FUNDING PROGRAMS
FISCAL YEAR 2019

WASATCH FRONT REGIONAL COUNCIL
WFRC Funding Programs

- Wasatch Front Economic Development District
- Community Development Block Grant Program
- Transportation & Land Use Connection Program
- Surface Transportation Program
- Congestion Mitigation Air Quality
- Transportation Alternatives Program
Mission: Support economic development plans, promote long-term economic competitiveness, and attract federal monies in order to implement local plans.

Expand Employment
- Planning Request
  - $100,000
  - Develop strategies to expand employment in Utah’s advanced composites manufacturing industry and supply chain

Encourage Entrepreneurship
- Construction Request
  - $2,000,000
  - Grow creative industries and connect people and organization to space, technology, and opportunity

Workforce Training
- Workforce Training Request
  - $614,000
  - Provide workforce training to disadvantaged youth in the green construction industry
**Mission:** Support economic development plans, promote long-term economic competitiveness, and attract federal monies in order to implement local plans.

### U.S. Economic Development Administration Funding Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUBLIC WORKS &amp; ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE</th>
<th>REGIONAL INNOVATION STRATEGIES</th>
<th>LOCAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 - $3,000,000</td>
<td>$0 – $500,000</td>
<td>$0 – $300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Job Creation</td>
<td>• Innovation Centers</td>
<td>• Economic Development Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Job Retention</td>
<td>• Entrepreneurial Centers</td>
<td>• Feasibility Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Construction</td>
<td>• Cluster-Based Startups</td>
<td>• Impact Analyses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Global Competitiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Leverage Private Capital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Coal Impacted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Build Regional Capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Small Cities Program

Program Purpose
The purpose of the CDBG Program is to assist in developing viable urban communities by providing decent housing and a suitable living environment, principally for persons of low and moderate income.

Program Eligibility
Morgan, Tooele, and Weber Counties
Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program

HOUSING and COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Total Funding for FY 2018
$762,697

- Water Storage Tank Updates
  Washington Terrace City $232,503
- Sewer Line Replacement
  Wendover City $192,417
- Waterline Replacement
  Wendover City $250,000
Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program

ELIGIBLE PROJECT TYPES

• Planning
• Building Rehabilitation
• Removal of ADA Barriers
• Public Safety Equipment
• Property Acquisition for Public Purposes
• Promotion of Neighborhood Centers
• Create/Rehab. Recreation Facilities
• Demolish Buildings to Reduce Slum/Blight
• Install/Modify Public Works Infrastructure
• Construct/Reconstruct Streets, Water, Sewer Facilities
• Housing Lot Acquisition for Multiple-Family Housing Construction
Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program

Timeline

October
- Attend How to Apply workshop

November-January
- Attend How to Apply workshop
- Conduct income surveys
- Hold first public hearing

February
- Submit applications in WebGrants
- Consolidated Plans due

April
- Awards announced
Maximize the value of investment in public infrastructure

Enhance access to opportunity

Increase travel options to optimize mobility

Create communities with opportunities to live, work, and play

TRANSPORTATION AND LAND USE CONNECTION
TLC PROJECTS

- Ordinances
- Transportation/Active Transportation
- Master Plans
- Complete Streets & Street Connectivity
- First/Last Mile Implementation
- Station & Small Area Plans
- Corridor Plans
- Studies (such as market, redevelopment)
- Visioning
- Parking Reform

WWW.WFRC.ORG/TLC
FEDERAL FUNDING PROGRAMS

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM (STP)

CONGESTION MITIGATION/ AIR QUALITY (CMAQ)

TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES PROGRAM (TAP)

FEDERAL FUNDING PROGRAMS
SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM (STP)
Eligible STP Project Types

- Street widening or new construction
- Improve or reconstruct existing streets
- Bridge replacement
- Projects that reduce traffic demand
- Intersection improvements
5600 West – 6200 South to 7000 South
Reconstruct & Widen
CONGESTION MITIGATION/ AIR QUALITY (CMAQ)
Eligible CMAQ Project Types

• Projects that improve Air Quality

• Construct or purchase public transportation facilities and equipment

• Commuter bicycle & pedestrian facilities

• Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)

• Projects that reduce traffic demand

• Intersection improvements
Constructed/Purchased Public Transportation Facilities and Equipment
Eligible TAP Project Types

- Construction, planning, and design
- Pedestrian, bicyclists, & other non-motorized forms of transportation
- Improvements could include:
  - Sidewalks
  - Bicycle infrastructure
  - Traffic calming techniques
  - Lighting and safety-related infrastructure for non-drivers
- Safe Routes to School projects
WFRC Funding Program Deadlines

