

NOTICE OF MEETING
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
CITY OF ST. GEORGE
WASHINGTON COUNTY, UTAH

Public Notice

Notice is hereby given that the Historic Preservation Commission of the City of St. George, Washington County, Utah, will hold a regular meeting at the **Administrative Conference Room**, 175 East 200 North, St. George, Utah on Wednesday, **September 17, 2025**, commencing at **12:00 p.m.**

The agenda for the meeting is as follows:

CALL TO ORDER

1. **ELECTION OF NEW CHAIR**
2. **DISCUSSION REGARDING NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES REGISTRATION**
Discuss next steps for the proposed City of St. George Historic District Nomination for the National Register of Historic Places
3. **DISCUSSION REGARDING A PROPOSED ARCHEOLOGICAL ORDINANCE**
4. **MINUTES**
Consider approval of the meeting minutes from May 14, 2025.
5. **ADJOURN**



Brenda Hatch, Planner II

Reasonable Accommodation: The City of St. George will make efforts to provide reasonable accommodations to disabled members of the public in accessing City programs. Please contact the City Human Resources Office at (435) 627-4674 at least 24 hours in advance if you have special needs.



HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION MEMO:

09/17/2025

BACKGROUND:

In recent years, questions have been raised regarding potential archaeological sites within the City of St. George. Todd Prince, a member of the Historic Preservation Commission, has suggested consideration of an archaeological ordinance to help protect these sites. He has requested that this proposal be included as a discussion item for this meeting.

EXHIBIT B

POWERPOINT PRESENTATION

Protecting Archaeology in St. George

Preserving Our Heritage for Future Generations



City Archaeological Ordinance

Draft July 2025: ARCHAEOLOGICAL PRESERVATION OVERLAY ZONE

A proposed amendment to Zoning Regulations, Title 10, Chapter 13 Article E-4, Landmark Sites ([City Code 10-13E](#))

CITY OF ST. GEORGE – PROTECTION OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Contents

.010	Key Terms.....	1
.020	Purpose	2
.030	City Projects and Archaeological Review	2
.040	Consideration of Significant Archaeological Sites.....	2
.050	Designation of Significant Archaeological Sites	2
.060	Relationship to Zoning Districts	3
.070	Review Process.....	3
.080	Discoveries of archaeological resources during construction	4
.090	Classification as protected records.....	4
.100	Fee schedule	4
.110	Forms.....	4
	Archaeological Resource Consideration Checklist.....	5
	Decision Flow Chart.....	8

Why An Archaeological Ordinance?

- Fast-paced development threatens archaeological resources
- Important sites and artifacts risk being lost forever
- Ordinance ensures balance between growth and preservation



What the Ordinance Does

- Calls for archaeological review for certain projects
- Establishes guidelines for monitoring & mitigation
- Promotes collaboration between City Planning, developers, the Historic Preservation Commission, archaeologists and Native American representatives



Benefits to the City

- Protect cultural heritage & community identity
- Support education and tourism
- Ensure compliance with state & federal preservation laws
- Economic & cultural advantages



Community & Developer Support

- Streamlines review process (see checklist)
- Early identification of sites reduces potentially costly delays
- Partnership model encourages cooperation, not conflict

Draft July 2025: ARCHAEOLOGICAL PRESERVATION OVERLAY ZONE

City of St. George
Archaeological Resource Consideration Checklist

To be completed as part of the development review and permitting process.

SECTION 1: Project Information

Project Name _____

Project Address _____

Parcel Number(s) _____

Applicant/Owner Name _____


Contact Information Phone _____ Email _____

Description of Proposed Work _____

Site Plan Attached? ☐ Yes ☐ No

SECTION 2: Initial Screening

Checklist Item	Yes	No	Notes
Reviewed City Archaeology Inventory for known sites	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Located within a Historic or Archaeological District	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Existing archaeological survey available	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	



Knetta's Knoll – A Case for a City Ordinance



Santa Clara River Villages: The Impact of Progress



Legacy Village
Dixie Drive



State History Inventory Project

THE ST. GEORGE CITY ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITE RECORDING PROJECT

by

Barbara W. Frank

prepared for

The City of St. George
175 E 200 No
St. George, UT
84770

and

Utah State Historic Preservation Office
Utah Department of Cultural & Community Engagement
Salt Lake City, UT

