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UTAHNS’ VISION FOR 2050

HOUSING AND COST OF LIVING
UTAH IS GROWING.

TODAY
There are three million people living in Utah.

2050
By 2050 there will be 5.4 million—the population will nearly double in 35 years!

UTAH IS GROWING.

11 TOPICS
Utahns’ values guided the selection of 11 topics critical to the future of Utah.

UTAHNS’ VALUES
Values studies told us not just what Utahns care about, but why they care about those things.

ACTION TEAMS
Experts from across the state studied the topics and helped shape potential scenarios for the future.

SCENARIOS
8 ACTION TEAMS
Of 400 experts worked for 18 months to develop potential scenarios for Utah’s growth across each topic.

YOUR UTAH, YOUR FUTURE SURVEY
53,000 UTAHNS
Weighed in on each topic and each scenario, telling us what they want Utah to look like in 2050.

VISION FOR 2050
A combination of survey results, values, and action team input formed a vision for Utah’s future.

THAT MEANS

2 x the homes, jobs, skiers, cars, students, food

OUR GOAL
Help Utahns create a vision for Utah’s future
Utahns believe that good homes, neighborhoods, and communities are essential to a high quality of life.

**INTRODUCTION**

Being able to provide for their families with a sense of financial security is critical to Utahns’ quality of life. A lower cost of living helps Utah families make ends meet with less stress and fewer working hours, so they can spend more time together doing things they enjoy. When Utah families can afford good homes in good neighborhoods, they can also break the cycle of poverty, make their homes and neighborhoods attractive, and contribute to their communities. This makes better, safer communities.

**HOUSING IS THE LARGEST EXPENDITURE IN A TYPICAL HOUSEHOLD BUDGET,** and as land prices continue to increase near job centers, housing costs will only increase.

**TRANSPORTATION COSTS ALSO EAT UP NEARLY ONE THIRD OF THE TYPICAL UTAH HOUSEHOLD BUDGET.** These costs include car payments, insurance, gas, repairs, and more.

Utahns want a variety of housing and transportation options in safe neighborhoods, with good access to jobs, shopping, schools, and other services and amenities. These housing and transportation options will allow Utahns to provide a high quality of life for themselves and their families, all without straining their budgets.
YOUR UTAH, YOUR FUTURE

VISION FOR HOUSING AND COST OF LIVING
Utahns envision good, safe communities with a variety of housing and transportation options that maintain a low cost of living. They envision communities where people with varying incomes and backgrounds and in different stages of life can find homes they can afford. They want the option to save money by driving shorter distances, walking, or biking to jobs, shopping, schools, public transportation, parks, and other services and amenities. Utahns envision keeping household costs for utilities and taxes low.
GOALS

1 Maximize how many people can afford decent housing.

2 Improve the ability for those with lower incomes to live in desirable neighborhoods, improving opportunity for them and their children.

3 Reduce how much each household needs to spend on transportation.

4 Provide access to opportunities, such as quality education, in all neighborhoods.

5 Reduce the cost of living for all households— including the amount spent on housing, transportation, utilities, taxes, fees, etc.—so Utahns have money to spend on other things.
KEY STRATEGIES

1. Provide a variety of neighborhoods Utahns can choose from, while allowing the housing market to supply a variety of housing options in all communities.

2. Develop an interconnected pattern of mixed-use neighborhood, village, town, and urban centers that bring destinations and opportunities closer to people.

3. Decrease household travel costs by making public transportation, walking, and biking more convenient.

For more details on these and other strategies, see the Recommended Strategies section beginning on p. 41.
BACKGROUND:
WHERE WE ARE TODAY
Reasonably priced housing and an affordable cost of living are vital for maintaining a good quality of life. When the cost of living is low, Utahns can afford to spend more on the things that are most important in their lives. A low cost of living allows Utahns to save more money and worry less about providing for their families and about whether their children will need to leave Utah to find a place they can afford. Employers are also attracted to Utah by comparatively low housing and other costs.

