THE VISION

DISCOVERY
- INTRODUCTION OF PROCESS
- ENGAGING COMMUNITY
- CONDITIONS, TRENDS, OPPORTUNITES, & CONSTRAINTS

ENVISION
- PRESENTING ANALYSIS
- POTENTIAL SCENARIOS
- DEVELOPING THE VISION

ALTERNATIVES
- DRAFT PRESENTATION
- PUBLIC REVIEW/REFINEMENT
- ALTERNATIVE FUTURES

TOOLS
- TDR & CONSERVTION EASEMENT
- TDR BANK
- ZONING REGULATION - OVERLAY
“I spent my entire growing up years exploring the River Bottoms, what I have learned is that huge diversity of plant and animal life that will be the victims of development. I want to see this area preserved as agriculture so that the life there will continue to thrive.”

- Spanish Fork Resident
SCENARIO 1

- Develop portion of the River Bottoms - less intense
- Develop everything south of South Field Rd. - less intense
- Develop large area along Main St east into the River Bottoms - more intense
- Preserve 100 year floodplain & floodway for agricultural and open space use
PRESERVATION OPTIONS

SCENARIO 2

- Develop portion of the River Bottoms - less intense
- Develop everything south of South Field Rd. - less intense
- Develop small area along Main St - more intense
- Preserve 100 year floodplain & floodway for agricultural and open space use
PRESERVATION OPTIONS

SCENARIO 3

- Develop everything south of South Field Rd. - less intense
- Develop small area along Main St - more intense
- Preserve River Bottoms for agricultural and open space use
NEXT STEPS

- SELECT PREFERRED SCENARIO
- CONDUCT STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS
- DEVELOP UNDERLYING LAND USE PLAN
- RESEARCH POTENTIAL PRESERVATION OPTIONS
- PRESENT OPTIONS TO CITY FOR DISCUSSION & STEPS FORWARD
PREFERRED SCENARIO

PRESERVE RIVER BOTTOMS BASIN

- PRESERVES OPEN SPACE & AGRICULTURAL LAND
- HELD IN PERPETUAL CONSERVATION EASEMENT
- SEVERAL PRESERVATION OPTIONS/AIDS

OPTIONS & AIDS

- TRANSFER DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS CODE
- TRANSFER DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS BANK
- COSTS & TRIGGERS OF DEVELOPMENT
KEY TAKEAWAYS

- RECEIVING AREAS ARE CRITICAL
  - THEY NEED TO BE DEFENSIBLE
  - THEY CAN’T RUN OUT
  - THEY NEED TO MULTIPLY TDRS TO BE VALUABLE
    (1 - 1 ISN’T ENOUGH)
  - CURRENT & FUTURE AREAS NEED TO BE IDENTIFIED

- TDR SALE VALUE NEEDS TO INCENTIVIZE VARYING TYPES OF SELLERS
  - FARMERS (STAGE OF LIFE), DEVELOPERS, ETC.

- BE CAREFUL DOWNZONING EXISTING AREAS & TDR PROGRAM SHOULD BE ONLY WAY TO INCREASE DENSITY

- CLOSELY TRACKING TDRS ENSURES SUCCESS

- CITY SHOULDN’T BE INVOLVED IN MARKET OR SETTING TDR PRICE
KEY TAKEAWAYS

- TDRS NEED TO BE GUARANTEED OR WON’T BE USED
  - PROCESS NEEDS TO BE EASY
  - ELIMINATE NEED FOR PLANNING COMMISSION & CITY COUNCIL HEARINGS
  - CERTAINTY OF TDR USE
  - POTENTIAL IN-LIEU OR REDUCED FEES/OPEN SPACE

