

**VISION DIXIE
STEERING COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES DECEMBER 21, 2006**

Chairman James J. Eardley, Washington County Commissioner, opened the meeting at 2:06 p.m.

Members in attendance:

James Eardley, Washington County Commission
Kenneth Sizemore, Five County Association of Governments
Amanda Smith, The Nature Conservancy
Gary Esplin, City of St. George
Judy Gubler, Ivins
Barbara Hjelle, Washington County Water Conservancy District
Karl Wilson, Mayor, LaVerkin
Brad Barber, Oquirrh Institute
Scott Hirschi, Economic Development Council
Rick Rosenberg, City of Santa Clara
Lee Caldwell, Dixie State College
Lorri Kocinski-Puchlik, Citizen-at-Large
Russell Behrmann, St. George Chamber of Commerce
Jim Crisp, Bureau of Land Management
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

Agenda

The proposed Agenda for this meeting was as follows:

Welcome and Introductions

Financial Report

Guidance/Input on Development of Scenarios

Detailed summary of workshops;

General concepts reflected on maps;

Recommendations of Technical Advisory Committee;

Questions to be answered by scenarios;

Chairman Jim Eardley

Jerry Rasmussen

Ted Knowlton, Envision Utah

Outline next steps

Approve Minutes from 11/21/06
Other Business
Next Meeting/Adjourn

Committee
Committee
Jim Eardley

Financial Report:

Assistant Washington County Administrator Jerry Rasmussen reported that so far Vision Dixie has a budget of \$468,000, of which \$281,000 has been collected. The following contributions have been received:

Five County Association of Governments	\$ 5,000
St. George Chamber of Commerce	5,000
SITLA	50,000
Water Conservancy District	50,000
Washington County	25,000
The Nature Conservancy	100,000
Envision Utah	20,000 (in kind)
Dixie State College	2,000
Economic Development Council	10,000
SUHBA	10,000
Cities:	
LaVerkin	2,000
Santa Clara	<u>2,000</u>
 TOTAL:	 \$281,000

Chairman Eardley said that he has received a letter from the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) indicating that it will be contributing \$40,000. Expenditures to date are \$155,545, so the committee is still on budget and within the projections.

Summary of Workshops:

Ted Knowlton of Envision Utah gave an overview of the visioning process through its conclusion. A copy of his PowerPoint presentation is available in the Washington County Commission Office. Ted presented the workshop results and asked for direction from the committee on the big questions that the scenarios will ask. Jeff Winston of Winston Associates was going to be at the meeting today but was snowed in at the Denver airport.

Ted said that scenarios are like crash-test dummies. They are not competing plans for the destiny

of Washington County but rather mechanisms to test strategies, so scenarios are illustrations of how the County might change if various strategies are systematically followed. They also illustrate how successful or unsuccessful various strategies might be. The basic steps in any visioning process are: (1) analyze the workshop results; (2) determine the key questions the scenario should attempt to answer; (3) explore how the scenarios are then mapped; (4) evaluate what the scenarios mean in terms of the long-term quality of life in the County; (5) attempt to understand why things came out the way they did; (6) determine which of those strategies the public supports as they look at the ideas. These strategies are then incorporated into a package of strategies that the committee can take to the various local agencies and municipalities who will be implementing them and ask if they are willing to support these strategies.

Envision Utah recently facilitated the Wasatch Front in a similar planning process called the Wasatch Choices 2040 Plan. After those workshops, a digital comparison was made, taking each map and geo-coding or geo-referencing the location of every piece of input and developing maps containing the most popular locations for development, open space, transportation facilities, high- vs. low-density housing, employment clusters, and so forth. For the Wasatch Plan, some of the common themes supported were: growth centers, re-development, housing, and bike/pedestrian routes. The results were mapped out and graphed to try to establish common themes. Every county projected at least 30% of its growth on top of existing growth.

For the Vision Dixie key strategies, the difficulty is in mapping them. Ted had 112 maps from the Washington County workshops, and after looking at those types of results, one goal is to determine the common themes and key differences. It is the goal of Vision Dixie to perform this process, in a completely transparent way. The goal for today's meeting is to establish the big themes from the workshop results. By the time of the January Steering Committee meeting, Envision Utah would like to have mapped scenarios. By and large, the goal should be to defer to the public's strategies, wherever feasible. Then, a smaller working group of experts, committee members, and planners (in addition to the Technical Committee) will help to map these scenarios.

Scenarios are then evaluated, e.g., What does this scenario mean in terms of air quality, water use, open space, traffic, etc.? Some measures looked at in the Wasatch study were traffic congestion, land use, water consumption, etc., and those were evaluated and studied. A list of agreed-upon strategies and a vision map resulted, illustrating how the Wasatch Front might grow if it followed those agreed-upon strategies.

