

Millard County General Plan

County Goals, Objectives and Action Steps

Fall 1998

Funding for this project has been provided by:
Millard County,
The Utah State Legislature
and
The Governor's Office of Planning and Budget

Millard County Planning Project General Plan Update

Fall 1998

The Millard County Planning Project and General Plan Update was a partnership effort including Millard County, the Governor's Office of Planning and Budget and the Utah Association of Counties. Special thanks to the citizens and local officials of Millard County who participated in this project.

As part of this planning effort, it should be noted that Millard County recognizes and supports the rights, privileges and authorities given to individuals and local governments through the United States Constitution and the Bill of Rights. The 1998 Millard County General Plan, as adopted, is an effort by County officials to uphold these principles and promote a balance between private and public interests.

Millard County, as a political subdivision of the State of Utah, expressly acknowledges that numerous powers are reserved to the States as formalized in the Tenth Amendment and reiterated in several Supreme Court decisions.

*Millard County Commissioners
Lana Moon
Tony Dearden
John Henry*

MILLARD COUNTY PLANNING PROJECT

1996-98

The Millard County Planning Project has been a partnership effort including Millard County, the Governor's Office of Planning and Budget and the Utah Association of Counties.

Special thanks goes to the citizens of Millard County and the local officials who served as members of the Citizen Plan Advisory Committee:

Lana Moon, Commissioner,
Comprehensive Plan Project Chair
Tony Dearden, Commissioner
John Henrie, Commissioner
Leon Smith, County Planner
Sheryl Dekker, Commission Assistant
John L. Adams
Dean S. Anderson
Tony Anderson
Harry L. Bell
Connie Best
Brent Blake
Chris Blake
Jerry Blanch
Louis Brown
Marian J. Bunker
Nan Bunker
Tim Carling
Thomas E. Chandler
Gale Chapman
Gordan Chatland
Ivan J. Christensen
Paula Christensen
Sheila Curtis
Nancy DeMille
Jim DeWyze
Ron Draper
R. Merrill Dutson
Michael Engstrom
Lynn T. Fergus
Jack Finlinson
Joyce Frampton
Jody Gale
Kevin Goertz
David Hatton

Brian Holley
Mark Huntsman
Lorraine Iverson
Abe Johnson
J. Howard Johnson
Rulon Jones
Suzanne Kershisnik
Don Knight
Carl Lyman
Shirley Lyman
Virginia Lyman
Don McMillian
Michael Melville
Lee Monroe
Mike O'Camb
Hal Peterson
LaWanna Peterson
Wes Peterson
Ken Porter
Belva Pratt
Steve Pratt
Jerry Reagan
Douglas Reid
David Remkes
Bob Robison
Forrest Roper
Kenneth Skeem
Allen Smith
Curtis Smith
Wayne Spencer
Glen Swalberg
Dave Williams
Jan Williams
Scott Williams
Lynn Zubeck

Contributors:

Millard County
The Governor's Office of Planning and Budget
Utah Association of Counties
Bear West Company

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1998 County Planning Project	
Introduction	Page 1
General Plan Purpose and Process	Page 3
Using and Amending the Millard County General Plan	Page 4
Value/Goal Statements: A Framework for Action	Page 5
Millard County Policies	Page 11
Elements	
Planning Coordination	Planning Coordination 1-2
Growth and Development	Growth and Development 1-2
Land Use	Land Use 1-7
Housing	Housing 1-2
Human and Community Services	Human & Community Services 1-6
Economic Development	Economic Development 1-9
Tourism	Tourism 1-4
Transportation	Transportation 1-2
Utilities	Utilities 1-1
Public Lands	Public Lands 1-20
Appendix A - List of Project Participants	A 1-2
Appendix B - Public Scoping Meeting Results	B 1-9
Appendix C - Citizen Plan Advisory Committee Meeting Summaries	C 1-5
Appendix D - General Plan Adoption and Amendment Process	D 1-1
Appendix E - Federal Planning Processes	E 1-3
Appendix F - Millard County Profile Table of Contents	F 1-1

MILLARD COUNTY GENERAL PLAN

1996-98 County Planning Project

Introduction

The 1996-98 Millard County Planning Project and the subsequent Millard County General Plan update are efforts by the County and its citizens to address the present and future needs of Millard County. This Plan addresses specific issues identified by County residents as County priorities and outlines a series of strategies designed to accomplish County goals and objectives.

Utah State statutes provide for the development of county-level plans under Title 17-27-301. Components which may be addressed within these plans include: land use, transportation, environmental issues, public services and facilities, rehabilitation and redevelopment, housing, economic development, recommendations for plan implementation, and "any other elements that the county considers appropriate". In its plan, Millard County has focused on issues identified by County residents during several public worksessions. These issues are addressed in the Plan through County "value/goal" statements. Issues identified as "County priorities" are further developed through "County Policy Statements" and "Action and Implementation Steps".

The purpose of the Millard County General Plan and the 1996-98 Planning Project is three-fold. First, the County now possess a single document that establishes the "guidelines" for other planning efforts within the County. It is anticipated that future County planning efforts will expand on the "values and objectives" identified in the County's General Plan. In respect to this purpose, County priorities and the issues facing the County will most likely change over time. For the document to function as a valuable decision-making tool, it should be reviewed and amended as necessary to address County issues and interests as they develop.

Second, under FLPMA (Federal Land Policy and Management Act) Title 43, U.S.C.A. Section 1712(c)(9), Federal land management agencies are required to recognize local plans and solicit participation. It is Millard County's position that County representatives should be properly notified and offered a seat at agency planning tables whenever changes affecting County interests are proposed, definitely before decisions are made and programs implemented. To improve cooperation between the County and Federal land management agencies and to ensure consistency between the County Plan and Federal planning documents, the County Planning Department, specifically the County Planner, will play an active role in all relevant Federal planning processes. In turn, the County Planner will inform and work closely with the Millard County Commissioners.

Third, the planning process itself has been a valuable learning experience for the citizens of Millard County. A diverse group of over 175 County residents actively participated in all stages of plan development including: issue identification, issue prioritization, objective identification and implementation strategy development. Through this process, County citizens have "planned for Millard County's future". The County's General Plan is the result of their combined expertise and experience. This experience will be invaluable as the County adopts and begins to implement this Plan.

As part of this planning project, a separate document, *The Millard County Profile*, has been

prepared. This document contains information, data, and maps covering County demographics, economics, land use, and public facilities and services. If consistently updated, this document will remain a valuable resource for Millard County officials, County residents, and individuals interested in general Millard County information. A copy of the *Millard County Profile* Table of Contents can be found in Appendix F.