We’re Here:

- Funding Programs Announced: August 2018
- Notice for Letters of Intent Sent: September 2018
- Letters of Intent Due: October 2018
- Applications Due: January 2019
- Projects Recommended: Spring 2019
For More Information

Wasatch Front Regional Council

www.wfrc.org

Christy Dahlberg
801-363-4250 x5005
christy@wfrc.org

Scott Hess
801-363-4250 x1104
shess@wfrc.org

Megan Townsend
801-363-4250 x1101
mtownsend@wfrc.org

Ben Wuthrich
801-363-4250 x1121
bwuthrich@wfrc.org
PRINCIPLES OF UPDATE PROCESS

• **Be transparent** throughout

• **Set expectations** from the start

• **Directly involve** technical and policy partners in design and development of decision models

• **Multiple opportunities** for review, feedback, and input

• **Educate and inform** all stakeholders

• **Build confidence and buy-in** in the process, data, and model
CAPACITY PRIORITY TOOL GOALS

• Outcome focused rather than problem focused

• The ability to assess regional and statewide economic development impacts and outcomes

• Assess the extent to which local land use plans support statewide initiatives

• Transparent and understandable to the public and stakeholders

• Strikes the right balance between complexity, simplicity and transparency

• The ability to compare across assets and modes, as well the ability to assess and compare rural vs. urban projects *
HIGHWAY AND TRANSIT

- Recognize differences; align processes
- Parallel tool development processes
  - Initial phase in 2018 will focus on highway decision model
  - Follow-on phase in 2019 will focus on transit decision model
- Develop separate models initially
- Work toward integration
OVERARCHING QUESTIONS

Why?
- Why is transportation important to Utah?
- Why are we prioritizing our investments?
- Why should Jon and Jane Q care?

What?
- What are we trying to impact?
- What transportation outcomes can we affect?
- What matters most?

How?
- How do we evaluate projects?
- How do score, weight, or balance projects?
- How do we measure the why’s and what’s?
WHAT THE GROUP SAID
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mode  improve  best
local  travel  user
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support  environment
access
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fiscal  equity  funding
health  goods
services  infrastructure
reduction
number
community
modes
use
life
WHY? THEMES

Access / Opportunity
Comprehensive
Economic Vitality
Environment
Equity
Fiscal Responsibility
Land Use
Mobility
Multi-modal
Process Consideration
Quality of Life
Safety
Technology
Trends

LJDOT - Keeping Utah Moving
WHAT CONNECTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Why’s</th>
<th>Unique What Connects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>#26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic vitality</td>
<td>#55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial sustainability</td>
<td>#22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>#32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of life</td>
<td>#32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Access to education
- Access to opportunity
- Community access to schools & food
- Community destinations
- Destination access
- Dock to dock
- Education - labor access
- Food
- Household access to education
- Household access to jobs
- Household access to recreation
- Job choice
- Job opportunities
- Jobs - number with reasonable time/distance
- Labor access
- Labor access to firms
- Leisure
- Lower income populations (vulnerability)
- Mode choice
- Recreation - local parks
- Recreation - open space access
- Recreation - tourism
## HOW CONNECTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Why’s</th>
<th>Unique What Connects</th>
<th>Unique How Connects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>#26</td>
<td>#21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic vitality</td>
<td>#55</td>
<td>#24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial sustainability</td>
<td>#22</td>
<td>#13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>#32</td>
<td>#26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of life</td>
<td>#32</td>
<td>#47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Why?
- Accessibility
- Economic vitality
- Financial sustainability
- Mobility
- Quality of life

### What?
- Unique What Connects
- Unique How Connects

### How?
- Average trip time
- Connections to land use
- Consider user costs of modes
- Cost of access (e.g. household and individual cost per trip
- Density of driveways
- Destinations - use decay weighting
- Distance to life support
- Distance to higher education
- Distance to recreation
- First-mile, last-mile
- Mode choice with 1/4 mile
- Number of destination types
- Number of destinations within 30 minutes
- Number of jobs within XX minutes of travel
- Project cost
- Proximity to an arterial
- Safe interactions by mode
- Variety of land use connections
- Vulnerable communities (e.g. low income)
- Travel time by mode, by destination, by origin
Why ↔ What ↔ How

**Why?**
Considerations
Organizing objectives of the prioritization framework; relate to unified plan goals and strategic initiatives

