

Utah's Great Outdoors Open Space Project Summary Results of Phase 2 - the Statewide Mail-back Survey

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

Project Goal: The purpose of the Open Space Project is to develop strategies and actions for addressing open space needs in each planning district in Utah. The focus is on protecting lands that are critical for providing *amenity* (e.g., parks, recreation, and esthetics) and *ecological service* (e.g., wetlands and wildlife habitat and corridors) values based on the opinions of local and regional officials, professionals, and residents. These results will complement other critical land initiatives such as agricultural land protection and biophysical studies of critical wildlife habitat.

Phase 1

On February 17, 1999, over 250 people, from all areas of the state of Utah, attended the Utah's Great Outdoors conference in Salt Lake City. The second half of the conference featured small (nominal) group working sessions facilitated by trained personnel from Utah State University's Institute of Outdoor Recreation and Tourism (IORT) and the Utah Division of Parks and Recreation. Conference participants were assigned to breakout groups based on within which of the seven planning districts, into which the state of Utah is divided, they lived. Five of the seven planning districts were represented by one group of 8-12 conference participants each. The Wasatch Front and Mountainland Planning Districts were represented by 11 and three groups respectively. Open space and outdoor recreation issues were identified by group participants in an initial brain-storming session. Group participants then voted on the importance of those issues. The product derived from each facilitated group discussion was a list of prioritized issues related to open space (non-agricultural land) and recreation and tourism on both a planning district level and a community specific level, time-framed over the next 20 years. The specific questions posed to conference participants in the working groups in order to generate discussion and the lists of issues were:

Question 1: What do you feel are the most pressing outdoor recreation and open space needs in your region of the state for the next twenty years?

Question 2: What are the most pressing outdoor recreation and open space problems or needs for specific towns and communities in your region of the state?

PHASE 2

The prioritized lists of planning district and community specific issues from each working group were used to prepare questions for a mail-back survey for each planning district. The survey represents Phase 2 of the process intended to eventually produce an action plan to address the most important issues related to open space, outdoor recreation, and tourism statewide. The purposes of the mail-back survey in Phase 2 were to validate and further prioritize the issues identified by conference participants and to quantify the importance of certain established tools for open space protection and management.

Survey Development and Methodology

In order to preserve the integrity of issues identified by the conference working groups, a separate mail-back questionnaire was developed for each planning district in the state. Except for the Wasatch Front Planning District, all issues identified in responses to both questions posed to conference participants were included in the individual planning district surveys. Because of the great number of issues identified by the 11 working groups for the Wasatch Front Planning District, only those issues that received one or more votes during the group voting exercise were included in the Wasatch Front Planning District mail-back survey.

All participants in the Utah's Great Outdoors Conference were sent a mail-back survey. Furthermore, in an effort to include a good mix of potential survey respondents for each planning district, additional individuals from certain planning districts were added to the sample population. These individuals were selected either for their obvious interest in, or concern for, open space and outdoor recreation and tourism in their planning district, or because they would best represent opinions and interests not otherwise represented by conference participants from that planning district. These additional individuals were selected after contacting Utah State University County Extension Agents, Utah Division of Parks and Recreation representatives, and other persons having knowledge of the types of individuals who should be included in the survey. As a result, each planning district was represented by private business owners, city and county government representatives, tribal representatives, state and Federal employees, Utah State University extension personnel and members of the general public, as appropriate. The initial survey mailing was at the end of May and first few days of June, 1999.

For each planning district questionnaire, a brief **Background and Instructions** section was included at the beginning. This section summarized the conference working group process which resulted in the issues presented as part of the survey, re-stated the questions posed to conference participants, identified the counties included in that planning district, and stated the purpose of the survey. In addition, survey participants were asked to provide their name, address, current occupation, number of years in that occupation, and current interests related to open space and recreation. This information was collected to verify that the person surveyed was a conference participant or to validate the additional individuals added to the sample population and their interest in or concern for open space and outdoor recreation and tourism issues in their planning district. Each questionnaire was numbered in order to track which individuals responded.

The questionnaire was divided into three sections. The first section re-stated Question 1 from the conference and listed the issues identified as responses to that question. For each issue stated, survey participants were asked to rate their perception of the importance of that issue on a 7 point Likert scale, where 7 was **Extremely Important** and 1 was **Not At All Important**. In addition, the survey participant was offered the option of marking 8 if the issue, as stated, was **Unclear**, or 9, **Don't Know**, if the respondent was unsure of the issue's importance. To better organize the questionnaire, and allow the survey participant to respond to related issues at the same time, issues were grouped under such headings as "Education," "Administration," "Land Use Issues," and "Projects". The survey participant was also given the opportunity to respond

to the question: *From the list above for Question 1, which three issues do you feel are the most important?*

The second section of the survey was devoted to conference Question 2. The question was re-stated, the issues identified as responses by conference participants to that question were listed, and the survey participant was given the same 7 point Likert scale response possibilities as well as the **Unclear** and **Don't Know** choices for each issue listed. Each survey participant was also given the opportunity to list the three most important issues from the list following Question 2 and asked to respond to the question: *Do you feel there are any additional outdoor recreation and open space planning needs for the _____ Planning District that are not on either of the two lists above?* This gave the survey participant the chance to add to the issues lists for either Question 1 or 2.

The third section of the questionnaire focused on established tools for open space protection or management. Along with the survey instrument, survey participants were sent a copy of "Mechanisms for Protecting Open Space in Utah," Robert J. Lillieholm and Charles J. Fausold. (Utah Recreation Fact Sheet # NR/RF/004, January 1999, produced by IORT and Utah State University Extension). This publication identified and explained the open space protection or management tools included in this section of the survey (see Appendix A). The tools were divided into two types: those open space tools available to individuals, government agencies, and non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and those open space protection tools available only to local governments. Again, the survey participants were asked to rate the importance of each separate tool on the 7 point Likert scale, in addition to having the **Unclear** and **Don't Know** response choices. Finally, the participants were asked if they had any comments regarding the use of any of the open space protection tools listed.

The questionnaire was printed with a postage paid mailing sheet as the back cover, allowing the respondent to simply seal the survey booklet shut and drop it in the mail.

Two weeks after the first mailing of the questionnaire and accompanying Utah Recreation Fact Sheet, a reminder postcard was sent to survey participants who had not yet responded. Two weeks later, non-respondents were sent the survey packet again with an accompanying letter stressing the importance of their participation in the survey. Finally, a month after that, non-respondents were contacted by telephone and were either asked to respond to the survey questions during that telephone call or to mail the completed survey back as soon as possible. Based on the telephone calls, additional survey packets were mailed to participants as needed. Data entry and analysis were begun mid-August.

Completed surveys were kept separate by planning district. Information obtained from the surveys was entered and stored as data using the dBASEIII+ computer program. Statistics reported below were developed from the data using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) computer program. Responses to open-ended questions were filed by individual respondent using the Word Perfect for Windows word processing computer program.

Survey Results

Table 1 shows the number of surveys sent, number of responses received, and response rate for each planning district. The overall, statewide response rate is also shown. These response rates are quite acceptable considering the fact that the survey was done during the summer, traditionally the busiest vacation/travel time of the year, and the questionnaires were all relatively long, requiring much thought and commitment on the part of respondents.

