# Table of Contents

**Acknowledgments** ................................................................. i

**1 Introduction** ....................................................................... 1
  - Purpose, Use and Organization of the Plan ....................... 1
  - Organization of the Plan ....................................................... 2
  - Coordination with Other Plan Documents ....................... 3
  - Planning Process and Public Involvement ....................... 5
  - Vision Statement ............................................................... 20
  - Herriman City Profile ....................................................... 20

**2 Parks & Open Space** .......................................................... 25
  - Public Input on Parks and Open Space ....................... 26
  - Existing Parks/System-at-a-Glance ............................ 29
  - Existing Park Needs and Service Levels .................. 38
  - Meeting Existing and Future Park Needs ................. 41
  - Park Standards .............................................................. 47
  - Park Amenities .............................................................. 52
  - Open Space ................................................................. 55
  - Recommendations ......................................................... 57

**3 Recreation, Community Arts, & Events** ......................... 58
  - Public Input on Recreation, Community Events & Arts ... 59
  - Recreation ................................................................. 61
  - Community Events ...................................................... 63
  - Arts ............................................................................... 64
  - Recommendations .......................................................... 65

**4 Trails** ............................................................................. 66
  - Public Input on Trails .................................................... 67
  - Existing Trails and Bike Lanes/Routes ....................... 70
  - Trailheads ................................................................. 73
  - Trail Crossings ......................................................... 73
  - Trail Needs Analysis ................................................... 74
  - Design Standards ....................................................... 74
  - Proposed Trails and Trailheads ................................ 77
  - Planned Trail Crossings ............................................. 82
  - Recommendations .......................................................... 83

**5 Priorities & Construction Costs** ...................................... 84
  - Survey Results: Spending Priorities & Willingness to Fund 85
    - Park and Open Space Priorities ................................ 85
    - Recreation and Community Events and Arts Priorities ... 88
    - Trails Priorities ...................................................... 88
    - Development Costs and Funding Priorities ................ 89
    - Total Probable Costs ................................................. 91
    - Establishing Funding Priorities ................................. 92
    - Existing Funding Sources ....................................... 95
    - Parks and Open Space ............................................. 110

**6 Goals and Policies** ......................................................... 110
  - Recreation, Community Events and Arts .................... 113
  - Trails ................................................................. 113
  - Other Goals & Policies ............................................... 116
Appendix A: Public Involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steering Committee Meeting Notes</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Web Page &amp; Email</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Pinpoint Results</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistically Valid Survey Results</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Group Meeting Notes</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Scoping Meeting Notes</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Open House Notes</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Acknowledgments

Herriman City Council
Jared Henderson  District 1
Clint Smith  District 2
Sherrie Ohrn  District 3
Nicole Martin  District 4
David Watts  Mayor

Herriman City Planning Commission
Jessica Morton
Adam Jacobson
Chris Berbert  Alternate
Lorin Palmer
Andrea Bradford
Jackson Ferguson
Andrew Powell
Brody Rypien

Steering Committee
Chris Berbert  Planning Commission
Jo Darton  Trails Committee
Kourtney Fitzgerald  Resident/Accessibility
Gordon Haight  Economic Development Director
Michael Maloy  Planning Department
Tami Moody  Director of Communications
Susie Nelson  Resident & Dog Park Advocate
Kevin Schmidt  Events & Recreation Manager
Heidi Shegrud  Landscape Architect
Anthony Teuscher  Parks Manager
Wendy Thomas  Director of Parks & Events
Kyle Walton  Resident

Planning Consultants
Landmark Design
Mark Vlasic, AICP, PLA, ASLA, Principal-in-Charge
Lisa Benson, AICP, PLA, ASLA, Senior Planner, Project Manager
Madison Merrill, ASLA, Project Planner
PURPOSE, USE AND ORGANIZATION OF THE PLAN

The Herriman Parks, Recreation, Open Space and Trails Master Plan 2018-2028 follows just five years on the heels of the previous master plan, but with the rapid rate of growth and development in recent years, the plan quickly became outdated. As one of the fastest growing communities in the region, an up-to-date and comprehensive parks, recreation, open space and trails master plan is an essential tool for ensuring acquisition, development and maintenance of facilities and programs in Herriman keeps pace with demands and needs.

The Herriman Parks, Recreation, Open Space and Trails Master Plan 2018-2028 captures the vision and needs of the community, providing policy guidance and specific implementation ideas for allocating resources to ensure the City keeps pace with demand for the next ten years and beyond.
ORGANIZATION OF THE PLAN

Chapter 1 Introduction

Summarizes the purpose and organization of the plan and relationships with other planning documents. It also describes the planning process, summarizes feedback and issues identified during the public involvement process, verifies the planning vision, and concludes with a summary of the City’s demographics focusing on future projections and needs.

Chapter 2 Parks & Open Space

Examines the City’s existing parks and open space amenities. It also analyzes existing and future needs using Level of Service (LOS) and distribution analyses, establishes park standards and outlines the approach for meeting future park and open space needs.

Chapter 3 Recreation & Community Events

Investigates recreation facilities and programming, arts programs, community events, and similar community needs and demands.

Chapter 4 Trails

Addresses the City’s trail network, building upon the concepts in the Herriman City Bicycle Master Plan 2011 and Transportation Master Plan 2009. The chapter looks at the current network, establishes a concept for meeting existing and future needs and creates a framework for a fully-connected trail system in the future.

Chapter 5 Priorities & Construction Costs

Prioritizes specific actions to help meet needs and standards for parks, open space, recreation, community arts and trails. These are then translated into probable cost estimates for meeting needs during the next ten years and beyond. The chapter includes an action plan that details implementation actions for the short and long-term. The chapter concludes with an updated list of potential funding sources to help facilitate implementation of the plan.

Chapter 6 Goals & Policies

Provides a comprehensive list of goals, policies and implementation actions for parks, recreation, open space and trails to help achieve the City’s vision.
COORDINATION WITH OTHER PLAN DOCUMENTS

Herriman City General Plan 2025

The *Herriman City General Plan 2025* addresses and supports parks, recreation, trails and open space in numerous ways. It encompasses a clear vision that supports the development of a balanced parks system linked together by a comprehensive system of trails. It respects the lay of the land, acknowledging the surrounding foothills, natural drainageways and agricultural roots of the community.

Specific goals contained in the plan encourage development that is pedestrian-friendly and walkable and that protects and conserves critical agricultural land and associated open spaces, sensitive lands, sensitive natural features, critical open spaces and habitat areas.

The plan maps include proposed parks, recreation and open space areas, as well as a hierarchical trail and bikeway plan intended to link key destinations, parks, and open spaces as part of creating a more walkable and bikeable city.

Herriman Hills Open Space Master Plan 2018

The *Herriman Hills Open Space Master Plan (2018)* summarizes the community’s vision for more than 1,800 acres of City-owned open space in the southern foothills of the City. These open spaces help to separate the City from Camp Williams National Guard training site to the south and provide unprecedented opportunities for creating a unique foothill trail system in the City. The plan used a combination of data collection and public involvement methods to create a concept plan. The concept plan proposes a variety of uses and facilities for the much loved area, including an extensive trail network, trailheads and trail access points and specialized recreation areas that facilitate back country camping, an off-leash dog trail area, bicycle pump tracks, bike skills parks, an amphitheater, winter tubing, ropes and obstacles courses, and archery and shooting ranges.
Herriman City Bicycle Master Plan 2011

The *Herriman City Bicycle Master Plan (2011)* addresses the needs of both recreational and commuter bicyclists, examining existing needs and facilities and proposing additional bikeways that complete the City’s network. The proposed network connects bikeways to key destinations and to the soft surface and backcountry trail network.

Herriman City Transportation Master Plan 2009

While the bulk of the *Herriman City Transportation Master Plan (2009)* addresses the City’s road system, it also contains a small discussion on pedestrian and bicycle trails, including support for a proposed network of primitive and urban trails.
PLANNING PROCESS AND PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

A comprehensive public involvement process was applied to this planning effort, providing meaningful opportunities for residents and stakeholders to provide input and become engaged in the development of the plan. Figure 1.1 illustrates the key techniques and activities that were utilized to ensure the plan represents the community vision.
Herriman Parks, Recreation, Open Space And Trails Master Plan

Steering Committee

A Steering Committee was established specifically for this project and was composed of key City staff, stakeholders, residents with specific interests in accessibility and dog parks, and representatives of the planning commission and Herriman Trails Committee. The Steering Committee met a total of four times at key points during the planning process, providing critical guidance and feedback as the planning concept was established.

Project Web Page

A project web page was established at the beginning of the project, providing comprehensive documentation of meeting results and directives, in addition to serving as a clearinghouse for information. The web page included information on meetings, presentation materials, notes, and survey results. It also included an email list sign-up, comment tools, updates on plan progress, draft plan documents and links to Social Pinpoint, an interactive on-line mapping and comment tool.

Ten people submitted comments via email and through the project web page. The complete comments are included in the Appendix and a summary follows.

Parks and Open Space

- Desire for a gun range for shooting practice, self-defense training and to host world-class shooting competitions.
- Need for dedicated and fenced off-leash dog parks.
- Support for using the parcel of land at 12600 South 5600 West for a park. Grants might be available to help clean the site up, and a park at this location would benefit the community.
- The neighborhood east of Mountain View Corridor needs a sand volleyball court. It was also requested that information about the plans for the Juniper Canyon Recreation Area be released.
- The public could partner with Herriman to improve the ADA accessibility of our playgrounds, and together could help the City secure grants and funding to make improvements and enhancements.
Social Pinpoint

Social Pinpoint (SPP) is a proprietary online community engagement software tool that helps communities such as Herriman connect with their residents and stakeholders. The tool was hosted on the project web page, providing a range of opportunities to comment, question and propose ideas for specific sites using online maps. The software allows participants to “drag and drop” various “comment pins” directly tied to a location. The software also allows participants to upload photos and images to help describe ideas and point out specific locations. Figure 1.2 is a summary map indicating the number and location of where the various pins were placed, and Figure 1.3 is a heat map that illustrates the concentration of comments and ideas across the City.

A total of 842 unique users spent an average of twelve minutes and forty-eight seconds on the SPP page. Seventy-six unique users submitted 126 comments and ten photos. Detailed responses generated via SPP are included in the Appendix and a summary of those comments follows.

**Trails**

- More trails for running and hiking are desired.
- Accessible trails are needed.
- A mountain bike park and improved mountain bike trails are desired.
- It was suggested that the City should encourage residents and others to walk and bike instead of relying solely on cars for circulation. This could help alleviate traffic issues that have emerged in recent years.

**General Comments**

- Herriman needs to consider the synergy between venues and activities including venues that support night-time activities, most specifically entertainment venues for movies, theater and art. There is also a need for good dining options.
Parks and Open Space

- Parks need active recreation components, like sports courts, east of the Mountain View Corridor and in the Juniper Canyon Recreation Area.
- Replace some lawn areas with pickleball courts and other active sports courts.
- Northwest Herriman lacks parks, trails and open space and maybe a splash pad.

- Need a sports complex with fields for high school and other sports organizations.
- Requested facilities in foothills: disc golf, shooting range, archery course, and picnic areas
- Want more multipurpose fields with playground nearby.
- City should secure top of South Mountain for open space – has great views.

- A couple of vacant lots need to be cleaned up and made formal open space.
- There is a need for a multi-purpose recreation reservoir on the west side of the City. The City should consider charging for non-resident parking like is done in Springville.
- Need more parks, dog parks, and a RV park/campground.
- Make parks more interesting – not just sites with grass and trees.
Recreation and Community Arts

- Desire a golf course and indoor year-round ice rink.
- Support for an indoor and outdoor pool.
- Need a pool for high school athletics and those in training.

Trails

- Need better signage, mileage markers, dog waste stations, equestrian trails, pump track, bike park, directional trails, trails separated by user group, off-leash dog trails and more primitive trails.
- Realign some trails for homeowner privacy.
- Both support and opposition to providing trailheads with parking was indicated.
- Both support and opposition for UHV/OHV motorized trails was indicated. Some participants are concerned about noise, fire risk and user safety if trails are allowed to include motorized vehicles.
- Trail access from neighborhoods is important.
- Both support and opposition for trailhead with parking in Wide Hollow area.
- Need to provide safe trail crossings, close trail gaps, and finish trails.
- Consider “single-track sidewalks”, unpaved trails that parallel paved trails.

General Comments

- Some maintenance issues for specific parks and trails.
- City has poor examples of high-density development – inadequate parks and open space, and residents do not have parks or open space within walking distance.
- Require developers to provide promised amenities and trails connected to parks. They need to provide amenities in parks, not just grass and trees.
- Partner with neighboring communities to ensure neighboring trails and lands are maintained properly and trails connected.
Statistically-Valid Survey

The City contracted with Y2 Analytics to conduct a statistically-valid survey. The Herriman Parks Plan 2019 Survey randomly sampled 1,367 residents, resulting in a margin of error of +/- 2.61 percent. Detailed survey results are located in the Appendix with survey highlights presented below. Overall, 31-percent of residents strongly agree and 42-percent somewhat agree that the City provides an adequate amount of parks, recreation, open spaces and trails opportunities.

Parks & Open Space

The most used parks are Blackridge, Butterfield and J. Lynn Crane, and the primary reason most people use their most-used park is that it is close to home. The most desired improvements to their most-used park include trees, walking/jogging paths, restrooms, and sports fields/courts, although many indicated that no improvements were needed.

Approximately 93-percent of respondents indicated that it is extremely, very, or moderately important to have parks within walking distance of home.

Approximately 66-percent percent of respondents indicated that is extremely, very, or moderately important to have dedicated dog parks, while 34-percent indicated is not very or not at all important to have dedicated dog parks. Residents are split over whether dogs and/or their owners cause conflicts with other users in Herriman parks and open spaces. They are also divided over the preferred ways to resolve these conflicts.
Recreation and Community Arts
The participation rate in recreation programs last year was 44-percent, with J.L. Sorenson Soccer, Junior Jazz, and school/club sports being the top programs. The primary reasons residents do not participate in recreation programs are that programs are not of interest, they are too expensive, or the programs are offered at inconvenient times.

Only 26-percent of residents are members of the J.L. Sorenson Recreation Center. Of those, 44-percent visit a few times a week, while 17-percent visit daily and 16-percent visit a few times a month.

The most popular children’s activities for exercise or recreation are swimming, walking, biking, soccer, basketball and dance, while the most popular adult activities for exercise or recreation are walking, running, biking, weight lifting, swimming and shooting.

The most popular community events are the Fort Herriman Towne Days, the Fort Herriman PRCA Rodeo, and the Herriman Howl. The top events people are most interested in attending in the future are Fort Herriman Towne Days, Night of Lights, and the Fort Herriman PRCA Rodeo.

More than half of residents have heard of the Herriman Arts Council. Approximately 69-percent do not take part in Herriman Arts Council events. The most popular Arts Council Events are the Summer Musical, the Herriman Live concert series, and the Kids Program. A majority of residents believe there is an appropriate amount of arts and cultural events in Herriman. Approximately 41-percent strongly or somewhat agree that cultural and arts events would be improved by having a dedicated Community Arts Center, while 36-percent neither agree or disagree, and 23-percent strongly or somewhat disagree with this statement.
Trails
Approximately 26-percent of respondents use trails a few times a year, 22-percent a few times a month and more, and 18-percent use trails at least weekly. In other words, approximately two-thirds of the population use trails at least a few times each year. Primitive trails located in the Herriman Hills Open Space are the most-used trails in the City (38-percent). Walking and jogging are the most popular trail uses at 77-percent, followed by recreational biking at 12-percent.

The most desired improvements to the trails in Herriman include making trails more complete or connected, linking neighborhoods with the trail system, increasing total trail miles, and providing pet waste disposal stations. The top reasons people do not use trails are a lack of information about the trails and a lack of UTV/OHV trails.

Most residents (89-percent) believe it is extremely, very or moderately important to have trails within walking distance of home. Natural surface trails are the most desired trail type, followed by asphalt trails and natural surface motorized trails.

Priorities and Funding
When asked how they would allocate $100 for additional parks, recreation programs, facilities, trails, or arts programs in Herriman, how would you divide your $100 among the various projects, exhibits, events, and performances that could be funded? (You may spend the $100 all in one category or divide it up as you please, but the total must be $100.)
include trails, open spaces, existing parks, and new parks.

The top special use facilities that should be considered for funding or construction are an indoor/outdoor pool, a dog park, outdoor amphitheater, climbing park and pickleball courts, in that order.

Residents are slightly more willing to pay a monthly usage fee of $7.50 for acquisition and maintenance of new parks, facilities or trails (67-percent extremely, very or somewhat willing) than to pay an equal amount for maintenance and upgrades to existing parks, facilities or trails (61-percent extremely, very or somewhat willing).

Residents are slightly more willing to pay a monthly usage fee of $10.00 for acquisition and maintenance of new parks, facilities or trails (60-percent extremely, very or somewhat willing) than are willing to pay for maintenance and upgrades to existing parks, facilities or trails (58-percent are extremely, very or somewhat willing).

Survey Demographics

Most respondents were between 25 to 44 years old, and approximately 95-percent own their own home. Nearly two-thirds of households have children under the age of 18 living at home (66-percent). Approximately 50-percent have lived in Herriman between 3-10 years while another 26-percent have lived here between 11-20 years.

Approximately 52-percent of households own one or two dogs and only 4-percent own horses.

Approximately 44-percent of respondents have an annual household income between $75,000-124,000, and 22-percent have an annual household incomes in excess of $150,000.
Focus Group Meetings

The planning team held three separate focus group meetings with various special interest groups in October and November 2018. A summary of the comments provided during each meeting is provided below, with detailed notes provided in the Appendix.