**What?**
Criteria
Operationalizing each consideration into unique, defined concepts that can be measured

**How?**
Calculations
Quantitative and qualitative information for each criteria depicting project benefits
**Economy**

- Access to opportunity
  - Jobs
  - Market
  - Freight movement
  - Resources

- Business costs
  - Productivity
  - Reliability
  - Travel time
  - Cost of good movement
  - Dock-to-dock

- Industry clusters
  - Mega-development
  - GOED Strategic Industry Clusters (e.g. tourism)

**Quality**

- Access to opportunity
  - Recreation
  - Education
  - Medical care
  - Community services / Food
  - Equity

- Land use and community
  - Policy and vision consistency

- Safety

- Public health
  - Air quality
  - Recreation

- Natural environment
  - Benefit

**Mobility**

- Reliability
  - Delay
  - Person throughput
    - Utilization
  - Connectivity
    - Redundancy / resiliency
    - First-last mile
    - Grid connectivity

- Integrated systems
  - Operations
  - Multimodal
  - Active transport
  - Interoperability

**Responsibility**

- Life-cycle cost benefit
  - Return on investment
  - Future preservation needs
  - Cost-benefit

- Cost share
  - Leverage
  - Partners
  - Pub/Priv
  - Geography equity

- Opportunity cost
Decision Support Tool

Making Informed Decisions
START CONSIDERATIONS

Economy
Quality
Mobility
Responsibility

CRITERIA

CALCULATIONS

PROJECTS
Access to Opportunity

Business Costs

Industry Clusters
Access to Opportunity

Jobs
- Market
- Freight movement
- Resources

Business Costs
- Productivity
- Reliability
- Travel time
- Cost of good movement
- Dock-to-dock time

Industry Clusters
- GOED STIC
- Megadevelopment

Opportunity Scores

Business Scores

Industry Scores
NEXT STEPS
NEXT STEPS

• Further develop measures and methods – Aug 21 & 22
  • Is the data available?
  • What will it tell us?
  • What can we calculate?
  • What is the level of effort?

• Consider input on other process aspects

• Follow-on sprint team meeting early Fall
  • Measures feedback
  • Weighting and scoring
  • Mapping the prioritization process
**Evaluation Criteria Category: Access to Opportunity**

**Question:** List the existing number of jobs within a ½ mile that are accessed annually by this proposed project. Data can be obtained by using the US Census Bureau OnTheMap at [https://onthemap.ces.census.gov/](https://onthemap.ces.census.gov/)

**Metric:** Using the OnTheMap tool, identify the estimated number of jobs available within a ½ mile from proposed project.

**Weighting:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5,000 or more jobs annually</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,500 – 4,999</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 – 2,499</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250 – 999 jobs</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 249 jobs</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question:** List the public or private job training and educational opportunities (higher education / vocational instruction / professional schools) within a ½ mile of the proposed project.

**Metric:** Number of public or private job training and educational opportunities (higher education / vocational instruction / professional schools) within a ½ mile of the proposed project.

**Weighting:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 or more job training or educational opportunities within ½ mile</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 within ½ mile</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 within ½ mile</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 within ½ mile</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question:** What is your existing mix of housing types? (Check with your jurisdiction’s Moderate-Income Housing Plan (MIHP). Is your diversification of housing types increasing over time (for example, the next 5 to 10 years)?

**Metric:** Percent increase in diversification of housing types over 5 – 10 years.
**Evaluation Criteria Category:** Wasatch Choice 2050

**Question:** Is this project part of an identified center (historical and/or emerging regional destination of economic activity)?

- **Metropolitan Center** – mixed land use with crossroads of regional roads as well as host to the region’s transit hub
- **Urban Center** – mix of land uses with significant commerce/regional retail; intersection of major arterials/freeway interchanges served by high capacity transit
- **Town Center** - mix of land uses including grocery stores, restaurants, civic, and retail in a node area of 6-8 city blocks or a corridor of several blocks in length; frequent bus lines, high capacity transit
- **Neighborhood Center** – mix of land uses including retail in a node area of approximately 1-4 city blocks or a corridor of a few blocks in length; frequent bus lines, high capacity transit
- **Employment** – office flex; arterial or higher roadway needs; high capacity transit
- **Industrial** – light and heavy industry, warehousing, incidental office, retail; freight-oriented roadway needs with bus services as optimal transit
- **Special District** - regionally significant special purpose such as an airport or university; a variety of context sensitive roadway and transit needs

**Metric:** Is proposed project part of an identified Wasatch 2050 Center?

**Weighting:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question:** Which Wasatch Choice 2050 Vision Key Strategies does the project meet?
- Provide transportation choices – Allows for more than one mode to reach a destination
- Support housing options
- Preserve open space
- Link development and transportation decisions – How does this proposed project link economic development, housing, and transportation?