Intersearch, Inc.
484 South 300 East
Cedar City, Utah
84720

September 30, 2022

PLPCO Permit No. 166
Utah Antiquities Report No. U22IG0055


More Than Red Rocks



St. George Archaeology Park

Points to Consider

- The location is adjacent to the Crosby Family Park which has parking and facilities that could be shared.
- The Mayor's Loop Trail provides access along the site perimeter.
- The infrastructure costs for the park will be comparatively low.
- This proposal has been shared with the Mayor of St. George. City officials and planning staff from various departments have toured the proposed park site and support the concept.
- Numerous opportunities exist to partner with universities, schools, scout groups, historical and archaeological societies, Utah State Office of Tourism, the State Historic Preservation Office, and other civic groups to create interpretive signs and smart phone applications regarding archaeology and river ecology.
- The Park Proposal has been endorsed by the Dixie Archaeology Society, Utah Rock Art Research Association, The Dinosaur Discovery Museum, Conserve Southwest Utah, the Friends of Snow Canyon State Park, Washington County educators, and the Outback Hiking Club of Southern Utah.



Excavation Site Map



Archaeologist Greg Woodall giving a site tour.



Archaeologist explaining a 1500-year-old storage room.



Brigham Young's "X" marks the spot.



1000-year-old Room Block & Pithouse

Prepared by: The Archaeology Park Plan Committee
For questions, contact Greg Woodall, gregwoodall@hotmail.com or Todd Prince, toddaprinced@gmail.com

Proposal for an Archaeology Park in St. George, Utah

At
The confluence of the Virgin and Santa Clara Rivers
Adjacent to the Crosby Family Confluence Park



Endorsed by

Washington County Science Educators

"Taking children to archaeological and historical sites and museums enriches their lives, fosters a desire to learn, provides understanding of the past and creates a love of history that can last a lifetime."

Proposal for a St. George Archaeology Park

Economic Benefit

More Than \$2 Million In Economic Impact Annually

The Dinosaur Discovery Museum in St. George, the Lost City Museum in Overton, NV, and the Anasazi State Park in Boulder, UT are models for a St. George Archaeology Park.

The St. George Convention & Tourism Office estimates \$145-\$175 per day per visitor to determine economic impacts.

In recent years the Dinosaur Discovery Museum is shown to host over 36,000 each year, with 90% coming from outside St. George. The economic impact is estimated at \$5 to \$6 million dollars per year.

Anasazi State Park enjoys nearly 30,000 visitors annually in the remote community of Boulder, UT. Visitor statistics indicate approximately 24% are from outside the State. The economic impact to the town of Boulder and Garfield County is estimated at over \$2 million dollars each year.

Similarly, an archaeology park in St. George is expected to attract visitation close to that of the Dinosaur Museum and Anasazi State Park.



Heath

Education Benefit

Available To Thousands Of K-12 Students

The Dinosaur Discovery Museum reports that over 1500 schoolchildren visit the Museum annually. An Archaeology Park will provide hands-on and exploration opportunities for school groups, scouts, researchers, visitors and local residents.

The park can provide an invaluable educational attraction with replicas of a prehistoric village (similar to those at Lost City and Anasazi State Park museums), an active archaeological excavation, interpretive signs, kiosk, and smartphone applications.

An archaeology park will increase respect for cultural resources including local petroglyphs, and help reduce vandalism and destruction of archaeological sites.



Lost City Museum replica pueblo



Anasazi State Park

Historic Benefit

Honoring Our Diverse Heritage

The Southern Paiute cultivated fields near the future Archaeology Park. Historic accounts document their numerous gardens along the Santa Clara River.

The confluence of the Virgin and Santa Clara Rivers is the place where Brigham Young stood when he declared his "vision" for St. George.

By creating an archaeology park, we will foster a greater understanding of Southern Paiute and Pioneer heritage.




The Crosby Family Confluence Park

Community Benefit

Convenience and an added attraction


Visitors traveling north on I-15 will be able to stop and visit the State Welcome Center and spend time walking the urban trail to view the hilltop excavation and learn about St. George's history and prehistory.

The site is convenient to several hotels, restaurants, picnic facilities, parking, and restrooms located at the Crosby Family Park.





