Wasatch Front Economic Development District
STRATEGY COMMITTEE
May 22, 2017, 1:00 pm – 3:00 pm

AGENDA

There will be a meeting of the Wasatch Front Economic Development District’s Strategy Committee on Monday, May 22, 2017 at 1:00 p.m. in the Wasatch Front Regional Council offices located at 295 North Jimmy Doolittle Road, Salt Lake City, Utah 84116. You are welcome to join the meeting by phone. Dial 801-363-4250, select extension 7, enter conference pin # 9012

Welcome and Introductions Shawn Milne

1. Action: Minutes from the February 27, 2017 Meeting Shawn Milne

2. Opportunity for Public Comment Shawn Milne

   a. Utah Advanced Materials and Manufacturing Initiative (approved via email April 2017) Andrew Buffmire
   b. International Center for Appropriate and Sustainable Technology LaNiece Davenport


5. Integrating Economic Development with the Wasatch Choice 2050 Vision & Transportation Planning
   a. Overview of Integrating Economic Development with Transportation and Land Use LaNiece
   b. Wasatch Choice 2050 Vision and 2019-2050 Regional Transportation Plan Scenarios Ted Knowlton
   c. Transportation Improvement Program Wayne Bennion

6. Other Business Shawn Milne

Next Meeting: August 28, 2017 at 1:00 p.m.

NOTE: Meeting material located at www.wfrc.org

Public participation is solicited without regard to age, sex, disability, race, color or national origin. Persons who require translation for a meeting should contact the WFRC’s Title VI Administrator at 801-363-4250 or sam@wfrc.org at least 72 hours in advance.

Se solicita la participación del público, sin importar la edad el sexo, la discapacidad, la raza, color o nacionalidad. Personas que requieren servicios de traducción deben contactar a WFRC’s Administrador de Título VI al teléfono 801-363-4250 o sam@wfrc.org por lo menos 72 horas antes de la reunión.
A meeting of the Wasatch Front Economic Development District (WFEDD) was held on Thursday, February 27, 2017 in the offices of the Wasatch Front Regional Council, 295 North Jimmy Doolittle Road, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Welcome and Introductions [Recording 00:00]
Mike Bouwhuis, vice-chair, chaired the meeting. The meeting was called to order at 1:00 p.m. Mr. Bouwhuis welcomed committee members and guests and introductions were made.

WFEDD Members and Alternates Present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IN ATTENDANCE</th>
<th>2017 WFEDD MEMBERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAVIS COUNTY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>Board Member: Commissioner Jim Smith (Davis County)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternate: Mayor Bob Stevenson (Logan City)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>Board Member: Reid Newey (Davis School District)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternate: Craig Bott (Grow Utah)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>Strategy Committee: Bruce Davis (Weber State University)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORGAN COUNTY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>Board Member: Councilmember John Barber (Morgan County)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board Member: Stephen Lyon (Morgan County Economic Development)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategy Committee: Shaun Peterson (Peterson Wealth Services)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALT LAKE COUNTY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>Board Member: Mayor Bill Applegarth (Riverton City)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board Member: Carlton Christenson (Salt Lake County)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategy Committee: Abby Osborne (Salt Lake Chamber)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategy Committee Alternate: Michael Parker (Salt Lake Chamber)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategy Committee: Susie Becker (Zions Public Finance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategy Committee Alternate: Scott Aylett (Zions Public Finance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategy Committee: Chris DeHerrera (Associated Builders &amp; Contractors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOOELE COUNTY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>Board Member: Commissioner Shawn Milne, Chair (Tooele County)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternate: Councilmember Brad Pratt (Tooele City)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board Member: Chris Sloan (Group 1 Real Estate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternate: Scott Snelson (Tooele Applied Technology College)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategy Committee: Handy Sant (Economic Development Consulting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategy Committee: Todd R. Bingham (Utah Manufacturers Assoc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategy Committee: Bill Perry (Perry Homes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEBER COUNTY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>Board Member: Commissioner James Ebert (Weber County)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternate: Mayor Brent Taylor (North Ogden City)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategy Committee: Jeff Edwards (Utah Advanced Materials &amp; Manufacturing Initiative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATEWIDE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>Board Member: Scott Parkinson (Bank of Utah)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternate: Rick Fairbanks (Ogden Exchange Club)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WFEDD Representatives and Others Present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tom Christopulos</td>
<td>Ogden City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelleigh Cole</td>
<td>GOED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon Cooper</td>
<td>Ogden City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christy Dahlberg</td>
<td>WFRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaNiece Davenport</td>
<td>WFRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie Gerard</td>
<td>WFRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Gruber</td>
<td>WFRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ned Hacker</td>
<td>WFRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Mauro</td>
<td>Summit Powder Mountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaun Muirhead</td>
<td>Summit Powder Mountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Sornsen</td>
<td>Summit Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megan Townsend</td>
<td>WFRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yvette Woodland</td>
<td>Department of Workforce Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Opportunity for Public Comment [Recording 04:20]
There were none.

Action: Meeting Minutes from November 28, 2016 and May 23, 2016 [Recording 04:38]
Commissioner Jim Smith moved that the minutes of the November 28, 2016 meeting and the minutes of the May 23, 2016 meeting be approved as written. The motion was seconded by Carlton Christensen. The meeting minutes were unanimously approved.

New Member Orientation [Recording 07:21]
LaNiece Davenport explained to the committee what the Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC) was, and what they did. WFRC is an Association of Government (AOG), a Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), and an Economic Development District (EDD). WFRC was created for regional consensus building to help with planning and implementation for visioning. The mission is to build consensus and enhance quality of life by developing and implementing visions and plans for a well-functioning multi-modal transportation system, livable communities, a strong economy, and a healthy environment. The majority of the work that the Wasatch Front Regional Council staff does falls into the MPO category but the Wasatch Front EDD staff is focused on economic development and how economic development integrates with other short and long-range initiatives.

Ms. Davenport discussed the membership of the Wasatch Front Economic Development District (WFEDD). There are 12 Board members, and 25 Strategy Committee members. The purpose of the Board is to provide policy guidance, oversight, and leadership of the WFEDD. They are to guide and implement the economic development activities of the Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS). The Strategy Committee is responsible for the development of the regional CEDS and to ensure that the CEDS is a result of a collaborative process. The mission of the WFEDD is to support economic development plans, promote long-term economic competitiveness, and attract federal monies in order to implement local plans. The WFEDD partners with the State of Utah, cities and towns, counties, universities, non-profit organizations, and the US Economic Development Administration.

There were no questions.

Action: CEDS Projects

a. Ogden City [Recording 17:30]
Brandon Cooper, Community Economic Deputy Director of Ogden City, presented on The Market – an Ogden City Makerspace. The Market is a highly collaborative, open-access art and fabrication facility. It will grow the creative industry by connecting people and organizations to space, technology, and opportunity. The Market will build the collaborate economy, which enables people to get the things they want or need from themselves or their community. The Market will also be a platform for education, entrepreneurship, and business development.

The goal of The Market is to increase business starts, household income, reduce unemployment, grow the creative industries, and increase private investment in the creative district. It is anticipated that 145 full-time equivalent jobs will be created over 10 years, and that 160 individuals will receive training each year.

The total estimated cost of this project is $2,000,000.

There was discussion among the committee.
b. Powder Mountain [Recording 49:15]

Greg Mauro, Chairman and Co-Owner of Powder Mountain, presented on Summit Mountain. He explained that Summit Mountain Holding Group, L.L.C. purchased Powder Mountain in April of 2013 to protect it from overdevelopment, and to preserve as much open space as possible with sustainability at its core. The new town of Summit at Powder Mountain rivals Telluride in size and is modeled after Wengen, Switzerland. The town is surrounded by upper-elevation meadows; providing an ideal environment for the best and largest on-property mountain biking in the county. This project will create thousands of jobs in the future, serve as a technology cluster and result in the relocation of several cutting-edge technology companies to the Wasatch Front. The first phase of construction is estimated to create 4,114 jobs.

Summit has a signed Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with University of Utah to explore the development of a Commercial Innovation Zone at Powder Mountain. This project involves a team from the University of Utah, ReGen Village, SIM-CI, and Blockable. The cost for this project has yet to be determined. To date, Summit Mountain Holding Group, L.L.C. has deployed over $100 million into the project, inclusive of the cost of acquiring Powder Mountain. Funding has been obtained through a combination of seller financing, principal investment, home site sales, and proceeds from mountain operations.

Councilman John Barber asked if a traffic study was being done or had been done. Mr. Mauro explained that a traffic study had already been completed and he could send that information out to the committee.

The question was asked if Goldman Sachs currently has a direct investment relationship with Summit. The answer was no, but that the relationship is evolving.

There was discussion among the committee.

Commissioner Jim Smith moved that the two projects be added to the CEDS. The motion was seconded by Carlton Christensen. The vote was unanimous among the committee.

U.S. EDA Evaluation of WFEDD [Recording 01:31:13]

LaNiece reported on the WFEDD EDA Evaluation. The following sections scored 4 out of 4:
- Staff: How effective is the staff in carrying out the activities of the EDD
- Economic Development Activities: To what extent does the EDD engage in the full range of Economic development activities listed in its EDA-approved CEDS
- Required Reports: How well does the EDD perform in submitting all required reports to EDA in accordance with the terms and conditions of the award
- Scope of Work: How effective is the EDD in carrying out the Scope of Work contained in its EDA grant award
- EDD Effectiveness: Overall, how effective is the EDD’s staff in carrying out its EDA-funded economic development program

The following sections scored 3 out of 4:
- Membership Participation: To what extend do the members of the organization participate financially and otherwise in the affairs of the EDD
- Governing Body: How effective is the governing body in providing policy guidance and leadership to the organization
- Public Information and Involvement: How effective is the EDD in providing information to and soliciting input from the general public about ongoing and proposed district activities
• Financial Accountability: To what extent has the EDD demonstrated that sound financial controls and practices are in place

A discussion was held among the committee.

**Roundtable Updates/Discussion [Recording 01:49:24]**
Jeff Edwards, Director, Utah Advanced Materials and Manufacturing, offered an update on UAMMI and related activities.

**Overview of the Utah Open and Public Meetings Act [Recording 01:53:43]**
This 11 minute video was shown to the committee.

**Other Business**
• Mark your calendar for the 2017 meetings: May 22\textsuperscript{nd}, August 28\textsuperscript{th}, November 27\textsuperscript{th}.  
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CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

The Wasatch Front Economic Development District will be referred to as the “District” or the “EDD” throughout the remainder of this document.

COMPREHENSIVE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY

One of the District’s primary responsibilities is the creation of a Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS). The CEDS provides a structure for economic developers to maximize and leverage regional assets when planning and setting economic development goals across jurisdictional boundaries.

CEDS ADOPTION

The CEDS is updated annually and revised every five years. To remain effective and up to date the CEDS will continue to be updated annually with a revision scheduled in 2019. The District adopted the Region’s first five-year (2014-2018) Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy on March 25, 2013. This annual update, the 2017 Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy, was approved and adopted by the District’s Strategy Committee on May 22, 2017.

MISSION STATEMENT

The District supports economic development plans, promotes long-term economic competitiveness, and attracts federal monies in order to implement local plans.

MEMBERSHIP

The District is governed by a 12-member Governing Board. The Governing Board has established a 25-member Strategy Committee that guides the development of the CEDS. The Regions’ economic interests and geographic diversity is represented in the District’s membership. Members include representatives from institutions of higher education, small business, finance, Chambers of Commerce, local elected officials, and other community and business leaders.
GOVERNING BOARD

The District’s Governing Board is made up of 12 members. Each of the five County Councils of Governments appoint one elected official or government representative. These five directors appoint the remaining directors, and statewide representatives.

DAVIS COUNTY
Michael Bouwhuis (Davis Applied Tech College)
Commissioner Jim Smith (Davis County)

MORGAN COUNTY
Councilmember John Barber (Morgan County)
Steve Lyon (Morgan County Economic Development)

SALT LAKE COUNTY
Mayor Bill Applegarth (Riverton City)
Carlton Christenson (Salt Lake County)

TOOELE COUNTY
Commissioner Shawn Milne Chair (Tooele County)
Chris Sloan (Group 1 Real Estate)

WEBER COUNTY
Commissioner James Ebert (Weber County)
Scott Parkinson (Bank of Utah)

STATEWIDE
Benjamin Hart (Governor’s Office of Economic Dev.)
Carrie Mayne (UT Department of Workforce Services)

STRATEGY COMMITTEE

The Strategy Committee is made up of 25 members, the following 13 members plus the 12 Board members listed above. The Committee has strong representation from key public and private sector organizations throughout the Region.

DAVIS COUNTY
Bruce Davis (Weber State University)
Reid Newey (Davis School Dist. Board of Educ.)

MORGAN COUNTY
Shaun Peterson (Peterson Wealth Services)
Gavin McCleary (Farm Bureau Financial Services)

SALT LAKE COUNTY
Susie Becker (Zions Public Finance)
Chris DeHerrera (Assoc. Builders & Contractors)

TOOELE COUNTY
Todd R. Bingham (Utah Manufacturers Assoc.)
Randy Sant (Economic Development Consult.)

WEBER COUNTY
Jeff Edwards (UAMMI)
*Joseph Spencer (Goldman Sachs)

STATEWIDE
Lew Cramer (Coldwell Banker Commercial)
Darin Mellott (CBRE)
Abby Osborne (Salt Lake Chamber)

*To be confirmed.
CHAPTER 2. REGIONAL ECONOMIC GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The District has the unique opportunity to identify and promote regional economic goals. The six regional goals and objectives support local, regional, and statewide priorities. When implemented the goals advance Utah’s existing and future plans, studies, and programs.

REGIONAL GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

1. ATTRACT BUSINESSES THAT OFFER HIGHER WAGES
   - Promote recruitment of businesses from GOED’s targeted clusters as well as other high-wage producing industry clusters in the Region.
   - Develop and modernize industrial and business sites.
   - Ensure that the Economic Development Corporation of Utah has up-to-date information regarding available buildings and green-field sites.
   - Ensure that the surrounding environments accentuate the lifestyles and living conditions that are desirable for potential recruits.

2. RETAIN AND EXPAND EXISTING UTAH BUSINESSES
   - Identify and connect the necessary capital and human resources that help retain and expand local businesses.
   - Where appropriate, encourage company visits, interface through industry associations, and develop direct electronic feedback systems to identify business needs.
   - Align and develop housing with employment opportunities and existing employment infrastructures to address out-migration of workers.

3. BUILD ON AND IMPROVE THE REGION’S GROWTH CENTERS
   - Encourage redevelopment in areas with existing infrastructure.
   - Identify capital resources needed for redevelopment in areas with existing infrastructure.
   - Provide technical assistance to support urban and growth center planning.
   - Support other accelerated growth centers, e.g. technology parks and research parks.

4. ENCOURAGE ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND INNOVATION
   - Establish and replenish revolving loan funds.
   - Support job creation through small business incubators and resource alignment with existing and developing financial resources at the local and private levels.
   - Support development projects that capitalize on innovation in education.

5. INCREASE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CAPACITY
   - Support economic development planning and studies in low-funded and low-resource areas.
   - Develop resources to fund training opportunities for economic development professionals.
   - Bolster existing and establish new sources of revenue to support city services.
   - Identify economic development partnerships and opportunities to leverage resources and bolster necessary capital resources.
   - Offer greater focus on coordination efforts among state, county, and local economic development offices.
   - Establish economic development standards for local areas and cities.

6. MAINTAIN AND IMPROVE OUR HIGH QUALITY OF LIFE
   - Support development for educational and training organizations.
   - Balance job creation with the maintenance of our pristine and environmentally sensitive areas.
   - Encourage development near transportation hubs and along public transit corridors.
   - Maintain consistency with the regional vision the Wasatch Choice for 2040 and other regional planning efforts.
   - Promote multi-modal transportation options, especially those that encourage and promote existing transportation corridors before the development of costly new multi-modal transportation options.
GOAL SETTING

The goals and objectives were created in four phases, described below.

1ST IDENTIFY A PRELIMINARY SET OF GOALS AND OBJECTIVES
The District staff reviewed existing economic goals and strategies in the participating counties. The District Board of Directors agreed to reinforce existing efforts rather than redirect them. These goals and objectives were compared to the Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats (SWOT) that had been identified through the SWOT analysis (Chapter 4).

2ND REFINE THE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES
The Strategy Committee worked to refine the goals and objectives to ensure they were based on the Region’s strengths, addressed our weaknesses, and considered both internal and external opportunities and threats.

3RD SEEK ADDITIONAL INPUT AND FEEDBACK
The District staff sought input from local and county economic development officials. This input was considered by the Strategy Committee and included where applicable.

4TH PRIORITIZE THE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES
The Strategy Committee finalized the regional goals and objectives and then prioritized them through extensive discussions. Ultimately, the members voted through electronic polling. The goals are listed in order of importance, with the first goal being the most important. However, the Strategy Committee made it known that all of the goals are important. The Strategy Committee carefully constructed criteria for creating goals, which included how closely they reflected existing goals in the Region, how well they aligned with our SWOT analysis, and if the goal and strategy were an appropriate role for the District to assume. The objectives under each goal are not ranked, as they are all considered equally important under their respective ranking.

Utah’s official nickname is the Beehive State. This nickname was chosen due to Utahn’s talent for industry, unity, and hard work. Since becoming the official state emblem in 1959, the beehive has appeared on many things associated with Utah. The beehive is on our state flag, the state seal, the state insect is the honeybee, the beehive is the official state emblem, and Utah even recognizes the Beehive Cluster as the state’s...
CHAPTER 3. SUMMARY OF REGIONAL ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

COUNTIES OF THE WASATCH FRONT REGION

In order to better understand the Wasatch Front Region and its unique geography and economic considerations each of the Region’s five counties are described in more detail.

DAVIS COUNTY

Davis County has a total land area of 634 square miles but two thirds of the land is under the Great Salt Lake. The Great Salt Lake is the largest water body in the state and named due to its high salt content. Only 233 square miles of land in the County is usable. This means that Davis County is the smallest county in Utah and the third most populated. There are 1,083 persons per square mile (2014, city-data.com). About half (49.8%) of the County is owned by the state or federal government and much of this land is designated as national forest (Figure 1).

Davis County is a bedroom community, 42% of the population work in a nearby county. Of the jobs in the County, one-fourth are government. Hill Air Force Base is the largest employer accounting for 12% of the County’s economy (3% of Utah’s economy). Other large employers include the Davis School District, Lagoon Amusement Park, County government, and Lifetime Products (jobs.utah.gov). Refer to Figure 2. Other important sectors following the government sector are trade, transportation, and utilities. The County’s largest business park is the Freeport Center that hosts over 70 companies and more than 7,000 employees. Falcon Hill Aerospace Research Park is located at Hill Air Force Base and currently features more than 2 million square feet of commercial space.

The most important road in Davis County is Interstate 15, which runs north south through the center of the County. Other important roads include U.S. 89 that parallels Interstate 15 to the east and Legacy Parkway that parallels I-15 to the west. The commuter rail line has four stops in the County: Woods Cross, Farmington, Layton, and Clearfield. The Farmington stop hosts Station Park, a large Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) shopping hub.

In 2016, Davis County’s population was 342,281. From 2010 to 2016, the population grew 11.7%. There were 96,910 households and 3.29 persons per household (2011-2015). The owner-occupied housing rate was 77.3% with a median value of $225,800 (2011-2015). About 95% of persons (95.3%) earned a high school degree and 34.6% have a bachelor’s degree or higher (census.gov). The 2015 median household income was $71,112 and the per capita income was $40,000 (U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis, 2015). Refer to Figures 3-8.
Figure 3. Population Estimates (U.S. Census Bureau)

Figure 4. Total Housing Units and Building Permits (U.S. Census Bureau)

Figure 5. Educational Attainment in 2015 (U.S. Census Bureau)

Figure 6. Income in 2015 (U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis)

Figure 7. Economy ($1,000) (U.S. Census Bureau)

Figure 8. Business (U.S. Census Bureau)
MORGAN COUNTY

“The best of rural America.” – Morgan County motto

Morgan County is the third smallest County in Utah by land area and the smallest by total area. The County has a total area of 611 square miles of which about two square miles is under water. Ninety-three percent of the land in Morgan County is privately owned ranking it the top county in the state for private land ownership. A large majority of Morgan County is home to farming and grazing lands. The County’s population density is very small at 17 people per square mile compared to Salt Lake County’s 1,481 people per square mile (2014, city-data.com).