- CONSERVATION EASEMENTS

- FUTURE PLAN FOR AGRICULTURE LAND MAINTENANCE, FLEXIBILITY, & FARMING

- CITY POTENTIAL TO OWN, BUY, OR MAINTAIN LAND

- CITY TO DETERMINE HARD & FAST CRITERIA FOR RECEIVING ZONES
SCENARIO 3 – LAND USE MODELS

- THREE APPROACHES FOR UNDERLYING DENSITY TO BE TRANSFERRED

- **APPROACH A – HIGH UNITS / ACRE***
  - PROVIDES GREATEST $ / ACRE & MOST INCENTIVE TO PARTICIPATE PRESERVING RIVER BOTTOMS
  - MOST TDR RELOCATION REQUIRES LARGEST AMOUNT OF RECEIVING AREAS IN CITY

- **APPROACH B – MEDIUM UNITS / ACRE***
  - PROVIDES GREATER $ / ACRE & MORE INCENTIVE TO PARTICIPATE THAN APPROACH C
  - MORE TDR RELOCATION REQUIRES LARGER/MORE RECEIVING AREAS

- **APPROACH C – LOW UNITS / ACRE***
  - PROVIDES GREATER $ / ACRE INCENTIVE TO PARTICIPATE WITH CITY OVER COUNTY
  - TDR RELOCATION REQUIRES TARGETED DEFENSIBLE RECEIVING AREAS

*ALL MODEL’S DU/AC ACRE LOWER THAN CITY AVERAGE
### Scenario 3

#### Approach A – Land Use Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AC</th>
<th>DU/AC</th>
<th>TDRs</th>
<th>County Units</th>
<th>TDR $/AC</th>
<th>County $/AC</th>
<th>Difference/AC</th>
<th>Anticipated $/AC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Floodway</td>
<td>151.89</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 Year Floodplain</td>
<td>616.79</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>$48,750</td>
<td>$19,766</td>
<td>$28,984</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30+% Slope</td>
<td>46.04</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Bottoms (Outside 100 Year)</td>
<td>659.16</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1,648</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>$81,250</td>
<td>$19,766</td>
<td>$64,484</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Field Rd Area*</td>
<td>352.02*</td>
<td>3.0*</td>
<td>1,056*</td>
<td>70*</td>
<td>$97,500*</td>
<td>$19,766*</td>
<td>$77,734*</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1,473.9</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>2,573</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>$83,625,225</td>
<td>$25,220,882</td>
<td>$58,404,402</td>
<td>$81,398,185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SPANISH FORK:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AC</th>
<th>DU/AC</th>
<th>TDRs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100 Year Floodplain</td>
<td>100.29</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Bottoms</td>
<td>95.55</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>195.84</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>389 (2,184)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* *SOUTH FIELD RD AREA UNITS NOT INCLUDED IN TDR UNIT TOTAL AS AREA COULD BE DEVELOPED AS INDICATED ON THE SCENARIO 3 MAP*
### APPROACH B – LAND USE MODEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AC</th>
<th>DU/AC</th>
<th>TDRs</th>
<th>County Units</th>
<th>TDR $/AC</th>
<th>County $/AC</th>
<th>Difference/AC</th>
<th>Anticipated $/AC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Floodway</strong></td>
<td>151.89</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>100 Year Floodplain</strong></td>
<td>616.79</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>$32,500</td>
<td>$19,766</td>
<td>$12,734</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>30+% Slope</strong></td>
<td>46.04</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>River Bottoms</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Outside 100 Year)</td>
<td>659.16</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1,318</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>$19,766</td>
<td>$45,234</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Field Rd Area</strong></td>
<td>352.02*</td>
<td>2.0*</td>
<td>704*</td>
<td>70*</td>
<td>$65,000*</td>
<td>$19,766*</td>
<td>$45,234*</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1,473.9</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1,935</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>$62,891,068</td>
<td>$25,220,882</td>
<td>$37,670,246</td>
<td>$81,398,185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SPANISH FORK:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AC</th>
<th>DU/AC</th>
<th>TDRs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>100 YEAR FLOODPLAIN</strong></td>
<td>100.29</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RIVER BOTTOMS</strong></td>
<td>95.55</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>195.84</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>291 (1,644)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*SOUTH FIELD RD AREA UNITS NOT INCLUDED IN TDR UNIT TOTAL AS AREA COULD BE DEVELOPED AS INDICATED ON THE SCENARIO 3 MAP*
## SCENARIO 3

