

## Chapter 3: Land Use

|            |   |             |
|------------|---|-------------|
| <b>3.1</b> | <b>Introduction .....</b>               | <b>3-1</b>  |
| <b>3.2</b> | <b>Regulatory Setting.....</b>          | <b>3-2</b>  |
| <b>3.3</b> | <b>Affected Environment.....</b>        | <b>3-2</b>  |
| 3.3.1      | Methodology .....                       | 3-3         |
| 3.3.2      | Existing Land Use .....                 | 3-4         |
| 3.3.3      | Local Land-Use Plans .....              | 3-6         |
| 3.3.4      | Regional Planning .....                 | 3-10        |
| 3.3.5      | Conservation Areas .....                | 3-12        |
| <b>3.4</b> | <b>Environmental Consequences .....</b> | <b>3-16</b> |
| 3.4.1      | Methodology .....                       | 3-16        |
| 3.4.2      | No-Action Alternative.....              | 3-17        |
| 3.4.3      | Alternatives A1–A2.....                 | 3-18        |
| 3.4.4      | Alternatives B1–B2.....                 | 3-26        |
| 3.4.5      | Wetland Avoidance Options .....         | 3-32        |
| 3.4.6      | Mitigation Measures.....                | 3-32        |
| 3.4.7      | Cumulative Impacts.....                 | 3-33        |
| 3.4.8      | Summary of Impacts .....                | 3-34        |
| <b>3.5</b> | <b>References .....</b>                 | <b>3-35</b> |

### 3.1 Introduction

This chapter describes the existing land use within each jurisdiction in the land use impact analysis area as well as the applicable land-use plans and policies. It also analyzes the expected impacts of the proposed West Davis Corridor (WDC) alternatives on land-use patterns in this area and its consistency with local and regional land-use plans and policies.

**Land Use Impact Analysis Area.** The land use impact analysis area includes portions of Weber and Davis Counties. The land use impact analysis area encompasses all of the areas where existing and planned land-use patterns could be affected by one or more of the WDC action alternatives (see Figures 3-1 and 3-2, Existing Land Use, in Volume IV).

#### What is the land use impact analysis area?

The land use impact analysis area encompasses all of the areas where existing and planned land-use patterns could be affected by one or more of the WDC action alternatives.

This area was selected by reviewing transportation demand information from the Wasatch Front Regional Council's (WFRC) travel demand model and land uses to determine where changes in the traffic patterns from the WDC could influence land-use patterns. The travel demand patterns showed that the area influenced by the WDC would be the area bounded by Interstate 15 (I-15) on the east, the Great Salt Lake on the west, 3000 South in Weber County on the north, and Parrish Lane in Centerville on the south. For a more detailed discussion of travel patterns, see Section 1.2, Description of the Needs Assessment Study Area.

#### **What is a travel demand model?**

A travel demand model is a computer model that predicts the number of transportation trips (travel demand) in an area at a certain time in the future. This prediction is based on the expected population, employment, household, and land-use conditions in the area.

Within the boundaries of the impact analysis area are parts of 14 municipalities and unincorporated areas in Davis and Weber Counties. The cities in Davis County are Centerville, Clearfield, Clinton, Farmington, Kaysville, Layton, Sunset, Syracuse, and West Point. The cities in Weber County are Hooper, Ogden, Riverdale, Roy, and West Haven (see Figure 3-3, Cities within the Land Use Impact Analysis Area, in Volume IV).

## **3.2 Regulatory Setting**

The Utah legislature has delegated responsibility for land-use planning and regulation to the state's Counties and Cities. These local governments develop general or comprehensive plans for land development within their jurisdictional boundaries. These plans provide the parameters for future land use as well as infrastructure needs. The public has the opportunity to participate in the land-planning process by reviewing and commenting on draft land-use and zoning plans before they are approved by local city officials.

All plans discussed in this chapter have been developed in accordance with this general approach and, therefore, represent the type of land use and community that each local government desires. However, during the WDC Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, the city council of Farmington signed a resolution supporting a WDC alternative on Shepard Lane that was different than the planned WDC alignment shown in Farmington City's land-use and transportation plans. The City felt that an alternative on Shepard Lane would have fewer impacts than would the alignments shown in the transportation plan.

## **3.3 Affected Environment**

This section describes the existing land use within each jurisdiction in the land use impact analysis area as well as the applicable local and regional land-use plans and policies.

The land-use patterns described below are the product of interdependent decisions by numerous parties including local elected officials, local planning staff, developers, citizens, regional planning authorities, transportation agencies, and many other public and private entities. The land use impact analysis area will be mostly developed by 2040 to accommodate the expected population growth projected by the Governor's Office of Management and Budget independent of any specific transportation facility.

Transportation decisions might be less important to developers as they make development decisions about individual projects because their timeframes and planning horizons are much shorter than the public sector's. Variables other than transportation, such as market demand, site suitability, capital availability, economic feasibility, and regulatory environment, play a substantial role in influencing the developer's process of determining the viability of a development (FHWA 2004).

Transportation has an important, although indirect, effect on land-use decisions. It can have a strong influence but does not always control the outcome. This is true for the WDC Project, whose study area has an existing transportation grid that is congested during peak travel periods. The access provided by the existing transportation grid is one of the many reasons why the area has changed substantially from agricultural uses to suburban development. The share of development that is influenced by new roadway projects such as the WDC must be considered in the larger context of these regional and local planning and development decisions as other essential components that influence development.

### 3.3.1 Methodology

The WDC team analyzed the existing land use for each county and jurisdiction using a combination of aerial photographs, geographic information systems (GIS) data, digital orthophoto quadrangles, and consultation with representatives from each jurisdiction (West Davis Corridor Team 2012).

#### What is the WDC team?

The WDC team consists of the lead agencies for the WDC Project (the Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] and the Utah Department of Transportation [UDOT]).

#### 3.3.1.1 Methodology for Existing Land Use

Section 3.3.2, Existing Land Use, provides a general description of existing land use in the impact analysis area by geographic area. This information is based on aerial photographs from 2016, field surveys, and land-use plans that were gathered in 2016. The existing land use was input into electronic GIS files so that the impacts of each alternative could be evaluated. The data layers in the GIS files included the general land-use types in the impact analysis area: agriculture, recreation, residential, commercial, industrial, institutional, open space, and conservation area.

*Open space* includes land that is undeveloped and has no active use. It can include wildlife areas that are not being actively protected. *Conservation areas* include state Wildlife Management Areas; land managed by the Utah Reclamation, Mitigation, and Conservation Commission (URMCC); land owned and managed by The Nature Conservancy (TNC); land conserved by conservation easements; and land within the Legacy Nature Preserve.

Note that the existing land use as described in this chapter does not necessarily match current zoning and land-use plans because these plans and zoning programs are continually being updated.

### 3.3.1.2 Methodology for Regional Planning and Local Land-Use Plans

The WDC team collected regional and local land-use and transportation plans from regional planning organizations such as WFRC, Counties, and local municipalities. The team reviewed information in each plan on future land use and zoning, the future transportation network, and any potential future alignments of the WDC.

For the Counties or municipalities without a land-use or transportation plan, the WDC team met with the planning department to obtain information about current and future land-use planning. The information from the plans that were used to compile this chapter was current as of November 2016.

#### What is the Wasatch Front Regional Council?

The WFRC is the designated metropolitan planning organization that works in partnership with UDOT, the Utah Transit Authority (UTA), city and county governments, and other stakeholders to develop the Regional Transportation Plan for the Wasatch Front Urban Area. This Regional Transportation Plan is the region's plan for highway, transit, and other transportation-related improvements to meet the area's growing transportation needs over the next 30 years.

### 3.3.2 Existing Land Use

The land use impact analysis area consists of an area of about 64,278 acres west of I-15 in Davis and Weber Counties. The impact analysis area contains parts of 14 incorporated cities in Davis and Weber Counties as well as unincorporated land in each county. Of this land, about 92% is privately owned. The State of Utah is the largest public landholder in the impact analysis area with 6% of the total land, followed by the federal government with about 2%. Most of the state and federal land is conservation land (Wildlife Management Areas and mitigation areas) along the shoreline of the Great Salt Lake.

Of the 14 municipalities in the impact analysis area, seven might be affected by a WDC alternative. Table 3-1 below shows the land-use categories used in the analysis, lists the percentage of each land use in each municipality and in the unincorporated areas of Davis and Weber Counties in the impact analysis area, and indicates the cities through which a portion of the WDC could pass, depending on the alternative. For illustrations of the existing land uses, see Figures 3-1 and 3-2, Existing Land Use, in Volume IV. Note that the street numbering system in Davis and Weber Counties changes at the county border, so there are some north-south and east-west roads in each county with the same street designation.

This section describes the existing land use beginning at the northern end of the impact analysis area and extending south. As shown in Figures 3-1 and 3-2, Existing Land Use, the land use is mostly agriculture and residential with interspersed commercial and industrial. The agricultural uses are in the western part of the impact analysis area, while the more dense residential developments are in the central and eastern parts of the impact analysis area. Most of the industrial and commercial land uses are in the eastern part of the impact analysis area near I-15. Conservation-area land uses are along the Great Salt Lake shoreline, as are most of the open-space land uses.

**Table 3-1. Land Uses in the Land Use Impact Analysis Area**

in acres

| Jurisdiction                        | Agriculture   | Commercial   | Industrial   | Institutional | Open Space   | Conservation Area <sup>a</sup> | Recreation   | Residential   | Total Acres   | Percent of Total Land |
|-------------------------------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|--------------------------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|-----------------------|
| Unincorporated                      | 4,805         | 5            | 98           | 112           | 4,659        | 4,064                          | 52           | 867           | <b>14,662</b> | <b>23%</b>            |
| Centerville <sup>b</sup>            | 239           | 0            | 160          | 0             | 213          | 238                            | 0            | 6             | <b>856</b>    | <b>1%</b>             |
| Clearfield                          | 262           | 179          | 1,244        | 175           | 0            | 0                              | 105          | 2,169         | <b>4,134</b>  | <b>6%</b>             |
| Clinton                             | 864           | 107          | 0            | 108           | 0            | 0                              | 219          | 2,512         | <b>3,810</b>  | <b>6%</b>             |
| Farmington <sup>b</sup>             | 720           | 195          | 3            | 135           | 71           | 282                            | 117          | 1,362         | <b>2,885</b>  | <b>4%</b>             |
| Hooper <sup>b</sup>                 | 3,927         | 39           | 0            | 0             | 1,865        | 650                            | 46           | 2,435         | <b>8,962</b>  | <b>14%</b>            |
| Kaysville <sup>b</sup>              | 697           | 147          | 64           | 115           | 16           | 32                             | 61           | 2,331         | <b>3,463</b>  | <b>5%</b>             |
| Layton <sup>b</sup>                 | 1,361         | 455          | 283          | 116           | 8            | 2                              | 174          | 2,521         | <b>4,920</b>  | <b>8%</b>             |
| Ogden                               | 0             | 0            | 180          | 711           | 0            | 0                              | 0            | 49            | <b>940</b>    | <b>2%</b>             |
| Riverdale                           | 0             | 0            | 0            | 15            | 0            | 0                              | 0            | 64            | <b>79</b>     | <b>1%</b>             |
| Roy                                 | 434           | 183          | 90           | 243           | 0            | 0                              | 141          | 3,930         | <b>5,021</b>  | <b>8%</b>             |
| Sunset                              | 0             | 93           | 0            | 47            | 0            | 0                              | 24           | 487           | <b>651</b>    | <b>1%</b>             |
| Syracuse <sup>b</sup>               | 1,779         | 121          | 16           | 194           | 97           | 17                             | 312          | 3,359         | <b>5,895</b>  | <b>9%</b>             |
| West Haven                          | 1,388         | 2            | 47           | 70            | 0            | 0                              | 52           | 1,904         | <b>3,463</b>  | <b>5%</b>             |
| West Point <sup>b</sup>             | 2,442         | 9            | 9            | 70            | 131          | 0                              | 168          | 1,708         | <b>4,537</b>  | <b>7%</b>             |
| <b>Total acres in analysis area</b> | <b>18,918</b> | <b>1,535</b> | <b>2,194</b> | <b>2,111</b>  | <b>7,060</b> | <b>5,285</b>                   | <b>1,471</b> | <b>25,704</b> | <b>64,278</b> | <b>100%</b>           |
| <b>Percent of total land use</b>    | <b>29%</b>    | <b>2%</b>    | <b>3%</b>    | <b>3%</b>     | <b>12%</b>   | <b>8%</b>                      | <b>2%</b>    | <b>41%</b>    | <b>100%</b>   | <b>—</b>              |

