

# Chapter 5: Community Impacts

<b>5.1</b>	<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>5-2</b>
<b>5.2</b>	<b>Regulatory Setting.....</b>	<b>5-3</b>
<b>5.3</b>	<b>Methodology .....</b>	<b>5-3</b>
5.3.1	Methodology for Community Cohesion.....	5-4
5.3.2	Methodology for Quality of Life.....	5-5
5.3.3	Methodology for Recreation Resources .....	5-5
5.3.4	Methodology for Community Facilities .....	5-6
5.3.5	Methodology for Public Health and Safety .....	5-6
5.3.6	Methodology for Public Services and Utilities .....	5-6
5.3.7	Methodology for Housing and Relocations.....	5-7
<b>5.4</b>	<b>Affected Environment.....</b>	<b>5-10</b>
5.4.1	Community Cohesion.....	5-10
5.4.2	Quality of Life.....	5-18
5.4.3	Recreation Resources .....	5-23
5.4.4	Community Facilities .....	5-26
5.4.5	Public Health and Safety .....	5-28
5.4.6	Public Services and Utilities .....	5-29
5.4.7	Housing and Relocations.....	5-31
<b>5.5</b>	<b>Environmental Consequences .....</b>	<b>5-34</b>
5.5.1	No-Action Alternative.....	5-34
5.5.2	Alternatives A1–A2.....	5-37
5.5.3	Alternatives B1–B2.....	5-48
5.5.4	Wetland Avoidance Options .....	5-57
5.5.5	Mitigation Measures.....	5-57
5.5.6	Cumulative Impacts.....	5-60
5.5.7	Summary of Impacts .....	5-61
<b>5.6</b>	<b>References .....</b>	<b>5-66</b>

## 5.1 Introduction

This chapter describes the social environment in the West Davis Corridor (WDC) community impact analysis area and the impacts to the social environment from the proposed project alternatives. For the affected environment and environmental consequences sections of this chapter, the social environment is divided into the following topics:

- Community cohesion
- Quality of life
- Recreation resources
- Community facilities
- Public health and safety
- Public services and utilities
- Housing and relocations

***Community Impact Analysis Area.*** The general community impact analysis area is the same as the WDC study area described in Section 1.2, Description of the Needs Assessment Study Area, with a focus on the parts of the communities that surround or are immediately adjacent to the proposed WDC alternatives in both Weber and Davis Counties. The community impact analysis area was used as the basis for describing the existing social environment.

For certain resources, a specific impact analysis area was selected to focus on the area where effects would likely occur. These impact analysis areas are as follows:

- **Recreation facilities, public facilities (such as churches, schools, and medical facilities), and public safety facilities (such as police, fire, and ambulance services):** All facilities within 0.5 mile on either side of a WDC alignment. This width was selected because it includes the area where traffic and other aspects of the alternative's location could affect access or a service provider's ability to perform adequate emergency response.
- **Utilities:** The area within 0.25 mile on either side of an alignment. Though most impacts to facilities would be within the roadway right-of-way and would occur during construction, the 0.25-mile area was selected because impacts could extend beyond the right-of-way if construction in the right-of-way were to require a more extensive reconfiguration of utilities in the general area.
- **Relocations (property impacts):** Properties that would be directly affected by construction of an alignment.

### What is the community impact analysis area?

The community impact analysis area is the same as the WDC study area with a focus on the parts of the communities that surround or are immediately adjacent to the proposed WDC alternatives in both Weber and Davis Counties.

## 5.2 Regulatory Setting

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) considers several types of community impacts, including impacts to community cohesion, the availability of public facilities and services, tax and property values, and displacements of people, businesses, and farms.

Among the community impacts analyzed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), one type is subject to specific legal requirements and obligations: the acquisition of residences, businesses, public facilities, or farms by the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) as necessary to build the WDC. When such acquisitions are necessary, UDOT's guidelines and policies are consistent with the federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (42 United States Code [USC] 4601 and subsequent sections, amended 1989) and the State of Utah Relocation Program (part of the Utah Relocation Assistance Act, Utah Administrative Code, Section 57-12). These laws provide for uniform and equitable treatment of all persons displaced from their homes, businesses, and farms without discrimination on any basis.

The guidelines used by UDOT for carrying out the provisions of these acts are contained in its 2013 *Relocation Assistance Brochure*. Relocation resources are available to all residents (including renters) and businesses whose properties need to be acquired, and the process for acquiring replacement housing and other sites must be fair and open. The 2013 *Relocation Assistance Brochure* can be viewed at [www.udot.utah.gov/main/uconowner.gf?n=200602240821161](http://www.udot.utah.gov/main/uconowner.gf?n=200602240821161).

## 5.3 Methodology

Some community elements, such as community cohesion and quality of life, are difficult to define. What makes a community cohesive or defines a quality living environment for one person might not match the perceptions or values of his or her neighbor. Because of this subjective nature, community cohesion and quality of life impacts are difficult to measure. This chapter focuses on general measures that most people associate with cohesion and quality living, measures such as community interaction and leadership, community amenities, and general opinions of well-being.

Physical, project-related impacts to community facilities, recreation resources, utilities, public safety, and relocated residents and businesses are easier to measure but in some cases include a degree of subjectivity, especially when considered in conjunction with quality of life. For example, one person might enjoy having convenient shopping opportunities and feel safer in a more developed area, while another might feel that the community is adversely affected by traffic, noise, air pollution, and lighting associated with the development.

### How are community elements defined, described, and measured in this EIS?

This EIS uses several methods to define, describe, and measure community elements, including general measurements of community cohesion and quality living; physical, project-related impacts to various resources; interviews with business and government representatives; and surveys and focus groups.

For this project, impacts to community facilities, recreation resources, utilities, public safety, and relocated residents and businesses are quantified based on physical impacts to structures or services. Quality of life concerns associated with these elements are addressed under the community cohesion and quality of life discussions, as appropriate.

To assist in the community impact analysis, in December 2009 the WDC team conducted a quality of life survey that focused on public awareness of the WDC Project (referred to as the WDC Project survey; Dan Jones & Associates 2009). This survey of 400 households within the 14 cities in the community impact analysis area sought residents' opinions about what issues they felt were important, their quality of life, transportation conditions, and community involvement in the area. Focus groups were also conducted in January 2010 to discuss community values and transportation needs in Davis and Weber Counties.

#### **What is the West Davis Corridor team?**

The West Davis Corridor team consists of the lead agencies for the WDC Project (FHWA and UDOT).

### **5.3.1 Methodology for Community Cohesion**

Community cohesion is the degree to which residents have a sense of belonging to their neighborhood or community. Community cohesion can be linked to commitment to the community or a strong attachment to neighbors, institutions, or particular groups. Specific indicators of community cohesion include interaction among neighbors, use of community facilities and services, long-serving community leadership, participation in local organizations, a desire to stay in the community and length of residency, satisfaction with the community, and the presence of families (FDOT 2003).

#### **What is community cohesion?**

Community cohesion is the degree to which residents have a sense of belonging to their neighborhood or community.

Impacts to community cohesion were determined using a qualitative approach. Specifically, the analysis considers how construction of the alternatives would affect the physical and social conditions that define the neighborhoods and communities in the community impact analysis area.

#### **What are quantitative and qualitative analyses?**

A quantitative analysis is one that produces specific numeric results, such as the number of properties that would require relocations.

A qualitative analysis looks at impacts in more general and comparative terms. For this EIS, qualitative analyses were performed when numeric data were not available.

Additionally, the WDC team considered the potential for alternatives to affect community facilities in order to determine the impacts to the physical layout of the community and to resources that might provide opportunities for community interaction. The elements evaluated include barriers that divide or limit access to areas of the community (edges), access (paths/nodes), connections to services and facilities (districts), removal of community facilities and services (districts/landmarks), residential or business displacements, and opportunities for infill or new development. These elements are described in more detail in Section 5.4.1.1, Physical Characteristics of Communities.

### 5.3.2 Methodology for Quality of Life

Quality of life can be characterized as a person's well-being and happiness. Like community cohesion, what constitutes a positive quality of life is subjective and cannot be solidly defined. For this analysis, quality of life considerations focus on those elements that the public generally associates with a high quality of life: education, safety, recreation opportunities, convenient shopping and services, access to transportation facilities, and a positive general living environment.

#### What is quality of life?

Quality of life can be characterized as a person's well-being and happiness.

To analyze quality of life, the WDC team reviewed the elements listed above that the public generally associates with a high quality of life for changes caused by the proposed alternatives. Other factors, such as air quality and noise, could also contribute to a person's sense of quality of life. For more information about air quality and noise impacts, see Chapter 11, Air Quality, and Chapter 12, Noise.

Additionally, letters from residents, newspaper articles regarding the project, and public comments were used to assess perceptions regarding increased or diminished quality of life.

### 5.3.3 Methodology for Recreation Resources

The WDC team identified existing and planned recreation resources through a variety of sources. Recently published aerial photographs were used to verify the locations of recreation areas and resources. The team consulted federal, state, and local (county and city) plans, such as land-management plans and general plans, with regard to recreation. A site visit was made in April 2012 to identify on-site land uses, and extensive internet searches of agency websites (federal, state, and local) were conducted to verify the location and specifics of both existing and planned recreation facilities.

All identified recreation facilities were added to a data layer in an electronic map file. Once the alternatives were developed, each alternative (and the associated right-of-way) was overlaid on the electronic map file to determine which recreation facilities would be affected. Impacts to recreation facilities were reported as the total acreage removed from parks, proposed parks, and other recreation facilities. Additionally, the analysis of impacts looked at changes in the use of park or recreation land that is not proposed for acquisition (that is, indirect impacts that affect the use of a park or facility). Examples of such indirect impacts include noise or visual impacts. For more information about noise and visual impacts, see Chapter 12, Noise, and Chapter 18, Visual Resources.

Recreation areas that are publicly owned and open to the public are subject to the provisions of 49 USC 303, commonly referred to as Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act. These properties and the expected impacts from the WDC alternatives are discussed in more detail in Chapter 27, Section 4(f)/6(f) Evaluation.

### 5.3.4 Methodology for Community Facilities

The WDC team compiled a list of community facilities and services in the impact analysis area using information gathered from internet searches and the Utah Automated Geographic Reference Center's Geographic Information Systems (GIS) Portal. All identified community facilities were added to a data layer in an electronic map file. Once the alternatives were developed, each alternative (and the associated right-of-way) was overlaid on the electronic map file to determine which buildings or facilities would be directly affected and which buildings or facilities would be adjacent to the proposed alternatives.

Impacts were calculated or quantified for any facilities that would be completely acquired or for which a partial property acquisition, also called a strip take, would be necessary. The community facilities analysis used a process similar to that used for recreation facilities. Impacts were determined by using an electronic map file to evaluate where the facilities were located relative to the alternatives. The impacts were reported as the total acreage removed from facility properties and/or as physical impacts that could affect facility operations.

### 5.3.5 Methodology for Public Health and Safety

The public safety discussion focuses on how public safety needs are met by various emergency services such as fire, ambulance, and law enforcement. The WDC team determined impacts to public health and safety by examining how the project alternatives would affect emergency responder access and the safety of pedestrians in the community impact analysis area. To some extent, health and safety impacts were analyzed qualitatively because limited amounts of data were available regarding emergency response and pedestrian safety. Impacts to public health and safety providers and facilities, including impacts to the facility's ability to operate because of the WDC, were analyzed for those providers within the public health and safety impact analysis area.

Each alternative (and the associated right-of-way) was overlaid on the electronic map file to determine which buildings or health and safety providers would be directly affected and which buildings or facilities would be adjacent to the proposed alternatives. Impacts were calculated or quantified for any facilities that would be completely acquired or for which a partial property acquisition (strip take) would be necessary.

### 5.3.6 Methodology for Public Services and Utilities

The WDC team contacted utility companies and municipalities in order to learn more about belowground and overhead facilities in the community impact analysis area because the presence of these facilities could affect the alternative alignments. The analysis focuses on physical impacts to public utilities during construction with the understanding that the availability of functioning services is an important part of the social environment.

#### What are points of conflict?

Points of conflict are places where a proposed alternative would require either a crossing or a relocation of a utility.

The utility analysis focuses on the major utility companies in the impact analysis area, including Rocky Mountain Power, the Hooper Canal Company, the North and Central Davis Sewer Districts, and the Weber Basin Water Conservancy District. Impacts to utilities are referred to as *points of conflict*, or places where a proposed alternative would require either a crossing or a relocation of a utility.

Relocations of these utilities (including water, sewer, storm drainage, and power lines that provide service to subdivisions or businesses) would cross the proposed alternatives perpendicularly, and the effects on these utilities would be determined by working with local jurisdictions during the final design phase of the project once an alternative is selected in the Record of Decision. Impacts to these utilities can usually be accommodated within the design of an alternative and would not affect the alternative's overall location. The estimated costs of major utility relocations have been included in the overall cost of each alternative identified in Section 2.5.3, Estimated Cost. The major utility relocations are shown in Volume IV, Figures and Roadway Plans.

#### What is the Record of Decision for the WDC Project?

The Record of Decision is the document in which FHWA will announce which WDC alternative it has selected.

### 5.3.7 Methodology for Housing and Relocations

This chapter considers the acquisitions of homes and businesses, and the relocations of residents and businesses, that would occur as part of the proposed alternatives. The WDC team identified the real property to be acquired, through purchase, easement, or other means, as a result of each alternative. This information was developed during the preliminary engineering phase of the project.

The WDC team identified property to be acquired based on the Davis and Weber County Assessors' information on properties in the community impact analysis area. The information identified property boundaries, ownership, and encumbrances such as easements and structures. The land to be acquired is described by location, use, and property type.

Relocation impacts were determined using a quantitative approach in much the same way as land use impacts. The alternatives were compared to existing property boundaries to determine the properties that would be subject to relocations, potential relocations, or strip takes. If impacts to a property would result in a relocation, the team prepared a summary of the households or businesses that would need to be relocated. This information is based on a visual inspection of the property and available public records.

#### What is a relocation?

A relocation occurs when constructing an alternative would require purchasing an occupied structure, such as a home or business. The residents or business would need to relocate.

#### What is a strip take?

A strip take occurs when a strip of land on the edge of a parcel would be acquired. A strip take is not considered a relocation.



For this analysis, three main types of impacts to residences and businesses were considered: direct impacts (relocations), proximity impacts (potential relocations), and land-only impacts (strip takes). These impacts were developed with UDOT right-of-way staff based on their experience with similar projects. Direct and proximity impacts to platted residences as well as construction easements were also considered. (For a list of specific property impacts, see Appendix 5A, Relocations and Potential Relocations in the Community Impact Analysis Area.)

#### What is a plat?

A plat is a map showing the divisions of a piece of land. Further refinement often splits these pieces into individual lots, known collectively as a subdivision.

***Direct Impacts (Relocations).*** For the purpose of this analysis, a direct impact to a residence or business occurs when an existing structure is within the right-of-way of a proposed alternative (see Figure 5-3, Relocation Schematic, in Volume IV). These structures include not only the primary home or business structure but also garages, sheds, and other buildings that are not attached to the main building. This type of impact is referred to as a *relocation* because the entire property would need to be acquired and the residents or business would need to relocate. However, the original structure itself would not be relocated.

***Proximity Impacts (Potential Relocations).*** For the purpose of this analysis, a proximity impact to a residence or business occurs when an existing structure (excluding porches and garages) is within 15 feet of the proposed right-of-way (see Figure 5-3, Relocation Schematic, in Volume IV) but it is not clear whether the entire property would need to be acquired. (According to UDOT’s *Environmental Manual of Instruction*, the value of 15 feet is only a “rule of thumb” to assess which properties might need to be relocated as a result of a project.) UDOT would make a final determination about the property during the right-of-way acquisition phase of the project, which would occur shortly before construction. By the end of the right-of-way acquisition phase, UDOT would determine whether each potential relocation is a full relocation or a strip take. This determination depends on an independent valuation of the property that includes any project-related damage to buildings.

***Land-Only Impacts (Strip Takes).*** For the purpose of this analysis, a land-only impact occurs when a property is located within the proposed right-of-way but the right-of-way is more than 15 feet from an existing structure (see Figure 5-3, Relocation Schematic, in Volume IV). This type of impact is referred to as a *strip take* because only a strip of land would need to be acquired. Strip takes are not considered relocations and are not included in the figures for this chapter.

***Impacts to Platted Residences.*** For the purpose of this analysis, direct impacts (relocations) and proximity impacts (potential relocations) to platted residences (that is, properties planned for development and approved by the City but that have not been constructed) were also calculated using the same methodologies described above. The locations of platted residences were based on county parcel information and approved subdivision plats provided by Cities or developers.



**Construction Easements.** Some properties outside the right-of-way might be affected by cuts or fills required during roadway construction. UDOT would temporarily acquire these properties with construction easements. These properties might be affected but are not considered relocations or strip takes because the property would not be permanently used. Construction easements are not included in the relocation impacts discussed in this chapter. UDOT would compensate the property owners for the temporary use of the property, and the restored property would be returned to the owner when the use of the property is no longer needed. These properties are not included in this analysis, nor are these properties discussed in this chapter.

**Relocation Assistance for Displaced Residents and Businesses.** All of the WDC action alternatives would require acquiring some property. As stated in Section 5.2, Regulatory Setting, UDOT would acquire the necessary right-of-way consistent with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended (42 USC 4601 and subsequent sections, amended in 1989), and Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. These policies ensure the uniform and equitable treatment of all people displaced from their residences, businesses, and farms without discrimination on any basis.

The guidelines used by UDOT for carrying out the provisions of this act are contained in its 2013 *Relocation Assistance Brochure* (UDOT 2013).

Relocation resources are available to all residents and businesses that are relocated, and the process for acquiring replacement housing and other sites will be fair and open.

