

2005 ULI/Gerald D. Hines Student Urban Design Competition COMPETITION BRIEF

I. COMPETITION PROCESS

INTRODUCTION AND MISSION

Please refer to the competition Web site (udcompetition.uli.org) for introductory information and the mission statement.

ELIGIBILITY

Members of the jury; the competition advisers; all officials, current employees, and recent former employees of the Urban Land Institute (ULI); the employees, students, and immediate families of any of the aforementioned parties; and those who ULI deem to present conflicts of interest are ineligible to compete. All participants from the finalist teams from the 2003 and 2004 competitions are also ineligible.

THE JURY

In agreeing to serve as members of the competition jury, the jurors attest they have reviewed the competition program and agree to be bound by the rules, regulations, and guidelines as stated.

Please refer to the competition Web site for information about each juror.

QUESTIONS

All questions regarding the competition must be sent in writing to udcompetition@uli.org. Answers will be posted on the Web site throughout the ten days of the competition. Please check the Update History to find out when the last changes were made.

Many answers to process-related questions can already be found on the Web site in the FAQ section.

ULI reserves the right to edit submitted questions before posting them to the Web site. The Institute also reserves the right not to answer all questions and not post redundant questions or remarks deemed to be inappropriate or irrelevant.

Once the program documents have been distributed, under no circumstances should there be any communication regarding the competition, other than in the manner stipulated here, with members of ULI staff, the nonprofit and public agencies involved, the landowner or employees of the landowner, consultants who worked on the project, or the competition jury.

No phone calls, please.

AWARDS AND PRIZES

Please refer to the competition Web site for this information.

SCHEDULE

Please refer to the competition Web site for this information.

II. SUBMISSIONS

EXAMINATION AND DISQUALIFICATION OF SUBMISSIONS

ULI will examine the submissions to ascertain whether or not the finalists comply with all competition requirements. They will report to the jury any failures to comply with requirements, and will present to the jury any resulting disqualifications. The jury may review all such disqualifications to satisfy itself as to the accuracy of the advisers' decision.

OWNERSHIP OF THE SUBMISSIONS AND COPYRIGHTS

All submissions shall become the property of ULI, which reserves the right to exhibit and/or reproduce any of the design presentations. ULI retains the right to reproduce any and all parts of the presentations for the purpose of publication or video representation, and to exhibit the competition results. Upon delivery to the jury, the presentation itself will remain the property of ULI. In any public use of the submissions, due credit will be given to the author(s) of the design.

ANONYMITY OF THE SUBMISSIONS

No submission will be juried that bears a name, symbol, or mark which might reveal the identity of the author(s) of the entry to the jury nor shall any competitor directly or indirectly reveal the authorship of any design. The only identifying mark on any submitted material will be the agreed-upon four-digit code.

RETURN OF SUBMISSIONS

No provisions will be made by ULI to mail or ship any entry back to the competitors. It is strongly suggested that all competitors maintain a complete record of their submission.

III. THE COMPETITION PROBLEM

THE CHALLENGE – LONG-RANGE PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT IN THE GREATER SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, AREA

The ULI/Gerald D. Hines Student Urban Design Competition is part of the Institute's ongoing effort to raise interest among young people in creating better communities, improving development patterns, and increasing awareness of the need for multidisciplinary solutions to development and design challenges. The purpose of this competition is to generate creative solutions that are products of multidisciplinary teams. This is an ideas competition; there is neither guarantee nor intent that any submitted scheme will be applied to the site.

To achieve the competition mission, ULI has selected a problem whose solutions require clear interdisciplinary coordination: each team must choose one of two potential development sites in the foothills of the north end of the Oquirrh Mountains west of Salt Lake City, provide justification for making that choice, design a master plan for the chosen site, and supply financial projections to support the master development plan.

The Regional Context

Located in the Salt Lake Valley, the Salt Lake City Metropolitan Area is home to 1.6 million residents, nearly 80 percent of the state's population. This metro area is facing many problems of rapid growth that are common in Western cities—too much traffic, declining air quality, less availability of water, and loss of open space. Since 1996, growth has consistently ranked in public surveys as the single most important issue facing the state.

In 1997, the Envision Utah public/private partnership was formed to study the effects of long-term growth in the region and to propose strategies to address growth-related issues. Envision Utah projects that by 2020 the Greater Wasatch Area of Utah will add one million residents. After a five-year process of public discussion and analysis, Envision Utah recommended actions to achieve a Quality Growth Strategy. The strategy focuses on six main goals to preserve the region's quality of life: increase air quality; increase mobility and transportation choices; preserve critical agricultural and sensitive lands; conserve and maintain availability of water resources; provide housing opportunities for a range of family and income types; and maximize efficiency in public and infrastructure investments.

