempting to want to plant more corn. However, if there is any disruption--whether economic or the health of the soil and crop--then the entire farm takes an enormous hit.

I worked in tourism at the economic downturn in 2007-8, and I can still very palpably remember the fear, the quiet town, the struggle in the local economy, the struggle of individuals to make ends meet. Perhaps our unchecked hotel growth is an echo, a consequence, of these hard times. While I realize it's doubtful that Moab would experience that kind of downturn again in the near future, I would like to focus our efforts on the SOIL, or the PEOPLE in our community, and the entire farm, to support a more robust economy that can weather the next inevitable economic downturn.

Specifically, Moab could prioritize a business-friendly climate with strategies used by other medium-sized communities to attract small businesses, starting with investments in diversified and modern infrastructure and workspaces, innovative housing funding and developments, and community designed around walkability and livability. Moab and Grand County can incentivize for and market to locally-owned businesses, restaurants, farmers, renewable energy generation, and industries.

Back to the corn analogy: as a nation, we have tried monocropping. We've discovered that it requires heavy subsidies, toxic chemicals, and narrowing profit margins distributed to fewer and fewer people--and often those people are not the farmers themselves, but distant corporations. This land use has proved an extremely difficult situation from which to wrench free. Moab now has the opportunity to leave its historical precarious dance with an undiversified economy, from livestock to mining to tourism. Moab has this opportunity to be revolutionary in our thinking about development, and evolve from past lessons in boom or bust economies. Let's choose a diverse garden that can weather our weather.

**2. Water:** Moab's water comes from one place: the La Sal mountains, and specifically the snowpack. The La Sals have experienced a 60-80% reduction in snowpack in the last 50 years, with projected snowpack dwindling to levels of less than 10% of 1960 levels. Further development cannot take place without taking this into more serious consideration. Moab has recently discovered that it does not have as much water as previously imagined--yet that message has not been marketed or distributed to the community. Moab has the opportunity to be proactive about our water and gain more time to develop more carefully with Option 5.

**3. Quality of tourism experience:** Our specific brand of tourism leans heavily on our landscape and keeping it pristine. We rely on that intangible feeling of openness, expansiveness, of the undiscovered when looking out across, or up from, a red canyon cradling an impossible green belly. Our viewscape, and even our soundscape, are arguably our most precious natural resources, and both of these have changed dramatically in the last 5 years. I would like to preserve these natural resources and the unique character of our visual and auditory experience not only for residents, but for the tourists who visit.

In addition, Moab can still capture some semblance of the quaint, small Western town character in and around our downtown area. We can use the Main street corridor to build out and emphasize this character, improving the experience for both visitors and residents. This is a win-win. However, additional hotels in this area are like a lose-lose: visitors and residents alike lose that character and charm that attracted both to spend time and money in our city's hub in the first place.

These local resources frequently go unacknowledged, and Moab will not know they're gone until visitation and home sales start to falter. Moab should be wary of the cruise ship, mass tourism experience, which is low dollar and externalizes profits, and instead opt for the small, authentic, carefully curated adventure travel experience--which attracts, at a minimum, visitors who spend 30-50% more per experience. This is not only quality of experience, but the direction of tourism as a whole. Moab must be strategic to stay ahead of this global trend.

**4. First impressions are the only impression:** This real estate slogan rings true for communities. How many scores of friends have told me that they were less than impressed when driving in to Moab? Most are shocked by the visual assault of chain hotels. If we choose Option 4, we doom our town to a painful introduction with a lack of forethought and imagination.

Why not make this entry corridor a showcase of thoughtful community development, with a backdrop of Moab's characteristic natural beauty? Restaurants mixed with affordable housing and existing hotels and RV parks could showcase our commitment to an equitable quality of life. Tourists and residents alike can experience authentic interactions with each other and the natural world. There is so much we can do with this space, instead of sacrificing this opportunity to make at least one entrance to our town thoughtful and fundamentally appealing.

**5. Quality of life:** I am happy to share the Moab valley with many more residents as our natural resources allow. However, careful planning is crucial in development, and Moab has not had the time fully consider the factors above, nor the actual specific timeline and actions to support specific visions, goals, and developments that could make Moab not only a natural wonder, but one of visionary city planning. Quality takes time.

I can imagine a Moab that serves the world as an example of community planning, a diversified economy, careful natural resource management, and unparalleled physical beauty alongside a tourism

experience that makes each tourist feel special--because local workers feel that they are cared FOR by their economy and their elected officials, and in turn reflect this quality of care back to tourists. In this vision, local profits are returned directly to the local economy. And the quality of the industries, whether tourism or otherwise, supersede the quantity. This also makes good economic sense.

**6. The unintended consequences of permitted use:** While I support the idea of the councils having more oversight, I can also imagine a council beholden to development interests for myriad reasons already on display in our political system. I am rightfully suspicious that, in the wrong hands, this feature can become a tool for campaign contributions and misuse of political power. If permitted use will exist, it must be beholden to a clear, transparent, and strict public process.