For this analysis, the numbers of relocations, potential relocations, and strip takes were calculated from county records of property data as of May 2010. To determine whether an acquisition was a relocation or potential relocation, UDOT considered whether there were known structures on a property or whether the property had been platted for development and lots had been identified in the plat.

## 5.4 Affected Environment

This section describes the existing social environment in the community impact analysis area.

### 5.4.1 Community Cohesion

The impact analysis area for community cohesion includes communities that would be physically crossed by the proposed alternatives. For this analysis, the communities are defined by existing city boundaries. For more information about each of these communities, see Chapter 3, Land Use.

Within the community impact analysis area are 14 cities: Centerville, Clearfield, Clinton, Farmington, Hooper, Kaysville, Layton, Ogden, Riverdale, Roy, Sunset, Syracuse, West Haven, and West Point. According to city planners and the WDC Project survey of residents in western Davis County and Weber County, each of the individual cities that is partially within the community impact analysis area is cohesive. Residents identify with their communities and feel a sense of belonging (J. Anderson 2006; S. Anderson 2006; Larson 2006; Vinzant 2006; Worthen 2006; Dan Jones & Associates 2009).

#### 5.4.1.1 Physical Characteristics of Communities

The following discussion uses Lynch's (1960) concepts of the physical elements of the community that were listed in Section 5.3.1, Methodology for Community Cohesion.

##### Districts

Within both Weber and Davis Counties, the communities in the community impact analysis area vary from urban to rural. Some communities were settled over 100 years ago. The Central Pacific and Union Pacific Railroad lines ran through many of these older communities, which allowed the communities to thrive and stay connected. Other communities were settled more recently and exhibit suburban characteristics. From a physical layout standpoint, most of the communities—even the older ones—don't contain historic downtowns with a main street in the historic sense and often contain many edges and lack the districts and identity that promote cohesion.

Instead, in most of the cities in the community impact analysis area, a state route that runs adjacent to or through the city is considered to be the city's main street. It is on these "main streets" that a city's primary commercial area is usually located. This is true of State Route (SR) 126 in Sunset, Clearfield, Layton, and West Haven; SR 107 in West Point; SR 108 in Syracuse; SR 108 and SR 37 in Clinton; SR 108 and SR 97 in Roy; and SR 37 and SR 97 in Hooper. These commercial areas serve as districts according to Lynch's model.

##### What districts are present in the communities?

Important districts in the community impact analysis area include state routes that function as main streets for most of the cities in the impact analysis area as well as Farmington's and Kaysville's Main Streets.

Farmington, which is partially located in the community impact analysis area, is one of the oldest cities in the impact analysis area. Unlike most of the other cities in the impact analysis area, Farmington does have a town center and Main Street, which is a district according to Lynch’s model. However, it is important to note that Farmington’s Main Street is east of Interstate 15 (I-15) and outside the impact analysis area. Because of I-15, Farmington is essentially separated into two distinct districts east and west of I-15. The part of Farmington in the impact analysis area is further split by the Denver & Rio Grande Western (D&RGW) Railroad line. Although the rail line is not currently active, the Utah Transit Authority (UTA) owns the rail corridor and could convert the line back to an active rail line, further splitting this part of Farmington. The part of Farmington west of I-15 is considered a cohesive area because of the shared values of being in the rural part of the city.

Kaysville also has a Main Street with several older buildings on it, which is a district according to Lynch’s model. However, as in Farmington, Kaysville’s Main Street runs predominantly north-south in Kaysville east of I-15 and outside the community impact analysis area. When this street reaches Layton, it crosses over into the impact analysis area (where it is called SR 126) and no longer retains the feel of a traditional Main Street.

## Edges

The existing boundaries for churches, schools, and school districts in the community impact analysis area create edges in each of the communities in the impact analysis area. Because a person is more likely to interact with others from her or his church or who attended the same school, these edges (such as roads and other identifiable boundaries) reduce the degree of interaction with people who are located on the other side of an edge.

Edges created by physical separators such as I-15, the Rocky Mountain Power utility corridor, and the D&RGW Railroad line in the impact analysis area also reduce the tendency for interaction among people because of the physical separation. Interactions are often reduced more at the neighborhood level than for the entire community because of the social relationships that neighborhoods often foster.

However, the reduction in interaction depends on the size of the edge. For example, the Rocky Mountain Power utility corridor separates several neighborhoods, so the effect occurs at the city level as well as the neighborhood level. I-15 bisects entire cities—such as Farmington and Kaysville—so again the separation effect occurs at a city level as well as at a neighborhood level. Although the D&RGW Railroad line is also a physical barrier between some neighborhoods within individual cities in the impact analysis area, this rail line has been converted to a Rails-to-Trails facility throughout most of the WDC study area, and the trail could also foster interactions among people who use it.

### What edges affect cohesion in the communities?

Cohesion is affected by various edges including existing boundaries for churches, schools, and school districts as well as physical separators such as I-15, the Rocky Mountain Power utility corridor, and the D&RGW Railroad line.

## Paths

The major roads that create paths in the communities are I-15, 4000 South in Hooper, 5600 South in Roy, 1800 North in Clinton, Antelope Drive in Syracuse, SR 126 in Roy, and SR 108/2000 West/Midland Drive in Syracuse. Because of the size of the major roads, they tend to divide the communities more than they provide a potential for interaction by promoting travel. In addition, many of these major roads have become commercial centers through their respective city and as a result have bisected existing neighborhoods. For more information regarding roads in the WDC study area, see Figure 1-7, Current (2015) Transportation Network, in Volume IV.

## Landmarks

Important landmarks in the community impact analysis area include the Great Salt Lake, the Davis County Legacy Events Center (Farmington), the D&RGW Trail, Farmington City Station Park, the Old Emigration Trail (Syracuse and West Point), Jensen Nature Park (Syracuse), and the Farmington Bay Waterfowl Management Area (Farmington). These facilities help create a sense of community in cities that do not have a distinct downtown district.

### 5.4.1.2 Social Interaction

#### Neighborhood Interaction, Residency, and Families

Social interaction is an important part of community cohesion. There are several factors that can lead to and affect social interaction, including the types of facilities and services in a community, how integrated an individual is in the community, or the amount of community leadership and activism that is taking place.

The use of and reliance on local services and facilities provides opportunities for interaction. Churches and schools create centers where people can interact, and these centers promote cohesiveness within the community. Community events and programs to create neighborhood identity also increase community cohesion.

Social integration and interaction can also be affected by family type and by how long people have lived in the community. Long-term residents tend to have higher levels of social attachment and integration into neighborhood and community life than do shorter-term residents (Kasarda and Janowitz 1974). The presence of families is another typical indicator of community cohesiveness. Families with children often interact at school events and other youth activities. The presence of children often brings people together in a neighborhood setting.

The type and amount of leadership and activism in a community also help define cohesiveness. When members of an area are engaged in the day-to-day operation of the

#### What factors affect the level of social interaction?

A survey found that 75% of respondents have lived in Weber or Davis County for over 10 years, and the percentages of households in the community impact analysis area that consist of families with children are higher than the state and national averages. These factors, among others, affect interactions between residents.

community, they can feel a strong sense of pride and belonging in their community. The existing boundaries for churches and schools in the community impact analysis area also contribute to some degree of social interaction and community involvement in the impact analysis area.

In particular, the boundaries of the local wards of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (LDS Church) can occur either within or between neighborhoods. These boundaries can cause either neighborhood division (if a neighborhood is severed by a ward boundary) or cohesiveness for the parts of the neighborhood within the ward boundary. Often, social interaction among people who belong to the same ward is fostered not only through coming together for church services but also through the various ward activities in which the congregants participate.

The WDC Project survey measured various aspects of social integration of residents in western Davis County and Weber County. The survey results show that 75% of the respondents had lived in Weber or Davis County for over 10 years, while another 16% of respondents had lived in Weber or Davis County for 1 to 5 years. These residency rates are an indicator of community cohesion.

Additionally, 59% of the households surveyed in the community impact analysis area reported that neighborhood schools are “very important” community aspects, which indicates that these households likely have children under age 18. This means that over half of the residents have families, which is another indicator of community cohesion because of the interaction between children in neighborhoods, at school, and at social events.

A community is built on shared common beliefs, values, concerns, and interests. Some of these shared beliefs, values, and interests revolve around geography—for example, owners of farms in a rural community might have common interests in farming. Shared problems can also lead to greater community cohesion as members of the community act together to prevent a potentially harmful event from occurring.

Forty-three percent of households surveyed for the WDC Project reported that a rural lifestyle was “very important” to them, which indicates that there is a shared value of maintaining a rural lifestyle among residents of this area. Further, when focus group participants were asked about the role that transportation plays in their view of quality of life in their community, residents were concerned that the area is growing too fast and that stop signs would turn to traffic lights. These comments indicate that residents are concerned about the loss of their rural lifestyle.

An important characteristic that unites community members is knowing one’s neighbors. A strong attachment to neighbors is an important characteristic of a cohesive community. Crime-prevention programs such as Neighborhood Watch work well in cohesive neighborhoods because residents feel a strong sense of community and want to keep the area safe (National Sheriff’s Association 2006). Thirty-seven percent of respondents to the WDC Project survey said that a sense of community is “very important” to them. Moreover, participants in the January 2010 focus groups said that neighbors, friends, and a sense of community are all important factors in their daily lives.

The presence of agriculture in the area gives the local farmers and ranchers an identity (especially given the continued population growth and development in the area), which helps provide cohesiveness among these individuals. Many of the farmers in the impact analysis area know each other well and have been very engaged in the WDC Project, as has the commissioner of the Utah Department of Agriculture and Food. The farmers and the commissioner believe that the agricultural sustainability of the local fresh-vegetable market will be at risk if the WDC is built through farmland. In 2011, the farmers, along with the Utah Department of Agriculture and Food, held several meetings with the WDC team and in April 2011 conducted a day-long agricultural tour through some of the farms that would be affected.

## Community Facilities and Groups

The existing city boundaries, as well as the boundaries for churches and school districts within individual cities, contribute to some degree of division in social interaction and community involvement in the community impact analysis area. Churches and schools create centers where people can interact, and these interactions promote cohesiveness within the communities.

Subdivisions and homeowners' associations (HOAs) enable residents to get to know each other, as do the pocket parks and community centers that are often located near subdivisions and that dot the impact analysis area (see Figures 5-1 and 5-2, Subdivisions and Neighborhoods; Figure 5-4, Recreation; and Figure 5-5, Non-school Community Facilities, in Volume IV). Parks are also important to fostering social interaction and community involvement. In addition to day-to-day recreation opportunities, the parks also offer locations for local celebrations such as founders' celebrations and seasonal or holiday-related gatherings. Thirty-five percent of respondents to the WDC Project survey said that parks and recreation facilities are "very important" to them.

The Legacy Events Center in Farmington is extremely important to Farmington. Every August, the Davis County Fair is held at the Legacy Events Center. Residents of Farmington who participated in the focus groups were very clear that they feel a direct connection to the Events Center and that the Events Center plays a daily role in many residents' lives.

## Community Leadership and Activism

Lastly, the type and amount of leadership and activism that occurs in a community also help to define cohesiveness. When members of an area are engaged with day-to-day community business, they can feel a strong sense of pride and belonging.

### What community facilities are present?

Important community facilities in the community impact analysis area include schools, churches, parks, and the Legacy Events Center in Farmington.

### What types of community leadership and activism occur?

Some examples of community leadership and activism in the community impact analysis area are the various resident groups that have formed to either support or oppose various alternatives for the WDC Project. Other community-wide or regional examples include Roy's Neighborhood Watch program, Kaysville's Uniting Neighbors program, Clearfield's Neighbor to Neighbor program, Ogden's Inter-faith Works, the Family Connection Center, and the Ogden-Weber Community Action Partnership.



Activism is typically locally focused. Perhaps the strongest indicator of community leadership and activism and by default community cohesion in the impact analysis area is the emergence of various resident groups that have formed to either support or oppose various alternatives for the WDC Project.

The most vocal residential groups are composed of residents who live in Farmington or near its border in Kaysville or in Syracuse. Groups such as the Go West Group have rallied hundreds of people to attend protests regarding proposed alternatives that would affect homes and neighborhoods. In March 2011, over 1,000 residents—primarily from neighborhoods in Farmington and south Kaysville—signed a petition against a proposed alternative through Farmington and Kaysville.

In February 2012, a new group consisting of residents from Syracuse came forward to oppose an alternative that goes through their city ([www.bettersyracuse.org](http://www.bettersyracuse.org)). A group from Farmington created a website called [stopthebottleneck.com](http://stopthebottleneck.com) and sponsored a billboard of the same name. This particular group is strongly opposed to an alternative on Shepard Lane. Websites created by these groups are listed below, though at the time this Final EIS was released, some are no longer in service.

- [www.stopthebottleneck.com](http://www.stopthebottleneck.com)
- [farmingtoncitizens.org](http://farmingtoncitizens.org)
- [www.savefarmington.org](http://www.savefarmington.org)
- [www.savekaysvilleandfarmington.com](http://www.savekaysvilleandfarmington.com)
- [paveourparks.blogspot.com](http://paveourparks.blogspot.com)
- [savekaysvillehomes.weebly.com](http://savekaysvillehomes.weebly.com)
- [www.bettersyracuse.org](http://www.bettersyracuse.org)

Community activism in the impact analysis area is not only neighborhood-based. Examples of community-wide activism include Roy's Neighborhood Watch program and others. The Neighborhood Watch program is focused on keeping the community crime-free. The West Haven community recently worked together to establish its River Parkway Trail, which is part of the planned regional Centennial Trail. Clinton City and West Point City have newsletters that provide information about how residents can stay active in their community. Syracuse is proud of its association with Antelope Island, a state park that relies heavily on local volunteers.

Kaysville's Uniting Neighbors program aims to make Davis County a place where everyone belongs. The program's mission is to coordinate volunteers and build a community where all viewpoints are recognized and valued and to decrease child abuse. Uniting Neighbors began in 1999 with the United Way and the Family Connection Center, and the program holds a recognition banquet yearly to recognize volunteers.

Clearfield's Neighbor to Neighbor program is similar to Uniting Neighbors. Ogden's Interfaith Works is an association of religious, social action, and community organizations in the greater Ogden area that meets regularly to share ideas and support social action in the community.

Activism is also common on the regional level. The Family Connection Center is a private, nonprofit agency that serves families and individuals in Davis County. The Center's main office is located in Clearfield. Its purpose is to protect children, strengthen and shelter families and individuals, foster self-sufficiency, and facilitate a caring community. The Family Connection Center provides the following services to help move families toward independence: emergency assistance, parent education, transitional housing, food bank, crisis respite/nursery, therapy, and Neighbors Helping Neighbors.

### 5.4.1.3 Neighborhood Particulars

Several of the neighborhoods in the community impact analysis area are internally cohesive, and other neighborhoods are both internally cohesive as well as cohesive with other bordering neighborhoods or subdivisions (see Figures 5-1 and 5-2, Subdivisions and Neighborhoods, in Volume IV). Some neighborhood residents, primarily in the southern part of the impact analysis area, have been particularly involved in the WDC Project. Several of the subdivisions and HOAs in the impact analysis area are described below. Not all subdivisions or HOAs are described in this section, but the neighborhoods that are described provide an overall snapshot of neighborhoods in the impact analysis area.

In the Draft EIS, the 4700 West subdivision in West Haven and the Fair Grove Estates subdivision in West Haven were evaluated because the action alternatives would have affected these subdivisions. For this Final EIS, the action alternatives have been reduced in length by about 1 mile and no longer would have direct or indirect impacts to these subdivisions. Therefore, they are not addressed in detail in this Final EIS.

***Farmington Ranches.*** Farmington Ranches in Farmington is an internally cohesive neighborhood. Many of the people who live in this neighborhood enjoy convenient access to natural areas such as the Farmington Bay Waterfowl Management Area, which is south of the neighborhood. The neighborhood consists mostly of young families. The neighborhood has a very active HOA and hosts a website, [farmingtonranches.com](http://farmingtonranches.com). There are several phases in the subdivision, and, based on online discussions, it appears that the residents of each phase are cohesive. HOA fees are crucial to phase improvements, such as landscaping improvements and winter and summer maintenance costs. The subdivision has developed a website, [www.savefarmington.org](http://www.savefarmington.org), to state their support for a WDC alternative that avoids their neighborhood.

***Farmington Meadows.*** Farmington Meadows in Farmington is a single-family-home HOA that borders Farmington Ranches. The subdivision offers a community park and playground.

***Sunset Equestrian Estates.*** Sunset Equestrian Estates in Kaysville is an internally cohesive neighborhood that was built around the use of the nearby equestrian facility. A 19.5-acre equestrian parcel located in the West Cluster Subdivisions is maintained as open space. As in the other newer subdivisions, many young families have located here. HOA fees are collected, and, while none of the fees subsidize the equestrian center, the fees help maintain the trails within the development. Amenities include 3 miles of pedestrian-equestrian trails and a community pool.

***Suncrest Meadows and Webster Farms.*** Suncrest Meadows and Webster Farms in Kaysville are internally cohesive neighborhoods that are likely cohesive with each other since they border one another. Both subdivisions are new and relatively small (about 50 homes). The neighborhoods rely on HOA fees collected from all of the homeowners.

***Kayscreek Estates.*** Kayscreek Estates is an HOA community located just off Weaver Lane in west Layton. The HOA is an internally cohesive subdivision. The homes in the neighborhood were constructed in the early to mid-2000s. The subdivision offers parks and walkways for residents to enjoy. The subdivision has a website, [kayscreekestates.com](http://kayscreekestates.com), for its residents and appears to be a close-knit community.

***View Crest Subdivision.*** The View Crest subdivision in Kaysville is a cohesive community of about 52 homes that has HOA fees. The subdivision has developed two websites, [www.savekaysvilleandfarmington.com](http://www.savekaysvilleandfarmington.com) and [savekaysvillehomes.weebly.com](http://savekaysvillehomes.weebly.com), to state their support for a WDC alternative that avoids their neighborhood.