Arts, History and Community Gardens

- Have great relationship with City
- Want to go beyond performance art
- Want to teach art, not just view art
- Would like arts venue but maybe locations throughout the community would be better
- Kids art classes fill up quickly
- City purchased Crane House - would like to restore it
- Would like to purchase several other historic homes and the barn for preservation/restoration
- “Historic District” not well defined - has a mix of old and new homes
- Want to offer self-guided tours of historic homes
- Want to relocate cabins from community gardens and create pioneer-era learning center
- Consider conservation district instead of historic district
- Embrace urban community while maintaining rural feel where possible
- 50 plots, 30 gardeners from all housing densities
- Not a huge demand for plots - run out of water halfway through season
- Donate some of produce grown in garden
- Possibility to convert old rail barn to greenhouse
- Create place to attract more than just gardeners - play on historic aspect, add flower gardens - make it an “Old Farm”
- Garden is locked sometimes so cabins are not always accessible
**Neighborhood Facilitators and Sports Clubs**

- Foothills offer unique opportunity
- Open Space is incredibly important
- Families want smaller parks close to home
- Too many small parks - need policy for bigger parks
- Update playgrounds on a regular basis
- Facilities wanted: shooting range, golf course, water park, equestrian facilities, outdoor pool, and ice rink
- Bacchus Highway is dangerous for road bikers
- “College Town” with USU and SLCC - partner as much as possible to meet needs
- Accessibility is huge - upgrade existing facilities, make it part of new facilities, provide programs
- Need space for tournaments like SLC RAC
- Several sports can share fields
- Want to use parks that are not currently programmed
- Utah Soccer Alliance - 1,200 players, would like RAC type facility with 16-24 fields
- Herriman Baseball - 1,000 players, would like another 4 or 5 plex
- Herriman Rugby - 25- to 300 players, practice in Lehi but play in Herriman, have to have tournaments in SLC
- Herriman Football - 700 players, use 11 fields

**Trails, Equestrians, OHV Users**

- Make a great loop trail using Bacchus and MVC, connect up Butterfield Canyon
- Have enough trailheads
- Not all trailheads need restrooms
- Have enough space to accommodate users of all types on separate trails
- Make the BST a true urban interface with a continuous trail along the foothills - require developers to support it in their projects - take it to Yellow Fork and beyond
- Need trails for younger kids on foot and for people of all ages and abilities
- Arena at Butterfield is awesome - needs camper/trailer hookups, need better access control with fencing, need ADA upgrades
- Mountain bikes are the biggest danger to horses, but we can all get along
- Indoor equestrian center would be nice, but is not necessary - could serve as venue for concerts and other indoor events as well
- Trail to circumnavigate Camp Williams would be great
- Tooele and Utah Counties have great OHV trail systems - Salt Lake County and Herriman are the gap
- If City provides major OHV facilities, there is a chance it will become overused
General Comments

- More field space
- Want: shooting range, archery range, rock scramble (rock climbing), places for mud races, outdoor pool, disc golf
- Winter sports: snowshoeing, hiking, skiing, fat-tire biking, cross country skiing
- Provide pickleball for seniors
- Provide ADA routes to a few destinations
- Provide camping areas in the foothills
Public Scoping Meetings

Approximately 30 people attended two public scoping meetings, which were held on November 5th at 1:00 pm and November 7th at 6:00 pm in the Community Room at City Hall. Each meeting began with a Visual Preference Survey, which presented 50 photos that were scored by participants to help determine the types and qualities of park, recreation, trail, open space, and community facilities/activities preferred in Herriman. All 50 images and their scores can be viewed in the Appendix. The top six highest-scoring images in each category are shown on the right, followed by the lowest-scoring six images.

A scoping session followed each Visual Preference Survey session, providing participants with the opportunity to freely discuss their ideas, visions, and concerns for the existing and future City. Verbatim notes from each meeting are located in the Appendix and a summary of compiled input follows.
### Parks & Open Space

- Love existing large parks (Crane, Butterfield, and Black Ridge)
- Want parks close to home
- Need safe routes to parks
- Want more interactive playgrounds
- Some maintenance/vandalism issues
- More shade while trees still young
- More parks with special amenities
- Need more open space within developments
- No hillside development
- Want outdoor hillside adventure park

### Trails

- Trailheads need restrooms and bike repair stations
- Need wayfinding and maps
- Better maintenance (weeds/flats)
- More hiking and biking trails
- Should be better connected
- Want BMX park and OHV trails
- No ATVs by neighborhoods

### General Takeaways

- Very active outdoor community
- New developments need to include better parks, trails, and open space
- Outdoor pool - want but cost is huge
- Accessibility is huge - need to provide accessible parks and trails
- Options for people of all ages, including teens
- Arts - support for and indifference
- Need indoor performance venue for the Arts
- Heritage/small town feel is important
- More community gathering places
- Focus on amenities that serve the most people and can be used year-round
- Partner on big ticket items
- VISION - play place, entertainment/sports hub - attract people from the region
Public Open House

A Draft Plan Public Open House was held on _____, providing the public an opportunity to view the ideas proposed in the Parks, Recreation, Open Space and Trails Master Plan, to ask questions, and to provide feedback and suggest changes. Approximately ___ people signed in, with more reviewing the documents on the project web page. Comments can be viewed in the Appendix.

City Leadership Briefings and Adoption Presentations

The planning team briefed the City’s leadership at key points during the planning process. The City Council was briefed on January 23, 2019 and ____. The final draft of the Herriman Parks, Recreation, Open Space and Trails Master Plan was presented to the Herriman City Council on ____. The Council adopted the plan on ______.
VISION STATEMENT

The City’s Vision Statement, shown below, summarizes the community’s hopes for the future and provides a reference point by which various ideas and concepts for the community can be evaluated and refined as Herriman continues to grow and evolve.

Herriman City will continue to be a place to establish roots, create opportunity, embrace our heritage, protect diversity, and promote economic development. And while preserving the “Herriman Feel” provide a safe and inviting place to live, work, and play.

HERRIMAN CITY PROFILE

Physical and Social Structure

Herriman City is located in the southwestern corner of Salt Lake County, nestled at the base of the foothills that separate the City from Camp Williams National Guard to the south, bordering unincorporated Salt Lake County lands to the west. The City encompasses slightly more than twenty square miles and features a series of intermittent eastward-running drainages emanating in the Oquirrh Mountains and the Rio Tinto Mine, both of which dominate the westward skyline of the City. From south to north, the key drainages include Rose Creek, Butterfield Creek, Copper Creek and Midas Creek. The Welby Jacob Canal runs north-south along a large portion of the eastern boundary of the City.
As described in the *General Plan (2025)*, Herriman was originally established in 1849 as a small settlement known as Butterfield. For a short time, it included a pioneer fort located near the crossing of Main Street and Pioneer Street called Fort Herriman. Early residents made their living by dryland farming and through sheep and cattle ranching while others worked in the nearby mines and smelters. Butterfield remained quite small for many years, with the first signs of significant growth occurring in the 1980’s and 1990’s, which ultimately led to the incorporation of Herriman City in 1999. Since then the community has been dominated by an era of rapid growth, and it is currently one of the fastest-growing communities in Salt Lake County, Utah, and the nation.

The settlement pattern in Herriman changed in response to growth and development pressure. For example, the large, single-family residential homes and lots, horse properties and agricultural fields, and farms that dominated during the 1980’s and 1990’s have been usurped by a wider range of residential uses, lot sizes, and housing types in more recent years. The City now contains significant areas of medium to high density residential neighborhoods, and it is anticipated that even higher-density uses will be located here in the future.

The City has made great strides establishing a town center near the north end of the community, which includes a new City Hall, J. Lynn Crane Park, and the Salt Lake County-owned Herriman Library and J.L. Sorenson Recreation Center. Large commercial areas have also emerged since incorporation, providing residents with a growing range of services and experiences within the municipal boundaries.
Demographic Profile and Projections

A clear understanding of the Herriman’s current population and household characteristics is necessary to accurately analyze current and future needs for public parks, recreation, open space and trails. The following is a summary of key population, age, and household size and composition characteristics, which are generally the most important characteristics for understanding existing and future needs for parks, recreation facilities and programs, community and arts facilities and programs, open spaces, and trails.

**Population**

Herriman has experienced significant growth since incorporation in 1999, increasing from 1,523 in 2000 to 51,681 in 2018 (see Figure 1.5). Growth was particularly rapid between 2010 and 2018 and is expected to remain high through 2040. Population is expected to gradually taper off by 2040, with relatively minor growth between 2040 and buildout, which is estimated will be reached by 2060 with a population around 115,844.

---

1. Demographic information was provided by the Herriman City planning department and supplemented with information from the U.S. census bureau as needed.
2. According to the General Plan 2025, which was updated in 2018
Age
While the City is anticipated to continue to grow rapidly through 2040, it is also gradually aging. This is demonstrated by the fact that the median age increased from 24.7 in 2010 to 26.2 in 2017, as shown in Figure 1.6. However, Herriman is still a very young City when compared to the median age of Salt Lake County at 32.4, the state at 30.5, and the nation at 37.8.

Table 1.1 provides a comparison of the percent children by age group in 2017 for Herriman, Salt Lake County, Utah, and the United States. As indicated, Herriman has many more children by percentage than the county, state, and U.S., with local rates nearly doubling national averages. According to the American Community Survey 2017 estimates, approximately 64.2-percent of households in the City have children under eighteen years. This data is critical for understanding existing and future needs, indicating the needs of children, young and old, will dominate needs for the next generation and possibly beyond.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>&lt;5 Years Old</th>
<th>5-14 Years Old</th>
<th>15-17 Years Old</th>
<th>Total &lt;17 Years Old</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Herriman City</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake County</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Utah</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.1: Comparison of Percent Population of Children by Age Group in 2017

Household Size
The average household size in Herriman has dropped slightly, decreasing from 3.93 in 2010 to 3.91 in 2017. However Herriman has a relatively larger household size compared to 3.01 for Salt Lake County, 3.14 for the state, and 2.63 for the nation. In other words, Herriman is a community with many children and meeting the needs of this cohort will likely to be the dominant theme through 2040 and beyond.

3. According to the American Fact Finder 2017
Household Income
The median household income in Herriman has increased from $79,182\textsuperscript{4} in 2010 to $94,837 in 2017, compared to $67,922 for Salt Lake County, $65,325 for the state, and $57,652 for the nation in 2017.

Summary
Herriman’s population is likely to continue growing at a rapid rate through 2040, adding approximately 41,784 residents by 2030, an increase of almost 81% over the next twelve years. The community is gradually aging, but it is nevertheless very young in comparison to regional, state, and national figures. The extremely large household sizes are tapering slightly, representing a slight counter-trend toward a more diverse age composition. Household income has increased significantly, which is indicative of the community appealing to a younger, more affluent cohort in recent years.

Taken together, these characteristics indicate that the existing and future parks, recreation, open space, and trails will need to serve a wide range of users. Although there will be significant pressure to meet the overwhelming needs of young families with both young children and teenagers, it is important to ensure that the needs of adults and seniors are not lost, as this could result in a two-tier system of access and accommodation.

\textsuperscript{4} In 2017 inflation-adjusted dollars
Parks and open space form the backbone of a healthy community, providing places to recreate, relax, and connect with family, friends, and the community at large. These green spaces provide visual relief from the built environment and offer the opportunity to connect with nature while physically engaging with the outdoor environment.

This chapter examines the state of existing parks and open space in Herriman City. It begins by documenting the number, size, amenities and distribution of the City’s existing parks and open spaces, applying tools to help determine how well current needs are being met. We also peer into the future, applying growth projections and trends to help determine the preferred method for meeting long-term park and open space needs as the City continues to grow and change.
The planning process included significant public outreach opportunities to ensure the needs and desires of the public were well-vetted and understood. The following is a summary of the public input that specifically addressed parks and open space.

### Web Page and Associated Email Comments

Comments included support for a shooting range, dedicated off-leash dog parks, and for all new parks to be accessible to a full range of user groups. New recreation facilities east of the Mountain View Corridor (MVC) were requested and that the City-owned lot located at 12600 South 5600 West be converted into a park.

### Social Pinpoint Input

There is a need for more recreation amenities east of MVC and in the northwest part of the City around the Creek Ridge community. Requested amenities included a sports complex, a disc golf course, a shooting range, an archery course, picnic areas, more multipurpose fields with playgrounds located nearby, a reservoir located on the west side of the City, more parks in general, dog parks and an RV park/campground. Respondents also want the City to cleanup a few vacant lots that seem to be attracting nuisance uses, to purchase the top of South Mountain for open space and to make parks more interesting with amenities other than just grass and trees.
**Statistically-Valid Survey Results**

Blackridge, Butterfield and J. Lynn Crane parks are the most-used in the City. The primary reason people visit their most-used park is its proximity to home. The most desired park improvements include trees, walking/jogging paths, restrooms and sports fields/courts, although many indicated that no improvements were needed. A majority feel it is moderately, very or extremely important to have parks within walking distance of home. The most desired improvements to Blackridge Park are trees and walking/jogging paths; to Butterfield Park are walking/jogging paths and restrooms; and to J. Lynn Crane Park are sports fields/courts. The top three reasons that respondents do not visit City parks include no interest, no time, lack of interesting park features or facilities, and a lack of information about park amenities.

Approximately two-thirds of respondents feel it is important to have dedicated dog parks. Residents are split over whether dogs and/or their owners cause conflicts with other users in Herriman parks and open spaces. They were also split on the preferred method to resolve these conflicts.

**Public Meetings**

The public expressed their appreciation the high-quality of J. Lynn Crane, Butterfield and Blackridge Parks. They requested more shade in parks as most are quite young, more open space within developments, an outdoor hillside adventure park as well as parks with special amenities and more interactive playgrounds. They also expressed a desire for more parks close to home, to keep the foothills free from development and the need for safe routes to parks. They also want to see options for people of all ages, improved accessibility at public parks and a focus on amenities that will serve the most people year-round. They indicated that developers should be providing better parks and open space.
Focus Interviews

Focus interview participants emphasized the importance of open space and the foothills. They requested additional facilities including a shooting range, golf course, water park, equestrian facilities, archery range, camping areas in the foothills, pickleball for seniors, outdoor pool, space for sports tournaments, a sports complex like Salt Lake City’s Recreation Athletic Complex, a baseball four or five-plex, more field space overall, a rock scramble for rock climbing, places for mud races, disc golf course, and an ice rink. They also suggested that playgrounds be updated on a regular basis and that all parks in the City be modified or designed to meet ADA accessibility requirements, with Butterfield Park indicated as having particular need for improvements. The various soccer, baseball, softball and other sport clubs suggested that several sports can share fields and that they would like to have access to fields in the City that are not currently programmed.

Participants also indicated a desire to enhance and improve existing community garden, converting it from a little known spot on the map into a place that is attractive for the entire community, not just the gardeners. They suggested leveraging the City’s history there, perhaps adding flower gardens or making it an “old farm”, perhaps turning it into a historic conservation district. It was suggested that the historic cabins be relocated to somewhere more accessible to the rest of the community, unless there is a way to provide greater access to the historic features while controlling access to the gardens.
EXISTING PARKS/SYSTEM-AT-A-GLANCE

Herriman City is fortunate to have a wide range of parks, open spaces, and other amenities that help meet the recreational needs of the community. Map 1 shows the location of existing parks and open spaces in the City, as well as the JL Sorenson Recreation Center, schools, special use parks, and other unique amenities. Table 2.1 provides a detailed inventory of the existing parks, amenities within each of the parks, and additional facilities that contribute to the recreation system.

There are approximately 210 acres of parks and other special recreation land, and more than 2,240 acres of open space that serve the community. The following is a description of each park type, beginning with the smallest category - Local Parks, followed by descriptions of Neighborhood Parks, Community Parks and the largest - Regional Parks. The plan also examines Special Use Parks and Other Recreational Facilities. The section concludes with a description of public Open Space distributed throughout the community.
**Table 2.1: Herriman Park Amenities Inventory**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Name</th>
<th>Total Park Acres</th>
<th>Formal Park Acres</th>
<th>Bike Path</th>
<th>Play Equipment</th>
<th>Restrooms</th>
<th>Tables</th>
<th>Volleyball Court</th>
<th>Tennis Court</th>
<th>Basketball Court</th>
<th>Baseball Field</th>
<th>Softball Field</th>
<th>Amenities Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NATIONAL PARKS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackridge Park</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M M Butterfield Park</strong></td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMMUNITY PARKS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Lynn Crane Park</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Cove at Herriman Springs</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. L. Sorensen Recreation Center</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER RECREATIONAL FACILITIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PARK LAND (Community, Neighborhood, Local, Special Use &amp; Other Recreation Facilities)</strong></td>
<td>208.6</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other recreational facilities**

- Neighborhood: Includes two neighborhoods, two parks, and a playground.
- Community Park: Includes a pool, a playground, and a basketball court.
- Formal Park: Includes a playground, a soccer field, and a basketball court.
- Special Use Park: Includes a pool, a playground, and a basketball court.

**Subtotal Regional Parks**: 75.8

**Subtotal Community Parks**: 25.8

**Subtotal Neighborhood Parks**: 70.8

**Subtotal Local Parks**: 17.2

**Grand Total Amenities**: 196.8

---

**Herriman Parks, Recreation, Open Space & Trails Master Plan 2018-2028**

---

**DRAFT** Herriman Parks, Recreation, Open Space & Trails Master Plan 2018-2028
Local Parks

Local Parks are typically **less than 2 acres** in size and usually have minimal amenities. Open lawn areas, picnic tables, benches, trees, and sometimes a playground or sport court are typical for this category of parks. Local parks usually serve the immediate residential neighborhood, helping to fill a gap where a larger Neighborhood or Community Park may not be accessible within a reasonable walking distance.

