

**MINUTES OF LAYTON CITY
COUNCIL STRATEGIC PLANNING
WORK MEETING**

JANUARY 29, 2015; 7:33 P.M.

**MAYOR AND COUNCILMEMBERS
PRESENT:**

**MAYOR BOB STEVENSON, JOYCE BROWN,
TOM DAY, JORY FRANCIS, SCOTT FREITAG
AND JOY PETRO**

STAFF PRESENT:

**ALEX JENSEN, GARY CRANE, BILL WRIGHT,
PETER MATSON, JAMES (WOODY) WOODRUFF,
AND THIEDA WELLMAN**

OTHERS PRESENT:

**KERI BENSON, CLEARFIELD CITY COUNCIL;
RANDY JEFFRIES, UDOT; AND MIKE BROWN
AND ROGER BORGENICHT, SHARED
SOLUTIONS**

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

Mayor Pro Tem Brown opened the meeting and indicated that Mayor Stevenson was running a little late. She had everyone introduce themselves. Councilmember Brown turned the time over to Mr. Randy Jeffries with UDOT.

DISCUSSION REGARDING WEST DAVIS CORRIDOR ALTERNATIVES

Mr. Randy Jeffries explained the EIS portion of the West Davis Corridor project and the requirement to review all alternatives for the project. He said the suggested shared solution alternative was one proposal that did not include a new highway, and proposed land use changes within each city. Mr. Jeffries said UDOT had been following approved general plans and the Wasatch Front Regional Council adopted land use scenario, but this alternative suggested that if there was no highway there would potentially be a different land use scenario, which should be studied.

Mr. Jeffries said they had been working with the coalition and UDOT wanted to make sure that they were thoroughly evaluating all alternatives. He said as part of this effort, UDOT agreed that if the cities accepted the land use changes that the coalition was proposing, then UDOT would consider the shared solution alternative as a viable alternative and study it further. Mr. Jeffries said the coalition had been presenting their land use scenario to all of the cities. He said UDOT was asking for formal feedback from the cities, which could be in the form of a letter or resolution from the Mayor and Council. Mr. Jeffries said they were not asking for any land use change at this time, but they would like to know if Layton City felt that the land use changes being proposed were reasonable, which meant were they technically and economically feasible. If that were the case, they would like to know if Layton City would be willing to change their General Plan in the event that this alternative was ultimately selected. Mr. Jeffries turned the time over to Roger Borgenicht.

Mayor Stevenson arrived at 7:38 p.m.

Mr. Roger Borgenicht stated that the State couldn't build its way out of congestion. He said additional highways would not reduce congestion on arterial and collector streets, or at intersections. Mr. Borgenicht said they had proposed this shared solution with residents in Davis County because of the challenge with

the population from 2009 to 2040 growing by 1.4 million, which was a 68% growth. He said the prediction was that vehicle miles traveled would grow from 49 million miles to over 90 million miles by 2040, which was an 84% increase. Mr. Borgenicht said the Regional Transportation Plan had a goal of having vehicle miles grow no faster than population, but they believed that continuing to feed 98% of the trips by automobile would negate that possibility. He said they also knew that land use and transportation affect each other; there would be a different outcome if boulevards, activity centers and town centers were built. Mr. Borgenicht said that was part of the Wasatch Choice for 2040.

Mr. Borgenicht displayed a vision map from Wasatch Choice for 2040 that was based on 1/3 of the development between now and 2040 being on 3% of the land, with 2/3 being single family homes. He said there was a demographic shift with millennials and baby boomers who were asking for something different. Mr. Borgenicht said it had been shown in market forces around the country where walkable suburban activity centers could provide another focus for suburban towns to provide that choice. He said the shared solution was based on this and the fact that the City had a wonderful I-15 corridor and Frontrunner. Mr. Borgenicht said the shared solution was a pilot project for putting on the ground what the Wasatch Choice for 2040 was putting forward as a way to grow, and not tank our quality of life as our population grew.