<sup>a</sup> For a list of conservation areas, see Section 3.3.5, Conservation Areas.

<sup>b</sup> City would be directly affected by a WDC alternative.

Table 3-1 above lists the existing land uses by jurisdiction (arranged alphabetically) and shows the total for each type of land use in the land use impact analysis area. Within the impact analysis area, the largest percentage of land is residential (41%, or 25,704 acres), and the second-largest percentage is agricultural (29%, or 18,918 acres). Open space and conservation areas are the next-largest uses at 12% (7,060 acres) and 8% (5,285 acres), respectively.

### **3.3.3 Local Land-Use Plans**

The land-use plans that apply to the impact analysis area show that the majority of this area is used or planned for residential uses with some farmland being maintained in the far west near the Great Salt Lake. The plans express the desires of the local jurisdictions to implement transportation improvements to encourage economic development. Concepts explored in regional and local land-use plans include opportunities for commercial nodes and retail centers along major roads surrounded by residential uses.

This section briefly describes the planned land uses in each municipality or county and the facility type and location of the WDC on the municipality's or county's transportation plans, if applicable. Only those cities for which the WDC action alternatives would be within or immediately adjacent to the City boundary are described below (see Figure 3-3, Cities within the Land Use Impact Analysis Area, in Volume IV). These are the cities of Centerville, Farmington, Hooper, Kaysville, Layton, Syracuse, and West Point, as well as unincorporated areas in both Davis and Weber Counties. Hooper is in Weber County, and the other six cities are in Davis County. Other cities listed in Table 3-1 above are not included in the discussion below but are included in the table to provide a context of the land use in the impact analysis area.

#### **3.3.3.1 Centerville (Centerville City General Plan, Updated 2008)**

Centerville encompasses 1% (856 acres) of the impact analysis area. The majority of this land within the impact analysis area is currently part of the Legacy Nature Preserve that was developed in the mid-2000s to offset the wetland impacts of Legacy Parkway. The land-use plan shows this area as the Legacy Preserve District and shoreland commerce/park district (Centerville City 2008).

Centerville City's general plan does not include a future WDC.

#### **3.3.3.2 Farmington (Farmington City General Plan, 2011; Transportation Plan Addendum, 2009)**

Farmington encompasses 4% (2,885 acres) of the impact analysis area. Farmington's general plan calls for controlled growth in order to maintain the city's historic and rural feel and to maintain a cohesive community. Farmington's plan calls for maintaining low-density residential development as well as preserving and maintaining current agricultural land. The redevelopment of the downtown commercial core is also a future consideration in order to serve as a focal point for the city. Farmington's general plan also acknowledges that the

ultimate goal of the City is to expand the city’s borders through annexation as stated in the City’s Master Annexation Policy Declaration.

The Farmington City General Land Use Plan (Farmington City 2011) shows mostly business park, transportation mixed use, light manufacturing, and some agricultural uses adjacent to the western side of I-15. Most residential development is west of the Denver & Rio Grande Western (D&RGW) Railroad line, and the area adjacent to the Great Salt Lake is identified as having development restrictions with either very low residential density and/or agricultural/open space/conservation areas. The area immediately south of Shepard Lane west of I-15 is a planned mixed-use development (North and South Station Park) of residential and commercial uses that is being built around the convenient access to the FrontRunner commuter-rail station and I-15.

The Farmington City Master Transportation Plan Addendum (Farmington City 2009) shows a “North Legacy Connector” starting at Legacy Parkway and Glovers Lane. The proposed connector follows the east-west Glovers Lane to about 1525 West. At about 1525 West, the connector angles northwest toward Kaysville. The addendum shows the WDC connecting to I-15 at Glovers Lane with a future interchange on the WDC near Shepard Lane and an east-west connector roadway connecting to I-15 at Shepard Lane. Though this is the WDC route currently shown in the addendum, the City has passed a resolution supporting a WDC alternative that would connect directly to I-15 at Shepard Lane.

### **3.3.3.3 Hooper (Hooper City Generalized Future Land Use Map, 2014; Hooper City Draft Transportation Master Plan, 2008)**

Hooper encompasses 14% (8,962 acres) of the impact analysis area. The Hooper City land-use plan shows that most of the area within the city is planned for residential uses. High-, medium-, and low-density residential uses are planned between 4700 West and 6300 West and between 5100 South and 5900 South. Within the city boundaries, the largest percentage of land is designated for medium-density residential.

Commercial and industrial uses are identified adjacent to 5500 South. There is also a commercial area planned at the corner of 4000 South and 5100 West. In the city, the area west of the 100-year floodplain of the Great Salt Lake is identified as open space (Hooper City 2014).

The Hooper City Draft Transportation Master Plan 2005–2025 (Hooper City 2008) identifies a future “Legacy Corridor.” The plan states that “5100 West is upgraded to the Legacy Highway, which is projected to be a four-lane, limited-access, divided highway from the south city limits to 5325 South. From that point north, the road will become a three-lane roadway that has more open access.” The 2014 Hooper City Generalized Future Land Use Map also shows the WDC along 5100 West (Hooper City 2014).

#### **What is a 100-year floodplain?**

A 100-year floodplain is the area that would be flooded by a water body during a 100-year flood.

A 100-year flood is a flood with a 1% chance of occurring in any given year, or one that occurs on average every 100 years.

#### **3.3.3.4 Kaysville (Kaysville City General Plan, 2014; Transportation and Traffic Circulation Plan, 2016)**

Kaysville encompasses 5% (3,463 acres) of the impact analysis area. Kaysville’s general plan shows predominantly low-density housing west of I-15, and this land use would not preclude agricultural activities (Kaysville City 2014). Kaysville City also plans to encourage the development of additional “moderate income housing,” with a goal of about 15% of additional housing meeting this category. Commercial uses are expected to be concentrated within the downtown area of Main Street and 200 North. Industrial uses will generally be confined to the area around I-15 and the Union Pacific Railroad line.

The Kaysville Transportation and Traffic Circulation Plan (Kaysville City 2016) shows “SR 67” as a principal arterial following a Farmington Glovers Lane alignment. State Route (SR) 67 travels along the western edge of the city parallel to the shore of the Great Salt Lake into Layton.

#### **3.3.3.5 Layton (Layton City General Plan, 2013; Master Street Plan, 2016)**

Layton encompasses 8% (4,920 acres) of the impact analysis area. The Layton General Plan shows commercial development along I-15 and Main Street with some residential and manufacturing uses between the UTA FrontRunner commuter-rail line and the D&RGW rail line. Immediately west of the D&RGW line, the land use is shown as residential and recreation. Mixed use with a commercial node is shown along Hill Field Road with a business node adjacent to the WDC. The land use on the very western side of the city is shown as residential (Layton City 2013).

The Layton City Master Street Plan (Layton City 2016) shows the WDC running along the western edge of the city, parallel to the shore of the Great Salt Lake, from Kaysville in the south to Syracuse on the north.

#### **3.3.3.6 Syracuse (Syracuse City General Plan, 2015a; Street Map, 2015b)**

Syracuse encompasses 9% (5,895 acres) of the impact analysis area. The Syracuse general plan shows most of the city as having residential uses. Commercial uses are shown along Antelope Drive and parts of 2000 West. An economic development area is shown along SR 193 in the northeast part of the city. Land uses along 3000 West, 4000 West, and 4500 West are shown as residential or agricultural except where 3000 West intersects with Antelope Drive, which is shown as commercial. Land uses along Bluff Road are mostly residential with some commercial where the road intersects Antelope Drive. A strip of agricultural and recreational uses is located immediately west of Bluff Road between 2700 South and 3700 South (Syracuse City 2015a).

The Syracuse Street Map (Syracuse City 2015b) shows the WDC from the southern city limits along the west side of Bluff Road to just north of Antelope Drive (SR 108). North of



Antelope Drive, the WDC would continue northwest into West Point. The WDC is shown on the west side of Jensen Park.

### 3.3.3.7 West Point (West Point City General Plan Land Use Map, 2013)

West Point encompasses 7% (4,537 acres) of the impact analysis area. The West Point general plan shows most of West Point as residential land uses. Commercial areas are found along 300 North with neighborhood commercial along 4500 West where the road intersects major east-west streets. The plan shows the area along the proposed “Legacy Parkway” in the western part of the city as residential except for regional commercial along 700 South and community commercial and research industrial park along 1800 North.

The West Point General Plan Land Use Map (West Point City 2013) shows a north-south corridor for Legacy Parkway along Bluff Road/Old Bluff Road from Syracuse (about 700 South) to 300 North (SR 107). The parkway then travels parallel to and just west of 4000 West between 300 North and the northern city limit at about 2000 North.

### 3.3.3.8 Davis County (Davis County General Plan 2006)

Unincorporated land in Davis County accounts for about 22% (13,490 acres) of the impact analysis area. Most of this land is along the shore of the Great Salt Lake, and the County and WFRC have not planned for the construction of any major roads through this area. Davis County’s general plan shows this area zoned as agricultural with a minimum of 5-acre lots (Davis County 2006). Permitted uses include agricultural, agricultural-related buildings, and single-family housing. Davis County has assisted in planning a WDC alignment in the general vicinity of the 2001 *North Legacy Transportation Corridor Study (North Legacy Study)* (WFRC 2001). The Davis County transportation plan shows an alignment of “Legacy Parkway” in the general vicinity of the WDC through Farmington, Kaysville, Layton, Syracuse, West Point, and Clinton (Davis County 2004).