Local Parks feature the greatest number of parks by category, with 22 parks in this classification. However, it comprises the least amount of total acreage by category, with **17.2 acres**. Local Parks average 0.8 acres per park.
Neighborhood Parks

Neighborhood Parks are smaller than Community Parks, typically 2 to 10 acres in size, and provide amenities that are focused on meeting the needs of the surrounding neighborhoods. They typically feature sport courts and/or fields, a perimeter walking path, trees, open grass areas, a playground, a pavilion, picnic areas, seating, and usually a restroom.

There are fourteen Neighborhood Parks in Herriman. Together they comprise 70.8 acres of land, ranging in size from 2.0 acres to 11.5 acres, with an average of 5.1 acres. Two of these parks – Rose Crest Park (10.4 acres) and Tuscany Park (11.5 acres) – are slightly larger than the typical maximum size for parks of this nature. However, neither parks meet the minimum standards for Community Parks as they lack a large special recreation feature such as a sports complex or aquatics facility. As a result, they have been placed in the Neighborhood Parks category.

Existing Neighborhood Parks

- Arches Park
- Copper Creek Park
- Emmabella Park
- Hamilton Farms Park
- Main Street Park
- Mineral Way Park
- Rosalina Athletic Field
- Rosalina Park
- Rose Crest Park
- Rose Crest Splash Pad Park
- Silver Reef Court Park
- The Ranches Park
- Tuscany Park
- Umbria Park
Community Parks

Community Parks serve the community through one large specialty feature with a community-wide draw. This category of parks also include sports fields and courts, playgrounds, pavilions, perimeter walking trails, restrooms, trees, large open grassy areas, picnic areas, and seating.

Community Parks are typically between 10 acres and 20 acres in size. As described below, Herriman City currently has two parks in this category. Together, these two parks encompass 25.6 acres of land.

Existing Community Parks

J. Lynn Crane Park is located south of City Hall and was named for Herriman’s first mayor. At 8.8 acres, this park is shy of the typical acreage for parks of this category but has such unique amenities that it was include in this category. J. Lynn Crane Park features a regionally-unique ice skating ribbon that doubles a splash pad in the summer. It also includes an outdoor performance stage with a green room, a gazebo, food court, a history walk, a large restroom, a large pavilion, a playground, a concessions building, bike racks, and a perimeter walking path.

The Cove at Herriman Springs is located on the western boundary of the City along the Rose Creek Drainage. It is 16.8 acres in size. The Cove offers an urban fishing pond and spawning area with interpretive signage, a restroom, one large and two small pavilions, a playground, and a volleyball court. The park also serves as a trailhead.
Regional Parks

The largest class of parks are **Regional Parks**, which serve the City and region with special features and amenities. Regional Parks are typically **20 acres or larger** in size. Typical amenities include multiple large specialty features with a regional draw, such as a sports complex, an aquatics facility or a splash pad. This category of parks also feature sports fields and courts, playgrounds, pavilions, perimeter walking trails, restrooms, trees, large open grassy areas, picnic areas, and seating.

As described below, Herriman has two parks that fall within this category. Together, these two parks encompass **73 acres** of land.

**Existing Regional Parks**

**Blackridge Park** is a 17-acre park located at the south end of the City at the base of the Oquirrh Mountain foothills along the Blackridge Creek drainage. The park ranked at the top of the most used parks in the City in the survey. It features a highly-popular reservoir for swimming and a sandy beach. Amenities also include a playground, a concession building, restrooms, bike racks, and pavilions with tables. No motorized watercraft are allowed on the reservoir. The park also serves as a trailhead, providing parking and access to the City’s extensive trail system, including direct access to backcountry trails and a section of the Bonneville Shoreline Trail that traverses the Herriman Hills Open Space.

**W. & M. Butterfield Park** is a 56-acre park located in the center of the City along the Rose Creek Drainage. It is named for Wayne and Mildred Butterfield, who spearheaded the founding of the park and donated the land on which it is located. The park ranked as the second most used park in the survey. It features a wide range of amenities, including three equestrian arenas, a covered outdoor performance stage, five baseball/softball fields, three volleyball courts, a playground, one large pavilion, two small pavilions, restrooms, two multipurpose fields, and a concession building. Butterfield Park also serves as a trailhead, connecting directly to the paved multi-use and urban soft surface trail system that eventually links with the backcountry trails in the Herriman Hills Open Space. The park hosts the City’s popular PRCA Rodeo and Enduro Motorcycle Race each summer. The 4.2-acre public works yard is also located on this site, although the acreage dedicated to that facility have been excluded from the park total since it does not directly help meet park or recreation needs.
Special Use Parks

There are several special use parks in Herriman, as described below. This category of parks does not serve traditional park and recreation needs, are pay to play facilities, or are not owned, controlled or maintained by the City. As a result, these special use parks have not been included in the total park acreage.

**Existing Special Use Parks**

**Herriman City Cemetery** is an 8.2-acre public cemetery located at the north end of the City, adjacent to Heritage Park. The cemetery includes a monument with plaques dedicated to the pioneer settlers and local war veterans, with quotes by Benjamin Franklin and George Washington.

**Herriman Community Garden** is a 0.7-acre site located just south of the cemetery along one edge of the Butterfield Creek drainage. The garden includes 50 small garden plots that are available to local residents. The garden also features a monument for Fort Herriman, several historic cabins which may eventually be relocated elsewhere in the City, and an old pole-barn that is slated to be replaced with a greenhouse in the future to better serve the garden. Herriman Community Garden is also home to two historic locust trees that were planted at the gateway to Fort Herriman and still survive along the western boundary of the gardens.

**Herriman Crane House** is a historic home located just north of Main Street Park. Historically, it was home to James Crane and his three wives - Alice Davis, Elizabeth Stewart and Rachel Briggs. The City recently purchased the home and would like to relocate and restore it elsewhere in the City.

**Real Salt Lake (RSL) Field Six and Park** was created as part of a development agreement between the City and Real Salt Lake (RSL) Soccer Club. According to the terms of the agreement, the City is allowed to use Field Six after 3:00 pm every day. The field is owned and maintained by RSL, which uses it for practice purposes during the day. A small park owned by the City but maintained by the adjacent HOA is located adjacent to the field. The City declined to maintain the park because the developer did not install an irrigation system that met the City’s standard. The park functions primarily as a private park, serving the adjacent homes.
Other Recreational Facilities

The 11.8-acre **JL Sorenson Recreation Center** helps meet the recreational needs of the community. Salt Lake County owns and operates this facility, providing all recreational programs in the City supplemented by private sports club facilities and programs\(^1\).

Other Land Maintained by the City

In addition to maintaining parks, open space, and trails, the City maintains an additional 26.75 acres of park strips and 2.09 acres of center medians. The City also maintains detention basins, landscapes around public buildings, and similar quasi-park parcels and features. While these uses often enhance the aesthetics of the community, they do not contribute to the City’s park land and place additional demands on the City’s maintenance staff.

Summary of Existing Park Acreage

While Herriman City has approximately 209.4 acres of land that help meet a broad spectrum of recreation needs, only a portion of those sites are used to calculate the City’s Level of Service (LOS). The Regional Parks, Community Parks, Neighborhood Parks and Local Parks described above are completely within the City’s ownership and control and contribute to the City’s existing park land Level of Service, totaling 186.6.

---

1. Recreation facilities and programming needs are discussed in Chapter 3: Recreation, Community Arts, & Events.
EXISTING PARK NEEDS AND SERVICE LEVELS

To determine whether existing parks in Herriman are meeting community needs, two different analyses were undertaken. The first is a **Level of Service (LOS) Analysis**, which examines park acreage in relation to population. The second is a **Distribution/Service Area Analysis**, which evaluates the distribution of parks in the City to determine if any gaps in service to residential areas exist.

**Existing Level of Service Analysis**

The Level of Service (LOS) Analysis was developed by the National Parks and Recreation Association (NRPA) to assist communities in evaluating whether the amount of park land is sufficient for meeting needs. The LOS analysis is a ratio calculated by dividing the total acres of park land by the population and multiplying by 1,000. This resulting figure represents the number of park acres provided for every thousand residents.

In the past the LOS analysis was a nationally-recognized benchmark for determining park needs, allowing a community to compare its performance with that of other communities and nationally-established minimum standards. While helping to evaluate a minimum standard of parks, the method has fallen out of favor as a standard benchmark, in large part because such comparisons do not reflect the unique conditions and goals of individual communities. This is especially true in the Intermountain West, where many communities, such as Herriman, have access to significant amounts of state and federal public lands or publicly-owned open space that help meet recreation needs. The LOS analysis nevertheless remains an important tool to help gauge whether traditional park acreage meets existing needs and whether adjustments are required as Herriman continues to grow and mature.

As described in the previous section, only regional parks, community parks, neighborhood parks, and local parks were used to calculate the existing Level of Service for Herriman City. The existing LOS was determined by dividing the acreage of existing City parks (186.6) by the 2028 population (51,681) and multiplying by 1,000 to calculate the number of park acres per 1,000 residents \( \frac{186.6}{51,681} \times 1,000 = 3.6 \). This results in an existing LOS of **3.6 acres of park land for every thousand residents**.
The Herriman City Cemetery, Community Garden, Crane House, RSL Field Six and Park, and the JL Sorenson Recreation Center were excluded from LOS calculations because they either do not meet traditional park needs, are special use facilities, are owned and/or maintained by others, or are “pay-to-play” facilities and therefore are outside of Herriman City’s control.

**Distribution Analysis**

In addition to determining the existing Level of Service, the distribution of parks and their corresponding service areas were analyzed to understand the spatial and locational characteristics of the local park system. This analysis is supported by public input, which indicated that **it is important to have parks within walking distance of their homes.**

Map 2 illustrates the distribution and service areas of existing parks, which were assigned service radii by park type as follows: **Local Parks** (1/4 mile radius), **Neighborhood Parks** (1/2 mile radius), **Community Parks** (1 mile radius) and **Regional Parks** (1 mile radius). Special use parks and other recreation facilities were not assigned service radii for the reasons previously discussed. Once the distributional reach of each park was mapped, existing and planned residential areas were added, helping to indicate which residential areas are served by existing parks and which are not.

As illustrated, there are several gaps in the community. The first is located at the north end of the City west of the Herriman Cemetery, and the next gap is located near Herriman Highway on the west side of the City. The third gap is found in the southwest corner of the City at the south end of Spring Canyon Drive, abutting the vast Herriman Hills Open Space. The fourth and largest gap is located in the southeast corner of the City, encompassing a large area east of the Mountain View Corridor and west of the MVC near the east end of Juniper Crest Road.
Chapter 2: Parks & Open Space

Map 2
Existing Park Distribution & Service Areas
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MEETING EXISTING AND FUTURE PARK NEEDS

This section addresses the acreage and distribution of future parks required to meet existing and future needs. The analysis is based on the analyses in the previous section and aligned with projections of future growth and park demands. Input and direction provided by City Staff, the Steering Committee, and other stakeholders has also proven invaluable for ensuring that future park service levels are aligned with the community vision.

Future Level of Service for Parks

As previously discussed, comparing the existing LOS with national standards has fallen out of favor in recent years. Likewise, comparing the existing park LOS in Herriman with those of other communities is not the best method for establishing a desired LOS, in large part because every community is unique. Nevertheless, such comparisons can be helpful for getting a general sense of where Herriman stands in relation to similar communities in the region, many of which may have similar goals, visions and needs. As illustrated in Table 2.2, the current LOS in Herriman City is relatively low when compared to the other communities.

Table 2.2: Level of Service Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Level-of-Service (LOS) Acres per 1,000 Residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Herriman City</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draper</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehi</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orem</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provo</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saratoga Springs</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Jordan</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Fork</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. George</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Jordan</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While this comparison can provide a general sense of where the community stands, it is important to note that many of the communities do not calculate LOS the same way - some include acreage that does not meet traditional park needs, undeveloped parks in anticipation of future need, or may have established different goals and priorities. As a result of these differences, the ratios are not directly comparable and are primarily beneficial for confirming that there are no fatal flaws as the City moves forward with the acquisition and development of new parks.

More telling is a comparison with the outdated Herriman City Parks, Recreation, Open Space and Trails Master Plan 2015, which indicated that the desired LOS for the City was 5.0 acres per 1,000 people. This ratio was based in large part on meeting modified NRPA standards for parks, including standards by park type. In contrast, this plan acknowledges the unique recreational assets and community priorities within the City, including the recent establishment of the Herriman Hills Open Space.

Revisiting the input received during the public involvement process, 31-percent of survey respondents strongly agree, and 42-percent somewhat agree that the City provides an adequate number of parks, recreation, open spaces and trails opportunities. Feedback from the web page, Social Pinpoint online map, and public scoping meetings indicate that there are some areas of the community that feel underserved by parks. Level of Service must be balanced both with the distribution of parks in the community and with the availability of vacant land for new parks. Herriman still has some vacant land available, and it is critical that the planned parks shown on Map 3 are acquired and developed. This plan therefore recommends the establishment of a future park LOS of 3.6, while noting that vigilance and care is necessary to ensure existing distribution gaps are filled, thereby providing equitable access to parks as the City continues to develop.
A Note About Level of Service (LOS) and Impact Fees

The LOS discussion in this document is related specifically to planning for future parks. The intent is to understand the level of service currently existing in the community, and to determine the means for maintaining that level of service or establishing a more appropriate level of service for the future. LOS is based on a quantity (acres, miles, numbers) per a determined number of persons (population), and results in a ratio of facilities to population. For example, the parks ratio is typically expressed as the number of acres of park land per 1,000 persons.

It is important to distinguish this discussion of LOS for planning purposes from the LOS typically used in determining impact fees. Impact fees are a means of charging new development its proportionate share of the cost of providing essential public services. While a LOS for planning is used to establish a standard or guideline for future facility development, an impact fee is used to assess new development for the actual cost of providing the service. For example, if there are five-acres of parks in Herriman for each 1,000 residents at present, new development cannot be charged at a rate for ten-acres of park land for each 1,000 residents. Herriman may elect to provide a higher LOS in the future because its current residents desire a higher level of service, but it cannot require new development to pay for the higher LOS. Utah law is clear on this point, stating the following:

“A local political subdivision or private entity may not impose an impact fee to raise the established level of service of a public facility serving existing development.” UC11-36-202(1)(a)(ii).

The Parks Master Plan should provide a foundation for developing a Capital Improvements Plan, Impact Fee Facilities Plan (IFFP), and Impact Fee Analysis (IFA). The IFFP is designed to identify the demands placed upon the existing facilities by future development and evaluate how these demands will be met by the City, as well as the future improvements required to maintain the existing LOS. The purpose of the IFA is to proportionately allocate the cost of the new facilities and any excess capacity to new development, while ensuring that all methods of financing are considered. While the IFFP and IFA will serve as a companion to this document, information may differ due to the specific requirements related to the calculation of impact fees as defined in Utah Code 11-36a – the Impact Fee Act.
Filling the Gaps

As described previously, there are four gaps in the existing park distribution and service areas. Recommended solutions to fill these gaps are shown in Table 2.3 and Map 3, which illustrates both existing and proposed parks and their associated service areas.

Table 2.3: Recommended Approaches for Filling Gaps in Existing Park Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gap Number</th>
<th>Recommended Solution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Develop the planned 1.8-acres Creek Ridge Park (Park A) as soon as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Develop a 20-acre Community Park (Park B), as shown on Map 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Herriman Hills Open Space should be used to serve the park needs of the local neighborhood, which has access to the area via an existing trailhead at the south end of Spring Canyon Drive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Filling this gap requires more significant and focused actions, due to the large area without easy access to a park. It is therefore recommended that three 10-acre neighborhood parks (Parks C, D and E) be developed east of the Mountain View Corridor, and that a 20-acre community park (Park F) be developed west of the Mountain View Corridor (see Map 3).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, a total of **71.8 acres of parks are needed to fill existing gaps** in service areas.

Meeting Needs During the 10-Year Planning Horizon

As the population in Herriman continues to grow, the majority of residential expansion will be focused in the northwest and southeast areas of the City. Herriman may acquire the planned park land ahead of time to meet future needs in these areas, or parks may be provided by developers as part of future developments. As development conditions are negotiated, the City must ensure that the parks and open spaces proposed in this plan are incorporated according to the general sizes and distribution indicated in Map 3.

Carrying the recommended future LOS of 3.6 forward to meet park need through the 10-year planning period, results in a total of 318.4 acres of public park land required by 2028 to meet needs \( \frac{88,445}{1,000} \times 3.6 = 318.4 \). There a 186.6 acres of existing public park land already
provided. Assuming the City acquires and develops the recommended 71.8 acres of park needed to fill existing gaps, that it develops the 8.2 acres of undeveloped park land (Parks J and K), and that 52.8 acres of parks slated for construction by developers are implemented as proposed (Parks G, H, I and P), no additional park acres will be needed to meet LOS needs by 2028 (318.4 – 186.6 – 71.8 – 8.2 – 52.8 = -1.0).

