

UTAH LEAGUE OF CITIES & TOWNS
BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING
UTAH LOCAL GOVERNMENTS TRUST, 55 US-89, NORTH SALT LAKE, UT 84054
MONDAY, OCTOBER 15, 2018 @ 9:00 AM
(TIMES ARE APPROXIMATE)

****BREAKFAST AT 8:45 AM****

- 1. Welcome and Introductions – Mayor Jon Pike, ULCT President** **9:00 AM**
ACTION: For information only
HANDOUTS: [April Board Retreat Summary](#)
- 2. Board Member Expectations – Cameron Diehl, Executive Director** **9:10 AM**
ACTION: For discussion
HANDOUTS: None
- 3. Review & Approval of Minutes – Mayor Jon Pike, ULCT President** **9:20 AM**
ACTION: Review & Approval of Minutes
HANDOUT: [August 20, 2018 Minutes](#)
- 4. Conflict of Interest Disclosure – Mayor Jon Pike, ULCT President** **9:25 AM**
ACTION: Disclosure of any potential conflict of interest with agenda items
HANDOUT: [2018-2019 Conflict of Interest Form](#)
- 5. ULCT Board & Commission Reports – Mayor Jon Pike, ULCT President** **9:30 AM**
ACTION: Receive reports from ULCT representatives to Boards & Commissions
HANDOUT: None
- 6. ULCT Board & Commission Appointments – Cameron Diehl, Executive Director** **9:35 AM**
ACTION: Review and Approval of Board and Commission Appointments
HANDOUT: [Board Appointments Memo](#)
- 7. ULCT Board of Directors Vacancy – Mayor Caldwell, ULCT 2nd Vice President** **9:40 AM**
ACTION: Appointment of ULCT Board Member
HANDOUT: [Memo on Appointment of ULCT Board Member](#)
- 8. ULCT Personnel – Cameron Diehl, Executive Director** **9:45 AM**
ACTION: Authorization of staff position adjustment
HANDOUT: [Job Description – Director of Policy](#)
- 9. Review & Approval of Check Register – Nick Jarvis, Chief Operating Officer** **9:50 AM**
ACTION: Review & Approval of September Check Register
HANDOUTS: [September 2018 Check Register](#)
- 10. FY 2018 Year-End Financial Report – Nick Jarvis, Chief Operating Officer** **9:55 AM**
ACTION: Review & Approval of FY 2018 Year-End Financial Report
HANDOUT: [FY 2018 Year-End Financial Report](#)

- 11. Public Opinion & Messaging Survey – Y2 Analytics** **10:05 AM**
ACTION: For information only
HANDOUT: [Housing Gap 2018: Public Opinion & Messaging Survey Topline Report](#)
- 12. ULCT Rebooting Local Control – Penna Powers** **10:50 AM**
ACTION: For information only
HANDOUT: None
- 13. Ballot Propositions Update – Cameron Diehl, Executive Director** **11:35 AM**
ACTION: For information only
HANDOUT: None
- 14. Closed Session (if needed) As per Utah Code 52-4-205** **11:45 AM**
ACTION: Vote required to enter closed session (as per Utah Code 52-4-204)
HANDOUT: None
- 15. Other Business**
ACTION: For Information Only
HANDOUT: None
- 16. Adjourn**



TO: ULCT Board of Directors
FROM: Cameron Diehl, Executive Director
DATE: June 7, 2018
SUBJECT: Takeaways from April board retreat in St. George

The Board of Directors requested that ULCT staff outline the key takeaways from the board retreat. On behalf of ULCT staff, we appreciate the vocal statements of support for the direction and progress of the organization during the past eighteen months. This memo outlines the key topics that the board discussed of legislative advocacy, communication (including the re-brand of local control and Making Life Better), training, and board duties.

I) Legislative advocacy

A) What is the value that ULCT provides to membership?

- ULCT gravitas provides a broader voice than each individual city and access to a broader audience (power in numbers)
- Guiding principles—referenced in the 2017-2018 prism and through policy resolutions—for how to approach legislation
- Opportunity to bring an issue to other cities to get buy-in (so long as it is consistent with the principles)
- Formulate policy ideas, strategy, and communication based on analysis (decisions will be made on anecdotes or analysis, so we must provide analysis)

B) What members provide to ULCT

- Data, insight, and potential consequences of proposed legislation
- #Leaguearmy personal engagement across the state with legislators through relationships of trust and accountability
- Recognition that the success of one city is the success of all cities; willingness to stand together

C) Next steps for ULCT

- Re-package local control and Making Life Better (see below)
- Integrate more cities into legislative decision-making process
- Strive for equity and balance between cities of different sizes and recognize the return on investment of cities within the organization
- Embrace the prism of principles and stand firm regardless of consequences (with the caveat that at times we must consider political realities)

MAKING LIFE BETTER



- Provide policy information and talking points to local officials so that they can advocate with legislators and the general public
- Give assignments to local leaders to do outreach and hold legislators accountable for their votes (i.e. unofficial report card, thank you letters, priority votes)
- Bring the membership together on big topics, similar to HB 362 in 2015, that facilitates group effort and group success; proactive strategy
- Emphasize legislative research (staff and deliverables); do not ramp it down in order to ramp up non-legislative research

II) Communication and Local Control

A) General

- Our target audience should be our membership and state policy makers, both in advocacy communication and training communication (rapid response as well)
- Defer to our membership to distribute the aforementioned messages to the general public
- Support cities who implement policy effectively and solve problems (best practices)
- Articulate that cities are standing up for their residents and help that message resonate with residents
- Tell the story of what local government does, how we do it, and how it impacts quality of life
- Appreciation for the expanded communication tools—Friday Facts, Director’s Message, social media, Wednesday Webchat, local media outreach—and would support more videos about legislative issues, advocacy, and training

B) Next steps

- More likes/shares of ULCT content on social media
- Polish messages to be direct and short
- Explain the “why” of the battle
- Provide tools for cities to inform their residents that city leaders are standing up for them to the legislature and not the other way around, and for cities to educate their residents about trends (i.e. population growth, need for city projects)
- Build a year round approach to communication about legislation and local authority
- Help cities navigate when their legislators or residents are antagonistic toward them
- Have coordinated response against social media attacks from opponents

C) Local control/Making Life Better re-boot, why

- Not a bumper sticker; need to define it (see prism from the 2018 legislative session)
- Making Life Better has run its course and is not tied to local control
- Re-boot the message about local control because the word “control” is often used against us; ULCT “controls” our membership and cities “control” their residents
- Local control message needs to get to the resident’s doorstep; we protect them, not our turf
- Legislators do not have knowledge of how to operate a city but we do

MAKING LIFE BETTER

D) Local control re-boot, how and potential themes

- Community driven local decision making
- Grass roots decisions
- Promote, not protect, local decision making
- Resident self-determination
- With great power comes great responsibility
- Think regional, act local
- Avoid one size fits all; even if state claims that they are pursuing “efficiency” across boundaries
- City best positioned to balance individual rights with community interests
- Public has more of a voice at City Hall: two council meetings per month v. 1 minute in committee hearing during the session
- Front line for the future (potential 2018 Annual Convention theme)
- Addition, post-Executive Directors retreat from August:
 - Florida: “Let Cities Work” and “We Live Local”
 - Massachusetts: “home town decision making” and “local democracy”
 - Michigan: “Better Communities, Better Michigan”; “you love where you live”
 - Alabama: “Live Locally Alabama”
 - North Carolina: “Here we grow” and “We are one North Carolina”
 - Kentucky: “Where opportunity begins and Kentucky thrives”

III) Training

A) Mission

- Articulate what we train on, what we don’t train on, and what the add on trainings are
 - Generalized trainings = expectation from dues
 - Specialized trainings = fee
 - We do not re-write codes but we can highlight priorities
- Focus on our areas of staff expertise
 - Expand staff bandwidth (FTEs, retired experts, etc.)
- Build an organized library of resources (website)
- Recruit “Fire fighters:” city experts who help fellow cities comply with the law or solve problems
- Incorporate affiliate organizations (i.e. UCMA), state entities (Archives on GRAMA, Auditor/Treasurer on finance, etc.), and other allies for training
- Partner with universities, foundations, etc. to bolster research arm
 - Update existing ULCT research (Making Sense of Dollars, Benchmarking database)

B) Conferences

- Beginner/intermediate/advanced tracks
- Train on communication strategies with public, sensitivity, social media, open houses, etc.
- Create a scholarship option



- Provide lobbying 101 training annually to local officials; ensure they know their voices are crucial
- Emphasize building relationships with legislators, utilize the policy prism, and develop talking points on key issues

C) Regional trainings

- Outreach throughout the year between city leaders and legislators on key topics (organize by Senate district?)
- Utilize technology to facilitate events (similar to Elected Officials Essentials and LUAU through USU)

IV) **Articulate expectations for future members of the board of directors:**

- Governing board with fiduciary and policymaking responsibilities
- LPC participation, either in person or remotely
- Subgroup (issue specific, caucuses, rapid response, amicus briefs, convention, etc.) leadership and participation
- Regular outreach and report back to ULCT membership (within your geographic region, regardless of whether you represent a geographic region, size of city/town, or are at large)
- Regular outreach and advocacy to legislators on behalf ULCT policy priorities

MAKING LIFE BETTER

MINUTES OF THE UTAH LEAGUE OF CITIES & TOWNS
BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING
Utah Local Governments Trust, 55 US-89
North Salt Lake, UT 84054
Monday, August 20, 2018
10:00 AM

CONDUCTING: ULCT Board of Directors President, Beth Holbrook, Bountiful

EXECUTIVE BOARD PRESENT

Council Member Beth Holbrook, President, Bountiful
Mayor Jon Pike, 1st Vice President, St. George
Mayor Steve Hiatt, Immediate Past President, Kaysville

BOARD OF DIRECTORS PRESENT

Mike Caldwell, Ogden
Don Christensen, West Valley City
Bob Stevensen (Electronic)
Andy Beerman, Park City
Richard Barnett, Richfield
Mike Mendenhall, Spanish Fork
Kent North Logan
Dean Baker, Naples
Damon Cann, North Ogden

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS PRESENT

Leigh Ann Warnock, UMCA Past President

ULCT STAFF PRESENT

Cameron Diehl, Executive Director
Nick Jarvis, Chief Operating Officer
Susan Wood, Director of Communications and Training

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

ULCT President, Beth Holbrook, called the meeting to order and welcomed all to the meeting.