### APPROACH C – LAND USE MODEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AC</th>
<th>DU/AC</th>
<th>TDRs</th>
<th>County Units</th>
<th>TDR $/AC</th>
<th>County $/AC</th>
<th>Difference/AC</th>
<th>Anticipated $/AC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Floodway</td>
<td>151.89</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 Year Floodplain</td>
<td>616.79</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>$16,250</td>
<td>$19,766</td>
<td>($3,516)</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30+% Slope</td>
<td>46.04</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Bottoms (Outside 100 Year)</td>
<td>659.16</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>$48,750</td>
<td>$19,766</td>
<td>$28,984</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Field Rd Area*</td>
<td>352.02*</td>
<td>2.0*</td>
<td>704*</td>
<td>70*</td>
<td>$65,000*</td>
<td>$19,766*</td>
<td>$45,234*</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1,473.9</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>1,297</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>$42,156,912</td>
<td>$25,220,882</td>
<td>$16,936,089</td>
<td>$81,398,185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SPANISH FORK:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AC</th>
<th>DU/AC</th>
<th>TDRs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100 YEAR FLOODPLAIN</td>
<td>100.29</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIVER BOTTOMS</td>
<td>95.55</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>195.84</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>193 (1,104)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*South Field Rd Area units not included in TDR unit total as area could be developed as indicated on the Scenario 3 map.*
SCENARIO 3

LAND USE MODEL COMPARISON

- EXISTING GROWTH POTENTIAL IN TERMS OF UNITS: 6,000*

- APPROACH A – HIGH UNITS / ACRE
  o 2,573 TDRS
  o CUMULATIVE LAND OWNER REVENUE: $83,625,225
  o COUNTY CUMULATIVE LAND OWNER REVENUE: $25,220,822

- APPROACH B – MEDIUM UNITS / ACRE
  o 1,935 TDRS
  o CUMULATIVE LAND OWNER REVENUE: $62,891,068
  o COUNTY CUMULATIVE LAND OWNER REVENUE: $25,220,822

- APPROACH C – LOW UNITS / ACRE
  o 1,297 TDRS
  o CUMULATIVE LAND OWNER REVENUE: $42,156,912
  o COUNTY CUMULATIVE LAND OWNER REVENUE: $25,220,822

*ASSUMING CURRENT LAND USE PATTERNS
OPTIONS

TDR PROGRAM

- ESTABLISH SENDING & RECEIVING ZONES & REGULATIONS

- ESTABLISH INCENTIVES & MECHANISMS FOR THE OWNERSHIP & TRANSFER OF DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS

- PROTECT & ENHANCE PROPERTY RIGHTS

TDR BANK

- ALLOW FOR CITY CONTROL OF TRANSFER OF DEVELOPMENT

- QUICK IMPLEMENTATION TIME & FLEXIBILITY WITH PROPERTY OWNERS

- REQUIRES BONDING

- POTENTIAL SOURCE OF INCOME
COSTS & TRIGGERS OF DEVELOPMENT

- MAJORITY OF RIVER BOTTOMS IN FLOODPLAIN.

  ○ REQUIRES SITE MITIGATION, FILL SOIL, & LETTER OF MAP REVISION (LOMR)

- COST TO INSTALL POWER SUB STATION

- COST TO RUN UTILITIES TO PARCELS

- COST TO DEVELOP STORM DRAIN

- COST TO DEVELOP SAINITARY SEWER

- EXISTING DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL THROUGH COUNTY IS 1 UNIT / 5 ACRES

  ○ DEVELOPMENT REQUIRES EVERYTHING ABOVE & COUNTY WON’T SERVICE THEM
MOVING FORWARD

DISCUSSION WITH CITY

NEXT STEPS
THANK YOU, QUESTIONS?