



All agenda items
in this packet are
preliminary, until
approved by the
Layton City
Council.

**REGULAR MEETING AGENDA OF THE
CITY COUNCIL OF LAYTON, UTAH**

PUBLIC NOTICE is hereby given that the City Council of Layton, Utah, will hold a public meeting in the Council Chambers of the City Center Building, 437 North Wasatch Drive, Layton, Utah, commencing at **7:00 PM on November 7, 2024.**

AGENDA ITEMS:

1. CALL TO ORDER, PLEDGE, OPENING CEREMONY, RECOGNITION, APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

A. Minutes of Layton City Council Meeting - October 3, 2024

2. MUNICIPAL EVENT ANNOUNCEMENTS:

3. VERBAL PETITIONS AND PRESENTATIONS:

A. Proclamation – Small Business Saturday, November 30, 2024

4. CITIZEN COMMENTS:

5. CONSENT ITEMS: (These items are considered by the City Council to be routine and will be enacted by a single motion. If discussion is desired on any particular consent item, that item may be removed from the consent agenda and considered separately.)

A. An Interlocal Agreement between Layton City and Davis County for the Purpose of Distributing Funds from the 2024 Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Number O-BJA-2024-172239 – Resolution 24-31

B. Bid Award – Craythorne, Inc. – Constitution Circle Storm Drain, Project 24-11 – Resolution 24-30 – Along Constitution Circle between Approximately Wasatch Drive and the North Entrance to Surf 'n Swim

C. Amending Title 18, Chapter 32, Section 080 Lot Line Adjustment and Title 19, Chapter 03, Section 040 Review of Application of the Layton Municipal Code – Ordinance 24-30

D. Amending 9.04 Lot Line Adjustment of the Development Guidelines and Design Standards – Ordinance 24-31

6. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

A. General Plan Amendment – Layton City Transportation and Parks and Recreation Element of the General Plan by the Adoption of the Layton City Active Transportation Plan – Ordinance 24-29

7. UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

ADJOURN:

Notice is hereby given that:

- A Work Meeting will be held at 5:30 PM to discuss miscellaneous matters.
- This meeting will also be live streamed via laytoncitylive.com and facebook.com/Laytoncity
- In the event of an absence of a full quorum, agenda items will be continued to the next regularly scheduled meeting.
- This meeting may involve the use of electronic communications for some of the members of this public body. Elected Officials at remote locations may be connected to the meeting electronically.
- By motion of the Layton City Council, pursuant to Title 52, Chapter 4 of the Utah Code, the City Council may vote to hold a closed meeting for any of the purposes identified in that chapter.

Date: _____ By: _____
Kimberly S Read, City Recorder

This public notice is posted on the Utah Public Notice website www.utah.gov/pmn/, the Layton City website www.laytoncity.org, and at the Layton City Center.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, persons in need of special accommodations or services to participate in this meeting shall notify the City at least 24 hours in advance at 801-336-3826 or 801-336-3820.

Citizen Comment Guidelines

For the benefit of all who participate in a PUBLIC HEARING or in giving PUBLIC COMMENT during a City Council meeting, we respectfully request that the following procedures be observed so that all concerned individuals may have an opportunity to speak.

Electronic Information: An electronic or hard copy of any electronic information presented to the City Council must be submitted to the City Recorder by the end of the meeting.

Time: If you are giving public input on any item on the agenda, please limit comments to three (3) minutes. If greater time is necessary to discuss the item, the matter may, upon request, be placed on a future City Council agenda for further discussion.

New Information: Please limit comments to new information only to avoid repeating the same information multiple times.

Spokesperson: Please, if you are part of a large group, select a spokesperson for the group.

Courtesy: Please be courteous to those making comments by avoiding applauding or verbal outbursts either in favor of or against what is being said.

Comments: Your comments are important. To give order to the meeting, please direct comments to and through the person conducting the meeting.

Thank you.

D R A F T

MINUTES OF LAYTON CITY COUNCIL MEETING

OCTOBER 3, 2024; 7:00 P.M.

MAYOR AND COUNCILMEMBERS PRESENT:

MAYOR JOY PETRO, ZACH BLOXHAM, CLINT MORRIS, TYSON ROBERTS, BETTINA SMITH EDMONDSON, AND DAVE THOMAS

STAFF PRESENT:

ALEX JENSEN, CLINT DRAKE, CHAD WILKINSON, DAVID PRICE, JOELLEN GRANDY, AND KIM READ

The meeting was held in the Council Chambers of the Layton City Center.

Mayor Petro opened the meeting and welcomed the public. Councilmember Smith Edmondson offered the invocation and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

MINUTES:

MOTION: Councilmember Bloxham moved and Councilmember Morris seconded to approve the minutes of:

**Layton City Council Work Meeting – July 18, 2024;
Layton City Council Meeting – July 18, 2024;
Layton City Council Meeting – August 15, 2024; and
Layton City Council Work Meeting – September 5, 2024.**

The vote was unanimous to approve the minutes as written.

MUNICIPAL EVENT ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Councilmember Roberts announced the following Parks and Recreation Department activities:

- Friday, October 18, 2024 – Halloween Bash with fun, games, and food at the Amphitheater Plaza.

Mayor Petro mentioned the Rotary Club would be providing train rides for a \$2 fee.

- Saturday, October 19 – Fall F.E.S.T. (Farmers, Entertainment, Shopping, and Trucks) at the Amphitheater Plaza. He mentioned there would be food trucks, vendors, live music, and storytelling.

D R A F T

Councilmember Smith Edmondson announced On Pitch Performing Arts (OPPA) would be having its annual Villains Family Fair, complete with Disney Villains on Saturday, October 12, 2024, from 5:00-7:00 PM at its facility located at 587 North Main Street. This is a free event. She mentioned there would be a family-friendly concert for \$5 following the Fair.

Mayor Petro announced Davis Arts Council's Active Pages was also scheduled for Saturday, October 12, 2024, in Commons Park. She directed interested individuals to its website for tickets and more information. She mentioned the Rotary Club would also be selling either hot chocolate or root beer during that event.

PRESENTATIONS:

PROCLAMATION – COURTNEY WAYMENT

Mayor Petro recognized Ms. Courtney Wayment, 2024 Olympic participant in the steeplechase, and read a Proclamation.

Ms. Courtney Wayment addressed the Council and recognized the sacrifices made in her behalf which allowed her the opportunity to achieve her dream of being an Olympian. She expressed appreciation to the City for its support and the support she had received from Layton City residents. She stated she was fortunate for having the opportunity to participate in the 2024 Paris Olympics.

The Council expressed appreciation to Ms. Wayment for representing Layton City, Utah, and USA in the 2024 Paris Olympics.

Mayor Petro announced although the Olympics had concluded in August 2024, Ms. Wayment had continued to compete in different competitions which delayed the recognition.

CITIZEN COMMENTS:

There were no citizen comments.

CONSENT AGENDA:

AGREEMENT BETWEEN LAYTON CITY AND THE UTAH DIVISION OF OUTDOOR RECREATION TO ACCEPT THE FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION'S

D R A F T

RECREATIONAL TRAILS PROGRAM FUNDS FOR THE KAY'S CREEK TRAIL PEDESTRIAN OVERPASS AT THE LAYTON FRONTRUNNER – RESOLUTION 24-27 – APPROXIMATELY 150 SOUTH MAIN STREET

JoEllen Grandy, Parks Planner, informed the Council on March 27, 2024, the City submitted a grant proposal through the Utah Division of Outdoor Recreation's Federal Highway Administration's Recreational Trails Program requesting funds to help construct the Kay's Creek Trail Pedestrian Overpass proposed to span the width of the Union Pacific/FrontRunner railway corridor and touch down immediately next to the FrontRunner Station. The overpass proposed would connect the east and west alignment of the Kay's Creek Trail to the FrontRunner Station and the downtown area of the City.

On August 22, 2024, the City was notified it had been awarded \$150,000 through the Federal Highway Administration's Recreational Trails Program. A fiscal assistance agreement had been issued by the Utah Division of Outdoor Recreation to formalize the awarded funds. Resolution 24-27 would authorize the execution of an agreement between the City and the Utah Division of Outdoor Recreation for funding assistance with the construction of the Kay's Creek Trail Pedestrian Overpass. Staff recommended the Council adopt Resolution 24-27 authorizing the City Manager to conduct negotiations and execute the Agreement.

She shared some illustrations of the proposed overpass and an artist's rendering of the finished overpass. She also shared the financial plan which identified the various grants and funding sources for the overpass. She mentioned approximately \$8.5 million had been secured via various grants.

Councilmember Smith Edmondson expressed appreciation and gratitude on behalf of the Council to Ms. Grandy for her efforts in securing the significant amount of grant funding for the overpass project.

Councilmember Thomas mentioned the bicycle amenity associated with the project and Ms. Grandy explained there was a tunnel which allowed cyclists to easily navigate the overpass without having to carry the bike.

Mayor Petro pointed out this project illustrated the progressive thinking of Layton City Staff and identified the benefit of the Kay's Creek Trail which would eventually be available from the western portion of the City near the Great Salt Lake to the Bonneville Shore Line Trail located at the eastern portion of the City.

Ms. Grandy expressed appreciation to UTA (Utah Transit Authority) for being a great partner with the City, as well as the developer of the Moda Apartments specific to this project.

D R A F T

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF TERMINATION OF AGREEMENT BETWEEN LAYTON CITY, THE LAYTON CITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY, AND JL VENTURES, LLC; DATED JANUARY 17, 2008 – RESOLUTION 24-26 – APPROXIMATELY 3550 NORTH FAIRFIELD ROAD

Chad Wilkinson, Community and Economic Development Director, informed the Council this was similar to the item brought before the RDA (Redevelopment Agency) during a its meeting earlier tonight. He explained the applicable Agreement was specific to the extension of Fairfield Road. This was a two part agreement: part of the Agreement was specific to the RDA and another part applicable to Layton City. He pointed out it was necessary that both the RDA and the City to acknowledge and terminate the Agreement. He reminded the Council, as was stated in the earlier RDA Meeting, all obligations in this Agreement had been met, all debts had been reimbursed to the City, the Agency, and to JL Ventures, LLC (Developer). The Developer requested the City consider terminating the Agreement to help facilitate future growth and development of the property. The Agreement would remain as a recorded document on the property. However, this Acknowledgment would provide evidence that any related encumbrance on the property had been satisfied and the Agreement had been terminated.

Staff recommended approval of Resolution 24-26, the Acknowledgment of Termination of Agreement between Layton City, Layton City RDA, and JL Ventures, LLC. He asked if there were any questions and there were none.

AMENDED PLAT – VALLEY HI PHASE 4 – 2068 EAST 2900 NORTH

Mr. Wilkinson introduced the agenda item; identified the location of the parcel and oriented the council to its location. He referenced an illustration which reflected a significant number of easements applicable to one of the parcels. The applicant requested the subdivision amendment in order to combine the parcels because of the difficulty with developing the lot due to the number of easements. By combining the lots, the applicant had more options to construct a home without the limited buildable area and the additional space would allow for accessory structures to be constructed of space from Lot 1.

He reported the request had been reviewed by the Planning Commission during its meeting on Tuesday, September 10, 2024 and recommended approval. He asked if there were any questions.

Councilmember Smith Edmondson inquired whether the property would be eligible for an Accessory Dwelling Unit once the properties were combined and Mr. Wilkinson responded in the affirmative.

D R A F T

MOTION: Councilmember Roberts moved to approve the Consent Agenda, including updated property descriptions for Agenda Item B. Councilmember Bloxham seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

There were no scheduled Public Hearings.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

There was no unfinished business.

The meeting adjourned at 7:36 p.m.

Kimberly S Read, City Recorder

**LAYTON CITY COUNCIL MEETING
AGENDA ITEM COVER SHEET**

Item Number: 3.A.

Subject:

Proclamation – Small Business Saturday, November 30, 2024

Background:

Mayor Petro will proclaim Saturday, November 30, 2024 as Small Business Saturday.

Alternatives:

N/A

Recommendation:

N/A

Whereas, the government of Layton City, Utah, celebrates our local small businesses and the contributions they make to our local economy and community; and

Whereas, according to the United States Small Business Administration, there are 34.7 million small businesses in the United States, small businesses represent 99.7% of firms with paid employees, small businesses are responsible for 61.1% of net new jobs created since 1995, and small businesses employ 45.9% of the employees in the private sector in the United States, and

Whereas, 68 cents of every dollar spent at a small business in the U.S. stays in the local community and every dollar spent at small businesses creates an additional 48 cents in local business activity as a result of employees and local businesses purchasing local goods and services; and

Whereas, 59% of U.S. consumers aware of Small Business Saturday shopped or ate at a small, independently owned retailer or restaurant on Small Business Saturday 2023; and

Whereas, Layton City, Utah, supports our local businesses that create jobs, boost our local economy, and preserve our communities; and

Whereas, advocacy groups, as well as public and private organizations, across the country have endorsed the Saturday after Thanksgiving as Small Business Saturday.

Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, I, Joy Petro, Mayor of Layton City, Utah, along with the Layton City Council, do hereby proclaim, November 30, 2024, as ***Small Business Saturday***, and urge the residents of our community, and communities across the country, to support small businesses and merchants on Small Business Saturday – celebrating its 15th year in 2024 – and Shop Small throughout the year.

In Witness Whereof: I have caused the Seal of the City of Layton, Utah, to be affixed on this 7th day of November 2024.

**LAYTON CITY COUNCIL MEETING
AGENDA ITEM COVER SHEET**

Item Number: 5.A.

Subject:

An Interlocal Agreement between Layton City and Davis County for the Purpose of Distributing Funds from the 2024 Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Number O-BJA-2024-172239 – Resolution 24-31

Background:

The Utah Interlocal Cooperation Act, Title 11, Chapter 13, of the Utah Code, Annotated 1953, as amended, in order to permit local governmental units to make the most efficient use of their powers to provide the benefit of economy of scale, authorizes public agencies of the State of Utah, including counties and municipalities, to enter into agreements with one another for the purpose of exercising on a joint and cooperative basis, any powers, privileges, and authority exercised or capable of exercise by such public agencies.

Layton City Corporation (City), a Utah municipal corporation, and Davis County, a body politic and political subdivision of the State of Utah, mutually desire to cooperate in applying for and distributing grant proceeds described herein.

The City intends to make a joint application for the 2024 Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (2024 Byrne JAG) offered by the Bureau of Justice Assistance, U.S. Department of Justice, on behalf of the City and Davis County. The City and Davis County (Participants) anticipate a 2024 Byrne JAG joint application award amount of \$18,392.00, which the Participants intend to divide and distribute among themselves in the manner set forth in this Agreement.

The Participants have negotiated the terms of this Agreement and determined that this Agreement is mutually beneficial to each Participant.

Alternatives:

Alternatives are to: 1) Adopt An Interlocal Agreement between Layton City and Davis County for the Purpose of Distributing Funds from the 2024 Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Number O-BJA-2024-172239 – Resolution 24-31; 2) Adopt Resolution 24-31 with any amendments the Council deems appropriate; or 3) Not adopt Resolution 24-31 and remand to Staff with directions.

Recommendation:

Staff recommends the Council adopt An Interlocal Agreement between Layton City and Davis County for the Purpose of Distributing Funds from the 2024 Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Number O-BJA-2024-172239 – Resolution 24-31 and authorize the Mayor to sign the necessary documents.

RESOLUTION 24 -31

AN INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT BETWEEN LAYTON CITY AND DAVIS COUNTY FOR THE PURPOSE OF DISTRIBUTING THE 2024 EDWARD BYRNE MEMORIAL JOINT JUSTICE ASSISTANCE GRANT NUMBER O-BJA-2024-172239 FUNDS

WHEREAS, the Utah Interlocal Cooperation Act, Title 11, Chapter 13, of the Utah Code Annotated 1953, as amended, in order to permit local governmental units to make the most efficient use of their powers to provide the benefit of economy of scale, authorizes public agencies of the State of Utah including counties and municipalities to enter into agreements with one another for the purpose of exercising on a joint and cooperative basis any powers, privileges, and authority exercised or capable of exercise by such public agencies; and

WHEREAS, the Utah Interlocal Cooperation Act, Title 11, Chapter 13, of the Utah Code Annotated 1953, as amended, in order to permit local governmental units to make the most efficient use of their powers to provide the benefit of economy of scale, authorizes public agencies of the State of Utah including counties and municipalities to enter into agreements with one another for the purpose of exercising on a joint and cooperative basis any powers, privileges, and authority exercised or capable of exercise by such public agencies; and

WHEREAS, Layton City Corporation, a Utah municipal corporation, (hereinafter "Layton City"), and Davis County, a body politic and political subdivision of the State of Utah, (hereinafter "Davis County"), mutually desire to cooperate in applying and distributing grant proceeds described herein; and

WHEREAS, Layton City intends to make a joint application for the 2024 Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (hereinafter 2024 Byrne JAG) offered by the Bureau of Justice Assistance, U.S. Department of Justice, on behalf of Layton City and Davis County; and

WHEREAS, Layton City and Davis County, (hereinafter jointly "Participants") anticipate a 2024 Byrne JAG joint application award amount of \$18,392.00, which amount the Participants intend to divide and distribute amongst themselves in the manner set forth in this agreement; and

WHEREAS, the Participants have negotiated the terms of this Agreement and determined that this Agreement is mutually beneficial to each Participant;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF LAYTON, UTAH:

1. That the agreement entitled an Interlocal Agreement Between Layton City and Davis County for The Purpose of Distributing The 2024 Edward Byrne Memorial Joint Justice Assistance Grant Number O-BJA-2024-172239 Funds, which is attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference, be adopted and approved.
2. That the Mayor be authorized to execute and deliver the Agreement and the Mayor is authorized to approve the final terms of the Agreement.
3. This Resolution shall become effective immediately upon adoption by the City Council.

*****SIGNATURE PAGE TO FOLLOW*****


PASSED AND ADOPTED by the City Council of Layton, Utah, this ____ **day of** _____, **20**__.

JOY PETRO, Mayor

ATTEST:

KIMBERLY S READ, City Recorder

APPROVED AS TO FORM:



CLINT DRAKE, City Attorney

**AN INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT BETWEEN LAYTON CITY AND DAVIS
COUNTY FOR THE PURPOSE OF DISTRIBUTING THE 2024 EDWARD BYRNE
MEMORIAL JUSTICE ASSISTANCE GRANT NUMBER O-B.JA-2024-172239
FUNDS**

RECITALS

WHEREAS, the Utah Interlocal Cooperation Act, Title 11, Chapter 13, of the Utah Code Annotated 1953, as amended, in order to permit local governmental units to make the most efficient use of their powers to provide the benefit of economy of scale, authorizes public agencies of the State of Utah including counties and municipalities to enter into agreements with one another for the purpose of exercising on a joint and cooperative basis any powers, privileges, and authority exercised or capable of exercise by such public agencies; and

WHEREAS, Layton City Corporation, a Utah municipal corporation, (hereinafter "Layton City"), and Davis County, a body politic and political subdivision of the State of Utah, (hereinafter "Davis County"), mutually desire to cooperate in applying and distributing grant proceeds described herein; and

WHEREAS, Layton City intends to make a joint application for the 2024 Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (hereinafter 2024 Byrne JAG) offered by the Bureau of Justice Assistance, U.S. Department of Justice, on behalf of Layton City and Davis County; and

WHEREAS, Layton City and Davis County, (hereinafter jointly "Participants") anticipate a 2024 Byrne JAG joint application award amount of \$18,392.00, which amount the Participants intend to divide and distribute amongst themselves in the manner set forth in this agreement; and

WHEREAS, the Participants have negotiated the terms of this Agreement and determined that this Agreement is mutually beneficial to each Participant;

NOW THEREFORE, for and in consideration of the mutual promises and covenants contained herein, the Participants hereto do hereby agree as follows:

**ARTICLE ONE
TERM**

- 1.01** This Agreement shall be effective for a term beginning October 1, 2024, and ending September 30, 2025.

**ARTICLE TWO
APPLICATION AND DIVISION OF 2024 BYRNE JAG PROCEEDS**

- 2.01** Layton City will: (a) make application for the 2024 Byrne JAG grant award on behalf of the Participants, (b) act as grant manager on behalf of the Participants, and (c) distribute 2024 Byrne JAG grant proceeds to the Participants in the manner set forth herein.
- 2.02** It is anticipated that the Participants will be awarded a 2024 Byrne JAG joint application award amount of \$18,392.00. Participants agree that Layton City shall manage the grant proceeds.
- 2.03** The Participants agree that Layton City shall distribute the joint application award amount amongst the Participants as follows:

- 2.03.1 Layton City:** Layton City shall receive \$16,392.00 in 2024 Byrne JAG funds. Layton City agrees to: (a) use the \$16,392.00 to purchase ten (10) Less Lethal Pepper Ball Systems to enhance police operations.
- 2.03.2 Davis County:** Davis County shall receive \$2,000.00 in 2024 Byrne JAG funds. Davis County agrees to: (a) use the \$2,000.00 to purchase computer and television hardware presentation equipment, to organize and present evidence during hearings and trials.
- 2.04** All 2024 Byrne JAG funds distributed shall be expended by the Participants for the purposes described herein during the term of this Agreement.
- 2.05** In the event the Participants receive a 2024 Byrne JAG joint application award of a total or incremental amount equaling more or less than \$18,392.00, the 2024 Byrne JAG funds shall be distributed amongst the Participants on a pro-rata basis, in the same proportion and for the same purposes as described above.

ARTICLE THREE MISCELLANEOUS

- 3.01 No Separate Entity.** It is the intent of the Participants that this Agreement not create a separate legal entity to provide for its administration. It shall be administered by the Executive of each of the Participants. Participants shall not jointly acquire, hold, or dispose of real or personal property pursuant to this Agreement, except as specifically set forth herein.
- 3.02 Privileges and Immunity.** All privileges and immunities which surround the activities of governmental officers and employees shall continue in full force and effect.
- 3.03 Amendment.** This Interlocal Agreement may be changed, modified or amended only by written agreement of the Participants, upon adoption of a resolution by each of the Participants when approved as to form by each respective entity's attorney, and upon meeting all other applicable requirements of the Interlocal Cooperation Act.
- 3.04 Effective Date.** This Interlocal Agreement shall become effective immediately upon the execution of an appropriate resolution, if required by law, approving this Agreement by each of the Participants. Per section 11-13-209 of the Interlocal Cooperation Agreement Act provides that "a[n] agreement made under this chapter does not take effect until it is filed with the keeper of records of each of the public agencies that are parties to the agreement."
- 3.05 Review by Legal Counsel.** Each of the Parties hereby certifies that, pursuant to the requirements of Section 11-13-202.5, Utah Code (1953 as amended), it has submitted this agreement to an attorney authorized to represent it for review as to proper form and compliance with applicable law.
- 3.06 Filing of Interlocal Agreement.** Executed copies of this Interlocal Cooperation Agreement shall be placed on file with the official keeper of records of each of the Parties within twenty-four hours of its execution and shall remain on file for public inspection during the term of this Interlocal Cooperation Agreement.
- 3.07 Governing Law.** This Agreement shall be governed by the laws of the State of Utah.

- 3.08 Rights and Remedies Cumulative.** The rights and remedies of the Parties under this Agreement shall be construed cumulatively, and none of the rights or remedies under this Agreement shall be exclusive of, or in lieu or limitation of, any other right, remedy, or priority allowed by law unless specifically set forth herein.
- 3.09 Entire Agreement.** This Agreement shall constitute the entire agreement between the Participants and any prior understanding or representation of any kind preceding the date of this Agreement shall not be binding upon any Participant except to the extent incorporated in this Agreement.
- 3.10 Indemnification.** Each Participant to this Agreement agrees to hold harmless, defend, and indemnify the other, for and against any negligent or wrongful acts committed by its officers, employees, or agents in relation to this Agreement.
- 3.11 No Third Party Beneficiaries.** The parties to this Agreement do not intend for any third party to obtain a right by virtue of this Agreement.
- 3.12 Waivers or Modification.** No waiver or failure to enforce one or more parts or provisions of this Agreement shall be construed as a continuing waiver of any part or provision of this Agreement, which shall preclude the Parties from receiving the full, bargained-for benefit under the terms and provisions of this Agreement. A waiver or modification of any of the provisions of this Agreement or of any breach thereof shall not constitute a waiver or modification of any other provision or breach, whether or not similar, and any such waiver or modification shall not constitute a continuing waiver. The rights of and available to any of the Parties under this Agreement cannot be waived or released verbally and may be waived or released only by an instrument in writing, signed by the Party whose rights will be diminished or adversely affected by the waiver.
- 3.13 Assignment Restricted.** The Parties agree that neither this Agreement nor the duties, obligations, responsibilities, or privileges herein may be assigned, transferred, or delegated, in whole or in part, without the prior written consent of all of the Parties.
- 3.14 Force Maieure.** In the event that any Party shall be delayed or hindered in or prevented from the performance of any act required under this Agreement by reason of acts of God, acts of the United States Government, the State of Utah Government, fires, floods, strikes, lock-outs, labor troubles, inability to procure materials, failure of power, inclement weather, restrictive governmental laws, ordinances, rules, regulations or otherwise, delays in or refusals to issue necessary governmental permits or licenses, riots, insurrection, wars, pandemics, epidemics or other reasons of a like nature not the fault of the Party delayed in performing work or doing acts required under the terms of this Agreement, then performance of such act(s) shall be excused for the period of the delay and the period for the performance of any such act shall be extended for a period equivalent to the period of such delay, without any liability to the delayed Party.
- 3.15 Severability.** If any part or provision of this Agreement is found to be invalid, prohibited, or unenforceable in any jurisdiction, such part or provision of this Agreement shall, as to such jurisdiction only, be inoperative, null and void to the extent of such invalidity, prohibition, or unenforceability without invalidating the remaining parts or provisions hereof, and any such invalidity, prohibition, or unenforceability in any jurisdiction shall not invalidate or render inoperative, null or void such part or provision in any other jurisdiction. Those parts or provisions of this Agreement, which are not invalid, prohibited,

or unenforceable, shall remain in full force and effect.