Meeting Needs Through Build-Out

The projected population at build-out requires a total of 417 acres of public park land by 2060 (115,844 / 1,000 x 3.6 = 417) to meet terminal park needs. Subtracting 186.6 acres of existing developed public park land, 71.8 acres of land needed to fill gaps, 8.2 acres of undeveloped park land the City already owns and 52.8 acres already slated for implementation by developers, 97.6 acres of additional park land is required to meet needs between 2028 and build-out (417 – 186.6 – 71.8 – 8.2 – 52.8 = 97.6). The City could maintain the recommended LOS of 3.6 in 2060 by developing Park Q, however, this must be balanced by assuring that distribution and service area requirements are met. Parks M and N are needed to fill gaps in the northwest corner of the City in the annexation area and should be developed in addition to Park Q. This plan recommends the development of Parks Q, M, and N to address both LOS and distribution by build-out, which would result in an additional 118.9 acres of additional park land for meeting needs.

Proposed Parks

Map 3 shows proposed parks, which total 251.7 acres (Parks A-K, M, N, P, and Q). Parks L and O are proposed stand-alone dog parks, which are special use parks and are not counted toward total park acreage required to meet future LOS needs (dog parks do not fill traditional park functions). Adding the area of existing parks (186.6) and the total planned parks (251.7) results in a total of 438.3 acres of proposed park land to serve the community in 2060. Developing Parks M and N as described above to help meet distribution needs increases the City’s LOS to 3.8 at build-out in 2060 (438.3 / 115,844 x 1,000 = 3.8). In other words, if the parks required to meet both LOS and distribution needs are implemented as recommended, the terminal LOS will be slightly higher than the goal established in this plan.

To ensure that the City achieves the recommended LOS in the future, this plan recommends that all new parks be developed toward the upper end of the recommended acreage ranges established in the park standards. The City should not develop or acquire any new local parks, as they are small, difficult to maintain and operate, and place a significant burden
on maintenance staff and resources. The City should instead focus on providing neighborhood and community parks to the greatest degree possible, as these types provide the most “bang for the buck” and are more efficiently utilize maintenance and operations funds. Furthermore, they serve the surrounding neighborhoods and community with more desirable amenities than local parks.

**PARK STANDARDS**

In order to ensure that Herriman’s parks meet expectations and needs, it is essential to establish development standards for each park type. The standards are not meant to be prescriptive or to suggest that every individual park should look and function exactly the same as other comparable parks. Instead, the standards are applied to help ensure that every park meets the basic needs for the intended purpose. It is assumed that each park will be unique, responding to the specific setting and requirements, and incorporating unique features and design themes, which will be achieved in part by soliciting input from the surrounding neighborhood as each park is designed, upgraded, and constructed.

Determining the standards begins by understanding expectations and needs. The statistically valid survey indicated that residents are generally satisfied with the City's provision of parks, recreation, open spaces, and trails. When asked how they would allocate $100 for parks, recreation programs, facilities, trails, or art programs, spending on existing parks ($10) was the third priority, ranking higher than spending on new parks ($8). Feedback from Social Pinpoint and through public meetings indicate that there are parks that need additional or upgraded amenities. This signifies that there is both a desire to upgrade amenities at some neighborhood and local parks and a need to ensure that future parks meet basic standards and expectations.

Another consideration to keep in mind is that while Herriman is a young community with many children, it is also aging and maturing. This means that parks need to be designed and implemented in a flexible manner in order to meet the needs of the widest range of users and age groups, all of whom have unique demands. In order to help assure this is achieved in a cost-effective manner, the following minimum standards are proposed for meeting existing and future park needs and expectations.

In order to meet these minimum requirements, existing parks should be upgraded to meet the minimum requirements for the designated type, and where acreage would qualify a park for a “higher” park type, amenities should be added to bring the park up to the higher standard. Future parks should be designed from the outset with features and amenities that meet the minimum standards.
Local Parks

Local Parks are less than 2 acres in size, and should include the following amenities:

- Trees
- Picnic table(s), bench(es) and site furnishings
- Grassy play area(s)
- A covered shelter, pavilion or shade structure OR a small playground, sport court or activity area
Neighborhood Park Standards

Neighborhood Parks are 2 to 10 acres in size, and should include the following amenities:

- Trees
- Picnic tables and benches
- A drinking fountain
- Grassy play area(s)
- Playground(s)
- Small/Medium Pavilion(s)
- A Restroom
- Sport court(s) (basketball, volleyball, pickleball and tennis)
- Sports field(s) (baseball, soccer, football and similar sports)
- Connections to other parks, open spaces, recreation amenities and community destinations by multipurpose trails, bike lanes, or routes
- Perimeter walking trail(s) where appropriate
Community Park Standards

Community Parks are between 10 and 20 acres in size and should include all of the amenities and features in Neighborhood Parks plus the following:

- At least one large pavilion.
- At least one specialty recreation feature, such as a sports complex, an aquatics facility, splash pad or arboretum.
- Two or more restrooms, depending on size and needs.
Regional Park Standards

Regional Parks are large, typically greater than 20 acres in size. They are also the most diverse park type, proving a range of amenities and features.

They should include all of the amenities and features in Neighborhood Parks above plus the following:

- At least one large pavilion.
- Two or more regional recreation features, such as a sports complex, an aquatics facility, splash pad or arboretum.
- Two or more restrooms, depending on size and needs
Chapter 2: Parks & Open Space

PARK AMENITIES

Amenities, paired with overall design and setting, contribute to each park’s character and function. As described below, the provision of park amenities have been analyzed using a Level of Service analysis (LOS) and on a park-by-park basis. This dual analysis helps us understand deficiencies and needs systemically and for specific park sites.

Amenity Level of Service

The NRPA provides suggested LOS standards for individual park amenities. These recommendations were used as a starting point and eventually adjusted to reflect the unique needs and expectations in Herriman. Table 2.4 identifies the total quantity of existing amenities in the City, compares the population per amenity to the suggested LOS, and summarizes the total surplus or deficit (shown in red).

This analysis indicates that the Herriman lacks 19 key amenities, including high-cost facilities such as multipurpose fields, a baseball/softball field, a skate/bike park, restrooms, and multiple athletic courts.

Deficiencies by Park Standards

The recommended park standards establish the minimum standard for parks by type for both new and existing parks. Table 2.5 indicates which existing parks in the City lack specific amenities according to those standards. While it is recommended that all existing parks meet these standards, the City should apply some subjective input to ensure that modifications and enhancements are feasible and desirable. It is also recommended that input and review from the neighborhood and community are solicited through planning and design for each park.

Amenity Deficiency Assessment

Both the Level of Service and Park Standard Analyses are helpful for presenting a clear picture of the needs for additional park amenities in the community. Table 2.6 below summarizes the total amenities that are required in order to correct the deficits in both analyses.
### Table 2.4: Amenity Levels of Service and Deficiencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amenity</th>
<th>Quantity of Existing Amenities</th>
<th>2018 Herriman Amenity Level of Service (pop. per Amenity)</th>
<th>Suggested level of Service (based on modified NRPA standards)</th>
<th>Quantity for LOS with 2018 Population</th>
<th>2018 Surplus of Deficit of Amenity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large Pavilions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17,689</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small/Medium Pavilions</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3,050</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrooms</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5,528</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playgrounds</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2,328</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball Courts</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14,741</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis Courts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44,223</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickleball Courts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multipurpose Fields</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12,635</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball/Softball Fields</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11,056</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand Volleyball Courts</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11,056</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skate/Bike Parks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>88,445</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Splash Pads/Water Features</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44,223</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2.5: Amenities Required to Meet Park Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amenity</th>
<th>Parks Lacking Amenities Required by Standards</th>
<th>Total Amenity Deficiency for Park Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Small/Medium Pavilions | Arches Park  
Hamilton Farms Park  
Mineral Way Park  
Rosalina Athletic Field  
Silver Reef Court Park | -5 |
| Restrooms | Emmabella Park  
Hamilton Farms Park  
Mineral Way Park  
Rosaline Athletic Field  
Rosaline Park  
Silver Reef Court Park | -6 |
| Playgrounds | Hamilton Farms Park  
Rosalina Athletic Field | -2 |
| Sports Fields or Courts | Blackridge Park  
J. Lynn Crane Park  
Arches Park  
Emmebella Park  
Hamilton Farms Park  
Mineral Way Park  
Rosecrest Splash Pad Park  
Silver Reef Court Park | -8 |
| Benches or Picnic Tables | Arches Park  
Rose Creek Tennis Court | -2 |

### Table 2.6: Total Amenities Required to Meet LOS Needs and Park Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amenity</th>
<th>2018 Surplus or Deficit of Amenity based on LOS</th>
<th>Total Amenity Deficiency for Park Standards</th>
<th>Total Amenities Required to meet BOTH LOS needs and Park Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large Pavilions</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small/Medium Pavilions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrooms</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playgrounds</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball Courts</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis Courts</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickleball Courts</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multipurpose Fields</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball/Softball Fields</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skate/Bike Parks</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benches or Picnic Tables</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. It is assumed that where specific parks are lacking amenities they will be upgraded with those amenities, bringing them up to standard (if conditions allow).
**OPEN SPACE**

Open space is a critical component in a comprehensive, balanced parks and recreation system. This is particularly true in Herriman, which is surrounded by steep mountains and foothills to the south and west with natural drainages crossing the City. Public input clearly indicates that the access to and proximity of open space is one of the key reasons people moved here. Open Space also provides a host of ecological benefits. It helps purify soil, water, and air; can absorb and deflect noise, wind, and visual disturbances; helps store storm water and absorb carbon; and helps reduce urban heat. These and other benefits help make Herriman a healthier community.

Herriman is fortunate to have 2,242 acres of existing open space, as shown on Map 1. Residents have a strong connection to the foothills and other open space and would like to see the acquisition of more. When asked how they would allocate $100 for parks, recreation programs, facilities, trails or art programs, spending on existing open spaces ranked second at $13, just behind trails at $18.

Map 2 shows an additional 1,791.9 acres of open space proposed for acquisition by the City. This includes the expansion of the Herriman Hills Open Space, and the acquisition and preservation of key natural drainages throughout the community. The expansion of the Herriman Hills Open Space will help with the implementation of the vision expressed in the Herriman Hills Open Space Master Plan 2018, while the preservation of natural drainages will help mitigate storm water storage and transport, in addition to serving as key trail corridor connections for the City’s trail network.

Map 4 illustrates some of the key environmental conditions in the City. These include 100 and 500 year flood zones, debris flow areas, landslides, wetlands, and mule deer habitat. The preservation of the proposed open space will help mitigate some of these potential hazards and preserve habitat for mule deer and other key species.

There is no standard Level of Service (LOS) for providing open space in Herriman City. Open space is typically acquired on a case-by-case basis where opportunities emerge. Given the public’s interest in acquiring additional open space, the City should consider some of the open space acquisition tools listed to the right. Additional funding resources and options are described in Chapter 5: Priorities and Acquisition and Construction Costs.

---

**Open Space Acquisition Tools**

- Open Space Design Standards/Clustered Development
- Zoning and Development Restrictions: Sensitive Lands Overlay as an Example
- Fee Simple Title (Outright Purchase)
- Purchase and Sellback or Leaseback
- Conservation Easements
- Land Banking
- Transfer of Development Rights (TDRs)
In order to meet needs by 2028, Herriman must acquire and develop 71.8 acres of park land as soon as possible to fill gaps, develop the 8.2 acres of park land it already owns, and ensure that 52.8 acres of developer provided parks are constructed.

The City needs to acquire and develop an additional 97.6 acres of park land to meet needs between 2028 and buildout. The planned parks and open spaces shown on Map 3 should be developed to help fill distribution gaps in service areas and to ensure that future development is served by a well-distributed network of parks.

The amenities that are lacking based on the Level of Service and Park Standards Analyses should be implemented as described in the Amenity Deficiency Assessment.

Code updates should include a new policy that detention basins are utilitarian in nature. While it is clear that these are essential facilities for meeting storm water storage needs, they should not be counted as meeting park and open space needs and requirements. Detention basins of this nature should be landscaped to fit in with the overall community structure, so they are positive features of an aesthetically-pleasing community.

As opportunities to acquire open space arise, the City should first verify they connect to other open spaces and parks and are large enough to be considered real community assets. For example, open space should help expand Herriman Hills Open Space, preserve natural drainages and other key natural resources, preserve critical habitat, and provide greater connections to parks and neighborhoods. Special recreational uses such as trails and trailheads should be considered for open spaces on a case-by-case basis, and the Herriman Hills Open Space Master Plan should serve as a resource for locating unique open space recreation features such as shooting ranges, archery ranges and urban camping sites.
While parks, open space, and trails form the foundation of a recreation system, there are several additional layers of facilities and services that contribute to the quality of life in a community. Chief among these are recreation, community arts, and events.
PUBLIC INPUT ON RECREATION, COMMUNITY EVENTS AND ARTS

In order to gauge needs, desires and support, public input was solicited using a broad array of formats. The following is a summary of public involvement, specifically addressing recreation, community events and arts.

Web Page and Associated Email Comments

Some desire was expressed for more venues that support nighttime activities, specifically entertainment venues for movies, the theater and the arts, as well as dining establishments.

Social Pinpoint Input

Participants indicated support for a golf course, an indoor year-round ice rink, a water park, equestrian facilities, and an indoor/outdoor pool to accommodate both recreational and competitive users, including the high school.

Statistically-Valid Survey

Approximately 44-percent of residents had participated in sports or recreation programs in the City during the previous 12 months. The most popular recreation programs are JL Sorenson Soccer, Junior Jazz, and high school/junior high sports and club sports. The top reasons residents do not participate in sports or recreation programs is because they are not interested in the activities offered, program fees are too expensive, or programs are not offered at convenient times. Only 26-percent of residents have a pass to the JL Sorenson Recreation Center.

The most popular City-supported public events are Fort Herriman Towne Days, the Fort Herriman PRCA Rodeo and the Herriman Howl. People indicated they are most interested in attending the following events in the future: Fort Herriman Towne Days, Night of Lights and the Fort Herriman PRCA Rodeo.
Statistically-Valid Survey Continued

Approximately half of those surveyed have heard of the Herriman Arts Council, and only two in five participate in Herriman Arts Council events. The most popular Arts Council Events are the Summer Musical, the Herriman Live concert series, and the Kids program. Three-fourths of residents believe there are an appropriate amount of arts and cultural events in Herriman. About 40-percent of those surveyed strongly or somewhat agree that cultural and arts events would be improved by having a dedicated Community Arts Center.

Public Meetings

Attendees discussed support for and opposition to an outdoor pool. They understand the cost implications are significant. Some participants expressed support for the arts, while others were not interested at all. Representatives of the arts community expressed a strong desire for an indoor performance venue.

Focus Interviews

Attendees mentioned the desire for indoor event space, which they envisioned to include facilities for equestrian training and events. An indoor ice rink, outdoor pool and gold course were also mentioned as desired recreational facilities.

Sports club representatives indicated that they would like more playing fields in the City, particularly larger complexes similar to Salt Lake City’s Recreational Athletic Complex, which is a large sports field complex capable of hosting large tournaments and accommodating numerous recreation and club teams. This group also wanted it to be known that sports help bring revenue to the City, and large facilities can be leveraged as economic development tools. Some indicated that they believed that the City should aim to become a nationally-prominent sports destination. They also indicated a desire to cooperate with each other and indicated that several sports can share fields, including soccer, lacrosse, rugby and football. Access was desired to some of the public parks that are not currently programmed, including Umbria and Rosecrest Park.

Arts Council representatives indicated that their current focus is on performance art, and that they would love to expand their focus to encompass a wider range of arts in the future. They would like to be able to teach the visual arts and to be engaged in the presentation of visual arts in the community. They felt that it would be helpful to have a dedicated arts venue, or as an alternative, multiple smaller venues throughout the City.
RECREATION

Herriman residents meet their recreation needs a variety of ways. They utilize the City’s various parks, open spaces, and trails but also participate in private fitness facilities and engage with other public lands and facilities in the region. The primary recreation facilities and programs they utilize are provided by the JL Sorenson Recreation Center, which is owned and operated by Salt Lake County and located north of City Hall and J. Lynn Crane Park on the north side of Main Street. Additional programs are provided by private sports clubs that utilize City-owned fields and other fields and facilities along the Wasatch Front.

JL Sorenson Recreation Center

The JL Sorenson Recreation Center was built in 2011 and serves the community with an indoor leisure pool with play features, a competition-sized indoor swimming pool with eight lanes, a gym, an indoor track, six racquetball courts, a group fitness studio, a cardio room, a weight room, and a multi-purpose room for birthday parties and rentals. Drop-in daycare is offered as a service to users. The center offers a host of recreation programs, which follow on the next page. The nearest outdoor swimming pool is in Riverton, approximately five miles east of the Sorenson Recreation Center.
Private Sports Clubs

There are several private sports clubs that serve the residents of Herriman. The focus on most of these clubs is youth sports and activities. Some of the most popular include Utah Soccer Alliance, Oquirrh Mountain Girls Softball Association, Herriman Baseball, Herriman Youth Football, Herriman Youth Lacrosse, Herriman Rugby, and Herriman Hockey Club. While most club teams include players from the City, many include players from outside the City as well. All sports leagues are operated independently.
COMMUNITY EVENTS

The City holds several large community events during the year, serving both specific user groups and the community at-large. Community hosted events are listed below.

- Fort Herriman Towne Days
- Fort Herriman PRCA Rodeo
- Herriman Howl
- Night of Lights
- Enduro Challenge
- Memorial Day Breakfast & Ceremony
- Pedal Palooza
- Basket Bash
- Senior Social
Herriman is served by an active Arts Council, which hosts a number of events and activities throughout the year. The mission of the Herriman Arts Council is to:

1. Increase public access, participation and investment in Herriman arts and culture,
2. Incorporate the arts as an essential element in the educational experience of Herriman residents,
3. Strengthen the environment in which artists’ work and contributions are valued and supported, and
4. Encourage and support diverse organizations that produce, present and promote excellence in the arts.