The County’s growth has been predominately residential with most of the development on former agricultural lands. Residential growth has occurred on sensitive soils in the Mountain Green area especially. Morgan County is working hard to diversify and expand its tax base while maintaining a rural lifestyle (Wasatch Front Regional Council, 2008).

A majority of the County’s residents commute to nearby Weber (Ogden City is a 30 minute commute), Davis, or Salt Lake County (Salt Lake City is an hour-long commute) for work. Morgan County is an increasingly popular destination for affluent homebuyers and has one of the highest median incomes in the state.

The County is bordered to the east by Rich and Summit Counties, to the north by Weber County, to the west by Davis County, and to the southwest by Salt Lake County. Morgan City is the only incorporated jurisdiction.

The most important road in Morgan County is Interstate 84, which runs east and west through the center of the County. Interstate 15 and 80 both run near the County.

Morgan County is home to Browning Arms Co., a multinational company, and Holcim Cement Co., a large cement manufacturer.

The largest employers include Morgan County School District, Browning Arms, Holcim Cement, and Morgan County Local Government (jobs.utah.gov). The County offers personal business training at the North Front Business Center.

Some of the County’s key attractions include Browning Outlet Store, Lost Creek Reservoir, Devils Slide (Figure 9), East Canyon State Park, and lots of outdoor activities such as boating, kayaking, fishing, golf, hiking, equestrian activities, biking, bird watching, wildlife viewing, big and small game hunting, fishing, and a short 30 minute drive to world-class skiing at Snowbasin Ski Resort (Figure 10).

In 2016, Morgan County’s total population was 11,437 persons. There were 3,024 households with 3.4 persons per household. There were 3,382 total housing units. The rate of owner-occupied housing units was 83.2% with a median housing value of $266,400 (2011-2015) – the highest in the Region. The median household income in 2015 was $74,314 and the per capita income in 2015 was $44,916 (U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis). 98.4% of the County earned a high school diploma and 34.6% have a bachelor’s degree or higher in 2011-2015 (U.S. Census Bureau). Refer to Figures 11 through 16.
Figure 11. Population Estimates (U.S. Census Bureau)

Figure 12. Total Housing Units and Building Permits (U.S. Census Bureau)

Figure 13. Educational Attainment (U.S. Census Bureau 2011-2015)

Figure 14. Income in 2015 (U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis)

Figure 15. Economy ($1,000), (U.S. Census Bureau)

Figure 16. Business (U.S. Census Bureau)
The County’s total land area is 807 square miles and includes mountains, valleys, farming, grazing land, and the Great Salt Lake. The land area encompasses 742 square miles. Salt Lake County is the most populated County in Utah with a population density of 1,481 people per square mile. It is home to the state’s capital and largest city, Salt Lake City (Figure 17). The County is made up of 16 incorporated cities and a handful of townships. Eighty percent of the land in Salt Lake County is privately owned ranking it second in terms of the percentage of privately owned lands.

The County is between two mountain ranges, the Oquirrh Mountains to the west and the Wasatch Range to the east. The valley floor is approximately 35 miles long from the Davis County border on the north to the 10-mile long Traverse Mountain Range on the southern border with Utah County. Tooele County borders the western edge and Summit, Wasatch, and Morgan Counties border the east. The cities within the County have limited room to grow due to the valley’s geographic constraints yet must meet the continual influx of people due to high rates of population growth. The County has lost much of its rural areas, farmland, and pastureland principally to residential development.

The County is home to many thriving industries including trade, transportation and utilities; professional and business services; government; education, health and social services; manufacturing; and leisure and hospitality. Salt Lake County’s top employers include Intermountain Health Care, University of Utah, State of Utah, Granite and Jordan School Districts, Salt Lake County, Wal-Mart, U.S. Postal Service, and Delta Air Lines.

Some of the County’s key activities and attractions include four world-class ski resorts (Alta, Brighton, Snowbird, and Solitude), the NBA’s Utah Jazz, Major League Soccer’s Real Salt Lake, the University of Utah NCAA basketball and football, AAA minor league baseball team the Salt Lake Bees, and Utah Blaze of arena football (Figure 18). Throughout the County, there are countless hiking, biking, fishing, boating, museum, golf, hunting, camping, and site-seeing opportunities.

The elevation ranges from the historical low of the Great Salt Lake (4,193 feet in 1963) to the highest point, 11,330 feet at Twin Peaks. The Jordan River is Salt Lake County’s major river drainage, flowing north through the middle of the valley from Utah Lake in Utah County into the Great Salt Lake (Wasatch Front Regional Council, 2008).

Transportation has been and will continue to be a major focus for many jurisdictions and the state due to rapid population growth and related quality of life and air quality concerns. The Salt Lake Valley has only four entrances but is traversed by a number of roads including Interstate 15, which travels the north-south length of the County. Interstate 80 runs east west through the northern portion of the County. Interstate 215 circles the mid portion of I-15 and encompasses I-80.

The County is home to many bus routes, light rail (TRAX) stops, a streetcar (S Line) line, and commuter rail (Front Runner). Amtrak and Union Pacific freight tracks enter and exit the County and Salt Lake City. Savage Bingham, and Garfield railroads operate solely within the County. The County is home to three airports including the Salt Lake City International Airport.
Residents of Salt Lake County have access to a number of trails that dissect the County including the Jordan River Parkway, Legacy Parkway, Crosstown, Parley’s, Bonneville Shoreline, and a variety of others accessible throughout the Wasatch-Cache national forest.

In 2016, Salt Lake County’s population was 1,121,354. There were 351,892 households and an average person per household size of 3.03 (2011-2015). 89.6% of the residents earned a high school degree and 32.1% have a bachelor’s degree or higher. The 2015 median household income was $62,117 and the per capita income was $44,692 (U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis). 66.2% of the housing units were owner-occupied (2011-2015). There were 380,749 total housing units. The median value of an owner occupied home was $234,700 in 2015. See Figures 19 through 24.
TOOELE COUNTY

In terms of land area, Tooele County is the second largest county in Utah, with 6,923 square miles. A large percentage of Tooele County’s population lives in the eastern portion of the valley where most of the irrigated and dry farmland is located. The western part of the County is sparsely populated mostly due to hundreds of square miles of arid desert largely owned by the federal government’s Department of Defense.

The County is bordered by Salt Lake and Utah Counties to the east, Juab County to the south, Davis and Box Elder Counties to the north, and the State of Nevada to the west. The County is made up of seven incorporated cities.

Altitudes in Tooele County range from 4,200 feet at the Great Salt Lake to 11,031 feet at the top of Deseret Peak in the Stansbury Mountain Range (Wasatch Front Regional Council, 2008). The County offers a variety of hiking, ATV, and mountain trails, rock hounding, hunting and fishing opportunities.

Due to Tooele County’s size, proximity to Salt Lake City, unique location and convenient access to Interstate 80 and 15, the following industries flourish: aerospace and defense, automotive, call and data centers, biosciences and pharmaceuticals, warehousing and distribution, and manufacturing.

Major employers include Tooele School District, Wal-Mart, U.S. Government, U.S. Magnesium, and Detroit Diesel Remanufacturing (jobs.utah.gov). Refer to Figure 25.

Tooele County offers higher education opportunities via the Utah State University Tooele Campus and certification programs through the Tooele Applied Technology College.

Tooele County is also home to the Bonneville Salt Flats. The Bonneville Salt Flats have become a world famous movie filming location and a destination of speed events, where many land speed records have been broken (Figure 26).

In 2016, Tooele County’s population was 64,833 with 9 people per square mile. Tooele County is one of Utah’s fastest growing counties with most of its growth occurring in Tooele City and Grantsville City. There were 18,631 households with an average of 3.25 persons per household. The 2011-2015 owner-occupied housing rate was 77% with a median value of $177,700.

Ninety two percent (92.4%) of persons earned a high school diploma and about 22.4% have a bachelor’s degree or higher. The median household income from 2011-2015 was $63,552 and the per capita income was $32,890 in 2015 dollars (U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis). Refer to Figures 27 through 32.
Figure 27. Population Estimates (U.S. Census Bureau)

Figure 28. Total Housing Units and Building Permits (U.S. Census Bureau)

Figure 29. Educational Attainment in 2015 (U.S. Census Bureau)
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Figure 32. Business (U.S. Census Bureau)
Located in north-central Utah, Weber County is the second smallest county in terms of land area yet the fourth most populated county in Utah. Weber County has a total of 662 square miles with the Great Salt Lake covering approximately 112 square miles of the County’s area.

The County is made up of 15 incorporated cities. The County is bordered by Box Elder County to the west, Cache and Rich Counties to the north, Morgan County to the east, and Davis County to the south.

Weber County’s residential growth has been moving west into agricultural lands near the Great Salt Lake. Growth pressures and the demand for a rural atmosphere continue to inflate property values in the Ogden Valley. Development pressure in west Weber County places a premium on the availability of drinking and secondary water.

The elevation in Weber County ranges from 4,200 feet at the Great Salt Lake to over 9,700 feet at Ben Lomond Peak. The Weber River and its tributaries, the Ogden River, Coldwater Creek, Burch Creek and several other smaller creeks, are the main river drainages. The Weber River drainage covers approximately 2,460 square miles. The ground is so flat near the lake that septic systems are not permitted due to the negative impact to groundwater supplies (Wasatch Front Regional Council, 2008).

The County is home to Weber State University in Ogden City, the largest undergraduate offering university in the state, and the Ogden-Weber Applied Technology College, which offers more than 300 technical skills courses and certifications (Figure 33).

Major employers include the United States Government, McKay-Dee Hospital Center, Weber County School District, Autoliv, and Weber State University. Weber County offers a variety of recreational opportunities including skiing and snowboarding at Snowbasin, Powder Mountain, and Wolf Mountain, fishing, boating, hiking, biking, hunting, as well as other outdoor activities. Weber County and Ogden City are building their outdoor industries. The Ogden Business Exchange is one place that these businesses are clustering (Figure 34).

In 2016, Weber County’s population was 247,560 with 418 people per square mile. There were 80,137 households with an average of 2.94 persons per household (2011-2015). The 2011-2015 owner-occupied housing rate was 71.2% with a median value of $168,000. Just shy of 90% of persons have graduated from high school (89.5%) and 23% have a bachelor’s degree or higher. The median household income in 2015 dollars from 2011-2015 was $56,581 and the per capita income in 2015 was $36,522. Total employment in 2014 was 77,436 with an employment change from 2013-2014 of 2.6% (2010 U.S. Census Bureau). Refer to Figures 35 through 40.
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THE WASATCH FRONT REGION’S GENERAL CONDITIONS

The Wasatch Front Region is made up of economically diverse communities. Within our Region, we have rural areas with small populations, emerging suburban areas with employment infrastructure needs, established suburban areas, urban areas that are thriving, and areas that are economically distressed. It is important to mention that when averages are reported, they can often paint a situation with a broad stroke. This can be especially true in distressed communities throughout the Region. For example, Weber County’s reported unemployment rate might be lower than the actual unemployment rate of certain cities (and even census tracts) within the County.

In the mid-2000’s, the State of Utah experienced extraordinary growth as the state rebounded from the 2001 recession. We were then hit with The Great Recession of 2008. Unfortunately, there was not a single state in the country not negatively impacted. Even today, some states are still recovering from the aftershock of the recession. Despite the adversities, Utah fared well when compared to other states in the nation. With lower poverty rates, low unemployment rates, and median household and family income levels ranking above the national average, the State of Utah’s economy is showing its resiliency by its ability to improve at faster rates than most other states (Governor’s Office of Management and Budget, 2012).

In 2017 Utah’s economy remains healthy. Between 2015 and 2016 Utah was the fastest growing state in the nation with a 1.9% growth rate and continues to grow. The annual employment growth rate was the strongest in the nation at 3.6%, as was the increase in total personal income, rising 5% from 2015 to 2016. The unemployment rate dropped from 3.6% to 3.1% from February 2016 to February 2017, and Utah’s economy is expected to be one of the top performing economies in the nation in 2017 (Gardner Policy Institute, 2017).

AGRICULTURE

Agriculture plays a lesser role in the regional economy, but a prominent role in some of the rural counties in the Wasatch Front Region. In 2014, total sales in agriculture were $2.37 billion, up 18% from fiscal year 2013. Livestock sales were up 9.9% to $1.08 billion and accounted for 78% of agriculture sales. In 2012, crop sales were up 21.8% to $531 million and accounted for 31% of agriculture sales. In 2015, crop sales decreased 4% and accounted for 22% of agriculture sales. Although grocery prices are rising, this is not necessarily translating into greater profits for farmers and ranchers. Currently, it is estimated that only 13.5% of each dollar spent by consumers on food goes towards farmers and ranchers (Governor’s Office of Management and Budget, 2016).

AIR QUALITY

The mission of the Utah Division of Air Quality (DAQ) is to protect public health and the environment from the harmful effects of air pollution. It is the responsibility of DAQ to ensure that the air in Utah meets health and visibility standards established under the federal Clean Air Act (CAA). To fulfill this responsibility, DAQ is required by the federal government to ensure compliance with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA) National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) statewide and visibility standards at national parks. DAQ enacts rules pertaining to air quality standards, develops plans to meet the federal standards when necessary, issues preconstruction and operating permits to stationary sources, and ensures compliance with state and federal air quality rules (Utah Division of Air Quality, 2012).

AIRPORT ACCESS

The Salt Lake International Airport is located in Salt Lake County. This international airport served 23,157,445 passengers in 2016. The airport is a hub airport with many flights arriving and departing at the same time. Delta Airlines is the airport’s largest user. The airport is undergoing a major renovation, a terminal redevelopment program that will be complete in 2020. Some highlights of the project include replacing facilities; new terminal that is efficient; and the new building is designed for LEED Gold standards. The redevelopment is expected to generate almost 24,000 jobs and result in $3 billion in total economic output over the life of the project (www.slcairport.com).
There are also smaller regional airports throughout the Region. The airports within the Wasatch Front Region include Salt Lake City International Airport, Wendover Airport, Ogden-Hinckley Airport, South Valley Regional Airport, Skypark Airport, Morgan County Airport, and Hill Air Force Base.

**BROADBAND**

Economic development, energy efficiency, and advances in education and health care rely on broadband infrastructure. Advances in technology have increased the importance of broadband technology in economic development. According to the Internet Innovation Alliance, the Information and Communications Technology industry contributed over $1 billion dollars to the nation’s economy in 2014 (Utah Broadband Outreach Center). Broadband enables industry and opens the door to new possibilities.

Broadband is no longer an amenity but a necessity. We live in a digital age where broadband service connects businesses and individuals to the global marketplace. Broadband access is one of the most important factors in the decision to choose a particular business location. The availability, quality, and competitiveness of broadband service is a key issue for the Wasatch Front Region and a top priority for the State as well.

To learn more about what Utah is doing, visit Utah’s Broadband Outreach Center at http://business.utah.gov/programs/broadband. The Center works with broadband providers, consumers, public institutions, policy makers across the state, and other interested stakeholders to improve efficiencies and expand deployment and usage.

**CLIMATE AND NATIONAL GEOGRAPHY**

Northern Utah has four seasons, low annual precipitation, convective and frontal storms, dry summers, low humidity, and large annual and diurnal temperature extremes. Utah’s climate is variable, wet in some areas of the state and dry in others. This variability is a function of latitude, elevation, topography, and distance from moisture sources. The Wasatch Front Region’s climate borders a semi-arid, mid-latitude steppe climate that occurs along the perimeter of the Great Basin Desert, and a humid continental climate found at slightly higher elevations in the Rocky Mountain foothills. Most of Utah’s water is from snowmelt that occurs during the spring and summer months. Larger drainages or river basins are formed from the mountain ravine’s that merge into perennial rivers, meet, and then form larger drainages.

The Greater Wasatch Front area includes the Jordan River Basin and portions of the Weber River, Tooele, and Bear River Basins. Spring runoff is at its peak from April through June and can cause flooding along the lower streams. Flash flooding from summer thunderstorms affects smaller, localized areas in this Region from summer thunderstorms.

The average annual precipitation in the Wasatch Mountain Range can exceed 40 inches, while the Great Salt Lake desert averages less than 5 inches annually. The average annual precipitation at the Salt Lake International Airport is 15.3 inches, with an average of 58.9 inches of snowfall. Utah is the second driest state in the nation. The surrounding mountain ranges act as a barrier to the cold continental arctic masses. This also insulates the area during the day and cools it rapidly at night. On clear nights, the colder air accumulates on the valley floor, while the foothills and benches remain relatively warm.

During the fall and winter months, smoke, haze, and fog can accumulate in the lower part of the valley because of sinking air or high-pressure anticyclones settling over the Great Basin. This stagnant air over the valley floor can last for several weeks significantly affecting air quality (Wasatch Front Regional Council, 2008).

The Wasatch Front Region is comprised of the Wasatch, Uintah, Oquirrh, and Stansbury Mountain Ranges. The Wasatch Mountain Range runs north-south and acts as the Region’s eastern boundary. The Uintah Mountain Range runs east west and is the eastern most range of the Great Basin, which is part of the much larger Basin and Range Province. The Oquirrh Mountain Range, running north south, forms the border between Salt Lake and Tooele County. The Stansbury Mountains bound the Tooele valley to the west. The mountains are inherent to the Region’s natural and economic prosperity and the Region’s water supply is dependent on the snow pack of the Wasatch Mountains.
The mountains also attract residents and visitors alike for a variety of outdoor recreation and tourism activities such as hunting, fishing, and skiing. Outdoor recreation and tourism brings a significant amount of investment to the Region.

The mountains also provide for the extraction of resources such as mining of coal and minerals, as well as oil and natural gas production. These sectors of the economy are vital for the state and the Region. The Region is home to the world’s deepest open pit mine, the Kennecott Copper Mine. The mine is owned by the United Kingdom based Rio-Tinto Group. Since the Kennecott mine has been in place, no other single private sector operation has generated more income, production, and employment within the state.

Utah is home to state and national parks and monuments, boating, hunting and fishing locations, hiking and biking trails, golf courses, world-class ski resorts, and other outdoor activities. The Region’s state parks include Willard Bay, Antelope Island, The Great Salt Lake and Marina, East Canyon Park, This is The Place State Park, and the Jordan River Off-Highway Vehicle State Recreation Area (Figure 41).

**CULTURAL AND SOCIAL GEOGRAPHY**

By national standards, the Wasatch Front Region has a relatively homogenous population. Approximately 91.2% of Utah’s population are white persons and 79% are White not Hispanic (U.S. Census Bureau, 2015).

Religious diversification is also a big issue in Utah. In 2013, approximately 60% of Utah’s population was counted as a member of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints (down 1% from 2007). This large majority of the population has defined much of Utah’s culture and conservative lifestyle. Due to this, Utah has gained a reputation of having a shortage of a diverse religious or racial population. This has caused a few challenges in bringing business into the state. Most notable, businesses may avoid Utah due to its rigorous liquor laws. However, it is important to note that much of that reputation has been diminished and due to the favorable business atmosphere, that Utah is now known for.

A considerable advantage that Utah has is having one-thirds of its workforce bilingual. The bilingual workforce is largely due to the Mormon practice of sending missionaries around the world, where they return fluent in a foreign language. Companies with a global reach consider Utah because of this renowned talent. Some of these companies include Goldman Sachs, Procter and Gamble, Adobe, eBay, IM Flash Technologies, Twitter, and Oracle.

A strong characteristic that Utah has is an outstanding reputation for volunteerism. Utah leads the nation in volunteer time and charitable giving. 43.2% of Utah residents volunteered in 2015, which translates to 75.6 volunteer hours per resident or 844,023 volunteers equaling 170.36 million hours of service, which is $3.8 billion dollars of service contributed (Corporation for National & Community Service). This spirit of volunteerism benefits the Region in ways other than monetary gains - parents that volunteer at schools result in children earning higher grades and having better attitudes towards school.

Figure 41. Utah’s Parks and Monuments
HIGHWAY ACCESS

Most of the people that live in the Wasatch Front work and live along the I-15 corridor. This major interstate travels from the southern end of Utah, through the Region, and into Idaho. Interstate 15 is intersected by I-80 in Salt Lake County. Interstate 84 connects Morgan County to Weber and Salt Lake Counties (Figure 42). There are over 700 trucking companies in Utah, mainly associated with its central location for distribution to major western cities and states.