REVIEW & APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Board reviewed the minutes of the June 18, 2018 ULCT Board of Directors meeting.

Mike Caldwell moved the approve the minutes of the June 18, 2018 ULCT Board of Directors meeting. The motion was seconded by Jon Pike. The vote was unanimous. The motion carried.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST DISCLOSURE

No disclosure of potential conflict of interest was presented.

ULCT BOARD & COMMISSION REPORTS & ULCT BOARD UPDATE

Mayor Pike reported the Committee for Joint Highways met while in St. George but he was unable to attend due to all the other meetings. Cameron stated it is a committee that has lost its value and needs to be reformed or ended. Others on the committee feel it needs enhancement. UDOT has expressed the opinion it should be changed or ended. The League is working on a better way to have communication with UDOT.

ULCT BOARD & COMMISSION APPOINTMENTS

Much interest has been shown for the Private Activities Board; there are ten applicants so far.

Motor Vehicle Franchise Advisory Board – Cameron will confirm with the Board whether they want him to officially represent the League as invited.

REVIEW & APPROVAL OF CHECK REGISTERS

Nick Jarvis reviewed the June End-of-Fiscal-Year reports. Another late fee was accrued in July. He is working with Kari Nakamura to figure out what is going on there as they thought it was set up for auto payments.

Andy Beerman moved to approve the check registers as presented. The motion was seconded by Mike Mendenhall. The vote was unanimous. The motion carried.

Cam reported the Board would not see a check for Y2 Analytics at this point. It will show up as a \$20,000 expenditure as part of communication strategy.

DECLARATION OF SURPLUS EQUIPMENT

Nick reported declaring surplus is a first now that they are operating correctly. New computers were purchased for some of the staff and they expressed an interest in buying their old computers for personal use. IT completed an independent assessment. If the Declaration of Surplus Equipment is not approved, the computers will be wiped and donated.

Damon Cann moved to further review the value of the computers for possible future approval. The motion was seconded by Any Beerman. The vote was unanimous. The motion carried.

ULCT INDEPENDENT CONTRACTORS

Several individuals who contract with the League (i.e. Kari Nakamura, Dave Church, and Roger Tew) make sure provide a Conflict of Interest Disclosure ensuring transparency with the Board. For example, Roger has a few clients who are sponsors of the League.

ULCT CONSTITUTION & BYLAWS

A change was made to the ULCT Bylaws to add the phrase, “or the immediate past president of the board” to the Nominations Committee section. The change clarifies that as long as an individual is a board member, they may be there.

Mike Caldwell moved to approve the addition of language to the ULCT Bylaws. The motion was seconded by Damon Cann. The vote was unanimous. The motion carried.

UPDATE ON STATE LEGISLATIVE ITEMS & INITIATIVES

Cameron wished to publicly applaud Mark Stratford and Shawn Guzman who represent the League on these issues.

Water Constitutional Amendment: A small group is proposing major potential policy changes that would attack underlying authority. Legislative focus is on Salt Lake City and providing water outside the City, but it would have long-ranging impacts on cities across the state.

Proposed constitutional amendment: currently cities are not authorized to sell water works or water rights; however, they can supply water outside boundaries. This is a discrepancy. The Constitution should be clarified to say that cities are still forbidden to sell water or rights outside the city but can sell supply outside the system. The works are not the rights. The change will be presented in resolution form at the September business meeting. Today, tentative approval is needed for this direction.

Jon Pike moved to approve the direction on the amendment and to direct staff to continue and prepare for the general membership at the conference in September. The motion was seconded by Mike Caldwell. The vote was unanimous. The motion carried.

Our Schools Now: The majority of Utahans oppose a gas tax to increase funding for schools. November’s ballot will include a non-binding question on whether the State’s gas tax should be increased; the gas tax would replace state revenue. Would cities be willing to pass individual resolutions? Some want to tie the gas tax to local land use. The League is definitely against that. He proposed the League support Schools Now and present the transportation link as a resolution to take to the September business meeting.

Jon Pike moved to support Schools Now and have Staff present a resolution at the September business meeting. The motion was seconded by Mike Caldwell. The vote was unanimous. The motion carried.

Medical Marijuana: Cameron met with Drug Safe Utah. The issue is not about pot, but about pre-emption. Cam reviewed Proposition Number 2 with the Board and stated it would establish a state-controlled process. There is nothing in there about cities. The actual initiative does not require medical marijuana to be Dr. prescribed. There seems to be a false premise that marijuana can cure everything. From a land use perspective, cities may not enact a zoning ordinance that prohibits dispensary. Cameron reviewed various language choices that have been disputed and what those arguments are.

From a political perspective, polling numbers are strong but don't reflect the language that is actually in the initiative. No organizations are now making proactive statements on land use regarding this proposition. Cam stated he worries about being hypocritical if we don't say anything and then go ahead and get into battles regarding land use components in other areas. He asked the Board how aggressive they want to be and if they want a resolution? Other leagues have had success working with the Legislature to make changes.

Beth commented it makes sense for the League to be involved, but in a way that minimizes potential blowback. A determination must be made as to whether to focus on marijuana itself, or the ways it impacts cities? It is difficult to stay focused on just that part of it without getting stuck. We opposed any preemptions of traditional local authority. That's land use and licensing. The resolution could be narrowly tailored with reference to law enforcement concerns. She asked to take the following questions into consideration:

1. Which is more appropriate, a statement or a resolution?
2. Do we give the Police Chiefs Association our blessing to speak out as an organization on law enforcement concerns?
3. Should the League join the Drug Safety Coalition?

Beth expressed her concern that messaging would be hijacked, but at the same time it is a land use issue that the League is involved in and must remain consistent.

Board members felt the need to fight for land use and give the Chiefs Association the go-ahead. General Preemption, Sales Tax Revenue and licensing preemption are issues worth fighting for. If they hijack, The League can counter it.

Mayor Pike suggested the resolution lay out the League's key issues. There are others, but this is the focus, other groups can focus on the others.

Cam laid out the priorities from a Staff perspective:

1. Put together a resolution identifying the League's key issues to take to membership.
2. Notify the Police Chiefs Association that the League supports them speaking out.
3. The Drug Safe Utah Coalition should continue engaging without an official position.

Mike Caldwell moved Staff continue to work on those three things while keeping the Board updated. The motion was seconded by Richard Barnett. The vote was unanimous. The motion carried.

COMMUNICATIONS PLAN & RESEARCH

Y2 analytics reported they are in the middle of a research project for the League and the Housing Gap Coalition. This is a three-phase research project. 1) They talk to developers and tell them what they are missing from their plans, 2) Regional communication plan to talk about the way Utah is growing, and 3) local recommendations by region so that if locals decide to increase density, they have talking points.

He reviewed the work that is being done with focus groups, surveys and articles. They want all to be aware things are going to get uncomfortable. Unlikely terms like multi-family housing will be used. The goal is to come back with solutions and talking points with regional variation. Y2's research provides the League a tool to address growth issues.

Mike Caldwell moved to support Y2 Analytics' communications plan and research. The motion was seconded by Andy Beerman. The vote was unanimous. The motion carried.

ADJOURN

Jon Pike moved the Board Meeting adjourn. The motion was seconded by Mike Caldwell. The vote was unanimous. The motion carried.

The next Board meeting will be held in September at the Annual Conference.



ANNUAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST DISCLOSURE 2018-2019

Personal information

Name:

Address:

Title:

ULCT POLICY

I will not place my personal interests in conflict with the interest of ULCT.

I will not directly or indirectly benefit improperly from my position or from any ULCT activity.

I will not allow any outside business or personal relationship create a conflict of interest by influencing decisions within ULCT.

I will disclose any perceived, potential, or actual conflicts of interest with the ULCT Executive Director immediately.

Please list any organization, entity, or person with which you have a personal or business relationship that you believe could present a perceived, potential, or actual conflict of interest. Mere disclosure of such a relationship may not be used as grounds for discipline or termination. (Use an additional sheet if necessary.)

Briefly describe what you believe could be the perceived, potential, or actual conflict. (Use an additional sheet if necessary.)

I ACKNOWLEDGE THAT I HAVE RECEIVED THIS DISCLOSURE & UNDERSTAND THAT I AM RESPONSIBLE FOR ADHERING TO THE PRINCIPLES HEREIN.

SIGNATURE:

Date Signed:



TO: ULCT Board of Directors

FROM: Cameron Diehl, Executive Director
& Brandon Smith, Legislative Research Analyst

DATE: October 15, 2018

SUBJECT: ULCT Boards and Commissions Appointments

There are no nominations or appointments that need to take place at this board meeting. The following is information regarding upcoming changes that will need to be addressed for each of the boards listed below.

Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC)

Bountiful Council Member, and Immediate Past President of the ULCT Board of Directors, will soon be resigning from her seat on the Bountiful City Council. If it is determined by the ULCT Board of Directors that there needs to be a replacement, then the Board of Directors is able to appoint an individual with no further action needed. Once that has taken place, staff will then relay the new appointment to WFRC. This seat does not technically need to be an elected individual, but that has traditionally been the case. The current alternate member for WFRC is Kaysville City Manager, Shayne Scott.