The Envision Utah analysis showed that by 2020 the implementation of the Quality Growth Strategy would conserve 171 square miles of land, increase the mix of housing options, reduce traffic congestion and emissions, and require \$4.5 billion less investment in water, sewer, utility, and transportation infrastructure.

ULI and Suburban Smart Growth

In recent years, ULI has been working to bring the Smart Growth movement to suburban areas. Initially, the movement focused mostly on urban infill and remaking the urban centers. But as growth continues on the suburban fringe and as greenfield development continues to be the most prevalent kind of development, ULI has been investigating alternative ways to plan communities that reverse the development patterns that encourage sprawl.

Optimal greenfield development offers the most practicable, affordable, and achievable chance to build without sprawl, given its potential to create large-scale conserved open lands and sustainable modern infrastructure.

Some of the basic principles that should be considered in order to achieve smart growth on the suburban fringe are: create and sustain green infrastructure; protect environmental systems and conserve resources; provide diverse housing types and opportunities; build centers of concentrated mixed use; use multiple connections to enhance mobility and circulation; create sustainable transportation choices; and preserve community character.

The Development Sites

The two potential development sites are on property owned primarily by the Kennecott Land Corporation (KLC), a development affiliate of Kennecott Utah Copper, the owner and operator of the Bingham Canyon Mine, the largest manmade excavation on earth. KLC was created in 2001 to focus on the development of the company's extensive surplus land holdings located on the west side of the Salt Lake Valley.

Kennecott's strategic plan for its 93,000-acre Oquirrh Mountain holdings is to continue its mining operations and to maximize the value of its developable land. KLC intends to act as its own master developer for its holdings at the foothills of the Oquirrh Mountains, creating the "West Bench" as a developable counterpart to the Salt Lake Valley's East Bench. Kennecott's existing railway (once used to transport mineral ore from the mines to the smelter, following the flattest possible topographic line) will act as a "backbone" for future development. KLC's principal master planning consultant has identified a number of sites along this connector, the first of which is Daybreak, a 4,126-acre master-planned community with 13,600 homes and 9.0 million square feet of office, industrial, and retail entitlement, at the southern terminus of the West Bench. The northern terminus is the subject for this competition.

The northern end of the West Bench is dominated by a 10,000-acre Tailings Pond, which is encircled by an 80-foot-high manmade impoundment berm. Adjoining this impoundment are the two development sites for this competition: 1) **Magna**; and 2) **Northwest Planning Area**.

The competition site of **Magna**, to the south and east of the tailings impoundment, is a 2,208-acre portion of Magna Township (population 23,000). The master plan will include both developable and undevelopable areas within Magna. The undevelopable component is an 831-acre residential zone (cross-hatched in the aerial site map), which will remain residential, primarily single-family under fee simple ownership. The developable component includes Main Street, owned by various private entities (assume that the developable component may be brought under the developer's sole ownership); and undeveloped land, owned by KLC. Main Street is the township's underutilized commercial and civic center, defined for this competition as a 100-acre area one block north and one block south of 2700 South, from 8400 West to 9200 West. Its market valuation is \$95 million. Market valuation of KLC's developable 1,270 acres within the Magna competition site is \$24 million.

Northwest Planning Area, an undeveloped site, comprises 2,002 acres to the east of the impoundment and south of Interstate 80 and lies within the jurisdiction of Salt Lake City. All of it is owned by KLC at a market valuation of \$10 million.

Assumptions

With both competition sites, teams should also assume that:

- (a) land acquisition costs will equal the market valuation plus transactional costs.
- (b) transit lines and stops/terminals will be part of the public infrastructure costs.
- (c) public mass transit is extendable into whichever development site is chosen.
- (d) the planned north-south four-lane highway (Mountain View Corridor) will be completed in 2010.
- (e) infrastructure costs for public schools under the Jordan School District or the Salt Lake School District will be borne by the developer; and that the land acquisition and school construction costs will be borne by the respective school districts.
- (f) Annual tax rates remain stable at the current 1.5% for Salt Lake County and 1.57% for Salt Lake City.