#### What is the North Legacy Transportation Corridor Study?

The *North Legacy Transportation Corridor Study (North Legacy Study)*, which was completed by WFRC in 2001, studied potential corridors for a northern extension of the Legacy Parkway.

### 3.3.3.9 Weber County (West Central Weber County General Plan, 2003)

Unincorporated land in Weber County accounts for about 1% (1,172 acres) of the impact analysis area. The Davis County–Weber County border is situated between Clinton and Hooper. Most of the unincorporated area is within the county’s West Central Weber County planning area (Weber County 2003). The general plan shows this area as a mix of residential and agricultural uses. The plan shows “planned improvements” for roads along 4700 West and along 5100 West. The plan shows a future WDC in the area of 5100 West.

### 3.3.4 Regional Planning

The responsibility for regulating land use rests with the local governments; there is no broad regional body with the authority to determine land-use policy. Nonetheless, the jurisdictions in the region have made several efforts to address broader regional issues through collaborative planning. Many of these efforts have been facilitated by nongovernmental organizations, such as Envision Utah. This section discusses several of the regional planning efforts that have influenced local planning decisions in the land use impact analysis area. Most of these efforts resulted in recommendations only, and the resulting goals and policies are not obligatory.

Regional planning also takes place as part of the ongoing metropolitan transportation planning process, which is carried out by WFRC. The plans adopted by WFRC focus on transportation (consistent with federal laws), and the transportation priorities established by the metropolitan planning organizations in their long-range plans provide an additional indication of the region’s overall approach to growth and development.

The WFRC Regional Transportation Plan is a financially constrained, 20-to-30-year plan of the anticipated highway and transit projects that would be needed to meet travel demand in the WFRC planning area. Transportation needs are based on projected and planned socioeconomic factors and land use within a region. Under federal law, WFRC must update its Regional Transportation Plan every 4 years. WFRC’s most recent Regional Transportation Plan was adopted in 2015 and meets federal requirements.

#### What is a fiscally constrained plan?

In general terms, *fiscally constrained* means that a metropolitan planning organization can approve a plan only if it is determined (and FHWA concurs) that sufficient funding is reasonably anticipated to carry out the projects included in the plan.

#### 3.3.4.1 Envision Utah

Envision Utah is an ongoing public-private community partnership that studies the effects of long-term growth on the Greater Wasatch Area of northern Utah and facilitates efforts to address growth through collaborative planning. Envision Utah’s goal is to create a publicly supported growth strategy that will preserve Utah’s high quality of life, natural environment, and economic vitality during the next 50 years (Envision Utah, no date).

#### What is the Greater Wasatch Area?

The Greater Wasatch Area is the region from Brigham City in the north to Nephi in the south and from Heber in the east to Tooele in the west.

To accomplish this goal, Envision Utah is educating and promoting the values of walkable neighborhoods, mixed housing types, higher-density developments, infill and redevelopment, preserved open space, and the protection of sensitive lands and air quality. New Urbanism or Smart Growth alternatives, such as transit-oriented developments and mixed-use developments, are also part of Envision Utah’s quality growth strategy. Unless adopted by one or more of the Cities and Counties, Envision Utah’s plans are recommendations only. Envision Utah helped develop the *Wasatch Choices 2040* plan (see Section 3.3.4.3, *Wasatch Choices 2040*).

### 3.3.4.2 Wasatch Front Regional Transportation Plan 2015–2040

The Wasatch Front Regional Transportation Plan 2015–2040 (WFRC 2015), which includes the land use impact analysis area, is the region’s long-range plan for roadway, transit, and other improvements to meet the growing travel demand in the region through 2040. The plan meets federal requirements for metropolitan areas with a population of 200,000 or more to adopt a long-range transportation plan for a minimum of 20 years.

The growth and distribution of employment in the Wasatch Front urban area will have a substantial influence on travel demand in 2040. The majority of the population growth is expected to occur in western Salt Lake County, northern Davis County, and western Weber County, with Salt Lake City remaining the dominant employment center in the region. The majority of undeveloped and agricultural land in the cities in the impact analysis area is projected to be developed for a mix of urban uses but mostly for residential uses. Future land use is projected to be primarily low density with small areas of higher density throughout. The anticipated growth increases the need for north-south travel throughout the impact analysis area. WFRC’s 2015–2040 Regional Transportation Plan uses *Wasatch Choices 2040* as a basis for land use planning (see Section 3.3.4.3, *Wasatch Choices 2040*).

The WFRC 2015–2040 Regional Transportation Plan, which was adopted in 2015, includes the WDC (WFRC 2015). WFRC has been coordinating with UDOT and FHWA to ensure that the travel demand modeling that is performed during the WDC EIS planning process considers WFRC’s 2015–2040 Regional Transportation Plan.

### 3.3.4.3 Wasatch Choices 2040

During 2005, WFRC teamed with Utah County’s Mountainland Association of Governments (MAG), UDOT, FHWA, UTA, and Envision Utah to complete *Wasatch Choices 2040: A Four County Land-Use and Transportation Vision* (WFRC and others, no date). MAG is the metropolitan planning organization for Utah County. The study, which included extensive public involvement, was intended to support an update of WFRC’s and MAG’s regional transportation plans. The study identified goals or principles for the future growth along the Wasatch Front, reviewed how land use and transportation interact, developed a “vision” for the future, and identified strategies to implement that vision.

Four initial scenarios were developed: Business as Usual, Transit Station Villages, Interconnected Network of Complete Streets, and Centers of Employment. Based on these scenarios, a Vision Scenario was developed that was a blend of the four initial scenarios. The Vision Scenario included a balanced variety of transportation modes including walking and bicycling, auto travel, and transit. The Vision Scenario presents strategies for local governments to consider when planning their communities.

The *Wasatch Choices 2040* report specifically identifies a north-south expressway as part of the Vision Scenario for the needs assessment study area (see Figure 2-2, Alternatives from Previous Transportation Studies, in

#### What is the needs assessment study area?

The needs assessment study is the area described in Section 1.2, Description of the Needs Assessment Study Area.

Volume IV). This north-south expressway is in the same location as the corridor shown in WFRC's 2001 study (the *North Legacy Transportation Corridor Study*).

### **3.3.5 Conservation Areas**

Six areas in the impact analysis area have been set aside for conservation uses: the Great Salt Lake Shorelands Preserve, the Farmington Bay Waterfowl Management Area, the Farmington Ranches conservation easement, the Farmington Meadows conservation easement, the Hunters Creek conservation easement, and the Black Agriland conservation easement (see Figure 3-4, Conservation Areas, in Volume IV). Not all of these conservation areas are afforded protection under Section 4(f) [see Chapter 27, Section 4(f)/6(f) Evaluation].

#### **3.3.5.1 Great Salt Lake Shorelands Preserve**

In the impact analysis area, URMCC and TNC have partnered to preserve valuable habitat around the Great Salt Lake, particularly in the Layton–Kaysville area, where they have established the Great Salt Lake Shorelands Preserve. The preserve contains land owned by the URMCC and TNC and managed as one property by both groups. The preserve is an undiked natural landscape located on the eastern edge of the Great Salt Lake and consists of about 12 contiguous shoreline miles and roughly 4,400 acres. The preserve is important because it protects one of the few remaining large, contiguous blocks of wetland habitat along the southeast shore of the Great Salt Lake in Davis County and because it is part of the Farmington Bay Globally Important Bird Area and is a Western Hemispheric Shorebird Reserve Network site.

The URMCC is a federal executive branch agency that was authorized under the Central Utah Project Completion Act of 1992. Under the terms of this act, URMCC is responsible for designing, funding, and implementing projects to offset impacts to fish, wildlife, and related recreation resources caused by the Central Utah Project and other federal reclamation projects in Utah (URMCC, no date).

Since 1994, URMCC has acquired over 1,750 acres with federal funds in the Great Salt Lake Shorelands Preserve. These purchases have complemented other area acquisitions, some by TNC and some by private entities for wetland mitigation banking.

URMCC has partnered with many government organizations, landowners, conservation groups, agencies, and others to help establish the preserve. An example of this collaboration is URMCC's involvement in Davis County's planning effort that produced the *Wetlands Conservation Plan: A Plan for Protection of the Great Salt Lake Wetlands Ecosystem in Davis County* (URMCC 1996). The plan was adopted by both URMCC and the Davis County Commission. The Steering Committee for the plan included URMCC; the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; TNC; the National Audubon Society; the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources; the Utah Division of Water Rights; the Utah Division of Forestry, Fire and State Lands; Davis County; the Davis County Council of Governments; the Davis/Weber Canal Company; consultants; and a private landowner. The Steering Committee established the following goals for Davis County:

1. Conserve and enhance wetland function and values
2. Conserve and enhance fish and wildlife habitat values
3. Increase public understanding of, and involvement in, wetlands conservation
4. Provide settings for outdoor recreation
5. Conserve "open space"
6. Improve water quality
7. Respect the rights of landowners and water users
8. Respond to public needs, including flood control and transportation provisions

The plan notes that, for almost 30 years, regional transportation plans have included the WDC situated along the western side of Davis County. The plan states:

Although a new roadway would threaten some existing wetlands, its construction could present unique opportunities for wetland preservation. Resource agencies, local governments, and UDOT should coordinate their efforts to acquire lands and preserve corridors. This plan will guide UDOT and others to lower-value wetlands that may be exchanged for purchase and mitigation of privately owned, higher-value wetlands. Such high-priority areas could be purchased in large quantities and in a systematic fashion.

The 1996 *Wetlands Conservation Plan* helped identify wetland acquisition priorities and provides important background for the more comprehensive *Davis County Shorelands Master Plan* (Davis County Council of Governments 2001). The 2001 *Shorelands Plan* is being uniquely implemented by each city in Davis County using innovative approaches such as a transfer of development rights, which encourages open space preservation along with development while compensating participating landowners.

The *Shorelands Plan* included, as part of the base mapping of resources and infrastructure, the WDC Project (called Legacy Highway in the *Shorelands Plan*) using the corridor developed by UDOT in 2001, called the 2001 *North Legacy Study* alignment. This alignment is similar to WDC Alternatives A1–A2 and B1–B2 from Gentile Street in Syracuse south to Kaysville. The *Shorelands Plan* identifies a future "Legacy Corridor" as the eastern boundary for the Great Salt Lake Shorelands Preserve. The *Shorelands Plan* notes that the WDC would affect wetlands and that mitigation to offset the impacts could be used to conserve important wetlands and wildlife habitat on private land in the Great Salt Lake Shorelands Preserve.

North of Gentile Street, the *Shorelands Plan* shows the WDC alignment along the west side of Bluff Road in Syracuse and West Point.