Mr. Mike Brown said he used to work for Wasatch Front Regional Council. He said the Wasatch Choice for 2040 was a good vision coordinated with the cities relative to land use, but there wasn't a lot of definition on how to get from where we were to where we wanted to be. Mr. Brown said one of the concepts of the shared solution was that part of the reason for congestion on I-15 was because jobs were in Salt Lake City. He said they needed to find a way to motivate companies to locate in northern Davis County. Mr. Brown said the opposite would be true if a new freeway was constructed; farms would develop faster and there would be some new jobs but mostly it would be housing with jobs remaining in Salt Lake City. He said it would also create more environmental harm.

Mr. Brown said the focus needed to be on the transportation grid that was already in place and improving arterial capacity. He displayed a map of the shared solution alternative. Mr. Brown indicated that it would reduce congestion and create jobs. He displayed a map of proposed bus/rapid transit concepts. Mr. Brown indicated that the principles of the shared solution included compact mixed use developments at boulevard nodes; boulevard roadway configurations; incentivized transit; connected protected bikeways; preventative ramp metering; and strategically placed I-15 overpasses.

Mr. Brown displayed conceptual drawings of proposed cross sections of streets that included protected bike paths. He discussed the great example at Farmington Station.

Councilmember Brown said Farmington Station didn't have a lot of high paying jobs that kept residents in Farmington from commuting to Salt Lake City.

Mr. Brown said that was correct. He said the higher paying tech jobs were ending up in Utah County for the most part. He said there were plenty of companies that could select Davis County as a location.

Mr. Borgenicht said PluralSight was a technical company locating in Farmington Station that had about 200 employees.

Councilmember Freitag asked what the residential element was of Farmington Station. He said Farmington Station was still primarily a vehicle supported or driven development.

Mr. Brown said that was correct.

Mr. Borgenicht said there were hundreds of housing units just north and west of Park Lane.

Councilmember Brown said most of those people would not want to cross that busy road with their children, either walking or on bikes. She made several comments about biking being a recreational use in Utah and not for commuting. Utah had large families and families didn't commute by bike. Councilmember Brown said winter weather also created a huge impact.

Mr. Brown said he would agree; this was America and Americans drove cars. He said there would never be a development that wasn't mostly serviced by automobile. Mr. Brown said that wasn't the goal; the goal was to increase the share of trips that occurred by something other than automobile. He said it was also about reducing the trip length.

Councilmember Francis mentioned the West Layton Village project and the problems that one isolated General Plan amendment caused.

Mr. Brown said it was possible that in that instance it wasn't the right location, but maybe there were other locations, such as Main Street, where people could support it. He said it was a matter of testing the water.

Councilmember Day asked if Farmington City had any plans to connect the high density housing to Farmington Station with things such as pedestrian overpasses or underpasses.

Mr. Borgenicht said they did have some plans for changes to that area.

Councilmember Brown said even if bike lanes were added under or over Park Lane, Utahns didn't commute by bike, or go to the grocery store on a bike.

Mr. Borgenicht said that was correct, but they were looking at the peak demand times; work trips.

Mr. Brown said their model considered that 2/3 of the homes would be single family homes. He said currently 1 to 1 1/2% of work trips per day were serviced by bike. Mr. Brown said through their proposals they might be able to increase that to 3%. He said even if it was being used primarily for a recreational use, there wasn't a problem with that.

Councilmember Brown said no one on the Council had a problem with increased recreational options or trails, it just wasn't moving traffic.

Mr. Brown said that was why they were calling this a shared solution; they recognized that all of these small projects couldn't compete with a freeway. He said the combination of a bunch of them together would add up to a pretty significant result. Mr. Brown said it wasn't hard to compete with this particular freeway; this freeway would not be a heavily used freeway. He said it would take just enough congestion away from I-15 that I-15 could work okay in 2040; but it was a lot of money and it wasn't being used to the level you would expect.