**Metric:** Which Wasatch Choice 2050 Strategy does the project meet?

**Weighting:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 strategies identified</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 strategies identified</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-1 strategies identified</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluation Criteria Category: Economic Innovation

**Question**: Is the proposed project within the boundaries of a Redevelopment Area / Community Redevelopment Area / Opportunity Zone / Transportation Reinvestment Zone? If so, provide the boundaries of the redevelopment area and the goal / purpose of the project area.

**Metric**: Is the proposed project within the boundaries of Redevelopment Area / Community Redevelopment Area / Opportunity Zone / Transportation Reinvestment Zone?

**Weighting**:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question**: Does this proposed project support Salt Lake County’s strategies for global engagement as outlined in the Salt Lake County Global Trade and Investment Plan?

**Metric**: Number of Global Trade and Investment Plan strategies supported? (pp 24-25 in the plan).

**Strategies**:
1. Develop a more diverse export portfolio that exhibits the region’s current economic landscape and extant international connections.
2. Establish workforce development programs for high- and low-skill workers that strengthen Salt Lake County’s talent pool.
3. Rebrand Salt Lake County as a globally fluent hub of culture and innovation.
4. Enhance and improve the region’s transportation and freight infrastructure.

**Weighting**:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 strategies</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 strategies</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 strategies</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 strategy</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No strategies</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Housing’s new normal

Regional Growth Committee

Ted Knowlton

August 16, 2018
Two points

- Our housing challenges are the start of a new normal
- Where lower cost housing occurs matters
Growth feels different now. Why?

• **Rapid price increases**
  • Salt Lake County: 10% price increase in the last year alone

• **Big shift in housing types**
  • Single family housing 65% of construction 5 years ago
  • 45% today (Wasatch Front)

• **More new housing is infill**
  • The average WFRC city is now 70% developed
This is the start of a “New Normal”

- Our growth is internal
- Land availability is falling
- Demographics are shifting
Growth: fastest in the US

The Wasatch Front:
Adding the rough equivalent of a Bountiful every year for the next 30 years
Utah growth is internal

- About \(\frac{2}{3}\) of our growth is from internal increase
Supply is severely lagging demand

**Figure 2: Increase in Households Compared to Increase in Housing Units for Utah**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Housing Units</th>
<th>Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1971-1980</td>
<td>174,272</td>
<td>150,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-2000</td>
<td>170,206</td>
<td>164,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-2010</td>
<td>211,115</td>
<td>176,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2017</td>
<td>111,455</td>
<td>162,288</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Ivory-Boyer Construction Database, Kem C. Gardner Policy Institute*
Supply is lagging – land is part of the reason

In about 15 years, almost all major pieces of vacant land between Ogden and Provo will be under development.

Vacant buildable land – pieces that are 10 acres or larger
Age helps drive the TYPE of housing in demand

Wasatch Front Population Forecast by Age

Source: Kem C. Gardner Policy Institute 2015-2065 State and County Projections, 2017
Baseline
WASATCH CHOICE 2050
Key Strategies

1. Provide Transportation Choices
2. Support Housing Options
3. Preserve Open Space
4. Link Economic Development with Transportation and Housing Decisions
Lower cost housing occurs:

Where also matters
What are “Centers”?  

- Fireclay, Murray
- Main Street, Bountiful
- Downtown, Sandy
- Downtown, Ogden
Centered Growth: Benefits for Individuals

- More housing choices
- More people with viable transit, walk, and bike options
- Better affordability
- Easier access to jobs and destinations
Centered Growth: Benefits for Communities

- More accepted density
- Helps preserve suburban neighborhoods and rural land
- More people near transit and jobs = reduced driving and better air

20% fewer auto trips and 30% shorter driving distances
Two points

• Our housing challenges are the start of a new normal

• Where lower cost housing occurs matters
Housing’s new normal

Regional Growth Committee

Ted Knowlton

August 16, 2018
• Noticing the looming housing affordability crisis, the Salt Lake Chamber commissioned a report through the Kem C. Gardner Policy Institute.

• Natalie Gochnour describes it as a landmark study on housing affordability.