Figure 42. Highways (Utah Department of Transportation)

HOUSING

When the United States housing bubble burst in 2008, it took several years for the market to stabilize. However, once the dust settled the market transformed from a buyer’s market to one that is more balanced for both buyers and sellers.

In the Wasatch Front Region, home prices have been stabilizing and are slightly increasing. In February 2013, sellers received an average of 91% of original list price (up 3% from 2012). Statewide median home sales price increased 7.1% from $210,000 to $225,000 from 2014 to 2015. Weber County sales were up 23.5% from June 2014 to June 2015. Tooele County saw the next largest increase in year to date home sales, up 22.3%. Davis County and Salt Lake County saw similar increases at 16.6% and 18.4% respectively. Morgan County’s sales decreased 18.0% during this same period. In terms of median sales price, Tooele County experienced the largest year-end increase of 14.6% from $165,500 in 2014 to $189,700 in 2015. Weber County’s year-end median sales price rose 10.2%, followed by Salt Lake County at 6.7% and Davis County at 3.2%.

Foreclosed and other distressed properties place a large downward pressure on home prices. These properties are being moved off the market and default rates on home mortgage payments are among the lowest in history. The excess supply of homes on the market is being absorbed. The inventory of available homes on the market dropped significantly from 2011. The inventory is now under 20,000 for the first time in five years. In 2014, it took an average of 92 days to sell a home, compared to 101 days in 2012. The combination of higher home sales and lower inventory levels is bringing the market back in balance. Based on these numbers and the improved median price of homes, Salt Lake City has been named the fifth best market in the country to invest in real estate (Forbes, 2016).

The majority of residential housing units in the Wasatch Front Region are single-family detached. In Morgan County over 93% of homes in single family detached and 72% in Weber County. Utah’s new home construction reached its lowest level on record in 2011. Single-family residential housing construction grew 32.6% from 2011. Also during that time, multiple-family housing construction decreased 8.8% from 2,949 units to 2,689 units. In 2013, multiple family residential

### Table 1. Housing Profiles by County (City-data.com)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DAVIS</th>
<th>MORGAN</th>
<th>SALT LAKE</th>
<th>TOELE</th>
<th>WEBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOME SALES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(YTD JUNE 2014)</td>
<td>2,109</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7,027</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>1,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOME SALES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(YTD JUNE 2015)</td>
<td>2,459</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8,322</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>2,093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OWNER-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCCUPIED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUSING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNITS</td>
<td>55,245</td>
<td>1,807</td>
<td>2,013,690</td>
<td>9,924</td>
<td>49,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RENTER-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCCUPIED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUSING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNITS</td>
<td>15,956</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>91,451</td>
<td>2,753</td>
<td>16,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTRACT RENT</td>
<td>$764</td>
<td>$534</td>
<td>$745</td>
<td>$616</td>
<td>$628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># OF NEW</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1,326</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUSE PERMITS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVE COST OF</td>
<td>$198,900</td>
<td>$300,200</td>
<td>$19,300</td>
<td>$148,800</td>
<td>$183,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HOUSE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
construction rose by more than 75%, which was a dramatic increase from previous years.

Mobile home units are the largest source of unsubsidized low-income housing in the Region. However, cities are losing more and more mobile home parks to developers that offer landowners more money than the value of operating a mobile home park.

INDUSTRY

One of the biggest advantages that the Wasatch Front Region has over many other western states is its diversity of industry. Within our Region there are many important and emerging industries including aerospace, energy, renewable energy, life sciences, manufacturing, financial services, digital media, and sports and outdoor products.

A great example of Utah’s diverse industry is the life sciences industry. This industry boasts more than 27,000 employees along the Wasatch Front. Per capita, this places Utah first among the western states for life science businesses and second for overall industry growth. Some of the life sciences companies that call Utah home include Bard Medical, BD Medical, Boston Scientific, Fresenius, ICU Medical, and Merit Medical.

Located in Salt Lake City, The University of Utah hosts the state’s only medical school. Some of the specialty programs offered include anesthesiology, neurology, emergency medicine, ophthalmology, family practice, pediatrics, internal medicine, and radiology diagnostic. The Huntsman Cancer Institute at the University of Utah treats patients from all over the world and conducts research in the treatment of melanoma, breast, colon, and pancreatic cancers. Furthermore, Weber State University, the applied technology colleges and centers, and other institutions of higher education offer degrees and training in life sciences.

Another example of a key industry for our Region and the State of Utah is outdoor recreation and tourism. Utah is home to 13 ski resorts, 5 national parks, 6 national forests, and 7 national monuments. The state has hosted worldwide events and competitions, including the 2002 Winter Olympics, the annual Outdoor Retailer show, and the Winter X Games.

PER CAPITA PERSONAL INCOME

One important metric in judging the actual economic well-being of residents in the Wasatch Front is measuring the Per Capita Personal Income (PCPI) of its residents. The PCPI, as measured by the U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA), considers not only wages, but also insurance, transfer payments, dividends, interest, and rent. In 2015, the national PCPI was $48,112 and the Wasatch Front Region’s PCPI was $39,804. From 2015 to 2016 the Per Capita Personal Income in Utah went up 6.4%. Earnings growth in construction, health care and social assistance, were the leading contributors to this increase. Tracking changes in personal income paints a picture of current conditions. Across the Region, personal income has grown significantly since 2000. From 2000 to 2014, Morgan County experienced the greatest increase in personal income with a 52.9% change, whereas Weber County experienced the weakest with a 28.3% change.

PERSONS LIVING IN POVERTY

Another effective measure of the Region’s economic well-being is by identifying the portion of persons living in poverty. Persons living in poverty often lack the goods and services commonly taken for granted by members of mainstream society. Although the poverty rates in the Wasatch Front Region are comparable to the rest of the nation, some counties experience higher rates. The percent of people in the state living in poverty in 2015 was 11.3%. Of that percentage, Salt Lake and Weber Counties have higher than average poverty levels for both the general population and for children (Figure 43).

Figure 43. Persons Living in Poverty, 2015 (source: US Census Bureau)
POPULATION

Over the last 10 years, the State of Utah and the Wasatch Front Region has maintained a faster rate of population growth than the national average. Most of the population growth has occurred in urban areas, namely along the I-15 corridor, the Region’s rural areas have also seen steady population growth. The urbanized area stretching from the south end of Salt Lake County to North Ogden in Weber County accounts for more than 90% of the Region’s population. The counties outside the urbanized area, Morgan and Tooele, also experienced high rates of population growth. Additionally, Morgan County saw an increase of nearly 40% from 2005 to 2015.

This pattern of growth is reflected in the overall makeup of the Region, with approximately 63% of the population residing in Salt Lake County, 19% in Davis County, 14% in Weber County, 4% in Tooele County, and less than 1% in Morgan County (Table 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>% CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAVIS COUNTY</td>
<td>268,187</td>
<td>336,043</td>
<td>25.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORGAN COUNTY</td>
<td>7,906</td>
<td>11,065</td>
<td>39.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALT LAKE COUNTY</td>
<td>948,172</td>
<td>1,107,314</td>
<td>16.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOOELE COUNTY</td>
<td>51,311</td>
<td>62,952</td>
<td>22.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEBER COUNTY</td>
<td>210,749</td>
<td>243,645</td>
<td>15.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE OF UTAH</td>
<td>2,469,585</td>
<td>2,995,919</td>
<td>21.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASATCH FRONT</td>
<td>1,486,325</td>
<td>1,761,019</td>
<td>18.48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Population Growth (Utah GOMB, 2015)

When comparing our Region to statewide growth rates, the Wasatch Front saw slightly slower rates. However, compared to the nation, Utah had about a 5% increase in population from 2010 to 2014, while the population of the United States increased by 0.7% during the same period. Both the state and the Region experienced nearly a 2% increase in growth between 2003 and 2005. The high growth rates did recede back to 2003 levels by 2009.

Most of the 54 incorporated jurisdictions and five counties in the Wasatch Front Region experienced growth rates larger than national trends. Population in the Region as well as the state is projected to continue to grow rapidly (Tables 3 and 4). Many communities struggle with current operation and maintenance expenses and demands. Some challenges that communities face are in planning, funding, operating and maintaining services, and infrastructure. With the increase in population comes more demand on community infrastructure, resources, human capital, and the provision of services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAVIS COUNTY</td>
<td>292,201</td>
<td>323,992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORGAN COUNTY</td>
<td>8,329</td>
<td>9,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALT LAKE COUNTY</td>
<td>1,077,556</td>
<td>1,105,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOOELE COUNTY</td>
<td>59,780</td>
<td>70,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEBER COUNTY</td>
<td>237,877</td>
<td>265,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE OF UTAH</td>
<td>2,787,670</td>
<td>3,126,736</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Population Growth 2010-2015 (Utah GOPB, 2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2040</th>
<th>2050</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAVIS COUNTY</td>
<td>359,968</td>
<td>391,933</td>
<td>426,392</td>
<td>465,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORGAN COUNTY</td>
<td>11,945</td>
<td>15,013</td>
<td>17,926</td>
<td>20,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALT LAKE COUNTY</td>
<td>1,180,859</td>
<td>1,340,665</td>
<td>1,507,997</td>
<td>1,659,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOOELE COUNTY</td>
<td>74,877</td>
<td>99,664</td>
<td>128,348</td>
<td>157,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEBER COUNTY</td>
<td>258,423</td>
<td>300,477</td>
<td>349,009</td>
<td>398,699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE OF UTAH</td>
<td>3,309,234</td>
<td>3,914,984</td>
<td>4,570,433</td>
<td>5,257,239</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Population Growth 2020-2050 (Utah GOPB, 2013)

RAIL AND TRANSIT ACCESS

The Utah Transit Authority (UTA) was incorporated on March 2, 1970 under authority of the Utah Public Transit District Act of 1969. UTA provides mass transportation access and opportunity to Utah’s residents. UTA began operation in Salt Lake County on 1970 with only 67 buses. Today, UTA operates a fleet of more than 600 buses and paratransit vehicles, 400 vanpools, 146 light rail vehicles, 63 commuter rail cars and 18 locomotives covering a 1,600 square mile service area that stretches over six counties. UTA serves approximately 1.8 million persons and operates in one of the largest geographical service areas of any transit agency across the nation (Utah Transit Authority, 2013).
In 2013, UTA added 24 compressed natural gas (CNG) buses to their fleet, and more than a dozen additionally in 2015. This makes their fleet 45% diesel (pre-2006), 42% clean diesel, 7% CNG, and 6% hybrid, saving money, resources, and pollution emissions.

Additionally, Utah has over 1,400 miles of railroad track. The Union Pacific is the primary service provider linking Utah to major lines in Los Angeles, Oakland, Portland, and Seattle. The Region also has transit rail networks, which include FrontRunner and TRAX light rail lines. The 89-mile FrontRunner commuter rail line runs from Provo in Utah County to the northern end of Weber County. In 2014 TRAX, FrontRunner, and S-Line, transported 83,160 commuters weekly, a 2.17% increase over 2013. There are four TRAX light rail lines: Airport Line, which opened April 2013 and connects downtown Salt Lake City to the Salt Lake International airport; Draper Line in southern Salt Lake County; Mid-Jordan Line from Day Break to the University of Utah; West Valley Line from western Salt Lake County to Salt Lake City. All four lines are located within the Salt Lake Valley.

STATE AND NATIONAL HISTORIC REGISTRY

State and national historic sites provide a wide variety of constraints that face development pressure. The constraints these properties have on development vary by city and county. For more information regarding these constraints, the project’s developer will need to work with the respective jurisdiction. Utah’s Department of Heritage and Arts is also a valuable resource for information. The Wasatch Front Region contains thousands of state and national historic properties, too many to name in this document. For a complete listing of the properties visit the interactive web map that can be found at http://historicbuildings.utah.gov. District staff are not aware of a CEDS project that significantly affects these sites.

UNEMPLOYMENT

The evidence for the Wasatch Front Region’s fast rate of recovery can be seen in state and local unemployment levels. In 2016, The Wasatch Front Region’s unemployment averaged 3.38%, compared to the national average of 4.4% as of April 2017. The State of Utah’s low unemployment level is typical of the State’s recent history. However, unemployment figures can sometimes disguise unseen economic distress. For example, per capita income, disposable income, and the rate of income growth are all issues that affect residents living along the Wasatch Front that may not be reflected in unemployment rate data (Figure 44).

Of the approximate 1,787,465 people living in the Wasatch Front Region, about 52% or 926,413 are part of the labor force. These are people currently employed or seeking employment. The county in our Region experiencing the lowest level of unemployment is Morgan County at 3%. The counties with the highest unemployment rates are Weber County and Tooele County at 3.8%. The unemployment rate of 3.38% is the percentage of people in the labor force that cannot find employment; however, this rate does not include those who have discontinued their search for work (bls.gov).

WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

Education plays a vital role in the economic development of Utah. Naturally, highly skilled workers and a highly educated workforce garner high wage jobs. As a result, high paying jobs provide family-sustaining wages that are important in establishing a strong economic base. While post-high school education trains and develops the workforce so that they meet the demands of today’s consumer markets.
EARLY EDUCATION

Since 2011, Utah has spent the lowest of any state for per student public school funding. This can be partially explained by the number of urban versus rural schools throughout Utah. There are economies of scale associated with school size: the larger the school district, the lower the per-pupil expenditure. The marginal cost of adding one student to a large, urban class is minimal. Conversely, the per-pupil cost of operating a rural school where class sizes are smaller is higher.

The urbanization of Utah’s population can explain why Utah’s current per-pupil expenditures are so low. In 2010, Utah spent approximately $6,583 per student on public school, the lowest in the nation and 58.8% of the national average. In 2014, Utah spent $6,500 per student on public school, showing a 1.3% decrease in spending per student. The money is principally from property taxes (state and local) and corporate and individual income taxes. A very small percent comes from federal sources. The fact remains, unfortunately, that Utah spends much less per student on public school education than the national average.

POST HIGH SCHOOL EDUCATION

At least 92% the Region’s adult population has a high school diploma (aged 25 years and older). Morgan County leads the Region - 98% of adults have a high school diploma. Weber and Salt Lake County have the fewest adults with a high school diploma at 89%. Davis County leads the Region for adults with a Bachelor’s Degree or more at 34.6%, followed by Morgan County with 34.6%, Salt Lake County at 32.1%, Weber County at 23%, and Tooele County has the lowest level with 22.4%.

Across the state, approximately 25,142 Utah students took Advance Placement (AP) exams in 2016, up 6% from 2015, with a pass rate of 66%. This was 10% above the passing rate of their national peers (56%). Passing an AP test means the student scored a 3, 4, or 5 on the test, thus earning college credit (Governor’s Office of Management and Budget, 2012). AP courses allow students in high school to get a head start on their higher education, further advancing the skill-set of the workforce within the state and Region.
CHAPTER 4. ANALYSIS OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ISSUES AND OPPORTUNITIES

SWOT ANALYSIS

In order to determine which economic developments the Region should pursue, it is important that we consider the opportunities and challenges that we face. By promoting our strengths, addressing our weaknesses, and considering the Region’s opportunities and threats, the District can better understand and further actions that provide the most effective strategy.

A strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats analysis was completed for the Region in three major steps: (1) staff drafted an initial analysis based on economic indicators found in Chapter 2; (2) the District Strategy Committee refined the analysis, paying particular attention to regional activities or needs; (3) city and county economic development professionals reviewed and refined the analysis paying close attention to local activities and needs.

The SWOT analysis was then used as a key component in the creation of the Region’s goals and objectives.

STRENGTHS

- Central Mountain West Location
- State and Regional industry clusters
- Natural resources
- Educated and diverse workforce
- Growing population
- Momentum of a strong economy

WEAKNESSES

- Poor retention of high skilled graduates
- Mismatch between employment and housing locations
- Lack of economic development resources
- Increased strain on physical infrastructure
- Pockets of unskilled labor
- Out of state perception of social cultures in Utah
- Significant distance from large global consumer markets

OPPORTUNITIES

- Stronger than national real estate markets
- F-35 fighter jet fleet potential at Hill AFB
- Wind energy in the Region
- Establishment of the Wasatch Front Economic Development District
- Transit oriented development via Front Runner

THREATS/CHALLENGES

- Demands on education infrastructure
- Nationwide Air Force base closures
- Unusual weather, air quality and drought
- National and global trends
- Fiscal demands on city, state, and county budgets
STRENGTHS

Strengths are characteristics that give the Wasatch Front Region an advantage over other regions.

CENTRAL LOCATION

Our State and Region are centrally located in the intermountain west. We are positioned to act as an interstate hub connecting much of the west coast to the rest of the country. It takes less than one day’s travel to hit the major metropolitan city centers, ports, and markets around the intermountain Region. Markets in Denver, Phoenix, Las Vegas, and throughout California are all within one-day driving distance by highway. The Salt Lake International Airport also provides a valuable business resource for quick travel in and out of the Region (Table 5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>HIGHWAY MILES</th>
<th>KILO-METERS</th>
<th>DRIVING TIME</th>
<th>FLYING TIME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DENVER</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>861</td>
<td>8.5 hours</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAS VEGAS</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>6.5 hours</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>1,109</td>
<td>11 hours</td>
<td>1.5 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHOENIX</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>1,067</td>
<td>11.5 hours</td>
<td>1.5 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN DIEGO</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>1,207</td>
<td>12 hours</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN FRANCISCO</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>1,184</td>
<td>12 hours</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEATTLE</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>1,352</td>
<td>13.5 hours</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Relative Location to Major Metropolitan Areas

Historically, the Defense Depot in Ogden City was considered the primary hub for supplying all 50 states with military supplies. Even though the value of track hub distribution has diminished, the centralization of road infrastructure has grown to renew the Region’s distribution strength. This infrastructure, coupled with some industries’ desire to have a centrally located distribution hub, has led to the development of a healthy distribution economy.

Information based industries like software development, biotech research, and other information technology firms are not as heavily affected by distance between locations of production and sale. These industries often consider the somewhat remote location of our Region as an advantage. Having a central location, low cost of living, and great natural amenities contribute to the excellent quality of life found in the Wasatch Front Region that is rarely found in larger metropolitan areas.

STATE AND REGIONAL CLUSTERS

Clusters can be defined as regional concentrations of related industries. Firms within certain industries have a tendency to cluster together in order to reduce operating costs and benefit from shared inputs. The clusters that exist in Utah act as magnets for similar businesses and further boost economic development. These are the clusters that the State’s economic development organization and the Governor’s Office of Economic Development (Utah Governor’s Office of Economic Development, 2015) have identified as desirable, strong clusters:

- Aerospace & Defense
- Outdoor Recreation
- Life Sciences
- Finance
- Energy & Natural Resources
- IT/Software

The Wasatch Front has strengths in nearly every one of the GOED-identified industry clusters. The Region can promote the creation of high-paying jobs by continuing to build on the strength of state and regional clusters. The growth of the state’s strong industry clusters will lead to the growth of other potential clusters, such as biotechnology, distribution, manufacturing, tourism, and film industry.
NATURAL RESOURCES
Utah has an abundance of natural resources that have proven to be a major economic asset. These resources range from rich mining and energy deposits to world-class skiing, hunting, fishing, and other outdoor activities. The Wasatch Front Region boasts a variety of scenic mountain resorts, rivers and streams, freshwater lakes, agricultural lands, and other natural amenities. The utilization of these assets has benefited the Region in the past, and through careful management and planning, they can continue to strengthen the Region’s economy and improve resident quality of life.

EDUCATED AND DIVERSE WORKFORCE
When compared to the rest of the nation, Utah has an above-average education rate. Utah has the 16th highest per capita percentage of adults with a bachelor’s degree or higher. Although there are pockets of low education levels within the Region and some exporting of high-skilled graduates, our Region has a well-educated workforce. There are more than 80 different languages spoken in Utah with a significant portion of the population being bilingual.

The Wasatch Front boasts world-class educational and training institutions. The University of Utah, Westminster College, Weber State University, Salt Lake Community College, LDS Business College, University of Phoenix, University of Southern Nevada, Neumont University and a large number of applied technology colleges (Salt Lake, Tooele, Ogden-Weber, and Davis Applied Technology Colleges) all offer the education and training that make the Wasatch Front’s workforce one of the most skilled and educated in the country.

GROWING POPULATION
The Wasatch Front’s young and diverse workforce can be attributed to rapid population growth in the Region. The consumer markets, although comparatively small, continue to grow and attract national production and retail firms. The high rate of population growth in the Region comes from both high birthrates and immigration. This provides the Region with an increasingly diverse labor force that meets the demands of a robust and healthy economy.