Mr. Jeffries said right now Legacy Parkway had 23,000 cars a day; the West Davis Corridor would have 30,000 cars a day. He said you couldn't say that it would be underutilized; it would meet the intended use of the freeway.

Councilmember Brown said the idea of building a new road was that in the beginning it would not be at capacity, but in the future it would be.

Mr. Jeffries said the idea was that it would have a 20 year life.

Mr. Brown showed data relative to the expected congestion in various scenarios. He said the shared solution compared very well with the other alternatives relative to congestion, but was about 50% better with east/west movement. Mr. Brown said the general congestion was about 30% better with the shared solution. He displayed maps and highlighted the areas of congestion in 2040 with three scenarios; no build, building of the freeway, and the shared solution.

Mr. Brown displayed a map of the Layton area with proposed land uses.

Councilmember Brown asked if the map showed apartments all along Main Street.

Mr. Brown said there was a generalization that along the boulevards, they would hope that communities could change their zoning to mixed use. He said that didn't mean it would only be apartments; it may not be apartments at all; it was completely market driven. Mr. Brown said there was a lot of evidence that communities had too much general commercial along boulevards. He said there was not enough demand for retail to be everywhere.

Mr. Brown said this would allow for the option of apartments or condominiums. He said they would hope for mixed use zoning and form based code so that the focus was on the quality of what was built.

Councilmember Freitag asked how much of the proposed land use changes had to take place in order for the shared solution to meet its goals relative to transportation impacts.

Mr. Brown said it might not be much at all; it might not require much action by cities. He said the big picture goal was to get jobs into Davis County. Mr. Brown said if jobs were brought in, people wouldn't commute as far. He said the more you mixed uses the more likely it would be that someone would walk to restaurants or work. Mr. Brown said if the streets were beautified the City might not have to do much else to increase the odds of attracting jobs into the area. He said in order for people to live in the area the City might need to make more locations in the City legal for mixed use zoning. Mr. Brown said there was the likelihood that the more action the City took to support mixed use zoning the more it would help.

Councilmember Petro asked where they came up with their model.

Mr. Borgenicht said it was a UDOT model that measured land use and transportation infrastructure to determine congestion.

Mr. Brown explained the model.

Councilmember Brown asked what other streets in Layton would be considered boulevards besides Main Street and Hill Field Road. She said other than Main Street, Highway 193 and Hill Field Road, there weren't other streets in the City that were 100 feet wide. Councilmember Brown said any other street would require the taking of homes.

Mr. Borgenicht said those were the main ones they had identified as boulevards.

Councilmember Brown said Layton's main traffic problems were with east/west movement; Gordon Avenue, Antelope Drive, Gentile Street; etc. She said if those were made into boulevards they would be taking out homes. Councilmember Brown said none of this addressed any of those traffic problems. She said the West Davis Corridor would relieve east/west traffic problems on those streets.

Mr. Borgenicht said the models showed most of the congestion along the I-15 corridor and that east/west congestion would be lowered by almost 50%.

Bill Wright, Community and Economic Development Director, said the statement that this wouldn't be a significant change was misleading. He said near the Frontrunner Station they had identified that their solution would need to have 1,245 households; right now there were 156 at Kays Crossing. Bill said it would grow from 156 units to 1,245, and the employment would also grow to 2,900 employees. He said that was significant.

Bill said from the Frontrunner Station north to Hill Field Road along Main Street, their model showed that that corridor would grow to have 1,456 dwelling units. He said at the mall area they were showing a growth of 1,700 dwelling units, and there were currently about 400 in that area. Bill said this would be a significant change for Layton City.

Mr. Brown said they would need to look at the actual geographical coverage; there may be more acreage. He said at this moment they were not exactly sure which variables were making the most contribution to the reduction in congestion. Mr. Brown said they had proposed things on I-15; they proposed innovative intersections; etc. He said what they did know was that the combination of everything had a pretty big effect. Mr. Brown said they wouldn't know what the impact of 1,200 units on the Frontrunner site would be until they got rid of those units and then tested the model again.