• To the best of our knowledge, this is the only study of its kind in the nation that proactively addresses the housing affordability issue before a crisis hits like we see today in San Francisco, San Jose and Seattle.
UTAH HOUSING UNIT VS. UTAH HOUSEHOLD GROWTH

Source: U.S. Census Bureau and Ivory-Boyer Construction Database
PROJECTED INCREASE IN HOUSEHOLDS IN UTAH 2017-2022

Source: Kem C. Gardner Policy Institute
Based on this growth rate, the value of a $125,000 home in Utah in 1991 has increased to $347,000 by 2017, but at the national growth rate that same home has increased to only $184,000 by 2017.
## Sales Price of a Single Family Home

**Median Sales Price: Percent Change 1991 – 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>1991 1st Qtr.</th>
<th>2017 4th Qtr.</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
<th>AAGR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Boulder, Colorado</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
<td>$484,000</td>
<td>410%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Greeley Colorado</td>
<td>$66,000</td>
<td>$324,000</td>
<td>391%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>San Francisco, California</td>
<td>$265,000</td>
<td>$1,257,000</td>
<td>374%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fort Collins, Colorado</td>
<td>$78,000</td>
<td>$361,000</td>
<td>363%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Portland, Oregon</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$364,000</td>
<td>355%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>San Jose, California</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
<td>$945,000</td>
<td>330%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Salt Lake City, Utah</td>
<td>$76,000</td>
<td>$307,000</td>
<td>304%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Reno, Nevada</td>
<td>$103,500</td>
<td>$415,000</td>
<td>301%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Colorado Springs, Colorado</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
<td>293%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Seattle, Washington</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
<td>$501,000</td>
<td>285%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Eugene, Oregon</td>
<td>$67,000</td>
<td>$255,000</td>
<td>281%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Provo-Orem, Utah</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$302,000</td>
<td>278%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*111 metropolitan areas.

**Source:** National Home Builders Association
Utahns are Cost Burdened

- One in eight Utah homeowners below the median income are severely cost burdened, paying 50% or more of their income on housing.
- One in five Utah renters below the median income are severely cost burdened.
- In the next several years, the typical Utah family will spend nearly 50% of its income on housing if current trends persist.

Part of our growth and prosperity in this state is due to the fact that so many Utahns want to stay here, close to their families and in the communities they love. The way things are going, that simply won’t be possible for many. They’ll be priced out.

This affects every industry and every profession.

A first year teacher in Nebo School District can afford 1% of the housing market. In ten years, the same teacher can afford 16% of the housing market.
WHAT’S DRIVING UP HOUSING COSTS?

• Housing Shortage
• Construction & Labor Costs
• Local Zoning Ordinances & Nimbyism
• Land Costs & Topography of Wasatch Front Counties
• Demographic & Economic Growth
HOUSING SHORTAGE
Since 2010, Utah has added four new households for every three new housing units.

All three housing markets are strained:
- Existing homes
- New construction
- Rentals and apartments
CUMULATIVE DAYS ON MARKET

Existing Single Family Homes

Source: UtahRealEstate.com
NUMBER OF MONTHS SUPPLY

Finished Vacant Inventory of New Homes in Utah

Source: Metrostudy Utah Database
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Davis County</th>
<th>Salt Lake County</th>
<th>Utah County</th>
<th>Weber County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vacancy Rate</td>
<td>Vacancy Rate</td>
<td>Vacancy Rate</td>
<td>Vacancy Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Apartment Units</td>
<td>New Apartment Units</td>
<td>New Apartment Units</td>
<td>New Apartment Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>9.70%</td>
<td>6.10%</td>
<td>8.70%</td>
<td>9.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>107</td>
<td>1,302</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>7.40%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>7.10%</td>
<td>6.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>5.70%</td>
<td>3.20%</td>
<td>3.80%</td>
<td>6.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>275</td>
<td>898</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>4.60%</td>
<td>4.60%</td>
<td>3.60%</td>
<td>7.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1,521</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>5.90%</td>
<td>7.20%</td>
<td>5.70%</td>
<td>9.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>108</td>
<td>2,442</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
<td>5.70%</td>
<td>7.00%</td>
<td>6.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>5.10%</td>
<td>5.20%</td>
<td>5.50%</td>
<td>6.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>538</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>5.80%</td>
<td>3.80%</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>6.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>712</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>6.60%</td>
<td>3.90%</td>
<td>3.20%</td>
<td>7.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>251</td>
<td>1,605</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>4.60%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>4.40%</td>
<td>4.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>394</td>
<td>3,326</td>
<td>2,318</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>4.50%</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
<td>3.60%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>198</td>
<td>2,918</td>
<td>1,315</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>4.50%</td>
<td>2.90%</td>
<td>3.40%</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>327</td>
<td>4,461</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>2.60%</td>
<td>4.20%</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>477</td>
<td>2,306</td>
<td>1,654</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Equimark and CBRE
CONSTRUCTION & LABOR COST
CHANGE IN CONSTRUCTION JOBS AND WAGES, 2007-2016