3.16 Authorization. The persons executing this Agreement on behalf of a Party hereby represent and warrant that they are duly authorized and empowered to execute the same, that they have carefully read this Agreement, and that this Agreement represents a binding and enforceable obligation of such Party.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have caused this agreement to be executed by their respective, duly authorized representatives as of the day and year first hereinabove written.

*****Signatures on following page*****

LAYTON CITY

Dated this ____ day of _____, 20__

JOY PETRO, Mayor

APPROVED AS TO FORM:



CLINT DRAKE, City Attorney

DAVIS COUNTY

Dated this ____ day of _____, 20__ .

COUNTY COMMISSIONER/Chairperson

ATTEST:

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

DAVIS COUNTY CLERK/Auditor

DAVIS COUNTY ATTORNEY/Deputy

**LAYTON CITY COUNCIL MEETING
AGENDA ITEM COVER SHEET**

Item Number: 5.B.

Subject:

Bid Award – Craythorne, Inc. – Constitution Circle Storm Drain, Project 24-11 – Resolution 24-30 – Along Constitution Circle between Approximately Wasatch Drive and the North Entrance to Surf 'n Swim

Background:

Resolution 24-30 authorizes the execution of an agreement between Layton City and Craythorne, Inc. for the Constitution Circle Storm Drain, Project 24-11. The project includes construction of new 12-inch to 15-inch reinforced concrete storm drain pipe (RCP) with box installations, removal of waterways, new ADA ramps, and all other incidental work associated with storm drain installation.

One bid was received, with Craythorne, Inc. submitting the lowest, responsive, responsible bid in the amount of \$230,431.73. The engineer's estimate was \$230,000.00.

Alternatives:

Alternatives are to: 1) Adopt Resolution 24-30 awarding the bid to Craythorne, Inc. for the Constitution Circle Storm Drain, Project 24-11; 2) Adopt Resolution 24-30 with any amendments the Council deems appropriate; or 3) Not adopt Resolution 24-30 and remand to Staff with directions.

Recommendation:

Staff recommends the Council adopt Resolution 24-30 awarding the bid to Craythorne, Inc. and authorize the City Manager to execute the agreement for the Constitution Circle Storm Drain, Project 24-11.

RESOLUTION 24-30

A RESOLUTION ADOPTING AN AGREEMENT WITH CRAYTHORNE, INC. FOR THE CONSTITUTION CIRCLE STORM DRAIN, PROJECT 24-11

WHEREAS, Layton City (City) has elected to construct street improvements, to be known as the Constitution Circle Storm Drain, Project 24-11 (Project 24-11), Located Along Constitution Circle between approximately Wasatch Drive and the North Entrance to Surf ‘n Swim; and

WHEREAS, the City received one bid for construction of the referenced project on October 21, 2024, with the results of the bid attached hereto for the Council’s review; and

WHEREAS, City Staff has reviewed and evaluated the response to the Advertisement for Bids and has found it to be in the best interest of the City and citizens of Layton City to conditionally select Craythorne, Inc. (Craythorne) as the contractor for Project 24-11.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF LAYTON, UTAH:

1. Craythorne is conditionally selected as the lowest responsive and responsible bidder with whom the City Manager should conduct negotiations for Project 24-11.

2. The City Manager is directed to conduct negotiations for an agreement (Agreement) with Craythorne for Project 24-11. The terms of the Agreement shall address the terms and conditions of the Advertisement for Bids as well as the price contained in the proposal submitted by Craythorne that are consistent with the intent of the Advertisement for Bids. The Agreement shall include such other provisions as are deemed necessary to accomplish the purposes of the City in entering an agreement for Project 24-11.

3. When the Agreement is in a form acceptable to the City Manager and City Attorney and after Craythorne has properly executed said Agreement, the City Manager is authorized to execute the Agreement on behalf of the City. Execution of the Agreement by the City Manager shall constitute the City's acceptance of the offer by Craythorne and the formal award of the contract to Craythorne for Project 24-11, pursuant to the terms and conditions of the Agreement.

4. This Resolution shall become effective immediately upon adoption by the City Council.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the City Council of Layton, Utah, this 7th day of November, 2024.


JOY PETRO, Mayor

ATTEST:

KIMBERLY S READ, City Recorder

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

for: 
CLINTON R. DRAKE, City Attorney


STEPHEN JACKSON, Department Director

LAYTON CITY CORPORATION
Constitution Circle Storm Drain, Project 24-11

Bid Opening October 21, 2024, 10:00 a.m.

Engineer's Estimate: \$230,000.00

Constitution Circle Storm Drain, Project 24-11				Craythorne, Inc.	
Schedule A: Emerald Drive to Cherry Lane		QTY	Unit	(\$ Per	TOTAL (\$)
A1	Furnish and install new 12-inch RCP	109	LF	\$75.52	\$8,231.68
A2	Furnish and install new 15-inch RCP	570	LF	\$82.40	\$46,968.00
A3	Construct standard hooded inlet box	4	EA	\$2,671.00	\$10,684.00
A4	Construct standard cleanout box	5	EA	\$4,418.00	\$22,090.00
A5	Construct standard combination box	3	EA	\$5,453.00	\$16,359.00
A6	Furnish 1-inch gravel (rock) bedding material for pipe	150	TN	\$33.90	\$5,085.00
A7	Furnish sand material for trench backfill in pipe zone	170	TN	\$17.65	\$3,000.50
A8	Furnish 3-inch minus, select borrow material for trench backfill above the pipe zone, (sand acceptable) (IF REQUIRED)	15	TN	\$17.65	\$264.75
A9	Furnish, place, and compact the 3/4-inch or 1-inch gradation gravel roadbase material	330	TN	\$23.56	\$7,774.80
A10	Furnish, place, and compact 1/2-inch gradation asphalt surface	180	TN	\$246.00	\$44,280.00
A11	Flush and video tape new storm drain lines	1	LS	\$2,148.00	\$2,148.00
A12	Remove existing concrete waterway and additional asphalt on both sides of waterway	3	EA	\$4,110.00	\$12,330.00
A13	Remove existing curb radius and construct ADA ramp	4	EA	\$4,896.00	\$19,584.00
A14	Remove and replace standard curb and gutter - additional quantity not included under another bid item	65	LF	\$65.00	\$4,225.00
A15	Remove and replace existing fire hydrant	1	EA	\$12,708.00	\$12,708.00
A16	Loop 18-inch fused HDPE secondary water line.	1	EA	\$9,371.00	\$9,371.00
A17	Loop 6-inch culinary water line under storm drain line (if needed)	1	EA	\$5,328.00	\$5,328.00
Schedule A Total:					\$230,431.73
Project Total:					\$230,431.73

**LAYTON CITY COUNCIL MEETING
AGENDA ITEM COVER SHEET**

Item Number: 5.C.

Subject:

Amending Title 18, Chapter 32, Section 080 Lot Line Adjustment and Title 19, Chapter 03, Section 040 Review of Application of the Layton Municipal Code – Ordinance 24-30

Background:

The City Council is authorized to enact and amend ordinances to protect the health, safety, and welfare of the public. The City Council finds that it is necessary to provide additional context, clarity, and direction regarding Lot Line Adjustments in Layton City. The City Council finds that certain changes to Title 18, Chapter 32, Section 080 Lot Line Adjustment, and Title 19, Chapter 03, Section 040 Review of Application of the Layton Municipal Code are in the best interests of the health, safety, and welfare of the City.

Alternatives:

Alternatives are to: 1) Adopt Ordinance 24-30 Amending Title 18, Chapter 32, Section 080 Lot Line Adjustment and Title 19, Chapter 03, Section 040 Review of Application of the Layton Municipal Code; 2) Adopt Ordinance 24-30 with any amendments the Council deems appropriate; or 3) Not adopt Ordinance 24-30 and remand to Staff with directions.

Recommendation:

Staff recommends the Council adopt Ordinance 24-30 Amending Title 18, Chapter 32, Section 080 Lot Line Adjustment and Title 19, Chapter 03, Section 040 Review of Application of the Layton Municipal Code, and authorize the Mayor to sign the necessary documents.

Layton City
ORDINANCE 24-30

LOT LINE ADJUSTMENT

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING TITLE 18, CHAPTER 32, SECTION 080 LOT LINE ADJUSTMENT, AND TITLE 19, CHAPTER 03, SECTION 040 REVIEW OF APPLICATION OF THE LAYTON MUNICIPAL CODE

WHEREAS, the City Council is authorized to enact and amend ordinances to protect the health, safety, and welfare of the public; and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds that it is necessary to provide additional context, clarity, and direction regarding Lot Line Adjustments in Layton City; and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds that certain changes to Title 18, Chapter 32, Section 080 Lot Line Adjustment, and Title 19, Chapter 03, Section 040 Review of Application of the Layton Municipal Code are in the best interests of the health, safety, and welfare of the City.

NOW THEREFORE, be it ordained by the City Council of Layton City, UT as follows:

SECTION 1: Repealer. If any provisions of the municipal code previously adopted are inconsistent herewith they are hereby repealed.

SECTION 2: Amendment. Section "18.32.080 " is hereby amended as follows.

1. The Community and Economic Development Director, as designated by the City Council, shall have the administrative authority to approve lot line adjustments within a subdivision. This approval is based on a recorded agreement between owners of adjoining properties adjusting their mutual boundary and no new lot is created and the adjustment does not result in a violation of the applicable zoning ordinance. If none exist, new PU&DEs ~~shall~~may be established along the adjusted lot lines and street frontage. The Development Staff review for a lot line adjustment shall comply with the process and criteria outlined in 19.03 of the Layton Municipal Code.

HISTORY

...

SECTION 3: Amendment. Section "19.03.040 " is hereby amended as follows.

1. No later than 15 business days for a preliminary plat application, 14 days for a lot line adjustment, and 20 business days for final plats and all other land use applications, (excluding City observed holidays), the Development Staff shall complete a review of the application. Review

timeframes shall comply with the following criteria:

- a. Review timeframes shall ... application is deemed complete.
- b. Review timeframes shall ... a general plan amendment.

...

SECTION 4: Severability. If any section, subsection, sentence, clause, or phrase of this amendment is declared invalid or unconstitutional by a court of competent jurisdiction, said portion shall be severed and such declaration shall not affect the validity of the remainder of this amendment.

SECTION 5: Effective Date. This ordinance being necessary for the peace, health, and safety of the City, shall go into effect at the expiration of the 20th day after publication or posting or the 30th day after final passage as noted below or whichever of said days is the more remote from the date of passage thereof.

****Signatures On Next Page****

PASSED AND ADOPTED by Layton City Council this _____.

JOY PETRO, Mayor
Layton City

Attest:

KIMBERLY S READ, City Recorder
Layton City



JADYN APPLONIE, Assistant City Attorney
Layton City

City Council Vote as Recorded:	AYE	NAY	ABSTAIN	ABSENT
Zach Bloxham	___	___	___	___
Clint Morris	___	___	___	___
Tyson Roberts	___	___	___	___
Bettina Smith Edmondson	___	___	___	___
Dave Thomas	___	___	___	___

RECORDED this _____.
PUBLISHED OR POSTED this _____.

CERTIFICATE OF PASSAGE AND PUBLICATION OR POSTING

In accordance with Utah Code Annotated §10-3-713, 1953 as amended, I, the City Recorder of Layton City, hereby certifies that the foregoing Amendment was duly passed and published or posted at:

- 1. Layton City Center
- 2. Surf 'n Swim Bulletin Board
- 3. Davis County Library - Layton Branch

on the above referenced dates.

KIMBERLY S READ, City Recorder
Layton City

**LAYTON CITY COUNCIL MEETING
AGENDA ITEM COVER SHEET**

Item Number: 5.D.

Subject:

Amending 9.04 Lot Line Adjustment of the Development Guidelines and Design Standards – Ordinance 24-31

Background:

The Layton City Engineering Department currently maintains and publishes Development Guidelines and Design Standards (Guidelines) for the purpose of assisting developers in meeting the current engineering standards required by the City. The Guidelines change or need to be updated from time to time for various reasons, including a change in the Utah State Code or case law. Section 19.01.240 of the Layton Municipal Code authorizes the City Engineer to draft, approve, adopt, interpret, and amend the Guidelines from time to time as determined necessary. The Utah State Code requires the approval of those Guidelines by ordinance. The City Attorney and City Engineer have reviewed the current Guidelines and have determined that Section 9.04 of the Guidelines needs to be amended. The City Council has determined that it is in the best interest of the City to adopt and amend Section 9.04 of the Development Guidelines and Design Standards.

Alternatives:

Alternatives are to: 1) Adopt Ordinance 24-31 Amending 9.04 Lot Line Adjustment of the Development Guidelines and Design Standards; 2) Adopt Ordinance 24-31 with any amendments the Council deems appropriate; or 3) Not adopt Ordinance 24-31 and remand to Staff with directions.

Recommendation:

Staff recommends the Council adopt Ordinance 24-31 Amending 9.04 Lot Line Adjustment of the Development Guidelines and Design Standards, and authorize the Mayor to sign the necessary documents.

ORDINANCE 24-31
Lot Line Adjustment

**AN ORDINANCE AMENDING 9.04 LOT LINE ADJUSTMENT OF THE
DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINES AND DESIGN STANDARDS**

WHEREAS, the Layton City Engineering Department currently maintains Development Guidelines and Design Standards (hereinafter “Guidelines”) for the purpose of assisting developers in meeting the current engineering standards required by the City; and

WHEREAS, the Guidelines change or need to be updated from time to time, as required by State Law; and

WHEREAS, Section 19.01.240 of the Layton Municipal Code authorizes the City Engineer to draft, approve, adopt, interpret, and amend the Guideline from time to time as determined necessary; and

WHEREAS, the Utah State Code requires the approval of those Guidelines by ordinance; and

WHEREAS, the City attorney has reviewed the current Guidelines and have determined that the current Guidelines need to be updated and amended; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has determined that it is in the best interest of the City to adopt and amend Section 9.04 of the Development Guidelines and Design Standards.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF LAYTON, UTAH:

SECTION 1. Repealer. If any provision of Layton City’s ordinance that is deemed to be inconsistent with this amendment is hereby repealed.

SECTION 2. Enactment. The following provision of the Development Guidelines and Design Standards is hereby amended: Section 9.04 Lot Line Adjustment

A. To adjust a lot line between two private properties, legal descriptions of the existing lots and the new lots must be submitted for review and approval.

1. The legal descriptions for the lots ~~will need to~~ may include the establishment of new public utility and drainage easements (PU&DEs) (dedication to the City) adjacent to the new lot lines (typically 5 feet each side of the new lot line) and along any public street frontage (typically 7 feet) if one does not exist. PU&DEs ~~shall~~ may be dedicated to the City with a form provided by the City.

2. The legal descriptions shall include the total area of the new lots.

3. The legal descriptions will need to be submitted on a deed form with proper signatures. In the event that new PU&DEs are established, ~~The~~ the Mayor will sign the documents as acceptance of the new PU&DE for the City. Once the document is approved, the deeds, along with the engineering staff report, will be filed with the County, which includes the exchange of title, an acknowledgement by each party, and the old and new descriptions. A copy of the recorded document will need to be submitted to the City for our records. Recorded copies of the documents will need to be received prior to any development affecting the lot line adjustment.

B. If the lot line adjustment is in a subdivision with existing PU&DEs, the existing PU&DEs will need to be abandoned by submitting letters from the power, gas, phone, and any other applicable utility companies acknowledging they have no utility infrastructure in the existing easement and no interest in maintaining the easement. The City will abandon the existing PU&DEs by ordinance at a City Council Meeting. If the lot line is moved a minimal distance, the PU&DEs may not have to be abandoned and re-established.

SECTION 3. Severability. If any part of this ordinance is found to be invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the remaining language shall remain in full force and effect.

SECTION 4. Effective Date. This ordinance amendment shall become effective immediately upon posting.

PASSED AND ADOPTED BY THE LAYTON CITY COUNCIL _____.

	AYE	NAY	ABSENT	ABSTAIN
Joy Petro	_____	_____	_____	_____
Zach Bloxham	_____	_____	_____	_____
Clint Morris	_____	_____	_____	_____
Tyson Roberts	_____	_____	_____	_____
Bettina Smith Edmondson	_____	_____	_____	_____
Dave Thomas	_____	_____	_____	_____

JOY PETRO, Mayor

ATTEST

KIMBERLY S READ, City Recorder



JADYN APPLONIE, Assistant City Attorney

**LAYTON CITY COUNCIL MEETING
AGENDA ITEM COVER SHEET**

Item Number: 6.A.

Subject:

General Plan Amendment – Layton City Transportation and Parks and Recreation Element of the General Plan by the Adoption of the Layton City Active Transportation Plan – Ordinance 24-29

Background:

The City desires to compile and update its bike and trail plans found in separate plan elements into one overarching document to be known as the Layton City Active Transportation Plan (ATP). This new plan element will supplement other General Plan elements to identify community opportunities and define goals and policies.

The ATP is intended to inform staff, commissions, and elected officials about alternative active transportation options including walking, biking, and rolling.

On March 15, 2021, the Transportation Land Use Connection Program, offered through Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC), notified the City of an award of \$90,000 to assist with preparing an active transportation plan contingent upon a local match of \$10,000.

Through a Local Government Understanding and Agreement signed by the Mayor on October 7, 2021, the City entered into an agreement between WFRC and Alta Planning + Design, Inc. for design services provided to assist with the development of an active transportation plan.

This two-year planning process included the involvement of a steering committee, stakeholders, and public participation. Major tasks accomplished from the plan include the establishment of vision and goals for active transportation; background research and analysis of the existing bike and trail plan network; outreach in stakeholder/public participation and feedback; recommendations for an updated active transportation network; the development of policies and programs; project prioritization; and the provision of high-level cost estimates and funding sources.

Alternatives:

Alternatives are to: 1) Adopt Ordinance 24-29 authorizing the Mayor to adopt the Layton City Active Transportation Plan; 2) Adopt Ordinance 24-29 with any amendments the Council deems appropriate; or 3) Not adopt Ordinance 24-29 and remand to Staff with directions.

Recommendation:

Staff recommends the Council adopt Ordinance 24-29 authorizing the Mayor to adopt the Layton City Active Transportation Plan.

ORDINANCE 24-29
(Layton City Active Transportation Plan)

**AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE LAYTON CITY TRANSPORTATION AND
PARKS AND RECREATION ELEMENTS OF THE GENERAL PLAN BY THE
ADOPTION OF THE LAYTON CITY ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PLAN**

WHEREAS, the City's General Plan provides direction and consistency in the planning and development of future facilities, and for the various City services; and

WHEREAS, the City has conducted a two year-long study that has included vision and goals for active transportation; background research and analysis of the existing active transportation network; outreach in stakeholder/public participation and feedback; recommendations for an updated active transportation network; the development of policies and programs; project prioritization; and the provision of high-level cost estimates and funding sources, and adoption; and

WHEREAS, the Layton City Planning Commission has reviewed the Layton City Active Transportation Plan and has recommended adoption thereof; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission's action of recommending approval of the Layton City Active Transportation Plan as an amendment to the Layton City Transportation and Parks and Recreation Elements of the General Plan as reasonable and rationally based; and

WHEREAS, the City staff recommends amendment of the current Layton City Transportation and Parks and Recreation Elements of the Layton City General Plan and the adoption of the Layton City Active Transportation Plan, as an amendment to Layton City Transportation and Parks and Recreation Elements of the General Plan; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF LAYTON, UTAH:

SECTION 1. Repealer. If any provision of Layton City's ordinance that is deemed to be inconsistent with this amendment is hereby repealed.

SECTION 2. Enactment. Layton City's General Plan is hereby amended by the adoption of the Layton City Active Transportation Plan, which is attached and incorporated herein.

SECTION 3. Severability. If any part of this ordinance is found to be invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the remaining language shall remain in full force and effect.

SECTION 4. Effective Date. This ordinance amendment shall become effective immediately upon posting.

Signatures on next page

PASSED AND ADOPTED BY THE LAYTON CITY COUNCIL _____.

	AYE	NAY	ABSENT	ABSTAIN
Joy Petro	_____	_____	_____	_____
Zach Bloxham	_____	_____	_____	_____
Clint Morris	_____	_____	_____	_____
Tyson Roberts	_____	_____	_____	_____
Bettina Smith Edmondson	_____	_____	_____	_____
Dave Thomas	_____	_____	_____	_____

JOY PETRO, Mayor

ATTEST

KIMBERLY S READ, City Recorder

For: 
CLINTON R. DRAKE, City Attorney


Department Director



2023

Layton Active Transportation Plan

Acknowledgments

Thank you to the local residents, community leaders, and government staff that participated in the development of this plan through meetings, workshops, events, comment forms, and plan review. Special thanks to those who participated as steering committee members, listed below.

LAYTON CITY STAFF:

JoEllen Grandy, Parks Planner (Project Manager)

David Price, Parks & Recreation Director

Elizabeth Felix, Engineer

Weston Applonie, City Planner

Brandon Rypien, Planner

Sadika Khan, Planner

LAYTON CITY COUNCIL:

Joy Petro, Mayor

Clint Morris, City Councilman

LAYTON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION:

Trevor Steenblik, Commissioner

LAYTON CITY PARKS & RECREATION COMMISSION:

Scott Quinney, Commissioner

DAVIS COUNTY:

Jeff Oyler, Planning Manager

UTAH TRANSIT AUTHORITY:

Clint Campbell

Alex Beim

UDOT, REGION 1:

Christopher Chestnut, Planning Manager

WASATCH FRONT REGIONAL COUNCIL:

Mikala Jordan

Hugh Van Wagenen

LAYTON RESIDENTS:

Ryan Bankhead

Morgan Cloward

Prepared for the City of Layton, Utah

Project Contact: JoEllen Grandy, City of Layton | jgrandy@laytoncity.org

Prepared by Alta Planning + Design



Table of Contents

CHAPTER 1: THE VISION	1
About This Plan	2
The Case for Active Transportation	3
Types of Bicyclists.....	6
Plan Goals	7
 CHAPTER 2: ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION IN LAYTON TODAY	9
Current Trends.....	11
Existing Active Transportation Network	13
Key Takeaways	18
 CHAPTER 3: COMMUNITY VOICE	29
Phase I: Listen & Learn.....	31
Phase II: Get Feedback & Direction.....	40
 CHAPTER 4: RECOMMENDATIONS	47
The Network.....	48
Supporting Infrastructure	54
Policies and Programs	58
 CHAPTER 5: PRIORITIZATION & IMPLEMENTATION	63
Project Prioritization.....	64
Cost Estimates and Funding Sources	73

Appendices

A: ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION IN LAYTON TODAY	83
B: COMMUNITY VOICE	95
C: RECOMMENDATIONS	101
D: PRIORITIZATION & IMPLEMENTATION.....	107

List of Maps and Table

MAPS

CHAPTER 2: ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION IN LAYTON TODAY

2.1 Existing Active Transportation Facilities	14
2.2 Access to Destinations	22
2.3 Transit Integration	23
2.4 Potential Active Transportation Demand	24
2.5a Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress (BLTS)	25
2.5b Pedestrian Level of Traffic Stress (PLTS)	26
2.6 Equity Analysis	27

CHAPTER 3: COMMUNITY VOICE

3.1 Public Input: Where People Live in Relation to Destinations	32
3.2 Public Input: Barriers & Suggested Routes	34
3.3 Public Input Phase 2: Top Facilities	42
3.4 Public Input Phase 2: Top Spot Improvements	43

CHAPTER 4: RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 Recommended Network	51
4.2 Recommended Spot Improvements	53

CHAPTER 5: PRIORITIZATION & IMPLEMENTATION

5.1 Project Value - Facilities	67
5.2 Project Value - Spot Improvements	68
5.3 Project Readiness - Facilities	70
5.4 Project Readiness - Spot Improvements	71
5.5 Priority Projects	72

APPENDIX

B.1 Public Input Phase 2: Public Comments	96
D.1 Recommended Network - Numbered	118
D.2 Pedestrian-Involved Crash Map	119
D.3 Bicyclist-Involved Crash Map	120

TABLES

CHAPTER 5: PRIORITIZATION & IMPLEMENTATION

5.1 Project Value Evaluation Criteria	66
5.2 Planning-Level Project Cost Estimates	73
5.3 Available Funding Sources	74

APPENDIX

B.1 Public Input Phase 2 - Added Comments	97
D.1 Priority Projects - Facilities	108
D.2 Priority Projects - Spot Improvements	115

This page intentionally left blank

- About This Plan
- The Case for Active Transportation
- Types of Bicyclists
- Plan Goals

1

The Vision

CHAPTER 1

The Vision

About This Plan

The purpose of the Layton Active Transportation Plan (ATP) is to identify actions the City can take to make walking and bicycling in Layton safe and convenient. Funded by the Wasatch Front Regional Council's (WFRC) Transportation Land Use Connection (TLC) program, the Layton ATP will serve as a guide to city staff, commissions, and elected officials on how to prioritize projects and allocate funds.

What is active transportation?

Active transportation is human-powered mobility, such as walking and bicycling, and includes the use of personal mobility devices like electric bicycles, wheelchairs, and scooters. A cohesive, thorough active transportation strategy has the potential to bring several benefits to the City of Layton and its residents. The City recognizes that investment in active transportation plays a vital role in fostering a livable and sustainable community and enhancing the overall quality of life for people who visit, live, and work in Layton (Layton Transportation Master Plan, 2017).

This plan outlines recommendations for infrastructure, policies, and programs that give the City a strategy for making walking and biking in Layton a safe and convenient way to get around.

The Case for Active Transportation

The majority of western American cities have developed their urban form and transportation systems around the optimization of automobile use. Therefore, driving a car, and often driving alone, is the most common way people use to get around, as is true in Layton. With the desire to provide options for active transportation to coexist in a city's infrastructure built around vehicular ownership and dependence as a common culture of living for over of the past 100 years, there are several personal and community factors to be accounted. They include the following: planning for safety, health and wellbeing, economic sustainability, environmental quality, and overall quality of life and community character.