A list of the primary activities offered by the council are listed to the right.

**Art Council Activities**

- Herriman Harmonix Performances
- Valentine’s Cabaret
- Adult Orchestra
- Best Dressed Halloween House
- Best Dressed Holiday House
- Children’s Orchestra
- Children’s Theatre Workshop
- Herriman Live Concert Series
- Miss Herriman Scholarship Pageant
- Night of Lights Gingerbread House Contest
- Summer Musicals
- Visual Arts Shows
RECOMMENDATIONS

The City should continue to partner with Salt Lake County for the provision of recreation programs and activities and the development of joint facilities. It should continue to cooperate with and work closely with club teams to ensure field and facility usage remains efficient, while protecting the integrity of City-owned amenities. The City should also investigate opportunities to partner with other public entities for the provision of recreation facilities including the Jordan School District, neighboring cities, and private organizations and sports clubs.

The City is currently working with a developer on the possibility of providing a public Community Center near the future Salt Lake Community College Campus. This facility is envisioned to serve a wide range of user groups including the arts community, and provide programs for youth, seniors, and others. The City should continue to work with key user groups to ensure future facilities are flexible while still meeting the specific needs of each group. It should also evaluate the feasibility of providing a dedicated indoor arts venue that can accommodate performances, exhibits, and classes if the pending Community Center is not able to fulfill program needs.

As population grows and demand increases, the City should conduct a feasibility study to examine the opportunities and implications associated with constructing and operating an outdoor swimming pool, with both leisure and lap swim components.
Trails play a vital role in the community. They are essential recreational amenity while also providing connections between home, work, play and important destinations like transit and services. Trails are a primary method for the public to access and enjoy local parks and open space. They are intrinsically democratic facilities, serving a wide range of uses (walking, running, cycling, and equestrian riding) and user groups (individuals, families, weekend warriors, youth, seniors, commuters and casual recreationalists). They are also part of the “Safe Routes to Schools” network, providing options for the City’s youth to get from home to school.
PUBLIC INPUT ON TRAILS

The planning process included significant public involvement to understand community values, needs, desires and priorities (see Chapter 1 and the Appendix for details). A summary of the public input specifically addressing trails follows.

Web Page & Email Comments

There is a desire to see more trails added. It was suggested that mountain bike trails need significant improvement and should be tied to other facilities such as bike parks to help people develop their cycling skills.

Social Pinpoint

The City trail system needs better signage, mileage markers, dog waste stations, equestrian trails, a pump track, a bike park, directional trails, trails separated by user group, off-leash dog trails and more primitive trails. Some trails need to be realigned to preserve homeowner privacy. There was both support and opposition indicated for providing more trailheads with parking and for Off Highway Vehicle (OHV) motorized trails within the City limits. Some are concerned about noise, fire risk and safety of other users if trails are motorized.
Statistically-Valid Survey

Nearly half of the respondents use trails once a month or more, and an additional 26-percent use trails a few times a year. The primitive trails in the Herriman Hills Open Space (HHOS) are the most used, and most residents use trails for walking/jogging followed by recreational biking. The most desired trail improvements include making trails fully connected, linking neighborhoods with the trail system, increasing total trail miles, and providing more pet waste disposal stations.

The primary reasons residents do not use trails are a lack of information about City trails and not enough OHV accessible trails. Approximately 89-percent of the respondents believe it is important to have trails within walking distance of home. They also indicated that natural surface hiking, biking, or equestrian trails are the most needed trail type, followed by asphalt trails and with natural surface motorized trails or other trails types the lowest priority. When asked to prioritize spending for additional parks, recreational programs, trails, or arts programs, trails topped the list.

Residents are split on whether they believe dogs and/or their owners cause conflicts with other users in Herriman park and open spaces. They are also conflicted regarding how to best resolve these conflicts, with equal numbers preferring more off-leash dog areas or parks and increased enforcement for not following regulations.

Public Meetings

Three of the five highest-scoring images in the visual preference survey that were conducted during the various public meetings contained images of trails.

Meeting participants indicated that the City’s trails are disconnected, are only focused in specific areas, and have not kept up with growth. There was concern expressed for the lack of wayfinding signs and trail maps and the frequency of “goat-head” thorns, which are both a City maintenance issue and a hazard for cyclists in particular. It was expressed that the City is not walkable, even to parks within short distances. Busy roads are barriers to pedestrians and are unsafe to cross. Hiking and biking trails should be prioritized, and the City should develop a variety of trails that cater to people of different abilities, ages and interests.
Public Meetings Continued

It was further expressed that trailheads need bathrooms, and that portable toilets should be used to meet summer event and peak demand. Some pointed out that trails in Herriman are not as well maintained as those in neighboring communities and indicated support for the provision of additional amenities including bike repair stations. There was some support for motorized trails and a desire for a destination trail experience, similar to the Cascade Springs trails near Heber City. Utah State Parks may have some funding available.

Some participants indicated that they do not want to have motorized trails around neighborhoods due to concerns with noise, safety, and fire danger. It was felt that developers need to be held to higher accountability and provide higher quality trails. No paved trails or roads should be allowed in the foothills - that they should remain undeveloped.

Focus Interviews

Discussions with trail advocates indicated that the City needs more interconnected trails, and they need to connect the neighborhoods to the foothills using trails. They envision a trail system that accommodates nearly all users, ability levels, and ages, and there was disagreement on whether or not to have motorized trails. It was noted that paved trails are an important component of ADA accessibility, and that the City needs on-street bike lanes and a road bike loop incorporating 11800 South and Bacchus Highway. It was suggested that user groups should be separated where possible. Even though user groups tend to get along, it was felt by some that there is enough space available to make single-use trails a feasible option.

If motorized trails are to be continued as a permitted use in the City, they needed to be located away from residences. Similar support was expressed for keeping motorized vehicle trailheads well away from homes and residential neighborhoods. It was suggested that the City look at Tooele and Utah County for examples on good motorized trail systems. There is some concern that if Herriman remains the only motorized area in Salt Lake County, it could become overused quickly.

It was noted that backcountry trails are heavily used by high school sports for mountain biking, lacrosse, football and cross country training. Many students have volunteered to help install and maintain trails, saving the City money. Completion of the Bonneville Shoreline Trail is important but has some challenges in adjacent communities, particularly where it extends into Camp Williams, which is not open to public use.
## EXISTING TRAILS AND BIKE LANES/Routes

As shown in Table 4.1 and on Map 4, Herriman City has approximately 48.6 miles of existing trails and 89.8 miles of proposed trails. These have been classified as multi-use trails, urban soft surface trails, regional trails, backcountry trails. There are also 2.5 miles of existing bike lanes/routes with 47.7 miles proposed.

### Table 4.1: Existing & Planned Trail & On-Street Bicycle Facility Mileage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Trails</th>
<th>Miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Use Trails</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Soft Surface Trails</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Backcountry Trails (Bonneville Shoreline Trail)</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backcountry Trails</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Striped Bike Lanes</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signed Bike routes</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned Trails</th>
<th>Miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Use Trails</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Soft Surface Trails</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Backcountry Trails (Bonneville Shoreline Trail)</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backcountry Trails</td>
<td>52.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Only Backcountry Trails</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorized Firebreak Trails</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Striped Bike Lanes</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signed Bike routes</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Multi-Use Trails

There are approximately 26.2 miles of paved multi-use trails in the City, many of which have been installed as part of residential developments that connect parks to the surrounding neighborhoods. Others extend through the corridors and natural drainages that are part of the City’s open space system or along transportation corridors such as the Mountain View Corridor Trail, which provides regional connections.

Urban Soft Surface Trails

Urban soft surface trails provide the same essential connections between neighborhoods, parks, and open spaces, but offer a different user experience as they have unpaved natural surfaces, which supports hiking, mountain biking and equestrian uses. The City currently has 7.5 miles of urban soft surface trails, most of which are focused in the central Rose Creek neighborhood north of Butterfield Park.

Regional Backcountry Trails

The western alignment of the Bonneville Shoreline Trail (BST) passes through Herriman along the base of the Herriman Hills Open Space foothills. With approximately 3.6 miles currently developed as a soft surface backcountry route, the BST is a soft surface regional trail with planned alignments through much of northern Utah as it traces the shoreline of ancient Lake Bonneville.

Backcountry Trails

Herriman has 11.3 miles of backcountry trails. These are soft surface primitive trails that are focused in the foothills at the south end of the City, primarily in the Herriman Hills Open Space but also feeding through the Juniper Canyon Recreation Area between Juniper Crest Road and the Mountain View Corridor.

Bike Lanes and Signed Bike Routes

The City currently has few designated bike lanes and bike routes, with 1.5 miles of bike lanes and 1 mile of bike routes. The short segment of existing bike lanes connects Mirabella Drive to Juniper Crest Road along Emmeline Drive, and the single signed bike route connects 12600 South to Rosecrest Road along Herriman Main Street, passing between City Hall and the JL
Sorenson Recreation Center and Salt Lake County Library complex. It is interesting to note that such facilities are lacking, as it was indicated through the public involvement process that road biking is a popular sport for local residents and that Herriman is a destination for regional road cyclists.

**TRAILHEADS**
Trail users are served by five existing trailheads, all of which are located in existing parks (see on Map 4). Copper Creek Park serves as a trailhead with parking in the northeast corner of the City, Butterfield Park and the Ranches Park provide access with parking to the trails in the center of the City in the Rose Creek neighborhood, and Blackridge Park provides access to trails at the south end of the City.

**TRAIL CROSSINGS**
There are six existing pedestrian underpasses in the City that provide safe passage for trail users, although none of the trail connections to these crossings are complete. Four underpasses are located along the Midas Creek Trail at the north end of the City, providing fully-separated access under the Mountain View Corridor, Herriman Main Street, Anthem Park Boulevard, and Mustang Trail Way. Two more underpasses are found at the south end of the City at either end of the Juniper Canyon Recreation Area, providing fully-separated extensions of the trails beneath Mountain View Corridor and Juniper Crest Road.
TRAIL NEEDS ANALYSIS

As already indicated, there is strong public support for additional trails of all types in Herriman. The provision of additional trails and related amenities were requested in all avenues of public involvement during this planning process. While the City has a good start on its trail system with more than 40 miles of trails already in place, there are many areas of the City that lack trails completely and others where trails are incomplete or disconnected.

Map 6 illustrates the distribution and service areas of trails by assigning them a service radius of 1/4 mile to illustrate how they serve existing and planned residential areas in the City. Bike lanes/routes are excluded from this map since they primarily serve bicycle commuters or more aggressive recreational bicyclists that are comfortable sharing the road with automobiles. As shown, many of the gaps are located in areas of the City that are already developed, making the addition of trails a challenging proposition.

DESIGN STANDARDS

Previous planning efforts have established standards for trail facilities in the Herriman City. Those recommendations have been incorporated into this plan, revised, and expanded in order to meet the broader needs of a comprehensive City-wide trail network.
## Trail Standards

The *Herriman Hills Open Space Master Plan 2018* and *Herriman City Bicycle Master Plan 2011* established trail and on-street bike facility standards for most trail types within the community. Those standards, with some supplemental information, is summarized below. These standards are illustrated by trail cross sections on the following page.

### Table 4.2: Herriman Trail Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trail Type</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Typical Materials</th>
<th>Maximum Grade</th>
<th>User Groups / Allowed Uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Use Trails</td>
<td>10-14’</td>
<td>Asphalt, concrete or other hard surface material</td>
<td>8% Steeper grades (up to 20%) may be allowed where needed in unique situations, beyond which switchbacks will be required.</td>
<td>Pedestrians, recreational and commuter bicyclists, equestrians and other non-motorized users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Soft Surface Trails</td>
<td>10-12’</td>
<td>Compacted road base or stone fines</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>Pedestrians, recreational bicyclists, equestrians and other non-motorized uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved Pedestrian Trails (Sidewalks)</td>
<td>6-8’</td>
<td>Concrete, pavers, brick or other hard surface material</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>Pedestrians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backcountry Trails (Includes Regional Backcountry Trails)</td>
<td>2-4’</td>
<td>Natural Surface</td>
<td>10-20% 17-20% slopes are desirable for short distances only, refer to IMBA standards</td>
<td>Pedestrians, recreational bicyclists, equestrians and other non-motorized uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Only Backcountry Trails</td>
<td>2-4’</td>
<td>Natural Surface</td>
<td>10-20% 17-20% slopes are desirable for short distances only, refer to IMBA standards</td>
<td>Recreational bicyclists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorized Firebreak Trail</td>
<td>4-6’</td>
<td>Natural surface with some imported materials for tread stabilization</td>
<td>3-35% Steepest pitch maximums between 10-40% of total trail length depending on class, refer to USFS standards</td>
<td>Off-Highway Vehicles (ATVs, UTVs and single-track motorized vehicles)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Striped Bike Lane</td>
<td>4-5’ (class II)</td>
<td>Roadway</td>
<td>As per roadway design standards</td>
<td>Bicyclists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signed Bike Route</td>
<td>Shared vehicle travel lanes</td>
<td>Roadway</td>
<td>As per roadway design standards</td>
<td>Bicyclists</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Multi-Use Trail

Urban Soft Surface Trail

Improved Pedestrian Trail

Backcountry Trail

- 10’-14’ Minimum Paved Trail
- 2’-4’ Natural Surface Trail
- 6’-8’ Paved Trail/Sidewalk
- 2’-4’ Natural Surface Trail
Trailhead Standards

The *Herriman Hills Open Space Master Plan 2018* established trailhead standards for the City, which have been summarized below.

**Table 4.3: Herriman Trailhead Standards**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trailhead Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class 1: Large Trailhead</strong></td>
<td>• Major developed paved parking hub for community and regional trails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 25 parking stalls minimum (paved)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Restrooms, information kiosk with trail map and other amenities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class 2: Medium Trailhead</strong></td>
<td>• Trail parking area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 6-24 parking stalls (paved or unpaved)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• May include restrooms, information kiosk with trail map and other amenities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class 3: Small Trailhead</strong></td>
<td>• Small, undeveloped, legal parking areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 10 or less off-street parking stalls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No trail amenities aside from a trail kiosk with a trail map and information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROPOSED TRAILS AND TRAILHEADS**

**Proposed Trails**

The City has experienced rapid growth since the development of both the *Bicycle Master Plan 2011*, the *Transportation Master Plan 2009*, and the previous *Parks, Recreation, Open Space and Trails Master Plan 2015*. Map 4 reflects updates to trail facilities in the community since these planning documents were developed and illustrates the proposed public network of trails and on-street bike facilities to help meet needs in future. It should be noted that more backcountry trails and trails in private developments are likely to be developed in the future beyond what is shown on Map 4.
As shown in Table 4.1, this plan proposes **17.0 miles of multi-use trails**, **2.1 miles of urban soft surface trails** and **62.2 miles of backcountry trails**, including the Bonneville Shoreline Trail and bike only trails. As shown on Map 4, these routes fill key trail gaps and provide critical connections to key destinations in the community, including commercial areas which are shown in red. The trail system takes advantage of natural drainages to provide pleasant off-street trail alignments through existing and planned open space areas.

Multi-use trails serve the broadest range of user groups, including people that need accessible routes. The City should partner with community stakeholders to plan and develop a selection of ADA accessible routes and upgrade existing routes where possible to meet the needs of the community at large.

The completion of the Bonneville Shoreline Trail through Herriman should be one of the top backcountry trail development priorities, which will facilitate regional access and linkages to amenities and destinations. Backcountry trails serve a large number of user groups that need and prefer natural surface trails. This subset of trail users includes hikers, mountain bikers, and equestrian riders. While all types backcountry trail users can share the backcountry trail system, the City should explore the possibility of providing select user-specific trails, perhaps adding more bike-only trails or new trails exclusively for hikers or horse riders. It is also recommended that the City develop a small portion of backcountry trails that are suitable for new and/or young trail users, providing a place for people to develop their skills in a location less likely to appeal to more skilled and aggressive user groups.

There are **8.7 miles of proposed motorized firebreak trails** shown on the map. It is the intent of the City to partner with Camp Williams to provide a motorized trail that parallels the perimeter boundary of the military facility, providing a recreation opportunity for off-highway vehicle (OHV) users while simultaneously serving as a firebreak to protect the City in the case of wildfire events. It is likely that most other user groups will avoid using the motorized trail while OHVs are present, and the City should explore the concept of adding a backcountry trail that generally parallels the motorized trail. This parallel trail should have periodic connections to the motorized trail which would allow non-motorized users to drop off of the motorized trail if OHVs are approaching.

In addition to the off-street trails above, there are approximately **32.5 miles of proposed striped bike lanes** and **15.2 miles of proposed signed bike routes**, as shown in Table 4.1 and on Map 4. These facilities are primarily located on major and minor collectors and arterials.
and primarily serve commuter bicyclists and a limited portion of recreational bicyclists that feel comfortable riding next to automobiles. One of the top priorities for on-street bicycle facilities is to develop long, looped routes for cyclists, capitalizing on roadway projects to create the safest routes possible.

As the trail system is expanded or modified, care should be taken to address residents’ concerns regarding privacy, noise, and safety where possible. Signage and wayfinding is an important feature of the trail system, not only to inform trail users of the proper use and regulations but to increase awareness and stewardship of the City’s trail and open space system.

**Proposed Trailheads**

There are ten proposed trailheads, as indicated on Map 4. Half of the trailheads fall within the Herriman Hills Open Space (HHOS) and are therefore addressed in the *Herriman Hills Open Space Master Plan 2018*. The plan describes the proposed trailheads in detail and establishes trailhead standards and therefore should be the guiding document for facilities within the Herriman Hills Open Space.

