

Citizens Jury[®]

Dakota County's Comprehensive Plan

November 3-7, 1997

sponsored by

Dakota County (MN) Board of Commissioners

Citizens Jury is a registered trademark of the Jefferson Center

Produced by the Jefferson Center

December 1997

Reprinted October 1999, June 2000

"I know of no safe depository of the ultimate powers of society but the people themselves; and if we think them not enlightened enough to exercise their control with a wholesome direction, the remedy is not to take it from them, but to inform their discretion."

Thomas Jefferson, 1820

The Jefferson Center would like to thank:

- The jurors for their time, effort, and dedication
- The staff at Dakota County; especially Jack Ditmore, Lynn Moratzka, Stephanie LeGros, and Jade Templin, for all the time and work that was put into the week
- The Dakota County Board of Commissioners for sponsoring the Citizens Jury project
- The witnesses for sharing their time and knowledge
- Helen Monsees and Paul Schaefer for their valuable moderating skills
- Northland Productions for all of the hard work that was put into making the video such a success

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface	1
Project Overview	3
Jury Recommendations	6
<i>Values And Social Concerns</i>	6
<i>General Policy Statements</i>	8
<i>Action Steps: Environment</i>	9
<i>Action Steps: Parks And Open Spaces</i>	10
<i>Action Steps: Transportation</i>	11
<i>Action Steps: Transit</i>	11
Juror Comments	13
Juror List	16
Jury Demographics	17
Evaluation	18
Project Staff And Steering Committee	19
Witness List	20
Agenda	21
About The Jefferson Center	24

PREFACE

Dakota County, like all other local governments in the metropolitan area, must submit a revised Comprehensive Plan to the Metropolitan Council by December 31, 1998. The revision of the County Comprehensive Plan is an involved process. In order to achieve a plan that reflects the values and vision of the residents of Dakota County, the public participation in the plan needed to shift from reaction to involvement in the process. From the beginning the Dakota County Board of Commissioners understood that it is unlikely that any single approach to public participation would meet all ends. In evaluating possible public involvement processes, the Board made a conscious decision to try innovative methods to engage the public in the planning process for its Comprehensive Plan.

Dakota County chose a combination of measures to encourage and foster public participation. The County began with internal teams to identify issues that were brought to citizen advisory groups. The results were used to help construct a county wide telephone survey of 875 households in the County. County staff and citizen advisory groups reviewed and analyzed the telephone survey results. These results were further refined for four focus groups of 8 to 10 people, randomly selected and statistically representative of the County. The focus groups discussed issues related to growth, transportation, environment, and parks and open space. The dialogue from the focus groups was recorded and evaluated along with all the previous public participation methods for use as a base for the Jefferson Center's Citizen Jury® project.

By taking the step to work with the Jefferson Center, the Dakota County Board of Commissioners took another innovative step to engage the public in the planning process. The County has continually sought more in-depth information about residents' concerns, priorities, and visions for the future. The previous work done with the citizen advisory groups, telephone survey, and focus groups worked well to elicit qualitative information and brainstorm on the issues. However, Dakota County wanted to take the process a step further by using a method that would, after education on the issues, allow its citizens to recommend policy, actions, and programs that the public would trust and support to deal with the issues.

Finally, to provide an equal opportunity for all residents to respond to the results of the Citizens Jury, a feature article entitled "How do we want to grow?" and survey response were included in the November, 1997 issue of the ***Dakota County Update***. Dakota County has been pleased by the overwhelming interest of its residents to be involved in the process. Dakota County will continue to seek innovative methods such as the Citizens Jury process to engage the public in planning for the future of Dakota County.

PROJECT OVERVIEW

The Citizens Jury[®] on Dakota County's Comprehensive Plan was designed to help identify the priorities of Dakota County citizens in light of the projected growth over the next twenty years. The County is expected to grow by approximately 140,000 people by the year 2020, and the Dakota County Board of Commissioners is in the process of revising their Comprehensive Plan to account for this growth. They asked that a Jury of Dakota County citizens discuss and make recommendations concerning the actions the County should take in the areas of transportation/transit, the environment, and parks/open spaces. The project was commissioned by Dakota County and conducted by the Jefferson Center with assistance from the Office of Planning. The jurors' recommendations were presented to the staff and to the Board of Commissioners to be considered for inclusion in the Comprehensive Plan.

THE JEFFERSON CENTER

The Jefferson Center is a non-profit, non-partisan organization located in Minneapolis, Minnesota. Established in 1974 to conduct research and development on new methods of fostering democratic participation and citizenship, the central focus of the Center has been the development of the Citizens Jury process, through which randomly selected, demographically representative panels of citizens meet for several days to examine public policy issues and present their findings to decision makers and to the community at large. The Jefferson Center offers a range of citizen input services, in addition to the Citizens Jury.

