

**VISION DIXIE  
STEERING COMMITTEE  
MEETING MINUTES APRIL 26, 2007**

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

[Note: Copies of all brochures and handouts referred to in these minutes are available for review in the Washington County Commission Office.]

**Members in attendance:**

James Eardley, Washington County Commission  
Elaine York for Amanda Smith, The Nature Conservancy  
Gary Esplin, City of St. George  
Barbara Hjelle, Washington County Water Conservancy District  
Karl Wilson, Mayor, LaVerkin  
Carol Sapp, SUHBA  
Jane Whalen, Hurricane  
Mike Empey, Congressman Matheson's Office  
John Andrews, SITLA  
Rick Rosenberg, Santa Clara Mayor  
Lorri Kocinski-Puchlik  
Donald Stratton, Interstate Rock Products  
Lin Alder, Citizens for Dixie's Future  
Judy Gubler, Ivins  
Steven Vance (Strategic Planner), for Terri Kane, Intermountain Health Care  
Scott Hirschi, Economic Development Council  
Russell Behrmann, Chamber of Commerce  
Jim Crisp, Bureau of Land Management  
Doug Paddock, Central  
Brad Barber, Oquirrh Institute  
Lee Caldwell, Dixie State College  
Kent Perkins, City of St. George  
Marc Mortensen, City of St. George

**Others in Attendance**

Dean Cox, Washington County  
Jerry Rasmussen, Washington County

David L. Patterson, Deputy County Attorney  
Jeff Winston, Winston Associates  
Ted Knowlton, Envision Utah  
John Willie, Washington County  
Ron Whitehead, Washington County  
Julie Cropper, Planning Commission  
Debra Christopher, Planning Commission  
Sharon May, *Dixie Weekly*  
Kai Reed, Citizens for Dixie's Future

## **Agenda**

The agenda for this meeting was as follows:

Welcome  
Chairman Jim Eardley  
Review Minutes from 3/22/07 Meeting  
Committee  
Overview of Draft Scenarios and Indicators  
Jeff Winston  
    Land use concepts and discussion  
    Recreation/Open Space frameworks  
    Transportation frameworks  
Review Draft Questionnaire  
Ted Knowlton  
Civic Dialogue Presentation Preview  
Jeff Winston  
Other Business  
Committee  
Schedule next meeting; adjourn  
Jim Eardley

## **Review Minutes from 3/22/07 Meeting**

Mayor Karl Wilson of LaVerkin moved to approve the Minutes from the previous Steering Committee meeting of 3/22/07, and the motion was seconded by Mike Empey. However, Jane Whalen expressed opposition to a sentence contained in those minutes on Page 6, as follows:

. . . Denny Drake agreed, saying that the consensus from previous Steering Committee meetings has been that there will be a Northern Corridor included in the vision, and therefore it should be on the map.

Jane requested that the minutes be changed to reflect the fact that Commissioner Drake was

expressing his opinion as to the consensus of the committee, and not stating such a consensus as a fact.

Chairman Eardley said that a footnote stating that Commissioner Drake was stating his own opinion could be inserted into the minutes from today's meeting. Barbara Hjelle said that in her opinion the minutes do reflect that which was actually said by Commissioner Drake and are, therefore, accurate. Washington County Deputy Attorney David Patterson agreed, saying that if any corrections are to be noted, they should be noted on the minutes from today's meeting. If Jane had objected to the statement during the meeting, when the statement was made, then it would be legally correct to indicate the revision in the minutes from the meeting in which the misstatement had occurred. Scott Hirschi agreed with Jane that Commissioner Drake's statement is not factually accurate.

Lin Alder suggested changing the wording of the minutes to the effect that . . . "Commissioner Drake *expressed his opinion* that . . ."

**MOTION: Motion by Mayor Karl Wilson to approve the Minutes from the 3/22/07 Steering Committee meeting, as submitted. Motion seconded by Mike Empey and carried by unanimous vote, with all present voting aye.**

Due to technical difficulties, Ted Knowlton proceeded with his agenda item out of sequence.

### **Civic Dialogue Survey/Draft Questionnaire**

Ted presented an overview of the Civic Dialogue Survey, saying that this questionnaire will be distributed at the time the Civic Dialogue Meetings are being held. The primary function of the questionnaire is for people to state their preferences for the large ideas that are tested in the scenarios. This survey can be distributed online and also made available at a number of city offices throughout the County so that people who do not have internet access will also be able to participate. Conceptually, the Draft Questionnaire will present some trade-offs to people and solicit their preferences. Ted wanted the Committee's input on whether this is the correct approach and whether the word usage contained in the questionnaire is of maximum benefit. This draft has been sent to Dan Jones & Associates and is considered structurally sound by that firm.

