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RESIDENTS OF SALT LAKE CITY
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

Salt Lake City's Parks, Natural Lands and Trails...

...Create a Sense of Place
Located along the northeast edge of the Salt Lake Valley, Salt Lake City sits flush against the Wasatch Mountains, offering residents access to a multitude of recreation trails in the foothills. Salt Lake City is also home to 9 miles of the Jordan River Parkway and its adjacent parks and golf courses, the country's largest municipally owned cemetery, a 150-year old urban forest and the crown jewel, known as Liberty Park.

...Are Highly Valuable to SLC Residents
Salt Lake City residents frequently use their parks and natural lands, and see them as critical to their quality of life. Residents who report visiting Salt Lake City parks once a week or more rate their overall quality of life higher.

...Are Essential
Parks, natural lands, trails and the urban forest are integral to Salt Lake City. They provide free access and diverse recreational and exercise opportunities to people of all ages, incomes and abilities. In addition to offering critical environmental benefits, they contribute to the city's economic vibrancy.

Why this Assessment?
Salt Lake City is growing fast, yet lacks vacant lands and adequate funding to acquire new acreage and develop parks. Overcoming these obstacles and planning for the future requires a coordinated effort between city departments and elected officials. Measuring the quantity and quality of existing parks and natural lands will help decision makers generate policy that maintains and improves the city's Parks & Public Lands system.
Salt Lake City’s range of parks create a robust and varied system. The 689.8 acres of existing park land are distributed throughout the residential areas of the city. The 1,693.7 acres of city owned natural lands are predominantly concentrated in the foothills and along Jordan River.
Existing Parks by Type

City staff has classified the parks into several categories, based on the parks' characteristics and roles in the community—not just size.

**A REGIONAL PARKS - 2 TOTAL**
Regional parks are the largest in Salt Lake City. Their size and amenities make them regional attractions, and include swimming pools, cultural venues, and special events facilities. The two regional parks in the city total 207 acres. Liberty Park is the flagship, and the Regional Athletic Complex is a large, sports-specific venue.

**B COMMUNITY PARKS - 15 TOTAL**
Like regional parks, community parks are large parks focused on meeting the major park and recreation needs of the city. They range in size from three to 29 acres and encompass a total of 280 acres. They often include a special amenity or recreation facility, such as athletic courts, sports fields and playgrounds.

**C NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS - 19 TOTAL**
Neighborhood parks are generally smaller than community parks and primarily serve neighborhood needs. They typically mix large and small amenities, such as open lawns and grass play areas, pavilions, playgrounds, sport courts and fields. They range from less than one to over 24 acres in size and encompass a total of 148 acres.

**D MINI PARKS - 42 TOTAL**
As the name indicates, mini parks are small sites that range from less than one to nearly two acres in size. They are the most prevalent park type in the city and predominate in older, urbanized areas. Mini parks encompass 24 acres in total.

**E SPECIAL EVENT PARKS - 3 TOTAL**
Centered in the downtown core, the three special events parks provide non-traditional park/plaza experiences. They each encompass an entire city block, which is equal to 10 acres (30 acres total), and primarily serve as settings for passive recreation or community events and festivals.

Steenblik Park, a mini park located in Salt Lake City's Northwest planning area
Existing Natural Lands by Type

City staff has classified natural lands into two categories—urban and non-urban. The categories reflect the role of the land and the amount of care, maintenance, and resources it requires. Urban natural lands are natural lands that are typically surrounded by urban development or adjacent to manicured parks. These lands often serve a parklike function, and they require a higher level of maintenance and resources than non-urban natural lands. Non-urban natural lands—such as the foothills above the U of U or Avenues—require less maintenance and often directly connect with other public lands. They are dominated by large areas of intact habitat and bisected by recreational trails.

Summary of Lands Owned and/or Maintained by SLC Parks & Public Lands

The Salt Lake City Parks & Public Lands Division owns and/or manages nearly 2,688 acres of land in total. Natural land accounts for nearly three times more acreage than parks and other landscapes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lands Owned and/or Maintained by PPL</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Parks</td>
<td>207.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Parks</td>
<td>280.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Parks</td>
<td>148.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini Parks</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Event Parks</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal: Parks</strong></td>
<td><strong>689.8</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Lands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Natural Lands</td>
<td>526.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Urban Natural Lands</td>
<td>1,167.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal: Natural Lands</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,693.7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Landscapes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Cemetery</td>
<td>121.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Use Parks</td>
<td>99.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscapes Surrounding City Buildings</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention Ponds, Medians, On-Ramps, etc.</td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal: Additional Landscapes</strong></td>
<td><strong>304.4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,687.9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Salt Lake City Parks & Public Lands Division owns and/or manages nearly 2,688 acres of land in total. Natural land accounts for nearly three times more acreage than parks and other landscapes.
**Existing Conditions: Level of Service (LOS)**

**Level of Service (LOS)**

LOS analyzes the provision of parks as a function of park acres in relation to population.

\[
\text{LOS} = \frac{\text{Existing Parks Acres per Person}}{1,000}
\]

When combined with a distribution analysis, LOS can help reveal how well the city’s parks and natural lands meet the needs of its residents. LOS can also be used to help determine how much additional park and natural land acreage the city will need as its population grows.