THE JURY PROCESS

The Steering Committee

A Steering Committee of representatives from the community, the Dakota County Office of Planning, and the Jefferson Center, played a critical role in insuring that information was presented to the Jury in an unbiased, objective and representative manner. The Committee worked with the staff to formulate the charge given to the jury, to assist in the construction of the week's agenda, and to aid in the selection of the witness presenters. A list of project staff and Steering Committee members can be found in Appendix A.

Juror Selection

The process for selecting the Jury began with a random telephone survey of Dakota County residents. The respondents who indicated an interest in the project were entered into a pool of potential jurors. Twenty-four jurors were then selected to participate in the Citizens Jury project. The jurors collectively represented the County in terms of age, education, gender, geographic location, and race. The jurors were also stratified on their opinion about growth, with the jury reflecting the community's feelings about whether the rate of growth was about right, too fast, or too slow. A list of the jurors and the relevant demographic information can be found in Appendix B and Appendix C.

Witness Selection

Experts on the issues at hand were called to serve as witnesses for the Jury hearings, providing valuable background information and testimony. The witnesses were selected to represent fair, objective, and wide ranging perspectives. Some of the witnesses consisted of staff members from Dakota County, while others were recruited from local government, private firms, and advocacy groups. A complete list of the witnesses that presented to the jury can be found in Appendix D.

THE EVENT

The Charge

The charge to the Jury outlined the Jury's directions for the week. It informed the Jury of their overall goals and objectives for the hearings. In this project the jurors were asked to answer three questions based on the extensive background and issue testimony they were given. The charge to the jurors was as follows:

1. What community/personal values are most enhanced or are most at risk by the projected growth in Dakota County in the next 20 years?
2. What aspects of living in Dakota County are important to keep and promote in light of projected growth?
3. What should be included in the Comprehensive Plan? Specifically what actions should the County take in the areas of transportation, the environment, and parks/open space?

The Hearings

In order to enable the jurors to answer the questions of the charge, the week was divided into three parts: Background Information, Issue Identification, and Deliberations. On days one and two, the jurors gained valuable information about the County and the implications of the projected growth. On days three and four, the jurors learned about issues relating to the environment, parks and open spaces, and transportation/transit. Finally, on day five, the jurors deliberated on the information they had received and developed their recommendations for the County. A complete agenda can be found in Appendix E.

Recommendations

The Jury's recommendations include some general policy statements that they felt the County should explore, as well as specific action steps for consideration. The jurors presented their recommendations on the afternoon of day five to the Board of Commissioners and Dakota County staff. The jurors were given the opportunity to dialogue with the Commissioners and staff about the week and the recommendations. The recommendations can be found following this Project Overview on page 4 in the exact form that the jurors themselves approved.

EVALUATION

At the conclusion of the process, the jurors were asked to complete an evaluation of the project. One of the most critical questions on the evaluation asked the jurors to consider the overall integrity of the project. An overwhelming majority of the jurors felt that the project was presented in an unbiased manner, with seventeen indicating that they were "very satisfied", six stated that they were "satisfied, and one juror was "neutral." A summary of the evaluations can be found in Appendix F. The jurors were also given the opportunity to write a personal statement about the project for inclusion in this report. These comments can be found on page 11.

THE VIDEO AND FOLLOW UP SURVEY

To gather public opinion on the recommendations of the jury, every household in Dakota County received a four-page insert as part of the "County Update". This insert described the project and the process, as well as highlighted the jurors recommendations. The residents of Dakota County were encouraged to watch a video, produced by the Jefferson Center. The video highlighted the week of the project and the recommendations made by the jurors. The video aired on cable access television throughout the month of December 1997, and was made available at Dakota County area libraries. After viewing the video and reading the insert, residents were then encouraged to respond to the survey in the insert.

UPDATE, written May 2000

In November 1998, the Jury re-convened for one evening to examine selected pieces of the Comprehensive Plan that was developed by Dakota County, prior to final approval and acceptance by the County Board. For each of the issue areas about which the original Jury developed recommendations, county staff presented relevant parts of the Comprehensive Plan. The Jury then discussed that component of the Plan and, through a series of electronic voting procedures, told the county whether they felt the Jury's recommendations were accurately and appropriately reflected in the Comprehensive Plan.

JURY RECOMMENDATIONS

We, the twenty-four jurors of the Citizens Jury® on Dakota County's Comprehensive Plan, have agreed upon the following answers to the charge questions posed to us in the following manner.