General Plan Purpose and Process

The Governor's Office of Planning and Budget and the Utah Association of Counties recognize the need for adequate county-level land use planning. Under Utah State law, a general plan must address certain social, economical, and environmental issues. The law also requires a minimum level of public participation. The process to update the Millard County General Plan went beyond the required level of public participation and provided residents of the County with the opportunity to participate through a number of public meetings and as members of citizen committees and task-groups. Bear West, a consulting firm with expertise in county-level planning and Federal and State land use issues, assisted the County throughout plan development.

At the beginning of the project, a citizen Plan Advisory Committee was formed. This committee represented a cross-section of Millard County interests and included local elected officials and representatives from Federal and State land and resource management agencies. (A list of the PAC members may be found on the inside cover of the General Plan.) This committee's main responsibility was to work with the consultants throughout the plan development process.

The Millard County project formally began in October of 1996 with public workshops held in Delta and Fillmore. Over one-hundred County residents attended these meetings. These workshops served as the "scoping" meetings for the project and gave County residents their first opportunity to identify the issues, concerns, values, and opportunities that they felt should be addressed as part of the County's General Plan. Once issues were recorded, workshop participants had the opportunity to indicate which issues they felt were County priorities. Priorities identified during the meeting include: maintaining the County's "small town" character and lifestyle, encouraging responsible economic growth and community development, participating in Federal and State land/resource planning processes and improving human and community services. A summary of these issues was prepared and reviewed by the Plan Advisory Committee. These topics became the focus of the plan development process. A list of these issues and their prioritization, *Public Scoping Meeting Small Group Issue Identification and Prioritization*, is attached in Appendix B.

Beginning in November, 1996, the Plan Advisory Committee and consultants met monthly. During these worksessions, the Committee discussed each County "priority issue" in detail. The Committee worked to articulate County sentiments through "value/goal" statements, to refine County objectives, and to development policy "implementation strategies". Depending on the topic of discussion, members of the Committee or "topic experts" were invited to present background information and to assist the Committee in developing realistic and viable approaches. A compilation of workshop agendas can be found in Appendix C.

The Plan Advisory Committee's recommendations are formally presented to the citizens of Millard County through this *Draft* Plan. Each "priority issue" is presented in the following fashion: County Policy Statement, County Objectives, and Action/Implementation Strategies.

As outlined in State statute, these recommendations are subject to Planning Commission and County Commission review through an open public hearing and adoption process.

Using and Amending the Millard County General Plan

It is intended that the updated General Plan will serve as a framework for Millard County as it considers future private and Federal and State land use decisions. The Plan is also designed to provide a policy foundation for human and community services and economic development activities.

To successfully implement specific portions of the General Plan, Millard County will need to take action beyond Plan adoption. Recommended actions are identified in the "Action/Implementation" or "strategy" sections following each County "Objective".

While this plan, upon adoption, reflects the thoughtful direction of Millard County in 1998, it is expected that the plan will be updated and revised as circumstances change and new challenges arise. The amendment process for the General Plan is defined by Utah statute, and follows the same requirements as the adoption process: hearings and action by the Planning Commission and County Commission with minimum 14 days notice by each body. Any interested person can propose an amendment at any time by filing an application with the Planning Commission. A copy of the Utah State "general plan adoption and amendment process" statute can be found in Appendix D.

Millard County Planning Project

1998

Value/Goal Statements: A Framework for Action

Community Lifestyle and Character

Millard County residents enjoy a lifestyle unique in today's society. The area's "rural character" and "small-town atmosphere" provide a "quality of life" vastly different than that found in larger urban areas. County residents also enjoy a solid moral climate, low crime rates, accessible government, quality human and community services, and a strong economic base. Maintaining these "quality-of-life" characteristics is a top County priority.

As growth in the State continues, Millard County will experience additional development pressure. County residents support continued economic and community growth and feel that if the County's development objectives are clearly articulated through County policies and plans, future growth will enhance rather than detract from the area's unique lifestyle and character.

Intra-County Relations

County residents recognize and appreciate the diverse interests and independent nature of Millard County communities. Nevertheless, the County feels that each community, and the County as a whole, can benefit from better community-to-community and community-to-County communication, coordination, and cooperation. Improving east-west relations has been identified as a priority.

Land Use

Existing land uses within the County provide residents with a variety of development options and a mix of urban and rural lifestyles.

The County will continue to support orderly residential, commercial, industrial and agricultural growth. Development will continue in a responsible manner and in locations that contribute to the economic and social well-being of County residents

In order to maintain its rural atmosphere, preserve prime agricultural land and provide adequate services to County residents, the County will encourage growth to take place within or adjacent to existing communities.

The County feels that land use plans and development standards should reflect citizen preferences and be amended to address relevant issues and challenges. Once adopted, regulations will be consistently enforced.

The County is also sensitive to private property right sentiments and will balance these rights with public interests.

Recreation and Tourism

Millard County possesses a variety of unique natural, cultural and historical resources. These resources provide residents and visitors with a number of diverse recreational opportunities. The County will continue to promote tourism activities that highlight the history, landscape and culture of the region.

Millard County recognizes the economic benefits that tourism-related activities bring to the area. The County will encourage and support private sector development of tourism facilities and venues and will participate in local, regional and State-level tourism promotion and planning efforts as deemed beneficial to the local industry. The County will also work with State and Federal land managers to promote responsible use of Federal and State recreation sites within the County.

When exploring future tourism development activities, the County will consider the following:

- impacts to County natural, cultural and historical resources;
- demands on County services and facilities (law enforcement, emergency services, water and waste management, search and rescue);
- impacts on the County's rural lifestyle; and
- impacts on traditional resource uses.

Recreation Facilities

Millard County encourages the use of recreational facilities within the area. As requested, the County will work with individual communities to explore potential funding sources for community-level recreation projects and facilities.

The County encourages private sector development of recreational facilities and services and may offer development incentives as doing so becomes feasible. The County also supports cultivating recreation facility development and maintenance "partnerships" with other entities, agencies and special interest groups.

Federal and State Lands/Federal and State Agencies

Over 87% of the land within Millard County is managed by Federal or State agencies. Due to the dependence of several County-based industries on these lands and the accompanying resources, decisions made by these management agencies directly impact the County and its residents.

As provided through the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA), the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the National Forest Management Act (NFMA), Millard County claims the powers, rights and authority given specifically to local governments to participate in Federal and State land management planning and decision-making processes.

The County will take full advantage of these opportunities to promote and protect County interests.

