

PROVO CITY GENERAL PLAN

Adopted August 26, 1997

Provo City Community Development Department

Acknowledgments

Provo City Administration

George O. Stewart, Mayor
Lewis Billings, Chief Administrative Officer
Ted Dowling, Executive Director

Provo City Municipal Council

Gregory A. Hudnall, Chair
David L. Rail, Vice Chair
Jane L. Carlile
Mark G. Hathaway
Shari C. Holweg
Dennis W. Poulsen
Karl J. Thalman

Provo City Planning Commission

Lois Kelson, Chair
Gary McKinnon, Vice Chair
Ron Fakler
Stan Lockhart
Gary Matthews
Sheldon Nelson
Cindy Richards
John Stohlton
Janice Young

Provo City Community Development

Richard Secrist, Director
Michael Hyde, Assistant Director
Bryce Armstrong, Zoning Enforcement Officer
Jason Bench, Planner II
Michael Brinton, Office Specialist
Jim Bryan, Senior Planner
Tami Call, Planning Intern
Geniel Davies, Office Specialist
Cleo Davis, Zoning Enforcement Officer
Troy Engstrom, Planning Intern
Ellen Evans, Planning Intern
Mathew Evans, Planner II
Roger Gonzalez, Zoning Enforcement Officer
Sonya Hatch, Office Specialist
Dixon Holmes, Zoning Administrator

Provo City Community Development (continued)

Janeen Jones, Executive Office Assistant
Vern Keeslar, Long Range Planner
Scott Knutti, GIS Coordinator
Marco Lopez, Zoning Enforcement Officer
Anthony Molloy, Zoning Enforcement Officer
Tricia Rawstern, GIS Intern
Kaye Snipes, Division Office Assistant
Reta Trimble, Ombudsman
Douglas Wright, Planning Intern

Provo City Departments

Community Development
Economic Development
Energy
Engineering
Finance
Fire
Information Systems
Library
Legal
Parks and Recreation
Personnel
Police
Public Services
Redevelopment
Water Resources

Provo City Task Force 2000

David Knecht, Chair
Bill Baranowski
Ray Beckham
Lewis Billings
Tim Brough
Craig Carlile
Doug Carlson
Bert Cherry
John Dester
Myla Dutton
Dave Freeman

Acknowledgments

(continued)

Provo City Task Force 2000 (continued)

Monty Groesbeck
John Hinckley
Dean Hughes
Nancy Hutchins
Stan Lockhart
Harry McKinley
Scott Norton
Bob Perry
Margarett Rasmussen
Debbie Smith
Pam Stowe
Bill Talbot
John Updike
John Wright

Outside Agencies

City of Orem
Mountainland Association of Governments
Springville City
Utah County

Table of Contents

Chapter	Element	Page
Chapter 1	Introduction	1
Chapter 2	Administration	16
Chapter 3	Population	21
Chapter 4	Housing	32
Chapter 5	Urban Design	44
Chapter 6	Urban Growth and Land Use	48
Chapter 7	Parks, Recreation, and Open Space	79
Chapter 8	Transportation and Circulation	86
Chapter 9	Environment	103
Chapter 10	Public Services and Facilities	110
Chapter 11	Rehabilitation, Redevelopment, and Conservation	123
Chapter 12	Economic	138
Chapter 13	Implementation	153

List of Tables

Table	Title	Page
3.1	Population by Year	21
3.2	Vital Statistics	22
3.3	Ethnic Diversity	23
3.4	Median and Mean Family Income	23
3.5	Average Family Income by Census Tract	24
3.6	Population Projection Methods and Results	28
3.7	Growth Comparison Table	29
3.8	Population by Area	29
3.9	Population Distribution by Age	30
3.10	Population Growth	30
3.11	Total Population and Students, 1975 and 1995	31
4.1	Land Use Breakdown by Residence Type	32
4.2	Policy Sections	33
4.3	Housing Stock Occupancy, 1980 and 1995	34
4.4	Average Rental Price For Housing	38
4.5	Growth Rates For Residential General Plan Designations	38
4.6	Residential Acreage Use by General Plan Designation	39
4.7	Income Requirements To Make Mortgage Payments	40
4.8	Moderate Income Housing Needs Projection	41

List of Tables

(continued)

Table	Title	Page
4.9	Survey of Provo City’s Total Zoning	41
5.1	Proposed Design Corridors	46
6.1	Existing Land Use	51
6.2	Vacant Land	52
6.3	Potentially Developable Land	53
6.4	Land Use Consumption by Housing Type for year 2015 Population (2%)	54
6.5	Land Use Consumption by Housing Type for year 2015 Population (2.7%) ...	54
6.6	Land Use Consumption by Housing Type for year 2015 Population (3%)	54
6.7	General Plan Land Use Designations	56
7.1	NRPA Park Standards	80
7.2	Major Recreational Facilities	83
7.3	Proposed Regional Recreational Facilities	84
8.1	Transportation and Circulation Headings	86
8.2	Proposed Traffic Signal Locations	94
8.3	Recreational Paths	99
10.1	Proposed Fire Stations	112
11.1	Historic Survey	130
12.1	Analysis of Commercial Area Number One	142
12.2	Analysis of Commercial Area Number Two	142

List of Tables

(continued)

Table	Title	Page
12.3	Analysis of Commercial Area Number Three	143
12.4	Analysis of Commercial Area Number Four	143
12.5	Analysis of Commercial Area Number Five	144
12.6	Analysis of Commercial Area Number Six	145
12.7	Analysis of Commercial Area Number Seven A & B	145
12.8	Analysis of Commercial Area Number Eight	146
12.9	Analysis of Commercial Area Number Nine	147
12.10	Analysis of Commercial Area Number Ten	147
12.11	Analysis of Commercial Area Number Eleven	147
12.12	Analysis of Commercial Area Number Twelve	148
12.13	Analysis of Commercial Area Number Thirteen	148
12.14	Analysis of Commercial Area Number Fourteen	149
12.15	Provo's Labor Force by Occupation	150
12.16	Major Employers in the Provo Metropolitan Area	150
12.17	1995 Cost/Revenue Analysis	152
12.18	General Plan Cost/Revenue Analysis	152
12.19	Overall Projected 2020 Cost/Revenue Analysis	152

Chapter One

Introduction

Previous General Plans

Provo City adopted its first general plan in 1968, at the start of a period of anticipated growth. But the construction of a major destination shopping mall in the City of Orem and the placement of an enrollment ceiling at Brigham Young University suppressed the predicted growth. These factors contributed to the decline of Provo's status as the business and retail center of Utah County and made it necessary to reassess the city's future. Efforts to update the 1968 general plan started in 1973. In 1977, a general plan which established policies for growth and development through the year 2000 was adopted.

The 1977 general plan set forth "pro-growth" strategies. The plan's primary objectives were economic development and an increased tax base. City leaders sought to increase the retail base, establish new industrial centers, and revitalize older neighborhoods through high density redevelopment. Some R1 (One-Family Residential) neighborhoods were re-zoned and designated in the general plan as Very High Density Residential (VHDR). Commercial zones were expanded into single family residential areas. Such zoning occurred because it was believed that land zoned for high intensity uses would be redeveloped, bringing needed tax dollars. However, many up-zoned areas were poor locations for commercial or high density uses. At best, such policies were "broad brush" and premature. At worst, they were guarantees for neighborhood decline.

In 1983, central city residents affected by high density zoning initiated grassroots efforts to protect their neighborhoods through down-zoning. Their efforts, dubbed the Neighborhood Conservation Program, resulted in much of the central city being down-zoned from R5 (Very High Multiple Residential) zones to R4 (High Multiple Residential) and R3 (Medium Multiple Residential) zones. Some R3 areas were down-zoned to the R2 (Two-Family Residential) zones. Down-zoning helped protect neighborhoods, but it was not enough.

Apartment developments already extended into single family neighborhoods. Even though densities had been lowered, zoning still permitted uses which were inconsistent with the original single family subdivisions. In the 1990s, largely through the work of several neighborhood planning task forces, residents decided zoning should reflect existing uses. Single family residential areas should be zoned single family residential. (Deteriorating areas with specific redevelopment plan proposals and plans for imminent development are an exception to this zoning concept.) While the general plan deals with future land uses and the timing of development, zoning is based on existing uses. This policy avoids creating nonconforming uses and protects existing neighborhoods.

The Need for a New General Plan

The basic elements of city planning - a comprehensive general plan, a comprehensive zoning ordinance, subdivision regulations, and a capital improvements plan - have existed in Provo for many years. However, the city's general plan has become outdated, even though portions of the plan have been amended since 1977.

Individual neighborhood master plans were prepared for some neighborhoods, but the plans were never integrated into an overall city plan. As printed copies of the neighborhood plans became scarce, it became difficult to provide city leaders and the public with written policies regarding development in these neighborhoods. In addition, a strong mayoral administration eliminated the long-range planning function from the Community Development Department, making it difficult to keep plans current. These factors, along with the erasure of the city's land use data base from computer tapes, set the city's planning efforts back nearly ten years.

Change has swept through Provo since 1977, particularly during the last decade. Unprecedented growth in high-tech industries created jobs, drawing people to Provo. Job growth, along with above average natural increase and increased enrollment at Brigham Young University and Utah Valley State College, has brought continued growth to the city over the last ten years. Growth has produced a variety of challenges such as increased traffic, air quality concerns, housing shortages, higher school enrollments (K-12), increased demand for services, and reduction in the amount of natural open space. City residents have noticed the consequences of growth and many fear the quality of life is declining.

In response to perceived changes in community character, grassroots efforts have called for change. Citizens called for the implementation of long-range planning to reevaluate the policies of the 1977 plan. In 1994, Mayor George Stewart initiated the process to rewrite the general plan. With the advice and consent of the Municipal Council, Mayor Stewart appointed a twenty-five-member citizen task force (Task Force 2000) to work with the Planning Commission and city staff in preparing a new general plan. Task Force members were charged with the responsibility of preparing a set of comprehensive policies for consideration and adoption by the Municipal Council.

What is a General Plan?

The term "general plan" describes a general, comprehensive, long-range statement of goals and related policies to guide future growth and development of a city. The term "general plan" is often used synonymously with "comprehensive plan" and "master plan," although the term "master plan" usually denotes a specific physical plan for one or a small group of parcels.

This plan is comprehensive because it seeks to coordinate all the interrelated systems of the city and all properties within the city. While it is primarily a plan to guide the physical development or non-development of the city, it deals indirectly with social and political issues. Thus, it is comprehensive on several levels.

This plan is general in that it does not precisely locate every church, institution, store, school, apartment building, or house in the city. The general plan acts as a guide, establishing policies and procedures for growth, development, conservation, and location of various land use activities. Policies are based on an analysis of the population being served, the physical conditions of the land, the adequacy of public facilities, and the compatibility of land use.

This plan is long-range, dealing with planning for the future and establishing policies for existing and future land uses. The plan cannot be fully implemented immediately, but is implemented in phases.

This plan emphasizes policies, not mapped, end-state solutions. Maps are used to show locations of land use activities, facilities, and physical characteristics, but emphasis is placed on policies for land use decision making. Policies provide consistency to maintain order and balance, and flexibility to meet unforeseen difficulties when applied with good, sound judgement. If a conflict occurs between the future land use map and adopted policies, written policies are the controlling factors in decision making. If ever the city or any of its residents decides an adopted policy is no longer in the community's interest, amendments to the general plan may be initiated according to procedures set forth in the Administration Element, and ultimately approved or denied by the Municipal Council, on recommendation of the Planning Commission.

The Contents of the General Plan

Utah State law requires general plans to include eight basic elements: Urban Growth and Land Use; Transportation and Circulation; Environment; Public Services and Facilities; Rehabilitation, Redevelopment, and Conservation; Economic; Moderate Income Housing; and Implementation. Other elements which the city deems appropriate to include in this general plan are: Administration; Population; Housing (including the Moderate Income Housing Plan); Parks, Recreation, and Open Space; and Urban Design. A separate chapter is devoted to each element, discussing current conditions and proposed changes, goals, policies, and action programs. The following sections provide brief descriptions of each element.

Administration Element

The general plan is a legal document. The general plan and future amendments thereto must be legally adopted. The Administration Element details procedures for amending the plan, including the frequency of amendment hearings, reviews, and updates.

Population Element

This element describes the population as enumerated in the latest census figures and explains how demographics affect the city. Population projections are given to provide information on the character and size of the population for which the city is planning. Population projections are the "demand side" for land, housing, business, industry, streets, utilities, parks, schools, and other needs of city residents. The "supply side" of the equation is presented in the other elements of the plan.

Housing Element

The Housing Element anticipates the type and quantity of housing needed by the projected resident population. It identifies the number of units in each price range of housing which must be provided to maintain affordable housing for the resident population. The Utah Legislature has mandated that each community's general plan contain an affordable housing component. A strategy to provide housing for moderate income families is outlined. Anticipated needs are carried over into the Urban Growth and Land Use Element (to set aside sufficient land for various types of housing), the Transportation and Circulation Element (to accommodate traffic demands), and the Public Services and Facilities Element (to provide adequate services).

Urban Design Element

The appearance of the built environment sends a message about the city's character. However subjective the message may be, the look and feel of a community affects people. If it is clean, interesting, visually stimulating, and orderly, people are comfortable moving in and around it. The design of the city can create a sense of community. Provo City has a fine, though sometimes neglected, architectural legacy. Preserving good design from the past and building new, quality traditions strengthens the community's image and gives it character and a sense of place. This element identifies projects, programs, and standards to enhance the appearance of the community.

Urban Growth and Land Use Element

Land use refers to the activity taking place on a given parcel of ground. It may be a business, school, farm, home, or vacant lot. The Urban Growth and Land Use Element outlines how land is to be used to ensure wise, efficient land use, and complementary relationships between differing land uses. Land use patterns should not be interpreted precisely, but as indications of predominant land usage in each generalized area. Specific parcel boundaries for land uses are guided by written policies in the plan and set forth on the zoning map. The Urban Growth and Land Use Element does not automatically change zoning classifications or permitted uses of the land; it merely establishes policy for future changes.

Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Element

Quality of life distinguishes "livable" communities from sterile, urban compounds. Passive and active recreational spaces are oases in an otherwise hurried, and often synthetic environment. Man-made recreational spaces designed for outdoor sports and activities, as well as natural scenic areas near mountains, canyons, rivers, lakes, trails, and parkways, contribute to the quality of life. The Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Element proposes the maintenance and improvement of the existing and proposed park system, improvement of organized activities in the recreation program, and protection of natural amenities in the community for the enjoyment of residents and visitors alike.

Transportation and Circulation Element

Ensuring the efficient movement of people and goods throughout the city is the goal of the Transportation and Circulation Element. Plans are laid for automobile, mass transit, pedestrian, and bicycle circulation. These plans create a powerful link between the Urban Growth and Land Use

Element and the Transportation and Circulation Element. Total segregation of land use activities--the land use pattern favored by most residents--creates the need to drive farther and more frequently, increasing congestion at an exponential rate. In developed areas of the city, transportation will not experience much change. However, in developing areas, where transportation routes are not set, emphasis will be placed on linking housing with shopping and places of employment, and increasing the safety of pedestrian and bicycle routes in neighborhoods and commercial districts.

Environment Element

This element addresses the protection, conservation, development, and use of natural resources, including air quality, forests, soils, rivers, wildlife, minerals, and other natural resources. Recommendations are made regarding the regulation of land use on hillsides, protection of water quality, including watersheds, wetlands, pollution control, flood hazard and control, and problems related to geological hazards, including rock fall, faults, earthquakes and liquefaction, land slides, and strata expansion.

Public Services and Facilities Element

The Public Services and Facilities Element addresses the need for maintenance and expansion of public facilities. Water must be provided; storm water must be drained away; sewage must be collected and treated; solid waste must be collected and disposed; schools must be built; communications systems must be built or expanded; power must be provided. This element compares existing facilities to the needs of the projected population and sets forth plans to upgrade facilities to meet future needs.

Rehabilitation, Redevelopment, and Conservation Element

This element includes a plan for historic preservation and proposes the establishment of historic districts within Provo City. Recommendations are made concerning the elimination of blight and the redevelopment, housing, business, industrial, and public building sites.

Economic Element

This element is composed of an economic development plan, including review of municipal revenue and expenditures, revenue sources, identification of base and residential, industry, primary and secondary market areas, employment, and retail sales activity. It includes a cost/revenue analysis of the implementation of this general plan.

Implementation Element

Implementation includes a discussion of specific actions necessary to carry out the general plan. It includes changes in zoning and subdivision ordinances, plans for capital improvements, design corridors, preservation and rehabilitation activities, etc. The Implementation Element ties the other elements together by presenting a comprehensive list of recommendations made in the general plan.

Comprehensive Plan Process and Design

The planning process involves determining reasons for existing problems, taking corrective actions to avoid or reduce such problems in the future, looking for opportunities, and devising means to take

advantage of opportunities in ways which promote the public good. Planning is a process, not an event. It is an ongoing process of evaluating what has been done and what is being done, and making appropriate changes to accomplish desired objectives according to the general plan.

During meetings with the Mayor and Municipal Council in October, 1994, basic general plan concepts were discussed. The Mayor and Council wanted the plan to be prepared by the city staff, not by outside consultants. The Task Force 2000 was the main component of citizen participation. The plan was to address growth management issues with an emphasis on policy statements. The assignment given by the Mayor and Council was based on the following concepts:

1. Policy statements should be used in the plan instead of the traditional “master plan” series of maps. Policy statements, which may apply to many situations, are more flexible than land use maps relating to site-specific situations.
2. Task Force members should be selected from existing organizations representing a wide range of interests. These interest groups should represent the key stakeholders in the city’s growth and development: neighborhood groups, educators, realtors, developers, builders, business, industry, environmental groups, etc. Existing organizations and interest groups have high levels of understanding and involvement with certain community issues and can express organized opinions. Interest groups can communicate with their members who, collectively, represent a cross-section of the community.
3. Alternative plan development should allow full expression of varying viewpoints and provide a means of arriving at a final plan by comparing alternatives. Creating alternative plans as an intermediate step toward the preparation of a final plan document can allow for different perspectives to be expressed and understood. The final plan should be a result of consensus building and some conflict resolution between interest groups. Alternative plans were evaluated by how well they fit within the values, goals, and objectives identified by the Task Force.
4. City departments should be represented in the plan development process. Departments should provide technical assistance and express opinions to help shape the plan. Interest group representatives and departmental representatives should communicate during the preparation process. Dialogue creates a feeling of ownership and identification with the plan, assuring greater understanding and implementation of the policies by city departments.
5. The Community Development Department staff should assume the roles of: (1) coordinators and facilitators of the planning process, (2) researchers and collectors of data and information needed by the program participants, (3) advocate planners for various interest groups in preparing alternative plans and the Task Force in its preparation of a final plan.

To carry out the comprehensive plan program, the Mayor and Municipal Council appointed the Provo Task Force 2000. Twenty-five representatives from all areas of the City and various community interest groups were represented in the Task Force. Members of the Task Force were

charged with the responsibility of preparing a set of comprehensive policies for consideration and adoption by the Municipal Council.

Building a Vision (Values, Goals, and Objectives)

The Provo Task Force 2000 members and the city staff held five area meetings in neighborhoods throughout the city. The Task Force gathered comments and information from citizens of Provo to determine residents' concerns about the future of Provo City. Following the area meetings, the Task Force and staff worked together to organize the public's concerns into a list of values, goals, and objectives of the community. These values, goals, and objectives were organized into workable elements of the general plan. The Task Force worked in subcommittees addressing public concerns and prioritizing values, goals, and objectives in order of importance. After a first draft by the Task Force, a series of community-wide meetings were held, one in each of the city's five area councils. A combination open house/hearing format was employed, allowing neighborhood participants to voice their sentiments regarding the values, goals, and objectives. Hundreds of citizens attended those meetings. Public comments recorded at the meetings were evaluated by the Task Force who reprioritized the values, goals, and objectives accordingly. Occasionally, priorities were shaped by city government's limitations to affect the values, goals, and objectives. Priorities outside the city's control were assigned a lower priority than those more directly controlled by the city.

Value Statements

Values, Goals, and Objectives

I. We Value Safety and Security for All Citizens, Within Our Homes and throughout Our Community

1.1 Goal: Create and Maintain Safe Neighborhoods

- 1.1.1 Objective: Bring public safety services closer to the neighborhoods
- 1.1.2 Objective: Promote zero tolerance of drug and alcohol abuse, gangs, gang activity, pornography, and gambling
- 1.1.3 Objective: Establish and strengthen neighborhood watch programs throughout the city
- 1.1.4 Objective: Develop neighborhood based emergency preparedness programs

1.2 Goal: Educate Residents about Local, State, and Federal Laws

- 1.2.1 Objective: Review and establish laws and ordinances for the protection of all residents
- 1.2.2 Objective: Provide public instruction about Provo City ordinances on a regular, on-going basis
- 1.2.3 Objective: Provide service opportunities for the public as a part of this education process

1.3 Goal: Promote Safety through Urban Design

- 1.3.1 Objective: Require maximum fire and life safety devices in multi-residential and commercial developments

- 1.3.2 Objective: Promote better pedestrian safety by using interior connections, footpaths, adequate lighting, crosswalks, etc.
- 1.3.3 Objective: Encourage design that focuses activity and surveillance in front yard space, and limits access by unwanted visitors (i.e., front porches, verandas, windows for surveillance, fences, gates, hedges, outdoor lighting, etc.)

II. We Value the Conservation and Protection of Existing Neighborhoods

2.1 Goal: Conserve and Protect the Physical Integrity of Neighborhoods

- 2.1.1 Objective: Encourage owner occupancy in single family neighborhoods
- 2.1.2 Objective: Encourage reinvestment in, beautification, and restoration of established neighborhoods
- 2.1.3 Objective: Maintain and upgrade neighborhood infrastructure
- 2.1.4 Objective: Revitalize blighted and dilapidated neighborhoods

2.2 Goal: Preserve Single Family Neighborhoods

2.3 Goal: Maintain Integrity and Preserve the Identifiable Personality of Neighborhoods

- 2.3.1 Objective: Encourage diversity of age groups in neighborhoods

2.4 Goal: Preserve Public Facilities, Parks, and Schools in Each Neighborhood

III. We Value Orderly Growth

3.1 Goal: Empower Neighborhoods

- 3.1.1 Objective: Continue emphasis on the Neighborhood Program
- 3.1.2 Objective: Involve neighborhood representatives to ensure orderly growth
- 3.1.3 Objective: Address specific concerns from each part of the city with regular area meetings

3.2 Goal: Establish Acceptable Service Levels for Public Infrastructure and Limit Growth to Maintain Those Levels

3.3 Goal: Develop High Quality Residential Neighborhoods

- 3.3.1 Objective: Encourage new single family detached neighborhoods
- 3.3.2 Objective: Identify and reserve areas suitable for family housing
- 3.3.3 Objective: Encourage new developments to create a sense of identity and belonging in their designs, fencing, entrances, landscaping, etc.
- 3.3.4 Objective: Identify criteria for properties with potential for multi-family and single family housing
- 3.3.5 Objective: Encourage gradual land use transitions

- 3.3.6 Objective: Promote safety through urban design
- 3.3.7 Objective: Make design standards for public and private roads similar
- 3.3.8 Objective: Design collector and arterial roads to support neighborhood residential streets
- 3.3.9 Objective: Require landscaping around perimeters of residential projects to soften development
- 3.3.10 Objective: Encourage site specific designs to take into account the uniqueness of the surroundings
- 3.3.11 Objective: Design the open space first in future residential development projects
- 3.3.12 Objective: Size utilities consistent with anticipated growth when development occurs
- 3.3.13 Objective: Continue to require developments to pay for their fair share of infrastructure
- 3.3.14 Objective: Regulate the scale of buildings by the land size of the parcel

3.4 Goal: Require High Quality Commercial Development

- 3.4.1 Objective: Encourage performance standards for commercial developments
- 3.4.2 Objective: Require landscaping around perimeters of commercial projects to soften development
- 3.4.3 Objective: Locate limited commercial and service facilities for the convenience of neighborhoods
- 3.4.4 Objective: Hide or soften commercial area parking by using berms and trees with perimeter and interior landscaping
- 3.4.5 Objective: Integrate signs within the architecture of a development and limit the size.
- 3.4.6 Objective: Design the open space first in future large-scale commercial development projects
- 3.4.7 Objective: Encourage site specific designs to take into account the uniqueness of the surroundings
- 3.4.8 Objective: Regulate the scale of commercial buildings by the land size of the project

3.5 Goal: Make Quality Housing and Services That are Accessible to All Segments of the Population

- 3.5.1 Objective: Encourage housing of diverse design in order to adequately accommodate all types of users (singles, young couples, families, and elderly)
- 3.5.2 Objective: Encourage maximum buildout in existing higher density areas (south of Brigham Young University and the Central Business District)

3.6 Goal: Disperse a Broad Range of Affordable Housing throughout the City

- 3.6.1 Objective: Encourage home ownership and preservation through neighborhood-based economic assistance programs

3.6.2 Objective: Encourage development patterns that reduce land and development costs

IV. We Value Convenient Access to All Parts of Our City with Well-Planned Streets and Neighborhoods

4.1 Goal: Provide an Efficient and Integrated Transportation System

4.1.1 Objective: Evaluate existing traffic and the current transportation system

4.1.2 Objective: Develop a Congestion Management Plan that will encourage flex-time, rideshare programs, alternative methods of parking, and discourage driving to work and school

4.1.3 Objective: Establish acceptable service levels for roads and intersections and limit growth to maintain those levels

4.1.4 Objective: Complete a collector and arterial road system (major streets plan) throughout the city

4.1.5 Objective: Improve east/west traffic flow

4.1.6 Objective: Control access on arterial streets

4.1.7 Objective: Prohibit on-street parking on major arterial and collector streets

4.2 Goal: Reduce Reliance on Automobiles by Encouraging Alternative Modes of Transportation

4.2.1 Objective: Expand and encourage rail, bus, bike, air, and other modes of transportation

4.2.2 Objective: Design streets to favor mass transit options

4.2.3 Objective: Secure future rights-of-way for all types of transportation systems

4.2.4 Objective: Improve pedestrian safety by evaluating pedestrian crossings, sidewalks, trails, and overpasses

V. We Value a Healthy, Livable Environment

5.1 Goal: Provide Clean Air and Water

5.1.1 Objective: Improve air quality through better monitoring of automotive emissions, fireplace and industrial pollution, and enforce standards not to exceed those set by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

5.1.2 Objective: Maintain and improve the quality of our water through constantly updating and modernizing our treatment plants and protecting our water supply

5.1.3 Objective: Conserve water through educating citizens about conservation

5.1.4 Objective: Acquire additional water resources

5.1.5 Objective: Evaluate runoff and drainage into the Provo River and Utah Lake to protect the quality of those water bodies

5.2 Goal: Require Clean Business and Industry

5.2.1 Objective: Develop a general plan that encourages non-polluting business and industry to locate in Provo.

5.2.2 Objective: Provide regulations and incentives to encourage established businesses to improve air quality

5.3 Goal: Enhance the City Park System

5.3.1 Objective: Evaluate the present park system plan as compared with other cities and states, including the quality, variety, location, and adequacy, and develop a revised general plan to provide adequate parks in the future

5.3.2 Objective: Develop a financial plan that would provide funds for the financing of an upgraded park system for the next century

5.4 Goal: Enhance Recreational Programs and Facilities

5.4.1 Objective: Develop a plan and financing for enlarged recreational facilities for youth, adults, and families for both summer and winter use

5.4.2 Objective: Develop a plan that would increase recreational programs for citizens of all ages

5.5 Goal: Preserve Natural Resources That All Can Enjoy

5.5.1 Objective: Implement the present plan for open space in association with parks, trails, canyons, Provo River, etc., including neighborhood parks close to residential areas

5.5.2 Objective: Develop a plan for optimizing the shores of Utah Lake as a Provo City asset, and purchase property bordering Utah Lake if necessary

5.6 Goal: Preserve or Replace Natural Vegetation and Habitats

5.6.1 Objective: Identify and evaluate the urban forest and habitat areas within the city, and develop policies and ordinances that would protect plant life, encourage planting, maintain a green belt, and preserve habitats for wildlife

VI. We Value Business Development

6.1 Goal: Develop Business Parks to Encourage New Business Growth and Job Formation

6.1.1 Objective: Build a major shopping mall in Provo

6.1.2 Objective: Develop business and industrial park areas near the airport

6.1.3 Objective: Clean up Ironton for future development

6.1.4 Objective: Plan for additional business parks to accommodate both small and large businesses

6.2 Goal: Promote the Central Business District

6.2.1 Objective: Improve public transportation and parking in the Central Business District

6.2.2 Objective: Create a vibrant mix of businesses, government, residential development, and cultural opportunities in the downtown area

6.2.3 Objective: Draw new cultural activities into the downtown area

6.3 Goal: Provide a “Business Friendly” Provo

6.3.1 Objective: Support Provo City Economic Development Department initiatives that aid local businesses and business development

6.3.2 Objective: Facilitate business interaction with city government

6.4 Goal: Support and Strengthen Existing Business Areas

6.4.1 Objective: Revitalize blighted and dilapidated commercial centers

VII. We Value a Caring Atmosphere for All Individuals and Families

7.1 Goal: Create an Atmosphere in Which People Care about Each Other

7.1.1 Objective: Consider the well-being of children as a number one priority

7.1.2 Objective: Promote understanding of our diverse cultures, traditions, beliefs, and heritage

7.1.3 Objective: Encourage community involvement by all ages, socioeconomic levels, geographic areas, and ethnic groups

7.1.4 Objective: Give recognition to caring people

7.2 Goal: Make Government more Accessible to Encourage Citizen Involvement

7.2.1 Objective: Improve communication between the citizens and city departments

7.2.2 Objective: Make the wording of ordinances and documents easier to understand

7.2.3 Objective: Include social, ethnic, and religious segments of the community on city boards, committees and commissions

7.2.4 Objective: Make better use of technology to communicate with the public

VIII. We Value a Beautiful and Well-Kept City

8.1 Goal: Establish Reasonable Community-Based Design Review Standards for All Development

8.1.1 Objective: Encourage quality design standards where desirable design themes are present

8.1.2 Objective: Discourage “cookie cutter” (overly repetitive) designs

8.1.3 Objective: Establish higher minimum landscaping and tree density requirements for all development

8.1.4 Objective: Establish open space requirements within developments

8.1.5 Objective: Encourage open space through appropriate clustering of developments

8.1.6 Objective: Encourage signage compatible with development

8.2 Goal: Establish and Maintain a Clean and Healthy Environment

8.2.1 Objective: Enhance ordinances, incentives, and penalties that would encourage the cleaning up of properties by removal of trash, junk, weeds, and the repair of deteriorating facilities

8.2.2 Objective: Continue and expand the present program of the regular cleaning of streets

8.2.3 Objective: Continue and enlarge the present programs of picking up seasonal trash through a community volunteer effort

8.3 Goal: Beautify Public Streets and Rights-of-Way

8.3.1 Objective: Define, identify, and beautify the major entrances to the community

8.3.2 Objective: Develop uniform street landscaping standards

8.3.3 Objective: Continue and enhance the street tree planting program

8.3.4 Objective: Continue the removal of billboards

8.4 Goal: Evaluate Open Spaces in the Community and Recommend Policies and Ordinances That Would Protect and Enlarge Green Belts and Open Space

8.4.1 Objective: Include preservation of vistas and views in open space requirements

8.5 Goal: Preserve Historic Landmarks

8.5.1 Objective: Encourage identification, marking, and restoration of historic landmarks

IX. We Value Quality Education for All Citizens

9.1 Goal: Support Quality Education

9.1.1 Objective: Cooperate with the Provo School District in planning for and anticipating growth

9.1.2 Objective: Continue and improve the partnership with Provo School District on community and school parks

9.1.3 Objective: Publicize community and school activities that enrich education (including colleges and universities)

9.2 Goal: Support the Arts

9.2.1 Objective: Provide an outstanding facility for performing and fine arts

9.3 Goal: Provide a Quality City Library

9.3.1 Objective: Enhance library facilities and library programs

Identifying Problems and Conflicts

Problems were qualified through citizen participation and quantified by research data. Inevitably, there are real problems, perceived problems, and occasional conflicting goals because of the interrelationships between them. Ideals began to be tempered by reality. Value statements represent a community wish list, a written description of conditions as we want them to be. When people identify problems in the community, it is usually because they perceive core values and goals are being threatened. Part of the purpose of the plan is to identify problems and find solutions. However, with many diverse interests in the city, sometimes there are competing interests. Consider the following two examples:

1. We want traffic congestion lessened, but we also want very low density neighborhoods with a complete segregation of residential and nonresidential land uses. The latter goal actually guarantees the former goal will not be met because it forces people to make more frequent and lengthier vehicle trips.
2. We want to conserve water in this arid climate, but we want large, landscaped yards to beautify development. The conflict here is obvious.

Judgments have to be made concerning the proper balance between competing interests. Limited financial resources force choices about which projects and initiatives can be funded. Priorities established in the comprehensive plan help city officials make fiscal decisions in their annual budgets and capital improvement programs.

Gathering Data (Community Profile)

City staff, consultants, and the U.S. Census Bureau gathered data on population, land use, housing, traffic and transportation, environmental constraints, public facilities and services, historic preservation, and public expenditures and revenues. Comprehensive land use and building condition surveys were conducted and entered into a land use database. Data were computerized and linked to a digital mapping system in the city's Geographic Information System (GIS). Meaningful descriptive statistics were organized from the data and, where possible, mapped to reflect and quantify existing trends, as well as the area and extent of problems and constraints. The GIS system facilitated the analysis of existing conditions and various plan alternatives.

The integrity of the general plan depends upon an objective and realistic analysis of data and statistics. Correct data interpretation is needed to provide an accurate picture of the city and an understanding of the causes of trends, patterns, problems, and opportunities. Data-based assumptions were made about the city's growth. Findings were made about the consequences of pursuing various courses of action. These assumptions and findings led to the recommendation of a "preferred plan" and its ultimate adoption by the Municipal Council.

Analyzing Causes and Effects

Solving urban problems is difficult, requiring great political will. However, having the will to make tough choices is only half of the equation. Integrity, courage, and an open mind are also required to evaluate the causes and effects of problems and their solutions. People often jump to conclusions

because they are misinformed, or because it is popular, and therefore, politically expedient. Unless the causes and effects of problems and solutions can be properly understood and community support generated to resolve them, we are treating symptoms, not curing problems. Therefore, it is imperative that findings are based on verifiable evidence or research data.

Formulating Potential Solutions and Drafting Alternative Plans

In this stage of the general plan process, solutions were formed which focused on changes needed to reach goals and objectives. Proposed solutions were based on data, community values, and priorities. At this point the process began to repeat itself, as the causes and effects of potential solutions were analyzed to make sure they were consistent with the data. These solutions, along with goals and objectives, were prioritized according to need and budget limitations.

Adopting the Plan

Working with the Task Force 2000 and neighborhood chairpersons, alternative plans were prepared. City departmental staffs reviewed the alternatives and made their own plans and recommendations to coordinate with land use proposals as well as the goals and policies of the Task Force. This process involved further refinements to the plan. Another series of community meetings were held throughout the city to present the draft recommendations to the public and to seek public comments. After further refinements to the plan, a draft was submitted to the Planning Commission in April, 1997. The Commission's recommendation was forwarded to the Council in May 1997. The Council held four public meetings and adopted the plan on August 26, 1997.

Chapter Two

Administration

A Legal Document

The Provo City General Plan, as approved by the Municipal Council, is a legal document. It contains legal parameters within which city planners, Planning Commissioners, citizens, and private developers can affect the future growth and development of the city.

This general plan was created with citizen participation. Thus, the plan reflects citizens' current values and desires for the future growth and development of Provo City. However, it may be unrealistic to believe the values and desires upon which this plan is based will remain totally unchanged for the duration of this general planning period. Thus, this plan allows for amendments as the values and desires of the community change.

Amendment Process

Proposed amendments will be heard on a bi-annual basis with a comprehensive update at least every five years. Hearings will be held once in April and once in October. Citizens, developers, land owners, and others who wish to amend the plan must file their proposals by December 31, for the April hearing, or June 30, for the October hearing. Proposals will be heard by the Planning Commission, who will recommend approval or denial to the Municipal Council. The Municipal Council will then hear proposed amendments, which they may approve or deny. Approved amendments become effective immediately. Exceptions to the bi-annual general plan amendment process may be granted by the Community Development Director when; (1) The amendment is initiated by Provo City, meaning the Mayor, a Municipal Council member, or city staff and not a private entity and (2) The amendment is of compelling public interest of city-wide or neighborhood wide significance, or designed to protect neighborhoods and (3) And the amendment was unforeseen.

Applicants proposing general plan amendments shall do the survey and analysis work necessary to justify the proposed change. To ensure the Planning Commission and Municipal Council have sufficient information to evaluate each request, the applicant shall submit the following:

For Map Amendments:

1. 8-1/2" x 11" map showing the area of proposed change
2. Current copy of County Assessor's Parcel Map
3. Mapped inventory of existing land uses within ½ mile of the proposed change
4. Correct property addresses of parcels included in the proposed general plan change
5. Written statement specifying the potential use of the property
6. Written statement explaining why the existing general plan designation is no longer appropriate or feasible

7. Analysis of potential impacts of the change on existing infrastructure and public services (traffic, streets, intersections, water and sewer, storm drains, electrical power, fire protection, garbage collection, etc.)

For Text Amendments:

1. Written statement with the desired language change
2. Written statement explaining why the existing general plan language is no longer appropriate or feasible
3. Analysis of the potential impacts of the change
4. Map showing affected areas if the text change will affect specific geographic areas

After all approved amendments have been added to the general plan for the year, the Long-Range Planning Division of the Community Development Department will conduct a year-end self-evaluation to determine how well the city is adhering to general plan guidelines. The self-evaluation will be submitted to the Planning Commission for review and future planning.

Notwithstanding the bi-annual general plan amendment process, applications for amendments to Specific Development Plans, as outlined in Chapter 6 - Land Use, may be made at any time. Otherwise, the process for amendment of these plans shall be the same as for other General Plan amendments.

Comprehensive Update

Every five years the general plan will undergo a comprehensive update, concurrent with the capital improvements budget. This update will include amendments added to the plan since the last comprehensive update.

Consistency of Zoning with General Plan

Before the Planning Commission recommends an amendment to the zoning ordinance or zoning map, it must be shown that the amendment is in the public interest and is consistent with the goals and policies of the Provo City General Plan. Recommendations made by the Planning Commission shall include findings with respect to the following:

1. Public purpose for the change in question
2. Confirmation that the public purpose is best served by the change in question
3. Compatibility of the proposed change with general plan policies, goals, and objectives
4. Consistency of proposed change with the general plan's "timing and sequencing" provisions on changes of use, insofar as they are articulated
5. Potential for hindrance or obstruction of attainment of the plan's articulated policies by the proposed change
6. Adverse impacts on adjacent land owners

7. Verification of correctness in the original zoning or general plan for the area in question

Planning and Zoning Hearings

Public hearings play a vital role in receiving input from citizens concerning the various proposals that are heard by the Planning Commission. The following procedures help ensure that citizens and other interested parties are informed and have an opportunity to be heard.

Notice

Adequate and timely notice of proceedings of the proposed decision-making or rule-making process should be made available to interested persons. All meetings shall be conducted in adherence to the Open and Public Meetings Act (Title 52, Chapter 4, Utah Code). All legislative and administrative hearings involving decisions on zoning amendments, subdivisions (over ten lots), conditional use permits, annexations, street and plat vacations, building relocations, project plan approvals (commercial projects over three acres in size and residential projects with twenty or more units) shall be noticed to the public in the following ways:

1. Legal notice placed in a newspaper of general circulation at least fourteen days in advance of the hearing
2. Notice of the meeting on Cable TV (Channel 42)
3. Mailed notice of meeting agenda to Neighborhood Chairperson
4. Neighborhood meeting held in advance of the public hearing for the purpose of educating the public about the proposal. The Neighborhood Chairperson conducts this meeting and the applicant presents plans to the public and answers questions. Meeting records are kept by the Neighborhood Chair and communicated to the Planning Commission. The Neighborhood Chair may provide additional notice beyond 500 feet.
5. Mailed notice shall be sent to all property owners of record as specified by the Provo City Zoning Ordinance.
6. Signs may be posted in the vicinity of the property to be developed by the Planning Commission staff.

Opportunity to be Heard

All persons interested in a prospective decision-making or rule-making process should be given an opportunity to be heard.

The Right of Cross Examination

When a hearing is regarded as adjudicative or quasi-judicial, all parties must be given the opportunity to question their opponents and opposing witnesses. Some courts have suggested a legislative hearing allow for cross-examination.

Disclosure

An opportunity to see, hear, and know all instruments, facts and evidence that are considered by the decision-making body must be provided. Any private communications to individual decision-makers (*ex-parte contracts*) must be made known at the hearing.

Findings of Fact

When an administrative decision is involved, the findings or reasons for the decision are an essential aspect of due process. Explicit and careful findings of fact enable all interested persons to know exactly what has been decided.

Conflicts of Interest and the Appearance of Conflict or Impropriety

When an individual decision-maker has a direct or indirect financial interest in the decision, or a close familial relationship with a participant, the decision could be infected with a potential bias. Such persons should be dismissed from participation in the discussion and decision.

Prompt Decisions

Adequate, timely notice, and a full, completely fair public hearing do not guarantee due process unless a decision is made promptly. The adage, “Justice delayed is justice denied” is appropriate here.

Records of Proceedings

Complete and accurate records of the proceedings must be kept. All exhibits must be preserved and a record must be kept of all testimony heard and all statements made.

Ground Rules for Fair Hearings

A decision-making body cannot conduct a hearing in an orderly and efficient manner unless it provides a set of rules which are available to all interested persons.

Legislative and Administrative Approvals

It shall be the policy of Provo City to separate the reviews of legislative decisions, such as; zoning amendments, general plan amendments, annexations, street plan amendments, and administrative development applications, such as; project plan approval, subdivision approval, conditional use permits, variances when such applications pertain to the same property. For example: if a property proposed to be subdivided also requires a re-zoning amendment, the zone change must be heard and decided by the Planning Commission and Municipal Council before the subdivision is reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission. In effect, this means that the subdivision application can not be heard until completion of the re-zoning hearing by the Municipal Council. In like manner, annexations shall be heard and approved prior to zoning and development approval requests, etc.