The January meeting will be the Committee's first chance to view the overall maps. Feedback will be received and refined. Then in February, the Committee will approve the finalized set of scenarios, preview how they are being tested, and then determine how to present these findings to the public. In March the civic dialogue meetings will occur, with the opportunity to find out which strategies the public supports. There are two components to the meetings: (1) a scientifically valid survey that would be sent out in advance; and (2) the dialogues themselves. Both methods will be employed. Large electronic keypad polling would be available to permit more in depth questions than the survey could accommodate and to get immediate reactions.

Barbara Hjelle asked whether Envision Utah could electronically forward information to the committee members, containing cues for what the members need to be thinking about and what the next steps are. Ted said that the slide show is part of the minutes and can be disseminated by the end of the week to all members.

Ted asked how many committee members were able to attend any of the 13 workshops, and most people raised their hands. Approximately 1,100 citizens participated, and 112 workshop maps resulted. Chairman Eardley said he had attended several workshops around the County and found them to be well-attended with a lot of positive energy and enthusiasm from the participants. Other members found a good cross-section of the community represented. Dr. Caldwell from Dixie State College reported that he heard many positive comments about the process. Kayla Koeber reported that many people felt there wasn't enough time to place their chips and there was some confusion whether or not all chips must be placed on the maps. Ted said that these were problem-solving workshops, the problem being: What do we want the County to look and/or be like at a population of 400,000? This does not mean that anyone wants a population of that size, but that the County should plan for that eventuality. As people grapple with this difficult problem, they must, in turn, make compromises and trade-offs. It was up to each individual table whether the participants were obliged to use all of their chips.

Barbara Hjelle asked how Envision Utah deals with the variables on the maps, in terms of comparing maps where people felt obligated to use all their chips and other maps where people did not necessarily do so. Ted said that there is a way to evaluate these different maps but that it hasn't been done yet. By the next meeting, that analysis will be complete; i.e., how much growth was indicated by each map as a percentage of what the participants at each table was asked to do. The majority of the maps is expected to be at 80% or higher of what the participants were supposed to allocate. Chairman Eardley said that, in a way, those who didn't place a chip were, in fact, using a chip - in a negative fashion.

As to hand-written notes on the maps, Ted said that two items were passed out, note pads and maps. All comments written on the pads have been recorded, but the comments that were written on the maps themselves have not been tallied. A document entitled "Recurring Themes" was compiled to track frequently-mentioned issues. Another document entitled "Key Categories" was prepared, which looks at particular geographic areas and delineates specific elements such as housing, mixed-use areas, slopes, open space, etc.

The next 20 slides of the PowerPoint focused on specific aspects of the workshop results. Ted explained the meanings of the color scheme and how to read the graphs and charts. He said that it takes approximately two to six man-hours to develop each map. Some of the readings represent how many maps placed a form of development on any square in the County. The maps were all laid upon one another, and any time there was development (or any other aspect of growth) indicated on any map, it was recorded. This frequency will eventually be translated into a percentage. For each slide, there is another map that zooms into a metro area. Interpreting the

results and deconstructing the data can be difficult tasks and require a high level of skill.

Lee Caldwell commented that his office has just completed its twenty-year master plan for Dixie State College, and the master planners have pointed out that there will be a parking problem if no significant mass transit system is in place by then. Dixie State College is expected to be the second most densely populated campus in the country in twenty years. The facilitators were deliberately vague about the specifics of transit, and Ted said that many participants of the workshops had ideas about transit but seemed naive about the ultimate cost.

Several slides derived from the workshop effort dealt with such issues as development frequency, dominant use (parks/open space, single family, multi-family, mixed, civic, employment), road frequency, transit frequency, trail frequency, open space frequency, employment frequency, mixed-use frequency, and acreage of development on public lands. The workshop maps do not cover the entire County but concentrate only on those areas where workshops were held. The workshops were an opportunity for people to have a broad public debate about all of the key questions with which Washington County is grappling. Barbara Hjelle said that although many people seemed confused about their options and responsibilities at the tables, the planners should be able to glean a range of usable data. Ted agreed, saying that many people are unfamiliar with map study.

Scott Hirschi mentioned that his experience at the workshops was that people tended to place the majority of chips in someone else's neighborhood. He said that if every community took the attitude that "We don't want growth in our community," the problem becomes where to put new development. The problem becomes more acute if (since these workshop maps represent a projected population of 400,000) the real number becomes 600,000 - 800,000.

Ted said that, ideally, scenarios should accomplish three things: (1) be different from one another, representing distinct choices; (2) bear a strong resemblance to the ideas that were explored in the public workshops; and (3) a group of intelligent and diverse people need to use this opportunity to debate the issues raised. Brad Barber asked for an example of what a scenario might look like. Ted responded that six variables from the workshop results, in different combinations, would be explored: transportation choice (with strong roadway emphasis), agriculture and open space (with minimal vs. substantial conservation), housing mix (trend vs. aggressive shift to smaller lots), response to public lands (no conversion vs. extensive conversion), mixing land uses (broad segregation vs. mix in centers), and growth centers (no new centers vs. many strong centers).

Lin Alder said that he doesn't see the major issue of water use being addressed. Ted said that this important issue will definitely be considered in the scenarios.

