

**VISION DIXIE  
STEERING COMMITTEE  
MEETING MINUTES JANUARY 25, 2007**

Chairman James J. Eardley, Washington County Commissioner, opened the meeting at 1:06 p.m.

[Note: Copies of all brochures and handouts may be seen in the Washington County Commission Office.]

**Members in attendance:**

James Eardley, Washington County Commission  
Alan Gardner, Washington County Commission  
Denny Drake, Washington County Commission  
Kenneth Sizemore, Five County Association of Governments  
Amanda Smith, The Nature Conservancy  
Gary Esplin, City of St. George  
Barbara Hjelle, Washington County Water Conservancy District  
Karl Wilson, Mayor, LaVerkin  
Brad Barber, Oquirrh Institute  
Scott Hirschi, Economic Development Council  
Lee Caldwell, Dixie State College  
Lorri Kocinski-Puchlik, Citizen-at-Large  
Dr. Lee Caldwell, Dixie State College  
Carol Sapp, SUHBA  
Jeri Iverson  
Jane Whalen, Hurricane  
Kayla Koeber, Merrill-Lynch  
Mike Empey, Congressman Matheson's Office  
Lin Alder, Citizens for Dixie's Future  
Lee Bracken, Enterprise Mayor  
Terri Kane, Intermountain Health Care  
Kent Perkins, City of St. George

**Agenda**

The proposed Agenda for this meeting was as follows:

**Welcome**      *Commissioner Jim Eardley, Chair*  
**Approve Minutes from 12/21/07 meeting**  
**Information Item: Overview of a Visioning Process,**

*Committee*

**Discussion Item: Summary of Additional Workshop Results and Discussion**

*Jeff Winston, Ted Knowlton*

**Discussion Item: Clarify the Vision Dixie approach to Water Issues**

*Jeff Winston*

**Action Item: Scenario Framework**

*Jeff Winston*

Number of scenarios

Scenario names

Basic scenario characteristics

Land use

Transportation

Environment

Preview example scenario(s)

*Steering Committee action: approve or modify framework recommendations*

**Action Item: scenario working committee**

*Ted Knowlton*

*Steering Committee action: approve or modify working committee*

**Discussion Item: quality of life indicators to be projected for scenarios**

*Jeff Winston*

**Discussion Item: agenda for next meeting**

*Committee*

**Other Business**

*Steering Committee*

**Adjourn**

*Commissioner Jim Eardley*

**MOTION: Motion by Mike Empey to approve minutes from 12/21/06 Steering Committee Meeting. Motion seconded by Brad Barber and carried by unanimous vote, with all members voting aye.**

**Overview of Visioning Process: Wasatch Choices 2040 Case Study:**

Alan Matheson of Envision Utah (EU) distributed a brochure highlighting the growth plan done in northern Utah called Wasatch 2040. This was an exercise to help develop a long-range transportation plan for a four-county area (Weber, Davis, Utah, and Salt Lake Counties instituted by two metropolitan planning organizations, Mountainlands Association of Governments and the Wasatch Front Regional Council. Public workshops were held and information gathered, with an eye toward exploring areas both of commonality and of differences. Four scenarios were developed with an emphasis on different variables (transit, road, employment centers, etc.). A set of growth principles was developed by the Steering Committee in conjunction with feedback from the public collected from polling, web-based surveys, public meetings, etc. This is the procedure that will be used in the Vision Dixie process, as well.

Jeff Winston of Winston Associates then distributed a handout entitled "Vision Dixie Public Workshops Key Categories." The data on these sheets represents choices made at the workshops

by the participants. Categories in which such choices were recorded include Warner Valley, Old Airport, New Airport Vicinity, Tortoise Reserve, Pipeline, Steep Slope and Ridge Top, Affordable Housing, Mixed Use/Village Centers, Parks/Open Space, and Roads and Transportation. The workshop areas from which the statistics were gathered were: Apple Valley, LaVerkin, Enterprise, Washington City, St. George, Shivwits, Springdale, Ivins, and Hurricane.