Implementation of this policy will help eliminate the co-mingling of general legislative actions, which by nature are more discretionary, and administrative site-specific project issues, which are held to more rigid requirements of due process, findings of fact, etc. Implementation of this policy will also clarify issues on appeal by not allowing administrative items to be decided before final

decisions are made on the related legislative issue. For example, if a final decision has not been made on a re-zoning, how can one appeal a decision on a conditional use permit on the same property. Without the zoning the applicant has no right to a conditional use permit. Granting a conditional use permit subject to getting the zoning only puts undue pressure on the governing body to approve the re-zoning.

Zoning Enforcement and Community Standards

Provo City is composed of agricultural, residential, public/institutional, commercial, and industrial land uses. Within the city, a variety of zoning designations allow land uses that are appropriate to and compatible with a particular zone. In any given zoning designation, some land uses are permitted, while others are conditional. Whether the owner or a renter uses the property, each enjoys certain property rights. However, the enjoyment of property rights is accompanied by a certain degree of responsibility. Property owners do not have the right to use land in any way which is contrary to the adopted zoning ordinance. The increasing diversity of people and land uses in the city assures conflicts or violations will arise, requiring the city to enforce adopted zoning ordinances.

The existence of land use laws infers enforcement of adopted laws. In Provo City, the intent of zoning enforcement is to seek compliance with established land use laws. The Provo City Zoning Ordinance is intended to regulate and restrict “for the purpose of promoting the health, safety, morals, promote the prosperity, convenience, and general welfare of the present and future inhabitants of Provo City.” Existing requirements are based on community standards of acceptability. Zoning enforcement should be based on maintaining and supporting community standards.

Therefore, zoning enforcement is not intended to harass, impugn, or otherwise punish, but is intended to seek compliance with community standards. Compliance should always be the first line of action. Then, in working to resolve the violation, if it becomes evident the individual or group is not willing to comply with community standards, the city will pursue compliance to the fullest extent the law will allow.

The bulk of zoning enforcement in Provo City results from complaints received from citizens and city departments. However, the city also enforces zoning ordinances as code enforcement officers become aware of violations.

Chapter Three

Population

Introduction

When the 1977 general plan was adopted, Provo’s population was 65,771. As of January 1, 1996, the population was 101,154. During the nineteen years since the last general plan was adopted, Provo’s population has grown by 54% (35,383 people) and the number of housing units has grown by 72% (11,456 units).

The average annual population growth rate from 1977 to 1990 was 2.99%. From 1990 to 1996, Provo City grew at an average annual rate of 2.7%, an increase of approximately 2,386 residents every year. Seventy-seven percent of growth can be explained by “natural increase.” Since 1990, the number of births in Provo City exceeded the number of deaths by approximately 2,129 annually. Net in-migration accounts for 23% of growth annually. Compared with the state and the nation, Provo has an unusually high percent of growth due to natural increase and a relatively lower percentage due to in-migration. (Statewide, net in-migration accounts for 40% of population growth.)

Based on net natural increase alone, Provo’s population would increase at a rate of 2.08% annually, or by approximately 1,837 people per year. If the city continues to grow at the current aggregate rate of 2.7%, it will reach the population milestones shown in Table 3.1.

Year	Population
2000	112,529
2005	128,563
2010	146,882
2015	167,811
2020	191,723

Demographics and Character of Provo

Provo City has a number of unique characteristics reflected in its demographic statistics. These characteristics result from age and gender cohorts, vital statistics, racial diversity, and income.

Age and Gender

In 1990, 25% of the city’s population (roughly 22,000 people) was under the age of eighteen and approximately 6.5% (5,648 people) was over the age of sixty-five. The population under eighteen years of age has remained fairly constant, but the percentage of elderly (over 65) in Provo City doubled between 1970 and 1990. The elderly population will continue to increase due to lower than average mortality rates and in-migration of retirees. Large numbers of school-aged children have obvious policy implications for Provo schools, parks and recreation, and the quantity and type of housing being provided. The growing elderly population suggests the need for elderly housing, nursing care, and retirement facilities.

The largest age and gender cohort in the city is males and females age twenty to twenty-four. The next largest cohorts are the fifteen to nineteen and twenty-four to twenty-nine age groups, respectively. The size of these age and gender cohorts is mainly due to the student population at BYU. These cohorts are significant, not only because they comprise 43% of Provo’s population, but because they contribute to the natural increase in population due to a higher than average fertility rate and a slightly higher than average marriage rate.

Vital Statistics

Table 3.2 compares Provo’s birth to death ratio to the county, state, and nation.

TABLE 3.2 VITAL STATISTICS			
Geographic Area	Births	Deaths	Birth/Death Ratio
Provo City*	26.2 per 1,000	3.3 per 1,000	7.9
Utah County**	25.3 per 1,000	4.1 per 1,000	6.2
State**	20.4 per 1,000	5.3 per 1,000	3.8
National***	16.3 per 1,000	9.6 per 1,000	1.7

*Source: Utah County Statistician **Source: U.S. Census Data ***Source: U.S. Census Bureau Homepage

Provo’s birth to death ratio is 27% higher than Utah County’s, 108% higher than the state’s, and 365% higher than the national average. This is likely due to Provo’s large student population, as the number of married students between ages twenty and thirty-four is nearly 10% higher than the national average. These statistics explain why 77% of Provo’s growth is due to natural increase as opposed to only 60% in average populations.

Racial Diversity

Table 3.3 presents a quick look at Provo’s racial diversity.

TABLE 3.3 ETHNIC DIVERSITY	
Caucasian	90.5 %
Hispanic	4.1 %
Asian / Islander	2.4 %
Afro American / other	2.0 %
Eskimo / Indian	1.0 %
Total	100 %

Data from 1990 U.S. Census

Provo City is very homogeneous racially. Only 9.5% of the population consists of racial minorities. This should suggest an even greater sensitivity to racial issues, because these population segments are under-represented and often lack the political and economic capital necessary to have a significant impact in the community. Every effort should be made to include minority populations in the workings of government and community involvement.

Income

The Median Family Income (MFI) of Provo City in 1990 was \$23,127. MFI is the level of income 50% of families are above and 50% are below. Approximately 17.4% of all families (2,888) earned incomes below the poverty level and approximately 30% of all persons (23,434) earned incomes below the poverty level. Table 3.4 compares the mean (average) and the median (middle) family incomes for the years 1970, 1980 and 1990. Median family income is considerably lower than the mean family income. These figures are undoubtedly skewed by the relatively large number of college students who earn very little while attending school, a condition that changes considerably after graduation.

TABLE 3.4 MEDIAN AND MEAN FAMILY INCOME		
Year	Median Family Income	Mean Family Income
1970	\$ 7,914	\$ 8,793
1980	\$ 13,340	\$ 18,141
1990	\$ 23,127	\$ 32,599

Data from U.S. Census, 1970, 1980, and 1990

Table 3.5 below displays the distribution of average family income according to census tracts (see Map # 3.1) which comprise the city. Predictably, the tracts south of the BYU campus (tracts 16 and 18) report the lowest incomes. Considerable growth in average family income has occurred over the last twenty years.

TABLE 3.5 AVERAGE FAMILY INCOME BY CENSUS TRACT			
Census Tract	Year		
	1970	1980	1990
14	10,902	16,974	33,210
1501	13,455	34,068	52,680
1502	--	32,647	50,406
16	5,304	7,561	29,902
17	14,384	26,798	35,977
18	7,437	9,958	18,757
19	6,086	11,376	16,912
20	7,001	13,813	21,494
21	9,509	22,481	47,894
22	7,946	18,761	29,776
23	7,834	14,486	18,626
24	4,950	10,768	20,523
25	6,880	12,967	19,596
26	--	--	--
27	9,161	19,875	27,995
28	7,495	11,516	20,056

Data from U.S. Census, 1970, 1980, and 1990

Demographic Summary

Based on the above statistics, Provo differs significantly from “average” U.S. cities with respect to age, gender, vital statistics, racial diversity, and income. Provo’s unique characteristics have implications for policies and programs regarding land use, housing, recreation, services to the elderly, etc., all of which are treated in more detail in respective elements of the general plan. Anticipating population growth and trends is essential to any long-range planning effort. Just as a business conducts market research on the wants, needs, and preferences of its client base, communities must know the size and composition of their resident population. The following section examines various population projection methods and includes projections for Provo according to each method. A combination of these estimates will be used to project future land use needs, including the size, location, and quantity of municipal services and facilities.

Population Projection Methods

The accuracy of population projection methods depends upon the accuracy of existing population figures and the sensibility of assumptions underlying the projection method. Methods used to calculate present population consist of outside projections and in-house projections. Outside projection methods are not clear and have been used primarily as a control standard for projections developed in-house. In-house projections include the Halley Cohort-Survival, arithmetic, historical growth, and building permit models.

Method 1: Halley Cohort-Survival Method (based on the Halley software model)

The Halley Cohort-Survival model breaks the population into discrete age groups (i.e., ages one through four years, ages five through nine years, etc.) and tracks the movement of the groups through a population pyramid. This model also tracks information on fertility, birth rate, death rate, and in- and out-migration. This method is generally considered one of the most accurate, but because information is compartmentalized into ten-year census cycles, the model projects medium to long range trends more accurately than short term trends.

Using Provo's statistics, the Halley Cohort-Survival Model estimates a growth rate of 2.377% and projects that the population in the year 2000 will be 113,756.

Errors in this projection are probably due to the university student population which represents the most fertile cohort. The model assumes the same proportion of college students are in the family creation mode as would be in normal model populations. For Provo, this number is likely higher than normal populations. Because the model uses a standard fertility rate based on average university populations, these projections are likely too low because of Provo's high fertility rate.

Method 2: Simple Arithmetic Method

Using this method, the population increase of the previous decade is added to the current census year estimate to produce the projection for the next census year estimate. For example:

$$1990 \text{ Population} + (1990 \text{ pop.} - 1980 \text{ pop.}) = 2000 \text{ Population}$$

This model estimates a growth rate of 1.72% and projects that the population in the year 2000 will be 99,562.

This method is the least accurate because it neglects fertility and death rates, economic conditions affecting growth, and exponential population growth. It clearly underestimates growth considering Provo's 1995 population was 101,154. Simple arithmetic projections are used for control purposes only.

Method 3: Historical Growth Method

This method assumes a fixed yearly rate of growth based on the historical growth rate. This rate is applied to current population figures. Projections can be made from one to N years into the future. By adding the variable N (number of years into future), a compounding effect allows the exponential

population growth factor to be considered in the projection. This model uses the historical growth rate of 2.7% and projects the population in the year 2000 will be 112,529.

$$\text{Future Population} = \text{Current Population} (1 + \text{Annual Growth Rate})^N$$

Method 4: Building Permit Methods

Three types of building permit statistics are used to project population growth in conjunction with the previously mentioned historical growth method:

1. Arbitrary occupancy density
2. Average occupancy density
3. Occupancy rate per census tract

All three of these occupancy statistics allow calculation of the current population. Growth rates are then derived from estimated increases in population for the year. Derived growth rates can be applied using the historical growth method to project future population figures.

Arbitrary Occupancy Density

To calculate the current population, the number of building permits is multiplied by the multi-family dwelling unit number of occupants based on U.S. Census data for Provo City to give a rough approximation of the in-migration for a specific period. For example:

1. Total residential building permits for 1990-1994 = 2,905
2. Multiply number of permits by 3.1 people (per unit occupancy rate)
 $2905 \times 3.1 = 9,006$ new residents 1990-1994
3. Add new residents (9,006) to 1990 population (per U.S. Census)
 $1990 \text{ population } (86,835) + \text{new residents } (9,006) = 1995 \text{ pop. } (95,841)$

The annual growth rate based on this calculation is 2.35%. This growth rate projects that population in the year 2000 will be 113,606.

Average Occupancy Density

To calculate the current population, the total population is divided by total housing units available inside city limits to yield an average density rate. The density is then multiplied by the number of building permits. For example:

1. $1990 \text{ pop. } (86,835) / 24,578 = 3.533$ density rate
2. 3.533×2905 building permits issued = 10,263 increase
3. $1990 \text{ pop. } (86,835) + \text{increase } (10,263) = 1995 \text{ pop. } (97,098)$

The annual growth rate based on this calculation is 2.64%. This growth rate projects that population in the year 2000 will be 115,225.

Occupancy Rate per Census Tract

To calculate population:

1. Add building permits per census tract
2. Divide the number of people in a census tract with the number of units in the tract
3. Multiply the number of building permits issued in a census tract by the occupancy rate for that tract
4. Add all census tract results together = 10,681
5. Multiply line 4 by 97% to account for a vacancy rate of 3% = 10,361
6. Add line five to 1990 population $86,835 + 10,361 = 97,196$
7. Subtract the corresponding number of residents displaced by demolition $97,196 - 604 = 96,592$

The annual growth rate based on these statistics is 2.51%. This growth rate projects that population in the year 2000 will be 114,497.

Building Permit Methods Summary

The building permit methods described above do not provide allowances for fertility rates. Since vacancy rates have remained low and stable, the above building permit methods represent only in-migration for Provo. Another one thousand to two thousand people could be added to the population figures derived using building permit methods to make the figures truly accurate. Adding people to the figures would change the derived growth rate and, therefore, future projections.

Method 7: Outside Projections

The Utah Governor's Office and the Utah State Data Center have released population projections for Utah cities.

The Governor's Office assumes an annual growth rate of 2.09% and projects the population in the year 2000 will be 114,514. The assumed growth rate is .61% below Provo's historical growth rate and much lower than the 1990-1995 growth rate.

The Utah State Data Center assumes an average annual growth rate of 2.47% and projects the 2000 population will be 114,274. This is .23% lower than Provo's historical growth rate. Projections were based on the 1992 U.S. Census Bureau Release.

Summary of Methods

Table 3.6 presents a summary of growth rates derived from the above methods and the resulting population projections through the year 2020.

TABLE 3.6 POPULATION PROJECTION METHODS AND RESULTS						
Methods	Growth Rate	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020
Halley Cohort	2.377%	113,756	127,929	143,868	161,794	181,955
Arithmetic	1.720%	99,562	105,929	112,294	118,659	125,024
Historical	2.700%	112,529	128,563	146,882	167,811	191,722
Average Occupancy	2.640%	115,225	131,254	149,513	170,314	194,009
Census Tract Occupancy	2.510%	114,497	129,601	146,698	166,051	187,958
Governors Office 1994*	2.090%	114,514	126,986	140,817	156,156	173,165
Utah State**	2.470%	114,274	129,096	145,841	164,760	186,132
Total Averages	2.358%	112,051	125,623	140,845	157,935	177,137

Based upon January 1, 1996 population of 101,154 Arbitrary Occupancy Projection omitted * State of Utah Population Projections for Cities 1994 Demographic and Economic Analysis Governor's Office of Planning and Budget December, 1994 ** 1992 Population Estimates for Utah's Cities Utah Data Guide Utah State Data Center April 1994

Population and Land Use

Population growth is influenced in part by land use policies which affect the amount of land set aside for residential growth and development densities. In addition to the methods shown above, population estimates may be determined by evaluating the amount and type of residential growth allowed under current or proposed policies. Based on the land use policies set forth in the Urban Growth and Land Use Element (Chapter Six), Provo City's population in the year 2015 could range from 159,167 people to 195,126 people. The lower figure represents the most reasonable estimate, given proposed policies and attitudes toward growth. The higher figure represents the maximum population based upon maximum densities and complete build-out, or an annual growth rate of about 4.65%. During the last six years the city has grown at 2.7% per year.

The growth which Provo City has experienced is similar to cities of comparable size in the intermountain west. Table 3.7 compares Provo's 2.7% annual growth rate and the 1995 population with other cities in Utah and neighboring states. Provo is growing at a steady rate, but its growth is average for cities of the same size in this region of the United States.

TABLE 3.7 GROWTH COMPARISON TABLE			
Municipality	1990 Population*	Annual Growth Rate Since 1990*	Estimated 1995 Population**
Billings, Montana	89,027	1.68%	101,451
Boulder, Colorado	83,312	2.81%	95,665
<i>Provo, Utah</i>	86,835	2.70%	<i>101,154</i>
Sandy, Utah	75,058	3.22%	98,966
West Valley, Utah	87,343	2.33%	97,634

*Source: US Census Bureau or Municipality **Source: Obtained from Municipality

Table 3.8 gives the population breakdown for each of the five areas of the city. The Central Area, where most university students live, makes up the largest share of the population, followed by the East Area, which also houses a large number of students.

TABLE 3.8 POPULATION BY AREA	
Area	Population (%)
Central	35,839 (35.4 %)
East	25,376 (25.1 %)
West	17,110 (16.9 %)
South	13,925 (13.8 %)
North	8,904 (8.8 %)
Total	101,154 (100 %)

Data from Provo City's 1995 Land Use Statistical Data

Table 3.9 shows the population distribution for Provo City based on various age cohorts. There is a large increase in percentage of population in the cohorts aged fifteen to twenty-nine. This is largely due to the local university, which has over 30,000 students enrolled, most of which are between the ages of eighteen and twenty-six.

TABLE 3.9 POPULATION DISTRIBUTION BY AGE		
Age Group	Male (%)	Female (%)
Under 5 years	4.79	4.50
5 - 9 years	3.32	3.13
10 -14 years	3.20	3.01
15 - 19 years	6.06	8.38
20 - 24 years	11.96	13.66
25 - 34 years	9.65	7.47
35 - 44 years	3.08	3.13
45 - 54 years	1.98	2.27
55 - 64 years	1.76	2.06
65 - 74 years	1.55	2.03
75 - 84 years	0.91	1.34
85+ years	0.23	0.42

Data from 1990 U.S. Census

Table 3.10 projects the population growth for Provo City for the next twenty-five years, until the fruition of this general plan. This growth rate is based on the historical 2.7% per annum growth experienced over the last twenty years. If this growth rate were to be constant until 2020, Provo's population would exceed 190,000.

TABLE 3.10 POPULATION GROWTH	
Year	Population
1960	36,047
1970	53,131
1980	68,915
1990	86,835
1995	99,570
2000	112,529

TABLE 3.10 POPULATION GROWTH	
Year	Population
2005	128,563
2010	146,882
2015	167,811
2020	191,722

Estimates made using Historical Growth rate of 2.7 % per annum

Table 3.11 shows the proportion of the city's total population composed of BYU students. In 1975, BYU students composed 33.7% of the total population. As the city has grown rapidly over the last twenty years, the percentage of the total population consisting of BYU students has dropped to 27.6%, and will continue to decrease in the future. The implication of this decrease in proportion is that the city is becoming less dependent upon college students to spur the economy.

TABLE 3.11 TOTAL POPULATION AND STUDENTS, 1975 AND 1995		
Year	Students (%)	Non-students (%)
1975	21,435 (33.7%)	42,240 (66.3 %)
1995	27,874 (27.6 %)	73,280 (72.4 %)

Data from Provo City, BYU, and UVSC

Chapter Four

Housing

Introduction

The term housing is defined as a dwelling in which people live. In analyzing and projecting future housing needs for Provo City, it is well to keep an obvious but frequently forgotten fact in mind: every family or individual needs a place to live. In Provo, housing is an especially important concern because of low vacancy rates, rising housing costs, varying densities, and a growing population. All of these factors make it difficult to provide sufficient, affordable housing.

The number of housing units must increase with the population. Housing quality should be adequate to support the health, safety, and welfare of the public. Provo City's primary housing goal is to provide safe and adequate housing for all residents.

Current Housing Stock

While the majority of land which is zoned residential is used for single family dwelling, the majority of housing units in Provo are multi-family. Current land use, broken down by dwelling type, can be seen in Table 4.1. Single family dwellings currently make up the largest portion of the land use at 41.2%, followed by apartment low rises at 21.2%, and apartment high rises at 13.2%. However, if the residential land uses are totaled, multi-family consists of 56.4%, single family 41.2%, and other 2.4%.

TABLE 4.1 LAND USE BREAKDOWN BY RESIDENCE TYPE	
One-Family	41.2 %
Apartment - Low Rise	21.2 %
Apartment - High Rise	13.2 %
Two-Family	11.8 %
Multi-Family	6.4 %
University	3.8 %
Mobile Home	2.3 %
Other	0.1 %

Data from 1995 Provo City SLUC Data Base

Evaluation of Housing Needs

Housing costs in Provo are increasing due to population growth and the finite amount of developable land. The already high housing costs in Provo will continue to increase due to scarcity. Land use policies and regulations will limit the population to between 159,167 and 195,126 people. Without special provisions, many residents may no longer be able to afford to live in Provo. It is likely that residents may be displaced because of their inability to afford housing.

Policies

The following two sections address policies to encourage neighborhood preservation and affordable housing. A special recommendation is made to meet the housing needs of the elderly. Policy sections are outlined in Table 4.2.

TABLE 4.2 POLICY SECTIONS	
Neighborhood Preservation	Affordable Housing
1. Residential Buffers	1. Accessory Apartments
2. Historic Preservation	2. Manufactured Homes
3. Down-zoning	3. Cluster Development Patterns
4. Owner Occupancy	4. Elderly, Disabled, and Special Housing

Neighborhood Preservation

Neighborhood preservation will be implemented through four primary policies: residential buffers, historic preservation, down-zoning, and owner occupancy.

Residential Buffers

Residential buffers help preserve neighborhoods and encourage diverse housing design to accommodate various housing needs. Residential buffers could include churches, parks, and higher density uses, such as apartments, condominiums, and townhouses which smooth the transition between non-residential areas and low density residential areas. Buffers in appropriate undeveloped areas would preserve the privacy of nearby low density residential areas. Since higher density dwellings are typically inhabited by students or young families, buffers would also serve diverse housing needs. In addition, such developments would contribute to the affordable housing stock in the city.

Historic Preservation

A number of National Historic Register Districts have been proposed in Provo. If such districts are approved, the incentives associated with the districts would greatly contribute to neighborhood preservation. Historic Register property owners would be eligible for tax credits, grants, and low-interest loans for the improvement or rehabilitation of their properties. (For a detailed discussion

of historic preservation, please refer to the Rehabilitation, Redevelopment, and Conservation Element (Chapter Eleven).

Down-zoning

The 1977 general plan permitted higher densities in neighborhoods comprised mainly of single family residences. Up-zoning allowed for the creation of duplexes, the demolition of historic buildings, and the construction of multi-family units. Consequently, neighborhood integrity has been threatened. The appearance of many neighborhoods has degenerated due to the conglomeration of multiple housing styles. To prevent further degradation and to promote neighborhood preservation, select areas in the central city will be proposed for down-zoning. As a result, historical buildings will be more likely to remain intact, single family detached neighborhoods will remain, and apartments and condominiums will be built in areas more suitable to their density, such as in areas where residential buffers are appropriate.

Owner Occupancy

Owner occupancy is encouraged. In general, owner-occupied properties are better maintained than rental properties. In neighborhoods with high percentages of owner-occupied homes, there tends to be a higher level of commitment to the community. Owner occupancy will be encouraged mainly through the implementation of R1.6A (One-Family Residential, Accessory Apartment Overlay) zones as discussed in the next section, “Affordable Housing.”

Affordable Housing

Affordable housing will be encouraged by using accessory apartments, manufactured homes, cluster development patterns, and providing housing for the elderly, disabled, and other special groups.

Accessory Apartments

Approximately 80% of Provo’s households cannot qualify to buy an average-priced home in Provo because their monthly incomes are inadequate to qualify for a mortgage. Allowing accessory apartments will enable more families to purchase homes because the rental income gained from an accessory apartment will contribute to their monthly income figures. Accessory apartments benefit home buyers and tenants by adding to the available low and moderate income housing stock. In Provo, owner occupancy has declined over the last fifteen years. In Table 4.3, the percentage of owner-occupied housing stock has fallen nearly 3%--from 40.9% in 1980 to 35% in 1995.

TABLE 4.3 HOUSING STOCK OCCUPANCY, 1980 AND 1995		
Year	Owner	Renter
1980	40.9 %	59.1 %
1995	35.0 %	65.0 %

Data from US Census Bureau and staff projections

Owner occupancy has declined due to the increase in rental housing market. Since most families in Provo cannot afford to purchase a home, they must rent. As rental demand grows, rental rates increase. Increased rental rates encourage property owners to profit from renting their housing unit. Homeowners then purchase a new home elsewhere inside or outside the community. Although the number of housing units in Provo has increased, the percentage of owner-occupied housing has declined.

The percentage of renter-occupied housing in Provo is comparable to that of other college towns in the United States. In 1990, Provo's 60% renter occupancy rate was only 4% higher than the average renter occupancy rate of college towns surveyed by Texas A&M University and the College Station, Texas, Community Enhancement Program. The twenty-three towns surveyed reported an average renter occupancy of almost 56%, 20% higher than the national average of 36% for all communities.

Owner occupancy is encouraged because it contributes to preserving neighborhood integrity. It will be encouraged mainly through the implementation of R1.6A (One-Family Residential, Accessory Apartment Overlay) zones which allow accessory apartments on the condition of owner occupancy in either unit. This policy will contribute to the number of housing units, but will do so in a way that will not be detrimental to existing neighborhoods.

Manufactured Homes

Manufactured homes are factory-built, single family dwellings which are built on a permanent chassis. They are designed to be used as a dwelling with or without a permanent foundation when connected to the required utilities, and include plumbing, heating, air conditioning, and electrical systems. Provo City considers manufactured homes to be single family dwellings.

Since manufactured homes are less expensive than site-built single family homes, they are encouraged as an affordable housing option. They may be placed on any lot within a zone where single family units are permitted. At present, manufactured home placement is subject to the Community Development Director's approval. This approval process should be changed from the Community Development Director to the approval of the Design Review Committee. This change will help ensure the compatibility and harmony of manufactured homes with existing structures in the vicinity.

Cluster Development Patterns

To reduce the costs of single family homes, land needs to be developed economically. One way to develop land economically is through efficiency. Clustering housing on smaller lots with common driveways is one way to accomplish this. The linear feet of roads, asphalt, concrete, water lines, and sewer lines are reduced, thereby lowering development costs. Innovative patterns need to become the norm, not the exception. Ordinances regulating land development need to make such innovations as simple and low risk as possible. Land consumption patterns with high improvement costs must be made more difficult to approve.

Elderly Housing

Elderly housing is considered to be housing units that can be afforded by older or retired persons living on fixed incomes. The number of elderly housing units currently available in Provo does not satisfy demand. Rising housing costs cause the elderly's fixed incomes to become more and more inadequate for their housing needs. Federally subsidized housing is in great demand. The Provo Housing Authority currently manages 110 housing units for the elderly. Those permitted to inhabit the units must have an income below 50% of the median household income range (50% of \$38,095). The rent paid by each tenant is based on a percentage of their fixed monthly income after adjusting for monthly medical costs--a sum not to exceed 30%. Monthly rent is around \$150. The Provo Housing Authority reports that subsidies usually account for 1/4 to 1/3 of total operating expenses for elderly housing. They also report that their waiting list is always filled, and demand continues to rise. If funds could be obtained, the Provo Housing Authority insists that they would not hesitate to construct another low cost housing development for the elderly.

Steps should be taken to build and develop at least fifty additional low cost housing units for the elderly. Incentives and tax breaks could be given to developers to encourage them to build low cost housing. Another alternative would be to establish a committee to create a non-profit organization that would accumulate funds for the construction of new low cost housing developments. As more elderly housing becomes available and inhabited by qualifying elderly persons, private housing units currently occupied by the elderly will be vacated, increasing the housing stock available for the growing demand of single family residences.

Disabled Housing

Housing for disabled adults is needed in Provo City. Many disabled adults live below the poverty line, making it difficult for them to rent an apartment on their own. Many live with aging parents or with roommates. Disabled individuals need roommates to be able to pay their rent, but they often cope better with the realities of life if they live alone. As clusters of disabled housing defeat the process of integrating the disabled into the community, such housing should be scattered throughout the city. The location of disabled housing is important. It needs to be located near bus routes and support services and agencies. To help disabled persons obtain quality, affordable housing, Provo City should seek funds which are available for housing disabled persons from the federal government, state government, and private agencies. To encourage the construction of low-cost housing for the disabled, incentives and tax breaks could be given to developers.

Housing for Special Groups

As housing needs arise for special groups, the city should evaluate the need to house these populations with public funds. Such housing should be spread throughout the city, as to mitigate any negative functions of public housing. Provo City should seek any funds which are available for public housing for special groups from federal and state governments and private agencies.

Moderate Income Housing Plan

The Utah State Code requires each municipality to adopt a plan for moderate income housing as part of the general plan. The Moderate Income Housing Plan must contain the following:

1. An estimate of the existing supply of moderate income housing located within the municipality
2. An estimate of the need for moderate income housing in the municipality for the next five years as revised annually
3. A survey of total residential zoning
4. An evaluation of how existing zoning densities affect opportunities for moderate income housing
5. A description of the municipality's program to encourage an adequate supply of moderate income housing

The following Moderate Income Housing Plan will contain a definition of "moderate income housing," evaluate the current need for moderate income housing, examine each of the five points above, and discuss policies and techniques designed to meet the estimated needs touched upon in the five points above.

Definition of Moderate Income Housing

As defined in the Utah State Code, "moderate income housing," is "housing occupied or reserved for occupancy by households with a gross household income equal to or less than 80% of the median gross income of the metropolitan statistical area for households of the same size."

The metropolitan statistical area for Provo City is the Provo/Orem Metropolitan Statistical Area. However, Orem's median income is significantly higher than Provo's median income due to the large population of students in Provo who, in general, earn less than non-students. As a result, when using the Provo-Orem Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA), the percent of the population falling in the moderate income housing category is somewhat skewed.

Existing Supply of Moderate Income Housing

Few affordable housing units are available for purchase by moderate income families. As defined above, 83.4% of the population cannot afford to purchase housing. Therefore, rental housing is the main alternative.

As the population increases, so will the demand for, and ultimately the cost of housing in Provo. Housing costs will continue to increase as the city comes closer and closer to buildout capacity. In order to accommodate moderate income families and their housing needs, the amount of housing units in higher density areas of the city which are not proposed for neighborhood conservation down-zoning, must be maintained and built at or near the capacity permitted by the Provo City Zoning Ordinance.

Table 4.4 gives a breakdown of current rental prices in Provo. A family not wanting to pay more than 30% of their monthly income for housing would need to have a combined monthly income of at least \$1650 after taxes to be able to rent a two-bedroom apartment in Provo--or \$2400 a month for a home.

TABLE 4.4 AVERAGE RENTAL PRICE FOR HOUSING	
Type of Unit	Dollars per Month
Studio	450
Two bedroom (apartment)	550
Two bedroom (duplex)	600
Two bedroom (condo)	700
Single home	800
Single home (luxury)	1400

Data from HUD and survey of Provo realtors

Over the past twenty years, considerable residential growth has occurred in the High Density Residential (HDR) and Very High Density Residential (VHDR) areas which consist primarily of high and low rise apartment complexes for students and young families. As maximum buildout approaches in those areas, it is expected that the highest growth rates will change from HDR areas to the Low Density Residential (LDR) and Very Low Density Residential (VLDR) areas. A comparison of growth rates for the previous and forthcoming twenty to twenty-five year periods can be seen in Table 4.5.

TABLE 4.5 GROWTH RATES FOR RESIDENTIAL GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATIONS				
Growth Period	General Plan Designations			
	VLDR	LDR1/LDR2	MDR	HDR/VHDR
1975-1995	30%	82%	176%	253%
1995-2020	29%	58%	19%	1%

1995 - 2020 growth projected by adding buildable land to current use

The general plan designation for manufactured home residences is LDR2. The number of manufactured home residences in the LDR2 acreage is not expected to increase or decrease with the implementation of the proposed general plan. The underlying reason for the drastic change in growth rates can be attributed to the amount of undeveloped land available in each general plan designation.

Table 4.6 shows the total acreage used in each density area for the years 1975, 1995, and 2020, with maximum buildout achieved in the year 2020.

TABLE 4.6 RESIDENTIAL ACREAGE USE BY GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION				
Year	VLDR	LDR1/LDR2	MDR	HDR/VHDR
1975	3,046	267	53	124
1995	3,965	415	146	437
2020*	5,110	616	174	440

*2020 data are from adding buildable acreage to current use

The total acreage available for High Density Residential (HDR) and Very High Density Residential (VHDR) developments is less than five acres for the next twenty-five years. In contrast, 1,100 acres are available for Very Low Density Residential (VLDR) before maximum buildout is reached around the year 2020. Limited acreage will lead to an increase in the cost of residential units in the HDR and VHDR areas.

Current Need for Moderate Income Housing

Two categories of need exist for moderate income families which merit discussion: the need of families who want to purchase housing and the need of families who want to rent housing. Following the sections describing the types of need, there will be a section projecting the quantity and the types of housing which will be needed over the next five years.

Purchasing Housing

Much of Provo's population cannot afford to purchase an average-priced home. Approximately 77% of Provo households filing tax returns in 1995 claimed incomes equal to or less than the Median Family Income (MFI) of \$40,100 (December 1995 Provo/Orem Metropolitan Statistical Area). According to the Utah County Board of Realtors, the average price of a house sold in Utah County in 1995 was \$132,600. To qualify for a mortgage on an average-priced home in Provo, with 5% down at 8% interest, a family would have to make \$43,200 annually. Nearly 80% of Provo City households could not qualify for an average-priced home today.

One may argue that not all families need to live in an average home. Some must live below the average. However, even the 1995 average condominium and townhouse price was \$99,600. Using the scenario of 5% down at 8% interest, a family would have to have a combined annual income of at least \$36,300.

Annual income requirements for either a single family dwelling, condominium, or townhouse purchase depend on a set of varying factors. These factors include: current interest rate, current monthly debt (not including the home mortgage under consideration), initial down payment, bank fees, and other closing costs. To show how the needed minimum annual combined salary varies, Zion's Bank has supplied information for obtaining home loans for a 5% down payment at 8% interest. Table 4.7 summarizes the findings.

TABLE 4.7 INCOME REQUIREMENTS TO MAKE MORTGAGE PAYMENTS					
Type of dwelling	Average Price of home sold during the 1996-1997 fiscal year	Monthly Payment based upon an 8% interest rate with 5% down	Monthly debt cannot exceed	Monthly minimum combined income	Yearly minimum combined income
Condominium or Townhouse	\$103,904	\$902	\$280	\$3,100	\$37,200
Single Family House	\$149,085	\$1,183	\$370	\$4,300	\$51,600

The middle line of Table 4.7 shows a minimum of \$37,200 yearly combined income to purchase an average condominium/townhouse with the down payment of at least 5%. The bottom line shows a minimum of \$51,600 yearly combined income to purchase an average house with the down payment of at least 5%. Nearly 80% of Provo households have incomes of less than \$38,095. Therefore, only a small percentage of the community is financially able to purchase an average condominium/townhouse or a single family dwelling.

Maintaining neighborhood integrity by encouraging single family detached dwellings is viewed as desirable, but low and moderate income families who cannot afford a single family dwelling must also be accommodated.

Renting Housing

Since most of the population in Provo cannot afford to purchase housing, the majority of residents rent. It must be considered, however, that 27.6% of the population is comprised of students, most of whom fall in the low to moderate income ranges. Student housing needs seem to be met. Most apartments, when rented to single students, rent for approximately \$200 per person--an amount easily affordable by the segment of the population within the aforementioned income brackets.

Currently 38.4% of the population is below the 80% of the MFI level making about \$21,423 annually. On the whole, moderate income individuals and families have their housing needs met as far as renting is concerned, but in terms of home ownership, the current home-buying market is not accessible to the majority of Provo’s current moderate income population. If those families or individuals want to purchase a dwelling unit, they will need to look elsewhere or take advantage of special housing placement programs.

Five Year Moderate Income Housing Need Projection

In order to project housing needs for the next five years, the anticipated population must be considered. The number of housing units necessary to accommodate the population are derived by dividing the population by 3.32 (the average number of occupants per housing unit). The results of these two projections are shown in Table 4.8.

TABLE 4.8 MODERATE INCOME HOUSING NEEDS PROJECTION		
Year	Population	Housing Units
1996	101,154	30,468
1997	103,885	31,291
1998	106,690	32,136
1999	109,570	33,003
2000	112,529	33,894

The current housing supply inhabited by renters comprises approximately 62% (U.S. Census plus staff projections). For the year 2000, 21,014 of the total housing units in Provo (total projected units times 62%) will need to be dedicated to moderate income housing. To meet the moderate income housing needs and to provide the additional 3,991 units needed, the following buildout will need to occur. Proposed land use designations in this general plan will accommodate 868 units if Medium Density Residential (MDR), High Density Residential (HDR), and Very High Density Residential (VHDR) areas are built to capacity for housing (based on staff analysis of developable acreage). The remaining 3,123 units will need to be accommodated by building in the Low Density Residential (LDR) and Very Low Density Residential (VLDR) land use areas in underutilized agricultural areas and undeveloped subdivisions.

Survey of Total Zoning

Table 4.9 below lists Provo City’s current zones, including the number of acres and housing units for each zone. The emphasis should be placed on residential zones, but there are nonconforming housing units in nonresidential zones.

TABLE 4.9 SURVEY OF PROVO CITY’S TOTAL ZONING					
Zone	Acres	Units	Zone	Acres	Units
A1.1	435	146	R1.8PD	175.95	583
A1.5	1816.63	156	R1.9	0	0
A1.10	348.78	11	R1.10	2101.02	4050
A1.20	1012.01	0	R1.10PD	45.41	37
A1.40	7768.19	1	R1.15	0	0
CA	10.46	1	R1.20	0	0

TABLE 4.9 SURVEY OF PROVO CITY'S TOTAL ZONING					
Zone	Acres	Units	Zone	Acres	Units
CBD	150.22	500	R2	573.26	3908
CG	239.42	686	R2PD	177.35	424
CH	18.56	0	R2.5	79.12	867
CM	204.14	222	R2.5PD	4.16	0
M1	271.64	63	R3	215.46	2510
M2	266.22	0	R3PD	30.77	309
MP	58	0	R4	184.16	3159
PC	53.98	0	R4PD	8.86	71
PF	5358.60	1142	R5	139.86	3393
PIC	648.29	1	RA	496.08	271
PO	70.48	78	RAPD	41.98	3
R1.6	174.03	874	RBP	140.97	5
R1.6PD	32.50	59	RM	107.38	767
R1.7	9.16	24	SC1	12.77	5
R1.8	1033.98	2552	SC2	96.64	5
R1.8A	10.67	54	SC3	108.93	0
R1.8S	140.62	519	SSC	4.17	0
			Total	24,875.88	27,456

Evaluation of Existing Zoning Densities

Current zoning allows moderate income housing to exist in Provo City. R5 (Very High Multiple Residential), R4 (High Multiple Residential), R3 (Medium Multiple Residential), and R2 (Two-Family Residential) zoning currently provides 14,429 moderate income housing units which is 52.6% of total housing units.

Program to Encourage Moderate Income Housing

Due to market demand and limited buildable acreage in areas designated for possible moderate income housing, affordable housing costs will continue to increase. Further, the high demand for housing in Provo (represented in its 2% vacancy rate*) creates an atmosphere in which developers

price new homes beyond the reach of moderate income families. A proposed zoning policy which would contribute to the moderate income housing pool is an “A” (Accessory Apartment Overlay) zone, which allows accessory apartments in owner-occupied, single family dwellings in the R1.6, R1.7, R1.8, R1.9, R1.10, R1.15, and R1.20 (One-Family Residential) zones. Provo City hopes the “A” Overlay zone will increase the moderate income housing supply by promoting home ownership and encouraging developers and property owners to construct and sell detached, single family, moderate income housing. A list of current housing programs can be obtained through the Provo City Redevelopment Department, Provo Housing Authority, and Neighborhood Housing Services.

*Source: Renter’s Association

Chapter Five

Urban Design

Purpose

The Urban Design Element identifies design standards for commercial and residential developments which should be implemented to enhance Provo City's appearance. Design standards must ensure public health, safety, and general welfare. Neighborhood conservation, maintenance of property values, and an improved city image are common purposes for design standards.

Design standards may regulate landscaping, signage, architecture, scale, setbacks, and the overall character of developments either city-wide or within specific design corridors. Standards can protect important views, vistas, and significant architectural and historic resources. They can lessen congestion in the streets, improve the overall quality of the built environment, and protect wild, natural beauty.

Architectural design influences the character and value of Provo neighborhoods and business districts. Preserving and enhancing character requires the existence of harmony and compatibility from one building to the next and throughout a particular neighborhood or district. Preserving and enhancing certain entryways to the city and areas of historical or architectural significance furthers the economic and cultural well-being of the city. However, balance needs to exist between aesthetically pleasing design and burdensome regulations.

Background

To facilitate urban design in Provo City, a Design Review Committee was established. The committee consists of professionals in various fields of design, architecture, and planning. They address general design relationships and site planning principles that are applicable city-wide. District guidelines, based on existing design characteristics and needs observed in particular districts, are also addressed in design review.

Urban design principles are difficult to quantify because they are conceptual. Because of the nature of design, decisions of the Design Review Committee may seem more subjective than objective. Design review seeks to ensure compatibility of structures in districts. Harmony of design is sought to protect visual patterns of the community and to enhance visual relationships and transitions between older and newer buildings. This can be achieved by repeating building lines and surface treatment and by requiring a degree of uniformity of detail, scale, proportion, textures, materials, color, and building form.

Provo has not developed as a design-oriented community. While areas displaying strong design elements exist, Provo does not have thematic districts. Many buildings and developments have

improved the appearance of our surroundings. Jamestown, downtown Provo, and South University Avenue/East Bay are good examples of urban design.

The Jamestown office complex is an example of sound design concepts that could be emulated city-wide. The thematic exterior design enhances visual appeal. Building around existing vegetation adds to the uniqueness of the property. However, parking could have been located behind the buildings, rather than being exposed on University Avenue, or could have been screened better, hiding vehicles while providing a clear view of the buildings. The lack of signs along University Avenue also enhances the visual appeal.