### **3.3.5.2 Farmington Bay Waterfowl Management Area**

The Farmington Bay Waterfowl Management Area (WMA) was established in 1935 and currently consists of more than 18,000 acres managed by the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources (Utah Division of Wildlife Resource 2013). Hundreds of thousands of waterbirds, songbirds, and raptors visit this area during the migration and nesting seasons. More than 200 different species have been documented in the WMA. A total of 96,000 people visited the WMA in 2010 (Utah Department of Natural Resources 2000, 2013).

The WMA includes the Great Salt Lake Nature Center, which was established to educate people about the functions and ecological diversity of the Great Salt Lake ecosystem. The Nature Center is a community partnership among the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources, the Davis School District Foundation, and the Utah Wildlife and Conservation Foundation, which is a nonprofit organization. The Nature Center is funded entirely from corporate and foundation donations. In 2003, a mobile Learning Center was constructed, and the Great Salt Lake Nature Center's long-term plan calls for the construction of a 14,000-square-foot visitor and education center to provide both overview and in-depth learning opportunities for the full spectrum of visitors. The WMA hosts student field trips three to four days per week, and about 10,000 students visit the Nature Center annually.

The Great Salt Lake and the Farmington Bay WMA also host many waterfowl hunters. The Utah Division of Wildlife Resources estimated that, in 2009, there were 194,557 waterfowl hunting trips in Utah, with about 55% of those trips occurring at the Great Salt Lake, and 25,475 waterfowl hunting trips to the Farmington Bay WMA (Utah Department of Natural Resources 2013).

### **3.3.5.3 Farmington City Conservation, Recreation, Wildlife and Waterfowl Refuge and Park**

On June 17, 2014, after the release of the Draft EIS, Farmington City approved Ordinance 2014-23, An Ordinance to Designate the Farmington City Conservation, Recreation, Wildlife and Waterfowl Refuge and Park and to Provide for Continued Management Thereof. The ordinance includes the conservation easements along the western part of the city within the floodplain of the Great Salt Lake (for more information about each easement, see the following sections). The ordinance established the area of the easements as the Farmington City Conservation, Recreation, Wildlife and Waterfowl Refuge and Park (the Park). The purposes of the ordinance were to better define uses in the easements, describe future facilities, and address overall management.

## **Farmington Ranches Conservation Easement**

The Farmington Ranches residential development provided for a 311-acre conservation easement (which includes the 24-acre Farmington Ranches and 287-acre Buffalo Ranches conservation easements). This easement, which was established in July 2003 and expanded in 2005, is held by Farmington City. The easement was established as part of an agreement that allowed the property owner to build a residential development on part of the property while placing the other part in the conservation easement. The purposes of the easement are to ensure that the property will be retained forever in its natural, scenic, agricultural, and/or open-space condition and to prevent any use of the property that will substantially impair or interfere with the conservation value of the property. The easement property is currently used for agricultural uses, livestock grazing, and open space (Farmington City 2003).

## **Farmington Meadows Conservation Easement**

The Farmington Meadows residential development provided for a 48-acre conservation easement. This easement, which was established in October 2007, is held by Farmington City. The easement was established as part of an agreement that allowed the property owner to build a residential development on part of the property while placing the other part in the conservation easement. The purposes of the easement are to ensure that the property will be retained forever in its natural, scenic, agricultural, and/or open-space condition and to prevent any use of the property that will significantly impair or interfere with the conservation value of the property. The easement property is currently open space and has an identified wetland preservation area.

The subdivision owners can graze animals on the conservation easement and build equestrian-related facilities. Farmington City plans to build a recreational trail on the eastern edge of the easement property. Besides the planned trail, there is no mention of opening the rest of the easement to public access (Farmington City 2007).

## **Hunters Creek Conservation Easement**

The Woodside Hunters Creek Corporation provided for an approximately 63-acre conservation easement for the Hunters Creek subdivision. At the time the Draft EIS was released, this conservation easement was only proposed; it was approved in November 2013. The easement is held by Farmington City. The easement was established as part of an agreement that allowed the property owner to build a residential development on part of the property while placing the other part in the conservation easement. The purposes of the easement are to ensure that the property will be retained forever in its natural, scenic, agricultural, and/or open-space condition and to prevent any use of the property that will substantially impair or interfere with the conservation value of the property. The easement property is currently used for agricultural uses, livestock grazing, and open space (Farmington City 2013).

#### **3.3.5.4 Black Agriland Conservation Easement**

The Black Agriland conservation easement is a 40-acre easement established in June 2000 near Gentile Street in western Davis County. The easement is held by the Utah Department of Agriculture and Food, but the land is privately owned. The primary purpose of the easement is to preserve and protect the relatively natural features and values of the property. An additional purpose of the easement is to preserve the agricultural, open space, and scenic features and values of the property. The land within the easement is currently farmed, and public access is restricted. The easement was proposed to provide a development buffer adjacent to TNC's Layton Wetlands Preserve south of the easement. This easement restricts the ability to develop the property, though farming continues on the easement.

### **3.4 Environmental Consequences**

This section analyzes the expected direct impacts to land use and conflicts with local and regional land-use plans and policies from the No-Action and WDC action alternatives.

The WDC action alternatives were evaluated equally in this chapter. However, to reduce repetitive discussions, if impacts from one alternative would be the same as impacts from a previously discussed alternative, the text is not repeated but instead references the previous analysis.

This section focuses on the direct impacts to land use and land-use plans from the WDC. For a detailed discussion of indirect effects on land use and growth as a result of the WDC, see Chapter 23, Indirect Effects.

#### **3.4.1 Methodology**

To assess the expected impacts to land use from the proposed alternatives, the WDC team used aerial photographs and GIS analysis to identify the types of land uses within the proposed alternatives' right-of-way and the total number of acres that would be converted to a roadway use. Both county and municipal governments supplied land-use data. In addition, the team analyzed each alternative's consistency with local and regional land-use plans.

All acreages in this chapter are rounded to the nearest whole number. The acreages shown in the individual impact tables for each alternative have been rounded to the nearest whole number directly from the spreadsheet that was used to calculate the acreages. Likewise, the acreages shown in the summary table at the beginning of each alternative discussion have been rounded directly from the spreadsheet that was used to calculate the acreages. For this reason, the impacts shown in the summary tables might not be consistent with a total of the impacts shown in the individual tables.



### 3.4.2 No-Action Alternative

The WFRC 2015–2040 Regional Transportation Plan includes potential transportation projects through 2040 including the WDC. The Regional Transportation Plan is used to form the basis of the No-Action Alternative by considering all planned transportation projects except for the WDC. With the No-Action Alternative, the WDC would not be constructed, and no other new project or projects would be identified in the Regional Transportation Plan to replace the WDC to improve regional mobility.

With the No-Action Alternative, the WDC would not be constructed, so no direct impacts to land uses would occur as a result of the WDC. With the expected population growth rate, by 2040 much of the farmland within city limits in the impact analysis area would be converted to urban, particularly residential, uses with or without the WDC and as projected in the Regional Transportation Plan (see Section 4.4.2, No-Action Alternative, in Chapter 4, Farmland). The growth can occur without the WDC because the WDC land use impact analysis area has good but congested transportation access. This access is one of the many reasons why the area has changed substantially from agricultural uses to suburban development. Farmland outside the city limits in Davis and Weber Counties could continue to be farmed in the future with the No-Action Alternative as shown in the land-use plans. For more information about land-use changes with the No-Action Alternative, see Chapter 23, Indirect Effects.

Most land-use plans of the Cities in the impact analysis area show a mixture of residential and associated commercial uses in the future to support the growth in population. With both the No-Action and action alternatives, WFRC would continue to develop other projects in the Regional Transportation Plan independent of the WDC. The impacts of these projects, which are independent of the WDC, would be evaluated in separate environmental documents.

With the No-Action Alternative, the change from agricultural uses to suburban would continue, as concluded in an independent market-based evaluation of the WDC study area (RCLCO 2015). The evaluation concluded that the inexpensive land in the WDC study area will be used to meet the strong demand for single-family homes and that the WDC is unlikely to change development patterns significantly. Therefore, the market-based evaluation further supports that the WDC study area will develop with or without the WDC. For more information about the land use and growth that is expected to occur in Davis and Weber Counties with the No-Action Alternative, see Chapter 23, Indirect Effects.

#### What is regional mobility?

Regional mobility addresses the need to develop a transportation system that improves access by reducing travel times for all transportation modes.

### 3.4.3 Alternatives A1–A2

As described in Chapter 2, Alternatives, Alternative A is the more westerly alternative and consists of two separate alternatives: Alternatives A1 and A2. These alternatives are defined in Table 3-2.

**Table 3-2. Components of Alternatives A1–A2**

| Alternative | I-15 Connection | Four-Lane Highway | Two-Lane Highway        | West Point/<br>Hooper Cities Segment | North Terminus          |
|-------------|-----------------|-------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| A1          | Glovers Lane    | I-15 to 2000 West | 2000 West to 1800 North | 4100 West                            | 1800 North (West Point) |
| A2          | Glovers Lane    | I-15 to 2000 West | 2000 West to 5500 South | 5400 West                            | 5500 South (Hooper)     |

Provided below is the land-use analysis for the cities that would be affected by Alternatives A1 and A2. From south to north, these cities are Centerville, Farmington, Kaysville, Layton, Syracuse, West Point, and Hooper. Table 3-3 below summarizes the land-use impacts by city for Alternatives A1 and A2, and Table 3-4 and Table 3-5 below summarize and discuss each alternative’s consistency with each city’s land-use and transportation plans.