### **Clarify the Vision Dixie Approach to Water Issues:**

Lin Alder asked to discuss the projected Lake Powell Pipeline, and Jeff said that in his opinion the pipeline issue as a project has so many other ramifications that it is best left for another forum. Gary Esplin agreed, saying that a discussion of the pipeline is likely to lead to discussions about sewer service, police protection, power sources, and garbage collection. In his opinion, Vision Dixie is all about accommodating and managing the growth of Washington County rather than how to provide services to that population or who will pay for it.

Jeff commented that any discussion of the Lake Powell Pipeline should probably be held at a different time, as it is so important that it deserves the entire focus of a meeting. Additionally, an attempt by the Steering Committee to incorporate it into other discussions would be a disservice to all issues. Brad Barber said that the pipeline discussion reminds him of a similar issue in the Wasatch Front concerning the Legacy Highway. That discussion polarized the committee members to the point where they had to move that project-specific issue off the table so that they could concentrate on the larger vision.

Kayla Koeber said that it is sensible to keep the pipeline issue as separate and distinct from the Vision Dixie process and perhaps reintroduce it in a subsequent phase, making the pipeline a grass-roots, inclusive public discussion.

Chairman Eardley confirmed that the pipeline discussion will be set aside for another day, and perhaps another committee.

Regarding the water conservation issue, Jeff said that Vision Dixie should be able to show the public the consequences of more aggressive or less aggressive water conservation and let citizens weigh in on alternatives.

Lorri said that she would like to see a realistic, accurate visual image of what certain conservation attempts would look like in terms of one's personal residence, the area parks and golf courses, etc. Jeff said what his group is trying to measure is the difference between a lower-density and a higher-density development, and the only way to make that measurement consistent is to assume the same kinds of water consumption across the board for each unit type.

Irrigation requirements were included from various lot sizes. Single-family homes will have larger irrigation requirements than a townhouse. These statistics are all subject to change. EU will continue to work with the Water District to ensure that assumptions made concerning water use are

accurate and/or plausible. Scott Hirschi asked when the Committee will have an opportunity to discuss the actual figures, and Jeff replied that it will be at the next meeting. At the next meeting, there will be a more complete list with actual numbers, and the tools we are using will allow for adjustment to determine their accuracy. Population per household is currently at 2.9888 in the urbanized area of Washington County; Strategic Planning Group (SPG) has actually estimated that the figure might go as low as 2, but EU predicts a figure closer to 2.6.

Issues that need to be addressed relative to water consumption include:

What will the roadways look like if people use more or less water?

What of infill and redevelopment? What will the costs be of using more or less water?

Once scenarios are in place, one needs to ask what is required to increase or decrease water usage?

What would a 25% reduction in irrigation look like in one's front yard?

What effect would xeriscape have on the community's water consumption?

### **Scenario Framework:**

Jeff Winston distributed a document entitled "Preliminary Scenario Constructs." This document presents a variety of possible scenarios with respect to items such as General Growth Patterns, Roadways, Transit, Housing Mix, Degree of Mixed Use, Infill and Redevelopment, Employment, Public Lands, and Open Land Conservation. Other comparisons include vehicle miles traveled, traffic congestion, water consumption, housing affordability, infrastructure, and units within walking distance of services and transit. It was suggested that air quality and total land consumption also be considerations. Jane Whalen asked whether agricultural lands should be considered. Jeff said it would be difficult to do so because both Washington City and St. George are in the midst of changing their general plans in areas that were previously designated for agriculture, and the current owners are going out of business. However, some prime agricultural land in places such as Apple Valley might be considered. Ted suggested looking at irrigated soils that have high agricultural value, and then overlay each scenario on top of those lands and explore which lands are taken out of potential production. Similarly, one can look at some of the valuable habitat that is spread over the whole county, not all of which is protected, in order to see how much development there is on each level of habitat. Certain technical considerations such as effects on habitat and on agricultural land would affect the measuring of these pieces of land.