Downtown Provo also uses design elements effectively. The historic tabernacle, county building, and the north side of the first blocks east and west of University Avenue on Center Street give a sense of the enduring past. Architectural styles are not necessarily the same, but craftsmanship and thoughtful design add interest to the downtown area. Landscaped medians on Center Street provide pedestrian friendly crosswalks. Tree-lined streets help compensate for the lack of greenery due to the absence of front setbacks. Benches encourage people to stop and leisurely enjoy the downtown atmosphere.

The southern entrance to Provo at the University Avenue and I-15 interchange displays effective urban design. On the east side of University Avenue is the commercial area of East Bay. Large buildings are set back a great distance from the street. Meandering sidewalks and landscaped berms along University Avenue add to the atmosphere. Landscaping is found in parking lots, although more could be added. Signs in this area are not overbearing. These elements add to the street appearance.

The above-mentioned areas have elements of design worth duplicating. Landscaping is a common element that enhances the appearance of any site. The absence or use of small-scale signs reduces the amount of visual clutter. Architectural design improves the appearance of buildings that would otherwise be mundane. Urban design is not limited to exterior design. It takes into account the appearance of the entire built environment and all aspects of development.

The implementation of urban design requirements will establish city-wide design standards to beautify the city as a whole and to carry out the values, goals, and objectives of Provo's citizens.

Design Standards

The following categories are to be implemented in some type of policy, regulation, or ordinance to establish urban design criteria within Provo City. Design elements must ensure public health, safety, and general welfare while serving the general interest of the public. Policies should be implemented in a timely fashion to encourage the style of development requested by the general citizenry.

Landscaping

Landscaping adds aesthetic qualities to the built environment. Without trees, shrubs, grass, and other greenery, the environment would be dull and unattractive. Landscaping improves the look and feel

of the community. To avoid becoming a concrete and asphalt-paved community, the city should require developments to meet landscaping standards. The percentage of land required to be landscaped in commercial zones and parking lots needs to be established. Once established, the standard needs to be strictly enforced. Parking lots should be screened from public view with berms and vegetation. Landscaping should correlate with the development’s architecture. Sliding scale requirements for building height and front yard landscaping should be established.

Signage

Without restrictions, signs can become garish and overbearing. Provo City has a sign ordinance, but further steps need to be taken to improve the appearance of signs throughout the city. The size and height of all signs should be reduced. Steps need to be taken to improve the desirability of monument signs. Signs should be required to reflect the building’s architecture and complement landscaped areas. A process to amortize all existing free standing signs over a certain height needs to be established. Billboards should be removed from developed sites.

Design Corridors

Design corridors preserve the aesthetic integrity of an area by imposing criteria for the appearance and design of buildings within the corridor. Twelve design corridors have been proposed to improve design and beautify the city. Some of the proposed corridors are dilapidated and there are no aesthetic qualities to maintain. In these corridors, it is hoped attractive, uniform design will aid redevelopment efforts. Each corridor will be established with unique design requirements. Developments in these corridors will be subject to design review. Corridors at city entryways will have logos, landscaping, and welcome signs. UDOT rights-of-way also need to be beautified.

TABLE 5.1 PROPOSED DESIGN CORRIDORS	
Design Corridor	Approximate Location of Design Corridor
North University-Riverbottoms	2230 North to Provo Canyon overpass
University Parkway	University Ave. to City Boundary
North State Street	1230 North to City Boundary
North University Downtown Area	200 North to 960 North University Ave.
South University	200 North University south to I-15 entrance ramp
500 West	300 South to 1230 North
Center Street	1100 West to 1000 East Center Street
West Center Street	1600 West to 2800 West Center Street
4800 North	University Avenue to City Boundary

TABLE 5.1 PROPOSED DESIGN CORRIDORS	
Design Corridor	Approximate Location of Design Corridor
3700 North	University Avenue to City Boundary
300 South	500 West to 850 East
South State Street	300 South to City Boundary

Construction

Incentives which encourage diversity in appearance (i.e. material, height, form) in multi-structure projects need to be provided. While diversity is encouraged, compatibility needs to exist in architecture and themes. Multi-structure projects which could benefit from incentives include commercial, multiple-family, and single family residential subdivisions. New construction in older, developed areas should be sympathetic to existing form, color, material, style, and scale. Remodels and additions must be sympathetic to form, color, material, style, and scale of the existing structure.

Chapter Six

Urban Growth and Land Use

Purpose

The Urban Growth and Land Use Element identifies growth rates and trends, projects growth for the next twenty years, and establishes policies regarding growth and the pattern of land use, including location, mix, and density. The Growth section addresses issues of annexation, growth limits, and sensitive lands. The Land Use section is organized to plan for: sufficient land for residential, industrial, commercial, and public uses; to locate land uses appropriately in order to enhance community character; to preserve important natural resources and sensitive lands; and to enable the city to efficiently ensure adequate public services are provided.

Issues

This element goes beyond managing projected growth. It seeks to address several major issues the community is currently facing. The plan sets forth goals, objectives, and specific actions to deal with these issues. Refinements in overall buildout have been modified downward as a result of the scarcity of developable land, politically unacceptable changes in the quality of life, and the adequacy of public facilities. This plan is shaped by the following key issues.

Protecting Viable Single Family Neighborhoods

Past city policies of re-zoning older neighborhoods for multi-family housing created a hodgepodge of densities in some central city neighborhoods. Potential home owners have to compete with outside investors who are willing to pay duplex, triplex, and fourplex prices for homes. As a result, these once affordable homes are being priced outside the reach of most home buyers. Families feel high density zoning leaves them unprotected by the city. Many families are moving from central neighborhoods because they do not want to live or invest in unstable, congested, and declining areas. Property maintenance is declining while crime is increasing. This cycle needs to be reversed.

Meeting the Need for Affordable Owner-occupied Housing

Between 1990 and 1995, the percentage of residences occupied by renters increased from 60.08% to 72%. Even for university towns, the percentage of renters is high. A 1995 survey of twenty-eight university towns conducted by Texas A&M University and the College Station, Texas, Community Enhancement Program revealed the average percentage of renter-occupied households in 1990 was 55.85%. In 1990, only five other communities had percentages higher than Provo's 60.08%. College Station, Texas (76%) and Borough State College, Pennsylvania (76.22%) were the only towns with higher rental percentages than Provo City's 1995 percentage. Affordable rental housing is available in the city, but 80% of the population have insufficient incomes to qualify for a loan to purchase an average priced home. More needs to be done to provide affordable owner-occupied housing.

Finding Ways to Reduce the Exponential Growth of Automobile Traffic

In many neighborhoods, the number of vehicle trips made by households exceeds national averages. Provo's development pattern has historically segregated land use activities, causing reliance on the automobile. Since most of the development pattern in Provo is set, automobile reliance probably will not change significantly. However, in developing areas, changes in development patterns could help decrease automobile traffic. Throughout the city, much can be done to encourage pedestrian travel, bicycle usage, and other forms of transportation.

Protecting Historic Neighborhood Character

The mix of land uses, density, and design affect a neighborhood's character. Historically significant design themes should be preserved through rehabilitation and protection of significant existing properties. New construction should be compatible with existing design themes in an area. Provo City's Design Review Commission is raising the level of awareness of design issues, and as a result, quality projects are being constructed. The Landmarks Commission is identifying properties worthy of preservation, finding ways to provide preservation incentives, and protecting historic properties.

Promoting Safe Development, Open Space Preservation, and Protecting Public Access to Recreational Areas in the Foothills

When the city cannot provide fire protection or garbage collection in steep bench areas; when homes are literally crumbling apart because of subsidence, landslides, and fault displacement; when grading of hillside areas damages the integrity of off-site views; or when private development interests are allowed to block public access to canyons, trails, and the mountains, hillside development has gone too far. Current policies regarding hillside development should be re-evaluated and strengthened to avoid these problems.

Increasing the Tax Base through Commercial Development

Residential development requires more services than paid for through property taxes and user fees. This is also true of many institutional land uses, such as churches and schools. To offset this, new opportunities to provide revenue-producing commercial and industrial uses, or to revitalize old uses need to be found. Provo City should be a "full service" community, providing consumer choices and convenient shopping opportunities.

Replacing and/or Consolidating Neighborhood Plans Adopted Since 1977

Lacking resources to revise the 1977 general plan, the city adopted neighborhood plans. They were substitutes for a comprehensive general plan and filled policy voids. The neighborhood plans have resulted in an amalgam of policies, codes, and requirements, proving cumbersome to administer and difficult to interpret. The creation of this general plan provides one document, ensuring consistency within the document and with overall city-wide needs.

Background

Established in 1849, Provo is Utah County's oldest city. It is the central city from which surrounding communities grew. Consequently, Provo's history, development, and growth patterns differ from nearby suburban bedroom communities. One third of the county's population and housing units are

located in Provo City, as are 45% of the jobs, and an abundance of cultural and recreational activities. As a result, the infrastructure and public services in Provo City serve not only city residents, but residents of surrounding communities as well.

Provo City is home to Brigham Young University, with an enrollment of approximately 30,000 students, and the LDS Church's Missionary Training Center, with a year-round population of approximately 2,600 people. The city enjoys the benefits of these institutions and deals with the impacts of these more or less transient populations. These institutions are major activity and employment centers, attracting people from throughout the county, state, and nation. Local businesses benefit from the activities of these populations. These institutions with their accompanying "transient" populations, contribute to a development pattern distinctly different from the surrounding suburbs.

As of January 1, 1996, Provo City covered an area of approximately 39 square miles and had a population of 101,154 people. The city is bordered on the east by the Wasatch Mountain Range and U.S. Forest Service lands, on the west by Utah Lake, on the north by the City of Orem, and on the south by Springville City. Within these general confines, there are several islands of unincorporated Utah County land.

Provo City's population grew from 86,835 in 1990 to 101,154 in 1996, a 16.49% increase. This is an average annual increase of approximately 2.7%, or 2,386 people per year. If 77% of growth results from natural increase, approximately 1,837 new people reside in Provo every year, without considering net in-migration.

In 1990, Provo's average household contained 3.32 people. At the rate of 3.32 people per household, providing housing for a population increase of 2,386 people per year means creating 719 new units each year. However, housing construction has been at the rate of about 274 units per 1,000 people of population increase. This is the equivalent of an average household size of 3.65 people per unit. This suggests some families became bigger instead of forming new households, and in other cases, housing units were illegally created, such as unauthorized basement apartments. Therefore, in housing projections we assume new household formation at the rate of one dwelling per 3.5 people of projected population.

Historically, Provo's growth rate has been around 3%. From 1920 to 1990, the overall growth rate was 3.092%, and 1960 to 1990 saw an overall rate of 2.974%. As explained above, the annual rate of growth through the 1990s has been 2.7%. There is reason to suggest the growth rate will continue downward somewhat, due to the increasing scarcity of developable land, higher housing costs, and a changing political climate that seeks to reduce growth.

These numbers seem to counter conventional wisdom. Most residents probably feel the amount of growth in recent years has far out-paced anything experienced previously. There is some justification for this perception. Although the rate of population growth has not reached record levels, over the last twenty years, automobile traffic has increased four times faster than the

population. Transportation impacts from growth have become worse. Based on natural increase alone, Provo will continue to grow by at least 2% per year for a total population in 2015 of 147,362 people. This is an increase of 46,208 people. This means an additional 13,200 housing units must be built, or about 700 units a year. Provo City’s population in the year 2015 could range from 159,167 people to 195,126 people. The lower figure represents the most reasonable estimate given proposed policies and attitudes about growth. The higher figure representing the maximum possible population based upon maximum possible densities and complete buildout, or an annual growth rate of about 4.65%.

Table 6.1 inventories existing land uses in Provo City.

TABLE 6.1 EXISTING LAND USE			
Land Use	Category	Acres	Percent of City
Residential	One-Family	3,964.92	14.03
	Two-Family (Duplex)	329.55	1.17
	3 & 4 Family	146.36	0.52
	Low Rise Apts.	204.75	0.72
	High Rise Apts.	232.66	0.82
	Mobile Homes	85.07	0.30
	Total	4,963.31	17.56
Commercial	Wholesale	76.35	0.27
	Retail	276.85	0.98
	Service	780.24	2.76
	Total	1,133.44	4.01
Industrial	Total	161.75	0.57
Agricultural	Total	2,708.18	9.58
Transportation	Roads	3,385.8	11.98
	Airport	1,264.66	4.47
	Other	61.22	0.22
	Total	4,711.68	16.67

TABLE 6.1 EXISTING LAND USE			
Land Use	Category	Acres	Percent of City
Public	Government	104.6	0.37
	Education	990.49	3.5
	Religious	223.41	0.79
	Utilities	215.47	0.76
	Total	1,533.97	5.43
Parks & Recreation	Parks	537.71	1.90
	Recreation Facilities	660.99	2.34
	Total	1,198.7	4.24
Vacant	Total	11,851	41.93
All Land Uses	Total	28,262	100.00

Vacant Land

There are 28,262 acres of land in Provo City. Roughly 42%, or 11,851 acres, are vacant, but not all such land is available or suitable for development. Some land is unsuitable for development due to physical constraints of the land, i.e., steep slopes, wetlands, flood plains, etc. Table 6.2 specifies the suitability of vacant land development.

TABLE 6.2 VACANT LAND	
Category	Acreage (Percent of Total)
Subdivided and Improved Vacant Lots	305 (2.6 %)
Unimproved Raw Land	1,631 (13.7 %)
Total Buildable for Residential	1,936 (16.3 %)
Non-Residential	2,144 (18.1 %)
Unbuildable	7,771 (65.6 %)
Total Vacant Land	11,851 (100 %)

According to the Table 6.3 below, 2,708 acres of land are used for agricultural cropland. Some or all of this land could be used for residential or commercial development. Including agricultural land, 6,788 acres of land are potentially developable.

TABLE 6.3 POTENTIALLY DEVELOPABLE LAND	
Category	Acres (% of Total)
Non-residential	2,144 acres (32%)
Improved Vacant Lots	305 acres (4%)
Raw Land	1,631 acres (24%)
Cropland	2,708 acres (40%)
Total	6,788 acres (100%)

Calculation of Residential Buildout

The estimated number of housing units and residential acres needed to accommodate a growing population at different rates of growth are given below (given a base population of 101,154):

1. Population in Year 2015 at 2% Growth - 147,362 or 46,208 additional people
 - a. New Housing Units - 13,202
 - b. Acres (including Roads) - 1,950

At this rate of growth, all vacant improved lots would be built on, all developable raw land would be developed and built on, and 5% of existing agricultural cropland would need to be converted to residential development.

2. Population in Year 2015 at 2.7% Growth - 167,811 or 66,657 additional people
 - a. New Housing Units - 19,045
 - b. Acres (including Roads) - 2,813

At this rate of growth, all vacant improved lots would be built on, all developable raw land would be developed and built on, and 39% of existing agricultural cropland would need to be converted to residential development.

3. Population in Year 2015 at 3% Growth - 177,374 or 76,220 additional people
 - a. New Housing Units - 21,777
 - b. Acres (including Roads) - 3,217

At this rate of growth, all vacant improved lots would be built on, all developable raw land would be developed and built on, and 56% of existing agricultural cropland would need to be converted to residential development.

TABLE 6.4 LAND USE CONSUMPTION BY HOUSING TYPE FOR YEAR 2015 POPULATION (2%)		
Housing Type	New Units Required by 2015	Acreage Required by Type
One-Family Detached	5,281	1,320
One-Family Attached	594	119
Two-Family Units	1,452	181
3- and 4-Family Units	1,056	88
5 or More Family Units	4,225	150
Mobile Homes	594	92
Total	13,202	1,950

TABLE 6.5 LAND USE CONSUMPTION BY HOUSING TYPE FOR YEAR 2015 POPULATION (2.7%)		
Housing Type	New Units Required by 2015	Acreage Required by Type
One-Family Detached	7,618	1,904
One-Family Attached	857	171
Two-Family Units	2,095	261
3- and 4-Family Units	1,524	128
5 or More Family Units	6,094	217
Mobile Homes	857	132
Total	19,045	2,813

TABLE 6.6 LAND USE CONSUMPTION BY HOUSING TYPE FOR YEAR 2015 POPULATION (3%)		
Housing Type	New Units Required by 2015	Acreage Required by Type
One-Family Detached	8,710	2,178
One-Family Attached	980	196
Two-Family Units	2,396	298

TABLE 6.6 LAND USE CONSUMPTION BY HOUSING TYPE FOR YEAR 2015 POPULATION (3%)		
Housing Type	New Units Required by 2015	Acreage Required by Type
3- and 4-Family Units	1,742	146
5 or More Family Units	6,969	248
Mobile Home	980	151
Total	21,777	3,217

Land consumption estimates are based on the assumption that the mix of housing types existing today will continue in the future. However, as stated at the beginning of this element, a city concern is the high percentage of renters. To correct the imbalance of renters versus owners, existing one-family neighborhoods should be protected to prevent them from turning into apartment neighborhoods. More vacant land could be reserved for the construction of one-family dwellings.

However, constructing one-family dwellings does not assure owner occupancy. Many of Provo’s one-family dwellings are being rented. Though nearly 65% of the existing housing stock in Provo is occupied by renters, only 55% of the housing stock is multiple family. Still, the likelihood of families moving into an area is higher if homes are available for purchase and the city is taking steps to protect their investment through appropriate zoning and development controls.

It is for these reasons that most of the remaining vacant, developable land is being proposed for the development of one-family subdivisions. In the city, 4,644 acres of potentially developable land are available for residential use. As many as 18,500 new units and a population increase of 65,000 people could be supported, but all developable agricultural cropland would be eliminated. The elimination of cropland is undesirable to those who want to maintain rural character and open space, as well as to the farmers who want to continue their agribusinesses. Therefore, this plan proposes using a little over 3,000 acres of vacant land for future Very Low Density Residential (VLDR) development, enough to accommodate about 14,000 new units, with the continued redevelopment of multiple family areas, at even higher densities near BYU campus and in the Central Business District (CBD).

New single family development patterns are proposed to more effectively handle traffic issues and to find ways to improve housing affordability. Cluster subdivisions, open space zoning, and courtyard developments are being examined to find ways of reducing improvement costs.

General Plan Designations

Table 6.7 shows the names and acronyms of the land use designations as used on the Land Use Map. It also shows the zoning districts which may be allowed in the various land use designations and the theoretical “densities” that may be achieved per gross and net acre under each zone. Net acreage

already has 25% land for streets and unbuildable areas subtracted out. (Note: These are “theoretical” densities allowed in the various zones. Actual densities allowed on a given site are based on the “lot area per dwelling” standards in the Provo City Zoning Ordinance, the actual amount of unbuildable land, and on the actual acreage of the parcel devoted to streets.)

General Plan Land Use Designation

It is hereby declared the policy of the city that property within a given General Plan Land Use Designation be re-zoned to the lowest density zone allowed under that land use designation, unless a higher density zone classification is deemed appropriate for a given area, and is specifically approved at the time of re-zoning.

TABLE 6.7 GENERAL PLAN LAND USE DESIGNATIONS			
General Plan Designation	Zones	Density per Net Acre¹	Density per Gross Acre
ESA Environmental Sensitive Area	A1.40	0.025	0.033
RA1 Rural Agricultural	A1.20	0.05	0.067
	A1.10	0.10	0.133
RA2 Rural Agricultural	A1.5	0.20	0.266
	A1.1	1.00	1.33
RA3 Rural Agricultural	RA	2.00	2.66
VLDR Very Low Density Residential	R1.20	1.63	2.17
	R1.15	2.18	2.90
	R1.10	3.27	4.35
	R1.9	3.63	4.84
	R1.8	4.08	5.44
LDR1 Low Density Res.	R1.7	4.67	6.22
	R1.6	5.45	7.26
LDR2 Low Density Res.	R2	5.45 to 6.45 ²	7.26 to 9.07
	RM	7.26	9.68
LDRC Low Density Res. Conservation	RC	N/A	N/A

TABLE 6.7 GENERAL PLAN LAND USE DESIGNATIONS

General Plan Designation	Zones	Density per Net Acre¹	Density per Gross Acre
MDR Medium Density Residential	R2.5	8.16	10.89
	R3	11.13	15.17
HDR High Density Res.	R4	18.44	25.70
VHDR Very High Density Residential	R5	31.50	44.02
GC General Commercial	CG	No dwellings permitted	No dwellings permitted
HC Heavy Commercial	CM	No dwellings permitted	No dwellings permitted
CBD Central Business District	CBD	Mixed Use (no limit except setbacks, heights, ground floor use)	Mixed Use (no limit except setbacks, heights, ground floor use)
Central Business District Fringe Area	CBD(F) ³		
SC Planned Shopping Center			
Specialty Support	SSC	No dwellings permitted	No dwellings permitted
Automotive Center	CA	No dwellings permitted	No dwellings permitted
Neighborhood Shopping Center	SC1	No dwellings permitted	No dwellings permitted
Community Shopping Center	SC2	No dwellings permitted	No dwellings permitted
Regional Shopping Center	SC3	No dwellings permitted	No dwellings permitted
RBP Research and Business Park	RBP	No dwellings permitted	No dwellings permitted
Manufacturing Park	MP	No dwellings permitted	No dwellings permitted
LI Light Industrial	M1	No dwellings permitted	No dwellings permitted
HI Heavy Industrial	M2	No dwellings permitted	No dwellings permitted

TABLE 6.7 GENERAL PLAN LAND USE DESIGNATIONS			
PF Public Facilities	PF	Only dormitories as accessory uses	Only dormitories as accessory uses
PO Professional Office	PO	Only nursing homes	Only nursing homes

¹Assumes that 25% of land is devoted to streets ²Assumes that duplexes represent no more than 20% of an R2 area

³Zone classifications in parentheses () are proposed new zone classification not yet adopted

Key Land Use Policies by Area

Area maps (Maps # 6.3 to 6.7) for the various area councils can be found in the map document accompanying the general plan. They include the West Area Council, North Area Council, East Area Council, South Area Council, and the Central Area Council.

West Area Council (Map # 6.3)

Key policies for the West Area Council are listed below by neighborhood:

Riverbottoms Neighborhood:

1. Extend Research and Business Park (RBP) land use designation to all property north of 4800 North and west of University Avenue. (Any properties 20 acres or more in size may develop as independent RBP. Land assembly may be required for smaller parcels. Individual lots along 50 West, Edgewood Drive should not be redeveloped for commercial or multi-family housing uses. The entire residential pocket should be redeveloped, or none of it should. It is an already isolated residential enclave, and should not be further entrenched, making it more difficult and costly to redevelop as commercial. If this area does redevelop for non-residential uses, it should be done to the same standards as those required in the Riverwoods Research Park.)
2. Designate the Heritage school property as Public Facilities (PF). Any growth of the school’s campus should be consistent with an overall master plan.
3. Designate the property located at approximately 6000 North east of University Avenue and Canyon Road as Medium Density Residential (MDR). Approximately two acres of the site are flat and developable if adequate access can be provided. The remaining 4.050 acres are too steep to develop, and are in the middle of a natural drainage channel.
4. Prohibit development of properties east of the property listed above in #3 and the power substation which are designated Environmental Sensitive Area (ESA). (While there are some flat lands on top, getting to it will require roads well in excess of 12% grades. Cutting and grading required to develop those roads could also be excessive, and contrary to Sensitive Lands Ordinance. Natural and man made hazards exist throughout this bench: fault lines, slide areas, unstable soils, and high power electric transmission lines. Providing adequate water pressures, fire protection, and garbage collection would be difficult, if not impossible.)

5. Designate the northeast corner of 4800 North University Avenue as Shopping Center (SC). Development must conform architecturally with the Shops at Riverwoods, not include any gasoline, fast food, or mini-mart components, and landscaped in a manner consistent with the existing Research and Business Park (RBP).
6. Designate the northwest corner of 4800 North University Avenue for a Shopping Center (SC).
7. Designate the University Avenue frontage between 3700 North and the mouth of the canyon as Very Low Density Residential (VLDR), excluding the Medium Density Residential (MDR) at 4800 North and University Avenue, the MDR at University Avenue and Canyon Road, the Shopping Center (SC) at 4800 North and University Avenue and the Low Density Residential (LDR) on the southwest corner of 4800 North and University Avenue.
8. Require all new residential developments along University Avenue to be performance developments.

Riverside Neighborhood:

1. Designate the narrow strip of land on the east side of University Avenue between 2300 North and 3200 North for Professional Offices (PO).
2. Require all new residential developments along University Avenue to be performance developments.
3. Change the land use designation at Plum Tree Plaza and Marriott Residence Inn from General Commercial (GC) to Regional Shopping Center (SC) to be consistent city-wide.
4. Designate Raintree Apartments as Medium Density Residential (MDR) to reflect the existing use.

Carterville Neighborhood:

1. Change the General Commercial (GC) designations along North State Street to reflect the existing use.
2. Change the Albertson's Parkway Village Center and the Riverside Shopping Center from General Commercial (GC) to Shopping Center (SC).
3. Expand the Shopping Center (SC) designation to include all of the Health Trust Property east of Christensen Chevrolet to accommodate an auto mall under the Automotive Center (CA) zone.
4. Designate the new Carterville Park Public Facilities (PF).
5. Designate the upper Silver Shadows area as Very Low Density Residential (VLDR) to match existing R1 (One-Family Residential) subdivisions.
6. Designate the narrow strip of land on the bench between Carterville Road and the Albertson's Parkway Village as Very Low Density Residential (VLDR) to match existing R1.8 (One-Family Residential) zoning. Access is poor from the east, and the neighborhood on the west side of Carterville would not want commercial traffic in the area. It is best suited to VLDR if accessed from Carterville Road. Low Density Residential (LDR) development may be appropriate if an acceptable plan

were submitted and approved under a specific general plan amendment. Until a specific plan is proposed, and approved, it should remain as it is.

Grandview North Neighborhood:

1. Develop Independence Avenue from 820 North to 1700 North.
2. Connect 1700 North and 1730 North through the existing orchard.
3. Designate existing parks as Public Facilities (PF).
4. Maintain the designated Very Low Density Residential (VLDR) status with mostly R1.10 (One-Family Residential) zoning.

Grandview South Neighborhood:

1. Develop Independence Avenue from 820 North to 1700 North.
2. Designate existing parks as Public Facilities (PF).
3. Maintain the designated Very Low Density Residential (VLDR) with mostly R1.10 (One-Family Residential) zoning.

Rivergrove Neighborhood:

1. Change the land use designation along lower 820 North from Manufacturing Park (MP) to Research & Business Park (RBP).
2. Change the area west of the River from Low Density Residential (LDR) to Very Low Density Residential (VLDR).
3. Designate Independence High School and Wilderness Park as Public Facilities (PF) to reflect existing uses.
4. Expand the Medium Density Residential (MDR) designation at the intersection of Columbia Lane and Grandview Lane to reflect the existing use.
5. Provide alternative land use designations for the mobile home park at that intersection: General Commercial (GC), Medium Density Residential (MDR), or Heavy Commercial (CM). Any of these could be appropriate at that location, and would facilitate the redevelopment of that parcel. Whatever is approved on this site should have landscaping along the street frontage consistent with the residential developments around it, and commercial buildings should be designed to fit in with the residential character.
6. Designate existing parks as Public Facilities (PF).

North Area Council (Map # 6.4)

Key policies for the North Area Council are listed below by neighborhood:

Little Rock Canyon:

1. Maintain Very Low Density Residential (VLDR) status.
2. Maintain the R1.10 (One-Family Residential) zoning.
3. Prohibit new agricultural zones which grant animal rights.
4. Prohibit development in the Environmental Sensitive Area (ESA).
5. Re-zone the Environmental Sensitive Area (ESA) east of the East Lawn Cemetery from A1.5 (Agricultural) to A1.40 (Agricultural).

Sherwood Hills:

1. Change the designation of the private school at the Ridge Athletic Club from Very Low Density Residential (VLDR) to Public Facilities (PF). If all or part of the structures are ever demolished, housing should replace it.
2. Re-zone the offices east of Timpview Seminary from Very Low Density Residential (VLDR) to Professional Office (PO).
3. Maintain Very Low Density Residential (VLDR) status.
4. Establish R1.10 (One-Family Residential) as the predominant zone.
5. Prohibit development above the 5200 foot elevation.
6. Re-zone the Environmental Sensitive Area (ESA) to A1.40 (Agricultural).

Edgemont Neighborhood:

1. Designate 3200 North Canyon Road Professional Office (PO) to reflect the existing use.
2. Limit rural agricultural tracts south of Timpview High School to R1.10 (One-Family Residential) or R1.8 (One-Family Residential) zoning. If developed as performance developments, they should be limited to clustered one-family dwellings, or one family attached housing of no more than two stories.
3. Prohibit existing commercial and office nodes from expanding.
4. Maintain Very Low Density Residential (VLDR) status.
5. Establish R1.10 (One-Family Residential) as the predominant zone.

Indian Hills Neighborhood:

1. Maintain the Very Low Density Residential (VLDR) status with mostly R1.10 (One - Family Residential) zoning.
2. Prohibit development in the unincorporated Forest Service land east of Indian Hills which is designated Environmental Sensitive Area (ESA).
3. Re-zone the Environmental Sensitive Area (ESA) A1.40 (Agricultural).

Rock Canyon Neighborhood:

1. Designate the property on Canyon Road and 140 East as Professional Office (PO) to reflect the existing use.
2. Designate the northeast corner of 2230 North and University Avenue Public Facilities (PF) to reflect the existing use.
3. Re-zone the A1.5 (Agricultural) remnant at approximately 1060 East 2320 North to R1.10 (One-Family Residential).
4. Prohibit development on the land east of Rock Canyon Park which is designated Environmental Sensitive Area (ESA).
5. Zone the Environmental Sensitive Area (ESA) A1.40 (Agricultural).

East Area Council (Map #6.5)

Key policies for the East Area Council are listed below by neighborhood:

Pleasant View Neighborhood:

1. Change the Shopping Center (SC) designation on University Avenue and 2230 North to Public Facilities (PF) to reflect the existing use.
2. Designate the existing bank property at 2120 North Canyon Road as Professional Office (PO).

University Neighborhood:

1. Modify Public Facilities (PF) designation boundaries to conform with Brigham Young University's land ownership.

Oakhills Neighborhood:

1. Limit development above 1550 East to a single row of homes.
2. Prohibit development of properties east of 1550 East that are designated Environmental Sensitive Area (ESA).
3. Zone the Environmental Sensitive Area (ESA) A1.40 (Agricultural).

Wasatch Neighborhood:

1. Establish Locust Lane as the eastern boundary of the Low Density Residential Two (LDR2) designation.
2. Designate existing businesses along 900 East and Birch Lane as General Commercial (GC) and the vacant parcel on the southeast corner of 900 East and Cedar Avenue as Professional Office (PO).
3. Prohibit any encroachment of existing or future General Commercial (GC), Professional Office (PO), or any other commercial or residential use with a greater intensity than Low Density Residential Two (LDR2).

Foothills Neighborhood:

1. Designate the high east bench as Environmental Sensitive Area (ESA).
2. Zone the Environmental Sensitive Area (ESA) A1.40 (Agricultural).
3. Designate the Low Density Residential (LDR) area between 900 East and 1080 East from Center Street to 300 North as LDR1 and re-zone to R1.6A (One-Family Residential, Accessory Apartment Overlay) zone.
4. Seven Peaks general plan policies include the following:

Land Use

- a. The lower play field below the water park should remain Public Facilities (PF) as a buffer between the State Hospital and residential areas.
- b. The land area in the Seven Peaks Development should be Very Low Density Residential (VLDR).
- c. Zoning associated with the Very Low Density Residential (VLDR) area should be R1.10 (One-Family Residential).

Circulation

- a. Obtaining street right-of-way through the State Hospital property from 300 South to Center Street is a high priority. Therefore, nothing should be done in the Seven Peaks area to hinder or obstruct the attainment of that goal. Efforts should be undertaken to find land suitable for trade to the State for the street right-of-way.
- b. The trails master plan should show a connection between Center Street to the Bonneville Shoreline Trail through Seven Peaks (see Map # 7.2).

Provost Neighborhood:

1. Designate existing businesses along State Street by Provost Elementary School as Heavy Commercial (HC) to reflect existing uses.
2. Change Low Density Residential (LDR) areas to Very Low Density Residential (VLDR).
3. Extend Slate Canyon Drive through to 300 South, and continue working to acquire a right-of-way between 300 South and Center Street through the State Hospital property.

Provost South Neighborhood:

1. Change the area between 1150 East and Nevada Avenue from Medium Density Residential (MDR) to Very Low Density Residential (VLDR). Nevada Avenue and 900 South are both under-improved roads, and medium densities are not appropriate at this location.
2. Designate the intersection of Slate Canyon Drive and State Street on the northeast corner, not to extend north of Alabama Avenue, Shopping Center (SC) with the intent of being zoned SC1 (Neighborhood Shopping Center).
3. Limit Medium Density Residential (MDR) areas to existing R3 (Medium Multiple Residential) zones, with possible exceptions on State Street as noted below.
4. Designate both sides of South State Street as Heavy Commercial (HC) to reflect the majority of existing uses, but also allow General Commercial (GC) and Very Low Density Residential (VLDR) as appropriate uses. Medium Density Residential (MDR) uses may be considered on a case-by-case basis after the development of new single family units in the Southeast Provo bench area where MDR projects meet the following criteria:
 - They are designed and restricted for owner occupancy;
 - They provide a mix of unit types but not stacked condominiums;
 - The project has a minimum parcel size of five acres;
 - That the project site is within 400 feet of South State Street;
 - The project is part of a Specific Development Plan with high design standards; and;
 - The project provides adequate open space, family style amenities and adequate buffering from non-residential uses.

The foregoing policy applies to any rezoning applications made on or after December 6, 2000, and not to applications made before December 6, 2000.

5. Establish a design corridor along South State Street from the south city limits to 300 South.
6. Designate an Environmental Sensitive Area (ESA) above the existing and proposed developments, east of Slate Canyon Drive.
7. Zone the Environmental Sensitive Area (ESA) A1.40 (Agricultural).
8. Use the jail area for office space, housing, or some commercial use if Utah County discontinues use of the jail.
9. Designate the Sunridge Hills area Low Density Residential (LDR) and Medium Density Residential (MDR) to reflect the existing zone designations.
10. Do not designate Nevada Avenue as a collector street at this time. Review the street's status after the Engineering Department completes the pending traffic studies and modeling that are under way.

South Area Council (Map # 6.6)

Key policies for the South Area Council are listed below by neighborhood:

Lakeview North and South Neighborhoods:

1. Annex unincorporated property to 2000 North.
2. Designate land for a shopping center in the area of 2000 North Geneva Road, or 1700 North Geneva Road.
3. Plan for future freeway access between 1700 North and 2000 North.
4. Install traffic signal at Geneva Road and 820 North.
5. Plan for street and sidewalk improvements to Geneva Road.
6. Designate everything in these two neighborhoods between I-15 and 3110 West as Very Low Density Residential (VLDR), with the exceptions of the Villages of Westgate which are Low Density Residential (LDR), and the proposed Shopping Center (SC) designation on Geneva Road.
7. Limit densities to the allowed R1.10 (One-Family Residential) zone due to circulation limitations on the west side until certain improvements are made in accordance with a future Provo Transportation Systems Plan.
8. Require all new large subdivisions on the west side to include some common open space. The subdivision ordinance will need to be amended to include clustering/open space requirements and guidelines.
9. Designate properties west of 3110 West as Rural Agricultural (RA), Public Facilities (PF), and Environmental Sensitive Area (ESA) to preserve farmland, wetlands, and flood plains.
10. Prohibit the conversion of agricultural land to urban development until the majority of vacant land in the Very Low Density Residential (VLDR) area is developed. The decision to develop agricultural area should be reviewed as needed when general plan amendments are heard.

Fort Utah Neighborhood:

1. Commercial land uses are proposed at the intersection of 1600 West Center Street, and all four corners of the intersection of Geneva Road and Center Street. It is anticipated that the Shopping Center (SC) designation will provide neighborhood shopping.
2. Designate existing multi-family housing at 1600 West Center and at 220 North Geneva as Medium Density Residential (MDR).
3. Designate all other residential areas in this neighborhood between I-15 and 3110 West Very Low Density Residential (VLDR) as R1.10 (One-Family Residential).
4. Limit densities to the allowed R1.10 (One-Family Residential) zone due to circulation limitations on the west side until certain improvements are made in accordance with the future Provo Transportation Systems Plan.
5. Prohibit the conversion of agricultural lands to urban development until the majority of vacant land in the Very Low Density Residential (VLDR) area is developed. The decision to develop agricultural areas should be reviewed as needed when general plan amendments are heard.

Provo Bay Neighborhood:

1. Develop the area east of 2530 West and north of 560 South, which is designated as Very Low Density Residential (VLDR), at R1.10 (One-Family Residential) density or less.
2. Designate the Airport and Utah Lake State Park as Public Facilities (PF). The Aerospace Park around the airport is designated Light Industrial (LI) and will continue to develop according to the airport and Aerospace Park master plans.
3. Discourage residential development west of 3110 West to avoid airport flight paths and noise corridors.
4. Designate everything else in this neighborhood as either Rural Agricultural (RA1, 10-20 acre lots), or Rural Agricultural (RA2, 1-5 acre lots).
5. Do not develop areas of wetlands and flood plain south of the Utah Lake meander line. Such areas are designated Environmental Sensitive Area (ESA).
6. Designate areas within the Flood Plain (AE) Rural Agricultural (RA1, 10-20 acre lots).
7. Designate the area at the southeast end of the airport Rural Agricultural (RA2, 1-5 acre lots).
8. Prohibit the conversion of agricultural lands to urban development until the majority of vacant land in the Very Low Density Residential (VLDR) area is developed. The decision to develop agricultural areas should be reviewed as needed when general plan amendments are heard.

Sunset Neighborhood:

1. Prohibit development of wetland and flood plain areas south of the Utah Lake meander line. Such lands are designated Environmental Sensitive Area (ESA).
2. Designate areas within the Flood Plain (AE) Rural Agricultural (RA1, 10-20 acre lots).

3. Designate the area south of 1150 South and west of 1100 West and the area south of 1560 South and west of 760 West as Rural Agricultural (RA2, 1-5 acre lots).
4. Designate the area between 600 South and 1150 South from 1100 West to 1600 West as Rural Agricultural (RA3, ½ acre lots).
5. Designate the existing Footprinters Park, Sunset Park, and Sunset Elementary School as Public Facilities (PF).
6. Develop all other areas which are designated Very Low Density Residential (VLDR) at R1.10 (One-Family Residential) densities or less.
7. Prohibit the conversion of agricultural lands to urban development until the majority of vacant land in the Very Low Density Residential (VLDR) area is developed. The decision to develop agricultural areas should be reviewed as needed when general plan amendments are heard.

Franklin South Neighborhood:

1. Reduce the Medium Density Residential (MDR) land use designation to the existing developments.
2. As Provo Towne Centre develops and opens for business there will be mounting pressure to commercialize 500 West south of 600 South, and to redevelop the manufactured home parks and other low density residential uses to higher intensity commercial or housing developments. Given current apartment and condominium development, the creation of such developments is not justified. If pressures do increase to where this becomes necessary, a minimum threshold size should be required to avoid a hodgepodge of multi-family developments on individual lots in the middle of the neighborhood. Intensive redevelopment of the Low Density Residential (LDR) area between the railroad tracks and the mall might be considered after the mall opens and circulation patterns impacts are known.
3. Any future proposals for multi-family housing should be performance developments.
4. Extend 700 South from 300 West to Freedom Boulevard. This would give the residential core area another access when trains block 500 West and Freedom Boulevard.
5. Designate the area on the east side of 400 West between the railroad tracks and 700 South as Low Density Residential (LDR).
6. Designate the tract south of 1560 South between 550 West and 700 West Rural Agricultural (RA2, 1-2 acre lots).
7. Designate areas within the Flood Plain (AE) Rural Agricultural (RA1, 10-20 acre lots).

Spring Creek Neighborhood:

1. Designate both sides of South State Street as Heavy Commercial (HC) to reflect the majority of existing uses. Consider allowing General Commercial (GC) and Medium Density Residential (MDR) uses on a case-by-case basis. Mixed residential and commercial uses could complement each other along this corridor. Some Light

- Industrial (LI) and Heavy Commercial (HC) could develop west of the State Street frontage.
2. Do not develop wetlands, flood plains, and accretion lands controlled by the State of Utah and/or the Army Corps of Engineers which are designated Environmental Sensitive Area (ESA).
 3. A minor amount of new housing is anticipated in this area. The R1.6 (One-Family Residential) subdivision at 1640 South State Street, and the possible redevelopment of “Daltonville” are the two exceptions. Medium Density Residential (MDR) redevelopment should not occur one lot at a time, but land should be assembled for larger scale development.
 4. Reserve the triangular area between the railroad tracks for Heavy Industrial (HI).
 5. Consider the Ironton area for industrial and commercial uses with a park-like atmosphere in which a minor league baseball development and commuter rail maintenance station could locate when the Ironton area is ready for development.
 6. Establish a design corridor along South State Street, from the south city limits to 300 South.
 7. Designate the property between 1640 South and 1860 South from the railroad tracks to South State Street Shopping Center (SC).

Central Area Council (Map # 6.7)

Neighborhoods in the Central Area will be targeted for a concerted neighborhood conservation effort. Past policies of allowing two-family and multi-family apartments to indiscriminately locate in enclaves of existing one-family dwellings in these neighborhoods has driven property owning families out of the central city. It has made existing dwellings the prey of investors, and has pushed prices out of reach for most low and moderate income families. In the process, the stability and character of these neighborhoods has been threatened. The neighborhood conservation effort seeks to reverse this trend by protecting one-family homes, and stabilizing the real estate market in those neighborhoods so that families will be willing to reinvest in the area.

1. Zone properties for the “uses” and “intensity of development” that currently exists. If the block is mostly one-family residential, zone it one-family residential. Up-zone only when redevelopment is imminent, and when it fulfills a public purpose.
2. Provide financial incentives to repair and remodel homes in older neighborhoods.
3. Develop “Specific Design Guidelines” for identifiable districts within neighborhoods.
4. Make needed capital improvements.
5. Put the area between Provo River and 500 North and west of 970 West in the North Park Neighborhood instead of the Dixon Neighborhood.
6. Put landscaped medians back in Center Street from I-15 to 500 West, and from 100 East to 900 East.
7. Waive the minimum acreage requirement for performance developments in R1 (One-Family Residential) zones in the Central Area in order to facilitate creative infill on small remnant or underutilized parcels.