Finally, as a professional consultant, writer, and editor, who shares your values for honest communication, I hope that we can change the name of the "No Growth" option to "Refocused" or "Diversified" Growth. "No growth" in this case is a misnomer. It implies that no new hotels equals no economic growth, when in fact the opposite is true: if Moab is able to carefully and thoughtfully devote more energy to diversified economic expansion and the promotion of careful community planning, Option 5 is our best chance for SUSTAINABLE, long-term economic and community growth--not to mention well-being.

Thank you to all parties emailed here for providing public opportunities for learning and involvement, and for soliciting feedback. I look forward to your future planning and development.

--

I am writing to express support for vision 5 for Moab, the No Growth option. I have lived in Moab for 5 years now and am worried that the city will not be able to sustain its current rate of under regulated growth.

Thank you.

--

I'm writing in regards to the land use matter currently on high priority. Thank you for tackling this issue and providing thorough information on the proposals.

I would urge the vote for #5. As a citizen and business owner in the downtown corridor I firmly believe a complete halt on overnight development would be the healthiest decision for our city at this point. We are right on the verge of being completely inundated by the large box hotels. A chance for the rest of the areas of development and infrastructure to catch up would be not only greatly appreciated but also pertinent to the future sustainability of our city.

As someone who communicates with our visitors on a daily basis this feedback also comes from them. I am concerned that the over development of hotels in particular is going to turn around and cause more of a negative effect than good on our tourism industry. Visitors want to experience the authentic version of our town. They don't want the real Moab to be swallowed by nationwide hotel chains sterilizing the culture that is unique to us. Thousands of visitors have commented on this very thing.

My hope is that thru this process we are able to hold strong to our Moab culture while developing with authenticity and prioritizing our community's way of life.

Thank you to each of you for your efforts and consideration.

--

I would like to give my input for the direction that the Land Use Plan takes during this much-needed moratorium (THANK YOU!!!). I am a Moab resident of 12 years, work for a small, locally owned company, have two children in middle school, and live near Swanny Park.

I draft this letter on the final eve that comments are due and draw heavily from an email written by my friend.

My opinions are based on great love and pride for the heart of this community and a fierce desire to protect both our human community and our ecological community from getting completely drowned in unchecked development, which has already begun happening at a rate that is alarming to me.

I believe it is in the Moab Valley's best interest to draft a plan in the vision of OPTION 5, the NO GROWTH option. Below I will outline my reasons:

- 1) "No Growth" is still growth! Even with this option, we will still see the momentum play out on already-slated projects, a roughly 20% additional increase of overnight lodging in Moab. More importantly, the "No Growth" option would transition the TYPE of growth promoted in Moab from accommodations, currently the most lucrative, to more needed development: restaurants, shops, small businesses, community development. By choosing this option, I believe we can continue to have economic growth which truly benefits the community and strengthens the core and quality of Moab, rather than just assist in getting higher visitation rates. We would begin to see much-needed economic diversity in non-lodging businesses, and can focus on creating incentives for small business owners who live and work in Moab.
- 2) Maybe we should take a cue from Venice. Existing rooms are filling up during the on-season. But perhaps, rather than indicating that we need more rooms, this is simply indicating that we are AT CAPACITY. There is only so much this town and this valley can accommodate, and as already stated, we can continue to economically grow in other aspects of our community, and strengthen the QUALITY of our tourist revenue rather than just focus on QUANTITY. In my experience living and working in Moab, more visitors don't necessarily bring more money, but they certainly bring more stress — for both residents and visitors. All over Moab, I see businesses, even City Market, maxed out on how many people they can provide service to. This creates an often-miserable experience for visitors and a completely untenable experience for locals just trying to get through the day-to-day.
- 3) Our resources are finite! In addition to local businesses feeling at capacity, I have serious concerns about our natural resources being at capacity. We need to definitively and unequivocally understand the capacity of our watershed, and be completely confident that we have water to spare (and will continue to have water to spare!) before opening the possibility for more overnight accommodations. This too goes for air quality and waste stream management. More dollars coming in with increased visitation has many hidden costs of the immense impacts that people on vacation, even the most conscientious people, have on local resources and infrastructure.

4) Our roads are finite. About 4 years ago, it felt like someone flipped a switch in Moab. Suddenly springtime means traffic jams and the new normal for locals is to not even think about venturing north of town during peak hours unless you want a Bay Area-style traffic jam on your way home. We need to focus on traffic management solutions, increasing pedestrian and bike-friendly people spaces, and establishing public transportation before thinking about adding more rooms and therefore more cars to town.

5) Quality of Life. I remember when you could find quiet in Moab! But the current amplitude of visitation has brought with it a constant hum of motors and activity that is increasingly impossible to escape as a resident of this valley. I moved here to get away from the woes of the city, and I know many others who are of the same mindset. What good is economic growth if none of us are enjoying it? By shifting focus from number of beds in town to creating green spaces and strengthening neighborhood hubs, we can take agency in maintaining a robust quality of life for locals, and by doing these things I guarantee we will also have the ability to provide visitors with greater quality of experience.