First, Ted recommended including a preamble in the questionnaire which would state, in effect, that each scenario reflects similar population and job statistics and that the intention is to explore the consequences of different ways of growing and providing transportation, etc. Scott suggested finding a way to allow respondents to editorialize somewhat on their answers, by providing an "Other Comments" space, or something to that effect. Several members said that they would prefer to see more room for responders to explain their answers, but Ted mentioned that open-ended answers are much more difficult to tabulate.

Additionally, Scott said he would prefer to see a different adjective rather than "affordable" to describe housing, and some suggestions were "workforce" and "reasonably priced." Mayor

Wilson said that in his experience people tend to associate the word “workforce” with “affordable.” Ted said that many people interpret affordable housing as being subsidized housing, but that in reality it simply means reasonably priced, and that is perhaps the phrase that should be used to describe it.

Jane suggested streamlining the Issue Ranking list on Page 6, especially for purposes of telephone surveys.

Scott mentioned that the general public probably does not understand the School Institutional Trust Lands Administration (SITLA) and how it administers land conversion issues. He would like to see the question made more meaningful by explaining SITLA as it relates to land development. He questioned in Number 12 how the “XX” cost will ultimately be determined. Ted said that the consultants possess the technology to determine those numbers. Further, the statement, “. . . borne by homebuyers and developers. . .” is not accurate, as developers rarely absorb such costs. It was suggested that the words “and developers” be removed from the sentence.

As to the overall structure, Gary Esplin said that the first question was poorly stated and, in fact, should be omitted. Most people do not have any idea what their city’s plans for growth are, and their answers to this question will not be useful or informed. The City of St. George, for example, has a build-out plan for 165,000 people; beltway transportation plans; a master plan, etc. Ted said that this question is simply intended to get the reaction of what people think is currently happening, not what is projected to happen. Gary argued that the purpose of Vision Dixie is to present various scenarios with proposed alternatives for growth based on an estimated population. Carol said that in her opinion, the results of this question would reveal the extent of knowledge of the general population. Gary suggested changing the question to read, “Have you read your city’s master plan for growth? ***If so***, what is your opinion of it?” Jeff said this question is intended to solicit the extent of respondents’ awareness of their community’s plans and their confidence in their community’s ability to plan for future growth. It was decided to remove the first part of the question, leaving the sentence to say: “Do you think growth will be positive or negative for your quality of life over the coming decade?”

Scott questioned the relevance of Question 18, and Ted responded that it seeks to determine how a responder feels about the manner in which planning in his community is done. Scott asked to have the demographic questions clarified, such as changing “Income” to “Household Income,” etc. As to Question 11, Lin Alder requested clarification of such terms as “public land conversion” and “open space conservation” so that the public will clearly understand them. He would like to see a fifth option in this question, so that people can respond “Other” and then expand on their answer.

Barbara asked whether there were some method of inserting a “test” question into the survey for purposes of determining whether the responders had thoroughly read the scenarios.

Lin complained that the Survey is written in such a form that it does not give people an option not to convert any public lands. He recommends reducing the lowest number of acres of public lands

(3,000 in Scenario D). Jim Crisp said that he doesn't believe there are 40,000 acres (as in Scenario A) of public lands that are suitable for conversion. He suggests that the scenarios reflect a range (0-3,000 and so forth) of acreage or use the terms "maximum" and "minimum" instead of figures. Jeff suggested removing the numbers from the choices and simply referring to the Scenarios. Lin said that he doesn't see any difference between Scenarios C and D.

Ted asked for a consensus from the committee whether this Survey is the appropriate approach, whether the language should be refined, and other input. Chairman Eardley said that a motion was needed from the group to approve the Survey before it is distributed. Ted said that his group will accept written comments until May 3<sup>rd</sup> and then re-send the draft to the Committee members by the following Monday, May 7<sup>th</sup>, via email. The plan is that the finalized Survey would be taken to the Civic Dialogue Meetings. Ted reiterated that this document will be tested by Dan Jones to ensure that the questions make sense. If significant changes were to be made, the Steering Committee would be informed.