Key policies for the Central Area Council are listed below by neighborhood:

Maeser Neighborhood:

1. Change the Low Density Residential (LDR) land use designation in this area to Low Density Residential One (LDR1).
2. Have the A (Accessory Apartment Overlay) zone accompany any down-zoning.
3. Down-zone concentrations of single family dwellings to R1 (One-Family Residential) zones in the following areas:
 - a. 200 East to 600 East
 - b. 700 East to 850 East
 - c. Area between 200 East and 350 East along 500 South
 - d. Southeast corner of 200 South and 600 East
4. Down-zone the dwellings at 100 South and 200 East which are designated Professional Office (PO) to R2 (Two-Family Residential).
5. Change the area west of 200 East from Medium Density Residential (MDR) to Low Density Residential Two (LDR2), and down-zone from R2.5 (Low Multiple Residential) to R2 (Two-Family Residential).
6. Re-zone the apartments on the northeast corner of 500 East and 500 South which are designated Medium Density Residential (MDR) from R2 (Two-Family Residential) to R2.5 (Low Multiple Residential).
7. Put landscaped medians back in Center Street from 100 East to 900 East.
8. Make as many residential properties as possible eligible for 20% State Rehabilitation Tax Credits by forming a National Register Historic District, extending from 100 East to 600 East between 500 North and 500 South.

Joaquin Neighborhood:

1. Property above 500 North between 400 East and 900 East retain the VeryHigh Density Residential (VHDR) designation.
2. It is the city's intent to entertain proposals for redevelopment in the Very High Density Residential (VHDR) and High Density Residential (HDR) areas south of BYU campus. It is suggested that incentives be developed to direct the highest densities to these areas, and then to contain them in these areas. Such incentives may include, but are not limited to, increasing densities and building heights; reducing off-street parking requirements for large scale multi-family housing projects where the owners contract with BYU to rent to students with no cars; and mixed use developments where the ground floor is devoted to commercial uses, and upper stories are devoted to housing.
3. Change future Low Density Residential (LDR) land use designation to LDR1 to match character of existing development. It is the intent to protect the character of one-family areas and to encourage owner occupancy. Any areas that deteriorate and become blighted would be considered for redevelopment proposals on a case-by-case basis.

4. Down-zone existing R2 (Two-Family Residential) zones to R1 (One-Family Residential) zones, with possible A (Accessory Apartment Overlay) zone from 400 East to 900 East south of 300 North.
5. Make as many residential properties as possible eligible for 20% State Rehabilitation Tax Credits by forming a National Register Historic District extending from 100 East to 600 East between 500 North and 500 South.
6. Put landscaped medians back in Center Street from 100 East to 900 East.
7. Develop “Specific Design Guidelines” for the district along East Center Street from 200 East to 1000 East.
8. The area between 600 East and 900 East from 300/350 North to 560/600 North shall be designated as High Density Residential (HDR).
9. The area between 400 East and 700 East from 300 North to 350/400 North shall be designated as Low Density Residential Two (LDR2).

Value Statement One

Maintain and enhance a safe, comfortable and livable residential neighborhood with a sense of community for all residents. *Most of the proposed policies apply to the entire South Joaquin neighborhood.*

Goal One: Increase the number of owner-occupied housing units in all of the central city neighborhoods.

Objectives:

1. Make available six homes per year in the five central city neighborhood for repurchase by low-moderate income homeowners through the coordinated use of various city, state and federal housing programs (*City initiative*).
2. Continue using HOME funds for a first-time home buyers program with an emphasis on central city neighborhoods. Set a target of funding ten homes a year in the central city neighborhoods (*Neighborhood Housing Services initiative*).
3. Coordinate with Neighborhood Housing Services to develop a demonstration home ownership project (8-10 units/acre) in a central city neighborhood. Establish an overlay district and special design standards to ensure new housing is compatible with the historic character of the existing neighborhood (*City initiative*).
4. Conduct an annual city-sponsored seminar for owners or purchasers of historic housing on the cost-saving advantages of using the Historic Building Code for remodeling. In addition, develop a video presentation for the rules and resources for remodeling historic homes within the city (*City/neighborhood initiative*).
5. Establish a homeowners association for each central city neighborhood to provide education and support for existing and potential homeowners (*Neighborhood/Neighborhood Housing Service initiative*).
6. Commit to an annual meeting between the Provo Municipal Council and the Provo School Board to set common objectives for the development of strong schools and strong neighborhoods in Provo (*City initiative*).

Value Statement Two

Maintain and enhance a safe, comfortable and livable residential neighborhood with a sense of community for all residents.

Goal Two: Reduce the negative impacts of existing housing on the neighborhood.

Objectives:

1. Based on a neighborhood vote, City adopts a residential parking permit program to limit the impact of BYU commuter parking in the area (*Neighborhood and City initiative*).
2. Neighborhood routinely provides all area residents with information on the rules and procedures governing traffic, parking, garbage collection, noise, snow removal and other applicable ordinances (*Neighborhood and City initiative*).
3. City adopts an ordinance requiring leases for rentals with strict enforcement of occupancy limits and civil penalties for violations (*City initiative*).
4. City sponsors residential facade program with a revolving loan fund to upgrade the public appearance of residential property (*City initiative*).

Value Statement Three

None.

Goal Three: Preserve the single-family appearance of the South Joaquin neighborhood.

Objectives:

1. Enforce nuisance ordinance provisions for property maintenance (*City Initiative*).
2. City sponsored neighborhood clean-ups with free dumpsters (*City*).
3. Sponsor a Home-of-the-Month program (*Neighborhood initiative*).
4. Consider adaption of a fit premise ordinance (*City initiative*).
 - a. Direct staff to work with the neighborhood on a traffic calming program (*Neighborhood approval and City funding*).
 - b. Expand facilities for bicyclists and pedestrians in entire Joaquin neighborhood (*City Initiative*).

Value Statement Four

Recognize and protect the historic nature of the South Joaquin neighborhood by promoting preservation of its historic resources and buildings.

Goal Four: Preserve, maintain and upgrade historic homes within the South Joaquin Neighborhood

Objectives:

1. City seeks private funding for national register district improvements (*City*).
2. Neighborhood seeks to secure funding from Heritage Foundation and/or other private organizations (*Neighborhood initiative*).

3. Investigate the feasibility of gradually replacing standard light fixtures in the central city neighborhoods with replicas of historic fixtures (*City Initiative*).
4. Implement the established General Plan policy for the Joaquin neighborhood and reinstall the landscaped median back in Center Street between 100 East and 900 East (*City Initiative*).
5. Investigate the feasibility of special “Historic Provo” signage in the area to create a sense of uniqueness and to help publicly define boundaries in the district (*City/neighborhood initiative*).

The Commission followed staffs recommendations and did not adopt two neighborhood requests to downzone the area to R16A and to establish a local landmarks district in the area.

General Plan Map Designation

The Commission also recommended a change to the General Plan map designation for the area from the current designations of Very High Density Residential (VHDR) and High Density Residential (HDR) to the Mixed-Use Residential Conservation (MURC) designation. The Municipal Council considered an alternative map amendment to redesignate the area to a Low Density Residential Conservation (LDRC) land use designation. This new General Plan designation would have the following characteristics:

1. The Low Density Residential (LDRC) designation would establish the vision of the neighborhood as a single-family area and encourage the conversion of former single-family homes back to lower density uses in the future.
2. The Low Density Residential (LDRC) designation would preserve all legally approved housing in the study area and treat it then as legally conforming uses.
3. The Low Density Residential (LDRC) designation would not allow any increase in total housing units beyond those now legally existing except for the option of adding an accessory unit to existing single family homes, which are owner occupied.
4. The Low Density Residential (LDRC) designation would be implemented by design guidelines which would ensure that new housing is compatible with the historic character of the neighborhood.

Central Business District:

1. Extend the Central Business District neighborhood 2 blocks to the north between 100 East and 100 West, and include Academy Square.
2. Divide existing Central Business District into two zones: Downtown Central Business District Core (CBD), and a Central Business District Fringe (CBDF) with different residential standards, height limits, and building setbacks.
3. Reserve ground floors in Central Business District (CBD) Core area for commercial and office uses.
4. Encourage higher residential densities in the Central Business District (CBD). Limit multi-family housing in other areas, except where already designated, and modify the residential standards in this area to promote residential development in CBD.
5. Encourage mixed use developments.

6. Establish location requirements for parking lots and structures for Center Street businesses so that buildings are not demolished to provide parking.

Franklin Neighborhood:

1. Protect viable, significant areas of one-family dwellings.
2. Change future Low Density Residential (LDR) land use designation to Low Density Residential One (LDR1) to match character of existing development.
3. Down-zone concentrations of one-family dwellings to R1 (One-Family Residential) zones, with possible A (Accessory Apartment Overlay) zone in the following areas:
 - a. 600 West to 1000 West
 - b. 200 West to 400 West
 - c. 700 West between 500 South and 600 South
4. Down-zone one-family dwellings from General Commercial (CG) and Heavy Commercial (CM) to R2.5 (Low Multiple Residential) in the following areas:
 - a. East side of 500 West between 400 South to 500 South
 - b. West side of 500 West between 220 South and 420 South
 - c. North side of 500 South between Freedom Boulevard and 400 West
5. Make as many residential properties as possible eligible for 20% State Rehabilitation Tax Credits by forming a National Register Historic District in the Dixon and Franklin Neighborhoods.

Timpanogos Neighborhood:

1. Maintain the High Density Residential (HDR) designation because of the existing multi-family dwelling uses in this area.
2. Make as many residential properties as possible eligible for 20% State Rehabilitation Tax Credits by forming a National Register Historic District in qualifying locations.

Dixon Neighborhood:

1. Change future Low Density Residential (LDR) land use designation to Low Density Residential One (LDR1) to match the character of existing development.
2. Down-zone concentrations of single family dwellings in R2 (Two-Family Residential) zones to R1 (One-Family Residential) zones, with possible A (Accessory Apartment Overlay) zone in the area between 100 North to 500 North, with the exception that the property at 220 North 1280 West remain Low Density Residential Two (LDR2) R2.
3. Up-zone apartments west of northwest corner of 800 W and 100 N from R2 (Two-Family Residential) to R2.5 (Low Multiple Residential).
4. Designate the south half of the block between 1000 West and 1100 West on Center Street as Light Industrial (LI).
5. The area between Center Street and 100 North is designated General Commercial (GC); The 100 North frontage should remain residential unless a development proposal is submitted that would change the entire block from Center Street to 100 North to GC.

6. The block at 200 North and 800 West should be designated Medium Density Residential (MDR) in the southeast corner of the block, with the balance of the block remaining Low Density Residential One (LDR1).
7. Continue Historic Building Survey west of 900 West.
8. Make as many residential properties as possible eligible for 20% State Rehabilitation Tax Credits by forming a National Register Historic District in the Dixon and Franklin Neighborhoods.
9. Develop “Specific Design Guidelines” for identifiable districts within neighborhoods such as 500 West from Center Street to 500 North and West Center Street from 600 West to I-15.

North Park Neighborhood:

1. Change future Low Density Residential (LDR) land use designation to Low Density Residential One (LDR1) to match the character of existing development.
2. Down-zone concentrations of one-family dwellings to R1 (One-Family Residential) zones, with possible A (Accessory Apartment Overlay) zone in the area of 650 North to 940 North between 250 West and 440 West.
3. Place the area between the Provo River and 500 North west of 970 West in the North Park Neighborhood instead of the Dixon Neighborhood.
4. Make as many residential properties as possible eligible for 20% State Rehabilitation Tax Credits by forming a National Register Historic District in qualifying locations.

Growth

Urban Growth Boundaries

Urban growth boundaries are typically used in metropolitan areas involving multiple jurisdictions, and where there is usually strong State or Metropolitan Planning Legislation. They are used to control and manage the infrastructure for growth, and thus annexation, and to preserve agricultural lands and other open spaces.

Physical geography has already set definite limits on growth. The Wasatch Range blocks the city’s growth to the east, and Utah Lake blocks it to the west and southwest. Orem and Springville block growth to the north and south, though there are still some areas within Provo’s influence that can be annexed to Provo. Provo is not an unbounded plain with limitless development potential like some communities. Provo is a mature city with an established infrastructure. The threat of runaway growth out-pacing the ability to provide municipal services is not as great as many new, high growth communities.

Nevertheless, on a micro level it becomes necessary and desirable to set some limits or benchmarks for growth. In Provo those limits are important on the mountainous bench areas, and on the agricultural lands of west Provo.

The 5200 foot elevation from mean sea level is established as the *proximate terminus* for urban development along the eastern benches of the city. This corresponds roughly with the Mountain Fuel gas line easement which traverses the city. A system of trails is proposed along these easements and service roads for recreational uses and access to the canyons. But for the most part, lands above

these elevations become too steep, and are fraught with geologic hazards and natural drainage ways that should not be disturbed. Providing services to these areas brings inordinate costs, and in some cases is simply impossible. Residents in these areas are put at risk because of the natural hazards and also the difficulty or inability to provide services.

The urban growth boundary proposed on the west side corresponds roughly with Lake Shore Drive from Center Street north, and with a stair-step line running in a northwesterly direction from the south University Avenue interchange to approximately where Lake Shore Drive crosses the Provo River. Of course these lines could be extended out into the buildable agricultural areas, but there are also good reasons for seeking to preserve agricultural lands for production. These urban limits can always be reevaluated, but by establishing growth “tiers,” infrastructure for development can be extended in a logical manner without leap-frogging. The one notable exception being storm drainage systems, which by their nature should extend logically from the low lands to higher ground, just the opposite direction of growth on the west side.

To be a truly “sustainable community” the demands upon our natural and man-made resources should be in balance with the ability of those resources to be replenished. This does not mean that the city needs to create some kind of closed or self-sufficient ecological system. It does mean, however, that the city needs to use wisely the resources it has, conserving where necessary and replenishing where possible. Having a strong agricultural base may become extremely important to the city if normal interurban or interstate lines of transportation are disrupted; if weather conditions adversely affect major agricultural suppliers; or if the supply of fossil fuels were suddenly disrupted.

The protection of some rural, natural, and even “wild” places in urban areas is something Provo’s residents seek, almost as a refuge from the urbanization taking place all around us. They rebel at the thought of “Los Angelesization,” where there is no relief from the asphalt and concrete jungle, which seems to expand out in all directions gobbling up everything in its path.

Many communities that have set out to preserve significant open spaces on their periphery, and to guide development into more compact urban corridors, have found that their communities have become even more attractive places to live and work. Many high-tech companies gravitate to those types of communities for the quality of life. Provo City will face the challenge of maintaining a high quality of life while encouraging development.

Annexation Policy

Annexation Policy Guidelines

The character of Provo City consists of agricultural, residential, commercial, public/institutional, and industrial land uses. As pressures for development and expansion continue within the city and its environs, it is necessary that the city maintain an annexation program to assure orderly growth and development of the community and to protect the general interests of the taxpaying public as well as those of individual property owners who wish to annex to the city to enjoy the benefits which accrue from being within the city limits. In order to assure this mutual protection, there must be specific policy guidelines, or criteria, by which the total annexation requirements of the city, as well

as each individual annexation, may be judged and evaluated. The following constitutes the policy guidelines established for the Provo City annexation program:

An annexation fee should not be charged by the city.

The city's present "pay as you go" policy (i.e., through bond and assessment districts) for improvements together with the policy of requiring the installation of street improvements as property is developed, seems to insure that needed facilities and services will be paid for on a relatively equitable basis without any initiation or service fee being charged for initial annexation. Furthermore, the orderly growth and development of the community could be thwarted if the attractiveness and desirability of annexation is reduced by having an annexation fee. There will, therefore, be no fee levied for processing an annexation petition or for bringing property within Provo City. The only fee the city may levy is the Services Fee for preparation of an annexation plat if this service is accomplished by the city rather than by a private consulting engineer or surveyor.

Each annexation should be expanded to include the greatest amount of property possible within the limits shown on the attached map, to assure that:

1. Public reaction in and around the annexation area is favorable;
2. Duplication of services is eliminated;
3. City standards related to improvements are maintained consistently on a contiguous block face and on adjoining properties to the greatest extent possible;
4. Piecemeal annexation of individual small properties does not occur which would diminish the potential for later annexation of small pockets or "islands" of opposing unincorporated area;
5. Expansion of city boundaries will include some unimproved land which will provide an inventory for future development;
6. The circulation system of streets and highways is enhanced by placing a system in one jurisdiction to eliminate maintenance confusion;
7. There is an increased ability to plan for orderly community and area-wide development through orderly and logical boundaries for the incorporated areas of Provo City; the unincorporated areas of Utah County, and the boundaries of adjacent communities;
8. The ability exists to better control fire, police, and other safety-oriented problems through more logical development and more reasonable political boundaries;
9. There is greater efficiency and economy in supplying utilities and other public services in areas of more orderly and systematic city boundaries;
10. The city's right of self-determination and local home rule is enhanced through the realization of ultimate city boundaries which are more desirable and more orderly;
11. The city is able to exercise greater regulation over improper and undesirable land uses and development in the fringe areas, thereby protecting the city taxpayers against future costs which may occur to correct such uses and development.

City utilities and services shall not extend into unincorporated properties on the fringes of the city, nor to "islands" of unincorporated properties; except to other units of government.

In order to provide for the orderly growth and development of Provo City and to avoid undue costs to taxpayers, Provo City utility and service hook-ons shall not be provided to unincorporated areas,

but shall only be made available to those areas which are annexed to Provo City. The only exception shall be those extensions which are made to other units of government under the Interlocal Government Cooperation Act as deemed appropriate by the Municipal Council.

Utilities should be extended to annexed areas as soon as practicable after annexation.

Water, sewer, and electrical utilities should be extended into newly annexed areas as soon as practicable after annexation. The requirements for extension of such utilities are set forth on an area by area basis which are described in “Areas Proposed for Future Annexation,” below.

The city feels the responsibility of developing the backbone of the various utility distribution and collection systems in newly developing areas. This work includes the development of new water wells, reservoirs, and utility trunk lines. However, specific commitments and the construction time frame for such utilities will be dependent upon development demand and sufficient capital budgets. Such commitments and time frames will be determined at the time annexation occurs and will be a part of the impact report required by the Provo City Code.

Provo City’s policy is to participate with developers in the cost of improvements for which benefits do not accrue directly to developers. For instance, when utility mainlines are required to be a certain size to serve an entire area but that size is larger than that required to service a given subdivision, the city will fund the difference in the cost of providing the larger size. In this way, costs of improvements benefitting the city at large are borne by the taxpayer and costs associated with the particular development are borne by the developer, who passes these costs onto individual property buyers. Adopted as part of the subdivision ordinance is the breakdown of costs in the respective portions to be paid for by the developer and the city. The city’s share is financed by the general fund, gas tax road funds, connection and user fees.

City services should be extended to annexed areas immediately after annexation.

Residents of urbanizing areas require increased municipal services which the city should provide immediately upon annexation. These include garbage collection, snow removal, paramedic services, and police and fire protection which are financed by general fund revenues and service fees.

Tax consequences and interests of affected entities relative to a proposed annexation should be considered.

Present mil levies in Provo City are comparable to adjacent county areas. In 1996, Provo had a mil levy of .011292 while Utah County residents in the Nebo and Alpine School Districts had mil levies of .011895 and .010389 respectively. Utility costs, particularly for electricity, are less expensive in the city than in the county. Thus, many times it is economically beneficial for property owners to annex to Provo City. Additionally, such property owners receive many benefits in return for higher tax assessments. These include snow removal, increased police and fire protection, etc.

Areas proposed for annexation are logical expansions of Provo City’s corporate limits and will not unduly affect the tax revenues of adjacent entities. Utah County has the policy of not providing urban services to rural areas and minimal services are now provided by the county to such areas. It is felt that Provo City can most efficiently deliver the urban services which will be required as urbanization occurs.

Areas Proposed for Future Annexation (Map # 6.9)

- Area 1:* Area 1 is bounded by existing Provo City limits on the north and west. No serious water or sewer constraints exist in this area. There are gravity flow sewers in the immediate vicinity, and the culinary water supply to the area was extended with the East Mountain development. The general plan calls for Low Density Residential Two (LDR2) development in this area. However, a portion of this area is currently being used for a sand and gravel mining operation with permits issued in the county. Any significant development here would first require the reclamation of the sand and gravel operation. There is also an auto salvage operation just south of the East Mountain development. Since South State Street is one of the major entries to the city, having this property in the city gives Provo some control over how it develops, and the image created as one enters town. South State Street is one of the “design review” corridors proposed along major entrances to the city.
- Area 2:* Area 2 is bounded by I-15 on the west, existing Provo City limits on the north and east, and the Provo/Springville City Boundary Agreement Line on the south. The general plan calls for a combination of light and heavy industry in this area: Heavy Industrial (HI) between the railroad tracks, and Light Industrial (LI) between Kuhni Road and I-15. Provo City has power facilities in this area, and has extended sewer as far south as the Kuhni rendering plant. Water and sewer extensions would be required to continue annexation south of the rendering plant and east of the railroad tracks.
- Area 3:* Area 3 is bounded by existing Provo City limits on the north and by Utah Lake on the south and west. The Central Utah Project calls for the eventual diking and drainage of Provo Bay, thus providing the potential for urban development. Should this occur, Provo City would be in the best position to service this area. The general plan currently designates this area as Environmental Sensitive Area (ESA) because of the flood plain and wetlands. A general plan amendment would be required to determine land use and other policies in this area, if it were re-claimed, and significant capital investment in utility systems would also be required to service this area. A frontage road west of I-15 between the University Avenue and Springville interchanges would also be necessary to provide access to this area.
- Area 4:* Area 4 is bounded by existing Provo City limits on the south and east, Utah Lake on the west, and about 2000 North on the north. The development of this area will require additional water distribution system capacity as well as the construction of waste water lift stations. Present land uses in this area are agricultural and very low density residential types. The general plan designation is Very Low Density Residential (VLDR) (approximately 3 units per acre) on most of the land in this area, and a future commercial shopping center in the vicinity of 2000 North Geneva Road. The commercial center is

dependent upon a new interchange being approved to I-15 somewhere between 1700 North and 2000 North. One of the principal property owners in the area has property that straddles the Provo/Orem boundary on the east side of I-15. If annexed to Provo City for commercial development, the owner may also seek to disconnect from Orem City.

Area 5: Area 5 is bounded on the west and south by existing Provo City limits, and on the east by the Uinta National Forest boundary. Existing water pressure zones can serve this area to an elevation of 5,200 feet. Area 5 can be served by gravity waste water systems, but main lines would have to be extended into the area from existing lines several thousand feet away. Development in most of this area (over 10% slope) would be controlled by the Hillside Development Standards of the Subdivision Ordinance. The general plan calls for Very Low Density Residential (VLDR) development in this area.

Area 6: Area 6 is bounded on the west and south by Provo City limits, on the east and south by Utah County, and on the north by Provo Canyon and Wasatch County. The area encompasses the Forest Service land east and north of Sherwood Hills and Little Rock Canyon all the way up South Fork of the Provo Canyon, including the south side of Provo Canyon. The lands of interest to Provo City in Provo Canyon and Southfork are currently governed by the Provo Canyon Plan adopted by Wasatch County and Utah County. If annexed to Provo City, it would be designated Environmental Sensitive Area (ESA), and the proposed zoning would be A1.40 (Agricultural). Provo City has an interest in the canyon and South Fork areas because of the city's water supply from that area. If the area were to be annexed, it would be primarily to protect Provo's water supply, not to allow residential or commercial development. The city has no public facilities to serve these areas, but Provo does contract with the county to provide backup fire services.

Specific Development Plans

A primary problem of growing cities and towns is piecemeal, uncoordinated development. Undeveloped land is often parceled into many separately owned holdings, each with a variety of sizes and configurations. If such properties develop independently, coordinated features, such as an overall network of connected streets or neighborhood parks, may be difficult to obtain. Standard subdivision requirements that prescribe open space requirements and street connections attempt to address this problem but may not always go far enough, resulting in uncoordinated, patchwork development, rather than a coherent neighborhood.

Different goals between property owners or a simple lack of communication can unnecessarily fragment new development. The design of development projects is largely left to landowners and their designers. Plans are then reviewed by the City for compliance with existing policies and standards. Often little design cooperation exists between neighboring property owners. As a result of people's different goals, many fractious hearings may be held concerning development proposals and associated rezonings.

These kinds of problems can be addressed by developing and adopting Specific Development Plans (“SDPs”). SDPs describe in more detail the type of development planned for a specific area than is typically found in most general plans, zoning ordinances, or public-facilities plans. Unlike a project plan, it can apply to a large area with multiple landowners. SDPs may require more detailed planning but also allow for more innovation in design and organization of land uses. SDPs are intended to promote coordinated planning concepts and pedestrian oriented mixed use development.

Establishing SDPs in particular areas in advance of development proposals can help ensure an area is built in a coherent fashion. SDPs can also provide a framework for locating creative, smart development features such as a connected network of safe streets, neighborhood parks, open space, efficient development patterns, and better neighborhood design. SDPs provide greater certainty for all parties: the city, developers, and the neighbors since a detailed overall plan is approved as a general plan amendment and the area may be zoned in accordance with this plan, in advance of development. The Council may rezone the entire property at the time of approval of the Specific Development Plan, they may rezone only a portion of the property, or they may defer the rezoning until such time as application is made for project plan or subdivision approval. Thus, all the stakeholders will know what will be built, and the quality of development expected. As a result, individual owners/developers and interested citizens will likely spend less time in hearings on a particular project located within a SDP area.

The City, and/or property owners should prepare SDPs for large or critical areas of the City, which may include many property owners in a particular area. Undeveloped or developed tracts with inadequate facilities may be considered for SDPs so that the timing of critical infrastructure can be coordinated with development. Specific Development Plans may include residential development, commercial development, or a combination of the two in mixed use projects. In some areas a SDP may be optional, such as in areas designated in the General Plan for "urban residential" or "commercial development". In these areas a Specific Development Plan may be initiated by the land owner, or required by the City for large, undeveloped tracts of land, or where greater flexibility and creativity of design is desired, such as in a mixed-use development involving residential and commercial uses. Once an optional SDP is approved, however, no building permit should be issued unless subdivision applications, project plans and other development are consistent with the SDP. Where SDPs are proposed on adjoining tracts of land, or nearly adjoining lands, there should be no gaps or islands of land not covered by the plans. The City may request the inclusion of properties needed to avoid such gaps and islands.

SDPs should be mandatory in newly developing areas and tracts over 3 acres annexing to the City. These areas include subdivisions of three or more acres, or site plans of three acres or more in areas designated "agricultural" or "rural agricultural". As with optional SDPs, once a plan has been approved any specific development plan must comply with the SDP.

The process to establish a SDP may be initiated by the Mayor, the Municipal Council, or interested property owners who represent a majority of the land area, and at least 1/3 of the value of real property within the planned area. Property owners who initiate SDP requests should pay the cost of preparing the plan. Similarly, an SDP fee should be imposed on persons seeking approvals

required to be consistent with a specific plan initiated by the City in an amount that is proportional to the applicant's relative benefit derived from the SDP.

SDPs should be prepared in consultation with the land owners and neighbors. The Mayor may appoint a steering committee to guide development of the plan, when it involves more than one property owner, and it is undertaken by the City. The steering committee should include persons representing affected property owners, neighbors, Planning Commission, Municipal Council, and city departments. If a consultant is hired by the City to prepare the specific plan, the Steering Committee may assist in evaluating the proposals and selecting the consultant.

A specific plan must have enough detail so that individual projects can be reviewed and approved administratively if the proposal conforms to the plan. Stakeholders, including landowners, developers, existing businesses and area residents need to be involved in the planning process to set and support these standards. With input from stakeholders, a set of objectives for each SDP should be identified. For example, the plan may encourage a certain type of development or may endeavor to protect open space.

The adoption of a specific plan does not necessarily vest development, but its entitlements may be defined by development agreement. Specific plans themselves are dynamic documents and may be subject to future revisions.

A principal purpose of each SDP is to provide administrative approval for projects consistent with the plan. Thus, each SDP, rather than a project, requires close scrutiny. Each SDP should:

1. Be consistent with General Plan policies
2. Meet identified objectives
3. Be compatible with the surrounding community
4. Identify specific uses and detailed site and building design guidelines, including street designs and locations
5. Identify the location, timing, and financing of public facilities

Draft SDPs should be submitted to the Planning Commission and Council for review, modification, and approval. Each plan should include text and maps or diagrams which specify all of the following in detail:

1. Plan objectives, including a narrative of the goals and objectives of the plan.
2. Site features analysis, including a map of the area and vicinity that indicates existing land use, topography, and natural features such as wetlands, geologic hazards, high water table, existing trees, water bodies, overhead utility lines, easements, surrounding land uses and streets.
3. Proposed land uses, including open space and parks.
4. Proposed utilities and other essential facilities.
5. Standards and criteria by which development will proceed (that may vary from the zoning ordinance), and standards for conservation, development and utilization of natural resources.

6. Existing land ownership pattern.
7. Circulation and transportation plan, including pedestrian pathways and bikeways.
8. Design standards, including street cross-sections.

The Planning Commission shall hold a public hearing on the SDP, as recommended by the Steering Committee, and should make recommendations to the Municipal Council, which would have final approval authority. The hearing process would be essentially the same as that for the General Plan. Once approved, a specific SDP should be added to the General Plan's specific policies for that area. Each SDP area should be rezoned to a new Specific Development Plan Overlay zone that requires all future development in the area to conform to the adopted SDP. If an SDP plan applies to land outside the City limits, the plan should indicate where the SDP overlay zone will be applied upon annexation. New construction under site review or building permit review should be required to meet the special development and design standards of an applicable SDP. Finally, allowed uses, standards, and procedures of an SDP zone should supplement and supersede standards and procedures of the underlying zone.

This new level of planning in the City will solve problems for both the City and developers: it empowers the City to exert greater control and coordination over the development process, promotes more liveable neighborhoods, creates a more predictable development process, and achieves greater consensus in the process. A thorough specific plan can enable planners to effectively implement selected long term general plan objectives in a relatively short time frame. This policy is to be flexible, allowing the City to create standards for the development of a wide range of projects or solutions to any type of land use issues. The plan may present the land use and design regulations which guide the development of a new civic center, or incorporate land use and zoning regulations, infrastructure plans, and development approval processes for the development of residential, office, commercial and open space uses.

The City will have to budget monies to have SDPs prepared, with reimbursement as development occurs. Development within areas targeted for SDPs should be restrained to the extent possible until such plans are prepared. The Administration, Council, and Planning Commission must be included in the process of prioritizing areas where SDPs will be prepared. SDPs that have not been developed within five years of their adoption should be reviewed by the Planning Commission to determine whether such SDPs remain viable or need to be amended.

Zoning and Development Policy Changes

In order to implement this plan, within the values of the city's residents, and to achieve the goals they have established, certain land regulation policies need to be considered. The following list of policies, while not an exhaustive one, will go a long way in achieving positive change in the community.

1. Establish a land trust, and a team of city officials, business people, and residents to actively seek to acquire lands for open space, and to manage those resources.
2. Consider having a bond election for funds to purchase open space along key corridors of the city for parks, trails, and buffer yards.

3. Write an “open space” subdivision ordinance which mandates set-asides of common open space, even in conventional subdivisions. Make the integration of open space the rule, not the exception. Make this ordinance simpler than the existing performance development ordinance. To encourage its use, it must be easier to get approved than the “no-risk, cookie-cutter” subdivisions which are seen all too often.
4. Re-write the Performance Development Ordinance. There are legitimate purposes for having performance developments - design continuity, flexibility to deal effectively with difficult development settings, more efficient land use patterns, economy etc. But there is growing dissatisfaction with some of the features of this ordinance and its results. Some of the things that should be examined for change are:
 - a. Simplify the ordinance. It must be easier for staff to administer, and it must be simple, and thus, less risky for developers.
 - b. The city may want to consider limiting its use to Low Density Residential (LDR1 and LDR2) and Very Low Density Residential (VLDR) designations. The zones within the Medium Density Residential (MDR) and High Density Residential (HDR) general plan designations already allow a variety of building types and site layout options. Such zones have high enough densities that bonuses in these areas are unnecessary.
 - c. The density bonus provisions should be reduced. That is, the types of features needed to justify a bonus should be more restrictive. Some of the density bonus features used to encourage better design should simply be required of all projects.
 - d. The base density allowed in an R2PD (Two-Family Residential, Performance Development) should not be based on the assumption that the parcel to be developed could be used exclusively for two-family dwellings without the PD overlay zone. In practice, very few subdivisions consist entirely of duplexes, even in R2 zones. The typical R2 neighborhood should still be predominantly one-family, with a small percentage of duplexes. For this purpose the plan proposes making two-family dwellings a conditional use in the R2 zone. The density in an R2PD should, therefore, be no more than 20% higher than the R1.6 (One-Family Residential) zone (the zone next lowest in density to the R2 zone), instead of being twice as high.
 - e. The base density of R1 (One-Family Residential) and R2 (Two-Family Residential) Performance Developments should be the number of R1 lots that could be designed on the site (plus 20% for R2 zones). The developer should be required to submit a “lot yield plan” to show how many lots the site would yield under a conventional subdivision. This would be the base density, or number of units allowed, and any bonus granted would be on top of this. This would eliminate the “built in” density bonus for PD’s by virtue of the fact they are not limited by the geometrical constraints of designing lots with street frontage, and average lot widths.
5. Develop an adequate Public Facilities Ordinance which establishes “acceptable levels of service” for such things as roadways, intersections, storm drainage facilities,

water lines, water pressure, sewer lines, fire and EMT response times, etc. If a development project is shown to create impacts in excess of these accepted levels of service, it would not be approved. Or at least it would not be approved until either the developer or the city made improvements calculated to raise service levels to accepted levels.

6. Consider amending the Land Development and/or Subdivision Ordinance to require all necessary improvements be completed and accepted for maintenance before building permits are issued.
7. Establish more definitive hillside development standards, particularly with respect to grading, stabilizing or retaining slopes, and flooding and erosion control.
8. Encourage the use of alleys in new developments so that garages are less prominent from the street.
9. Discourage future land use districts or zones from locating adjacent to another district if its average daily vehicle trips per acre is double that of the adjoining district. (Based upon typical base gross densities for the respective zones. Note: This shall not apply to zones bordering A (Agricultural) or PF (Public Facilities) zones. Other exceptions may be where a multi-family zone is used as a buffer on the edge of a neighborhood along a collector or arterial street. If this policy were adopted no zone more dense than an R2 (Two-Family Residential) zone could locate next to R1.10 (One-Family Residential) and R1.8 (One-Family Residential) zones. No zone more dense than R3 (Medium Multiple Residential) could locate next to R1.6 (One-Family Residential) and R2 zones. No zone more dense than R4 (High Multiple Residential) could locate next to R3.)
10. Require off-site road or intersection improvements of the developer, commensurate with the impact imposed by the respective development.
11. Require traffic impact studies for all multi-family re-zonings and general plan amendments.
12. Allow multi-family zoning only on collector and arterial streets in areas designated on the general plan map for multi-family housing. Or perhaps only certain multi-family zones i.e., R4 (High Multiple Residential) and R5 (Very High Multiple Residential).
13. Permit multi-family housing on the outskirts or "edges" of lower density residential neighborhoods only where traffic from the multi-family housing can get direct access to a collector or arterial road without going through a lower density residential district.
14. Prepare and adopt specific development plans as set forth in this chapter. Prepare and adopt an ordinance creating a Specific Development Plan Overlay Zone and establish standards and procedures to implement the policies of adopted specific development plans.

Chapter Seven

Parks, Recreation, and Open Space

Introduction

Park and recreation opportunities serve as one of the benchmarks against which the quality of life within a community can be measured. Recreation is increasingly viewed as an important factor in maintaining adult health--both physical and mental. It is perceived as more than just a weekend activity. Recreation is an integral and necessary element of life which needs to be incorporated into a daily routine. In addition to sports, recreation for both adults and children includes physical activities, social contact, experiences in natural environments, and intellectual and cultural experiences. Child behavior and development studies have documented the importance of play, not only for children's physical development, but also for social, intellectual, and creative growth. Recreation is seen as a means to an end rather than simply as an end itself.

Parks and open space, whether for passive or for active recreation, are important elements in creating a balanced living environment. The increase in dual income households and the pace of life in general, causes leisure time to often come at a premium. Having recreational opportunities close at hand is important not only for convenience, but to maintain the physical and social strength of the community through active recreation and social interaction with family and neighbors. Provo's citizens have repeatedly expressed the need and the desire for additional parks, recreational opportunities, and the retention of the open and rural feeling of the community.

In establishing a parks and recreation plan for a community, it is important to provide a variety of recreation experiences through various sizes of parks intended for different types of use and users. Parks should be designed with the users in mind, whether those users be healthy children and adults, senior citizens, or the disabled. It is also important to achieve equitable distribution of basic park lands, recreation facilities, and programs throughout the community by applying standards uniformly and consistently.

Park Standards

The National Recreation and Parks Association establishes standards for park and open space acreage in relation to population size. Standards vary according to park types which include neighborhood parks, community parks, and special use or regional parks. Parks are classified based on their size and service area. Current standards are listed in Table 7.1.

TABLE 7.1 NRPA PARK STANDARDS			
Park Type	Service Area	Acres/1,000 People	Desirable Size
Neighborhood	½ mile radius	1 - 2	4 - 8 acres +
Community	1 ½ mile radius	4	5 - 60 acres
Special Use/Regional	No applicable standard	4	Variable

A *neighborhood park* will generally provide activities for children up to fifteen years, their parents and senior citizens. Facilities may include open lawn areas for a variety of informal field sports, tot-lots, playgrounds, picnic tables and/or shelters, drinking fountains, restrooms, horseshoe pits, sand volleyball courts, benches, and possibly tennis or hard-surfaced play areas for basketball. These parks are generally designed as walk-to facilities and, as such, do not include large parking lots or any on-site parking if the site is small.

A *community park* will generally be designed to serve all age groups and persons with disabilities and will provide a wide variety of recreation opportunities. In addition to facilities found in neighborhood parks, community parks may include regulation baseball, football, and soccer fields, multiple tennis courts, multiple picnic pavilions, amphitheaters, and parking lots.

Special use/regional parks are large recreation areas that serve an entire city or region. They usually exceed fifty acres in size and often include a special use facility such as a golf course, nature center, botanical garden, outdoor theater, trails, zoo, or a broad expanse of natural scenery or open space. Regional parks are designed to accommodate large numbers of people for a variety of day use activities. If possible, they should be developed around a unique or significant resource or emphasize regional recreational interests. Regional parks can also serve as buffers and separations between communities or other urban areas.

The National Recreation and Parks Association guidelines recommend ten acres of parks for every 1,000 persons in Provo. Based on the 1996 population of 101,154, this computes to a need of approximately 1,011 acres of park land. As the city continues to grow, this need will increase proportionally. These standards should be viewed as a guide as they address minimum, not maximum goals to be achieved. The need for city parks can be offset by the proximity of state parks.

Utilization of school facilities or privately owned facilities can also address community needs through joint use agreements. This approach should be expanded, especially if there is an identified shortage of city-controlled facilities in particular geographical areas or specific uses such as indoor swimming, tennis, racquetball, etc.

Planning for Parks

The importance of advance acquisition of park land and open space cannot be stressed strongly enough. Once general locations have been identified as suitable for parks or open space as set forth

in the Parks and Recreation Master plan, land should be acquired in advance of actual need in order to ensure its protection and availability for future use. Once these lands are acquired, they may be leased for agricultural or other use until the land is to be developed. The acquisition and/or reservation of prime open space should be a priority.

However, not all pieces of land are suitable for park development. As the city considers land to purchase, receives offers of donated land, or requires park land dedication as a condition of development, it should be careful to not become caretakers of unusable or high maintenance property. All property considered for acquisition should have a reconnaissance report describing zoning, neighborhood conditions, traffic patterns, and site features such as soils, seismic limitations, water availability, development capability, and historical and environmental considerations.

One of the major difficulties in any park plan is to establish funding sources for acquisition, development, operation, and maintenance of the park system. Although federal and state funding programs for recreation exist, these sources have dwindled in recent years and some programs have ended altogether. Cities are having to depend more and more on local revenues, donations, and volunteerism to develop their parks and recreation programs. The key to park funding is to establish an annual commitment within the capital improvement program for park property acquisition, new park development, and existing park renovation.

Existing and Proposed Parks

There are many existing and proposed parks within Provo City’s boundaries. They include regional parks, special use parks, community parks, neighborhood parks, and the Provo Canyon Parkway System. The following information lists the type of park, the name of the park, with current and/or proposed acres.