Utility Facility Review Board

This seat is also held by Bountiful Council Member, and Immediate Past President of the ULCT Board of Directors, will soon be resigning from her seat on the Bountiful City Council. If it is determined by the ULCT Board of Directors that there needs to be a replacement, then the Board of Directors will nominate two individuals and submit those names to the Governor's Office for appointment. There is no Senate confirmation for this seat. The person filling this role needs to be nominated by the ULCT Board of directors but does not include a requirement to be elected or employed by a city.

Governor's Rural Partnership Board

The Governor's Rural Partnership Board is part of the Governor's Office of Rural Development. The Office of Rural Development (ORD) works with businesses in Utah's rural counties, providing resources and programs to sustain business and improve employment opportunities. The office collaborates with local governments and other development partners to support rural economic growth. The seat on this board was previously held by Mayor Kelleen Potter of Heber City. The individual holding this seat needs to be a rural member of the ULCT Board of Directors. It is our

MAKING LIFE BETTER



recommendation that this seat be filled by Mayor Christensen of Mayfield, Council Member Barnett of Richfield, or Mayor Niehaus of Moab. These three Board Members fit the requirements needed to fill this seat.

Quality Growth Commission

Steve Pruden recently resigned from the Quality Growth Commission due to a change in his current situation. Steve expressed his appreciation for the opportunity to serve and represent ULCT on the Commission.

The commission makes recommendations to the Legislature on how to define more specifically quality growth areas within the general guidelines provided to the commission by the Legislature and advise the Legislature on growth management issues. The commission is to conduct a review each year to determine progress statewide, and administer the program as provided in state statute. The commission is charged to assist as many local entities as possible, at their request, to identify principles of growth that the local entity may consider implementing to help achieve the highest possible quality of growth for that entity.

The seat on the Quality Growth Commission needs to be filled by a nominee of the ULCT Board of Directors, who will then be appointed by the Governor, and finally confirmed by the Senate. Staff will present names in the following Board of Directors meeting in December for this position. The Commission consists of six local government officials. Three each from cities and counties. There is a requirement that no more than three of the six come from within counties of the 1st and 2nd class. There are currently already three members from 3rd class counties. Thus, the Board of Directors need not restrict their nominations to any specific size of counties.

MAKING LIFE BETTER



TO: ULCT Board of Directors
FROM: Mayor Mike Caldwell, ULCT 2nd Vice President
DATE: October 15, 2018
SUBJECT: Board Vacancy – Area 5

Background:

Having served a full two-year term on the ULCT board of directors, and having been reselected for another term, Mayor Dean Baker of Naples has now resigned as a member of the ULCT Board of Directors. On behalf of the entire Board of Directors, I offer our thanks and gratitude to Mayor Baker for his service. Working with ULCT staff, I have reached out to other interested elected officials in Area 5 (Daggett, Duchesne, and Uintah counties) and have found a worthy replacement.

Discussion:

I present to you my recommendation to fill the current vacancy on the Utah League of Cities and Towns Board of Directors—Council Member Dustin White of Roosevelt. Please see Council Member White’s official bio attached to this document.

MAKING LIFE BETTER

Council Member Dustin White, Roosevelt

Dustin was born and raised in Upalco, Utah on a farm/ranch where he worked with his father and brother. In 2003, he moved his wife Cassie and daughter Emma to Roosevelt. Dustin and Cassie have added four more children to their family – Nathan, Allie, Aaron, and Lola. Along with his duties on the city council, Dustin works as an X-Ray/CT Technologist at the Uintah Basin Medical Center.

Education is important to Dustin and he holds a Bachelor degree in agriculture from Utah State University, an Associate degree in radiography and a Bachelor degree in advanced radiography from Weber State University.

Agriculture and the outdoors is in Dustin's blood. He has a small farm here in Roosevelt as well as some ranch property in Hannah, Utah, and he enjoys spending time hunting, fishing and camping with his family.





Director of Policy

Date Opened: October 15, 2018

Closing Date: Open until filled

Job Description:

The Utah League of Cities and Towns is the advocacy and training organization for Utah's 248 municipalities. Your primary task is to direct and coordinate ULCT's policy research and related outreach with both the legislative and administrative teams. The ideal candidate will be responsible for:

- 1) Directing and developing the League's research efforts,
- 2) Compiling and analyzing the data that ULCT uses to support our legislative positions and assist municipal governments,
- 3) Coordinating and developing education for League members.
- 4) Tracking and analyzing relevant legislation,
- 5) Fostering relationships with ULCT members and other affiliates and stakeholders,
- 6) Providing subject matter expertise to members and affiliates,
- 7) Communicating collectively and individually with ULCT membership about policy issues and priorities

You will also participate in preparing for ULCT's conventions, events, and trainings. You will guide the research efforts of ULCT legislative research analysts, and coordinate with the ULCT Director of Communications and Training. You will report to the ULCT Executive Director, who in turn reports to the ULCT Board of Directors.

Minimum Requirements:

- Minimum of 3 years of related experience in public policy, research, administration, legal affairs, finance, or related field
- Bachelor's degree in political science, public policy, or related field
- Knowledge of local government processes and structures
- Knowledge of state legislative and regulatory processes
- Strong communication skills, ability to understand and articulate complex law and policy issues and ensure that they are communicated effectively internally and externally
- Ability to develop relationships with diverse individuals and audiences
- Ability to remain poised and juggle complex tasks on deadlines in a fast-paced environment
- Ability to work independently and perform effectively
- Some travel required

Preferred Qualifications:

- Advanced degree in public policy, political science, finance, law, or related field
- Experience in land use, water, or other local government related law or policy
- Experience in organizing membership to engage in the political process
- Experience in event planning and coordination

Compensation: Commensurate with experience; 401K, health insurance, cafeteria plan

To apply: Send a resume and cover letter to Nick Jarvis at njarvis@ulct.org

Utah League of Cities & Towns

Check Register (Checks and EFTs of All Types)

Sorted by Check Number
September 2018 Checks/EFTs

Check Number	Date	EFT #/ Vendor	Name	Discounts	Net Amount
Cash Account #1 [Zions Bank - Checking]					
EFT	09/15/18	2018 09 15 PAYROLL FEES			
		NAT 102	National Payroll Systems	0.00	119.06
EFT	09/15/18	2018 09 15 PAYROLL STATE			
		NAT 102	National Payroll Systems	0.00	1325.78
EFT	09/15/18	2018 09 15 LEGAL FEES			
		CHU 100	David Church	0.00	3000.00
EFT	09/15/18	2018 09 15 PAYROLL TAX			
		NAT 102	National Payroll Systems	0.00	7699.42
EFT	09/30/18	2018 09 30 PAY			
		NAT 102	National Payroll Systems	0.00	7408.57
EFT	09/30/18	2018 09 30 STATE			
		NAT 102	National Payroll Systems	0.00	1325.78
EFT	09/30/18	2018 09 30 DIRECT DEP			
		NAT 102	National Payroll Systems	0.00	24498.70
EFT	09/12/18	2018 09 12			
		SEL 100	Select Health	0.00	2376.00
EFT	09/30/18	2018 NAT FEES			
		NAT 102	National Payroll Systems	0.00	108.40
EFT	09/15/18	2019 09 15 DIRECT DEPOSI			
		NAT 102	National Payroll Systems	0.00	23753.29
37255	09/13/18	DOU 100	600 East Partnership	0.00	3000.00
37256	09/13/18	FAS 100	Fast Forward Productions	0.00	5800.00
37257	09/13/18	JOH 107	John Hiskey	0.00	5000.00
37258	09/13/18	LON 100	Lone Peak Productions	0.00	9030.00
37259	09/13/18	PAU 102	Paulsen Construction LLC	0.00	53320.65
37260	09/13/18	UTAH 104	Utah Foundation	0.00	5625.00
37261	09/17/18	INT 103	Interior Solutions		Voided
37262	09/17/18	INT 103	Interior Solutions	0.00	45878.69
37263	09/30/18	6TH 100	Sixth East Condo Assoc.	0.00	900.00
37264	09/30/18	ABB 100	Abby Bolic	0.00	23.44
37265	09/30/18	APA 101	APA Utah Chapter	0.00	300.00
37266	09/30/18	CAR 100	Carr Printing	0.00	244.00
37267	09/30/18	COM 100	Comcast	0.00	729.21
37268	09/30/18	DIX 100	The Dixie Center	0.00	5956.00
37269	09/30/18	FIV100	Five Stone Inc.	0.00	12500.00
37270	09/30/18	JOH 107	John Hiskey	0.00	5000.00
37271	09/30/18	JOH106	John Michael Oliver	0.00	3725.00
37272	09/30/18	LOV 101	Love, Utah Box, LLC		Voided
37273	09/30/18	MOD 100	Modern Display		Voided
37274	09/30/18	NIC 101	Nicole Handy	0.00	246.99
37275	09/30/18	OPD 100	The OP Dealer	0.00	89.33
37276	09/30/18	PEH 100	Public Employees Health Program	0.00	601.92
37277	09/30/18	QUE 100	Dominion Energy	0.00	23.30
37278	09/30/18	SAR 100	Sara Dunford	0.00	175.00
37279	09/30/18	SHE 100	Sheraton City Centre	0.00	298697.05
37280	09/30/18	SPA 100	Spatafore Design	0.00	3048.00

4:46 pm

Utah League of Cities & Towns

Check Register (Checks and EFTs of All Types)