***Wellington Drive.*** The Wellington Drive neighborhood in Kaysville is internally cohesive. No HOA fees are collected.

***Schick Farms.*** Schick Farms is an HOA in Kaysville located at about 2200 West 200 North. Future plans for this community include an equestrian trail that crosses 200 North.

***Bridgeway Island.*** The Bridgeway Island HOA, a new-home community in Syracuse, is an internally cohesive community with a community pool sited in the middle of the development. This is a newer community (started in 2006) where the residents are very close-knit. Most residents moved to the neighborhood to get away from freeways and commercial developments with the desire to stay for many years.

***Bluff Road Neighborhoods in Syracuse.*** Several neighborhoods surround Bluff Road between Antelope Drive and Gentile Street in Syracuse. Syracuse City has preserved a highway corridor (known as the Bluff Road alignment) through this area. Because this open space is fairly large, it's reasonable to assume that it currently acts as a barrier between subdivisions to the east and west. However, residents use the area for walking and recreation, and therefore it could be considered a community resource.

It's likely that the neighborhoods east of Bluff Road and south of Antelope Drive (such as Hansen Meadows, Hansen Farms, Country Crossing, West Sunset View, Hunters Crossing, Three Oaks, and Quail Bluff) are cohesive within themselves as well as with each other. Subdivisions west of Bluff Road (Fremont Estates and Outwest) are likely cohesive within themselves and with each other.

Because the swath created by the preserved corridor already separates the subdivisions to the east and west, it's reasonable to assume that residents of neighborhoods on each side of the preserved corridor are not particularly close, although they might participate together in regional events outside their neighborhoods. The City preserved the Bluff Road corridor before many of the surrounding subdivisions were built.

#### 5.4.1.4 Summary of Neighborhood and Community Cohesion

In summary, available information shows that the communities in the community impact analysis area are individually as well as regionally cohesive. Residents identify with their individual neighborhoods and communities but are also involved in regional events outside their neighborhoods, events such as holiday celebrations and festivals. Residents also participate in their neighborhoods and communities by volunteering in various social endeavors.

Edges and paths generally diminish community cohesion; the extent of the reduction depends on the type of path or edge. For some residents, I-15 and the Rocky Mountain Power utility corridor might diminish community cohesion more than smaller roads do. Districts and landmarks such as main streets, downtown areas, and community centers promote community cohesion and community identity.

##### What is the overall state of neighborhood and community cohesion?

Available information shows that the communities in the community impact analysis area are individually as well as regionally cohesive. Residents identify with their individual neighborhoods and communities but are also involved in regional events outside their neighborhoods.

### 5.4.2 Quality of Life

Quality of life can be characterized as a person's well-being and happiness. The factors that affect quality of life can vary by person but often include general living environment, safety, accessibility to public services and shopping, and recreation opportunities. For information about recreation, community facilities, and community services, see Section 5.4.3, Recreation Resources; Section 5.4.4, Community Facilities; and Section 5.4.6, Public Services and Utilities.

Other factors, such as air quality and noise, could also contribute to a person's sense of quality of life. For more information about air quality and noise impacts, see Chapter 11, Air Quality, and Chapter 12, Noise.

#### 5.4.2.1 General Living Environment

Residents of Utah generally consider their quality of life to be high. Contributing factors include a varied four-season climate, a moderate cost of living, diverse natural resources, a low rate of violent crime, high-quality education and health care, and varied cultural and recreation opportunities (State of Utah 2010).

The nonprofit organization Utah Foundation published a study of Utah's priorities, taken from a citizen survey. The 2010 Utah Priorities Project report summarizes the issues that were most important in 2010 and how residents felt about Utah's economy, society, and politics. The survey listed the top 10 issues for 2010 in order of priority. Respondents said they're worried about jobs and the economy, government spending, public education, health care, ethics, taxes, and energy issues. States' rights, the environment, and immigration round out the top 10 issues (Utah Foundation 2010).

Respondents were also asked to rate the overall quality of life in Utah compared to 5 years before. Not surprisingly, the percentage of respondents who felt that Utah’s quality of life was “somewhat worse” was noticeably higher in 2010 than it was in 2008. A minority of voters (16%) felt that the quality of life in Utah was somewhat or much better, and slightly more than a third (37%) felt that it was about the same. The largest bloc of respondents (45%) felt that Utah’s quality of life was somewhat or much worse. These sentiments likely reflect the strains placed on individuals and the state by the economic recession.

### 5.4.2.2 County and City Particulars

Respondents to the WDC Project survey were very satisfied with their quality of life. The comments made about their communities stressed the importance of neighbors, the “country” feel of the communities, the availability of open space and parks, clean houses and streets, quality schools, safe neighborhoods with low crime, proximity to shopping and entertainment, and a general sense of community. In an open-ended question on the survey, participants were asked, “What do you like most about the community where you live?” Twenty-five percent of respondents cited the rural atmosphere, while another 20% cited people and neighbors.

#### What are residents’ general attitudes toward quality of life?

Residents of the community impact analysis area generally are very satisfied with their quality of life. Contributing factors are the importance of neighbors, the “country” feel of the communities, and the availability of open space and parks, among other factors.

Many residents moved to cities in the community impact analysis area because of the rural atmosphere. However, 61% of the respondents for the WDC Project survey believed that transportation in their area needs to be improved. Throughout the WDC EIS process, UDOT has received letters from residents in the impact analysis area stating that a WDC alternative close to their home would ruin their community and lower their quality of life. In addition, newspaper articles periodically appear in local papers regarding the WDC and the effect it might have on people’s neighborhoods and quality of life.

City general plans and master plans provide the goals and policies (often considered value statements) and recommendations that give Cities direction in dealing with future population growth and development. The goals and policies listed in the paragraphs below address quality of life for some of the cities in the community impact analysis area. Some Cities currently don’t have value statements specific to quality of life issues in their general plans, and therefore these cities aren’t discussed below. However, the snapshot given for the cities below is fairly representative of the WDC study area overall.

**Davis County.** The Davis County Code includes regulations promoting the health, safety, and welfare of residents of the county. The purpose of Chapter 15 of the code, Land Use and Development Management Ordinance, is to promote the prosperity of and improve the morals, peace, good order, comfort, convenience, and aesthetics of the unincorporated territory of the county and its present and future inhabitants, businesses, and the general public. A specific purpose of this ordinance is to prevent overcrowding of land and an undue concentration of population. Unincorporated land in Davis County accounts for about 22% of

the land in the community impact analysis area. Most of this land is along the shore of the Great Salt Lake.

**West Central Weber County.** The Vision Statement for west central Weber County includes several elements meant to protect the quality of life of west central Weber County residents. According to the Vision Statement, west central Weber County is a place that values and protects its rural character, lifestyle, and atmosphere. The goals in the Vision Statement that are oriented toward quality of life include managing growth to strike a balance between preservation and development; providing the necessary and desired community services to ensure a high standard of living for residents; encouraging safe, efficient, and varied transportation systems; and maintaining a community that is safe from environmental hazards and criminal activity.

West central Weber County residents were actively involved in updating the municipality's General Plan in a number of ways including a community-wide issues-identification meeting, two community-wide planning workshops, a Draft General Plan public open house, and briefings before the Township Planning Commission and the Weber County Commission. During these opportunities, the community was asked to help identify issues to be addressed in the General Plan. One of the key issues raised was a strong preference to maintain the open agricultural spaces in west central Weber County. Agriculture has been the primary use since the area was settled by Euro-American settlers, and most people said that agriculture should continue to be the highest priority for the area.

A rural atmosphere is the quality that residents most often expressed as desirable. When speaking about rural quality or atmosphere, people wanted to preserve the openness of the area, the right to have farm animals on the property, and the agricultural uses and businesses in the area. The lack of curb and gutter along most streets is regarded as positive.

**Farmington.** The #1 goal for Farmington is to “maintain Farmington as a peaceful, family-oriented, pastoral community.” A second goal is to promote public safety and community security, while a third goal is to broaden recreation opportunities and programs for all citizens. Moreover, in its General Plan, Farmington City recognizes that park and recreation opportunities serve as one of the benchmarks against which the quality of life within a community can be measured and has therefore prioritized parks and open space in the community.

**Kaysville.** According to the Kaysville General Plan, Kaysville is a safe residential community with supporting businesses and public facilities. The residents are family oriented, have a strong commitment to quality education, and enjoy the peaceful lifestyle with a sense of neighborliness and caring that make it an attractive community.

**Syracuse.** Syracuse is known as the “Gateway to Antelope Island.” According to the Syracuse City Master Plan, Syracuse is a community that highly values the preservation of quality of life. Residents of Syracuse have chosen to live there because they enjoy the current quality of life, aesthetics, trails and recreation opportunities, mix of land uses, and patterns of development that the city provides. The agricultural setting has attracted many people to Syracuse including many who don't themselves wish to farm.



**Clearfield.** Clearfield City has developed a 10-year strategic plan called Vision 2020. According to this plan, Clearfield is a clean, attractive, and affordable city with a sound government. A goal of Vision 2020 is to foster residents’ involvement and community awareness through recreation, arts, and education.

**Centerville.** The West Centerville Neighborhood Vision was developed to ensure Centerville’s economic health, quality of life, and effective use of land and development west of I-15. The West Centerville Neighborhood Vision establishes a comprehensive guide to future physical land-use patterns and desired attributes that have been expressed by the neighborhood.

**Riverdale.** The mission statement in Riverdale’s Master Plan is “Uniting citizens and commerce for quality living.” The Master Plan includes several economic, housing, transportation, urban design, and public facility goals. In addition, the Master Plan includes physical goals to protect and preserve the natural environment of Riverdale as well as goals that protect and promote citizens’ health, safety, and welfare.

**Sunset.** The vision statement in Sunset City’s General Plan states that the City will give the community a stable, safe, healthy, caring, and friendly neighborhood. The vision statement states that the City will give particular emphasis to “protecting and enhancing beautification of the city, promoting the local economy, supporting the range of educational opportunities, promoting housing property values, maintaining an effective infrastructure, enhancing leisure activities, and encouraging volunteer opportunities for those who seek greater involvement.”

**West Point.** The West Point City General Plan cites primary objectives of promoting the health and general welfare of city residents, reducing traffic congestion, ensuring safety from fire and other dangers, and introducing an orderly, geographic arrangement of land uses designated to promote overall distribution and growth within the city. The plan goes on to say that “most residents would prefer to maintain a semi-rural atmosphere, but, at the same time, residents must recognize that the city is located in a high-growth area.”

### 5.4.2.3 Safety

Safety is a major contributor to quality of life. Although crimes such as burglary, rape, assault, and auto theft happen in rural areas, they happen less frequently in rural areas than in cities (Duhart 2000). The respondents to the WDC Project survey and focus group attendees specifically cited congestion, lack of street lights, I-15 traffic, lack of west-to-east travel routes, and population growth and resulting traffic issues as problems in the communities.

In an open-ended question on the WDC Project survey, respondents were asked, “What do you like most about the community where you live?” Three percent responded that they felt safe and that there is low crime. Another 12% responded that their community is quiet and peaceful. Twenty-five percent responded that they liked the rural atmosphere.

#### What are residents’ attitudes toward safety and crime?

In general, residents of the community impact analysis area don’t feel that safety and crime are major concerns. In a recent survey, only 1% of respondents said that less crime or more law enforcement would make their community a better place to live.

In addition, in another open-ended question, survey participants were asked what aspects of their community they would like to see changed in the future that would make it a better place to live. Only 1% mentioned less crime and crime prevention or increased police and law enforcement. It's reasonable to assume that the rural, quiet, and peaceful atmosphere contributes to and results in a safe environment.

#### 5.4.2.4 Accessibility

Though more services and shopping areas are becoming available, the WDC Project survey showed that many residents are frustrated with accessibility in the community impact analysis area. Fifty-nine percent of respondents felt that it is "very important" to study transportation issues in Davis and Weber Counties, and 61% believed that transportation in their area needs to be improved.

Twenty-one percent of respondents felt that improved north-south travel is the most important, while 22% felt that improved east-west travel is the most important. Twenty-three percent of respondents felt that improved freeways are very important to their community, while 23% of respondents also felt that improved local streets in their community are very important.

In addition, 48% of survey respondents felt that transportation in their area would become much more of a concern or issue in the future, while 36% felt that it would be somewhat more of a concern or issue in the future. Nine percent of respondents thought that transportation issues would be less of a concern or issue in the future.

Finally, in an open-ended question on the WDC Project survey, participants were asked what aspects of their community they would like to see changed in the future that would make it a better place to live. Eleven percent of respondents made comments about roads or stoplights.

##### **What are residents' attitudes toward accessibility?**

According to a recent survey, a majority of residents of the community impact analysis area feel that addressing transportation issues is "very important." Areas of concern include improved north-south and east-west travel and freeways.

#### 5.4.2.5 Summary of Quality of Life

In summary, most residents of the communities in the community impact analysis area are happy with their quality of life. Quality of life in the impact analysis area is defined by how residents feel about safety, the accessibility of community resources such as shopping centers, the availability of community services such as city services, and the general living environment. During public meetings for the WDC Project, many residents identified safety as an element that contributes to their quality of life.

Additionally, through comments received during public meetings and through the WDC Project website, it's apparent that many people are concerned about their "lifestyle" being changed, which equates to effects on their quality of life. Many people chose to move to the impact analysis area because of the rural feel of the community, which is characterized by fewer residences and lower noise levels. Others enjoy the close proximity to the natural areas in the impact analysis area, such as the Farmington Bay Waterfowl Management Area.

However, they know that the area is changing and that change will make their communities busier places. Many residents still view their rural lifestyle as the most important facet of their quality of life. However, they say that they would be more likely to adapt to community changes if there is an improved roadway system that allows easy access to community services but that doesn't dramatically affect the overall community atmosphere.

### 5.4.3 Recreation Resources

Recreation activities refresh, enliven, and enhance people's quality of life. Recreation facilities provide opportunities for social interaction and are often the focus of a neighborhood or community. The 14 cities in the community impact analysis area are close to many recreation areas including community parks, nature and wildlife preserves, county fair parks, golf courses, and trail systems.

The trail systems and specific considerations related to pedestrians and bicyclists (including trails) are discussed in Chapter 10, Considerations Related to Pedestrians and Bicyclists. In addition, residents enjoy accessibility to the Wasatch Mountains and the shores of the Great Salt Lake.

Community parks are generally built to accommodate field games, court games, playgrounds, and picnicking and are administered by city or county governments. Community events are often held at community parks in the pavilions that are available for rental. In addition to providing places for residents to meet and recreate, local parks are often used for local celebrations and events. The annual Fourth of July celebration at Hooper City Park is one such event, as is the multi-day Sunset City Fun Days held in Sunset's Central Park. The Davis County Legacy Events Center in Farmington hosts the yearly Davis County Fair as well as the annual Great Salt Lake Bird Festival. In addition, equestrian events are held at the events center, and horse boarding is available.

Table 5-1 below lists recreation facilities within 0.5 mile of the proposed alternatives. Figure 5-4, Recreation, in Volume IV shows the recreation resources in the impact analysis area. The WDC Project survey included questions about the importance of community parks and recreation facilities in the project region. Many survey respondents stated that community recreation activities, city parks, and open space are important community aspects. For a discussion of the Farmington City Conservation, Recreation, Wildlife and Waterfowl Refuge and Park, see Chapter 3, Land Use.

#### What recreation resources are available?

Important resources in the community impact analysis area include community parks, nature and wildlife preserves, county fair parks, golf courses, and trail systems. Residents also enjoy accessibility to the Wasatch Mountains and the shores of the Great Salt Lake.