A. REGIONAL PARKS

1.	North Park	18	Acres
2.	Provo Canyon Parkway System	100+	Acres

B. SPECIAL USE PARKS

1.	East Bay Golf Course	209	Acres
2.	Provo Golf Course	200	Acres proposed
3.	Squaw Peak Nordic Sports Park	260	Acres proposed
4.	Provo River Parkway Trail System		
	a. Paul Ream Wilderness Park	17	Acres
		4	Acres proposed
	b. Exchange Park	16	Acres
	c. Riverside Park	8	Acres
	d. Ron Last Park (City owned-privately operated)	2	Acres
	e. Provo River/CUP Corridor	170	Acres
5.	Utah Lake/East Bay Wetlands Nature Area	100	Acres proposed
	a. Utah Lake/CUP Lake Trail System	14	Acres

6.	Memorial Park	7	Acres
7.	Provo Recreation Center and Pool		
8.	Provo Gun Range	20	Acres
9.	Rock Canyon Trailhead	4	Acres

C. COMMUNITY PARKS

1.	Slate Canyon Park	60	Acres proposed
2.	Kiwanis Park	27	Acres
3.	Harmon Park	5	Acres
4.	Sertoma Park	14	Acres
5.	Rock Canyon Park	55	Acres
6.	Timp-Kiwanis	11	Acres
7.	Footprinters Park/Softball Complex	15	Acres
		6	Acres proposed
8.	Sunset View Park	14	Acres
		6	Acres proposed
9.	Fort Utah Park	15	Acres
10.	Rotary Park	12	Acres
11.	Lion's Park	17	Acres
12.	North Side / Provo Canyon	60	Acres proposed
13.	West Side / High School	20	Acres proposed

D. NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS

1.	Bicentennial Park	31	Acres
2.	Pioneer Park	4	Acres
3.	Powerline Parks	5	Acres
4.	West Park	2	Acres
5.	Grandview Park	8	Acres
6.	Neighborhood Park	.8	Acres
7.	Provost Park	4	Acres
8.	Harbor Park	2	Acres
		8	Acres proposed
9.	Road Side Park	.25	Acres
10.	Riverview Park	13.5	Acres proposed
11.	Carterville Park	3.5	Acres
12.	Maeser Park	2	Acres
13.	One additional neighborhood park required on west side of city	4	Acres
14.	Two additional neighborhood parks required on north side of city	4	Acres proposed (each)
15.	One additional park in the area between 300 South and the railroad tracks	2	Acres proposed

E. PROVO CANYON PARKWAY SYSTEM

- | | | |
|----|-------------------|--|
| 1. | Canyon View Park | UDOT |
| 2. | Canyon Glen | City owned |
| 3. | Nunns Park | County owned |
| 4. | Bridal Veil Falls | City owned-a private lease |
| 5. | Upper Falls | Forest Service owned - County operated |
| 6. | Vivian Park | County owned and leased |
| 7. | South Fork Park | City owned and operated |
| 8. | Big Springs Park | City owned (proposed) |

Major Recreation Facilities

Along with standards for park acreage per 1,000 people, standards exist for major facilities per 100,000 people. Table 7.2 lists fifteen facilities, the national standard, existing facilities of each type in Provo City, a proposed Provo City standard with an additional facility amount needed, and a proposed Provo City standard with a 20% growth projection with an additional facility requirement.

TABLE 7.2 MAJOR RECREATIONAL FACILITIES						
Facility Type	Standard per 100,000	Existing Facilities	Proposed Standard	Amount Needed	Proposed Standard w/ 20% Growth	Amount Needed
Little League Baseball	20	12	15	3	18	6
Pony League Baseball	11	2	6	4	7	5
Full Size Baseball	5.5	2	3	1	4	2
Softball	33	8	15	7	18	10
Football/Soccer	10	9	15	6	18	9
Rugby	None	1	2	1	2	1
Tennis	50	23	45	22	54	31
Facility Type	Standard per 100,000	Existing Facilities	Proposed Standard	Amount Needed	Proposed Standard w/ 20 % Growth	Amount Needed
Pavilions	50	38	56	18	68	30
Swimming Pools	5	2	3	1	4	2
Golf Courses	54 holes	27 holes	27 holes	0 holes	45 holes	18 holes

TABLE 7.2 MAJOR RECREATIONAL FACILITIES						
Community Rec. Center	None	0	1	1	1	1
Cultural Arts Center	1	0	1	1	1	1
Performing Arts Center	1	0	1	1	1	1
Senior Citizen Center	1	1	1	0	1	0
Gymnasiums	None	6	11	5	13	7

The Provo City Parks and Recreation Department has officially proposed the following major facilities for future development as outlined in the Parks and Recreation Master plan. These proposed facilities, found in Table 7.3, fall in the category of regional recreation facilities.

TABLE 7.3 PROPOSED REGIONAL RECREATIONAL FACILITIES
1. Olympic Ice Sheets
2. Minor League Baseball Field
3. Recreation Center (with a 50 meter indoor pool)
4. Performing Arts Center
5. Additional Softball Complex
6. Additional Little League Complex
7. New Prep League Baseball Field
8. Second Outdoor Swimming Pool

Details about these proposed facilities and plans for capital improvements to existing facilities can be obtained by referring to the Parks and Recreation Master plan.

Provo City Parks and Recreation Goals

The Parks and Recreation Master plan outlines the eleven goals listed here. That plan also contains extensive policies to be followed in the achievement of these goals. For a complete listing of those policies, please refer to the Parks and Recreation Master plan. (Contact the Reference Desk at the Provo City Library to view a copy.)

Goal 1: Provide a system of attractive and accessible parks and recreation facilities that will provide a complete range of activities for all age groups.

- Goal 2:** Encourage and provide increased public access to natural amenities such as the Provo River, Utah Lake, Rock, Slate and Provo Canyons and mountain open space.
- Goal 3:** Protect and enhance Provo’s cultural, historic, and architectural resources.
- Goal 4:** Promote efficiency and resource conservation in the selection, design, operation and maintenance of parks and recreation facilities.
- Goal 5:** Encourage the use of bicycling as a mode of transportation and recreation.
- Goal 6:** Provide a well-rounded selection of recreation programs and activities that will provide uplifting, healthful, enjoyable, and personally satisfying experiences for city residents.
- Goal 7:** Pursue special events of regional, statewide, national, and international significance to intensify community pride, enhance economic development, and assist in providing lasting facilities to be used by city residents.
- Goal 8:** Strengthen the role of the cultural arts in recreation programming.
- Goal 9:** Maintain a progressive Urban Forestry and Community Beautification program.
- Goal 10:** Develop funding sources and strategies to supplement appropriation from the city general fund on providing park and recreation facilities.
- Goal 11:** Provide a burial park that meets the needs of the citizens in times of bereavement and also adds to the beauty and dignity of the community.

Chapter Eight **Transportation and Circulation**

Introduction

The transportation and circulation system is a key component in the development of a community, whether it is in residential developments, central business districts, industrial developments, or commercial centers. A viable transportation and circulation system can contribute to the character of a community and promote safety, orderly growth, economic growth, and environmental sensitivity.

Provo City has grown steadily within the last twenty years and will continue to do so. Population projections show an estimated increase of about 50,000 to 70,000 people in Provo by the year 2020. Steps need to be taken to ensure that an adequate transportation and circulation system will be available for the future. Alternative modes of transportation and circulation are needed to increase the effectiveness of the current system.

The vision of the future transportation system for Provo is influenced by the goals and objectives derived by the Provo Task Force 2000. The Transportation and Circulation Element of the general plan will concentrate on both the current status and future proposals for improvements in the transportation system. Those areas include the headings found in Table 8.1.

TABLE 8.1 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION HEADINGS	
1. Regional Planning	8. Pedestrian Paths
2. Land Use	9. Railroads
3. Street System	10. Air Transportation
4. Transportation Demand Management	11. Air Quality
5. Parking	12. Funding
6. Public Transportation	13. Education
7. Bike Paths	14. Future Studies

Regional Planning

Much of the transportation demand in Provo City is created by citizens, students, workers, business customers, and those living outside of the city. These people play an important role in maintaining the economic viability of the city. They also create some of the greatest challenges to the transportation and circulation system. Further, land use and transportation decisions made by other jurisdictions in Utah County have a significant impact on Provo City.

In addition to Provo City, five other entities--the Utah Department of Transportation, Utah Transit Authority, Utah County, City of Orem, and Springville City--influence transportation within Provo City. Also, Mountainland Association of Governments has a responsibility to ensure that each of these entities considers area-wide transportation planning in Utah County. As the metropolitan area continues to grow, there are increased transportation impacts on Juab, Salt Lake, and Wasatch counties. If Provo City is to be successful in controlling its transportation future, cooperation and coordination with other jurisdictions and agencies is essential.

Economic issues are a major impediment to regional land use planning. Every jurisdiction should develop its own commercial and industrial developments to maintain a stable economic base. There is competition among these jurisdictions to lure tax revenue-generating businesses. Without cooperation in the planning of land uses, regional transportation plans fail to adequately address the impacts of land use decisions across jurisdictional boundaries.

Economic development desires can impact decisions relating to the control of transportation. Many of the incentives and disincentives used to influence the transportation choices are ineffective or economically unacceptable if implemented inconsistently or by only one jurisdiction. The vision and direction expressed in the general plan must be shared with and accepted by other jurisdictions and transportation agencies. These agencies and jurisdictions can be partners in helping Provo City achieve the objectives contained in the Task Force 2000 value statements.

Land Use

There can be no doubt of the link between land use and transportation. The types of land use and their locations influence the travel patterns of an area. In the past, the primary solution for congestion was to build newer roads and additional travel lanes. This approach, which is very costly, encourages more growth, which again results in increased levels of congestion.

As the transportation and circulation system in Provo City is modified to be more transit-oriented and allow greater options for other modes of travel, we need to recognize the benefits of matching land use patterns with the total transportation and circulation system. Transportation and circulation systems benefit from higher densities along major transit corridors, provided that all other public infrastructure, including schools, are meeting the demands placed upon them. Encouraging higher density housing and concentrating business and commercial uses at transit corridors allows transit to provide better service and greater opportunities for ridesharing. Major transit corridors where significant bus service is provided include State Street, Freedom Boulevard, University Avenue, University Parkway, and 900 East.

Allowing neighborhood commercial uses in residential neighborhoods provides economically viable services within walking distances of the users. New commercial developments can be designed to better interact with non-motorized modes of transportation. For example, bicycle racks can be provided and shower/locker room facilities can be installed by employers to encourage bicycling, walking, and jogging.

Street System

The street system is the circulatory system of the city, providing routes for the movement of goods, services, and people. The street system provides both access and mobility. The majority of Provo City's street system is laid out in a grid pattern, especially in the central area. The grid pattern allows for the greatest accessibility and spreads local traffic over a number of streets. This street pattern generally minimizes travel lengths to get from one point to another. However, many new developments have built streets that contain curves and cul-de-sacs. Cul-de-sacs often discourage walking in a neighborhood, and make it difficult to travel from one street to another. There are advantages and disadvantages of the grid patterns and other street patterns. (See Map #8.1 in the map document accompanying the general plan for the Major Streets Plan.)

Right-of-way Designations

Within the city, streets serve different purposes and are classified by their function and purpose. There are several types of rights-of-way with various purposes and design standards. The location of the right-of-way, what it connects to, and its daily traffic load, determines what type of right-of-way it is. Listed below are definitions of the four major rights-of-way found in Provo City and the four technical classifications to describe the rights-of-ways. Further, capacities and levels of service are defined for additional understanding.

Interstate

An interstate connects two or more states. The interstate allows very limited access, services high traffic volumes, and connects major metropolitan areas. Interstate 15 passes through Provo City's boundaries and connects several states including California, Nevada, Arizona, Utah, Idaho, and Montana.

Highway

A highway is a main public right-of-way that connects cities and towns with other communities. A highway can be a U.S. Route or a State Route. Highway 89, a U.S. Route, passes through Provo connecting Orem to the north and Springville to the south.

Street

A street is a public right-of-way in a city or town, usually including the sidewalks lining one or both sides of the street. Timpview Drive connects several neighborhoods within the city and would meet the definition of a street.

Alley

An alley is a narrow public right-of-way within a block, generally used for vehicular traffic between or behind properties fronting onto another public right-of-way. An example of an alley is located between 700 and 780 South between University Avenue and 100 East just south of the railroad tracks.

Technical Classifications

Freeway

A freeway is a divided, major right-of-way, with full control of access, and with zero at-grade crossings. It can also be a divided, arterial right-of-way for through traffic with full or partial control

of access, capable of safely carrying traffic at speeds greater than 50 mph. Interstate 15 is an example of a freeway that passes through Provo City.

Arterial

An arterial right-of-way is part of the transportation and circulation system serving as the principal network for through traffic. Arterial rights-of-way connect areas of principal traffic generation and important rural highways entering into a community. It also provides for through traffic movement between and around areas and across a city with minimum direct access to abutting property. Arterial rights-of-way are generally wider than collector and local rights-of-way and are given preference in signing and signalization. Arterial rights-of-way should not have lots fronted on them or have any direct access to them. An example is University Avenue, where the main function of the arterial is to provide a safe, rapid, and convenient means of vehicular transportation between various areas of the city.

Collector

A collector moves traffic from an arterial to local rights-of-way and vice versa. Collectors provide limited access to abutting properties and should serve traffic movements within residential, commercial, and industrial areas. Timpview Drive is an example of a collector, which is designed to limit traffic to that occurring in the immediate neighborhoods rather than providing a means of access for through traffic.

Local

A local street is used primarily for direct access to adjoining residential, commercial, industrial, or other abutting property. Moving traffic is a secondary function. A local street generally does not carry through traffic. An example is Sheffield Drive, which serves a residential neighborhood.

Physical Capacity

The physical capacity of a transportation facility is defined as the maximum number of vehicles (or pedestrians) that can reasonably be expected to use the facility in a given time period under prevailing right-of-way, traffic, and control conditions. The physical capacity of a right-of-way and an intersection is dependent on several objective factors, including street width, adjacent development, added turn lanes, parking conditions, traffic signal timing and regulation, types of vehicles using the intersection, and the nature of traffic movement.

Perceived or Environmental Capacity

A perceived capacity, also called ‘environmental’ capacity, is the perception of a level of service within operating conditions as perceived by users of local streets. In other words, is the local street considered acceptable by the adjacent residential, commercial, or industrial occupants? Unlike the objective physical capacity, the perceived or environmental capacity is highly subjective.

Level of Service

The concept of level of service was originally defined as a qualitative measure of operational conditions. Such a measure would ideally cover factors such as speed and travel time, delays, freedom to maneuver, traffic interruptions, comfort and convenience, and safety. Level of service should comprise a set of defined operating conditions for each facility type. Provo City will need to do a city-wide traffic study to recommend levels of service that are acceptable to the city. Due

to the time involved in completing such a study and to avoid a significant delay in adopting the general plan, it is recommended that the traffic study for recommended levels of service be completed after the general plan is adopted. Further, it is important to recognize that the report may recommend significant land use changes to the adopted general plan, in an attempt to make land use more transportation efficient.

Service Volume

The service volume is the maximum amount of traffic that can be accommodated while maintaining the defined operating conditions for a specific level of service.

Challenges

Although land use relates directly to travel demand, street classifications, particularly major streets, do not necessarily relate directly to the land use adjoining a street. For example, many arterial streets pass through residential neighborhoods and commercial developments. These streets need to function as designated in order to meet the legitimate travel needs for which they were planned and designed, while being sensitive to the safety and quality of life needs of the adjacent land use.

The street system doesn't always function the way it is intended to. Increased residential and economic growth inside and outside of Provo City and increased enrollment at Brigham Young University and Utah Valley State College has put additional pressure on the city's street system to accommodate travel demand. Currently, travel demand is primarily composed of automobile trips, which have steadily increased. As traffic volumes and congestion increase along the arterial streets, drivers look for less-congested alternatives. Hence, traffic spills over onto adjacent collector and local streets. This is the primary cause of many of the speeding and traffic volume concerns expressed by residents living along collector and local streets.

Traffic Calming Measures

Physical traffic management techniques the city could use as 'traffic-calming' devices range from mildly restrictive to very restrictive. Some of these measures include those listed below.

Roundabout

A roundabout is a traffic circle constructed in the middle of an intersection. All traffic entering the intersection circles the roundabout in a counterclockwise direction until the desired street is reached. A roundabout slows traffic as it enters the intersection, discouraging high-speed, through traffic.

Gateway

A gateway is a designed entrance to a local street which resembles that of a private entrance. Gateways have textured, colored surfaces with reduced surface width at the entrance. Landscaping with a center island and posts with ornamental gates are installed in a permanent open position to resemble the look of a private street, although it remains a public local street.

Choker

A choker, also called a curb extension, is a narrowing of a street, either at an intersection or mid-block, in order to reduce the width of the road. The term is usually applied to a design which widens

a sidewalk for safe pedestrian crossing. It also includes the use of islands which force traffic toward the curb while reducing the street width.

Diagonal Diverters

Diagonal diverters are barriers which extend diagonally across residential intersections. They are effective at reducing ‘cut through’ traffic where drivers slice through neighborhoods to circumvent congested intersections. However, in some cases, they cause substantial inconveniences for neighborhood residents’ vehicle circulation. Full diverters are placed diagonally across the entire intersection, forcing vehicles to turn one direction at the intersection. Semi-diverters extend halfway across the intersection, preventing vehicles from entering a street in one direction.

Neck Downs

Neck downs are landscaped islands that extend from the curb onto the street. They divide the road into smaller visual units, intruding into the road to form a narrowed look and feel.

Raised Medians

Raised medians are elevated strips which are often landscaped that run parallel to traffic in the middle of the street. They narrow the street space devoted to vehicles, providing pedestrians a refuge when crossing larger streets such as arterials and collectors.

The roundabout is the most recent effort of Provo City to reduce the negative impacts of traffic. Roundabouts are effective methods for regulating traffic flow at busy intersections. Traffic lights often cause vehicle speeds to increase as drivers tend to try to “hit the green or yellow light”; roundabouts, however, cause drivers to slow down to a safe entry speed of fifteen miles per hour. Roundabouts ensure efficient traffic flow as they do not cause drivers to come to a full stop and wait long periods of time for a green light. Also, the lack of an incentive to increase speeds to make a green light will keep traffic flow at moderate speeds, thus preserving neighborhood integrity. One roundabout exists at Seven Peaks Boulevard and 300 North. Roundabouts are proposed at 1720 North and 550 West and at 700 East and Center Street.

Enforcement

Traffic control enforcement is a key component of a traffic calming program. In particular, police enforcement of speed limits and other traffic regulations is important to ensure compliance with these regulations. Two programs that serve as non-physical traffic calming techniques are Speed Maintenance and Radar Trailers (SMART) and school crossing guards. SMART is used to inform automobile drivers the speed they are traveling. When motorists drive through an area where SMART is in use, SMART flashes their traveling speed upon its screen. Citations or fines are not levied with the SMART program. School crossing guards provide safe crossing for school pedestrians walking to and from school during school days and specified times. School crossing guards provide the Provo City Police Department with information on motorists not obeying traffic regulations within school zones. Police officers are monitoring the school zones when complaints are received.

Many programs have been implemented in other communities. Salt Lake City offers a Neighborhood Speed Watch Program for residents who want to be actively involved in monitoring

traffic speeds on their streets. Residents use radar equipment on loan to them from the Salt Lake City Transportation Division to record speeds of vehicles driving on local streets. Drivers found to be driving well over the speed limit are mailed an education pamphlet explaining safety concerns associated with speeding. This is an educational program and no citation or fines are levied.

Traffic Signal Coordination

Traffic signal coordination is effective in meeting some street system challenges. In general, traffic signal coordination results in fewer stops for traffic traveling at the speed limit along a major corridor. Decreasing traffic delays by reducing stops decreases vehicle emissions, resulting in better air quality.

Street Conditions

Street conditions vary greatly throughout the city depending upon the type of road. The Provo City Engineering Department inspects city streets on an ongoing basis and assigns each street a condition category. The five categories assigned by the Engineering Department are 0-2, 2-4, 4-6, 6-8, and 8-10, with 0-2 being a dirt or gravel road and 8-10 for a newly paved road in excellent and/or best possible condition. The current road bond provides the city with the funds necessary to restore all residential streets to the 8-10 category. After having completed the residential street restoration by the year 2000, preventive maintenance measures should ensure city streets a twenty-year life span. Arterial and collector streets need to be resurfaced every five to seven years due to their high volume of traffic. All city streets will be maintained by the Public Works Department to stay within the 8-10 category.

New Arterial Streets

To improve the daily traffic flow from the east side of the city to the west, a constant flowing highway connector will be constructed. This arterial road will connect South State Street to I-15 and will be known as the US 89/189 connector. The connector will run perpendicular to University Avenue, joining I-15 at the southern end of University Avenue. The US 89/189 connector will provide easy access to East Bay businesses and the new mall. Another proposed arterial connection is Lakeshore Drive, connecting Center Street at approximately 3110 West and extending north to Geneva Road. Also, 1150 South from 1600 West to 3110 West will be extended and be classified as an arterial. A joint effort between Provo City and City of Orem will need to occur to provide an arterial which will connect 2000 South in Orem to Columbia Lane and Geneva Road at 3110 West in Provo.

New Collector Streets

Several collectors are proposed to increase connections between arterial and local streets. The east collector that needs connections to make a through street is 4800 North and Foothill Drive. The first connection needs to occur at 4800 North connecting 4525 North between University Avenue and Canyon Road. The second connection will link Mohican Way with Foothill Drive to the North, connecting Foothill Drive on the north and south of Mohican Way. The next connection will link 1450 East to Center Street via Seven Peaks Boulevard and Slate Canyon Drive to Center Street via property owned by the State Hospital.

The following is a list of proposed new collectors:

1. connection of 100 East to 3700 North and University Avenue
2. connection of 1700 North between 1500 West and 2000 West
3. connection of Independence Avenue between 820 North and 1700 North
4. connection of Independence Avenue from the Provo River to 200 North
5. connection of 1390 North from 2770 West to Lakeshore Drive
6. connection of 560 South from 2470 West to 3110 West
7. connection of 2050 West from 600 South to 1150 South
8. connection of 1100 West from 1560 South to 2000 South to the Springville I-15 interchange
9. connection of 1560 South from 1100 West to 500 West
10. connection of Frontage Road and 500 West from 1020 South to 2000 South
11. connection of 500 West, Freedom Boulevard, and University Avenue via the mall perimeter road
12. connection of 1300 South from State Street to Slate Canyon Drive

Major Streets Plan

The Provo City Planning Commission shall adopt and maintain a major streets plan for Provo City in conformance with, and part of the general plan (see Map # 8.1). The major streets plan shall contain the proposed location of all arterial and collector streets, and such other principal streets as the Planning Commission may deem appropriate. Upon adoption of the major streets plan by the Planning Commission, the plan shall be submitted and recommended to the Provo City Municipal Council for adoption.

Local Streets Plan

The Provo City Planning Commission shall also adopt and maintain a local streets plan (see Map # 8.1), which will provide long-range planning for local neighborhood streets. The local streets plan is not intended to define specific alignments, rather it is intended to ensure that property within a given area, which is expected to be subdivided, can be adequately developed and serviced. Upon adoption of the local streets plan by the Planning Commission, the map shall be submitted and recommended to the Provo City Municipal Council for adoption.

Traffic Signals

Currently, a few intersections have met the mandatory warrants, thereby requiring the construction of new signals. The intersections in Table 8.2 are planned for improvement (See Map # 8.1 in the map document accompanying the general plan for proposed traffic signals map).

TABLE 8.2 PROPOSED TRAFFIC SIGNAL LOCATIONS	
820 North and Geneva Road	3300 North and University Avenue
2680 North and University Avenue	5200 North and University Avenue
South State and U.S. 89/189	4800 North and 300 West

Transportation Demand Management

Transportation Demand Management (TDM) is a system of actions intended to alleviate traffic problems through improved management of vehicle trip demand. The purpose of TDM is to

maximize the movement of people, not vehicles, within the transportation system. Provo City recognizes TDM as a powerful tool in reducing congestion, improving air quality and community livability. TDM must play an increasingly important role in transportation decisions and addressing transportation related problems. Three examples of current TDM actions include:

1. mandatory trip reduction for government employers
2. voluntary trip reduction for private employers
3. public education for individual trip reduction

Initial use of TDM strategies by the population, especially major employment centers, should be voluntary with incentives that are attractive enough to actually achieve significant use. These include, but are not limited to: providing subsidies to transit users; preferred or free parking for rideshare vehicles; creating on-site services such as cafeterias, bank or automatic teller machine access, and day care; and other incentives that decrease the need for someone to drive alone to work.

The possibility exists that voluntary use of all available TDM strategies will not achieve the desired shift to alternative transportation modes. In this case, serious consideration should be given to gradually implementing mandatory TDM strategies. Large employers may need to develop a TDM program and/or create disincentive-based options such as: eliminating employee parking allowances and requiring payment for one occupant vehicle parking. TDM strategies are discussed throughout the transportation and circulation element and should be included in the city's pending transportation study.

Parking

The supply and price of parking are important considerations when someone is deciding which mode of transportation to use. The thinking in the past has been to always provide an adequate supply of parking for each individual land use. This encourages automobile use and consumes valuable land for parking, land that could be used for better purposes. As methods to encourage the use of alternatives to the single occupancy automobile are considered, controlling the supply and cost of parking is an effective method for encouraging change. New parking lots including more than 600 parking stalls and expanded parking lots over 350 parking stalls require a permit from the Utah Division of Air Quality. The project must show that new and expanded parking lots are including the best available alternatives to automobile travel including, but not limited to: public transit access, bicycle access, pedestrian access, parking and access control, roundabouts, etc. This also includes transit stops on site, if warranted.

Employee Parking

Currently, many employers provide free parking for their employees. This free parking is essentially an employer-provided tax-free benefit, which serves as an inducement to drive to work. There are several TDM techniques which are available to control commuter parking. They include four suggestions: (1) peak-hour pricing for long-term parking, (2) parking tax on private parking, (3) requirement to charge employees for parking, and (4) employee transportation allowance.

Peak-hour pricing for long-term parking increases rates during morning peak commuter arrival periods. This impacts the commuter while missing most shoppers and deliveries. In areas with

available transit capacity, transit use increases. In areas without adequate transit service, ridesharing and alternative work hours see the greatest increase. A parking tax on private parking increases the city's tax base, which is then used in needed transportation projects. Requirements to charge employees for parking will result in reduced parking needs because of increased use in public transit, ridesharing, and other alternative modes of transportation. Employee transportation allowance encourages the employer to provide a cash allowance equivalent to the value of the employer provided parking. The employee has the option of using the allowance for on-site parking, purchasing a transit pass, ridesharing, bicycling, or walking and pocketing the unused balance.

Studies in other cities have reported that parking management measures by employers resulted in a 4% to 48% reduction in vehicle trips. Employees shifted their travel to ridesharing and increased transit use. Parking spaces not utilized by employees are then available for retail use.

Customer Parking

The convenient availability of short-term parking is vital for the success of businesses. Provo City provides free parking downtown with time restrictions and parking enforcement to encourage the turnover of on-street parking for customer use and discourage long-term parking. Increased long-term parking restrictions and continued enforcement of restrictions may be necessary to further encourage alternatives to single occupant automobile commuting and employee parking.

Residential Parking

Neighborhood preservation and enhancement efforts need to consider parking. Controls placed on the availability of business and institutional parking may force commuters to park in adjacent residential neighborhoods. A residential parking permit program could be considered in neighborhoods affected by overflow business and university parking in residential areas.

Public Transit

The use of public transportation reduces the number of vehicles on the road and reduces the demand for parking. Transit increases the people-carrying capacity of our transportation system by increasing the number of people per vehicle.

Transit use is impacted by land use. Higher densities of residential and commercial developments encourage more efficient bus/commuter rail transit service. Higher density developments can be encouraged at or near major transit nodes. Transit centers should be considered to improve transit service anywhere with a concentration of shopping and employment. Large employers should be encouraged to locate in areas already served by transit or easily served by extension of the transit system. Transit stops should be conveniently located and comfortable. Information needs to be provided to inform people how the system works with routes, times, and dates of transit service.

Utah Transit Authority Bus Routes

The Utah Transit Authority (UTA) feels the current public transit system is a baseline system and could be very much improved if resources were available. Between 1985 and 1995, the UTA increased the number of routes serving Provo from five to sixteen. These routes connect schools and universities, major shopping centers, and major areas of employment. The UTA reports an average of 8,500 passenger trips per day during the week, and 3,200 on Saturdays. UTA would like

to improve on the current system by increasing the frequency of the routes and the coverage area.

New Proposed Bus Routes

Utah Transit Authority currently has plans for route expansion in the Seven Peaks and Riverwoods areas of Provo. As the development and expansion of residential areas continues, UTA will adjust its current routes accordingly in order to provide efficient and convenient service to its customers. For example, the new road construction around the Seven Peaks area will facilitate easy expansion of Route 3's service into that area. Plans are also under consideration to increase the frequency of transit service throughout the city.

Rideshare

Rideshare is a program of UTA which includes coordinating companies and individuals forming van pools and car pools through employer-based programs and individual car pool match-ups. Van pooling offers a lowcost lease program for employers to form van pools and a zero percent interest purchase option for workers who then own their van and share rides with others. Car pooling is an arrangement among private individuals to share the expenses for commuting. Rideshare commuting allows efficient and economical transportation within the Provo/Salt Lake City area, and also reduces automobile pollution. As right-of-way construction continues to be upgraded and expanded, rideshare commuting will become a good alternative, greatly reducing commuter traffic between and within Provo and Salt Lake City.

Commuter Rail

With the imminent arrival of the 2002 Winter Olympic Games in Salt Lake City and I-15 construction, alternative transportation between Provo and Salt Lake City will be more difficult to find. One possible solution is to institute a commuter rail service between Provo City, Salt Lake City, and Ogden City. A three-part commuter rail analysis is under way, the first phase of which has been completed. It provides information regarding route miles, number and location of stations, estimated ridership, operating expenses, funding sources, and start-up costs.

Amtrak/Multi-modal Station

A new Amtrak station is needed to service the Provo/Orem area, replacing the current inefficient Provo station, which consists of a plexiglass shelter, seating for only nine people, one pay phone, and no lighting. The parking area is not hard surfaced and not maintained. Provo City hired RAIL Associates of Olympia, Washington to assess possible sites for potential Amtrak stations. Mountainland Association of Governments, Provo City, and City of Orem found two major possibilities for a new station. They are located as follows: (1) on the west side of I-15 opposite from UVSC and north of 1300 South in Orem near the UTA facility; and (2) on the east side of I-15 and south of Center Street in Provo. The proposed rail station should be multi-modal in nature--able to service Amtrak, Greyhound, UTA, Park and Ride, and commuter rail. It should service the majority of Utah County residents. The two sites in the study with the highest ranking are in Orem and Provo. Both sites should also be considered as station sites for future commuter rail use.

Bike Paths

The recreational path that follows the Provo River from the mouth of Provo Canyon to Utah Lake is about 13.2 miles in length and represents the city's most recent effort in providing bikeways for recreation and commuting purposes. Bike paths within the city are incomplete, and conscious efforts must be maintained to continue construction of safer bike paths and trail systems. (See Map # 7.2 in the map document accompanying the general plan for the bike paths and trails map.)

The last ten years have sparked a wide interest in recreational bicycling. This interest has spilled over into commuting by bicycle, as can be observed by the overflowing bicycle parking racks on campus at BYU. It is believed many more people would commute to work and school by bicycle if safe and efficient bike paths were available. Bicycle commuting should be encouraged through increased routes, as it would cut down on both automobile traffic and air pollution within the city. The Provo City Parks and Recreation Department plans to significantly increase both intercity and recreational bike paths. Employers can promote greater use of bicycles for commuting by providing showers, lockers, and secure bicycle racks for employees and customers. Intercity bike paths would allow safe and efficient transportation routes from residential areas to major employment areas. An added recreational path would follow the eastern borders of the city along the foothills, then south through East Bay and finally around the north side of the airport, ending at Utah Lake State Park.

Provo City's Parks and Recreation Plan identifies four bike path classification routes. Class I routes are a completely separate right-of-way designated for exclusive use of bicycles. Class II routes are paths which are part of the street right-of-way that is separated by a physical barrier, e.g., a landscaping median or a guard rail. Class III routes are designated lanes, which is a portion of the road or shoulder, which has been designated for use by bicyclists. It is distinguished from the portion of the right-of-way for motor vehicle traffic by a painted stripe, curb, or other similar device. Class IV routes have no specific lane designation, but bicyclists use the outside lane or shoulder. The Provo City Parks and Recreation Plan has a mix of these types of bike paths. The West Side may provide an opportunity to develop Class I routes because of the open space and undeveloped land.

Several bike paths have been implemented in Provo City since the last general plan. Although the bike paths plan is continually being updated, the following is a list of streets which have had bike paths added to them:

1. University Avenue from 500 North to the mouth of Provo Canyon has bike paths established on both sides of the street.
2. Timpview Drive has bike paths implemented on both sides of the street adjacent to the parking lane from 2230 North to 4525 North.
3. A sidewalk replacement project in conjunction with BYU has replaced the sidewalk along 900 East on the east side of the street from Temple View Drive down to the intersection of University Parkway where the path crosses to the west side of 900 East and follows the 10-foot wide sidewalk into the BYU campus. This was done in conjunction with the Facility Services Department of BYU.
4. A bike path was established on 700 North between University Avenue and 900 East.

This required the removal of parking along the street and has improved safety along 700 North while providing safe bicycle access.

5. A bike path was added to 200 East between 500 North and 800 North. This bicycle lane exists on the east side of the street and required the removal of parking on that side of the street.
6. A bike path has been added to 800 North which exists currently between 500 West and the Provo River recreation trail.
7. Bike paths have been painted on Center Street from the intersection of 2050 West to the Utah Lake State Park.
8. A bike path has been painted on 3700 North between University Avenue and the Provo City limits which exist just east of the Provo River bridge.
9. A recreation trail has been established along the old Carterville Road alignment which begins at approximately 4300 North and ends at 5600 North at the intersection of the Provo River recreation path.

The above listed bike paths have been established through a lengthy process of contacting adjacent landowners, discussing the ramifications of riding in the bike lanes, the removal of parking, and the continual maintenance of those bike path lanes and lines.

The increasing need for bike paths along 900 East became obvious through observation and bicycle counts. Because of the 5-lane section which exists on 900 East and the asphalt width being 55 feet wide, it was impossible to add a bike lane; however, the city was able to narrow the travel lanes down and paint an 8-inch line 30 inches off the curb face which is not a bike lane per se, but does provide for bicycles to operate outside of the travel lane for vehicles.

The Provo City plan for implementing a useable bike path system throughout the city has been evaluated and the city is in the process of implementing small sections of that as it becomes feasible with the neighborhoods. Provo's most recent addition to the bike path system will be in conjunction with the 1860 South Connector between State Street and 700 East. That system will be constructed with an extra wide sidewalk to accommodate bicycle traffic.

Pedestrian Paths

Walking has changed in popularity from the first and often only choice of transportation for nearly all people a century ago, to an activity now enjoyed by only a small percentage of our population. As urban growth spreads farther out into the suburbs, walking is increasing for recreational purposes, but declining for all other trip purposes.

While the growing travel distances between work and home can account for some of the decline, many who could walk for commuting, school or shopping purposes simply choose not to. Reasons include the convenience of the automobile, time constraints, weather conditions, and pedestrian barriers to access. Provo, with its long blocks and wide streets can be especially frustrating for pedestrians who walk significant distances to cross at an intersection. Much of the attractiveness for walking as an alternative mode of transportation depends on the feeling of open space in the pedestrian environment. Many of the traffic calming techniques discussed earlier in this chapter promote a pedestrian friendly environment.

Other than the obvious sidewalks and signaled crosswalks, pedestrian paths are the same as those used by bicyclists. There are currently six trails for jogging, hiking and bicycling, and another seven are proposed (see Map # 7.2). Table 8.3 lists both existing and proposed facilities:

TABLE 8.3 RECREATIONAL PATHS	
Existing Facilities	Proposed Facilities
1. Provo River Parkway	1. Bonneville Shoreline Trail
2. Great Western Trail	2. Utah Lake Trail
3. Slate Canyon Trail	3. West Side Equestrian Trail
4. Squaw Peak Road/Trail	4. Provo South Loop Trail
5. Rock Canyon Springs to Big Springs Trail	5. New bikeways
6. Existing city bikeways	6. Interconnecting existing and proposed trails
	7. Equestrian facilities on foothill connections

Railroads

Freight rail service in Provo City is provided by the Union Pacific Railroad, the Utah Railway, and the Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad. The Union Pacific Railroad acquired the former tracks of the Southern Pacific Railroad, which are former tracks of the Denver and Rio Grand Western Railroad. The Utah Railway is a coal hauling railway that mainly operates from Provo to Helper, Utah near Price, but has track rights from Helper to Grand Junction, Colorado. The Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad has track rights from Denver to Provo to Salt Lake City on the tracks recently acquired by the Union Pacific Railroad.

Provo is a scheduled stop for trains number five and six daily for Amtrak, the National Rail Passenger Service. The California Zephyr originates in Chicago, Illinois and terminates in Oakland, California passing through the great cities of the West including Denver, Salt Lake City, and Sacramento, before heading back to Chicago from Oakland. The location of the train stop is located at approximately 600 South 300 West. As was discussed earlier in this chapter, there is not a sufficient train station or depot located where Amtrak stops.

The mainline tracks pass through Provo paralleling South State Street, 600 South, and I-15. Approximately 20 trains daily pass through Provo. Many of these trains are interstate trains that do not stop or switch in Provo. Some trains cause minor delays and inconvenience motorists and pedestrians. The railroad tracks also create the need for long viaducts which is evident on the southern part of University Avenue and West Center Street. Further, accesses are often limited along the tracks for safety purposes.

Air Transportation

Provo City's Municipal airport has been in operation at its present location since 1943. It provides complete General Aviation (GA) service for the Utah Valley area and the southern portion of the Wasatch Front. The airport supports approximately 90,000 operations per year and can handle the largest corporate aircraft and jet transports with special handling.

Basing capacity exceeds 330 and the current demand is approximately 210. Future demand is unlikely to exceed 300. For this reason, basing capacity is adequate for the planning horizon with some facility improvements.

Planned improvements include an extension of runway 13/31 to 8,600 feet long by 150 feet wide. This improvement was recommended in the airport master plan to increase the stage length of aircraft currently using the airport and the safety areas mandated by the Federal Aviation Administration. Operational forecasts are consistent among the several documented plans that deal with aviation planning. An annual growth rate of 1.58% is expected in the number of airport operations.

There is no question that the Salt Lake City International Airport will remain the predominant airport in Utah. However, as growth continues in Utah Valley, the institution of commercial service is very likely to occur in the future. Charter service connected with nearby winter recreational areas could prove economically viable. Further, the establishment of commercial service to larger hubs would financially benefit Provo City and the entire aviation community. High-tech and manufacturing facilities, as well as tourist industries, Brigham Young University, and the Missionary Training Center, would all benefit as a result of bringing commercial service to Provo City. Commuter air service would reduce automobile traffic on I-15 between Provo and Salt Lake City. With the exception of a terminal facility, the airport is capable of commuter commercial service now.

Air Quality

In 1970, Congress passed the Clean Air Act, which established ambient air quality standards for several types of air pollution. The Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 were passed in an effort to reemphasize the air quality standards. They established deadlines for progress to be achieved in nonattainment areas with accompanying federal funding and penalties for noncompliance. The amendments require that all federally-funded highway and transit projects come from a Transportation Plan and Transportation Improvement Program that conforms with the latest air quality implementation plan.

Nonattainment areas are classified as marginal, moderate, serious, severe, or extreme. Counties can become nonattainment areas for one or more of four pollutants: particulate matter (PM₁₀), sulfur dioxide (SO₂), carbon monoxide (CO) and ozone (O₃). Provo City is a nonattainment area for particulate matter and carbon monoxide.

When exceeding national PM₁₀ air quality standards in Utah County, it may be characterized as a winter-time problem because strong temperature inversions trap air in the valleys. As particles are emitted into the stagnant air, concentrations may increase levels to almost twice the federal standard. The primary manmade sources of PM₁₀ include nitrogen oxides (NO_x), fugitive dust from road

sanding, motor vehicles, combustion of solid fuels, agricultural activities, and construction services. More than 79% of the emissions in Utah County are attributed to motor vehicles. Control strategies include the wood burning restrictions program, encouraging combustion of natural gas rather than coal during winter at major industrial sources, continuing inspection and maintenance programs for automobiles, and encouraging alternative transit modes.

The primary manmade source of CO is the incomplete combustion of fuels such as gasoline. For Utah's nonattainment areas, 88% of CO emissions are from mobile, wood burning and miscellaneous non-road mobile services. Primarily, local weather conditions and the increasing number of automobiles in the area influence CO levels. Control strategies for CO emissions include wood burning restrictions during winter months which are defined by red, yellow, or green burn days. Since mobile emissions are the primary source of CO, a number of control strategies are directed toward motor vehicles; strategies include enhanced vehicle inspection and maintenance programs, the oxygenated fuels program, roadside enforcement of vehicle emission standards, ridesharing programs, and transportation control measures such as transit improvements and parking lot permits from the Utah Division of Air Quality.

Not meeting the air quality standards developed by the federal government can result in the loss of federal funding for transportation projects. Unless the region's Long Range Transportation Plans and the Transportation Improvement Program can be shown to conform with Environmental Protection Agency regulations, no new capacity-increasing highway or transit projects that are regionally significant may be implemented. The policies that must be implemented to ensure cleaner air may be strict, but achieving clean air has become critical not only to community health, but also to moving forward with any new transportation projects. Provo City will continue to investigate and implement transportation-related measures to reduce air pollution.

Funding

Funding for transportation is divided into two categories: capital budget for the construction of new facilities and an operating budget to fund the day to day staff and maintenance work of the city. A capital improvement program is developed as part of the city's budget each year. Current funding sources for capital improvements in the city include: (1) General funds, (2) Community Development Block Grants, (3) Class 'B' and 'C' state gas tax, and (4) Utah Department of Transportation.

Education

During the development of this general plan, many comments were received from the public about the need for more and better education of the public regarding transportation and traffic issues. The public also stressed the need for information to be made available on transportation issues so that they could better understand why decisions are made by city officials. In addition, public education has been demonstrated to have a measurable impact on commute choices and travel behavior.

Future Studies

In order to get a better handle on local traffic problems, it is recommended that Provo City undertake the following studies:

1. Develop a local table of Trip Generation Rates for targeted land uses within the city. These rates should be based on surveys of existing traffic counts in designated areas.
2. Develop a classification of road levels of service based on “public acceptance” not physical capacity of the road.
3. Look at the feasibility and necessity of using road impact fees.
4. Commission a study to look at the costs/benefits of establishing a city-owned bus system.
5. Commission a study to look at the feasibility of not permitting overnight on-street parking.

Chapter Nine **Environment**

Introduction

The geologic and geographic features of Provo City have created many unique environmental issues. General plan policies for future development must consider environmental issues. This element identifies issues and concerns relating to protection of the environment. The purpose of this element is to examine critical environmental issues and to consider means of preserving the environment for the future.

Natural Resources

Provo City is rich in natural resources. Some resources are visible in the landscape, while others are buried in the soil. All resources must be protected, conserved, and developed. This does not imply that resources should not be used; resources should be used. However, natural resource usage should be tempered with wisdom and governed by a vision of future needs and desires for the natural, physical environment.

The following sections will consider the city's natural resources--air, forests, soils, rivers, wildlife, minerals--and make recommendations for the protection, conservation, development, and use of these resources.

