HOUSING CRISIS RESEARCH
OBSTACLES & OPPORTUNITIES IN PUBLIC ATTITUDES
1. **The public cares strongly about this issue.** For the first time, housing affordability tops the list of issues that voters say is facing Utah communities.

2. **Nearly 2/3rds of voters currently see their communities as growing too quickly.** Some have characterized the negative response to the crisis as a vocal minority, but our research suggests discomfort with growth is widespread and common.

3. **The type of growth matters.** Voters care about the details of housing developments going up near their homes. Being proactive about addressing the most common hang ups will help residents feel better about developments.

4. **There is no silver bullet, however.** The most important attributes for public acceptance of new housing are density, ownership, access to transit, mixed use, and approval process. Density concerns abate in municipalities where similar density already exists (the second townhome development is easier than the first). But no one attribute predicts public support. Smart planning will require consideration of all impacts to existing residents.
We asked respondents which issue they considered the most important issue facing communities and residents.

A plurality of respondents chose housing affordability as the most important issue, followed by air quality, education, and infrastructure.

None of these attain a majority of support, however combined the top four represent the most common pain points of high growth.

That said, the fact that no one issue dominates public perception means that we have space to educate, inform, and help shape public opinion over the next few years.
We also asked respondents how they felt about the current pace at which their city or town was growing.

Nearly two-thirds of respondents feel that their local city or town is growing too quickly.

Only 34% said their city or town is growing at an appropriate pace.
We asked respondents to tell us who they thought should be responsible for communicating with the community about proposed developments, as well as who they trusted to fulfil this responsibility.

There is a clear gap between expectations and trust when it comes to key players in the housing market.

42% of respondents say they expect their city or town government to communicate with them about plans and developments while more than half trust them in that role. Community groups such as HOAs were also expected to perform this role and more than 1/3rd of respondents say they trust these groups most.

Conversely, real estate developers in Utah are upside down. 19% of respondents say they expect developers to communicate with them but only 4% trust developers most with that responsibility.
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Option 1</th>
<th>Housing Option 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duplexes</td>
<td>Single-family homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30% owner-occupied and 70% rental units</td>
<td>Owner-occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks, schools, recreation, shopping, and restaurants are all within walking distance of the development</td>
<td>Parks, schools, recreation, shopping, and restaurants are all within a 10-minute drive of the development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contains a mix between housing, businesses, and recreational features such as walking paths and parks</td>
<td>Contains a mix between housing and recreational features such as walking paths and parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has been approved by voters through a ballot referendum</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can bike or drive a short distance to connect to mass transit such as buses, Trax, and Frontrunner</td>
<td>Cannot connect easily to mass transit. Need to rely on a car for transportation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adds a few hundred total residences and up to two thousand new people to the community</td>
<td>Adds a few hundred total residences and up to two thousand new people to the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built in an area that is mostly commercial</td>
<td>Built in an area that is currently undeveloped open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing roads are expected to accommodate the development</td>
<td>New or expanded roads will be completed and space will be allotted for parking in the development after it is built</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTRIBUTES TESTED

• Housing type
• Number of new occupants
• Proximity to amenities
• Mixed use features
• Approval processes
• Transportation access
• Density
• Location in the community
• Infrastructure accommodations
Scores here show the relative effects of each trait to the least popular option (thousands of apartments with no access to transit).

Traits with positive scores indicate a respondent is more likely to select a housing option where that trait is present.
## Hypothetical Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single family homes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All rental units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential only, no mixed use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000+ new people moving in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No new roads or parking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved by planning commission &amp; city council (but no citizen input</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(but no citizen input beyond what is required by ordinance)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No access to mass transit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools and dining are accessible by car</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built inside an existing neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Public Opinion

- **Approve**: 23%
- **Disapprove**: 77%
THE KEY IS DESIGNING A DEVELOPMENT THAT MAKES SENSE

Hypothetical Development

- Townhomes
- Mix of owner-occupied and rentals
- Business & recreational mixed use
- A few hundred new residents
- New roads & parking
- Approved by planning commission & city council after a series of public meetings for feedback
- Transit accessible without car
- Walking distance to amenities
- Built inside an existing neighborhood

56%

44%

APPROVE

DISAPPROVE
APPENDIX
Conjoint Analysis is a method used to determine how residents value different attributes that make up a preference decision—in this case, what type of housing development they would prefer.

Attributes of hypothetical developments included variants of:
- Housing type
- Occupants
- Proximity to amenities
- Mixed use features
- Approval processes
- Transportation access
- Density
- Location
- Infrastructure accommodations
Our survey randomly assigned one trait from each of the following categories to two options of what a potential housing development could look like.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOUSING TYPE</th>
<th>OCCUPANTS</th>
<th>PROXIMITY TO AMENITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-family homes</td>
<td>Owner-occupied</td>
<td>Parks, schools, recreation, shopping, and restaurants are all within walking distance of the development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhomes</td>
<td>Rental units</td>
<td>Parks, schools, recreation, shopping, and restaurants are all within a 10-minute drive of the development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxury apartments</td>
<td>70% owner-occupied and 30% rental units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>30% owner-occupied and 70% rental units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplexes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MIXED USE FEATURES**
- Contains only units for housing
- Contains a mix between housing and businesses
- Contains a mix between housing, businesses, and recreational features such as walking paths and parks
- Contains a mix between housing and recreational features such as walking paths and parks

**APPROVAL PROCESS**
- Has been approved by the planning commission and the city council
- 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
- Has been approved by the planning commission and the city council after consulting with the school district
- Has been approved by voters through a ballot referendum
- 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
Our survey randomly assigned one trait from each of the following categories to two options of what a potential housing development could look like.