The Wasatch Front’s increasing population is providing greater opportunities for specialization in employment and increased income potential. Planning for the economic needs of a growing population can ensure that population growth strengthens the economy. Balancing the infrastructure and economic needs of a growing population with the maintenance of environmentally sensitive and pristine areas is one of the District’s objectives.

MOMENTUM OF A STRONG ECONOMY
Moving forward, one of the greatest strengths of the Wasatch Front is the momentum created by a strong economy. The State of Utah has received consistent, positive reviews for both its current and prospective economy and business climate from national publications like Forbes and Business Facilities.

Building from this momentum, the Region can continue to be a leader for much of the nation in economic growth and increased quality of life. Maintaining a good pace of infrastructure development is critical to the Region’s success.

Some accolades the Wasatch Front and the State of Utah have earned include:
#1 “Top Destination in the World to Visit In 2016” (Fodor’s Travel)
#1 “Best State for Businesses and Careers 2015” (Forbes)
#1 “Economic Growth Potential 2015” (Business Facilities)
#1 “Best States for Business 2015” (CNBC)
#1 “Fastest Growing States 2016” (U.S. Census Bureau)
#1&2 “Fastest Job Growth in the Nation” (Bloomberg Business)
WEAKNESSES

Weaknesses are characteristics that give the Region a disadvantage relative to other regions.

POOR RETENTION OF HIGH-SKILLED GRADUATES

One of the most pertinent problems the Region faces is the loss of high-skilled graduates to other areas in the country. Currently, Utah is the 8th highest exporter of graduates with degrees in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) in the United States. The loss of these valuable graduates takes a considerable toll on the economic competitiveness of the Region because these and other high-skilled graduates provide the backbone for our economic future.

Although there are many STEM-related jobs in the Region, there is often a mismatch between the qualifications for existing job openings and the skill-set of college graduates. For example, aligning the skills of STEM graduates with the need of STEM-related employment is vital in order to reduce the amount of young, educated workers leaving the area.

Educators across Utah have been taking steps to correct this issue. The University of Utah has been successful in assisting technology and engineering start-up companies. The University of Utah has rivaled Massachusetts Institute of Technology in terms of total technology start-ups over the last few years. Weber State University is working with the Utah Science Technology and Research initiative at the University of Utah in order to better align graduates with employers as well. Further, local applied technology colleges and centers have been successful in matching employment needs with available human capital.

MISMATCH BETWEEN EMPLOYMENT AND HOUSING LOCATIONS

A large percentage of the Region’s workforce cross county lines for their daily commute between home and work. In Davis County, 45% of the population commutes outside of the County for work each day. The rate is even higher in Morgan County where 85% of residents travel outside the County for work.

Davis and Morgan County are not alone. Other counties in our Region also experience high rates of out-migration for employment reasons. In some cases, employment infrastructure is not fully utilized and needs to be maximized in order to reduce commuting distances and the costs associated with mass out-migration.

The lack or under-development of employment centers in Morgan and Tooele Counties is the primary cause for the high level of daily out-migration. The need to create more employment centers in these Regions is apparent from the economic damage that occurs when the tax base leaves on a daily basis. Furthermore, a lack of developed employment centers in certain areas often results in increased stress on the Region’s transportation systems. As a greater portion of the workforce travel significant distances between home and work, the increased traffic levels have a negative impact on the Region’s transportation infrastructure. Increased travel times also decreases the quality of life for the Region’s workforce.

In some areas, the opposite of this problem occurs. The aging infrastructure in some cities shows a significant need for redevelopment of existing housing stock. As a result, many people who work in the Region’s larger cities seek homes in other areas. This phenomenon’s significant economic harm to those cities and counties as large portions of personal income is spent outside the area. This leads to lower sales tax revenues and reduced funding in order to complete necessary infrastructure improvements or housing redevelopment.

LACK OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT RESOURCES

Another weakness that can be addressed is the lack of financial and labor resources for local economic development efforts. This weakness is most prominent in rural areas. These areas struggle to pay a staff of economic development professionals. Additionally, many cities and counties may have the staff but cannot access adequate funding. In many cases, essential city services frequently take priority over economic development efforts, leaving projects unfunded and plans unrealized.
Having created an Economic Development District, the Region will be able to improve resource allocation for economic development. This can take place through regional collaboration, shared staff, and joint financing. Other potential funding and resources can come by working with the Region’s financial institutions. For example, many banks provide incentives through Community Reinvestment Act funding. One emerging possibility of using the Community Reinvestment Act in local economic development is through local Certified Development Finance Institutions (CDFIs). CDFIs often invest in regional transportation-oriented development projects. Such opportunities will be better served at a regional level through organizations like the Wasatch Front Regional Council.

**INCREASED STRAIN ON PHYSICAL INFRASTRUCTURE**

The Wasatch Front Region is among the fastest growing regions in the country. Demographers have estimated that by the year 2040 the population growth will require an additional 1.9 billion square feet of new and rebuilt space in order to accommodate the expected 2.9 million jobs. With the increase in population comes an increased demand for public services and infrastructure. This demand will significantly affect the Region’s economy. In anticipation of the expected growth, the Wasatch Front Regional Council, with support of the Region’s local governments, created a vision for its future. The Regional vision is known as the Wasatch Choice for 2040.

The Wasatch Choice for 2040 considers economic development along with community development, transportation, land use, and green infrastructure to best accommodate expected growth while also enhancing economic competitiveness compared to other regions in the country.

**POCKETS OF UNSKILLED LABOR AND LOW PER CAPITA INCOME**

Portions of the Wasatch Front experience low levels of per capita income and higher than average levels of unemployment. Often these measures are correlated with the skill and education levels of the workforce. Tooele County, for example, has the second lowest post-high school education rate in Utah. The recent expansion of Utah State University is helping curb the low per-capita income in Tooele County. The expanded branch is a result of investments by Tooele City and their work with the state legislature aimed at improving education. Actions like these provide opportunities for regional and state collaboration in building and improving educational infrastructure. Weber State University and Ogden-Weber Applied Technology College and Davis Applied Technology College have also expanded their missions to meet the critical need of improving the skill level of the Region’s workforce.

**SIGNIFICANT DISTANCE FROM SOME LARGE GLOBAL MARKETS**

Many businesses value close proximity to large consumer markets. Due to Utah’s distance from large population centers (Houston, Chicago, New York, etc.) some national production and retail firms consider Utah a poor place for business expansion and relocation. This distance is further increased when considering global markets. This disadvantage is not easy to address, as Utah does not have the power to change its geographic location. Nevertheless, advances in telecommunication and transportation reduce these challenges. Additionally, with an increase in technology led industries (that are driven less by location) give rise to new opportunities.

The State of Utah has worked hard to improve its telecommunication and transportation infrastructure in order to support these opportunities. These improvements, along with the advantages that have allowed Utah to be recognized as one of the best states in the country to do business, allows Utah to overcome this disadvantage.

**OUT OF STATE PERCEPTION OF UTAH’S CULTURE**

Utah is considered one of the best states for business in the country. This is due in part to the State’s skilled and hardworking workforce, a positive regulatory atmosphere, and low cost of living. Despite the positive attention in national publications, there are still perceptions that damage the potential for business expansion. These perceptions include concerns over the quality of education, the perceived homogenous population, and discernment regarding the State’s strict liquor laws.
There is also a misconception that Utah does not have a robust metropolitan population and that the State’s infrastructure cannot sustain a growing economy outside of the Salt Lake City metropolitan area. The Governor’s Office of Economic Development, Economic Development Corporation of Utah, Chambers of Commerce, and other economic development institutions are working hard to correct these misperceptions and to promote the great economic advantages found in Utah. Fortunately, many of the negative perceptions about business in Utah are yielding to the positive aspects of our economic potential.

**OPPORTUNITIES**

*Opportunities are elements that the Region can use to its advantage.*

**STRONG REAL ESTATE MARKET**

As stated in the housing section of this plan, real estate prices in the state have not experienced the decline and distress seen in much of the country. While certain areas of the Region were hit harder than others, on average, prices were much stronger than what was seen on a national scale. This provides an opportunity for growth in real estate, which has positive residual effects throughout the economy.

**HILL AIR FORCE BASE**

Hill Air Force Base plays a major role in the regional economy. It brings in billions of dollars annually and creates various opportunities for employment. The growth of Hill AFB depends on its relevance in terms of national defense. The Base has recently acquired F-35 jets and has the potential to host more. This would continue to prove the national security value of Hill AFB. With the continuation of major operations comes continuation of the positive economic impact the Base provides the Region.

**RENEWABLE AND GREEN ENERGY**

With the increased cost of fossil fuels in both monetary and environmental terms comes the opportunity for renewable forms of energy to take more prominent roles. Utah has had success in developing wind energy resources, providing a unique opportunity for more locally produced energy.

**ESTABLISHMENT OF THE WASATCH FRONT ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT**

An important opportunity for the Region was the establishment of the Wasatch Front Economic Development District. Communities and other eligible entities throughout the Region now have the support of the District in applying for and attracting investments and other opportunities, leveraging dollars, and collaborating on regional projects.
COORDINATED PLANNING

Solidarity among various groups has been a valuable resource for the Region. Multiple organizations have come together to form a common vision for the future, known as the Wasatch Choice for 2040. The Wasatch Choice for 2040 is a transportation and land use vision for addressing the Region’s growth. Local communities are adjusting their general plans and transportation agencies are conforming transportation plans to the Vision. An important element of the Vision’s growth principle is economic development.

The project’s partners have created a set of tools and resources that give local governments and private developers the ability to implement the Vision. The Vision will facilitate communication, generate information, and provide practical assistance to communities as they build development projects. For more information on the Wasatch Choice for 2040, refer to WasatchChoice2040.com.

THREATS / CHALLENGES

Threats are elements in the environment that can negatively affect the Region’s economy.

DEMAND ON EDUCATIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE

While Governor Gary Herbert prioritizes education in Utah’s Economic Development Plan, there is still significant progress that can be made. At 29th in the nation, Utah ranks among the bottom half of states in terms of public education spending per student. While part of this can be explained by the large family size, it still presents significant workforce development challenges. Utah’s students scored last compared to states with similar income, parent education, and ethnic diversity on standardized math and reading tests. Over the last twenty years, Utah has lost its competitive advantage of being among the most highly educated states. Nationally, Utah ranks 27th in percentage of high school graduates. One in four young adults does not have a high school diploma.

Utah businesses have seen these factors as red flags in regards to our state’s education. As a result, they have initiated Prosperity 2020, the largest business led movement to enhance educational prosperity in the State of Utah. Prosperity 2020 is an innovation and investment plan that identifies ways to improve the economy through education investments and awareness. For more information on Prosperity 2020, visit prosperity2020.com.

AIR FORCE BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE

Just as the expansion of the air base provides positive impacts to the regional economy, it can negatively affect the economy when the National Air Force Base Realignment and Closure Committee considers making changes to Hill Air Force Base. Hill Air Force Base has survived the last few rounds of base closures but the threat of closure still exists.
WEATHER, CLIMATE, AIR QUALITY

Over the last few years, Utah has seen relatively unique and record-setting weather patterns. Unexpected and adverse weather conditions such as low precipitation and drought can have negative impacts on transportation, construction, agriculture, and quality of life within the Region. The air quality issue is a significant one within the Wasatch Front Region. Air quality presents a host of issues related to the Region’s economy and to the general health of Utah’s residents.

NATIONAL AND GLOBAL TRENDS

Uncontrollable national and global market trends continue to have immense impacts on the regional economy. For example, the health of the European economy can affect the exports of this country, state, and region. Understanding external threats and trends allows us to understand the Region’s income, unemployment, and standard of living that are directly affected by markets and industries outside of the Region.

FISCAL DEMANDS ON LOCAL AND STATE BUDGETS

Over the last few years, many organizations have experienced dramatic budgetary strains. The Wasatch Front Region is no exception. Many organizations, cities, counties, and state agencies, have been forced to reduce services, employment, and assistance due to dramatic decreases in revenue streams. This presents a serious threat to economic development efforts undertaken throughout the Region.
CHAPTER 5. INTEGRATING WITH UTAH’S PRIORITIES

The incorporation of resources from existing state, regional, and local economic development efforts is a key aspect of the Wasatch Front Economic Development District’s mission. In the creation of the CEDS, data was pulled from a variety of organizations including the Utah Governor’s Office of Economic Development (GOED), Utah Department of Workforce Services (DWS), Utah Science Technology and Research (USTAR), Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC), and the Region’s member counties, cities, and towns. This data was used to identify existing goals and economic development efforts. Further, this CEDS was completed with input from the Region’s economic development professionals. Counties and cities understand best the economic development efforts that will work for them and the District will continue to develop its strategic goals in a way that will supplement local and regional economic development efforts.

An important goal of the District is not re-creating the wheel, rather, supporting existing efforts already underway, filling necessary gaps, and offering assistance and networking opportunities. The District does not seek to duplicate, override, or direct economic development efforts in the Region. Instead, the District wishes to build on the positive momentum of the Region’s economy and assist distressed communities by reinforcing and supporting their efforts through the tools of regional planning, collaboration, and leveraging resources.

The methodology for cooperating and integrating with Utah’s economic development priorities are outlined in three major steps below.

1. Throughout the creation and implementation of the CEDS, each of the State’s four objectives have been incorporated. The following areas are examples of where Utah’s priorities have been included: Introduction, Background, Goals and Objectives, and Implementation Efforts.
2. The District echoed Utah’s priority for focusing economic development efforts on particular and targeted industry clusters.
3. The District worked to ensure collaboration with the State throughout the CEDS process and will continue to enrich the planning process that has been established.

STATEWIDE VISION

UTAH’S VISION

Utah will lead the nation as the best performing economy and be recognized as a premier global business environment and tourist destination.

MISSION AND OBJECTIVE

The Governor’s Office of Economic Development’s mission is to enhance quality of life by increasing Utah’s revenue base and improving employment opportunities.

BUSINESS PROMISE

Utah’s business promise is our commitment to a business friendly environment and high quality of life. These fundamental principles set Utah apart and serve as a foundation for our economic success.

GOVERNOR’S ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PLAN OF UTAH

Utah’s current Governor, Gary Herbert, have set the tone to prioritize economic development across the state. The District and the Region’s CEDS have concentrated on echoing, supporting, and implementing the goals of state. The District also strives to follow the Governor’s lead in focusing on the six targeted economic clusters. View the State of Utah’s economic development plan by visiting the State’s website at http://business.utah.gov/start/econ-plan/.

WASATCH FRONT REGION’S VISION

WASATCH CHOICE 2040

The Wasatch Choice for 2040 Vision points the way for the Region to focus growth in a variety of activity centers, many of which are coordinated with our existing and near-term transportation system: freeways, rail lines, rapid busways, and key boulevards. While these centers are coordinated with today’s transportation system, tomorrow’s new transportation investments will be planned to serve these activity centers, areas of growth, and our Region’s special districts – like the airports and the universities.
WASATCH CHOICE 2050

Wasatch Choice 2050 represents the most significant update to the Wasatch Choice for 2040 Vision since Wasatch Front communities first established it over a decade ago. Wasatch Choice 2050 will update the regional vision looking out to 2050. It will better articulate how to make the vision a reality through recommended implementation strategies. It will build on the dynamic changes happening in communities throughout the Region, local efforts like Salt Lake County’s The Future We Choose, and the Your Utah, Your Future statewide vision in which nearly 53,000 Utahns participated (http://wasatchchoice2040.com/about-wc2040).

CENTERS

The Wasatch Choice’s centers are located where regional destinations have grown, where economic activity has clustered, or in strategic locations that are pointed in this direction. The Vision suggests that these centers should expand to provide ever-broadening choices for residents to live, work, shop and play; a mix of all of these activities is welcome. Centers should work with the long-term market, helping provide opportunities to residents who want to live close to work, walk or bike to shop, and have both great transit and road access. These opportunities are desperately needed as our population ages, gas prices and congestion increase, and the cost of transportation for work and play rises, and available land shrinks (Refer to the Center Analysis in Appendix C).

INTEGRATED ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, TRANSPORTATION, AND LAND USE

3 KEY STRATEGIES FOR INTEGRATING ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, TRANSPORTATION, AND LAND USE PLANNING

Utah is growing, rapidly. Rapid growth within a limited geography necessitates an integrated approach to transportation, land use, and economic development planning. To help our economy thrive, the WFRC, a Metropolitan Planning Organization and Economic Development District, has prioritized the following 3 key strategies for integration in the Wasatch Choice 2050 Vision, Regional Transportation Plan, Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy, and other efforts.

1. COORDINATE TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENTS WITH ECONOMIC CLUSTER LOCATIONAL AND SERVICE NEEDS

Clusters are geographical concentrations of related businesses and organizations within an industry sector. Utah’s Six Key Clusters are broadly promoted by economic development organizations including the Governor’s Office of Economic Development.

WFRC supports the varied locational and service needs of clusters. Locational needs can include their preferred mode of access such as car, rail, truck, bike or pedestrian. Service needs include characteristics and amenities for the built and natural environment and proximity to workforce, consumers, and allied businesses. Addressing locational and service needs ensures Utah’s clusters grow and remain healthy over the long term.

Progress Measures
- Growth of clusters relative to transportation investments
- Travel time of goods delivered to clusters
- Workforce access to clusters

Collaborative Actions
- Create a coordinated regional cluster priority map
- Align WFRC programs with cluster needs

2. COORDINATE TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENTS TO IMPROVE ACCESS TO OPPORTUNITY

Access to opportunity means people can get to a large number of jobs, services, and educational opportunities within a reasonable amount of time and that businesses have access to employees, customers, and suppliers.

WFRC improves access to opportunity by addressing transportation infrastructure needs and encouraging coordination with housing, jobs, services, and educational institutions. Improving access to jobs and services helps individuals be more self-sufficient and facilitates upward economic mobility. Metropolitan areas that promote upward mobility achieve higher economic performance.
Progress Measures
- Jobs and educational opportunities within a short car, transit, bike or walk trip
- Access to large job and educational centers
- Program funding to improve areas with lower incomes

Collaborative Actions
- Prioritize projects that support access to opportunity
- Prioritize projects that improve access for lower income households
- Work with local governments to maximize access to opportunity through new development

3. ENSURE FISCAL SUSTAINABILITY THROUGH EFFICIENT GROWTH AND INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENTS

Efficient growth and infrastructure investment refers to locations and forms of growth that are resource efficient - such as growth in already-developed areas and near regional transportation infrastructure. Efficient growth reduces travel demand, uses existing infrastructure to meet demand, and as a result increases local revenues while mitigating infrastructure cost increases. Encouraging efficient growth and the use of existing infrastructure stretches our limited resources.

Progress Measures
- Center and infill growth
- Revenue and cost burden for communities
- Travel demand, including driving distances and use of alternative modes

Collaborative Actions
- Align programming/funding decisions to utilize existing investments and promote efficient growth
- Work with local governments to encourage efficient growth
- Collaborate to reduce travel demand

CLUSTERS, TRANSPORTATION, AND LAND USE

With the largest expansion of light rail in the nation in the past 20 years, the Wasatch Front Region has made immense investments in its transit system. Different employment types require different transportation infrastructure. It is critical to understand where firms are located and how land uses interact and support the burgeoning transit system to encourage multi-modal travel behavior.

Sectors that are more industrial in nature such as aerospace, defense, natural resources and energy may require employees and the transfer of goods to travel via automobile and/or freight in order to transport machinery and tools. These uses have historically been located in peripheral, non-dense areas where public safety concerns are lessened; it is expected these firms have efficient access to both road and rail freight infrastructure.

Conversely, firms considered part of the “knowledge economy” such as information technology, financial services and life sciences may locate in more dense centers where they can benefit from information exchange, and closer to transit stops as employees do not require the same freight carrying capacity, can access services and restaurants via foot if located nearby and can work en-route using on-board technology and wireless internet.

The same can be true for the retail economy, such as Outdoor Recreation, which also benefits from locating in dense locations through increased travel to these destinations, as well as knowledge spillovers, which spur product innovation and advancement.

