



# Executive Summary

**CAMP<sup>W</sup> & WILLIAMS**  
JOINT LAND USE STUDY  
**IMPLEMENTATION**



# *Camp WG Williams Joint Land Use Implementation Project*

## *Executive Summary*

### Project Overview

---

#### JLUS Implementation

A JLUS is a comprehensive planning process which identifies a variety of “tools” that can be used to mitigate or avoid compatibility concerns between military operations and their host communities. A JLUS attempts to find common ground that will allow communities and their military facilities to thrive. A JLUS Implementation program further engages stakeholders in a collaborative effort to refine, adopt and actually use these tools. While a JLUS is a critically important first step, absent implementation, a JLUS alone will not lead to enhanced coordination, communication, plan, policy or regulatory alignment. The power of a JLUS is latent. It takes implementation to make it manifest.

The Camp Williams JLUS Implementation effort grew out of the Camp Williams JLUS. Leadership and citizens living and working near Camp Williams understand and appreciate the Camp’s military, economic and community contributions. Camp Williams’ officials understand and respect the rights that local communities have to achieve their particular aspirations. Both worked very hard over more than a year to develop and adopt the Camp Williams JLUS. That JLUS was completed in October of 2012.

But leadership also understood that extra effort would be necessary to make sure that the JLUS would not become just another excellent plan sitting on a bookshelf. For this reason, they went the extra step and agreed to undertake the implementation program.

#### Sponsors and Participants

As with the JLUS, Eagle Mountain City agreed to be the project sponsor and in October 2013, retained Matrix Design Group to carry out the Implementation program. While Eagle Mountain had overall responsibility for managing the OEA grant used to fund the effort, several other local communities also participated in the program and have made substantial contributions to both the process and the outcome. These communities are listed below. A list of the project committee members is included in the appendix.

- Camp W.G. Williams
- Eagle Mountain City
- Herriman City
- Lehi City
- Saratoga Springs City
- Salt Lake County
- Utah County

Representatives from Camp Williams and all of the above communities volunteered many hours towards the program’s success, providing important insights, guidance, services and other contributions. They reviewed draft work products, staffed community engagement events and supported the inaugural Camp Williams “Iron Will” event. In addition, they acted as critical liaisons to citizens, interest groups and others in their respective communities.

## Work Program and Products

### *Overview*

By its nature, a JLUS Implementation project is more complex than a JLUS, primarily due to the fact that each participating community (municipality or County) has its own unique history, culture, economic base, demographics, geography and other characteristics. Some communities are undeveloped or primarily rural, while others might be almost fully “built out.” In addition, each impacts and/or is impacted by, Camp William’s military operations in unique ways. In some communities, aviation safety is the primary concern, while in others it may be noise and vibration. In some cases, land uses are a major concern and in some instances, all of the compatibility factors may be more or less equally relevant.

In addition, each community has developed and attempts to implement its own unique plans in order to achieve community objectives in housing, economic development, land use, environmental protection, infrastructure, public safety, recreation, public services, transportation and other areas fundamental to promoting orderly development. Although grounded in state and federal law, how each community chooses to pursue these ends varies considerably. For instance, some communities may choose to rely primarily on master planned community design and related “development agreements” to accomplish community objectives. Others may take a more conventional approach to zoning and other land use regulations. Some might be very specific in providing detailed policy guidance in all relevant areas, while others might focus on a few topics, while still others might prefer to provide only very general policy guidance in all subject areas. Some might choose to be very aggressive in pursuing and funding transportation and other infrastructure improvements to guide development, while others might seek out partnerships with State or other cohorts in siting or expanding major public facilities. Rural counties with limited resources might choose to limit growth conflicts by guiding development to areas where appropriate infrastructure, paved roads and utilities already exist.

The Camp Williams implementation program was based on these and other fundamental realities. As a result, rather than seeking to implement a “one size fits all” approach, project participants worked hard to understand the unique nature of each community, and to design and implement compatibility tools that would be both relevant and feasible. However, while the means might vary, the intent and the aggregate affect is to create and implement a set of tools that accomplish common objectives in a relatively consistent and most of all, effective way across the affected area. That said, the process is also, well, a process. No one community will immediately and completely adopt every possible “tool.” It’s more likely that success will be incremental and additive. Success will require a long term commitment to an on-going collaboration. The good news is that an objective assessment of program results accomplished so far, supports an optimistic outlook for both Camp Williams and its neighboring communities.