**Table 3-3. Impacts of Alternatives A1–A2 to Land Use<sup>a</sup>**

in acres

| Jurisdiction                                 | Agriculture | Commercial | Industrial | Institutional | Open Space | Conservation Area <sup>b</sup> | Recreation | Residential | Total Acres   | Percent of Total Land <sup>c</sup> |
|--|-------------|------------|------------|---------------|------------|--------------------------------|------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------------------|
| <b>Unincorporated (existing)<sup>d</sup></b> | 4,805       | 5          | 98         | 112           | 4,659      | 4,064                          | 52         | 867         | <b>14,662</b> |                                    |
| A1 – Glovers Lane/4100 W                     | 292         | —          | —          | —             | 25         | 85                             | —          | 14          | <b>415</b>    | <b>3.0%</b>                        |
| A2 – Glovers Lane/5400 W                     | 300         | —          | —          | —             | 25         | 85                             | —          | 14          | <b>423</b>    | <b>3.1%</b>                        |
| <b>Centerville (existing)</b>                | 239         | —          | 160        | —             | 213        | 238                            | —          | 6           | <b>856</b>    |                                    |
| All alternatives                             | 2           | —          | 1          | —             | 12         | —                              | —          | —           | <b>15</b>     | <b>1.8%</b>                        |
| <b>Farmington (existing)</b>                 | 720         | 195        | 3          | 135           | 71         | 282                            | 117        | 1,362       | <b>2,885</b>  |                                    |
| All alternatives                             | 64          | 1          | —          | 1             | 25         | 77                             | 6          | 20          | <b>194</b>    | <b>5.9%</b>                        |
| <b>Kaysville (existing)</b>                  | 697         | 147        | 64         | 115           | 16         | 32                             | 61         | 2,331       | <b>3,463</b>  |                                    |
| All alternatives                             | 37          | —          | —          | —             | —          | 5                              | —          | —           | <b>42</b>     | <b>4.9%</b>                        |
| <b>Layton (existing)</b>                     | 1,361       | 455        | 283        | 116           | 8          | 2                              | 174        | 2,521       | <b>4,920</b>  |                                    |
| All alternatives                             | 25          | —          | —          | —             | —          | 1                              | —          | 1           | <b>27</b>     | <b>0.5%</b>                        |
| <b>Syracuse (existing)</b>                   | 1,779       | 121        | 16         | 194           | 97         | 17                             | 312        | 3,359       | <b>5,895</b>  |                                    |
| All alternatives                             | 42          | —          | —          | 1             | —          | —                              | 12         | 7           | <b>62</b>     | <b>1.1%</b>                        |
| <b>West Point (existing)</b>                 | 2,442       | 9          | 9          | 70            | 131        | 0                              | 168        | 1,708       | <b>4,537</b>  |                                    |
| A1 – Glovers Lane/4100 W                     | 42          | —          | —          | —             | —          | —                              | —          | 17          | <b>59</b>     | <b>1.3%</b>                        |
| A2 – Glovers Lane/5400 W                     | 78          | —          | —          | —             | —          | —                              | —          | 15          | <b>93</b>     | <b>2.0%</b>                        |
| <b>Hooper (existing)</b>                     | 3,927       | 39         | —          | —             | 1,865      | 650                            | 46         | 2,435       | <b>8,962</b>  |                                    |
| A1 – Glovers Lane/4100 W                     | —           | —          | —          | —             | —          | —                              | —          | —           | —             | —                                  |
| A2 – Glovers Lane/5400 W                     | 17          | —          | —          | —             | —          | —                              | —          | 2           | <b>19</b>     | <b>0.2%</b>                        |

<sup>a</sup> A dash (—) means that either the land use is not within the city boundary within the land use impact analysis area or there would be no impact to this land use from the alternative.

<sup>b</sup> For a list of conservation areas, see Section 3.3.5, Conservation Areas.

<sup>c</sup> Percent of total land in each municipality or county within the impact analysis area.

<sup>d</sup> Existing is the current acres of land use within each jurisdiction. This information provides a context for the impact from each alternative.

**Table 3-4. Consistency of Alternatives A1–A2 with Land-Use Plans<sup>a</sup>**

| Alternative              | Consistent with Land-Use or Transportation Plans or Policies? (Y/N) |                         |           |        |          |            |        |              |              |
|--------------------------|---|-------------------------|-----------|--------|----------|------------|--------|--------------|--------------|
|                          | Centerville   | Farmington <sup>b</sup> | Kaysville | Layton | Syracuse | West Point | Hooper | Davis County | Weber County |
| A1 – Glovers Lane/4100 W | Y   | Y                       | Y         | Y      | N        | N          | —      | N            | —            |
| A2 – Glovers Lane/5400 W | Y   | Y                       | Y         | Y      | N        | N          | Y      | N            | Y            |

<sup>a</sup> A dash (—) means that either the land use is not within the city boundary within the land use impact analysis area or there would be no impact to this land use from the alternative.

<sup>b</sup> The adopted Farmington City Transportation Plan shows a future WDC on Glovers Lane (Alternatives A1 and A2). However, city officials have passed a resolution supporting a WDC alignment on Shepard Lane.

### 3.4.3.1 Alternative A1 – Glovers Lane and 4100 West/1800 North

#### Impacts to Existing Land Use

Alternative A1 would require 815 acres of land for the WDC right-of-way, or 1.3% of the land in the impact analysis area. Of this land, the largest land use required for right-of-way would be agricultural (504 acres) followed by conservation area (168 acres), open space (62 acres), residential (59 acres), recreational (18 acres), institutional (2 acres), industrial (1 acre), and commercial (1 acre). As shown in Table 3-3 above, most of the land required for right-of-way would be from unincorporated Davis County (415 acres) followed by Farmington (194 acres) and Syracuse (62 acres). For more information about impacts to conservation areas, see the section titled Conservation Areas on page 3-22.

The amount of agricultural land acquired for right-of-way would be about 3% of the agricultural land in the impact analysis area, and this acquisition would be consistent with the trend of the loss of farmland to suburban development in Weber and Davis Counties. The amount of conservation land acquired for right-of-way would be about 3% of the conservation land in the impact analysis area, and this acquisition would reduce the areas set aside for wetlands and wildlife habitat. Overall, the right-of-way for the WDC would be converted from its existing land uses noted above to a more urban-related land use. The conversion to more urban land uses (right-of-way) would be similar among all of the action alternatives. This conversion would generally be consistent with local and regional land-use and growth plans, since improved roadway infrastructure has been included as part of all local and regional planning efforts.

## Consistency with Plans and Policies

### Local Cities

Table 3-5 shows the consistency of Alternative A1 with local land-use and transportation plans. Of the six cities through which Alternative A1 passes, four cities have plans that are consistent with the alternative.

**Table 3-5. Consistency of Alternative A1 with City Plans and Policies**

| Jurisdiction | Consistent with Plan? (Yes/No) | Discussion   |
|--------------|--------------------------------|--|
| Centerville  | Yes                            | Alternative A1 would be consistent with the Centerville City land-use plan. The plan does not include a future WDC; however, Alternative A1 in Centerville would consist of freeway ramps adjacent to the existing Legacy Parkway and I-15 to connect the WDC to these facilities. The freeway-to-freeway ramps would be consistent with the existing freeway infrastructure of I-15 and Legacy Parkway.   |
| Farmington   | Yes                            | Alternative A1 would be consistent with the Farmington City general land-use plan and transportation master plan addendum. The Farmington City Master Transportation Plan Addendum (Farmington City 2009) shows a “North Legacy Connector” that starts at Legacy Parkway and Glovers Lane, follows the east-west Glovers Lane, and then angles northwest toward Kaysville. The Farmington City land-use plan considers the proposed WDC Glovers Lane alignment in the land-use planning. However, city officials have passed a resolution supporting a WDC alignment on Shepard Lane, which conflicts with the adopted plans. So while Alternative A1 is consistent with the adopted plans, it is inconsistent with the City’s resolution. |
| Kaysville    | Yes                            | Alternative A1 would be consistent with the Kaysville City general and transportation master plans. The Kaysville City Transportation and Traffic Circulation Plan (Kaysville City 2016) shows “SR 67” (or the WDC) as a principal arterial following a Glovers Lane alignment through Farmington. The transportation plan also shows the WDC traveling along the western edge of the city parallel to the shore of the Great Salt Lake (west of the Rocky Mountain Power corridor).   |
| Layton       | Yes                            | Alternative A1 would be consistent with the Layton City general plan and master street plan. The Layton City Master Street Plan (Layton City 2016) shows a “proposed expressway” running along the western edge of the city, parallel to the shore of the Great Salt Lake, from Kaysville in the south to Syracuse on the north in the same general area as Alternative A1.  |
| Syracuse     | No                             | Alternative A1 would not be consistent with the Syracuse City general plan or street map. Both of the A Alternatives would run along the southern and western edges of the city along Gentile Street and 4000 West with a proposed interchange on Antelope Drive at about 4000 West. The Syracuse Street Map (Syracuse City 2015b) shows a “proposed parkway” running north-south immediately adjacent to Bluff Road with an interchange at about 3000 West. The Syracuse City general plan was developed assuming the WDC along Bluff Road with major commercial development around the interchange at Antelope Drive and 3000 West.  |
| West Point   | No                             | Alternative A1 would not be consistent with the West Point City land-use plan. The West Point General Plan Land Use Map (West Point City 2013) shows a north-south corridor for Legacy Parkway along Bluff Road/Old Bluff Road from Syracuse (about 700 South) to 300 North (SR 107). The parkway then travels parallel to and just west of 4000 West between 300 North and the northern city limit at about 2000 North. Alternative A1 would be west of the alignment shown in the city land-use plan in an area identified for residential development.  |

### **Davis County**

Davis County has identified the 2001 *North Legacy Study* alignment as its preferred alignment for the WDC. Alternative A1 would be consistent with Davis County’s preferred alignment from I-15 to Gentile Street; however, north of Gentile Street, the WDC alignment would be west of the 2001 *North Legacy Study* alignment and therefore would not be consistent with the alignment supported by the County.

### **Weber County**

Alternative A1 does not enter Weber County.

### **Regional Plans**

Both the 2015–2040 WFRC Regional Transportation Plan and *Wasatch Choices 2040* identify a regional transportation facility in the vicinity of the WDC A Alternatives. Therefore, both of the A Alternatives would be consistent with the regional transportation plans.

### **Conservation Areas**

Table 3-6 lists the impacts of Alternatives A1 and A2 on the six conservation areas in the impact analysis area.

**Table 3-6. Impacts of Alternatives A1–A2 to Conservation Areas**

in acres

| Conservation Area                        | Total Area | Right-of-Way within Conservation Area |           |
|--|------------|---------------------------------------|-----------|
|  |            | A1                                    | A2        |
| Great Salt Lake Shorelands Preserve      | 4,400      | 75 (1.7%)                             | 75 (1.7%) |
| Farmington Bay Waterfowl Management Area | 18,000     | —                                     | —         |
| Farmington Ranches conservation easement | 311        | 51 (16%)                              | 51 (16%)  |
| Farmington Meadows conservation easement | 48         | 10 (21%)                              | 10 (21%)  |
| Hunters Creek conservation easement      | 63         | 16 (25%)                              | 16 (25%)  |
| Black Agriland conservation easement     | 40         | 14 (35%)                              | 14 (35%)  |

#### ***Great Salt Lake Shorelands Preserve***

Alternative A1 would require about 75 acres or 1.7% of the 4,400-acre preserve property. The alternative would affect the following features of the Preserve:

- Wetlands within the preserve
- Agricultural area used to grow corn to feed migratory birds in Kaysville
- Change in access and water-diversion points
- Habitat quality near the highway because of vehicle noise and visual disturbances

Although Alternative A1 would affect parts of the Great Salt Lake Shorelands Preserve, the alternative would be consistent with the 1996 Wetland Conservation Plan and the 2001 Davis County Shorelands Master Plan. Both plans identify the WDC as the eastern boundary of the Great Salt Lake Shorelands Preserve and state that mitigation for wetland impacts from the WDC Project could be used to purchase higher-value wetlands on private land within the preserve. However, the WDC would not be consistent with the establishment of the preserve as an area to protect wildlife and wildlife habitat.

Both plans state that there should be coordination among UDOT, URMCC, and TNC during the planning phase of the WDC Project. During the EIS process, UDOT has held numerous meetings with URMCC and TNC to review alternatives and discuss potential impacts of the project. During the meetings, the attendees discussed refinements to alternatives to minimize impacts along with mitigation options to offset impacts from the project. Based on these discussions, UDOT with TNC and URMCC are working collaboratively on an agreement to define the mitigation measures to minimize impacts. The potential mitigation measures to offset impacts to the Great Salt Lake Shorelands Preserve are described in Section 3.4.6, Mitigation Measures.