As the population living in the Wasatch Front continues to grow and its transit system becomes more engrained in the regional culture, it is important to encourage the appropriate land uses to locate within proximity to commuter rail infrastructure in order to increase multi-modal travel patterns and lessen the impacts of an auto-centric lifestyle such as traffic congestion, obesity, harmful air emissions and a higher potential for automobile crashes. This analysis may serve as one lens with which to view the current interaction between these distinct infrastructures and economic development needs.
STATEWIDE STRATEGIC INDUSTRY CLUSTERS

UTAH’S SIX STRATEGIC CLUSTERS:
- Aerospace and Defense
- Energy and Natural Resources
- Financial Services
- Life Sciences
- Outdoor Products
- Software Development and Information Technology

WASATCH FRONT REGION’S INDUSTRY CLUSTERS

When identifying the Region’s issues and opportunities, general industries and targeted industry clusters were considered. This allows the Region the ability to leverage and offer more opportunities based on strengths and opportunities.

As part of a regional economic development strategy, the Wasatch Front Economic Development District staff provided an analysis of the state’s economic clusters. Staff identified where clusters exist within the Wasatch Front Region and created maps to display them. This spatial identification will assist stakeholders in maintaining appropriate infrastructure to serve the unique needs of the employment firms and can guide future land use policy to shape areas into desirable places to work and live. Ongoing analysis of these clusters may aid in strengthening target efforts, and may support network development within the clusters. To understand the current interaction between firm location and the transit system, the maps also portray the streetcar, commuter, and light rail stations that host one or more firms within one half mile of the stop.

In order to determine the size and magnitude of employment clusters, all firm locations within Salt Lake, Davis, Weber, Morgan, and Tooele Counties were geocoded (data provided by Department of Workforce Services, 2012) and displayed spatially. To determine the amount of clustering within a small area, the firms were joined to the corresponding Transportation Analysis Zone (TAZ). TAZs are the unit of analysis widely used in transportation planning and are generally an acre in size in urbanized areas. The TAZs were then examined to determine the areas with the largest concentration of targeted industries.

Existing Conditions maps on the WFRC website display:
- Targeted industry firm location; firm and employment density by TAZ
- Cities that host the most firms
- Employees per industry (when compared regionally)
- Employment by trade cluster


KNOWLEDGE ECONOMIES REPRESENT LARGE, DENSE CLUSTERS WITH A LARGE BREADTH OF TRANSIT COVERAGE

Largely due to the University of Utah Medical Research Center, the Life Science Cluster (535 firms) has the greatest density per TAZ (29) as well as the highest employment density (approximately 4,000 employees in one TAZ), exceeding that of the Financial Services Cluster, which has nearly 5 times the amount of firms (2,445 total firms in cluster).

The highest density in the Financial Services Cluster is 21 firms per TAZ, located in eastern Salt Lake County and in particular Cottonwood Heights. This city alone hosts approximately 2500 employees in its 115 firms. Southern Davis County also hosts a dense pocket of Financial Service firms; however, they are separated from the FrontRunner commuter rail by I-15.

The IT and Software cluster is most dense (21 firms per TAZ) in southern Salt Lake County as well as along the I-15/commuter rail corridor in both Salt Lake and Davis Counties. As the second largest cluster in the Region (1,725 firms), 17% of firms (approximately 300) are served by transit stops. Each of the clusters in the knowledge economy is well served by transit, with 40 – 60 of the 70 rail stops serving these firms. It should be expected that supporting uses such as commercial and residential units are integrated horizontally and vertically to compliment these thriving sectors.
INDUSTRIAL ECONOMIES ARE WELL-SERVED BY RAIL AND FORM LESS DENSE CLUSTERS YET HIGH INDIVIDUAL FIRM EMPLOYMENT

The cluster currently best served by commuter rail is Energy and Natural Resources (26% of firms served by transit). Although it is less likely for these workers to utilize light rail for commuting and industrial uses are perhaps least appropriate to be located near transit stops, this is likely due to the alignment of the light rail that follows the preexistent freight infrastructure right-of-way, which historically served industrial uses in the valley. The same may be said for the Aerospace and Defense Cluster (15% of firms served by commuter rail – a good chunk located in downtown Salt Lake City and some in Central Salt Lake County).

As the transit system transcends from its nascent stage, it is expected the land use around these stops will adapt to a mixture of commercial, residential and office buildings to better accommodate pedestrian travel around the transit stops, yielding more walkable living environments.

The densest clustering of these firms is in the Energy and Natural Resource cluster, which has four to seven firms per TAZ in central Salt Lake City, along the I-15 and commuter rail corridor; this trend continues northward into southwestern Davis County, in North Salt Lake and Woods Cross). The densest employment in the Aerospace and Defense cluster exists on the west side of the valley, in West Valley City and western Salt Lake City.

RETAIL ECONOMIES ARE SOMEWHAT DISPERSED WITH NO DISTINCT SPATIAL PREFERENCE BETWEEN EAST/WEST AND NORTH/SOUTH

Fourteen percent of Outdoor Recreational firms are served by transit, largely downtown Salt Lake City and on the far eastern side of the S-Line in the Sugarhouse neighborhood. There is also a large clustering in Ogden City near the commuter rail line.

ADDITIONAL INDUSTRIES AND INDUSTRY CLUSTERS

It is important to note that other important industry clusters exist within the remaining 84% of the regional workforce. These clusters include manufacturing,
SALT LAKE COUNTY
- Business Services
- Distribution and e-commerce
- Financial Services
- Transportation and Logistics

TOOELE COUNTY
- Business Services
- Distribution and e-commerce
- Upstream Metal
- Production Technology and Heavy Machinery

WEBER COUNTY
- Marketing, Design, and Publishing
- Business Services
- Food Processing/Manufacturing
- Automotive

WASATCH FRONT REGION
- Business Services
- Distribution and e-commerce
- Financial Services
- Transportation and Logistics

STATE AND LOCAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM AND STRATEGIES

Throughout the creation and planning process, the District worked with the state and our Region’s five counties as well as with city economic development departments to ensure that the SWOT analysis, regional goals and objectives, as well as list of projects was consistent with the efforts undertaken by these organizations.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION OF UTAH

The State of Utah established the Economic Development Corporation of Utah in 1987. EDCUtah works with state and local government and private industry to attract and grow competitive, high-value companies, and spur the development and expansion of local Utah businesses. There have been a wide variety of incentives and recruitment efforts undertaken by the state, counties, and cities in the Region to grow the economy to what it is today.

Recently, EDCUtah created a “megasite” certification process that smooths the way for companies considering Utah for landmark projects (1,000+ jobs, $1billion+ capital expenditure). The certification evaluates and certifies sites to remove the risk of the unknown.

UTAH’S REDEVELOPMENT AGENCIES (RDA’S)

The Utah Neighborhood Development Act (Utah Code 17A-2-1200) was created to aid communities in the removal and prevention of blight from previously developed areas. The Redevelopment Agencies Act (Utah Code 17B-4) encourages private investment in deteriorated areas in order to achieve desired development through reconstruction, rehabilitation, and residential, commercial, industrial, and retail development. RDAs are entities created by city or county governments to implement the development goals of the community. For a city, the RDA board is the city council. For a county, the RDA board is an assembly of boards of supervisors. RDAs approve redevelopment plans and provide a budget.

URBAN STREET DESIGN

The study of Urban Street Design is an emerging field of research that utilizes quantifiable measurements to grade the design of a street. How a street is designed affects individual’s decisions on how they interact with the environment—whether they are comfortable walking and bicycling from activity to activity, or whether they believe they need to drive to each destination. In addition to affecting the mode of travel, the built environment also affects how attractive, and ultimately, how economically viable an area will be. Because street design is related to economic growth and development, it is important to study why and how successful streets can influence job growth, revenue, and overall attitudes towards a particular area. Refer to our website for detailed interactive maps for the Wasatch Front Region, www.wfrc.org. See Appendix D for urban design qualities.
RDAs assist communities in addressing three types of development issues: redevelopment (blighted areas), economic development (increase jobs), and housing development (high-density housing close to institutions of higher education). RDAs define the project area and then adopt a plan for redevelopment. A budget is then decided and approved by the Taxing Entity Committee (made up of persons who represent taxing entities, which levy a property tax within the RDA boundaries).

In 2006, there were 77 RDAs in the State of Utah, 71 in cities and towns and 6 in counties. Between 1993 and 2005, 51 RDA projects were approved. The property tax increment received by RDAs has increased by an average of 9% annually. In 1994, the tax increment amount was $30,553,000. In 2004, the tax increment amount was $87,022,000.

The following jurisdictions operate an RDA in the Wasatch Front Region: For more information, refer to the following:

- Bluffdale City
- Bountiful City
- Centerville City
- Clearfield City
- Draper City
- Grantsville City
- Holladay City
- Kaysville City
- Layton City
- Midvale City
- Morgan City
- North Salt Lake City
- Ogden City
- Riverton City
- Roy City
- Salt Lake City
- Salt Lake County
- Sandy City
- South Jordan City
- South Ogden City
- Taylorsville City
- Tooele City
- Washington Terrace City
- Weber County
- West Jordan City
- West Valley City

**WORLD TRADE CENTER UTAH**

World Trade Center Utah helps companies think, act, and succeed globally. They have four key objectives to help them accomplish their mission: motivate and educate Utah businesses to expand their global presence, build capacity of Utah businesses for international trade, expand global network of Utah businesses with foreign trade officials and support partners in strengthening Utah’s international business economy (wtcutah.com).

**CONSISTENCY WITH STATE AND LOCAL WORKFORCE INVESTMENT STRATEGIES**

The information provided explains how the CEDS has and will continue to remain consistent with applicable state and local workforce investment strategies.

Each county in the Region uses the state incentives and has added a few of their own. Some of the incentives include tax increment financing, waiving of fees, fast track permitting, revolving loan funds, and bond programs.

More information about county and city incentives can be found at their respective websites. For more information, refer to the following website: business.utah.gov/relocate/incentives.

**UTAH DEPARTMENT OF WORKFORCE SERVICES**

The Department of Workforce Services (DWS) focus is to ensure the availability of a skilled workforce. DWS will do this through coordinated development services with higher education, public education, vocational rehabilitation, and human services. DWS supports the statewide-targeted clusters as they are well established and provide a solid base to build on.

The businesses within these targeted clusters have instant access to information, new technology, and a network of related companies. Universities can tap into new research funds and a larger pool of potential students, as well as having a greater flexibility to respond to the market. By continuing to grow these and other competitive clusters, the Region can benefit from their positive impacts and continue to collaborate with the State of Utah in their efforts to grow the economy (Utah Department of Workforce Services, 2010).
The EDD staff will continue to work with DWS’s Regional Divisions. The DWS divisions include the Wasatch Front North, which covers Morgan, Davis, and Weber Counties, and Wasatch Front South, which covers Tooele and Salt Lake Counties. This will ensure a coordination of activities and resources. The EDD staff will further coordinated activities with other local workforce organizations and investment strategies to ensure the CEDS is up to date and continually identifies and includes activities important to local economies.

**Talent Ready Utah**
Talent Ready Utah is a resource gateway for educators, industry and other stakeholders. They will support businesses who want to involve education activities such as job shadowing, internships, donations, industry tours, and in-classroom presentation. This program will promote training and certification opportunities in high-demand occupations, for unemployed and underemployed adults. Talent Ready Utah provides a great partnership between industry and education. ([http://talentreadyutah.com](http://talentreadyutah.com)).

**Utah Science Technology and Research Initiative (USTAR)**
The Utah Science Technology and Research initiative (USTAR) is a long-term, state-funded investment to strengthen Utah’s knowledge economy. This initiative invests in world-class innovation teams and research facilities at the University of Utah and Utah State University, to create novel technologies that are subsequently commercialized through new business.

The EDD echoes the concerns and goals that USTAR strives to reach. One of the EDD goals and objectives is to improve innovation and entrepreneurship in the Region. The CEDS also recognizes the value of science, technology, engineering, and math graduates to the innovative base of the economy. Both USTAR and EDD follow the lead of the Governor in targeting particular industries for growth.

**Technology Acceleration Program (TAP)**
The Technology Acceleration Program is a USTAR grant program that supports private sector technology development for Utah-based companies. Proposed work includes research and development, proof of concept, product validation, product development, and more. TAP grants must accelerate development and commercialization of a technology. Awardees will also receive non-material support to help achieve technical and business milestones with the goal of commercial success (ustar.org/tap-technology-acceleration-program).

**Educational Institutions**
EDD and the educational institutions of the Region follow the lead of the Governor in prioritizing workforce development through education and training. EDD membership composition includes members of institutions of higher education. EDD acknowledges some of the difficulties in keeping highly educated students in the Region after graduation and works alongside these educational institutions to provide promising working opportunities within the State of Utah.

The University of Utah hosts the Lassonde Entrepreneur Institute, a nationally ranked hub for student entrepreneurship and innovation. The institute provides opportunities for students from any academic background to learn about entrepreneurship and innovation. Programs include workshops, networking events, business-plan competitions, startup support, innovation programs, graduate seminars, scholarships, community outreach and more (lassonde.utah.edu).

**Past, Present, and Projected Economic Development Investments**
The Wasatch Front Region has a rich history of successful economic development efforts that have been undertaken by the state, communities, and the private sector. Utah has been recognized year after year as a growing, healthy place to live and do business.
Currently, the state has a handful of corporate incentives aimed at attracting businesses that create new, high-paying jobs in order to help improve the standard of living, diversify the state economy, increase the tax base, attract and retain top-level management, and encourage graduates of in-state universities to remain in Utah (Utah Governor’s Office of Economic Development, 2015). See below for some of the statewide corporate incentives in Utah.

Regional economic development efforts and investments have been numerous and successful. One effort included creating a favorable tax (5% average business tax rate) and regulatory environment for businesses to survive in Utah. The state averages a median property tax of $1,351, which is approximately 2.04% of the property owner’s income. This property tax averages to about 0.6% of the value of the property yearly (Tax-Rates.org, 2017).

**EDTIF TAX CREDIT**

The Economic Development Tax Increment Financing Tax Credit is a post-performance, refundable tax credit for up to 30% of new state revenues (sales, corporate and withholding taxes paid to the state) over the life of a project (typically 5-10 years). It is available to companies seeking relocation and expansion of operations to the State of Utah.

**ENTERPRISE ZONES**

The Utah Enterprise Zone Program was established in 1988. An enterprise zone comprises an area identified by local elected and economic development officials and designated by the state. Under the program, certain types of businesses locating to, or expanding in a designated zone may claim state income tax credits provided in the law.

**INDUSTRIAL ASSISTANCE FUND**

The Industrial Assistance Fund is a post-performance grant for the creation of high-paying jobs in the state. The requirements for this incentive include:
- Obtain commitment from local government to provide local incentives.
- Enter into an incentive agreement with the Governor’s Office of Economic Development, which specifies performance milestones.
- Create new high-paying jobs in the state with: at least 50 jobs in urban counties, at least 125% of urban county average or 100% of rural county average
- Demonstrate company stability and profitability
- Demonstrate competition with other locations

**RECYCLING MARKET DEVELOPMENT ZONES**

In 1996, the Utah Legislature created the Utah Recycling Market Development Zone Program, which focuses on recycling as an economic development tool. As more products are recycled and used to manufacture new products, the economy will be stimulated through new company expansion or formation and the creation of additional jobs. The zone legislation was established to incent businesses to use recycled materials in their manufacturing processes and create new products for sale. It also benefits business or individuals that collect, process, distribute recycled materials. Composting is considered an eligible recycling operation.

**RENEWABLE ENERGY DEVELOPMENT INCENTIVE**

The amount and duration of the renewable energy development incentive is determined by the Governor’s Office of Economic Development Board and Executive Director. It is based on statutory guidelines and evaluation criteria, including the financial strength of the company, the number and salary of jobs created, amount of new state tax revenue, long-term capital investment, competition with other locations, and whether the company engages in renewable energy generation related to:
- Geothermal
- Wind
- Waste Gas / Heat Recovery
- Geothermal
- Wind
- Waste Gas / Heat Recovery

**RURAL FAST TRACK**

The Rural Fast Track Program is a post-performance grant available to small companies in rural Utah. The program provides an efficient way for existing, small companies to receive incentives for creating high-paying jobs in rural areas and to promote business and economic development.
CHAPTER 6. COMMUNITY AND PRIVATE SECTOR PARTICIPATION

PARTICIPATION EFFORTS

Community and private sector participation is an important aspect of creating a successful CEDS. As part of our effort in making a CEDS that represents the geographic diversity of the Region, we looked toward existing economic development efforts. These efforts included other government and workforce investment strategies as well as efforts by the community and private sector. To further equal opportunity, in a safe and healthy environment (social equity), lower-income persons and residents within areas of distress were especially encouraged to participate. The District staff used existing plans and studies as a base for understanding and identifying the Region’s strengths and weaknesses, establishing goals and objectives, and creating the CEDS action plan. Copies of the Strategy can be found on the Wasatch Front Regional Council’s website, www.wfrc.org or by request from District staff.

While developing the CEDS various organizations were contacted to review the Strategy and offer input, see below. Additionally, The District staff will work to partner and seek input from these organizations to ensure ongoing participation and CEDS project implementation.

These partners and resources include financial institutions, major employers, and nonprofit organizations that had representation on the District Board, Strategy Committee, and who participated in the public comment period. This sector also included views represented by the participating Chambers of Commerce and the following entities.

STATEWIDE PARTNERS

These statewide partners actively contributed to the District and the CEDS: Governor’s Office of Economic Development, Utah Department of Workforce Services, Economic Development Corporation of Utah, World Trade Center Utah, Utah Alliance for Economic Development, Grow Utah Ventures, Utah Science Technology and Research Initiative, and the Utah Association of Counties.

GOVERNOR’S OFFICE OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

The District staff approached GOED for data and analysis regarding the targeted industry clusters in the Region and for their support of the District in July 2012. GOED’s Chief Economist assisted the District in compiling and analyzing industry clusters and continue to provide ongoing support.

UTAH DEPARTMENT OF WORKFORCE SERVICES

District staff met with the Department of Workforce Services to increase collaboration between the organizations. DWS shared some of the efforts, goals, and objectives that they were working toward and District staff shared the plans and progress that had been made toward the creation of the District in May 2012. The meeting allowed for further and ongoing collaboration efforts between District and DWS.

WASATCH FRONT REGIONAL COUNCIL

WFRC took action to approve staff in moving forward with the creation of the Regional Economic Development District and Regional Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy in October 2011. The Council is informed of major updates and adoptions by EDD staff.

MOUNTAINLAND ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

District staff met with the EDD staff of Mountainland Association of Governments beginning in January 2013 and periodically throughout the CEDS process to ensure coordination of activities and ongoing collaboration. Since then the meetings center on information sharing, lessons learned, and identification of best practices.

COUNTY COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

In the Wasatch Front Region, each of the five counties has a Council of Governments (COG) made up of elected officials that represent each municipality throughout the county. The COGs are planning bodies that address regional issues such as planning, water use, public services, safety and transportation. These meetings are well publicized on county websites, in newspapers, and posted at county buildings. Additionally, meeting agendas are faxed and emailed to large distribution lists within each county.
Monthly meeting agendas and minutes are available by contacting each county COG or by viewing each of the county websites.

The District staff attended two rounds of County COG meetings in order to garner support and gather initial input for the creation of the District and CEDS in February and March of 2012. The counties chose representatives to serve on the District Board of Directors who then selected Strategy Committee members.

The District staff visited each County COG in order to review the CEDS, outline the final steps for District creation, and garner input regarding projects, programs and activities. The reception at all of the meetings was positive and supportive. District staff requested letters of support from each county and attended subsequent meetings in order to receive the letters from each county in February and March 2013. Subsequent visits are made to COGs as needed to ensure they remain involved.

CITY AND COUNTY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OFFICIALS

During the months of August – December 2012, each city and county economic development director was contacted and sent the SWOT analysis in order to assess whether it was reflective of the municipality and to identify gaps. Many suggestions were received which were added to the SWOT analysis. Some counties expressed the desire for many changes, while others suggested none.

Additional presentations were made to the Region’s Technical Advisory Committee’s made up of planners, engineers, and other city and county personnel to ensure they are and remain involved. All 15 cities in Davis County, 1 city in Morgan County, 16 cities in Salt Lake County, 7 cities in Tooele County, and 15 cities in Weber County have participated in some way in the District and the CEDS.

INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

The following institutions of higher education and workforce services are located within the Region: Davis ATC, LDS Business College, Neumont University, Ogden-Weber ATC, Salt Lake ATC, Salt Lake Community College, Tooele ATC, University of Phoenix, University of Southern Nevada, University of Utah, Westminster College, Western Governor’s University, and Weber State University

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

The initial 30-day public comment and participation process ran from February 1, 2013 to March 4, 2013. Local and regional institutions, cities, counties, businesses, and the public at large were encouraged to review the CEDS and offer input. The public participation period was noticed in the Region’s newspapers. Comments from the comment period were summarized and included in the plan where appropriate. County economic development officials, city economic development departments, state economic and transportation agencies, the public, and any other interested party had the opportunity to review and offer input on the CEDS. The District incorporated a variety of changes during this time, the majority of which were based on EDA’s suggested revisions to the draft CEDS.