Table 1. Utah's Great Outdoors Mail-back Survey Response Rates by Planning District

Planning District (Counties)	Surveys Sent	Surveys Received	Response Rate
Bear River (Box Elder, Cache, and Rich)	30	21	70%
Wasatch Front (Davis, Morgan, Salt Lake, Tooele, and Weber)	80	52	65%
Mountainland (Summit, Utah, and Wasatch)	47	24	51%
Uintah Basin (Daggett, Duchesne, and Uintah)	30	21	70%
Central (Juab, Millard, Piute, Sanpete, Sevier, and Wayne)	28	17	61%
Southeastern (Carbon, Emery, Grand, and San Juan)	32	23	72%
Southwestern (Beaver, Garfield, Iron, Kane, and Washington)	40	24	60%
STATEWIDE	287	182	63%

On the following pages, data are presented organized by planning district. In some cases, where very large numbers of issues were generated in response to Questions 1 and 2, tables presented will show the top 10 ranked issues for the planning district, the mean score on the 7 point Likert scale for each issue, and the percentage of votes each issue received from Utah's Great Outdoors Conference participants. The same information will be presented for the bottom 5 ranked issues for each question. Otherwise, that information will be presented for all issues listed as part of the survey. The data pertaining to the tools for open space protection or management are presented in one table for each planning district. This table presents results both for those responses dealing with tools available to be used by individuals, governmental agencies, and non-governmental organizations, as well as for those responses dealing with tools available only to local governments. In both cases, the tools are presented in rank order based on

the mean score on the 7 point Likert scale. Also shown, for comparison purposes, is the statewide mean score for each open space protection tool listed.

Tables with all the issues listed for each planning district appear in the appendices. In addition to the mean score for each issue, tables in the appendices also show the standard deviation value. The standard deviation is a numerical indicator of how much variation of responses occurs around the mean. In other words, a higher standard deviation value would indicate a stronger difference of opinion as to the importance of an issue. For purposes of this report, standard deviation values in excess of 1.75 are considered to be high. For each issue identified, these tables also show the total number of missing, **Unclear**, and **Don't Know** responses, as well as information on how each issue was valued by Utah's Great Outdoors Conference participants. Similar information is presented on the open space protection tools for each planning district. However, conference participants were not asked to rank the open space protection tools.

Bear River Planning District
Counties: Box Elder, Cache, Rich

Table BR1 presents the information on the issues in response to Question 1. Survey respondents felt that maintaining and preserving existing resources were most important. The open space issue relating to creating more funding sources, which received the most votes by conference participants, was ranked 6th by survey respondents. The issue among the top 10 that had a relatively high standard deviation value (i.e., that issue had differing opinions as to its importance) was issue number 7: *Resolve problems between wildlife habitat preservation and development*.

Table BR1. Bear River Planning District: Ranked Issues in Response to Question 1: *What do you feel are the most pressing outdoor recreation and open space needs in your region of the state for the next twenty years?*

Rank	Issue	Mean ¹	C% ²
1	Maintain existing facilities	6.42	10%*
2	Preserve lands we have	6.26	4%
3	Address local community growth planning	6.21	13%*
4	Educate people to take care of resources	6.11	12%*
5	Foster better relationships and communication among Federal agencies, local governments, and private individuals	6.05	8%
6	Create more funding sources	6.00	22%*
7	Resolve problems between wildlife habitat preservation and development	5.95	10%*
8	Protect and acquire more access to public lands	5.68	7%
9	Include small recreational opportunity ideas for smaller communities	5.58	0
10	Acquire land	5.42	10%*
11	Increase and enhance access to flat water boating	5.36	3%
12	Develop strategic multiple agency plans for land acquisition	5.29	3%
13(t)	Increase trailhead parking	5.16	4%
13(t)	Promote off-season and shoulder season use	5.16	3%
15	Provide and interpret cultural experiences for visitors (heritage tourism)	4.95	1%
16	Develop Watchable Wildlife programs along the Bear River	4.77	2%
17	Develop Watchable Wildlife programs along the Great Salt Lake	4.72	2%

¹ On a 7 point scale where 7= **Extremely Important** and 1= **Not At All Important**

² Percentage of votes that issue received from conference participants

* Indicates this issue was ranked among the top 5 by conference participants

Bear River Planning District survey respondents felt that the issue of improving existing facilities versus creating new recreation options should be resolved as a first priority at a local level (Table BR2). While natural resources education was quite important at the planning

district level (Question 1, Rank 4), related issues at the local level (*Educate adults, communities, and children, and Require public school curriculum in recreation, outdoor use, and ethics*) were ranked only 10th and tied for 14th, despite being ranked #1 at the conference. Hardware Ranch (issue 18) is a facility focused on wildlife programs, particularly elk winter feeding, run by the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources.

Table BR2. Bear River Planning District: Ranked Issues in Response to Question 2: *What are the most pressing outdoor recreation and open space problems or needs for specific towns and communities in your region of the state?*

Rank	Issue	Mean ¹	C% ²
1	Resolve issue- which should we spend money on first: improving current facilities or creating new recreation options	6.06	3%
2	Protect hillsides	5.95	3%
3	Create more funding sources	5.86	17%*
4	As populations grow, so should recreation opportunities and open space	5.76	4%
5	Sales tax for recreation extended to municipalities	5.62	11%*
6	Protect and improve natural areas	5.57	1%
7	Cooperative wetlands banking	5.53	0
8	More linkage between open space areas, trails, bike paths, etc.	5.52	15%*
9	Address surface water contamination	5.48	1%
10	Educate adults, communities, and children	5.38	20%*
11(t)	Develop creative zoning ordinances	5.30	5%
11(t)	Have a developer's impact fee assessment	5.30	0
13	Complete improvements in Logan Canyon and Bear Lake Overlook	5.29	5%
14(t)	Require public school curriculum in recreation, outdoor use, and ethics	5.19	20%*
14(t)	Protect and improve wildlife habitat areas	5.19	1%
16	Create more community parks (e.g., softball)	5.14	5%
17	Protect and improve wildlife	5.04	4%
18	Dedicate funding for Hardware Ranch	4.24	5%

¹ On a 7 point scale where 7= **Extremely Important** and 1= **Not At All Important**

² Percentage of votes that issue received from conference participants

* Indicates this issue was ranked among the top 5 by conference participants

The importance survey respondents assigned to tools for open space protection is presented in Table BR3. The statewide mean score for each tool is shown for comparison purposes. For tools available to individuals, governmental agencies, and non-governmental organizations, there was a high standard deviation value for the importance of the tools ranked 1, 3, and 4. Also,

there are relatively large differences in the state and district means for tools ranked 6 and 7, with the survey respondents feeling those tools less important, in both cases, as open space protection tools than the statewide average. For those tools available only to local governments, district respondents appeared to feel such tools as *Urban Growth Boundaries* and *Transfer Development Taxes/Conversion Taxes* to be considerably more important while tools such as *Intergovernmental Agreements*, *Impact Fees*, *Limited Development* and *Cluster Zoning and Conservation Subdivisions* to be considerably less important than the statewide average response.

Table BR3. Bear River Planning District: Ranked Importance of Tools Available for Open Space Protection

Utah's Great Outdoors Open Space Project: Phase 2

Rank	Tools Available to Individuals, Governmental Agencies, and Non-Governmental Organizations	District Mean	State Mean
1	Easements	6.00	6.06
2	Purchase of Development Rights	5.71	5.47
3	Rights of First Refusal	5.10	5.08
4	Fee Simple Acquisitions	4.95	5.18
5	Purchase and Lease-back	4.94	4.87
6	Bargain Sale	4.79	5.39
7	Purchase Options	4.55	5.10
8	Purchase and Sell-back	4.47	4.91
Tools Available Only to Local Governments			
1	Agricultural Land/Open Space Zoning	5.89	5.85
2	Agriculture Protection Areas	5.70	5.69
3	Sensitive Lands Overlays	5.67	5.56
4	Exactions and Dedications	5.65	5.62
5	Urban Growth Boundaries	5.52	5.20
6	Special Areas Preservation/Mitigation Programs	5.50	5.76
7	Land and Mitigation Banking	5.45	5.29
8	Quality Development Standards (QDS)	5.42	5.61
9	Intergovernmental Agreements	5.37	5.70
10	Transfer Development Taxes/Conversion Taxes	5.33	4.84
11	Transfer of Development Rights(TDRs)	5.32	5.13
12	Impact Fees	5.20	5.63
13	Performance Zoning	4.90	5.11
14	Limited Development	4.79	5.29
15	Cluster Zoning and Conservation Subdivisions	4.66	5.48
16	Preferential Tax Assessments	4.55	4.80
17	Building Moratorium	4.30	4.61

Central Planning District

Counties: Juab, Millard, Piute, Sanpete, Sevier, and Wayne

Table CE1 presents the information on the top 10 and bottom 5 ranked issues in response to Question 1. For purposes of understanding the issue ranked 1, refer to Revised Statute 2477 passed by Congress in 1866 to facilitate settlement of the West. RS 2477 states: “The right of way for the construction of highways across public lands not otherwise reserved for public purposes is hereby granted”. The only noteworthy diversity of responses in the top 10 issues was associated with the issue ranked 8. There were considerable differences of opinion for all 5 of the lowest ranked issues, indicating a lack of consensus as to their importance.