As part of their General Plan, the County has articulated their Federal and State land management priorities. Specific objectives include:

- actively participating in Federal and State land management planning processes,
- maintaining “multiple-use” management practices,
- supporting responsible Federal and State land resources use and development,
- participating in wildlife management decisions,
- encouraging Federal and State land consolidation/disposal,
- promoting Federal and State land recreation and tourism, and
- maintaining adequate Federal and State lands access.

Human and Community Services

Millard County residents desire to maintain the current quality of human and community services available throughout the County. The County will continue to work with communities and private interests to improve service availability. Services identified as County priorities are listed below.

Emergency Services/Law Enforcement

Millard County is a safe place to live and raise a family. Considering the County's demographic and economic profile, residents feel the existing County and community law enforcement, fire protection, emergency response, and search-and-rescue personnel and agencies are well-prepared and trained. Maintaining an adequate level of agency staffing and personnel preparedness is viewed as a necessity.

The County is also dedicated to maintaining and expanding emergency services/law enforcement facilities according to County needs.

It is the County position that local law enforcement personnel and agencies should be given preference in law enforcement matters on Federal and State lands. Money to perform such duties should be funneled from the Federal to local level.

Medical Facilities/Health Care

Private health care providers within the County maintain excellent medical facilities and provide the finest health care in the region. County residents desire to maintain this level of excellence and support expanding services and facilities as doing so becomes economically feasible.

The County will continue to support the strategic planning, physician recruitment and marketing efforts of the existing health care system.

Senior Citizen Services

Senior citizens are integral members of Millard County communities. The County is committed to providing recreational, educational, residential, and medical services and opportunities for this sector of the population.

Education

Providing additional education opportunities for all County residents is a top priority. In this effort, the County will continue to support public and private efforts to provide quality educational facilities and instruction materials. The County also supports the development of additional in-County post-secondary education opportunities and the expansion of existing technical training programs.

Utilities

County residents support the expansion of public utilities within existing communities or areas designated for future growth and development.

Housing

Millard County is a wonderful place to live and raise a family. With increased interest and development in the area, providing adequate and affordable housing opportunities is a top County priority.

The County has identified the need to better understand area housing needs and will work with community leaders, developers and citizens to identify ways in which these issues can be politically and socially addressed.

Communications

Millard County supports upgrading existing tele-communication facilities and services to improve in-County communication links and increase County access to outside information sources.

Economic Development

Millard County enjoys a diverse economic base and employment profile. The County will continue efforts to strengthen their existing position and will encourage economic growth that is compatible with the area's character and lifestyle. County economic development objectives include: business retention and expansion, value-added marketing and business recruitment. The County will also pursue economic development activities that compliment existing businesses and industries.

Natural Resources

The abundance and availability of natural resources within the County provide a variety of economic development opportunities. Millard County will continue to support the responsible use and development of these resources and associated industries and businesses.

Agriculture

Millard County also recognizes the economic contributions made by the area's agricultural industry and related businesses. The County will continue to encourage and support growth and expansion of this sector.

Infrastructure

Maintaining adequate transportation and water/sewer systems within the County is a necessity. The County will continue to work with the State, individual communities and the appropriate special service districts to address these issues.

Millard County understands that future development is most likely to occur in areas where services are available. With this in mind, the County does not support extending services through or into areas that have not been identified for future development. It is the County's position that the majority of residential growth should take place within existing communities where services are readily available.

Water Resources

Water quality and availability will determine the type, level and location of future growth. Millard County encourages the efficient management and use of water resources. The County also supports the development, adoption and implementation of water collection, storage, distribution and conservation plans by local municipalities, the Conservancy District and water companies. The County also encourages continued cooperation among these entities as water-management decisions are made.

The County will take an active role in all relevant Federal and State water-resource management plans and decisions impacting the County and/or the interests of its residents.

Transportation

Maintaining an adequate and safe transportation system throughout the County is a necessity. Residents depend on the existing network of roads and highways to access human and community services, recreational areas, natural resources, and regional and interstate markets.

The County realizes that adequate access to and across Federal and State lands is necessary for efficient natural resource use and development. The County encourages continued cooperation among Federal and State land management agencies, private interests and Millard County to address access, right-of-way and road maintenance issues.

Millard County recognizes the Delta City and Fillmore City airports as important regional transportation facilities. The County encourages these entities to maintain their respective facilities and services as viable transportation alternatives.

Millard County General Plan Elements

Planning Coordination
County Growth and Development
Land Use
Housing
Human and Community Services
Economic Development
Tourism
Transportation
Utilities
Federal and State Lands

Appendix A

List of Project Participants

List of Project Participants -

The following individuals participated in the Millard County Planning project as members of the Citizen Plan Advisory Committee, County Officials/staff, resource specialists and/or interested citizens.

John L. Adams	Gerald Coats	Marilyn Jensen
Darcie Allan	Randy Coats	Abe Johnson
David Allan	David Copeland	Beth R. Johnson
Dean S. Anderson	Vince Crawford	J. Howard Johnson
Tony Anderson	Curt Crosby	Jacki Johnson
Ken Ashby	Clay Cummings	Keith Johnson
Dan Barkdell	Sheila Curtis	Stewart Johnson
Scott P. Bassett	Don Dafoe	Venez Ann Johnson
Nolean Bean	Cloyd C. Day	Andrea Jones
Justin Beck	Tony Dearden	Rulon Jones
Harry L. Bell	Sheryl Dekker	Brian Kershishnik
Connie Best	Nancy DeMille	Suzanne Kershishnik
Cal Bishop	Dallon Dennison	Dennis Killian
Gloria Bishop	Alan Dewsnap	Monte Kimball
Brent Blake	Darlene Dewsnap	Don Knight
Chris Blake	Jim DeWyze	Austin Lovell
Jerry Blanch	Ron Draper	Carl Lyman
Norm Bowden	Dian Durrant	Colleen Lyman
Joe Brokke	R. Merrill Dutson	Louise Lyman
David Brown	Michael Engstrom	Marshall S. Lyman
Ed Brown	Sara Farmer	Pam Lyman
Louis Brown	Lynn T. Fergus	Shirley Lyman
Sylvia Brown	Jack Finlinson	Virginia Lyman
Clyde Bunker	Joyce Frampton	Evan Madsen
Gayle Bunker	Jody Gale	E. Martinez
Marian J. Bunker	Kevin Goertz	Evan Maxfield
Nan Bunker	Robert Guichard	Joanne Maxfield
Donald Burt	Roger Haglund	Paul J. McCollaum
Sam Bushman	David Hatton	Don McMillian
John Bushnell	Ilene Hatton	Kim Melville
Wanda Bushnell	Lewis Hatton	Michael Melville
Carl Camp	J. Hawkes	Lee Monroe
DeLyle Carling	John Heath	G. Moody
Tim Carling	John Henrie	Lana Moon
Richard Cary	Michael Hill	Kim Morse
Thomas E. Chandler	Neno Hoelzle	D. Scott Nickle
Gale Chapman	Brian Holley	Clark Nielson
Gordan Chatland	Ladd Holman	John Nye
Don Christensen	Rey Huber	Mike O'Camb
Ivan J. Christensen	M. Hudson	
Jon Christensen	Mark Huntsman	Hal Peterson
Paula Christensen	Lorraine Iverson	LaWanna Peterson
Sandra Christensen	Mark Iverson	Warren Peterson
Gary Church	Lon Jackson	Wes Peterson
Wally Church	Reed Jeffery	Derin Phelps