**Table 5-1. Recreation Facilities within 0.5 Mile of the Proposed Alternatives**

Facility Type	Publicly Owned?	Name	Location	Facilities and Activities
Golf course	No	Crane Field Golf Course	2300 North 3800 West, Clinton	18-hole American-type course, driving range
Park	Yes	Kestrel Park	1800 North 3420 West, Clinton	Running track, playground
Nature trail	Yes	Nature Trail	2050 North 2000–3000 West, Clinton	Paved trail system with 9 acres of land
Park	Yes	Farmington Ranches	142 N. Ironside Way, Farmington	11.5 acres, large open lawn area
Park	Yes	Bus Park	400 W. Glovers Ln., Farmington	Two baseball diamonds, large bus parking lot
Park	Yes	1100 West Park	1100 W. Glovers Ln., Farmington	11 acres, grass fields used for soccer
Park	Yes	Spring Creek Park	Spring Creek Subdivision, 1900 West 550 North, Farmington	Pavilion, playground, basketball
Recreation area	No	Great Salt Lake Shorelands Preserve	Southern Syracuse and western Layton	Visitor boardwalk, pavilion, bird-viewing platforms
Recreation area	Yes	Farmington Bay Waterfowl Management Area	1325 W. Glovers Ln., Farmington	17,200 acres, wetland and waterfowl management, hunting during season only
Park	Yes	South Park	1384 S. Frontage Rd., Farmington	Ball diamond, large playing field, volleyball, paved paths, pavilion, skate bowl, basketball, parking
Park	Yes	Sound Wall Park	1050 S. Frontage Rd., Farmington	Junction of paved trails, small mowed lawn area
Park	No	Hunters Creek Park	950 North 2250 West, Farmington	Trail
Park	Yes	Hooper City Park	5500 South 5100 West, Hooper	Pavilion, play equipment, parking, lawns
Park	Yes	Angel Street Soccer Complex	150 S. Angel St., Kaysville	Five soccer fields, playgrounds, picnic area
Park	Yes	Quail Crossing Park	50 East 2200 South, Kaysville	Play equipment, pavilion, trail
Future park	Yes	Kaysville Creek Park	2950 North 1750 West, Kaysville	Undeveloped; land deeded to Kaysville City for park purposes
Future park	Yes	Outwest Park	Near 2600 West 2300 South, Syracuse	Undeveloped; land identified by Syracuse City on recreation plans for future park purposes
Equestrian park	No	Sunset Equestrian Center	1513 S. Equestrian Pkwy., Kaysville	3 miles of pedestrian and equestrian trails, equestrian club, 20 acres of horse boarding and pastures, 25 acres of open space
Park	Yes	Kaysville Creek Park	1700 W. Weaver Ln., Layton	Large, green, open, mowed area
Golf course	No	Glen Eagle Golf Course	1700 South 3176 West, Syracuse	18 holes, driving range, two large ponds
Park	Yes	Canterbury Park	1600 South 2500 West, Syracuse	6 acres, playground, jogging path, athletic fields

*(continued on next page)*

**Table 5-1. Recreation Facilities within 0.5 Mile of the Proposed Alternatives**

Facility Type	Publicly Owned?	Name	Location	Facilities and Activities
Park	Yes	Centennial Park	1800 South 2000 West, Syracuse	5 acres, playground, volleyball courts
Park	Yes	Founders Park	1500 South 1900 West, Syracuse	16 acres, skate park, sports fields, playground, picnic area
Park	Yes	Fremont Park	1950 South 3000 West, Syracuse	41 acres, playground, picnic area, sand volleyball court, soccer fields
Park	Yes	Jensen Nature Park	3176 S. Bluff Rd., Syracuse	20 acres, fishing pond, picnic area, walking paths
Park	Yes	Linda Vista Park	2700 South 1800 West, Syracuse	6 acres, playground, jogging path, athletic fields
Park	Yes	Rock Creek Park	700 South 3850 West, Syracuse	10 acres, playground, picnic area, athletic fields
Equestrian center	Yes	Syracuse Equestrian Center	About 3000 South 2400 West, Syracuse	Outdoor arena, equestrian center
Park	Yes	Arnold T. Bingham Memorial Park	550 North 4550 West, West Point	Running track, sports fields, playground, picnic areas
Park	Yes	Loy F. Blake Park	550 North 3500 West, West Point	Sports fields, playgrounds, pavilions
Golf course	No	Schneider's Bluff Golf Course	300 North 3500 West, West Point	18-hole course linked-style, driving range
Park	Yes	Blair Dahl Park	4800 West 200 South, West Point	Farm field and wetland, bird watching

For more information about trails, see Chapter 10, Considerations Related to Pedestrians and Bicyclists.

For more information about the Great Salt Lake Shorelands Preserve and the Farmington Bay Waterfowl Management Area, see Chapter 14, Ecosystem Resources.

## **5.4.4 Community Facilities**

Community facilities provide opportunities for residents to interact socially. Community facilities generally include (but are not limited to) schools, churches, community centers, libraries, senior centers, and city facilities (such as city halls). A project alternative can result in direct or indirect impacts to these resources. Direct impacts occur when a community facility is physically altered or displaced, while indirect impacts occur when a project alternative results in a population increase that would generate demands for services and affect the delivery of such services.

### **5.4.4.1 Non-school Facilities**

The community impact analysis area is predominantly suburban and includes numerous community facilities. These facilities include churches, libraries, several city offices and city halls, cemeteries, a hospital, and several healthcare centers. Table 5-2 below and Figure 5-5, Non-school Community Facilities, in Volume IV show the non-school community facilities within 0.5 mile of the proposed alternatives. Recreation-related community facilities are discussed in Section 5.4.3, Recreation Resources. Fire, ambulance, and law-enforcement facilities (which might also be community facilities) are discussed in Section 5.4.5, Public Health and Safety.



**Table 5-2. Community Facilities within 0.5 Mile of the Proposed Alternatives**

Type	Name	Address	City
Church	LDS meeting house	14 Bonanza Rd.	Farmington
Church	LDS meeting house	79 South 1525 West	Farmington
Church	LDS meeting house	905 Foxhunter Dr.	Farmington
City offices	Hooper City offices	5580 West 4600 South	Hooper
Cemetery	Hooper Cemetery	5290 South 6300 West	Hooper
Church	LDS meeting house	5000 South 5900 West	Hooper
Church	LDS meeting house	5375 South 5900 West	Hooper
Church	LDS meeting house	5601 South 6100 West	Hooper
Church	LDS meeting house	4979 South 5100 West	Hooper
City offices	Kaysville City offices	23 E. Center St.	Kaysville
Recreation dept.	Kaysville Recreation Dept.	85 North 100 East	Kaysville
Church	Church of Christ	490 S. Angel St.	Kaysville
Church	Kaysville Bible Church	181 N. Flint St.	Kaysville
Church	LDS meeting house	1275 West 200 North	Kaysville
Church	LDS meeting house	1505 Whispering Meadow Ln.	Kaysville
Church	LDS meeting house	1988 South 350 East	Kaysville
Church	LDS meeting house	270 W. Burton Ln.	Kaysville
Church	LDS meeting house	2800 W. Gordon Ave.	Kaysville
Church	LDS meeting house	615 N. Flint St.	Kaysville
Behavioral health	Davis Behavioral Health	2250 North 1700 West	Layton
Church	LDS meeting house	2120 W. Gentile St.	Layton
Church	LDS meeting house	2160 W. Gordon Ave.	Layton
Church	LDS meeting house	3161 West 150 North	Layton
Urgent care	IHC InstaCare	745 South 2000 West	Syracuse
Library	Northwest Branch	1875 South 2000 West	Syracuse
Church	LDS meeting house	1313 South 2500 West	Syracuse
Church	LDS meeting house	1600 South 4500 West	Syracuse
Church	LDS meeting house	2500 S. Bluff Rd.	Syracuse
Church	LDS meeting house	3267 West 700 South	Syracuse
Church	LDS meeting house	497 South 2000 West	Syracuse
Church	LDS meeting house	702 South 2500 West	Syracuse
City offices	West Haven City offices	4150 South 3900 West	West Haven
Church	LDS meeting house	3826 South 2700 West	West Haven
City offices	West Point City offices	3200 West 300 North	West Point
Cemetery	West Point Memorial Cemetery	40 North 4000 West	West Point
Church	LDS meeting house	400 North 3500 West	West Point
Church	LDS meeting house	550 North 2300 West	West Point
Church	Christ Community Evangelical Free Church	2941 West 800 North	West Point
Church	LDS meeting house	2852 West 300 North	West Point
Church	LDS meeting house	2855 West 800 North	West Point
Church	LDS meeting house	3488 West 300 North	West Point
Church	LDS meeting house	4383 West 300 North	West Point
Church	LDS meeting house	855 North 4000 West	West Point

### 5.4.4.2 Schools

As shown in Table 5-3 and in Figure 5-6, Schools, in Volume IV, there are many existing public and private schools within 0.5 mile of the proposed alternatives. Residents are concerned with the safety of schoolchildren who currently walk to school.

Officials from the Syracuse Arts Academy, located at 2893 West 1700 South in Syracuse, have said that they are concerned with the safety of their students who walk to school.

Finally, other commenters have stated concerns regarding some of the schools that would be near the proposed WDC alternatives, citing not only safety concerns about walking to school but also health concerns from reduced air quality as well as impacts from noise and vibration.

**Table 5-3. Schools within 0.5 Mile of the Proposed Alternatives**

School Name	Grade Level	Public/Private	Address	City
Buffalo Point Elementary	Elementary	Public	1924 S. Doral Dr.	Syracuse
Eagle Bay Elementary	Elementary	Public	100 North 1933 West	Farmington
Endeavour Elementary	Elementary	Public	1870 South 25 West	Kaysville
Hooper Elementary	Elementary	Public	5500 South 5900 West	Hooper
Island View School	Secondary	Private	2650 West 2700 South	Syracuse
Oquirrh Mountain Charter School	K-9	Public/charter	1425 S. Angel St.	Kaysville
Syracuse Arts Academy	K-9	Public/charter	2893 West 1700 South	Syracuse
Syracuse Elementary	Elementary	Public	1503 South 2000 West	Syracuse
Syracuse High	Secondary	Public	665 South 2000 West	Syracuse
Syracuse Junior High	Middle	Public	1450 South 2000 West	Syracuse
West Point Elementary	Elementary	Public	3788 West 300 North	West Point
Canyon Creek Elementary	Elementary	Public	700 South 950 West	Farmington
Future Farmington High School	Secondary	Public	475 W Glovers Lane	Farmington
Kays Creek Elementary	Elementary	Public	2400 West 200 North	Kaysville
Future Layton Junior High	Middle	Public	1100 Westside Dr.	Layton
Future West Point Junior High	Middle	Public	700 North 4000 West	West Point
Future West Point Elementary	Elementary	Public	400 North 4300 West	West Point
Future West Point High School	Secondary	Public	5000 West 1800 North	West Point

K-9 = kindergarten through ninth grade

### 5.4.5 Public Health and Safety

Police services, fire protection, and ambulance services in the community impact analysis area are typically provided by combined jurisdictions. Police and fire services in the impact analysis area are provided by county sheriff's departments, county fire departments, city police departments, or city fire departments, depending on whether the community is in an incorporated or unincorporated area of the county. The county departments often serve small incorporated cities as well.

Emergency medical services and ambulance services are provided by local ambulance services or by the fire departments. The 911-dispatch service is usually provided at the county level by a countywide 911-dispatch center. Because the cities are close to each other and their

fire departments are fairly small, each city has cooperative agreements with other cities to provide assistance when needed. Table 5-4 and Figure 5-7, Public Health and Safety Providers, in Volume IV show the law enforcement and fire protection facilities within 0.5 mile of the proposed alternatives.

**Table 5-4. Law Enforcement and Fire Protection Facilities within 0.5 Mile of the Proposed Alternatives**

Type	Name	Address	City
Sheriff	Davis County Sheriff	800 W. State St.	Farmington
Police	West Point City Police Dept.	800 W. State St.	Farmington
Fire	Syracuse Fire Dept.	1869 South 3000 West	Syracuse
Police	Syracuse Police Dept.	1751 South 2000 West	Syracuse

### 5.4.6 Public Services and Utilities

The availability of public services and utilities helps define the social environment. The more services are available, the more densely settled a community is likely to be. Physical impacts to public services and utilities can affect the social environment, especially as they relate to convenience. Several utilities—electric, natural gas, water, storm drains, and sanitary sewer—are adjacent to or cross the proposed alternatives.

#### What utilities are present?

The community impact analysis area includes high-pressure natural gas lines, high-voltage electric transmission lines, and culinary water and sewer lines.

Six companies have major utilities parallel or perpendicular to the proposed alternatives and within the community impact analysis area: Rocky Mountain Power Transmission, Questar HP, Jordan Valley Water Conservancy District, Weber Basin Water Conservancy District, North Davis Sewer District, and Central Davis Sewer District.

The compiled data show that a geographic area surrounding Hooper lacks reported utilities. All six utility companies were contacted regarding this area in Hooper, and all reported that they did not have any transmission lines or facilities in Hooper. Hooper City owns and operates its own sewer system (including a vacuum system), the Hooper Water Improvement District owns and operates the culinary water system, and the Hooper Irrigation Company owns and operates the pressure irrigation system.

The following facilities are present along or cross the community impact analysis area:

- Questar HP operates several high-pressure natural gas lines including a line that runs north-south between the northern boundary of the WDC study area (3000 South in Weber County) and 4000 South in Hooper between SR 134 and SR 108. Another high-pressure gas line runs parallel with 1900 West; this line starts at 12th South in south Marriott-Slaterville/West Haven, runs south to I-15 just south of 5600 West in Roy, and then parallels I-15 within the impact analysis area. Two horizontal high-pressure gas lines spur off this main line and run west at about SR 37 in Sunset and at about SR 193 in Clearfield.

- Rocky Mountain Power Transmission has several electric transmission lines running north-south between 3000 South at the northern boundary of the WDC study area to the southern end of the study area in Centerville. There are two high-voltage lines that consist of 230-kilovolt and 345-kilovolt systems. Structures for these high-voltage lines are generally single steel poles or wooden H-frames. There are also two lower-voltage transmission lines (46-kilovolt and 138-kilovolt) in the impact analysis area. Structures for these lower-voltage systems are generally single-pole structures of wood or steel.
- The Jordan Valley Water Conservancy District is a wholesaler of water to cities and improvement districts. The Jordan Valley Water Conservancy District has purchased right-of-way for a future water pipeline that starts in West Haven and runs south through Roy, Clinton, Clearfield, and Layton and ends near I-15 north of Farmington.
- The Weber Basin Water Conservancy District is northern Utah's regional water supplier. The Weber Basin Water Conservancy District has various-sized drains and pipelines running in both directions throughout the impact analysis area. The District owns and operates the Layton Canal.
- The North Davis Sewer District owns and operates about 100 miles of sewer collection lines that convey and deliver wastewater to its treatment facility in Syracuse. The North Davis Sewer District has sewer pipelines running in both directions between the southern tip of West Haven to the north and Kaysville to the south in the impact analysis area. The North Davis Sewer District property is about 500 acres.
- The Central Davis Sewer District serves the Farmington and Kaysville areas. The Central Davis Sewer District has sewer pipelines running in both directions in the Farmington and Kaysville areas of the impact analysis area. The Central Davis Sewer District property is about 225 acres.
- The Hooper Irrigation Company has provided the city of Hooper's irrigation water for over 100 years. The company owns and operates the Hooper Canal and provides a pressurized irrigation system.

## 5.4.7 Housing and Relocations

Single-family housing is the predominant type of residence in the community impact analysis area. Much of the housing is in subdivisions.

For residential relocations, the ability of residents to relocate in a given area depends partially on the housing market conditions in the area. The following section provides an overview of the current housing and rental market in the project region. The purpose of this information is to provide project decision-makers with an understanding of the available housing market so that they can manage any housing impacts associated with the project.

### 5.4.7.1 Housing Market Conditions

Property values nationally and in Utah increased until 2008 and declined in 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011. Table 5-5 shows the median sales values from 2010 to 2016 for cities and ZIP codes in the community impact analysis area.

**Table 5-5. Median Sales Values in the Community Impact Analysis Area**

in \$

City and ZIP Code	2010 <sup>a</sup>	2011 <sup>a</sup>	2012 <sup>a</sup>	2013 <sup>a</sup>	2014 <sup>a</sup>	2015 <sup>a</sup>	2016 <sup>a</sup>
Clearfield 84015 <sup>b</sup>	168,750	149,950	154,062	167,500	177,500	191,750	215,775
Centerville 84014	238,000	237,000	235,500	261,000	240,000	265,000	314,900
Farmington 84025	278,435	240,000	274,900	300,750	325,000	340,000	377,000
Kaysville 84037	260,000	242,000	246,400	265,000	301,700	309,452	341,850
Layton 84040	220,500	206,805	242,000	253,484	249,000	273,500	293,500
Layton 84041	187,000	155,100	187,375	193,000	198,250	214,950	226,500
Syracuse 84075	212,000	206,300	230,000	246,000	250,000	275,000	313,250
Riverdale 84405	141,000	157,400	162,500	154,999	171,250	174,500	218,500
Roy 84067	148,000	135,000	140,000	155,000	168,000	174,800	195,000
Hooper 84315	224,900	205,000	257,300	270,000	255,000	277,500	325,000
West Haven 84401 <sup>b</sup>	153,280	131,500	120,500	144,500	148,100	179,450	188,450

<sup>a</sup> Source: The Salt Lake Tribune 2017

<sup>b</sup> The sales values reported by *The Salt Lake Tribune* are grouped by ZIP code. Clinton and West Point share a ZIP code with Clearfield (84015), and West Haven shares a ZIP code with Ogden (84401).

Housing availability data from the Wasatch Front Multiple Listing Service were also reviewed. These data are presented by ZIP code, and some ZIP codes cover more than one city. In particular, Clearfield, Clinton, Sunset, and West Point share the same ZIP code (84015).

As of January 2017, within the 84015 ZIP code that encompasses Clearfield, Clinton, Sunset, and West Point, there were 160 residential properties available ranging in price from \$135,000 for a single-family home in Clinton to \$544,000 for a single-family home in Clinton. There were also 47 properties available in Farmington, 76 properties in Kaysville, 161 properties in the two ZIP codes in Layton, 106 properties in Syracuse, 98 properties in Roy, 30 properties in Hooper, and 128 properties in the 84401 ZIP code in West Haven and Ogden (Wasatch Front Multiple Listing Service 2017).

### 5.4.7.2 Housing Conditions

In 2005, the Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC), which is the metropolitan planning organization for the Wasatch Front Urban Area, conducted a “windshield study” (a drive-through assessment) of housing conditions in Davis and Weber Counties. For this study, representatives from WFRC first met with city and county representatives (mayors, commissioners, planners, engineers, and community and economic development personnel). Each representative identified the areas with dilapidated and deteriorated homes and/or neighborhoods in his or her community. Once these areas were identified on a map, representatives from WFRC drove through the areas to tally each of the dilapidated or deteriorated homes. Table 5-6 provides an overview of the housing conditions in the community impact analysis area.

**Table 5-6. Single-Family Housing Conditions in the Community Impact Analysis Area**

City <sup>b</sup>	Total	Housing Condition <sup>a</sup>			
		New	Acceptable	Deteriorated	Dilapidated
Centerville	4,280	450	3,800	30	0
Farmington	3,693	994	2,658	37	4
Kaysville	6,318	831	4,807	37	4
Syracuse	4,539	2,464	2,030	42	3
Clinton	5,176	1,700	3,501	55	12
West Point	2,000	377	1,294	28	3
Roy	12,239	1,302	10,903	26	8
Riverdale	2,970	174	2,756	39	1
Sunset	1,832	17	1,799	14	10
Hooper	1,519	234	1,260	21	4
West Haven	1,279	250	1,018	10	1

Source: WFRC 2005

<sup>a</sup> Housing conditions are defined as follows:

- New homes appear to have been constructed within the last 5 years.
- Acceptable homes have no visible signs of deterioration. These homes need minimal to moderate rehabilitation.
- Deteriorated homes have visible signs of deterioration. These homes are inhabitable but need minimal or moderate rehabilitation.
- Dilapidated homes are considered uninhabitable but might still be inhabited. These types of homes need major rehabilitations or complete replacement.