----------------------|-------|--------|---------------------
Construction Jobs     | 104,613 | 92,756 | -11%               
Construction as % of total state employment | 8.40% | 6.50%  |          
Construction of Buildings | 22,153 | 19,133 | -14%               
Heavy and Civil Engineering Construction | 12,398 | 10,194 | -18%               
Specialty Trade Contractors | 70,062 | 63,430 | -9%                
Average Construction Monthly Wage | $3,138 | $3,956 | 26%                

Source: Utah Department of Workforce Services

- Construction and labor cost is driving up housing costs.
- Construction demand is increasing.
- Labor force is constrained.
- Labor demographics are changing.
  - Before 2010, one in five immigrants in Utah worked in the construction industry. Currently, only 2% of Utah’s foreign-born population is in construction.
**HARD CONSTRUCTION COST DRIVERS**  
Percent Change 2007-2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DRYWALL</th>
<th>CABINETRY</th>
<th>ROOFING</th>
<th>SIDING</th>
<th>LUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent Change</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>148%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ivory Homes
PERMIT AND IMPACT FEE

Percent Change 2007 – 2017

- Increasing of permit fees are reflective of CPI and raw material cost increasing, and at the high end are still less than 10% of the overall home cost.

Source: Kem C. Gardner Policy Institute
LOCAL ZONING ORDINANCES & NIMBYISM
BALANCE OF HOUSING TYPES

• Zoning ordinances determine:
  • Density
  • Spatial distribution of housing types (renter versus owner)
  • Construction material standards
  • As well as, regulatory requirements that can increase housing prices and cause developmental delays

• There needs to be a balance between housing types to make sure we aren’t pricing people out.

• Cities must continue to implement smarter growth policies to ensure their residents are able to afford the quality of life they want them to enjoy.

• Local opposition, also known as NIMBYism (not in my backyard) has driven up costs and constrained supply, particularly for affordable high density rental housing.

• A lot of cities have found good ways to mitigate this problem. We need to work together to find other ways to expand these efforts throughout the state.
LAND COSTS & TOPOGRAPHY
LAND IMPROVEMENT COST CHANGE, 2007-2017

The best land is not saved for last.

40% Increase 2007-2017

Source: Kem C. Gardner Policy Institute
WE CAN ONLY GROW SO FAR

- There are physical constraints on developable land due to topography.
- We have the mountains to our east and the lake to our west, we can only grow so far.
- There is insufficient land in metro areas close to jobs.
- Building only single-family homes will require more infrastructure and more travel time for homeowners.
DEMOGRAPHIC & ECONOMIC GROWTH
POPULATION GROWTH: TOP TEN STATES

Annual Average Rate of Change 2010-2016

Source: U.S. Census Bureau
JOB GROWTH: TOP TEN STATES

Percent Change 2010-2016

Source: U.S. Census Bureau
UNCHECKED HOUSING PRICES

By 2044, Utah Housing Prices could be Equivalent to Today’s San Francisco Prices

= More than $700,000 in next 26 YEARS
WHAT NOW?
• After commissioning the study and seeing the report, the Salt Lake Chamber launched the Housing GAP Coalition in May.

• The Coalition is poised to address the challenges associated with housing affordability to ensure the American Dream is kept alive for all Utahns.

• This can be done by providing access to a variety of housing types for all income groups.

• As a business community, we’ve had great success when we’ve worked together to address other issues like transportation and education.

• In a similar fashion, we’ve organized this Housing GAP Coalition to proactively address housing affordability before it becomes a crisis.