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

**DENSITY**
- Adds up to a hundred total residences and a few hundred new people to the community
- Adds a few hundred total residences and up to two thousand new people to the community
- Adds several hundred to a thousand total residences and more than two thousand new people to the community

**LOCATION**
- Built inside an existing neighborhood
- Built on the edge of an existing neighborhood
- Built in an area that is mostly commercial
- Built in an area that is currently undeveloped open space

**INFRASTRUCTURE**
- New or expanded roads will be completed and space will be allotted for parking in the development before it is built
- New or expanded roads will be completed and space will be allotted for parking in the development as it is being built
- New or expanded roads will be completed and space will be allotted for parking in the development after it is built
- Existing roads are expected to accommodate the development
WASATCH CHOICE
2050

Economic Development
Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy

Land Use
Transportation and Land Use Connection

Transportation
Regional Transportation Plan

City Plans and Ordinances
Vision and RTP Process Overview

- Updated every four years
- Planning horizon 20+ years
- Regional blueprint
- Financially constrained
- Input and review
- Air quality conformity
- Amendment process
Vision and RTP Process

Explore
- Establish Goals
- Develop Scenarios
- Evaluate Scenarios

Choose
- Draft & Evaluate Preferred Scenario
- Endorse Vision

Prioritize
- Assess Financial Considerations
- Phase Projects
- Present Impacts & Benefits

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN 2019-2050

The Regional Transportation Plan is an element of

WASATCH CHOICE 2050

Stakeholder Input
Explore – Goals and Develop Scenarios

• **WC2050 Goals**
  – WFRC Adopted October 2016

• **Input**
  – Local Communities
  – Planning Partners
  – Stakeholders
  – Public

• **Workshop 1: Identify Needs**
  – Land use
  – Transportation
  – Economic Development
Explore – Evaluate Scenarios

• WC2050 Scenario Development
• Performance Measures
• Input
• Workshop 2: Scenario Review
Choose – Evaluate and Endorse Vision

- WC2050 Draft Preferred Vision
- Performance Measures
- Input
- Workshop 3: Review Preferred Vision

WFRC Endorsed Wasatch Choice 2050 Vision
May 2018
Prioritize – Phase Projects

• Two Tiered Process
• Evaluation Criteria
• Input
• Phases
  – Phase 1: 2019-2030
  – Phase 2: 2031-2040
  – Phase 3: 2041-2050
  – Unfunded
Prioritize – Assess Financial Considerations

- Unified Plan Financial Model
- Transit Financial Plan and Scenario Tool
- Project Cost Estimates

- Existing revenue sources
- Growth rates
- New funding sources
  - Local option sales tax
  - Vehicle registration fees
  - Fuel tax ceiling increase
  - Federal funds
- Bonding
### Local Option Sales Tax Assumptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Assumed</th>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Box Elder County</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>2030</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>2040</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by 2050</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weber County</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td>2030</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th</td>
<td>2040</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by 2050</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Davis County</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td>2030</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th</td>
<td>2040</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by 2050</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Salt Lake County</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td>2030</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th</td>
<td>2040</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by 2050</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tooele County</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td>2030</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th</td>
<td>2040</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by 2050</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regionally Significant Transportation Projects

### Roadway Costs by Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>UDOT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfunded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Transit Costs by Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Capital</th>
<th>Operations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfunded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Active Transportation Costs by Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Cost (Billions, NPV)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Billions, NPV
Next Steps

- WC2050 Draft Phased RTP
- Performance Measures
- Workshop 4: Review Phased RTP
- Public Comment  
  - October 22 to November 30, 2018

WFRC Adopt Wasatch Choice 2050 Vision and 2019-2050 RTP  
May 2019
2019-2050 RTP
Funding Discussion

October 11, 2018
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**
LAYTON ENVISIONED
Life is great from the mountains to the lake.

2014 AWARD

LAYTON FORWARD
GENERAL PLAN UPDATE

We would like to thank the 1,800 individuals who participated in the survey (between October 2017 and January 2018), as well as the 150 community members who attended the January 24, 2018 Community Workshop!

Survey Results Presentation Video

Should new development in town centers provide a small percentage of below market housing so people in the workforce who earn less than most can live there?

- Yes: 27%
- No: 48%
- Other: 25%
Successes

84% of WFRC communities have participated

93% of completed projects have made the next step toward implementation
Emerging Opportunities

• Conversation around region’s growth and housing is charged!

The Salt Lake Tribune

“Home prices are rising, but sales are down as the housing gap squeezes Utah markets”
Emerging Opportunities

- SB 136 Transportation Governance
  - Relating transportation investment more to land use
  - Broader integrated corridor/area planning
- Planning and Environmental Process Linkages

TRANSPORTATION AND LAND USE CONNECTION
Emerging Opportunities

• Transportation Reinvestment Zones (TRZs) and other funding strategy support
Emerging Opportunities Summary

- A solid resource for growing communities
- Regional corridors: land use and transportation planning
- Furthering implementation efforts, financial strategies, etc.
Discussion

Megan Townsend
TLC Program Lead and Planner
mtownsend@wfrco.org
801-363-4250 x. 1101

Letters of Intent due October 29th for 2019 funding