Planning for Safety

According to Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) crash data, for Layton, there were 96 pedestrian-involved and 77 bicycle-involved crashes reported from 2017-2021. Six of these crashes were fatal, and 23 resulted in serious injury. While the details and circumstances of these crashes vary, most of these crashes are preventable. Education and enforcement are important strategies for improving roadway safety, but safe infrastructure that is designed to slow vehicle speeds and provide separation between motorists, bicyclists, and pedestrians is the most effective way to reduce roadway crashes and crash severity¹.

Higher vehicle speeds are closely associated with both crash frequency and crash severity. In 2021, nearly 30% of fatal crashes across the state of Utah were reported as involving excessive speeds. These statistics support research suggesting that streets designed for slower speeds result in fewer crashes [footnote Ewing] and that crashes are more severe as vehicle speeds increase, especially for pedestrians and bicyclists².

Pedestrians struck by a car traveling 20 mph have a 95% chance of survival, whereas pedestrians hit by a car traveling 40 mph only have a 15% chance of survival³.

1 National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) Report 500, Volume 18. 2004. A Guide for Reducing Collisions Involving Pedestrians

2 Ewing, Reid and Dumbaugh, Eric. 2009. The Built Environment and Traffic Safety. Journal of Planning Literature. Volume 23 Number 4.

3 National Traffic Safety Board. 2017. Reducing Speeding-Related Crashes Involving Passenger Vehicles. Available from: <https://www.nts.gov/safety/safety-studies/Documents/SS1701.pdf>

Community Health

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention recommends that adults get 150 minutes of moderate-intensity physical activity every week (e.g., 30 minutes a day for five days) to reduce chances of chronic diseases, such as diabetes or cardiovascular disease. However, recent data shows that roughly 80 percent of American adults do not achieve this.⁴ Communities that make walking and bicycling safe and convenient ways to travel enable residents to incorporate physical activity into their daily routines.

Despite the inherent risks tied to walking and bicycling, studies have shown that the health benefits to an individual outweigh the risks 9 to 1, even when accounting for higher exposure to air pollution and risk of traffic collisions.⁵

⁴ Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. <https://www.cdc.gov/physicalactivity/index.html>

⁵ de Hartog, Jeroen Johan; Boogaard, Hanna; Nijland, Hans; Hoek, Gerard. 2010. Do the Health Benefits of Cycling Outweigh the Risks? Environmental Health Perspectives. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2920084/>

Quality of Life & Urban Character

Research from the National Association of Realtors shows that increasingly more Americans have a desire to live in walkable and bikeable communities, which enable a lifestyle that provides transportation options and reduces reliance on motor vehicles. This research also shows that people who perceive their community as walkable indicate an increased satisfaction with their quality of life.⁶

In addition to personal preference, some community members may not be able to drive and must walk or bike to get around independently; this includes children, aging adults, people with disabilities, and people who lack access to a vehicle. A strong active transportation system expands the autonomy and freedom of choice of these individuals.

Encouraging more walking and bicycling in Layton can help maintain the City's quiet, small-town character and foster spontaneous social interaction among residents.

⁶ NAR 2017 Community and Transportation Preference Survey. <https://www.nar.realtor/reports/nar-community-and-transportation-preference-surveys>

Economic Sustainability

Investment in active transportation has the potential to provide economic benefits to individuals, as well as the City. Vehicle ownership and maintenance can be an expensive endeavor in America, especially for lower-earning households. 2019 national research shows that lower-earning American households proportionately spend roughly twice as much of their income as the average-earning household on transportation. In 2016 the lowest-earning 20 percent of the population spent almost 30 percent of their income on transportation costs.⁷ Having more transportation choices, including biking, walking, and transit, presents important opportunities for individuals and families to be more financially stable and self-reliant.

Research suggests that active transportation also has the potential to contribute to the general economic vitality of the community. For example, a number of studies document increased economic indicators, such as employment and sales, for businesses facing streets with improved walking and bicycling infrastructure.^{8,9} Another study found that proximity to bicycle boulevards and separated bike lanes was associated with increasing residential property values, as was access to a denser and more extensive bicycle network.¹⁰

7 ITDP (Institute for Transportation & Development Policy). The High Cost of Transportation in the United States. 2019. <https://www.itdp.org/2019/05/23/high-cost-transportation-united-states/>

8 Garrett-Peltier, H. (2011). Pedestrian and Bicycle Infrastructure: A National Study of Employment Impacts. University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Political Economy Research Institute. <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.362.5819&rep=rep1&type=pdf>

9 Liu, J. H., & Shi, W. (2020). Understanding Economic and Business Impacts of Street Improvements for Bicycle and Mobility – A Multicity Multiapproach Exploration (NITC-RR-1031). National Institute for Transportation and Communities, Portland State University.

10 Liu, J. H., & Shi, W. (2017). Impact of Bike Facilities on Residential Property Prices. Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board, 2662, pp 50-58. <https://doi.org/10.3141/2662-06>

Several direct and indirect factors go into the benefit-cost analysis of active transportation projects, and each project can be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. In general, however, the cost of implementing and maintaining bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure is significantly lower than that of improvements for motor vehicles.

Environmental quality

Motor vehicle emissions are the greatest contributor to air pollution in Utah.¹¹ Encouraging Utahans to walk, bike, and take public transit, while providing the infrastructure to do so, can reduce reliance on motor vehicles for daily trips and help clean Utah's air, especially during winter inversions. Air quality is closely tied to public health and directly affects those who want to exercise outdoors as well as young and old populations and people with asthma, lung disease, or heart disease.

11 Utah Division of Air Quality, 2019. <https://deq.utah.gov/air-quality/taking-stock-of-emissions-in-utah>

Types of Bicyclists

It is important to consider bicyclists of all skill levels when planning a network of bikeways. Infrastructure should allow for a comfortable experience for the greatest number of users and user types as possible.

There are four general types of bicyclists:¹²

- **“Highly confident”** bicyclists will typically ride anywhere regardless of road or weather conditions, ride faster than other user types, prefer direct routes, and will typically choose to ride on the road, even if shared with vehicles, over separate bikeways like shared use trails.
- **“Somewhat confident”** bicyclists are fairly comfortable riding bike lanes with passing traffic, but typically prefer low traffic streets or physically separated bikeways or trails, when available.
- **“Interested but concerned”** bicyclists comprise the majority of the population (approximately 60%) and are interested in using a bicycle for transportation, but concerned about safety, especially interacting with motor vehicles. This demographic will typically only ride on quiet neighborhood streets or physically separated routes. If they don’t perceive conditions as safe, they choose not to ride.
- **“Not currently interested”** individuals will not ride a bicycle under any circumstances, either due to physical disability or overall lack of interest.

According to a survey conducted by People for Bikes, nearly half of American adults (47 percent) would like to ride a bicycle more often, and 43 percent would be more likely to ride if bikeways were physically separated from motor vehicles, confirming that the potential for higher ridership is present, but that a lack of comfortable infrastructure is a major barrier.¹³

¹² Four Types of Cyclists. (2009). Roger Geller, City of Portland Bureau of Transportation: <https://www.portlandoregon.gov/transportation/44597?a=237507>

¹³ U.S. Bicycling Participation Study. (2018) People for Bikes: <https://peopleforbikes.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/Corona-Report-for-PFB-Participation-2018-for-Website.pdf>



**Highly
Confident**

1-3%

Comfortable riding with traffic; will use roads without bike lanes



**Somewhat
Confident**

5-10%

Prefer more separated facilities, but comfortable riding in bike lanes or on paved shoulders



**Interested but
Concerned**

50-60%

Often not comfortable with bike lanes - may prefer sidewalks even if bike lanes are provided; prefer separated facilities or quiet residential streets. May not bike at all if facilities do not meet perceived comfort.



**Not Currently
Interested**

30%

Physically unable or not currently interested in using a bicycle to get around

Plan Goals

The goals of the Layton ATP were used to guide the development of the plan's recommendations and priority project selection, and should be used to steer the implementation of walking and biking facilities moving forward. The goals below were established through a collaboration among community stakeholders, City staff, and the general public.

Layton's Active Transportation Network Should...



MAKE USEFUL CONNECTIONS

- Everyday needs (stores, schools, parks, programs, etc.) should be accessible for people walking and biking
- The network should be cohesive and minimize gaps
- The network should create regional connections
- The network should connect to transit
- Areas of high demand for active transportation facilities should be prioritized



SUPPORT LOCAL ECONOMY

- The network should attract regional recreation and improve access to local commerce
- The implementation and maintenance of the network should be sustainable based on City resources



HEALTH AND SAFETY

- Transportation infrastructure, policies, and initiatives should enable active lifestyles
- The network should create safe roadway conditions for all people and modes



SERVE A WIDE VARIETY OF PEOPLE

- The network should serve both recreation and transportation purposes, with emphasis on transportation facilities for people who rely on active modes for their daily needs
- The network should offer independence and expand transportation choice



PROVIDE A QUALITY USER EXPERIENCE

- Infrastructure should be legible, intuitive, and accessible and contribute to Layton's sense of place
- The network should connect people with Layton's special places and attractions
- The system should include other accommodations (detailed in **Chapter 4**) in addition to bikeways and trails that make walking and bicycling more convenient
- Facilities should be designed in a way that reduces conflicts between various modes and speeds



COMMUNITY SUPPORT

- Implementation of the network should be guided by community input and feedback

- 
- A photograph of a person riding a bicycle on a narrow, winding concrete sidewalk. The sidewalk is bordered by green grass on both sides. In the background, there are trees with autumn-colored leaves, a white fence, and a large, rugged mountain range under a clear blue sky. The left side of the image is overlaid with a semi-transparent blue rectangle containing text.
- Current Trends
 - Existing Active Transportation Network
 - Key Takeaways
 - Planning History

2

Active Transportation in Layton Today

For many of Layton's transportation corridors, people on bicycles are limited to narrow sidewalks.

CHAPTER 2

Active Transportation in Layton Today

Like many communities along the Wasatch Front, Layton's historic development and land use patterns have revolved around a reliance on motor vehicles as the primary mode of transportation. In order to include active transportation as a viable alternative mode of transportation, it will require implementing creative solutions to existing circuitous street network patterns and regional and interstate highways that serve high volume vehicular traffic into the main corridors of neighborhoods and commercial centers.

This chapter takes a look at walking and biking in Layton today and outlines some of the challenges and opportunities that exist.

Current Trends

State of Biking and Walking in Layton

COMMUTING TO WORK

According to the 2019¹ 5-year American Community Survey (ACS) data, of the 39,757 recorded commuters in Layton, 88.2% drive a private vehicle (78.9% drive alone), 9.3% carpool, 1.1% use transit, 0.9% walk, and 0.5%, bike. That means just 1.4% of commuters in Layton are currently using active transportation to get to work.

Commuting characteristics data from the ACS is an important and consistent data source to measure changes in mode share over time; however, **this data represents only one type of trip and does not accurately reflect levels of bicycling and walking for all trip purposes.** For example, trips made to access schools, grocery stores, socializing, and other daily needs are not accounted for in the ACS data.

GETTING TO AND FROM SCHOOL

UDOT currently coordinates Safe Routes Utah, a comprehensive program to educate and engage students, parents, school staff members, and the general community, about walking and biking safely to school. This includes required Safe Routes Plans (formerly called SNAP - Student Neighborhood Access Program) for each elementary, middle, and junior high school.

Currently, all Davis County schools have a mapped Safe Route, including safe routes to connect to the school, indication of where crosswalks and other crossing features, like crossing guards and traffic signals, are available.

¹ 2019 ACS data used to reflect pre-COVID-19 pandemic conditions

Transit Ridership in Layton

CURRENT SERVICES

With access to two FrontRunner stations (Layton and Clearfield), and multiple bus routes (six total transversing Layton) that connect to surrounding communities, including a locally-circulating trolley bus, Layton residents have the opportunity to use transit to get around locally and regionally.

Service Frequency

On weekdays, the northbound FrontRunner stops at Layton Station every 30 minutes during peak hours (5:30am to 8:30am and 4:30pm-6:30), then every 60 minutes outside of those times. The southbound FrontRunner is on a similar schedule, stopping every 30 minutes during peak hours (5:30am to 7:30am, 4:30pm-5:30pm, and 7:30pm-10:30pm) and 60 minutes outside of those times. On Saturdays, both routes depart every 60 minutes, and neither operate on Sundays.

Bus routes in Layton operate at the following frequencies:

- Route 455 (U of U/Davis County/WSU) run every 30-60 minutes on weekdays depending on time of day.
- Route 470 (Ogden/Davis Co/SLC Commute) runs every day of the week on 30-minute intervals during the weekend and on 20, 30, or 60-minute intervals on weekdays depending on time of day,
- Route 627 (WSU Davis/DATC) runs every 60 minutes Monday-Saturday.
- Route 640(W. Davis County/Weber State University) runs every 30 minutes Monday-Saturday.

- Route 628 (Midtown Trolley) circulates Layton every 30 minutes on weekdays and Saturdays.
- Route 473 (SLC/Ogden Hwy 89 Express) makes limited stops during peak time only, totaling 12 trips per day only on weekdays.

CURRENT USAGE

According to UTA, in 2019, an average of 812 riders boarded the FrontRunner at Layton Station daily on weekdays (345 on Saturdays), and 707 alighted (304 on Saturdays). The numbers for the nearby Clearfield Station were similar but slightly greater, with 878 boarding on weekdays (382 on Saturdays) and 763 alighting (354 on Saturdays). However, due to the COVID-19 pandemic and an increase in the ability to work from home, ridership numbers have dropped into 2021, with 380 boarding on weekdays (211 on Saturdays) and 352 alighting on weekdays (192 on Saturdays). This drop in ridership is consistent, but ever greater at the Clearfield Station.

FUTURE PLANS

Future plans for improved transit in Layton include double tracking the FrontRunner, which would allow FrontRunner service to operate every 15 minutes. Additionally, the addition of 15-minute bus service along State and Main Street between Farmington and Ogden is planned.

Improvements to transit service are not recommended in this plan, but making safe active transportation connections to and from transit stations is critical to the success of the overall transportation system.

1.1%

Percentage of Layton residents using transit to commute to work

812/380

Average daily individuals boarding the FrontRunner - Layton Station (2019 vs 2021)

878/355

Average daily individuals boarding the FrontRunner - Clearfield Station (2019 vs 2021)



Existing Active Transportation Network

Today, Layton's active transportation network is comprised of just over nine miles of bike lanes and 21 miles of paved trails, totaling approximately 30 miles. The majority of this mileage comes from the Denver and Rio Grande Western (D&RGW) Rail Trail and the numerous segments of the Kays Creek Trail. While these trails are great amenities as they exist now, expanding the active transportation network to connect to and from these trails throughout Layton will make their value even greater.

Map 2.1 on the following page illustrates Layton's existing active transportation network.

Existing Active Transportation Network Takeaways

While a few trails of significant length and several bike lane fragments exist in Layton, the network as a whole lacks enough coverage to serve as a reliable transportation option for Layton residents.

The D&RGW Trail, a trail running north from Farmington all the way to West Haven that connects to other regional trails to ultimately connect Ogden and Provo, runs right through Layton, connecting Layton to many surrounding communities. Having this regional amenity provides residents with access to numerous destinations throughout the region, while also bringing trail users from out of town into Layton. However, there are very few active transportation facilities in Layton that connect to this trail, or other longer trail corridors like the Kays Creek Trail. Without adequate facilities to reach these trails, using them for active transportation purposes can be a challenge. The map of existing facilities reveals that in general, west, north, and east Layton are especially lacking on-street facilities, making the existing trails challenging to access.

EXISTING FACILITY TYPES IN LAYTON TODAY

**9.1
Miles**



Bike Lanes are a common facility type in many cities, designating 4-7 feet of roadway width with 6-inch striping, signage, and stencil markings.

**21
Miles**



Sidepaths & Shared Use Paths

sometimes called trails, are paved off-street paths/trails found adjacent to roadways, along riparian or rail corridors, or through parks and open space. Typically 10-12' wide (8' minimum), they are designed to accommodate two-way travel by people walking, biking, rolling, or using other non-motorized modes.

30.1 miles of active transportation facilities in Layton today


MAP 2.1
**EXISTING ACTIVE
TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES**

Base Map

- FrontRunner Station
- Rail Lines
- Waterbody
- Parks and Open Space
- Layton City Boundary

Existing Facilities

- Bike Lane
- Buffered Bike Lane
- Paved Trails
- In-Process Paved Trail
- Natural Surface Trail



Active Transportation in Context

The following section explores varying influential factors and characteristics of Layton in an effort to better understand the quality of the existing active transportation network and identify opportunities for improvement. Existing facilities were overlaid on various datasets to evaluate:

- Access to key destinations
- Integration with transit routes
- Potential Demand for Active Transportation
- Level of Traffic Stress (LTS)
- Proximity to higher-need populations




ACCESS TO DESTINATIONS

Connecting people to the places they need to go is one of the driving goals of the plan. **Map 2.2 (Page 22)** overlays the existing active transportation network with some of the community's key destinations. The general lack of bikeways and trails shows a lack of connectivity to most community destinations; however, a few destinations are somewhat served by active transportation, such as:


- Layton's Urban District via the new Midtown Crossing and 1425 N
- The Gordon Town Center via the Gordon Avenue Sidepath
- Ellison Park and surrounding schools via the D&RGW Trail
- Layton Hospital via Layton Parkway bike lanes and Kays Creek Trail

Many of Layton's important destinations are currently difficult to access using active modes.




TRANSIT INTEGRATION

Layton is fortunate to have many transit options, both local (trolley bus) and regional (bus and FrontRunner). Located at the junction of auto-oriented I-15, Main St, and Layton Pkwy, the Layton FrontRunner station is difficult to walk or bike to. Similarly, Clearfield Station is bound by busy, auto-oriented corridors. While some UTA bus stops in Layton are accessible by bike, infrastructure for comfortable first/last-mile connections to and along bus route corridors, such as shared use paths or separated bike lanes, are lacking. Using UTA transit route and stop data, **Map 2.3 (Page 23)** illustrates the spatial relationship between transit routes and existing bikeways and trails.




POTENTIAL ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION DEMAND

Several factors in Layton have the potential to influence the demand for active transportation accommodations. **Map 2.4 (Page 24)** uses WFRC's data and methodology for determining which roadway corridors in Layton might see the most active transportation use if bicycle facilities were provided. This analysis combines contextual information such as population density, employment density, land use, schools, retail centers, and demographics, among other variables, to project where the City might see the most return on investments in active transportation. This tool highlights areas that are typically intuitive as places where the most transportation activity is happening in the City, such as in and around the urban district along Main Street.



LEVEL OF TRAFFIC STRESS (LTS)

Level of Traffic Stress (LTS) analysis is a framework for measuring how comfortable street and trail networks are for people riding bikes or walking. LTS analysis combines several factors related to street characteristics, such as number of lanes, vehicle speeds, presence of bike lanes and sidewalks, etc. It uses a set of rules established by research on bicyclist and pedestrian comfort to calculate the level of stress or discomfort one can expect to experience on any given corridor while riding a bike or walking (for more information on these rules, see **Appendix A**). The results from this analysis (detailed in **Appendix A**) illustrate corridors and intersections that may be barriers to walking and biking and can be used to target future improvements. **Maps 2.5a (Page 25)** and **2.5b (Page 26)** show bicycle and pedestrian LTS results, respectively. LTS results are dependent upon data accuracy.



DEMOGRAPHICS ANALYSIS

There are several factors that can limit individuals' and families' ability to get around the community and access daily needs or employment. For some people, reliance on car ownership and maintenance can be financially burdensome; or walking, biking, and transit may be someone's only options due to factors such as disability, inability to obtain a drivers license, or lack of access to a vehicle. The demographics analysis combines publicly available U.S. Census data such as income, race, English language proficiency, and age to identify specific parts of the City where people might benefit more from active transportation improvements. See **Map 2.6 (Page 27)**.

Key Takeaways

What does the existing conditions analysis say about active transportation in Layton today? This section describes some of the strengths and weaknesses of the network and outlines potential opportunities and challenges for improvements moving forward.


Strengths

EXISTING TRAIL CORRIDORS

The Denver and Rio Grande Western Rail (D&RGW) Trail on the west side of Layton and the Kays Creek Trail are strong building blocks for a well-connected trail network throughout the community. The D&RGW trail links Layton to several communities along the Wasatch Front and currently fills both recreation and transportation needs. The Kays Creek Trail is a beloved amenity that connects residents to nature and has the potential to make a continuous cross-town connection.

PROXIMITY TO RECREATION

Sandwiched between the Wasatch mountains and the Great Salt Lake, with numerous parks and trails in between, the community is in close proximity to many recreational opportunities. Connecting a network of active transportation facilities to these recreation areas should be a focus of future improvements.





Weaknesses

EXISTING NETWORK COVERAGE AND ACCESS

The existing network is fragmented and lacks coverage across the City.

With the exception of those neighboring the D&RGW and segments of the Kays Creek Trail, very few residents have access to dedicated active transportation facilities. Additionally, many of Layton's community destinations are not served by the existing bikeways and trails.

POLICIES

The city currently has many positive policies, codes, and ordinances in place that are supportive of active transportation. However, specific policies related to facility design standards, support of bicyclist and pedestrian safety, school access, and bicycle parking requirements are lacking.

EAST-WEST CONNECTIVITY

The railroad, I-15, Main Street, and HWY 89 are barriers to east-west travel in Layton. Locations at which residents can cross these barriers are primarily limited to major roadways and interchanges that are not currently conducive to safe and comfortable use by people using active modes.

TOPOGRAPHY

Layton's east side lies at the foot of the Wasatch mountains, with ravines carved by Kays and Holmes Creeks. These features create a hilly landscape that can deter people from choosing to use active transportation.

STREET NETWORK PATTERNS

Neighborhood streets often serve as comfortable routes for walking and biking. However, historic development patterns in Layton have resulted in a street network that is circuitous and indirect; this discourages walking and biking due to increased travel times and perceived direct access to destinations.

Opportunities

LINKING EXISTING FACILITIES

Filling gaps between existing trails and bikeways could be a small effort that would vastly improve the usefulness of the existing network. Kays Creek is an example of a corridor with several fragmented trail sections. Kays Creek and other east-west corridors could create a “mountains-to-lake” experience that would serve as a regional attraction.

MAIN STREET

Several previous planning efforts have indicated a strong desire to re-imagine the function of Main Street. Wide shoulders and right-of-way could present opportunities to improve conditions for people walking and biking along and across the corridor. With so many businesses along the street and its close proximity to the Layton FrontRunner Station, Main Street should be considered a priority in the active transportation network.

INTEREST IN SHARED TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS

The Layton Forward General Plan mentions community interest in developing shared transportation systems, including shared bike programs, or other private alternative transport systems. Incorporating shared transportation systems could help reduce people’s reliance on cars, especially for first/last mile connections to and from transit.

INTEGRATION WITH TRANSIT

Making connections to Layton and Clearfield FrontRunner stops, as well as bus stops and the community trolley bus, can enable people to go even further in the community and beyond, without a car.

FUTURE DEVELOPMENT

Especially on Layton’s west side, the City continues to see growth and new development. New development presents opportunities for the City to partner with private developers to incorporate off-street trail connections and, from the beginning, construct street networks that are suitable for walking and biking. The City can leverage the rezoning and entitlements process to require infrastructure and amenities recommended in this plan as part of the approval process.





Challenges

CITY INFLUENCE IN KEY CORRIDORS

Railroads, interstates, and state highways present challenges for implementing safe active transportation facilities. The City has less influence along these corridors, and extra coordination with third parties is needed.

CURRENT PUBLIC PERCEPTION

Just 1.4% of Layton residents currently use active transportation for their work commute (2019 ACS data). This could be due to a variety of factors, including the lack of safe active transportation facilities, environmental factors (summer heat, winter ice and smog, etc.), geographical features (topography), perceived time it takes, and many others. Using a car for transportation is the primary choice for most people, so while building out the active transportation network is critical, other policies and programs are likely needed to normalize and encourage walking and biking as an everyday transportation mode.

CONNECTING TO FRONTRUNNER STATIONS

Both the Clearfield and Layton FrontRunner stations are bound by traffic heavy roadways and difficult to access. Making safe walking and biking connections to these transit stops may prove difficult.

FINANCIAL CONSTRAINTS

A broader network of active transportation facilities comes with a cost. While there are many federal, state, and local funding sources the city can draw from (highlighted in **Chapter 5**) to implement the recommended projects, challenges such as coordinating with private stakeholders to obtain land/easements or adding infrastructure in constrained areas can lead to additional costs.

MAP 2.2
ACCESS TO DESTINATIONS

Base Elements


- Rail Lines
- Frontrunner Station
- Waterbody
- Layton City Boundary

Existing Facilities

- Bike Lane
- Buffered Bike Lane
- Paved Trail
- Natural Surface Trail

Destinations

- Grocery Store
- Golf Course
- Park
- Reservoir
- Hospital
- Library
- School
- Town Center
- Business District
- Urban District



MAP 2.3
TRANSIT INTEGRATION

Base Elements

- Rail Lines
- Frontrunner Station
- Waterbody
- Layton City Boundary

Existing Facilities


- Bike Lane
- Buffered Bike Lane
- Paved Trail
- Natural Surface Trail

Transit

- UTA Bus Stops
- UTA Park & Ride
- Trolley Bus
- Local Bus
- Express Bus
- FrontRunner

Destinations

- Golf Course
- Park
- Reservoir
- Hospital
- Library
- School
- Town Center
- Business District
- Urban District




MAP 2.4
**POTENTIAL ACTIVE
TRANSPORTATION DEMAND**

- Base Elements**

 - Rail Lines
 - Frontrunner Station
 - Waterbody
 - Parks and Open Space
 - Layton City Boundary
- Bike Demand**

 - Higher Demand
 - Lower Demand



MAP 2.5A
**BICYCLE LEVEL OF TRAFFIC STRESS
(LTS)**

Base Elements

- Rail Lines
- Frontrunner Station
- Waterbody
- Parks and Open Space
- Layton City Boundary


Bicycle LTS

- LTS 1 (Low Stress)
- LTS 2
- LTS 3
- LTS 4 (High Stress)

Intersection Data

- Standard Signals
- HAWK Signal
- Roundabout

The LTS results illustrated on this map are based on available data and may contain inaccuracies due to missing or incomplete data.