Scott said that, because there is not much agricultural acreage of significance (with the possible exception of the Enterprise area), it is not prudent to put a lot of time and resources into identifying agricultural lands.

Kayla Koeber asked how one knows that the maps reflect actual data from the workshops. Jeff said that the maps represent the big-picture items about where development should or should not go, buttressed with technical data to make the projections realistic. Ted Knowlton said that it is important that the process remain transparent so that the public's perception is that Vision Dixie is using the most precise, most defensible statistics available.

Jeff discussed the expansion and upgrade of the SunTran bus system, using BRT (bus rapid transit) as a way of encouraging regional connections. Scenario E would provide for a light rail system of mass transit to Zion National Park. Light rail costs approximately \$34 million per mile vs BRT, which is about \$13 million per mile. BRT is a type of dedicated highway, with stations, shelters, and platforms. The transit lines placed on the workshop maps by the participants look very congested, with some people placing mass transit as far north as Enterprise and as far east as Zion. Clearly, most people recognize the need for some form of mass transit, especially in a community containing many physical impediments (landforms) to travel.

As for roadways, the big-picture items to test in the scenarios are the completion of the belt routes and the MPO's long-range plan for roads. Ted said that the key end product is a set of principles. What set of strategies will guide our development and growth? If we build a roadway in a certain portion of the county, what will be the broad consequences to land use? In order to understand the resulting impacts of various strategies, a map must be developed first.

Lorri said that the community should be educated about the consequences of failing to build an east-west corridor because it is irresponsible to allow development to progress in that direction if such a corridor is not provided for. Jeff said that this is one scenario that will be tested.

In the area of housing mix, Jeff showed slides indicating several combinations of multi-family vs. single-family proportions. Ted said that the slides indicate that, as people placed chips on the map, EU figured what percentage of housing the people put on the maps were single-family units on small lots. Jeff said that there is some disagreement as to whether a condo is a single-family or multi-family unit. His group will be using SPG's statistics and projections in preparing its scenarios. In the mixed use category, the percentages represent choices made by the participants at the tables. The density figures represent the number of houses per acre.

As to the public lands category, Jane Whalen asked if the Steering Committee will be given actual acreage numbers in conjunction with percentages, and Jeff said yes. The word "suitable" is also vague and will be defined more specifically by the Working Committee. Public lands for disposal were indicated all over the county by the workshop participants. Scott Hirschi commented that there are none indicated in the Western grid of the county and almost none in the East. Most of them surround existing privately-owned property. Chairman Eardley speculated that the cause may be a lack of public awareness of, or familiarity with, those outlying areas.

Jeff said that the housing affordability gap is related to trends in the cost of relative types of housing as well as the cost of land relative to projected incomes. In terms of measuring the costs of housing, the higher density schemes will have a different infrastructure cost than the lower density schemes. Ted added that it will not be feasible for EU or Winston Associates to come up with comprehensive or completely defensible numbers for cost of living. Such data is outside the scope of this project. However, they may be able to translate some of these figures into the impact per taxpayer or the differences in per capita water usage into what the data means per household.

Chairman Eardley asked how much attention has been paid to the housing affordability gap relative to transportation. Ted replied that the SPG presented data showing that about 20% of household expenses are going towards transportation. They will be looking at vehicle miles of travel per capita and may be able to consider auto ownership per capita, converting that data to a figure that represents cost to the household. That figure, plus the housing affordability gap measured by itself, is the net impact on the living expenses of a household.

**Scenario Working Committee:**

Ted reiterated that the Steering Committee is the body that establishes policy direction as to what questions the scenarios will attempt to answer. It is incumbent upon EU to prove to the Committee that the scenarios accurately reflect what people did at the workshops. After that policy direction is given to the technical consultants, the Steering Committee must develop an actual map, depicting land, transportation, and development on the ground. The role of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) is to help avoid fatal flaws, identify good methodology, and develop effective measures. But the TAC meets only monthly, and its commitment to the process is minimal. The Steering Committee, therefore, needs a small subset of the TAC, a group of about five people, who can look at these scenario maps and help identify ways to make the scenarios more plausible. This group should consist of people who have experience with habitat, suitability, transportation, fatal-flaw, and land-use issues.