Air

The Wasatch Range borders Provo, creating air quality issues because the mountains are a barrier to airmass flows from west to east. Consequently, Provo has a high degree of particulate matter (PM10) accumulation, carbon monoxide (CO), and ozone (O₃) buildup in its lowlands. The amount of ozone (the brown haze seen settling in the valley) in the air increases as it is trapped between the mountains during temperature inversions in the winter.

Diminishing air quality is directly related to the increase in population in Provo. The ever-increasing population continues to bring more cars and more traffic.

Automobiles are primary contributors to air pollutants in Utah County. Idling automobiles produce twice as many polluting emissions than are produced by automobiles traveling at normal speeds. Positive steps have been taken to reduce stop-and-go traffic in the city. The installation of timed, sequential traffic lights on University Avenue has created a smoother flow of traffic through this major north-south corridor. Prohibiting parking on major arterial and collector streets allows for wider traffic lanes, which help keep traffic moving. Bus turnouts need to be designed for major arterial and collector streets to eliminate buses blocking the paths of other vehicles during loading and unloading. When cars stop for buses, air pollution increases.

Future development plans should consider alternatives which have been implemented elsewhere to promote clean air. Ideas to be considered are roundabouts, narrower streets, alternative modes of transportation, and regulation of wood burning stoves.

Roundabouts

Roundabouts at major intersections have been used in Europe for many years and have several benefits:

1. Reduce stop-and-go traffic, creating a smoother flow of traffic.
2. Reduce and more evenly disperse emissions.
3. Create identifiable landmarks for the community and businesses.
4. Lower maintenance costs due to lack of traffic lights.
5. Preserve the natural environment by providing ornamental flower beds or grass strips which would not be placed at a traffic light.
6. Reduce traffic accidents and congestion.

A roundabout was installed at 300 North and 1200 East. Roundabouts are being considered throughout the city in the Transportation and Circulation element of the General Plan.

Narrower Streets

Provo's wide streets originate from the days of Brigham Young. In those days, streets needed to be wide enough for wagons to turn around. Today, wider streets encourage traffic flow, increasing pollution. Narrower roads make parking more difficult, discouraging driving and encouraging usage of alternative modes of transportation such as bus, bike, train, car pool, and foot. As long as automobiles are the most convenient mode of transportation, alternative travel modes will never reach their potential.

Alternative Modes of Transportation

Communities friendly to pedestrians, bicyclists, and public transportation are more efficient. Planning and transportation demand management policies are needed to become such a community. Pedestrian and bike paths which interconnect the city need to be developed. The Parks and Recreation Department has established bicycle and pedestrian path plans as part of its master plan. Implementation takes planning, public education, and funds to be developed properly. (For further discussion of traffic issues, please see the Transportation and Circulation Element, Chapter Eight.)

Regulation of Wood Stoves

Wood stoves need to be regulated. Most wood stoves are not efficient enough to burn all the toxic gases emitted, such as carbon monoxide. They also contribute to airborne particulate matter in the air, which is hazardous to public health. Wood stoves are also environmentally unfriendly because most of the wood which is burned is gathered from hillsides or from dead timber cut from the forests. This practice increases the erosion rate. When heavy rains come, streams can become clogged with debris and silt that can kill aquatic life. Pellet stoves emit a minimum level of particulate. They burn a compact pellet which is usually the by-product of timber milling. When the air is calm, white haze can be seen lingering over the city in the early morning. The haze results mostly from wood stoves which are left to burn during the night. An ordinance regarding wood stoves or incentives to upgrade to more efficient stoves, such as the pellet stove or natural gas appliances, is recommended.

Forests

Provo City owns many forested acres in the South Fork and Squaw Peak areas. These lands lay next to United States Forest Service lands. While these forests are to be enjoyed, they are also important watershed areas. Strict enforcement of watershed policies is needed to maintain the water supply quality. Forested lands are designated in the general plan as Environmental Sensitive Areas (ESA).

Provo City has an urban forestry program that manages the public tree resources within Provo City. Trees are valuable to the city in terms of the appearance and microclimate of neighborhoods. Efforts should be continued in the management of a sustainable urban forest. New trees should be planted on a systematic basis to replace trees that decline in health due to urban impacts, old age, or insects/disease. The city's urban forestry program should continue to provide guidance to citizens regarding the selection, planting, and proper maintenance of city trees.

Soils

To provide the best mix of future land uses, the capability of the land to support a specific use and the compatibility of the current land use with the proposed future use must be considered.

Soils vary in terms of their suitability for housing, industry, agriculture, recreation, and other uses. Knowledge of soil types is very important when determining land uses. Areas with shallow water tables have limited use for foundations and septic tanks. Steep slopes with rocky soils place severe limitations on foundations and other underground building features.

Soil Limitations for Foundations

When placing a foundation, potential settling, cracking, and flooding of basements need to be considered. The weight capacity of the soil is important in such considerations.

Rivers

The Parks and Recreation Department, which has been actively developing the riverside parks system, monitors and maintains the levees in cooperation with the Storm Water Division of the Public Works Department. The 1983 floods made clear the need to develop a storm drain system that would protect property, decrease soil erosion, and prevent toxic materials from entering the natural stream system that runs through the heart of Provo's industrial sections. Several million dollars have been spent to upgrade the system. Improving the storm drain system is a primary function of the Storm Water Service District. (For more details, please refer to the storm drainage subsection of the Public Services and Facilities Element in Chapter Ten. For more information concerning flooding, see heading below.)

Wildlife

In the process of identifying, preserving, and creating wetlands for wetland mitigation, the city has effectively created new wildlife habitats for waterfowl and other aquatic life. The land west and south of Provo along Utah Lake and the land south of East Bay are prime locations for wildlife preserves and are to remain wetlands.

Parts of northwest Provo are being considered as additional wildlife preserves. The creation of a wetland bank will be valuable to Provo's future development potential. The designation of Environmental Sensitive Area (ESA) protects natural habitats and local deer trails.

Minerals

At present there are no active mining operations within Provo and none are anticipated in the future. Provo derives revenue from the sale of sulfur from a hydrothermal power generation facility in Beaver County near Cove Fort. It is a by-product of the operation and the amounts are minimal.

Other Natural Resources

Properties in Provo Canyon, such as South Fork, have been designated as Environmental Sensitive Areas (ESA). Commercial development is discouraged in the area. Restrictions on the use of such land should remain to protect the watershed.

Land Use Regulation

Hillsides

Development on the foothills and areas above the fault line needs to cease. Alternatives to retard growth and development along the fault zone and in the canyons need to be implemented. Areas located above the 5,200 foot level of the east bench are designated in the general plan as Environmental Sensitive Areas. Land at this altitude is not stable to build upon. The ancient Lake Bonneville shoreline hovered at this altitude. Gilbertian deposits were deposited as fresh water from glacial run-off during the Pleistocene Era (Ice Age) entered Lake Bonneville. It has a very high grade or slope and is consolidated conglomerate. The proximity to the Wasatch Fault Line also makes it unstable. The future Bonneville Shoreline Trail is just below the actual shoreline and follows the Questar Gas easement, which acts as a natural buffer to development. Concerns regarding fire control, providing water, and other services above the 5,200 foot level are also development impediments.

Protection of Water Quality

Watersheds

Watersheds critical to Provo City's spring collection areas exist in several areas of Provo Canyon as well as the South Fork of Provo Canyon. Watershed areas for surface waters tributary to the Provo River are much more extensive and extend all the way to the Upper Provo River drainages. Provo City has adopted a Watershed Protection Ordinance designed primarily to protect the city's pristine spring collection areas from potential contamination. This ordinance is based upon State law which allows a municipality to exercise extraterritorial jurisdiction in watershed areas. While the ordinance is not intended to prohibit any or all development in watershed areas, it does allow the city to regulate development in such a way as to protect the integrity of the city's sources of water supply.

Wetlands

Wetlands play an important role in the ecological system. They are recharge zones for natural aquifers and ground water reservoirs. Wetlands provide a habitat for many varieties of aquatic, land, and waterfowl wildlife. Natural beauty is sustained by wetlands. Wetlands can be created and incorporated into the landscape of industrial parks, subdivisions, and shopping centers. This is being

done already in many areas of the city (i.e., East Bay), but additional incentives to create and preserve wetlands are needed.

Storm Drainage

As wetlands are natural recharge zones which are necessary for continued replenishment of groundwater, concern arises with respect to development. Rain water run-off is ordinarily absorbed into the ground. However, impervious surfaces (i.e., buildings, streets, parking lots, etc.) disrupt this natural process. On impervious surfaces, oil, antifreeze, and other toxic substances are no longer trapped by the natural filtering process of the soils. They are redirected into the storm drainage system which drain directly into the rivers and lakes. In short, these substances are never broken down biologically as they should be because toxins are not filtered in the soil or treated at the wastewater treatment plant. As a result, these pollutants threaten to contaminate surface water.

Oil, antifreeze, and other substances are often dumped directly into the storm drain system which flows through canals to Utah Lake. Severe penalties for illegal dumping into storm drains should be implemented. Signs with dumping fines listed should be posted throughout the community. Information on the dangers of illegal dumping should be stenciled on the pavement next to every storm drain.

Flood Hazard and Control

Soil Drainage and Overflow Hazard

Flood hazards must be recognized when locating housing, business, or industry. The federal government has issued specific regulations to cities where extensive flood areas are located. Thus, knowing which soils are susceptible to flooding and the overall drainage capabilities of soils in Provo is important. Generally, floods have occurred near Utah Lake in poorly drained lower lying areas which are susceptible to rising water levels. Serious flash flooding has occurred along the Provo River and in the mouths of both Slate and Rock Canyons. The last major floods of this nature were in 1983 and 1984.

Flood Insurance Study

A flood insurance study for the city has been developed by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). The study includes flood insurance rate maps that identify areas of the city subject to flooding during 100 year flood episodes (see Map # 9.1). Land use policies should discourage dense development in flood hazard areas. Zoning ordinance provisions can be utilized to ensure that development in flood hazard areas occurs in accordance with FEMA regulations. Administration of flood zone regulations consistent with federal law enables Provo citizens to be eligible for participation in the national flood insurance program.

Upstream of Provo, the Deer Creek Dam on the Provo River is operated by the Central Utah Water Conservancy District. This facility helps provide for the water needs of the community. Although there is no cause for concern at this time, extraordinary events could lead to the failure of this dam. The city has mapped the approximate areas that would be affected by such an event (see Map # 9.3). This map is included in the general plan not to cause alarm, but to make the public and emergency service providers aware of the area that could be impacted by this unlikely event.

Geological Hazards

Safety is a primary concern when discussing the environment. Because Provo lies along the Wasatch Fault, one of the largest continuous fault lines in the United States, Provo has some unique problems that are rarely discussed: rock fall, faults, earthquakes and liquefaction, land slides, and strata expansion.

Rock Fall

Frost wedging can cause boulders to fall from the mountains of the Wasatch Front. Homes located in the foothills are at risk to potential rock fall. As boulders fall and roll through the gullies and ravines of the hillside, it is possible that a multi-ton boulder may find its resting place in a residential area. While it is too late to protect existing homes from this danger, caution must be taken to prevent new homes from being built in the path of potential rock falls, avoiding possible damage to persons and property.

Faults, Earthquakes and Liquefaction

There is great potential for earthquake damage along the Wasatch Front. Areas with high risk of earthquake damage due to liquefaction (soil liquification as a result of ground movement) are found throughout the city (see Map # 9.1). The river bottoms and the west side, especially near Utah Lake, are areas in danger of damage caused by liquefaction. Special engineering standards and additional code requirements must be met to build in these areas.

Geology

The general geologic conditions of the area are shown on Map # 9.2.

Faults and Earthquakes

Earthquake hazards in Provo are important considerations for planning. Map # 9.2 shows two major faults exposed in the mountains east of Provo and two inferred faults, one in the mountains and one in the valley. The term “inferred fault” means that somewhere between the mountains and Utah Lake there is probably an additional fault. An exact location of this fault would be difficult to pinpoint. The following general considerations should be made with respect to planning in fault areas:

1. Major hazards caused by earthquakes are violent ground movement, soil instability, ground shifts, rockslides, and snowslides.
2. Hazardous effects to structures and development can be tempered by sound planning and engineering which identifies and protects areas of the greatest concern.

Through compliance with seismic codes and building regulations, earthquake damage can be minimized in the central area of Provo. The inferred fault need not be a major obstacle to development or new construction in Provo City.

Land Slides

Along the Wasatch Front, alluvium or unconsolidated strata is deposited at the canyon mouths. This land can move in what is called a land slide or slump. When the water table rises, soils become saturated. Water adds weight to the soil, causing movement down the slope. This movement is very

rapid at times and can cause major property damage and, occasionally, loss of life.

Strata Expansion

The Manning Canyon Shale Formation is a prevalent problem along the Wasatch Front. These are soils and strata that expand and shift when saturated. Many foundations have been displaced and cracked in some areas along the higher benches due to strata expansion.

Many areas affected by strata expansion and rock fall have been identified by geologic research. The public needs to be made aware of incentives and funds available to land owners who want their lands designated as permanent open spaces or who want to obtain conservation easements and will grant public access for nature trails or parks. This could be beneficial to the community in ways not yet realized.

Conclusion

Environmental issues are associated with all aspects of the general plan. Decisions affecting the environment affect everyone who lives in that environment. Careful consideration must be taken with any changes made which may affect the environment.

Chapter Ten **Public Services and Facilities**

Introduction

Citizens depend on government and private agencies to provide essential and desirable services and facilities which benefit the community. Public facilities and services include utilities, police, fire, libraries, and schools.

Public services are the backbone of the city. Without certain services, the city cannot develop, grow, or service citizens. The needs and desires of citizens should determine which facilities or services should be expanded to accommodate growth.

Population growth demands increased services and maintenance of existing services. By looking at projected growth rates, city departments can identify needed service and maintenance improvements. Departments which provide public services need to assure improvements keep pace with residential and commercial development.

Municipal Facilities

Provo City Center is located at 351 West Center Street and houses administration and staff offices of the municipal government. These offices include the Mayor, Municipal Council and chambers, Police, Fire, Community Development, Legal, Information Systems, Finance, City Recorder, Personnel, and Parks and Recreation. The present building, completed in 1971, is no longer adequate to provide the current level of service. Several departments have had to be relocated in order to provide better services.

The four departments which make up the Public Works group include Water Resources, Engineering, Public Services, and the Storm Water Service District. These four departments are headquartered in the Water Resource Building at 1377 South 350 East. Operational facilities for these four departments are located in the immediate vicinity. As the city continues to grow, it is anticipated that some expansion of these Public Works facilities will be necessary.

The Provo City Library is located at 425 West Center Street. However, to adequately service citizens, the library needs to expand. The Energy Department is located at 251 West 800 North. The city has relocated some storage of materials to other locations throughout the city to make better use of space within the existing structure. The Eldred Center is located at 450 West 500 North and is the recreational and cultural center for Provo's senior citizens. Facilities include space for dances, lectures, musical interests, hobbies, and administrative offices.

Fire Protection

The city is responsible for ensuring public safety. Minimizing loss of life and property through adequate and efficient fire protection is a service the Provo City Fire Department provides the city and contracted areas, including Provo Canyon, North Fork, South Fork, and Vineyard. The Fire Department provides the essential services of fire protection, emergency medical service, hazardous material control, public education, and fire code enforcement.

Fire Department services also benefit Provo citizens financially. The city has a Class 4 Insurance Services Office rating. Lower insurance rates based on this factor save the community millions of dollars each year on fire insurance. The Fire Department will continue to broaden its service coverage and capabilities to reduce the insurance rating factor even further.

Emergency Response

National standards for emergency response times are three minutes or less to all areas of a city. Central areas of Provo are serviced within a 3.4 minute response time. Outlying areas vary in their response times from four to fifteen minutes (see Map # 10.1). Areas with especially lengthy response times are found in the southeast area from 300 South and 900 East outward, the southern part of East Bay, and east of 900 East from 400 North to 1200 North. Response times in these areas and the extreme northeast of the city do not meet the safe response time standards.

Traffic congestion contributes to lengthy response times. Traffic concentration on arterial streets, during peak travel time, creates a barrier, increasing response times. The flow of traffic north and south is relatively smooth, but traffic flowing east and west often stops for red lights. Steps to control traffic need to be taken in order to provide safe emergency response for the community. Several products on the market provide control of signal lights for emergency vehicles. These products should be investigated and evaluated based on efficiency, effectiveness, and feasibility.

In addition to traffic congestion, roads with grades greater than 12% increase response times because steep grades slow emergency vehicles. During freezing weather, such grades may prohibit access to certain areas. Future roads should not have more than a 12% grade.

In order to decrease response times of fire and emergency personnel, the Fire Department wants to establish single engine fire stations in neighborhoods with unacceptable response times. Plans exist to construct five new stations by the year 2010, as shown in Table 10.1 below.

TABLE 10.1 PROPOSED FIRE STATIONS	
Year	Facility Improvement
2000	Construct station in Southeast
2001	Construct station near Provo Airport
2002	Relocate Canyon Road Station
2004	Construct station near BYU
2010	Construct station in Central Area

NOTE: New stations to have a minimum manning to include 3 firefighters on Engine and 2 paramedics on rescue unit

These additional fire stations should sufficiently reduce emergency response times in areas of the city which currently have unacceptable response times.

Public safety is being brought closer to citizens through a neighborhood-based emergency preparedness program. Community Emergency Response Teams (C.E.R.T.) are organized, trained, and equipped to respond to disasters and emergencies requiring trained manpower to assist in providing public safety. C.E.R.T. volunteers are found through contacts with clergy groups, civic clubs, and similar organizations.

Future fire and emergency medical service needs are governed by factors such as type and size of population, residential, commercial, and industrial growth, political philosophies, and government mandates. However, the Fire Department can control some impacts of growth and politics by being proactive in response to fire safety. A 10% reduction in fire related problems is realized for each 10% increase in fire prevention efforts.

Fire Prevention

Fire prevention can be achieved through fire education, code enforcement, efficient dispatch, and adequate, well-maintained equipment.

Education

Fire prevention is the most economical way to fight fires. Public education is an effective way to prevent fires. The Fire Department actively provides fire and life safety education to the primary education system of the Provo School District. The recently acquired fire education trailer, designed to provide “hands on” fire safety training for young people, will aid in teaching children to save lives and property.

Code Enforcement

Strict fire and building code enforcement prevents fires. Fire and building codes ensure firefighting equipment can be effectively used in buildings. All commercial and multi-residential buildings need to be fire sprinkler protected. Fire sprinkler systems in all new residential construction should be mandatory. Incentives for retro-fitting existing structures should be implemented. Penalties for noncompliance to nuisance ordinances such as weed abatement, trash, illegal dumping, and unkempt properties should be increased.

Dispatch

Fire dispatch is a vital link to the community and needs to be a top priority. Currently, dispatch is located in a building which does not meet seismic standards. This creates potential danger in the event of an earthquake. The facility must be upgraded to current seismic standards. Employee turnover has also been a problem, creating less reliable service. Incentives need to be offered to employees to discourage turnover.

Equipment

The Fire Department will continue to maintain and replace equipment needed for fire response services. The replacement of emergency vehicles is provided for by a thirty-year replacement schedule. Plans should be implemented to install a computer system which provides area-wide data

communication with dispatch and stations with portable computer information links to response vehicles for dispatch data, incident reporting, global positioning, and automatic statistical generation.

Police Protection

Provo's Police Department is a multi-faceted law enforcement agency committed to meeting the constant and changing needs of the community. The Police Department strives to serve the community and promote an environment of mutual respect between citizens and police officers. The department's mission is: to provide high quality, community-oriented police services with sensitivity; to protect constitutional rights; and to provide leadership for the law enforcement profession.

Crime

Provo has long been regarded as a safe place to live. However, in recent years, crimes committed in the city have become more serious in nature. Intoxication has become driving under the influence. Juvenile delinquency has led to gang activity and drug abuse. Disturbing the peace has turned into domestic violence, rape, child abuse, and robbery.

To meet the changing needs of the city, the Police Department continually assesses the safety of the community. Provo residents enjoy a relatively low crime rate and a quality of life that many communities envy. According to the latest U.S. Department of Justice Uniform Crime Report, Provo is 82% below the national average in violent crime.

Law Enforcement and Other Services

The Police Department employs ninety-two officers, twenty-two dispatchers, and thirty-nine support personnel. Thirty-two crossing guards are also employed to assist children on their way to and from school. However, Provo's ratio of police officers per thousand citizens is 0.8, significantly below the national average of 2.5 officers per thousand citizens. The city hopes to have one officer per thousand before the year 2000, enabling police to maintain service levels as the city grows and to focus on additional crime prevention activities.

The Police Department currently consists of three divisions and one bureau. The Patrol Division is the most visible. Patrol officers, on bikes and in police vehicles, investigate criminal activity, respond to the emergency calls, and monitor traffic to free the streets of hazards. The Communications Center, more commonly known as dispatch, works closely with patrol officers to provide rapid radio and telephonic communication. Police personnel dispatched 75,673 calls for police service in 1996, more than 20,000 of those were 911 calls.

The Support Services Division provides officers with the latest in law enforcement training in areas such as computer-aided composite sketching, criminal profiling, legal updates, and crime analysis. Highly trained, specialized teams are assigned to this division to enhance response to unique needs in the community. These teams include a Mountain Rescue Team, Hostage Negotiation Team, Special Response Team, Dignitary Protection Team, and Accident Investigation Team.

The Criminal Investigative Division is composed of several units including investigative detectives. The division is in the process of creating a state-of-the-art crime laboratory to analyze evidence

collected at crime scenes. The department obtained a federal grant to purchase the equipment. The Narcotics Enforcement Team is included in this division. These officers work with officers from Utah County agencies as a multi-agency task force, investigating cases involving the use and distribution of narcotics.

The Public Safety Information Bureau develops and coordinates community relations and crime prevention programs to educate the public. The bureau maintains a state-of-the-art electronic records system in addition to processing and preparing citations, documents, and reports to the courts, citizens, and other city departments. Included in this bureau is a Crime Analyst/Grant Coordinator who compiles and analyzes data identifying crime trends and develops crime prevention strategies. The bureau pursues state and federal grants to supplement taxpayer dollars and enhance existing budgets.

New Programs

Many new programs have been implemented in the department in preparation for the next century. Among them are the Warrants Program, Special Operations Services (SOS), Victim Assistance Program, School Resource Officers Unit, Community Oriented Policing Unit, and Community Emergency Response Teams.

Warrants Program

The Warrants Program, also called the Judicial Enforcement Team (JET), aggressively pursues outstanding warrants for people who have chosen to ignore court orders. Currently, associated fines and fees are financially sustaining this effort.

Special Operations Services

The Special Operations Services (SOS) is a proactive unit, addressing serious offenders, major cases, and gang related crimes. Since the unit's founding in October 1995, SOS officers have made about 500 arrests, including 150 felony arrests. They have also recovered approximately \$400,000 in stolen property. SOS officers are committed to restricting activities of career criminals by closely monitoring and quickly solving crimes committed against citizens and their property.

Victim Assistance Program

In response to increasing trends of domestic violence, the Police Department created the Victim Assistance Program to assist domestic violence victims by providing an assistant to support adult and child victims through the judicial system during an emotionally turbulent time. The Victim Assistance Program strives to empower victims to take back the quality of life they seek and realize there is an alternative to violence and abuse. The department is in the process of hiring a Social Worker and a Child Victim Assistant in further support of this effort. The program also trains officers and community groups about the signs and dangers relative to domestic violence.

School Resource Officers

The School Resource Officers Unit assigns an officer to every middle and high school in Provo. This unit consists of five officers including a sergeant who also teaches at Independence and Provo High Schools. Also incorporated into the unit is the Officer Friendly Program, an educational

program aimed at elementary school students. The department is participating in the Drug Abuse Resistance Education (DARE) program on a part-time basis. Youth who have positive experiences and relationships with officers, are more likely to have better rapport, trust and confidence in the officers as they mature in age. The intent of the School Resource Officers Unit is to encourage troubled youth toward a personally productive life.

Community Oriented Policing Unit

Additionally, the department has organized a progressive Community Oriented Policing Unit which focuses on forging an interdependent relationship between police and the community. The Community Oriented Policing Unit will establish a partnership with thirty-four geographically organized neighborhoods. Neighborhoods' needs will be assessed, problems will be identified, and problem solving strategies will be implemented. This team effort will endeavor to increase safety, reduce fear of crime, increase interaction between police and citizens, strive for crime reduction, and improve the quality of life.

Community Emergency Response Training

The Provo Police Department reaches out to the community in a variety of ways. Successful community programs such as Community Emergency Response Training (C.E.R.T.) are offered to educate the community. A joint effort of the Police and Fire Departments, C.E.R.T. is a seven-week course designed to prepare citizens to assist in times of disaster with disaster medical operations, light search and rescue, fire suppression, disaster psychology, and team organization. One hundred and twenty citizens were trained the first year and classes continue to be offered to C.E.R.T. volunteers.

Grants provide funding for many programs. Advanced technology in crime analysis, enhanced officer training, and increased public education are proactive means of crime prevention. These initiatives are consistent with the vision of the need for police and citizens to work together to create a healthy society.

Library

The Provo City Library was located at 100 East Center Street until 1988 and contained 12,000 square feet in floor area. American Library Association (ALA) standards recommended a library of at least 42,792 square feet to service the 1977 population. The 1977 general plan called for a new library containing 54,000 square feet to be constructed. Due to funding problems, an inadequate 29,000 square foot library was constructed at 425 West Center Street. This is the lowest library square footage per capita in Utah. Current library holdings number approximately 150,000 items, the second lowest library holdings per capita. Due to the limited size of the library, one book must be discarded for each new book acquired.

Library Services

Although library services are limited, seventeen elementary and secondary schools of the Provo School District act as network sites of the library. Computer access and interlibrary loan are available from these locations. Extensive interaction with school libraries in the Provo School District is ongoing. Interlibrary loan and other cooperative services to other public and private academic libraries in the area are provided. Brigham Young University and Utah Valley State

College make their library catalogs available from public access terminals.

In addition to services available at the library itself, direct access and outreach services are also available. Library services can be accessed through the Internet and direct modem dial-up twenty-four hours a day. Patrons can renew items, place items on hold, review materials they have checked out, see which materials are available, write to librarians, and check on community events through the computers. The library provides outreach services to the home bound, where volunteers gather materials from the library and deliver them to senior citizen centers, rest homes, and private homes with individuals who are unable to come to the library.

City demographics suggest the library should concentrate heavily on service to children and young adults. The library will also concentrate on providing popular materials and a business reference section.

Future Plans

A recent library design study has concluded that the library will need 80,000 square feet and a collection of 450,000 materials by the year 2015. A joint proposal by the Brigham Young Academy Foundation (BYAF) and the Library Board will relocate the library in a renovated Education Building at Academy Square, with a new addition to the east. The plan calls for a 96,000 square foot library with a 300-seat auditorium, a children's library four times the current size, 400 personal computers, 1200 square feet for Project Read, 1000 square feet to educate parents, a browsing library, covered parking, a full floor reference library, seven conference and meeting rooms, 100 multi-media stations, and room for holdings of 450,000 (three times the current number of holdings).

Private and public funds will pay for the relocation of the library. Following the approval of a bond issue by Provo voters in February 1997, the BYAF raised the balance of private funds by June 30, 1997. With construction beginning shortly thereafter, the library is expected to be operational in the summer of 2000.

Schools

Facilities and Enrollment

Public education for school-aged children is provided through the Provo School District. The district operates twelve elementary schools, three middle schools, three high schools, one young mothers school, and one school for students with disabilities.

Public school enrollments total 5,811 elementary students (grades K-6) and 5,952 secondary students (grades 7-12), a total of 13,242 students. Over the past few years, enrollment in elementary grades has been decreasing, except in the area west of I-15, while secondary levels have been increasing. In order to build a new school, the student population within the community must be large enough to support an additional building. The student population determines the area where the next school is constructed.

Elementary Schools

To keep pace with continued growth, Provo School District held a bond election in 1997 to finance construction of elementary schools at approximately 260 South and 2530 West, and at approximately

1500 South Slate Canyon Drive. The schools will be operational by fall of 1998 and/or 1999. These schools are planned to address growth in the southeast and southwest areas of the city. Another site owned by the school district at approximately 1390 North and 2900 West may be used to construct an elementary school in the future.

Along with new school construction, additions and remodels help the district cope with growth. Plans are made on a priority basis as funds become available. A new gymnasium is planned for Timpanogos Elementary.

Secondary Schools

With the opening of Centennial Middle School, middle school facilities are sufficient to meet current and projected needs for the planning period. Senior high schools are near capacity levels. To cope with the population, new classrooms are planned for Timpview High School. Property has been reserved on the west side for a high school which may be constructed in the next five to ten years.

City Involvement

The city needs to meet regularly with the Provo School District in anticipating and planning for growth. Continued partnership with the district and the Parks and Recreation Department in the creation of school parks is encouraged.

Department of Energy

Public Owned Electric Utility

The city established its own electric utility in 1940. Since that time, the people of Provo have enjoyed the benefits of owning their own electrical system. The primary benefit revolves around the ability of the citizens to have a direct voice in the operation of the utility and the allocation of derived benefits. The Mayor and Municipal Council are responsible for policy, rates, procedures, and all other matters concerning the operation of the municipal electric utility.

Local control has allowed the city to transfer in excess of \$3.8 million annually from the electric utility to the city's general fund to help defray the costs associated with the general operations of the city. Those funds greatly reduce the city's need for additional tax or fee revenues. The decision has also been made to provide street lighting as a general benefit to Provo citizens without a direct charge being assessed on each customer's account. Local control of the electric utility systems must be maintained to further economic and competitive benefits that accrue to the public.

Physical Facilities

During the early years, most of the energy required by the city was generated by the power plant located at 200 West 700 North in Provo. Since those days, the city has entered into numerous contracts, agreements, and purchases with various agencies to provide for the power needs of the city.

Currently, the city is a member of the Utah Municipal Power Agency (UMPA). Through contractual agreements, Provo has dedicated all of its generating capacity and sells all of the electrical energy it produces to UMPA. Provo then purchases back all of its electrical requirements from UMPA. The total generating resources available to UMPA which are owned by Provo, other members of UMPA,

or by UMPA itself include (1) coal fired power plants, (2) hydroelectric power plants, (3) a geothermal power plant, (4) a diesel engine power plant, (5) a natural gas power plant, (6) an experimental wind generating station, and (7) an extensive interchange agreements with many utilities and municipal power systems throughout the western United States.

Provo's Power Distribution System Master plan is depicted on Map # 10.2. The city maintains two transmission substations (see Map # 10.3). The Tanner Substation is in the southeast section of the city near South State Street. The Gillespie Substation is located in the northeast section of the city near the entrance to Provo Canyon. Each of these substations receive electric energy at 138 kilovolts (Kv) and reduce those voltages to 46Kv for transmission to the distribution substations.

The city maintains twenty-two distribution substations which are located throughout the city. Each distribution substation reduces the transmission voltage of 46Kv to 12Kv or to 4Kv for use by the city's residential, commercial, and industrial customers.

Future Facilities

With the current level of development, it will be necessary to build additional transmission and distribution substations. These substations will be located in such a manner that minimizes negative impacts to neighborhoods. Infrastructure design and construction methods will incorporate available technology to improve efficiency, reduce costs, and provide for the most aesthetically pleasing environment possible. When economically feasible, all new electrical utilities will be planned and built underground.

Each year, the Energy Department reviews and updates its five and twenty-year capital improvement project plans based on the most current strategic information available. Ongoing project coordination with other city departments includes plan review, monthly city-wide utility coordination meetings, and periodic general plan review with the Departments of Community Development and Economic Development.

Public Information

A primary goal of the Department of Energy is to provide the best customer service possible. The department has programs to communicate with customers about electrical safety, energy services and conservation, project planning, construction, and operating improvements.

Residential Customers

Residential customers may receive information on electric products and on conservation of electric energy. To help promote the conservation of energy, free shade trees are available annually to Provo residents with central air conditioners. Residents with electric water heaters can receive free water heater blankets. The Department of Energy also leases compact fluorescent light bulbs to save customers money and to conserve energy resources. Home energy audits are also available.

Commercial/Industrial Customers

Commercial and industrial customers may also benefit from the multitude of services the Department of Energy provides. Since commercial and industrial customers demand the most energy, efforts toward these customers emphasize the efficient use of energy. The department assesses the

efficiency of electrical products and suggests methods that economize resources. Commercial energy audits are available.

Solid Waste Disposal

The Provo City Sanitation Division of the Public Services Department currently operates five pick-up routes servicing 14,900 one-family residences each week. Residences larger than two-family dwellings and all commercial and industrial sites are serviced by private sanitation companies. Condominium associations, however, may opt for city or private services.

Previous to Provo's landfill in East Bay being capped in 1992, a special services district was formed by Provo City, Springville City, Mapleton City, Spanish Fork City, and Salem City. Together they developed a landfill and transfer station. Solid waste from the five cities is transported to the transfer station in Springville. From there it is trucked to the Bayview landfill on the west side of Utah Lake where the district has leased land from the state. Approximately 60% of the waste received by the landfill comes from Provo City.

The landfill has a capacity of ten million tons of municipal solid waste (MSW). Since opening in 1991, the landfill has received 581,000 tons of MSW. The remaining capacity should be adequate to service the district for the next 86 to 88 years. As recycling becomes economically feasible, programs will be implemented to reduce waste through recycling.

The Sanitation Department's goal for the future is to meet community needs with increasingly better service at a lower cost than private companies. Increasing service demands will be met by adding new routes and vehicles as necessary.

Water Resources

The Department of Water Resources provides comprehensive culinary water and sanitary sewer services to the community. The department's budget is provided entirely by water and sewer user fees, service connection fees, and some minor revenue sources such as interest earned and billings for miscellaneous services.

Since the Water Resources Department is dependent on water and sewer service sales to support operational and capital improvement programs, water and sewer rates are a very important and sensitive issue. Provo's water and sewer rates have historically been very competitive and remain among the lowest in Utah County and the State of Utah. This competitive position will allow the city to make moderate rate increases as necessary to support an ongoing operation, maintenance, and capital improvement program sufficient to meet the needs of a growing community while at the same time providing the citizens of Provo with an excellent value for their water and sewer utility dollar.

Water Resources

The primary source supply for Provo City's culinary water system is represented by spring areas in Provo Canyon and Rock Canyon. In addition, eleven deep wells scattered throughout the city provide additional water to meet peak demands during the summer months.

In 1995, the Alpine Aqueduct Reach IIB was completed in a cooperative effort between Provo City, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Central Utah Water Conservancy District. This aqueduct runs from the Central Utah Water Conservancy District's Northern Utah County Treatment Plant in North Orem to Provo's 48 inch aqueduct on North Canyon Road. The completion of Alpine Reach IIB allows the city to divert Provo River water for treatment at the Northern Utah County Treatment Plant and the return it to the city system for culinary water.

Provo City presently uses approximately 27,600 acre feet (8.99 billion gallons) of water annually. It is estimated that a build-out population in Provo of approximately 160,000 will require approximately 45,000 acre feet of culinary water per year. Recent acquisition of additional water rights allows the city to drill eight new wells. This and the gradual conversion of irrigation water to municipal supply could allow the city to comfortably meet those build-out demands.

Wastewater Treatment

Provo's water reclamation plant was upgraded and expanded in 1979. This project was intended to increase plant capacity, as well as to improve treatment processes in order to meet emerging water quality regulations. Since that time, the plant has been recognized by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) on three different occasions as the "Best Operated-Advanced Treatment Plant" in EPA's Region VII. Since the 1979 expansion and modernization, considerable additional investment has been made in plant facilities designed to make operations more efficient as well as to enhance the treatment process.

In 1996, average daily flows at the Water Reclamation Plant were 15.3 million gallons per day which represents an average per capita daily flow of 151 gallons. Since average per capita daily flows should be approximately eighty gallons, it is evident that the intrusion of ground water into the sewer collection system is a serious problem. Ongoing efforts to reduce ground water infiltration by rehabilitating or replacing older collection lines will result in increased collection system and reclamation plant capacity.

In cooperation with Provo's Sanitation Division, a very successful composting program is maintained, utilizing yard waste from throughout the community which is ground and mixed with biosolids from the water reclamation plant. This composting operation has been a model in the State of Utah and produces an environmentally compatible compost from thousands of tons of materials that would otherwise end up in the landfill.

The city has also undertaken an aggressive program designed to rehabilitate aging reclamation plant facilities and to modernize various processes within the plant in an effort to ensure compliance with federal regulations and to provide responsible protection of the environment.

Continued efficient management of the city's wastewater collection and treatment system will require considerable investment in the city's aging collection mains and reclamation facilities. Although this investment will undoubtedly require increases in the city's sewer rates, Provo residents will likely continue to enjoy sewer rates that are very near the lowest in Utah County as well as in the State of Utah.

Storm Drainage

While storm drain planning and funding should be motivated by a prudent desire to “be prepared,” they are often motivated by the fear of flooding due to storms or spring runoff. Flooding creates a real cost in property damage. Literally millions of dollars are lost and millions more must be spent to prevent damage.

The Storm Drainage Master Plan was prepared in 1986, largely in response to the high water and flooding in the springs of 1983 and 1984. At that time, storm drains were inadequate. Presently, storm drains are still not adequate. Capital improvements of \$30 million were recommended to bring the system up to par.

The capital improvements map (Map # 10.4) shows work that needs to be done. Thirty to thirty-five years will be needed to complete the work. Pink lines indicate completed drains. Of the \$30 million in work, \$25 million remains. Yellow and blue lines indicate eighteen prioritized projects which represent \$11 million of the remaining \$25 million. While that represents 45% of the cost, these improvements will solve an estimated 60% to 65% of the system’s problems. Funding for these projects comes from three sources: user fees, CDBG funds, and other federal funds.

User Fees

User fees are currently \$2.43 per month per equivalent service unit (ESU). An ESU is the impervious surface area of the average one-family residence. This equates to total annual revenues of approximately \$1.1 million. Half of the revenue goes to operations and maintenance. The other half to capital improvements projects. User fees may be increased to generate revenues significant enough to guarantee a \$8 million bond. The bond would make it possible to complete nearly all eighteen projects within a five year period.

Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Funds

Typically about \$250 to \$300 thousand is available from CDBG funds each year. Over the last five years, approximately \$1.25 million has been made available.

Other Federal Funding

Provo City has been seeking federal funds for drainage improvements because a large portion of the runoff in Provo comes from Forest Service lands east of Provo. A draft report completed in February, 1997, by the United States Army Corps of Engineers indicates the federal government may be interested in contributing funding to these projects.

Recommendations

In addition to acquiring funding for the intended projects, the following recommendations should be implemented to benefit the community and to protect city and public welfare.

1. Prohibit development where high water tables exist or require either flood proofing of basement walls or pumping mechanisms which will be connected to canals or storm drains (as opposed to being connected to the sewer lines).
2. Protect the public from surface flooding and runoff from public rights of way, especially that caused by obstructed gutters. As it is impractical for Provo City to clean all the

- gutters in the city, section 9.15.230 of the Provo City Code should be amended to resemble 9.16.030 by making owner, tenants, or lessees responsible for removal of debris from the gutters and liable for any damages or injuries resulting from failure to do so.
3. Pursuant to the above ordinance being amended, a public education program should be funded to “get the word out.”

Chapter Eleven **Rehabilitation, Redevelopment, and Conservation**

Purpose

The Rehabilitation, Redevelopment, and Conservation Element consists of plans and programs for historic preservation and redevelopment, including the elimination of blight in residential, commercial, and industrial locations. This element focuses directly on historic preservation and redevelopment programs the city has implemented, and ways to increase the effectiveness and productivity of these efforts.

Neighborhood Conservation

Provo's central neighborhoods have changed considerably over the last twenty years due to the pro-growth strategies of the 1977 general plan. Neighborhoods which were once one-family areas were zoned for high density uses. Consequently, apartment complexes and other multiple family housing replaced one-family homes. As neighborhood character changed, the central neighborhoods began to decline.

Today, the city and its citizens are seeking to conserve central neighborhoods through zoning. Zoning should reflect existing uses. Therefore, this plan does not recommend high density zoning in one-family neighborhoods. In essence, this plan corrects growth policies of the 1977 plan. Proposed zone changes in central city neighborhoods, historic preservation, and the city's redevelopment powers are the primary tools to conserve these areas. It is hoped these tools will increase home ownership, enable residents to acquire individual housing equity, enable neighborhoods to strengthen community-held assets, stabilize property values, and encourage families to move back to central neighborhoods.

Historic Preservation

Why is Historic Preservation Important?

Preservation of historic buildings enriches the lives of all who reside in or visit Provo by providing a greater understanding of the history of the community. History is not found only in written form, but is found within the homes, stores, churches, factories, and civic buildings which dot the landscape of the city. Buildings have their own historic saga to tell about their age, prestige, function, and importance. As a collective whole, buildings tell the city's history, chronicling the growth, character, and culture of Provo. Times of economic fortune and hardship can be seen in the ages of our structures.

When we lose buildings of an era, we lose the ability to grasp the complete history of the landscape, for the era no longer exists on the landscape. We are also unable to completely experience the present and future because it is necessary to look back at who we were to realize completely who we are and who we can become. For this reason, preserving elements from every period of history is important.

While saving the past is important, preserving every old building to achieve a full understanding of Provo's past is not necessary. Buildings which should be preserved are those which best represent their historical period and can be adapted to functional uses that are economically viable, without sacrificing the uniqueness of their age and architectural style.

Purpose and Intent of Historic Preservation

The 1990 Utah State Historic District Act granted counties, cities, and towns the power to preserve, protect, and enhance historic and prehistoric areas and sites within their jurisdiction. In agreement with this act, the Landmarks Ordinance, passed by the Municipal Council in 1994, listed the following as its purpose and intent:

1. To safeguard the city's historic and cultural heritage, as embodied and reflected in its landmarks and historic districts;
2. To revitalize neighborhoods by restoring confidence and creating an environment conducive to reinvestment and continued maintenance;
3. To stabilize and enhance property values;
4. To foster community identity and civic pride;
5. To protect, enhance, and perpetuate the use of structures, sites and areas that are reminders of past eras, events, and persons important in local, state or national history; or which reflect the distinct phases of the city's, state's, or nation's cultural, social, economic, political, and architectural heritage;
6. To educate citizens about Provo's history;
7. To promote compatible new development while at the same time protecting the old;
8. To protect and enhance the city's attractions to residents, tourists, and visitors, and serve as a support and stimulus to business and industry;
9. To strengthen the economy of the city;
10. To generally improve the quality of life in the city; and
11. To maintain community integrity for future generations.