6) Overnight accommodations development is increasingly only going to benefit the already-wealthy. With hotel development, I have seen a marked shift from locally owned modest hotels to large-scale corporate chains. For smaller overnight rentals, the increasing disparity between local wages and real estate prices (the worst in Utah, as discussed in a recent KZMU news feature) means that future development even on the smaller scale will likely be only accessible to outside money, those who already have money, and second homeowners. Let's redirect our development into small businesses that are more likely to be an option for working people in Moab, and make sure that commercial properties can be developed toward that potential, rather than bought up by the highest bidder, likely to be more corporate hotel chains. Small locally-owned businesses keep their money local. I am skeptical that revenue dollars from large hotel chains spend any time circulating in Moab before escaping this valley completely.

7) Finally, OPTION 5 still holds potential for other options, but in choosing a less conservative option, we will never be able to revert to the "No Growth" option. This is simply the smartest approach at this point in time, and leaves room for the most available alternatives down the road. Moab can always choose more growth in the future. But if we choose restraint at this crucial moment, we have the luxury to explore all the areas listed above, and take a full, measured look at all the realities of our valley. Sometimes the smartest thing to do is to pause, get still, and look at the long view of what lies ahead, and take the time to conscientiously plan our future.

It is my hope that those guiding this process will have the prudence and courage to take this approach. I do believe the future of our community really hinges on what happens here.

Thank you for your time!

--

Please consider these suggestions on The Moratorium and County Growth in general. Grand County citizens want to see the growth in tourism stop and stabilize. Upgrades are needed to assure a quality experience for visitors and a quality of life for residents. Our roads need an upgrade and our downtown needs a by-pass. Our National Park Service needs time to resolve overcrowding and access issues. We

need more businesses to service visitors (ex. restaurants). We need housing for service workers. Until these issues are resolved it would be foolhardy to continue to expedite tourist growth. We can tweak our LUC and let zoning do some of the work for us. However, without the support and commitment of this body, that effort will likely be inadequate. I want to ask for 5 specific forms of support:

1. Hold the Line: Do not allow an appeals process to become a “go-around” to obtain building permits for tourist accommodations.
2. Coordinate and Negotiate with San Juan County: Use Grand County’s leverage to convince SJC to build more residences and less tourist accommodation. We are all in this boat together. SJC depends on Grand County for many essential services. It behooves them to consider our requests!!
3. Start Building: Invest in “Social Housing”. Stop trying to incentivize commercial development of affordable housing. Use income from your Assured Housing ordinance, use or sell County Real Estate. Partner with other Govt. Agencies/ Non-Profits and build. Commercial developers will never have the commitment to the community that is required to harmonize high density affordable housing with existing neighborhoods.
4. Revise High Density Overlay: The average housing density of New York City is 18 units/ acre. San Francisco is 13/acre. Midvale, UT. (Greatest average density in Salt Lake County) is 4/acre. Our Overlay offers densities of 35units/acre; 25units/acre; 15units/acre; 10units/acre; and 5 units/acre. The sunset clause in this ordinance cites 300 units (“certified”). Since the Arroyo Crossing Project will satisfy that number, maybe it’s time for an early sundown. Metropolitan densities in this community should be restricted to affordable housing developments ONLY. Approving these densities for commercial housing developments (deed restricted or not) is a betrayal of the public trust and your responsibility to existing neighborhoods. We do need housing for our “essential workers”: teachers, law enforcement, nurses, etc. So, let’s make them eligible for actual affordable housing. A waiver of the income requirements covering certain classes of workers would do the trick.
5. Move Back to Center: Social Justice applies to all. Balance your concerns for seasonal workers/ affordable housing with concern for existing neighborhoods and year-round residents.

Maybe it’s time for an actual public referendum on the “urbanization of Grand County”. Put it on the ballot & let the people vote! Then when the special interest groups loudly protest against limits to growth, you will have a defense that cannot be shouted down.

Thank-you for your time & service to this community.

--

Hello folks, I am responding to the 180-day moratorium regarding the building of overnight rentals. I am in FULL support of this measure and believe it should be much longer. What we need is affordable housing for the people who live and work in this community. I fear that if we do not address this issue as a number one priority we will end up with no work force, or one that is forced to commute large distances to get to work. That scenario has played out in other communities and the result create a problem on an even larger scale.

I encourage you to stand strong against the proliferation of nightly rentals, and yes...even second homes at this point.

Thank you for your time and efforts.

--

To say we have a problem in Moab, is an understatement. The traffic jam that occurred during Car show weekend was insane. The inconvenience is one thing but what about the inability of emergency vehicles to navigate the jam.

I left for SLC that Sunday headed for IHC hospital and got caught in the jam on 5th West. I was transporting a sick husband and it was alarming how long we sat in traffic. Once we got to the light On Hwy 191 traffic started to move again.

I can't imagine what our lives are going to be like when Hwy 191 is widened.

We do not need to advertise! Moab has been discovered and our quality of life is being impacted as well as our delicate desert environment. Please direct TRT to help mitigate the negatives created by the crowds of visitors. Bank TRT rather than spend it on more advertising.

--

I would like to formally request you look into the option of BANKING TRT FUNDS until such time as we can resolve our challenges with overwhelmed infrastructure.

If you haven't seen this video, please view it. I do not subscribe to the comments made by those filming this traffic jam. However, it is important documentation of a serious problem.  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xwG1TQyo9Ug>

Thanks for your consideration of this suggestion.

--

I am in favor of Option 5 limited growth of hotel development in Moab. While tourists are our business, we also need to preserve a quality of life for our locals.