The names being presented for approval today are:

Rick Rosenberg (Santa Clara Mayor)  
Ken Sizemore (Five County Association of Governments)  
Lowell Elmer (Dixie Metropolitan Planning Organization)  
Bob Nicholson (Community Development Director, St. George City)  
Tom Dancy (Planner, Springdale City)

Ted said that an additional person, preferably with a biology and/or technical background is also needed. The gentlemen above are all currently part of the TAC and all work for governmental agencies.

Amanda Smith suggested Jim Crisp (BLM) or a representative from his agency.

This Working Committee will meet on average one hour per week for the next six weeks. It will discuss transportation and allocation networks, print out and review maps, and provide recommendations to the Steering Committee. This Working Committee will not have policy authority but will simply provide informational and technical assistance to the Steering Committee.

**MOTION: Motion by Mike Empey to appoint Rick Rosenberg, Ken Sizemore, Lowell Elmer, Bob Nicholson, and Tom Dancy to the**

**Scenario Working Committee, with an additional person to be appointed from a biology and/or technical background at a later time. Motion seconded by Karl Wilson and carried by unanimous vote, with all members voting aye.**

**Other Business:**

Ted Knowlton raised what he considers a crucial question: What exactly is Vision Dixie asking the public to comment on? In general terms, the idea is to give the community distilled information about the projected consequences of each scenario. Ideally, before they attempt to answer any questions or prepare any responses, they have tried to understand the advantages and disadvantages of how the scenarios perform. They will hopefully see some pictures of prototypical development, illustrative of how that development pattern may look, so they can begin to get a picture of the feel of the quality of life in that scenario. At that point, the public would be asked to think about specific issues (transportation, land-use, recreational opportunities, etc.) and rank them in order of preference.

After obtaining reactions from scenarios, Vision Dixie would be able to assume that the public supports a particular scenario. The principles could then be tested by either a survey of some kind or a public meeting and then brought back to the Steering Committee for approval. Ted said that in the next phase, EU will back up its findings as having statistical validity. Alan added that 600,000 people in the Wasatch Front responded to questions mailed to their households, and EU followed up with some polling research to weigh those results. Ted said that at the next meeting, one agenda item will be a discussion of a more specific proposal for how the next steps unfold.

Lin Alder asked if it were possible to create a video that could be posted on the website to show flyovers and other visual data, and Jeff said that it was. Additionally, Ted said that interactive maps have been delivered to the Vision Dixie Webmaster to be posted on the website.

**Agenda for Next Meeting:**

Ted suggested discussing a process for unveiling the scenarios and also a discussion by SPG about its housing analysis. Barbara Hjelle suggested a detailed progress report from the Scenario Working Committee, including its recommendations for further activity. Chairman Eardley suggested a financial update, as well.

**Next Meeting Dates/Adjourn:**

The next regularly-scheduled meeting date, the third Thursday of the month, would be February 15, 2007. The typical meeting time has been 2:00 p.m., but as many items require attention a longer meeting seems necessary. It was asked if the meeting could be pushed back one week, to February 22<sup>nd</sup>, because of a conflict. Chairman Eardley said he would be unavailable on the 22<sup>nd</sup>. Jeff Winston and Ted Knowlton both said that the 22<sup>nd</sup> would be better for them, enabling them to

prepare better.

**Next Meeting Date:**

**February 22, 2007**

**1:00 p.m.**

**Dixie Center**

Kayla Koeber led a round of applause for the Envision Utah representatives and for Jeff Winston for their hard work at a difficult job.

Finally, Alan Matheson handed out a letter dated January 9, 2007, from the participants at Table #10 at the Ivins Workshop and his response, dated January 22, 2007. Copies of this correspondence is available for review in the County Commission Office.

Chairman Eardley adjourned the meeting at 3:48 p.m.