1. The competition submission should reflect three specific levels of decision-making:

- (a) **Planning Context and Analysis:** Competitors should analyze the overall context of the surroundings at a regional scale. As part of the "planning context and analysis," competitors may wish to offer overall recommendations for planning, development, and design of this larger area to support a preferred scenario.
- (b) **Development Area Selection:** Based on the analysis above, choose one of the two development areas, delineated as **Magna** and **Northwest Planning Area**. Justify this selection using financial feasibility, geographic considerations, locational considerations, and available market studies. Having to choose an initial development site is one of the most difficult decisions in development of large-scale areas. Students may want to review the case study of Irvine Ranch in Orange County, California; or the former Stapleton Airport site in Denver, Colorado; or Summerlin in Las Vegas, Nevada; as having an analogous development strategy, with a similar size and timeline.
- (c) **Master Development Plan:** Competitors shall propose a "master development plan" for their chosen development site. Teams must choose the entirety of one or the other of these two sites; teams that choose both, or parts of one, or parts of both, will be disqualified.

IV. JUDGING

CRITERIA FOR JUDGING

The jury will be instructed to use these criteria in selecting the finalists and honorable mentions. Remember, the primary goal is to demonstrate direct linkages among, and integration of, professional disciplines in planning, design, and economic feasibility. Specifically, the solutions should:

1. Integrate Planning and Design Decisions with Economic Feasibility
 - (a) Public investments in infrastructure, public facilities (schools, transit, etc.), and public programs should have clear value for private investors and their proposed development.
 - (b) Private investments and developments should have a clear value for the public planning goals that have been expressed for the study area.
 - (c) Planning and design concepts should support and reinforce public planning goals.

 2. Demonstrate awareness of design issues contributing to a workable, livable, sustainable configuration of development. Specific aspects of this includes:
 - (a) Sustainable development;
 - (b) Environmental responsibility;
 - (c) Pedestrian-friendly design;
 - (d) Smart growth practices; and
 - (e) Development around transit.

 3. Demonstrate attention to factors affecting the risks and feasibility of the project, including:
 - (a) Development and construction costs;
 - (b) Future expenses and revenues from operations and land sales; and
 - (c) Effect of project phasing on risks and feasibility.

 4. The jury will be neutral about the choice of development areas. The jury will base its decisions on the criteria above overlaid on the following three:
 - (a) Thoroughness of analysis leading to the choice;
 - (b) How well the proposed master development scheme supports the rationale for the choice; and
 - (c) Feasibility of the master development scheme, taking into account public and private investments and the financial and social value these investments impart on the development and region.

 5. Additional Criteria
- While the jury may not ignore any of the above criteria, they may, if they wish, use additional criteria in making their final decisions.

V. SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS

PRESENTATION REQUIREMENTS

The presentation rules have been developed to ensure that the jury will have sufficient information to effectively evaluate and compare individual solutions for the competition phase. This is particularly important because the jury will have to review and evaluate a large number of solutions in a relatively brief period. Disregarding presentation guidelines and recommendations may place the competitors at a disadvantage. It must be emphasized that the presentation guidelines are developed for the benefit of the competitors as well as the jurors.

The presentation shall consist of a series of **no more than six sheets**, each 11" x 17". As indicated in the following list, competitors have some discretion regarding the number of sheets used for each category. Maps, plans, and drawings may be at any scale; indicate scale used.

1. Context and Analysis (one or two sheets):

This should include an overall annotated plan and/or diagram drawn at a scale that describes overall patterns and concepts for regional issues the team considers relevant. These might include, for example:

- (a) Land use;
- (b) Circulation (pedestrian, vehicular, transit, etc.);
- (c) Open space;
- (d) Strengths and weaknesses of the area;
- (e) Environmental and sustainability considerations;
- (f) Image and character of the area;
- (g) Social and economic concerns;
- (h) Community planning and infrastructure concepts; and
- (i) Private sector development concepts.

2. Master Plan (four sheets):

The Master Plan drawings must be for one of the two development sites as delineated on the maps, showing:

- (a) Land and building uses;
- (b) Blocks and streets;
- (c) Location of transit line(s) and stops/terminal—for purposes of the competition, assume that there will be at least one transit stop on the site and that it will connect to existing transit;
- (d) Other public infrastructure;
- (e) Connections to neighboring sites;
- (f) General concepts for landscape and open space.

The Master Plan drawings should include an elevation or section drawing illustrating the general architectural character of an emblematic group of buildings proposed for the 100 percent corner of the master plan.