*Utahns, however, spend most of their monthly budgets on housing and transportation. Nothing will have a greater impact on the cost of living than reducing these two costs.*

**HOUSING COSTS**

Providing a variety of housing options in all communities helps ensure that everyone has a decent, affordable place to live. Factors such as housing supply, market demand, and cost of infrastructure affect how affordable housing is for Utahns.

To keep housing affordable, the supply of housing types must match what Utahns want and can afford. For example, if Utahns desire or need to live in townhomes, apartments, or condominiums, and those housing types are in short supply in desirable neighborhoods, the cost of those types of housing will unnecessarily increase. Having a variety of housing options will also allow Utahns to remain in their communities as their family sizes, incomes, job locations, or other circumstances change.
When housing markets are allowed to work, almost everyone can find a place to live. It is important that zoning regulations do not prevent the market from supplying the housing that is needed.

For decades, the housing market in Utah has been shifting to fewer large-lot homes and more compact housing such as small-lot homes, townhomes, condominiums, and appartments. This is mainly due to rising land prices near job centers and shifting housing preferences.

This market shift provides an opportunity to reduce infrastructure costs because when homes are closer together, roads, pipes, and other infrastructure don’t have to stretch as far and don’t cost as much per home. Increased costs for building and maintaining local infrastructure like roads and pipes raise the price of housing because these expenses are typically passed on to homebuyers and renters through taxes, increased utility fees, and higher home prices.

Another major market trend is a result of online shopping. Because many purchases do not come from a store, the amount of retail store space per person is declining and is predicted to dramatically decrease in the future. Many buildings in today’s shopping centers will become available for other uses or will be replaced by different types of buildings. These retail areas can be converted into mixed-use centers, with compact housing, restaurants, and other local services. Not only do mixed-use centers revitalize old shopping centers and allow cities to combat declining sales tax revenues, but they also provide Utahns with convenient access to jobs, shopping, recreation, public transportation, and other uses.

**TRANSPORTATION COSTS**

Transportation costs make up nearly a third of a typical family’s budget in Utah. These costs are largely determined by how close housing is to jobs and daily needs, by the availability of good public transportation, and by the convenience and safety of other transportation options, like biking or walking. If Utahns can reach work, school, shopping, and other destinations without driving or by driving shorter distances, they can drive less or even own fewer or no cars. This saves money on car payments, fuel, insurance, and maintenance.
INCOME SPENT ON HOUSING AND TRANSPORTATION COSTS

**Income Spent on Two Cars**
Typical Utah Family

- Income spent on housing and utilities: 41%
- Income spent on two cars: 31%
- Income spent on all other expenses: 29%

**Income Spent on One Car**
Typical Low-income Family

- Income spent on housing and utilities: 36%
- Income spent on one car: 57%
- Income spent on all other expenses: 7%

- Income spent on housing and utilities
- Income spent on two cars
- Income spent on all other expenses
- Income spent on one car
- Income spent on all other expenses
HOW WE CREATED A VISION:

PEOPLE AND PROCESS

To create a vision for the future of housing and cost of living in Utah, a team of experts gathered over a two-year period to share knowledge and extensively research and discuss options for improvement.
Members of the Housing and Cost of Living Action Team were selected by Governor Gary Herbert and Envision Utah to represent a spectrum of professional experience and political affiliations. Team members included developers, legislators, affordable-housing advocates, and other experts from across the state. From 2013 to 2015, the action team met to identify Utahns' choices related to housing, create scenarios for public input, and synthesize a vision for the future. The process of creating this vision also included the following components:

1. A 2014 values study. This study was conducted by Heart+Mind Strategies to identify (1) what factors Utahns view as affecting their quality of life the most and (2) the underlying emotions and values tied to those factors. The study concluded that Utahns highly value having good, diverse housing options close to amenities and services, so everyone can afford housing, spend less money on transportation, and live in better, safer communities. (More information on the values study can be found in the Utahns' Values section on p. 19.)