#### *Farmington Bay Waterfowl Management Area*

With Alternative A1, there would be no direct land-use impacts to the Farmington Bay WMA. The alternative would be about 1,000 feet from the WMA's public entrance and about 0.5 mile from the Nature Center building. Alternative A1 would not change the use of the Farmington Bay WMA, and noise levels from the WDC would not affect the Nature Center building. Noise levels at the Nature Center building were modeled at 46 dBA (decibels on the A-weighted scale), which is the same for the mean concentration of 46 dBA taken from actual noise monitoring at Farmington Bay WMA during the Legacy Avian Noise Research Program (BIO-WEST 2011).

#### *Farmington City Conservation, Recreation, Wildlife and Waterfowl Refuge and Park*

After the release of the Draft EIS, Farmington City approved Ordinance 2014-23 to establish the conservation easements along the city's western boundary as the Farmington City Conservation, Recreation, Wildlife and Waterfowl Refuge and Park. The WDC would affect the conservation easements, as discussed in the following paragraphs. These impacts would not be consistent with the ordinance's establishment of this area as a wildlife and waterfowl refuge, conservation area, and recreation area.

Farmington City has stated that, as a result of the impact to the conservation easements from the WDC, the City might not be able to maintain the easements, and they could be used for other uses including development. The City stated that this change could result in a substantial impact to the quality of life, livability, and cohesiveness the City has worked toward by establishing the conservation easements as a recreation area and wildlife and waterfowl refuge. The conservation easements' conservation, recreation, and wildlife values would be substantially diminished with the introduction of the WDC as a result of increased noise and light pollution, fragmentation of the easements, and an overall reduction of

conservation value. Chapter 14, Ecosystem Resources, provides details about how the WDC would affect wetlands and wildlife along the roadway, including the area within the easements.

***Farmington Ranches Conservation Easement.*** Alternative A1 would require 51 acres of the 311-acre Farmington Ranches conservation easement. The alternative would not be consistent with the purpose of the conservation easement because it would affect the easement directly, would convert land dedicated to conservation and recreation uses to highway use, and would cause indirect noise and visual impacts that would change the value of the remaining land. Farmington City stated that, as a result of the impact to the conservation easement from the WDC, the City might not be able to maintain the easement, and it could be used for other uses including development. The City stated that this change could result in a substantial impact to the quality of life, livability, and cohesiveness the City has worked toward by establishing the conservation easement.

***Farmington Meadows Conservation Easement.*** Alternative A1 would require 10 acres of the 48-acre Farmington Meadows conservation easement. The alternative would not be consistent with the purpose of the conservation easement and would require converting land dedicated to conservation and recreation uses to highway use. Farmington City has stated that, as a result of the impact to the conservation easement from the WDC, the City might not be able to maintain the easement, and it could be used for other uses including development. The City stated that this change could result in a substantial impact to the quality of life, livability, and cohesiveness the City has worked toward by establishing the conservation easement.

***Hunters Creek Conservation Easement.*** Alternative A1 would require 16 acres of the 63-acre Hunters Creek conservation easement. The alternative would not be consistent with the purpose of the conservation easement and would require converting land dedicated to conservation and recreation uses to highway use. Farmington City has stated that, as a result of the impact to the conservation easement from the WDC, the City might not be able to approve or maintain the easement, and it could be used for other uses including development. The City stated that this change could result in a substantial impact to the quality of life, livability, and cohesiveness the City has worked toward by establishing the conservation easement.

#### ***Black Agriland Conservation Easement***

Alternative A1 would require 14 acres of the 40-acre Black Agriland conservation easement. The alternative would not be consistent with the purpose of the conservation easement because it would require converting part of the development buffer to highway use. Although the buffer from development would be maintained in undisturbed areas of the easement, Alternative A1 would disrupt the intent of the easement.



### 3.4.3.2 Alternative A2 – Glovers Lane and 5400 West/5500South

#### Impacts to Existing Land Use

Alternative A2 would require 878 acres of land for the WDC right-of-way, or 1.4% of the land in the impact analysis area. Of this land, the largest land use required for right-of-way would be agricultural (565 acres) followed by conservation area (168 acres), open space (62 acres), residential (61 acres), institutional (2 acres), industrial (1 acre), and commercial (1 acre). As shown in Table 3-3 above, Impacts of Alternatives A1–A2 to Land Use, most of the land required for right-of-way would be from unincorporated Davis and Weber Counties (423 acres) followed by Farmington (194 acres) and West Point (93 acres). For more information about impacts to conservation areas, see the section titled Conservation Areas on page 3-26.

The amount of agricultural land acquired for right-of-way would be about 3% of the agricultural land in the impact analysis area, and this acquisition would be consistent with the trend of the loss of farmland in Weber and Davis Counties. The amount of conservation land acquired for right-of-way would be about 3% of the conservation land in the impact analysis area, and this acquisition would reduce the areas set aside for wetlands and wildlife habitat. Overall, the right-of-way for the WDC would be converted from its existing land uses noted above to a more urban-related land use. The conversion to more urban land uses (right-of-way) would be similar among all of the action alternatives. This conversion would generally be consistent with local and regional land-use and growth plans, since improved roadway infrastructure has been included as part of all local and regional planning efforts.

#### Consistency with Plans and Policies

##### Local Cities

Table 3-7 shows the consistency of Alternative A2 with local land-use and transportation plans. Of the seven cities through which Alternative A2 passes, five cities have plans that are consistent with the alternative.

**Table 3-7. Consistency of Alternative A2 with City Plans and Policies**

| Jurisdiction | Consistent with Plan? (Yes/No) | Consistency with Plans and Policies   |
|--------------|--------------------------------|---|
| Centerville  | Yes                            | Same as Alternative A1.   |
| Farmington   | Yes                            | Same as Alternative A1.   |
| Kaysville    | Yes                            | Same as Alternative A1.   |
| Layton       | Yes                            | Same as Alternative A1.   |
| Syracuse     | No                             | Same as Alternative A1.   |
| West Point   | No                             | Same as Alternative A1.   |
| Hooper       | Yes                            | Alternative A2 would be consistent with the Hooper City land-use and transportation master plans. The Hooper City Draft Transportation Master Plan 2005–2025 (Hooper City 2008) and the 2014 Generalized Future Land Use Map (Hooper City 2014) identify a future WDC immediately east of 5100 West as it enters the city limits from Davis County to the south. Overall, Alternative A2 would be consistent with the City's transportation and land-use plans. |

### ***Davis County***

Alternative A2’s consistency with Davis County’s preferred alignment would be the same as that of Alternative A1.

### ***Weber County***

Weber County’s general plan shows a highway in the vicinity of 5100 West. Alternative A2 would be consistent with Weber County’s general plan.

### ***Regional Plans***

Alternative A2’s consistency with regional plans would be the same as that of Alternative A1.

### ***Conservation Areas***

Alternative A2’s impacts to conservation areas would be the same as those of Alternative A1.

## **3.4.4 Alternatives B1–B2**

As described in Chapter 2, Alternatives, Alternative B is the more easterly alternative and consists of two separate alternatives: Alternatives B1 and B2. These alternatives are defined in Table 3-8.

**Table 3-8. Components of Alternatives B1–B2**

| <b>Alternative</b> | <b>I-15 Connection</b> | <b>Four-Lane Highway</b>            | <b>Two-Lane Highway</b>      | <b>West Point City Segment</b> | <b>North Terminus</b>   |
|--------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|
| B1                 | Glovers Lane           | I-15 to Antelope Drive <sup>a</sup> | Antelope Drive to 1800 North | 4100 West                      | 1800 North (West Point) |
| B2                 | Glovers Lane           | I-15 to Antelope Drive <sup>a</sup> | Antelope Drive to 1800 North | 4800 West                      | 1800 North (West Point) |

<sup>a</sup> The transition from a four-lane highway to a two-lane highway would occur between Antelope Drive and 700 South.

Provided below is the land-use analysis for the cities that would be affected by Alternatives B1 and B2. From south to north, these cities are Centerville, Farmington, Kaysville, Layton, Syracuse, and West Point. Table 3-9 below summarizes the land-use impacts by city for Alternatives B1 and B2, and Table 3-10 and Table 3-11 below summarize and discuss each alternative’s consistency with each city’s land-use and transportation plans.

**Table 3-9. Impacts of Alternatives B1–B2 to Land Use<sup>a</sup>**

in acres

| Jurisdiction                                 | Agriculture | Commercial | Industrial | Institutional | Open Space | Conservation Area <sup>b</sup> | Recreation | Residential | Total Acres   | Percent of Total Land |
|--|-------------|------------|------------|---------------|------------|--------------------------------|------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------------|
| <b>Unincorporated (existing)<sup>c</sup></b> | 4,805       | 5          | 98         | 112           | 4,659      | 4,064                          | 52         | 867         | <b>14,662</b> |                       |
| All Alternatives                             | 212         | —          | —          | —             | 25         | 69                             | —          | 9           | <b>315</b>    | <b>2.2%</b>           |
| <b>Centerville (existing)</b>                | 239         | —          | 160        | —             | 213        | 238                            | —          | 6           | <b>856</b>    |                       |
| All alternatives                             | 2           | —          | 1          | —             | 12         | —                              | —          | —           | <b>15</b>     | <b>1.8%</b>           |
| <b>Farmington (existing)</b>                 | 720         | 195        | 3          | 135           | 71         | 282                            | 117        | 1,362       | <b>2,885</b>  |                       |
| All alternatives                             | 64          | 1          | —          | 1             | 25         | 77                             | 6          | 20          | <b>194</b>    | <b>5.9%</b>           |
| <b>Kaysville (existing)</b>                  | 697         | 147        | 64         | 115           | 16         | 32                             | 61         | 2,331       | <b>3,463</b>  |                       |
| All alternatives                             | 37          | —          | —          | —             | —          | 5                              | —          | —           | <b>42</b>     | <b>4.9%</b>           |
| <b>Layton (existing)</b>                     | 1,361       | 455        | 283        | 116           | 8          | 2                              | 174        | 2521        | <b>4,920</b>  |                       |
| All alternatives                             | 25          | —          | —          | —             | —          | 1                              | —          | 1           | <b>27</b>     | <b>0.5%</b>           |
| <b>Syracuse (existing)</b>                   | 1,779       | 121        | 16         | 194           | 97         | 17                             | 312        | 3,359       | <b>5,895</b>  |                       |
| All alternatives                             | 82          | —          | 1          | —             | 62         | —                              | 12         | 53          | <b>210</b>    | <b>3.6%</b>           |
| <b>West Point (existing)</b>                 | 2,442       | 9          | 9          | 70            | 131        | 0                              | 168        | 1,708       | <b>4,537</b>  |                       |
| B1 – Glovers Lane/4100 W                     | 52          | —          | —          | —             | —          | —                              | —          | 17          | <b>69</b>     | <b>1.5%</b>           |
| B2 – Glovers Lane/4800 W                     | 56          | —          | —          | —             | —          | —                              | —          | 13          | <b>69</b>     | <b>1.5%</b>           |

<sup>a</sup> A dash (—) means that either the land use is not within the city boundary within the land use impact analysis area or there would be no impact to this land use from the alternative.