Respectful Treatment of Human Remains in Site Preservation Policy

- Utah Code
 - Title 9 Ch. 8, Part 3 Section 309
 - Title 9 Ch. 9. Part 4, and
 - Title 76 Ch. 9 Part 7 Section 704



The Role of Canine Forensics



Cooperation with Rock Climbers



Preservation Partners

- St. George City
- Washington County School District
- Archaeological Conservancy
- Greater Zion
- Paiute Tribe/Shivwits Band
- SHPO
- Desert Archaeological Society
- Rock Climbing Groups

Questions



A proposed amendment to Zoning Regulations, Title 10, Chapter 13 Article E-4, Landmark Sites ([City Code 10-13E](#))

CITY OF ST. GEORGE – PROTECTION OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Contents

.010	Key Terms.....	1
.020	Purpose	2
.030	City Projects and Archaeological Review.....	2
.040	Consideration of Significant Archaeological Sites.....	2
.050	Designation of Significant Archaeological Sites	2
.060	Relationship to Zoning Districts	3
.070	Review Process.....	3
.080	Discoveries of archaeological resources during construction	4
.090	Classification as protected records.....	4
.100	Fee schedule	4
.110	Forms	4
	Archaeological Resource Consideration Checklist	5
	Decision Flow Chart.....	8

.010 Key Terms

Archaeological Site: A place with evidence of past human activity.

Significant Archaeological Site: A site that meets one or more of the City's criteria for importance or has been officially designated as a Landmark Site.

Landmark structure or site means a structure or site included in the St. George Historic and Archaeological City Register that meets the criteria specified in [City Code 10-13E-4](#). Briefly, to qualify as a historic resource, a property must:

1. Be located within St. George City.
2. Be at least 100 years old.
3. Retain significant historic features without major alterations.
4. Be listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places and maintain historical integrity.
5. Be associated with significant historical events or persons.
6. Exhibit distinctive architectural or artistic characteristics, or represent a unique construction style.
7. Have the potential to provide important historical or archaeological information.

Certificate of Approval: A city-issued form confirming that the applicant has completed a city-approved plan to protect an important archaeological site.

Certificate of No Effect: A city-issued form confirming that:

8. No archaeological resources are present,
9. The resources found are not significant, or
10. Planned work won't harm any important resources—so development can move forward.

Certificate of Exemption: A city-issued form allowing a project to skip the mitigation plan requirement.

Economic Waiver: A city-issued form confirming that the cost or time to implement the plan creates financial hardship.

Development: Any activity that changes land or buildings—like building, digging, grading, or removing vegetation.

Preservation Easement: A legal agreement that protects the historical or archaeological features of a property, even if privately owned.

Mitigation Plan: A detailed strategy for protecting, studying, or documenting important archaeological resources before a project begins.

.020 Purpose

This ordinance aims to:

- A. Identify and protect important historical and archaeological sites in St. George.
- B. Prevent accidental damage to these sites, including human remains.
- C. Create an official city list of protected places.
- D. Promote public education and appreciation of the city's unique cultural heritage.

.030 City Projects and Archaeological Review

- A. This ordinance applies to all City-owned properties, City-sponsored projects, and projects receiving City funding. Before any development begins, the City's Archaeology Inventor/database must be reviewed for known archaeological sites.

.040 Consideration of Significant Archaeological Sites

- A. Density or building rights transfer and/or including the site in an Open Space, Hillside or other existing protective ordinance or other set-aside agreement, are encouraged to avoid disturbance to significant archaeological sites.
- B. Known archaeological site locations are on file with the City of St. George Planning Department. Private landowners and developers are asked to consider known or suspected sites during project planning.
- C. Landmark Site designation (per [Chapter 10-13E-4](#)) or Historic Preservation (HP) District status for properties with significant archaeological resources may be utilized to protect cultural resources.
- D. No development, construction, excavation, or other ground disturbance may occur on land with archaeological resources until the City issues either a Certificate of No Effect or a Certificate of Approval.
- E. The Planning and Zoning Department will include a check for significant archaeological resources as part of its required development review, with input from the Historic Preservation Commission.
- F. An archaeological subcommittee may be appointed as an ancillary support body to the Historic Preservation Commission, providing specialized expertise and recommendations on matters related to archaeological resources.