<sup>b</sup> Data for Clearfield and Layton were not available.



### 5.4.7.3 Businesses and Public Facilities

Businesses and public facilities in the community impact analysis area are more highly concentrated in areas where there is a higher population.

- Within the Davis County part of the impact analysis area, the largest employers are Lifetime Products, Inc.; Smith’s Marketplace Distribution Center; Davis Hospital and Medical Center; and Utility Trailer Manufacturing Company (see Figure 1-4, Percent Employment Growth 2015–2040, in Volume IV).
- Within the Weber County part of the impact analysis area, the largest employers are Autoliv, Focus Services, and William International Company, all of which are identified in Figure 1-4.

#### Where are the major areas of employment located?

Within the community impact analysis area, most areas of employment are concentrated around I-15 and its interchanges, SR 126 and SR 108, Freeport Center in Clearfield, and the Ogden Commercial and Industrial Park.

Another important employment center in the impact analysis area is Freeport Center in Clearfield. Freeport Center is the largest distribution center in Utah (Davis County, no date). More than 70 companies, with over 7,000 associated employees, operate out of Freeport Center (Freeport Center, no date).

Most areas of employment are located in areas with industrial, manufacturing, commercial, or institutional land uses. Within the community impact analysis area, these industrial, manufacturing, commercial, and institutional land uses are concentrated around I-15 and its interchanges, SR 126 and SR 108, Freeport Center, and the Ogden Commercial and Industrial Park. Most of the industrial and manufacturing employment areas are located within 1 mile of I-15, either around an I-15 interchange, along SR 126, at Freeport Center, or at the Ogden Commercial and Industrial Park. The SR 108 corridor consists primarily of commercial employment areas at the intersections of SR 108 and east-west-running state routes (SR 107, SR 37, SR 97, 4800 South/Midland Drive, 400 South, and SR 126).

Farmington City has developed the Station Park development, which has become a major commercial center in south Davis County. Station Park includes a mix of residential, commercial, and office developments. Farmington City is in the process of expanding the development to the north; this area will include more residential and office buildings.

Although the areas listed above are the primary employment areas in the WDC study area, it is worth noting that only 33% of the 2015 home-based work trips in the WDC study area are internal, meaning that 67% people who live in the WDC study area commute to work outside the study area. For detailed information about travel patterns and home-based work trips in the WDC study area, see Section 1.7.3, Travel Patterns.

## 5.5 Environmental Consequences

This section analyzes the expected direct and indirect impacts to the social environment 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.

As stated in Section 5.3, Methodology, community facilities and parcel data were added to an electronic map file. These data were examined during the impact analysis for community cohesion, quality of life, recreation resources, public facilities, utilities, public safety services, and relocation impacts. Each alternative (and the associated right-of-way) was overlaid on the electronic map file to determine which recreation resources, buildings, or facilities would be directly affected and which recreation resources, buildings, or facilities would be adjacent to the proposed alternatives. (Trail impacts are discussed in Chapter 10, Considerations Related to Pedestrians and Bicyclists. Impacts to the Farmington City Conservation, Recreation, Wildlife and Waterfowl Refuge and Park are described in Chapter 3, Land Use.)

Impacts were calculated or quantified for any facilities that would be completely acquired or for which a partial property acquisition (strip take) would be necessary. Other impacts, such as those to community cohesion and quality of life, were evaluated on both a qualitative level and in quantitative terms by analyzing how some community facilities would be affected by the alternatives.

### 5.5.1 No-Action Alternative

With the No-Action Alternative, the WDC would not be constructed. With both the No-Action and action alternatives, the social environment would generally continue to be affected by ongoing change and population and development growth in the region. This continued growth would change the rural nature of the area.

Further, the No-Action Alternative is not compatible with regional transportation goals and plans. If transportation improvements do not keep pace with continued population and development growth, the cohesive nature of the communities could decline as congestion increases, despite the strong attachments within and between the existing neighborhoods and communities. No other transportation projects are planned as a result of the WDC not being built even if congestion increases, and this lack of other transportation projects would further contribute to a decline in community cohesion and quality of life in the area.

The availability of recreation resources, community facilities, housing, and public services would not change, although access to community facilities, workplaces, homes, and areas of commerce would become more difficult and less convenient without improvements to the transportation system. There is the potential for slower response times from police, ambulance, and fire-protection services with the increased congestion that would occur with the No-Action Alternative. Increases in other services, such as the construction of new

homes, recreation, and medical facilities, would be consistent with the Cities' adopted plans and the anticipated population and development growth in the region.

### 5.5.1.1 Community Cohesion

Many factors contribute to community cohesion, including the connectivity of the physical community and social interactions. With the No-Action Alternative, school and church boundaries and a general familiarity with the neighborhoods would continue to foster social interactions and cohesiveness, and more-cohesive districts would develop in the newer communities over time.

#### What is travel demand?

Travel demand is the expected number of transportation trips in an area. Travel demand can be met by various modes of travel such as automobile, bus, commuter rail, carpooling, and bicycling.

The planned transportation improvements identified in the WFRC Regional Transportation Plan 2015–2040 with both the No-Action and action alternatives independent of the WDC would not change the cohesive nature of communities in the community impact analysis area. However, if the transportation improvements do not meet the travel demand due to increased population and development, the cohesive nature of the communities could decline as congestion increases.

### 5.5.1.2 Quality of Life

With the No-Action and action alternatives, jurisdictions in the community impact analysis area would continue to grow and develop as specified in the land-use and general plans for each of the Cities and Counties and as identified in the WFRC Regional Transportation Plan 2015–2040. As part of the anticipated future population growth, the residential and commercial development in the area would continue, although, according to city planners, the predominant development pattern would be single-family residential (West Davis Corridor Team 2012). This development would result in increased opportunities for recreation, shopping, and other community services and activities.

Other transportation facilities would be developed with both the No-Action and action alternatives independent of the WDC as specified in the WFRC Regional Transportation Plan. However, without the WDC, as described in Section 1.7.2.2, Level of Service, by 2040, roads throughout the region will become more congested as more people move into the area and the population continues to grow. Because congestion would continue to increase with the No-Action Alternative, residents' quality of life would continue to be affected by transportation issues.

In addition, the continued development growth would likely contribute to a further reduction in open space and farmland and a loss of the rural and small-town lifestyles that many local residents value and wish could be preserved. Overall, the general quality of life is expected to diminish as the area becomes more urban and as a result of increased congestion and the loss of the rural feel of the area.

### **5.5.1.3 Recreation Resources**

With the No-Action Alternative, recreation facilities would continue to be managed according to the recreation plans and policies for each jurisdiction. No recreation facilities are expected to be removed, and amenities such as playground equipment or picnic shelters could be added or replaced as needed and as determined by each recreation service provider.

### **5.5.1.4 Community Facilities**

With the No-Action Alternative, existing community facilities would be maintained. As the population of Davis and Weber Counties continues to grow, additional community facilities could be constructed as determined by each jurisdiction. As described in Chapter 23, Indirect Effects, several community facilities, such as the future high school in West Point at about 5000 West and 1800 North, are planned with or without the WDC.

### **5.5.1.5 Public Health and Safety**

Construction of roadway and transit projects specified in the WFRC Regional Transportation Plan that would occur independent of the WDC with both the No-Action and action alternatives could improve traffic flow in the community impact analysis area, which should result in fewer traffic accidents. However, even with these improvements, the amount of traffic delay will increase between 2015 and 2040 as the population of the region grows. This increase in delay could decrease the mobility of emergency responders and consequently increase emergency response times.

### **5.5.1.6 Public Services and Utilities**

With the No-Action Alternative, normal and necessary utility maintenance needed to supply service to utility customers would continue. Regional population growth could also require the construction of new facilities needed to serve planned development. Activities associated with such development could physically affect utilities.

### **5.5.1.7 Housing and Relocations**

With the No-Action Alternative, there would be no relocations as a result of the WDC Project.

## 5.5.2 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 5-7.

**Table 5-7. Components of Alternatives A1–A2**

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

Provided below is the community impact analysis for the cities that would be affected by Alternatives A1 and A2. From south to north, these cities are Farmington, Kaysville, Layton, Syracuse, West Point, West Haven, and Hooper. Table 5-8 summarizes the community impacts from Alternatives A1 and A2.

**Table 5-8. Community Impacts from Alternatives A1–A2**

Alternative	Recreation Resources <sup>a</sup>	Community Facilities	Public Health and Safety Providers	Public Services and Utilities	Relocations <sup>b</sup>	Potential Relocations <sup>c</sup>	Business Strip Takes <sup>d</sup>
A1 – Glovers Lane/4100 W	3	1	0	7	30	1	5
A2 – Glovers Lane/5400 W	3	2 <sup>e</sup>	0	8	35	3	5

<sup>a</sup> The recreation resources category does not include impacts to trails (see Chapter 10, Considerations Related to Pedestrians and Bicyclists).

<sup>b</sup> The total number of relocations includes residential properties, platted residential properties, vacant residential properties, commercial properties, and agricultural business properties. For a list of specific relocations, see Appendix 5A, Relocations and Potential Relocations in the Community Impact Analysis Area.

<sup>c</sup> The potential relocations category includes only residential properties. There would not be any potential impacts to non-residential properties from the WDC Final EIS alternatives. For a list of specific potential relocations, see Appendix 5A, Relocations and Potential Relocations in the Community Impact Analysis Area.

<sup>d</sup> The total number of business strip takes includes impacts to businesses that are located within the proposed right-of-way but would not be required to be relocated. No primary business structures would be affected. Strip takes are not considered relocations. Only strip takes for agricultural and non-agricultural businesses are included. Residential strip takes are not shown in this table but are included in Appendix 5A.

<sup>e</sup> One of the two impacts is a planned high school, not an existing facility.

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

#### **Impacts to Community Cohesion**

Generally, the effects on community cohesion from roadway projects occur when an alignment disrupts (that is, creates a new edge in) an existing subdivision or neighborhood, since these residential areas typically tend to be cohesive within themselves as well as cohesive with neighboring communities. The greatest impact to community cohesion from Alternative A1 would be to established neighborhoods and HOA subdivisions, particularly Bridgeway Island in Syracuse, which would be severed by the alternative and would therefore have a new edge. Alternative A1 would require the total relocation of at least 19 residences in the Bridgeway Island subdivision.

Members of the Bridgeway Island HOA have told UDOT that this impact could be large enough to cause the HOA to go bankrupt, since the HOA is relatively small and relies on all of the membership dues it collects from current homeowners. Because their neighborhood would be severed by Alternative A1, it's reasonable to assume that the existing sense of community that the Bridgeway Island residents currently feel would be lost, since the subdivision would no longer feel like a single unit. Moreover, if the HOA were to go bankrupt, it's reasonable to assume that the effects from this and the impact to community cohesion would be long-term.

Alternative A1 would affect the open space associated with both the Knighton subdivision and Sunset Equestrian Estates in Kaysville. Although no homes would be relocated, the alternative would come close to the horse-boarding facility associated with Sunset Equestrian Estates and would affect a smaller outbuilding and corrals on the southern edge of the parcel for the horse-boarding facility. However, since impacts would be to the edge of the subdivision, the alternative's impacts aren't likely to divide the community. Although the alternative would split the Knighton subdivision in Farmington, no homes would be affected, though a swath of open space and farmland would be acquired.

Overall, it is unlikely that Alternative A1 would affect other aspects of neighborhood and community cohesion such as the length of residency, the presence of families, or community leadership and activism in the cities along the alignment. Alternative A1 could positively contribute to quality of life if families find the communities easier to navigate and want to stay in the area for many years.

About 25 residences would be subject to relocation along Alternative A1, while 1 additional residence would potentially require relocation. This could affect local, or neighborhood, cohesion by altering both formal relationships, such as neighborhood associations, and informal relationships, such as friendships. However, because there is adequate housing available in the communities for the relocated residents, for the most part the anticipated relocations are not expected to have long-term effects on local cohesiveness, since presumably the people whose homes are acquired could be relocated within the same neighborhoods or close by. An exception to this could be the Bridgeway Island HOA in Syracuse. As described at the beginning of this section, members of the Bridgeway Island HOA have told UDOT that this impact could be large enough to cause the HOA to go



bankrupt. If this were to occur, it is likely that the existing sense of community that the Bridgeway Island residents currently feel would be lost, since the subdivision would no longer operate as a single unit.

Alternative A1 would reduce community cohesion among the farmers in the community impact analysis area since it would convert a substantial amount of farmland to a non-agricultural use (the most farmland impacts of all the action alternatives). Four agricultural businesses would be subject to relocation along Alternative A1. Additionally, some farmers might discontinue farming, and, if they sell their land, they might lose some of the camaraderie they currently experience by being part of the close-knit farming community.

### **Impacts to Quality of Life**

Alternative A1 would swing around the westernmost edge of the Farmington Ranches subdivision and would cut through part of the westernmost open space/conservation area in the Farmington Meadows subdivision as well as through open space/farmland in the Knighton subdivision. Many of the people who live in these subdivisions enjoy the open space surrounding their homes and the convenient access to the Farmington Bay Waterfowl Management Area, which is south of both subdivisions. Alternative A1 would be between the Farmington Bay Waterfowl Management Area and these subdivisions and would change the setting of the subdivisions to the west, which would reduce the residents' quality of life.

The same effect would occur as the alternative runs north into Kaysville and borders the Suncrest Meadow, Suncrest Park, and Webster Farms subdivisions. Homes on Viewcrest Drive and Wellington Lane would be about a tenth of a mile (528 feet) from the new highway. The highway would separate these neighborhoods from the Great Salt Lake Shorelands Preserve and would disrupt the rural quality of life currently enjoyed by residents of these neighborhoods.

Similar issues would arise at the Pheasant Brook and Schick Farm subdivisions in Kaysville; the Bluff Ridge, Kays Creek, Island View Ridge, and Kershaw Estates subdivisions in Layton; and the Harmony Bluff Estates subdivision in Syracuse as Alternative A1 continues north. Alternative A1 would also change the quality of life of residents from rural to more suburban in the communities of Syracuse and West Point. More direct property impacts and similar quality of life effects would also occur at the Bridgeway Island subdivision in Syracuse, as well as at other smaller subdivisions located along the alternative as described in the section titled Impacts to Community Cohesion on page 5-38 and as shown in Figures 5-1 and 5-2, Subdivisions and Neighborhoods, in Volume IV.

Other quality of life concerns of residents in the impact analysis area include general concerns about effects on air quality, concerns about dividing existing communities and affecting the quality of life within the communities, effects on HOAs if less revenue is collected either because homes are relocated or because open space preserved for future homes is converted to roadway use, effects on community facilities, the need to recognize the importance of farmland, the preservation of open space, and increased noise.

For some neighborhoods, increased noise from the new highway would be an issue and could affect quality of life. Varying levels of noise impacts would occur to neighborhoods along

Alternative A1, with the neighborhoods closest to the highway having the highest noise levels. In general, in areas where there is currently no existing road, noise levels are about 50 to 55 dBA (decibels on the A-weighted scale). With Alternative A1, residents with a direct view of the highway from their home would experience a substantial noise increase of about 10 dBA over existing noise levels. For more information regarding noise impacts, see Chapter 12, Noise.

Alternative A1 could contribute to a sense among residents that their rural lifestyle is being lost, especially because of its impacts to farmland and open space compared to other alternatives, but the alternative would not be the sole cause of the loss of farmland and open space. According to comments received throughout the project, development growth is seen as a big detractor from quality of life in the impact analysis area. Development is occurring in this area and is likely already affecting the lifestyle there. This development is expected to occur with or without the WDC. Alternative A1 would improve travel within the communities and would provide more access to nearby services, thereby enhancing quality of life.

Alternative A1 would not affect the growth of residential and commercial development. According to city planners, the cities are expected to continue developing with or without the WDC (West Davis Corridor Team 2012). Planners for every city in the impact analysis area agree that roadway improvements could affect the rate at which new development occurs during the study period (2011 to 2040), but, for the most part, the improvements would not affect the amounts of development that are already anticipated. The only exception is that some city planners thought that lower-density residential development would be more likely in some areas without the WDC, but with the WDC areas around proposed interchanges would likely develop with higher-density residential and commercial uses. Alternative A1 would remove some traffic from local and neighborhood streets, which would also improve neighborhood safety.

Recreation is an important part of quality of life. There are several recreation facilities along Alternative A1 from which land would be required, including Glen Eagle Golf Course in Syracuse, South Park in Farmington, and the Farmington City 1100 West Park. The Farmington City 1100 West Park would likely require full relocation. Depending on where the park is relocated and how accessible it is to residents, the loss of this community resource could affect the quality of life of local residents who use the park.

Alternative A1 would affect some natural resources and farmland (see Chapter 4, Farmland, and Chapter 14, Ecosystem Resources), and therefore the overall natural environment that is experienced by residents and that contributes to quality of life would change if this alternative is constructed. The natural beauty of the area comes from features such as the Great Salt Lake and associated wetlands. However, the Great Salt Lake Shorelands Preserve and various conservation easements are in place, which prohibit development in the floodplains and would help retain the look and feel of the impact analysis area. However, if Alternative A1 is selected, the conservation easements in Farmington (see Chapter 3, Land Use) would be affected. These conservation easements provide trails, open space, and a natural environment area to the residents of Farmington. This impact would reduce the quality of life for the residents that use this area.

Beauty also comes from the rural, agricultural lifestyle in the impact analysis area. People currently living this agricultural lifestyle are experiencing change as a result of urbanization, but this change will continue regardless of transportation improvements such as the WDC. Therefore, although Alternative A1 could contribute to a degradation of residents' quality of life, the rural lifestyle is already changing and will continue to do so with or without the WDC.