2. A 2014 land availability and market study. This study was commissioned to determine where housing development is likely to occur and what the mix of housing will be between now and 2050. The primary investigator in this study, RCLCO, took into consideration where vacant land is located, where demand for housing is the strongest, and what types of housing and other development are likely to be needed to provide Utahns with what they want and can afford.

3. The “Build Your 2050 Utah” web app. This app allowed Utahns to identify what housing forms are most important to them and interactively test the effects of certain decisions concerning housing. More than 3,000 people across Utah gave input through the app. The information gathered indicates that Utahns want the following:
   a) Neighborhoods with a variety of housing types.
   b) Amenities like jobs and shopping that are close to where people live.
   c) An array of convenient and affordable transportation options in most communities.

4. Envision Tomorrow Plus modeling software. Using this software, a variety of population growth patterns were modeled to show what Utah might look like in 2050. These projections differed in how places developed, the amount of land consumed by development, the size of single-family lots, the variety of housing types, the extent of different transportation options, and the extent to which Utah’s urban and suburban areas would create a pattern of mixed-use centers.

The action team used this information to create four different scenarios for the future of housing and cost of living in Utah. These scenarios differed in the variety and inclusiveness of housing options in communities, people’s proximity to public transportation, how close the housing built matches what people and the market want and need, and the proximity of amenities and services to where people live. These scenarios (p. 25) were presented to the public in the Your Utah, Your Future survey in spring 2015, and 52,845 Utahns weighed in.

After receiving public input on the four scenarios, the action team met to frame a vision, including goals and strategies, to achieve what Utahns said they wanted for housing and cost of living in 2050.
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WHY HOUSING AND COST OF LIVING MATTER:

UTAHNS’ VALUES

In 2014, Envision Utah conducted a statewide values study to identify (1) what factors Utahns view as affecting their quality of life the most and (2) the underlying emotions and values tied to those factors.
Utahns believe that having a range of housing and transportation options, with housing close to amenities and services, will decrease the cost of living in Utah. Utahns want to spend less on housing and transportation, so they can save money, get ahead, and work less. A low cost of living also means their children are more likely to stay in Utah. This provides more time with family, reduces stress, and gives Utahns a sense of enjoyment, as well as peace of mind that future generations will have good opportunities.

Utahns also feel that having more housing options and an affordable cost of living will allow more people to live in nice housing. This reduces homelessness, helps end the cycle of poverty, and creates a culture of ownership, leading to safer neighborhoods and better communities. As a result, Utahns experience a sense of personal security and peace of mind.

Having amenities and services close to housing saves not only money, but also time because Utahns don’t have to commute as far. As a result, they can spend more time doing other things with family and friends, which gives them peace of mind and a sense of enjoyment.
A diverse range of housing options allows me to find an affordable home in the neighborhood I want, which helps me save money and cultivate a sense of ownership. This leads to less stress and a better quality of life, along with nicer neighborhoods and a better sense of community, which contribute to my peace of mind.”
“I want housing that is close to amenities and services so that I can save time and money. This lets me do other things with my time and reduces stress, resulting in a sense of enjoyment and peace of mind.”
I believe a more affordable cost of living will allow more people to afford good housing. This will help to end the cycle of poverty while contributing to stable families, safe neighborhoods, and better communities. In turn, this leads to a sense of personal security, family love, and peace of mind.”
“I feel that an affordable cost of living will give me the ability to work less, save money, prepare for retirement, and spend more time with family or doing other things. This gives me a sense of security, fulfillment, and peace of mind that future generations will have the same opportunities.”
The following scenarios were drafted by the Housing and Cost of Living Action Team to represent possible outcomes for Utah’s housing in 2050. The scenarios differed in the following variables:

- The variety and types of housing in communities
- People’s proximity to public transportation, amenities, and services
- Where growth occurs
- How closely the housing built matches what Utahns are projected to want and afford
- The extent to which a pattern of mixed-use centers is created

The scenarios were presented to the public as part of the Your Utah, Your Future survey in spring 2015.