.050 Designation of Significant Archaeological Sites

- A. Archaeological resources may be designated as Landmark Sites in the City of St. George if it meets the criteria specified in [City Code 10-13E-4: Landmark Sites](#).
- B. Of particular concern are sites that are likely to contain associated human remains, as these are protected under Utah State Statute. See Utah Code:
 - 1. Title 9 Ch. 8, Part 3 Section 309
 - 2. Title 9 Ch. 9. Part 4, and

3. Title 76 Ch. 9 Part 7
4. The intent is to prevent inadvertent or unnecessary destruction of human remains, while allowing for use and development of those lands. Discovery of human remains requires local law enforcement officials and the State Antiquities Section to be notified. With landowner approval, the Antiquities Section will properly exhume the remains at no cost.

.060 Relationship to Zoning Districts

- A. *Open Space (OS) Zoning*: locations of significant archaeological sites should be considered for inclusion in OS areas as a means to preserve significant sites.
- B. *Hillside Development Overlay*: locations of significant archaeological sites within a parcel subject to the Hillside Overlay should be considered for inclusion in a “no disturbance” area.
- C. *Geologic Hazard Areas*: locations of significant archaeological sites in a geologic hazard area or shrink/swell soils area should be considered for inclusion in a “no disturbance” area within a parcel.

.070 Review Process

- A. Certificate of No Effect

A **Certificate of No Effect** is issued when a developer applies for a permit and either no significant archaeological resources are found, the resources are not considered significant, or a qualified archaeologist confirms the project won’t harm them and a protection plan is in place. With this certificate and all other required City permits, the project can move forward without further review under this ordinance.

- B. Certificate of Approval

If a **Certificate of No Effect** isn’t approved, a **Certificate of Approval** is needed before development can start. The Historic Preservation Commission will check if the property has significant archaeological resources. If it does, the applicant must submit a Mitigation Plan to protect them. If the plan is too costly or time-consuming, the applicant can request an Economic Waiver, which the Commission will review and send to the City Council. Once the mitigation plan is completed to the City’s satisfaction, the City Planner will issue a Certificate of Approval. Construction can begin after the archaeological work is completed.

- C. Appeals Process

If an applicant disagrees with a staff decision—such as the site’s significance, certificate, or a mitigation plan—they can appeal to the Historic Preservation Commission. The Commission will hold a hearing and may approve, change, reject, or return the decision with suggestions. If the applicant still disagrees, they can appeal to the City Council, which may also choose to review the case on its own.

.080 Discoveries of archaeological resources during construction

- A. If an unknown archaeological site is found during construction, the property owner is urged to notify the Historic Preservation Commission. A qualified archaeologist will check the site, and together with the Historic Preservation Commission, decide if it's significant. If there's no harm to the site, construction can continue. If the site is important and would be affected, the project must be reviewed at the Commission's next meeting.

.090 Classification as protected records

In accordance with Utah Code Ann. § [63G-2-305](#)(26) (2015), any records that reveal the location of historic, prehistoric, paleontological, or biological resources that if known would jeopardize the security of those resources or of valuable historic, scientific, educational, or cultural information shall be classified as "protected records."

.100 Fee schedule

No fee is required for an application for a Certificate of No Effect, a mitigation plan, an Economic Waiver, or a Certificate of Approval.

.110 Forms (to be developed)

- A. Certificate of No Effect
- B. Certificate of Approval
- C. Certificate of Exemption
- D. Economic Waiver

City of St. George

Archaeological Resource Consideration Checklist

To be completed as part of the development review and permitting process.

SECTION 1: Project Information

Project Name _____

Project Address _____

Parcel Number(s) _____

Applicant/Owner Name _____

Contact Information Phone _____ Email _____

Description of Proposed Work _____

Site Plan Attached? ☐ Yes ☐ No

SECTION 2: Initial Screening

Checklist Item	Yes	No	Notes
Reviewed City Archaeology Inventory for known sites	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Located within a Historic or Archaeological District	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Existing archaeological survey available	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

SECTION 3: Site Identification

Checklist Item	Yes	No	Notes
Archaeological survey conducted	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Archaeological resources identified on the property	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Historic Preservation Commission consulted	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

SECTION 4: Resource Evaluation

Checklist Item	Yes	No	Notes
Site contains significant archaeological resources (per city criteria)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Applicant is pursuing Landmark Site or HP District designation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

SECTION 5: Certification

Checklist Item	Yes	No	Notes
Certificate of No Effect issued	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
- No significant resources found	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
- Project will not harm resources; protection plan submitted	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Certificate of Approval required	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
- Mitigation Plan submitted	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
- Economic Waiver requested (if applicable)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
- Mitigation Plan reviewed and approved	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

SECTION 6: Commission/Council Review (If Applicable)