<sup>b</sup> For a list of conservation areas, see Section 3.3.5, Conservation Areas.

<sup>c</sup> Existing is the current acres of land use within each jurisdiction. This information provides a context for the impact from each alternative.

**Table 3-10. Consistency of Alternatives B1–B2 with Land-Use Plans**

| Alternative              | Consistent with Land-Use Plans? (Y/N) |                         |           |        |          |            |              |              |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------|--------|----------|------------|--------------|--------------|
|                          | Centerville                           | Farmington <sup>a</sup> | Kaysville | Layton | Syracuse | West Point | Davis County | Weber County |
| B1 – Glovers Lane/4100 W | Y                                     | Y                       | Y         | Y      | Y        | Y          | Y            | —            |
| B2 – Glovers Lane/4800 W | Y                                     | Y                       | Y         | Y      | Y        | N          | N            | —            |

<sup>a</sup> The adopted Farmington City Master Transportation Plan Addendum shows a future WDC on Glovers Lane (Alternatives B1 and B2). However, city officials have passed a resolution supporting a WDC alignment on Shepard Lane.

### **3.4.4.1 Alternative B1 – Glovers Lane and 4100 West/1800 North**

#### **Impacts to Existing Land Use**

Alternative B1 would require 871 acres of land for the WDC right-of-way, or 1.4% of the land in the impact analysis area. Of this land, the largest land use required for right-of-way would be agricultural (474 acres) followed by conservation area (152 acres), open space (124 acres), residential (99 acres), recreational (18 acres), industrial (2 acres), commercial (1 acre), and institutional (1 acre). As shown in Table 3-9 above, Impacts of Alternatives B1–B2 to Land Use, most of the land required for right-of-way would be from unincorporated Davis County (315 acres) followed by Syracuse (210 acres), Farmington (194 acres), and West Point (69 acres). For more information about impacts to conservation areas, see the section titled Conservation Areas on page 3-30.

The amount of agricultural land acquired for right-of-way would be about 3% of the agricultural land in the impact analysis area, and this acquisition would be consistent with the trend of the loss of farmland in Davis County. The amount of conservation land acquired for right-of-way would be about 3% of the conservation land in the impact analysis area, and this acquisition would reduce the areas set aside for wetlands and wildlife habitat. Overall, the right-of-way for the WDC would be converted from its existing land uses noted above to a more urban-related land use. The conversion to more urban land uses (right-of-way) would be similar among all of the action alternatives. This conversion would generally be consistent with local and regional land-use and growth plans, since improved roadway infrastructure has been included as part of all local and regional planning efforts.

## Consistency with Plans and Policies

### Local Cities

Table 3-11 shows the consistency of Alternative B1 with local land-use and transportation plans. Of the six cities through which Alternative B1 passes, all cities have plans that are consistent with the alternative.

**Table 3-11. Consistency of Alternative B1 with City Plans and Policies**

| Jurisdiction | Consistent with Plan? (Yes/No) | Consistency with Plans and Policies  |
|--------------|--------------------------------|--|
| Centerville  | Yes                            | Same as Alternative A1.  |
| Farmington   | Yes                            | Same as Alternative A1.  |
| Kaysville    | Yes                            | Same as Alternative A1.  |
| Layton       | Yes                            | Same as Alternative A1.  |
| Syracuse     | Yes                            | Alternative B1 would generally be consistent with the Syracuse City general plan and street map. The Syracuse Street Map (Syracuse City 2015b) shows a “proposed parkway” running north-south immediately adjacent to Bluff Road with an interchange at about 3000 West. Syracuse City’s general plan was developed assuming the WDC along Bluff Road with major commercial development around the interchange at Antelope Drive and 3000 West. Alternative B1 would be west of Bluff Road as it enters the city from the south, but, north of 2700 South, the alternative would follow Bluff Road with an interchange at about 3000 West. The alternative would then follow Bluff Road as it exits the city to the north. |
| West Point   | Yes                            | Alternative B1 would be consistent with the West Point City land-use plan. The West Point General Plan Land Use Map (West Point City 2013) shows a north-south corridor for Legacy Parkway along Bluff Road/Old Bluff Road from Syracuse (about 700 South) to 300 North (SR 107). The parkway then travels parallel to and just west of 4000 West. Alternative B1 would generally follow this corridor identified in the City’s plan.  |

### Davis County

Davis County has identified the 2001 *North Legacy Study* alignment as its preferred alignment for the WDC. Alternative B1 would be consistent with Davis County’s preferred alignment, since the alternative is on or adjacent to the 2001 *North Legacy Study* alignment supported by the County.

### Weber County

Alternative B1 does not enter Weber County.

### Regional Plans

Alternative B1’s consistency with regional plans would be the same as that of Alternative A1.

### Conservation Areas

Table 3-12 lists the impacts of Alternatives B1 and B2 to the conservation areas crossed by these alternatives. Neither of the B Alternatives would affect the Black Agriland conservation easement. The impacts to the other conservation areas for both B Alternatives would be the same as those from Alternative A1.

**Table 3-12. Impacts of Alternatives B1–B2 to Conservation Areas**

in acres

| Conservation Area                        | Total Area | Right-of-Way within Conservation Area |           |
|--|------------|---------------------------------------|-----------|
|  |            | B1                                    | B2        |
| Great Salt Lake Shorelands Preserve      | 4,400      | 75 (1.7%)                             | 75 (1.7%) |
| Farmington Bay Waterfowl Management Area | 18,000     | —                                     | —         |
| Farmington Ranches conservation easement | 311        | 51 (16%)                              | 51(16%)   |
| Farmington Meadows conservation easement | 48         | 10 (21%)                              | 10 (21%)  |
| Hunters Creek conservation easement      | 64         | 16 (25%)                              | 16 (25%)  |
| Black Agriland conservation easement     | 40         | —                                     | —         |

#### 3.4.4.2 Alternative B2 – Glovers Lane and 4800 West/1800 North

##### Impacts to Existing Land Use

Alternative B2 would require 872 acres of land for the WDC right-of-way, or 1.4% of the land in the impact analysis area. Of this land, the largest land use required for right-of-way would be agricultural (478 acres) followed by conservation area (152 acres), open space (124 acres), residential (96 acres), recreational (18 acres), industrial (2 acres), commercial (1 acre), and institutional (1 acre). As shown in Table 3-9 above, Impacts of Alternatives B1–B2 to Land Use, most of the land required for right-of-way would be from unincorporated Davis County (315 acres) followed by Syracuse (210 acres), Farmington (194 acres), and West Point (69 acres). For more information about impacts to conservation areas, see the section titled Conservation Areas on page 3-30.

The amount of agricultural land acquired for right-of-way would be about 3% of the agricultural land in the impact analysis area, and this acquisition would be consistent with the trend of the loss of farmland in Weber and Davis Counties. The amount of conservation land acquired for right-of-way would be about 3% of the conservation land in the impact analysis area, and this acquisition would reduce the areas set aside for wetlands and wildlife habitat. Overall, the right-of-way for the WDC would be converted from its existing land uses noted above to a more urban-related land use. The conversion to more urban land uses (right-of-way) would be similar among all of the action alternatives. This conversion would generally be consistent with local and regional land-use and growth plans, since improved roadway infrastructure has been included as part of all local and regional planning efforts.

## Consistency with Plans and Policies

### Local Cities

Table 3-13 below shows the consistency of Alternative B2 with local land-use and transportation plans. Of the six cities through which Alternative B2 passes, five cities have plans that are consistent with the alternative.

**Table 3-13. Consistency of Alternative B2 with City Plans and Policies**

| Jurisdiction | Consistent with Plan? (Yes/No) | Consistency with Plans and Policies  |
|--------------|--------------------------------|--|
| Centerville  | Yes                            | Same as Alternative A1.  |
| Farmington   | Yes                            | Same as Alternative A1.  |
| Kaysville    | Yes                            | Same as Alternative A1.  |
| Layton       | Yes                            | Same as Alternative A1.  |
| Syracuse     | Yes                            | Same as Alternative B1.  |
| West Point   | No                             | Alternative B2 would not be consistent with the West Point City land-use plan. The West Point General Plan Land Use Map (West Point City 2013) shows a north-south corridor for the Legacy Parkway along Bluff Road/Old Bluff Road from Syracuse (about 700 South) to 300 North (SR 107). The parkway then travels parallel to and just west of 4000 West. Alternative B2 would be west of the City's identified plan. |

### Davis County

Davis County's general plan has identified the 2001 *North Legacy Study* alignment as its preferred alignment for the WDC. Alternative B2 would not be consistent with Davis County's preferred alignment since the alternative is farther west than the 2001 *North Legacy Study* alignment supported by the County.

### Weber County

Weber County's general plan shows a highway in the vicinity of the 2001 *North Legacy Study* alignment. Because Alternative B2 would not follow the 2001 *North Legacy Study* alignment, it would not be consistent with the County's general plan.

### Regional Plans

Alternative B2's consistency with regional plans would be the same as that of Alternative A1.

### Conservation Areas

Alternative B2 would not affect the Black Agriland conservation area. The impacts to the other conservation areas would be the same as those from Alternative A1.

### 3.4.5 Wetland Avoidance Options

Two wetland avoidance options are being evaluated in this Final EIS, as shown in Table 3-14. The purpose of these options is to avoid wetland impacts per guidance from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers on wetland avoidance. Either wetland avoidance option could be implemented with any of the A or B Alternatives.

In this section, the impact information for the wetland avoidance options provides only the differences in impacts for the A and B Alternatives as a result of using the wetland avoidance options. The differences in impacts would apply to any of the A and B Alternatives if they were to use the wetland avoidance options.

**Table 3-14. Components of the Wetland Avoidance Options**

| Option     | Location                                 | City       | Description   |
|------------|--|------------|---|
| Farmington | Prairie View Drive and West Ranches Road | Farmington | Shift the A and B Alternatives in Farmington about 150 feet east to the southwest side of the intersection of Prairie View Drive and West Ranches Road. |
| Layton     | 2200 West and 1000 South                 | Layton     | Shift the A and B Alternatives in Layton about 500 feet east to the northeast side of the intersection at 2200 West and 1000 South.                     |

The wetland avoidance options would require about 7 acres of additional land. The wetland avoidance options would result in 11 more acres of agricultural land and 7 more acres of residential land being affected. However, the wetland avoidance options would reduce the impact to the Great Salt Lake Shorelands Preserve by 11 acres. The wetland avoidance options would be consistent with local and regional land-use plans.