Sorted by Check Number
September 2018 Checks/EFTs

Check Number	Date	EFT #/ Vendor	Name	Discounts	Net Amount
37281	09/30/18	SPE 102	Spencer Gardner	0.00	1800.00
37282	09/30/18	SUS 102	Susan Astle	0.00	898.93
37283	09/30/18	UTA 100	Utah Local Gov't Trust	0.00	439.34
37284	09/30/18	CAM 101	Cameron Diehl	0.00	100.73
37285	09/30/18	DS 100	DS Accounting Services LLC	0.00	2000.00
37286	09/30/18	RAC 100	Rachel Otto	0.00	258.00
37287	09/04/18	ZIO 100	Zions Bank	0.00	4359.71
Cash account Total				0.00	541385.29
Report Total				0.00	541385.29

Utah League of Cities and Towns Credit Card Reallocation of Expenses Template

Card Name: VISA-Abby

Card Number: VISA

RECEIPTS DATE	TO	AMOUNT	BUSINESS PURPOSE	REALLOCATE TC
Yes 8/23/2018	CAFE ZUPAS - DOWNTOWN SLC UT	\$272.65	LUTF Mtg	8200.099
Yes 8/23/2018	PINPROSPPLUS 866-345-7467 UT	\$1,110.00	Supplies	8345.099
Yes 8/23/2018	MARCO PROMOTIONAL PROD 920-65	\$5,475.00	Convention Supplies	6400.022
Yes 8/23/2018	MARCO PROMOTIONAL PROD 920-65	\$238.12	Convention Supplies	6400.022
Recurring 8/23/2018	ADOBE SYSTEMS INC 800-443-8158 C	\$85.47	Recurring	8100.099
Yes 8/23/2018	AMAZON.COM AMZN.COM/BILL AMZ	\$13.99	Office Supplies	8345.099
Yes 8/23/2018	AMZN Mktp US Amzn.com/billWA	\$5.23	Office Supplies	8345.099
Yes 8/24/2018	CKO*Catchbox 123-456789 MA	\$449.00	Equipment	8550.099
Recurring 8/25/2018	EIG*CONSTANTCONTACT.COM 855-2	\$125.00	Recurring	8100.099
Yes 8/26/2018	Amazon.com Amzn.com/billWA	\$9.94	Office Supplies	8345.099
Yes 8/27/2018	JIMMY JOHNS - 1121 - E 801-466-782	\$215.48	LUTF Mtg	8200.099
Yes 8/28/2018	INTUIT *QB ONLINE 800-286-6800 CA	\$32.06	Recurring	8100.099
Yes 8/29/2018	AMZN Mktp US Amzn.com/billWA	\$27.96	Convention Supplies	6400.022
Yes 8/29/2018	Amazon.com Amzn.com/billWA	\$19.99	Convention Supplies	6400.022
Yes 8/30/2018	MODERN DISPLAY 801-355-7427 UT	\$2,864.09	Annual Set Up	6170.022
Yes 8/30/2018	ADOBE *PHOTOGRAPHY PLAN 800-833-	\$10.67	Recurring	8100.099
Yes 8/31/2018	UTAH STATE FAIR 801-5388453 UT	\$2,340.00	Concert Tickets	6110.022
Yes 8/31/2018	WORDPRESS P5E9PK5KC8 HTTPSWOR	\$34.83	Yearly Recurring	8100.099
	- 08/31 BR REAL			
	- 08/31 144.00 X 0.24187500			
8/31/2018	FOREIGN TRAN FEE	\$0.70		8037.099
Yes 8/31/2018	4TH S ACE HARDWARE SLC UT	\$11.07	Office Supplies	8345.099
Recurring 9/1/2018	STOR-N-LOCK #9 801-974-0200 UT	\$202.00	Recurring	8100.099
Recurring 9/5/2018	ADOBE *ACROPRO SUBS 800-833-668	\$16.02	Recurring	8100.099
Yes 9/5/2018	WALGREENS #9238 SALT LAKE CITUT	\$3.19	Board	8040.099
Yes 9/5/2018	Amazon.com Amzn.com/bill WA CREE	-\$2.03	Office Supplies	8345.099
Yes 9/6/2018	IKEA DRAPER DRAPER UT	\$126.98	Convention Supplies	6400.022
Yes 9/6/2018	IKEA CLICK & COLLECT 3097888-434-4	\$90.27	Board	8040.099
Yes 9/6/2018	WALGREENS #9238 SALT LAKE CITUT	\$3.19	Board	8040.099
Yes 9/6/2018	WALGREENS #9238 SALT LAKE CITUT	\$3.19	Board	8040.099
Yes 9/6/2018	EB THE HIDDEN COSTS O 801-413-720	\$2,000.00	Event Registration	8600.099
Yes 9/7/2018	ALL OUT EVENT RENTAL 801-9886288	\$462.71	Annual Rental	6430.022
Yes 9/7/2018	WALGREENS #9238 SALT LAKE CITUT	\$6.39	Board	8040.099
Yes 9/7/2018	WALGREENS #9238 SALT LAKE CITUT	\$63.90	Board	8040.099
Recurring 9/8/2018	VBULLETIN SOLUTIONS(USD) VBULLE	\$19.95	Recurring	8100.099
Yes 9/8/2018	TST* EVEN STEVENS SANDWICSALT LA	\$97.18	Staff Meeting	8200.099
Recurring 9/8/2018	ZOOM.US 888-799-9666 CA	\$14.99	Recurring	8100.099
Recurring 9/9/2018	MICROSOFT *OFFICE 365 msbill.info	\$7.47	Recurring	8100.099
Recurring 9/9/2018	ADOBE *ACROPRO SUBS 800-833-668	\$16.02	Recurring	8100.099
Yes 9/10/2018	MARCO PROMOTIONAL PROD 920-65	\$21.50	Convention Supplies	6400.022
Yes 9/10/2018	ZAO 4TH SOUTH SALT LAKE CITUT	\$60.94	Staff Meeting	8200.099
Yes 9/10/2018	Pond5 646-3500410 NY	\$26.00	Music	8355.099
Yes 9/11/2018	ALPHAGRAPHICS 16 801-487-9600 UT	\$32.42	Convention Supplies	6400.022
Yes 9/11/2018	ALPHAGRAPHICS 16 801-487-9600 UT	\$574.64	Convention Supplies	6400.022
Yes 9/13/2018	UTAH STATE FAIR GATES SALT LAKE CI	\$78.00	Concert ticket	6110.022
Recurring 9/13/2018	DS SERVICES STANDARD COFF800-492	\$35.51	Recurring	8100.099
Yes 9/14/2018	TARGET 00026419 SALT LAKE CITUT	\$14.41	Board	8040.099
Yes 9/15/2018	OLIVE GARDEN 0021399 SALT LAKE CI	\$193.96	David Food	6110.022

Recurring 9/16/2018	MICROSOFT *OFFICE 365 msbill.info v	\$7.47	Recurring	8100.099
Recurring 9/16/2018	MICROSOFT *OFFICE 365 msbill.info v	\$7.47	Recurring	8100.099
Recurring 9/16/2018	MICROSOFT *OFFICE 365 msbill.info v	\$7.47	Recurring	8100.099
Recurring 9/16/2018	MICROSOFT *OFFICE 365 MSBILL.INFO	\$7.47	Recurring	8100.099
Yes 9/17/2018	ALL OUT EVENT RENTAL 801-9886288	\$26.72	Annual Rental	6430.022
Recurring 9/17/2018	MICROSOFT *OFFICE 365 msbill.info v	\$7.47	Recurring	8100.099
Yes 9/17/2018	GREEK SOUVLAKI - DOWNT STRIPE.CC	\$97.10	Staff Meeting	8200.099
Recurring 9/17/2018	ZOOM.US 888-799-9666 CA	\$14.99	Recurring	8100.099
Yes 9/18/2018	IN *LOVE, UTAH BOX, LLC 801-859505	\$534.25	Speakers	6150.022
Yes 9/19/2018	CAFE ZUPAS - DOWNTOWN SLC UT	\$272.65	LUTF	8200.099
Yes 9/19/2018	SQ *FITCHES, LLC gosq.com UT	\$684.00	Convention Supplies	6400.022
Yes 9/20/2018	MODERN DISPLAY 801-355-7427 UT	\$1,244.57	Convention Supplies	6400.022
Recurring 9/20/2018	MSFT * E02006KJEU MSBILL.INFO WA	\$8.82	Recurring	8100.099
Recurring 9/20/2018	ZOOM.US 888-799-9666 CA	\$14.99	Recurring	8100.099
Yes 9/20/2018	IN *CAPHOLOGY 801-4366828 UT	\$1,490.32	Annual Graphic Design	6210.022
Yes 9/20/2018	ZIONS AMAZING DEALS 1-888-758-53	-\$5.21	Office Supplies	8345.099
Recurring 9/23/2018	ADOBE SYSTEMS INC 800-443-8158 C	\$85.47	Recurring	8100.099
	ABBY BOLIC			
	TOTAL XXXXXXXXXXXX8233	\$22,016.07		

Common Reallocation Accounts	Account Name	Total
6110.022	Entertainment	\$2,611.96
6150.022	Speaker Fees	\$534.25
6170.022	Facility Rent/Set Up	\$3,326.80
6210.022	Printing	\$1,490.32
6400.022	Convention Supplies	\$8,445.18
6430.022	Special Equipment Rent	\$26.72
8037.099	Credit Card and Bank Fc	\$0.70
8040.099	Board Expenses	\$184.54
8100.099	Dues and Subscriptions	\$761.61
8200.099	Food and Beverage	\$1,016.00
8345.099	Office Supplies	\$1,142.99
8355.099	MISC	\$26.00
8500.099	Equipment	\$449.00
8600.099	Staff Training	\$2,000.00
	TOTAL	\$22,016.07



TO: ULCT Board of Directors
FROM: Nick Jarvis, Chief Operating Officer
DATE: October 15, 2018
SUBJECT: FY 2018 Year-End Financial Report

Attached please find a ULCT FY 2018 year-end unaudited actual income and expenses compared to budget report. This report covers the period July 1, 2017 – June 30, 2018. We are happy to report that at the end of FY 2018 revenues for ULCT outpaced expenditures by \$510,548.