• We are bringing together the state’s brightest minds from business, academia and government to tackle this very real threat to our long-term economic prosperity.
POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS

Local Policy Decisions can Help Housing Affordability

- ZONING FOR WIDE VARIETY OF HOUSING TYPES AND PRICES
- EVALUATE COST-PROHIBITIVE IMPACT AND PERMIT FEES
- SUPPORT MULTI-USE LAND DEVELOPMENT
POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS

Transportation and Land Use Connection (TLC)

Photo: Dominic Valente, The Daily Herald
POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS

Keys to Success program for construction and labor
“Build to Success”
POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS

General public awareness campaign

Photo: KSL.com
NEXT STEPS
NEXT STEPS

• We are visiting every city council across the Wasatch Front and discuss how we can partner with them to address housing affordability in their area.
LOCAL GOVERNMENT CALL TO ACTION & DISCUSSION

• General Plan Overview
  • Moderate Income Housing Plan
• Zoning Overview
• Sign Support Resolution
FOR MORE INFORMATION OR TO BECOME INVOLVED

For more information or to read the full report, visit SLChamber.com/HousingGapCoalition

Follow us on Twitter @UtahHousingGap

For sponsorship or membership information, contact Brynn Mortensen bmortensen@slchamber.com 801-706-9853
RTP And Amendment Process Overview

• RTP is updated every four years
  – Recently adopted May 2015

• Periodic adjustments are needed between adoption cycles

• WFRC’s RTP amendment process
  – Financial constraints
  – Public review and input
  – Modeling and Air quality conformity

• Proposed requests reviewed annually beginning in March
RTP And Amendment Process Overview

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN AMENDMENT PROCESS

1. Receive and WFRC Staff Review of Request
2. WFRC Staff Determines Level of Amendment
   - Level 1: Staff Modification
     - WFRC Executive Director Approval per adopted procedure
   - Level 2: Board Modification for Non-Regionally Significant Projects
     - TAC Review and Recommendation to RGC
     - RGC Review and Release for Public Comment
   - Level 3: Full Amendment for Regionally Significant Projects
     - Air Quality Conformity Determination
RTP And Amendment Process Overview

1. Notification to County COG
2. 30-day Public Comment Period
3. WFRC Staff Review of Comments and Recommendation
4. Are there Regionally Significant Changes from the Comment Period?
   - Yes: RGC Review Staff Recommendation for Modification and New Public Comment Period
   - No: RGC Review Staff Recommendation for WFRC Approval and Website Update
5. WFRC Review and Approval
Level 3 Request
1-15 – UDOT

Scope:

• Widening of one additional general purpose lane northbound on I-15 from Bangerter Highway to I-215.

• New Project to the RTP - Phase 1.

Benefits:

• The additional lane is needed to ensure the safe movement of autos as they change lanes along I-15.

• The additional lane will be part of the planned I-15 connector / distributor system.

Funding Source:

This project is funded through the Transportation Investment Fund (TIF).

Cost:

$135 Million
## 4700 South – West Valley City and Kearns

**Scope:**
- Widening of 4700 South to 5 lanes from 4000 West to 5600 West.
- New construction – Move from Phase 2 to Phase 1.

**Benefits:**
- Capacity improvement for east / west traffic flow.
- Four lanes in each direction with a center turn lane.
- Uniform geometrics and horizontal geometry. Improvements to steep 12 percent cross slopes.
- Shoulder and bicycle lane are also planned.
- Project is being developed multi-jurisdictionally.

**Funding Source:**
Possible local and STP funds.

**Cost:**
$15 Million
Level 2 Request
14600 South – Bluffdale City

Scope:
- Operational improvements on 14600 South from Redwood Road to Porter Rockwell Blvd.
- Redefine the project from widening to operational improvements and a new construction segment.
- Modified project – Move from unfunded to Phase 1.

Benefits:
- Major collector that connects Redwood Road to I-15 Freeway at 14600 South interchange.
- Will include center turn lanes, bicycle, and pedestrian elements.
- Links communities and commuters, along with recreational traffic.
- Improvements to existing geometric configuration and improved safety.

Funding Source:
Possible Salt Lake County preservation, STP, and local funds.

Cost:
$6.12 million
# Level 2 Request

## 700 South – Salt Lake City

### Scope:

- New construction of the 700 South railroad bridge near 4800 West.
- New construction and realignment of 700 South from 5600 West to approximately 5300 West.
- New Project to the RTP - Phase 1.

### Benefits:

- A new bridge on 700 South and 4800 West will improve safety for both automobiles and trains.
- No future stopping of auto traffic by train traffic that has come to a complete stop.
- Realignment of 700 South will move the intersection approximately 400 feet to the north improving sight lines and safety.

### Funding Source:

Possible UP Railroad, Salt Lake City, Salt Lake County, or other grant funds.