Table CE1. Central Planning District: Top 10 and Bottom 5 Ranked Issues in Response to Question 1: *What do you feel are the most pressing outdoor recreation and open space needs in your region of the state for the next twenty years?*

Rank	Issue	Mean ¹	C% ²
1	Protect RS 2477 roads	6.75	3%
2	Develop outdoor recreation opportunities that will help support local economic development	6.41	2%
3(t)	Help Congress and legislature understand the needs	6.25	0
3(t)	Protect and improve water resources	6.25	0
5	Encourage a united effort on the part of public land agencies	6.20	2%
6	Address public and private access concerns	6.12	3%
7	Educate trail users on the compatibility of off-highway vehicle and non-off-highway vehicle uses	6.06	5%*
8	Keep agricultural land agricultural	6.00	2%
9	Offer a greater number of dispersed recreation opportunities	5.94	0
10	Maintain and complete existing programs	5.88	2%
Central Planning District Bottom 5 Ranked Issues: Question 1			
30(t)	Spend available funds where the highest use is occurring	5.00	12%*
30(t)	Maintain an interpretive heritage resource center	5.00	3%
32	Educate residents and visitors to be more environmentally aware	4.69	3%
33	Develop local user information centers	4.43	0
34	Develop more intercity parks	4.31	0

¹ On a 7 point scale where 7= **Extremely Important** and 1= **Not At All Important**

² Percentage of votes that issue received from conference participants

* Indicates this issue was ranked among the top 5 by conference participants

Survey respondents indicated that some specific, local projects were relatively important to them- the Piute and Great Western Trails, Piute Reservoir, and Skyline Drive- while other

specific projects (Fish Lake Basin, Marysvale Canyon) were relatively less important (Table CE2).

Table CE2 . Central Planning District: Ranked Issues in Response to Question 2: *What are the most pressing outdoor recreation and open space problems or needs for specific towns and communities in your region of the state?*

Rank	Issue	Mean ¹	C% ²
1	Develop a dependable funding source for operation and management of the Piute and Great Western Trails	6.07	10%*
2	Protect landowner's rights	5.94	4%
3	Increase funding for county infrastructure	5.88	3%
4	Develop Skyline Drive in Sanpete County	5.78	4%
5	Coordinate a master plan between cities and counties	5.76	7%*
6	Initiate conservation and recreation development at Piute Reservoir	5.64	7%*
7	Develop trails linking towns to public lands	5.53	7%*
8	Develop more urban trails and parkways for jogging, biking, etc.	5.41	7%*
9	Develop local funding opportunities (promotion groups, special interest organizations, etc.)	5.37	2%
10	Allow for better access management	5.29	10%*
11	Develop biking trails in Marysvale Canyon	5.27	0
12	Develop a non-motorized trail system to connect communities in Sanpete County	5.21	4%
13	Encourage better user compliance to laws and regulations	5.18	7%*
14	Increase land available for parks	5.13	7%*
15	Replace the recreation facilities at Fishlake Basin	5.07	4%
16	Preserve open space by limiting development	5.00	4%
17	Develop hiking trails in Marysvale Canyon	4.86	0
18	Hire recreation directors	4.63	2%
19	Offer recreation safety and environmental awareness training in Sevier and Piute Counties	4.35	2%
20	Develop a multi-agency information center in Torrey	4.14	7%*

¹ On a 7 point scale where 7= **Extremely Important** and 1= **Not At All Important**

² Percentage of votes that issue received from conference participants

* Indicates this issue was ranked among the top 5 by conference participant

As with every other Utah planning district, Table CE3 shows survey respondents in the Central Planning District identified *Easements* as the most important open space protection tool available to individuals, governmental agencies, and non-governmental organizations. Table

CE3 also shows that the tools for open space protection available only to local governments thought to be most important were *Agriculture Protection Areas* and *Cluster Zoning and Conservation Subdivisions*. And, as with most other survey respondents, Central Planning District respondents felt a *Building Moratorium* to be relatively unimportant as an open space protection tool.

Table CE3. Central Planning District: Ranked Importance of Tools Available for Open Space Protection

Utah's Great Outdoors Open Space Project: Phase 2

Rank	Tools Available to Individuals, Governmental Agencies, and Non-Governmental Organizations	District Mean	State Mean
1	Easements	6.11	6.06
2	Purchase of Development Rights	5.58	5.47
3	Purchase Options	5.24	5.10
4	Bargain Sale	5.14	5.39
5	Purchase and Sell-back	5.13	4.91
6(t)	Purchase and Lease-back	5.00	4.87
6(t)	Rights of First Refusal	5.00	5.08
8	Fee Simple Acquisitions	4.94	5.18
Tools Available only to Local Governments			
1(t)	Agriculture Protection Areas	6.12	5.69
1(t)	Cluster Zoning and Conservation Subdivisions	6.12	5.48
3	Intergovernmental Agreements	6.00	5.70
4	Impact Fees	5.94	5.63
5	Exactions and Dedications	5.93	5.62
6	Quality Development Standards (QDS)	5.88	5.61
7(t)	Agricultural Land/Open Space Zoning	5.76	5.85
7(t)	Special Areas Preservation/Mitigation Programs	5.76	5.76
9	Performance Zoning	5.60	5.11
10	Transfer of Development Rights (TDRs)	5.47	5.13
11	Urban Growth Boundaries	5.38	5.20
12	Sensitive Lands Overlays	5.35	5.56
13	Transfer Development Taxes/Conversion Taxes	5.18	4.84
14	Land and Mitigation Banking	5.08	5.29
15	Preferential Tax Assessments	5.00	4.80
16(t)	Building Moratorium	4.94	4.61
16(t)	Limited Development	4.94	5.29

Southwest Planning District

Counties: Beaver, Garfield, Iron, Kane, and Washington

As shown in Table SW1, survey respondents in the Southwest Planning District were the only ones, statewide, who did not consider a water-related open space issue to be among the top 10 ranked issues in response to Question 1. On the other hand, the top 10 list of issues exhibits the most diversity of issues of any planning district. The bottom 5 ranked issues are equally diverse. Also noteworthy is the relatively low importance, compared to conference participants, survey respondents place on including Native Americans in the planning and management process for the protection of cultural resources.

With a mix of relatively large (St. George) and medium-sized (Cedar City) cities and small towns in this planning district, one should not be surprised that the two open space issues tied for top rank in response to Question 2 were: *Establish funding sources and technical assistance* and *Urban sprawl- improper development into open spaces* (Table SW2). The issue ranked 3rd by these respondents, relating to the state legislature's "bias" against providing land acquisition funds to counties and communities, directly impacts upon the 5th and 9th ranked issues, which require funds for land acquisition. Respondents seem to be relatively less concerned about curbs or controls on development in an area that has been a hotbed of development over the past few years, e.g., Boulder, Utah. Utah Highway 143, identified in the issue ranked 18th, extends from Parowan, passing Brian Head Ski Resort and Cedar Breaks National Monument to Panquitch. The majority of the population of this planning district lives in and around St. George, an area where snowfall accumulation is rare, perhaps explaining the low importance given to snowmobile trail grooming by survey respondents.