Historic Preservation and Land-Use Activity

In the past, zoning has not been conducive to the historic preservation effort. High densities have been allowed in older areas with concentrations of historically significant properties. High densities in such neighborhoods along with the escalation of land values have actually promoted the demolition of older structures because of financial incentives. In R1 (One-Family Residential) neighborhoods, the city has sought to down-zone properties in order for zoning to become compatible with the existing neighborhood. Where one-family neighborhoods are still viable, the city hopes to eliminate incentives to demolish older homes. Down-zoning strengthens neighborhoods and preserves historic properties. The city desires to have a zoning system that is compatible with its historic preservation program.

Zoning is only one element which affects the relationship between historic preservation and land-use. The Landmarks Commission has duties which are related to land-use activity. In the Landmarks Preservation Title of the Provo City Code, the Landmarks Commission is given the following powers and duties:

1. Conduct or cause to be conducted a survey of the historic, architectural, and archaeological resources within the community. The survey shall be compatible with the Utah Inventory of Historical and Archaeological Sites. Survey and inventory documents shall be maintained and shall be open to the public. The survey shall be updated at least every ten years.
2. Recommend the designation of historic sites and landmarks to the Municipal Council.
3. Review applications for Certificates of Historic Appropriateness concerning any alteration or construction affecting a designated or formally nominated historic resource, including, but not limited to, alterations that require a permit from the Building Inspections Division.
4. Review all applications for re-zoning, conditional use permits, and variances which apply to designated or formally nominated historic resources. Recommendations of the Commission shall be forwarded to the Planning Commission, Board of Adjustment, or Municipal Council, depending on which body makes the final decision on the matter.
5. Review applications for Redevelopment Agency rehabilitation and historic preservation loans to determine the historic appropriateness of the application. Recommendations of the Commission shall be forwarded to the Municipal Council.
6. Recommend future policies and programs to the City Council which will further the purposes of historic preservation, and carry out such programs and policies as directed by the Municipal Council. The Landmarks Commission shall prepare and recommend a historic preservation element in the Provo City general plan.
7. Review and comment upon nominations for the National Register of Historic Places as referred to the Landmarks Commission by the Utah State Division of History.
8. Provide the Planning Commission with a regular update of historic preservation projects in the community.
9. Support the enforcement of all state laws relating to historic preservation.

The jurisdiction of the Landmarks Commission includes actions concerned with development, reconstruction, redevelopment, rehabilitation and preservation that effect visual quality or structural matters related to preservation and control of deterioration of a designated, or formally nominated, historic site or landmark.

Historic Designations

Designation is the legal listing of a site, structure, building, natural feature, or district as a historic site or landmark. A historic site is any district, building, structure, object, or site formally designated to the Provo List of Historic Sites. A landmark is any property or structure formally designated to the Provo Landmarks Register. Historic sites and landmarks differ in the nomination process and designation requirements.

Historic Sites

Any person, group, or government agency may nominate a property for listing in the Provo Historic Sites List. Completed Intensive Level Survey documentation for each nominated property must be submitted in duplicate to the Landmarks Commission which in turn will review and evaluate the property. Any district, building, structure, object or site may be designated to the Historic Sites List

if it meets all of the criteria outlined below:

1. Location: It is located within the official boundaries of Provo City.
2. Age: It is at least fifty years old.
3. Integrity: It retains its historic integrity, in that no major alterations or additions have obscured or destroyed the significant historic features. If the property does not meet the integrity requirements, it may still qualify for designation if it meets one of the four following requirements for exceptional significance:
 - a. Historical Event: It is directly associated with events of historic significance in the city, state, or nation.
 - b. Person: It is closely associated with the lives of persons who were of historic importance to the city, state, or nation.
 - c. Construction: It exhibits significant methods of construction or materials used within the historic period.
 - d. Documentation: It has been documented according to the Utah State Historic Preservation Office standards for intensive level surveys, and copies of that documentation have been placed in the local and state historic preservation files.

Landmarks

Official nominations of properties to the Landmarks Register must originate with the owner of the property, the Landmarks Commission, or the Municipal Council. Completed Intensive Level Survey documentation for each nominated property must be submitted in duplicate to the Landmarks Commission, who will review the documentation for completeness, accuracy and compliance with the set criteria. The Commission forwards its recommendation to the Municipal Council. The Municipal Council then may, by approval and passage of an appropriate resolution, designate properties to the Landmarks Register. To be designated to the Landmarks Register, a particular district, building, structure, object or site must meet the following criteria:

1. Location: It is located within the official boundaries of Provo City.
2. Age: It is at least fifty years old.
3. Integrity: It retains its historic integrity, in that no major alterations or additions have obscured or destroyed the significant historic features.

In addition to these requirements, one of the six additional requirements must be met:

1. National Recognition: It is currently listed in the National Register of Historic Places, or it has been officially determined eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.
2. Historical Event: It is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of the history of the city, state, or nation.
3. Person: It is associated with the lives of persons significant in the history of the city, state, or nation.
4. Architecture/Construction: It embodies distinctive characteristics of a rare or unique type, period, or method of construction; represents the work of an architect or builder

recognized as a master in his or her field; possesses high artistic values or style; or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction.

5. Prehistory: It has yielded or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory.
6. Neighborhood: Because of its prominent spatial location, contrasts of siting, age, or scale, it is an easily identifiable visual feature of its neighborhood or the city, and contributes to the distinctive quality or identity of its neighborhood or the city.

Historic Contexts for Preservation in Provo City

Presettlement Era, 1776-1849

Although there are no remaining structures from the presettlement era, early explorers surveyed the land and trapped animals. In 1776, Spanish explorers led by two Franciscan priests arrived in the area in search of a route from Santa Fe, New Mexico to Monterey, California. Fathers Antasio Dominguez and Silvestre Velez de Escalante were guided by a desire to bring Christianity to the Indians. Efforts to reach California failed, but the friars explored much of Utah Valley, developed good relations with local Indians, and planned to return to establish a permanent settlement. Due to changes in the Catholic Church, the two never did return. However, their legacy is seen in the St. Francis Catholic Church, originally operated by Franciscan clergy and constructed in the Spanish Mission Style.

Trappers led by Etienne Provost were the next visitors to this region. They were attacked by Indians at the Jordan River. Only two survived, one being Provost. In memory of the trappers, a nearby river was named after Provost, and from that river the name of our city originates, Provo.

Settlement Era, 1849-1869

Fort Utah, the first Mormon colony in Utah outside the Salt Lake Valley, was established in 1849, near present day Provo City. A fort was built for security because of hostilities with American Indians. In time, relations with the natives became less turbulent and settlers moved from the confines of the fort. Early homes constructed outside the fort were built with logs running both horizontal and vertical, using mud to fill the gaps. Soon, an adobe yard was established, providing sufficient materials to build a meetinghouse, a pottery, a tannery, a sawmill, flour mills, commercial shops, and many one- and two-story residences. In the mid-1860s fired brick production impacted the appearance of Provo's buildings. Red and yellow brick structures stood along side or replaced earlier gray adobe buildings. Structurally superior to adobe, fired brick allowed for larger, taller, and more permanent buildings. Crowning architectural achievements of the late Settlement Era include the Provo Tabernacle, Opera House, and County Courthouse.

Economic Cooperation and Expansion, 1870-1899

The Transcontinental Railroad and cooperative Mormon economics arrived in the 1870s, bringing industrial and commercial expansion to a mostly agrarian community. Expansion brought growth and wealth, allowing development of the city's architecture. Wealthy, influential entrepreneurs made their mark by building impressive commercial structures along West Center and University, as well as mansions and large homes along East Center Street. Foundries, machine companies, iron processors and manufacturers produced sophisticated churches, schools, stores and dwellings.

The Victorian era came to Provo, with its philosophy of flamboyance and extravagance. Local architecture combined older pioneer forms with fashionable Victorian ornament. Gothic Revival found its way to Provo in the 1870s, as did Italianate styling in the 1880s, and a variety of Victorian styles, especially Queen Anne, Victorian Eclectic and Victorian Romanesque, in the 1890s. By 1880, brick and stone buildings of multiple masses, roofs, porches, and ornamentation appeared. The Education Building of Brigham Young Academy is the epitome of the Victorian vision of the picturesque.

Early 20th Century Growth and Development, 1900-1945

Continued prosperity allowed for construction. From 1900 to 1905 the Knight Block, with its landmark clock tower, and a square-towered bank to the west were built on the north corners of University Avenue and Center Street, by then the main intersection of Provo. These proud commercial structures, along with the new Knight Mansion on East Center, reflected the wealth of mining magnate and businessman Jesse Knight. During this decade, most of the school structures on the Brigham Young Academy campus were built.

Growth continued through the 1910s and 1920s, although fewer architecturally impressive structures were built after passage of the Sixteenth Amendment, requiring the payment of income taxes. Brigham Young Academy became Brigham Young University and expanded northeastward up the bench where new facilities, like the neoclassical, limestone Maeser building, were built. Older neighborhoods south and west of campus began to change as student apartments replaced older homes.

From 1910 to 1930, the prevalent new house type was the Bungalow, built in many stylistic variations. The two-story neoclassical county courthouse, designed by architect Joseph Nelson is an important public edifice from the era. On the heels of World War I, Columbia Steel's Ironton plant, built southeast of the city in the 1920s, provided further economic stimuli to Provo's economy. Toward the end of the 1920s and into the 1930s, stylistic changes were apparent as period cottage styles, especially those of English influence, were seen in small homes and educational buildings such as Amanda Knight Hall.

In general, construction and growth slowed significantly during the years of the Great Depression. Government-sponsored building projects kept some of the work force employed during the decade between the Depression and America's involvement in World War II.

Post-War Modern Era, 1946-1996

World War II impacted Provo, due to construction of the Geneva Steel Plant which employed many residents. After the war, a boom in growth was experienced both in the general populace and at BYU. The campus expanded dramatically after 1951, and the city continued to build up around it. New post-war styles were introduced, among them the World War II cottage and the ranch house. Modern materials and architectural styles had become highly varied. Modern structures such as the Nu Skin building and the Provo Park Hotel on Center Street have resulted in a more urbanized appearance at the expense of smaller-scale, historic parts of the city.

At present, a variety of buildings combine to give insight into what Provo is like today and what it was like in the past. Each building offers a glimpse of both the needs and desires of those who built it, whether they were a fort dweller entering the wilds for the first time in a log cabin, an entrepreneur at the turn of the century building a Victorian Style-Colonial Box Revival home, or a contemporary business executive realizing a vision of corporate headquarters. The integration of structures from all time periods provides a rich diversity of buildings on the landscape.

Past Historic Preservation Efforts

Early efforts to preserve buildings have been sparse, but increased interest in historic preservation is augmenting the efforts put forth by both private citizens and the city. Nominations of several properties to the National Historic Register have resulted from grassroots endeavors. Additionally, the designation of the downtown portion of West Center Street as a National Historic District is the result of work by the private sector, as was the creation of Provo Town Square at the northwest corner of University Avenue and Center Street. Much of the initial preservation in Provo was motivated by the efforts of its citizens.

Work conducted by the city includes a 1980 survey of historical locations in Provo. The survey was completed as a result of work on neighborhood revitalization and reinvestment. Unfortunately, the survey was not used until around 1994. From 1980 to 1994, some locations in Provo had been listed on the National Register for Historic Sites, but efforts at creating a local landmarks register were unsuccessful. Over the years, Provo City has tried to encourage the preservation of historic buildings by providing certain regulatory incentives through its zoning ordinance. Authority was given to the Planning Commission (before the creation of the Landmarks Commission) to designate “historic buildings.” Once designated, buildings were eligible for land use activities that may not have ordinarily been permitted in a particular area. Adaptive re-uses of properties were permitted as “conditional uses,” and were approved by the Planning Commission. However, the Planning Commission did not feel competent making decisions on what qualified as a historic building. They felt some property owners were taking advantage of this provision in the ordinance for properties not particularly significant. As a result, the Planning Commission recommended the Municipal Council adopt legislation authorizing the appointment of a Preservation Commission to make such decisions.

In 1993, renewed interest in historic preservation and the recommendation of the Planning Commission led to the creation of a study committee whose purpose was to write a Landmarks Preservation Ordinance for Provo City. This ordinance, passed by the Municipal Council in December 1994, gave authority for a Landmarks Commission. Since the formation of the Landmarks Commission, commissioners have met regularly to create a base for historical preservation upon which the city can build. The commission has worked to include National Historical Register sites on the Provo City Local Landmarks Register. In addition to designating individual sites, the commission has proposed historical districts to preserve the appearance of specific city neighborhoods. The commission is continuing in its efforts to add individual sites and districts to the register, as well as making efforts to inform and educate the public on the benefits of historic preservation.

Surveys of Historic Resources

A survey of 286 city blocks was conducted from 1995 to 1996 identifying potentially eligible sites for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places. It was a reconnaissance level survey of 3,100 sites in a survey area bounded on the east by 900 East, on the south by 600 South, on the west by 900 West, and on the north by a partially irregular line running mostly along 700 North. The boundaries were selected because earlier surveys found this area is Provo's oldest and contains the greatest concentration of potentially eligible sites. The 3,100 sites were evaluated based on their eligibility for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places. Four designations were assigned, A, B, C, and D. "A" sites are those which are eligible and architecturally significant. "B" sites are eligible. "C" sites are ineligible due to alterations. "D" sites are out of the time period. The number of sites in each category is found in Table 11.1.

TABLE 11.1 HISTORIC SURVEY		
Type of Site	Number of Sites	Percentage
A Sites	190	6.1%
B Sites	1,422	45.9%
C Sites	310	10.0%
D Sites	1,178	38.0%
Total	3,100	100.0%

The number of sites fifty years of age or older is 1,922, or 62% of the surveyed sites. Thirty-eight percent, or 1,178 of the sites were built after 1946. This number may actually be lower because the survey includes many World War II era buildings which may date from just before or after 1946. Most World War II era buildings were recorded as built in 1950. Also, those commercial facades clearly dating after 1946 were rated "D" although some of them may have pre-structures hidden behind their facades, in which case they might be invisibly "C" structures.

From this survey, intensive level surveys will be conducted on the properties which were listed as potentially eligible nominations to the National Register of Historic Places. This will aid the city in adding more sites to the Landmarks Register and the Historic Sites List.

In the future, all areas of the city containing buildings which are fifty years of age or more need to be surveyed to guard against singling out some owners of historic structures for designation while other property owners, with equal sites, are overlooked for designation. Provo City is required to provide equal protection of the law. To provide such protection, Provo will gather data of the city's historic resources by systematically considering discrete geographical areas. The next survey will likely include that area which is west of 900 West between the Provo River and the railroad tracks. In time, all areas of the City with homes more than fifty years of age will be surveyed. Surveys of historical resources form the basis of future preservation activities, such as the designation of individual landmarks and historic districts.

Incentives

In order for a preservation program to function well, there must be incentives for property owners. Preservation incentives are usually either community-based or economic-based. Provo City needs to do more to encourage both types of incentives.

Community-Based Incentives

1. Designation of the structure, site, or district as a historic site or landmark provides publicity and information distribution of why that resource is important.
2. Plaques can be placed on the property declaring it is either a historic site or a landmark.
3. Activities such as home tours, receptions, lectures, educational programs, and celebrations give members of the community a sense of historical importance.
4. Awards for outstanding preservation efforts emphasize individual and business efforts and their contribution to the community.

Economic-Based Incentives

1. Loans could be offered to owners of landmarks and historic sites by the city. These loans are to be low-interest and used for rehabilitation or preservation.
2. Building code exceptions may be given in the event of the rehabilitation of a landmark.
3. Assistance from the Landmarks Commission may be received in applying for grants or tax credits for rehabilitating properties.
4. Zoning incentives, such as special consideration in the granting of zoning variances or conditional use permits, may be given to encourage preservation.
5. Federal tax credits are available to those owners of historic properties that meet the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and are reviewed by the National Park Service.
6. State tax credits are available to those qualified rehabilitation expenditures which cost more than \$10,000 and are incurred in connection with any residential historic building which is certified by the state.
7. Matching Grants stimulate private investment in historical buildings. These grants are so stimulating that it has been found for each dollar of public grant money given, many additional dollars are spent.

Future Actions

Preservation will not occur without action. Measures need to be taken by the city to ensure the preservation effort continues in the positive direction it has been moving in the last few years. Through legislation and education, preservation efforts in Provo can be strengthened. The following list includes recommendations for future actions.

1. Strengthen the Demolition Ordinance: Since the 1980 survey, approximately 350 potentially eligible sites have been demolished. This amounts to more than 10% of the buildings in the area and about 20% of the total number of historic buildings. At this rate, the city's historic building stock would be lost within the next seventy-three

years. To absolve the city from unnecessary demolitions, the demolition ordinance must be strengthened.

2. Create a Partnership between Community Identities: Concerted efforts must be made between the Provo City preservation efforts and organizations such as Neighborhood Housing Services of Provo to improve the quality of the housing stock while revitalizing neighborhoods.
3. Educate the Community: The key to a successful preservation program is community involvement. Education and training seminars for homeowners, investors, builders, and developers in subjects such as researching your own home, completing a National Register Nomination Form, and historic building rehabilitation tax credits are needed to involve community members.
4. Retain Existing Historic Districts: Provo's Center Street/University Avenue Commercial District and the Brigham Young Academy complex remain intact architecturally and should be retained as historic districts.
5. Continue Designations of Historic Sites and Landmarks: With the completion of the reconnaissance survey, information is available for the continuance of the designation of historic sites and landmarks. This is especially important for the "A" sites which have not previously been designated as historic.
6. Create Historic Districts: Rather than designate sites individually, areas with high concentration of eligible buildings may be designated as historic districts. There are two types of historic districts: local and national. Local districts protect local resources through control of building and demolition permits. National historic districts are formed to make as many properties as possible eligible for federal and state tax credits. Historic districts eliminate the need to designate every site within the districts as historical, making them not only time effective, but allowing for the preservation of neighborhood character. A National Historic District is proposed in the East Central City, from 100 East to 600 East between 500 North and 500 South, where approximately 70% of the properties are potentially eligible (see Map # 11.1). Another district may be formed in the West Center Street Area, where a solid group of homes and a few commercial buildings exist on the north side of West Center Street between 632 West and 850 West, and along the south side of the street in the 700 block. Of the properties in this proposed district, 79% are potentially eligible.
7. Consider Funding a Matching Grant Program: Such a program stimulates private spending and could be used to target rehabilitation in a particular area such as storefront renovations in the downtown district, or for individual sites throughout the community.

Redevelopment

Provo's ability to conserve and improve its stock of private houses, apartment buildings, industrial and commercial structures, and public facilities is dependent upon three factors: the willingness of the private sector to invest, the ability of the city to effectively plan and administer programs for conservation and redevelopment, and the level of federal assistance available. To provide an atmosphere conducive to private investment, the Redevelopment Agency has been given the authority to support and assist private investment. Redevelopment plan objectives must benefit

Provo's citizens and its economy. Federal assistance aids redevelopment efforts by providing needed funding.

The private sector is willing to invest in real estate when investment is economically beneficial. The initial cost of investment can be high, providing a large disincentive to invest. Even though real estate investment is generally profitable, initial investment costs prevent many people from making such investments. Thus, most of the private sector is unable or unwilling to invest in real estate other than their personal dwelling. The Redevelopment Agency is able to assist potential investors by helping to finance private ventures which further redevelopment goals, making real estate investment more attractive. The Agency is also able to assemble privately-owned properties in order to resell such properties for private projects which further the goals of redevelopment.

The Redevelopment Agency was established to assist in forming redevelopment project areas. Redevelopment project areas are designated blighted areas. With the formation of a redevelopment project area, the Redevelopment Agency is able to assemble parcels of land under the power of eminent domain. The Redevelopment Agency is the only entity that has power to sell or grant property acquired through eminent domain to another private party who will use the land to fulfill goals of the agency. The formation of a redevelopment area allows the ability to utilize tax increment financing to fund part of the redevelopment.

Redevelopment Areas

Four main redevelopment areas exist in the city. They are as follows:

1. Central Business District
2. Academy Square
3. South University Avenue
4. Project Area #4 (also known as the mall area)

These are all older projects which are gradually losing some of their redevelopment powers. All of the redevelopment areas have lost the power of eminent domain, which expires seven years after the creation of the area. The exception to this is Project Area #4, where eminent domain will not be used.

Central Business District

In the Central Business District, redevelopment is sought to strengthen downtown economic conditions while preserving the historic qualities unique to central Provo. The majority of the city's redevelopment efforts are centered in the Central Business District. The goals of the Redevelopment Agency for the Central Business District redevelopment area are:

1. Maintain and enhance the Central Business District as the business and financial center.
2. Maintain the Central Business District as a government center by encouraging the centralization of city, county, state, federal, and judicial activities in the Central Business District.

3. Encourage the continued development of retail in the downtown and also encourage specialty retail that would service the downtown.
4. Encourage the promotion and development of the conference center and facilities in the downtown in an effort to attract conferences and to serve the traveling public.
5. Maintain and enhance the dining and entertainment characteristics of the Central Business District.

In an effort to meet these goals, the following potential project areas should be considered:

1. The west half of the block encompassed by 100 North, 100 West, 200 North, and Freedom Boulevard could be redeveloped as either an expansion of the court facilities or as an office building. The state court is currently doing a study which could result in the consolidation of court facilities, requiring a substantial expansion of the court facilities. If the court decides it is necessary to make a major expansion, the Redevelopment Agency could consider allowing the court to utilize this property. However, if the court decides a minor expansion is sufficient, their present property should be able to accommodate expansion.
2. When the Provo Towne Centre Mall is completed, Sears will relocate, leaving the current Sears property, located at 207 North 100 West, vacant. As part of the agreement with JP Realty for the development of the mall, the Redevelopment Agency is acquiring the present Sears property. Ideally, this property will be redeveloped into a retail center, but it could also be developed into a mixed-use project. Part of this property should be sold to Smith's, as they are currently using it for parking. The balance of the property will be redeveloped.
3. Additional parking alternatives need to be developed. Parking is needed in the block encompassed by Center Street, 100 East, 100 North, and University Avenue. The city owns surface parking in the block. This parking lot should be combined with some property from First Security Bank in order to build the parking facility this block needs. The parking structure may be financed through a Community Development Block Grant or through a special improvement district which would include property owners on this block. Additional parking is also needed on the Provo Town Square block, which is encompassed by Center Street, University Avenue, 100 North, and 100 West. The Town Square Parking Garage was originally built to provide for an addition of two floors to the structure, simplifying the addition process.

Retailing is an important function of the Central Business District. However, the financial strength of retailing functions is primarily secured from people who come to the district for purposes other than shopping. Those who live or work in the district come for medical, dental, business, legal services, financial services, attend conventions, and patronize downtown shops. To ensure the survival of downtown merchants, it is necessary to supply a proper combination of offices, services, and retailers.

Additional office space is needed downtown. The construction of major office buildings will provide new jobs and the customer base needed in order to keep specialty shops and other small businesses alive. The city's economy benefits not only from job creation, but from increased business at downtown shops.

In addition to creating office space, high-density housing is also desired for the Central Business District. Housing developments must be large enough to have an impact in the neighborhood and be of high enough quality to attract stable, long-term residents to the downtown area. Residential units provide a neighborhood clientele for retailers and a sense of community which can increase the image of the district. Development of apartment and condominium projects in the downtown area is important to the daily activity there.

Existing buildings and buildings which will be constructed in the future should be used to their full capacity. Today, many buildings in the downtown are not used to their full potential. To encourage their full utilization, improvements need to be made to buildings in order to make the downtown an attractive place to do business. Such improvements need to maintain the historical and architectural character of the downtown buildings.

A positive image is needed for the downtown if it is to be successful. If citizens and downtown merchants feel that downtown is not successful, that feeling can become a self-fulfilling prophecy. The downtown needs to be promoted as a unit from within the downtown. The city should encourage any organization of the downtown merchants in an effort to market the downtown jointly with the city.

Academy Square

The Academy Square redevelopment area is the oldest existing project area within the city. The area has long been fraught with the challenge of renovating or redeveloping the Academy Square Block, located at 500 North University Avenue. With the passage of the general obligation bond to build a library at this location, and the raising of private funds by the Brigham Young Academy Foundation, the library has gone under construction and is expected to be operational in summer 2000.

South University Avenue

The South University Avenue redevelopment area was created primarily to beautify the south entrance to the city and to keep automobile dealerships on University Avenue and Third South corridors. The Redevelopment Agency has attempted to assist all of the automobile dealerships in this area, and has been able to help them to some extent. However, because of automobile company requirements, it is anticipated that the automobile dealerships will eventually be required to move to new, modern facilities that will be located on or near freeway interchanges or major streets.

The major goal of this redevelopment area should be to continue to encourage businesses along South University Avenue to improve their properties and their strength as a business. As properties turn over and become vacant, new and stronger businesses should be encouraged to take their place. The Redevelopment Agency is able to financially help private investors in this district in order to achieve their goals.

Project Area #4 (also known as the Mall area)

Project Area #4 was created to redevelop the area to the west of East Bay. This redevelopment area has a Disposition and Development Agreement with JP Realty for the development of a regional shopping mall in this area. The mall is scheduled to be completed in 1998. It is felt the shopping mall is necessary in order to ensure Provo's economic survival. The mall will also help enhance the appearance of the south entrance to the city.

Redevelopment Grants

Provo City receives Community Development Block Grants from the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) were developed to benefit low and moderate income people, remove slums and blighting influences, and respond to urgent needs in the community which result from natural calamities. Grant money received by Provo must be used to benefit those for whom the program was developed.

Provo receives approximately two million dollars a year from the CDBG program. The funds are allocated to the following areas:

1. Neighborhood programs which includes streets, sidewalks, storm drains and parks;
2. Social services which includes economic assistance to non-profit agencies;
3. Economic development projects which include job creation projects and downtown redevelopment projects;
4. Administration of CDBG funds and revolving loan funds.

CDBG funds allow the city to offer a number of loan programs to low and moderate income people. Zero percent interest loans are offered to low-income senior citizens for home improvements, making it possible for senior citizens to remain in and maintain their homes. Three percent interest loans for renovating and improving homes to existing code standards are offered to low income families, encouraging the resettlement of older central neighborhoods. Property owners renting to low and moderate income persons are offered 4% interest loans to reinvest in their properties without needing to raise rents. Commercial property owners are provided assistance in the renovation of their buildings' facades.

In addition to CDBG funds, Provo receives HOME program funds. Money received is used for housing rehabilitation similar to the CDBG programs, to develop additional facilities for special needs housing, to encourage first-time home buyers to acquire homes in the central part of the city, and to house homeless persons.

Special purpose grants are available to the city on a need basis. The money is available through the Department of Housing and Urban Development for projects authorized by Congress. The city has used these grants to improve the airport road and to add conference facilities at the Provo Park Hotel.

Community Involvement

As the city puts forth efforts to redevelop areas of town, care must be taken to respond to the needs of the people. A program with good intentions will not be supported if the citizens of this city do

not agree with the objectives or the implementation of the program. Community involvement is needed as redevelopment occurs.

Chapter Twelve

Economic

Introduction

The economic element of the general plan is designed to analyze the city's current economic situation. This chapter contains a review of municipal revenues and expenditures, revenue sources, economic goals proposed by the Provo City Task Force 2000, reviews of employment and sales activity--with projected changes induced by the plan, and a cost/revenue analysis of the fiscal impact of the general plan.

Municipal Revenues and Expenditures

In the last 20 years Provo City has grown by nearly 40,000 residents. The population has risen from 63,675 in 1975 to 101,154 in 1995. This increased population demands an increase in municipal services. This translates into an increase in municipal expenditures; however, an increased population also results in a larger tax base for municipal revenues.

As the population element of this general plan presents, Provo's population growth is anticipated to continue to grow at a constant rate for the next 20 years. Projections for Provo's population in the year 2020 float anywhere within the range of 160,000 to 195,000 (see Chapter Three). The main restriction to growth will come with the unavoidable buildout in Provo's residential areas. As the city grows, a major challenge for Provo City administrators will be to regulate municipal expenditures, thus trying to keep them from exceeding municipal revenues. At the same time, the city must meet the needs of its citizens in terms of providing efficient public services. In recruiting those types of businesses that will both increase the city's tax base and provide the goods and services desired by the residents of Provo, it is important to consider how the development affects the quality of life for Provo City citizens.

This element will discuss both the current municipal revenues and expenditures, and those induced by the general plan. Also, a cost/revenue analysis is provided showing the overall economic effects of implementing this general plan on both the Municipal and School District Budgets.

Municipal Revenue Sources

Current revenues for Provo City, as reported in the 1995-1996 annual budget, are as follows:

A. General Fund Revenues

1. Taxes

a. Real Property	\$ 3,311,298
b. Sales Tax	\$ 9,911,504
c. Franchise Taxes	\$ 3,290,600
Total Taxes	\$ 16,513,402

2. Charges / Miscellaneous

a. Licenses & Permits	\$ 681,800	
b. Charges for Services	\$ 1,525,500	
c. Fines & Forfeitures	\$ 175,000	
d. Interest & Rents	\$ 116,300	
e. Misc.	\$ 818,433	
f. Transfers	\$ 4,682,378	
g. Intergovernmental Transfers	\$ 1,343,829	
Total Charges / Miscellaneous		\$ 9,343,240
Total General Fund Revenues		\$ 25,856,642

B. Other Fund Revenues

1. Enterprise Funds

a. Airport	\$ 107,280	
b. Energy	\$ 37,923,667	
c. Golf Course	\$ 701,879	
d. Sanitation	\$ 1,946,000	
e. Wastewater	\$ 3,529,105	
f. Water	\$ 5,060,000	
Total Enterprise Fund		\$ 49,267,931

2. Special Revenue Funds

a. Emergency Response	\$ 224,000	
b. Library	\$ 1,303,362	
Total Special Revenue Funds		\$ 1,527,362

3. Debt Service Funds

Total Debt Service		\$ 1,224,007
TOTAL OTHER FUND REVENUES		\$ 52,019,300

TOTAL MUNICIPAL REVENUE **\$ 77,875,942**

Revenue projection for the year 2020 becomes difficult as it is impossible today to predict the actual businesses that will open in the intermediate period, let alone what types of tax revenue they will be generating for the city. The Cost/Revenue Analysis in this chapter explores the probable costs and revenues associated with a 50,000 person increase in the population. The analysis also reports the probable revenues to be generated by property taxes from a few large planned developments within the city. The only projected sales tax from these new planned developments comes from a study performed by Provo City Economic Development for the Provo Towne Centre--and that figure is

\$1.4 million. The Cost/Revenue Analysis projects an additional \$40,209,386 in municipal revenue to be induced by the general plan.

Municipal Expenditures

The 1995-1996 budget for the Provo City Corporation contains a detailed description of the expenditures for the city by department. To simplify the reporting of municipal expenditures for this element of the general plan, we will combine all expenditures into four categories. Total expenditures for the city appear as follows:

1. General Fund

a. Mayor & Administration	\$	498,304
b. Finance	\$	825,805
c. City Recorder	\$	83,274
d. Personnel	\$	614,773
e. Legal	\$	665,279
f. Economic Development	\$	302,120
g. Community Development	\$	1,412,434
h. Municipal Council	\$	1,010,451
I. Info. Systems	\$	895,539
j. Equipment	\$	604,894
k. Nondepartmental	\$	246,459
l. Debt Service	\$	1,185,833

Total	\$	8,345,165
--------------	----	------------------

2. Public Safety

a. Police	\$	7,098,351
b. Fire	\$	5,009,042
c. EMR	\$	209,591

Total	\$	12,316,984
--------------	----	-------------------

3. Public Works

a. Engineering	\$	912,597
b. Public Services	\$	3,326,142
c. Water/Wastewater	\$	8,544,839
d. Energy	\$	38,646,770

	Total	\$ 51,430,348
4. Recreation & Culture		
a. Parks & Rec.		\$ 4,200,809
b. Library		\$ 1,495,808
	Total	\$ 5,696,617
	TOTAL MUNICIPAL EXPENDITURES	\$ 77,789,114

As can be seen from the city's reported revenues and expenditures, for the fiscal year 1995-1996 the city finished with a surplus of \$86,828 (see Table 12.17). The city is not a private business and therefore approaches its annual surpluses and deficits a little differently. The city has a limit on how much money it can have on reserve, or allow to carry over into the next fiscal year's budget. All excess funds will have to be assigned to some type of expenditure in the future, either through some type of capital improvement fund, or increase in services to the public (i.e., the addition of police officers or fire fighters).

To project the expenditures that will be induced by the general plan, first assign a share of total expenditures to each resident of the city. Then multiply that per capita expenditure by the increase in number of residents added to the city through the implementation of the general plan. This, along with the projected costs of nonresidential uses induced with plan implementation, produces an additional annual cost of \$39,542,827 for the city (see Table 12.18). This projected figure is \$666,559 less than the new projected revenues due to the general plan. The overall impact of the plan is expected to then be an annual surplus of around \$750,000 (see Table 12.19), with which the city can improve its services provided to the public.

Economic Goals

Many of the values, goals and objectives comprised and recommended by the Provo City Task Force 2000, to aid in the drafting of the general plan, dealt with the economic development of the city. Please refer to Chapter One for related goals, values, and objectives.

Industry

The primary industries for Provo City fall into several major categories including that of education, health, and computer technology. Utah Valley has historically had a strong agricultural base and heavy industrial base (Geneva Steel). While these activities are still very important, they represent a decreasing presence in the overall economy. Major new players in the economy of Provo are the high-tech businesses and industries that are being developed by both the educational institutions and spin-off technologies from our existing industries.

Market Areas

Primary Market Area

Currently two primary market areas exist in Provo. They are the Smith's/Sears shopping center located in the CBD between Freedom Boulevard and 100 West at about 300 North, and the Albertson's/Food-4-Less shopping center located on both sides of University Parkway from about 1800 North to 2400 North. The general plan provides for another primary market area to be located at: (1) 4800 North and University Avenue, and (2) the addition of the Provo Towne Centre to be located between I-15 and University Avenue around 1200 to 1400 South.

Secondary Market Area

A number of secondary market areas exist within the city. They include the following; the Albertson's shopping center at Center Street and 500 W; the shopping center at 300 South and South State Street; the shopping center along State Street from 1230 North to Grandview Lane; and the shopping center at 900 East and 450 North. Future secondary market areas are planned at the following locations: (1) 2050 West Center Street, (2) near 2000 South State Street, (3) 1700 North and 2300 West, and (4) at 1800 North Geneva Road.

Commercial Development Areas within Provo City

The following tables are a detailed analysis of each of the commercial areas within the city.

TABLE 12.1 ANALYSIS OF COMMERCIAL AREA NUMBER ONE	
Location	East Bay Commercial District
Description	Mixed-use business and research park
Current Status	Park is nearly filled
Age	14 years
Number of Tenants	97
Sales Tax Revenue per Node	\$1,510,664
Future Potential	This area will continue to be the major retail sales tax producing area in the future. When the Provo Towne Centre Mall is completed in 1998 other areas around the mall will redevelop into their highest and best commercial use.
Traffic Volumes Per Node	52,880
Unique Issues	The I-15 interchange at the Novell exit is one of the busiest in the state. The new Provo Towne Centre Mall will also generate more traffic. The new interchange and State Street connector road should alleviate some of that congestion. With the construction of the mall, East Bay becomes Provo's most lucrative retail node. East Bay is already one of the most important job providers.

TABLE 12.2 ANALYSIS OF COMMERCIAL AREA NUMBER TWO	
Location	Center Street and University Avenue, five blocks out in all directions
Description	Central Business District
Current Status	This area is making a comeback. Large office employers like NuSkin, Utah County, Provo City, Utah State, federal agencies, banks, and several service industries make the downtown area one of the most highly trafficked areas in the city.
Age	Historic (late 1800's)
Number of Tenants	334
Sales Tax Revenue per Node	\$2,217,168
Future Potential	This area has great potential as a restaurant and entertainment area as well as for destination-type retail. The new mall could be a great benefit to current shopping traffic by bringing retail closer to the CBD.
Traffic Volumes Per Node	66,240
Unique Issues	The historic buildings and designs create a quaint atmosphere. Parking is always an issue. The challenge is changing the perception of the parking problem in downtown in the eyes of the shoppers. The Downtown Action Committee (a retail- based committee) is making a dramatic impact on this area.

TABLE 12.3 ANALYSIS OF COMMERCIAL AREA NUMBER THREE	
Location	University Parkway
Description	University Parkway from Orem to Canyon Road. Brigham's Landing, Plumtree, Albertson's, etc...
Current Status	This is one of the city's best retail corridors, anchored principally by retail food stores (Food 4 Less and Albertson's) and restaurants (Olive Garden, Tony Roma's, Galaxy, and Training Table). The principal retailer is ShopKo.
Age	N/A
Number of Tenants	107
Sales Tax Revenue per Node	\$1,325,351

TABLE 12.3 ANALYSIS OF COMMERCIAL AREA NUMBER THREE	
Future Potential	Turnover in the secondary stores remains high, but the anchors are holding steady. The shopping center area is full with no room for growth, but the city's third largest retailer (Christensen Automotive Group) is involved in a plan for an auto mall at this location. An auto mall would increase the area sales tax revenue by approximately \$400,000 per year.
Traffic Volumes Per Node	35,175
Unique Issues	Food stores are a good source of steady revenue but not a growth item. Much of the area's future retail viability is dependant upon the creation of the auto mall.

TABLE 12.4 ANALYSIS OF COMMERCIAL AREA NUMBER FOUR	
Location	North State Street
Description	Old commercial corridor heavily used in the days prior to University Parkway.
Current Status	This is a highly trafficked node drawing from both Orem and Provo. It is not as well utilized for retail as it could be. Auto services are the principal tenants with some retail, restaurants, housing, and newly constructed commercial office space.
Age	1950's
Number of Tenants	73
Sales Tax Revenue per Node	\$517,025
Future Potential	Redevelopment of underdeveloped properties will be the primary growth potential in the area.
Traffic Volumes Per Node	46,525
Unique Issues	This area consists of old businesses with old buildings, mainly auto repair shops. It could be a great retail center, Desert Industries is in the process of rebuilding and thus providing the first major reinvestment in the area. Traffic is there, business is there, residential is there. This area deserves Provo City's attention as a potential sales tax giant.

TABLE 12.5 ANALYSIS OF COMMERCIAL AREA NUMBER FIVE	
Location	1230 North Commercial Corridor
Description	This retail corridor contains many fast food establishments. It extends from BYU to State Street on 1230 North and from University to University Parkway on Canyon Road.

TABLE 12.5 ANALYSIS OF COMMERCIAL AREA NUMBER FIVE	
Current Status	Fast food and specialized retail
Age	This corridor was developed in the 1950's with some redevelopment currently underway at the old Barbizon site.
Number of Tenants	76
Sales Tax Revenue per Node	\$319,162
Future Potential	Fast food and strip retail targeted toward the student market is the primary use for this area. With new office space being constructed at the site of the old Barbizon Building, higher end restaurants may now have a reason to try again. Retail and service industry could see a boost in the near future. The hospital expansion could also add new retail opportunities to the corridor. No other vacant land is available.
Traffic Volumes Per Node	60,505
Unique Issues	This area is very segmented toward fast food. Businesses that can capitalize on BYU and hospital traffic do the best. Some retail is succeeding. Wilkinson Trophy and Athletic, Fast Signs, Pegasus Records, and the medical supply store have had the best longevity of retail.

TABLE 12.6 ANALYSIS OF COMMERCIAL AREA NUMBER SIX	
Location	BYU Campus
Description	Nation's largest private university
Current Status	Enrollment at the University has recently been increased.
Age	New construction almost yearly.
Number of Tenants	2
Sales Tax Revenue per Node	\$330,193
Future Potential	The University continues to provide much of the commercial and services needed by the on-campus community. It is anticipated that the current policy of the University will encourage some growth in this area.
Traffic Volumes Per Node	Dependant on season and events.

TABLE 12.6 ANALYSIS OF COMMERCIAL AREA NUMBER SIX	
Unique Issues	This religious institution is property tax exempt. However, BYU is the city's second largest sales tax producer. BYU remains the driving force behind Utah County's economic growth.

TABLE 12.7 ANALYSIS OF COMMERCIAL AREA NUMBER SEVEN A & B	
Location A	South State Street
Description	Old commercial and industrial corridor. Mostly automotive repair and like businesses.
Current Status	Pioneer drive-in is the sole entertainment venue in the area with some restaurant and extended stay motel.
Age	N/A
Number of Tenants	43
Sales Tax Revenue per Node	\$88,946.26
Future Potential	Corridor will become a viable retail center as Ironton develops and the new connector to East Bay is complete. New residential construction and high density housing are keys to the future development of this corridor.
Traffic Volumes Per Node	16,595
Unique Issues	The new connector road from I-15 to State Street should increase traffic along the State Street corridor making it a more viable retail and commercial area. Growth in Springville and Mapleton directly impact the long term success of this node.
Location B	South State Street and 300 South
Description	Old mixed-use area.
Current Status	Some retail, mostly residential and low volume commercial.
Age	N/A
Number of Tenants	12
Sales Tax Revenue per Node	\$109,774
Future Potential	With the new State Street connector road, this node could become a major retail area. The growth of South State Street is also dependent on the development of Ironton.
Traffic Volumes Per Node	16,595

TABLE 12.7 ANALYSIS OF COMMERCIAL AREA NUMBER SEVEN A & B	
Unique Issues	This area has the potential to draw from Springville and could become a route to the new mall and East Bay. Currently the area has modest traffic flows, poor freeway access, and no major employment or retail anchors. With residential growth, the connector road, and Ironton, this node could turn around in a hurry.