CHARGE

- 1. What community/personal values are most enhanced or are most at risk by the projected growth in Dakota County in the next 20 years?**
- 2. What aspects of living in Dakota County are important to keep and promote in light of the projected growth?**
- 3. What should be included in the Comprehensive Plan? Specifically, what actions should the County take in the areas of transportation, environment, parks and open spaces?**

Questions 1 & 2 (Values and Social Concerns):

In order to answer the first and second questions of the charge, we the jury went through an exercise in which we listed the values, social concerns and actions that are important to us, the residents living in the county. We then grouped the values under general headings. The following list is a combined answer to the values we care about and the aspects of living in Dakota County that we want to protect and promote in light of growth.

ART & CULTURE ENTERTAINMENT CHOICES

- Cultural opportunity, more entertainment
- Increased choices in amenities (jobs, food and entertainment)

NATURAL AREAS/HABITAT PARKLAND

- Open spaces

SENSE OF COMMUNITY IDENTITY & BELONGING

- Community identity, belonging
- Small town feeling
- e nse of community
- Privacy & personal identification

AGRICULTURAL ECONOMY

- Rural areas (farms)
- Farmland, open space
- Agricultural lifestyle
- Family farms

ECONOMIC GROWTH & DEVELOPMENT

- Increased local job opportunities
- Attract new families

- Increased tax base, more services
- Job opportunities
- Stronger local economy

TIME EFFICIENT TRANSPORTATION OPTIONS

- Transit mobility
- Traffic safety
- Mobility
- Traffic related issues: congestion, road-rage
- Less traffic
- Better transportation system
- Cost effective public transit

CLEAN ENVIRONMENT

- Reduce garbage
- Clean environment
- Awareness of environmental problems associated with community growth
- Water quality
- Water supply at risk
- Peace & tranquility (noise pollution)
- Awareness of air pollution
- Awareness of dumps
- Public information about environmental degradation

PUBLIC SAFETY

- Prevent increased crime
- More people may lead (or potential for) to more crime
- Public health

GOOD QUALITY EDUCATION

- Schools
- Community education

DIVERSE HOUSING MIXTURE

- Affordable housing

Question 3:

In answering question three of the charge, we identified general policy statements we feel should be considered as well as specific action steps the county can take in the areas of Environment, Parks/Open Spaces, and Transportation/Transit.

GENERAL POLICY STATEMENTS (in order of importance)

1. Encourage policies that manage growth so that we can keep pace with our ability to provide a supply of quality resources. (Vote: 24-yes, 0-no)
2. Pursue revenue generating options and pro-active funding for County Park acquisitions and operations. (Vote: 23-yes, 1-no)
3. Pursue strategies and policies, which allow the County to assume greater control over land-use decisions, which directly impact the environment, parks, and transportation/transit. (Vote: 20-yes, 2-no, 2 -undecided)

Why:

- Need to focus on bigger picture
- Better management of urban sprawl
- Better coordination of watershed management

Why Not:

- Met Council already oversees planning
- County role should be limited to advisory capacity
- Don't want to overburden County's ability to maintain quality

4. County should become more involved in providing some active recreational activities in County parks. (Vote: 9-yes, 14-no, 1 -undecided)

Why:

- Active recreational activities generate revenue.

Why Not:

- Cities do a fine job of providing active recreational activities.

ACTION STEPS: ENVIRONMENT

- **Initiate water conservation programs**
- **Take river water and run it into natural areas to naturally increase aquifer levels**
- **Restrict water use**
- **Set water use limits with billing incentives**
- **Initiate more aggressive surface water run off management strategies:**
 - ✓ Phase out Watershed Management Organizations - give money to the county to oversee water issues
 - ✓ Regulate/monitor fertilizer use - offer incentives for alternatives
 - ✓ Develop holding ponds for surface water control
- **Pursue a wide range of high priority strategies to address water quality concerns including:**
 - ✓ Promote regular water testing with tax incentives
 - ✓ Develop computer modeling to track water quality and quantity
 - ✓ Establish a fund especially for ensuring high quality water
 - ✓ Locate all possible water contamination sites and sources
 - ✓ Consider building water treatment plants
 - ✓ Strict industrial standards to avoid leaks and spills
 - ✓ Take nitrate-contaminated water for use on farm fields (recycle)
- **Acquire/purchase remaining natural areas for purposes of protection /preservation**
- **Provide financial incentives, which encourage preservation of natural areas**
 - ✓ More use of Land Stewardship organization
 - ✓ Easements should be provided
 - ✓ Tax breaks to support conservation
 - ✓ Initiate Program with incentives to encourage non-development of natural areas
- **Pursue/create public education initiatives regarding environmental issues:**
 - ✓ Establish public education on who to contact about old dumpsites
 - ✓ Establish public education on conservation of water and the effect on quantity
- **Create green corridor program**