Table SW3 presents the results associated with the tools available for open space protection. As with all other planning districts, the use of *Easements* was the most popular tool available to individuals, governmental agencies, and non-governmental organizations. Of interest is the relatively close agreement between the state and district means in the list of those tools available only to local governments, with the exceptions of *Performance Zoning* (district relatively higher) and *Sensitive Lands Overlays* and *Transfer Development/Conversion Taxes* (district considerably lower than state mean).

Table SW1. Southwest Planning District: Top 10 and Bottom 5 Ranked Issues in Response to Question 1: *What do you feel are the most pressing outdoor recreation and open space needs in your region of the state for the next twenty years?*

Utah's Great Outdoors Open Space Project: Phase 2

Rank	Issue	Mean ¹	C% ²
1	Find proper balance among development, recreation, dispersed recreation, and wilderness	6.00	2%
2	Better cooperation and communication among Federal, state, and local groups to plan and execute recreation programs for the future	5.92	5%
3	Establish a program to work with communities to develop community trail systems (e.g., Cole Creek)	5.91	2%
4	Increase children and adult awareness for protecting and enjoying nature through education programs	5.83	7%*
5	Coordinate, acquire, and construct the Three Rivers Trail in Washington County (Gunlock to Zion)	5.75	7%*
6	Protect and improve wildlife habitat	5.71	3%
7	Address staffing and facility issues based upon increased visitation	5.65	2%
8	Preserve farm land	5.63	5%
9	Locate and designate a trail system for off-highway vehicle (OHV) users to reduce conflict	5.58	5%
10	Enforce protection of archaeological resources	5.52	5%
Bottom 5 Ranked Issues in Response to Question 1			
23	Include more Native Americans in the planning and review process for protecting southwest Utah's prehistoric and historic resources	4.74	7%*
24	Address highway mortality of wildlife	4.71	2%
25	Incorporate citizens in law enforcement	4.52	2%
26	Use permit system to control overuse of resources (e.g., off-highway vehicles, bikers, backpackers)	4.21	5%
27	Stretch hunting/fishing opportunities- more permits for SW Utah	3.39	3%

¹ On a 7 point scale where 7= **Extremely Important** and 1= **Not At All important**

² Percentage of votes that issue received from conference participants

* Indicates this issue was ranked among the top 5 by conference participants

Table SW2. Southwest Planning District: Ranked Issues in Response to Question 2: *What are the most pressing outdoor recreation and open space problems or needs for specific towns and communities in your region of the state?*

Utah's Great Outdoors Open Space Project: Phase 2

Rank	Issue	Mean ¹	C% ²
1(t)	Establish funding sources and technical assistance	6.00	11%*
1(t)	Urban sprawl- improper development into open spaces	6.00	11%*
3	Address concern about state legislature's bias against acquisition funds	5.88	3%
4	Within city planning- emphasize recreation planning	5.83	8%*
5(t)	Increase funding for small communities for purchase of critical lands for development of recreation facilities (e.g., Confluence Project and Three Rivers Trail)	5.59	14%*
5(t)	Develop new trails and enforce the use of existing trails for off-road vehicle use in Washington County	5.59	2%
7	Volunteerism! Encourage and utilize human resources and talents	5.55	6%
8	Find and develop water sources	5.52	5%
9	Acquire property for park, recreation, and interpretive opportunities (e.g., Kanarraville City, Austin property, Boulder, Confluence, Washington County)	5.48	5%
10	Protect and improve wildlife habitat and areas	5.45	3%
11	Acquire and develop Washington County hiking trails	5.29	6%
12	Develop regional water park opportunities (e.g., Sand Hollow and Wide Hollow)	5.25	8%*
13	Acquire and develop Washington County biking trails	5.24	6%
14	Extend financial assistance in developing infrastructure for gateway communities to the new Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument	5.04	6%
15	Assistance from National Forests, State Parks, and others to fund public safety	5.00	6%
16	Provide open space in Boulder- developers need ethical development to provide for open space	4.89	2%
17	Address concern of astronomical increase in tourism based on destinations (e.g., monuments and wilderness)	4.81	2%
18	Provide bike lanes along UT 143	4.44	6%
19	Provide snowmobile trail grooming in winter	3.82	6%

¹ On a 7 point scale where 7= **Extremely Important** and 1= **Not At All Important**

² Percentage of votes that issue received from conference participants

* Indicates this issue was ranked among the top 5 by conference participants

Table SW3. Southwest Planning District: Ranked Importance of Tools Available for Open Space Protection

Utah's Great Outdoors Open Space Project: Phase 2

Rank	Tools Available to Individuals, Governmental Agencies, and Non-Governmental Organizations	District Mean	State Mean
1	Easements	6.22	6.06
2	Bargain Sale	5.87	5.39
3	Purchase of Development Rights	5.45	5.47
4(t)	Fee Simple Acquisitions	5.26	5.18
4(t)	Purchase Options	5.26	5.10
6	Purchase and Sell-back	5.24	4.91
7	Rights of First Refusal	5.17	5.08
8	Purchase and Lease-back	5.00	4.87
Tools Available Only to Local Governments			
1	Agriculture Land/Open Space Zoning	5.83	5.85
2	Quality Development Standards (QDS)	5.70	5.61
3	Intergovernmental Agreements	5.65	5.70
4	Special Areas Preservation/Mitigation Programs	5.61	5.76
5	Cluster Zoning and Conservation Subdivisions	5.60	5.48
6	Exactions and Dedications	5.55	5.62
7	Agriculture Protection Areas	5.54	5.69
8	Impact Fees	5.42	5.63
9	Performance Zoning	5.39	5.11
10	Limited Development	5.38	5.29
11	Land and Mitigation Banking	5.33	5.29
12	Urban Growth Boundaries	5.22	5.20
13	Transfer of Development Rights (TDRs)	5.17	5.13
14	Sensitive Lands Overlays	5.00	5.56
15	Preferential Tax Assessments	4.83	4.80
16	Building Moratorium	4.66	4.61
17	Transfer Development Taxes/Conversion Taxes	4.36	4.84

Wasatch Front Planning District
Counties: Davis, Morgan, Salt Lake, Tooele, and Weber

Table WF1 presents the top 10 and bottom 5 ranked issues generated by Wasatch Front Planning District survey participants in response to Question 1. Noteworthy are the high proportion of water-related issues and the strength of importance placed on issues in the top 10. There was a very strong difference of opinion among respondents about the importance of the bottom 5 issues, particularly the issue ranked 139th, *Pass the Legacy Parkway initiative*.

Table WF1. Wasatch Front Planning District: Top 10 and Bottom 5 Ranked Issues in Response to Question 1: *What do you feel are the most pressing outdoor recreation and open space needs in your region of the state for the next twenty years?*

Rank	Issue	Mean ¹	C% ²
1	Protect and improve water quality	6.51	8%
2	Protect and improve riverways	6.43	19%*
3(t)	Protect and improve large open spaces that still exist within cities (not golf courses)	6.41	11%*#
3(t)	Protect and improve large enough tracts of land to maintain wildlife habitat	6.41	5%#
5	Active partnering among Federal, state, and local governments	6.40	2%
6	Protect and improve native habitat	6.39	15%*
7	Protect and improve streams	6.37	19%*
8(t)	Identify and secure a steady source of funding	6.29	9%*
8(t)	Protect and improve watersheds	6.29	4%
10(t)	Protect and improve open space	6.27	19%*#
10(t)	Protect and improve riparian corridors	6.27	19%*#
Bottom 5 Ranked Issues in Response to Question 1			
137	Establish a huge regional park (8-10 times bigger than Liberty Park)	4.08	2%
138	West desert protection (concern over access for public)	3.95	2%
139	Pass the Legacy Parkway initiative	3.92	2%
140	Get access to Antelope Island on the south end	3.31	3%
141	Create a Wendover Interpretive Center to educate visitors to responsibly use and maximize economic development	3.07	7%

¹ On a 7 point scale where 7= **Extremely Important** and 1= **Not At All Important**

² Percentage of votes that issue received from conference participants

* Indicates this issue was ranked among the top 5 by conference participants

This issue was mentioned by more than one discussion group from this planning district

Striking among the responses to Question 2 (Table WF2) is the number of issues in the top 10 dealing with access to open space areas. Perhaps this is not surprising, considering the amount of development of urban/suburban areas in this planning district and the desire for people to have access to adjacent public lands, open space, and river corridors preserved in population centers.

