

Fountain Green City Council/Planning Commission/Citizen Committee Meeting
Fountain Green City Hall
March 2, 2023 6:11 p.m. PENDING MINUTES

Attendance: Shay Morrison (from Six-County Association of Governments), Joseph Papenfuss, Mark Woods, Riley Hansen, Tyler Smith, Rod Hansen, Jerime Ivory, Dan & Helen Naylor (arrived 6:17 pm)

Excuse: Alyson Strait

- Alyson had asked Stuart Smith to take her place tonight, but he did not come or answer a call or message from Jerime so Rod called the meeting to order. He did not think it necessary to have Heather to read the minutes from the last Committee Work meeting. He asks Riley to present the questions that have been submitted with the ones worked on at the last meeting. He has his lap top with him and his survey questions are very similar to Joseph's.
- Riley reports that Alyson submitted a question dealing with potential uses of grants or low-interest loans for development or improvement of recreation facilities asking what the City should improve or construct. The demographics of a community affect grant proposals and awards. Rod submitted two questions concerning support for the City's Ordinances and Ordinance Enforcement Officer.
- The Committee discusses whether to distribute 1 survey per household or 1 survey per resident. It is agreed that not all spouses will agree on the same answers for the survey questions. There may also be adult children or grandparents living in the same household. The Committee decides that all people living in the household can share the survey and mark different answers with explanations after each question. Joseph suggests numbering each survey so that one person doesn't submit more than one survey, but Shay points out that some people would think they were being identified. The survey answers should be anonymous.
- Tyler suggests a disclaimer at the beginning of the survey to assure respondents that the questions do not reflect any future plans that the City may have. We could point out that two other surveys were conducted in 1994 and 2007. The City is just collecting information to help update the General Plan.
- The Committee discusses whether to conduct the survey electronically or by paper. Helen tells the Committee that many older people are not comfortable using a computer, but they could go to the City Library and get help on their computers. Shay uses Central Valley as an example of the City Clerk going door-to-door to distribute and collect their paper surveys! They were collected in sealed envelopes to ensure confidentiality (they received 93 responses). He didn't know their total population. Fountain Green has approximately 1200 residents.
- Riley recommends an introductory paragraph to define the time limit for completing and returning the survey. The Committee discusses 1 week or 10 days or 30 days and decide that 30 days would be too long and the surveys would probably be forgotten. Jerime and Rod admit that they do not even pick up their mail more often than two or three times per month! Most of their bills, etc. are on-line. Maybe the City Library volunteers or the Lamb Day Royalty could distribute and collect the surveys. Shay interjects that most of the surveys that he has helped cities to conduct have been electronic. If someone wanted a paper copy, they could be advised to call the City Hall to have one delivered to them. The Committee thinks

that a notice on the City water bill, on the City web site, and on the City Facebook site would be helpful in alerting the citizens to watch for the upcoming survey.

- Shay points out that open-ended questions are much more difficult to tabulate. Yes/no or multiple choice questions are much easier to tabulate and create graphs from. He suggests that we could have an open-ended question for explanations at the end of each question. The Census type questions can be answered from the 2020 Census even though Shay notes that the margin of error is large on the Census. Many people resist giving personal information on a survey. He advises that most surveys that he has worked with have had about 17 very general questions. They generally deal with water, sewer, and roads – critical infrastructure needs. Tyler agrees that we should keep the survey questions simple or people won't bother to answer. He thinks ranking questions are a viable addition to yes/no and multiple choice questions.

- Riley offers to read through all the questions to make sure everyone is satisfied with them after the changes that were made during discussion. #1 Why FG? #2 What like about FG? #3 Anything to change? #4 How long intend to remain in FG? #5 What improvements like to see? – rank in order of importance (recreational, streets, EMT/Ambulance, other, other). #6 Historical structures to restore or preserve? #7 Expand BC Zone? #8 Expansion of short-term rentals in City (Air B&Bs, B&Bs)? #9 Adjustments to zoning laws in FG? (reduce minimum lot size in BC Zone, new zone for multi-family housing, allow detached ADUs, other).

- Dan would like to add a question concerning whether the City residents want to see Fountain Green enlarged through annexation. He strongly recommends that the City ignore the County's assignment of the Future Annexation Corridor (Buffer one). The ½-acre lots around the 1st mile perimeter of the City would be more than we could sustain! Heather reminds the Committee that Gene Jacobson (County Planning & Zoning Commission member) reported that the City doesn't decide to invite a developer to annex, but the developer must be allowed annexation if they meet all the City requirements and request annexation! Shay reports that that is not true – the City can refuse annexation of a development if they don't see a benefit. At the same time, Shay recommends that the City should have an Annexation Policy. This should deal with water exchange, sewer development, streets lining up with current City streets, etc.. Dan points out that the County only allows 5-acre building lots and if someone builds in the City's "Buffer Zone" they should be required to have 5 acres just like in the County.

- Instead of using a question to encourage volunteers, Riley suggests an ending paragraph explaining the positions using volunteers and asking those willing to help to contact the City Hall.

- Riley reads through the questions left after review and simplification. Some have been rejected and others combined or modified. Riley has the updated version on his lap top with him at the meeting and will forward it to Shay. He will also "cc" it to Michelle and Heather. The Planning Commission meets next Thursday (March 9) and Shay thinks he can check it over and have it back to Heather before the Planning Commission meeting for their review. If it looks OK, the Planning Commission could then bring it to the City Council the next week (March 16). It would still take a month or more to prepare it for presentation to the citizens for their input. The Committee has discussed sending postcards to each household to encourage their participation in the survey on-line with paper copies available from the City Hall by request.

- Rod suggests that there is no need to meet again until after the survey results have been compiled by Shay and delivered to the City. Then the Committee will need to begin updating the General Plan.
- The meeting adjourns at 8:10 pm.