The scenarios were titled Allosaurus, Bonneville Trout, Seagull, Quaking Aspen, and Sego Lily (the state fossil, fish, bird, tree, and flower).

78% OF UTAHNS SELECTED THE SCENARIO PRESENTED IN QUAKING ASPEN AND SEGO LILY.
**ALLOSAURUS SCENARIO**

*High housing costs; high transportation costs in suburbs, low in downtowns*

By 2050, most Utahns live in either large-lot homes in the suburbs or high-rise buildings in the cities. Because many suburban areas do not allow apartments, condominiums, townhomes, or small lots, most multifamily housing is located in the downtowns of cities such as Salt Lake City, Provo, Ogden, and Sandy. High-rise buildings have high construction costs, and large suburban homes are also expensive, making housing unaffordable for many. Utah has fewer townhomes, low-rise apartments, condominiums, duplexes, and small-lot homes than needed.

As a result:

- Utahns must spend more money on housing and less on other needs.
- More people require public assistance for housing and other needs.
- People with different incomes generally do not live in the same neighborhoods, limiting opportunities for low-wage earners and their children.
- Transportation costs are low for Utahns living downtown because they can walk, bike, take public transportation, or drive short distances to destinations.
- Transportation costs are high for Utahns living in suburban areas because public transportation is limited and people must drive longer distances to reach destinations.
BONNEVILLE TROUT SCENARIO

High housing and transportation costs

Housing development trends of the last two decades continue. By 2050, most Utahns live in single-family homes. Because many communities do not allow a full range of housing options and mandate minimum lot sizes, the housing that is built does not always correspond with what Utahns can afford. Housing options are limited for low-wage earners because Utah has fewer townhomes, low-rise apartments, condominiums, duplexes, and small-lot homes than needed.

As a result:

• Utahns spend more on housing and less on other needs.
• More people require public assistance for housing and other needs.
• People with low incomes can afford to live in only a small number of neighborhoods, limiting their access to opportunities like good schools.
• Transportation costs are high for most Utahns because public transportation is limited and people must drive long distances to reach destinations.
By 2050, Utahns live in a variety of types of housing. Utah supplies a wider range of housing options that match what Utahns want and can afford. However, apartments, condos, townhomes, and small-lot homes are often separated from communities with homes on larger lots. In addition, much of the housing is not close to walkable centers, where jobs, shopping, recreation, and access to public transportation are located.

As a result:
- Utahns spend less on housing and more on other needs.
- Fewer people require public assistance for housing and other needs.
- People with low incomes cannot afford to live in mixed-income communities, limiting their access to opportunities like good schools.
- Transportation costs are high for many Utahns because people must drive long distances to reach destinations and public transportation is somewhat limited.
QUAKING ASPEN AND SEGO LILY SCENARIO

Reasonable housing and transportation costs

By 2050, Utahns live in a variety of types of housing. Communities supply a wide range of housing options that match what Utahns want and can afford. Most people live close to walkable centers, where they can access jobs, shopping, and recreation.

As a result:

- Utahns spend less on housing and transportation and more on other needs.
- Fewer people require public assistance for housing and other needs.
- Many people with low incomes can afford to live in mixed-income communities, increasing their access to opportunities like good schools.
- Transportation costs are low because many Utahns live close to public transportation and can easily walk, bike, or drive short distances to destinations.
**SUMMARY OF SCENARIOS**

### TOTAL NEW DEVELOPED ACRES

*In Thousands*

- **Allsaurus**: 323
- **Bonneville Trout**: 373
- **Seagull**: 315
- **Quaking Aspen and Sego Lily**: 282

### LOCAL INFRASTRUCTURE COSTS

*In Billions of Dollars*

- **Allsaurus**: 22.7
- **Bonneville Trout**: 25.5
- **Seagull**: 23
- **Quaking Aspen and Sego Lily**: 20.8

### PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLDS WITHIN ONE MILE OF A CENTER WITH DAILY SERVICES

- **Allsaurus**: 29%
- **Bonneville Trout**: 15%
- **Seagull**: 29%
- **Quaking Aspen and Sego Lily**: 85%

### NEW DEVELOPMENT HOUSING MIX

- **2050 Housing Need**
  - Multifamily: 17%
  - Small-lot single-family (<7,000 sq. ft.): 24%
  - Conventional-lot single-family (7,000–10,000 sq. ft.): 11%
  - Large-lot single-family (>10,000 sq. ft.): 24%

- **Allsaurus**
  - Multifamily: 17%
  - Small-lot single-family (<7,000 sq. ft.): 24%
  - Conventional-lot single-family (7,000–10,000 sq. ft.): 15%
  - Large-lot single-family (>10,000 sq. ft.): 15%

- **Bonneville Trout**
  - Multifamily: 21%
  - Small-lot single-family (<7,000 sq. ft.): 25%
  - Conventional-lot single-family (7,000–10,000 sq. ft.): 25%
  - Large-lot single-family (>10,000 sq. ft.): 25%

- **Seagull**
  - Multifamily: 21%
  - Small-lot single-family (<7,000 sq. ft.): 21%
  - Conventional-lot single-family (7,000–10,000 sq. ft.): 17%
  - Large-lot single-family (>10,000 sq. ft.): 21%

- **Quaking Aspen and Sego Lily**
  - Multifamily: 14%
  - Small-lot single-family (<7,000 sq. ft.): 17%
  - Conventional-lot single-family (7,000–10,000 sq. ft.): 21%
  - Large-lot single-family (>10,000 sq. ft.): 25%
In April and May 2015, 52,845 Utahns shared their voice through the Your Utah, Your Future survey. Participants chose their favorite scenarios for housing and cost of living and other topics. After choosing scenarios, survey participants had the option to answer a series of questions to prioritize housing and cost of living among other issues, determine the most important outcomes related to housing and cost of living, and identify how willing they would be to take specific actions that would ensure those outcomes. The survey results were cross-checked against a random-sample survey to ensure they represented the desires and opinions of Utahns.
Almost 80% chose the Quaking Aspen and Sego Lily scenario, in which communities supply a wide range of housing options that match what Utahns want and can afford. In these communities, most people live close to walkable mixed-use centers, where they can access jobs, shopping, recreation, and public transportation.

Utahns want communities that have a diverse mix of housing types so that many people can afford decent homes and so that those with lower incomes can live in desirable neighborhoods, improving opportunity for them and their children. Utahns also want to reduce how much each household spends on transportation. They place very little importance on limiting how many apartments, townhomes, and low income people or renters are in their communities.

Utahns are very willing to have more communities allow a variety of housing types other than large-lot homes (e.g., small-lot homes, townhomes, apartments, duplexes, and mother-in-law and basement apartments).
WHAT UTAHNS WANT

- **78%**
  - Reasonable housing and transportation costs
  - Quaking Aspen and Sego Lily

- **16%**
  - Reasonable housing costs; average transportation costs
  - Seagull

- **4%**
  - High housing costs; high transportation costs in suburbs, low in downtowns
  - Allosaurus

- **3%**
  - High housing and transportation costs
  - Bonneville Trout
WHY UTAHNS WANT IT

(OR WHAT OUTCOMES UTAHNS EXPECT FROM HOUSING AND TRANSPORTATION)

Survey participants were asked to allocate 100 points across these outcomes based on which they considered most important.

- **27%**
  
  Providing a full mix of housing types (townhomes, duplexes, apartments, single-family homes with a variety of yard sizes, mother-in-law apartments, etc.) that maximizes how many people can afford decent housing.

- **23%**
  
  Improving the ability for those with lower incomes to live in desirable neighborhoods, improving opportunity for them and their children.