3. Development Schedule and Finances

Somewhere among the six sheets above, provide:

- (a) A summary of the market information of the Greater Salt Lake City Area that helped you determine an optimal start year for your chosen development.
- (b) In addition to the requirements specified in *1: (Context and Analysis)* and *2: (Master Plan)* include and account for the following information: the target markets for, and values of, property development; a demonstration of sustainability concepts; a demonstration of financial feasibility, showing acquisition, development, and construction costs.
- (c) As a summary of the financial feasibility of the choices you have made, calculate the development's internal rate of return (IRR) for its first ten years of development. Identify the assumptions (e.g., number of units, sales/rents, itemized costs, etc.) you have used in its calculation. The IRR will be expected to be a positive number, but the jury only will use it

to verify that it supports your proposal, and will not use it as a comparison of one team proposal to another.

These sheets should also incorporate statements describing site design and development concepts, public infrastructure—including circulation and open space—investments, and market options and strategies.

Text—in the form of charts, graphs, matrices, spreadsheets, timelines, etc.—should analyze the costs for infrastructure, buildings, open space, and the value that they will create. Drawings—in the form of plans, sketches, and collages—should describe the architectural and other design concepts for the public and private realms.

SUBMISSION GUIDELINES

All items described in the above list of presentation requirements must be included on a maximum of 6 sheets. Two copies of the sheets should be submitted. One set—which is intended to be shown to the jury—should be mounted on rigid, lightweight boards, preferably foam core. The other set should be loose so that it can be photocopied easily.

One consistent corner of every sheet must have the entrant's four-digit code, as chosen by the team in the application.

A separate CD—with only the team's four-digit code to identify it—should also be submitted, containing the six sheets in PDF format at "Press Quality" resolution.

Graphic techniques are entirely at the discretion of the competitors. Drawings should include a graphic scale and a north arrow.

Supplemental diagrams or information not presented directly on the sheets, will not be accepted as part of the presentation.

CHECKLIST FOR SUBMISSION

1. Maximum of six sheets mounted on boards (copy 1);
2. Maximum of six sheets (same as item #1), unstapled, and loose (copy 2);
3. CD of the same sheets as item #1 in PDF format, press quality;

Remember: All items can contain only the self-defined four-digit code and no other identifying mark. This includes the CD, the CD envelope, every sheet submitted, etc.

PACKAGING AND DELIVERY OF SUBMISSIONS

All submissions must be received as one package, addressed to:
Student Urban Design Competition
Urban Land Institute
1025 Thomas Jefferson St., N.W.
Suite 500 West
Washington, DC 20007
202-624-7000

All submissions must be mailed to the above address with a postmark no later than Monday, February 7, 2005. Hand-delivered solutions must be received prior to 5:00 p.m., e.s.t., on February 7, 2005.

Submissions sent by U.S. Mail, express company, or by private courier service must be postmarked by the deadline stated in the previous paragraph. Competitors are advised to consider an express mail service that can guarantee delivery in one or two days. Only properly postmarked submissions, as described above, that are delivered to ULI before the jury meets will be eligible for consideration. No notification of receipt by ULI will be sent to competitors; therefore, it is recommended that materials be sent by registered mail, FedEx, UPS, or other means that allows the sender to track the status of the materials. Neither ULI nor the jury bears any responsibility whatsoever for the safe and timely delivery of the submissions to ULI.

It is recommended that all materials be sent in one "Large" box (12½"x18"x4") as provided by FedEx and UPS. The return address/billing information will be the only part of the submission that contains identification of the submitting team. There cannot be any identifying mark INSIDE the mailing package except the 4-digit team code.

Note: Additional program rules and guidelines for the next phase shall be announced after the four finalists are selected.

VI. CD CONTENTS

This list includes all the items in the program CD and serves as a checklist for competitors to make sure they have received all the materials.

1. Competition Brief (this document as a MS Word file)
2. Resources: relevant studies not available on the Web
3. ULI publications pertaining to Smart Growth and sustainable development
4. Related Web information with live links (MS Word file)
5. Context photos
6. Aerial images showing the two competition sites and regional context (PDF files) and region (with world JGW files to convert associated JPGs to GIS layers)
7. GIS files at metric scale

You may reproduce the CD for distribution only among team members, faculty adviser, and professional adviser. All materials on the CD are to be used for this competition only, and may not be used, copied, or distributed for any other purpose.

A note about the GIS files: This folder contains GIS layers for the two competition sites, and raster images of the Greater Salt Lake City region (approximately 18 miles by 21 miles). The raster images are aeriels and USGS Quads in JPG format with associated JGW files (to allow conversion of JPGs to GIS layers). Some of the shape files are for the entire Greater Salt Lake City region; some are for the two competition sites; and some are for a particular competition site. Not all shape files were available in the same projection. Use GIS software equivalent to ArcGIS 8.x or higher to automatically reproject all shape files.