Ed Phillips
Mark Pixton
Rachel Pope
Theodore Pope
Elzo Porter
Ken Porter
Belva Pratt
Ben Pratt
Lori Pratt
Steve Pratt
Jerry Reagan
Douglas Reid
David Remkes
Bob Robison
Jaren Robison
James D. Robson
Forrest Roper
John Rowlette
Larry C. Ryan

Robert Sanderson
Jeanette Skeem
Kenneth Skeem
Allen Smith
Curtis Smith
Daren Smith
Leon Smith
Richard Smith
Robin Smith
Wayne Spencer
Dan Sperry
Rex Stanworth
Roger Stanworth
V.B. Starley
David Steele
Tom Stephenson
Bryant Stevens
Vern Stewart
Mike Styler

Glen Swalberg
Garth Swallow
Fred Talbert
Verl Talbert
Becky Thomas
Adam Tolman
Elise Tolman
Tony Trezza
Bill Tuttle
Lynn Wall
Lynn Whitaker
Dave Williams
Jan Williams
Mervin G. Williams
Scott Williams
Dean Wood
Bill Wright
Craig Young
Lynn Zubeck

Appendix B

Public Scoping Meeting(s) Results

October 8, 1996 Delta, Utah
October 15, 1996 Fillmore, Utah

Millard County Planning Project
Public Scoping Meeting(s)
October 8, 1996 Delta, Utah
October 15, 1996 Fillmore, Utah

Participant List

John L. Adams	R. Merrill Dutson	Mark Pixton
Dean S. Anderson	Michael Engstrom	Elzo Porter
Tony Anderson	Lynn T. Fergus	Ken Porter
Ken Ashby	Jack Finlinson	Belva Pratt
Scott P. Bassett	Joyce Frampton	Steve Pratt
Nolean Bean	Jody Gale	Jerry Reagan
Harry L. Bell	Kevin Goertz	Douglas Reid
Connie Best	David Hatton	Bob Robison
Brent Blake	Michael Hill	Jaren Robison
Chris Blake	Lorraine Iverson	Forrest Roper
Jerry Blanch	Marilyn Jensen	Larry C. Ryan
Clyde Bunker	Abe Johnson	Curtis Smith
Marian J. Bunker	Beth R. Johnson	Daren Smith
Nan Bunker	Keith Johnson	Leon Smith
Donald Burt	Stewart Johnson	Richard Smith
Tim Carling	Andrea Jones	Robin Smith
Gordan Chatland	Brian Kershnik	Dan Sperry
Don Christensen	Suzanne Kershnik	Rex Stanworth
Ivan J. Christensen	Dennis Killian	David Steele
Jon Christensen	Monte Kimball	Tom Stephenson
Paula Christensen	Carl Lyman	Bryant Stevens
Gary Church	Marshall S. Lyman	Vern Stewart
Wally Church	Shirley Lyman	Glen Swalberg
Randy Coats	Evan Maxfield	Garth Swallow
David Copeland	Joanne Maxfield	Fred Talbert
Vince Crawford	Michael Melville	Verl Talbert
Sheila Curtis	Lee Monroe	Bill Tuttle
Cloyd C. Day	D. Scott Nickle	Dave Williams
Tony Dearden	LaWanna Peterson	Jan Williams
Sheryl Dekker	Warren Peterson	Mervin G. Williams
Nancy DeMille	Wes Peterson	Scott Williams
Jim DeWyze	Ed Phillips	Craig Young
Ron Draper		

Millard County General Planning Project

Public Scoping Meeting(s) Summary

October 8 & 15, 1996 Public Scoping Meeting(s)

Small Group Issue Identification and Prioritization

County residents identified 383 issues during the public scoping meetings held last month. The number within each () represents the number of resident "votes" for that particular issue. In preparation for our Plan Advisory Committee discussion, we have combined similar subjects under eight major headings. Further clarification on several issues will be necessary as the County develops its policies for the General Plan.

(Number of votes) *(Value or Issue)*

Community Lifestyle and Character

Maintaining our quality of life (163 votes total)

- (38) No big city bureaucracy or traffic; don't have to drive I-15; slower pace than the Wasatch Front; small town atmosphere; limited government control; lower crime; peace and quiet; clean; well-cared for
- (32) "Neighborly" atmosphere - look out for each other; great people: friendly, caring, supportive, trustworthy; people are independent; a lot of ethnic diversity, yet no segregation between groups; several generations living together, young families, family heritage; thankful for city folks who don't live here
- (26) Agricultural based economy and lifestyle
- (20) Open space--freedom to enjoy surrounding lands; can see a long way, space between neighbors; opportunities to live in town if you want services, outside if you don't; only need five acres to build outside of existing towns
- (17) Solid economic base provides good services/facilities; unemployment rate near state average; household income near state average; good schools and medical facilities; progressive attitude in respect to economic development and education
- (16) County/Community atmosphere - small, farming communities; united, yet separate; important to encourage county-wide (east-west) cooperation yet maintain community identities
- (9) Natural/geographical diversity; enjoy sunsets, available natural resources and recreation opportunities; variety of terrain
- (5) Clean air/water

Recreation and Tourism

Promote in-county activities and tourist attractions (44 total votes)

- (17) Hunting/fishing--quality has decreased--better management is needed; too many outside people coming in; promote additional non-resident hunters; more local residents consideration in licensing-hunting decisions; improve waterfowl
- (10) Advertise the national monument and west desert; rock hounding
- (9) Historical sites: museum, Cove Fort
- (4) Limit the use of Gunnison Bend, too many outside visitors
- (2) Explore feasibility of dairy tourism
- (2) Improved management of ATV trails, keep ATV off private roads

Recreation and Tourism promotion (30 total votes)