As with Question 1, there was a considerable difference of opinion about the importance of those issues rated as the bottom 5. Those with the highest standard deviation were issues dealing with off-highway/off-road vehicle opportunities in this planning district (99th and 102nd).

Table WF3 presents information on the importance placed by planning district residents on open space protection tools available for use. Wasatch Front survey respondents assigned higher importance to almost all of the tools as compared to the state mean, perhaps indicating that urban residents are more concerned with open space issues and more likely to accept land use controls than rural residents. Noteworthy among these is the very high level of importance assigned to *Easements*, perhaps supporting the importance these respondents placed on preserving access to open space and corridors in urban/suburban areas as evidenced by the information presented in responses to Question 2. Even though relatively unimportant as compared to the other tools, there was considerable difference of opinion on the importance of *Building Moratorium* as an open space protection tool.

Table WF2. Wasatch Front Planning District: Top 10 and Bottom 5 Ranked Issues in Response to Question 2: *What are the most pressing outdoor recreation and open space problems or needs for specific towns and communities in your region of the state?*

Utah's Great Outdoors Open Space Project: Phase 2

Rank	Issue	Mean ¹	C% ²
1	Have a strategy or policy in place (especially in foothills) along Wasatch Front and other places where private development is closing access to public land	6.50	16%
2	Preserve open space corridors	6.34	29%*
3	More matching grant funds for programs like land and water conservation, trails, riverways, or urban forestry- budget for state and local match	6.32	9%
4	Protect and improve open space on Wasatch Front	6.31	11%*#
5	Protect and improve river corridor habitat	6.27	2%
6(t)	Protect and improve Wasatch Front canyons	6.25	8%
6(t)	Require city planning and ordinances to include open space in new housing developments	6.25	14%*
6(t)	Educate the public on the need for responsible land ethics	6.25	19%*#
9	Protect and improve native habitats	6.12	13%*
10(t)	Implement new zoning ordinances for new development that would require open space and public access to trails	6.10	8%
10(t)	Protect and improve wetlands	6.10	22%*#
Bottom 5 Ranked Issues in Response to Question 2			
99(t)	Restore Land and Water Conservation Funds in Taylorsville	4.30	6%
99(t)	Develop more off-road vehicle and all-terrain vehicle opportunities on the Wasatch Front	4.30	9%*
101	Provide hunter education and gun ranges in Salt Lake County and other areas	4.24	7%
102	Develop more city off-highway vehicle (OHV) parks	4.23	5%
103	More community centers for specific recreation in Holladay	4.16	3%
104	Allow state to buy Blue Lake (near Wendover) for an underwater park (SCUBA diving)	3.55	5%

¹ On a 7 point scale where 7= **Extremely Important** and 1= **Not At All Important**

² Percentage of votes that issue received from conference participants

* Indicates this issues was ranked among the top 5 by conference participants

This issue was mentioned by more than one discussion group from this planning district

Table WF3. Wasatch Front Planning District: Ranked Importance of Tools Available for Open Space Protection

Utah's Great Outdoors Open Space Project: Phase 2

Rank	Tools Available to Individuals, Governmental Agencies, and Non-Governmental Organizations	District Mean	State Mean
1	Easements	6.44	6.06
2	Purchase of Development Rights	5.80	5.47
3	Rights of First Refusal	5.68	5.08
4	Fee Simple Acquisitions	5.58	5.18
5	Purchase Options	5.56	5.10
6	Bargain Sale	5.52	5.39
7	Purchase and Lease-back	5.26	4.87
8	Purchase and Sell-back	5.18	4.91
Tools Available Only to Local Governments			
1	Special Areas Preservation/Mitigation Programs	6.17	5.76
2	Sensitive Lands Overlays	6.15	5.56
3	Exactions and Dedications	6.09	5.62
4	Intergovernmental Agreements	6.04	5.70
5	Cluster Zoning and Conservation Subdivisions	5.98	5.48
6	Quality Development Standards (QDS)	5.96	5.61
7	Agriculture Land/Open Space Zoning	5.94	5.85
8	Impact Fees	5.92	5.63
9	Agriculture Protection Areas	5.75	5.69
10	Limited Development	5.71	5.29
11	Land and Mitigation Banking	5.61	5.29
12	Transfer of Development Rights (TDRs)	5.57	5.13
13	Urban Growth Boundaries	5.54	5.20
14	Performance Zoning	5.50	5.11
15	Preferential Tax Assessments	5.21	4.80
16	Building Moratorium	5.00	4.61
17	Transfer Development Taxes/Conversion Taxes	4.84	4.93

Mountainland Planning District
Counties: Summit, Utah, and Wasatch

Mountainland survey respondents placed a far greater importance on public education about open space issues than did respondents from any other planning district, as evidenced by the listing of the top 10 issues in response to Question 1 shown in Table MT1. Also assigned high importance were issues related to access to open space and water resources. There was considerable difference of opinion on the importance of the bottom 5 ranked issues, particularly those ranked tied for 85th.

Table MT1. Mountainland Planning District: Top 10 and Bottom 5 Ranked Issues in Response to Question 1: *What do you feel are the most pressing outdoor recreation and open space needs in your region of the state for the next twenty years?*

Rank	Issue	Mean ¹	C% ²
1	Educate the public on general use and responsibility	6.33	3%#
2	Preserve good open space in and around towns for use as parks	6.25	3%
3(t)	Educate the public on the need for conservation and multiple-use	6.21	18%*
3(t)	Identify, protect, and secure access to current open space	6.21	10%*
5	Create new community trails and connect existing trails	6.17	5%
6(t)	Identify funding sources for outdoor recreation and open space needs	6.13	10%*#
6(t)	Maintain public access to canyons and foothills	6.13	3%
6(t)	Protect and improve clean and open waterways	6.13	1%
6(t)	Protect and improve river and stream quality	6.13	1%
6(t)	Control development on benches	6.13	1%#
6(t)	Protect the integrity of the Provo River watershed	6.13	3%
Bottom 5 Ranked Issues in Response to Question 1			
82	Increase access to pack-in camps	4.17	0
83	Promote diversity of use of participants (race, gender, etc.)	4.13	4%
84	Increase equestrian opportunities	4.09	1%
85(t)	Develop recreation that pays for itself (e.g., golf)	3.21	1%
85(t)	Allow access to wilderness areas for four-wheel drive vehicles	3.21	3%

¹ On a 7 point scale where 7= **Extremely Important** and 1= **Not At All Important**

² Percentage of votes that issue received from conference participants

* Indicates this issue was ranked among the top 5 by conference participants

This issue was mentioned by more than one discussion group from this planning district

Highest priority in this planning district was given to developing continuing funding sources for recreation and open space as shown in Table MT2. Following in the top 10 were issues concerned with a mix of ecological service (e.g., functional watersheds and urban forests) and

amenity (e.g., trails and water-oriented recreation) values. There was considerable difference of opinion about the importance of issues ranked 6, 8, and 9 as well as those ranked 23, 24, and 26.