The proposed trailheads from the *Open Space Plan* and additional proposed trailheads follow.
### Table 4.4: Proposed Trailheads and Amenities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Trailhead</th>
<th>Proposed Class</th>
<th>Proposed Parking</th>
<th>Proposed Amenities</th>
<th>Other Potential Amenities or Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Wide Hollow Trailhead¹   | Class 1 or Class 2 | Not to exceed 60 Stalls | • Restrooms w/ drinking fountain/bottle filler  
• Picnic tables  
• Small picnic pavilion  
• Dog waste station  
• Trail map/rules kiosk  
• Trail access for hiking and mountain biking | • Potential for loop trails  
• Off-leash fenced dog park  
• Small challenge staircase (150-300 stairs) |
| Friendship Trailhead¹    | Class 2 or Class 3 | 6-10 stalls     | • Restrooms w/ drinking fountain/bottle filler  
• Picnic tables  
• Trail map/rules kiosk  
• Dog waste station  
• Trail access for hiking and mountain biking | • Fit trail from Butterfield Parkway to trailhead   |
| Juniper Crest Trailhead¹ | Class 1         | 130-150 Stalls  | • Restrooms w/ drinking fountain/bottle filler  
• Picnic tables  
• Small/medium picnic pavilion  
• Dog waste station  
• Race start area  
• Pump track  
• Gravity flow trail  
• Small amphitheater  
• Trail map/rules kiosk  
• Trail access for hiking and mountain biking | • Off-leash dog park  
• Playground  
• Reception/Event Center  
• Outdoor Gym |
| The Cove Area¹           | Class 2         | 6-25 Stalls     | • Restrooms w/ drinking fountain/bottle filler  
• Trail map/rules kiosk  
• Dog waste station | • Equestrian Trailhead |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Trailhead</th>
<th>Proposed Class</th>
<th>Proposed Parking</th>
<th>Proposed Amenities</th>
<th>Other Potential Amenities or Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tickville Gulch Area&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Class 1</td>
<td>50-200 stalls, plus space for food trucks</td>
<td>• Restrooms w/ drinking fountain/bottle filler&lt;br&gt;• Picnic pavilion&lt;br&gt;• Interpretive/educational trail loops&lt;br&gt;• Amphitheater&lt;br&gt;• Mountain bike recreation area (pump track, downhill biking, skills course, etc.)&lt;br&gt;• NICA course&lt;br&gt;• Challenge staircase (2 or 3 sets of 200 stairs, serpentine with a trail loop)&lt;br&gt;• Winter slope activities such as tubing&lt;br&gt;• Rope/obstacle course with zip lines</td>
<td>• Snowflex (artificial surface) year-round tubing hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluffs at Herriman Springs Area&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Class 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Motorized and equestrian trailhead</td>
<td>• Archery/paintball site&lt;br&gt;• Shooting range&lt;br&gt;• Overnight camping (no fires)&lt;br&gt;• Yurt village retreat area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porter Rockwell Trailhead&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Class 1</td>
<td>&gt;25 stalls</td>
<td>• Restrooms&lt;br&gt;• Other amenities are not known at this time</td>
<td>• UDOT will be developing this trailhead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Center Trailhead</td>
<td>Class 1</td>
<td>Shared parking with the Community Center</td>
<td>• Trail map/rules kiosk&lt;br&gt;• Dog waste station</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthem Trailhead</td>
<td>Class 2</td>
<td>6-25 stalls</td>
<td>• Restrooms w/ drinking fountain/bottle filler&lt;br&gt;• Trail map/rules kiosk&lt;br&gt;• Dog waste station</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midas Mountain Trailhead</td>
<td>Class 2</td>
<td>6-25 stalls</td>
<td>• Restrooms w/ drinking fountain/bottle filler&lt;br&gt;• Trail map/rules kiosk&lt;br&gt;• Dog waste station</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Addressed in the *Herriman Hills Open Space Master Plan 2018*
2. To be developed by the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT)
PLANNED TRAIL CROSSINGS

Herriman has a significant number of existing trail underpasses, as shown on Map 4. These grade-separated crossings provide safe passage under existing roadways, ensuring that trail users have as little disruption in their routes as possible. Three types of proposed crossings are indicated on the map, including underpasses, pedestrian bridges, and enhanced crossings. While underpasses and pedestrian bridges provide grade-separated crossings, enhanced crossings may include a variety of solutions at-grade, depending on the unique needs and conditions of each location.

As the City’s Transportation Master Plan is updated, special attention should be placed on bicycle and pedestrian safety and crossings. Specific guidance should be developed for trail and on-street bicycle facility crossings, including the creation of a decision matrix illustrating the appropriate uses for different crossing types according to roadway classifications. Generally speaking, local streets, which have much lower speeds and are typically only two lanes, should use crosswalks for the main crossing treatment. Collector streets have more lanes, more traffic, and faster speeds, which requires additional crossing tools to facilitate safe crossings. Examples of enhanced facilities include the installation of warning lights or crossing signals and Hawk Beacons. Arterial streets have high traffic levels and fast-moving vehicles, which requires the most restrictive crossing tools and facilities. Key examples include traffic signals and grade-separated crossings.

[Images and links to external resources related to crossing types and examples.]

https://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/ped_bike/tools_solve/fhwasa14014/
https://perkinswill.com/work/griffiths-pedestrian-bridge.html
RECOMMENDATIONS

The City should update the design standards for trails as indicated in this plan. These should be reviewed frequently to ensure they meet future needs and demands as the City and the preferences of its residents continue to evolve.

The proposed trail network should be fully implemented by build-out, which is projected to take place by 2060. It is assumed that the on-street bicycle facilities will be constructed as part of implementation and upgrading projects for the roadways they are located. In contrast, trails will be developed as part of opportunistic and strategically-programmed initiatives. The City should explore the possibility of implementing trails that serve specific user groups, including ADA compliant, beginner, and use-specific routes. Future trail development should take into account privacy, noise, and safety for the adjacent residential areas.

This plan supports the trailhead standards developed in the *Herriman Hills Open Space Master Plan 2018* and proposes additional trailheads that will provide more equitable access to trails as the system is expanded. The City should continue to pursue development of the recommended trailhead amenities and explore the inclusion of the additional potential amenities described in the *Herriman Hills Open Space Master Plan* and in this plan.

Herriman should continue to partner with the Utah Department of Transportation on the development of trailheads and trail crossings along major state routes. The City should actively pursue the acquisition and implementation of proposed crossings facilities and continue to evaluate safety needs and requirements as roadways and trail systems are developed in the future.

The City should provide a comprehensive signage and wayfinding system and should publish and distribute information about the trail system to promote safety, safe navigation, and stewardship. Proper trail maintenance is required to ensure the trail system functions as intended.
As described in the preceding chapters, numerous improvements and actions are required to ensure existing and future needs related to parks, recreation, open space, and trails in Herriman City are met. The following is a summary of the specific projects, probable costs and implementation tasks.
SURVEY RESULTS: SPENDING PRIORITIES AND WILLINGNESS TO FUND

The statistically-valid survey conducted by Y2 Analytics featured several questions specifically related to funding priorities and residents’ willingness to fund maintenance and improvements. When asked how they would allocate $100 for additional parks, recreation programs, facilities, trails or arts programs, residents top priorities included trails, open spaces, existing parks, and new parks. Additionally, residents are slightly more willing to pay a monthly usage fee for acquisition and maintenance of new parks, facilities or trails than to pay for maintenance and upgrades to existing parks, facilities or trails.
PARK AND OPEN SPACE PRIORITIES

A  Meeting Existing Park Needs

There are four gaps in the park service and distribution areas for existing parks in Herriman. The gap in the southwest corner of the City at the south end of Spring Canyon Drive abuts the Herriman Hills Open Space, and the gap will be filled by the provision of a new trailhead at that location. A total of 71.8 acres of parks are needed to fill the remaining three existing gaps in service areas, as summarized in the table below and shown on Map 3.

Table 5.1: Parks Needed to Fill Existing Gaps in Distribution and Service Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creek Ridge Park (Park A)</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Park (Park B)</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Park (Park C)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Park (Park D)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Park (Park E)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Park (Park F)</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Acres Needed</strong></td>
<td><strong>71.8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B  Meeting Park Needs by 2028

Carrying the recommended future LOS of 3.6 forward to meet park need through the 10-year planning period results in a total of 318.4 acres of public park land required by 2028 (88,445/1,000 x 3.6 = 318.4). No acres of additional park land are required to meet needs by 2028, beyond the 186.6 acres of existing parks, the 71.8 acres described above to fill existing gaps, 8.2 acres of City-owned undeveloped land and 52.8 acres of parks slated to be developed by developers, and (318.4 – 186.6– 71.8 – 8.2 – 52.8  =-1.0).

C  Meeting Park Needs at Build-Out

By build-out in 2060 with a projected population of 115,844, Herriman City will need a total of 417 acres to meeting park needs (115,844/1,000 x 3.6 = 417). Subtracting the existing park acres, the undeveloped land owned by the City, the parks slated to be built by developers and the acres needed to fill existing gaps results in 97.6 acres of new park land required to meet needs between 2028 and build-out (417 – 186.6 – 71.8 – 8.2 – 52.8  = 97.6).
D Adopting Minimum Standards and Upgrading Existing Parks

The amenities listed in Table 5.2 are required both to meet Level of Service needs based on population and to bring existing parks up to proposed standards. As indicated in the table, the total cost these amenities is $2,539,000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amenity</th>
<th>Total Amenities Required to meet both LOS needs and Park Standards</th>
<th>Probable Costs</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large Pavilion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small/Medium Pavilion</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrooms</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Playground</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball Courts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis Courts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickleball Courts</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multipurpose Fields</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball/Softball Fields (skinned/outfitted)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skate/Bike Parks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benches or Picnic Tables</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To ensure existing and future parks meet community needs, the minimum park standards presented in Chapter 2 should be adopted as official City policy. New parks should include amenities and features to meet the minimum park standards, and surrounding neighbors and other community stakeholders should be consulted during design to ensure new parks meet the needs of the neighborhood and community. The implementation should have a level of flexibility to encourage creative design solutions that capitalize on the unique opportunities and setting of each park location.

Additional improvements or studies include the development of a Recreation Accessibility Plan, a comprehensive Wayfinding and Signage Plan and an Open Space Facility Standards Manual.
Residents indicated support for the acquisition of additional open space by the City. Herriman City should continue to secure additional open space as opportunities arise, expanding the existing network to help connect parks, trails and open spaces, and preserving the unique natural drainages and foothills that form the framework of the open space system.

**RECREATION AND COMMUNITY EVENTS AND ARTS PRIORITIES**

The City should continue its partnership with Salt Lake County to provide recreation programs, and should explore partnerships and cooperative agreements with the Jordan School District, neighboring cities, and private organizations and sports clubs to provide additional recreation facilities as needs arise in the future.

Feasibility studies recommended for the future as needs dictate include both the evaluation of constructing and operating an outdoor pool with leisure and lap features and the provision of a dedicated indoor arts venue.

**TRAILS PRIORITIES**

Priorities for trails in Herriman City include the development of approximately 45.8 miles of trails (multi-use, urban soft surface, backcountry and motorized) and 47.7 miles of on-street bike facilities (striped bike lanes and signed bike routes). The top priorities are the completion of the Bonneville Shoreline Trail alignment within the City, and the construction of multi-use trails along natural drainages, which will follow on the heels of the acquisition of those corridors as part of the City open space system.

The development of the ten proposed trailheads with recommended amenities and possibly additional potential amenities will be important to provide access to and complement the envisioned trail network, while the provision of eight planned crossings will help ensure safe use.

A comprehensive signage and wayfinding system will tie the system together and provide users with important information on use, directions to key destinations and offer an opportunity for branding and promoting a unique identity for the City’s trail system.
DEVELOPMENT COSTS AND FUNDING PRIORITIES

Park and Open Space Costs

Table 5.3 summarizes the costs to upgrade existing parks and meet amenity levels of service, and the costs to acquire and develop parks through 2028 and build-out in 2060 as described above. Estimated acquisition costs are $250,000 per acre based on information research by a local realtor. Per acre development costs are estimated at $250,000 per acre for parks. A total of $101,489,000 is required to meet park standards, fill existing gaps, meet needs by build-out and develop two stand-alone special use dog parks. Some of the proposed parks may be developer provided, which would reduce the total probable costs.

Table 5.3: Probable Costs for Parks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Probable Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meeting Standards</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost to Upgrade Existing Parks &amp; Meet Amenity LOS</td>
<td>$2,539,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Amenities</strong></td>
<td>$2,539,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Filling Existing Gaps</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost to Acquire and Develop Creek Ridge Park, Park A (1.8 acres, assume developer provided)</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost to Acquire and Develop Land for 2 Community Parks and 3 Neighborhood Parks, Parks B-F (70 acres x $500,000)</td>
<td>$35,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Current Need</strong></td>
<td>$35,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meeting Needs by 2028</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost to Acquire and Develop Parks G, H, I and P (52.8 acres, assume developer provided)</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost to Develop Parks J and K Already Owned by City (8.2 acres x $250,000)</td>
<td>$2,050,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal 2028 Need</strong></td>
<td>$2,050,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meeting Needs by Build-Out</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost to Acquire and Develop Park Land to Meet Needs by Build-out, Park Q, M and N (118.9 x $500,000)</td>
<td>$59,450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Build-out Need</strong></td>
<td>$59,450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Stand Alone Special Use Dog Parks</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost to Develop Parks L and O (9.8 x $250,000)</td>
<td>$2,450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Build-out Need</strong></td>
<td>$2,450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>$101,489,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recreation, Community Events and Arts Priorities

Survey respondents indicated that the City should consider the development of an indoor/outdoor pool, and the arts community expressed a desire for a dedicated indoor art facility. Due to the high level of uncertainty regarding these improvements, the establishment of a reliable opinion of probable cost is not included in this plan. Since the timeframe and scope of conducting feasibility studies are also not known at this time, estimated costs for those planning services are also not included in this plan.

Trail Priorities

Table 5.4 summarizes the costs required to develop the complete trail network and associated improvements as shown on Map 4. It is assumed that on-street bicycle facilities will be constructed with roadway development projects, therefore costs are not included here. It is also assumed that grade separated crossings for major roadways will be completed as part of roadway improvements with the Utah Department of Transportation, therefore costs are not included here. The average cost for trailheads include only the basic amenities described in the trailhead standards.

The total cost for trail system improvements is $10,904,000, which may be reduced if the City is able to partner with local volunteers for trail development, as it has done in the past.

Table 5.4: Probable Costs for Trails

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Miles or Quantity</th>
<th>Unit Cost Each or Per Mile</th>
<th>Probable Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Bike Lanes and Bike Routes*</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Multi-use Trails (cost per mile)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$4,250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Soft Surface Urban Trails (cost per mile)</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$315,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Regional Backcountry Trails (Bonneville Shoreline Trail)</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$118,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Backcountry and Bike-Only Backcountry Trails</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$814,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Motorized Firebreak Trails</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$261,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Enhanced Crossings</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Pedestrian Bridge (over canal)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Pedestrian Underpasses**</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting and Safety Improvements (cost per mile)</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$3,820,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Trailheads (excludes UDOT trailhead) ***</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>$1,080,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$10,904,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Costs for the proposed bike lanes are addressed in the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan 2016.
**It is assumed that grade separated crossings will be completed as part of road improvements.
***Costs include only basic amenities described in trailhead standards.
TOTAL PROBABLE COSTS

The total probable costs for developing the proposed park and trail system improvements through build-out in 2060 is $112,693,000 as shown in Table 5.5. This cost includes the development of the master plan and the installation of a City-wide Wayfinding and Signage Master Plan, an Accessibility Plan and an Open Space Facility Standards Manual for the parks, recreation, open space and trails system.

Table 5.5: Total Probable Costs for Park & Trail System Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Probable Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Probable Costs to Upgrade Existing Parks, Acquire New Park Land, and Develop Future Parks Through Buildout</td>
<td>$101,489,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probable Costs to Develop Trails, Trailheads and Other Improvements</td>
<td>$10,904,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayfinding &amp; Signage Master Plan (for entire parks, recreation, open space and trails system)</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayfinding &amp; Signage Installation (for entire parks, recreation, open space and trails system)</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility Plan</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space Facility Standards Manual</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$112,693,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE COSTS

Herriman City maintains its parks, open spaces and trails at a high standard, and few comments citing maintenance issues were received during the public involvement process. However it can be helpful to establish an annual budget amount to address the ongoing needs for replacing/upgrading playgrounds, parking lots and other park amenities over time. For rough planning purposes, taking the total probable costs for park and trails improvements through the year 2060, multiplying that by 5-percent and dividing that by years until 2060 yields an annual budget amount of $137,430 (112,693,000 x .05 / 41 = 124,443). This budget should be used to address deferred maintenance issues, to complete special park and trail enhancement projects and ensure that existing and future park and trail amenities do not fall behind on maintenance.
ESTABLISHING FUNDING PRIORITIES

Establishing funding priorities for parks, recreation, open space and trails is a challenge for communities with limited resources and diverse needs. To the right are some key considerations when prioritizing specific projects properly prioritized.

It should be noted that budgets should be established for the acquisition of land as soon as possible to help avoid escalating acquisition costs over time.

Table 5.6 is an Action Plan which summarizes short, medium and long-term implementation actions and priorities. Section 1 of the table addresses recommended capital facility improvements and operations and maintenance, while Section 2 addresses the policy actions that are described in Chapter 6: Goals and Policies. In order to meet future needs, it is critical that the suggested improvements be made according to the corresponding 2028 and 2060 schedules.