MAP 2.5B
**PEDESTRIAN LEVEL OF TRAFFIC
 STRESS (LTS)**

Base Elements

- Rail Lines
- Frontrunner Station
- Waterbody
- Parks and Open Space
- Layton City Boundary


Pedestrian LTS

- LTS 1 (Low Stress)
- LTS 2
- LTS 3
- LTS 4 (High Stress)

Intersection Data

- Standard Signals
- HAWK
- RRFB
- Roundabout

The LTS results illustrated on this map are based on available data and may contain inaccuracies due to missing or incomplete data.



MAP 2.6
EQUITY ANALYSIS

Base Elements


- Rail Lines
- Frontrunner Station
- Waterbody
- Layton City Boundary

Existing Facilities

- Bike Lane
- Buffered Bike Lane
- Paved Trail
- Natural Surface Trail

Equity Index Score

- Lower Need
-
-
- Higher Need



This page intentionally left blank

- Phase 1: Listen & Learn
- Phase 2: Get Feedback & Direction

3

Community Voice



CHAPTER 3

Community Voice

Hearing from people who visit, live, and work in Layton is critical in identifying opportunities, challenges, goals, and priorities for the active transportation system. The development of this plan included collaboration and input from City staff, a stakeholder steering committee, and the general public.

General public outreach was done in two phases. The first phase (Listen & Learn) focused on gaining the community's perspectives and insights related to challenges and opportunities that currently exist to improve active transportation in Layton. This input was factored into the development of the recommendations in **Chapter 4**, which were taken back to the public in the second phase of public outreach for feedback.

Phase I: Listen & Learn

The initial phase of public engagement involved a series of different ways to connect with community members and alert them to opportunities to share their input. These outreach strategies included:

- Online interactive map & survey option
- In-Person open house on March 9, 2022 (Collected in-person surveys and map input)
- In-person pop up booth at the Davis County Central Library: Dr. Suess Library Night
- In-person pop up booth at the Layton City Small Business Seminar held at Valentine CPA
- Social media blasts on Layton City Facebook page; video with Mayor Petro on her Facebook page
- Layton City Digital Board Ad at Wasatch/Gentile & 2200 W/Hill Field locations
- Mailed out with Layton City utility mailer: parks & recreation flyer
- Boards displayed at Layton City Center - Department Reception Centers
- Email blasts to interested mailer lists for recreation and past planning events (ie. Layton Forward mailing list, Layton City Business Contacts, etc.)
- Email list to Stakeholders to share

Online Interactive Map

The online interactive map included in the survey prompted participants to a) mark destinations they commonly visit or would like to visit using active modes, b) draw lines/routes where they would like to see safe connections, and c) identify barriers to walking and biking throughout Layton. Over 600 unique participants made comments on the map.

DESTINATIONS

Destinations that participants visit frequently, or would like to visit using active modes, were marked on the map (**Map 3.1**) in addition to the general areas where participants live, revealing key areas that would benefit from better biking and walking connections. Some of the most frequently mentioned or liked destinations are listed below and labeled in red on **Map 3.1**.

- Bonneville Shoreline Trail (13 likes)
- Kays Creek Parkway - Southwest (9 likes)
- Denver Rio Grand Western Trail (6 likes)
- TNC Bird Refuge (5 likes)
- Layton FrontRunner Station (5 likes)
- Christian Life Center (5 likes)
- Layton Utah Temple (4 likes)
- Layton Commons Park (4 likes)


MAP 3.1
**PUBLIC INPUT:
 WHERE PEOPLE LIVE
 IN RELATION TO
 DESTINATIONS**

- Public Input**
- Where People Live
 - Where People Want to Go

- Existing Facilities**
- Bike Lane
 - Buffered Bike Lane
 - Trails
 - Natural Surface Trail

- Base Map**
- FrontRunner Station
 - Rail Lines
 - Waterbody
 - Layton City Boundary

- Destinations**
- Golf Course
 - Park
 - Reservoir
 - Hospital
 - Library
 - School
 - Town Center
 - Business District
 - Urban District



SUGGESTED ROUTES

Roughly 63 new active transportation connections were suggested on the map. Map users were able to “like” suggested routes to voice support. These routes are shown on **Map 3.2**. The most commonly “liked” routes are detailed below:

Sun Hills Trail Extension

The most “liked” route suggestion (23 likes) shows a paved trail connecting from the existing Sun Hills Trail connected to Greyhawk Park. This trail extension would provide connections to new development in this area, as well as an improved connection to Mountain View Elementary School.

Continuation of Kays Creek Trail

A route shown connecting from Layton Commons Park to Antelope Dr (9 likes) demonstrates the desire to continue the Kays Creek trail to the south and west part of Layton. This would create a strong north/south connection in Layton, highlighting the beautiful, natural areas of town.

Safe connection along Layton Pkwy crossing I-15

An active transportation route along Layton Parkway collected 8 likes. The comment explains that Gentile isn’t friendly enough for those walking or biking, even with the new bridge.

Loop Trail in East Layton

A loop trail shown in eastern Layton connects Oak Hills Dr to Hwy 89, 89 to Hwy 193, 193 to Fort Ln, and then back to Oak Hills Drive. This loop (5 likes) would create a great starting point for many connections in east Layton, and could be used for both recreation and transportation.

BARRIERS

Participants were also asked to identify issues or barriers to walking and biking throughout Layton (see **Map 3.2**). The key themes revealed and areas where there were large concentrations of barriers marked are detailed below.

Overall Themes:

- Difficult to cross many roads due to missing crosswalks, poor signal timing, and low visibility for pedestrians/bikes.
- Incomplete sidewalk, bikeway, and pathway networks
- Need better opportunities to cross Hwy 89
- Existing sidewalks, bikeways, and pathways are not well maintained
- Feelings of danger due to car volumes and speeds

Areas of concentrated barriers:

- Gentile St and the D&RGW Trail intersection
- Along 2200 W
- 3000 N / Hwy 193
- Downtown Layton area (FrontRunner Station, Layton Parkway, Gentile St)
- Antelope Dr
- Hwy 89

MAP 3.2
**PUBLIC INPUT:
BARRIERS &
SUGGESTED ROUTES**

Areas Needing Improvement

- 1 Like
- 2-5 Likes
- 6-10 Likes
- 11-15 Likes
- 16+ Likes

User-Drawn Routes

- Route
- Top-Ranked Route

Existing Facilities


- Bike Lane
- Buffered Bike Lane
- Trails
- Natural Surface Trail

Base Map

- FrontRunner Station
- Rail Lines
- Waterbody
- Layton City Boundary

Destinations

- Park
- Golf Course
- Reservoir
- School
- Library
- Hospital
- Town Center
- Business District
- Urban District



Survey 1 Results Summary

882 Unique Survey Participants

Please select your
relation to Layton
(882 respondents)



89%
Live in



37%
Work in




14%
Visit Often




2%
Visit Occasionally

How often do you walk, bike, or roll for Exercise? (882 respondents)



How often do you walk, bike, or roll for Transportation? (882 respondents)



Of those that said they rarely or never walk, bike, or roll for transportation, 80% expressed an interest in using a bicycle to get around in a later survey question

What **prevents your from using Active Transportation** more often? (882 respondents)

- #1 Bikeways, trails, or sidewalks do not connect to where I want to go - 54%**
- #2 Driving is more convenient - 48%**
- #3 I feel unsafe interacting with vehicle traffic - 44%**
- #4 I don't want to be exposed to the weather - 33%**
- #5 The distance I have to travel is too far - 31%**
- #6 Don't want to arrive sweaty/disheveled at destination - 26%
- #7 Usually travel with kids - 21%
- #8 Lack of amenities, like safe bike parking, at destination - 20%
- #9 Don't have time - 15%
- #10 Have too much to carry - 12%
- #11 No access to a bike or personal mobility device - 7%
- #12 Other - 6%
- #13 Layton is too hilly - 5%
- #14 Just not interested - 3%
- #15 Can't walk or bike for other reasons - 2%
- #16 Walking or biking is my only option - I use it every day - 1%

What do you think is **most important for the City to address**? (1 = top priority, 12 = last priority)

-  + **#1** **Expand sidewalk network**
(7,879)*
-  + **#2** **Expand bikeway network**
(6,927)
-  **#3** **Maintain/upkeep existing bikeways**
(6,459)
-  **#4** **Improve bike/ped crossings**
(6,357)
-  **#5** **Maintain existing sidewalks**
(6,314)

- #6** Maintenance/upkeep of existing streets (5,959)
- #7** Expand pathway network (5,868)
- #8** Maintenance/upkeep of existing pathways (5,342)
- #9** Build more trailheads/access points (5,128)
- #10** Improve transit stops (3,311)
- #11** Improved traffic signal timing (3,133)
- #12** Expand street network for cars (2,137)

*These results were calculated using a multiplier to give greater weight to options prioritized closest to #1. The highest score (#1 priority: Expand sidewalk network) was 7,879.

How would you generally describe yourself when it comes to **riding a bicycle** (882 respondents)



7%

Strong & Fearless


I don't mind sharing the road with cars, even without a dedicated bike lane



31%

Enthusied & Confident

I prefer separated bikeways, but I'm comfortable riding in regular bike lanes or on paved shoulders



48%

Interested but Concerned

I would like to ride a bike more, but I'm concerned about safety, interacting with cars, and other issues selected previously




14%


Not Interested

I'm not currently interested in using a bicycle to get around


If there are school-aged children in your household, **how do they typically get to school** (of participants with school-aged children)? (865 respondents, 525 with school-aged children)



If school-aged children in your household **don't walk, bike or roll to school**, please share **why**: (342 responses)



Would you consider **biking, walking, or rolling to your closest shopping center** if it was safe and convenient?
(882 respondents)



Reasons for disinterest: Distance is too far, difficult carrying everything, old age, feel unsafe, difficult to transport kids, not interested

Desired Uses for Bikeways, Paved Trails, and Sidewalks in Layton (882 respondents)



Other desired uses: stress management, access public transit, avoid parking challenges, walking pets, alternative if car is unavailable

What are your **thoughts on Active Transportation** in general? - Themes (865 comments)

Interested in active transportation, with improvements






- Using AT along most roads/existing bike lanes feels unsafe
- Complete bikeway/pathway networks are needed
- The look and feel of sidewalks and trails needs to be improved
- Traffic/congestion has increased in Layton, making AT harder
- Recreation opportunities benefit with more AT infrastructure
- Destinations need to be close together to make AT practical

Not interested in active transportation

- Interested in recreational facilities rather than facilities geared toward AT
- Not practical due to transporting kids
- Not practical because destinations are too far apart
- Generally not interested

Survey 1 Demographics Summary

The following demographics were represented in Survey 1.



Phase II: Get Feedback & Direction

The second phase of public engagement aimed to get feedback on proposed active transportation projects, and to understand which projects community members would like to see prioritized. These outreach strategies included:

- Online interactive map & survey option
- In-person open house on November 9, 2022 (Collected in-person surveys and map input)
- In-person pop-up booth at the Kendall O' Bryan Fire House open house
- In-person pop-up booth at Layton City Parks & Recreation Halloween Bash
- A frames set out at UTA Bus Stops at Layton Station (FrontRunner), Mall and other strategic locations
- Social media blasts on the Layton City Facebook page
- Layton City digital board ad at Wasatch/Gentile & 2200 W/Hill Field locations
- Mailed out with Layton City Utility Mailer: Parks & Recreation Flyer
- Boards displayed at Layton City Center - Department Reception Centers; City property locations around the City; Weber State Layton Campus
- Flyers at Layton City Park pavilions reservation boards
- Email blasts to interested mailer lists for recreation and past planning events (ie. Layton Forward mailing list, Layton City Business Contacts, Bicycle Businesses, Davis School District Peach Jar, etc.)
- Email list to Stakeholders to share

Stakeholder Active Transportation Tour

A stakeholder active transportation tour was hosted on May 10, 2022 in Provo, UT. This tour was an opportunity to highlight different types of active transportation infrastructure that wasn't currently being used in Layton. Stakeholders rode bikes and scooters to various destinations, giving them an understanding for what it feels like to use different types of facilities.



Online interactive map

The second online interactive map prompted participants to a) like, dislike, and/or comment on recommended projects, b) identify their top 5 priority projects (**Maps 3.3 and 3.4**), and c) identify any additional potential projects or problem areas (shown in **Map B3.5**). Over 295 unique participants interacted with the map.

TOP PRIORITY PROJECTS

Participants were able to explore the map of recommended projects and learn more about why each project was being proposed. They were then prompted to select the top five projects that they would like to see prioritized for implementation. Participants were also able to “like” and “dislike” any projects as another way to show their support or disapproval of a project. To determine the top-preferred projects, the quantity of priority votes and “likes” were totaled and the dislikes were subtracted from that number. The top projects are listed below, and shown in **Maps 3.3 and 3.4**.

Top 10 Facility Projects

The top facility projects, based on the total score they received, are highlighted in **Map 3.3**, and the top priority projects are listed below:

1. **Kays Creek Trail Extension** Golden Ave/700 N to Hidden Hollow Dr (32 points)
2. **UP&L Power Corridor** Clearfield south border to Kaysville north border (24 points)
3. **Church St Bike Route** Gentile St to Hwy 193 (17 points)
4. **Kays Creek Trail Connection** Roberts Farm section, east of Angel St (16 points)
5. **Gentile St Bike Route** Bluff Rd to 175 W (15 points)
6. **Davis Weber Canal Trail** Hill Field Rd to Church St (14 points)
7. **Valley View Dr Bike Route** Mutton Hollow Rd to 3000 N (14 points)
8. **Oak Hills Drive Sidepath** 2250 E to Adams Canyon Parking Lot (13 points)
9. **Gentile Street Sidepath** Main St to Wasatch Dr (12 points, tied)
10. **Main Street Buffered Bike Lanes** Clearfield border to 300 N (12 points, tied)
11. **Hill Field Rd Buffered Bike Lanes** Gordon Ave to 3000 N (12 points, tied)
12. **Gordon Avenue Bike Lanes** Fairfield Rd to Andy Adams Park (12 points, tied)

Top 10 Spot Improvement Projects


The top spot improvement projects, based on the total score they received, are highlighted in **Map 3.4**, and the top priority projects are listed below:

1. Intersection improvement at the DRGW Trail at Gentile St (73 points)
2. Grade- separated crossing to access the FrontRunner station (64 points)
3. Intersection improvement at Gordon Ave & Church/Fort Ln (48 points)
4. Mid-block crossing on Antelope Drive providing a connection for the proposed Kays Creek Trail Extension (46 points)
5. Intersection improvement at Oak Hills Dr & Gentile (45 points)
6. Intersection improvement at Main St and Gentile St (40 points)
7. Grade-separated crossing for the DRGW Trail at 2200 W (36 points)
8. Grade-separated crossing at Oak Hills Dr (36 points)
9. Grade-separated crossing for the DRGW Trail at Gordon Ave (35 points)
10. Intersection improvement at 500 S & Fairfield Rd (34 points)


MAP 3.3
**PUBLIC INPUT
PHASE 2:
TOP FACILITIES**

Top Facilities



Score (Likes & Priority Votes)



Existing Facilities



Base Map



MAP 3.4
**PUBLIC INPUT PHASE 2:
 TOP SPOT
 IMPROVEMENTS**

Top Spot Improvements

Score (Likes & Priority Votes)

- 1-15
- 16-30
- 31-45
- 46-60
- 61+

Planned Facilities


- Signed Bike Route
- Neighborhood Byway
- Bike Lane
- Buffered Bike Lane
- Separated Bike Lanes
- Shared Use Path/Sidepath
- TBD, Further Study Needed

Existing Facilities

- Bike Lane
- Buffered Bike Lane
- Paved Trail
- In-Process Paved Trail
- Natural Surface Trail

Base Map

- Frontrunner Station
- Rail Lines
- Parks and Open Space
- Waterbody
- Layton City Boundary



Survey 2 Results Summary

683 Unique Survey Participants

Relation to Layton
(683 respondents)



93%
Live in



22%
Work in




7%
Visit Often




2%
Visit
Occasionally

Frequency of walking, biking, rolling
for **Recreation** (683 respondents)



Frequency of walking, biking, rolling
for **Transportation**
(683 respondents)



Of those that said they rarely or never walk, bike, or roll for transportation, 44% expressed being interested but concerned in using a bicycle to get around in a later survey question

How participants describe themselves when it comes to **riding a bicycle** (682 respondents)



4%

Strong & Fearless


I don't mind sharing the road with cars, even without a dedicated bike lane



35%

Enthusied & Confident

I prefer separated bikeways, but I'm comfortable riding in regular bike lanes or on paved shoulders



43%

Interested but Concerned

I would like to ride a bike more, but I'm concerned about safety, interacting with cars, and other issues selected previously







18%

Not Interested

I'm not currently interested in using a bicycle to get around

Survey 2 Demographics Summary

The following demographics were represented in Survey 2.



This page intentionally left blank

- 
- The Network
 - Supporting Infrastructure
 - Policies and Programs
 - Recommended Network Evaluation

4

Recommendations

CHAPTER 4

Recommendations

Based on lessons learned in the existing conditions analysis and input from the community, **Chapter 4** outlines Layton's planned active transportation network and discusses other infrastructure elements that support active transportation use. This chapter also outlines policy and program recommendations that can make Layton a more bike- and walk-friendly community.


The Network

Building on the 30 miles of existing bikeways and trails in Layton, this plan proposes an additional 99 miles of active transportation facilities be added to the network, shown in **Map 4.1**. Improvement types include signed bike routes, neighborhood byways, standard bike lanes, buffered bike lanes, separated bikeways, and paved trails.

99 miles of newly
**proposed bikeways
and trails** in Layton,
making the **total
mileage** of Layton's
Active Transportation
Network **129.1 miles**


Proposed Facility Types

Facility types included in the Layton Active Transportation Plan recommendations are illustrated on the following pages.




**23.3
Miles**

Signed Bike Routes are routes marked with signage that make necessary connections to other proposed facility types.




**14.7
Miles**

Bike Lanes are typically 5-7 feet in width and designate space for bicyclists with 6" white striping.




**5.3
Miles**

Neighborhood Byways are quiet neighborhood streets with low vehicle volumes & speeds. Bicyclists are prioritized by managing speeds and volumes via traffic calming elements. Signage and pavement markings are also incorporated. These improvements will need to be determined on a case-by-case basis, studied, and recommended by the Engineering Department.




**17.3
Miles**

Buffered Bike Lanes are similar to bike lanes, but include an additional striped buffer to provide visual separation.




**0.6
Miles**

Separated Bike Lanes include a physical barrier between bicyclists and vehicular travel lanes. These can be located at street level or sidewalk level (raised bike lanes).



**8.7
Miles**

Sidepaths or trails, are paved off-street pathways that run alongside roadways and are designed to accommodate two-way, non-motorized travel.



**18.2
Miles**

Shared Use Paths or trails, are paved off-street pathways, completely separated from roadways and designed to accommodate two-way, non-motorized travel.

**10.9
Miles**

Routes that **Need Further Study** are important routes for the overall bike network, but need further study to determine appropriate facility type.

MAP 4.1
**RECOMMENDED
NETWORK**

Planned Facilities


- Signed Bike Route
- Neighborhood Byway
- Bike Lane
- Buffered Bike Lane
- Separated Bike Lanes
- Shared Use Path/Sidepath
- TBD, Further Study Needed

Existing Facilities

- Bike Lane
- Buffered Bike Lane
- Paved Trail
- In-Process Paved Trail
- Natural Surface Trail

Destinations

- Grocery Store
- Frontrunner Station
- Park
- Golf Course
- Reservoir
- School
- Library
- Hospital
- Town Center
- Business District
- Urban District



Spot Improvements

Applying proper intersection and other crossing treatments should be carefully considered when designing and constructing active transportation networks. Failing to do so can make an otherwise safe, accessible, and continuous route dangerous and disconnected. **Map 4.2** identifies location-specific spot improvements that achieve connectivity where barriers may currently exist. These improvements will need to be determined on a case-by-case basis, studied, and recommended by the Engineering Department.



Intersection Improvements (28 total)

Improvements at intersections, including elements like sidewalk bulbouts, traffic circles, added/updated signalization, etc.



Mid-Block Crossings (13 total)

Bicyclist/pedestrian crossings mid-block are often added to make trails continuous and reduce the need to cross at an intersection. Feasibility studies need to be completed to evaluate crossing treatment. (warrant based)




Grade-Separated Crossings (6 total)

Under or overpasses to avoid railroad tracks or eliminate roadway conflicts where crossings are needed.

MAP 4.2
**RECOMMENDED
 SPOT IMPROVEMENTS**

- Spot Improvements**
 - Intersection Improvement
 - Mid-Block Crossing
 - Grade-Separated Crossing
 - In-Process Project
- Planned Facilities**
 - Signed Bike Route
 - Neighborhood Byway
 - Bike Lane
 - Buffered Bike Lane
 - Separated Bike Lanes
 - Shared Use Path/Sidepath
 - TBD, Further Study Needed
- Existing Facilities**
 - Bike Lane
 - Buffered Bike Lane
 - Paved Trail
 - In-Process Paved Trail
 - Natural Surface Trail
- Destinations**
 - Grocery Store
 - Frontrunner Station
 - Park
 - Golf Course
 - Reservoir
 - School
 - Library
 - Hospital
 - Town Center
 - Business District
 - Urban District



Supporting Infrastructure

Building quality active transportation facilities is only the first step in creating a successful active transportation system that enables Layton residents to use active modes of transportation. Additional amenities can be included throughout the network to enhance the user experience. The creation of a complete active transportation system with these additional amenities will make walking and bicycling in Layton more convenient with useful connections that serve a wide variety of people.

Additional recommended amenities include:

- Bicycle parking
- Wayfinding and branding
- Trailheads and rest areas
- Green infrastructure
- Lighting



Bicycle Parking

Adequate parking for bicycles throughout the community is a critical element in making bicycling a viable transportation option. Non-recreational bike trips are limited if cyclists cannot securely lock their bike at their destination. Bicycle parking standards should follow best practices established by the Association of Pedestrian & Bicycle Professionals (APBP) in “Bicycle Parking Guidelines, 2nd Edition” (2010) and “Essentials of Bike Parking: Selecting and Installing Bicycle Parking that Works” (2015). See Amenity Requirements on page 49 for more guidance on bicycle parking.

Layton City currently has bike parking requirements for new development (1 per 10 bedrooms for apartments, 2 per 10,000 SF of Institutional and Civic/Industrial, and 1 per 3,000 SF of Retail/Commercial/Services/Office), but should consider increasing quantities and differentiating between short and long-term parking. Additionally, existing developments should be encouraged to install bike racks if they haven’t already done so.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- Update minimum bicycle parking rates and types for new development
- Install bike racks at existing development/facilities that do not have them; create a Request-a-Rack Program (See **Policies and Programs** section)



Wayfinding & Branding

Wayfinding is an essential component of an easily accessible active transportation network. Wayfinding is a system of signs, pavement markings, and maps intentionally placed to inform network users of recommended routes, and to increase overall orientation within the active transportation network. Signage along Kays Creek Trail, D&RGW Trail, the UP&L Trail, and other significant regional systems will help trail users know how to access various parts of Layton using the active transportation network.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- Develop a wayfinding and branding plan for trails and other major routes along the network
- Include wayfinding in the planning, design, and cost estimating for new active transportation projects



Trailheads and Rest Areas

Trailheads and rest areas placed strategically along longer trails support trail users while also contributing to community placemaking. These areas may include several or all of the following amenities, depending on its prominence in the network:

- Site furnishings such as seating, trash receptacles, drinking fountains, and lighting
- Shade and enhanced landscaping
- Information and wayfinding kiosks
- Bike repair stations
- Bike parking

Typically implemented where anticipated trail use is high, these spaces should be incorporated along both new and existing trails.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- Consider the inclusion of trailheads and rest areas during the design of new trails.



Green Infrastructure

Green infrastructure is a design approach that helps manage stormwater, mitigates the urban heat island effect, and improves air quality. These elements include, but are not limited to, bioretention swales, permeable pavement, shade trees, and intentional landscaping. New trails, streets, and other facilities should incorporate landscaping and shade trees to grow Layton's urban canopy coverage and improve the active transportation experience.

RECOMMENDATION:

- Coordinate with Layton City Parks and Recreation, Planning, and the Engineering Departments to ensure that trees and landscaping best practices are implemented when new trails and streets are constructed. All drainage Best Management Practices (BMPs) will need to be vetted by the Engineering Department.



Lighting

Lighting is encouraged within the Urban Districts where heavily used facilities of the network may be used to ensure individuals may ride a bike even when it is dark. Properly designed lighting can improve visibility and natural surveillance, increase active transportation access and use, and extend operating hours during shorter winter days. In addition, properly lit pathways can reduce bicycle and pedestrian collisions.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- Consider adding trail and other active transportation facility lighting to Layton's Development Guidelines & Design Standards for the Urban District areas between the FrontRunner to Midtown area.



Bike Share Program

In order to expand mobility options in Layton and to increase the visibility and normalcy of bicycle use, the City may consider developing a community-wide bike share program similar to what has been done in Ogden and Salt Lake City. A feasibility study would need to be conducted to explore system types and governance models that may be appropriate for Layton. Bike share programs provide a multitude of community benefits, including:

- **Economic Opportunity:** Bike share programs can support local economic growth by increasing the amount of traffic to, and spending patterns at, local businesses, and through the creation of jobs in the bike share programs operations.
- **Improved Mobility:** Bike share rides are typically very short distance and time, indicating that bike share trips fill a mobility gap for trips that may be too far to walk, or are inconvenient for driving or taking transit.
- **Improved Air Quality:** Since bike share trips are often replacing automobile trips, they can help to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and other types of air pollutants, such as PM2.5, leading to better air quality. Bike share trips that replace car trips are even more critical during periods of bad air quality in Utah, especially during winter inversions.