ACTION STEPS: PARKS AND OPEN SPACES

- **Continue/Finish Current Park Master Plans**
 - ✓ Continue existing park plans
 - ✓ Finish a portion of acquisition and development of existing parks
 - ✓ Finish C.I.P. projects
 - ✓ Feasibility study on suitability of land for purchase
- **Increase City/County partnerships in Comprehensive, Long-term Park planning**
 - ✓ County and City plan from 100% developed perspective-more collaborative planning
 - ✓ Continue connecting trails city to city
 - ✓ Partnership between city/county to develop area-wide corridors
- **Maintain Priority of Preserving Open Space throughout county**
 - ✓ Extend shoreline protection to include more right of way
 - ✓ Maintain priority of preserving wildlife and natural resources
 - ✓ Keep Open Spaces
- **Diversify and increase passive recreational opportunities in county parks**
 - ✓ Develop large parks to include more passive recreational options, i.e., biking, in-line skating, playgrounds, tandem bike, and boat rentals
- **Publicize Park Issues and Opportunities**
 - ✓ Educate public regarding park issues
- **Maintain adequate separation of passive/active park recreational activities**
 - ✓ Keep passive use areas separate from active use areas
- **Pursue revenue-generating options/activities at county parks**
 - ✓ Add special interest areas to create revenue i.e., pools, skate parks, golf, and volleyball
 - ✓ Transfer of Development rights
 - ✓ Make funding a priority i.e., fees, tax, private contributions
 - ✓ Be creative in funding, county and city together, volunteer laborers
 - ✓ Institute user fees for Dakota County parks, possible reciprocity between other counties
 - ✓ Consider user fees to some extent
 - ✓ Aquatic facility to generate revenue

ACTION STEPS: TRANSPORTATION

- **Look at big picture**
 - ✓ Create outside citizen elected arbitration board to help settle disputes between Met Council, County, municipalities and developers. This group will have the final say.
 - ✓ Greater cooperation between City, County, State and developers on fully developed county property
 - ✓ Collaboration with cities to ensure city wide efficient transportation
 - ✓ Require cities to give comprehensive plan on future access to County roads

- **Plan and build with growth as assumption**
 - ✓ Look further than 2020, go to 2050
 - ✓ Build or plan roadways for the future
 - ✓ Continue present efforts

- **Charge impact fees for development**
 - ✓ Allow cities and counties to charge impact assessment to be pooled to pay for future road issues (come from developers and commercial)
 - ✓ Lobby for impact fees
 - ✓ Make developers more accountable through legislation

- **Continue to improve mobility on existing roads**
 - ✓ Expand the high occupancy lanes, turnouts & park - walk and rides
 - ✓ Correct existing roadways using access management principles
 - ✓ Continue to improve mobility on existing roads
 - ✓ Educate public on alternate routes

- **Promote industrial commercial & residential diversity**
 - ✓ Diversity of development – decentralize

ACTION STEPS: TRANSIT

- **Provide a range of financial incentives for those who use public transit such as:**
 - ✓ Car-poolers offered tax relief and special use of lanes
 - ✓ Incentives for people who ride the bus
 - ✓ Tax deductions for transit users
 - ✓ Encourage large businesses to provide bus vouchers
 - ✓ Create incentives for employers to encourage transit use
 - ✓ Encourage commercial businesses to provide transit vouchers

- **Provide leadership in developing alternative regional transit options**
 - ✓ Create a railway

- ✓ Commuter trains
- ✓ County should continue to explore options or alternate transit with regional focus (subway & rail)

- **Expand bus lanes**
(Some disagreement among jurors on this point)

- **Provide adequate park and ride space for bus riders and car-poolers**
 - ✓ Separate bus riders from car-poolers in park and ride areas.

- **Expand the tax district and add transit to populations who are not being served**

JUROR COMMENTS

“What a remarkable experience. For the first time in my life, I really felt a part of the democratic process. I also feel more connected to my county, and realize they do care about my opinions on the county’s growth and land use. If everyone in this country participated in a Citizens Jury, maybe we would take more notice about issues impacting our lives and in turn, help guide legislation that governs our existence in the United States. It was truly an honor for me to be heard, along with my fellow jurors, as well as to learn more about my county.”

- **Reena Abraham**

“It was an honor to be selected and allowed to participate on the Citizens Jury. This was a great experience as well as very educational. I think more people should be involved in this type of a process.”

- **Jeff Canada**

“Issues: I feel we need to slow down urban sprawl at a faster rate. We need to generate funding for additional parkland. We need to get a control on county childcare spending. Process: This is an excellent way to get people more interested in county issues.”