### 3.4.6 Mitigation Measures

Overall, the right-of-way for the WDC would be converted from its existing land uses discussed above to a more urban-related land use. The conversion to more urban land uses (right-of-way) would be similar among all of the action alternatives. This conversion would generally be consistent with local and regional land-use and growth plans, since improved roadway infrastructure has been included as part of all local and regional planning efforts. Additionally, the local and regional plans show much of the area proposed for the alternatives being converted to urban uses such as residential, commercial, industrial, and infrastructure uses. Therefore, no mitigation is proposed. Specific mitigation for impacts to conservation properties is discussed below.

***Mitigation for Impacts to the Great Salt Lake Shorelands Preserve.*** UDOT will continue to coordinate with TNC and URMCC regarding impacts to the Great Salt Lake Shorelands Preserve, including potential impacts to the current land uses on the preserve. UDOT is coordinating with these entities to ensure that water conveyance and property access are maintained at their current levels so that the conservation land use can also be maintained. UDOT is developing the necessary measures to minimize impacts to the preserve consistent



with the intent of the 1996 Wetland Conservation Plan and the 2001 Davis County Shorelands Master Plan and in accordance with state and federal property acquisition laws.

As a result of this coordination, the current roadway design in this EIS maintains access to the preserve at the Central Davis Sewer Plant, Roueche Lane in Kaysville, 200 North in Kaysville, the proposed Layton interchange, 3200 West in Layton, and Gentile Street in Davis County. The roadway design for the WDC will include properly sized water conveyance pipes or culverts to maintain all existing water conveyance to the preserve. These conveyances include all creeks, storm drains, canals, ditches, and field drains.

As part of the wetland and wildlife mitigation process for the WDC Project, UDOT plans to mitigate for wetland and wildlife impacts by purchasing private in-holdings within the Great Salt Lake Shorelands Preserve. UDOT will be responsible for all mitigation for direct and indirect impacts to the Great Salt Lake Shorelands Preserve and will either preserve or improve wetland and wildlife functions on these properties and turn the properties over to TNC and URMCC for long-term management. For additional mitigation measures, see Section 14.4.7, Mitigation Measures, in Chapter 14, Ecosystem Resources.

For the URMCC lands that would be directly affected by the WDC right-of-way, URMCC will transfer these properties to UDOT. These properties will be transferred out of federal ownership to State of Utah ownership. This process will require that URMCC prepare its own decision document based on the analysis in this EIS regarding the transfer of property.

***Mitigation for Impacts to the Farmington Ranches, Farmington Meadows, Hunters Creek, and Black Agriland Conservation Easements.*** If Alternative A1, A2, B1, or B2 is selected, UDOT will provide compensation in accordance with state and federal property acquisition laws for right-of-way impacts to land that is included in the Farmington Ranches, Farmington Meadows, and Hunters Creek conservation easements. If an A Alternative is selected, the same mitigation will apply to the Black Agriland conservation easement.

For any wetland and wildlife impacts that occur on the easements as a result of the WDC, UDOT is providing the appropriate mitigation in accordance with the Clean Water Act Section 404 permitting process. For more information regarding the mitigation for the ecological value of the conservation easements, see Chapter 14, Ecosystem Resources.

### 3.4.7 Cumulative Impacts

There are no anticipated cumulative impacts to land use. Cumulative impacts were analyzed for local and regionally important issues (ecosystem resources, air quality, water quality, floodplains, farmland, economics, and community impacts). The list of resources analyzed for cumulative impacts was developed with input from resource agencies and the public during scoping. For a more detailed discussion of cumulative impacts, see Chapter 24, Cumulative Impacts.

#### **What are cumulative impacts?**

Cumulative impacts are the resulting impacts from the proposed action combined with impacts from other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions.

### 3.4.8 Summary of Impacts

Table 3-15 summarizes the impacts from each alternative. Table 3-16 summarizes the consistency of the various land-use plans for each alternative.

**Table 3-15. Summary of Land-Use Impacts**

in acres

| Alternative                    | Impacts by Land-Use Category |            |            |               |            |                                |            |             | Total Acres |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------|------------|------------|---------------|------------|--------------------------------|------------|-------------|-------------|
|                                | Agriculture                  | Commercial | Industrial | Institutional | Open Space | Conservation Area <sup>a</sup> | Recreation | Residential |             |
| A1 – Glovers Lane/4100 W       | 504                          | 1          | 1          | 2             | 62         | 168                            | 18         | 59          | <b>815</b>  |
| A2 – Glovers Lane/5400 W       | 565                          | 1          | 1          | 2             | 62         | 168                            | 18         | 61          | <b>878</b>  |
| A1 – wetland avoidance options | 515                          | 1          | 1          | 2             | 62         | 157                            | 18         | 66          | <b>822</b>  |
| A2 – wetland avoidance options | 576                          | 1          | 1          | 2             | 62         | 157                            | 18         | 68          | <b>883</b>  |
| B1 – Glovers Lane/4100 W       | 474                          | 1          | 2          | 1             | 124        | 152                            | 18         | 99          | <b>871</b>  |
| B2 – Glovers Lane/4800 W       | 478                          | 1          | 2          | 1             | 124        | 152                            | 18         | 96          | <b>872</b>  |
| B1 – wetland avoidance options | 485                          | 1          | 2          | 1             | 124        | 141                            | 18         | 106         | <b>878</b>  |
| B2 – wetland avoidance options | 489                          | 1          | 2          | 1             | 124        | 141                            | 18         | 103         | <b>879</b>  |

<sup>a</sup> For a list of conservation areas, see Section 3.3.1.1, Methodology for Existing Land Use.

**Table 3-16. Summary of the WDC’s Consistency with Local Plans and Policies**

| Alternative                    | Centerville | Farmington <sup>a</sup> | Kaysville | Layton | Syracuse | West Point | Hooper | Davis County | Weber County |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------|-----------|--------|----------|------------|--------|--------------|--------------|
| A1 – Glovers Lane/4700 W       | Y           | Y                       | Y         | Y      | N        | N          | —      | N            | —            |
| A2 – Glovers Lane/5400 W       | Y           | Y                       | Y         | Y      | N        | N          | Y      | N            | Y            |
| A1 – wetland avoidance options | Y           | Y                       | Y         | Y      | N        | N          | —      | N            | —            |
| A2 – wetland avoidance options | Y           | Y                       | Y         | Y      | N        | N          | Y      | N            | Y            |
| B1 – Glovers Lane/4100 W       | Y           | Y                       | Y         | Y      | Y        | Y          | —      | Y            | —            |
| B2 – Glovers Lane/4800 W       | Y           | Y                       | Y         | Y      | Y        | N          | —      | N            | —            |
| B1 – wetland avoidance options | Y           | Y                       | Y         | Y      | Y        | Y          | —      | Y            | —            |
| B2 – wetland avoidance options | Y           | Y                       | Y         | Y      | Y        | N          | —      | N            | —            |

<sup>a</sup> The adopted Farmington City Master Transportation Plan Addendum shows a future WDC on Glovers Lane (Alternatives B1 and B2). However, city officials have passed a resolution supporting a WDC alignment on Shepard Lane.



## 3.5 References

### BIO-WEST

2011 Legacy Avian Noise Research Program Final Report. September.

### Centerville City

2008 Centerville City General Plan.

### Davis County

2004 Davis County Transportation Strategic Plan. June.

2006 Davis County General Plan. February.

### Davis County Council of Governments

2001 Comprehensive Land Use Master Plan, A Plan for Conservation and Preservation of the Lands along the Great Salt Lake. Prepared in partnership with The Nature Conservancy and Envision Utah. July 25.

### Envision Utah

No date The History of Envision Utah.

### Farmington City

2003 Farmington Ranches Conservation Easement. July.

2007 Farmington Meadows Conservation Easement. October.

2009 Farmington City Master Transportation Plan Addendum.

2011 Farmington City General Land Use Plan. October.

2013 Hunters Creek Conservation Easement. November.

### [FHWA] Federal Highway Administration

2004 Influence of Transportation Infrastructure on Land Use. December.

### Hooper City

2008 Hooper City Draft Transportation Master Plan 2005–2025. October.

2014 Hooper City Generalized Future Land Use Map. August 21.

### Kaysville City

2014 Kaysville City General Plan. December.

2016 Kaysville City Transportation and Traffic Circulation Plan. January.

### Layton City

2013 Layton City General Plan. October 28.

2016 Layton City Master Street Plan. Accessed October 31, 2016.

### [RCLCO] Robert Charles Lesser & Co.

2015 Market-Based Evaluation of Shared Solution Alternative Land Use Plan, Davis and Weber Counties, Utah. March.



#### Syracuse City

- 2015a Syracuse City General Plan. December 24.
- 2015b Syracuse Street Map. October 22.

#### [URMCC] Utah Reclamation and Mitigation and Conservation Commission

- No date About the Mitigation Commission. [www.mitigationcommission.gov/aboutus/aboutus.html](http://www.mitigationcommission.gov/aboutus/aboutus.html). Accessed February 1, 2012.
- 1996 Wetlands Conservation Plan: A Plan for Protection of the Great Salt Lake Wetlands Ecosystem in Davis County. December.

#### Utah Department of Natural Resources

- 2000 Great Salt Lake Comprehensive Management Plan Resource Document. May 1.
- 2013 Final Great Salt Lake Comprehensive Management Plan and Record of Decision. March.

#### Utah Division of Wildlife Resources

- 2013 Farmington Bay Waterfowl Management Area. [wildlife.utah.gov/habitat/farmington\\_bay.php](http://wildlife.utah.gov/habitat/farmington_bay.php). September 17. Accessed March 31, 2014.

#### Weber County

- 2003 West Central Weber County General Plan.

#### West Davis Corridor Team

- 2012 Minutes from a meeting with the West Davis Corridor team and planning officials from the Cities of West Haven, Hooper, Clinton, West Point, Syracuse, Layton, Kaysville, and Farmington. March 14.

#### West Point City

- 2013 West Point City General Plan Land Use Map. April 10.

#### [WFRC] Wasatch Front Regional Council

- 2001 North Legacy Transportation Corridor Study. [www.udot.utah.gov/westdavis/uploads/doc\\_pdf/Documentation\\_PreviousStudies\\_2001NorthLegacyCorridorStudy.pdf](http://www.udot.utah.gov/westdavis/uploads/doc_pdf/Documentation_PreviousStudies_2001NorthLegacyCorridorStudy.pdf).
- 2015 Wasatch Front Regional Transportation Plan 2015–2040.
- 2017 Real Estate Market Model (REMM) results comparing 2040 West Davis Corridor Project household and employment projections to No-Action projections. February.

#### [WFRC and others] Wasatch Front Regional Council, Mountainland Association of Governments, Utah Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, and Utah Transit Authority

- No date Wasatch Choices 2040: A Four County Land-Use and Transportation Vision. [www.udot.utah.gov/westdavis/uploads/doc\\_pdf/Documentation\\_PreviousStudies\\_WasatchChoices2040.pdf](http://www.udot.utah.gov/westdavis/uploads/doc_pdf/Documentation_PreviousStudies_WasatchChoices2040.pdf).