--

I represent a property owner and their business organizations. I suspect that you are aware that my client has been a long-time resident and business owner in the Moab area and has made significant investments in Moab. My client's developments have greatly assisted in the development of Moab's infrastructure.

As a longtime resident, my client has sought to balance development so that the natural beauty and the lifestyle of the area residents are not adversely impacted. My client has continually put the interests of the community in the forefront of their business endeavors. I am personally aware of occasions where they have forgone opportunities for development that they did not believe were in

the best interest of the Moab area. I would be happy to ask my client for permission to discuss these with you if you feel it would be helpful.

I am informed that you are associated with an Advisory Committee that will make recommendations concerning future development within Moab. The residents of Moab have an expectation that the current lifestyle and development opportunities of the area will be maintained. I suggest that Moab has a duty to the world community. Undoubtedly, Moab is an international destination, and my client, along with other residents and business owners in Moab, want to make sure its unique beauty can be enjoyed by many.

The issue is balancing lifestyle with the obligation to make sure the area can be appreciated by people from around the world. My client has right fully concluded that a balance can be reached by responsibly addressing the highest and best economic use of the area which is accommodating tourism. My client does not believe that this will be accomplished by a moratorium of tourist related development. Not only would this be a selfish effort, but it would economically harm Moab.

I will not propose a solution, but I will be so bold as to suggest that this issue should include long time, responsible residents and developers such as my client.

Should you have any questions or concerns or require additional information, please contact me. Thank you.

--

I am writing in response to your options regarding growth in Moab. I support option 5 No Growth, at present. Until the highways, roads and other public infrastructure can meet our present needs, further growth will be nothing more than a blight on this community.

Presently traffic jams extending for miles routinely occur in this community, causing a headache for visitors as well as residents, and destroying the quality of life for both. Such traffic problems also cause a disruption of local businesses, as it is too difficult to get in and out of parking lots, and makes one inclined to avoid local businesses altogether. I have found that over the past twenty years, due to the increase in traffic, just getting to work in the morning is becoming progressively more difficult and occasionally dangerous.

Despite the findings of the recent study we do not have adequate parking for our local businesses. There is not much parking available on the main street, and the few off street public parking lots are inadequate. Frequently the parking lot is completely full in the Village Market in the evening. The City Market parking lot is also frequently full. Locals can accommodate by visiting these businesses early in the morning, but it affects quality of life for everyone, and again often local businesses are avoided due to lack of parking space.

I have talked to several individuals about the water supply in the valley and have received various opinions. Some individuals state that we have plenty of water and unimpeded growth is possible. Others state that we are nearing the maximum that our water supply can sustain. Until there is consensus on this issue it makes no sense to allow more growth. If we allow growth beyond that the

water supply can sustain, the rationing that will occur will severely impact all residents and local businesses, and potentially create a catastrophe for this community.

Although this is outside of the purview of this committee, it is apparent that the local National Parks, etc. are being loved to death. The long line of cars attempting to get into the parks, the inability to find a parking space, once in the parks, and the hordes of people one meets in the park or at popular spots all are evidence of a rapidly declining experience for our visitors. If this continues our local tourist industry may eventually suffer due to the unmet expectations of our visitors. Until a plan can be established to address this issue, growth needs to be curtailed.

With all of the increase in population (permanent and transient) the city/county needs to ensure that there is adequate Fire, Public Safety, and EMS capabilities. To this end, more finances need to be directed to these departments.

To finance the improvements that we need for roads, water and other infrastructure the cost should be primarily borne by the companies that are profiting by it. Ergo taxes and fees on commercial enterprises should be commensurate with the impact that they have on our community, and not borne primarily by the residents in our community.

Thank you for your hard work to serve our community and your consideration of this message.

--

Rosalie properties should be included in the commercial zoning overlay to match the adjacent land uses to the north and south. They are ON the highway and ON Emma/Maxine as its being expanded as a crossing. We are both in favor and we have spoken with planning and with the developer, both of which see the intelligence of a cohesive commercial plan along the highway and at the Emma crossing... the Rosalie properties are the only properties ON the highway that don't have commercial zoning and this is a key view and land use at arguable the beginning of town as people come in from the north. Please contact me ASAP. Thank you.

--

Unfortunately, I have not reviewed the options presented in regards to growth in Moab. However, I must express my feelings on a few issues and hope that they will be addressed in the plan.

**WATER:** hotels use an extraordinary amount of water- thousands more showers, laundry, landscaping, etc. Water is a limited, scarce and precious resource. We cannot afford to be frivolous.

**HOUSING:** The lack of affordable housing is a growing issue, and gets worse with the continued commercial development.

**TRAFFIC:** God help us if there were an emergency and people needed to get out of town. God help us if we want to continue to BREATHE in this little oasis. We need to widen the main corridors, improve traffic safety, and reduce traffic where possible.

**TAXES:** locals are suffering the increased tax burden of our property taxes (increased value does nothing but raise your taxes if you want to continue to live in your home); gas tax affects us all. If we have more hotels, they should be forced to pay some kind of tax or fee to improve services for ALL of us.,

So much more. At this point, I sadly anticipate that I might have to move away from Moab; that is a terrible way to feel when I have raised my children here, built my home and my life here.