- (18) Identify what we have and want to promote; the County offers a variety of attractions
- (5) Develop a marketing strategy, east side doing a good job; determine area-specific interest
- (4) Use tourism dollars to hire an events coordinator
- (1) Maintain working relationship with industry with respect to tourism
- (1) Cooperate with surrounding counties
- (1) Don't put a cap on recreation

Existing County recreation facilities (26 total votes)

- (7) Make better use of existing recreational facilities: pools, ballfields,
- (6) Better promote and advertise existing recreation opportunities
- (4) Too much in our County already, should be based on population
- (4) We need additional recreation for residents, identify needs
- (3) Excellent facilities on west side, east side facilities need improvement; suggestions include a golf course
- (2) Too many taxes are going to facilities upkeep facilities; funding is an issue

Future recreation and tourism facilities (25 total votes)

- (8) develop a natural recreation facility
- (7) organize sports/cultural events (ball fields and rodeo grounds)
- (4) improve the Delta airport for recreational use (transportation and hobby)
- (4) rodeo grounds
- (2) develop a tourist loop off I-15

Recreation and Tourism development criteria (18 total votes)

- (14) Recreation and tourism development should be secondary to substantial economic uses; promote tourism growth—but not at expense of long-term resource development
- (3) service provision costs should be evaluated
- (1) should be sensitive to local events

Public lands recreation

- (2) Tied to use/designation of public lands; necessary to maintain adequate access

Land Use Issues

Land use planning and community development (65 total votes)

- (16) In-fill development within cities; preserve agriculture/open spaces by concentrating growth in towns. This will increase tax base and use existing services more efficiently; may be more difficult to purchase lots in town.
- (15) Millard County has diverse land uses - plan should continue this; manage all aspects of land/cultural, economic, recreational, agricultural; opportunities from government to promote county values; beautify the county
- (11) Plan ahead; people need to know what uses are allowed e.g. housing, dairy, farming
- (9) Land use should be based on the relevant resources (e.g. farm land) (Delta City's annexation of land is good example)
- (4) Enforce land use ordinances; once regulations and zones are set, do not change
- (3) "Service provision costs" should determine land uses

- (2) Each community should determine future annexation plans; small communities need better planning, preparation for growth, annexation
- (2) Tighter requirements for subdivision development--water, sewer, etc.
- (2) Bedroom communities lead to higher land prices
- (1) Provide adequate parks and open space in urban areas

Agricultural land and open space preservation (63 total votes)

- (21) Land use planning must be consistent with continued agricultural land uses; agricultural land preservation strategies should include identifying prime agricultural land and encouraging development on marginal agricultural lands and within existing communities
- (18) Preserve agricultural rights; animal rights for large property owners; continue agriculture plan
- (18) Land uses should be sensitive to agriculture uses; address conflicts between agricultural and residential land uses; in urban areas-homeowner takes priority, in agricultural areas-agriculture takes priority
- (4) Needs immediate attention: Sutherland area--dairies or no dairies? Why not designate certain areas for dairies through zoning?
- (2) Lots of usable land set aside by Feds - people being paid not to grow

Protect private property rights (61 total votes)

- (49) Protect private property rights; additional regulations are needed to protect peoples rights
- (8) Private property rights vs community values
- (2) Zoning to provide individual lifestyle not to infringe
- (2) Zoning ordinance is violation of 14th amendment

miscellaneous

- (1) Post property properly (hunting seasons)

Public Lands

Multiple use

- (49) Support multiple use management concept; maintain traditional uses on public lands: grazing, mining, recreation, etc.

County participation in public land decisions (25 votes total)

- (26) Public land management is a top-down issue--explore how we can get involved in public land decision;. County needs more local involvement and input in management decisions
- (2) Wildlife management--counties needs more input; wild horses, geese
- (2) Understand our legal rights and responsibilities--law written with one meaning may cut out other meaning/option; create policy awareness
- (1) It is important for the County to maintain good relationships with public land managers
- (1) Millard County should require feds to obey law of the land

Access

- (23) Access; who owns the roads?: which are public, which are private; settle RS2477

debate; maintain access to public lands for traditional uses; maintain access across private land to public lands

Public land resource development/management (15 total votes)

- (10) Maintain air quality standards so industry can continue
- (3) Responsible use of resources; promote additional resource development
- (2) Healthy - prescribed natural fire

Wilderness

- (5) Wilderness is coming whether we want it or not - need to address. General Plan should include information from the wilderness hearings in Millard County. There are some areas good for wilderness. Where we live (the west desert) is not appropriate--because of distance. How will wilderness affect our development?

Water

- (5) Address public land water rights

Proposed County positions

- (3) Do not waste county money on issues we can not win
- (2) Transfer ownership from feds to state; reduce quantity, privatize
- (1) Teach people importance of public lands; understand relationship between public lands and private lands

Infrastructure

Transportation/Roads (27 total votes)

- (15) Streets and roads - right of way, maintenance; roads should be widened in smaller towns
- (5) Business--should be responsible for damaged roads (bonding)
- (5) I-15 is an important corridor; railroad and I-70
- (2) Need street signs, numbers

Overall condition and availability (26 total votes)

- (12) Maintenance; good infrastructure overall
- (7) Need County-wide capital facilities plan
- (7) Identify existing carrying capacity and excess capacity; encourage development in incorporated areas

Water/sewer (18 total votes)

- (13) Protection, use, conservation, quality; improve and make better use of rivers/reservoirs
- (2) Explore feasibility of special interest district
- (2) Credit for water and sewer plans - maintain
- (1) Outlying communities need sewer systems (state will soon prohibit septic)
- (1) Nice water system in Hinckley

Electricity

- (1) Electricity deregulation (research-state government)

Natural Gas

- (1) Natural gas is currently available to some parts of county--should expand to others

Community Services

- (10) Excellent medical, education, law enforcement, transportation, utilities, recreation, and emergency services; should be maintained
- (7) Coordinated city/county efforts are necessary; coordinate services offered with tax income

Service Funding (35 total votes)

- (10) Encourage volunteerism/not expect County to pay for everything; citizen-run programs are more successful; too much dependence on LDS church for support services
- (8) The more community services that are funded by outside dollars, the less control we have. People come/stay here for sense of independence. Community services make us more attached; don't want to be cradled through every aspect of our lives
- (5) Services provided to non-county residents--funding not there. User fees for services
- (5) Need to privatize services. Less taxes with better services if private owned; explore possibility of privatizing
- (4) Community services operate better when independent.
- (2) Disagree with redistribution of tax dollars; don't like the use of county (rural) taxes for city projects
- (1) Funding mechanisms make it more costly to provide care in rural areas. Need vehicle for equal distribution of funding for community services.