- **Mark Cemensky**

“I thank you for allowing me to be a part of the process. I won’t say I enjoyed it but I found it informative. I also found it to be a needed part of the decision making process to involve the citizens. What I wait for now is whether or not our elected officials will act on any of the jury’s suggestions. Thanks again.”

- **Bob Clark**

“The opportunity to participate has provided me with a lot of information about how various levels of government work together. This experience, with all its related discussions and presentations, has renewed my faith in my fellow Dakota County residents. The Jefferson Center staff demonstrated expertise in conducting this event, and proved to be a great resource to the jurors.”

- **Ron Clayton**

“It gave me a chance to learn how government works. It also gave me a chance to help it (government) work with my input.”

- **Curtis Cook**

“It is important to encourage mixed-use developments (housing, retail. Etc.) in suburban areas, in order to focus less use on automobiles. There is a need to encourage more pedestrian and bicycle transportation. This can/should be done in a tasteful manner by providing adequate separations and buffering from existing homes.”

- **Tim Damgaard**

"I feel the county should have the right to approve or disapprove a development which has many cul-de-sacs and not enough exits and this may result in a major road project."

- Penny Dimmen

"Being a part of the Citizens Jury was an honor. I feel I have not only learned about environmental, park, and transportation issues, I have learned first hand how our government works. This experience has made me feel like a productive member of our county and society. I feel good about the contribution that I have made to this group, and the contribution this group has made to the county. I would recommend being a part of a Citizens Jury to others."

- Alice Fitzgerald

"I was delighted to be part of this history making event. I truly believe that all twenty-four of us came here to do the best job we could. We may not always agree on the specifics, but we agree on the idea of more citizen input in government. Thank you for this opportunity to learn and grow from this event."

- Marsha Frank

"Excellent way to get some idea of what the citizens think or relate to. This process should happen on different levels of our government."

- Eugene Gatzke

"It was an honor and a privilege as a citizen of Dakota County to be involved in a process that normally would not have had *real* citizen input into areas that impact our future and way of life. We are the experts in what concerns most citizens in Dakota County. This forum was a chance for us to voice our opinions."

- Barbara Gotofski

"The entire process was very illuminating. I do think the issues were very difficult to define due to the fact that who had authority over whom or what was sometimes difficult to understand. I also think it could have been more manageable if the charge to the jury had been more specific, so the jury could focus more on specific solutions to the problems that not only exist, but anticipated problems as well."

-John Kalin, Jr.

"I am excited by this whole process. I think it would be beneficial however, if we would have had a jury to deal with each issue on its own. For example, one jury on Environment, one jury on Transportation, and one on Parks and Open Spaces. Then have this presented in a packet. I hope more government agencies utilize this process. I feel that it is a great option to involve people in planning."

- Joan B. Mies

"I think that issues concerning quality/quantity of water, parks, open spaces, use of land, etc., are issues that cannot be denied as extremely important. However, taking more power from, or imposing more regulations on the citizens, is not always the best way to protect the resources; I don't think that this philosophy was fairly represented by the panel of speakers. It scared me a little bit that some people so readily accept what one or two people say as *facts*, rather than seeing it as only one piece of the issue. It seems somewhat unethical to recommend policy changes without knowing all the facts pertaining to the particular issue."

-Soni Morgan

"A Citizens Jury is an excellent way of involving the residents on important issues that the county faces. Presenters of different views, the discussions of critical issues, and starting to formulate possible solutions by the citizens, is an excellent process."

-Adam Napiorkowski

"The moderators and staff are very friendly, considerate and humorous. It was really nice to participate in the Citizens Jury when there are so many great people working with you. A lot of what I heard was new to me, as I do not own (or rent) a home, or own any land. But I wanted to participate because a lot of what was discussed are issues for more than just Dakota County. If and when I move, and if it happens to be out of the county, I can carry this information with me."

-Missy Sapletal

"I am proud to have had the opportunity to take part in this Citizens Jury. So often, I hear the words, *what can I do about it?*, when referring to government. The Citizens Jury is an excellent answer to that question. We get the kind of government that we vote for, or don't vote for! So those people that do not vote, do not have a moral standing for their criticism of government. Citizen involvement is the only answer to shabby government. "*Just do it*" should be the slogan for citizen involvement."

- John Schmidt

"This week was a great experience. I was a little unsure of what it would be like. I learned a lot about Dakota County that I hadn't learned before. It was great to meet the people who work for our county, they seem concerned and knowledgeable. The idea of a Citizens Jury is great. The Jefferson Center staff is excellent. I wish more people could participate in something like this."

- Anita Sullivan

"The process was conducted in a very professional manner. The people presented their views and ideas clearly, knew their subject, and are doing a good job for everyone in Dakota County. The moderators did an outstanding job in getting full input from the jurors."