Table MT2. Mountainland Planning District: Top 10 and Bottom 5 Ranked Issues in Response to Question 2: *What are the most pressing outdoor recreation and open space problems or needs for specific towns and communities in your region of the state?*

Rank	Issue	Mean ¹	C% ²
1	Develop an endowment program to address the lack of funding for recreation and open space	6.09	15%*#
2	Protect and improve functional watersheds (e.g., Upper Weber and Upper Provo Rivers)	6.04	9%*
3	Protect and improve urban forests	5.91	5%
4	Acquire easements for Bonneville Shoreline Trail, connect the pieces (in Provo-Orem-Springville)	5.90	8%
5	Develop a comprehensive counties-wide trail system	5.87	32%*
6	Trails needed to connect Wasatch County and Utah County	5.68	5%
7	Improve quality of Utah Lake recreation opportunities while preserving natural western shoreline	5.65	4%
8	Educate public on need for open space	5.63	3%
9	Prevent further scarring of Wasatch Front by off-road vehicles	5.61	9%*
10(t)	Address concerns with public relations problems for recreation and open space priorities	5.59	5%
10(t)	Improve existing parks in cities for family use (e.g., soccer fields)	5.59	17%*
Bottom 5 Ranked Issues in Response to Question 2			
22	Increase access to streams and waterways	5.04	3%
23	Identify and increase opportunities for eco-tourism sites in Utah County	4.86	4%
24	Identify and increase opportunities for historic sites in Utah County	4.70	4%
25	New teeth in Utah code to confine growth within incorporated areas	4.54	8%
26	Increase funding to update and improve Heber Creeper facilities	3.52	3%

¹ On a 7 point scale where 7= **Extremely Important** and 1= **Not At All Important**

² Percentage of votes that issue received from conference participants

* Indicates this issue was ranked among the top 5 by conference participants

This issue was mentioned by more than one discussion group from this planning district

Table MT3 shows *Easements* was again the most important open space protection tool available to individuals, governmental agencies, and non-governmental organizations for survey

respondents in the Mountainland Planning District. There was considerable difference in opinion about the importance of using *Purchase and Lease-back* as an open space protection tool. There was also more than average difference of opinion concerning the importance of all of the tools available only to local governments. Those tools that had the highest standard deviation values were *Sensitive Lands Overlays*, *Building Moratorium*, *Cluster Zoning and Conservation Subdivisions*, and *Exactions and Dedications*. The statewide mean for each open space protection tool is shown for comparison purposes.

Table MT3. Mountainland Planning District: Ranked Importance of Tools Available for Open Space Protection

Utah's Great Outdoors Open Space Project: Phase 2

Rank	Tools Available to Individuals, Governmental Agencies, and Non-Governmental Organizations	District Mean	State Mean
1	Easements	5.95	6.06
2	Bargain Sale	5.71	5.39
3	Fee Simple Acquisitions	5.45	5.18
4	Purchase Options	5.24	5.10
5	Rights of First Refusal	5.20	5.08
6	Purchase of Development Rights	5.00	5.47
7	Purchase and Sell-back	4.85	4.91
8	Purchase and Lease-back	4.57	4.87
Tools Available Only to Local Governments			
1	Agriculture Land/Open Space Zoning	6.05	5.85
2	Impact Fees	5.71	5.63
3	Special Areas Preservation/Mitigation Programs	5.65	5.76
4	Intergovernmental Agreements	5.62	5.70
5	Agriculture Protection Areas	5.48	5.69
6	Land and Mitigation Banking	5.43	5.29
7	Sensitive Lands Overlays	5.33	5.56
8(t)	Limited Development	5.26	5.29
8(t)	Quality Development Standards (QDS)	5.26	5.61
10	Cluster Zoning and Conservation Subdivisions	5.18	5.48
11	Exactions and Dedications	5.05	5.62
12	Transfer Development Taxes/Conversion Taxes	4.88	4.84
13	Performance Zoning	4.84	5.11
14	Transfer of Development Rights (TDRs)	4.79	5.13
15	Preferential Tax Assessments	4.73	4.80
16	Urban Growth Boundaries	4.55	5.20
17	Building Moratorium	4.32	4.61

Southeast Planning District
Counties: Carbon, Emery, Grand, and San Juan

The information presented in Table SE1 indicates the survey respondents from this planning district strongly favor strategic planning with action behind the planning. While there are no specific projects among the top 10 issues listed in response to Question 1, there are some areas of concern to be addressed: protection of public lands, education of users, protection of cultural resources (historic and heritage), and increasing collaboration. Respondents were also concerned with protecting and improving the quality of life for planning district residents. The top ranked issue, producing results of open space initiatives, received no votes at the conference. The only water related issue identified in the top 10 was one concerned with protecting and improving riparian areas. The bottom 5 ranked issues seem to support the idea of keeping the management and use of open space areas as simple as possible: i.e., little support given to adding recreational areas, creating mechanisms to segregate recreation experiences, and recognizing the diversity of values. The “Enlibra” initiative seems to have relatively little importance to residents of this planning district.

As shown in Table SE2, a considerable amount of attention was given to water resources by respondents to Question 2- with 3 of the top 10 issues identified having to do with such water resources as the San Raphael River drainage, Scofield Reservoir, Price River drainage, and riverways in general. Respondents favored such diverse issues as an outdoor education curriculum in public schools and resolving the state wilderness situation to accommodate better planning by communities and businesses. Ranked relatively high was the need for funding, both for infrastructure improvement and obtaining land for parks and recreation facilities. There was less support for issues related specifically to Emery County, including the town of Green River. Respondents thought to be relatively unimportant the need for linked trail systems either in the Price/Castle Dale area or in and around Moab, despite relatively high support for these issues at the conference.

Table SE3 shows the ranked importance respondents placed on those tools available for open space protection. As with other areas of the state, the most favored protection tool available for use by individuals, governmental agencies, and non-governmental organizations was *Easements*. Among those tools available only to local governments, those dealing with protection or preserving agricultural lands were most favored. A tool gaining popularity in areas of heavy development, *Impact Fees*, was also ranked relatively high. *Sensitive Lands Overlays* and *Limited Development* were listed as considerably more important as open land protection tools by planning district respondents, as compared to the statewide mean scores for those tools.

Table SE1. Southeast Planning District: Top 10 and Bottom 5 Ranked Issues in Response to Question 1: *What do you feel are the most pressing outdoor recreation and open space needs in your region of the state for the next twenty years?*

Rank	Issue	Mean ¹	C% ²
1	Go beyond talk and produce results	6.38	0
2	Establish long range plans that deal with recreational users	6.36	2%
3	Protect public lands and resources which includes stewardship, education, and controls	6.23	19%*
4	Educate users on appropriate activities in region	6.22	0
5	Protect regional significant, historic, and heritage features	6.17	9%*
6	Protect and improve the quality of life for southeast Utah residents	6.15	9%*
7	Find long range funding sources for facilities and infrastructure	6.14	19%*
8(t)	Acquire necessary funding to improve existing recreational areas	6.13	4%
8(t)	Increase collaboration- decrease polarization	6.13	4%
10(t)	Protect and preserve cultural resources	6.09	6%
10(t)	Protect and improve riparian areas	6.09	4%
10(t)	Wilderness issues need to be resolved	6.09	0
10(t)	Protect certain areas from development	6.09	2%
Bottom 5 Ranked Issues in Response to Question 1			
25(t)	Encourage cooperation between private entities and recreation users	5.22	0
25(t)	Recognize the diversity of values	5.22	4%
27	Develop additional recreational areas	5.14	4%
28	Address the need for partnerships and planning to obtain and maintain “Enlibra”	5.10	2%
29	Create mechanisms to segregate recreation experiences to allow each type of recreationist an optimum experience	4.48	0

¹ On a 7 point scale where 7= **Extremely Important** and 1= **Not At All Important**