## Impacts to Recreation Resources

Alternative A1 would directly affect two existing parks and one golf course. Potential impacts to the recreational value of the Farmington City conservation easements are described in Chapter 3, Land Use.

- **Glen Eagle Golf Course, Syracuse (strip take of 0.8 acre).** Alternative A1 would require a strip take along the southwestern edge of the course. The strip take would not affect facilities or tee boxes, and the overall function of the golf course would not be lost. UDOT has coordinated with the owners of Glen Eagle Golf Course and has determined that the function of the golf course can be maintained through the mitigation process provided through the federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act for the loss of property and facilities.
- **South Park, Farmington (strip take of 0.08 acre).** Alternative A1 would require a strip take of the western boundary of the park adjacent to the frontage road. The strip take would remove the park sign but would not affect any park facilities. UDOT would work with Farmington City to replace the park sign.
- **1100 West Park, Farmington (strip take of about 6 acres).** Alternative A1 would require a strip take of about 6 acres of the middle part of the 11-acre park. The impacts would be substantial enough that the day-to-day operation of the park used for recreation would be adversely affected.

All of the impacts would involve acquiring property needed for roadway right-of-way. The Farmington City 1100 West Park would need to be relocated because the impacts would be substantial enough that the day-to-day operation of the park used for recreation would be adversely affected. Aside from that park needing to be fully relocated, Alternative A1 would not cause any long-term, permanent adverse effects on the remaining two existing recreation resources affected by strip takes. UDOT is coordinating with the owners of the golf course to ensure that mitigation measures are provided to maintain the function of the course. Impacts to the Farmington City conservation easements are discussed in Chapter 3, Land Use. The WDC Project would affect the conservation easements but would not affect the recreational trails within the easements. Public access to the easements is restricted except for the trails.

For some recreation facilities, increased noise from the new highway would be an issue. In general, in areas where there is currently no existing road, noise levels are about 50 to 55 dBA. With Alternative A1, recreation resources could experience a substantial noise increase of about 10 dBA over existing noise levels. However, it is unlikely that the traffic noise from the new highway would interfere with the uses at the recreation resources in the impact analysis area, since the primary uses include golf, ball fields, and playgrounds, which

are not eligible for noise mitigation. For more information regarding noise impacts, see Chapter 12, Noise. For more information regarding impacts to the Great Salt Lake Shorelands Preserve and the Farmington Bay Waterfowl Management Area, including noise impacts, see Chapter 14, Ecosystem Resources.

***Impacts to Hunting, Fishing, or Bird-Watching Areas.*** The WDC action alternatives would not prohibit or restrict access to the Great Salt Lake, the Farmington Bay Waterfowl Management Area, the Great Salt Lake Shorelands Preserve, or Antelope Island. Conversely, access to these areas could be enhanced by the WDC alternatives, so the WDC is not expected to decrease tourism. Impacts to the Great Salt Lake ecosystem, the Farmington Bay Waterfowl Management Area, and the Great Salt Lake Shorelands Preserve are described in Chapter 14, Ecosystem Resources.

### **Impacts to Community Facilities**

Based on coordination with the Davis County School District, Alternative A1 would not directly affect the proposed Farmington High School on Glovers Lane near I-15. However, the relocation of 1100 West around the WDC could affect Canyon Creek Elementary School in Farmington. About 50 square feet of the southwest corner of the 3.5-acre school playing field would be affected by the relocated 1100 West, but the overall use of the field could continue. None of the school's access points would be affected. The WDC alignment would be about 450 feet from the nearest school building.

Alternative A1 would not affect the elementary school planned for Kaysville near the WDC 200 North interchange or a future junior high school in Layton on Westside Drive.

### **Impacts to Public Health and Safety**

Alternative A1 would not directly affect any public health and safety service providers. The increased transportation accessibility and safety benefits from this alternative would enhance emergency service providers' mobility, which could in turn improve response times.

During the EIS process, the public raised concerns about safety issues related to increased traffic and a new roadway facility. The WDC would be designed in accordance with the latest safety guidelines from UDOT and the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO). This design would include maintaining existing roadway connections under or over the WDC with appropriate sidewalks as well as fencing the WDC with appropriate safety zones to ensure the safety of pedestrians and drivers. The guidelines have been developed over the years by transportation engineers and take into account the type of roadway facility, vehicle speed, and amount of traffic expected.

As stated in Chapter 7, Transportation, there would be a substantial reduction in daily delay, lane-miles in congestion, vehicle-miles traveled in congestion, and vehicle-hours traveled in congestion in the WDC study area with Alternatives A1 and A2 compared to the No-Action Alternative. Overall, Alternatives A1 and A2 would provide similar improvements and would substantially improve regional mobility in 2040 compared to the No-Action Alternative. The

safety elements of this roadway facility would be designed considering the type of roadway, amount of traffic, and vehicle speed.

One key element is the overall right-of-way width. The right-of-way would be a maximum of 250 feet wide (where the WDC is a four-lane divided highway) and a minimum of 146 feet wide (where the WDC is a two-lane highway). Much of this width is a safety buffer to prevent errant vehicles from leaving the right-of-way and going onto adjacent property. In addition, UDOT would provide roadway fences to ensure that pedestrians can't access the highway. All interchanges and associated ramps and roadway connections would follow the same safety guidelines.

During the EIS process, residents who live on Glovers Lane in Farmington stated that heavy fog occurs in the area and that it could present a travel hazard for vehicles using the WDC in this area. The WDC team's review of weather data found no specific information about fog along Glovers Lane in Farmington. Fog data are kept by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration National Weather Service's Weather Forecast Office near the Salt Lake City International Airport. The airport has a similar geographic setting as Glovers Lane in Farmington with similar nearby wetlands and saturated soils. Both locations are adjacent to the Great Salt Lake.

According to the National Weather Service, the mean number of days with heavy fog (visibility less than or equal to 0.25 mile) at the airport reporting station is 11.8 days per year. The foggiest months are December through February, and the other months have few to no fog events. Other major highways in Utah are located in similar areas, highways including Legacy Parkway, Interstate 80 (I-80) west of the Salt Lake City International Airport, and I-15 near Willard Bay in Utah. Therefore, the WDC team does not expect that fog along the WDC Glovers Lane Option would pose an increased safety risk compared to other highways in similar settings in Utah.

If an incident occurs on the WDC, interchanges to the highway would provide access for emergency vehicles. The spacing between most interchanges is about 2 miles except for the segment of the WDC between 950 North in Kaysville and the next exit to the south in Centerville to I-15 or Legacy Parkway, a distance of about 7 miles. UDOT would work with local emergency providers to provide access to the WDC in this segment.

Some residents in the communities surrounding the WDC alignments are concerned that the WDC could increase crime in their neighborhoods. The WDC would be a limited-access highway designed mostly to serve traffic from the surrounding communities, so it would not allow non-residents to freely access the neighborhoods along the WDC. The highway would not increase traffic on local neighborhoods streets and would not disrupt the ability of local law enforcement to patrol local roads or respond to emergencies.

### **Impacts to Public Services and Utilities**

Alternative A1 would have seven points of conflict with utilities. These conflicts are listed in Table 5-9 below. The relocation of utilities and any crossing would be identified and appropriate measures would be taken in coordination with the utility companies to ensure the safety and continuity of utility service during construction.

**Table 5-9. Utility Relocations for Alternatives A1–A2**

Utility Type	Owner	Conflict Location		Type of Conflict	Proposed Resolution <sup>a</sup>	Alternatives
Transmission line	Rocky Mountain Power	Glovers Lane and I-15	Farmington	Relocation	Adjust lines to span WDC	A1, A2
Transmission line	Rocky Mountain Power	Glovers Lane and 1525 West	Farmington	Relocation	Adjust lines to span WDC	A1, A2
Transmission line	Rocky Mountain Power	200 North and 2200 West	Farmington	Relocation	Adjust lines to span WDC	A1, A2
Wastewater treatment	Central Davis Sewer District	466 North 900 West	Kaysville	Operations	Work with sewer district regarding conflict to operations	A1, A2
Transmission line	Rocky Mountain Power	Angel Street	Kaysville	Relocation	Adjust lines to span WDC	A1, A2
Sewer pipeline	North Davis Sewer District	South of Gentile Street	Layton	Potential relocation	Adjust sewer line if longitudinal impacts with WDC occur	A1, A2
Wastewater treatment	North Davis Sewer District	4252 West 2200 South	Syracuse	Operations	Work with sewer district regarding conflict to operations	A1, A2
Hooper Canal	Hooper Irrigation Company	800 North and 4400 West	West Point	Relocation	Relocate a portion of Hooper Canal	A2

<sup>a</sup> The proposed resolution has not yet been determined for every conflict. The final resolution of utility conflicts would be determined during the final design phase of the project.



Four of the conflicts would be with Rocky Mountain Power transmission lines, one conflict would be with Central Davis Sewer District land operations, one conflict would be with a North Davis Sewer District sewer pipeline (potential relocation so that the existing pipeline is not located underneath the new highway), and one conflict would be with the North Davis Sewer District land operations.

Construction of Alternative A1 could cause temporary disruptions in service; however, all utility relocations would be coordinated with the utility owner during the final design phase of the project to ensure that utilities are properly maintained and that service disruption is minimized. The estimated costs of major utility relocations have been included in the overall cost of each alternative identified in Section 2.5.3, Estimated Cost. The utility relocations are shown in the plan sheets in Volume IV.

***Central Davis Sewer District Property.*** Both of the A Alternatives would require the acquisition of about 40 acres of the west side of the 225-acre Central Davis Sewer District property. The alternatives would not affect any structures and would maintain all current site access but would eliminate the far southwest corner of the composting area and parts of the areas where biosolids are applied to farmland. The District has stated that complaints about odors from the facility by users of the WDC could cause them to install additional control equipment or treatment processes (at cost of \$1.5 million to \$3 million) resulting in more energy used, more air pollutant emissions generated, and a possible loss of carbon sequestration of soils.

In addition, with the loss of property from the WDC, biosolids might need to be hauled off site instead of being composted on site, thereby increasing cost and generating additional traffic and associated vehicle emissions. The land that would be acquired for the WDC is farmland used by the facility for applying biosolids. With the loss of this farmland, the District might need to apply the biosolids in buffer areas closer to residential areas, change the process (at a cost of \$0.5 million to \$5 million), or shut down the biosolids-application process, requiring material to be hauled off site and thereby increasing cost, traffic, and associated vehicle emissions. If the biosolids are landfilled, the amount of greenhouse gases associated with biodegradation of biosolids could increase.

Finally, the Utah Division of Water Quality has developed a draft nutrient implementation strategy that will require the older treatment process to be replaced by new facilities. According to the District, the ideal location for the new facility is in the proposed location of the WDC. Installing the new facility at alternate locations on site would require additional pumping of wastewater and possible site mitigation if the alternate location is in the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) floodplain (for more information, see Chapter 15, Floodplains).

***North Davis Sewer District Property.*** Both of the A Alternatives would require the acquisition of about 46 acres of the 530-acre North Davis Sewer District property. The alternatives would not affect any structures and would maintain all current site access but would eliminate a strip of property on the east side of 4000 West and some property at the intersection of Antelope Drive and 4000 West. The impacts to these properties would likely require the reconfiguration of some operations at the North Davis Sewer District since these lands are currently being used as part of their operations.

## Impacts to Housing and Relocations

The relocations, potential relocations, and strip takes described in this chapter are based on preliminary engineering. The actual property impacts could change and would be determined during the final design phase of the project and during the property-acquisition process.

Construction of Alternative A1 would require 30 total relocations consisting of 25 residential properties, one commercial property, and four agricultural business properties. Two of the 25 residential properties are vacant, uninhabited residential properties. There could be one potential residential relocation. In addition, there would be strip takes at four non-agricultural businesses and one agricultural business.

For a list of relocations, see Table 5-8 above, Community Impacts from Alternatives A1–A2, and Appendix 5A, Relocations and Potential Relocations in the Community Impact Analysis Area. Strip takes at residential properties are also shown in Appendix 5A.

Relocations and potential relocations can change the quality of life for affected residents. Some of the residents would relocate near their current home and neighborhood (or presumably even within their existing subdivision) and so might experience only temporary inconvenience. Others who have to relocate outside their current neighborhood could experience quality of life effects such as adjusting to a new neighborhood, church, or school or establishing new relationships with neighbors.

The future availability of real estate in the community impact analysis area cannot be reliably predicted. However, given the large residential market in the region and within each individual city, it is likely that there would be available housing in all price ranges for the number of displaced residents with this alternative. Additionally, planners from all Cities stated that, with or without the WDC, new housing was planned in their cities (West Davis Corridor Team 2012).

A number of commercial properties are currently available in the impact analysis area, and the Cities in the impact analysis area are planning for new commercial development, which could also accommodate the small number of relocated businesses.

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

#### **Impacts to Community Cohesion**

The impacts to community cohesion from Alternative A2 would be the same as those from Alternative A1.

#### **Impacts to Quality of Life**

The impacts to quality of life from Alternative A2 would be the same as those from Alternative A1.

#### **Impacts to Recreation Resources**

The impacts from Alternative A2 to recreation resources, including noise impacts, would be the same as those from Alternative A1.

#### **Impacts to Community Facilities**

The impacts to community facilities from Alternative A2 would be the same those as from Alternative A1 except for the proposed high school in West Point. Alternative A2 would require about 12 acres of the 30-acre parcel to be set aside for the future West Point high school on the southeast corner of 1800 North and 5000 West. According to West Point city planners, this impact would be great enough that the future high school would need to be moved to a different location (West Davis Corridor Team 2012).

#### **Impacts to Public Health and Safety**

The impacts to public health and safety from Alternative A2 would be the same as those from Alternative A1.

#### **Impacts to Public Services and Utilities**

The impacts to public services and utilities from Alternative A2 would be the same as those from Alternative A1 except that the alternative would also affect the Hooper Canal (a direct impact to the canal in one location, requiring relocation of the canal).

#### **Impacts to Housing and Relocations**

Construction of Alternative A2 would require 35 total relocations consisting of 29 residential properties, 1 commercial property, and 5 agricultural business properties. Two of the 29 residential properties are vacant, uninhabited residential properties. In addition, there could be 3 potential residential relocations. Additionally, there would be strip takes to 4 non-agricultural businesses and 1 agricultural business.

For a list of relocations, see Table 5-8 above, Community Impacts from Alternatives A1–A2, and Appendix 5A, Relocations and Potential Relocations in the Community Impact Analysis Area. General relocation impacts would be the same as those from Alternative A1. Strip takes at residential properties are also shown in Appendix 5A.

### 5.5.3 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 5-10.

**Table 5-10. Components of Alternatives B1–B2**

Alternative	I-15 Connection	Four-Lane Highway	Two-Lane Highway	West Point City Segment	North Terminus
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 community impacts analysis for the cities that would be affected by Alternatives B1 and B2. From south to north, these cities are Farmington, Kaysville, Layton, Syracuse, West Point, Clinton, and Hooper. Table 5-11 summarizes the community impacts from Alternatives B1 and B2.

**Table 5-11. Community Impacts from Alternatives B1–B2**

Alternative	Recreation Resources <sup>a</sup>	Community Facilities	Public Health and Safety Providers	Public Services and Utilities	Relocations <sup>b</sup>	Potential Relocations <sup>c</sup>	Business Strip Takes <sup>d</sup>
B1 – Glovers Lane/4100 W	4	1	0	7	22	9	5
B2 – Glovers Lane/4800W	4	2 <sup>e</sup>	0	8	24	9	5

<sup>a</sup> The recreation resources category does not include impacts to trails (see Chapter 10, Considerations Related to Pedestrians and Bicyclists).

<sup>b</sup> The total number of relocations includes residential properties, platted residential properties, vacant residential properties, commercial properties, and agricultural business properties. For a list of specific relocations, see Appendix 5A, Relocations and Potential Relocations in the Community Impact Analysis Area.

<sup>c</sup> The potential relocations category includes only residential properties. There would not be any potential impacts to non-residential properties from the WDC Final EIS alternatives. For a list of specific potential relocations, see Appendix 5A, Relocations and Potential Relocations in the Community Impact Analysis Area.

<sup>d</sup> The total number of business strip takes includes impacts to businesses that are located within the proposed right-of-way but would not be required to be relocated. No primary business structures would be affected. Strip takes are not considered relocations. Only strip takes for agricultural and non-agricultural businesses are included. Residential strip takes are not shown in this table but are included in Appendix 5A.

<sup>e</sup> One of the two impacts is a planned high school, not an existing facility.

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

#### **Impacts to Community Cohesion**

Similar to the impacts from Alternative A1 (see the section titled Impacts to Community Cohesion on page 5-38), the greatest impact to community cohesion from Alternative B1 would be to established neighborhoods and HOA subdivisions. On the south end of the alternative (Farmington, Kaysville, and Layton), impacts to community cohesion would be the same those from Alternative A1. Farther north, Alternative B1 would follow Bluff Road through Syracuse. In this area, the alternative would split the Bailie Acres subdivision and would border several other subdivisions including Fremont Estates, Outwest, Myrtlewood, Hunters Crossing, West Sunset View, Stone Haven, and Muirfield. However, because the alternative would follow Bluff Road, none of the neighborhoods would be bisected.

Because of the space between the neighborhoods, it's reasonable to assume that Bluff Road, coupled with the large swath of open space preserved as the Bluff Road roadway corridor, currently acts as a natural divider of neighborhoods (such as Fremont Estates to the southwest and Myrtlewood and Hunters Crossing to the northeast) on either side of the road and that the neighborhoods on either side are currently cohesive within themselves. However, residents of these communities have said that these subdivisions are also cohesive with the neighborhoods across Bluff Road and that Alternative B1 would create a new edge and would affect their relationships with neighbors.