This section provides an overview of the process used to develop these successful outcomes, including several implementation actions that have already been accomplished, due to the initiative and leadership of participating communities.

### *Program Management*

In order to expedite program initiation and to provide continuity, the same basic structure was used as for the JLUS, i.e. a Policy Committee and a Technical Committee, but in the streamlined form of a combined “Task Force.” In practice, the Policy Committee evolved to serve both functions effectively, in that “PC” membership included senior administrators responsible for land use planning and regulation, city

management and other critical implementation areas. In addition, much of the technical groundwork had already been accomplished during the JLUS project (e.g. as relates to noise impacts, over flight locations, data assembly, etc.).

Throughout the project, the Task Force met to provide program guidance, to determine the approach to work products and major program events, to review and discuss draft deliverables and to otherwise assist the consultants and each other. These meetings included the following.

#### Project Kick Off – Committee Meeting #1

On December 10, 2013, committee members met with the consultant to review and refine the project work program and initial schedule, to identify any information gaps, refine the draft public engagement program and in general, initiate the process. The JLUS project was reviewed, including the implementation strategies adopted during that project, which would establish the foundation for the JLUS Implementation program. Project consultants were able to get a “head start” on evaluating the Eagle Mountain and Saratoga Springs general plans and other relevant matters, by meeting individually with City staff prior to and after the main committee meeting. During the main meeting, all committee members also provided updates on the status of planning and other initiatives in their communities.

It was agreed that the next major effort would be to undertake a very detailed and comprehensive analysis of each communities general plan policies and recommendations, as well as each communities zoning and other land use regulations. Findings and initial recommendations would be reviewed at the next committee meeting and would establish the basis for the first community meetings.

#### Committee Meeting #2

On May 16, 2014, the second committee meeting was held with substantial progress being made. The results of the comprehensive evaluation of community general plans and land use regulations was presented and discussed. In addition, an initial template or outline for the approach to the MCAOD was provided and discussed. The initial findings and conclusions with regard to the feasibility of a regional agricultural protection overlay (as to promoting compatibility in relevant locations) were presented and it was concluded that for various reasons, feasibility was limited at best. Finally, the status of additional work products was discussed and a schedule and approach to “next steps” was agreed upon.

The following day, community meeting #1 was held in the form of informational booths at the inaugural Camp Williams “Iron Will” event. Details of this exciting, innovative and very successful event are provided below.

#### Committee Meeting #3

On September 9, 2014, the third committee meeting was held in conjunction with the first two community meetings (held on September 8 in Herriman and September 9 in Saratoga Springs). The focus of the September 9 committee meeting was to review the prior night’s community meeting and to prepare for the second community meeting. Committee members also provided an update on the status of implementation efforts and other events in their communities.

#### Committee Meeting #4

On February 5, 2015, committee members met to review the results of the public meeting held on the prior evening, as well as to prepare for the meeting to be held that evening. In addition, the members were provided with hard copy “binders” containing a comprehensive assemblage of project work products (Final Draft).

Each community will be responsible to present the final Implementation Report to its governing body for review and endorsement. Subsequent to that action, each community will be expected to remain engaged in positive efforts to implement the final report's recommendations.

### *Public and Stakeholder Engagement*

#### Outreach Plan

A critical project component was the public and stakeholder engagement strategy. The strategy was discussed, refined and agreed upon at the kick off meeting. For the Williams JLUS Implementation project, this strategy consisted of the following components. Related work products are provided in the Report appendix. In addition, the main community events are described below.

#### Project Task Force

This management group and its activities are described above. A copy of the membership list is provided in the Report appendix.

#### Project Branding

In order to leverage the effort and brand identity established during the JLUS, the same basic branding was carried over to the Implementation project. All public documents, flyers, fact sheets, notices, displays and other materials, as well as the project website, incorporate this project branding. This branding was also deployed as part of the "Iron Will" event, in terms of banners, a "Friends of Camp Williams" fact sheet and free handouts (book marks).

#### Project Website

Also, in order to promote continuity and a smooth and easy transition from JLUS to Implementation, the same domain name was used for the project website, with content being edited and supplemented as necessary throughout the project. Links to the project website are provided on the web pages of participating communities and this website domain will be handed over to the client upon completion of the project, with the hope that it will be maintained with updated information, news of events and additional "success stories," and other appropriate information. The dedicated page can also serve as a portal for access by more permanent "implementation task force" members, an idea that has been discussed by current task force members.