**MOTION: Motion by Carol Sapp to authorize the finalized Civic Dialogue Survey to be sent to Dan Jones for testing and then, after final approval of, and reflecting changes made by, the Steering Committee, to be presented at the Vision Dixie Town Meetings and used for the purpose of soliciting input from those who respond. Motion seconded by Lin Alder and carried by unanimous vote, with all present voting aye.**

### **Overview of Draft Scenarios and Indicators / Jeff Winston**

Jeff said that there are four scenarios, whose definitions have changed slightly after conversation with the TAC yesterday. A is expansive, low-density, and spread out. B is also called "current trends" and tends to follow closely the comprehensive plans, although in many cases the comprehensive plans are not being followed. C is more oriented around villages and mixed-use centers, and D is at the other end of the spectrum from A, emphasizing downtown centers and consolidating development. The scenarios are intended to be broad, with enough variations to give people a sense of cause and effect.

Lin said that his concern is that open space should be discussed as well as development, and the phrase should be included in the description of each scenario. He also had trouble interpreting the colors on some of the maps.

Scott suggested that a series of bullet points be added to the maps for ease of interpretation. Jeff described an "indicator" as an order-of-magnitude measure, a consistent measure among the scenarios but not an absolute number, referring to vehicle miles traveled, water used, or other variables. By applying the same formula to all four scenarios, it is therefore possible to compare them on an equal basis.

In terms of transportation frameworks, each scenario represents an emphasis on different corridors, light rail systems, walkability, etc.

A discussion ensued about the Northern Corridor. Chairman Eardley said that there has been discussion since the last meeting concerning the routes and maps, and the conclusion is that any reference to the Northern Corridor cannot be route-specific. Jane Whalen commented that there had not been consensus at previous meetings on whether the Northern Corridor would be included on all scenario maps.

Jeff said that of the eighty (80) tables that included the Northern Corridor in their study areas, fifty (50) had roads through the northern part of the county and thirty (30) did not.

Jane Whalen proposed a motion with respect to the Northern Corridor issue:

**MOTION: Motion by Jane Whalen to remove the line representing the Northern Corridor from all scenario maps because it was not identified during the public workshop process and there was no consensus by the Steering Committee as to its inclusion. Motion seconded by Lin Alder.**

Chairman Eardley said that in his opinion what will emerge from the Civic Dialogue Meetings is that a route through the HCP (the Northern Corridor) will become a necessity.

Ted said that it is important to approach the Civic Dialogue Meetings with an open mind, without anticipating what will emerge from them.

**ALTERNATE MOTION: Motion by Gary Esplin that three out of the four scenario maps show a road across the top of and through the Red Cliffs Desert Reserve and one map (Scenario D) that does not contain a specific reference to a Northern Corridor. Motion seconded by Brad Barber.**

Doug Paddock suggested a note be placed on all scenario maps to the effect that the location of the Northern Corridor route is not fixed but rather flexible. Mayor Wilson said that while the HCP plan makes no reference to the Northern Corridor, the minutes reflect considerable debate on this topic.

Jim Crisp said that in 1992 a committee addressed this issue and agreed not to list a road on the map. The decision at that time was to enlarge the Red Cliffs Parkway. The issue was again raised in the HCAC last year, where the conclusion was reached that, when it comes time to build this highway, a decision will be made on its location. A route analysis has not been done at this time, nor has a NEPA analysis or a Fish & Wildlife review. He recommends two alternatives that display a Northern Corridor and two alternatives that do not. It is important to show that a northern beltway must exist somewhere, connecting the east side of the county to the west side. The exact placement of the route will ultimately have full public input, including a NEPA analysis and BLM input.

Scott Hirschi proposed yet another alternate motion with respect to the Northern Corridor issue:

**2<sup>ND</sup> ALTERNATE MOTION: Motion by Scott Hirschi to show the Northern Corridor as a line on all four (4) maps with a text note above the road stating that no environmental clearances, unlike the rest of the beltway, have been performed; that this is an area of special environmental concern; and that as the line is symbolic only, it is quite possible that no road will ever be built there. Motion seconded by Carol Sapp. All members present voted aye, eliminating the necessity for voting on the two (2) previous motions.**

Elaine York from The Nature Conservancy said that Amanda Smith asked her to make the comment that if something were going to be shown on the map other than text for both the Western and Northern Corridors, it be depicted in some way as to distinguish it from other roads that are more solidly accepted.

Lin Alder predicted vocal opposition from members of the public who want an option that does not include the Northern Corridor.