Farther north, Alternative B1 would not divide any cohesive subdivisions in West Point but would divide the cohesive nature that has developed between residents in this rural area of scattered single-family homes and farmland.

#### **Impacts to Quality of Life**

The impacts to quality of life from Alternative B1 would be the same as those from Alternative A1 for residents of Farmington, Kaysville, and Layton. The quality of life for residents of neighborhoods in Syracuse on either side of Bluff Road would be reduced because the neighborhoods would be separated by a highway instead of open space, thus increasing noise levels and creating visual impacts. However, this open space along the bluff was preserved for a future highway, and the developers of adjacent neighborhoods were not allowed to extend their developments into this area. The quality of life for residents in West Point adjacent to Alternative B1 would also be reduced, since open-space and farmland areas would be converted to highway use.

## Impacts to Recreation Resources

The impacts to recreation resources from Alternative B1, including noise impacts, would be similar to those from Alternative A1. Alternative B1 would directly affect three existing parks and one golf course. Impacts to the recreational value of the Farmington City conservation easements are described in Chapter 3, Land Use.

- **Glen Eagle Golf Course, Syracuse (strip take of 3.8 acres).** Alternative B1 would require a strip take along the northeastern edge of the course (where the course borders the Syracuse Trail). The strip take would be adjacent to the green for hole 17. UDOT has coordinated with the owners of Glen Eagle Golf Course and has determined that the function of the golf course can be maintained through the mitigation process provided through the federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act for the loss of property and facilities.
- **Fremont Park, Syracuse (strip take of 22.02 acres).** Alternative B1 would require a strip take of about 22.02 acres of the 41-acre property along the east side of the park, which parallels Bluff Road. All but about 3 acres of this impact is in the undeveloped eastern portion of the park, which Syracuse City has identified on its transportation and land-use plans as being the future location of the WDC. None of the park facilities or amenities would be affected.
- **South Park, Farmington (strip take of 0.08 acre).** Alternative B1 would require a strip take of the western boundary of the park adjacent to the frontage road. The strip take would remove the park sign but would not affect any park facilities. Part of the park grass is within the UDOT right-of-way. UDOT would work with Farmington City to replace the park sign.
- **1100 West Park (strip take of about 6 acres).** Alternative B1 would require a strip take of about 6 acres of the middle part of the 11-acre park. The impacts would be substantial enough that the day-to-day operation of the park used for recreation would be adversely affected.

All of the impacts would involve acquiring property needed for roadway right-of-way. Alternative B1 would not cause any long-term, permanent adverse effects on the recreation resources affected by strip takes except for the Farmington City 1100 West Park. This park would need to be relocated because the impacts would be substantial enough that the day-to-day operation of the park used for recreation would be adversely affected. UDOT is coordinating with the owners of the golf course to ensure that mitigation measures are provided to maintain the function of the course.

## Impacts to Community Facilities

Alternative B1 would require about 0.3 acre of right-of-way from the Syracuse Arts Academy, a charter school located at 2893 West 1700 South in Syracuse. This right-of-way would be needed to modify access to the school's parking lot and accommodate the Layton Canal on a relocated alignment. UDOT would improve this access by providing a one-way loop road, which should reduce congestion compared to the current access to Antelope Drive.



Representatives of the Syracuse Arts Academy believe that, if an alignment close to the school (such as Alternative B1) is chosen, a number of parents would withdraw their children from the school because of the potential for nuisance effects from the construction and operation of the WDC. According to the representatives, a reduction in student enrollment would reduce the per-pupil funding that the school receives from the State and would jeopardize the school's survival.

The WDC team could not find anecdotal evidence to support the assertion that perceived nuisance effects from the WDC would cause parents to transfer their students to other schools. Moreover, the nuisance effects that the school representatives cite can be mostly mitigated. Parents might feel that the value of the education their children receive at the school, coupled with proper mitigation of the effects from the WDC, is a reason to keep their children enrolled.

School representatives also said that they are concerned with the environment in and around the school during construction. They believe that construction close to the school would unavoidably impair the learning environment for students for a prolonged period and cite issues such as noise, vibration, air quality impacts, safety, and vehicle access to and from school.

Representatives further stated concerns about the pedestrian access to and from the school, especially for students coming from Bluff Road or locations farther east who would have to cross through or under the Antelope Drive interchange associated with Alternative B1.

School representatives also voiced concerns about the safety of students as they walk to and from school. The representatives consider pedestrian tunnels unsafe for children. They are concerned about students crossing signalized intersections and about the potential for children to cross the barriers and railings that would be installed as part of the new roadway. Further, they feel that pedestrian underpasses could cause new parking or traffic problems on Bluff Road.

Other impacts to community facilities from Alternative B1 would be the same as those from Alternative A1, including the impact to Canyon Creek Elementary School in Farmington.

### **Impacts to Public Health and Safety**

The impacts from Alternative B1 to public health and safety would be similar to those from Alternative A1. Alternative B1 would not directly affect any public health and safety service providers. The increased transportation accessibility and safety benefits from this alternative would enhance emergency service providers' mobility, which in turn could improve response times. The impacts from fog, impacts to providing access for emergency service providers for incidents on the WDC, and the potential for increased crime along the WDC would be the same as the impacts from Alternative A1.

Alternative B1 would be within 0.25 mile of the Syracuse Fire Station at 1869 South 3000 West. The construction of Alternative B1 would be an overall benefit to the Syracuse Fire Department, since the fire station's access to the community would be improved and travel

times would decrease. During construction, there could be short-term changes to local travel patterns.

The Antelope Drive interchange on Alternative B1 could affect the travel patterns of emergency providers during construction. Overall, the interchange at Antelope Drive would be a net beneficial impact for the fire department.

As discussed in the section above titled Impacts to Community Facilities, representatives from the Syracuse Arts Academy have concerns about the pedestrian access to and from the school, especially for students coming from Bluff Road or locations farther east who would have to cross through or under the Antelope Drive interchange associated with Alternative B1. School representatives also believe that construction close to the school would unavoidably impair the learning environment for students for a prolonged period and cite issues such as noise, vibration, air quality impacts, safety, and vehicle access to and from school.

Air quality impacts during construction would be limited to short-term increases in fugitive dust, particulates, and local pollutant emissions from construction equipment. If construction were phased, air quality could be further reduced because there would be several construction mobilization and demobilization periods.

Noise during construction could be a nuisance to nearby residents as well as to students at the Syracuse Arts Academy. All of the action alternatives would generate similar types of noise that would occur sporadically in different locations throughout the construction period. The most common noise source in construction areas would be engine-powered machinery such as earth-moving equipment (bulldozers), material-handling equipment (cranes), and stationary equipment (generators). Mobile equipment (such as trucks and excavators) operates in a sporadic manner, while stationary equipment (generators and compressors) generates noise at fairly constant levels.

During construction, equipment and excavations could pose a safety hazard for students who walk to school, although the construction contractor would be required to mitigate for such hazards.

As for the long-term operation of the WDC, as described in Section 11.4.6, Mitigation Measures, air pollutant emission modeling found that the total emissions in the WDC study area would improve over existing conditions due to technological improvements in vehicle emissions systems in the future despite the projected increase in the number of vehicle-miles traveled. The WDC Project complies with air quality conformity requirements under the Clean Air Act.

In addition, the noise level in the Syracuse Arts Academy parking lot was modeled with Alternative B1, and the model showed that the noise level would not change with the WDC and that the school did not meet UDOT's criteria for a noise barrier. See Chapter 12, Noise, for more information regarding noise barrier locations.

## Impacts to Public Services and Utilities

Alternative B1 would have seven points of conflict with utilities. These conflicts are listed in Table 5-12 below. The relocation of utilities and any crossing would be identified and appropriate measures would be taken in coordination with the utility companies to ensure the safety and continuity of utility service during construction.

Four of the conflicts would be with Rocky Mountain Power transmission lines, one conflict would be with a North Davis Sewer District sewer pipeline (potential relocation so that the existing pipeline is not located underneath the new highway), one conflict would be with the Central Davis Sewer District operations, and one conflict would be with the Layton Canal (direct impact to about 2 miles of the canal, requiring relocation of the canal).

Construction of Alternative B1 could cause temporary disruptions in service; however, all utility relocations would be coordinated with the utility owner during the final design phase of the project to ensure that utilities are properly maintained and that service disruption is minimized. The estimated costs of major utility relocations have been included in the overall cost of each alternative identified in Section 2.5.3, Estimated Cost. The utility relocations are shown in the plan sheets in Volume IV.

***Central Davis Sewer District Property.*** Both of the B Alternatives would require the acquisition of about 26 acres of the west side of the 225-acre Central Davis Sewer District property. The alternatives would not affect any structures and would maintain all current site access but would eliminate the far southwest corner of the composting area and parts of the areas where biosolids are applied to farmland. The District has stated that complaints about odors from the facility by users of the WDC could cause them to install additional control equipment or treatment processes (at cost of \$1.5 million to \$3 million), resulting in more energy used, more air pollutant emissions generated, and a possible loss of carbon sequestration of soils.

**Table 5-12. Utility Relocations for Alternatives B1–B2**

Utility Type	Owner	Conflict Location		Type of Conflict	Proposed Resolution <sup>a</sup>	Alternatives
Transmission line	Rocky Mountain Power	Glovers Lane and I-15	Farmington	Relocation	Adjust lines to span WDC	B1, B2
Transmission line	Rocky Mountain Power	Glovers Lane and 1525 West	Farmington	Relocation	Adjust lines to span WDC	B1, B2
Transmission line	Rocky Mountain Power	200 North and 2200 West	Farmington	Relocation	Adjust lines to span WDC	B1, B2
Transmission line	Rocky Mountain Power	Angel Street	Kaysville	Relocation	Adjust lines to span WDC	B1, B2
Wastewater treatment	Central Davis Sewer District	466 North 900 West	Kaysville	Operations	Work with sewer district regarding conflict to operations	B1, B2
Sewer pipeline	North Davis Sewer District	South of Gentile Street	Layton	Potential relocation	Adjust sewer line if longitudinal impacts with WDC occur	B1, B2
Layton Canal	Weber Basin Water Conservancy District	Antelope Drive and 3000 West	Syracuse	Relocation	Relocate about 2 miles of Layton Canal	B1, B2
Hooper Canal	Hooper Irrigation Company	800 North and 4400 West	West Point	Relocation	Relocate a portion of Hooper Canal	B2

<sup>a</sup> The proposed resolution has not yet been determined for every conflict. The final resolution of utility conflicts would be determined during the final design phase of the project.

In addition, with the loss of property from the WDC, biosolids might need to be hauled off site instead of being composted on site, thereby increasing cost and generating additional traffic and associated vehicle emissions. The land that would be acquired for the WDC is farmland used by the facility for applying biosolids. With the loss of this farmland, the District might need to apply the biosolids in buffer areas closer to residential areas, change the process (at a cost of \$0.5 million to \$5 million), or shut down the biosolids-application process, requiring material to be hauled off site and thereby increasing cost, traffic, and associated vehicle emissions. If the biosolids are landfilled, the amount of greenhouse gases associated with biodegradation of biosolids could increase.

Finally, the Utah Division of Water Quality has developed a draft nutrient implementation strategy that will require the older treatment process to be replaced by new facilities. According to the District, the ideal location for the new facility is in the proposed location of the WDC. Installing the new facility at alternate locations on site would require additional pumping of wastewater and possible site mitigation if the alternate location is in the FEMA floodplain (for more information, see Chapter 15, Floodplains).

### **Impacts to Housing and Relocations**

Construction of Alternative B1 would require 22 total relocations consisting of 18 residential properties, 1 commercial property, and 3 agricultural business properties. Two of the 18 residential properties are vacant, uninhabited residential properties. In addition, there could be 9 potential residential relocations. In addition, there would be land-only strip takes at 4 non-agricultural businesses and 1 agricultural business.

For a list of relocations, see Table 5-11 above, Community Impacts from Alternatives B1–B2, and Appendix 5A, Relocations and Potential Relocations in the Community Impact Analysis Area. General relocation impacts would be the same as those from Alternative A1. Strip takes at residential properties are also shown in Appendix 5A.

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

#### **Impacts to Community Cohesion**

The impacts to community cohesion from Alternative B2 would be the same as those from Alternative B1.

#### **Impacts to Quality of Life**

The impacts to quality of life from Alternative B2 would be the same as those from Alternative B1.

#### **Impacts to Recreation Resources**

The impacts to recreation resources from Alternative B2, including noise impacts, would be the same as those from Alternative B1.

## **Impacts to Community Facilities**

The impacts from Alternative B2 to the Syracuse Arts Academy would be the same as those from Alternative B1. The impacts from Alternative B2 to the future West Point high school would be the same as those from Alternative A2 except that only 3 acres would be required from this property with Alternative B2. No other community facilities would be affected.

## **Impacts to Public Health and Safety**

The impacts to public health and safety from Alternative B2 would be the same as those from Alternative B1.

## **Impacts to Public Services and Utilities**

Alternative B2 would have eight points of conflict with utilities (see Table 5-12 above, Utility Relocations for Alternatives B1–B2). Four of the conflicts would be with Rocky Mountain Power transmission lines, one conflict would be with a North Davis Sewer District sewer pipeline (potential relocation so that the existing pipeline is not located underneath the new highway), one conflict with the Central Davis Sewer District operations, one conflict would be with the Layton Canal (direct impact to about 2 miles of the Layton Canal, requiring relocation of the canal), and one conflict would be with the Hooper Canal (a direct impact to the canal in one location, requiring relocation of the canal).

The permanent impacts to these utilities as well as the temporary impacts from construction of Alternative B2 and coordination with the utility owners would be the same as those from Alternative B1.

## **Impacts to Housing and Relocations**

Construction of Alternative B2 would require 24 total relocations consisting of 19 residential properties, 1 commercial property, and 4 agricultural business properties. Two of the 19 residential relocations are vacant, uninhabited residential properties. In addition, there could be 9 potential residential relocations. Additionally, there would be land-only strip takes at 4 non-agricultural businesses and 1 agricultural business.

For a list of relocations, see Table 5-11 above, Community Impacts from Alternatives B1–B2, and Appendix 5A, Relocations and Potential Relocations in the Community Impact Analysis Area. General relocation impacts would be the same as those from Alternative A1. Strip takes at residential properties are also shown in Appendix 5A.

## 5.5.4 Wetland Avoidance Options

Two wetland avoidance options are being evaluated in this Final EIS, as shown in Table 5-13. 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 5-13. 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 of 2200 West and 1000 South.

The impacts to community resources from the wetland avoidance options would not change the analysis above for Alternatives A1, A2, B1, and B2, except that the number of home relocations would increase by seven, and one platted property would be affected by the wetland avoidance options.

## 5.5.5 Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures apply to all action alternatives unless specified otherwise.

### 5.5.5.1 Mitigation for Impacts to Community Cohesion

To reduce the impacts of dividing the Bridgeway Island subdivision with the A Alternatives, UDOT will provide an underpass on Hammon Lane to ensure that all residents can access the clubhouse. To reduce the impacts of dividing residents along Bluff Road in Syracuse with the B Alternatives, UDOT will provide a grade-separated crossing to connect the Old Emigration Trail with Fremont Park. The underpass at Bridgeway Island was coordinated with the HOA, and the grade-separated crossing in Syracuse was coordinated with Syracuse City. For information about improvements to trail facilities made as part of the WDC Project that could improve community cohesion, see Chapter 10, Considerations Related to Pedestrians and Bicyclists.



### **5.5.5.2 Mitigation for Impacts to Quality of Life**

For alternatives that are developed in residential and commercial areas, UDOT will work with the affected communities within UDOT's guidelines to identify measures to lessen project-related impacts to quality of life. These measures might include noise barriers (see Chapter 12, Noise, for locations), special landscaping and lighting, and accessibility considerations.

### **5.5.5.3 Mitigation for Impacts to Recreation Resources**

Any loss of land from recreation resources due to the selected alternative will be compensated under the federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act and the Utah Relocation Assistance Act for the loss of property and facilities, as appropriate [for more information about impacts to recreational resources and potential mitigation measures, see Chapter 27, Section 4(f)/6(f) Evaluation]. The following recreation resources are subject to property losses and compensation for the property taken, except for 1100 West Park, which will be relocated:

- Glen Eagle Golf Course (all action alternatives; more impact from B Alternatives)
- Fremont Park (both B Alternatives)
- South Park (all action alternatives)
- 1100 West Park (all action alternatives) – This park will be relocated as required under Section 4(f) adjacent to the Farmington Gymnasium and Regional Sports Complex at 294 South 650 West. For more information, see Chapter 27, Section 4(f)/6(f) Evaluation.

UDOT has coordinated with and will continue to coordinate with the owners of the golf course to ensure that the function of the golf course can be maintained through the mitigation process provided through the federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act for the loss of property and facilities.

### **5.5.5.4 Mitigation for Impacts to Community Facilities**

Any loss of land from community facilities due to the selected alternative will be compensated under the federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act and the Utah Relocation Assistance Act for the loss of property and facilities, as appropriate. At this time, no right-of-way would be required from the Syracuse Arts Academy, but access to the school would be modified if one of the B Alternatives is selected. UDOT will coordinate with the school regarding access modifications. UDOT's current plans are to provide access to the school from 3000 West and access from the school by a new one-way loop road to the south that would connect to 3000 West.

### **5.5.5.5 Mitigation for Impacts to Public Health and Safety**

UDOT will work with emergency providers, such as police, fire protection, and ambulance services, to ensure that the final roadway design does not hinder emergency provider access or affect responder response times. Proper access will be provided across the new highway near existing and future emergency service provider facilities. UDOT and the contractor will coordinate with emergency service providers before construction to ensure that access for their vehicles will be maintained. Before construction begins, the contractor will coordinate with the schools so that appropriate safety measures can be implemented.