-L.W. Tighe

JUROR LIST

NAME	OCCUPATION	AGE	HOMETOWN
Reena Abraham	Risk Management	32	Apple Valley
Jeffery Canada	Industrial Coatings Contractor	33	Apple Valley
Mark Cemensky	Electrician	36	Mendota Heights
Robert Clark	Communications Technician	50	Apple Valley
Ronald Clayton	Quality Supervisor	59	South St. Paul
Curtis Cook	Retired, Aikline Mechanic	69	Lakeville
Tim Damgaard	Sales	32	Apple Valley
Penny Dimmen	Realtor/Casino Supervisor	53	Farmington
Alice Fitzgerald	Registered Nurse	38	South St. Paul
Marsha Frank	Dressmaker/Homemaker	44	Eagan
Eugene Gatzke	Machine Shop Supervisor	62	Burnsville
Barbara Gotofski	Bookkeeper	40	West St. Paul
Kristi Guza	Data Entry	31	Burnsville
John Kalin, Jr.	Golf Professional	42	Lakeville
Rosalind McGuire	Student/Homemaker	20	Hastings
Joan Mies	Farming	45	Hampton
Soni Morgan	Student	31	Rosemount
Adam Napirkowski	Network Manager	45	Eagan
Missy Sapletal	Secretary	21	South St.Paul
John Schmidt	Retired, Patio Installer	62	South St. Paul
James Smith	Retired, Pressman	68	Lakeville
Anita Sullivan	Homemaker	34	Eagan
Lawrence Tighe	Retired	76	Rosemount
Donna Marie Wyatt	Restaurant Service	31	Farmington

JURY DEMOGRAPHICS

One of the key components of any Citizens Jury is its demographic balance. The group is selected to be representative of the community as a whole. We therefore first assess the demographics of the region (in this case, Dakota County) and balance the jury on up to six demographic characteristics. Our standard variables are age, education, gender, geographic location, and race. The sixth variable is usually an attitudinal response to the issue at hand. For this jury we balanced the group on citizens' response to the question, "From what you have heard or seen, do you think the rate of population growth in Dakota County is too slow, about right, or too fast?" to ensure a group of jurors with a diversity of opinions. In assigning targets for representation, we used projected data for 1997 when possible. For education, 1997 projections were not available, and so the targets are based on the 1990 Census. In some cases, we missed our assigned targets due to last minute cancellations and substitutions.

Characteristics Stratified On	Actual % in County	Target # of Jurors	Actual # of Jurors
Age:			
18-34 years	44%	10	9
35-44 years	24%	6	6
45+ years	32%	8	9
Education:			
High School or less	42%	10	8
Some College	33%	8	12
College or more	25%	6	4
Gender:			
Male	50%	12	12
Female	50%	12	12
Geographic Location:			
Southern/Rural	13%	3	4
North./Established	25%	6	6
Suburban/Develop.	62%	15	14
Race:			
White	94%	22	22
Non-white	6%	2	2
Attitudinal Questions:			
Too Slow/About Right	58%	14	13
Too Fast	42%	10	11

EVALUATION

In general, how do you feel about the Citizens Jury on Dakota County's Comprehensive Land Use Plan now that you have completed the project?

Very Satisfied	13
Satisfied	9
Neutral	1
Dissatisfied	0
Very Dissatisfied	0

How do you feel about different parts of the project?

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
Introductory Session	15	6	1	1	0
Bus Tour	18	6	0	0	0
Day 1 Presentations	8	15	0	1	0
Day 2 Presentations	6	14	3	1	0
Day 3 Presentations	5	10	7	2	0
Day 4 Presentations	7	15	1	0	1
Deliberations	6	15	3	0	0

One of our aims is to have the staff and volunteers conduct the project in an unbiased way. How satisfied are you with their performance in this regard?

Very Satisfied	17
Satisfied	6
Neutral	1
Dissatisfied	0
Very Dissatisfied	0

PROJECT STAFF AND STEERING COMMITTEE

JEFFERSON CENTER

Marla Ivan	Executive Director
Ned Crosby	Project Coordinator
Jen Augustson	Project Associate
Amy Gagstetter	Project Associate
Lynette Uetz	Office Manager/Project Associate

DAKOTA COUNTY

Jack Ditmore	Deputy Director, Office of Planning
Lynn Moratzka	Senior Planner, Office of Planning
Stephanie LeGros	Planner, Office of Planning
Jade Templin	Planner, Office of Planning