- **Healthier Community:** Bike share systems can help individuals and the overall community improve their health by increasing levels of physical activity. Additionally, bike share programs provide access to health-related destinations, like grocery stores and healthcare providers.
- **Expanded Public Transportation Options:** Many bike share riders report biking to and from transit stations, or using bike share to get around after arriving by transit. Bike share can help solve the “last mile” gap that can be particularly challenging in lower-density areas where destinations are spaced further apart.

Today’s bike share programs more commonly feature electric bikes, also referred to as “pedal-assist” or “electric-assist” bikes. These bikes generally have higher utilization rates, and allow riders to cover greater distances in less time than a traditional bike. Some bike share fleets are entirely electric, while others include a mix of electric and non-electric.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Consider conducting a bike and/or scooter share feasibility study. A successful feasibility study may answer questions such as:

- Where in the City is there potential demand for shared micromobility options? (including public interest/support)
- What system type should the City pursue? (e.g., docked, dockless, or hybrid)
- How should the system be governed? In other words, who owns and operates the system?
- Where should bike share stations be located?
- What are the costs and funding options?
- What case studies exist that are relevant to Layton?



Policies and Programs

An additional feature of a successful active transportation network that goes beyond the physical infrastructure is ensuring that there are policies and programs in place that will support active transportation use in Layton. Non-infrastructure initiatives such as policy adoption, programs that promote active transportation participation, and other initiatives make a significant impact on the success of an active transportation network.

The initiatives outlined in this section can help a) get active transportation facilities built and b) make active transportation safer and more convenient for the Layton community. Broader information on some of these policies and programs are included in **Appendix C**.

Policies

The following are general recommendations to provide Layton with guidance for policy adoption tailored specifically to the community's needs.

STREET DESIGN AND LAYOUT

Add Bike Facility Standards to Development Guidelines & Design Standards

Layton's Development Guidelines & Design Standards contains a section for standard street sections, including required widths of streets, park strips, sidewalks, but currently contains no standards for bicycle facilities. Including bicycle facility standards and street cross sections ensures that bicycling is considered when new streets are built and existing streets are improved.

Require Pedestrian Connectivity through the End of Cul-de-sacs

Dead ends created by cul-de-sacs lead to disconnected pedestrian networks, and often make walking times longer due to broken connections. Including pedestrian connections to the surrounding streets via cul-de-sacs should be considered if new developments are proposing them in a street layout.



Develop Pedestrian-Friendly Block Length Standards

Many communities in Utah have very large block sizes due to historic plans and standards, but large blocks make using active transportation much more challenging. Depending on context, best practices for average intersection spacing on local streets is 300-400 feet, with a maximum intersection

spacing for local streets of about 600 feet. Lehi, UT for example, requires new developments to achieve a minimum street connectivity index and includes maximum block lengths in its code language, depending on zoning and density. ([Utah Street Connectivity Guide, 2017](#))

Adopt a Complete Streets Policy

Complete Streets are streets that consider all modes of transportation. A Complete Streets approach seeks to improve the safety and functionality of the street for pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists, and transit riders of varying ages and abilities during all phases of a project, including planning, design, and post-construction maintenance and operations. A Complete Streets Policy is critical in ensuring that alternative transportation modes, including bicycling, walking, and transit, are closely considered and evaluated for inclusion on roadway projects. Thoughtful planning in advance of Complete Streets Policy adoption will improve outcomes for all parties involved from the ground up. Complete streets can bridge gaps in the current active transportation network as well as continually expand the current network as roads get reconstructed or new roadways emerge.

AMENITY REQUIREMENTS

Bicycle Parking Requirements

As mentioned in **Bicycle Parking (p.54, with additional information in Appendix C)**, Layton should update its development standards to ensure that bicycle parking requirements, both short-term and long-term, for new developments are consistent with standards from the Association of Pedestrian & Bicycle Professionals (APBP) in *Bicycle Parking Guidelines, 2nd Edition (2010)* and *Essentials of Bike Parking: Selecting and Installing Bike Parking that Works (2015)*. Standards for rates, selection (shown at right) and placement should be included (bottom right).

Short term bicycle parking is bicycle parking for those visiting a place for up to a few hours. It mostly consists of bike racks.

Long term bicycle parking is for those spending longer amounts of time at a place – i.e. a workday or work shift, or at a multi-family residential building. Long term bicycle parking is designed to be more secure than short term parking and provides enclosed space for one or more bikes.

Other Amenities

Beyond bicycle parking, other end-of-trip facilities should be considered for inclusion in development standards, such as bicycle repair stations. Due to common tool thefts from these repair stations, they should be placed in high-traffic areas where eyes are on them throughout the day. Additionally, the City should coordinate with UTA to ensure that appropriate end-of-trip accommodations are made at UTA transit stops within Layton, such as long-term bicycle parking, bike repair stations, bus shelters and information, and, if applicable, bike share services. See **Appendix C** for additional information on bike parking.

RACKS FOR ALL APPLICATIONS

INVERTED U
also called
staple, loop



POST & RING



WHEELWELL-SECURE



HIGH-DENSITY RACKS


STAGGERED WHEELWELL-SECURE



VERTICAL



TWO-TIER



SPEED REGULATION

Adopt E-Bike Speed Regulation

With the recent boom in electric bike development and sales, there are more electric vehicles on the roads and trails than ever before. While they provide a comparable alternative to traveling by car, they come with their own unique challenges. Because of the dangers associated with higher-speed modes traveling alongside slower modes, Layton should consider adopting enforced speed limits for e-vehicles. See **Appendix C** for additional information.

Programs

The following section outlines programs that Layton can consider to help promote and support active transportation use.

EDUCATION

Bike Utah's Youth BEST Program

The Youth Bicycle Education and Safety (BEST) Program teaches kids how to safely and confidently travel through their communities by bicycle. The program is a 5-hour, in-class and on-bike program taught at schools around Utah. Bike Utah provides trained instructors, bicycles, helmets and all other necessary equipment for the program. This program gives kids the practice they need to independently access to their school, after school activities, and any other destinations they need to reach throughout Layton.

Community Bicycle Safety Classes

Leading community bicycle safety classes in a variety of settings, and with different groups in Layton, will provide people with the knowledge and skills necessary to safely operate a bike while navigating different types of bike facilities and while sharing the road with cars. These classes could be coordinated between the city and a community group, and could involve one longer event, or a series of shorter trainings. The Bicycle Collective in Provo, UT has hosted urban cycling safety courses to help individuals feel more confident biking in the community.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Senior Mobility Education Program

With many seniors being unable to drive, walking, biking, and transit become the only way to get around. Layton could create a senior mobility education program that teaches older individuals how to be a safe pedestrian, provides information about e-bikes and other small assisted mobility devices, and how to take advantage of the local public transit system.

Layton Biking Webpage

While Layton already has a Trails page under the Parks and Recreation section of the City website, an additional or amended page could be created to highlight active transportation facilities in Layton. In addition to hosting maps of existing facilities, the page could include education opportunities, a calendar of bike/ped-related events, surveys for upcoming projects, and an interactive network map that allows residents to report issues experienced.

EVENTS AND ACTIVITIES

Celebrate and Program Events for Bike Month

May is designated nationwide as Bike Month. Having a specific bike month encourages people to explore riding a bicycle as a means of transportation and can be leveraged to raise awareness and excitement around active transportation and active living.



Develop a Bike Co-Op

A bike co-op is a non-profit or volunteer-based organization that offers a centralized location for bike maintenance and safety education. They often provide services at free or reduced prices compared with for-profit shops, and become the known space for quick, education-based bike fixes. Some bike co-ops also take donated bikes and bike parts to fix up and either re-sell or donate to community members in need.

Open Streets Events

Open Streets events temporarily close off a street (anything from one block to an entire roadway corridor) to motorized vehicles, and instead allow people to walk, bike, roll, and play in the street. The purpose is to allow the City to explore creative uses for the public right of way that bring people together to create a stronger sense of community and promote active living.



Helmet Giveaway Program

Developing a program that provides helmets free of charge to those who need one throughout the community will make biking safer for many who might not be able to afford or access a helmet otherwise. These giveaways could be hosted at a few specific locations throughout the community throughout the year, or at a series of community events.

Organized Community Walks and Bike Rides

Organizing community walks and bike rides that explore different areas of the community help people feel more connected to their community, while also providing a group to walk or ride with. These types of walks and rides can highlight parks, new bike facilities, and local shops/restaurants.

COMMUNITY BUILDING

Adopt-A-Trail Program

Many communities host an “adopt a trail” program, where individuals or groups “adopt” a trail segment by either paying a sponsorship fee that helps to cover the costs of maintenance and improvements to the trail system, or by taking on temporary ownership of basic maintenance and cleanup of the segment. This relieves city maintenance staff of simple maintenance work, and builds community land stewardship.



Apply for Bike Friendly Community Status

The League of American Bicyclists (LAB) coordinates a Bicycle Friendly Community program that recognizes bicycle-friendly communities at varying levels (Bronze, Silver, Gold, and Platinum) based on a set of bike-related metrics. Applying as a Bicycle Friendly Community is a great way to create new local partnerships and gather bicycle-related data all in one place. The LAB also has a program that recognizes businesses with a welcoming, supportive atmosphere for employees, customers, and community members that ride their bike to that business.

BUILD CAPACITY FOR ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION

Continue to Build on the Safe Routes Utah Program

The Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) [Safe Routes Utah program](#) provides funding for both infrastructure improvements and educational programs that promote the benefits of walking or biking to school. Currently, schools in the Davis School District have safe routes maps available. Layton could help to review and provide updates to these routes as facilities from this active transportation plan are implemented.

Develop a Request-a-Rack Program

A bike rack request program gives local businesses and schools the ability to request bike racks in front of their property in the public right-of-way, installed by the City. These programs allow businesses and property owners to be involved in helping the City promote active transportation.

Data Collection Program

Layton should consider developing a formal data collection program to be able to observe trends in on-street and trail facility-use in as many locations as possible year round. Two common types of usage counts include short-duration (collected manually, and can help understand peak-period usage of a facility) and continuous counts (collected automatically with a counter technology to provide insight into general travel patterns, including the peak times of day and seasonality of active transportation infrastructure).

DOCUMENTATION

Development of an Annual Report Highlighting Economic Benefits and Progress of Regional Active Transportation Efforts

To share the economic benefits that are the result of an expanded active transportation network, it is important to keep track of, and share these successes by adding an Active Transportation Section to the City’s annual report with the positive data. Having this information pulled together in one place can help make the case for future investments in active transportation, and provides transparency for the public by showing the benefits of active transportation.

- 
- A person wearing a green shirt and dark pants is walking a light-colored dog on a leash along a paved path. The path is bordered by a metal railing on the right side. In the background, there are rolling hills and mountains under a cloudy sky. The left side of the image is overlaid with a blue semi-transparent rectangle containing text.
- Project Prioritization
 - Cost Estimates and Funding Sources

5

Prioritization & Implementation

CHAPTER 5


Prioritization & Implementation

With approximately 99 miles of newly-proposed active transportation facilities including bikeways and trails, and 53 proposed spot improvements (see **Chapter 4, p. 46-51** for more details), what are the next steps, and how should the City prioritize future investment? **Chapter 5** details an approach for prioritizing projects, and outlines potential funding strategies for implementing them.

Project Prioritization

The project prioritization approach includes two evaluations of each project based on 1) **project value, or benefit** and 2) **project readiness, or feasibility**. “High” and “low” scores are assigned for both evaluations, resulting in a project landing in one of four possible priority categories, as shown in **Figure 5.1**. This approach is intended to guide the City in understanding which projects to focus on first; however, the City should be flexible in its approach. Priorities may change based on further studies or as potential synergies arise with new development, road reconstruction, or other opportunities for cost savings.

Figure 5.1: *Project Priority Categories*



Project Prioritization Evaluation Part I:
Project Value

Project value, or benefit, is determined by how well projects achieve the goals of the plan in **Chapter 1**. **Table 5.1** lists the criteria that were used to evaluate project value based on those goals. Each project received a score of 0, 1, or 2.

- 0 = does not meet criteria
- 1 = somewhat meets criteria
- 2 = meets criteria

Because some criteria are more important than others, multipliers were applied to the evaluation criteria to reflect City priorities. For example, based on input from community stakeholders, connecting to Layton town centers is considered a higher priority than connecting to parks or recreational facilities.

Project Value Evaluation Results

Maps 5.1 and 5.2 highlight the facility projects and spot improvement projects, respectively, that received the highest scores based on the project value criteria. A complete list of recommended active transportation facilities and spot improvements, ranked by project value, are included in **Table D.1 and D.2**, respectively, in **Appendix D**.

TOP 10 FACILITY PROJECTS (BASED ON VALUE CRITERIA)

1. Main St Buffered Bike Lanes (Clearfield to Gordon Ave)
2. Gentile St Sidepath (Gentile/Cross St to Fort Ln)
3. Kays Creek Extension (Golden Ave/700 N to Hidden Hollow Dr)
4. Antelope Dr Facility (2200 W to University Park Blvd)
5. UP&L Power Corridor Trail (Jesse Barlow Park to park west of Wellington Dr)
6. Gordon Ave Buffered Bike Lanes (400 W to Fairfield Rd)
7. Kays Creek Trail Extension(Dawson St to Main St)
8. Fort Ln Buffered Bike Lanes (Wasatch Dr to Gentile St)
9. Antelope Dr Buffered Bike Lanes (1200 W to Fairfield Rd)
10. Kays Creek Trail(Hawthorne to Gentile)

TOP 10 SPOT IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS (BASED ON VALUE CRITERIA)

1. Intersection Improvement at Antelope Dr & Main St
2. Intersection Improvement at Gentile & Main St
3. Intersection Improvement at Gordon Ave & Church/Fort Ln
4. Mid-Block Crossing or Grade-Separated Crossing at Antelope & Emerald Dr
5. Intersection Improvement at 2200 W and UP&L Trail
6. Intersection Improvement at UP&L Trail & Hill Field Rd
7. Mid-Block Crossing at 2700 W & UP&L Trail
8. Intersection Improvement at Gentile St & UP&L Trail
9. Intersection Improvement at Up&L Trail & Granite Dr
10. Intersection Improvment at UP&L Trail & Weaver Ln

Table 5.1:
Project Value Evaluation Criteria

How each criterion relates to the goals of the plan

Making Useful Connections

Supporting Local Economy

Health & Safety

Serving a Wide Variety of People

Quality User Experience

Community Support

CRITERIA	MULTIPLIER	SCORE	SCORE BREAKDOWN	REFERENCE
Connects to a Layton town center or urban district	4	0	No connections	Map 2.2
		1	Connects to one town center or urban district	
		2	Connects to multiple town centers or urban districts	
Provides an improved facility on a roadway with past bike/ped-related crashes	4	0	No bike/ped crashes recorded on this roadway	Map D.2 & D.3
		1	One bike/ped-related crash on this roadway	
		2	More than one bike/ped-related crashes on this roadway	
Improves a route where there is high bicycle & pedestrian demand	4	0	Low demand (LD of 0-20 (Yellow/Orange – bottom two in legend))	Map 2.4
		1	Moderate demand (LD of 21-40 (Pink/Purple – middle two in legend))	
		2	High demand (LD of 40+ (Dark Purple/Blue – top two in legend))	
In an area with high need for active transportation facilities	4	0	In an area of low need based on the demographics analysis	Map 2.6
		1	In an area of medium need based on the demographics analysis	
		2	In an area of high need based on the demographics analysis	
Connects to transit	3.5	0	No connections	Map 2.3
		1	Makes a direct connection to a UTA bus route	
		2	Makes a connection to the Layton or Clearfield FrontRunner stations, UTA bus stop at Layton Hills Mall, or to multiple transit routes	
Provides separation from motor vehicles	3	0	Signed bike route	Maps 4.1 & 4.2
		1	Neighborhood byway, striped bike lane, or buffered bike lane	
		2	Separated bike lane, sidepath, or shared use path	
Connects to schools	3	0	No connections	Map 2.2
		1	Connects to an elementary school	
		2	Connects to a middle school or high school	
Builds on an existing active transportation facility	2.5	0	No connections	Map 2.1
		1	Connects to one existing active transportation facility	
		2	Connects to two or more existing active transportation facilities	
Achieves a low Level of Traffic Stress (LTS)	2.5	0	LTS 3 or 4	Map D.4
		1	LTS 2	
		2	LTS 1	
Makes regional connections	2.5	0	No connections	Map 2.2
		1	Connects to one regional facility	
		2	Connects to multiple regional facilities or creates a new regional route	
Connects to parks, recreational facilities, or Layton attractions	2	0	No connections	Map 2.2
		1	Connects to one park, recreational facility, or Layton attraction	
		2	Connects to multiple parks, recreational facilities, or Layton attractions	
Receives public support	1.5	0	Received widespread opposition in online input map	Maps 3.3 & 3.4
		1	Received some public support and limited opposition in online input map	
		2	Received widespread public support in online input map	

MAP 5.1

PROJECT VALUE - FACILITIES

Goal-Based Project Value


- High (>40 points)
- Medium (21-40 points)
- Low (0-20 points)

Existing Facilities

-  Frontrunner Station
- Bike Lane
- Buffered Bike Lane
- Paved Trail
- - - In-Process Paved Trail
- Natural Surface Trail

Top 10 Facility Projects

- 1** Main St Buffered Bike Lanes
(Clearfield to Gordon Ave)
- 2** Gentile St Sidepath
(Gentile/Cross St to Fort Ln)
- 3** Kays Creek Extension
(Golden Ave/700 N to Hidden Hollow Dr)
- 4** Antelope Dr Facility
(2200 W to University Park Blvd)
- 5** UP&L Power Corridor Trail
(Jesse Barlow Park to park west of Wellington Dr)
- 6** Gordon Ave Buffered Bike Lanes
(400 W to Fairfield Rd)
- 7** Kays Creek Trail Extension
(Dawson St to Main St)
- 8** Fort Ln Buffered Bike Lanes
(Wasatch Dr to Gentile St)
- 9** Antelope Dr Buffered Bike Lanes
(1200 W to Fairfield Rd)
- 10** Kays Creek Trail
(Hawthorne to Gentile)



MAP 5.2
**PROJECT VALUE -
SPOT IMPROVEMENTS**

Goal-Based Project Value


- High (>40 Points)
- Medium (21-40 Points)
- Low (0-20 Points)
- High (>40 points)
- Medium (21-40 points)
- Low (0-20 points)

Existing Facilities

- 🚆 Frontrunner Station
- 🚲 Bike Lane
- 🛤 Buffered Bike Lane
- 🌿 Paved Trail
- 🌿 In-Process Paved Trail
- 🌿 Natural Surface Trail

Top 10 Spot Improvements

- 1 Intersection Improvement at Antelope Dr & Main St
- 2 Intersection Improvement at Gentile & Main St
- 3 Intersection Improvement at Gordon Ave & Church/Fort Ln
- 4 Mid-Block Crossing or Grade-Separated Crossing at Antelope & Emerald Dr
- 5 Intersection Improvement at 2200 W and UP&L Trail
- 6 Intersection Improvement at UP&L Trail & Hill Field Rd
- 7 Mid-Block Crossing at 2700 W & UP&L Trail
- 8 Intersection Improvement at Gentile St & UP&L Trail
- 9 Intersection Improvement at Up&L Trail & Granite Dr
- 10 Intersection Improvement at UP&L Trail & Weaver Ln



Project Prioritization Evaluation Part II: Project Readiness

Project readiness and feasibility is evaluated based on the complexity of the project related to design, funding availability (including funding needed for additional planning and design), constructability, and maintenance. Projects that include minimal adjustment to the roadway (pavement striping and signage only), such as bike lanes, received a high project readiness score. Projects that require roadway rebalancing, traffic calming, right-of-way acquisition, or significant hardscape improvements received a low project readiness score.

Low-readiness projects may be re-evaluated as high-readiness depending on future feasibility studies or their alignment with planned Capital Improvement Projects (CIP) or future development projects.

Project Readiness Evaluation Results

To see project readiness evaluation results, see **Maps 5.3** and **5.4** on the following pages.

Overall Priority Projects: Project Value & Readiness Combined

Combining project value and project readiness evaluation scores resulted in a prioritized project list. **Map 5.5** illustrates projects in the four priority categories:

- **Short Term, High Value:** Projects that achieve several goals of the plan and are easy to implement. These projects should be considered for near-term implementation and are contingent on funding availability.
- **Long Term, High Value:** Projects that achieve several goals of the plan, but need further feasibility study or require external funding. Next steps for these projects include independent concept and feasibility studies and applications for external grants.
- **Opportunistic:** Projects that offer a lower benefit based on the goals, but are easy to implement. These projects may become a priority after short-term priorities are complete, if an opportunity arises (e.g., new development), or if safety needs become evident.
- **Low Value:** Lower benefit, challenging projects that may be pursued long term, but are not a priority at this time

For a complete list of priority projects, see **Appendix D, Tables D.1 and D.2**. These results are subject to change based on further studies, partnership opportunities, funding availability, or other circumstances that may influence the City's ability to implement and maintain improvements.


MAP 5.3
**PROJECT READINESS -
FACILITIES**

Project Readiness Level

- High
- Low

Existing Facilities

- Frontrunner Station
- Bike Lane
- Buffered Bike Lane
- Paved Trail
- In-Process Paved Trail
- Natural Surface Trail




MAP 5.4
**PROJECT READINESS -
SPOT IMPROVEMENTS**

Project Readiness Level

- High
- Low
- High
- Low

Existing Facilities

- 🚆 Frontrunner Station
- Bike Lane
- Buffered Bike Lane
- Paved Trail
- - - In-Process Paved Trail
- Natural Surface Trail



MAP 5.5
**OVERALL
PRIORITY PROJECTS**

Spot Improvement Priority


- Short Term, High Value
- Long Term, High Value
- Opportunistic
- Low Value

Facility Priority

- Short Term, High Value
- Long Term, High Value
- Opportunistic
- Low Value

Top 10 “Short-Term, High Value” Projects

- 1 Main St Buffered Bike Lanes (Clearfield to Gordon Ave)
- 2 Gordon Ave Buffered Bike Lanes (400 W to Fairfield Rd)
- 3 Kays Creek Trail Extension (Dawson St to Main St)
- 4 Mid-Block Crossing (Hill Blvd at Gordon Ave)
- 5 Kays Creek Trail (Golden Ave to Gentile)
- 6 Hill Field Rd Buffered Bike Lanes (2200 W to D&RGW Trail)
- 7 Grade-Separated Crossing (2200 W at the Railroad Crossing)
- 8 Hill Field Rd Buffered Bike Lanes (3000 N/HWY 193 to Gordon Ave)
- 9 Church St Bike Route (HWY 193 to Main St)
- 10 Kays Creek Trail Connection (Kays Creek Trail to Gentile)



Cost Estimates and Funding Sources

Cost Estimates

Table 5.2 outlines planning level unit costs for the various facility types proposed in the plan. It is important to note that applying general, planning level cost estimates on a network scale presents several potential discrepancies when compared to actual implementation costs. Therefore, for planning purposes, it is recommended that a conservative **contingency of 30 percent** be applied to the numbers shown in **Table 5.2** to account for associated costs such as final engineering and design, mobilization, traffic control, permitting, inflation, or the removal of existing pavement striping. The cost estimates reflected in the table assume that existing curb and gutter will remain; any relocation of curb and gutter will need to be factored in as an additional cost. Additionally, land acquisitions or easements have not been taken into consideration with these cost estimates, so additional costs should be expected if either are necessary.

Table 5.2 Planning-Level Project Cost Estimates
(LF: Linear Foot, EA: Each)

FACILITY TYPE	UNIT	UNIT COST	ASSUMPTIONS
NEIGHBORHOOD BYWAYS (PER DIRECTION)	LF	\$3.10	TOTAL, ONE WAY, NO TRAFFIC CALMING
Shared lane marking	EA	\$500	thermoplastic, spaced every 250'
Regulatory sign	EA	\$660.00	spaced every 600'
Crossings & traffic calming			see individual items below
BIKE LANES (PER DIRECTION)	LF	\$5.60	TOTAL, ONE WAY/SIDE OF STREET
6" white striping	LF	\$3.50	thermoplastic
Bike lane symbol pavement marking	EA	\$500	thermoplastic, spaced every 500'
Sign	EA	\$660	spaced every 600'

FACILITY TYPE	UNIT	UNIT COST	ASSUMPTIONS
BUFFERED BIKE LANES (PER DIRECTION)	LF	\$9.71	TOTAL, ONE WAY/SIDE OF STREET
Bike lane total cost	LF	\$5.46	
6" white striping (for buffer)	LF	\$3.50	thermoplastic
8" buffer diagonal hatching	LF	\$0.75	thermoplastic, 30' spacing
SEPARATED BIKE LANES (PER DIRECTION)	LF	\$74.50	TOTAL, ONE WAY/SIDE OF STREET
18" wide concrete curb	LF	\$70	cast in place
Bike lane symbol pavement marking	EA	\$500	thermoplastic, spaced every 500'
Flex post installation	EA	\$175	50' spacing
SIDEWALK OR SIDEPATH			
10' wide concrete sidepath	LF	\$150	6" concrete, saw cut joints
6' wide concrete sidewalk	LF	\$80	6" concrete, tooled joints
SHARED-USE PATH			
10' wide path - asphalt	LF	\$130.00	
10' wide path - concrete	LF	\$160.00	8" concrete, saw cut joints
CROSSINGS AND TRAFFIC CALMING			
Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon	EA	\$30,000	post-mounted
Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon	EA	\$150,000	4 assemblies, 2 new mast arms
Curb bulbouts (per corner)	EA	\$10-15,000	no inlet/drainage relocation
Raised median /refuge island	EA	\$10-20,000	
Speed hump/cushion	EA	\$3,000	formed asphalt
Neighborhood traffic circle	EA	\$25,000	concrete
Grade-separated crossing	EA	Varies	Varies per site constraints, utilities, etc.