UDOT has been coordinating with the Syracuse Arts Academy regarding potential impacts from Alternatives B1 and B2 during construction and operation of the WDC. The items discussed have included student safety at school and while walking to school, traffic circulation and safety, air quality, noise and vibration, and visual impacts. If one of the B Alternatives is selected, during the final design process, UDOT will develop and finalize necessary measures with the school to ensure that traffic circulation and safety and student safety at school and while walking to school meet applicable design standards, safety requirements, and traffic level-of-service goals. If one of the B Alternatives is selected, prior to construction, UDOT will meet with representatives from the school to discuss student and traffic safety requirements during construction.

Depending on the alternative that is selected, during construction, equipment and excavations could pose a safety hazard for students who walk to Canyon Creek and Kays Creek Elementary Schools and the Syracuse Arts Academy. Before construction begins, the contractor will coordinate with the schools so that appropriate safety measures can be implemented.

The construction contractor will develop a maintenance-of-traffic plan that defines measures to minimize construction impacts on traffic (for more information, see Section 20.3.10.3, Mitigation Measures for Construction-Related Impacts to Motorists, Pedestrians, Bicyclists, and Businesses).

Mitigation measures for construction-related impacts to air quality will be developed as part of the Emission Control Plan submitted to the State of Utah (for more information, see Section 20.3.3.1, Mitigation Measures for Construction-Related Impacts to Air Quality).

Construction noise would be minimized by following UDOT's Standard Specifications for Environmental Protection. No mitigation is proposed for construction-related vibration, since little vibration is anticipated.

### **5.5.5.6 Mitigation for Impacts to Public Services and Utilities**

The UDOT document *Accommodation of Utilities and the Control and Protection of State Highway Rights-of-Way*, Utah Administrative Code, Rule 930-6, will be followed. The construction contractor will contact local businesses and residences if any loss of utility service is required during construction.

### 5.5.5.7 Mitigation for Impacts to Housing and Relocations

Property acquisitions, both partial and total, will be completed according to the provisions of the Federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended, and the Utah Relocation Assistance Act, Utah Code, Section 57-12.

## 5.5.6 Cumulative Impacts

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. As part of the WDC EIS process, scoping meetings were held with the public and resource agencies to help identify issues to be analyzed in the EIS. The comments received during the public and agency scoping period were reviewed to determine whether any significant issues were identified.

In this EIS, community impacts are considered for changes to community cohesion, quality of life, recreation resources, community facilities, public health and safety, and public services and utilities. Of these resources, the WDC action alternatives would not have any substantial adverse effects on recreation resources, community facilities, public safety, or public services and utilities.

In addition, public and agency comments received during the scoping period, the alternatives-development process, and Draft EIS comment period were focused on how the WDC would affect residents' quality of life and the cohesive nature of their neighborhoods. Therefore, the cumulative impacts analysis for community impacts focuses on community cohesion and quality of life. For a detailed analysis of the potential cumulative impacts, see Chapter 24, Cumulative Impacts. This section provides a summary of that analysis.

For some of the communities, the initial construction of the WDC would reduce the cohesive nature of their city and reduce the quality of life for those residents adjacent to the highway. The WDC would add to the cumulative effect of the area's changing from rural to urban and would continue the trend of roads dividing communities as they continue to grow. However, this cumulative effect of the area's changing from a rural to a more urban setting would occur with or without the WDC. The pace of growth and development in the WDC study area communities has been occurring rapidly, and this is evident in the Wasatch Front's loss of 434,000 acres of farmland between 1974 and 2007 (Downen 2009).

Moreover, this incremental contribution by the WDC to the change in the rural nature of the communities is consistent with the communities' plans for overall growth and would occur with either the No-Action or action alternatives. The WDC alternatives would require

#### 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.

#### What is scoping?

Scoping is an early and open process for determining the scope of issues to be addressed and for identifying the significant issues related to a proposed action.

relocating between 26 and 39 residences (both relocations and potential relocations) and would thereby reduce the cohesive nature of specific neighborhoods. Although the WDC might locally reduce the cohesive nature of specific neighborhoods, no other projects are planned that would add to a cumulative loss of community cohesion in these areas.

The WDC could cause additional cumulative impacts to the cohesive nature of Farmington and Kaysville, which are divided by I-15. However, these cities were mostly on the east side of I-15 when that highway was constructed and have since expanded to the west side as population has continued to grow.

The WDC is being considered to address the expected substantial population growth in the WDC study area through 2040. This growth will change the area from more rural to typically suburban. This change in the rural quality of life will occur with or without the WDC, and therefore the WDC would not substantially add to the change in the quality of life or the cohesive nature of communities through 2040.

## **5.5.7 Summary of Impacts**

### **5.5.7.1 Summary of Impacts to Community Cohesion**

Relocations associated with all of the action alternatives could reduce the cohesiveness of the areas around the alignments but are not expected to affect the communities as a whole. For the communities and the parts of the community impact analysis area that are located more than a few blocks east or west of each alternative, the alternative would have little, if any, influence on patterns of community cohesion. The neighborhoods that are severed by an alternative would experience reduced cohesion and, depending on the proximity to other neighborhoods, cohesion with other adjacent developments could also be reduced.

The WDC could bisect several larger neighborhoods, such as Bridgeway Island, a large development in Syracuse that would be bisected by both of the A Alternatives. Representatives of Bridgeway Island have stated that the loss of homes, and consequently the loss of HOA fees, could cause the HOA to go bankrupt, since the HOA is relatively small and relies on all of the membership dues it collects from current homeowners. If this were to occur, the impact to community cohesion at Bridgeway Island would be long-term.

The Bluff Road component of both of the B Alternatives would also separate several neighborhoods in Syracuse, including Fremont Estates, Outwest, Hunters Crossing, and Myrtlewood, which are currently separated by the Bluff Road open space but consider themselves cohesive with each other.

In addition, the WDC could require strip takes from the edges of neighborhoods, such as in the Farmington Meadows subdivision in Farmington, where a portion of open space on the western edge of the subdivision plat would be acquired. Other subdivisions or neighborhoods could also have similar impacts (see Figures 5-1 and 5-2, Subdivisions and Neighborhoods, in Volume IV).

Given the relatively high proportion of long-term residents living in homes in the community impact analysis area, many relocated residents would experience adjustment difficulties.

Most relocated residents could establish new patterns of involvement in community life through church participation, community organizations, and interactions with new neighbors. However, the initial impact of relocating would be very disruptive until new relationships are developed.

For the most part, none of the alternatives would likely alter existing boundaries of churches or school districts. Patterns of participation in community and neighborhood organizations and activities among people living north and south of each alternative would not change substantially from current conditions. However, residents in households immediately east or west of the new highway could experience reduced interactions with and ties to their immediate neighbors due to the creation of an edge by the new highway and the associated increased traffic and noise that would make their outdoor environment less attractive.

### **5.5.7.2 Summary of Impacts to Quality of Life**

The impacts to quality of life would closely mirror the impacts to neighborhood cohesion discussed in Section 5.5.7.1, Summary of Impacts to Community Cohesion. Generally, the community impact analysis area is undergoing rapid urbanization. Residents whose quality of life depends on the agricultural feel of the area would be most sensitive to the effects of the alternatives, but it is likely that their quality of life would change with or without the WDC.

For residents who moved into the area to take advantage of the new housing, quality of life could improve because this alternative would improve travel mobility. Conversely, for those residents who live in subdivisions that would be severed by an alternative, or who would have a roadway built through what is currently open space in their neighborhood, quality of life would likely be reduced. As described in Section 5.5.7.1, Summary of Impacts to Community Cohesion, many subdivisions and neighborhoods could be bisected, which would change the look and the feel of the current neighborhoods and affect the quality of life for residents.

In addition, several neighborhoods might not be bisected but could have the highway built nearby or in currently open space on the edge of the neighborhood, which would reduce the quality of life for people who moved to these neighborhoods for the rural feel. New noise impacts from the new highway could also affect the quality of life in neighborhoods. In general, in areas where there is currently no existing road, noise levels are about 50 to 55 dBA. With any of the alternatives, residents with a direct view of the highway from their home would experience a substantial noise increase of about 10 dBA over existing noise levels.

### 5.5.7.3 Summary of Impacts to Recreation Resources

All of the action alternatives would affect some recreation resources. The B Alternatives would affect the most recreation resources (four), while the A Alternatives would affect the fewest (three). If a recreation resource would be relocated, it is because the impacts would be substantial enough that the day-to-day operation of the recreation resource or the portions of the resource used for recreation would be affected. Table 5-14 summarizes the impacts to recreation resources by alternative.

**Table 5-14. Summary of Impacts to Recreation Resources by Alternative**

Alternative	Relocations	Strip Takes
A1	1	2
A2	1	2
B1	1	3
B2	1	3

For some recreation facilities, increased noise from the new highway would be an issue. In general, in areas where there is currently no existing road, noise levels are about 50 to 55 dBA. With any of the action alternatives, several recreation resources would experience a substantial noise increase of about 10 dBA over existing noise levels. However, it is unlikely that the traffic noise from the new highway would interfere with the uses at the recreation facilities in the community impact analysis area, since the primary uses include golf, ball fields, and playgrounds. For more information regarding noise impacts, see Chapter 12, Noise.

***Impacts to Hunting, Fishing, or Bird-Watching Areas.*** The WDC action alternatives would not prohibit or restrict access to the Great Salt Lake, the Farmington Bay Waterfowl Management Area, the Great Salt Lake Shorelands Preserve, or Antelope Island. Conversely, access to these areas could be enhanced by the WDC alternatives, so the WDC is not expected to decrease tourism.

Impacts to the Great Salt Lake ecosystem, the Farmington Bay Waterfowl Management Area, and the Great Salt Lake Shorelands Preserve are described in Chapter 14, Ecosystem Resources and Chapter 3, Land Use. Although there would be some direct and potential indirect impacts to wildlife habitat in these areas, the affected habitat would be a small percentage of the overall wildlife habitat in the Great Salt Lake ecosystem and the Great Salt Lake Shorelands Preserve, and the WDC is not expected to substantially reduce wildlife habitat, wildlife populations, or ecosystem functions. Therefore, any impact to the recreational use of these resources from the WDC alternatives is not anticipated to be substantial.



#### **5.5.7.4 Summary of Impacts to Community Facilities**

One existing school and one future school in the community impact analysis area would be affected by the WDC. All of the alternatives would affect 50 square feet of an open field on the Canyon Elementary School property, but none of the school facilities or access would be affected. Alternatives A2 and B2 would require either 3 acres (Alternative B2) or about 12 acres (Alternative A2) of the 30-acre parcel set aside for the future West Point high school on the southeast corner of 1800 North and 5000 West. West Point city planners have said that this impact would be great enough that the future high school would need to be moved to a different location.

The B Alternatives would require about 0.3 acre of right-of-way from the Syracuse Arts Academy in order to modify the access to the school's parking lot.

Syracuse Arts Academy representatives said that they are concerned with the environment in and around the school during construction of the B Alternatives. Representatives also feel that these perceived nuisance effects could in turn cause parents to transfer their children to other schools and thus reduce the number of students enrolled at the academy. Representatives further stated concerns about the pedestrian access to and from the school, especially for students coming from Bluff Road or locations farther east who would have to cross through or under the Antelope Drive interchange.

#### **5.5.7.5 Summary of Impacts to Public Health and Safety**

None of the action alternatives would directly affect any public health and safety service providers. The increased transportation accessibility and safety benefits resulting from all of the action alternatives would enhance emergency service providers' mobility, which in turn could improve response times.

UDOT has been coordinating with the Syracuse Arts Academy regarding potential impacts from Alternatives B1 and B2 during construction and operation of the WDC. The items discussed have included student safety at school and while walking to school, traffic circulation and safety, air quality, noise and vibration, and visual impacts.

All of the action alternatives would generate similar types of noise that would occur sporadically in different locations throughout the construction period. The most common noise source in construction areas would be engine-powered machinery such as earth-moving equipment (bulldozers), material-handling equipment (cranes), and stationary equipment (generators). Mobile equipment (such as trucks and excavators) operates in a sporadic manner, while stationary equipment (generators and compressors) generates noise at fairly constant levels.

As for long-term operation of the WDC, as described in Chapter 11, Air Quality, the WDC would conform to the applicable State Implementation Plan for air quality conformity requirements under the Clean Air Act. Air quality modeling results also showed that none of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's health-based air quality standards would be exceeded along the WDC.



### 5.5.7.6 Summary of Impacts to Public Services and Utilities

All of the alternatives would require major utility relocations and would require acquisition of land used by the Central Davis Sewer District for application of biosolids and composting. Alternatives A1 and A2 would also require acquisition of lands used by the North Davis Sewer District for its operations. Alternatives A2 and B2 would have the most points of conflict (eight), while Alternatives A1 and B1 would have the fewest (seven). Minor relocations such as local sewer, water, and minor power lines would also be required, but these would be identified during the final design phase of the project.

The estimated costs of major utility relocations have been included in the overall cost of each alternative identified in Section 2.5.3, Estimated Cost. Table 5-15 summarizes the points of conflict with utilities by alternative.

**Table 5-15. Summary of Points of Conflict with Utilities by Alternative**

Alternative	Transmission Lines	Sewer Lines/ Operations	Layton Canal	Hooper Canal	Total
A1	4	3	0	0	7
A2	4	3	0	1	8
B1	4	2	1	0	7
B2	4	2	1	1	8

### 5.5.7.7 Summary of Impacts to Housing and Relocations

For a summary of impacts to housing and relocations, see Appendix 5A, Relocations and Potential Relocations in the Community Impact Analysis Area. Given the large residential market in the region and within each city, it is likely that there would be available housing in all price ranges for displaced residents. In addition, all of the Cities in the community impact analysis area are planning for new residential development. A number of commercial properties are currently available in the impact analysis area, and the Cities in the area are planning for new commercial development, which could also accommodate relocated businesses.



## 5.6 References

Anderson, J.

- 2006 Personal communication between J. Anderson, West Point City Planner, and Nicole Donegan of The Langdon Group regarding land use, transportation planning, and public involvement opportunities. June 27.

Anderson, Steve

- 2006 Personal communication between Steve Anderson, West Haven City Planner, and Sue Lee of HDR Engineering regarding land use. September 27.

Dan Jones & Associates

- 2009 Public opinion survey of residents in western Davis County and Utah County. December.

Davis County

- No date Davis County History. [www.co.davis.ut.us/county\\_info/county\\_history.cfm](http://www.co.davis.ut.us/county_info/county_history.cfm). Accessed August 30, 2010.

Downen, John C.

- 2009 Utah's Urban Farmers: Agricultural Activity on the Wasatch Front. [bebr.utah.edu/Documents/uebr/UEBR2009/UEBR2009no3.pdf](http://bebr.utah.edu/Documents/uebr/UEBR2009/UEBR2009no3.pdf). *Utah Economic and Business Review*, Vol. 69, No. 3.

Duhart, Detis

- 2000 National Crime Victimization Survey: Urban, Suburban, and Rural Victimization, 1993–98. Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report. October.

[FDOT] Florida Department of Transportation

- 2003 Project Development and Environmental Manual: Part 2, Chapter 9, Community Impact Assessment.

Freeport Center

- No date Freeport Center: About Us. [www.freeportcenter.com/aboutUs.php](http://www.freeportcenter.com/aboutUs.php). Accessed August 30, 2010.

Kasarda, J.D., and M. Janowitz

- 1974 Community attachment in mass society. *American Sociological Review* 39(3): 328–339.

Larson, Mark

- 2006 Personal communication between Mark Larson, Roy City Planner, and Vince Izzo of HDR Engineering regarding land use, transportation planning, and public involvement opportunities. June 21.

Lynch, Kevin

- 1960 Image of the City. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

National Sheriff's Association

- 2006 About Neighborhood Watch. [www.usaonwatch.org/AboutUs/AboutNeighborhoodWatch.php](http://www.usaonwatch.org/AboutUs/AboutNeighborhoodWatch.php). Accessed November 16, 2006.



#### The Salt Lake Tribune

- 2017 Home prices along the Wasatch Front. [www.sltrib.com/money/homeprices](http://www.sltrib.com/money/homeprices). Accessed January 19, 2017.

#### State of Utah

- 2010 Quality of Life. [www.utah.gov/business/relocating/qualityoflife.html](http://www.utah.gov/business/relocating/qualityoflife.html). Accessed September 7, 2010.

#### [UDOT] Utah Department of Transportation

- 2013 Relocation Assistance Brochure.  
<https://www.udot.utah.gov/main/uconowner.gf?n=200602240821161>.

#### Utah Foundation

- 2010 The 2010 Utah Priorities Fall Survey: Voters' Preferences for Candidates and Policy Solutions. [utahfoundation.org/img/pdfs/rr696.pdf](http://utahfoundation.org/img/pdfs/rr696.pdf). Report 696. September. Accessed September 7, 2010.

#### Vinzant, Lynn

- 2006 Personal communication between Lynn Vinzant, Clinton City Community Development Director, and Vince Izzo of HDR Engineering regarding land use, transportation planning, and public involvement opportunities. June 21.

#### Wasatch Front Multiple Listing Service

- 2017 Utah Real Estate. [www.utahrealestate.com](http://www.utahrealestate.com). Accessed January 24, 2017.

#### [WFRC] Wasatch Front Regional Council

- 2005 Weber County Consolidated Plan, Chapter VII, Regional Analysis.  
[wfr.org/cms/publications/consplan/Chapter%20VII.%20Regional%20Analysis.pdf](http://wfr.org/cms/publications/consplan/Chapter%20VII.%20Regional%20Analysis.pdf).

#### 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.

#### Worthen, Rodger

- 2006 Personal communication between Rodger Worthen, Syracuse City Community Development Director, and Vince Izzo of HDR Engineering regarding land use, transportation planning, and public involvement opportunities. June 21.



*This page is intentionally blank.*