Project Prioritization Considerations

- Do they help fill a critical need or service gap?
- Do they address life and safety concerns?
- Do they support on-going maintenance of existing facilities (thereby protecting existing resources and investments)?
- Do they meet future needs in clear and logical phases?
### Table 5.6: Action Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Immediate Implementation</th>
<th>Short-Term Implementation 0 to 10 years 2018 - 2028</th>
<th>Medium-Term Implementation 10 - 20 years 2018 - 2039</th>
<th>Medium to Long-Term Implementation 20 years+ (through build-out) 2036 - 2060+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Utilize 3.6 acres per 1,000 population as the future level of service through build-out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Upgrade existing parks to meet standards and amenity levels of service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ensure development of 1.8 acres at Creek Ridge Park to help fill existing gaps (assume developer provided)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Acquire 70 acres to fill existing gaps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Develop 70 acres to fill existing gaps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ensure construction of 52.8 acres of parks slated to be provided by developers to meet needs by 2028</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Acquire 118.9 acres to meet needs by build-out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Develop 118.9 acres to meet need by build-out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Acquire 20 acres of neighborhood parks to fill future gaps in annexation area by 2050</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Develop 20 acres of neighborhood parks to fill future gaps in annexation area by 2060</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Install City-wide wayfinding and signage system which applies to trails &amp; open space as well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Acquire the proposed open spaces shown in this plan, including the expansion of the Herriman Hills Open Space and natural drainages.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Continue to implement and regularly update the vision established in the Herriman Hills Open Space Master Plan 2018.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Develop 47.7 miles of proposed bike lanes and bike routes (assume with road projects)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Develop 17 miles of proposed multi-use trails</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Develop 2.5 miles of proposed urban soft surface trails</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Develop 7.9 miles of Regional Backcountry Trails (Bonneville Shoreline Trail)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Develop 54.3 miles of backcountry and bike-only backcountry trails</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Develop 8.7 miles of motorized firebreak trails</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Develop 4 enhanced crossings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Develop 1 pedestrian bridge (in cooperation with canal company)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Develop 3 pedestrian underpasses (assume UDOT fund/install)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Implement lighting and safety improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Develop 9 proposed trailheads and cooperate with UDOT on 1 at Porter Rockwell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Establish annual budget for deferred maintenance and upgrades to parks, open space and trails.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>As the community grows ensure that the recommended LOS is maintained.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Develop City-wide Wayfinding and Signage Master Plan which applies to trails &amp; open space as well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Work with accessibility interest groups to develop an Accessibility Plan to enhance the accessibility of existing parks and open spaces and to ensure that new facilities are as accessible as possible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Pursue neighborhood and community parks (parks 2 acres or larger) in the future to meet the needs of the community while minimizing the maintenance demands associated with smaller parks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Update City development codes to reflect that detention basins are utilitarian in nature, and while they still need to be landscaped appropriately, they should not count toward meeting the open space requirement for development projects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Develop a Parks, Trails and Open Space Facility Standards Manual that builds upon the City Engineering standards by providing specific requirements for items such as park structures, playgrounds, ball courts and athletic fields, site furnishings, fences and walls, trails, lighting, surfacing, utility systems and signage.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Adopt the minimum development standards for parks detailed in this plan as a City policy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Design and develop all new parks with amenities and features that meet the established standards, and allow and encourage public input on the design.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Modify zoning as needed to require developer participation in the provision of parks, recreation and trails amenities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Update annual budgets to ensure funding for operation and maintenance of City parks and other land the City maintains is sufficient to meet needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Continue to maintain an up-to-date inventory of all parks, park facilities and parkways, documenting and implementing improvements according to a feasible schedule.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Apply design standards for all parks in a way that helps reduce maintenance requirements while promoting better long-term use of public parks and recreation amenities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Provide amenities and facilities to help residents “self-maintain” their parks and park facilities: (trash receptacles, animal waste containers, hose bibs, pet clean-up stations, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Parks and Open Space

| Item | Immediate Implementation | Short-Term Implementation 0 to 10 years 2018 - 2028 | Medium-Term Implementation 10 - 20 years 2028 - 2039 | Medium to Long-Term Implementation 20 years+ (through build-out) 2016 - 2060+
|------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------
| 42   | Work with Salt Lake County and the State of Utah to ensure that city, county and state statutes and regulations are met as new facilities are developed. | | | |
| 43   | Work with Salt Lake County to survey residents and fitness center users on a regular basis to make sure programs and facilities are meeting needs. | | | |
| 44   | Partner with other public and private agencies, facilities, organizations and groups to provide additional facilities and programs, including the Jordan School District and private developers. | | | |
| 45   | Continue to support the Arts Council and non-profit and non-profit organizations to provide high quality arts events and activities. | | | |
| 46   | Continue to work with the developer on the design and construction of a Community Center near the future Salt Lake Community College campus. | | | |
| 47   | Explore partnerships with other public and private agencies, facilities, organizations and groups to provide arts-specific facilities, including Salt Lake Community College, and private developers. | | | |
| 48   | Explore the feasibility of providing a dedicated arts facility. | | | |
| 49   | Adopt a Complete Streets Policy for the City. | | | |
| 50   | Require all Capital Improvement Projects to conform to the Herriman City Bicycle Master Plan, the Herriman Transportation Master Plan and this master plan. | | | |
| 52   | Encourage multi-jurisdictional cooperation and funding relationships with the Wasatch Front Regional Council and neighboring cities. | | | |
| 53   | Update the Herriman City Bicycle Master Plan, the Transportation Master Plan and this master plan on a regular basis. | | | |
| 54   | Make trail and bike path maps available to the public. | | | |
| 55   | Develop an accessible network of pedestrian supportive infrastructure, including sidewalks, curb ramps, and trails near existing parks and other high-use destinations. | | | |
| 56   | Continually evaluate system-wide trail needs as part of future planning initiatives, focusing on closing gaps, developing trailheads, and improving connections with existing and future neighborhoods, destinations, parks and recreation facilities, and transit stations. | | | |
| 57   | Require private development projects to finance and install bicycle facilities, sidewalks, and trails as appropriate and where recommended in the Herriman City Bicycle Master Plan, the Herriman Transportation Master Plan and this plan. | | | |
| 58   | Work with the local school district, police, UDOT, Salt Lake County, local developers and neighborhood groups to identify and clearly mark appropriate trails and routes. | | | |
| 59   | Ensure that maintenance routines include the control of weeds (particularly thorny species), the removal of trash and debris, and selective plowing of key routes to facilitate winter trail use. | | | |
| 60   | Promote an “Adopt a Trail” program to encourage trail user assistance in maintaining the trail system. Encourage participants to become involved in all aspects of trails development, through maintenance and long-term improvements. | | | |
| 61   | Provide a bicycle and pedestrian network that is safe and attractive to all users, including women, children and the elderly. | | | |
| 62   | Utilize drip irrigation, moisture sensors, central control systems and appropriate plant materials and soil amendments to create more sustainable West Jordan parks and recreational system. | | | |
| 63   | Utilize industry best practices to make sure plants are water-wise, regionally-appropriate and as low maintenance where appropriate to reduce maintenance and water demands. | | | |
EXISTING FUNDING SOURCES

The following are some of the key funding sources currently available for implementing the plan recommendations.

- **General Funds** - funds that come through government levies such as property and sales taxes that are divided up as the City sees fit.
- **Park Improvement Funds** - impact fees assessed with new development and redevelopment to provide comparable level of service for parks as the City grows.
- **Enterprise Funds** - business-type funds where governments charge fees for programs and services and then use the money to pay for those services.
- **Bonds** - debt obligations issued by government entities.

Details regarding the various funding options and sources follow.
Funding Opportunities and Options For Large Projects

General Obligation Bonds

The lowest interest cost financing for any local government is typically through the levying of taxes for issuance of General Obligation Bonds. General Obligation Bonds, commonly referred to as “G.O. Bonds,” are secured by the unlimited pledge of the taxing ability of the City, sometimes called a “full faith and credit” pledge. Because G.O. bonds are secured by and repaid from property taxes, they are generally viewed as the lowest credit risk to bond investors. This low risk usually translates into the lowest interest rates of any municipal bond structure.

Under the Utah State Constitution, any bonded indebtedness secured by property tax levies must be approved by a majority of voters in a bond election called for that purpose. Currently, bond elections may only be held once each year on the November general election date.

If the recreation improvements being considered for funding through a G.O. bond has broad appeal to the public and proponents are willing to assist in the promotional efforts, G.O. bonds for recreation projects can meet with public approval. However, since some constituents may not view them as essential-purpose facilities for a local government or may view the government as competing with the private sector, obtaining positive voter approval may be a challenge.

It should also be noted that a G.O. bond election, if successful, would only cover the financing of capital expenditures for the facility. Facility revenues and/or other city funds would still be needed to pay for the operation and maintenance expenses of the facilities.

State law limitations on the amount of General Obligation indebtedness for this type of facility are quite high with the limit being four percent of a city’s taxable value. Pursuant to state law the debt must be structured to mature in forty years or less, but practically the city would not want to structure the debt to exceed the useful life of the facility.

Advantages of G.O. bonds:

• Lowest interest rates
• Lowest bond issuance costs
• If approved, a new ‘revenue’ is identified to pay for the capital cost

Disadvantages of G.O. bonds:

• Timing issues; limited dates to hold required G.O. election
• Risk of a “no” vote while still incurring costs of holding a bond election
• Can only raise taxes to finance bonds through election process to pay for physical facilities, not ongoing or additional operation and maintenance expense. This would have to be done through a separate truth-in-taxation tax increase.
Sales Tax Revenue Bonds

Utah State law allows municipalities to issue debt secured by a pledge of their sales tax receipts. Sales tax revenue bonds have been well received in the markets and may be used for a wide variety of municipal capital projects, including recreation facilities. State law limits the amount of sales tax revenue bonds that may be issued by a community. Due to the fact that (1) most cities rely heavily on their sales tax revenues for their operations; and (2) local governments have very little control over the sales tax revenue source; the financial markets will typically only allow an issuer to utilize approximately one-half of the revenues available as a pledge toward debt service as they require minimum debt service coverage covenants of two times revenues to debt costs.

Additionally, due to the reliance on sales tax revenues for the general operations of most communities, existing sales tax revenues would have to be diverted to repay the bonds, unless the City has additional revenue sources that can be devoted to repayment of the bonds, or is anticipating a spike in sales tax revenues due to new large retail businesses locating in the City.

Utah local government sales tax revenue bonds are very well regarded in the bond market and will generally trade within five to fifteen basis points of where the City’s General Obligation Bond debt would price.

Advantages of Sales Tax Revenue Bonds:
• Relatively low interest rates
• No vote required

Disadvantages of Sales Tax Revenue Bonds:
• Utilizes existing City funds with no new revenue source identified
• Somewhat higher financing costs than G.O. Bonds
Special Assessment Areas

Formerly known as Special Improvement Districts or (SIDs), a Special Assessment Area (SAA) provides a means for a local government to designate an area as benefited by an improvement and levy an assessment to pay for the improvements. The assessment levy is then pledged to retire the debt incurred in constructing the project.

While not subject to a bond election as General Obligation bonds require, SAAs may not, as a matter of law, be created if 40 percent or more of the property owners subject to the assessment, weighted by method of assessment, within the proposed SAA, protest its creation. Politically, most City Councils would find it difficult to create an SAA if even 20-30 percent of property owners oppose the SAA. If created, the City’s ability to levy an assessment within the SAA provides a sound method of financing although it will be at interest rates higher than other types of debt that the City could consider issuing.

The underlying rationale of an SAA is that those who benefit from the improvements will be assessed for the costs. For a recreation facility or similar major project, which is intended to serve all residents of the community, and in this case possibly serve multiple communities, it would be difficult to make a case for excluding any residential properties from being assessed, although commercial property would have to be evaluated with bond counsel. The ongoing annual administrative obligations related to an SAA would be formidable even though State law allows the City to assess a fee to cover such administrative costs. Special Assessment notices are mailed out by the entity creating the assessment area and are not included as part of the annual tax notice and collection process conducted by the County.

If an SAA is used, the City would have to decide on a method of assessment (i.e. per residence, per acre, by front-footage, etc.) which is fair and equitable to both residential and commercial property owners. The ability to utilize this mechanism by cities joined together under an inter-local cooperative would need to be explored with legal counsel. There are several issues that would need to be considered such as ownership of the facility as a local government can only assess property owners within its proper legal boundaries.

Advantages of SAA Bonds:
- Assessments provide a ‘new’ revenue source to pay for the capital expense
- No general vote required (but those assessed can challenge the creation)

Disadvantages of SAA Bonds:
- Higher financing costs
- Significant administration costs for a City-Wide Assessment area

Note – Due to the costs of administering a City-Wide SAA and given that special assessments cannot be deducted from income taxes, but property taxes can, it seems more rational to seek for G.O. election approval rather than form a City-Wide SAA.
Lease Revenue Bonds

One financing option which, until the advent of sales tax revenue bonds, was frequently used to finance recreation facilities is a Lease Revenue Bond issued by the Local Building Authority (formerly Municipal Building Authority) of the City. This type of bond would be secured by the recreation center property and facility itself, not unlike real property serving as the security for a home mortgage. Lease revenue bonds are repaid by an annual appropriation of the lease payment by the City Council. Generally, this financing method works best when used for an essential public facility such as city halls, police stations and fire stations. Interest rates on a lease revenue bond would likely be 15 to 30 basis points higher than on sales tax revenue bonds depending on the market’s assessment of the “essentiality” of the facility.

Financial markets generally limit the final maturity on this type of issue to the useful life of the facility and State law limits the term of the debt to a maximum of forty years. As the City is responsible to make the lease payments, the financial markets determine the perceived willingness and ability of the City to make those payments by a thorough review of the City’s General Fund monies.

As this type of bond financing does not generate any new revenue source, the City Council will still need to identify revenue sources sufficient to make the lease payments to cover the debt service.

Creative use of this option could be made with multiple local governments, each of which could finance their portion through different means – one could use sales tax, another could issue G.O. bonds, etc.

Advantages of Lease Revenue Bonds:
- No general vote required
- No specific revenue pledge required

Disadvantages of Lease Revenue Bonds:
- Higher financing costs than some other alternatives
- No ‘new’ revenue source identified to make up the use of general fund monies that will be utilized to make the debt service payment
**Transient Room Tax Revenue Bonds**

Transient Room Tax Revenue Bonds are similar to Sales Tax Revenue Bonds and are paid from excise tax revenues governed pursuant to Utah State Code. Without the need for a vote, cities and counties may issue bonds payable solely from excise taxes levied by the city, county or those levied by the State of Utah and rebated to the city or county, such as gasoline taxes or sales taxes.

For all sales and excise tax bonds, there exists in State law a non-impairment clause that restricts the State’s ability to change the distribution formula in such a way that would harm bondholders while local governments have debt outstanding.

---

**Tax Increment Financing (Utah Community Development & Renewal Agencies Act (CDRA))**

Tax increment financing can be an attractive option to communities, developers and landowners because it provides public assistance and funding for improvements, infrastructure, land write-downs, etc., in partnership with private investment in an area. The purpose is to encourage development to take place in areas that are deteriorating, to create jobs, or to assist with important community projects.

The main steps in establishing a tax increment area include:

- Formation of a Community Development Redevelopment Agency (must only be created once by a community, not for each project) — this step has already been completed by the City.
- Creation of a project area plan and budget
- Approval of taxing entities
Short-Term Financing

Short-term financing options are obligations that are remarketed or become due over a relatively short period of time. They are issued to provide working capital to pay operating expenses or provide interim short-term financing for capital projects.

There are several tools that can be used under this mechanism including:

- Tax & Revenue Anticipation Note (TRANs)
- Bond Anticipation Notes (BANs)
- Grant Anticipation Notes (GANs)
- Interim Warrants

Social Impact Bonds

Through Social Impact Bonds (SIB), or Pay for Success Bonds, governments collaborate with investors/funders and service providers to improve services for a disadvantaged population. In exchange for funding, a governmental entity sets specific, measurable goals for early prevention programs that will achieve clearly defined outcomes. The investors/funders provide the initial capital support and the municipality makes payments to the program as outcomes are reached.

Creation of a Special Service District

A city, or several cities via inter-local agreement, can create a Recreation District charged with providing certain services to residents of the area covered by the District. A Special District can levy a property tax assessment on residents of the District to pay for both the bond debt service and O&M. It should be noted that the City already can levy, subject to a bond election and/or the truth-in-taxation process, property taxes. The creation of a Recreation Special Service District serves to separate its designated functions from those of the City by creating a separate entity with its own governing body. However, an additional layer of government may not be the most cost effective.
Creative Financing

Non-traditional sources of funding may be used to minimize the amount that needs to be financed via the issuance of debt. The City’s approach should be to utilize community support for fund-raising efforts, innovative sources of grants, utilization of naming rights/donations, corporate sponsorships, contracting services, partnership opportunities involving other communities and the private sector, together with cost-sharing arrangements with school districts. To the extent debt must be incurred to complete the financing package, alternative bonding structures, as discussed above, should be evaluated to find the optimal structure based on the financial resources of the City.