Funding Sources

There are many potential funding sources available at the federal, state, regional, and local levels that Layton can consider for the implementation of projects in this plan. **Table 5.3** provides a list of many of those available funding sources.

Most funding sources are competitive in nature, and will require applications and long-term planning. For multi-agency projects, applications will likely be more successful if prepared as a joint effort with other local and regional agencies.

Private contributions should also be taken advantage of, when appropriate, in implementing recommended projects. Additionally, Layton may explore the creation or continuation if already established of a dedicated local funding source for active transportation improvements and maintenance through a general fund allocation. This will lead to sustainable funding that can be used to leverage other sources, as well as the development of projects.

In addition to these funds, active transportation projects can be funded through a variety of measures at the local level: bonds financing, special improvement districts, or specified local sales taxes.

Table 5.3 Available Funding Sources

NAME	DESCRIPTION	MORE INFORMATION
FEDERAL & STATE FUNDING SOURCES		
Safe Streets and Roads for All (SS4A) Grant Program	The new SS4A Grant Program funds the development or update of a comprehensive safety action plan (Action Plan), conducting planning, design, and development activities in support of an Action Plan, and/or carrying out projects and strategies identified in an Action Plan . In February 2023, WFRM was awarded funding to complete a SS4A Action Plan. Once this action plan is adopted, cities will be able to request implementation grants for projects identified in the Action Plan	https://www.transportation.gov/SS4A
State Class B and C Program fund	Class B and C funds can be used for maintenance and construction projects, including active transportation. For these projects, thirty percent of the funds must be used for construction or maintenance projects that exceed \$40,000. The remainder of these funds can be used to match federal funds or pay the principal, interest, premiums, and reserves for issued bonds.	https://www.udot.utah.gov/connect/business/public-entities/local-government-program-assistance Regulations: https://drive.google.com/file/d/10KwUcoo9En7H8yYulOWzZxi3QnFZ6g1K/view
Safe Routes to School (SRTS)	UDOT administers Safe Routes to School (SRTS) funding - a \$1.2 Million annual fund to fund active transportation safety improvements within two miles of Utah schools. Cities can apply for this funding (a reimbursement fund) without matching requirements. These funds can be used for improvements such as new trails or sidewalks, signals, crosswalks, and other related facilities.	https://site.utah.gov/connect/business/public-entities/safe-routes-to-school-srts-program/
Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST Act)	The FAST act provides a long-term funding source for surface transportation and planning. Overall, the FAST Act retains eligibility for big programs - Transportation Investments Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER - now called RAISE), Surface Transportation Program (STP), and Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)	https://www.transportation.gov/fastact

NAME	DESCRIPTION	MORE INFORMATION
FEDERAL & STATE FUNDING SOURCES (CONTINUED)		
Transportation Alternatives (TA)	<p>Transportation Alternatives (TA) is a funding source under the FAST Act that consolidates three formerly separate programs under SAFETEA-LU: Transportation Enhancements (TE), Safe Routes to School (SRTS), and the Recreational Trails Program (RTP). Funds are available through a competitive process. These funds may be used for a variety of pedestrian, bicycle, and streetscape projects including:</p> <p>SRTS programs (infrastructure and non-infrastructure programs)</p> <p>Construction, planning, and design of on- and off-road trail facilities for pedestrians, bicyclists, and other non-motorized forms of transportation, including sidewalks, bikeways, pedestrian + bicycle signals, traffic-calming, lighting, and other safety-related infrastructure</p> <p>Construction, planning, and design of infrastructure-related projects and systems that will provide safe routes for children, seniors, and individuals with disabilities who cannot drive</p> <p>Construction of rail-trails</p> <p>Recreational trails program</p>	https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/transportation_alternatives/
Active Transportation Investment Fund (ATIF)	TIF funds are awarded through the State Transportation Commission and administered through UDOT. Projects must be paved, part of the UDOT Active Transportation Plan, provide traffic congestion mitigation on a state highway system, and include 40% non-UDOT funds to match to be eligible for funding.	https://www.udot.utah.gov/connect/about-us/commission/project-prioritization-process/
Safe Sidewalk Program	The Safe Sidewalks Program, administered by UDOT, provides legislative funding for construction of new sidewalks where they are missing or where major construction or reconstruction of a route is not planned for ten or more years. For a proposed sidewalk location to be considered for the program, it must be: located adjacent to a state highway, within an urban area, have significant pedestrian traffic, and include a 25% local government match.	https://www.udot.utah.gov/connect/business/public-entities/local-government-program-assistance/ Regulations: https://docs.google.com/document/d/1sfOQu5qictzKDAj0yDvSO48JFuYrZZbuYsyW4bbardY/edit
Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)	HSIP funds are available for projects aimed at improving safety on all public roads to reduce traffic fatalities and serious injuries. Bike lanes, roadway shoulders, crosswalks, intersection improvements, underpasses, and improved signage are examples of eligible projects. These funds are administered through the UDOT Highway and Safety Division, and require a local match.	https://www.udot.utah.gov/connect/about-us/operations/traffic-safety/
Rebuilding American Infrastructure with Sustainability and Equity (RAISE) Grants	RAISE grants, which were originally created under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act as TIGER grants, can be used for a wide variety of projects, including road, rail, and transit projects. These grants provide capital funding to any public entity, including municipalities and counties.	https://www.transportation.gov/RAISEgrants

NAME	DESCRIPTION	MORE INFORMATION
Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Grants	The FTA has several grant programs available to local and state governments to enhance active transportation connections to public transportation facilities.	https://www.transit.dot.gov/funding/grants/grant-programs
Federal Lands Access Program (FLAP)	The FLAP is intended to improve transportation facilities that provide access to, are adjacent to, or are located within Federal lands. The fund is administered through UDOT in coordination with the Central Federal Lands Highway Division, which develops a Programming Decisions Committee. The Committee puts out the call for projects, establishes selection criteria, and prioritizes selected projects. The next call for projects is anticipated to be in 2025.	https://highways.dot.gov/federal-lands/programs-access
STATE-LEVEL FUNDING SOURCES (NON-UDOT)		
Recreational Trails Program (RTP)	Administered by the Utah Division of State Parks and Recreation, the RTP requires that motor fuel tax revenues generated from motor fuel sales for off-highway recreational purposes be transferred from the Highway Trust Fund to the Trails Trust Fund for recreational trail and facility improvements. This program provides grants for non-motorized and motorized trails, including construction and maintenance of trails and facilities, staging areas, trailheads, restroom facilities, and trail signing.	https://stateparks.utah.gov/resources/grants/recreational-trails-program/
Land and Water Conservation Fund	Administered by the Utah Division of State Parks and Recreation, the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act provides federal grants for the acquisition and/or development of public outdoor recreation areas. Any site/facility purchased, developed, or improved with funding from this grant is protected in perpetuity as a public outdoor recreation area.	http://stateparks.utah.gov/resources/grants/land-and-water-conservation-fund/
Utah Outdoor Recreation Grant	Administered through the Office of Outdoor Recreation, the Utah Outdoor Recreation Grant project helps communities build trails and other recreation infrastructure by awarding matching grants. The grants help enhance recreational opportunities and amenities in Utah's communities.	https://business.utah.gov/outdoor/uorg/
Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)	The CDBG Program provides annual grants on a formula basis to states, cities, and counties to develop viable urban communities by providing decent housing and a suitable living environment, and by expanding economic opportunities, principally for low- and moderate-income persons. The State of Utah administers the funds for cities with fewer than 50,000 residents.	https://jobs.utah.gov/housing/community/cdbg/index.html

NAME	DESCRIPTION	MORE INFORMATION
MPO-LEVEL FUNDING SOURCE		
WFRC Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)	WFRC awards 40-50 million dollars annually in federal transportation funding for transportation projects within the Salt Lake-West Valley and the Ogden-Layton urbanized areas. These funds are allocated through the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Program, Surface Transportation (STP) Program, Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP), and Carbon Reduction Program (CRP)	https://wfrc.org/programs/transportation-improvement-program/
COUNTY FUNDING SOURCES		
Prop 1	Layton's Prop 1 specified sales tax should continue to be used to fund active transportation and general road safety improvements. These taxes can be used to generate funds for highway, transit, and local road (including bicycle) projects.	
3rd Quarter County Sales Tax for Transportation	<p>3rd Quarter County Sales Tax for Transportation is revenue specifically intended for the funding of priority transportation needs and infrastructure as authorized by the applicable state statute, and the Board of Davis County Commissioners for the following purposes:</p> <p>A. The development, construction, maintenance, or operation of:</p> <p>(i) a class A road; (ii) a class B road; (iii) a class C road; (iv) a class D road; (v) traffic and pedestrian safety infrastructure, including: (A) a sidewalk; (B) curb and gutter; (C) a safety feature; (D) a traffic sign; (E) a traffic signal; or (F) street lighting; (vi) streets, alleys, roads, highways, and thoroughfares of any kind, including connected structures; (vii) an airport facility; (viii) an active transportation facility that is for non-motorized vehicles and multimodal transportation and connects an origin with a destination; or (ix) an intelligent transportation system;</p> <p>B. A system for public transit;</p> <p>C. All other modes and forms of conveyance used by the public;</p> <p>D. Debt service or bond issuance costs related to a project or facility</p> <p>E. Corridor preservation related to a project or facility</p>	<p>https://le.utah.gov/xcode/Title59/Chapter12/59-12-S2212.2.html?v=C59-12-S2212.2_2019051420190701#59-12-2212.2(1)(a)</p>
CITY FUNDING SOURCES		
Bond Financing	Bonds can be approved by voters to fund a range of projects. A local successful precedent is the 2012 Parks and Trails Bond in Salt Lake County, which authorized \$47 million in bond funds to complete the Jordan River Parkway, Parley's Trail, and acquire land for/construct new parks throughout the County.	

NAME	DESCRIPTION	MORE INFORMATION
Sales Tax	Layton should continue to use the Recreation, Arts, Museum, and Parks (RAMP) sales tax initiative (one cent for every \$10 spent in Layton) established, which could be used to benefit active transportation infrastructure.	
Special Assessment or Taxing Districts	Local municipalities can establish special assessment districts for infrastructure improvements, like sidewalks, that are missing or in need of improvement in certain areas.	
Parking Fees	Some cities have instituted parking fees for public parking spaces that are then used to pay for infrastructure improvements.	
Development Impact Fees	Development impact fees are one-time charges collected from developers for financing new infrastructure construction and operations and can help fund bicycle and pedestrian improvements. Impact fees are assessed through a city's impact fee program.	
New Construction	Future road widening and construction projects are methods of providing improved bike and pedestrian infrastructure. To ensure that roadway construction projects provide these improvements, it is important that the review process includes a review of any relevant active transportation related plans. Layton should also coordinate with UDOT to find opportunities for bike and pedestrian facilities on state road construction projects.	
PRIVATE FUNDING SOURCES		
PeopleForBikes Community Grant Program	The PeopleForBikes Community Grant Program supports bicycle infrastructure projects and targeted advocacy initiatives that make biking safer for people of all ages and abilities. PeopleForBikes accepts requests for funding up to \$10,000.	https://www.peopleforbikes.org/grant-guidelines
Private Developers	Developers should consider constructing local streets with bike- and pedestrian-oriented facilities within subdivisions, including dedicating right-of-way to trails and parks. Cities can encourage developers to include active transportation amenities during development review, and should require developers to show how the proposed development will accommodate or enhance active transportation connections.	

Interagency Coordination

Layton City has the opportunity to partner with other agencies to implement active transportation projects, including UDOT, UTA, and adjoining cities. Some of the projects recommended in this plan will require coordination with these entities. Below is a list of projects that will require multi-agency coordination:

PROJECTS INVOLVING UDOT

Facility Projects (Oak Hills Dr, Antelope Dr, 3000 N, Main St)

- 9 - Main St Buffered Bike Lanes
- 22 - Hill Field Rd Buffered Bike Lanes
- 39 - Main St Protected Bike Lanes
- 46 - 3000 N/Hwy 193 Facility
- 50 - Gentile St Facility
- 78 - Oak Hills Dr Trail Extension
- 79 - Gentile St/Oak Hills Dr Facility
- 84 - 3000 N / Hwy 193 Sidepath
- 86 - Layton Pkwy Facility Connection
- 115 - Main St Sidepath
- 116 - Antelope Dr Facility
- 120 - Main St Buffered Bike Lanes

Spot Improvement Projects

- 12 - Mid-Block Crossing at Main St & Church
- 13 - Underpass at Oak Hills Dr Trail, just east of the Temple
- 17 - Intersection Improvement at Church St & 3000 N

- 39 - Intersection Improvement at Antelope Dr & Main St
- 40 - Intersection Improvement at Gentile St & Main St
- 53 - Intersection Improvement at Oak Hills Dr & Gentile St

PROJECTS INVOLVING UTA

Facility Projects

- 2 - University Park Blvd Buffered Bike Lanes
- 3 - University Blvd/1200 W Facility Connection
- 4 - University Park Blvd/Heritage Park Blvd Bike Lanes
- 9 - Main St Buffered Bike Lanes
- 19 - Gordon Ave Buffered Bike Lanes
- 20 - Antelope Dr Buffered Bike lanes
- 22 - Hill Field Rd Buffered Bike Lanes
- 27 - Layton Ridge Dr Bike Route
- 30 - Flint St Bike Lanes
- 31 - South Main St Buffered Bike Lanes
- 39 - Main St Protected Bike Lanes
- 40 - 700 W Facility Connection
- 42 - Hobbs Creek Dr Bike Route
- 43 - Mall Ring Rd Facility
- 47 - Fort Ln Facility
- 58 - Woodland Park Dr Buffered Bike Lanes

68 - Antelope Dr/Hwy 89 Facility Crossing

71 - Fairfield Rd Buffered Bike Lanes

78 - Oak Hills Dr Trail Extension

84 - 3000 N/Hwy 193 Sidepath

86 - Layton Pkwy Facility Connection

99 - Hill Field Rd Sidepath

109 - Gentile St Sidepaths

115 - Main St Sidepath

116 - Antelope Dr Facility

120 - Main St Bike Lanes

Spot Improvement Projects

16 - Bike/Ped overpass at Main St and the Layton Frontrunner Station

PROJECTS INVOLVING ADJOINING CITIES

Clearfield

2 - University Park Blvd Buffered Bike Lanes

5 - 2200 W Buffered Bike Lanes

9 - Main St Buffered Bike Lanes

16 - 2550 W Neighborhood Byway

44 - 1600 N Neighborhood Byway

112 - UP&L Power Corridor Trail

Syracuse

25 - Sand Ridge Pkwy Bike Lanes

63 - Gentile Bike Route

Hill AFB

84 - 3000 N/HWY 193 Sidepath

South Weber

56 - Future Roadway Bike Lane

93 - South Weber Trail Connection

Kaysville

27 - Layton Ridge Dr Bike Route

30 - Flint St Bike Lanes

31 - South Main St Buffered Bike Lanes

33 - Boynton Rd Facility

35 - Angel Street Facility

42 - Hobbs Creek Dr Bike Route

71 - Fairfield Rd Buffered Bike Lanes

112 - UP&L Power Corridor Trail

The Nature Conservancy (TNC)/Great Salt Lake Shorelands Preserve

36 - TNC Bike Route Connection

- 
- A: Active Transportation in Layton Today
 - B: Community Voice
 - C: Recommendations
 - D: Prioritization & Implementation

Appendix

This page intentionally left blank

A

Active Transportation in Layton Today Appendix

To: JoEllen Grandy, Layton City

From: Mack Drzayich, Alta

Date: January 26, 2022

Re: Layton ATP – LTS Memo

Level of Traffic Stress

Introduction

The following memorandum summarizes the methodology for both Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress (BLTS) Analysis and Pedestrian Level of Stress (PLOS) Analysis. This information will provide additional insight into the challenges and opportunities for active transportation in Layton as it relates to measuring the level of comfort for pedestrians and cyclists.

Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress (BLTS) Analysis

Introduction and Methodology

To understand the relative comfort of the existing network, a Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress (BLTS) analysis was completed. In addition to demonstrating how stressful it is to travel along a roadway, the analysis reveals the impact that major roadway crossings have on connectivity. This analysis builds on the methodology defined by the Mineta Institute¹, further developed by Peter Furth², the BLTS examines the relative comfort of traveling along and across roadways. This analysis considers the following elements:

- Motor Vehicle Speed
- Number of Travel Lanes
- Bicycle Facility Presence
- Signal Location

When considered together, these factors score roadways on a four-point scale. An LTS 1 represents the lowest stress pathway and is typically considered appropriate for all ages and abilities. An LTS 4 designates roadways that are the highest stress and typically not comfortable for a bicyclist of any level. Bicycle boulevards and trails are most often considered BLTS 1 (lowest stress), while arterials and other high-speed, high-volume roadways are considered BLTS 4 (highest stress).

¹ *Low-Stress Bicycling and Network Connectivity*. Mineta Transportation Institute. 2012. <https://transweb.sjsu.edu/sites/default/files/1005-low-stress-bicycling-network-connectivity.pdf>

² Furth, Peter. *Level of Traffic Stress Criteria for Road Segments, Version 2.0*. 2017. <http://www.northeastern.edu/peter.furth/wp-content/uploads/2014/05/LTS-Tables-v2-June-1.pdf>

Table 1 outlines the scoring criteria used in this analysis.

Table 1 - BLTS scoring Criteria

Data Element	Description	Source	Assumption/Limitations
Road Centerlines/ Active Transportation Facilities	Location of roadways, including the number of travel lanes, volume, posted speed limit, and existing Bike Facilities	Utah Geospatial Resource Center	Assumptions for local roadways/bike facilities were provided by the City of Layton. Data does not include facility width; the assumption of 5 feet is used for bicycle lanes. The benefit is provided only when bike lanes measure 6 feet wide or greater and have posted speed of 30mph or less.
Traffic Signals	While traveling along low-stress segments may be comfortable, crossing a major arterial without a signal can be a significant barrier to bicycling. Standard traffic signals reduce but do not entirely deter the impact of crossing wide highspeed streets.	UDOT, 2019 - https://maps.udot.utah.gov/arcgis/rest/services/TrafficSignals/MapServer	
Speed Limit	Higher-speed roadways are considered to be less comfortable for bicyclists, particularly in mixed traffic or with minimal separation from motor vehicles. Low-speed roadways are considered more comfortable.	Utah Geospatial Resource Center	Speed limit data is available utilizing the <i>Speed Limits</i> attribute from UGRC's Roads Centerlines Data Model V3.1.7
Presence and width of on-street parking adjacent to bicycle lanes	On-street parking is particularly important for corridors on which bicycle lanes are present. Bicycle levels of travel stress are greater on bicycle lanes adjacent to parking than on bicycle lanes not adjacent to parking, due to the potential for 'dooring' incidences.	Utah Geospatial Resource Center	The absence or presence of on-street parking is not included in UGRC's Roads Centerlines Data Model V3.1.7. As such, this criterion has been excluded from consideration, and we will not be evaluating LTS based on the LTS criteria outlined in Table 4.
Number of Lanes	The number of travel lanes corresponds with an increase in the roadway width, which has an effect on bicyclists' level of stress. Roadways with fewer lanes are generally less stressful for bicyclists.	Utah Geospatial Resource Center	When data is not available or inadequate, assumptions about the number of lanes will be made based on the roadway's functional classification.

Table 1 - Criteria for Level of Traffic Stress in Mixed Traffic

Prevailing Speed or Speed Limit (mph)	Street Width		
	2-3 Lanes	4-5 Lanes	6+ Lanes
≤ 25	BLTS 1 or 2 ¹	BLTS 3	BLTS 4
30	BLTS 2 or 3 ¹	BLTS 4	BLTS 4
≥ 35	BLTS 4	BLTS 4	BLTS 4
1. Lower value is assigned to streets without marked centerlines or classified as residential with fewer than 3 lanes.			

Table 2 - Criteria for Bike Lanes Not Alongside a Parking Lane

	BLTS 1	BLTS 2	BLTS 3	BLTS 4
Street Width (Through lanes per direction)	1	2, if directions are separated by a raised median	More than 2, or 2 without a separating median	(no effect)
Bike Lane Width	6 feet or more	5.5 feet or less	(no effect)	(no effect)
Speed Limit (mph)	30 mph or less	(no effect)	35 mph	40 mph or more
Note: (no effect) = factor does not trigger an increase to this level of traffic stress.				

Table 4 - Criteria for Bike Lanes Alongside a Parking Lane

	BLTS 1	BLTS 2	BLTS 3	BLTS 4
Street Width (Through lanes per direction)	1	(no effect)	2 or more	(no effect)
Sum of Bike Lane Width + Parking Lane Width ¹	15 feet or more	14 or 14.5 feet	13.5 feet or less	(no effect)
Speed Limit (mph)	25 mph or less	30 mph	35 mph	40 mph or more
1. This evaluation will not be including parking lane level detail				

BLTS results are one tool to identify where and what types of improvements can increase the connectivity and comfort of a bicycle network. For example, lowering roadway speeds, increasing the separation of bicyclists from motor vehicles, and designating crossings can all improve the overall comfort of the bicycle network. Table 1 below outlines the data used in this analysis, along with limitations and assumptions.

Pedestrian Level of Stress (PLOS) Analysis

Introduction and Methodology

The Pedestrian Level of Stress (PLOS) analysis provides a framework for understanding the relative level of pedestrian comfort while traveling in Layton. This analysis considers roadway characteristics that affect pedestrian safety, including the number of lanes and posted speed limits, as well as the presence of complete sidewalks on one or both sides of the street.

These three factors are scored together to assess a relative level of comfort. Similar to the BLTS, this is scored on a four-point scale. PLOS 1 and PLOS 2 identify low-stress roadways most suitable for walking. These roadways generally have complete sidewalks, slower motor vehicle travel speeds, and few lanes. PLOS 1 and PLOS 2 roadways often include residential roadways as well as off-street or separated paths.

On the other hand, an incomplete sidewalk network, higher vehicle speeds, and more travel lanes translate to a higher level of pedestrian stress, which is represented by PLOS 3 or 4. In these situations, people traveling by foot are more exposed to motor vehicles and have less dedicated space or protection. Examples of higher-stress roadways include busy arterial and collector streets.

It is important to note that many factors can influence pedestrian comfort but are not considered in this analysis. For example, this analysis does not directly consider roadway crossing quality, buffers, vegetation, or lighting. However, PLOS is a starting point for network evaluation, allowing an assessment of a large area where limited data is available.

Table 2 summarizes the scoring criteria used for this analysis.

Table 3 - PLTS Scoring Matrix

Pedestrian Space along Roadway	Speed Limits (MPH)					
	<=25 MPH		30-35 MPH		>=40 MPH	
	2 Lanes	>2 Lanes	2 Lanes	>2 Lanes	2 Lanes	>2 Lanes
Complete sidewalk on both sides	1	1	2	3	3	4
Complete sidewalk on one side	2	3	3	4	4	5
No sidewalk	2	3	4	5	5	5

Summary

Several trends emerge from the LTS and PLOS Analysis. First, the majority of Layton's major roadways including arterials and collectors are under higher stress due to higher travel speeds and incomplete sidewalk networks. These areas create islands of disconnect as people who rely on cycling and walking as their primary modes of transportation may find these routes stressful as they relate to existing facility absence and/or motor vehicle speed safety concerns. Major roadways are often where important destinations are located, including shopping centers, medical offices, and bus stops. Prioritizing improving facility types along these corridors would allow for greater separation from motor vehicles and will contribute to greater connectivity and improved safety across the city.

Additional Data Limitations

A comprehensive analysis of the pedestrian network is limited by the extent of the data available. Where sidewalk presence is known, high speeds and a greater number of lanes generally provide for a less comfortable walking environment. Future data collection efforts should consider documenting complete sidewalk data for a more robust analysis of the pedestrian network.

Planning History

Integrating Previous Plans

There have been many active transportation project and policy recommendations in the City of Layton over the years. Some projects/policies have been implemented, while others are still high level concepts or simply identified potential corridors for improvement. One of the first steps of this planning process has been to analyze existing plans, what's in the process of being planned, and what has been proposed but not yet been studied in depth or taken forward into design and implementation.

The following previous plans were reviewed:

- Layton City Parks, Recreation, Trails, Open Space & Cultural Facilities (PRTOSCF) Master Plan 2015-2025 (2016)
- Layton City Transportation Plan (2017)
- Layton Forward – General Plan (2019)
- Kaysville Active Transportation Plan (2016)

Layton City Parks, Recreation, Trails, Open Space & Cultural Facilities (PRTOSCF) Master Plan 2015-2025 (2016)

As of 2016, Layton had 27 miles of existing trails and bike lanes/routes and 88.25 miles of proposed, totaling 115.35 miles. In this system, about 35% of the proposed facilities will be multi-use paved trails, while 64% will be dedicated on-road bike routes and lanes. The map on the following page displays the goals of this plan.

TRAILS

The trail system in Layton is made up of multi-use paved trails, unpaved trails, and bike lanes/routes. As part of the proposed facilities, three “priority trails” projects (regional transportation, recreation, and inner-city connecting trails) are identified, creating a comprehensive system of trails in Layton.

The plan also states “There are also over 86 miles of bicycle lanes and routes planned within the City. These facilities generally meet the needs of a

growing population through 2025, and should be developed as envisioned, thus representing a more connected and complete trail and bicycle system for the future.”


GOALS AND POLICIES

Goal 4.0: Assure that residents of Layton City have access to trails that provide links between neighborhoods and important destinations and attractions.

- Policy 4.1: Adopt the Layton City Trail Concept to guide the development of a comprehensive trail system through 2025.
- Policy 4.2: Work with engineering to implement all 55 miles of proposed bicycle lanes and routes that are currently proposed by 2025.
 - *Assure they are included in the Transportation Master Plan.*
- Policy 4.3: Require trail master planning as part of the City's development review process. The master plan should clearly address the development of trailheads and access to trails.
- Implementation Measures:
 - *Include system-wide trails development in any future planning initiatives, focusing on closing gaps in trails, developing trailheads, and connecting existing and future neighborhoods to downtown, parks and recreation facilities, public transit and community destinations.*
 - *Maintain trails in a safe and usable condition by controlling weeds, particularly thorny weeds, removing trash and debris, and where possible select some trails to be plowed of snow in the winter.*
 - *Initiate an “Adopt a Trail” program to encourage users as care-takers of the trail system. Encourage participants to become involved in all aspects of trails planning, development, maintenance, and improvement.*
 - *Develop a trail and bike path/route signing program that provides clear information to users about how to access trails and proper trail behavior. Make trail and bike path maps available to the public.*

Goal 5.0: Assure that trails are safe.