Education

- (24) Encourage additional secondary education opportunities; continued support for the technical school

Law Enforcement

- (13) Law enforcement - need new jail; our "wannabe" gang problem will get worse; law enforcement: examine ways to improve, equal coverage of law enforcement

Communications (8 total votes)

- (5) Communication with outside world--telecom; Internet access--technology should be expanded; additional local radio stations; improved cellular coverage
- (3) Pressure phone company to give local service throughout Millard County

Emergency services (7 total votes)

- (4) Fire protection: Sutherland, Abraham, Sugarville, needs improvement
- (3) Additional emergency education is needed - C.E.R.T, EMS; ambulance response is slow (police, too); need additional participation in the 911 services

Medical Services

- (6) Medical services should be coordinated; tie into regional services; good positive health care vs injuries (non treatable)treated by local facility

Social Programs (6 total votes)

- (3) Social services - strengthened - chemical, family related
- (2) We have too many youth community services
- (1) Youth and elderly programs--for those not in LDS church. Concern about services

to minority groups--address issues at interaction with community.

Affordable housing (1)

Protect County from noxious weeds (3)

Natural Resources

Resource Use and Development-County Participation (102 total votes)

- (47) County will participate in determining adequate uses and adequate levels of use; promote natural resource development; protect traditional uses: mining, grazing, promote multiple use; determine those areas to be preserved vs developed
- (23) Identify/inventory county resources: land, water, sun, wind, renewable and non-renewable
- (13) Maintain our diverse natural resource base: mining, forest, water (not enough), agricultural land
- (9) Uses are determined by P/L designation--find out what we can do about it.
- (5) Some areas need to be preserved (responsible local management)e.g.: Notch Peak, wildlife management; ORV/ATV use; recreation/tourism
- (5) Sustainable resource base - don't exceed carrying capacity

Unique County Resources (21 votes total)

- (10) Vast lands - wilderness - keep roads open; important to resource development
- (7) Unique scenic areas: Notch Peak, Crystal Peak, King's Canyon, Crystal Caves, Harp Pans and Dry Lake Bed, volcanoes
- (2) Diversified interest of local county residents
- (2) Youth - labor force potential

Water

- (7) Address water issues; water is a great concern with additional growth; increased cooperation with the Millard County Water Conservancy District

Mining, Oil & Gas (4 votes total)

- (2) Mining - protect industry
- (2) Development of natural gas resources

Economic Development

General Comments (56 votes total)

- (12) Continuing campaign for economic development; use central location to attract additional professionals (doctors, businesses); communities(public) should be more involved in economic development discussions and decisions
- (7) Growth can come from existing natural and provided resources. Identify our resources--natural and man-made. Growth based upon resource - mineral, soil, water, open space
- (6) For Millard County to stay rural we should attract much smaller employers (and sole proprietors), not big ones.
- (6) Moderate, controlled growth; what is our desired population? Do we want to be a bedroom community or do we want our kids to have jobs here?; Prepare for growth coming in from Provo/Utah Counties--commuters

- (6) Define types of industry we want
- (5) Not realistic to stop growth - make sure it's well managed.
- (4) Too much development/growth will destroy local lifestyle; need growth to keep communities alive; community is aging.
- (4) Make sure development does not compromise natural resources (water, clean air, etc)
- (3) Identify our strengths
- (3) Provide incentives to attract economic development

Employment opportunities (31 total votes)

- (18) Need family supporting jobs; provide career opportunities for children; attract more permanent economic employers; balance with recreation
- (8) Improve pay scale without increasing population
- (5) Industry (above minimum wage--with training and education, scientific, hi-tech)--to keep young people here; new observatory in County with job potential

Future economic development criteria (25 total votes)

- (11) Compatible with lifestyle
- (8) Ensure that adequate services exist: water, sewer, emergency services, etc.
- (3) Well placed development - zoning
- (2) Compatible with adjacent land uses
- (1) Environmental impacts; pollution control - limited, rules, (studied)

Support/expand existing businesses (25 total votes)

- (10) Maintain air quality standard so industry can continue
- (5) Explore value added processing
- (4) Support local business; incentives to get people to shop local (local campaign); better service, convenience
- (3) Turn more dollars into community--associated industries
- (2) Retain current businesses
- (1) Attract support industries for existing businesses

Agriculture (24 total votes)

- (15) Address agricultural issues--mainstay of Millard County--continued support of agricultural promotion projects--maintain or increase? If increase--where do we get water?
- (5) Promote agricultural based industries to keep youth in town
- (4) Can't make a living at agricultural job

IPP (11 total votes)

- (5) Is there going to be a change in operation of IPP? Offices have been moved out of the County. Will there be a loss of jobs/tax base? IPP is being devalued.
- (3) More diversity is needed to maintain;
- (2) Maintain tax base that IPP initially invested in.
- (1) Plant employees 400 locals

Maintain/pursue economic diversity (9 total votes)

- (5) Encourage more technological advances (cell phones, digital services, etc)
- (5) Explore value added processing

- (2) Attract businesses that are self-supporting--avoid welfare
- (1) Hazardous waste issues
- (1) Need to decide in advance if we want to promote a retirement community

Appendix C

Citizen Plan Advisory Committee Meeting Summaries

Millard County Planning Project 1996-98

Meeting Agenda Summaries

May 3, 1996 Meeting with County Commissioners and GOPB

Discussion Items - Review County Documents, Project purpose and process

- Review County planning documents
- Discussion of project process and timeline

June 27, 1996 Meeting with County Commissioners (Delta)

Discussion Items - Project purpose and process

- Discussion of project process and timeline
- Tailor process to fit County needs
- Organize citizen Plan Advisory Committee

October 8, 1996 Plan Advisory Committee Orientation (Delta)

Discussion Items - Orientation and Process

- Discussion of project and process
- Roles and Responsibility of Plan Advisory Committee members

October 8, 1996 Public Scoping Meeting - (Delta)

Discussion Item - County Issues

- Discussion of project and process
- Identifying County resident issues, concerns, priorities and goals.

October 15, 1996 Plan Advisory Committee Orientation (Fillmore)

Discussion Items - Orientation and Process

- Discussion of project and process
- Roles and Responsibility of Plan Advisory Committee members

October 15, 1996 Public Scoping Meeting - (Fillmore)

Discussion Item - County Issues

- Discussion of project and process
- Identifying County resident issues, concerns, priorities and goals.