TABLE 12.8 ANALYSIS OF COMMERCIAL AREA NUMBER EIGHT	
Location	4800 North (Riverwoods, etc.)
Description	This is a retail and commercial area located next to the Business and Research Park. The Shops at Riverwoods and the Riverwoods Business and Research Park make up the majority of this commercial area. The current uses in the commercial center include the corporate headquarters of a major fast food chain and working demonstration chain store and a 12 screen, stadium seating Carmike Theaters.
Current Status	Established office and business users. Retail and entertainment portions now under construction.
Age	Under construction
Number of Tenants	2
Sales Tax Revenue per Node	\$29,244
Future Potential	Beginning in the summer of 1997, construction of an additional 167,300 sq. ft. of commercial and restaurant space is projected in this area. This area will be an upscale fashion and lifestyle center, as well as a variety of restaurants and food uses to complement the new theater.
Traffic Volumes Per Node	26,555
Unique Issues	Located in the county's most prestigious business park, this corridor is the most likely to sustain upscale retail and restaurant development. The corridor sits between Provo's and Orem's most affluent sections and is going to gain better traffic flows when the new University to Edgemont connector is complete.

TABLE 12.9 ANALYSIS OF COMMERCIAL AREA NUMBER NINE	
Location	Ninth East from University Parkway to Center Street
Description	Mixed uses all along the corridor.

TABLE 12.9 ANALYSIS OF COMMERCIAL AREA NUMBER NINE	
Current Status	Education, residential, commercial, health and fitness, and fast food are all finding success on Ninth East. Major employers in this area include BYU, Wasatch Elementary, and Marketing Ally Teleservices. Major businesses include Gold's Gym, McDonalds, Hogi Yogi, and Little Caesars.
Age	No new construction in the last 10 years
Number of Tenants	23
Sales Tax Revenue per Node	\$68,826
Future Potential	There is not much room to grow in this area.
Traffic Volumes Per Node	22,365
Unique Issues	High density student housing, BYU as a border, and no vacant land make it unlikely that much new development can occur.

TABLE 12.10 ANALYSIS OF COMMERCIAL AREA NUMBER TEN	
Location	West Center Street & Geneva Road
Description	This is mostly a commercial and industrial area in far west Provo.
Current Status	This area has had slow development due to low traffic volumes. It is largely a residential area.
Age	N/A
Number of Tenants	10
Sales Tax Revenue per Node	\$37,762
Future Potential	With new access to the airport, the entire west side could take off.
Traffic Volumes Per Node	16,181
Unique Issues	This is an older area firmly established as residential with higher crime rates, a high water table, and a lot of farm land, probably Provo's most agrarian node.

TABLE 12.11 ANALYSIS OF COMMERCIAL AREA NUMBER ELEVEN	
Location	Edgemont
Description	All Northeast Provo retail and commercial pockets

TABLE 12.11 ANALYSIS OF COMMERCIAL AREA NUMBER ELEVEN	
Current Status	This area is not a commercial growth node at the present. It is mostly upscale residential.
Age	N/A
Number of Tenants	53
Sales Tax Revenue per Node	\$124,443
Future Potential	There is not much room to grow east and northerly growth approaches the canyon. Commercial growth is not likely in the near future because of a lack of open land and residential zoning. However, University Avenue frontage property in this node is developing with office, commercial, and retail users.
Traffic Volumes Per Node	University and Canyon only 39,290
Unique Issues	Zoning is a major obstacle to commercial development as well as the fact that this area is housing for the most vocal and influential element of the city.

TABLE 12.12 ANALYSIS OF COMMERCIAL AREA NUMBER TWELVE	
Location	The west side of South State Street from approximately 2000 South to State Highway 75.
Description	Ironton
Current Status	This site is currently under option by Provo City. The majority of the property is in a designated Brownfields site. USX, Provo City and Brigham Young University are currently evaluating the development potential of the site.
Age	First developed as a steel mill in the 1920's, currently mostly undeveloped.
Number of Tenants	1
Sales Tax Revenue per Node	\$897
Future Potential	Great potential as a multi-use area including commercial, light industrial, office, transportation and some recreation.
Traffic Volumes Per Node	N/A
Unique Issues	The major question that still needs to be addressed in this area is the determination as to the extent of the environmental clean up that is necessary to return this property to a useable condition. Once the level and method of clean up is determined a master plan will need to be developed.

TABLE 12.13 ANALYSIS OF COMMERCIAL AREA NUMBER THIRTEEN	
Location	I-15 and 1700 North
Description	Future freeway interchange
Current Status	Undeveloped
Age	N/A
Number of Tenants	11
Sales Tax Revenue per Node	\$5,039
Future Potential	If the freeway access is approved and constructed, this site will become a major retail hub.
Traffic Volumes Per Node	N/A
Unique Issues	N/A

TABLE 12.14 ANALYSIS OF COMMERCIAL AREA NUMBER FOURTEEN	
Location	300 North and 1500 East (Seven Peaks Recreational Area)
Description	This area is commercial entertainment. The Seven Peaks Water Park makes up the majority of this specialized commercial area with its primary commercial function being seasonal recreational. It serves as a water park in the summer and an ice rink in the winter.
Current Status	The water park is open and the balance of the property is in the planning and development process.
Age	N/A
Number of Tenants	1
Sales Tax Revenue per Node	\$3,602
Future Potential	Two Olympic-size practice ice skating sheets are scheduled for construction in 1997.
Traffic Volumes Per Node	3,024
Unique Issues	New East bench connector road to the south should improve traffic flows. It is currently a one draw destination node.

Employment

Utah’s skilled labor force is a major factor in Utah’s economic success. Provo’s labor pool reflects a broad range of skills available to companies seeking expansion or relocation. Our highly

productive work force includes personnel skilled in information technology, manufacturing, construction, education, and services. As seen in Table 12.15, the largest share of the labor force is in the services sector. This can be largely attributed to BYU, which employs more than 14,000 people.

TABLE 12.15 PROVO'S LABOR FORCE BY OCCUPATION	
Occupation Type	% of Labor Force
Services	39.8 %
Trade	21.5 %
Government	14.3 %
Manufacturing	13.9 %
Construction	5.5 %
Financial/Insurance	3.0 %
Transport/Utilities	1.8 %
Total	100 %

Provo is home to many successful companies which collectively have contributed to Provo's low 2.4% unemployment rate. Table 12.16 lists major employers in the Provo Metropolitan area.

TABLE 12.16 MAJOR EMPLOYERS IN THE PROVO METROPOLITAN AREA		
Employer	Employee	Classification
Brigham Young University	14,375	Education
Alpine School District	4,353	Education
Novell, Inc.	4,160	Manufacturing
Geneva Steel	2,570	Manufacturing
Utah Valley State College	2,550	Education
Utah Valley Regional Medical Center	2,350	Medical
Nebo School District	1,700	Education
Provo School District	1,610	Education
United States Postal Service	1,358	Government

Sears Telephone Service	1,200	Service
Micron	1,100	Manufacturing
NuSkin International	1,100	Service

Provo City has a variety of business parks designed to invite new business and spur economic growth. From the picturesque landscaping of Riverwoods Business and Research Park to the functional beauty of East Bay Business Center, Provo City provides a variety of site location choices to fit every business personality. The Provo City Office of Economic Development offers assistance in selecting the location right for each business. The Ironton Industrial Park is a 300-acre park that will be master-planned for light industrial and manufacturing business. A planned connector highway will make this area ideal for manufacturing and distribution.

Retail Sales Activity

The retail sales picture in Provo is undergoing a major change at this time. With the introduction of the Provo Towne Centre Mall at the south end of University Avenue the retail mixes of goods and services will greatly change. It is anticipated that many additional types of commercial stores will locate around the Mall area. Downtown will also continue to grow as a business and governmental center. The location of the mall will bring additional commerce to the downtown area from the northern and southern areas of the county. Land in both of these areas is at a premium. Redevelopment will play a major role in how and where commercial, financial, and governmental activities will be located.

Cost/Revenue Analysis for Provo's General Plan

Provo City is growing. Growth is a natural process. The real question is the type and quality of that growth. Growth can lead to an increase of city revenue, from both taxes and fees, and a larger variety of businesses and professional services, which will want to locate within the city, hoping to tap into its large consumer market. One goal of Provo City is to provide an effective method to deal with the city's growth, thus increasing city revenue at a faster rate than city expenses. A measuring stick that could be used to determine the success of a growth plan is the fiscal impact or cost/revenue analysis.

One such method for analyzing the fiscal impact of a growth plan is found in a book by Robert W. Burchell and David Listokin, appropriately titled *The Fiscal Impact Handbook*. This book, published in 1978, gives a detailed step-by-step procedure on how to go about analyzing the costs and revenues associated with the implementation of a proposed plan.

Although the analyst does not claim the 100% total accuracy of these projections, they are believed to accurately reflect the available data. The main concern in presenting the results of this study is that the Municipal Revenues induced by the general plan, from new businesses, are mostly unavailable. Therefore, the total revenue brought about by the general plan is estimated. However,

as those revenues become known and are integrated into the cost/revenue multiplier equation, the city expects that overall projected public revenues will, indeed, exceed overall projected public costs.

Calculate the Cost/Revenue Surplus or Deficit

Tables 12.17, 12.18, and 12.19 calculate the cost-revenue surplus/deficit for both 1995 and the proposed general plan, and compare the results to see if the plan will increase the surplus or deficit.

TABLE 12.17 1995 COST/REVENUE ANALYSIS			
Public Body	Total Annual Public Cost	Total Annual Public Revenue	Total Annual Net Fiscal Impact
Municipality	\$77,789,114	\$77,875,942	\$86,828
School District	\$54,646,996	\$54,903,088	\$256,092*
Total	\$132,436,110	\$132,779,030	\$342,920

TABLE 12.18 GENERAL PLAN COST/REVENUE ANALYSIS			
Public Body	Total Annual Public Cost	Total Annual Public Revenue	Total Annual Net Fiscal Impact
Municipality	\$39,542,827	\$40,209,386	\$666,559
School District	\$24,521,449	\$24,636,363	\$114,915*
Total	\$64,064,276	\$64,845,749	\$781,473

TABLE 12.19 OVERALL PROJECTED 2020 COST/REVENUE ANALYSIS			
Public Body	Total Annual Public Cost	Total Annual Public Revenue	Total Annual Net Fiscal Impact
Municipality	\$117,331,941	\$118,085,328	\$753,387
School District	\$79,168,445	\$79,539,451	\$371,007*
Total	\$196,500,386	\$197,624,779	\$1,124,393

*Provo School District will vary their debt service in order to keep their total revenues equal to total expenditures for an annual year ending balance very close or equal to \$0, to be in compliance with tax laws for a nonprofit organization

Conclusion

The fiscal impact from the proposed general plan will be approximately \$781,473,** which amounts to a total surplus of approximately \$1,124,393.**

**These numbers are based upon low estimates for future municipal revenue. As more of the revenues from the planned businesses and projects become known, municipal revenues should increase and the fiscal impact from the proposed general plan is expected to remain positive.

Chapter Thirteen **Implementation**

Introduction

As the general plan was written, careful attention was given to ensure it was in harmony with the values, goals, and objectives compiled by the Task Force. The general plan is most influential when specific implementation policies are written and abided by. Implementation policies can involve changes or additions to ordinances, zoning, and policy.

Provo City department heads were given the Task Force values, goals, and objectives and asked to determine ways to implement them. Their input, combined with the ideas of the Community Development staff and the ideas of the Task Force, is the basis for implementation strategies of the general plan. Active participants and time guidelines are given in some cases, to place responsibility on the departments who are to carry out the implementation process of the general plan. In many cases, the priority for addressing implementation measures is left for Municipal Council consideration during future goal setting sessions.

Tools for Plan Implementation

The general plan details developmental goals and policies which promote land use patterns adopted by the Municipal Council. General guidelines necessary to accomplish the objectives of the plan are given. However, in the end, the impacts of this plan are dependent upon its usage in day-to-day planning decisions relating to development and land use. The general plan is carried out by tools designed to help the Municipal Council, Planning Commission, and the Community Development staff. These tools include zoning ordinances, subdivision regulations, capital improvement program, and bi-annual amendments to the plan.

Zoning Ordinances

Zoning ordinances are adopted and enacted for the purpose of promoting the health, safety, morals, prosperity, convenience, and general welfare of the present and future inhabitants of Provo City. Furthermore, the purpose of the zoning ordinance is to:

1. Encourage and facilitate the orderly growth and development of the city;
2. Provide adequate open space for light and air, air quality, to prevent overcrowding of the land, and to lessen congestion on the streets;
3. Secure economy in municipal expenditures, to facilitate adequate provision for public or alternative transportation, water, sewage, schools, parks, vegetation, trees and landscaping, and other public facilities and services;
4. Increase the security of home life and preserve and create a more favorable environment for the citizens and visitors of Provo;
5. Secure safety from fire, panic, and other dangers;
6. Stabilize and improve property values;
7. Enhance the economic and cultural well being of the inhabitants of Provo;

8. Promote the development of a more wholesome, serviceable, and attractive city resulting from an orderly, planned use of resources.

These objectives are achieved through regulation and control of types and patterns of land uses, population densities in residential areas, building densities in commercial and industrial areas, and the arrangement and size of buildings through setback and height regulations.

The zoning ordinance needs to be reviewed and if necessary, revised in order to assure agreement with the general plan. Ideally, the zoning ordinance is used in conjunction with the general plan and is used as a tool for achievement of the objectives of the plan.

Subdivision Regulations

Subdivision regulations provide minimum design standards for new streets and lot divisions in the city. They also enable the community to require developers to construct utility lines, roads, curbs, and other necessary infrastructure in accordance with community standards. Subdivision regulations are important to the general plan because of the regulation of development on vacant land they provide. All new subdivisions of land have to meet these regulations or they cannot be developed. Once land has been built up, the community does not get a second chance, at least for many years, to control its development.

Capital Improvements Program

The capital improvements program should be the single most important tool in carrying out the development guidelines of the general plan. It is used to schedule financing for the construction of major non-recurring community facilities such as streets, utilities, public buildings, acquisition of land, etc. The capital improvements plan is based on an analysis of the community's financial capability in order to reconcile proposed expenditures with fiscal reality. This presents the opportunity for planning finances for the developments proposed in the general plan. The capital improvements program will enable the city to:

1. Relate physical planning to financial planning.
2. Obtain maximum value from the expenditure of public funds.
3. Ensure the community's financial ability to meet future demands for public service.
4. Devote adequate time to the study and development of capital improvement projects.

Bi-annual Amendments

Amendments to the general plan may be made bi-annually by citizens, developers, landowners, the city, and other interested persons. Proposals will be heard by the Planning Commission, who will make recommendations to the Municipal Council. The Planning Commission will hear amendment proposals in April and October.

Notwithstanding the bi-annual general plan amendment process, applications for amendments to Specific Development Plans, as outlined in Chapter 6 - Land Use, may be made at any time. Otherwise, the process for amendment of these plans shall be the same as for other General Plan amendments.

Implementation Measures

Chapter One - Introduction

- 13.1** No implementation measures.

Chapter Two - Administration

Amendment Process

- 13.2.1** Revise application forms and procedures to accommodate the bi-annual processing of general plan amendment requests.
- 13.2.2** Discuss ways to build flexibility into the bi-annual amendment process to facilitate review of defined special cases where “fast track” processing is necessary.
- 13.2.3** Develop the framework for conducting an annual self-evaluation to enable the Planning Commission and Municipal Council to judge how well the city is adhering to general plan guidelines.

Comprehensive Update

- 13.2.4** Budget staff resources to provide adequate time for a comprehensive update of the general plan every five years. The plan update shall be considered concurrently with the city’s capital improvements budget.

Consistent Zoning

- 13.2.5** Systematically review existing zoning compared to the new general plan land use designations. Conduct public hearings, after giving notice to affected property owners and agencies, to consider zoning map amendments that reflect general plan land use designations.

Planning and Zoning Hearings

- 13.2.6** Provide, in cooperation with the City Attorney’s office, printed materials and training sessions for city land use decision makers and staff to promote equity, fairness, and due process in Provo City’s review of land use requests.
- 13.2.7** Implement the separation of legislative decisions (such as zoning map amendments) from administrative decisions (such as conditional uses or subdivisions). This may necessitate re-visiting the lists of outright permitted and conditionally permitted uses in all zones. It also may involve the establishment of a “Limited Use Overlay Zone” to further limit allowed uses or intensity of uses to address special circumstances.

Zoning Enforcement

- 13.2.8** Continue an emphasis on code enforcement to maintain neighborhood quality of life. This includes close cooperation with the City Attorney’s office, Police Department and participation in the satellite police station program.

Chapter Three - Population

Demographics

- 13.3.1** Collect and maintain demographics data available periodically from the U.S. Census Bureau and other agencies for use in long-range land use planning, economic development efforts, and for the five-year update of the general plan.

Population Projections

- 13.3.2** Obtain population projection figures generated by private utilities, government agencies, and other sources for use in the five-year update of the general plan. Compare these projections to those in the general plan to determine whether the basis for the general plan land needs remains valid.

Chapter Four - Housing

Neighborhood Preservation

- 13.4.1** Amend the zoning map to provide areas for multi-family housing to serve as a buffer or transitional use between non-residential areas and low density residential areas.
- 13.4.2** Encourage establishment of historic districts in areas with sufficient concentrations of eligible structures. Historic districts enable property owners to utilize tax incentives to improve their property.
- 13.4.3** Initiate public hearings to consider the “down-zoning” of lands near the central city to encourage owner occupancy and preservation of established neighborhoods.
- 13.4.4** Enable the development of accessory apartments in selected areas to promote owner occupancy, provide needed housing units and maintain an owner maintenance presence on the property.

Affordable or Moderate Income Housing

- 13.4.5** Encourage a broad range of housing choices for all income levels, without sacrificing neighborhood quality of life and property values.
- 13.4.6** Promote the use of accessory apartments in selected areas to allow more citizens to qualify for a home purchase and increase owner occupancy rates in Provo.
- 13.4.7** Encourage the development, in selected areas, of housing types that cost less per square foot to construct (i.e., manufactured and modular homes).
- 13.4.8** Amend zoning regulations to encourage cluster development patterns that conserve land and require less linear footage of infrastructure.
- 13.4.9** Consider a program to offer incentives (such as permit and/or fee discounts, loans or other means of support) to projects that utilize Low Income Housing Tax Credits or other programs that will ensure new housing units are made available to low and moderate income citizens.

- 13.4.10** Maintain close coordination with the Provo Housing Authority, Neighborhood Housing Services, Habitat for Humanity, the Utah Housing Finance Agency and the Utah Department of Commerce and Economic Development so that Provo City can be informed of and involved with housing projects proposed for this area.

Chapter Five - Urban Design

Landscaping

- 13.5.1** Establish specific landscape requirements in all commercial zones, including parking lot landscaping.
- 13.5.2** Establish specific zoning guidelines relating to screening parking lots from the public view.
- 13.5.3** Establish general zoning guidelines to require landscaping to correlate with the proposed architecture.
- 13.5.4** Develop a sliding scale requirement for building height and required front yard landscaping.

Signage

- 13.5.5** Develop and adopt a monument sign only requirement, including the concept that signs should relate to the architecture and landscaping.
- 13.5.6** Establish a process to amortize all free-standing signage over a certain height.
- 13.5.7** Require that billboards be removed from potential development sites prior to project approval.

Design Corridors

- 13.5.8** Establish the design corridors as outlined in the general plan to provide guidelines for improved development. Each design corridor may have specific or unique design requirements.
- 13.5.9** Provide better entrances to the city in relation to welcome signage and landscaping.
- 13.5.10** Encourage beautification of the Utah Department of Transportation rights-of-ways.

Construction

- 13.5.11** Establish incentives to encourage diversity in the design of multi-structure projects while allowing for compatibility with the overall project.
- 13.5.12** Encourage new construction, remodels, and additions to existing structures to be sympathetic to form, color, material, style, and scale of surrounding areas and/or structures.

Chapter Six - Urban Growth and Land Use

- **13.6.1** Establish a land trust, a team of city officials, business people, and residents to actively seek to acquire lands for open space, and to manage those resources.
- **13.6.2** Consider having a bond election for funds to purchase open space along key corridors of the city for parks, trails, and buffer yards.
- **13.6.3** Write an “open space” subdivision ordinance which mandates set-asides of common open space, even in conventional subdivisions. Make the integration of open space the rule, not the exception. Make this ordinance simpler than the existing Performance Development ordinance. To encourage its use, it must be easier to get approved than the “no-risk, cookie-cutter” subdivisions we see all too often.
- **13.6.4** Re-write the Performance Development Ordinance. There are legitimate purposes for having performance developments - design continuity, flexibility to deal effectively with difficult development settings, more efficient land use patterns, economy etc. But there is growing dissatisfaction with some of the features of this ordinance and its results. Some of the things that should be examined for change are:
 1. Simplify the ordinance. It must be easier for staff to administer, and it must be easier, and thus, less risky for developers.
 2. The city may want to consider limiting its use to the zones included in the Low Density Residential One (LDR1) and Two (LDR2), and Very Low Density Residential (VLDR) general plan designations. The zones in the Medium Density Residential (MDR) and High Density Residential (HDR) and Very High Density Residential (VHDR) general plan designations already allow a variety of building types and site layout options. Such zones have high enough densities that bonuses in these areas are mostly unnecessary.
 3. The density bonus provisions should be reduced, that is, the types of features needed to justify a bonus should be more restrictive. Some of the density bonus features used to encourage better design should simply be required of all projects.
 4. The base density allowed in an R2PD (Two-Family Residential, Performance Development) should not be based on the assumption that the parcel to be developed could be used exclusively for two-family dwellings without the PD overlay zone. In practice, very few subdivisions consist entirely of duplexes, even in R2 zones. The typical R2 neighborhood should still be predominantly one-family, with a small percentage of two-family dwellings. For this purpose it is proposed make two-family dwellings a conditional use in the R2 zone. The density in an R2PD should, therefore, be no more than 20% higher than the R1.6 (One-Family Residential) zone (the zone next lowest in density to the R2 zone), instead of being twice as high.
 5. The base density of R1 (One-Family Residential) and R2PD's (Two-Family Residential, Performance Development) should be the number of R1 lots that could be designed on the site (plus 20% for R2 zones). The developer should be required to submit a “lot yield plan” to show how many lots the site would yield under a

conventional subdivision. This would be the base density, or number of units allowed, and any bonus granted would be on top of this. This would eliminate the “built in” density bonus for PD’s by virtue of the fact they are not limited by the geometrical constraints of designing lots with street frontage, and average lot width.

- 13.6.5** Develop an adequate public facilities ordinance which establishes “acceptable levels of service” for such things as roadways, intersections, storm drainage facilities, water lines, water pressure, sewer lines, fire and EMT response times, etc. If a development project is shown to exceed these accepted levels of service, it would not be approved. Or at least it would not be approved until either the developer or the city made improvements calculated to raise service levels to accepted norms.
- 13.6.6** Consider amending the land development/subdivision ordinance to require all necessary improvements be constructed before building permits are issued.
- 13.6.7** Establish more definitive hillside development standards, particularly with respect to grading, stabilizing or retaining slopes, flooding, and erosion control.
- 13.6.8** Encourage the use of alleys in new developments so that garages are less prominent from the street.
- 13.6.9** Discourage future land use districts or zones from locating adjacent to another district, if Provo’s average daily vehicle trips per acre is double that of the adjoining district. (Based upon typical base gross densities for the respective zones) Note: This shall not apply to zones bordering agricultural or public facilities zones. Other exceptions may be where a multi-family zone is used as a buffer on the edge of a neighborhood along a collector or arterial street. (If this policy were adopted no zone more dense than an R2 (Two-Family Residential) zone could locate next to R1.10 (One-Family Residential) and R1.8 (One-Family Residential) zones. No zone more dense than R3 (Medium Multiple Residential) could locate next to R1.6 (One-Family Residential) and R2 zones. No zone more dense than R4 (High Multiple Residential) could locate next to R3.)
- 13.6.10** Require off-site road or intersection improvements of the developer, commensurate with the impact imposed by the development.
- 13.6.11** Require traffic impact studies for all multi-family re-zonings and general plan land use amendments.
- 13.6.12** Allow multi-family zoning only on collector and arterial streets in areas designated on the general plan map for multi-family housing. Or perhaps only certain multi-family zones i.e., R4 (High Multiple Residential) and R5 (Very High Multiple Residential).
- 13.6.13** Permit multi-family housing on the outskirts or "edges" of lower density residential neighborhoods only where traffic from the multi-family housing can get direct access to a collector or arterial road without going through a lower density residential district.

- 13.6.14** Down-zone all LDR1 areas in the Central Council Area to R1.6A (One-Family Residential, Accessory Apartment Overlay) zone.
- 13.6.15** Establish and adopt standards for design review corridors at all major entrances to the city.
- 13.6.16** Hold area-wide neighborhood meetings to discuss alternative ways of dealing with accessory apartments. Then establish a city-wide policy.
- 13.6.17** Rewrite the Outdoor Sign Ordinance so that standards are more consistent throughout the city, and so that all properties within a given district meet the same standards even if they are in different zones.
- 13.6.18** Phase out the practice of allowing car dealerships permission to park vehicles in the street rights-of-way. And participate with owners to replace parkway landscaping, curb and gutter, and sidewalk in these areas.
- 13.6.19** Devise a system of regulatory incentives to attract high density uses to the Central Business District (CBD) and the R5 (Very High Multiple Residential) and R4 (High Multiple Residential) areas south of BYU.
- 13.6.20** Establish a new zone known as the CBDF (Central Business District Fringe) zone, and establish appropriate standards for height of buildings and setbacks.
- 13.6.21** Establish the policy, procedures, and funding for the preparation and adoption of Specific Development Plans, as outlined in Chapter 6 - Land Use.

Chapter Seven - Parks, Recreation, and Open Space

Parks and Recreation Appropriations

- 13.7.1** Purchase property for future regional and community parks in appropriate locations, where optimum automobile and pedestrian access exists or can be created.
- 13.7.2** Encourage residential clustering to provide relaxed minimum lot size standards in exchange for land to be utilized as neighborhood parks.
- 13.7.3** Identify and acquire specific properties for neighborhood or community parks where needed.
- 13.7.4** Pursue available local, state, and federal funding, for grants for the acquisition and improvement of parks, recreation areas and open spaces.

Open Space Appropriations

- 13.7.5** Encourage agricultural green belt areas in existing and appropriate locations by the use of a development right transfer or acquisition system.

- 13.7.6** Provide measures to require all sensitive land areas to remain open and natural.

Parks and Recreation Development

- 13.7.7** Require larger, medium and higher density residential developments to create functional private and public open spaces and recreation areas to service the needs of the individuals who occupy these developments.
- 13.7.8** Require all new developments to provide public access to natural amenities such as the Provo River Parkway System, Utah Lake, Provo, Slate and Rock Canyons, as well as the Bonneville Shoreline Trail and mountain side open spaces.
- 13.7.9** Charge appropriate and justifiable park impact fees for new residential developments.
- 13.7.10** Formulate and develop city-wide funding sources and strategies to supplement capital appropriations from the general fund to provide park and recreation facilities.

Joint Operations

- 13.7.11** Establish further agreements between the Provo City School District and the city to utilize school grounds as neighborhood parks and existing school facilities as city recreation areas.

Trails

- 13.7.12** Encourage the use of bicycling as a mode of transportation and recreation by providing paved surface trails and off-street neighborhood connections.
- 13.7.13** Establish and route new urban trail systems throughout the city by connecting existing trails and encouraging new residential development to install or provide public access easements for trails.

Regional Parks

- 13.7.14** Explore the feasibility of creating a large indoor or outdoor regional cultural/recreation center to provide a venue for symphonies, concerts, plays, sports events, conventions, and general regional assembly.

Urban Forestry

- 13.7.15** Maintain and expand urban forestry efforts in all residential areas.

Chapter Eight - Transportation and Circulation

Regional Planning

- 13.8.1** Work with state, county, local governments, and transit providers toward the development of a transportation system plan for the entire region.

Land Use

- 13.8.2** Consider amending zoning districts and regulations to encourage higher density uses in proximity to major transportation facilities. Discourage high density development where transportation facilities cannot provide an acceptable level of service.
- 13.8.3** Investigate the amendment of zoning regulations to make new development and redevelopment more “user friendly” to bicyclists and pedestrians.
- 13.8.4** Ensure that adequate measures are in place to protect the Provo Airport from the encroachment of incompatible development.

Street System

- 13.8.5** Promote “connectivity” in the developing street system by requiring a “grid system” of streets versus an emphasis on cul-de-sacs.
- 13.8.6** Utilize traffic calming measures where deemed appropriate to discourage through traffic on residential streets, reduce traffic speeds, and enhance neighborhood safety.
- 13.8.7** Continue efforts to enforce speed limits through use of the Speed Maintenance and Radar Trailers (SMART) program and investigate establishment of Neighborhood Speed Watch programs.
- 13.8.8** Study and take action to improve traffic signal coordination where feasible.
- 13.8.9** Monitor street conditions and plan for the systematic resurfacing of streets, with emphasis on high volume collectors and arterials.
- 13.8.10** Consult the Major Streets Plan when developing Capital Improvements Plans and reviewing development applications to ensure that needed street and traffic signal improvements and adequate public rights-of-way are provided when warranted.
- 13.8.11** Conduct a survey to determine if Trip Generation Rates in Provo are comparable to national average rates typically used in traffic studies. The survey may also determine what “level of service” citizens expect to receive from the local street system.
- 13.8.12** Commission a study and conduct public hearings to determine if Traffic Impact Fees could be utilized as a means of funding off-site transportation improvements needed to mitigate impacts of existing and new developments.
- 13.8.13** Revisit city access control policies and procedures and evaluate how effective they have been in preserving traffic capacity on arterial and collector streets. Amend access control policies and procedures as needed to improve future traffic flow on major streets.

Transportation Demand Management

- 13.8.14** Consider the allocation of resources toward the development of a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program in Provo. Such programs typically reward major

employers that encourage employees to utilize alternative modes of transportation (other than the one occupant vehicle).

- 13.8.15** Investigate means of controlling the supply and cost of off-street parking in the central area of the city as a way of discouraging one occupant vehicles.
- 13.8.16** Work with the Utah Transit Authority (UTA) to enhance the ability of that agency to provide service to as many citizens as possible. Consider offering incentives for major employers to participate in rideshare or car pool programs.
- 13.8.17** Continue to participate in projects to locate an improved Amtrak station in the Provo area and study the feasibility of a commuter rail system connecting major cities along the Wasatch Front.

Bike and Pedestrian Paths

- 13.8.18** Continue implementation of the city bicycle plan. Construct additional bike paths and bike lanes as funding becomes available.
- 13.8.19** Continue implementation of the plan for pedestrian trails. Aggressively seek funding for the installation of proposed trails identified in the general plan.
- 13.8.20** Evaluate existing and proposed pedestrian and bicycle facilities with the goal of improving safety for users.

Air Transportation

- 13.8.21** Upgrade facilities and market the Provo Airport for commuter airline service.

Chapter Nine - Environment

Air Quality

- 13.9.1** Work with the Utah County Bureau of Air Quality and the Air Quality Division of the Utah Department of Environmental Quality to develop and implement programs to improve ambient air quality in Provo during all seasons of the year. This includes, but is not limited to: public health education efforts, voluntary winter wood burning curtailment programs, financial incentives for the installation of clean-burning heating appliances, encouragement of alternative modes of transportation to reduce reliance on the automobile, continued efforts to improve traffic signal timing, and the installation of additional bus turnout areas.

Forests

- 13.9.2** Enforce the Watershed Protection Ordinance to ensure the protection of forests in city watershed areas.
- 13.9.3** Maintain funding and cultivate volunteers for an active Urban Forestry Program to preserve and enhance the benefits derived from a healthy urban forest.

Soils

- 13.9.4** Work with the Natural Resource Conservation Service to develop educational materials informing the public of the soil properties in the area and the consequences or limitations for development thereon.
- 13.9.5** Require engineering expertise be involved with development projects on poorly drained and low bearing strength soils.

Geologic Hazards

- 13.9.6** Enforce building codes that will protect new construction from seismic hazards.
- 13.9.7** Explore incentives and funding sources for the seismic retro-fitting of existing buildings.
- 13.9.8** Enact land use regulations that will limit development in areas subject to rock fall, land slides, and strata expansion.

Flood Control

- 13.9.9** Continue maintaining the levee system and floodway areas free of encroachments to facilitate the discharge of flood flows.
- 13.9.10** Minimize development in flood hazard areas to preserve storage space for flood waters and protect persons and property.
- 13.9.11** Continue participation in the National Flood Insurance Program, in coordination with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). Maintain a library of FEMA publications for public use.

Wildlife and Wetlands

- 13.9.12** Work with applicable state and federal agencies to identify and preserve significant wetlands.
- 13.9.13** Consider establishment of a “wetland bank” or other means to mitigate the loss of wetlands with future urbanization.
- 13.9.14** Evaluate and enforce land use regulations that call for the preservation of existing desirable vegetation in developing areas.
- 13.9.15** Coordinate with state and federal fish and wildlife officials and adopt land use regulations as necessary to protect land areas frequented by wildlife.

Water Quality

- 13.9.16** Maintain lot coverage/open space ratios for new development that will ensure adequate lands are preserved for water absorption.

- 13.9.17** Acquire/develop and publicize educational materials reminding the public of the importance of proper disposal of chemicals.
- 13.9.18** Encourage participation in Household Hazardous Waste disposal programs offered by governmental or environmental agencies.
- 13.9.19** Design parking lots to provide for filtration of storm water before discharge.

Solid Waste

- 13.9.20** Recognize and support volunteer efforts to keep Provo City clean.
- 13.9.21** Consider modification of solid waste and nuisance enforcement procedures to increase compliance by involving the Police Department in violation follow-up and issuance of citations.
- 13.9.22** Study a sliding scale solid waste collection fee, based on container size, that encourages recycling and reduces the amount of waste that is land filled.

Chapter Ten - Public Services and Facilities Element

Fire

- 13.10.1** Establish single engine company fire stations, with police facilities, in neighborhoods with unacceptable response times from existing facilities.
- 13.10.2** Establish a city-wide network of C.E.R.T. trained citizens to be utilized in an event of an emergency.
- 13.10.3** Establish a Nuisance Abatement program.
- 13.10.4** Establish programs to educate the community concerning local, state, and federal ordinances and local enforcement programs.
- 13.10.5** Require developers of projects within Provo to provide all fire and life safety features required by city codes and ordinances.
- 13.10.6** Bring Dispatch Center up to seismic standards.
- 13.10.7** Install a computer system that provides area wide voice communication with all units, dispatch, and stations, with portable computer information links to response vehicles for dispatch data, incident reporting, global positioning and automatic statistical generation.

Police

- 13.10.8** Use Officer Friendly and establish DARE program. Meet with parent groups for training and education.

- 13.10.9** Establish police officer stewardship in each neighborhood to introduce and establish programs.
- 13.10.10** Encourage federal disaster preparedness programs to be taught to citizens of Provo.
- 13.10.11** Establish police liaison in each neighborhood, and identify and train volunteers.
- 13.10.12** Introduce and educate the community of the value of crime prevention through environmental design.
- 13.10.13** Provide timely removal of all graffiti.
- 13.10.14** Staff and fund unit to identify community needs, provide enforcement, and educate owners and landlords.
- 13.10.15** Provide extra police patrol (1 officer per 1,000 population) to maintain safety and enforce all laws.

Library

- 13.10.16** Institute programs through the library that educate citizens about various cultures, beliefs, traditions, and heritage.
- 13.10.17** Appoint socially, ethnically, and religiously diverse library board members, also varying in age, marital status, and gender.
- 13.10.18** Provide the information on community events data base and the home page on the Internet.
- 13.10.19** Work with design committee on the new library and determine how to enhance facilities and programs.

Schools

- 13.10.20** No implementation measures.

Electrical Service

- 13.10.21** Present electrical safety programs in schools, fairs, and community activities. Work with neighborhood committee chairs in presenting electrical safety programs.
- 13.10.22** Standardize lighting fixtures for the entire city to reduce cost and stock.
- 13.10.23** Upgrade existing electrical services as maintenance and budget permits. Continue maintenance program. Construct a secondary substation on the west side to service the

growing population. Incorporate new technology to improve efficiency and to reduce costs. When economically feasible, place all new distribution laterals and services underground in conduit. Review and update periodically both the five-year and twenty-year capital improvement and strategic plans.

- 13.10.24** Encourage proactive commercial and industrial contracting.
- 13.10.25** Continue working with citizens to identify their power needs and reliability. Help citizens understand the need for system upgrade as demand and budget permits. Project coordination with city departments concerning current and long-range projects. Provide information to the public concerning programs and services available to the public.
- 13.10.26** Make use of the Internet web site.
- 13.10.27** Extension of circuit #11-1 to the west side as a second distribution feed to the airport. Acquisition of substation property and procurement and installation of equipment for a southwest/airport substation. Procurement and installation of a new substation for either the southeast or northwest sections of the city dependent upon growth and load requirements. Procurement and installation of a new 138Kv to 44 Kv transmission substation to supply additional transmission capacity to the southeast and southwest sections of the city. Transmission and distribution line upgrade and improvement. Existing SCADA (computer monitoring and control of substations) should be expanded to include new substation installations.

Solid Waste Disposal

- 13.10.28** Provide the city with better service at a lower cost. Add new vehicles and routes as the service demand increases.
- 13.10.29** Have volunteer groups involved in picking up Christmas trees at the curb and taking them to the compost site.
- 13.10.30** Include the following policies as improvements in the city's Capital Improvement Plan: (1) Up size 3110 West Center, (2) Up size 550 South 3110 West to Lift Station and install 2750 West trunk, (3) Up size 600 South force main, and (4) Install Boat Harbor Drive lift station and 3110 West trunk.
- 13.10.31** Replace aging sewer collection lines and mains.

Water Resources Department

- 13.10.32** West side residential and commercial sump pumps and roof drainage lines should be required to be routed to canals and storm drains instead of being attached to sewer lines.
- 13.10.33** Wastewater fees must be increased by 20% in order to rehabilitate the wastewater treatment plant to provide for increased population. Continue to obtain new sources of culinary water through water stock purchases, new wells, and spring collection development.

- 13.10.34** Include the following policies as improvements in the city’s Capital Improvement Plan: (1) Install 12 inch water line at 2000 North from 2100 West to 2750 West and from 2000 North to 820 North, (2) Install 12 inch water line at 1150 South from 1600 West to 3110 West, and (3) Install 12 water line at 3110 West from 2000 North to Boat Harbor Drive.

Storm Drainage

- 13.10.35** Provo City Code Section 9.15.230 should be amended to require the owners, tenants, or lessees to be responsible for the removal of debris from the gutters and liable for damages or injuries resulting from failure to do so. Pursuant to section 9.15.230 being amended, a public education program should be funded to inform the public.
- 13.10.36** Prohibit development where high water tables exist or require either flood proofing of basement walls or pumping mechanisms which will be connected to canals or storm drains.
- 13.10.37** Storm water user fees may be increased in order to generate revenues to complete current and future projects.

Chapter Eleven - Rehabilitation, Redevelopment and Conservation

Neighborhood Conservation

- 13.11.1** Down-zone lands in central area neighborhoods to increase home ownership rates, stabilize property values, improve neighborhood cohesiveness, and foster pride of ownership with property maintenance.
- 13.11.2** Encourage the formation of National Register Historic Districts to make tax credits available for housing rehabilitation in these areas.
- 13.11.3** Target these areas for infrastructure upgrades, such as street lighting and sidewalks.
- 13.11.4** Offer incentives, such as low interest loans, for property owners to repair deteriorated sidewalks.

Historic Preservation

- 13.11.5** Consider revising the Landmarks Preservation Ordinance to strengthen the city’s ability to prevent the destruction of Provo’s unique historic resources.
- 13.11.6** Educate the community regarding the social and economic benefits of historic preservation.
- 13.11.7** Preserve the character of existing historic districts and seek to establish new districts in areas where a concentration of eligible buildings remain.
- 13.11.8** Work with the State Historic Preservation Office, the Utah Heritage Foundation, and the National Trust for Historic Preservation to identify funding sources and programs to support preservation efforts.

- 13.11.9** Recognize and reward the efforts of those who provide leadership in preserving community heritage.

Redevelopment

- 13.11.10** Maintain and enhance the position of the Central Business District (CBD) as the business, retail, government, entertainment, and conference center for the city. Do so through promotion and marketing, economic restructuring, management and organizational strength, provision of adequate parking, and continuing efforts to enhance the appearance of the core area.
- 13.11.11** Promote efficient utilization of building space by encouraging a mix of uses in the Central Business District (CBD), including retail, office, service, and high density residential occupancies.
- 13.11.12** Continue support of the efforts to redevelop the Academy Square area on North University Avenue.
- 13.11.13** Continue efforts to assist existing businesses in the South University Avenue redevelopment area and encourage design improvements.
- 13.11.14** Update the community development plan on a routine basis, utilizing a community involvement process, to ensure that Community Development Block Grants are channeled to projects which most appropriately meet the needs of low and moderate income citizens and redevelop blighted areas.

Chapter Twelve - Economic

- 13.12.1** Explore regulatory and financial incentives to encourage established businesses to expand and new businesses to locate in Provo.
- 13.12.2** Develop new business park sites (such as the Provo Aerospace Park and the Ironton Business and Industrial Park) to encourage new business growth and job formation.
- 13.12.3** Work with the Provo Downtown Action organization to maintain the Central Business District (CBD) as a vibrant center of business, government, retail, service, and cultural activities in Provo.
- 13.12.4** Facilitate a dialogue between local businesses and city government so that business and government needs and concerns can be addressed in a timely manner.
- 13.12.5** Utilize redevelopment programs and incentives to encourage the revitalization of blighted commercial and industrial areas.
- 13.12.6** Provide support and assistance to businesses locating in or around the Provo Towne Centre Mall.

- 13.12.7** Encourage the retention of auto dealerships in Provo.
- 13.12.8** Continue efforts that will lead to the environmental clean-up of the Ironton site and develop a master plan for the creation of a business park in the area.
- 13.12.9** Advocate construction of a new I-15 interchange at 1700 North and adopt a plan for retail development of the lands nearby.
- 13.12.10** Periodically update the cost/revenue analysis contained in the general plan to determine if implementation of the general plan is generating sufficient public revenues to offset the cost of providing services to the community.
- 13.12.11** Collect, maintain and regularly evaluate a sales and property tax database showing tax generation by commercial locations.
- 13.12.12** Encourage the development of the downtown area into a mixed use development pattern including housing, office, support retail, arts, and entertainment.