Revenue

Overall, by the end of FY 2018, the ULCT collected 94% of all revenue budgeted for the year. 49% of ULCT annual budgeted revenue derived from **Membership Dues**. Membership dues were 101% collected by the end of Q4. The fact that dues revenue is over 100% is the result of prudent budgeting (considering that one community opted not to participate with the League in the previous fiscal year). We are happy to report that through collaborative dialogue, effective outreach, forward-looking leadership, each and every city and town in the state are now dues-paying members of the Utah League of Cities and Towns.

The ULCT's budgeted revenue for **Registration Fees** is 15% of total revenue budgeted. By the end of Q4, the ULCT received 94% of the registration fee revenue budgeted.

Donation and Advertising revenue accounts for 9% of annual budgeted revenue. ULCT exceeded the budgeted amount by \$100,555 (131%). This is largely the result of the modernization of our sponsorship program and the addition of several top-tier sponsors.

Exhibit Space revenue at the end of FY 2018 is 71% of budget—largely due to the fact that sponsors no longer pay for booth space under the updated sponsor arrangement. This has been addressed in the FY 2019 budget.

83% of **Grants and Special Project** revenue was collected in FY 2018. This is largely due to an unforeseen reduction in State funds for the LUAU program, and having to account for funds previously received for the “Deseret News Project”—a discontinued program.

MAKING LIFE BETTER

Expenditures

Overall, actual ULCT FY 2018 expenditures are 77% of what was budgeted.

Personnel Services

Expenditures for Personnel Services account for 27% of overall ULCT budgeted spending. However, expenditures in this category topped out at 84% largely due to the fact that a portion of the fiscal year had our Interim Executive Director, Roger Tew, paid through the contract labor category, and the Director of Government Relations position being vacant for another portion of the fiscal year

Charges for Services

As a result of the aforementioned adjustments, Charges for Services is only 98% expended at the end of FY 2018.

Operating & Program Expenses

Actual expenditures for FY 2018 in this category are 89% of budget for the year. Though some line-items came in over budget, savings were found elsewhere in this category to ultimately come in under budget.

Grants and Special Projects

ULCT staff will not spend on special projects without commitments that the revenue to support the project has been received. A number of special projects did not incur any expenses in FY 2018, which has informed management's allocation of resources in the FY 2019 budget.

Materials and Supplies

The ULCT budget includes \$12,000 for office supplies. At the end of FY 2018, ULCT expended only 56% of its budget for office supplies. Staff continued to monitor this budget throughout the year with a special eye to managing expenses and found savings to offset expenditures in other areas of the budget.

Miscellaneous

ULCT's Miscellaneous line item is budgeted at \$1,500. ULCT overspent in this particular category, but savings were found elsewhere to keep the League's expenditures in the black.

Capital Outlay



None of the \$369,510 budgeted for capital outlay and capital improvements was expended in FY 2018, largely due to construction delays relevant to the remodel of the ULCT office. These budgeted funds are to be spent in the current fiscal year (FY 2019).

Conclusion

Staff has been able to effectively reallocate League funds to more effectively benefit our members and has managed the finances to put ULCT in a cash positive situation at year-end. This has allowed ULCT to invest more in the PTIF and collect more interest revenue in FY 2019.



MAKING LIFE BETTER

UTAH LEAGUE OF CITIES AND TOWNS

FY 2017-18 YTD 06.30.2018

REVENUES	<i>2017-2018 ADOPTED BUDGET</i>	<i>YTD Actual July -June YTD Actual</i>	<i>Difference 2018 Budget TO Actual</i>	<i>% Collected 100%</i>
General Revenue				
Membership Dues	\$1,650,000	\$1,663,747	\$13,747	101%
Registration Fees	\$490,000	\$461,895	(\$28,105)	94%
Donations & Advertising	\$320,000	\$430,555	\$110,555	135%
Exhibit Space	\$118,000	\$83,530	(\$34,470)	71%
Interest	\$3,500	\$26,814	\$23,314	766%
Publications	\$15,000	\$13,173	(\$1,827)	88%
Miscellaneous Income	\$250	\$26,207	\$25,957	10483%
Reserves	\$288,000	\$0	(\$288,000)	0%
Rental Income	\$0	\$7,500	\$7,500	100%
General Revenue	\$2,884,750	\$2,713,421	\$171,329	94%
Grants & Special Projects				
Essay Contest Donations	\$10,000	\$0	(\$10,000)	0%
Co-Op Funds Deseret News Project	\$48,000	\$0	(\$48,000)	0%
Grant for Research Assistant	\$0	\$0	\$0	0%
Transfer-Making Life Better	\$0	\$0	\$0	0%
Grants-Active & Healthy Communitie	\$300,000	\$300,000	\$0	100%
Grants-LUAU	\$130,286	\$97,000	(\$33,286)	74%
Grant-UTOPIA	\$0	\$0	\$0	0%
Benchmarking	\$0	\$0	\$0	0%
Grants & Special Projects	\$488,286	\$397,000	(\$91,286)	81%
TOTAL REVENUE	\$3,373,036	\$3,110,421	\$262,615	92%

EXPENDITURES	<i>2017-2018 PROPOSED BUDGET</i>	<i>YTD Actual July -June YTD Actual</i>	<i>Difference 2018 Budget TO Actual</i>	<i>Difference %</i> <i>Expended</i>
Personnel Services				
Employee Benefits	\$273,000	\$198,203	\$74,797	73%
Staff Salaries	\$625,000	\$557,362	\$67,638	89%
Personnel Services Subtotal	\$898,000	\$ 755,565	\$142,435	84%
Charges for Services				
Database Maintenance	\$0	\$0	\$0	0%
Accounting Expenses	\$30,000	\$45,812	(\$15,812)	153%
Contract Labor	\$332,500	\$291,832	\$40,668	88%
Building Utilities	\$4,000	\$7,132	(\$3,132)	178%
Computer Services	\$24,000	\$25,377	(\$1,377)	106%
Legal Expense	\$24,000	\$36,000	(\$12,000)	150%
Charges for Services Subtotal	\$414,500	\$406,153	(\$13,377)	98%
Operating & Program Expenses				
Car Expense	\$3,000	\$6,375	(\$3,375)	213%
Building Repairs	\$0	\$18,781	(\$18,781)	100%
Dues and Subscriptions	\$22,000	\$63,944	(\$41,944)	291%
Depreciation	\$0	\$20,965	(\$20,965)	0%
Convention Entertainment	\$94,000	\$100,642	(\$6,642)	107%
Food & Beverage	\$545,000	\$320,642	\$224,358	59%
Facility Rent/Setup	\$68,526	\$206,401	(\$137,875)	301%
League Relations	\$24,000	\$2,285	\$21,715	10%
Library	\$1,500	\$0	\$1,500	0%
Insurance	\$8,500	\$7,726	\$774	91%
Speakers Fee/Honorariums	\$150,000	\$86,894	\$63,106	58%
Printing Expense	\$75,000	\$56,874	\$18,126	76%
Postage and Freight	\$6,500	\$5,144	\$1,356	79%
Equipment Repairs and Maint.	\$1,000	\$3,450	(\$2,450)	345%
Staff Training & Tuition Aid	\$2,500	\$3,002	(\$502)	120%
Equipment purchases	\$10,000	\$370	\$9,630	4%
Spec. Equip. Rental	\$65,000	\$58,274	\$6,726	90%
Telephone Expense	\$15,000	\$11,737	\$3,263	78%
Travel and Lodging	\$70,000	\$43,418	\$26,582	62%
League Office Lease Payment	\$36,000	\$36,000	\$0	100%
Credit Card Processing/Bank Fees	\$10,000	\$32,006	(\$22,006)	320%
Board Expenses	\$11,000	\$1,909	\$9,091	17%
Operating & Program Exp. Subtotal	\$1,218,526	\$1,086,839	\$131,687	89%
Grants & Special Projects				
Special Project-UTOPIA	\$0	\$0	\$0	0%

Salary Survey	\$12,000	\$0	\$12,000	0%
Special Project-ULCTv	\$0	\$0	\$0	0%
Special Project-LUAU	\$76,000	\$25,346	\$50,654	33%
Special Project-Making Life Better	\$0	\$20,000	(\$20,000)	0%
Special Projects-IHC Wellness	\$278,000	\$278,000	\$0	100%
Deseret News Project	\$48,000	\$0	\$48,000	0%
Tax Book	\$0	\$10,000	(\$10,000)	0%
Municipal Funding Project	\$0	\$0	\$0	0%
University of Utah Policy Institute	\$10,000	\$0	\$10,000	0%
Essay Contest Expenses	\$10,000	\$4,950	\$5,050	50%
Benchmarking	\$20,000	\$0	\$20,000	0%
Grants & Special Projects Subtotal	\$454,000	\$338,296	\$53,050	75%
Materials and Supplies				
Office Supplies	\$12,000	\$6,749	\$5,251	56%
Materials & Supplies Subtotal	\$12,000	\$6,749	\$5,251	
Miscellaneous				
Miscellaneous	\$1,500	\$6,261	(\$4,761)	417%
Transfer to Fund Balance	\$0	\$0	\$0	0%
Contingency Reserve	\$5,000	\$0	\$5,000	0%
Miscellaneous Subtotal	\$6,500	\$6,271	\$239	96%
Capital				
Capital Outlay	\$9,510	\$0	\$9,510	0%
Capital Improvements - Office remodel	\$360,000	\$0	\$360,000	0%
Capital Subtotal	\$369,510	\$0	\$369,510	0%
TOTAL EXPENSES	\$3,373,036	\$2,599,873	\$773,163	77%
TOTAL ALL REVENUES	\$3,373,036	\$3,110,421	\$262,615	92%
REVENUES (Under) Over EXPENSES	\$0	\$510,548		



**UTAH HOUSING GAP 2018
PUBLIC OPINION RESEARCH & MESSAGING SURVEY
TOPLINE REPORT**

METHODOLOGY DETAILS

n=2,213 Registered Voters
Online interviews fielded September 4-9, 2018
Margin of error +- 1.96

For this survey, 2,213 Utahns residing in Box Elder, Cache, Davis, Salt Lake, Summit, Utah, Wasatch, Washington, and Weber Counties were sampled from a publicly available list of registered voters in Utah. Survey invitations were sent to email addresses purchased from a third-party vendor.