Funding Options For Smaller Projects

Private Funding Sources

Private and Public Partnerships

The Parks and Recreation Department or a group of communities acting cooperatively, and a private developer or other government or quasi-government agency may often cooperate on a facility that services the public, yet is also attractive to an entrepreneur or another partner. These partnerships can be effective funding opportunities for special use sports facilities like baseball complexes or soccer complexes; however, they generally are not feasible when the objective is to develop community parks that provide facilities such as playgrounds, informal playing fields, and other recreational opportunities that are generally available to the public free of charge. A recreation center, community center, or swimming/water park is also potentially attractive as a private or public partnership.
**Private Fundraising**

While not addressed as a specific strategy for individual recreation facilities, it is not uncommon for public monies to be leveraged with private donations. Private funds will most likely be attracted to high-profile facilities such as a swimming complex or sports complex, and generally require aggressive promotion and management on behalf of the park and recreation department or City administration.

---

**Service Organization Partners**

Many service organizations and corporations have funds available for park and recreation facilities. Local Rotary Clubs, Kiwanis Clubs, and other service organizations often combine resources to develop park and recreation facilities. Other for-profit organizations such as Home Depot and Lowes are often willing to partner with local communities in the development of playground and other park and recreation equipment and facilities. Again, the key is a motivated individual or group who can garner the support and funding desired.

---

**Joint Development Partnerships**

Joint development opportunities may also occur between municipalities and among agencies or departments within a municipality. Cooperative relationships between cities and counties are not uncommon, nor are partnerships between cities and school districts. Often, small cities in a region can cooperate and pool resources for recreation projects. There may be other opportunities as well which should be explored whenever possible to maximize recreation opportunities and minimize costs. To make these kinds of opportunities happen, there must be on-going and constant communication between residents, governments, business interests and others.
Heart of the Community Grant Programs (Project for Public Spaces)
The Heart of the Community Program began in April 2014 and is sponsored by Southwest Airlines. Southwest Airlines has partnered with the nonprofit Project for Public Spaces (PPS) to leverage resources in order to strengthen connections between people and places. PPS is dedicated to building communities through planning, design, and education and aims to revitalize communities by creating spaces for members of the community to gather. The goal is to “capitalize on a community’s assets and potential to create vibrant destinations—such as neighborhood gardens, community markets, and downtown squares.”

Industrial Loan Companies (ILC) or Industrial Banks (IB)
Industrial Loan Companies (ILC) or Industrial Banks (IB) are financial institutions in the United States that lend money for all kinds of consumer and commercial projects. Many of the largest ILCs are located in the State of Utah. ILCs like other commercial banks have community reinvestment requirements (CRA credits, as discussed in this document) that encourage lending within the market areas in which they operate.

Point of Sale Fundraising
Point of Sale Fundraising allows businesses the opportunity to collect voluntary donations from patrons of hotels, restaurants, grocery stores or other service providers at the time they pay for the primary service. Patrons may elect to round up their bill or contribute a self-designated amount to go towards the City designated fund, park or project.
ZAP Taxes

Zoo, Arts and Park (ZAP) taxes have been very effective in raising funds for a range of recreation, trails, and arts projects. This program is administered by Salt Lake County, which receives one penny for every $10.00 purchased, and redistributes the funds to more than 160 qualified parks, recreation cultural organizations and events. The existing ZAP tax was recently approved, and will be in effect for a ten-year period.

Park and Recreation Impact Fees

The City is developing an impact fee program for park, recreation and trail projects concurrent to this planning process. Impact fees can be used by communities to offset the cost of public parks and facilities needed to serve future residents and new development.

Impact fees are especially useful in areas of rapid growth or redevelopment. They help the community to maintain a current level of service as new development puts strain on existing facilities. It assures that new development pays its proportionate share to maintain quality of life expectations for City residents.

Dedications and Development Agreements

The dedication of land for parks, and park development agreements has long been an accepted development requirement and is another valuable tool for implementing parks. The City can require the dedication of park land through review of projects such as Planned Unit Developments (PUDs), for example.
**Park Utility Fee**

A park utility fee is charged as a specified amount per housing unit in connection with the utility bill. The revenue may be used to pay for park and public lands maintenance and operations. A park utility fee provides a dedicated stream of funding for parks and public lands regardless of appropriations from the general fund. The fee may be determined by a set project cost or ongoing maintenance, based on the number of units within the city. The fee is collected simultaneously with the utility fee each month.

**Special Taxes or Fees**

Tax revenue collected for special purposes may be earmarked for park development. For instance, the room tax applied to hotel and motel rooms in the City could be earmarked for parks, recreation and trails development but is generally earmarked for tourism-related projects.

**Community Development Block Grants**

Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) can be used for park development in areas of the City that qualify as low and moderate income areas. CDBG funds may be used to upgrade parks, purchase new park equipment and improve accessibility (Americans with Disabilities Act). Additionally, CDBG funds may be used for projects that remove barriers to access for the elderly and for persons with severe disabilities.

**User Fees**

User fees may be charged for reserved rentals on park pavilions and for recreation programs. These fees should be evaluated to determine whether they are appropriate. A feasibility study may be needed to acquire the appropriate information before making decisions and changes.
Chapter 5: Priorities and Construction Costs

Redevelopment Agency Funds

Generally, Redevelopment Agency (RDA) Funds are available for use in redevelopment areas. As new RDA areas are identified and developed, tax increment funds generated can, at the discretion of the City, be used to fund park acquisition and development.

Local, State and Federal Programs

The availability of these funds may change annually depending on budget allocations at the local, state or federal level. It is important to check with local representatives and administering agencies to find out the status of funding. Many of these programs are funded by the Federal government and administered by local State agencies.

These include:
- USFWS Sharon Steel Natural Resource Damage Assessment
- Jordan River Commission Corridor Grants
- Utah Watershed Restoration Initiative
- Utah Office of Outdoor Recreation Grants
- Utah Forestry, Fire and State Lands Grants
- Utah Division of Water Quality Nonpoint Source Grants
- Utah Department of Agriculture and Food Invasive Species Management Grants
- Utah State Parks Recreation and Trails Program
- Salt Lake County Tourism, Community and Cultural Centers Grants

Land and Water Conservation Fund

This Federal money is made available to states, and in Utah is administered by the Utah State Division of Parks and Recreation. Funds are matched with local funds for acquisition of park and recreation lands, redevelopment of older recreation facilities, trails, accessibility improvements and other recreation programs /facilities that provide close-to-home recreation opportunities for youth, adults, senior citizens and persons with physical and mental disabilities.
TIGER Discretionary Grants

According to the U.S. Department of Transportation, “the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2016 appropriated $500 million, available through September 30, 2019, for National Infrastructure Investments otherwise known as TIGER grants. As with previous rounds of TIGER, funds for the FY 2016 TIGER program are to be awarded on a competitive basis for projects that will have a significant impact on the Nation, a metropolitan area or a region.

TIGER Discretionary Grants have supported innovative projects, including multi-modal and multi-jurisdictional projects which are difficult to fund through traditional federal programs. Successful TIGER projects leverage resources, encourage partnership, catalyze investment and growth, fill a critical void in the transportation system or provide a substantial benefit to the nation, region or metropolitan area in which the project is located. The 2016 TIGER grant program will continue to make transformative surface transportation investments that dramatically improve the status quo by providing significant and measurable improvements over existing conditions.”

Federal Recreational Trails Program

The Utah Department of Natural Resources, Parks and Recreation Division administers these Federal funds. The funds are available for motorized and non-motorized trail development and maintenance projects, educational programs to promote trail safety and trail-related environmental protection projects. The match is 50 percent, and grants may range from $10,000 to $200,000. Projects are awarded in August each year.

Utah Trails and Pathways/Non-Motorized Program

Funds are available for planning, acquisition and development of recreational trails. The program is administered by the Board of Utah State Parks and Recreation, which awards grants at its fall meeting based on recommendations of the Recreation Trails Advisory Council and Utah State Parks and Recreation. The match is 50 percent, and grants may range from $5,000 to $100,000.
In-Kind and Donated Services or Funds

Several options for local initiatives are possible to further the implementation of the master plan. These kinds of programs would require the City to implement a proactive recruiting initiative to generate interest and sponsorship, and may include:

- Fund-raising and volunteer support of Herriman’s parks, open spaces, recreation facilities and trails;
- Adopt-a-park or adopt-a-trail, whereby a service organization or group either raises funds or constructs a given facility with in-kind services;
- Corporate sponsorships, whereby businesses or large corporations provide funding for a facility, as per an adopt-a-trail and adopt-a-park program; or
- Public trail and park facility construction programs, in which local citizens donate their time and effort to planning and implementing trail projects and park improvements.
Goals and Policies

PARKS AND OPEN SPACE

Goal 1.0: Assure that Residents of Herriman City Have Adequate Access to Parks

Policy 1.1: Meet the recommended Level of Service (LOS) for parks of 3.6 acres per 1,000 population in the future.

a. **Implementation Measure**: Ensure development of 1.8 acres at Creek Ridge Park to fill existing gaps (assume developer provided) as soon as possible.

b. **Implementation Measure**: Acquire and develop 70 additional acres of planned park land to fill existing gaps as soon as possible.

c. **Implementation Measure**: Develop 8 acres of undeveloped park land already owned by the City by 2028.

d. **Implementation Measure**: Ensure development of 52.8 acres of additional park land to meet need by 2028 (assume developer provided).

e. **Implementation Measure**: Acquire and develop an additional 97.8 park acres to meet needs between 2028 and build-out in 2060.

f. **Implementation Measure**: As the community grows ensure that the recommended LOS is maintained.
g. **Implementation Measure**: Develop and implement a signage and wayfinding system for the City so residents have ample information about available facilities and amenities.

h. **Implementation Measure**: Work with accessibility interest groups to develop an accessibility master plan to enhance the accessibility of existing parks and open spaces and to ensure that new facilities are as accessible as possible.

**Policy 1.2: Ensure that new parks and open space provide high-quality recreation opportunities for the community.**

a. **Implementation Measure**: Pursue neighborhood and community parks (parks 2 acres or larger) in the future to meet the needs of the community while minimizing the maintenance demands associated with smaller parks.

b. **Implementation Measure**: Update City development codes to reflect that detention basins are utilitarian in nature, and while they still need to be landscaped appropriately, they should not count toward meeting the open space requirement for development projects.

c. **Implementation Measure**: Develop a Parks, Trails and Open Space Facility Standards Manual that builds upon the City Engineering standards by providing specific requirements for items such as park structures, playgrounds, ball courts and athletic fields, site furnishings, fences and walls, trails, lighting, surfacing, utility systems and signage.

d. **Implementation Measure**: Modify zoning as needed to require developer participation in the provision of parks, recreation and trails amenities.

**Policy 1.3 Upgrade existing parks to meet minimum park standards and amenity levels of service requirements and develop new parks with at least the minimum required amenities.**

a. **Implementation Measure**: Upgrade existing parks to meet the minimum requirements for amenities and features where possible.
b. **Implementation Measure**: Adopt the minimum development standards for parks detailed in this plan as a City policy.

c. **Implementation Measure**: Design and develop all new parks with amenities and features that meet the established standards, and allow and encourage public input on the design.

d. **Implementation Measure**: Modify zoning and development standards as needed to require developer participation in the provision of parks, recreation and trails amenities.

**Goal 2.0: Continue to Maintain a High Standard of Maintenance for Herriman City’s Park in the Future**

**Policy 2.1: Continue to improve the best management and maintenance procedures to protect the City’s park and recreation investments.**

a. **Implementation Measure**: Establish an annual budget for deferred maintenance and park upgrades.

b. **Implementation Measure**: Protect the City’s investment in sports fields by resting fields on a regular basis to prevent damage by overuse.

c. **Implementation Measure**: Update annual budgets to ensure funding for operation and maintenance of City parks and other land the City maintains is sufficient to meet needs.

d. **Implementation Measure**: Continue to maintain an up-to-date inventory of all parks, park facilities and parkways, documenting and implementing improvements according to a feasible schedule.

f. **Implementation Measure**: Apply design standards for all parks in a way that helps reduce maintenance requirements while promoting better long-term use of public parks and recreation amenities.

g. **Implementation Measure**: Increase the variety of amenities in parks to promote
better long-term use of parks.

h. Implementation Measure: Provide amenities and facilities to help residents “self-maintain” their parks and park facilities (trash receptacles, animal waste containers, hose bibs, pet clean-up stations, etc.)

Goal 3.0: Increase the Amount and Variety of Natural Open Space in the City

Policy 3.1: Secure and expand the Herriman City open space system as part of a flexible and opportunistic approach.

a. Implementation Measure: Acquire the proposed open spaces shown in this plan, including the expansion of the Herriman Hills Open Space and natural drainages.

b. Implementation Measure: Continue to implement and regularly update the vision established in the Herriman Hills Open Space Master Plan 2018.

c. Implementation Measure: Work with Salt Lake County and the State of Utah to ensure that city, county and state statutes and regulations are met as new facilities are developed.

RECREATION, COMMUNITY EVENTS AND ARTS

Goal 4.0: Assure that Residents of Herriman City Have Access to High Quality Recreation and Arts Facilities and Programs

Policy 4.1: Continue to partner with Salt Lake County to provide a diverse range of programs at the JL Sorenson Recreation Center.

a. Implementation Measure: Work with Salt Lake County to survey residents and fitness center users on a regular basis to make sure programs and facilities are meeting needs.
b. **Implementation Measure**: Partner with other public and private agencies, facilities, organizations and groups to provide additional facilities and programs, including the Jordan School District and private developers.

c. **Implementation Measure**: Continue to support the Arts Council and non-profits to provide high quality arts events and activities.

d. **Implementation Measure**: Continue to work with the developer on the design and construction of a Community Center near the future Salt Lake Community College campus.

e. **Implementation Measure**: Explore partnerships with other public and private agencies, facilities, organizations and groups to provide arts-specific facilities, including Salt Lake Community College, and private developers.

f. **Implementation Measure**: Explore the feasibility of providing an dedicated arts facility.

**TRAILS**

**Goal 5.0: Develop a Complete Streets Approach to Roadway Development**

**Policy 5.1: Implement Complete Streets practices.**

a. **Implementation Measure**: Adopt a Complete Streets Policy for the City.

b. **Implementation Measure**: Require all Capital Improvement Projects to conform to the *Herriman City Bicycle Master Plan 2016*, the *Herriman City Transportation Master Plan 2009* and this master plan.

c. **Implementation Measure**: Develop a comprehensive network of bike lanes as shown in this plan.

**Goal 6.0: Implement the Recommended Trail Facilities**

**Policy 6.1: Complete a non-motorized transportation system network.**

a. **Implementation Measure**: Encourage multi-jurisdictional cooperation and funding relationships with the Wasatch Front Regional Council, Salt Lake County and the neighboring cities of South Jordan, Riverton and Bluffdale.

b. **Implementation Measure**: Update the *Herriman City Bicycle Master Plan*, the *Transportation Master Plan* and this master plan on a regular basis.

**Goal 7.0: Assure that the Herriman City Trails System Meets Public Needs and Expectations**

**Policy 7.1: Work with the Herriman City Engineering Department to ensure all trails and bike lanes are implemented as envisioned.**

a. **Implementation Measure**: Install all proposed multi-use and backcountry trails by build-out, including other trail system improvements suggested in this plan.

b. **Implementation Measure**: Make trail and on-street bike facility maps available to the public.

c. **Implementation Measure**: Develop an accessible network of pedestrian supportive infrastructure, including sidewalks, curb ramps, and trails near existing parks and other high-use destinations.
Policy 7.2: Require trail master planning to be incorporated into community planning, land use planning and the development review process of Herriman City, including the development of trailheads and access to trails.

- Implementation Measure: Continually evaluate system-wide trail needs as part of future planning initiatives, focusing on closing gaps, developing trailheads, and improving connections with existing and future neighborhoods, destinations, parks and recreation facilities, and future transit stations.

- Implementation Measure: Require private development projects to finance and install bicycle facilities, sidewalks, and trails as appropriate and where recommended in the Bicycle Master Plan, the Transportation Master Plan and this plan.

Goal 8.0: Promote and Enhance Safe Trails

Policy 8.1: Implement a Safe Routes to Schools program with an emphasis on trail linkages.

- Implementation Measure: Work with the local school district, police, UDOT, Salt Lake County, local developers and neighborhood groups to identify and clearly mark appropriate trails and routes.

Policy 8.2: Ensure Trails are safe places at all hour of operation.

- Implementation Measure: Install a safe system of trail lighting and emergency response stations along multi-use trails where appropriate.

Policy 8.3: Maintain trails as safe, attractive and comfortable amenities for the community.

- Implementation Measure: Ensure that maintenance routines include the control of weeds (particularly thorny species), the removal of trash and debris, and selective plowing of key routes to facilitate winter trail use.
b. **Implementation Measure**: Promote an “Adopt a Trail” program to encourage trail user assistance in maintaining the trail system. Encourage participants to become involved in all aspects of trails development, through maintenance and long-term improvements.

c. **Implementation Measure**: Provide a bicycle and pedestrian network that is safe and attractive to all users, including women, children and the elderly.

d. **Implementation Measure**: Develop a wayfinding and signage program that provides clear information to users about how to access trails and proper trail behavior, including allowed uses and other regulations.

**OTHER GOALS & POLICIES**

**Goal 9.0: Promote Water Conservation and Similar Practices to Help Ensure the Herriman City Parks and Recreation System is Sustainable and Resilient**

**Policy 9.1**: As new parks, open spaces, recreation facilities and trails are developed, utilize the most up-to-date technologies to conserve water and other resources in public parks and associated facilities.

a. **Implementation Measure**: Utilize drip irrigation, moisture sensors, central control systems and appropriate plant materials and soil amendments to create a more sustainable Herriman City parks and recreation system.

b. **Implementation Measure**: Utilize industry best practices to make sure plants are water-wise, regionally-appropriate and as low maintenance where appropriate to reduce maintenance and water demands.