--

I attended the meeting on April 30. Our table did not get represented in the end very well because we got blasted by one vocal person so I thought I would send in what was discussed. We felt that limiting overnight rentals to just the north area would congest one area. On our table, 8 out of ten voted for option 2 I feel like the plans were not explained very well. For example, option 2 might have fewer overnight rentals than option 3 depending on the overlays that are put in place but everyone thought that 2 is guaranteed to have more than 3 and so on. Secondly, bed and breakfast or condos should not be in the same category as hotels. Their impact is much less and if you allow downtown to do a business with overnight condos above, it would make it affordable for a lot of businesses to actually come and thrive. Just some thoughts.

Thanks.

--

I am writing as an educator, parent, and professional who has long been involved in community health to ask you to vote for very strict controls on growth (#4) or no growth (#5). the number of businesses and amount of resources devoted to people who simply pass through this area has already diffused our community culture. A town center is healthy when it's a place we can go to socialize with friends from other neighborhoods, keep track of each other's kids, and provide friendship to our elderly. Sadly, it seems that Moab has been drowning under this tourist development ideation. Our conversations used to include the concept of diversification--let's leave room for other options. It's time to build quality over quantity.

Thank you for all of your hard work and genuine efforts.

--

I would like to thank you all for participating in this process to understand the needs & desires of our community. As a long term resident and business owner in the tourism industry I strongly feel we need to extend the moratorium on the construction of nightly rentals. Ushering in ever larger and more expensive structures seemingly every few months has created a MASSIVE footprint on our town with many complex ramifications for everyone living and vacationing here. With each additional large project our community is on the hook to provide that business with numerous services and resources that are in finite supply. In the past couple of decades we needed these types of developments, these jobs, and the money it brought to the community. It allowed Moab to evolve into a great small city that I'm proud to be a part of. Yet I feel we're now past the point of diminishing returns. With lodging already being such a huge component of our local economy I see the trickle-down from any new large (or small) developments adding little benefit to our community while only adding more headaches. We have an

infrastructure imbalance. If we don't act aggressively now the result we Moab residents will further experience are: higher living expenses, more chaos with traffic, pollution, noise, dust, and other stressors; and these negative qualities will also be seen and experienced to a more noticeable degree by the visitors.

Every time I drive north of town past the Motel 6 I acknowledge how nice it is to have an open field where my view to the portal has largely remained unchanged from my arrival to this area 34 years ago. I've begun to rely too heavily on the notion that it might not get turned into another big parking lot surrounding another shiny structure to further remove the landscape from those of us--locals and tourists alike--who came here to be IN that landscape. Maintaining a quality of life experience in this area requires protecting the rusty clues to Moab's historical character--boom & bust. Therefore I support Landmarks' Option 5 of No Growth until our community can better perceive how to manage the many problems I mentioned above. After that deep breath of air, an eventual segue towards other sensible options would follow as we steer our community away from allowing the reckless sprint to pave every last chunk of dirt in the Moab valley.

Again, thank you for your consideration.

--

This letter is to submit feedback on the "Preferred Alternative" land use ordinance draft dated 05.03.19 that was discussed at the the May 7, 2019 City-Council Meeting for which the public was not invited to comment. Although the public was not given the opportunity to review and comment, it is imperative that public concerns with this proposal are raised before any Ordinance action.

Respectfully, there are several concerns with the "Preferred Alternative" presented:

- The "Preferred Alternative" for overnight lodgings should be complementary to resolve or relief the Moab Area Land Use Project Goals. The proposal does not address three of the four stated goals.
  - "Address multi-family housing, infill housing development, and redevelopment" – There is no mention, consideration, or solution presented for this goal.
  - "Address how overnight accommodations influences the Moab Area Affordable Housing Plan" – The solution target of the proposed ordinance is misplaced. It is erroneous to try to address affordable housing by limiting commercial development in the commercial districts rather than through actual residential development. According to the *2017 Moab Area Affordable Housing Plan* updated Fall 2016, overnight accommodation from hotels/motels is not listed as a cause, barrier, or impediment to affordable housing. Key findings and facts from that report state that:
    - "Although an average of 69 new residential units were constructed countywide each year between 2013 and 2015, more than double average annual household formation, building permits and business licenses reveal the majority were unaffordable to the majority of Grand County households or immediately converted to short-term rentals, seasonal or vacation homes. "
    - "Building permit data suggest that an increasing share of new residential construction is actually intended for seasonal or vacation occupancy in the unincorporated areas of Grand County and the City of Moab, representing 38.5% and 34.1% of new residential construction, respectively. These types of

end-uses tend to push sales prices higher than long-term owner- or renter-occupancy.”

Nightly residential rentals (e.g., Airbnb’s, nightly rentals in C1/C2 zones) that truly impact the availability of affordable housing is nominally mentioned throughout this ordinance development exercise and not seriously considered as culpable. Their growth is not addressed. However, per the Moab Area Housing Task Force, they are a major part of the issue and cause.