EDD BOARD AND STRATEGY COMMITTEE MEETINGS

The EDD Board and Strategy Committee meetings take place quarterly. All of the meetings are open to the public. If you wish to receive a copy of the meeting agenda or minutes refer to www.wfrc.org for contact information.
CHAPTER 7. PROJECT LISTS, PLAN OF ACTION, AND EVALUATION OF PERFORMANCE

STRATEGIC PROJECTS, PROGRAMS, AND ACTIVITIES (APPENDIX A)

Strategic projects, programs, and activities are selected and prioritized at the local level to help implement the Region’s goals. All entities eligible for EDA funding are notified and asked to submit a list of known or expected projects. Each city and county prioritizes their project list and identifies potential funding sources, impacts / benefits, the lead agency, and explains how the project fits with the regional goals and objectives. This is facilitated by the use of a “project form” that all entities are asked to complete when submitting project(s). The Strategy Committee reviews the new/amended projects and updates the CEDS Project List quarterly, or as needed. This ensures we have the following information for projects: updated scope, budget, timeline, and/or performance measures. The following information is included for each project:

- Project title, description, location, cost, timeline
- Local project priority (high, medium, low)
- Estimated EDA investment and other funding sources/investments
- Regional goals the project targets
- Benefits and performance measures including number of jobs created or retained, number of workforce development training programs offered or targeted changes in the economic environment

All approved projects, programs, and activities are found in Appendix A. Contact the District staff for a more detailed description of each project.

VITAL PROJECTS, PROGRAMS, AND ACTIVITIES

Strategically important or vital projects, programs, and activities are those that accomplish the Region’s goals and have been identified as having a “high” priority by the entity that submitted the project.

CEDS PLAN OF ACTION

The CEDS promotes the Region and fosters effective transportation access, enhances and protects the environment, maximizes effective development and use of the workforce, promotes the use of technology, increases access to high-speed telecommunications, balances resources through sound management of physical development, and obtains and utilizes adequate funds from other sources. The CEDS plan of action outlines how the goals and objectives are implemented. Implementing these actions as well as advancing the projects, listed in Appendix A, allows the District the ability to promote economic development.

Table 6 (next page) identifies the actions that the District seeks in order to implement the goals and objectives outlined in the CEDS. In conjunction with the projects found below, the District seeks to promote and facilitate a wide variety of activities that have regional economic impacts.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Lead Agencies</th>
<th>Funds</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Regional Goals</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative economic development symposium planning</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>District, MAG, EDCU, Grow Utah</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>'15 '16 ✓</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td>X X H X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain consistency with other efforts</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>District, GOED, EDCU, WFR, UA, DWS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>'15 '18</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X X H X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide CEDS participation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>District and other EDDs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>'14 '15 ✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X X L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist applicants with EDA application</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>'13 '18</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X X H X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure participation from rural communities</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>'13 '18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update CEDS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>'14 '18</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X X M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve access to capital through relationships</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>District, CRAs, Zions, Bank of Utah</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>'13 '18</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X X M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist communities leverage assets</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>District, EDA, HUD, USDA, CRA</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>'13 '18</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X X M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify linkages for transportation planning</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>District, WFR, UDOT, UTA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>'15 '18</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X X H X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure consistency &amp; inclusion in transportation planning</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>'14 '18</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X X H X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in meetings / conferences</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>'13 '18</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X X M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase partnership w/Universities</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>District, UofU, WSU, ATCs</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>'13 '18</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X X M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market District &amp; EDA resources</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>'13 '18</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X X H X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support statewide and regional efforts</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>'13 '18</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td>X X X H X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. District Action Plan
EVALUATION OF PERFORMANCE

The District staff will evaluate project performance as projects are accomplished. Additionally, the Strategy Committee will complete an annual review of the progress and accomplishments of the Plan of Action and its effectiveness of meeting the goals and objectives established in the CEDS. Staff will prepare an annual CEDS report for the Committee that does the following: outlines the accomplishments, identifies changes in economic conditions, identifies changes in resources and funding, and will make the Committee aware of any other pertinent factors. The District staff will also prepare an annual report for EDA as per the planning grant requirements.

The annual report will provide progress on each of the projects or activities identified in the action plan that have been funded in part or in whole with EDA funding. The performance measures and other factors are subject to refinement and revisions as part of the ongoing CEDS process. The performance measures may include:

- Number of jobs created as a result of CEDS implementation
- Number of jobs retained as a result of CEDS implementation
- Amount of capital that existing businesses have accessed/acquired as a result of the CEDS program implementation
- Amount of private sector investment in the Region as a result of CEDS implementation
- Amount of jobs/businesses created in the GOED targeted clusters
- Amount/value of new infrastructure built in the Region as a result of CEDS implementation
- New workforce development/training programs initiated in the Region as a result of CEDS implementation
- Changes to the Goals and Objectives as directed by the District Strategy Committee

The District staff will collect, monitor, analyze, and present data and information on the Region’s economic conditions in an ongoing manner to the Strategy Committee. The data and information shared will include economic indicators, such as labor force, jobs, unemployment, wages, population, and national and state economic trends. Additionally, the expected performance measures will be tied to the projects that receive EDA funding. The performance measures for each project in the action plan can vary depending on the size and scope of the project. These measures will be determined by the individual entities that submit the project(s). The District staff highly encourages eligible entities, including the cities and counties that participate in the District, to include the measures mentioned above. The indicators used to evaluate performance can be found in the project, program, and activity list.

The District Strategy Committee and Board of Directors stressed that the role of the Economic Development District is to support existing efforts, not redirect or work against existing economic development efforts. In an effort to comply with EDA guidelines and the District Board of Directors, the projects, programs, activities, and performance measures in this CEDS are determined by the entities that have submitted the aforementioned projects, programs and activities.

On August 3, 2016, the U.S. EDA Denver Regional Office conducted a Peer Evaluation of the Wasatch Front Economic Development District. The purpose of the review was to conduct an evaluation of the management, fiscal operation, and the performance of the District with respect to the EDA Partnership Planning program. Refer to Appendix E.
CHAPTER 8. ECONOMIC RESILIENCY AND THE ENVIRONMENT

DISASTER MITIGATION

The Wasatch Front Region has a disaster preparedness plan in place, which was completed under the guidance of the State of Utah’s Department of Public Safety and Hazard Mitigation (Utah Department of Public Safety, 2011). The guidelines for developing a disaster and economic recovery resiliency strategy as part of the CEDS states that this effort is not supposed to be comprehensive or intended to replace the existing plan. Therefore, much of the information in this chapter comes from the Wasatch Front Natural Hazards Pre-Disaster Mitigation Plan and from the State’s Hazard Mitigation Plan. It has been supplemented by other necessary disaster preparedness and resiliency strategies in order to address the two-phase approach.

STEPS TO BECOMING MORE RESILIENT AND MITIGATING DISASTERS

PHASE I: PLANNING STEPS OVERVIEW

The following steps should be taken to establish a resiliency or disaster mitigation plan. These steps were taken to create the most recent plan.

Step 1: Organize Resources: Organize human and monetary resources as well as existing plans and studies.

Step 2: Public Officials Outreach: Reach out to public and elected officials including hazard mitigation and emergency managers and elected leaders to garner their support. Additionally, some communities recommended meeting with city council members to better inform the community.

Step 3: Establish Continuity in the Planning Process: Work with all service districts, towns, cities, counties, state, and federal organizations as well as private sector entities to ensure a multi-jurisdictional and coordinated planning effort and response plan.

Step 4: Data Acquisition: Gather data and information from GIS technicians and/or planning commission staff in cities and counties. Agreements may need to be made to allow for the exchange of data.

Mapping data layers can include local roads, plot maps, county tax assessor’s data, hazard data, flood maps, topographic data, aerial photographs, and land development data.

Step 5: County Hazard Identification and Profile: Gather data on the hazards that threaten the planning region. This information is gathered from local, state and federal agencies, organizations, newspapers and other local media accounts, state and local weather records, conversations with the public and local officials, surveys, interviews and meetings with key informants within the planning area. Additionally, county-level mitigation planning meetings were held to allow the public and others the ability to review hazard information and offer feedback. These meetings also provided a forum for discussion on the information that was needed to gain a general understanding of the geography, geology, recreation, and natural resources of the planning region.

Step 6: County Vulnerability Assessment: This step is to be conducted through a review of local base maps, topographical maps, floodplain maps, United States Geological Survey (USGS) and Utah Geological Survey (UGS) maps, Automated Geographic Reference Center (AGRC) maps, FEMA hazard maps and climate maps from the National Climatic Data Center (NCDC). A detailed vulnerability assessment should be completed with the use of GIS software for each county within the WFRC Planning Region. The FEMA modeling program (HAZUS-MH) should be used to determine vulnerability to earthquakes and floods. Loss estimation methodology was developed by the core planning team, with assistance from the technical team, to determine vulnerability from each identified hazard. Transportation Analysis Zone (TAZ) and Census data should be used to estimate the number of residents and households that could be affected by a hazard. Utah State sales tax and Equifax Business data can be used to find the total number of businesses and annual sales vulnerable to hazards. HAZUS-MH infrastructure data can be used to analyze the amount of infrastructure vulnerable to hazards.
Step 7: Review Existing Local Mitigation Actions: This step is conducted through a review of the governing documents of the planning Region, as well as conversations, interviews, and meetings with interested community leaders and members. Identify existing goals and what has already been adopted.

Step 8: Form Local Working Groups: Organize a planning group for the member counties. These working groups should be comprised of individuals with an interest in hazards mitigation, as well as technical experts from the government sector having mitigation expertise. These committees should include city planners, city engineers, county and city GIS staff, floodplain managers, sheriff and fire staff, and city and county emergency managers. The working groups can also vet the plan.

Step 9: Risk Assessment Review: The working groups should be tasked with reviewing county risk assessments for accuracy and completeness and with developing mitigation strategies for all natural hazards threatening their respective county. Changes or additions need to be conveyed to the Core Planning Team for revision.

Step 10: Mitigation Strategy Development: Developing the mitigation strategies is a process in which all of the previous steps are taken into account. Each participating county should evaluate, identify, and profile the hazards and vulnerability assessment. Each Mitigation Strategy should undergo a cost/benefit analysis to determine the best action given limited budgets allocated to local hazard mitigation efforts.

Step 11: Prioritization of Identified Mitigation Strategies: The prioritization process is to be completed by the core planning team, the technical team, and the local planning team over a series of planning meetings. The method used could be the STAPLEE method as explained in the FEMA How to Guide, Document 386-3. This process results in each strategy given a High, Medium, or Low priority by the local planning teams.

Step 12: State Review: The state will need to create a Plan review committee to insure local plans meet state and federal requirements. This committee will offer final review and acceptance.

Step 13: Adoption: The Plan will then need to undergo an adoption process in order to receive a non-binding adoption from its member cities and counties.

PHASE II: DISASTER ASSESSMENT OVERVIEW

Each community and the WFRC have calculated potential disasters and have worked with local, state, and federal agencies to assess the nature and magnitude of any given disaster and its impact on the economy (business, industry sectors, labor market). During an actual emergency event, there are local, state and federal damage assessment modules in place to address physical impacts. Local emergency managers have been trained in rapid needs assessment, damage assessment, and are familiar with individual assistance programs, grants, and other public assistance programs.

Step 1: Assess the impact on transportation and public infrastructure: The state, county, and communities have the capabilities to assess how the transportation and public infrastructure are impacted in addition to the impact on the economy.

Step 2: Assess the impact on housing, schools, and health care facilities: School districts, individual school administrators and state offices are prepared and in place to assess the damage in the event of an emergency.

Step 3: Develop and Implement Recovery Timeline: Refer to the disaster mitigation plans for each individual jurisdiction to understand that communities approach and timeline.

Step 4: Implement Recovery Plan (long-term recovery): Long term recovery options will vary by disaster in conjunction with the covered partners and resources available to the Region in the event of a disaster.
Step 5: Identify Other Disaster Preparedness Plans:
- Davis County Emergency Management Plan, [www.co.davis.ut.us](http://www.co.davis.ut.us)
- Salt Lake County Emergency Preparedness Plan, [www.slvhealth.org](http://www.slvhealth.org)
- Weber County Emergency Management, [www.co.weber.ut.us](http://www.co.weber.ut.us)
- Wasatch Front Natural Hazards Pre-Disaster Mitigation Plan, [www.wfrc.org](http://www.wfrc.org)

**RISKS AND VULNERABILITIES**

The following table identifies potential hazards likely to affect the Wasatch Front Region and outlines how and why they were identified, including the organizations that assisted in the identification (Table 7).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hazard</th>
<th>How Identified</th>
<th>Why Identified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Earthquake     | • Review of County Emergency Operations Plans  
• Review of past disaster declarations  
• Input from City and County Emergency Operations Managers, USGS, UGS, Utah DHLS, and community members | • Utah has a 1/5 chance of experiencing a large earthquake within the next fifty years  
• Numerous faults throughout Utah, including the Intermountain Seismic Zone  
• Utah averages approximately 13 earthquakes annually of a magnitude 3.0 or greater  
• Earthquakes can create fire, flooding, hazardous materials incident, transportation, and communication limitations  
• The Wasatch Front has recorded large earthquakes in the past and can expect large earthquakes in the future |
| Landslide      | • Input from City and County Emergency Operations Managers, USGS, UGS, NGDC, Utah DHLS, and community members | • Have caused damage in the past to residential and commercial infrastructure  
• Can be life threatening  
• Generally occur in known historic locations therefore risks exist throughout Region  
• To increase community awareness |
| Wildland Fire  | • Review of County Emergency Operations  
• Plans Review of Community Wildfire Plans  
• Input from County Emergency Managers, Utah DHLS, Utah FFSL, Utah FS, NWS, FEMA, and local community members | • Serious threat to life and property  
• Threat due to urban growth in WUI areas  
• Secondary threat associated with flooding, drought, and earthquake  
• Most of Utah is at risk including the growing counties of the Wasatch Front Region  
• Additional funding and resources offered by local and state agencies to reduce risk  
• To increase community awareness |
| Problem Soils  | • Review of County Emergency Operations Plans  
• Input from community members, Utah, DHLS, and UGS Researched historical data | • Related to subsequent effects from earthquakes  
• Have affected infrastructure and local economy in the past |
| Dam Failure    | • Review of County Emergency Operations Plans  
• Input from community members, Utah DWS, Dam Safety Section, Utah DHLS inundation maps | • Can cause serious damage to life and property and have subsequent effects such as flooding, fire, debris flow  
• Many reservoirs located in the five county Region  
• Threat to downhill communities  
• Subsequent effects include flooding, fire, and debris flows  
• To increase community awareness  
• To incorporate mitigation measures into existing plans to help serve local residents |
| Flood          | • Review of past disaster declarations Input from City and County Emergency Operations Managers, Utah DWS, UGS, Utah Army Corps of Engineers, Utah DHLS, and community members  
• Review of Flood Insurance Studies, Floodplain and Flood Insurance maps | • Several incidents have caused severe damage and loss of life  
• Many of the rivers and streams are located near neighborhoods  
• Many neighborhoods are located on floodplains, alluvial fans  
• Topography and climate lead to cloudburst storms and heavy precipitation resulting in flash floods |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hazard</th>
<th>How Identified</th>
<th>Why Identified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drought</td>
<td>• Review of Utah State Water Plan Input from community members, Utah DHLS, NWS, NCC, and NCDC</td>
<td>• Affects local economy and residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reduces available water in reservoirs impacting culinary, irrigation, and municipal water supplies</td>
<td>• Results in economic loss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Drought periods may extend several years</td>
<td>• Can cause property damage and loss of life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Secondary threat associated with wildfire</td>
<td>• Results in economic loss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Utah is the nation’s second driest state</td>
<td>• Lightning is number one cause of natural hazard death in Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Can impact farming and ranching operations</td>
<td>• Recovery costs can be high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infestation</td>
<td>• Review of Utah Department of Agriculture and Food Annual Insect Report and the Utah Forest Insect and Disease Report</td>
<td>• Declined forest health and agriculture losses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Input from community members, UDAF, Utah FFSL, Utah State University Extension Service</td>
<td>• Previous experiences have affected the residents of the Wasatch Front</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Results in economic loss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Destroy can be severe and is very costly to mitigate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• To better understand mitigation and response techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe Weather</td>
<td>• Review of County Emergency Operations Plans</td>
<td>• Damage to communities, homes, infrastructure, roads, ski areas, and people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Review of past disaster declarations Input from City and County Emergency Operations Managers, Utah Avalanche, Forecast Center, Utah Department of Transportation, and community members</td>
<td>• Can cause property damage and loss of life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Results in economic loss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Lightning is number one cause of natural hazard death in Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Recovery costs can be high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Affects the young and old more severely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radon</td>
<td>• UGS Maps</td>
<td>• Is odorless and colorless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Utah Division of Radiation</td>
<td>• Can cause lung cancer over time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Control Testing Data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Hazard in the Wasatch Front

**DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF PHASES & STEPS**

**INVENTORY OF COMMUNITY RECOVERY RESOURCES AND PERSONNEL**

The assessment found that every county and most of the large incorporated cities within the WFR Region have extensive capabilities to accomplish mitigation. Most counties and cities are already protecting their citizens from natural hazards under one or more departments within their governmental structure.

**CITY AND COUNTY ELECTED OFFICIALS**

An elected council or a commission consisting of three to seven members governs each county. A town or city council, consisting of five to seven members, governs each municipality. The elected officials have the responsibility of adopting mitigation policies. All cities and counties receive their legal authority to govern from the State of Utah.

**COUNTY GENERAL CAPABILITIES**

Listed below is a general organizational list of city and county governmental administrative organizations involved in pre-disaster mitigation:

- Elected officials
- City Managers
- County and City Attorneys
- County Assessors
- County Clerks
- Human Services/Personnel Directors
- County and City
- Treasurers / Finance
- Public Works Departments
- County Health Departments
- Police and Fire Departments
- County Emergency Management Agencies
- Special Improvement Districts

**EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT**

All of Utah’s counties, most of the larger cities, and the universities have designated emergency management directors. The emergency management office is responsible for natural and man-made hazard mitigation, preparedness, and response and recovery operations (Wasatch Front Regional Council, 2008).
LOCAL EMERGENCY PLANNING COMMITTEE (LEPC)
The mission of LEPC is to coordinate emergency preparedness for hazardous materials between all public and private emergency task disciplines. Many LEPC’s have expanded their mandated hazardous materials function to include all hazards. LEPC’s are comprised of elected officials; law enforcement, emergency management, firefighting, emergency medical services, health, local environmental, hospital and transportation personnel; broadcast and print media; community groups; and owners and operators of hazardous chemical facilities that are required by federal law to have hazardous chemical emergency planning. Each county in the Region has an active LEPC.

FIRE/EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES
Most cities staff fire service organizations and all five counties have fire service. Following a national trend, several multi-jurisdiction fire districts have been formed with the goal of better providing fire and emergency medical services.

PUBLIC WORKS
Divisions within public works often include streets, engineering, water, power, wastewater and sanitation. The public works departments within the counties and larger cities are very sophisticated and currently account for much of the mitigation already taking place within the Wasatch Front Region. Several public works departments have storm water management sections and watershed management departments.

HEALTH CARE
The Region’s hospitals and county health departments provide medical emergency preparedness and response. County health departments organize, coordinate and direct emergency medical and health services. The health department assesses health hazards caused by damage to sewer, water, food supplies, and other environmental systems. They also provide safety information, assess disaster related mental health needs and services, and provide crisis counseling for emergency workers. Short of a pandemic disease outbreak, health departments within the five counties will likely continue to adequately staff, train and fund their missions.

SCHOOL DISTRICTS
School Districts are located in all the counties. District administrators work closely with local public safety officials including law enforcement, fire emergency medical services, and public health to help to ensure that schools are well prepared for any kind of emergency.

SPECIAL SERVICE DISTRICTS
Special Service Districts (SSD) are defined as quasi-governmental agencies having taxing authority, providing a specific public service that may include; public transportation, fire, water, wastewater and sewer. The SSD’s work closely with local and public safety officials to ensure that the Districts are well prepared for any kind of emergency. In many cases, the Districts participate in the county or city emergency preparedness committee for emergency coordination, planning, and response.