- **22%**
  
  Reducing how much each household needs to spend on transportation (gas, insurance, car payments, transit passes, etc.).

- **15%**
  
  Reducing how much we need to spend on social services because high housing and transportation costs increase social needs.

- **13%**
  
  Limiting how many apartments, townhomes, and low-income people/renters are in my community.
WHAT UTAHNS ARE WILLING TO DO TO INCREASE HOUSING OPTIONS IN UTAH

More communities will have to allow a variety of housing types other than large-lot homes (small lots, townhomes, apartments, duplexes, mother-in-law and basement apartments, etc.).
Outcomes Utahns Expect From Transportation and Communities That Would Affect Housing and Cost of Living

Survey participants were asked to allocate 100 points across these outcomes based on which they considered most important.

- **23%**
  - Improving how convenient it is to get around without a car (public transportation, walking, biking)

- **22%**
  - Limiting traffic congestion

- **18%**
  - Minimizing how much land we develop for homes and businesses

- **18%**
  - Making sure daily services and amenities (work, shopping, parks, etc.) are close to where people live

- **10%**
  - Ensuring there are plentiful neighborhoods that are mostly just single-family homes on large lots

- **9%**
  - Reducing how much we spend on roads, pipes, rail, and other infrastructure
TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNITIES RESULTS THAT WOULD AFFECT HOUSING AND COST OF LIVING

WHAT UTAHNS ARE WILLING TO DO TO HAVE MIXED-USE CENTERS

We will have to design our shopping, jobs, and roads to be more convenient for pedestrians and cyclists, which might make them a little less convenient for cars.

Mixed-use centers would have to be distributed throughout the urban area to put them close to people, which means a mixed-use center with apartments and multistory buildings might be within a mile of you.

Traffic congestion might increase slightly near you, even though you wouldn’t have to travel as far, so you’d actually spend less time driving.
TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNITIES RESULTS THAT WOULD AFFECT HOUSING AND COST OF LIVING
WHAT UTAHNS ARE WILLING (NOT WILLING) TO DO TO HAVE LARGER HOME LOT SIZES

We will spend more money building and maintaining infrastructure like roads and pipes, which will have to stretch farther.

Socioeconomic classes will not mix as much because larger lots are more expensive, thus leading to more income-segregated communities.

Household transportation costs and time spent driving will increase because homes will be farther from city centers, shopping, jobs, and other destinations.
TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNITIES RESULTS THAT WOULD AFFECT HOUSING AND COST OF LIVING

WHAT UTAHNS ARE WILLING (NOT WILLING) TO DO TO HAVE LARGER HOME LOT SIZES (CONT’D)

*People will be less able to travel by public transportation, walking, or biking because everything will be farther apart.*

People will be less able to travel by public transportation, walking, or biking because everything will be farther apart.

- Not At All Willing: 37%
- Somewhat Willing: 25%
- Very Willing: 23%

*We will have to spend more money on infrastructure and impact the environment to develop and move water supplies because larger lots use more water.*

We will have to spend more money on infrastructure and impact the environment to develop and move water supplies because larger lots use more water.

- Not At All Willing: 40%
- Somewhat Willing: 25%
- Very Willing: 22%

*We will convert more farmland into houses.*

We will convert more farmland into houses.

- Not At All Willing: 45%
- Somewhat Willing: 27%
- Very Willing: 18%
OTHER RESULTS THAT WOULD AFFECT HOUSING AND COST OF LIVING

WILLINGNESS TO REDUCE WATER USE

Our homes will need to have smaller yards.

WILLINGNESS TO IMPROVE AIR QUALITY

Build energy efficient homes and businesses with less polluting appliances and higher upfront cost but with overall savings.
REALIZING THE VISION:

RECOMMENDED STRATEGIES
1. **Provide a variety of neighborhoods Utahns can choose from, while allowing the housing market to adequately supply a variety of housing options in all communities.**

   a) Streamline regulation of housing development and construction to avoid undue costs or delays.

   b) Structure zoning to allow a sufficient supply of a full variety of housing types, while mitigating impacts to existing neighborhoods.

   c) Otherwise ensure that regulation does not hinder developers from providing an adequate supply of housing to meet market demand.

   d) Provide opportunities for subsidized housing in each community so that those who can’t afford market-rate housing can still find a decent place to live.