Checklist Item	Yes	No	Notes
Reviewed by Historic Preservation Commission	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Referred to City Council	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Public hearing held	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	


SECTION 7: Construction Authorization

Checklist Item	Yes	No	Notes
Archaeological work completed	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Final report submitted (within one year of Certificate of Approval)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Construction authorized	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	


Reviewed by (City Staff): _____

Date: _____

Decision Flow Chart **ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES: NO IMPACT** Certificate of No Effect



ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES: IMPACTS Mitigation Plans, Economic Waiver and Certificate of Approval



ST. GEORGE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION MINUTES
MAY 14, 2025, 12:00 P.M.
CITY HALL ADMINISTRATIVE CONFERENCE ROOM

PRESENT:

Historic Preservation Commission Vice Chair Bob Nicholson
Historic Preservation Commission Member Susan Crook
Historic Preservation Commission Member Scott Messel
Historic Preservation Commission Member Todd Prince

EXCUSED:

Historic Preservation Commission Chair Rick Atkin
City Council Member Michelle Tanner

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Planner II Brenda Hatch
Assistant City Attorney Kristopher Pearson
Community Development Office Supervisor Angie Jessop

OTHERS PRESENT:

Applicant Caleb Barlow
Applicant Tyson Christensen
Applicant Andrew Steed
Applicant Jackelyn Choto

CALL TO ORDER:

The meeting of the Historic Preservation Committee was called to order.

Link to call to order: [00:00:10](#)

LANDMARK SITE REHABILITATION

Consider a request for a Landmark Rehabilitation on Dr. Pike Home, located at 189 N Main Street.

[Link to Packet \[page 2\]](#)

Link to presentation by Brenda Hatch [00:01:24](#)

Link to discussion between Commission Members, Applicants, and Ms. Hatch [00:04:36](#)

Link to motion: [00:08:18](#)

47
48 **MOTION:**

49 A motion was made by Historic Preservation Commission Member Crook to approve Landmark
50 Rehabilitation on Dr. Pike Home located at 189 N Main Street.

51
52 **SECOND:**

53 The motion was seconded by Historic Preservation Commission Member Messel.

54
55 **VOTE:**

56 Historic Preservation Commission Vice Chair Nicholson called for a vote, as follows:

57
58 Historic Preservation Commission Chair Atkin - absent
59 Historic Preservation Commission Vice Chair Nicholson - aye
60 Historic Preservation Commission Member Crook - aye
61 Historic Preservation Commission Member Messel – aye
62 Historic Preservation Commission Member Prince - aye
63 City Council Member Tanner - absent

64
65 The vote was unanimous. The motion carries.

66
67 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

68
69 **Minutes**

70 Consider a request to approve the meeting minutes from the March 19, 2025 meeting.

71
72 [Agenda Packet \[page 28\]](#)

73
74 Link to motion: [00:11:09](#)

75
76 **MOTION:**

77 A motion was made by Historic Preservation Commission Member Messel to approve the
78 minutes from the March 19, 2025 meeting.

79
80 **SECOND:**

81 The motion was seconded by Historic Preservation Commission Member Prince.

82
83 **VOTE:**

84 Historic Preservation Commission Vice Chair Nicholson called for a vote, as follows:

85
86 Historic Preservation Commission Chair Atkin - absent
87 Historic Preservation Commission Vice Chair Nicholson - aye
88 Historic Preservation Commission Member Crook - aye
89 Historic Preservation Commission Member Messel – aye
90 Historic Preservation Commission Member Prince - aye
91 City Council Member Tanner - absent
92

The vote was unanimous. The motion carries.

Link to miscellaneous items discussed by Commission Members [00:11:20](#)

ADJOURN:

Link to motion: [00:25:17](#)

MOTION:

A motion was made by Historic Preservation Commission Member Messel to adjourn.

SECOND:

The motion was seconded by Historic Preservation Commission Member Crook.

VOTE:

Historic Preservation Commission Vice Chair Nicholson called for a vote, as follows:

Historic Preservation Commission Chair Atkin - absent

Historic Preservation Commission Vice Chair Nicholson - aye

Historic Preservation Commission Member Crook - aye

Historic Preservation Commission Member Messel – aye

Historic Preservation Commission Member Prince - aye

City Council Member Tanner - absent

The vote was unanimous. The motion carries.

/s/

Angie Jessop, Community Development Office Supervisor