- “Create land use policies and tools that address these and other land use challenges”- Although this is a draft, the policies created have only served to curb one type of development that is the subject of misplaced blame to the affordable housing issue in Moab. During the public comments, some citizens expressed fatigue with new hotel construction; however, the majority of concerns were regarding the lack of affordable housing and not hotels themselves. Singling out and restricting overnight accommodations is scapegoating an easy and visible use type. Further, there is much discussion of wanting to have other types of commercial businesses, but the proposal does not address it. There are no incentive proposals for other commercial development.
- The proposal, as worded, does not satisfy the “intent” of “focusing more intense overnight accommodations north of downtown, permit properly scaled overnight accommodations downtown, and eliminate overnight accommodations south of downtown.” The proposal actually imposes additional requirements/restrictions upon North of Downtown and Downtown Area through future overlay zones, while no such overlays are planned for South of Downtown, Downtown Edge or in other zoned areas where overnight accommodations are currently allowed or being conducted illegally and legally. This is a disparate treatment. All equivalent or similar commercial AND residential parcels/areas should be subjected to the same treatment of overlay requirements
- Targeting only one type of commercial use, overnight accommodations, the most regulated by Federal, State and City level is reactionary and discriminatory.
- The new language introduced to the proposed ordinance that stripped landowner “use-by-rights” was not included in the proposed options provided in the public workshops and comment sessions.
- The lack of public notification of a timeline date change of a significant project delivery (i.e., the draft ordinance) by pulling it ahead one week from May 21 to May 14 is troubling. It was unknown to the public until a news article publication that “City and county officials instructed planning consultant Landmark Design on Tuesday, May 7 to write draft land use ordinances during the following week that would eliminate overnight lodging as a use by right in the Moab Valley.” (Pape. Carter, *The Times-Independent*. May 10, 2019)
- The development of the “Preferred Alternative” is the result of a process that did not adequately represent all key stakeholders. For example, the three focus groups did not represent key

stakeholders such as the landowners and business owners that would be most impacted by the ordinance. With the focus of the ordinance on overnight accommodations, only one hotel owner was included in the three focus groups. In contrast, there were approximately 15 high school students, six 7<sup>th</sup> Grade students, and six veterans. It is important to include all input; however, the disproportionately low, insufficient representation of certain key stakeholders skews and generates inaccurate conclusions. In addition, the advisory committee, itself, lacks representation of overnight accommodation stakeholders. Thus, those who are burdened with the most impact by this proposal were not afforded the opportunity to provide viewpoints.

- There seems to be a lack of consideration for unintended consequences. Limiting overnight accommodations like hotels/motels will not eliminate or solve the tourist volume or lack of affordable housing. In the city's own Economic Analysis, Rooms per Tourist has declined. Restricting building of hotels will result in tourists dispersing to B&B's and Airbnb's in residential neighborhoods all over the Moab area versus in a concentrated commercial area. Airbnb's are usually rented by larger parties and can hold 10-15 people or more versus a hotel room. This is evident in this year's Jeep Safari. The town is busier than ever; however, hotel/motel rooms had excess rooms available. Where did the jeepers stay? Many jeepers stayed at the ever-expanding, loosely regulated Airbnb's. The consequences of this proposal would be increased traffic and parking issues with transient individuals in residential areas which ultimately change the dynamics, character and safety of residential neighborhoods. As was Moab City's own findings, these Airbnb's may operate illegally, unregulated, without the proper licenses and in non-permitted zones. The likely increase in Airbnb's will further intensify the lack of housing for Moab residences as housing stock are used for nightly rentals because they become the best and highest return use of the asset.

As a long-time, 40+ years resident of this beautiful town, I like to consider myself an "old-timer". This distinction is a great honor. I support measures to ensure its continued enjoyment by all. Moab is where my children grew up from pre-school to high school. It is our home. As a business owner and town citizen, I have always sought to be involved with and supported the community. I believe in investing in our community. Being one of the larger employers, I was amongst the very first, and still of only a few, to provide affordable employee housing starting over three decades ago. I understand the need. Therefore, I desire to address the right issue with the right tools. But it is not stripping landowners of their rights through an expedited process of a pre-set outcome. Government taking rights away from its citizens goes against the beliefs of this country and the American way.

The proposed ordinance does not address the Moab Area Land Use Project Goals. It is my intention and hope that highlighting in good faith the concerns with the draft proposal, that the "Preferred Alternative" be re-evaluated and re-designed with the considerations above.

--

Plan #4 please. Let's slow down and take a breath! PLEASE !!!!!!!

Moab has become unbearable. I have lived here for over 30 years and have retired after my career in health care. I gave my life to this town. Now it is taking the life out of me.

--

Apologies for the hastiness here, because I so appreciate those of you willing to take action to defend our town from the onslaught of corporatized industrial tourism, if we can...

I work in the backcountry documenting threatened and endangered species (35 years now). It has never been a sadder time to live in Moab as I watch the expanding circle of impacts from ignorant and/or insensitive people destroying our fragile and beautiful canyons at an exponentially increasing rate. We need immediate triage, something even Curtis Wells was publicly recognizing before his chain got jerked by his filthy rich masters, or whatever... still time for you to do good, Curtis!

I agree we need to diversify the economy, which is why I got out of tourism back in 1989 when I saw what it would do to the canyons- not to mention our town, which is more of a corporate controlled, non-resident town servicing tourists and the rich with low-wage, undocumented labor.