November 7, 1996 Plan Advisory Committee Worksession (Delta)

Discussion Items - Citizen Issues and Priorities, County Profile

- Process review - "Where do we go from here?"
- Review Public Scoping Meeting results
- Issue grouping, clarification and prioritization
- Task-group or plan advisory committee approach and prioritization
- GOPB presentation and committee discussion - *Millard County Economic/Demographic Profile*

December 5, 1996 Plan Advisory Committee Worksession (Fillmore)

Discussion Item - Public Lands

- Review "Public Lands" scoping issues
- County public lands profile and maps
- Consultant presentation and committee discussion - *The relationship between the County and public land management agencies.*

January 9, 1997 Plan Advisory Committee Worksession (Delta)

Discussion Item - Public Lands and Resources (continue)

- Clarifications or comments concerning federal and state public-land planning processes
- Public lands issue review and prioritization
preliminary issues include:
 - public lands access
 - multiple-use management, public land resource use and development
 - County and private property rights
 - County participation in public-land management decisions
 - public land recreation and tourism
 - wildlife management
- Discussion and development of County policy and action steps for each issue.

January 21, 1997 Meeting with County Commissioners and GOPB (Delta)

Discussion Items - Project purpose and process

- Review County contact list
- Discussion of project process and timeline

January 23, 1997 Plan Advisory Committee Worksession (Fillmore)

Discussion Item - Public Lands and Resources (continue)

- Clarifications or comments concerning federal and state public-land planning processes
- Review *draft* "public lands committee" writeup
- Review *draft* "multiple-use" writeup
- Public lands issue review and prioritization
preliminary issues include:
 - public lands access
 - County and private property rights
 - public land resource use and development
 - public land recreation and tourism
 - wildlife management
- Discussion and development of County policy and action steps for each issue.

February 6, 1997 Plan Advisory Committee Worksession (Delta)

Discussion Item - Public Lands and Resources (continue)

- Clarifications or comments concerning federal and state public-land planning processes
- Public lands issue review and prioritization
preliminary issues include:
 - public lands access
 - public land resource use and development
 - public land recreation and tourism

- wildlife management
- Discussion and development of County policy and action steps for each issue.

February 20, 1997 Plan Advisory Committee Worksession (Fillmore)

Discussion Item - Recreation and Tourism

- Committee Presentation and Discussion -
 - Brenda Wadsworth - *state tourism profile/Millard County comparison*
 - Glenn Swalberg - *Millard County Tourism Director*
 - Becky Thomas - *Fillmore City business owners (motel)*
- Issue review and prioritization
- Discussion and development of County policy and action steps for each issue.

March 6, 1997 Plan Advisory Committee Worksession (Delta)

Discussion Topic - Economic Development

- Committee Presentations and Discussion: County Economic Development Objectives and Action-steps Discussion; Current Programs, County Objectives, and Future Direction
- Presentations
 - Brenda Wadsworth - County economic profile
- Discussion - Review existing economic development objectives and discuss additional considerations.

April 7, 1997 Meeting with County Planning Commission (Delta)

Discussion Items - County General Plan

- Project Update
- Identification of land use issues

April 17, 1997 Plan Advisory Committee Worksession (Fillmore)

Discussion Item - Land Use

- Review Public Scoping Meeting land use issues
- Review existing land use policies
- Discuss issue grouping, clarification and prioritization
- County Profile (population trends and projections) - GOPB
- Develop *draft* County policies, objectives and action steps for residential, commercial and industrial land uses.

May 1, 1997 Plan Advisory Committee Worksession (Delta)

Discussion Item - Land Use

- Continue issue identification and prioritization
- Review “community design” summary
- Review *draft* County policies, objectives and action steps for residential, commercial and industrial land uses.
- Develop agricultural land use objectives

June 5, 1997 Plan Advisory Committee Worksession (Delta)

Discussion Item - Land Use

- Committee Review and Comment on *Draft* Land Use Policies and agricultural land use objectives
- Discussion
 - Agricultural land and “use” preservation strategies, Agricultural Protection Areas

- Open Space preservation - develop County criteria
- Sensitive Lands - Review existing County criteria, discuss additional considerations

July 8, 1997 Plan Advisory Committee Worksession (Fillmore)

Discussion Items - Public Lands Resources

- Review *draft* County policies, objectives and action steps developed at last public lands meeting (2/6/97):
 - County participation in public-land management decisions
 - Multiple-use management
 - Public land resource use and development
 - Wildlife management
 - Water Resources

August 12, 1997 Plan Advisory Committee Worksession (Delta)

Discussion Items - Public Lands Resources (continued)

- Review *draft* County policies, objectives and action steps revised at last meeting(July)
 - County participation in public-land management decisions
 - Multiple-use management
 - Public land resource use and development
 - Wildlife management
 - Water Resources
- Review *draft* County policies, objectives and action steps
 - Public land access
 - Land consolidation
 - Recreation and tourism

September 9, 1997 Plan Advisory Committee Worksession (Fillmore)

Discussion Items - Human and Community Services

- Review public scoping meeting issues and existing County policies
- Issue review and prioritization
- Discussion and development of County policy and action steps for each issue.

October 14, 1997 Plan Advisory Committee Worksession (Delta)

Discussion Items - Agricultural Land Policies

- Review *draft* County policies, objectives and action steps developed for agricultural lands
- Discuss *draft* County Plan public review and adoption process

January 5, 1998 County Planning Commission (Delta)

Discussion Items - Agricultural Land Policies

- Review *draft* County policies, objectives and action steps developed for agricultural lands
- Discuss *draft* County Plan public review and adoption process

April 6, 1998 County Planning Commission (Delta)

Discussion Items - Agricultural Land Policies

- Review *draft* County policies, objectives and action steps for public lands
- *Draft* County Plan briefing and planning commission worksession scheduling

April 21, 1998 County Planning Commission (Delta)

Discussion Items - *Draft Plan*

- *Draft County Plan* briefing and planning commission worksession scheduling

September 14, 1998 Planning Commission Public Hearing (Delta)

Meeting Agenda -

- Solicit public comments on the *Draft Plan*
- Discuss proposed revisions

October 5, 1998 Planning Commission Worksession (Delta)

Meeting Agenda -

- Discuss proposed revisions and prepare *draft* for County Commission review

November 23, 1998 County Commission Public Hearing (Fillmore)

Meeting Agenda -

- Solicit public comments on the *Draft Plan*
- Discuss proposed revisions and prepare *draft* for formal adoption and final printing

Appendix D

General Plan Adoption and Amendment Process

State Code Plan Adoption and Amendment Process

17-27-303

- (1) (a) After completing a proposed general plan for all or part of the area within the county, the planning commission shall schedule and hold a public hearing on the proposed plan.
(b) The planning commission shall provide reasonable notice of the public hearing at least 14 days before the date of the hearing.
(c) After the public hearing, the planning commission may make changes to the proposed general plan.
- (2) The planning commission shall then forward the proposed plan to the legislative body.
- (3) (a) The legislative body shall hold a public hearing on the proposed general plan recommended to it by the planning commission.
(b) The legislative body shall provide reasonable notice of the public hearing at least 14 days before the date of the hearing.
- (4) After the public hearing, the legislative body may make any modifications to the proposed general plan that it considers appropriate.
- (5) The legislative body may:
 - (a) adopt the proposed general plan without amendment;
 - (b) amend the proposed general plan and adopt or reject it as amended; or
 - (c) reject the proposed general plan.
- (6) (a) The general plan is an advisory guide for land use decisions.
(b) The legislative body may adopt an ordinance mandating compliance with the general plan.