- Policy 5.1: Safe Routes to Schools is an on-going concern regarding trails.
- Implementation Measure
 - *Work with the Davis School District, police authorities, local developers, and local neighborhoods to identify and clearly mark appropriate routes.*



Layton City Transportation Plan (2017)

ALTERNATIVE MODES OF TRANSPORTATION SECTION

As part of this TMP, the bicycle and pedestrian policy as well as the cross sections and design guidelines were updated. The street types that were included in the cross section and design guidance include:

- Signed shared roadway
- Marked shared roadway
- Bicycle boulevard
- Bike lane
- Buffered bike lane
- Protected bike lane (i.e. cycle track)
- Shared use path

EXISTING STRENGTHS:

- General ordinance supporting pedestrian and bicycle safety
- Maximum block sizes in residential and agricultural zones
- Pedestrian accommodations in parking lots in mixed use zones
- Good ordinance language requiring property owner participation in sidewalk maintenance
- Good language prohibiting obstructions to sidewalks
- Good language requiring overhangs and shelters to protect pedestrians in mixed use zones

PRIORITY NEEDS:

- Develop a comprehensive Complete Streets Ordinance
- Require pedestrian improvements with new development and redevelopment (sidewalks, lighting, street trees, etc.)

- Develop citywide bicycle parking requirements
- Update suburban, auto-oriented development standards to be more context-based and pedestrian-friendly
- Develop policy and ordinances for required width and installation of sidewalks
- Expand the walking and bicycling-friendly requirements that exist in mixed use zones to all nonresidential and non-agricultural zones in the City

Layton Forward – General Plan (September 2019)

The general plan is primarily a land use blueprint intended to provide policy foundation and guidance for zoning, private development decisions, and land use framework it also provides information for prioritization of road, transit, parks and trail improvements. Specifically, it identifies areas where bicycle and pedestrian facilities should be concentrated throughout Layton.

SUPPORTING POLICIES

Recreation, cultural, open space, and agriculture

- Layton will work with private land development partners to create a citywide parks and trails system that links neighborhoods to the mountains and lake, and to regional trail corridors that connect to other communities.
- New development will support implementation of park improvements and trail corridors, either through public/private partnerships or through park impact fees. Established parks and trails promote more walking and biking and less driving for a healthy and active lifestyle.

Sustainable growth

- More convenient shopping areas located near residential neighborhoods will support local businesses and generate local sales tax revenues to maintain streets, parks, trails and other public services.

Mobility

- Layton will continue to encourage and provide facilities to promote walking and biking as a convenient choice of transportation to access daily needs. This will be accomplished by designing and installing infrastructure that supports safe pedestrian and cyclist travel, and by bringing goods and services closer to existing and future residential neighborhoods in Town Centers, Urban Districts, and Mixed-Use Corridors.
- Neighborhoods, Town Centers, Business Centers, and Urban Districts should be joined together by a well-connected system of streets, walkways, and bike paths to provide access to parks, open spaces, schools, public gathering areas, and transit options.

Mixed-Use Development

- Layton's Mixed-Use locations include Urban Districts, Town Centers, Mixed-Use Areas and Mixed-Use Corridors, and Business Park/Mixed-Use areas that are strategically placed throughout the community. Pedestrian access is important, with the building orientation to walkable streets and pathways, and residential and non-residential uses within a short walking distance of one another.
- Urban District – Urban Districts emphasize walkable and bikeable streets and are hubs for transit use.

Non-Residential Uses – Open Space/Public Facility

- These areas include trail corridors. Open space corridors are intended to expand along the City's planned trail system, particularly along natural drainages and other natural areas, and power corridors.

Residential Uses

- New residential development should be designed with streets and sidewalks that connect to existing or future development, and nearby trails and parks where available.

Urban Districts

- Challenges include developing a more pedestrian, bike and transit-friendly environment where car-centric planning in the past has reduced the functionality and enjoyment of walkable streets and blocks, and encouraged large-scale, auto-oriented development.
 - *Promote shared transportation options for vehicle, bikes or other modes of transportation to reduce parking demand.*
- Historic Downtown Opportunities:
 - *Establish pedestrian, bike and vehicular connectivity with new development to create a network of smaller blocks and connections to sidewalks, pathways and trails.*
 - *Redesign and reconstruct Main Street to enhance pedestrian friendliness.*
 - *Encourage more choices for mobility within the district for pedestrians, bikes, shuttles, buses, and cars, including associated amenities such as: shared cycling, shared vehicles, and bicycle parking for businesses and housing.*
 - *Design and construct a pedestrian/bike bridge over FrontRunner and Union Pacific Road tracks to encourage passenger rail ridership by connecting medical facilities/employment, housing and transit, and to encourage trail use and visitation to Historic Downtown from residential areas.*
 - *Promote opportunities to link regional and City trails to Historic Downtown, including the Bamberger Trail and Kays Creek Trail, and provide way-finding signage for cyclists and pedestrians.*
- Midtown Opportunities
 - *Create pleasant and pedestrian-friendly streetscapes that include street trees, furniture, outdoor eating/gathering spots, and public art.*
 - *Provide visitors with pedestrian wayfinding signage to local businesses, and highlight popular tourist destinations*
 - *Improve the connectivity of all uses and mobility of pedestrians throughout Midtown with additional trails, urban sidewalks, more Free Fare Transit and e-Bike Share opportunities.*

Town Centers

- By providing services closer to where people live, Town Centers can encourage more walking and biking, and less driving.
- Development design standards that promote a pedestrian-friendly and walkable neighborhood design should include Smaller, walkable blocks with sidewalks, street trees and minimal curb cuts, or larger blocks that promote connectivity for vehicles and pedestrians, Pedestrian connectivity to surrounding residential areas via trails and bike paths, and community identity established through branding signage and wayfinding to encourage place recognition and arrival oriented to the pedestrian and cycling experience.
- Town centers to be developed with bike and pedestrian consideration: West Layton Town Center, Hwy 89 & Gordon Town Center, Antelope & Main Town Center, and Church Street & HWY 193 Town Center

Business Centers

- Develop a recreational and commuter multi-purpose trail connecting the West Davis Business Center north to the West Layton Town Center, and south to the Nature Conservancy Shorelands Preserve as identified in the Layton City Parks, Recreation, Trails, Open Space & Cultural Facilities Master Plan

Regulatory and Policy Strategies

- Funding:
 - *Funding sources for Recreational Park and Trail Projects include impact fees, City Prop 1 funds, City RAMP Tax, County Prop 1 funds, TAP (Transportation Alternatives Program) grants (through Wasatch Front Regional Council and UDOT), Utah Outdoor Governor's Grant, Recreational Trail Program (RTP), County TTAB grants, Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and general City funds.*

Main Street Reconstruction:

- Study of the potential redesign and reconstruction of Main Street is needed to support Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) near the FrontRunner Station. Planning and design efforts include crossing Main Street with a signalized intersection, and a pedestrian bridge along the Kays Creek Trail to connect TOD on east and west sides of the FrontRunner Station.

Partnership Strategies:

- Potential shared transportation systems, including shared car programs, shared bike organizations, or other private alternative transport systems.
- Pedestrian bridge connecting the Intermountain Health Care property west of the FrontRunner Station to the FrontRunner Station.
- Trail Easements and Public Open Space Access
- Public/Private partnerships such as private developments reserving public space for public purposes, such as a PRUD open space designation for public park, trail or future school site, or regional storm water detention facility.

Kaysville Active Transportation Plan (March 2016)

MENTION OF LAYTON:

- Layton's FrontRunner station can be accessed on foot by using the sidewalks on the north side of Layton Parkway, but they are not as comfortable as a separated path of a landscaping-buffered sidewalk.

B

Community Voice

Appendix

MAP B.1
PUBLIC INPUT
PHASE 2:
PUBLIC COMMENTS

Most-Liked Comments

- 1-10 Likes
- 11-20 Likes
- 21-30 Likes
- 31+ Likes

Planned Facilities

- Signed Bike Route
- Neighborhood Byway
- Bike Lane
- Buffered Bike Lane
- Separated Bike Lanes
- Shared Use Path/Sidepath
- TBD, Further Study Needed

Existing Facilities

- Bike Lane
- Buffered Bike Lane
- Paved Trail
- In-Process Paved Trail
- Natural Surface Trail

Base Map

- Frontrunner Station
- Rail Lines
- Parks and Open Space
- Waterbody
- Layton City Boundary




Table B.1 Public Input Phase 2 - Added Comments

ID	COMMENT	LIKES
1	People take this curve very fast. Makes it feel really dangerous for the people biking here. This is also near a school crossing area.	26
2	Completion of sidewalk on north side of Oakridge Dr.	28
3	Add some traffic calming measures or a light along Flint Street to allow for residents to be able to turn left into traffic. A pedestrian crossing is also greatly needed in this area.	21
4	Some sort of mid-block crossing on this stretch of Antelope would provide the northern neighborhood access to Woodward Park	31
5	If Gentile had a path from the mountains on the east to the Santa Fe Trail on the West it would open up the Santa Fe trail to those that live on the East side. It could be another East West location but it appears it is close to the connection on Gentile/Oakhills.	30
6	Add crosswalk for school kids walking to/from East Layton Elementary.	25
7	100K of our tax dollars went to build the (completed) underpass under 89. Lets get the Kay's Creek trail to connect NOW	53
8	We need those flashing solar powered speed limit/radar signs and painted crosswalk lines here. People are routinely clocked going 45-50mph on this 25mph road. There are crosswalk signs but they just do not catch attention.	13
9	This intersection should be improved for pedestrian and bicycle use, particularly as it connects the keys creek trails.	19
10	I see nothing that indicates any improvements or additions to the East side trails that could/should be improved and ultimately connected to the Bonneville Shoreline trail. I live on the East side of Layton and I would love to be able to ride my mountain bike without having to drive to Ogden valley or bountiful to start.	24
11	Please tell me the new trail is connecting to the current trail on bluff road.	11
12	This needs to become a 4 way stop. There is so much cross traffic (auto, pedestrian and bicycle) n Emerald Dr that something needs to be fixed. People race more up and down on Cherry Lane. There is also a school bus stop right there as well.	12
13	Review the placement of crosswalk. It is at such a pinch point. A cross walk would be better suited just west of East Layton Elem. Please reconsider it.	7
14	Even though it's completely residential from Gentile to Layton parkway on this section of Angel street, the speed limit is 35 (and people go faster than that all the time). There's no crosswalks (except at Gentile and Layton parkway), no bike lanes, no flashing speed limit signs. Slow it down so it actually feels safe to bike and walk along this street.	14
15	Like a proximate comment, this street (Angel north of Layton Parkway) can have fast traffic going through. This point is several blocks away from a school, by a church, residential neighborhoods, and could have design to help caution drivers around pedestrians. If a crosswalk was ever placed here, it would need something like pedestrian initiated flasher signals to vehicles (maybe pedestrian-held flags, too). Otherwise, a pedestrian-vehicle accident could occur due to the speed of traffic.	10
16	An EV charging station needs to be considered here. For example, see Kaysville library and park area with charging stations, as well as Kaysville pickle-ball park near Smith's. Layton needs to consider further EV charging infrastructure. This is an increasing demand, and alongside benefiting residents, will influence the amount of visitors stopping by, supporting business economy, etc. Libraries and parks are great locations for charging stations.	3
17	Flint St Northbound traffic is impeded by the bottleneck of narrower pavement at 691 Flint St. When Flint NB traffic is heavy it backs up there behind vehicles waiting to turn left west to Phillips St. The situation is exacerbated when cars are parked on the curb on the east side of Flint at the Flint/Phillips intersection.	11
18	When northbound traffic on Flint Street is heavy, it is difficult to make a right turn on Flint from 900 S; you cannot see the on coming NB traffic sufficiently to see a safe traffic gap because cars parked on the east side curb of Flint Street block your visibility of the oncoming NB traffic. During heavy traffic, left turns from 900 South on to Flint Street are impractical/unsafe.	8
19	Add a full sidewalk on the south side of Gordon. To walk to school, bus, store, we have to step into the road, walk through people's yards, or cross busy Gordon which doesn't have a crosswalk! Please add a full sidewalk!!! Add a crosswalk here. The new builds have increased the number of kids walking to school and trying to cross the road here. I see them almost getting hit daily!!	36
20	This road (500 S) is a "major" connector between the communities east and west of Angel St. The closest signed/controlled crossings are .25 mi to the south and .5 mi to the north. Angel st. traffic does not slow for pedestrians crossing the street anywhere along Angel between Gentile and Layton Parkway, even where there is an obvious continuation of 500 S east to west.	4
21	Signal at north end of south FrontRunner parking. Allow people to cross Main Street and provide a way for buses to turn left and right out of Layton Station bus bays.	6
22	Better signal recognition of bikes waiting at the intersection.	7

ID	COMMENT	LIKES
23	Traffic gets backed up during school pickup and drop off and creates unsafe driving conditions for those trying to get around as it is hard to see around the bend	5
24	Since the completion of this street cars are regularly driving down it at excessive speeds. More safety is needed for adults and children riding bikes or walking down this road.	1
25	There is poor lighting along this road making it unsafe for people to walk this stretch during the evening or early morning.	5
26	Those of us living on Peacefield drive are wondering why ours is the only street in the area that has not been re-paved. All streets around us have been done and yet our sits just getting more and more potholes. Two years ago when Gordon was re-done I personally counted around 50 large semis carrying heavy loads of concrete, gravel, road base going up and down Peacefield and really made a mess of our street. The residents on this street are very disappointed in this neglect. Please HELP	3
27	Add a pedestrian crossing here. With the development of The Park there has been an increase of people crossing Gordon. Many don't want to go the distance to cross at 2200 W or the D&RGW Rail Trail. This intersection would be a good intermediate. A signalized intersection would be best. Any marking and signage would work.	2
28	There needs to be some type of crosswalk along Fairfield, either by Maple Way or E Mary Land. Kids are constantly darting across the street here to get to friend's houses or to church. There is nothing that stops traffic on Fairfield between Gentile and Mutton Hollow, and many cars travel way too fast along here.	3
29	Gentile and Fort Lane need to be adjusted to be more bike friendly so kids feel comfortable riding bikes to Layton High. My son doesn't like to ride to school because the road is too narrow and he doesn't feel comfortable with the cars so close to him.	19
30	I live at 2499 w 650 N and think for Safety the Yield signs need to be removed along this street I have had numerous vehicles pull out in front of me while I am either in my car or on a bike or even walking	0
31	Also with new homes that were built within the last year just west of swan meadows there has been a large increase in trafic along 650 N with drivers going well over the speed limit of 25 Layton PD has been helpful but they can't be here all the time. With UT snow speed bumps won't work but a hump would so plow trucks can still clear the roads	0
32	Roundabout, stop light, or cement barrier prohibiting left hand turns onto 193. In addition to additional right turn lane from 193 to 89. The remaining two lanes would shift left forcing the left lane to turn left on to 89 and having the right lane allowed to continue to to 89 North or merg into "new" (re striped) SB 89 lane.	3
33	This will need a pedestrian (preferably a HAWK beacon) signal of some sort to connect the two paths; it is extremely dangerous for bicycle commuters to turn left here.	4
34	Could we add a roundabout here as well as the top of the hill? Lots of traffic using this corner and it's tricky to get across or to turn at times	0
35	Could we add a trail at the end of Cherry Meadows that connects to the new trailhead?	2
36	Would be great for bike lane to connect new overpass bike lanes and existing bike lanes and trail further down Oak Hills Ln. through this section	10
37	The east side of Church St. does not have a complete sidewalk and does not have a crossing at Hawthorne or a safe crossing at Green St., despite this area getting lots of foot traffic to the schools and park. It's a dangerous gap in school commuting for surrounding kids--another Fort Ln to Lindsay St. incident waiting to happen.	24
38	2200 W needs sidewalks on both sides of the street the whole length of the street	7
39	Finish the sidewalk on Gentile	8
40	This is a dangerous Blindspot due to overgrowth of trees along the reservoir. So many folks love to walk/bike/run on Gentile around the golf course but there is no official path. It would be incredible to have a safe path all the way down to where the sidewalk begins. This would allow people to safely reach shopping centers and churches.	5
41	This is a blind intersection. As you leave the neighborhood to access the nice new paved path on Gordon, you cannot see the cars coming down the hill due to the concrete privacy wall. It's also difficult to see the ones coming uphill due to the steep grade. This makes it dangerous for all the people who live in that neighborhood who want to use the new path on Gordon.	5
42	This intersection needs a light. Cars on Gordon are in highway mode doing 50+ day and night	1
43	The intersection on 400 N and Bluff Ridge BLVD is extremely dangerous. This needs to be a 4 way stop with painted crosswalks and police monitoring. Bluff Ridge BLVD is used a race track for cars all day with speeds continually over 45 mph.	0
44	Additional trails for mountain biking	1
45	Plan for location for public transit stop to front runner	0
46	Finish cement on Gentile	1

ID	COMMENT	LIKES
47	Need a turn lane to the right when church hits gordon	1
48	Desperately need sidewalks between 193 and antelope on fort lane. This road is narrow and not engineered correctly. Cars are constantly sliding off the road in winter when heading south bound. The curve is slopped incorrectly. Marchant family has placed large rocks in front of property to protect fencing. This is a place where a fatality is likely to occur due to incorrect road engineering.	1
49	Consider a more permanent crossing feature such as a stop light, a catwalk or even a tunnel to cross Gentile. Children need to be given opportunities to be independent, by walking to and from school is 'low hanging fruit' that should be encouraged. Also, elementary aged children are hard pressed to maintain their friendships with each other as this road has grown nearly impossible to cross.	0
50	Additional protection for pedestrians and bikes would be great. LOTS of kids cross here for school and even the crossing guards are nervous about the apathy of many drivers here. I've helped with an accident where a driver entered the crosswalk and hit a child, throwing them... And I've known of multiple other MVAs there too. Controlling the speed along Flint more would possibly help some? Thanks!	0

This page intentionally left blank

C

Recommendations

Appendix

Policies and Programs

The following information is supplementary to the policy and program content included in **Chapter 4**.

Policies

STREET DESIGN AND LAYOUT

Adopt a Complete Streets Policy

To develop a Complete Streets Policy for adoption:

- Develop a clear set of goals and outcomes for the Complete Streets Policy to help navigate trade-offs when new infrastructure projects arise.
- Be honest and transparent about trade-offs inherent to complete streets implementation with regards to potential parking loss, reduced speed limits, and travel time changes.
- Engage with partner agencies early and often in the development of a Complete Streets Policy, including police and fire departments, transit providers, UDOT, public utilities, and relevant advocacy and stakeholder groups to increase support for complete streets in advance of policy adoption.
- Reference local and national best practices in complete streets implementation to ensure clearer actions following policy adoption, including development of funding sources and design standards.

AMENITY REQUIREMENTS

Short term bicycle parking is bicycle parking for those visiting a place for up to a few hours. It mostly consists of bike racks. Users of short-term bike parking tend to be infrequent visitors, so the bike parking needs to be self-explanatory and convenient. It should be within 50 feet of the entry of the


building it is serving, placed in a high-visibility area, and as weather protected as possible.

Rates for short term bike parking range from 0.5 spaces for each bedroom in multi-family dwellings, 1 space per 2,000 square feet of floor area for general food sales or groceries, 1 space per 5,000 square feet of floor area for general retail, or 1 space per 20,000 square feet of floor area for office buildings. A typical Inverted-U Rack comfortably fits two bikes, should be centered in a 36" (24" minimum) x 96" (72" minimum) area (as shown at right. Image).

Long term bicycle parking is for those spending longer amounts of time at a place – i.e. a workday or work shift, or at a multi-family residential building.

Long term bicycle parking is designed to be more secure than short term parking and provides enclosed space for one or more bikes. Types of long-term bicycle parking include lockers (around 40" x 78" x 6') for two bikes, cages, and bike rooms.

Rates for long term bicycle parking are generally 1 space per 10,000 square feet for office, 1 space per 12,000 square feet for general retail, or 0.5 spaces per bedroom for multi-family residential.



Programs

SPEED REGULATION

Adopt E-Bike Speed Regulation

In Utah, a three-tier classification system is in place, intended to differentiate between models with varying speed capabilities (Class 1: pedal-assist; max. speed of 20mph, Class 2: throttle propelled; max. speed of 20 mph, Class 3: pedal-assist; max. speed of 28mph, has a speedometer). This legislation gives riders similar rights and duties to that of traditional bike riders, allowing e-bikes to ride on bike paths but not on sidewalks. Local agencies are able to create their own regulations regarding E-bikes, such as Park City's E-bike ordinance that bans E-bikes from singletrack trails and provides yielding rules on other facilities, shown at right. Utah's full e-bike policy can be viewed [here](#).



EDUCATION

Senior Mobility Education Program

As people age, mobility options become more and more limited. With an inability to drive, walking, biking, and transit become the only way to get around. A transportation network is not successful unless everyone has fair access, so giving older individuals the opportunity to continue to be mobile and independent, despite losing their ability to drive, is critical. The Davis County Senior Activity Centers host Smart Driving Classes with AARP, so Layton could consider partnering with one of their locations, AARP, or another community group to host a senior mobility class.

Layton Biking Webpage

While Layton already has a Trails page under the Parks and Recreation section of the Layton City website, an additional or amended page should be created that highlights all active transportation facilities in Layton. This will facilitate a greater understanding of the available network, and will help people plan recreational and commuter routes and routes to get around the City. In addition to hosting maps of existing bike facilities, the webpage could include education opportunities, a calendar of bike-related events, public surveys for upcoming projects, and an interactive map that allows residents to report any issues they experience while using the active transportation network.

EVENTS AND ACTIVITIES

Develop a Bike Co-Op

Some bike co-ops take donated bikes and bike parts to fix up and either re-sell or donate to community members in need. Developing an "Earn-a-Bike" program as part of a co-op is another way to help those in need and increase community members' access to transportation choices. A program like this teaches participants bike maintenance as they fix up a donated bike. Once they have completed the program, they get to keep the bike. Ogden, Salt Lake City, and Provo all have bike co-ops referred to as bike collectives.

Helmet Giveaway Program

Some cities, like Greenville, SC have partnered with their local bike share program, transit authority, and local bike shops to fund and distribute helmets.

Organized Community Walks and Bike Rides

Group walks and rides often happen organically through the efforts of advocacy groups, but the City can play a role in organizing and supporting them.

COMMUNITY BUILDING

Adopt-A-Trail Program


An adopt-a-trail program works differently from place to place. In some communities, “adopting” a segment refers to an individual, family, or organization paying a sponsorship fee that helps to cover the costs of maintenance and improvements to the trail system. “Adopting” a trail segment in other communities means that an individual or group will take temporary ownership of basic maintenance and cleanup of the segment.

For either type of program, if a person or group “adopts” a trail segment, communities will often install signage indicating who adopted the trail, giving recognition to their generosity, hard work, and passion for the trail system.

Apply for Bike Friendly Community Status

To be considered for a Bicycle Friendly Community ranking, an application process is required that assesses the community against a set of metrics shown in the image at right. Applying as a Bicycle Friendly Community is a great way to understand how Layton stacks up against other communities of similar scales. Currently, Utah has 11 Bicycle Friendly Communities, including cities with similar population sizes to Layton, like St. George, Orem, Draper, and Ogden.

The LAB also has a program that recognizes businesses with a welcoming, supportive atmosphere for employees, customers, and community members that ride their bike to that business. Recognition makes businesses more attractive to those riding bikes, and encourages more people to bike.



BUILD CAPACITY FOR ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION

Continue to Build on the Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Program

Students in Layton who want to walk or bike to school should be able to do so safely. Safe Routes to School programs help students to do this by training them on safe practices for walking and biking to school, sharing the most direct and safe routes, and identifying community leaders that will help students get to and from school safely.

Infrastructure improvements that could be made using SRTS funding include new sidewalks, school pavement markings, signage, bicycle parking, and more, while funding for non-infrastructure could include any type of education or encouragement program.

Currently, schools in the Davis School District have mapped out safe routes on the Safe Routes Utah website. Layton should help to review and provide updates to these routes as facilities from this active transportation plan are implemented. Additionally, funding should be explored to enhance these routes, through programs like WFRC's Transportation and Land Use Connection (TLC) funding.

Develop a Request-a-Rack Program

Many cities across the U.S. have a bike rack request program; one example is Salt Lake City (<https://www.slc.gov/transportation/bike/get-involved/>) Bike rack request programs allow businesses and property owners to be involved in helping the City promote active transportation.

Data Collection Program

Accurate data drives decisions; counts will help inform walking and biking trends and patterns. Pre- and post-construction data is especially important when a new facility is built to develop a strong basis of data that can inform future decisions.