A town of servants to the frolicking rich is what we are becoming. Last chance to be brave and bold and take serious action to STOP THE ADVERTISING AND MOTEL OWNER driven wasting of my home town!

YOU GUYS are who we've been waiting for! Now is the moment to take the heat from the State and the poser out of town rip-off artists and just say no to more tourists!!! Not that our economy will be free of them- just higher value, with a filter, please! People don't get to see the Sistine Chapel if they aren't willing to follow the rules and minimize their impact. No better way to do that than by

- stopping advertising by redirecting or refusing TRT's
- outlawing off-road rec vehicles from our town (and, ultimately, public lands!)
- CAPPING OVERNIGHT ACCOMMODATIONS, the way option 5 spells out.

I personally want our small rural town back and want to go much more extreme, banning all renters and sellers of side by sides and keep them off our streets, as they are in most places, but anyone with a brain can see Moab has totally lost it in pursuit of tourist bucks.

MONEY IS THE PROBLEM. We have plenty of it, but thinly distributed in low wage jobs and siphoned off by Maverick, Hilton, et.al.

Please, keep Moab a real town, not a fake, over-run, corporate caricature of itself, like Park City, Springdale, Vail, Aspen, Telluride, Breckenridge. There is nothing like Moab. You must defend it if you want it to exist. I will be happy to see my tax dollars, lots of them, defending your decisions to defend our town. We are under assault, by the State, by SITLA, out-of-town developers and their ilk, by corporate accommodations and motorized recreation. Believe me, from a backcountry perspective, Moab's tourism plague is metastasizing. We have to be bold and fight those destroying and Disnifying the experience if we want a home worth living in!

Thank you for having vision and going big!

--

With almost 1200 more rooms in the pipeline, I believe that there is wide consensus that we are at our visitor maximum for now. I urge you to support removing hotels, b&bs and other short-term rentals from all zones when the moratorium expires, at least until our infrastructure catches-up with our success, we develop solutions for some of the pressing problems now facing us and our community catches its breath. It will always be possible to open the subject again and consider allowing new short-term rental development in selected areas. However, if we continue to allow such development in any zone, once a project has started the permitting process it cannot be stopped.

--

In April of 2016, I came to Moab for the first time. As a travel and landscape photographer, Utah is high on the list of beautiful landscapes. I recall the long weekend lineups to get into Arches Park, lineups that often went all the way back into town. I was surprised to see so much car traffic, but it was still relatively manageable.

Fast Forward: April 26-May 3 in Moab, 2019: I arrived on the Friday afternoon of the vintage car show. As I came in from Grand Junction, I was astonished by the volume of traffic headed towards Moab. I had taken the 128 south to meet up with the 191 into town. It took me almost an hour to get from that light to the Moab Valley Inn at the south end of Moab. The traffic was horrible, and the noise – oh, my goodness, THE NOISE. This is Moab, this place is a gateway to several of nature’s most stunning geological wonders, and you cannot hear yourself think. I felt like I wanted to cry, I felt like my ears were being assaulted by the noise of the traffic. Trying to go anywhere was impossible, and trying to get into any restaurant just for a single seat – almost impossible (I finally got something about 9 pm).

As I drove into town, I couldn’t quite get my bearings. The place that I left 3 years ago bore no resemblance to this string of hotels down the main drag of Moab. What had happened? How had a place as beautiful as Moab ALLOWED this kind of overbuilding to be done?

Council members: every local Moab resident I spoke with during my week in your city told me how disturbed they were with these changes. Local people, without exception, told me about the high cost of living there, many talked about holding multiple jobs in order to pay their living expenses. Many told me about not even spending their money in town, that they prefer to drive to the Colorado border in order to be able to afford groceries, etc.

On the Friday morning, I went up to Corona Arch area. The picture I have attached shows you what I saw. And this was in no way unusual this time; every camping ground I passed all throughout my trip this year was overcrowded. The local Moab infrastructure is so overloaded that I fear for your town accepting any more contracts, I fear that the good intentions of increasing tourism will cause yet another beautiful place on this earth to be “loved to death”. I have seen it in Joshua Tree, I have seen it in Iceland, it is starting to happen to Greenland, it is happening right here in my own home province of Ontario in Canada.

Please, Council, I implore you: put a moratorium on new contracts, until the town has had at least 3-5 years of working through the current massive levels of change. Take the time to assess the damage by tourism, by unbridled building and ensure that you protect the stunning gifts that your area has been given by the forces of Mother Nature.

Thank you for taking the time to read my concerns.

--

Moab is struggling to find the right balance between tourism and townspeople and I feel your pain when I visit during peak season.

As an owner of a nightly rental in the C2 zone I want to share some perspective and encourage you to leave this downtown C2 zoning as is. The Entrada Complex on 400 North and ~600 West has been built over the past several years and was completed in 2018. The 45 units were built and marketed as units owners could enjoy and then rent out as nightly rentals. The land for the complex and the units were expensive on a per foot basis because of the rights for overnight rental that they came with.