JURISDICTION TECHNICAL EXPERTISE
Most of the counties and large incorporated cities within the WFRC have full-time planners, emergency managers, building inspectors, housing specialists and engineers on staff. Salt Lake County also employs a part-time geologist.

GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEMS (GIS)
Staff experience with GIS varies widely between the large resources of Salt Lake, Davis, and Weber counties and the relatively small resources of Morgan and Tooele counties. All counties in the Region have at least some staff to coordinate data processing and computer capabilities for GIS.

GIS is a geo-referenced set of hardware and software tools that are used to collect, manage, and analyze spatial data. (GIS capabilities are often found in other departments such as public works or information technology.) GIS is most beneficial when data from all departments and planning jurisdictions is inputted for analysis.
PUBLIC SAFETY COMMUNICATIONS (PSC)
Public safety communications networks assure emergency communications through radio, microwave, telephone, satellite, internet, e-mail, fax and amateur radio. One of the most beneficial capabilities of PSC is providing cross communication between equipment and frequencies. PSC coordinates dissemination of emergency information to the media, the public and emergency personnel; activates internal information systems; acts as a liaison to elected officials; assists in the provision of emergency information and documents the impact of disasters.

PUBLIC WORKS
Public works departments generally provide engineering, transportation, GIS, water, wastewater, sanitation (in some cases electric power), expertise, and capability. As a team, public works personnel identify critical infrastructure and plan and prepare for emergency mitigation.

UTAH DIVISION OF HOMELAND SECURITY (UTAH DHLS)
Utah DHLS assisted WFRC in providing information on preparing for and responding to emergencies. The division serves as the liaison between local, state and federal emergency assistance. The division educates the public about earthquakes, hazardous materials, floods, communications, leadership, information technology, funding, coordination and supplies.

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY (USU) COOPERATIVE EXTENSION
The USU Extension Service assisted with family and community data in putting research-based knowledge to work. Many of the programs and informational courses improve pre-disaster mitigation.

UNIVERSITY OF UTAH
The University of Utah was utilized as a technical resource for academic mitigation research and demographic data.

EMERGENCY SHELTERS WITHIN THE DISTRICT REGION
Community evacuation plans exists at the city and county levels and have been disseminated to the necessary parties to ensure awareness.

- Family Promise of Salt Lake 801-961-8622, Salt Lake City, UT 84165
- Rescue Mission of Salt Lake 801-355-1302, Salt Lake City, UT 84101
- Wasatch Homeless Health Care 801-364-0058, Salt Lake City, UT 84101
- The Road Home - Palmer Court 801-505-7777, Salt Lake City, UT 84111
- St. Anne's Center 801-621-5036, Ogden, UT 84401
- Rescue Haven 801-521-5925, Salt Lake City, UT 84111
- The Road Home 877-864-4937, Salt Lake City, UT 84101
- Ogden Rescue Mission 801-621-4360, Ogden, UT 84401

ENVIRONMENT

PARKS AND WILDLIFE REFUGES
When it comes to national parks there are few places in the country that can compare with Utah. Although none of the national parks are within the Wasatch Front Region, the parks bring tourist to Salt Lake City and other areas within the Wasatch Front Region. Utah has 43 state parks, six within the Wasatch Front Region: Willard Bay, Antelope Island, Great Salt Lake Marina, Jordan River Off Highway Vehicle Center, This is the Place, and East Canyon.

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service manage three wildlife refuges in Utah: Bear River Migratory Bird Refuge, Fish Springs National Wildlife Refuge, and Ouray National Wildlife Refuge. The Bear River Refuge is the only one of the three located in the Wasatch Front Region. These refuges provide opportunities for wildlife observation, photography, environmental education, interpretation, fishing, and hunting.

Millions of birds that migrate along both the Pacific and Central flyways use Utah refuges as important resting, feeding, and nesting sites (U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, 2011).
BEAR RIVER MIGRATORY BIRD REFUGE

This refuge is located on the northeast arm of the Great Salt Lake and offers phenomenal bird watching, especially in spring and early summer. Each year, millions of birds spend time on the refuge. More than 200 species have been observed here. A 12 mile-long auto tour route loops around large wetland units, giving birders close views of American Avocet, Black-Necked Stilt, White-Faced Ibis, Western and Clark’s Grebes, Snowy Egret, Black-Crowned Night-Heron, Snowy Plover, and many others (UT Travel Industry, 2013).

FISH SPRINGS NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE

This refuge is located at the southern end of the Great Salt Lake Desert. It was established in 1959 to provide habitat for migrating and wintering birds. The refuge is named for the native Utah chub that is found throughout the refuge springs and impoundments. Totaling 17,992 acres, the refuge supports 10,000 acres of lush, spring-fed wetlands, a critical habitat in the arid Great Basin. The water from the springs is brackish and warm. The refuge has a very rich cultural history. The area’s first inhabitants were Paleo Archaic natives about 11,500 years ago. Modern inhabitation dates back to 1861. The historic Pony Express Trail runs along the edge of the refuge and a Pony Express station was established here.

The marshes of Fish Springs NWR are truly an oasis in the desert. Several springs, fed by underground water that fell as precipitation thousands of years ago, provide important breeding, migrating, and wintering habitat for a diverse array of birds and other wildlife (U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, 2011).

OURAY NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE

This refuge is located in the desert of northeastern Utah, outside of the Wasatch Front Region. Though its annual precipitation is less than 7 inches, the Green River brings water attracting thousands of waterfowl and other birds to this otherwise dry landscape. The refuge is 11,987 acres and includes 3,800 acres of leased land from the Uintah and Ouray Indian tribes and the State of Utah. It provides prime breeding, resting, and feeding for migratory waterfowl as well as nurseries for endangered fish species (US Fish Wildlife Service, 2011).

WILDERNESS AREAS

The Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management manage over 900,000 acres of federally designated wilderness in Utah. These areas provide opportunities for respectful public use and an understanding of the value of landscapes left wild. Motor vehicles and mountain bikes are not allowed in wilderness areas. These areas are mostly used for hunting, fishing, horseback riding, hiking, backpacking, and camping activities (Utah Office of Tourism, 2013).

There is one wilderness area fully contained within the Wasatch Front Region and three other wilderness areas that are partially contained in the state. Of the four wilderness areas connected to Utah, only the Cedar Mountain Wilderness Area is within the Wasatch Front Region.

The Forest Service has designated four Wilderness Areas in the Wasatch Front Region: Mount Olympus (16,000 acres), Twin Peaks (11,463 acres), Lone Peak (30,088 acres), and Timpanogas (10,750 acres).

DEEP CREEK MOUNTAINS

The Deep Creek Mountains are located in the West Desert of southwestern Tooele County and northwestern Juan County. The area is 68,910 acres and 32 miles long. It offers hunting, hiking, rock climbing, wildlife observation, exploring, and backpacking. The Bonneville cutthroat trout, a sensitive species, is found here (U.S. Bureau of Land Management, 2011).
NORTH STANSBURY

Located in northeastern Tooele County, 40 miles west of Salt Lake City and north of the Deseret Peak Wilderness Mountain range, the area is 10,480 acres. Recreational activities include camping, hiking, hunting, backpacking, horseback riding, and limited off-highway vehicle use. Sensitive species that can be found here are the ferruginous hawk, long-billed curlew, western yellow-billed cuckoo, and spotted bat (U.S. Department of the Interior Bureau of Land Management, 2011).

CEDAR MOUNTAIN WILDERNESS AREA

Congress and the President officially designated this area in January 2006. It encompasses approximately 100,000 acres of public land 50 miles due west of Salt Lake City, south of Interstate 80. The wilderness area is long and narrow, running north to south for 32 miles along the length of the Cedar Mountains with a maximum width of only 7 miles. There are natural springs that support native wildlife, livestock, and wild horses. There are approximately 250 head of wild horses that frequent the area.

Other wildlife include golden eagles, bald eagles (seasonally), mule deer, pronghorn antelope, ferruginous hawk, Swainson’s hawk, spotted bat, black tail jack rabbit, desert cottontail, bobcat, mountain lion, badgers, and the Skull Valley pocket gopher (U.S. Bureau of Land Management, 2011).

SUPERFUND SITES, UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANKS, AND BROWNFIELD SITES

Superfund is the name given to the environmental program established to address abandoned hazardous waste sites. It is also the name of the fund established by the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980, as amended (CERCLA statute, CERCLA overview). This law was enacted in the wake of the discovery of toxic waste dumps such as Love Canal and Times Beach in the 1970s. It allows the EPA to clean up such sites and to compel responsible parties to perform cleanups or reimburse the government for EPA-lead cleanups.

The Utah State Underground Storage Tank program is a regulatory branch of the Department of Environmental Quality. Its primary goal is to protect human health and the environment from leaking underground storage tanks (USTs). The UST staff oversees UST notification, installation, inspection, removal, and compliance with State and Federal UST regulations concerning release prevention and remediation (Utah Department of Environmental Quality, 2013).

Brownfields sites are real property where the expansion, redevelopment, or reuse may be complicated by the presence or potential presence of contamination. This can impede economic development. The Department of Environmental Quality, Division of Environmental Response and Remediation conduct Brownfields activities under authority of the Voluntary Release Cleanup Act, Hazardous Substances Mitigation Act and the Small Business Liability Relief Brownfields Revitalization Act. These statutes provide mechanisms by which the DERR oversees the assessment and cleanup of Brownfields, as well as provides redevelopment-planning assistance to communities struggling with Brownfields issues throughout Utah.

Applicants from the Region that have been awarded Brownfields grants include Ogden City, Salt Lake County, Salt Lake City Corporation, and the Wasatch Front Brownfields Coalition (Utah Department of Environmental Quality, 2013).

THREATENED AND ENDANGERED SPECIES

Utah is home to a wide variety of wildlife. There are many protected species and critical habitats throughout the state (Table 8). Our Region contains approximately five different species protected or considered for protection. There are no designated critical habitat areas within the Wasatch Front Region (U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, 2013).
The Bureau of Land Management has designated 32 segments of wild and scenic rivers throughout the State of Utah, however, none are found within the District’s boundaries. Additionally, there is little to no federally designated agricultural prime or unique agricultural lands within the District’s boundaries.

There is a robust manufacturing base within the Region. The effects of each manufacturing related project will be considered as they are brought forward through an EDA grant application and implementation. Utah does have three sole source aquifers. However, none of them are located within the District’s boundaries. The closest sole source aquifer is the Western Uinta Arch Paleozoic Aquifer System located in the mountains to the east of Salt Lake County. Utah does not contain any designated coastal zone areas with a federally approved coastal zone management plan.

Proposed development will likely have positive impact on minority and low income populations. The CEDS projects seeking EDA funding are within the District’s boundaries and will benefit a distressed community. Distressed communities include those with high unemployment, low per capita income, or other distress criteria as designated by EDA.

### MISCELLANEOUS ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION

#### Table 8. Endangered, Threatened, and Candidate Species by County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Davis County</th>
<th>Morgan County</th>
<th>Salt Lake County</th>
<th>Tooele County</th>
<th>Weber County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(C) Least Chub</td>
<td>(T) Canada Lynx</td>
<td>(T) Canada Lynx</td>
<td>(C) Greater sage-grouse</td>
<td>(T) Canada Lynx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) Western Yellow-Billed Cuckoo</td>
<td>(E) June Sucker</td>
<td>(C) Greater sage-grouse</td>
<td>(C) Least Chub</td>
<td>(C) Greater sage-grouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T) Ute ladies’-tresses</td>
<td>(C) Western Yellow-Billed Cuckoo</td>
<td>(C) Western Yellow-Billed Cuckoo</td>
<td>(C) Western Yellow-Billed Cuckoo</td>
<td>(C) Western Yellow-Billed Cuckoo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(E) – Endangered Species. (T) – Threatened species. (C) - Candidate species have no legal protection under the Endangered Species Act. However, these species are under active consideration by the Service for addition to the Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Species and may be proposed or listed during the development of the proposed project.

### WATER MANAGEMENT AND 100-YEAR FLOOD PLAIN MAPS

Utah’s Department of Environmental Quality, Division of Drinking Water manages the quality of drinking water in the state as well as water source protection. This organization maintains a database of all the wellheads and other water sources within the Region. The Division helps to regulate development around them. They have developed a guide for communities to help protect their drinking water that can be found at drinkingwater.utah.gov.

Flooding within the Region has caused serious damage resulting in millions of dollars of recovery investments. Project managers must be cognizant of whether or not a project is located in a floodplain. Projects located in a floodplain need to be functionally dependent on the location.
## APPENDIX A. PROJECT LISTS, PROGRAMS, AND ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Lead Agency</th>
<th>Project Cost</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Regional Goals</th>
<th>Project Priority</th>
<th>EDA Submittal</th>
<th>Project Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Porter Rockwell CDA feasibility study</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Bluffdale City</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>X X X X High X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>140/15 storm drain extension</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Clearfield City</td>
<td>$210,000</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>X X X X Med X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Demolition assistance fund</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Clearfield City</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2017 2022 X</td>
<td>X X X X Med</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>UTA circulator feasibility study</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Clearfield City</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>2013 2014 X X</td>
<td>X X X X Med X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Depot Street extension</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Clearfield City</td>
<td></td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>2013 2019 X X</td>
<td>X X X X Med X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Legend Hills 36” waterline upgrade</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Clearfield City</td>
<td>$234,100</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>X X X Med X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Legend Hills traffic improvements</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Clearfield City</td>
<td>$26,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>X X Med</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Economic development strategic plan</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Cottonwood Heights</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>2010 2011</td>
<td>X X X X X X Med</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Burnt Mill Road waterline</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Grantsville City</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>X X X X X X Med</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>SR 138 waterline</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Grantsville City</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>2019 2019 X X</td>
<td>X X X X Med X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Herriman town center</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Herriman City</td>
<td>$100,000,000</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>2013 2020 X</td>
<td>X X X X Med</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Rosecrest commercial center</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Herriman City</td>
<td></td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>2013 2023 X X</td>
<td>X X X X Med</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Historic downtown redevelopment</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Layton City</td>
<td>$91,500,000</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>2013 2020 X</td>
<td>X X X X Med</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>South Fort Lane</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Layton City</td>
<td>$148,000,000</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>2013 2030 X</td>
<td>X X X X Med</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>East Gate business park</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Layton City</td>
<td>$26,000,000</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>2018 2023 X X</td>
<td>X X X X Med</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Layton hospitality walk</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Layton City</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>2018 2023 X</td>
<td>X X X X Med</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Young and Commercial streets bridge</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Morgan City</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>X X X Med</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Galleria site study</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Murray City</td>
<td></td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>X X Med</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>5300 S. infrastructure improvements</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Murray City</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>2013 2013</td>
<td>X X Med</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Vine Street powerline relocation</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Murray City</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>2013 2013</td>
<td>X X X Med</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Fireday right-of-way enhancements</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Murray City</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>2013 2013</td>
<td>X X Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Regional nondestructive inspection/destructive test</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Ogden City</td>
<td>$2,100,000</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>2013 2014</td>
<td>X X X Med</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Fife project</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Ogden City</td>
<td>$16,000,000</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>2013 2015</td>
<td>X X X Med</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Trackline/Exchange business park</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Ogden City</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>2013 2017</td>
<td>X X X Med</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>17th Street expansion</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Ogden City</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>2014 2016</td>
<td>X X Med</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>24th Street road expansion</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Ogden City</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>2014 2019</td>
<td>X X X Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>24th Street corridor redevelopment</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Ogden City</td>
<td>$40,000,000</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>2014 2022</td>
<td>X X X Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Rubion White Blvd. extension</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Pleasant View City</td>
<td>$714,000</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>2013 2020</td>
<td>X X Med</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Ninigret North phase I PRV vaults</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Syracuse City</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>2013 2018</td>
<td>X X Med</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Regional innovation clusters</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Salt Lake County</td>
<td>$150,000,000</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>2013 2016</td>
<td>X X X Med</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Cairns Master Plan</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Sandy City</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>2013 2017</td>
<td>X X Med</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Water treatment roof installation</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Stockton Town</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>2014 2015</td>
<td>X Med</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Planning assistance</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Stockton Town</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>2014 2015</td>
<td>X X Med</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>IMCP strategy/Tech transit center</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>University of Utah</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>2013 2015</td>
<td>X X X X Med</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>EDA university center</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Weber State University</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>2013 2019</td>
<td>X X X Med</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Fiber optic network expansion</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>West Valley City</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>2013 2014</td>
<td>X X X Med</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>3030W road and intersection improvements</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>West Valley City</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>2013 2015</td>
<td>X X X Med</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Freeport industrial road extension</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>West Valley City</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>2013 2015</td>
<td>X X Med</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>Lead Agency</td>
<td>Project Cost</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Timeline</td>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>Regional Goals</td>
<td>Project Priority</td>
<td>EDD Submittal</td>
<td>Project Completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>BiotInnovations Gateway Institute expansion</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>BIG</td>
<td>$1,600,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>FrontRunner Pedestrian Bridge</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Clearfield City</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>2016 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>H Street pond redevelopment</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Clearfield City</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>2016 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Facade and site improvement programs</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Clearfield City</td>
<td>$7,529,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Northwest Weber industrial park</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Weber County</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2014 RIS</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>UofU, UAMMI</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>2015 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Envision Utah</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Envision Utah</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>2016 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Quatere cohort innovation centers statewide exp</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Tooele County</td>
<td>$2,529,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>2016 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Ogden Airpor aerospace cluster initiative</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>2016 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ogden Airpor aerospace cluster initiative</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Ogden City</td>
<td>$150,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>2016 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>FrontRunner Pedestrian Bridge</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Clearfield City</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>2016 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>H Street pond redevelopment</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Clearfield City</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>2016 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Facade and site improvement programs</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Clearfield City</td>
<td>$7,529,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Northwest Weber industrial park</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Weber County</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2014 RIS</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>UofU, UAMMI</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>2015 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Envision Utah</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Envision Utah</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>2016 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Quatere cohort innovation centers statewide exp</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Tooele County</td>
<td>$2,529,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>2016 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ogden Airpor aerospace cluster initiative</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>2016 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Ogden Airpor aerospace cluster initiative</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Ogden City</td>
<td>$150,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>2016 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Lead Agency</th>
<th>Project Cost</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Regional Goals</th>
<th>Project Priority</th>
<th>EDD Submittal</th>
<th>Project Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Coal to Carbon Fiber Composite Research</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>USU, UIAMMI</td>
<td>$1,600,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>2016 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mountain View Corridor Study</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Salt Lake County</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>2017 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2017 Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy Annual Update – June 2017
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Lead Agency</th>
<th>Project Cost</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Regional Goals</th>
<th>Project Priority</th>
<th>EDD Submittal</th>
<th>Project Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>US Advanced Composites Manufacturing</td>
<td>UAMMI</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B. DESCRIPTION OF EDA FUNDING PROGRAMS

The following descriptions are from the U.S. Economic Development Administrations website and from the U.S. Economic Development Administration (http://www.eda.gov/programs.htm). Final funding appropriations will be determined by Congressional appropriations yet to be determined.

1. **PUBLIC WORKS**

   **Program Description:** Empowers distressed communities to revitalize, expand, and upgrade their physical infrastructure to attract new industry, encourage business expansion, diversify local economies, and generate or retain long-term, private-sector jobs and investment. (Name may change to 21st Century Innovation Infrastructure.)

   **Project Award Ceiling:** $3,000,000
   **Eligible Entities:** States, Cities, Counties, Units of Local Government, EDDs, Non-Profits, Universities

2. **ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT**

   **Program Description:** Assists state and local interests in designing and implementing strategies to adjust or bring about change to an economy. The program focuses on areas that have experienced or are under threat of serious structural damage to the underlying economic base.

   **Project Award Ceiling:** $3,000,000
   **Eligible Entities:** States, Cities, Counties, Units of Local Government, EDDs, Non-Profits, Universities

3. **PARTNERSHIP PLANNING**

   **Program Description:** Supports local organizations with long-term planning efforts.

   **Project Award Ceiling:** $100,000
   **Eligible Entities:** Economic Development Districts

4. **(LOCAL) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE**

   **Program Description:** Helps fill the knowledge and information gaps that may prevent leaders in the public and non-profit sectors in distressed areas from making optimal decisions on local economic development issues.