The data were weighted to ensure that the demographics of the respondents were reflective of all registered voters in the nine selected counties in Utah, specifically in regards to age, gender, and county.

CONTACT

For more information, please contact Scott Riding or Quin Monson at:

Scott Riding, 801-556-3204, scott@y2analytics.com
Quin Monson, 801-367-6588, quin@y2analytics.com

Y² Analytics
60 South 600 East Ste. 250
Salt Lake City, Utah 84102



QINTRO.	Do you currently live in Utah? (n = 2,259)	
	Yes	100%
	No (TERMINATED)	--
<hr/>		
QSEX.	What is your gender? (n = 2,257)	
	Male	47%
	Female	53
<hr/>		
QYEARBORN.	Please select the year you were born: (RECODED INTO AGE CATEGORIES, n = 2,239)	
	18-24	4%
	25-34	15
	35-44	22
	45-54	17
	55-64	20
	65+	22
<hr/>		
QSCREEN.	Are you, or is anyone in your household, employed with a newspaper, television or radio station? (n = 2,213)	
	Yes (TERMINATED)	--
	No	100%
	Don't know (TERMINATED)	--
<hr/>		
QTIMELIVED1.	How many years have you lived in the state of Utah? (n = 2,213)	
	Years lived in Utah	Average 35
<hr/>		
QORIGINAL.	Were you born in Utah or did you move here from another state or country? (n = 2,212)	
	Born in Utah	53%
	Moved here from another state or country	47
<hr/>		

QHOUSTYPE. Which of the following best describes your current residence? (n = 2,212)

Single-family home	82%
Duplex	2
Townhome	6
Condominium	4
Mother-in-law or basement apartment	2
Apartment in a small complex (10 or fewer units in one building)	1
Apartment in a medium sized complex (11-30 units in one or two buildings)	1
Apartment in a large complex (31 or more units in three or more buildings)	3

QOWNRENT. Which of the following best describes where you are currently living? (n = 2,212)

Own or buying my own home	81%
Rent my home or apartment	14
Live with parents or relatives	4
Other (please specify)	1

QHOUSSAT. Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your current residence? (n = 2,213)

Very satisfied	61%
Somewhat satisfied	27
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	5
Somewhat dissatisfied	6
Very dissatisfied	2

QTIMELIVED2. How long have you lived in your current residence? (n = 2,212)

	Average
Years lived in current residence	12

QURBAN. In your view, which of the following best describes the area where you live? (n = 2,211)

Urban	19%
Suburban	72
Rural	9

QRELIGION. What, if any, is your religious preference? (n = 2,199)

Mormon or LDS	61%
Protestant [e.g. Baptist, Methodist, etc.]	5
Roman Catholic	4
Other Christian	<1
Jewish	6
Muslim/Islamic	<1
Other non-Christian	1
Agnostic/Atheist	7
None	16

IF 'AGNOSTIC/ATHEIST' AND 'NONE' WERE NOT SELECTED IN QRELIGION, RESPONDENTS SAW QGOCHUR2

QGOCHUR2. How active do you consider yourself in the practice of your religious preference? Would you say you are... (n = 1,709)

Very active	67%
Somewhat active	15
Not very active	7
Not active	8
Prefer not to say	3

QOVERALL. All things considered, on a scale from 0 to 100, with 0 being very low and 100 being very high, how would you rate your overall quality of life in your community? (n = 2,202)

	Average
Overall quality of life in your community	81

QISSUE. Which of the following do you consider to be the most important issue facing Utah communities and residents today? (n = 2,211)

Housing affordability	22%
Air quality	19
Water quality, supply, and conservation	7
Education	12
Infrastructure (roads, bridges, mass transit)	10
Crime and public safety	7
Jobs and the economy	8
Healthcare	9
Other (please specify)	7



QFAV. Below are the names of some people and organizations who have been in the news lately. For each one, please tell me whether you have a favorable or unfavorable impression of that person or organization. If you are not aware of a person or organization, or if you have no impression of them, please select Not aware. (n = 2,210)

	Very favorable	Somewhat favorable	Neither favorable nor unfavorable	Somewhat unfavorable	Very unfavorable	Not aware
Utah Governor Gary Herbert	21%	30	18	15	12	4
The Utah State Legislature	4	28	23	22	16	7
The mayor and council members in the city or town where you live	12	36	23	13	6	10
The Utah Housing Gap Coalition	2	9	25	7	4	54
Real estate or housing developers in Utah	2	15	31	26	15	11

QGROWRATE. Which of the following statements best reflects how you feel about the pace at which your city or town is growing? (n = 2,210)

My city or town is growing much too quickly	33%
My city or town is growing a bit too quickly	30
My city or town is growing at an appropriate pace	34
My city or town is growing a bit too slowly	2
My city or town is growing much too slowly	1

QPREV. Some people have lived in many types of housing throughout their life. Below are a few kinds of housing in which you may have lived before your current residence. What are the different types of housing in which you have lived? Select all that apply. (n = 2,210)

Single-family home	83%
Duplex	27
Townhome	24
Condominium	17
Mother-in-law or basement apartment	23
Apartment in a small complex (10 or fewer units in one building)	33
Apartment in a medium sized complex (11-30 or more units in one or two buildings)	26
Apartment in a large complex (31 or more units in three or more buildings)	35
I have never lived in another residence	1

IF 'NEVER LIVED IN ANOTHER RESIDENCE' WAS NOT SELECTED IN QPREV1, RESPONDENTS SAW QPREV2

QPREV2. Did you rent or own each of the previous types of housing in which you have lived? Select all that apply. (n = 2,096)

	Previously rented	Previously owned
Single-family home	28%	60
Duplex	22	2
Townhome	15	7
Condominium	9	7
Mother-in-law or basement apartment	20	1
Apartment in a small complex (10 or fewer units in one building)	30	<1
Apartment in a medium sized complex (11-30 or more units in one or two buildings)	23	<1
Apartment in a large complex (31 or more units in three or more buildings)	31	<1

QIMPORTANT. How important were each of the following factors when you chose to live in your current community? (n = 2,205)

	Very important	Somewhat important	Neither important nor unimportant	Somewhat unimportant	Very unimportant
Proximity to family and friends	28%	41	19	6	6
Staying in the community where I grew up	5	14	29	14	38
Personal space, privacy	55	37	5	2	1
Room for family to grow	33	28	18	8	13
Affordability	68	25	5	1	1
Safety and security	72	23	4	<1	1
Access to amenities such as restaurants, entertainment, parks, etc.	25	47	20	6	3
Job opportunities	34	29	23	6	8
Neighbors who are like me	17	35	32	9	7
Appearance	42	47	8	3	1

QIMPORTANT_OTHER. Are there any other factors not listed above that contributed to your decision to live in your current community? (OPEN-ENDED RESPONSES VERBATIM IN APPENDIX)



ASKED ONLY OF HOME OWNERS:

QPROPVAL. Some people like to have real estate prices go up because their homes are worth more money. Others do not like to have housing prices go up because it means they have to pay more property taxes. Which comes closest to your view? (n = 1,789)

I like it when real estate prices increase because it raises the value of my home	54%
I do not like it when real estate prices increase because it raises my property taxes	35
Don't know	12

QMIGRATION. Which statement comes closer to your own views, even if neither is exactly right? (n = 2,206)

People moving in from out of state strengthen Utah because they add to the tax base and contribute hard work and talents to our communities	73%
People moving in from out of state are a burden on Utah because they take our jobs and put strain on our infrastructure, housing, government services, and health care	27

QHOUSE. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements. (n = 2,209)

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
Owning a home is part of the American dream	52%	35	10	2	1
Housing affordability is a major problem in my community	37	36	18	7	3
I want my community to stay the way it was when I chose to live here	16	31	28	18	7
More of the population growth in Utah right now comes from people moving in from out-of-state than from our own children and grandchildren	19	33	32	12	4
People moving into my community today share my values	5	33	44	15	4
Population growth and the change it brings will ruin my community	8	23	27	26	17
I have a meaningful say in the way my community is growing and developing	4	19	29	28	21
I am worried about the increasing crime rates that come with a growing community	22	38	20	14	6
Increased traffic and congestion always accompany growth	48	39	7	5	1

and development in a community					
Buying a home is the best long-term investment an individual can make	39	41	12	6	3
I sometimes have anxiety about paying my rent or mortgage	10	21	20	17	33
ASKED ONLY OF SELF-IDENTIFIED MEMBERS OF THE CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST OF LATTER-DAY SAINTS (n = 1,335):					
Growth in my community is important for the health of my local church congregation	6	22	47	14	10
High turnover in my community puts a strain on my local church congregation	7	17	37	21	18
Members of my congregation who rent their homes or apartments tend to need more assistance from the church than home owners in the congregation	9	28	42	14	7
I wish growth would slow down so I could get to know people in my congregation	6	16	46	19	12

RESPONDENTS WERE RANDOMLY ASSIGNED TO SEE ONE OF QINFOFLOW/REACT SERIES – A OR B

SERIES A.