---

**Some benefits of providing a variety of neighborhoods and housing options:**

- Maximizes how many people can afford quality housing in safe communities.
- Allows mixed-income communities to flourish, thereby improving opportunity for lower-income people and their children.
- Improves the ability of people to stay in the neighborhood they want at different stages of life.
2. **Build mixed-use centers throughout urban and suburban areas that include places of employment, compact housing, shopping, civic uses (schools, churches, etc.), and recreation.**

   a) Provide a variety of centers, including neighborhood, village, town, and urban centers.

   **NEIGHBORHOOD CENTERS** might include a park, school, and/or church within walking distance of homes.

   **VILLAGE CENTERS** might include local shopping (e.g., a grocery store), small-scale employment, compact housing, and local-serving development (e.g., 9th and 9th in Salt Lake City; SodaRow in Daybreak).
**TOWN CENTERS** might include regional shopping (e.g., home improvement or department stores), employment, higher education, compact housing, and other development (e.g., Sugar House).

**URBAN CENTERS** may serve as downtowns (e.g., Ogden or Salt Lake City), with significant employment, shopping centers, multistory housing, etc.

**Benefits of Having a Variety of Mixed-Use Centers:**

- Improves the convenience of traveling and reduces how much time people must spend driving
- Increases the convenience of using public transportation, walking, or biking
- Reduces cost of living through less-expensive transportation options and the reduced need to own a car
- Reduces air pollution and improves air quality
- Encourages more compact urban development while preserving agricultural land and open space
- Provides better access for all Utahns to good schools, healthcare, recreation, healthy food, shopping, jobs, etc.
b) Design new communities to be centered around neighborhood, village, and town centers.

c) Remove barriers to and encourage the development of mixed-use centers within existing communities, particularly in older, underutilized commercial areas.

d) Design mixed-use centers to make walking and biking convenient.

e) Locate centers around existing high-frequency public transportation where feasible, and plan new routes to and from centers.

3 **Design a balanced transportation system that makes travel in communities convenient with or without a car.**

a) Create an interconnected network of streets that disperses traffic and increases the convenience of traveling by foot or bicycle.

b) Expand the public transportation system (bus, rail, etc.) to improve coverage, frequency, access, and convenience.

c) Continue to improve and expand roads.

d) Locate places of employment, schools, and healthcare facilities near public transportation.

e) Improve infrastructure for walking and biking (sidewalks, bike lanes, trails, etc.), particularly near public transportation stations.

f) Design streets, where appropriate, to accommodate bicycles, pedestrians, and public transportation, as well as automobiles.

g) Design buildings to improve access for bicycles and pedestrians by locating entrances near the street and placing parking where it does not impede pedestrian access.
4 Provide easily accessible recreation areas in all communities.

a) Develop additional recreational facilities to accommodate increasing demand and to avoid overcrowded facilities.

b) Expand trail networks to connect parks and communities.

c) Design and enhance trails so people can conveniently use them to travel either to their destinations or to public transportation.

d) Cooperatively plan trail networks at community and regional scales before population growth occurs.

e) Work with federal, state, and local entities to provide mechanisms to fund the building and maintenance of parks, bike lanes, paths, and trails.

SOME BENEFITS OF AN INTERCONNECTED NETWORK OF PARKS AND TRAILS:

- Provides recreational spaces close to where people live
- Improves health of Utahns by increasing their ability to exercise outdoors
- Improves air quality and reduces traffic congestion by providing an alternative means of traveling
- Provides habitat and green space
- Reduces the urban heat island effect
- Helps control, absorb, and clean stormwater runoff
- Improves quality of life