There was discussion about various impacts to the model.

Councilmember Day asked if the model would be tested again with various components eliminated to verify what the impacts would be.

Mr. Jeffries said every city had been asked to look at the proposal for their city, and they would only be coming to the cities once. They would not bring multiple modified proposals back to the City. He said if a city didn't accept the land use, those assumptions would be taken out of the model.

Councilmember Brown said the City hoped that there would eventually be a hospital and medical buildings in the TOD zoned area that would have high income jobs, but it wouldn't be 2,900 jobs at one hospital.

Councilmember Freitag said you couldn't have both; a hospital and 2,900 jobs.

Keri Benson, Clearfield Councilmember, asked where the jobs would come from; what research had been done on companies coming to the area.

Mr. Borgenicht said they had talked with developers and UDOT had just agreed to bring in one of the most reputable national firms to look at those questions. He said typical office jobs and higher paying jobs looked at transit rich locations. Mr. Borgenicht said they would have that information probably in the near future.

Mr. Jeffries said they wanted the cities to indicate if this was something they envisioned for their city. He said whether or not the transportation side of it would work would be something UDOT would figure out; whether or not it was something the markets would support, they had consultants that could figure that out. Mr. Jeffries said the land use proposal, including the types of developments; was that something the City would support. Was it something the City felt was reasonable for their City? He said the market analysis results would probably not be available for each city and they didn't have the transportation analysis available for each city, but he felt that the three were independent.

Councilmember Brown said there had been a lot of new jobs created in Utah County, but when you considered where those jobs were located, you didn't see big apartment buildings. She said those people were still commuting from somewhere to get to that area. Councilmember Brown said some of the things that brought those companies to that area were the expansion of I-15 and the other new roads in the area that helped move traffic to those businesses. She said by just putting people in the area didn't bring jobs.

Councilmember Brown said Layton City had spent countless hours looking at what the population was going to be in 2040, and how they could make sure there was sufficient water, roads, etc., to service the people. She said this model was adding people that the City might not be able to service, and in the process removing some of the commercial development to put in more housing. Commercial development was a large portion of what paid for the services.

Councilmember Francis said he didn't see definitive answers. He said if the City tried to zone for 3,000 apartments, he would run for his life. Councilmember Francis said it was a big issue with the West Layton Village area because it allowed for apartments.

Mr. Brown said that was because it was on rural farmland.

Councilmember Brown said no; it was also the fact that the people were concerned with impacts to schools, churches, roads, etc. She asked how long the West Davis Corridor had been in the planning stages.

Mr. Jeffries said this study had been ongoing for five years, but it went back much further than that.

Councilmember Brown asked why we were at this late of a date and all of a sudden they were proposing this solution. They could have come to any of the public meetings that she had attended over the years; why were they able to put their foot in the door at this late date.

Mr. Borgenicht said they presented comments in 2010.

Councilmember Brown said those comments must not have gotten any ground. She said she was having a hard time with there being a very small group that was putting its foot in the door when she was trying to do what was best for the entire community.

Councilmember Petro said she felt that they were putting the cart before the horse; they needed the information from the studies.

Mr. Brown said UDOT could only react to a proposal for an alternative. In the past it was more of a conversation of wishing there was another way; UDOT couldn't react to that.

Mr. Borgenicht said they had talked about the shared solution during the comment time period, but UDOT didn't respond to it in writing.

Mr. Jeffries said the point of this meeting was not to talk about one alternative versus another. He said there were 46 alternatives, and anybody that wanted to propose any type of alternative had ample opportunity to do that, and every comment was responded to.

Councilmember Petro asked what UDOT hoped to get out of this meeting.

Mr. Jeffries said his goal was to make sure the Council understood what the land use proposal was, and

for Layton City to discuss that proposal. He said UDOT needed a formal response from the City with feedback on the proposal; whether the City felt that it was reasonable or not. Mr. Jeffries said his goal tonight was to make sure the Council understood the land use proposal.