QINFOFLOW1A. Have you seen, read, or heard anything about new apartment, condo, or townhome developments, either proposed or under construction, in or near your neighborhood? (n = 1,084)

Yes	68%
No	27
Don't know	5

IF 'YES' WAS SELECTED IN QINFOFLOW1A, RESPONDENTS SAW QINFOFLOW2A-QREACT2A

QINFOFLOW2A. What have you recently seen, read, or heard about new apartment, condo, or townhome developments, either proposed or under construction, in or near your neighborhood? (OPEN-ENDED RESPONSES VERBATIM IN APPENDIX)

QREACT1A. And how would you describe your reaction to or feelings toward the new apartment, condo, or townhome developments, either proposed or under construction, in or near your neighborhood? (n = 738)

Very negative	21%
Somewhat negative	34
Neither negative nor positive	22
Somewhat positive	14
Very positive	6
Not sure, no feelings	3



QREACT2A. Please briefly explain why you had a "[PIPED IN RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS QUESTION]" reaction to the new apartment, condo, or townhome developments, either proposed or under construction, in or near your neighborhood. (OPEN-ENDED RESPONSES VERBATIM IN APPENDIX)

SERIES B.

QINFOFLOW1B. Have you seen, read, or heard anything about new single-family home developments, either proposed or under construction, in or near your neighborhood? (n =1,128)

Yes	57%
No	37
Don't know	6

IF 'YES' WAS SELECTED IN QINFOFLOW1B, RESPONDENTS SAW QINFOFLOW2B-QREACT2B

QINFOFLOW2B. What have you recently seen, read, or heard about new single-family home developments, either proposed or under construction, in or near your neighborhood? (OPEN-ENDED RESPONSES VERBATIM IN APPENDIX)

QREACT1B. And how would you describe your reaction to or feelings toward the new single-family home developments, either proposed or under construction, in or near your neighborhood? (n = 642)

Very negative	10%
Somewhat negative	31
Neither negative nor positive	23
Somewhat positive	20
Very positive	13
Not sure, no feelings	3

QREACT2B. Please briefly explain why you had a "[PIPED IN RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS QUESTION]" reaction to the new single-family home developments, either proposed or under construction, in or near your neighborhood. (OPEN-ENDED RESPONSES VERBATIM IN APPENDIX)



RESPONDENTS SAW A RANDOM SELECTION OF THREE OF THE FOLLOWING RESPONSIBILITY/TRUST QUESTION PAIRS
(QPLAN-QFOLLOWUP_STIMGROW)

QPLAN. Please indicate which of the individuals and organizations listed below you believe should be responsible for... Planning for the long-term needs of a growing community. Select all that apply. (n = 739)

Utah Governor Gary Herbert	13%
The Utah State Legislature	18
Your local city or town government	40
The Utah Housing Gap Coalition	11
Real estate or housing developers in Utah	14
Community groups such as a neighborhood council or a home owner's association	21
Other (SPECIFIED RESPONSES IN APPENDIX)	3

QFOLLOWUP_PLAN. And which of these individuals or organizations do you trust the most with... Planning for the long-term needs of a growing community? (n = 739)

Utah Governor Gary Herbert	5%
The Utah State Legislature	6
Your local city or town government	58
The Utah Housing Gap Coalition	5
Real estate or housing developers in Utah	2
Community groups such as a neighborhood council or a home owner's association	22
Other (SPECIFIED RESPONSES IN APPENDIX)	2

QCOMM. Please indicate which of the individuals and organizations listed below you believe should be responsible for... Communicating with community residents about plans and developments. Select all that apply. (n = 758)

Utah Governor Gary Herbert	7%
The Utah State Legislature	10
Your local city or town government	42
The Utah Housing Gap Coalition	9
Real estate or housing developers in Utah	19
Community groups such as a neighborhood council or a home owner's association	24
Other (SPECIFIED RESPONSES IN APPENDIX)	1



QFOLLOWUP_COMM. And which of these individuals or organizations do you trust the most with... Communicating with community residents about plans and developments? (n = 758)

Utah Governor Gary Herbert	2%
The Utah State Legislature	2
Your local city or town government	53
The Utah Housing Gap Coalition	2
Real estate or housing developers in Utah	4
Community groups such as a neighborhood council or a home owner's association	35
Other (SPECIFIED RESPONSES IN APPENDIX)	1

QRESEARCH. Please indicate which of the individuals and organizations listed below you believe should be responsible for... Conducting research to understand community thoughts and feelings about new developments. Select all that apply. (n = 772)

Utah Governor Gary Herbert	9%
The Utah State Legislature	16
Your local city or town government	39
The Utah Housing Gap Coalition	14
Real estate or housing developers in Utah	19
Community groups such as a neighborhood council or a home owner's association	23
Other (SPECIFIED RESPONSES IN APPENDIX)	2

QFOLLOWUP_RESEARCH. And which of these individuals or organizations do you trust the most with... Conducting research to understand community thoughts and feelings about new developments? (n = 772)

Utah Governor Gary Herbert	3%
The Utah State Legislature	4
Your local city or town government	47
The Utah Housing Gap Coalition	9
Real estate or housing developers in Utah	4
Community groups such as a neighborhood council or a home owner's association	32
Other (SPECIFIED RESPONSES IN APPENDIX)	2



QINFRA. Please indicate which of the individuals and organizations listed below you believe should be responsible for... Ensuring that the necessary infrastructure is in place to accommodate new developments. Select all that apply. (n = 760)

Utah Governor Gary Herbert	13%
The Utah State Legislature	22
Your local city or town government	39
The Utah Housing Gap Coalition	8
Real estate or housing developers in Utah	21
Community groups such as a neighborhood council or a home owner's association	12
Other (SPECIFIED RESPONSES IN APPENDIX)	2

QFOLLOWUP_INFRA. And which of these individuals or organizations do you trust the most with... Ensuring that the necessary infrastructure is in place to accommodate new developments? (n = 760)

Utah Governor Gary Herbert	5%
The Utah State Legislature	11
Your local city or town government	62
The Utah Housing Gap Coalition	4
Real estate or housing developers in Utah	5
Community groups such as a neighborhood council or a home owner's association	11
Other (SPECIFIED RESPONSES IN APPENDIX)	2

QINTERESTS. Please indicate which of the individuals and organizations listed below you believe should be responsible for... Looking out for the best interests of community residents. Select all that apply. (n = 735)

Utah Governor Gary Herbert	13%
The Utah State Legislature	16
Your local city or town government	39
The Utah Housing Gap Coalition	9
Real estate or housing developers in Utah	11
Community groups such as a neighborhood council or a home owner's association	27
Other (SPECIFIED RESPONSES IN APPENDIX)	3



QFOLLOWUP_INTERESTS. And which of these individuals or organizations do you trust the most with... Looking out for the best interests of community residents? (n = 735)

Utah Governor Gary Herbert	3%
The Utah State Legislature	2
Your local city or town government	45
The Utah Housing Gap Coalition	3
Real estate or housing developers in Utah	1
Community groups such as a neighborhood council or a home owner's association	43
Other (SPECIFIED RESPONSES IN APPENDIX)	3

QSTIMGROW. Please indicate which of the individuals and organizations listed below you believe should be responsible for... Stimulating economic growth in the community by attracting businesses and creating jobs. Select all that apply. (n = 685)

Utah Governor Gary Herbert	20%
The Utah State Legislature	22
Your local city or town government	37
The Utah Housing Gap Coalition	5
Real estate or housing developers in Utah	9
Community groups such as a neighborhood council or a home owner's association	10
Other (SPECIFIED RESPONSES IN APPENDIX)	3

QFOLLOWUP_STIMGROW. And which of these individuals or organizations do you trust the most with... Stimulating economic growth in the community by attracting businesses and creating jobs? (n = 685)

Utah Governor Gary Herbert	16%
The Utah State Legislature	13
Your local city or town government	54
The Utah Housing Gap Coalition	2
Real estate or housing developers in Utah	3
Community groups such as a neighborhood council or a home owner's association	9
Other (SPECIFIED RESPONSES IN APPENDIX)	2



QBLAME. And which of the individuals and organizations, if any, listed below do you believe is responsible for the current housing market conditions. Select all that apply. (n = 2,208)

Utah Governor Gary Herbert	18%
The Utah State Legislature	28
The government in the city or town where you live	46
The Utah Housing Gap Coalition	15
Real estate or housing developers in Utah	62
Community groups such as a neighborhood council or a home owner's association	14
Other (SPECIFIED RESPONSES IN APPENDIX)	11



QPULSE1. Suppose a new townhome development has been proposed in your community. It will develop two community blocks (or about six acres) of land with fifteen townhomes per acre, adding ninety new townhomes to the community. These townhomes would be occupied by a mix of owners and renters once the development is finished. Would you support or oppose this development? (n = 2,203)

Strongly support	9%
Somewhat support	35
Somewhat oppose	28
Strongly oppose	28

Next you will read some statements that have been made about growth and housing developments in Utah. Still thinking about a development of 90 townhomes on six acres of land (15 townhomes on each acre) where some people will buy and live in the townhomes and other townhomes will be for people to rent, please indicate whether each of the following statements make you more likely to support or oppose this type of development.