MODERATORS

Helen Monsees
Paul Schaefer

STEERING COMMITTEE

Jim Benson	Community Representative
Donald Buckner	Community Representative
Ned Crosby	Jefferson Center
Jack Ditmore	Dakota County
Amy Gagstetter	Jefferson Center
Lynn Moratzka	Dakota County
Joanne Seaberg	Community Representative

WITNESS LIST

DAY 1

Kurt Chatfield	Senior Planner, Office of Planning, Dakota County
Jack Ditmore	Deputy Director, Office of Planning, Dakota County
Kathleen Gaylord	Mayor, South St. Paul
Lynn Moratzka	Senior Planner, Office of Planning, Dakota County
Brandt Richardson	County Administrator, Dakota County
Hank Tressel	Township Supervisor, Ravenna Township

DAY 2

Kurt Chatfield	Senior Planner, Office of Planning, Dakota County
Jack Ditmore	Deputy Director, Office of Planning, Dakota County
Gunnar Isberg	Planning Consultant, President: Gunnar Isberg & Associates
Gary Laurent	President, Laurent Builders Inc.
Lee Ronning	Program Director, 1000 Friends of Minnesota, Land Stewardship Project
Jade Templin	Planner, Office of Planning, Dakota County
Lezlie Vermillion	Transportation Engineer, Highway Department, Dakota County

DAY 3

Hannah Dunevitz	Natural Heritage Program, MN Department of Natural Resources
Eric Evenson	Senior Planner, Office of Planning, Dakota County
Steve Michaud	Parks Director, City of Lakeville
Dave Riggs	Center of the American Experiment
Michael Rutten	Environmental Specialist, Environmental Management, Dakota County
Steve Sullivan	Parks Supervisor, Parks Department, Dakota County
Lois Swanson	Parks & Open Space Commission, Metropolitan Council
Jade Templin	Planner, Office of Planning, Dakota County
John Vondelinde	Director of Parks, Anoka County

DAY 4

Mark Hoisser	Dakota Area Resources & Transportation for Seniors
Beverly Miller	MN Valley Transit
Lynn Moratzka	Senior Planner, Office of Planning, Dakota County
Keith Nelson	City Engineer, City of Lakeville
Pete Sorenson	Traffic Engineer, Highway Department, Dakota County
Lezlie Vermillion	Transportation Engineer, Highway Department, Dakota County
Brian Vollum	MN Department of Transportation & Metropolitan Council
Dave Zech	Design Engineer, Highway Department, Dakota County

AGENDA

DAY 1: Monday, November 3rd INTRODUCTIONS

- 8:30 Introduction of Jurors, Dakota County Staff, and Jefferson Center Staff.
Jack Ditmore, Deputy Director Dakota County
- 9:15 Brief introduction of Jefferson Center, Citizens Jury Process, Charge, Agenda, and Rules of Procedure *Ned Crosby, Jefferson Center*
- 9:30 Dakota County overview of taxing authority and services
Brandt Richardson, County Administrator, Dakota County
Question and Answer
- 10:30 Profile of the County and Projected Growth
Kurt Chatfield, Senior Planner, Dakota County
- 11:00 Bus Tour of Dakota County
Lynn Moratzka Senior Planner Dakota County
LUNCH - eat at a county facility
- 3:15 Other Layers of Government and Planning Initiatives
Hank Tressel, Supervisor, Ravenna Township
Kathleen Gaylord, Mayor, South St. Paul
Question and Answer, Dialogue
- 4:15 Wrap-up
- 4:30 ADJOURN

DAY 2: Tuesday, November 4th BACKGROUND

- 8:30 Brief review of Comprehensive Land Use Plan and county planning efforts
Jack Ditmore
- 8:50 Implications of population growth
Kurt Chatfield, Senior Planner, Dakota County
- Current Environmental issues *Eric Evenson, Senior Planner, Dakota County*
- Current Parks issues *Jade Templin, Planner Dakota County*
- Current Transportation/Transit issues *Lezlie Vermillion, Engineer, Highway Dept.*
Question and Answer will be taken throughout
- 10:40 Panel Discussion: How should Dakota County be involved in addressing issues relating to growth?
Gary Laurent, Laurent Builders, Inc.
Gunnar Isberg, Planning Consultant
Lee Ronning, Land Stewardship
- 12:30 LUNCH
- 1:30 Review Question 1 of the charge.
- 3:00 Review Question 2 of the charge.
- 4:15 Wrap-up
- 4:30 ADJOURN