² Percentage of votes that issue received from conference participants

* Indicates this issue was ranked among the top 5 by conference participants

Table SE2. Southeast Planning District: Ranked Issues in Response to Question 2: *What are the most pressing outdoor recreation and open space problems or needs for specific towns and communities in your region of the state?*

Rank	Issue	Mean¹	C%²
1	Include as part of the curriculum outdoor education programs in public schools	6.00	11%*
2(t)	Improve and protect water quality on the rivers and reservoirs on the San Raphael drainage	5.95	11%*
2(t)	Improve and protect water quality for Scofield Reservoir and Price River water drainage	5.95	6%
4	Resolve wilderness issues so communities and businesses can plan accordingly	5.87	4%
5	Protect cultural resources in Cedar Mesa	5.85	6%
6	Coordinate the overall management of recreational growth in Emery County	5.70	1%
7	Plan for the use of riverways	5.65	4%
8	Develop funding sources for the development of recreation infrastructures and/or facilities	5.62	1%
9(t)	Set aside biases- think outside the box with regards to economic opportunity associated with recreational opportunities	5.48	10%*
9(t)	Address the need to obtain land and funding for parks and recreation facilities	5.48	14%*
11	Stop prolonged dispersed camping in the Moab area	5.33	0
12	Address the need for a plan for development around the Scofield area	5.32	6%
13	Hire more personnel to maintain park and recreation facilities	5.17	3%
14	Address the need for additional community and city picnic and park facilities	5.04	0
15	Build a trail system linking areas in Moab and Spanish Valley to each other and to trailheads and sites outside the communities	4.95	10%*
16(t)	Plan and construct additional recreation facilities in Emery County	4.90	1%
16(t)	Maintain the quality of life in Emery County for Emery County residents or compensate financially for impact	4.90	11%*
18	Manage conflicts resulting from coal bed methane development west of Highway 10	4.78	3%
19	Develop intra/inter community trail facilities (e.g., Price to Castle Dale)	4.64	6%
20	Address the concern of no funding for improving the basic infrastructure in Green River to accommodate growth	4.35	0

¹ On a 7 point scale where 7= **Extremely Important** and 1= **Not At All Important**

² Percentage of votes that issue received from conference participants

* Indicates this issue was ranked among the top 5 by conference participants

Table SE3. Southeast Planning District: Ranked Importance of Tools Available for Open Space Protection

Rank	Tools Available to Individuals, Governmental Agencies, and Non-Governmental Organizations	District Mean	State Mean
1	Easements	6.00	6.06
2	Bargain Sale	5.68	5.39
3	Purchase of Development Rights	5.55	5.47
4(t)	Purchase and Sell-back	5.05	4.91
4(t)	Rights of First Refusal	5.05	5.08
4(t)	Fee Simple Acquisitions	5.05	5.18
4(t)	Purchase Options	5.05	5.10
8	Purchase and Lease-back	4.89	4.87
Tools Available Only to Local Governments			
1	Agriculture Land/Open Space Zoning	6.05	5.85
2(t)	Agriculture Protection Areas	6.00	5.69
2(t)	Impact Fees	6.00	5.63
4	Sensitive Lands Overlays	5.94	5.56
5	Special Areas Preservation/Mitigation Programs	5.90	5.76
6	Limited Development	5.68	5.29
7	Intergovernmental Agreements	5.67	5.70
8(t)	Urban Growth Boundaries	5.58	5.20
8(t)	Exactions and Dedications	5.58	5.62
10	Quality Development Standards (QDS)	5.50	5.61
11	Cluster Zoning and Conservation Subdivisions	5.48	5.48
12	Land and Mitigation Banking	5.05	5.29
13	Transfer of Development Rights (TDRs)	4.89	5.13
14	Building Moratorium	4.86	4.61
15	Preferential Tax Assessments	4.85	4.80
16	Performance Zoning	4.81	5.11
17	Transfer Development Taxes/Conversion Taxes	4.79	4.84

Uintah Basin Planning District
Counties: Daggett, Duchesne, and Uintah

Table UB1 presents the information on all issues in response to Question 1 for the Uintah Basin Planning District. The issues ranked 1 and 2 were both concerned with water. Within the top 10, those issues ranked 3-10 had fairly high standard deviation scores, indicating there was some difference of opinion as to the importance of those issues. The issue ranked 9, *Develop the funding to support the facilities and people that are currently being added*, had the highest standard deviation score of any of the 22 issues listed. There was a high level of agreement between Phase 1 and Phase 2 results for this planning district, in that all of the top 5 conference issues were ranked among the top 11 by survey participants. Of interest among those issues ranked near the bottom of this list is the relatively little importance placed on using capacity limits to preserve quality (recreational) experiences and maintaining the quality of life and diversity of recreation opportunities within the planning district. Also, there appears to be little interest in developing winter recreation, historical resources, or planning for trails.

Ranked highest among those issues listed in response to Question 2 (Table UB2) was resolving access problems on public lands and focusing on protecting critical open space areas and developing the marginal areas. An equal amount of importance was placed on strengthening partnerships and identifying common goals. Of less importance for survey respondents was support for the proposal to privatize Dutch John within the Flaming Gorge National Recreation Area and establishing bike paths in Vernal.

While not so highly favored, on average, as statewide, *Easements* still ranked highest in importance as a tool available to individuals, governmental agencies, and non-governmental organizations for open space protection. In fact, all tools in this category were ranked less important by respondents as compared to the statewide means for those tools. This also holds true for those open space protection tools identified as being available or useful only to local governments. Surprising is how relatively low the two tools geared specifically to protect agriculture areas are ranked (6 and 10 compared to their statewide rankings of 1 and 4 respectively). Throughout both these lists of open space protection tools, there was considerable difference of opinion, based on relatively high standard deviation values, on the importance of these tools for open space protection. The two tools with the highest standard deviation values in both lists were *Impact Fees* and *Building Moratorium*.

Table UB1. Uintah Planning District: Ranked Issues in Response to Question 1: *What do you feel are the most pressing outdoor recreation and open space needs in your region of the state for the next twenty years?*

Rank	Issue	Mean ¹	C% ²
1	Protect and improve watersheds	6.48	11%*
2	Protect and improve drinking water	6.33	11%*
3	Figure out how to pay for operation and maintenance of aging infrastructure of recreational facilities	5.86	9%*
4	Protect and improve wildlife	5.81	11%*
5	Bring together the partners necessary to do planning studies to determine what opportunities should be provided for the area as a whole	5.67	0
6	Instill in the community that open space and recreation have value	5.62	0
7	Increase partnerships among private, local, Federal, and tribal entities	5.60	15%*
8	Protect and improve agriculture	5.57	11%*
9	Develop the funding to support the facilities and people that are being added	5.52	4%
10	Develop ways to keep public lands accessible yet protected from development	5.50	0
11	Develop an area wide management plan for development, management, and protection of our resources, and then do it	5.43	17%*
12	Establish community identity, values and quality of life	5.38	0
13	Develop city and county plans for green space and pocket parks for our city core areas and also for future growth	5.33	7%
14(t)	Do a resource inventory for the Basin, identify critical open space areas	5.29	6%
14(t)	Fund and develop education on outdoor land ethics and water conservation	5.29	7%
16	Address the need to look at developing outlying water-based areas	5.23	4%
17	Develop the museum in Vernal to meet increasing local and tourist needs	5.22	7%
18	Provide quality experiences, particularly by observing maximum capacity limits	5.16	2%
19	Maintain the existing way of life and diversity of recreational opportunities	5.10	0
20	Develop winter recreation	5.05	2%
21	Develop a basin-wide master plan for trails, motorized and non-motorized	4.86	4%
22	More development and research of historical resources	4.65	6%

¹ On a 7 point scale where 7= **Extremely Important** and 1= **Not At All Important**