   **Project Award Ceiling:** $300,000
   **Eligible Entities:** States, Cities, Counties, Units of Local Government, EDDs, Non-Profits, Universities, Indian Tribes

5. **REGIONAL INNOVATION STRATEGIES**

   **Program Description:** A national initiative to encourage innovation, regional collaboration, and regional innovation clusters (e.g. i6 Challenge, Jobs and Innovation Accelerator Challenge). The Program is based on the premise that it is critical to support advanced job creation strategies that promote regional innovation clusters.

   **Project Award Ceiling:** $500,000
   **Eligible Entities:** State, Indian Tribe, City or other political subdivision of the state, non-profit/higher ed/public-private/science or research park/fed lab/or EDO/EDDs, consortium of any entities above

6. **FDI AND TRADE: INTERNATIONAL ENGAGEMENT READY COMMUNITIES**

   **Program Description:** This $600,000 program seeks to help drive foreign direct investment (FDI) in U.S. communities with diverse economic development needs by enhancing their FDI attraction and export promotion efforts. This program will support empirical research on successful international engagement strategies and develop best practice reports and a competitiveness assessment tool.

   **Project Award Ceiling:** $600,000
   **Eligible Entities:** States, Counties, Cities, Towns, Special Districts, EDDs, Non-Profits, Private Institutions of Higher Education, Universities, Native American Tribes
7. PARTNERSHIPS FOR OPPORTUNITY AND WORKFORCE AND ECONOMIC REVITALIZATION (POWER) INITIATIVE

Program Description: A new interagency effort to assist communities negatively impacted by changes in the coal industry and power sector. Booming natural gas production, declining costs for renewable energy, increases in energy efficiency, flattening electricity demand, and updated clean air standards are changing the way electricity is generated and used across the country.

Award Ceiling: -

Eligible Entities: Local governments, planning organizations, labor unions, state and local workforce agencies, institutions of higher education, social service providers

8. EDA UNIVERSITY CENTER ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Program Description: This program funds technical assistance provided by an accredited institution of higher education that is focused on advancing regional commercialization efforts, entrepreneurship, innovation, business expansion in a region’s innovation cluster(s), and a high-skilled regional workforce. FY 2017 Funding for the Seattle and Atlanta Region’s only.

Award Ceiling: -

Eligible Entities: Public and state controlled institutions of higher education and private institutions of higher education
APPENDIX C. WHERE DO CENTERS EXIST IN 2015?

CENTER ANALYSIS: WHERE DO CENTERS EXIST IN 2015?
The Centers Analysis 2015 can be used to evaluate features of human activity (residential and population density) and street connectivity.

These factors are seen as key pieces of an active center and are encouraged in order to achieve regional growth management objectives. High street connectivity encourages walkable and active neighborhoods, as pedestrians are able to travel more directly and efficiently with a high number of close, alternative routes. Density is an important component of an active center as it tends to draw a critical mass of people, both residential and employment based. Additionally, a greater amount of destinations within close proximity encourages walk behavior as trip distance between destinations is lessened. The benefits associated with active centers include a high amount of economic activity in the area, a greater use of non-automobile travel behavior and an increase in physical activity by those who frequent local destinations.

HOW WE MEASURED TODAY’S CENTER ACTIVITY
The following data was used to measure a center’s performance in developing areas with high employment and residential density that are served by a well-integrated street network.

- Residential Density (persons per acre): Block level census counts were synthesized to the parcel level from the Wasatch Front Regional Council’s Real Estate Market Model; parcel level population counts were assigned to the parcel centroid and rasterized, creating a density measure of persons per acre.
- Employment Density (employees per acre): Employment counts were provided at the firm level. Firms that are categorized as office, government, healthcare or education were weighted higher by multiplying employment by two; all other firms were totaled using original employment numbers. The points were rasterized, creating a density measure of employees per acre.
- Street Connectivity: Street connectivity was measured by creating an intersection density score. Intersections were assigned a count of one and totaled within a quarter mile radius from any given point. This total was then divided by 9 (1/4 mile acre radius) in order to normalize the intersection count by a 10 acre block size (the average size of a downtown Salt Lake City block).

Ten-acre blocks now have a Street Connectivity Score of 1; the range of scores falls between .25 and capped out at 2.5 to help normalize anomalies in the data, thus creating a weighting factor. The weight rewards areas with high street connectivity (street connectivity score >1), while penalizing areas with low connectivity (street connectivity score < 1).

See Figure 48 (next page) for a display of today’s center activity (independent of Wasatch Choice for 2040 Vision). Map Algebra All factors were totaled using the following formula:

\[
\text{Residential Density} + \text{Office employment density (x 2)} + \text{Retail, industrial employment density} \times \text{Street connectivity factor} = \text{Total Acre Score}
\]
INTERSECTION OF CENTERS AND THE WASATCH CHOICE FOR 2040 VISION

As noted above, the Wasatch Choice for 2040 Vision (WC 2040) is the Region’s growth management vision for the future. The Vision was created using extensive collaboration between counties and cities to allocate and contain growth in metropolitan, regional, town, and village centers. The allocation is based on existing development trends and projected growth. The Vision Map represents a shared vision to create livable and prosperous communities now and well into the future. Use this link to view the Wasatch Choice for 2040 Vision:

Analyzing current centers (Snapshot of Centers 2015) against the shared Vision provides an opportunity to evaluate progress made in concentrating growth by aligning land use, density allowances, and infrastructure investments based on the aforementioned data.
The Centers were analyzed based on the following three criteria:
1. Which existing current centers and WC2040 Vision centers align?
2. Which WC2040 Vision centers are underperforming in these factors?
3. Which areas are not identified in WC2040 Vision but display visible building blocks of an emerging center?

An example of each of the three criteria noted above can be seen in Figure 49.

**Progress Evaluation of Wasatch Choice 2040 Centers: Alignment with the Vision**

**INTERSECTION OF CENTERS AND THE 2015-2040 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN**

The Wasatch Front Regional Transportation Plan 2015 – 2040 (RTP) has been developed to enhance the ability of the Region’s transportation network to meet the anticipated travel demand projected for the next 25 years. The 2015 - 2040 RTP provides programmed capacity improvements and specific recommendations for highway and transit facilities, pedestrian and bicycle paths, park and ride lots, and airport and freight services. The Plan is created for the Salt Lake – West Valley and Ogden – Layton Urbanized Areas of the Wasatch Front.
Based on the Wasatch Choice for 2040 Vision, the 2015 – 2040 RTP was developed in accordance with federal guidelines. It is financially constrained, meets state requirements for air quality conformity, is scheduled to be updated every four years, and reflects a continuous effort by regional planners and engineers to identify and successfully meet existing and expected growth in travel demand throughout the Wasatch Front Region through the year 2040.

The transportation projects included in the 2015-2040 RTP are planned to meet the travel needs and improve quality of life within the Wasatch Front for the next 30 years. WFRC developed project lists with residents, local government stakeholders, and partner agencies by collecting project ideas and testing them against the RTP Goals. Both highway and transit projects are evaluated based on whether the project serves or connects to an active center. Refer to Figures 50 and 51.

**Figure 50. Wasatch Choice for 2040 Centers and Transit Projects**
Existing Centers

1. **METROPOLITAN CENTER**
   - Metropolitan Centers serve as the hub of business and cultural activity in the region. They benefit from pedestrian-friendly streetscapes and an urban-style grid network, and are a hub for public transportation. Auto access is prevalent with access to several major highways and thoroughfares.

2. **URBAN CENTER**
   - Urban Centers are the focus of commerce and local government services, benefiting a market area of a few hundred thousand people. Urban Centers are served by high-capacity transit and major streets. They are characterized by two- to four-story employment and housing options.

3. **TOWN CENTER**
   - Town Centers provide localized services to tens of thousands of people within a two to three-mile radius. One- to three-story buildings for employment and housing are characteristic. Town Centers have a strong sense of community identity and are well served by transit and streets.

Figure 51. Wasatch Choice for 2040 Centers and Road Projects
APPENDIX D. URBAN STREET DESIGN

URBAN DESIGN QUALITIES

All streets incorporate various physical features within their boundaries. Urban design qualities depend on these physical features, but at the same time remain distinct from them. The way people perceive and interact with their environment is what determines how well a street or city block is designed. Since physical features can be measured objectively, it is possible to quantify certain elements of a street’s design. It is necessary to physically visit and analyze street segments to identify and count the street features.

In the field manual entitled “Measuring Urban Design Qualities”, experts in transportation planning and design provide a list of the five most important elements that lead to (or detract from) high quality urban street design. The five qualities that are measured include Imageability, Enclosure, Human Scale, Transparency, and Complexity. Each of those five urban street design qualities are briefly explained below.

IMAGEABILITY

Imageability is the quality of a place that makes it distinct, recognizable, and memorable. A place has high imageability when specific physical elements and their arrangement capture attention, evoke feelings, and create a lasting impression (Measuring Urban Design Qualities, 2005).

ENCLOSURE

Enclosure refers to the degree to which streets and other public spaces are visually defined by buildings, walls, trees, and other elements. Spaces where the height of vertical elements is proportionally related to the width of the space between them, a room-like quality (Measuring Urban Design Qualities, 2005).

HUMAN SCALE

Human scale refers to the size, texture, and articulation of physical elements that match the size and proportions of humans and, equally important, correspond to the speed at which humans walk. Building details, pavement texture, street trees, and street furniture are all physical elements contributing to human scale (Measuring Urban Design Qualities, 2005).

TRANSPARENCY

Transparency refers to the degree to which people can see or perceive what lies beyond the edge of a street or other public space and, more specifically, the degree to which people can see or perceive human activity beyond the edge of a street or other public space. Physical elements that influence transparency include walls, windows, doors, fences, landscaping, and openings into midblock spaces (Measuring Urban Design Qualities, 2005).

COMPLEXITY

Complexity refers to the visual richness of a place. The complexity of a place depends on the variety of the physical environment, specifically the numbers and kinds of buildings, architectural diversity and ornamentation, landscape elements, street furniture, signage, and human activity (Measuring Urban Design Qualities, 2005).

REGIONAL STREET DESIGN STUDY

Staff used the aforementioned urban street design qualities to gather data about regional street segments, in order to determine how effective street design affects the local and regional economy. To this end, data is currently being gathered and organized from various street segments within Davis, Morgan, Salt Lake, Tooele, and Weber counties. By 2016, the WFRC expects to draw conclusions from the study, and determine to what extent street design qualities impact local and regional economies. The Urban Street Design Scoring Sheet is provided below to illustrate how each design quality is measured.
REGIONAL STUDY OBSERVATIONS

While the cities surveyed thus far have varying design quality scores, there have been a few general trends and patterns that have emerged. Cities and streets that are more densely developed generally merit higher overall design scores, as they have been designed to cater to pedestrian traffic. The buildings in these kinds of developments usually have low building setback measurements, most of them fronting the street and immediately adjacent to the sidewalk. They also typically include on-street parking rather than large parking lots. Having buildings that are close to the sidewalk also increases the feeling of comfort for pedestrians by creating a room-like feel to the public space.

In the data gathered so far, each of the cities that were surveyed exhibited similar patterns of development. Cities that were developed around pedestrian traffic had much higher overall scores. The highest overall score is located near Ogden’s Historic 25th Street District, which includes the two blocks of 25th Street between Wall Avenue and Washington Boulevard (see below for Urban Design Score maps by city).

This area was originally developed in the late 1800s near a railroad hub when most of the development catered to walking. The historic buildings found along 25th Street adds to the uniqueness of the area. The buildings were constructed with the front of the building facing the sidewalk with large windows to further encourage pedestrian traffic. During warm weather, trees provide shade and outdoor dining tables reinforce the feeling that 25th Street is a pedestrian-friendly street. Additionally, on street parking provides excellent accessibility to the area.

The above-mentioned factors lead to higher scoring in downtown areas when compared to the rest of the city. Tooele, for example, has a historic district near the intersection of Vine and Main Streets, which is reflected in its relatively high score. Similar patterns occur in Morgan (along Commercial and Young Streets), Grantsville (along Main Street), and Bountiful (along Main Street) where buildings have been constructed close to the sidewalk, historic or otherwise.

By comparing these cities, however, it is clear to see that simply having historic buildings does not necessarily lead to a higher street design score. Other factors that affect the score include building density, the proportion of properties currently in use, and presence of on-street items that encourage people to stop walking and enjoy the street such as public art, plants, and appropriately sized building signage. For example, most cities studied have historic buildings and pedestrian-friendly development, but only Ogden, Tooele, and Bountiful have historic buildings that line both sides of the street. Along Morgan’s Commercial Street, only one side has retained historic building frontage due to the railway development on the northern side of the street. This characteristic significantly lowers the attractiveness of the area since there are fewer businesses to draw people and there is a less enclosed and secure feeling commonly found in other, more walled-in streets.

A similar pattern can be seen in Grantsville along its Main Street. Over time, the once pedestrian-friendly town has become more auto-dependent which can be seen by the number of strip malls and parking lots lining Main Street. The development of these types of land uses has replaced the historic feel to a large extent. Only a few blocks along Main Street have retained the pedestrian friendly feel, as evidenced by its low design scores. Similarly, 500 South (in Bountiful) and Redwood Road (in Taylorsville) have also seen significant auto-oriented development, evidenced by large parking lots and long building setback measurements. These design elements tend to discourage pedestrian traffic to and around these businesses.

Another major factor influencing the overall score is the amount of vacant properties. This is especially true areas with low density with fewer retail establishments. Ogden’s 25th District has seen a lot of redevelopment over the years, and most of the properties in the area are either occupied or in the process of renovation. Ogden’s busiest downtown street also provides a lot of unique amenities and caters to a broad audience, which improves the amount of foot traffic, revenue, and ambiance of the area. Vacant properties tend to serve as natural barriers to casual pedestrian traffic as it breaks up the connectivity of active businesses and loses the interest of the window shoppers.
The high-scoring streets in Ogden, Bountiful, and Tooele differ from those found in Taylorsville, Morgan, and Grantsville in their utilization of on-street items such as benches, flower boxes, and streetlamps, which improve the street’s atmosphere. Not only do these amenities provide accent to the surrounding roads and buildings, they also help the area appear more friendly and inviting. Benches, plazas, and outdoor dining provide areas for people to connect, which encourages visitors to lengthen the time of their visit.

Another development worth noting is The Junction, located between 24th and 22nd streets on Kiesel Avenue in Ogden (Kiesel Avenue lies between Grant Avenue and Washington Boulevard). This new shopping and entertainment hub was developed on the site of a former mall that was in decline. Ogden City and private companies saw the area as an opportunity to create new mixed-use developments.

The Junction provides restaurants, housing, office space, a movie theater, and other recreational opportunities in close proximity to the 25th Street District, while focusing on creating a pedestrian friendly atmosphere—the area has on-street parking with sidewalks next to buildings, benches and outdoor dining, public art, and wide sidewalks. Because it exhibits these pedestrian oriented design qualities, it earned the highest overall score of any block not containing a historical building.

While the areas studied may not represent the street design qualities of the Wasatch Front as a whole, they provide insights into what types of development patterns have better design qualities. Analyzing these cities and their streets has also given insight into what a city can do to increase urban street design qualities throughout the city. An overall conclusion from the analysis taken from the streets assessed indicates that higher scores are closely correlated with areas that focus on pedestrian oriented development. Refer to Figure 52 for the Urban Design Score Sheet template.

![Figure 52. Urban Street Design Score Sheet Template](image-url)
United States Department of Commerce
Economic Development Administration
Denver Regional Office
1244 Speer Boulevard, Suite 431
Denver, Colorado 80204

December 21, 2016

In reply refer to:
Award No. ED16DEN3020087

Andrew Gruber, Executive Director
Wasatch Front Economic Development District
295 North Jimmy Doolittle Road
Salt Lake City, UT 84116

Dear Mr. Gruber:

On August 3, 2016, the Denver Regional Office conducted a Peer Evaluation of your organization. Members of the Peer Evaluation team consisted of Patrick Waggoner, Economic Development Specialist; Kirk Keysor, Economic Development Representative; and Risk Hunsaker, Executive Director of Region XII Council of Governments. The purpose of the review was to conduct an evaluation of the management, fiscal operation, and the performance of the District with respect to the EDA Partnership Planning program. We appreciate the time and effort you and your staff took to accommodate the review, and the professional manner in which your staff worked with the evaluation team.

Attached is the “Performance Evaluation and Recommendation Report”, completed by the EDA Denver Regional Office. Please make note of the sections outlining the recommendations. Our team was impressed with the activities and procedures that your District has incorporated to implement the EDA planning process.

We commend you for the work you are doing to meet the needs of the counties served by the Wasatch Front Economic Development District. If you have any questions regarding the evaluation or other matters pertaining to your work with EDA, please contact Patrick Waggoner in the Denver Regional Office at (303) 844-4088. We look forward to continuing our economic development partnership with you.

Sincerely,

Angela B. Martinez
Regional Director

Enclosures
EDA Denver Regional Office
Economic Development District Performance Evaluation & Recommendation Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Development District Name &amp; Location: Wasatch Front Regional Council / Wasatch Front Economic Development District, UT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Review Team Members: Patrick Waggoner, Economic Development Specialist, Trent Thompson, Economic Development Representative, Rick Hunsaker, Executive Director of Region XII Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDD Participants: LaNiece Davenport, Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDA Grant #: ED16DEN3020087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of Evaluation: Denver, CO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Instructions for the Reviewer:**

Based on your evaluation of the organization through interviews and the materials provided, supply the appropriate response to the questions in the three sections below. For questions requiring a “Yes” or “No” answer, please circle or otherwise indicate the correct response (marked in red). For self-assessment questions requiring variable responses, please circle or otherwise indicate your rating using the following scale: 4=Excellent, 3=Good, 2=Fair, 1=Poor. Add pertinent comments and recommendations, and attach supplementary materials as needed.

### PART I. REGIONAL ELIGIBILITY:
DISTRESS, SIZE, RESOURCES, CEDS, SUPPORT, COOPERATION WITH STATE(S)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Continuing Regional Eligibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Does the EDD’s region contain at least one geographic area that is subject to EDA’s economic distress criteria?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Is the EDD of sufficient size or population and contains sufficient resources to foster economic development on a scale involving more than a single geographic area subject to EDA’s economic distress criteria?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Does the EDD have an EDA-approved CEDS that meets EDA’s regulatory requirements and contains a specific program for intra-district cooperation, self-help, and public investment?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Does the EDD have the support of the majority of the counties within its boundaries for the economic development activities of the district?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E) Does the EDD work cooperatively on economic development with the State(s) in which it is located?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Comments &amp; Recommendations:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### PART II. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT MANAGEMENT:
ORGANIZATION, GOVERNANCE, OPERATIONS, FINANCIAL ACCOUNTABILITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Membership Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do the members of the organization participate financially and otherwise in the affairs of the EDD?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Governing Body</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the composition of the governing body meet EDA’s regulatory requirements?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How effective is the governing body in providing policy guidance and leadership to the organization.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How effective is the staff in carrying out the activities of the EDD?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Public Information &amp; Involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How effective is the EDD in providing information to and soliciting input from the general public about ongoing and proposed district activities?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 5. Economic Development Activities |
To what extent does the EDD engage in the full range of economic development activities listed in its EDA-approved CEDS?

6. Financial Accountability
To what extent has the EDD demonstrated that sound financial controls and practices are in place?

7. Comments & Recommendations:

Very detailed and thorough policies and procedures.

---

**PART III. EDA PARTNERSHIP PLANNING PROGRAM: CEDS IMPLEMENTATION AND PROGRAM PERFORMANCE**

1. **Required Reports**
   - How well does the EDD perform in submitting all required reports to EDA in accordance with the terms and conditions of the award?

2. **Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS)**
   - How effective is the EDD’s CEDS development, implementation, review, and update process?
   - How complete, relevant and useful is the EDD’s CEDS document?

3. **Scope of Work (SOW)**
   - How effective is the EDD in carrying out the Scope of Work contained in its EDA grant award?
   - To what extent is the SOW based on the priorities and activities identified in the CEDS?

4. **EDD Effectiveness**
   - Overall, how effective is the EDD’s governing body in the guidance and oversight of its EDA-funded economic development program?
   - Overall, how effective is the EDD’s staff in carrying out its EDA-funded economic development program?

7. **Comments & Recommendations:**

Reports have been submitted timely; are thorough and adequately address accomplishments on the scope of work. This newly designated district has done a superb job catching up to the reporting requirements, philosophy, CEDS planning, and community outreach since their inception.

The district’s governing body is encouraged to stay engaged and to continue to provide direction and guidance to the EDD staff.
WORKS CITED