This page intentionally left blank

D

Prioritization & Implementation

Appendix

Table D.1 Priority Projects - Facilities (Sorted from highest to lowest score for each prioritization category)

#	PROJECT NAME	FROM	TO	FACILITY TYPE	SCORE	PROJECT VALUE	PROJECT READINESS	PRIORITIZATION
Short Term, High Value Projects (22)								
9	Main St Buffered Bike Lanes	Clearfield border	Gordon Ave	Buffered Bike Lane	60.5	High	High	Short Term, High Value
19	Gordon Ave Buffered Bike Lanes	400 W	Fairfield Rd	Buffered Bike Lane	51.5	High	High	Short Term, High Value
102	Kays Creek Trail Extension	Dawson Street	Main St	Shared Use Path	51.5	High	High	Short Term, High Value
81	Kays Creek Trail: Golden to Gentile	Golden Ave	Gentile St	Shared Use Path	48	High	High	Short Term, High Value
1	Hill Field Rd Buffered Bike Lanes	2200 W	D&RGW Trail	Buffered Bike Lane	47	High	High	Short Term, High Value
22	Hill Field Rd Buffered Bike Lanes	3000 N/HWY 193	Gordon Ave	Buffered Bike Lane	46.5	High	High	Short Term, High Value
70	Church St Bike Route	HWY 193	Main St	Signed Bike Route	46	High	High	Short Term, High Value
98	Kay's Creek Trail Connection	Kays Creek Trail: Golden to Gentile St	Gentile St	Shared Use Path	46	High	High	Short Term, High Value
103	Kays Creek Trail Extension	Main St	Gentile St	Shared Use Path	46	High	High	Short Term, High Value
4	University Park Blvd/Heritage park Blvd Bike Lanes	Antelope Dr	700 W	Bike Lane	42.5	High	High	Short Term, High Value
8	Fort Ln Buffered Bike Lanes	Gordon Ave	Wasatch Dr	Buffered Bike Lane	41.5	High	High	Short Term, High Value
71	Fairfield Rd Buffered Bike Lanes	Gordon Ave	"Mutton Hollow Rd	Buffered Bike Lane	41.5	High	High	Short Term, High Value
59	Gordon Ave Bike Lanes	Fairfield Rd	Andy Adams Park	Bike Lane	40.5	High	High	Short Term, High Value
41	Woodland Park Dr Bike Lanes	Woodland Park Dr	Mall ring road	Bike Lane	38	High	High	Short Term, High Value
31	South Main St Buffered Bike Lanes	Fort Ln	B St	Buffered Bike Lane	37.5	High	High	Short Term, High Value
48	2275 E Bike Route	Sunset Dr	2400 N	Signed Bike Route	37.5	High	High	Short Term, High Value
2	University Park Blvd Buffered Bike Lanes	HWY 193 / 3000 N	"Davis Weber Canal	Buffered Bike Lane	36	High	High	Short Term, High Value
73	Fairfield Rd Bike Lanes	Mountain Shadow Dr (north of Antelope)	Gordon Ave	Bike Lane	36	High	High	Short Term, High Value
58	Woodland Park Dr Buffered Bike Lanes	Antelope Dr	Heritage Park Blvd	Buffered Bike Lane	34.5	High	High	Short Term, High Value

#	PROJECT NAME	FROM	TO	FACILITY TYPE	SCORE	PROJECT VALUE	PROJECT READINESS	PRIORITIZATION
34	Dawson St Bike Route	Gentile St	Kay's Creek Trail Entrance on Dawson St.	Signed Bike Route	33.5	High	High	Short Term, High Value
17	1225 N Bike Route	Golden Ave & Hill Blvd Intersection	Hill Field Rd	Signed Bike Route	33	High	High	Short Term, High Value
100	Hill Field Rd Sidepath	2200 W	Ellison Park Sidepath (along Hill Field Rd)	Sidepath	33	High	High	Short Term, High Value
Long Term, High Value Projects (41)								
109	Gentile St Sidepath	Gentile/Cross St. Intersection	Fort Ln	Sidepath	58.5	High	Low	Long Term, High Value
75	Kays Creek Trail Extension	Golden Ave / 700 N	Hidden Hollow Dr	Shared Use Path	57.5	High	Low	Long Term, High Value
116	Antelope Dr Facility	2200 W	University Park Blvd	Undetermined Facility	54.5	High	Low	Long Term, High Value
112	UP&L Power Corridor Trail	Jesse Barlow Park (Syracuse)	Park West of Wellington Dr. (Kaysville)	Shared Use Path	54	High	Low	Long Term, High Value
122	Fort Ln Buffered Bike Lanes	Wasatch Dr	Gentile St	Buffered Bike Lane	51.5	High	Low	Long Term, High Value
20	Antelope Dr Buffered Bike Lanes	1200 W	Fairfield Rd	Buffered Bike Lane	50.5	High	Low	Long Term, High Value
5	2200 W Buffered Bike Lanes	Antelope Dr	Hill Field Rd	Buffered Bike Lane	47	High	Low	Long Term, High Value
120	Main St Buffered Bike Lanes	Gordon Ave	301 N	Buffered Bike Lane	46	High	Low	Long Term, High Value
63	Gentile Bike Route	Sand Ridge Parkway	175 W (Cross St.)	Signed Bike Route	45.5	High	Low	Long Term, High Value
97	Midtown Shopping Center Trail	University Blvd/1200 W	700 W	Sidepath	45.5	High	Low	Long Term, High Value
99	Hill Field Rd Sidepath	Layton mall	Gordon Ave	Sidepath	45	High	Low	Long Term, High Value
115	Main St Sidepath	189 S	Layton Pkwy	Sidepath	44.5	High	Low	Long Term, High Value
49	2200 W Bike Lanes	Hill Field Rd	Layton Pkwy	Bike Lane	44	High	Low	Long Term, High Value
111	University Park Blvd Sidepath	Richards & Brown PC on University Park	Davis Weber Canal Trail	Sidepath	44	High	Low	Long Term, High Value

#	PROJECT NAME	FROM	TO	FACILITY TYPE	SCORE	PROJECT VALUE	PROJECT READINESS	PRIORITIZATION
110	Church St Facility	Main St	Gentile	Undetermined Facility	43.5	High	Low	Long Term, High Value
3	University Blvd./1200 W Facility Connection	Davis Weber Canal Trail	Antelope Dr	Undetermined Facility	43	High	Low	Long Term, High Value
45	Ash Dr Neighborhood Byway	Cherry Ln	Snowcreek Dr	Neighborhood Byway	43	High	Low	Long Term, High Value
76	Davis Weber Canal Trail	University Blvd/1200 W	525 W	Shared Use Path	43	High	Low	Long Term, High Value
77	Davis Weber Canal Trail	Hill Field Rd	Church St	Shared Use Path	43	High	Low	Long Term, High Value
39	Main St Separated Bike Lanes	301 N	Layton FrontRunner Station	Separated Bike Lanes	42.5	High	Low	Long Term, High Value
86	Layton Pkwy Facility Connection	100 W	Fort Ln	Undetermined Facility	42	High	Low	Long Term, High Value
89	Kay's Creek Trail: Flint Sidepath Connection	Layton Pkwy	Weaver Ln	Sidepath	42	High	Low	Long Term, High Value
14	Wasatch Dr Facility	Fort Ln	Fairfield Rd	Undetermined Facility	41.5	High	Low	Long Term, High Value
105	D&RGW Reroute	D&RGW Trail	Gentile/Angel St. Intersection	Sidepath	41	High	Low	Long Term, High Value
46	3000 N / Hwy 193 Facility	Fairfield Rd	2650 E	Undetermined Facility	40	High	Low	Long Term, High Value
95	Kays Creek Trail extension	Hobbs Reservoir Dead End	Hobbs Creek Dr Frontage Rd	Shared Use Path	40	High	Low	Long Term, High Value
84	3000 N / Hwy 193 Sidepath	University Park Blvd	Harriger Way	Sidepath	39.5	High	Low	Long Term, High Value
15	Rosewood Ln/700 S Neighborhood Byway	Main St (near Kaysville Border)	Oak Hills Dr / Gentile St. Intersection	Neighborhood Byway	39	High	Low	Long Term, High Value
43	Mall Ring Rd Facility	1425 N/Midtown Roundabout	1225 N	Undetermined Facility	38.5	High	Low	Long Term, High Value
50	Gentile St Facility	Wasatch Dr	Fairfield Rd	Undetermined Facility	38.5	High	Low	Long Term, High Value
104	D&RGW Trail Reroute	Gentile / Angel St. Intersection	D&RGW Trail	Shared Use Path	38.5	High	Low	Long Term, High Value
18	Golden Ave Neighborhood Byway	400 W	Fort Ln Rd	Neighborhood Byway	38	High	Low	Long Term, High Value

#	PROJECT NAME	FROM	TO	FACILITY TYPE	SCORE	PROJECT VALUE	PROJECT READINESS	PRIORITIZATION
80	Bamberger Trail Extension to Mall	525 N	Mall Ring Rd	Sidepath	38	High	Low	Long Term, High Value
119	Hill Field Rd Sidepath	Layton Mall	Gordon Ave/ Hill Field Rd	Sidepath	37	High	Low	Long Term, High Value
69	Weber State Facility Connection	Weber State	Hill Field Rd	Undetermined Facility	36.5	High	Low	Long Term, High Value
33	Boydton Rd Facility	Oak Hills Rd	Mutton Hollow Rd	Undetermined Facility	35.5	High	Low	Long Term, High Value
83	Kay's Creek Trail: Connection to West Davis Corridor	Grace Way/Weaver Lane Intersection	West Davis Corridor Trail	Shared Use Path	35.5	High	Low	Long Term, High Value
30	Flint St Bike Lanes	Layton Pkwy	Phillips St	Bike Lane	34.5	High	Low	Long Term, High Value
10	Cold Creek Way Neighborhood Byway	Hill Field Rd	Layton Pkwy	Neighborhood Byway	34	High	Low	Long Term, High Value
79	Gentile St / Oak Hills Dr Facility	Fairfield Rd	East Side of Temple where Shared Use Path Begins	Undetermined Facility	33	High	Low	Long Term, High Value
85	Cold Creek Way Sidepath	Gordon Ave	Hill Field Rd	Sidepath	33	High	Low	Long Term, High Value
Opportunistic Projects (27)								
90	Hill Field Rd Sidepath	Cold Creek Way	D&RGW Trail	Sidepath	32	Low	High	Opportunistic
60	Fort Ln Bikeway	Antelope Dr	1450 N	Bike Lane	31.5	Low	High	Opportunistic
12	Gordon Ave Bike Lanes	3700 W (Syracuse)	Cold Creek Way	Bike Lane	31	Low	High	Opportunistic
64	Hawthorne Dr Bike Route	Church St	Wasatch Dr	Signed Bike Route	31	Low	High	Opportunistic
6	Sunset Dr Bike Route	Antelope Dr	Hobbs Creek Dr Frontage Rd	Signed Bike Route	30	Low	High	Opportunistic
42	Hobbs Creek Dr Bike Route	Kays Creek Trail: Hobbs Reservoir Future Extension Entrance	Mutton Hollow Rd	Signed Bike Route	30	Low	High	Opportunistic
108	Ellison Park Elementary Connection	Ellison Park/Cold Creek Way	D&RGW Trail connection	Shared Use Path	30	Low	High	Opportunistic

#	PROJECT NAME	FROM	TO	FACILITY TYPE	SCORE	PROJECT VALUE	PROJECT READINESS	PRIORITIZATION
26	2900 N Bike Route	3000 N/Hwy 193	Canyon View Dr. & Kays Creek Trail Access at Hobbs Reservoir	Signed Bike Route	28	Low	High	Opportunistic
74	Fairfield Rd Bike Lanes	Terminus of north end of Fairfield Rd	3000 N & Church St	Bike Lane	27	Low	High	Opportunistic
7	Cherry Ln Bike Route	Fairfield Rd	Hobbs Creek Dr	Signed Bike Route	25	Low	High	Opportunistic
21	Antelope Dr Buffered Bike Lanes	Fairfield Rd	Hobbs Creek Dr Frontage Rd	Buffered Bike Lane	25	Low	High	Opportunistic
72	Emerald Dr Bike Route	Antelope Dr	Gordon Ave	Signed Bike Route	25	Low	High	Opportunistic
13	E Gentile St Bike Route	Oak Hills Dr/Gentile St. Intersection	Woodridge Dr. Frontage Road	Signed Bike Route	24.5	Low	High	Opportunistic
56	Future Roadway Bike Lane	Fairfield Rd	3000 N	Bike Lane	24.5	Low	High	Opportunistic
11	3200 W Buffered Bike Lane	Gordon Ave	Gentile St	Buffered Bike Lane	23.5	Low	High	Opportunistic
66	Whitesides St Bike Route	Gentile St	500 S/ Rosewood Ln	Signed Bike Route	22.5	Low	High	Opportunistic
55	West Hill Field Rd bike lanes	Sand Ridge Pkwy	3200 W	Bike Lane	21.5	Low	High	Opportunistic
65	1100 W Bike Lanes	Gordon Ave	Hill Field Rd	Bike Lane	21.5	Low	High	Opportunistic
62	2450 E Bike Route Connection	Kays Creek Trail Access from 2750 N	Sunset Dr	Signed Bike Route	21	Low	High	Opportunistic
52	Layton Pkwy bike lane	2200 W	2000 W	Bike Lane	19.5	Low	High	Opportunistic
61	Hobbs Creek Dr Bike Route	Gentile St	Oak Hills Dr	Signed Bike Route	19.5	Low	High	Opportunistic
25	Sand Ridge Pkwy Bike Lanes	Gordon Ave	Layton Pkwy	Bike Lane	17.5	Low	High	Opportunistic
53	Hill Field Rd Buffered Bike Lane	3200 W	UP&L Trail	Buffered Bike Lane	17.5	Low	High	Opportunistic
24	Fernwood Dr Bike Route	Valley View Dr	BST	Signed Bike Route	16	Low	High	Opportunistic
36	TNC Bike Route Connection	Gentile St	TNC Trailhead Entrance	Signed Bike Route	14.5	Low	High	Opportunistic

#	PROJECT NAME	FROM	TO	FACILITY TYPE	SCORE	PROJECT VALUE	PROJECT READINESS	PRIORITIZATION
51	Gordon Ave Buffered Bike Lanes	Cold Creek Way	Main St	Buffered Bike Lane	12.5	Low	High	Opportunistic
32	Wasatch Dr Bike Lanes	Gentile St	Fort Ln	Bike Lane	9.5	Low	High	Opportunistic
Low Value Projects (28)								
23	Gordon Ave Facility	2625 E	Valley View Dr	Undetermined Facility	32	Low	Low	Low Value
118	950 W/Weber State connection	Weber State parking lot	950 W cul-de-sac	Shared Use Path	32	Low	Low	Low Value
40	700 W Facility Connection	Davis Weber Canal Trail	Mall ring road	Undetermined Facility	31	Low	Low	Low Value
82	Kay's Creek Trail: Roberts Section	Hill Farms PH 7 (east of Angel St)	Abbey Way	Shared Use Path	30.5	Low	Low	Low Value
94	Gentile St Sidepath	Gordon Ave	End of Holmes Creek Reservoir	Sidepath	30	Low	Low	Low Value
67	Mall Ring Rd facility	Woodland Park Dr	1425 N/ Midtown Roundabout	Undetermined Facility	28.5	Low	Low	Low Value
96	Kays Creek Trail Connection	Church St	Kays Creek Trail	Shared Use Path	28.5	Low	Low	Low Value
114	Mid Fork Trail	Kay's Creek Trail: Eastridge Park PRUD	Cherry Ln	Shared Use Path	28.5	Low	Low	Low Value
121	Hill Field Rd Buffered Bike Lanes	D&RGW Trail	825 N	Buffered Bike Lane	28.5	Low	Low	Low Value
123	Layton Pkwy Sidepath	Syracuse	2200 W	Sidepath	28.5	Low	Low	Low Value
106	Kays Creek Estates Park Connection	Kay's Creek Estates Park: Future Trail	UP&L Trail	Shared Use Path	28	Low	Low	Low Value
117	Layton Pkwy Sidepath	2200 W	2700 W	Sidepath	26	Low	Low	Low Value
16	2550 W Neighborhood Byway	Chelemes Way	Hill Field Rd	Neighborhood Byway	25.5	Low	Low	Low Value
107	Hill Field Rd Sidepath	3200 W	2200 W	Sidepath	25.5	Low	Low	Low Value
78	Oak Hills Dr Trail Extension	2250 E	Adams Canyon Trailhead	Sidepath	25	Low	Low	Low Value
92	Sun Hills Trail	1700 E & 3350 N	3500 N & Fairfield	Shared Use Path	25	Low	Low	Low Value

#	PROJECT NAME	FROM	TO	FACILITY TYPE	SCORE	PROJECT VALUE	PROJECT READINESS	PRIORITIZATION
113	Holmes Creek Reservoir Trail	Gentile St	Woodridge Dr. / 670 N. (Frontage Road west of 89)	Shared Use Path	21.5	Low	Low	Low Value
35	Angel Street Facility	Gentile St	Kaysville (About 600 N)	Undetermined Facility	21	Low	Low	Low Value
68	Antelope Dr / Hwy 89 Facility Crossing	Hobbs Creek Dr	Valley View Dr	Undetermined Facility	20.5	Low	Low	Low Value
91	Boynton Park Trail Connection	Rosewood Lane	Boynton Rd	Shared Use Path	20.5	Low	Low	Low Value
93	South Weber Trail Connection	Sun Hills Trail: Golf Course Loop	1900 E (South Weber)	Shared Use Path	20.5	Low	Low	Low Value
27	Layton Ridge Dr Bike Route	Valley View Dr	Mutton Hollow Rd	Signed Bike Route	20	Low	Low	Low Value
47	Fort Ln Facility	Gentile St	South Main St	Undetermined Facility	20	Low	Low	Low Value
57	Hobbs Creek Dr Connection Facility	Hwy 193	3025 N	Undetermined Facility	18	Low	Low	Low Value
87	Snow Canyon Trail	Eastside Dr / Valley View Dr.	BST	Shared Use Path	16.5	Low	Low	Low Value
88	Snow Canyon Trail Access Point	1300 N	Proposed BST Connection	Shared Use Path	14	Low	Low	Low Value
101	Boynton Park Trail Connection	Oak Hills Dr	Proposed pathway to Boynton Park	Shared Use Path	11.5	Low	Low	Low Value
44	1600 N Neighborhood Byway	2200 W	Main St	Neighborhood Byway	9.5	Low	Low	Low Value

Table D.2 Priority Projects - Spot Improvements (Sorted from highest to lowest score for each prioritization category)

PROJECT NUMBER	SPOT IMPROVEMENT LOCATION	SPOT IMPROVEMENT TYPE	TOTAL PRIORITIZATION SCORE	PROJECT VALUE	PROJECT READINESS	PRIORITIZATION TOTAL
Short Term, High Value Projects (6)						
2	Hill Blvd at Gordon Ave	Mid-Block Crossing	51.5	High	High	Short Term, High Value
20	2200 W at the Railroad Crossing	Grade-Separated Crossing	47	High	High	Short Term, High Value
4	775 N & 2200 W	In-Process Project	37	High	High	Short Term, High Value
16	Main St. at the Layton Frontrunner Station	In-Process Project	36.5	High	High	Short Term, High Value
1	Bamberger Trail at Church St	Mid-Block Crossing	35.5	High	High	Short Term, High Value
44	Angel St & Kay's Creek Trail	Mid-Block Crossing	30.5	High	High	Short Term, High Value
Long Term, High Value Projects (33)						
39	Antelope Dr & Main St	Intersection Improvement	60.5	High	Low	Long Term, High Value
40	Gentile St & Main St	Intersection Improvement	58.5	High	Low	Long Term, High Value
21	Gordon Ave & Church/Fort Ln	Intersection Improvement	57.5	High	Low	Long Term, High Value
29	Antelope & Emerald Dr	Mid-Block Crossing or Grade-Separated Crossing (needs to be studied)	57.5	High	Low	Long Term, High Value
18	2200 W and UP&L Trail	Intersection Improvement	54	High	Low	Long Term, High Value
34	UP&L trail & Hill Field Rd	Intersection Improvement	54	High	Low	Long Term, High Value
35	2700 W & UP&L Trail	Mid-Block Crossing	54	High	Low	Long Term, High Value
37	Gentile St & UP&L Trail	Intersection Improvement	54	High	Low	Long Term, High Value
41	UP&L Trail & Granite Dr	Intersection Improvement	54	High	Low	Long Term, High Value
42	UP& L Trail & Weaver Ln	Intersection Improvement	54	High	Low	Long Term, High Value
43	UP&L Trail & 1700 W	Intersection Improvement	54	High	Low	Long Term, High Value
45	UP&L Trail & Layton Pkwy	Intersection Improvement	54	High	Low	Long Term, High Value
47	725 N & Future UP&L Trail	Mid-Block Crossing	54	High	Low	Long Term, High Value
48	Gordon Ave & 3200 W	Intersection Improvement	54	High	Low	Long Term, High Value
38	Antelope Dr & 700 W	Intersection Improvement	50.5	High	Low	Long Term, High Value

PROJECT NUMBER	SPOT IMPROVEMENT LOCATION	SPOT IMPROVEMENT TYPE	TOTAL PRIORITIZATION SCORE	PROJECT VALUE	PROJECT READINESS	PRIORITIZATION TOTAL
27	Kays Creek Trail & Hawthorne Dr	Intersection Improvement	48	High	Low	Long Term, High Value
23	Hill Field Rd + Hwy 193	Intersection Improvement	46.5	High	Low	Long Term, High Value
7	Church St & 3000 N	Intersection Improvement	46	High	Low	Long Term, High Value
12	Main St & Church	Mid-Block Crossing	46	High	Low	Long Term, High Value
24	Midtown Future Trail & Woodland Park Dr	Intersection Improvement	45.5	High	Low	Long Term, High Value
14	University Park Blvd & Davis Weber Canal Trail	Intersection Improvement	43	High	Low	Long Term, High Value
30	Hill Field Rd & Davis Weber Canal Trail	Grade-Separated Crossing	43	High	Low	Long Term, High Value
49	Garden Ln & Davis Weber Canal Trail	Mid-Block Crossing	43	High	Low	Long Term, High Value
50	800 W & Davis Weber Canal Trail	Mid-Block Crossing	43	High	Low	Long Term, High Value
51	650 W & Clearfield Davis Weber Canal Trail	Mid-Block Crossing	43	High	Low	Long Term, High Value
52	50 W & Davis Weber Canal Trail	Mid-Block Crossing	43	High	Low	Long Term, High Value
9	Rosewood Ln & Fairfield Rd	Intersection Improvement	41.5	High	Low	Long Term, High Value
31	Gordon Ave & Adams Reservoir Parking Lot	Intersection Improvement	40.5	High	Low	Long Term, High Value
3	DRGW Trail at Gentile St	Intersection Improvement	39.5	High	Low	Long Term, High Value
53	Oak Hills Dr & Gentile	Intersection Improvement	39	High	Low	Long Term, High Value
11	Gordon Ave at the D&RGW Trail	Grade-Separated Crossing	37	High	Low	Long Term, High Value
10	2200 W at the D&RGW Trail	Grade-Separated Crossing	35.5	High	Low	Long Term, High Value
8	Gordon Ave & Valeria Dr	Intersection Improvement	33	High	Low	Long Term, High Value

PROJECT NUMBER	SPOT IMPROVEMENT LOCATION	SPOT IMPROVEMENT TYPE	TOTAL PRIORITIZATION SCORE	PROJECT VALUE	PROJECT READINESS	PRIORITIZATION TOTAL
Opportunistic Projects (4)						
17	3200 W & West Davis Corridor Trail	In-Process Project	26	Low	High	Opportunistic
25	Gordon Ave & Emerald Dr	In-Process Project	25	Low	High	Opportunistic
5	2550 N & Church St	Intersection Improvement	23	Low	High	Opportunistic
22	Heritage Park Blvd & 700 W	In-Process Project	11.5	Low	High	Opportunistic
Low Value Projects (9)						
32	Gordon Ave & Gentile St	Intersection Improvement	32	Low	Low	Low Value
28	Cold Creek Way & Ellison Park Elementary	Intersection Improvement	29	Low	Low	Low Value
36	Mid Fork Trail at Kay's Creek	Grade-Separated Crossing	28.5	Low	Low	Low Value
26	Kays Creek Trail & Golden Ave	Intersection Improvement	28	Low	Low	Low Value
6	Antelope Dr & Church St	Intersection Improvement	25	Low	Low	Low Value
15	1700 E at Sun Hills Trail Connection	Intersection Improvement	25	Low	Low	Low Value
33	Church St + Future Sun Hills Trail	Mid-Block Crossing	25	Low	Low	Low Value
13	Oak Hills Dr Trail, just east of the Temple	Grade-Separated Crossing	23.5	Low	Low	Low Value
46	East Gate New Road & South Weber Proposed Trail Connection	Mid-Block Crossing	20.5	Low	Low	Low Value

RECOMMENDED NETWORK - NUMBERED

Planned Facilities


- Signed Bike Route
- Neighborhood Byway
- Bike Lane
- Buffered Bike Lane
- Separated Bike Lanes
- Shared Use Path/Sidepath
- TBD, Further Study Needed

Planned Spot Improvements

- Intersection Improvement
- Mid-Block Crossing
- Grade-Separated Crossing
- In-Process Project

Existing Facilities

- Bike Lane
- Buffered Bike Lane
- Paved Trail
- In-Process Paved Trail
- Natural Surface Trail



MAP D.2 PEDESTRIAN-INVOLVED CRASH MAP

Crashes (Severity)

- Fatal
- Serious Injury
- Minor Injury
- Property damage only

Spot Improvements


- Grade-Separated Crossing
- Intersection Improvement
- Mid-Block Crossing
- In-Process Project

Planned Facilities

- Signed Bike Route
- Neighborhood Byway
- Bike Lane
- Buffered Bike Lane
- Separated Bike Lanes
- Shared Use Path/Sidepath
- TBD, Further Study Needed

Destinations

- Park
- Golf Course
- Reservoir
- School
- Library
- Hospital
- Town Center
- Business District
- Urban District



MAP D.3
**BICYCLIST-INVOLVED
CRASH MAP**

Crashes (Severity)

- Fatal
- Serious Injury
- Minor Injury
- Property damage only

Spot Improvements


- Grade-Separated Crossing
- Intersection Improvement
- Mid-Block Crossing
- In-Process Project

Planned Facilities

- Signed Bike Route
- Neighborhood Byway
- Bike Lane
- Buffered Bike Lane
- Separated Bike Lanes
- Shared Use Path/Sidepath
- TBD, Further Study Needed

Destinations

- Park
- Golf Course
- Reservoir
- School
- Library
- Hospital
- Town Center
- Business District
- Urban District



Crash data source: Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT)