Councilmember Petro asked what the time frame was.

Mr. Jeffries said the City could take as much time as needed. He said they were hoping to see feedback by mid February, but if that was too soon UDOT would be patient.

Councilmember Freitag said the land use question was enormous and had an enormous impact in Layton by what they had seen this evening. He said in trying to determine if that made sense or not, he needed to know if that much change could happen and how much it would cost. Councilmember Freitag said he didn't think they would get those answers in the next two weeks, and he didn't know any councilmember that would make that big of a decision on land use changes without knowing some of that information. He said any decision the Council would give would have to be based on a little bit of data and information. Councilmember Freitag said the economics of it was a big part and the Council would have to consider that.

Councilmember Freitag said the two block project that happened in Salt Lake City cost 1.5 billion dollars and was all private funds. He asked if the City decided to move forward with the proposal, would the funding be there to make it happen without the cities contributing significantly.

Mr. Jeffries said UDOT would do the roadway work and UTA would do the transit, but the funding for these types of developments would come from the development community. He said the City would be responsible for landscape improvements in the rights of way and there were some grants available for those betterments. Mr. Jeffries said UDOT could contribute ¾% toward those betterments, but ultimately they became the responsibility of the developer.

There was discussion about the costs associated with the various alternative proposals. Cost had not been determined on the shared solution proposal.

Mr. Jeffries said they didn't need a final answer from the City tonight; they just needed enough information from the City to know if it was worth spending the time to study this alternative in greater detail to work out what the costs were, and to see what the impacts would be. He said if the cities did not feel that it was reasonable, then they probably shouldn't spend the time to determine those things.

Councilmember Petro asked how many cities had already received this presentation.

Mr. Jeffries said Layton was their third city; they still had about ten to go.

Councilmember Brown said she didn't see East Gate considered in this proposal, or the business nod that had been planned at the West Davis Corridor connection. She said there was no consideration for the issues of moving traffic east and west. Councilmember Brown said the City had been working on these types of issues for many years, but they would not get the City to 2040. She said there was congestion on Main Street, Hill Field Road, and Antelope Drive, and with the solutions the City had already been working on for this next year it still wouldn't get the City to 2040, much less with all the proposed additional housing units to these areas.

Councilmember Francis asked Mr. Brown and Mr. Borgenicht what their objection was to the West Davis Corridor.

Mr. Brown said for him it wasn't so much an objection to the West Davis Corridor, but if he had \$700,000,000 he would spend it in these types of community building ways and tackle that problem first. He said relative to the land use question, he thought that it was likely with this discussion, this would not be desirable to Layton City. Mr. Brown said he could appreciate that the numbers of housing units proposed in the shared solution might not be reasonable, but he would hope that the City would suggest what might be reasonable and not close the door on this idea.

Gary Crane, City Attorney, said the shared solution relied a lot on changes the City might be willing to make in the future. He said the West Davis Corridor relied on what the City's current Master Plan had designated, which was the safe place to be because people had already agreed to it. Gary said there were two different types of bodies that made decisions in the State of Utah; one was the elected officials and the other was the people through referenda or initiatives. He said a lot of the shared solution was relying on what individual and private developers would bring to the community, and would rely on private investment. Gary said UDOT would only build the roads and they would not invest in the betterments being proposed. He said the City might say that this was fantastic and they wanted 500 units in a given area; master plan it and try to rezone for it, and then the public could say no way were you going to put that many units in that area, or no way were you going to put mixed use in that area, or they didn't believe in form based code. He said this is what happened the last time the City tried this with the West Layton Village Center.

Gary said the shared solution hadn't taken into consideration the incredible risk of another form of government called the vote by the people. He said citizens could easily stop this from coming together even if the City loved it. Gary said it was stopped out west on 106 acres. He said it was happening more and more, and the courts were not only saying you could do it on zoning issues but they were saying you could do it on something as small as a development agreement or a subdivision. All of these could be taken to a vote through the referendum process. Gary said that was ominous for a governing body that was looking at giving up this other possibility, which accommodated the current Master Plan, and bet on this with the idea that everybody in Layton was going to go along with it.