#### Community Organization Engagement

Through the task force as well as through direct engagement, project principals have been able to discuss how the project and its objectives relate to the specific needs or interests of important groups such as master planned community developers, real estate brokers and others. These efforts have had a direct impact on the form and approach to implementing certain tools, such as disclosures suggested for approved development plats.

### Media Outreach

Notifications for community meetings were provided to all local media and while coverage has been fairly light overall, it has been positive. In particular, the community meetings held in September 2014 were covered by local print media, and participating public officials have discussed the project, its status and its relevance in various public forums covered by local media, including with respect to the successful adoption of various implementation tools (e.g. general plan amendments, “dark sky” lighting ordinances, etc.).

### Public Meetings

Public meetings are obviously a fundamental component of any outreach strategy, however, it can be difficult to motivate citizens to attend and participate in “conventional” night meetings, with long presentations and formal public input protocols. Therefore, project leadership attempted, with some success, to leverage other more creative public meeting formats, including collaborating with Camp Williams and their successful “Iron Will” event. The following briefly describes the public meetings required and held for the Implementation project. Materials relating to these are provided in the Report appendix.

- **Camp Williams Iron Will Event – May 17, 2014**

Camp Williams' officials disclosed early in the project that they were planning a significant community event for May of 2014 at the Camp and that it would be a good opportunity to educate citizens about the Implementation project, as well as to receive public input. Committee members wholeheartedly embraced the idea. Several communities volunteered to produce and staff their own booths at the event, while the consultant produced and staffed a “Friends of Camp Williams” booth dedicated specifically to the Implementation project.

The result was a tremendous success for both Camp Williams and the project, as several hundred people came to Camp Williams to participate in endurance events, or just to have fun and enjoy the day with friends and family. Dozens of people visited the project booth, asking questions, learning about the project and leaving with free “branded” fact sheets and book marks. The event website is still online at [www.ironwillrace.com](http://www.ironwillrace.com). The event’s Facebook page has over 800 “likes” and climbing.

- **Community Meeting #1 – September 8 and 9, 2014**

The first community meeting was actually two meetings on consecutive nights, held in two different communities in order to provide better access for different citizens. The first was held in Herriman on the night of September 8. Although advertised widely and with sufficient advance notice, the event was sparsely attended. The second event was held in Saratoga Springs on the evening of September 9 and was much better attended, including local print media coverage.

At each event, participating communities manned booths with project information relating specifically to their communities, such as brochures, general plan recommendations and related displays, as well as more general information such as the draft Military Compatibility Area Overlay District regulation (MCAOD). In addition, Camp Williams provided and also staffed its own informational booth containing displays and information about its military operations.

Patrons were able to visit the booths of their interest and speak in a casual, informal way with friendly staff who could answer questions about specific properties and the project’s relevance to those properties. Those who needed or wanted more detailed information were directed to the website or to the community task force members for additional consultation.

- Community Meeting #2 – February 4 and 5, 2015

The second set of community meetings were held in Herriman and in Saratoga Springs, to present the final committee recommendations and to receive public input regarding these documents. The format was more formal than the earlier “open houses” held in September, allowing the project consultants with an opportunity to provide a thorough description of all work products, as well as a more structured approach to final public input.

## Early Accomplishments

---

Area communities are already embracing and carrying out implementation strategies that will not only help Camp Williams, but will promote important community objectives as well. Some of these are briefly described below, understanding that these are “moving targets” and in that this report has a production date, it is not possible to capture each and every specific effort that might be in progress. Therefore, the items below should not be considered all inclusive and questions about what may or may not be in process in a given community should be directed to that community’s senior management.

### “Dark Sky” Lighting Ordinances

Early on Eagle Mountain, Saratoga Springs and Lehi showed interest in the benefits of adopting some form of outdoor lighting controls, both to reduce impacts on Camp Williams (as to night training), but also to promote community character, to save money and to otherwise enjoy the benefits of “common sense” outdoor lighting controls. Eagle Mountain adopted a new ordinance in November of 2014.

### General Plan Amendments

As a general rule, these Plans are not revised frequently and in fact, updates are typically reserved for some time increment, such as every five years or often more. Given that the project involves six different communities, each with its own general plan update timeframe, it’s impractical to believe that every community will be able to adjust operations (and staffing/funding) to accomplish plan updates related exclusively to the JLUS Implementation project.

However, the opposite is also true and by good fortune, the timing of various community Plan updates coincided more or less with the JLUS Implementation project. As a result, certain communities have already adopted supportive Plan edits and others are actively considering them. These include Utah County and Eagle Mountain.