**MOTION: Motion by Lin Alder to display text only to represent the Northern Corridor on all scenario maps, and remove the line. Motion seconded by Jane Whalen. There were four (4) aye votes and eleven (11) nay votes; motion fails.**

Chairman Eardley pointed out that Lin had just voted in favor of Scott Hirschi's motion and was now making a different motion. Lin said that he hadn't understood the motion clearly and would not have voted for it had he understood it.

Jeff next presented the vehicle transit study, including such considerations as air pollution, traffic, congestion, light rail ridership, etc. There is more traffic congestion in Scenarios C and D within the centers than in the first two scenarios. Other indicators show positive benefits with Scenarios C and D. Rick Rosenberg asked if there is a minimum distance that constitutes a "trip," and Jeff said that there is no arbitrary number of miles. Vehicles hours traveled is higher in Scenario A than in the others.

Matt Rifkin, traffic consultant, has said that there are systems in Salt Lake similar to some of these possibilities. Scenario D could attract federal funding if the statistics meet the criteria threshold.

Ted said that the freeway congestion moves from high to low as one moves across the scenarios. The generalized story is that these density areas tend to have more cars on the road because the population is denser. There are collectors and arterials serving some of these major mixed-use centers. Winston's group is still tweaking numbers on the transit study.

Barbara Hjelle suggested advising the Dialogue participants that the graphs they are looking at are computer models that were created in general terms rather than actual maps that represent specific statistics. Jeff said that most people have short attention spans and may respond better to sound

bites than to extended explanations.

### **Community Dialogues**

Jeff said that it is important to discuss how to tell the story. There are eight (8) community dialogues, including Springdale, which was added at the request of residents there. The consultants will talk about what density means and looks like in practice, not just present graphs. There will also be some keypad polling to get immediate feedback from the audience. Some of the same questions that are in the survey will also be repeated.

First will be an introduction: What is Vision Dixie? Then there will be a discussion about how to accommodate the growth that is known to be coming: where people will live, where they will work, and how they will travel. The chip game will be described, transparencies displayed, and the four scenarios explained. Key concepts will be introduced: housing types, centers, nature of recreation and open areas. Diagrams will be used to illustrate key development patterns. Some of the characteristics of density will then be discussed: the fact that it is related to affordability, the fact that larger lots increase water use, there is more length of road per house, there are more units per acre, etc. Comparisons will be made to other communities in terms of redevelopment and the range of choices for growth principles. The keypad polling ensures that everyone remains anonymous throughout the voting; no one dominates the meeting, no one can make speeches, and everyone has an equal voice. Also, there is an immediate feedback via a bar chart that appears on the screen as soon as the poll is closed. People may be surprised to discover that they are in the minority, or in the majority, not having assumed so previously. This is a very positive way for public input to happen.

Jeff said that Vision Dixie will tabulate the results from all the meetings, cross-check them against the demographics that generated them, and compare them with the responses from the other survey results. Gary Esplin asked whether participants were permitted to attend more than one meeting, and, if so, how to prevent a meeting from being “packed.” Jeff said that this has not been a problem in other communities. Several key questions can determine whether there is some general, built-in bias; but the survey was never represented to be 100% scientifically accurate. Further, the keypad polling will permit weighing the answers against a larger cross-section of the community. Dan Jones will be conducting a sample survey and using the answers to the demographic questions to ensure that the sample is representative of the County. There may be flyovers of a few selected areas in the County in order to present realistic visual images.

Scott Hirschi said that he thinks the questionnaire is too long. Alan Matheson suggested that adding bullet points may assist in shortening the questionnaire. Jeff said that his group tends to use long questionnaires, finding the information gleaned to be invaluable.

Lorri agreed that the questionnaire is too long and said that she would like to see the presentation scheduled for the Dialogue Meetings in advance of the first meeting on May 29<sup>th</sup>. Chairman

Eardley asked if the consultants could let the Steering Committee know when the presentation is available for viewing, and a preview can be posted online. Chairman Eardley said he trusted Jeff's team to assemble a polished final product, considering their experience and expertise.

Ted said that a sample invitation letter to the Dixie Dialogue Meetings will be emailed to the Committee shortly, along with the finalized list of meeting dates and locations.

**Schedule Next Meeting; Adjourn**

The next Steering Committee meeting will be:

**Thursday, June 21, 2007**

**1:00 p.m.**

**Dixie Center, Entrada Room B**

If it becomes clear that a Steering Committee Meeting is advisable before the June 21<sup>st</sup> date, an interim meeting will be scheduled.

Chairman Eardley adjourned the meeting at 4:25 p.m.