Appendix E

Federal Planning Processes

The Role of Local Government in Federal and State Lands Planning

The United States Constitution has delegated and the United States Congress bestowed considerable power and authority to local governments relevant to Federal and State land management and decision-making processes. Federal acts relevant to the County include:

- The Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA)
- The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)
- The National Forest Management Act (NFMA)
- The Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (WSRA)

Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA)

Under FLPMA, Federal land management agencies are required to acknowledge local plans and participation. Title 43, U.S.C.A. §1712(c)(9) states:

“[The Secretary of Agriculture shall] to the extent consistent with the laws governing the administration of the public lands, coordinate the land use inventory, planning, and management activities of or for such lands with the land use planning and management programs of other Federal departments and agencies and of the States and local governments within which the lands are located.... In implementing this directive, the Secretary shall, to the extent he finds practical, keep apprised of State, local and tribal land use plans; assure that consideration is given to those State, local and tribal plans that are germane to the development of land use plans for public lands, assist in resolving to the extent practical, inconsistencies between Federal and non-Federal Government plans, and shall provide for meaningful public involvement of State and local government officials...in the development of land use programs, land use regulations, and land use decisions for public lands.... Land use plans of the Secretary under this section shall be consistent with the State and local plans to the maximum extent he finds consistent with Federal law and the purposes of this Act.”

National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)

The Supreme Court has described the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) as having two major objectives. The first purpose is to place “upon an agency the obligation to consider every significant aspect of the environmental impact of a proposed action.” The second aim is to ensure “that the agency will inform the public that it has considered environmental concerns in its decision making process.” In respect to land use planning, agency-prepared NEPA documents must identify and discuss “possible conflicts between the proposed action and the objectives of Federal, regional, State and local plans, policies and controls for the area concerned.” 40 CFR 1502.16(c). This discussion shall include “any inconsistencies between the proposed action and any approved State or local plans or laws.... Where inconsistencies exist, documents should describe the extent to which the agency will reconcile its proposed action with the plan or law.” 40 CFR 1506.2(d). The Act also directs agencies to “cooperate to the fullest extent possible” with State and local agencies to reduce duplication between NEPA and State and local requirements. This “cooperation” includes: joint planning processes, joint environmental research/studies, joint public hearings, and joint environmental assessments. 40 CFR 1506.2(b)(1-4).

National Forest Management Act (NFMA)

Principal provisions of the National Forest Management Act (NFMA) include implementing “multiple-use and sustained yield” management practices, long-term (50 year) renewable resource programs, land and resource management plans for forest units (every 15 years) and forest management practices “in accordance with” plans 16 U.S.C.A. §1061(d)(1); “plans and permits, contracts and other instruments for the use and occupancy of National Forest System lands consistent with land management plans.” 16 U.S.C.A. §1604(l). In respect to local governments, Forest Service plans shall be “coordinated with the land and resource planning processes of State and local governments...” 16 U.S.C.A. §1604(a)

Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (WSRA)

Federal regulatory agencies are also obligated by the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (WSRA) to consider historic, cultural or other similar values when completing “wild and scenic” river plans. These issues include existing rights, grazing leases and permits. Federal agencies must also formally recognize local planning efforts to protect river corridor resources and consult with local governments during wild and scenic river plan development processes.

Overview - Millard County Relevant Federal and State Land Management Agencies

Bureau of Land Management (BLM)

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) manages Federal lands and resources under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA). Resource Management Plans (RMPs) are the primary mechanism for implementing the “multiple-use/sustainable yield” stipulation and other guidelines outlined in FLPMA. Consistent with Federal laws and regulations, RMPs establish the management direction for designated planning areas and are kept in place as long as they remain pertinent to the issues of that area. RMPs also contain the standards and criteria used to govern subsequent decisions.

FLPMA requires the BLM to coordinate its land use plans with local (County) plans and take all practical measures to resolve inconsistencies between documents. BLM plans must be consistent with local plans to the extent that the latter does not contradict Federal laws and regulations. Prior to final RMP approval, the BLM is also required to submit a list of known inconsistencies to the Governor for review and comment. The BLM is exempt from these requirements if the local government fails to notify the agency of an adopted plan and subsequent revisions.

United States Forest Service (USFS)

Unlike the BLM, the Forest Service does not have a local plan “consistency” requirement. However, Forest Service regulations do call for “coordination”. This has been interpreted to include: participating in local planning efforts, developing and evaluating Forest Management Plan alternatives in light of potential conflicts with local plans, briefing local leaders prior to selecting the preferred alternative, displaying local plan reviews as part of agency Environmental Impact Statements (EIS) and monitoring how Forest Service actions affect nearby communities.

United States Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS)

The United States Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) is required to give a 90 day notice to local governments of any intent to list additional species or identify additional critical habitat. Proposed listings must be based on the best scientific and commercial data available. Species and habitat recovery plans must take into account county efforts to protect the identified species and assure that the proposed recovery plans will provide conservation of the species. The FWS must also take into account economic impacts to the area before making critical habitat designations (areas may be excluded unless failure to designate would result in extinction of a species). Local governments are given the opportunity to formally comment on all listings or habitat designations.

Appendix F

Millard County Profile Table of Contents

Millard County Profile

As part of the County's 1998 General Plan update, a County profile was prepared as a companion document for the General Plan. The profile contains information, data and maps covering County demographics, economics, land use, and public facilities and services. If consistently updated, this document will remain a valuable resource for Millard County officials, residents and individuals interested in general Millard County information. A copy of this document may be reviewed at the County's planning office.

Materials in the 1998 *Millard County Profile* include:

- Infrastructure and Human/Community Services Inventories,
- Economic and Demographic Profiles, and
- Maps and Overlays