QARGS1. The cost of housing will continue to skyrocket if more housing is not made available for residents. Does this information make you more likely to support or oppose the proposed townhome development? (n = 2,207)

Much more likely to support	12%
Somewhat more likely to support	34
No effect	35
Somewhat more likely to oppose	10
Much more likely to oppose	9

QARGS2. There is not enough land left in our community to continue to build the kind of homes that have traditionally been built here. Does this information make you more likely to support or oppose the proposed townhome development? (n = 2,208)

Much more likely to support	6%
Somewhat more likely to support	19
No effect	38
Somewhat more likely to oppose	18
Much more likely to oppose	19

QARGS3. For the first time in recent history, the housing industry in Utah cannot provide enough housing to meet demand, causing prices to soar. To facilitate economic growth, having sufficient housing options that are affordable must be a top priority for every community. Does this information make you more likely to support or oppose the proposed townhome development? (n = 2,203)

Much more likely to support	17%
Somewhat more likely to support	36
No effect	29
Somewhat more likely to oppose	9
Much more likely to oppose	10

QARGS4. Different types of housing are good because each community has people who are in different stages of their life. There is no one-size-fits-all approach to housing, and we should have a mix of developments for people's varying needs. Does this information make you more likely to support or oppose the proposed townhome development? (n = 2,203)

Much more likely to support	15%
Somewhat more likely to support	36
No effect	32
Somewhat more likely to oppose	7
Much more likely to oppose	9

QARGS5. Well-planned housing developments, even higher-density developments, add to the quality of life in our communities because they bring more conveniences, like parks, shops, and other community amenities, and increase diversity in our area. Does this information make you more likely to support or oppose the proposed townhome development? (n = 2,208)

Much more likely to support	11%
Somewhat more likely to support	32
No effect	34
Somewhat more likely to oppose	11
Much more likely to oppose	12

QARGS6. Higher-density housing options lead to higher crime rates, decreased property values for the surrounding homes in the neighborhood, and a decline in the overall quality of life for those in the community. Does this information make you more likely to support or oppose the proposed townhome development? (n = 2,207)

Much more likely to support	2%
Somewhat more likely to support	4
No effect	23
Somewhat more likely to oppose	34
Much more likely to oppose	38

QARGS7. We don't truly need more townhomes or higher-density housing. People just say we need more housing as a way to make a quick profit on a little bit of land. Does this information make you more likely to support or oppose the proposed townhome development? (n = 2,207)

Much more likely to support	3%
Somewhat more likely to support	6
No effect	36
Somewhat more likely to oppose	25
Much more likely to oppose	29

QARGS8. Having a large number of renters in one area puts too much of a strain on local schools, parks and trails, and government services, including fire and police departments. Does this information make you more likely to support or oppose the proposed townhome development? (n = 2,208)

Much more likely to support	2%
Somewhat more likely to support	5
No effect	30
Somewhat more likely to oppose	33
Much more likely to oppose	29

QARGS9. Growth and new housing developments bring new infrastructure needs for which developers are not held responsible. This means that parking, traffic congestion, and water needs are afterthoughts when a housing project is proposed for a community. Does this information make you more likely to support or oppose the proposed townhome development? (n = 2,206)

Much more likely to support	2%
Somewhat more likely to support	4
No effect	16
Somewhat more likely to oppose	34
Much more likely to oppose	44

QARGS10. Developers and local government officials make a lot of promises when proposing and approving new housing developments, but then they do not follow through on the promises and the development ends up ruining the community. Does this information make you more likely to support or oppose the proposed townhome development? (n = 2,204)

Much more likely to support	1%
Somewhat more likely to support	3
No effect	21
Somewhat more likely to oppose	34
Much more likely to oppose	40

QARGS11. If we want our children and grandchildren to be able to afford a decent place to live in our communities, we have to provide more housing options. Does this information make you more likely to support or oppose the proposed townhome development? (n = 2,208)

Much more likely to support	13%
Somewhat more likely to support	37
No effect	35
Somewhat more likely to oppose	7
Much more likely to oppose	8



QPULSE2.

After everything you've read about growth and housing developments in Utah, think again about the new townhome development that has been proposed in your community. As a reminder, this would develop two community blocks (or about six acres) of land with fifteen townhomes per acre, adding ninety new townhomes to the community. These townhomes would be occupied by a mix of owners and renters once the development is finished. Would you support or oppose this development? (n = 2,203)

Strongly support	10%
Somewhat support	33
Somewhat oppose	28
Strongly oppose	28



CONJOINT.

Imagine for just a moment that a housing development is going to be built in your community. You need to decide which of the following two different housing developments you would prefer to be built in your community. Please read the descriptions of the two types of housing developments that could be built in your community. Then please indicate which of the two housing developments you would most prefer in your community. If you think that neither is preferable or that both are preferable, just pick the one that you think is the most preferable.

Scores below show the frequency with which each trait was selected, not controlling for other traits included in the options, and marginal effects of each trait in making a respondent more likely to select an option where it is present.

Baseline model included the following attributes: apartments, rental units, amenities within a 10-minute drive, only housing units, approved by the planning commission and city council, need to rely on a car for transportation, adds more than two thousand people to the community, built inside an existing neighborhood, and existing roads are expected to accommodate the development.

	Selected in a Combination	Marginal Effects (Compared to Baseline Model)
HOUSING TYPE		
Single-family homes	25%	0.23*
Townhomes	21	0.12*
Luxury apartments	19	0.06*
Apartments	16	--
Duplexes	20	0.09*
OCCUPANTS		
Owner-occupied	30	0.22*
Rental units	19	--
70% owner-occupied and 30% rental units	29	0.20*
30% owner-occupied and 70% rental units	22	0.06*
PROXIMITY		
Parks, schools, recreation, shopping, and restaurants are all within walking distance of the development.	51	0.02**
Parks, schools, recreation, shopping, and restaurants are all within a 10-minute drive of the development.	49	--
MIXED-USE		
Contains only units for housing.	23	--
Contains a mix between housing and businesses.	24	0.04*
Contains a mix between housing, businesses, and recreational features such as walking paths and parks.	26	0.09*
Contains a mix between housing and recreational features such as walking paths and parks.	27	0.09*

APPROVAL

Has been approved by the planning commission and the city council.	19	--
Has been approved by the planning commission and the city council after a series of public meetings where the community members provided substantial input to the plans.	21	0.08*
Has been approved by the planning commission and the city council after consulting with the school district.	20	0.03**
Has been approved by voters through a ballot referendum.	20	0.05*
Has been approved by the planning commission and the city council after consulting with the school district and holding a series of public meetings where the community members provided substantial input to the plans.	21	0.07*

TRANSPORTATION

Can walk to mass transit such as buses, Trax, and Frontrunner.	35	0.12*
Can bike or drive a short distance to connect to mass transit such as buses, Trax, and Frontrunner.	35	0.10*
Cannot connect easily to mass transit. Need to rely on a car for transportation.	29	--

DENSITY

Adds up to a hundred total residences and a few hundred new people to the community.	36	0.09*
Adds a few hundred total residences and up to two thousand new people to the community.	33	0.04*
Adds several hundred to a thousand total residences and more than two thousand new people to the community.	31	--

LOCATION

Built inside an existing neighborhood.	23	--
Built on the edge of an existing neighborhood.	25	0.03**
Built in an area that is mostly commercial.	26	0.05*
Built in an area that is currently undeveloped open space.	26	0.07*

INFRASTRUCTURE

New or expanded roads will be completed and space will be allotted for parking in the development before it is built.	26	0.06*
New or expanded roads will be completed and space will be allotted for parking in the development as it is being built.	25	0.04*
New or expanded roads will be completed and space will be allotted for parking in the development after it is built.	26	0.06*
Existing roads are expected to accommodate the development.	23	--

** effects are statistically significant at the $p < .01$ level, ** effects are statistically significant at the $p < .1$ level*

Now I have just a few final questions to ensure we have a representative sample. Please remember that your answers are completely confidential.

QCHILDREN. How many children under the age of 18 live in your home, if any? (n = 2,207)

None	57%
1	12
2	13
3	8
4	6
5 or more	4

QSOCMEDIA. About how often do you use social media, such as Facebook, Instagram, or Twitter? (n = 2,207)

Several times a day	42%
Once a day	21
3-5 times a week	9
1-2 times a week	8
Every few weeks	4
Less than once a month	4
Never	12

QEDOFR. What is the last year of school you completed? (n = 2,207)

Some high school or less	1%
High school graduate	6
Some college	25
College graduate	41
Post graduate degree (e.g. MA, MBA, LLD, PhD)	24
Vocational school or technical school	3

QEMPLOY. What is your employment status? (n = 2,204)

Self-employed	12%
Employed by someone else	52
Unemployed	1
Homemaker	9
Retired	24
Student	2

QMARRIAGE. Are you currently... (n = 2,206)

Married	75%
Divorced	7
Widowed	3
Living with partner	3
Single	11

QIDEOLOGY. On most political matters do you consider yourself: (n = 2,199)

Strongly conservative	19%
Moderately conservative	35
Neither, middle of the road	24
Moderately liberal	15
Strongly liberal	8

QRACE. Are you: (n = 2,199)

American Indian / Native American	1%
Asian	2
Black / African American	<1
Hispanic / Latino	4
White / Caucasian	82
Pacific Islander	1
Other (Please specify)	2

QINCOME. What do you expect your 2018 household income to be? (n = 2,197)

Under \$25,000	5%
\$25,000 - 34,999	6
\$35,000 - 49,999	10
\$50,000 - 74,999	16
\$75,000 - 99,999	18
\$100,000 - 124,999	13
\$125,000 - 149,999	8
Over \$150,000	13
Prefer not to say	11

QFINAL. Thank you for your time spent taking this survey. If you have any additional comments you'd like to share, please do so in the space below. (OPEN-ENDED RESPONSES VERBATIM IN APPENDIX)



COUNTY NAME (FROM VOTER FILE)

Box Elder	2%
Cache	4
Davis	13
Salt Lake	42
Summit	2
Utah	23
Wasatch	1
Washington	6
Weber	7