I now want to share a true cautionary story about the state of Utah that I personally learned the last year. I am a resident of Draper and we have a terrible gravel pit that has been attempting to expand in a windy area of Draper right near hundreds of thousands of residents right in the fastest growing part of the state. Their dust is silica and is a known and well documented carcinogen and it contributes to overall poor air quality on the Wasatch Front. I worked with others residents to lobby our City Council to oppose mining expansion and to increase regulations. The City acted in 2018 and then in the latest legislative session the mining companies immediately struck back with HB288 which limited local oversight and put the power back to the state and to the mining companies. I personally fought HB288 and went to hearings and lobbied against it on health and science-based reasons and we could not stop it. <https://www.ksl.com/article/46530019/infrastructure-bill-passes-prompts-concern-among-drapeer-residents> Draper City ended up in a weakened position because of their approach, even when facts justified their actions.

I would caution Moab to not over-reach on private property rights in C2. I think the recently built Entrada Complex is an area in particular where diminishing the zoning rights or moving it to legal non-conforming use would be readily challenged by the State. I would recommend that for the recently built Entrada complex, that you leave the C2 nightly rental rights as is.

--

I am a concerned citizen and multiple small business owner in the Moab community. My husband and our family have been in the Moab valley for over 4 generations and we have seen a lot of change in this valley, mostly good, but some of the current proposed changes could be detrimental to citizens and small business in the future. My concern is the "taking" of private property rights. Some of the citizens of the community weren't here or don't remember when Moab was basically a drab ghost town when

the uranium mines shut down. You couldn't even give away homes, businesses were closing and it was a pretty undesirable place. With the tourism industry, the town has flourished. The City and County benefit from the TRT and property tax and if the right to do nightly rentals is taken away, it will be a huge ding in the economy and in the tax revenue to our community. It seems like the citizens who want to stop all nightly rentals, tourism and to go back to the 1990's are people who have moved here in the last 10-15 years and now they want to shut the gates so no one else can come to Moab and build a future in a great community.

When nightly rentals were removed from the residential zones and put in commercial zone the County created an overlay for the complexes that had a majority of rentals versus full time residences. These include Rim Village, Rim Vistas, Coyote Run, Solano Vallejo, Puesta del Sol, Redcliff Condos, Southgate Villiage, Tierra Del Sol, Desert Wind, etc. in the County and Moab Springs Ranch, Entrada, Cottonwoods on Williams Way, etc in the City. I think it is only fair that these continue to be allowed to do nightly rentals along with those B&B's and current nightly rentals that are "Grandfathered" in. I am concerned about the talk of "sun-setting" the grandfathered rentals and those in complexes where nightly rentals are now allowed. People have invested in Moab with their hard earned cash. (I am not talking about the big money motels. These are individuals and families who have mortgages to pay. They bring money into the community through the TRT tax, property tax, and employing people to clean, do maintenance, electricians, plumbers, contractors, etc. I am a strong advocate for affordable housing, and housing solutions. I have 3 rentals that I lease at an affordable rate to try to help in a small way. You should not take away vested property rights from property owners and members of our community. We live in a free market society, which is one of the coveted principles that our country was founded upon. If you restrict and do away with nightly rentals I fear it will have economic impacts to our community that can not be reversed. Moab has been discovered! What is to stop people from investing in San Juan County. They will still have to go through Moab, impact traffic and our roads, use our services, but San Juan Co will get the tax benefits and the revenue. The market will correct itself. It always comes back to supply and demand...the basic economic principle. I would encourage you to tread carefully on private property rights. We don't want the state to come down and take over control of our community because you have pushed the boundary on taking away rights.

--

Respectfully - is there any way to have you publish public notices speaking directly to all COMMERCIAL property owners and overnight rental owners in Moab City and Grand County? The majority of property owners I am speaking to do not believe this is happening and have no clue you are moving toward removing lodging as a use by right in ALL COMMERCIAL ZONES. I am receiving comments of 'I am in Highway Commercial (or C3) that won't happen to me' or 'I bought in that zone with that use, they can't take that from me'.

I also believe that the City and County have an obligation to property owners to direct them on how to protect their (soon to be) legal non-conforming uses by having business licenses. Please guide your commercial property owners.

Please make this clear and transparent.

The notices of “land use discussion & overnight lodging moratorium” are not enough. I am appalled of the lack of knowledge from this sector. Most are so sure of their zoning that they don’t believe it to be true or they are so busy running their businesses that they don’t read between the lines.

How can the Association of Realtors and the real estate industry help in this regard? We want to be a part of the solution, while making sure property owners are in the ‘know’.

Will you please forward this correspondence to all planning commission members?

Thank you!

---

#### COMMENTS RECEIVED IN PERSON

---

Option #5 – One disadvantage that needs to be listed is that you run the risk of the State of Utah removing your regulation on short-term rentals in its entirety. This would be devastating to all of our neighborhoods

--

What is proposed for the Resort Special areas located at Highway 313/Highway 191

How does this affect city and county budgets? Because they need more funding for their budgets to maintain roads, bridges, parks, sidewalks, community centers, etc.

--

Please allow overnight rentals outside of Moab Valley. I live outside of the mapped area. We have very different problems. My adjacent single-family homes are abandoned. They would be much nicer and occupied if they were vacation rentals. We have had problems with the vacant houses having starving horses and abandoned dogs as well as broken windows and hoarding. Outside of the Moab Valley needs overnight rentals.