Scott asked the committee to consider the following question: Does Vision Dixie put together the scenarios and then build policies around the scenarios or do we build policies and then manufacture scenarios that reflect those policies? Ted responded that it would be the latter; the scenario tells the story of many policies that are chosen by the citizens. Scott said that another approach would be for this group to come up with its preferred scenario and then write policies that would support that

scenario. If the Steering Committee developed its own scenario, then there would tend to be more consensus in the creation of policy. He said he would like to force this group into some kind of process whereby people would bring various agendas to the table and compromise to the point of consensus, resulting in 2-3 workable scenarios to present to the public. One of those scenarios, the Steering Committee's, would be supported by policy.

Lorri expressed doubt about this approach in the sense that the public may see it as an effort by the Steering Committee to control the outcome of the Vision Dixie process. Ted agreed, saying that he would like to avoid the appearance of holding 13 workshops only to concentrate on the "real" workshop, which consisted only of Steering Committee members. Alan Matheson said that he was concerned about proceeding with a "Steering Committee Scenario" before the committee obtains thorough input from the workshop process. He suggested getting the scenarios analyzed and getting public feedback, and then the group would be in a better position to present this information to the public in terms of a long-term vision.

Ted said that, in developing the maps of the scenarios, it is necessary to determine the key questions that need to be answered. Ideally, four to six planners, experienced in various aspects of growth and development, would convene and attempt to agree upon the particular locations of different forms of development, transportation solutions, conservation of public lands, etc. These people would consult the workshop results and ultimately map out the scenario in such a way that it becomes a feasible outcome. Jeff Winston and his group will be leading this process. The feasible quality-of-life measures of each scenario are measured and the consequences projected in an open and honest way, eliciting peer review. The small group of planners may consist of members of the Steering Committee or the hired consultants, or both. The group will present its findings to the Steering Committee for approval, after which the information will be disseminated to the public.

Ted said that the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) already has meetings that are open to anyone. The TAC can look at the data and provide input but does not have the decision-making authority to change scenarios. The Winston team is in charge of measuring outputs (costs and benefits); all standard measures are in place. Jeff Winston will present his list to the Steering Committee at its next meeting, listen to suggestions from Committee members of other potential measures, and determine whether it is feasible to measure them. Standard data such as air quality, land consumption, travel demand, impact on habitat, infrastructure costs, and housing mix, will all be measured.

Scott said that his perception of the final product of this entire process is a set of policies, not maps. He sees the maps as the vehicle that drives Vision Dixie to develop policies. For example, one policy could be that the committee recommends the City of Ivins to have a mix of residential housing of certain types, or that the HCP should have a north/south road but not an east/west road.

Ted agreed that the final product would be a set of policies, using a map to illustrate how those policies might manifest themselves. Chairman Eardley said that Vision Dixie has never been about

identifying specific parcels of land for use in any given way. Alan Matheson clarified that after the Committee goes through the scenarios and public input, an analysis must take place, identifying the policies that create the relationships that work in the scenario. Scott's concern is that when the Steering Committee finally comes up with a plan, there won't be an opportunity for the public to comment upon it.

Lorri suggested that Committee members send suggestions or questions to Envision Utah and the Winston Group by e-mail. Additionally, it would be helpful if Ted and/or Alan e-mailed the committee members the key objectives that should be focused on. Carol asked for the graphs and slides and the rest of the PowerPoint presentation to be sent electronically. Ted said that he would be sending out maps for clarification purposes, so that at the next meeting the Committee will have a common ground for discussion. The maps will provide a higher level of detail and some tangible information for the Steering Committee to consider.

Scott requested clarification of the composition of the Finance Committee and the Fund-Raising Committee, stating that they are two separate entities. Chairman Eardley agreed, saying that the Finance Committee is comprised essentially of Jerry Rasmussen and Jim Eardley; and the Fund-Raising Committee consists of Lorri Kocinski-Puchlik, Scott Hirschi, Brad Barber, Ron Thompson, and Washington County staff members.

Approval of Minutes:

MOTION: Motion by Barbara Hjelle to approve Steering Committee and Executive Committee Meeting Minutes of 11/21/06, with two corrections: that the minutes reflect a contribution of \$50,000 from the Washington County Water Conservancy Districts; and that the Finance Committee and Fund-Raising Committees be identified as two distinct entities, the former consisting of James J. Eardley and Jerry Rasmussen, and the latter consisting of Lorri-Kocinski-Puchlik, Scott Hirschi, Brad Barber, Ron Thompson, and Washington County staff members. Motion seconded by Brad Barber and carried by unanimous vote, with all present voting aye.

Next Meeting Dates/Adjourn:

The next regularly scheduled meeting for the Steering Committee is January 18, 2007. However, Jeff Winston will not be available to give a report on that date. Therefore, it was agreed to move the next Steering Committee meeting to:

**January 25, 2007
1:00 p.m.- 4:00 p.m.
Dixie Center**

The earlier starting time was suggested in order to allow for more discussion without running late

into the afternoon.

Chairman Eardley adjourned the meeting at 4:21 p.m.