### Cost:

$21.3 million
Level 2 Request
5500 West – Hooper City

Scope:
• Operational improvements on 5500 West from 3500 South to 5500 South.
• Functional classification change to Major Collector.
• New Project to the RTP - Phase 1.

Benefits:
• Widening of a country roadway from two narrow travel lanes to 12-foot lanes.
• Widening will also include 9-foot paved shoulders and curb, gutter, and sidewalk.
• This facility will help address near and future traffic and safety concerns in a growing area of the City.

Funding Source:
Possible Local and STP funding sources.

Cost:
$3.9 million
Level 2 Request

2800 North / North Plain City Rd. – Plain City

Scope:

- Operational improvements on 2800 North and North Plain City Road from 4200 West to SR-126.
- Functional classification change to a Minor Collector.
- New Project to the RTP - Phase 1.

Benefits:

- This project will provide for increased safety with the addition of shoulder and the reconfiguration of the street cross-section.
- Center turn-lane at intersections will improve mobility and traffic flow.
- Project is being developed in close cooperation with Farr West City.

Funding Source:
Possible local and STP funds.

Cost:
$7.4 Million
## Technical Considerations for Level 3 Requests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Safety Index</th>
<th>Vehicle Hours Traveled</th>
<th>Project Readiness</th>
<th>Support WC2050</th>
<th>Connections to Clusters</th>
<th>Job and Education Training (ATO)</th>
<th>Multimodal Transportation Choices</th>
<th>Vulnerable Communities</th>
<th>Air Quality Conformity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-15 North Bound UDOT</td>
<td><strong>7.5 of 10</strong></td>
<td>NB 1,403,430 Build 1,393,320 -10,110</td>
<td>Preliminary engineering complete. Some right-of-way will need to be acquired.</td>
<td>Supports Village and Town Centers near I-15.</td>
<td>Economic Clusters include Energy, Finance Service, Life Sciences, Software and IT.</td>
<td>Draper Crossing, SLCC Miller Campus, Sandy Downtown, South Town Mall and Auto Mall.</td>
<td>Within Proximity to UTA Front Runner service and east/west Core Bus Routes.</td>
<td>Impacts Vulnerable Communities</td>
<td>Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4700 South West Valley City</td>
<td><strong>6 of 10</strong></td>
<td>NB Build 893,930 890,330 -3,600</td>
<td>Preliminary engineering complete. Some right-of-way will need to be acquired. EIS approved.</td>
<td>Supports a Village Center at 5600 West.</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>Mostly residential land use with some small commercial businesses located at intersections.</td>
<td>Supports Core Bus Route on 5600 West. Proposed bicycle route.</td>
<td>Impacts Vulnerable Communities</td>
<td>Required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Technical Considerations for Level 2 Requests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Safety Index</th>
<th>Vehicle Hours Traveled</th>
<th>Connectivity</th>
<th>Project Readiness</th>
<th>Support WC2050</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14600 South Bluffdale City</td>
<td>4 of 10</td>
<td>No Build 192,740 VHT</td>
<td>Connects Redwood Road with I-15 at 14600 South.</td>
<td>Preliminary engineering complete. Some right-of-way will need to be acquired.</td>
<td>Connection to Jordan River Parkway and Urban Center in Draper City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Build 192,490 VHT -250 VHT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700 South Salt Lake City</td>
<td>3 of 10</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>East / West connectivity will improve with new bridge.</td>
<td>Preliminary engineering. Some right-of-way will need to be acquired.</td>
<td>Connection to Industrial Area in Salt Lake City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5500 West Hooper City</td>
<td>2 of 10</td>
<td>No Build 50,460 VHT</td>
<td>Connects North / South portions of Hooper City.</td>
<td>Preliminary engineering completed. No right-of-way needed.</td>
<td>Passes near Village Center in Hooper City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Build 50,390 VHT -70 VHT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2800 North / North Plain City Road Plain City</td>
<td>1.5 of 10</td>
<td>No Build 44,950 VHT</td>
<td>Connects Plain City to SR-126.</td>
<td>No engineering completed to date. Some additional right-of-way will need to be acquired.</td>
<td>Terminates near Industrial Center between I-15 and US-89.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Build 44,920 VHT -30 VHT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Air quality conformity not required for level 2 requests.
Process - Amendment 6

• Review by Councils of Government
  - Salt Lake County COG - May 24
  - Weber County COG - June 4

• 30-Day Public Review and Comment Period
  - June 30 through August 4

• Review by Regional Growth Committee
  - August 16

• Recommended adoption by the Regional Council
  - August 23