² Percentage of votes that issue received from conference participants

* Indicates this issue was ranked among the top 5 by conference participants

**Table UB2. Uintah Basin Planning District: Ranked Issues in Response to Question 2:
*What are the most pressing outdoor recreation and open space problems or needs for specific towns and communities in your region of the state?***

Rank	Issue	Mean¹	C%²
1	Resolve access issues on public lands	6.14	9%*
2	Less development of critical areas. Protect the critical, develop the marginal	6.11	2%
3(t)	Strengthen partnerships	6.10	6%
3(t)	Identify common goals	6.10	4%
5	Better county zoning and planning	5.90	9%*
6	Develop an inventory of resources (e.g., water, recreation, wildlife) and protect the places that are most critical	5.67	15%*
7	Identify and prioritize recreation needs and wants for each town	5.62	4%
8(t)	Develop and establish a community identity and address issues such as quality of life, open space, recreation values, etc.	5.48	20%*
8(t)	General funding for such things as open space and outdoor recreation facilities	5.48	15%*
10	Equalize outdoor activities through education and promotion	5.13	2%
11	Develop additional pocket parks and green space in the Vernal area	4.90	13%*
12	Establish bike paths in Vernal	4.80	2%
13	Privatize Dutch John	4.32	0

¹ On a 7 point scale where 7= **Extremely Important** and 1= **Not At All Important**

² Percentage of votes that issue received from conference participants

* Indicates this issue was ranked among the top 5 by conference participants

Table UB3. Uintah Basin Planning District: Ranked Importance of Tools Available for Open Space Protection

Rank	Tools Available to Individuals, Governmental Agencies, and Non-Governmental Organizations	District Mean	State Mean
1	Easements	5.67	6.06
2	Purchase of Development Rights	5.17	5.47
3(t)	Fee Simple Acquisitions	5.06	5.18
3(t)	Bargain Sale	5.06	5.39
5	Purchase Options	4.78	5.10
6	Purchase and Sell-back	4.47	4.91
7	Purchase and Lease-back	4.44	4.87
8	Rights of First Refusal	4.35	5.08
Tools Available Only to Local Governments			
1	Special Areas Preservation/Mitigation Programs	5.72	5.76
2	Intergovernmental Agreements	5.70	5.53
3	Quality Development Standards (QDS)	5.53	5.61
4	Sensitive Lands Overlays	5.50	5.56
5	Exactions and Dedications	5.47	5.62
6	Agriculture Land/Open Space Zoning	5.45	5.85
7	Cluster Zoning and Conservation Subdivisions	5.35	5.48
8	Limited Development	5.28	5.29
9	Impact Fees	5.21	5.63
10	Agriculture Protection Areas	5.20	5.69
11	Performance Zoning	5.11	5.11
12	Land and Mitigation Banking	5.06	5.29
13	Transfer of Development Rights (TDRs)	4.69	5.13
14	Urban Growth Boundaries	4.61	5.20
15	Preferential Tax Assessments	4.44	4.80
16	Transfer Development Taxes/Conversion Taxes	4.38	4.84
17	Building Moratorium	4.20	4.61

DISCUSSION

There appears to be no single, clearly identifiable trend as to the nature of outdoor recreation, tourism, and open space issues felt to be most important by survey respondents. However, the most important issues, both on the regional and local scale, seem to be those that relate to: 1) obtaining long-term funding sources to acquire land and develop new recreational facilities or maintain existing facilities; 2) preserving existing open spaces, both urban and rural; 3) calling for the education of existing and/or potential users of open space areas to make them more aware of possible impacts of use; 4) encouraging long-term planning to deal with anticipated increases in quantity and diversity of use of open spaces; 5) calling for protection of water-related resources; 6) protecting access to public lands for recreation; and 7) recognizing the need for cooperation among the various land management and planning entities, special interest groups, and users to ensure the best possible, long-term management and use of open spaces. Also, there appeared to be a general consensus of agreement as to the importance of the higher-ranked issues based on the lower standard deviation values for these issues.

On the other hand, the lower ranked issues had relatively higher standard deviation values, indicating less agreement among survey respondents as to their importance. Lower ranked issues were most often those that: were project or activity specific and occurred in areas of the planning district perhaps perceived to be low-profile by some survey respondents; seemed to benefit out-of-state or out-of-region visitors more than residents; called for actions that were illegal or impractical; or concerned actions that were better expressed in an issue that was more inclusive and ranked higher.

Survey respondents from the more populous, urban planning districts (Wasatch Front and Mountainland) generally felt the most important issues were those dealing with water quality and quantity, access to public lands, preservation of urban/suburban open space areas, and education of adults and children as to the sensible and enjoyable use of open space areas. Generally felt to be less important by these respondents were those issues related to specific projects or activities that occurred within the planning district but outside the urban areas.

Survey respondents from rural areas seemed to favor long range planning and obtaining dependable, long-term funding sources both for acquiring land for recreation development and maintaining existing facilities. Also favored were specific projects that had an economic benefit within the planning region. Issues that would increase or maintain local control over development or use of open space areas were relatively highly ranked by these respondents. Lower ranked by rural respondents were projects that appeared to have little economic impact to an area, like bicycle paths and information/interpretive centers. Among all the issues identified for the rural planning districts, the one with the lowest score of importance was: *Stretch hunting/fishing opportunities- more permits for southwest Utah.*

The mean scores indicating the level of importance respondents placed on issues relating to Question 1 were, on the average, higher than mean scores for responses to Question 2. While the original intent of Question 2 was to get at issues that had a local, i.e. town or community, rather than a regional focus, it became apparent that many issues identified in response to

Question 2 either had a regional as well as a local focus or else bridged the gap between the two (such as concerns with preserving a watershed area providing quality culinary water to a community). Thus, survey respondents may have felt such issues identified in response to Question 2 were redundant or repetitive and, therefore, marked them as less important.

Planning district by planning district, there was general consensus of opinion as to the usefulness of the open space protection tools. All planning district respondents felt, for example, that *Easements* was the most useful tool available to individuals, governmental agencies, and non-governmental organizations. While there was not such clear-cut agreement on a most useful tool available only to local governments, such mechanisms as *Agriculture Land/Open Space Zoning*, *Agriculture Protection Areas*, *Special Areas Preservation/Mitigation Programs*, and *Intergovernmental Agreements* ranked near the top for most planning districts. Consistently ranked among the bottom were *Building Moratorium* and *Preferential Tax Assessments*; although there was considerable difference of opinion as to the importance of these open space protection tools. There was also considerable difference of opinion as to the importance of *Impact Fees* and *Limited Development* as open space protection tools. These differences of opinion were true for respondents from both urban and rural planning districts. Also noteworthy is that the mean scores for all open space protection tools are higher, on average, for the more urbanized planning districts than for the rural planning districts. This may suggest a greater resistance to any type of governmental control by rural residents.

CONCLUSIONS

Phase 2 of the Utah's Great Outdoors Open Space Project has resulted in planning district specific prioritized lists of issues and areas of concern related to amenity and ecological service values of non-agricultural open space lands. These lists can be used as a framework into which specific open space protection or management projects can be fit and matched up with the issues identified. Information has been collected on open space issues and areas of concern on both the planning district/regional and local community levels. Phase 3 of the Open Space Project will consist of taking the lists of issues and areas of concern to planning district-wide and local meetings of decision makers, land managers, and citizens concerned with open space protection and identifying those specific projects. The identification of specific open space protection projects will aid in the realization of the overall goal of the Open Space Project; to develop strategies and actions for addressing open space needs in each planning district in Utah.

In addition, lists indicating the relative usefulness of various types of open space protection or management tools were also generated for each planning district during Phase 2. Survey respondents gave their opinions on the importance of tools available to individuals, governmental agencies, and non-governmental organizations, as well as tools available only to local governments. Where appropriate, these tools could be used to address specific open space protection projects to be identified in Phase 3.