### Herriman/Camp Williams Buffer (ACUB)

Early analysis of community general plans identified common interests between Salt Lake County, Herriman City and Camp Williams, specifically the desire to preserve specific areas northwest of the Camp for public recreational purposes (Yellow Fork Canyon). As a result of subsequent collaboration, Camp Williams and Herriman are jointly pursuing efforts that will hopefully lead to the Camp’s eligibility for DoD funding programs intended to preserve natural buffer areas. If successful, this effort can lead to similar initiatives in other appropriate locations adjacent to Camp Williams, where such efforts are also consistent with community objectives.

### Potential Master Plan Community (MPC) Plan Adjustments

Part good fortune and part design, anticipated changes in the alignment of future regional transportation corridors southeast of Camp Williams may allow for a cooperative reallocation and relocation of planned commercial uses farther away from the Camp, thus providing greater safety and reducing potential



compatibility conflicts (land use, possibly residential density, noise and vibration impacts, etc.). This example points out the benefits of considering the JLUS and the JLUS Implementation plans as a standard part of the project design and entitlement process.

### APO Analysis

This analysis is described in detail below, but is listed here in that it has, or can, serve as a “complimentary” tool for perhaps selected compatibility efforts.

## Document Organization

---

Various alternatives were considered for “packaging” project materials and ultimately it was determined that documents intended for wide application, such as the MCAOD and the Agricultural Protection Overlay Analysis (APO) should be distinguished from those relating to a specific community. In addition, materials relating to public and other meetings were assembled into the report appendix. Finally, all project materials are located and can be accessed via the project website.

This final report includes the following sections and corresponding work products:

### Military Compatibility Area Overlay District (MCAOD)

This is the most basic and fundamental implementation component. The intent was to create one comprehensive resource that participating communities could use as a common reference for their individual implementation efforts. It contains provisions to address all of the military compatibility areas (MCAs), including Aviation Safety, Land Use (both LU-A and LU-B), Light and Glare, and Noise and Vibration. It also includes standard zoning provisions to address issues like procedures and requirements for variances and conditional use permits, treatment of lawful nonconforming uses, exemptions, compliance review procedures and other administrative matters.

Certain unique provisions affecting lands that could be included in an MCA overlay zone include items such as disclosure requirements and “higher” standards for notification and comment, specifically concerning projects that might have a negative impact on Camp William’s operations.

Although the ideal would be for all participating communities to immediately adopt every part of the MCAOD “template,” the more practical and likely outcome is that each community will review it and use it as a basis to design its own unique approach to particular implementation topics. In fact, as noted above, this has already occurred in regards to recent adoption of “Dark Sky” ordinances by certain local communities.

### Agricultural Preservation Overlay Feasibility Analysis (“APO”)

This very comprehensive analysis led to early conclusions that a region-wide approach to farmland preservation was probably not feasible. However, it did point out a number of issues and perhaps opportunities for those communities, organizations and persons who might be interested in pursuing this worthwhile topic in a more “surgical” manner. Some are already doing this, for example as in the case of Utah County and its recent general plan updates. Sadly, however, there is often a significant disconnect between the generally supportive (but vague) intentions embodied in community general plans (as to farmland and agri-business support) and the corresponding zoning and land use mapping and regulations which, almost without exception, strongly promote the conversion of farmland to other land uses, particularly in locations proximal to existing or planned regional transportation routes.

As the scope of the JLUS Implementation project was limited, the scope of the APO analysis also had to be limited to those areas impacted by one or more of the MCAs. This limitation did not allow for a more comprehensive assessment of the issue within the participating communities, but given the amount of farmland and agri-business remaining, a broader analysis might be worthwhile. However, the analysis was able to identify substantial impediments, including the relevant State law itself. Unfortunately, absent a very basic and significant change in policy (and law), the long-term future for farmland and agri-business in the subject area does not seem bright.

### Community Sections

Each of the six participating communities has been provided with its own section in this report. Included in each is the following:

- A summary of analysis of the communities general plan and land use regulations
- The consultant's recommendations for revisions to the respective communities general plan (intended to promote compatibility)
- A map showing the location of the military compatibility areas as relates to that communities current zoning map designations
- A copy of the informational brochure designed for that specific community in terms of how the JLUS Implementation project, its objectives and its strategies relate to that particular community.

### Report Appendix

The appendix contains three sections, each containing materials relating to the topic:

- Task Force Meetings
- Community Meetings
- Iron Will Event