DAY 3: Wednesday, November 5
ENVIRONMENT AND PARKS/OPEN SPACE

- 8:30 Introduction to environmental issues and specific questions to be addressed
***Eric Evenson**, Dakota County*
- 9:05 Discussion of Ground Water
***Michael Rutten**, Environmental Management, Dakota County*
*Commentary by **Dave Riggs**, Center of the American Experiment*
- 10:10 Discussion of Natural Areas
***Hannah Dunevitz**, Department of Natural Resources*
*Commentary by **Dave Riggs**, Center of the American Experiment*
- 11:00 Question and Answer, Dialogue with first four witnesses
- 11:20 Group Activity: Discuss the most important issues facing the county with regards to the environment questions posed to during the presentations.
- 11:45 LUNCH
- 12:30 Background on parks issue and future trends in park use. ***Jade Templin***
- 12:45 Overview of parks system.
***Steve Sullivan**, Parks Department Dakota County*
- 1:05 Regional park system funding sources and constraints
***Lois Swanson**, Met Council, Parks & Open Space Commission*
- 2:00 City and county parks and their relationship with regional parks system
***Steve Michaud**, Parks Director, City of Lakeville*
- 2:25 Review of Anoka County park system
***John Vondelinde**, Director of Parks, Anoka County*
- 2:50 Question and answer to panel
- 3:05 Group Activity: Discuss the most important issues facing the county with regards to the Parks questions posed to during the presentations.
- 3:30 Discuss how to respond to Question #3 of charge regarding environment and parks.
- 4:15 Wrap-up
- 4:30 ADJOURN

DAY 4 : Thursday, November 6th
TRANSPORTATION/TRANSIT

- 8:30 Review agenda for the day
- 8:40 Overview of land use, its relationship to transportation and how future growth will affect this area.
***Lezlie Vermillion, Pete Sorenson, & Dave Zech** Dakota County:
Highway Dept. Traffic Engineer Design Engineer*
- 9:40 Additional witnesses on Transportation
***Brian Vollum**, MN DOT/ Met Council*
- 10:30 ***Keith Nelson**, City Engineer, City of Lakeville*
- 11:00 Questions to morning witnesses
- 11:45 LUNCH
- 12:30 Overview of Transit and question to be answered
Lynn Moratzka

- 12:50 Additional witnesses on Transit
Mark Hoisser, Dakota Area Resources and Transportation for Seniors
Beverly Miller, MN Valley Transit
Q&A to both witnesses
- 2:10 Group Activity: Discuss the most important issues facing the county regarding transportation/ transit questions posed during the presentations.
- 2:40 Discuss how to respond to Question #3 of the charge regarding transportation and transit.
- 3:10 DELIBERATIONS START. Begin by answering Question #1 of the charge and move on to Question #2 if time permits.
- 4:30 ADJOURN

DAY 5: Friday, November 7th
DELIBERATIONS AND DEBRIEFING

- 8:30 DELIBERATIONS CONTINUE
Day starts with quick discussion of timing. It is expected that jurors will spend one hour answering Question #2 and two hours answering Question #3.
- 12:30 LUNCH
- 1:30 Review of wording of answers to the charge. Evaluation and personal statement will also be done during this time.
- 2:30 Informal conversation between jurors and moderators about the project.
- 3:00 Debriefing. Jurors present their findings and recommendations to county officials in a discussion format allowing for questions and comments by jurors and county officials alike.



J E F F E R S O N C E N T E R

CITIZEN INPUT. REAL RESULTS.

The Jefferson Center is a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization working to strengthen the democratic process by generating thoughtful citizen input on matters of public importance. In fulfilling this mission, the Jefferson Center provides services to help decision makers learn what citizens think and value regarding key issues.

Established in 1974, the Center is best known for its trademarked Citizens Jury process. The Center has conducted Citizens Jury projects on a wide range of local, state and national issues.

Including the Citizens Jury process, the Jefferson Center offers five services designed to produce useful citizen input for decision makers, their organizations and the public.

Citizens Jury®: A randomly selected and demographically representative panel of rank-and-file citizens meets for five days and carefully examines an issue of public significance. They hear from a variety of expert witnesses, deliberate together and present their recommendations to policy makers and the public.

Feedback Panel: Citizens, customers clients or stakeholders meet for one or two days to provide input about how an agency or organization can modify a service, improve performance, or deal with a challenging problem.

Public Participation Workshop: This one-day workshop examines a full range of tools & techniques that can be used to organize and manage effective public participation efforts. It features a methodology that helps public officials select citizen participation strategies that fit their particular situation.

Needs Analysis: The Center helps clients identify & understand their public participation needs & challenges and provides expert counsel about how to handle them. This unique service offers highly customized advice and assistance with their citizen input needs.

Public Hearings Plus: The Jefferson Center provides clients with advice about how they can improve public hearings: how to prepare and manage hearings, and how to get maximum benefit from public hearings by doing effective follow-up.

For further information about the Jefferson Center or its services, please contact the Center at 612.926.3292 or visit www.jefferson-center.org.