Gary said he would like to see extensive information about a referendum and how they would propose to deal with that if this proposal moved forward. He said the Council had to consider the possibility that the people would take this to a referendum and reverse the decision.

Mr. Brown said right now they were not sure if the land use element of the shared solution was 50% of the benefit or 10% of the benefit. He said it wouldn't be that challenging to run the same model with the other land use element. Mr. Brown said that would help answer a lot of the questions. He said they might be able to rely on the market based part of the jobs attraction, which was a separate issue. Mr. Brown said he felt that the beautiful arterial streets and walkableness of it was worth making an attempt.

Mr. Borgenicht said besides the impacts of the West Davis Corridor to neighborhoods, this was an air quality issue. He said there was a study published in August 2014 on the background air quality and mitigation strategies for the Mountain View Corridor, and the study talked about the link between nearby roadway air pollution and the number of health affects including the onset of childhood asthma and impaired lung function. Mr. Borgenicht said there were five schools that would be within 500 feet of the roadway.

Mr. Borgenicht said it would increase miles traveled, it would increase auto dependence and increase air pollution. He said freeways typically divided communities, boulevards bound them together. Mr. Borgenicht displayed a picture of a rundown main street with pawn shops, overhead power lines and blighted conditions. He said they would spend \$700,000,000 on the freeway and there would be no money to beautify the local streets.

Councilmember Freitag said he appreciated what Mr. Borgenicht said, and from a 10,000 foot level most people would not disagree with him. He said there was no money set aside to fix the local streets; where would the money come from.

Mr. Borgenicht said it would come from the project funds.

Councilmember Brown said the money slated for the West Davis Corridor would not improve all the local streets.

Mr. Jeffries said transportation funds would not be used to put power lines underground, and the landscaping would not be funded beyond the ¾%.

Councilmember Day asked Mr. Jeffries if he was saying that if \$700,000,000 was not spent building the West Davis Corridor then that money would go to the cities.

Mr. Jeffries said that would be a legislative decision.

Councilmember Brown said it may go to Utah County.

Mr. Brown said his point was that if the money was spent on the Corridor, it was pretty certain that there wouldn't be any money left over to beautify local streets and there might not be any funding anyway because of policy. He said he cared about public money being spent wisely. Mr. Brown said in his opinion it was wise to spend the money on the Corridor, but it was wiser to spend the money on local streets. He said spending money to move more cars to Salt Lake City would not attract jobs to this area. Mr. Brown said we had to want it first; policies could change and funding could become available.

Mr. Borgenicht said looking out 25 years; things would be very different than they were today. He read a UDOT policy that considered bicycle and pedestrian trails as aesthetic features and not as potential transportation modes. Mr. Borgenicht said the world was changing; the Active Transportation Committee, and Davis County was a leader in that, was moving towards a change where people biked to Frontrunner; where people biked in communities where there were connected, protected bikeways. He said UDOT had a wonderful active policy that they completed last year, but it had to go from policy down to implementation. Mr. Borgenicht said he felt that policies would change and 2040 would be very different than it was today. If we wanted to grow up to be Los Angeles we would continue to feed the 98% of trips that were done by automobile, but if we wanted to try to deal with the peak hour traffic by getting people on transit, it would be a very big change.

Mr. Borgenicht said this was a complicated issue. He said the numbers in the model needed to be adjusted based on reasonableness and market based consulting, but they had to start somewhere. Mr. Borgenicht said the numbers presented in the model were not final numbers, they were a beginning point, that could reduce vehicle miles traveled and improve air quality.

Councilmember Freitag expressed appreciation for the work that had been done. He said it was something different and something for the Council to consider.

The meeting adjourned at 9:16 p.m.

Thieda Wellman, City Recorder