**LOS for Parks**

Existing LOS with SL County & Jointly Owned Parks Included Increases LOS to 4.2 acres per 1,000

Existing LOS for Salt Lake City Owned & Managed Parks 3.5 acres per 1,000

**LOS for Natural Lands**

Salt Lake City Park and Public Lands’ 1,693.7 acres of natural lands, equates to an LOS of **8.6 acres per 1,000 people**. Acreage owned by the United States Forest Service (USFS), University of Utah, Salt Lake City Public Utilities, and other landowners in the foothills adds several thousand acres of additional, functional natural lands, making the LOS for the area as a whole substantially higher.

**LOS for Trails & Bike Routes**

If Proposed Off-Street Trails are implemented, LOS would increase to **1.4 miles per 1,000**

On-Street Bike Routes increase LOS to **1.1 miles per 1,000**

LOS for Existing Off-Street Trails

\[
\frac{70.7}{196,307} \times 1,000 = 0.4 \text{ miles per 1,000}
\]
The Central Community has the lowest park LOS and no natural lands within its boundary. This area is slated for most of the future growth within the city. Sugar House Park dramatically impacts existing LOS in the Sugar House planning area, raising it from 1.1 to 4.7 acres/1,000. Four of the seven planning areas have significant state or federal natural lands within or adjacent to their boundaries, enhancing their natural lands acreage.
Existing Conditions: Distribution Analysis

**Distribution Analysis**

Distribution analysis is a mapping tool that is used to determine the geographic distribution and influence of the city’s various parks, natural lands and trails.

When used in conjunction with LOS analyses, distribution analyses can help pinpoint areas of the city that are well-served by park, natural land and trail amenities, and conversely, areas where service gaps exist.

**Distribution of Parks**

The distribution of parks, natural lands and trails was mapped and analyzed according to walk distance and bike/drive time and then correlated to residential development.

Most residents of the city live within a half mile of a park, natural land or trail (see top right map), but the physical environment sometimes makes walking to these places challenging. The lower map illustrates areas that are within a half mile walk of parks, natural lands and trails using existing roads and trails. This second analysis reveals more gaps within the Parks & Public Lands system (visible light yellow areas). The Central Community, Sugar House and East Bench planning communities all have significant gaps when you consider how residents approach parks or trails on foot.

A 5-Minute Bike Time distribution analysis reveals that the city is generally well-served for cyclists and drivers. Only a handful of parks are not easily accessible by bike. A 5-Minute Drive Time distribution analysis demonstrates that the city’s parks are usually within a 5-minute drive of neighboring residences.
The Needs Assessment also considers the individual amenities of the Parks & Public Lands system. An example of the distribution of amenities and the levels of service for each appear in the map at right. Amenities in County facilities are also mapped, to help clarify where gaps exist. Compared to the comparable Intermountain West cities of Boise and Fort Collins and to national standards, most or all of the Salt Lake City amenities evaluated meet or exceed amenity levels of service.

**CITY PARK AMENITIES TOTALS:**

- **61** Playgrounds
- **43** Multi-Purpose Fields
- **18** Baseball Fields
- **14** Pickleball Courts
- **3** Softball Fields
- **12** Sand Volleyball Courts
- **9** Dog Parks
- **71** Tennis Courts
- **3** Basketball Hoops
- **3** Skate Parks

**Amenity: Multi-purpose Fields**

Multipurpose fields include soccer, football, and other fields and are well distributed in the Northwest, Capitol Hill, Avenues, East Bench, and Sugar House planning areas. The Central Community planning area has no multipurpose fields, and the West Salt Lake community is minimally served.

**CONDITIONS ASSESSMENT**

Parks & Public Lands staff conducted its first asset condition assessment of parks and individual amenities in 2017. The results indicate that 37% of amenities are in good condition, 53% are in fair condition, and 10% are in poor condition. The Division intends to conduct this assessment on a biannual basis, to track the condition of assets over time. This will allow staff to make better-informed decisions about maintenance and improvements.
The city currently has 70.7 miles of off-street trails. Of these, 47.1 miles are paved, multipurpose trails and 23.6 miles are unpaved trails primarily used for hiking and/or mountain biking. Additionally, the city has proposed or planned 64.4 miles of future multipurpose trails. One hundred five miles of the city’s existing 145.5 miles of bike routes are bike lanes and 40.5 miles are shared lanes that are specially signed, marked or buffered.

### OFF-STREET TRAILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Paved Trails</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multipurpose Trails</td>
<td>47.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal: Existing Paved Trails</strong></td>
<td><strong>47.1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Unpaved Trails</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiking Only Trails</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiking/Mountain Bike Trails</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal: Existing Unpaved Trails</strong></td>
<td><strong>23.6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total Existing Trails</strong></td>
<td><strong>70.7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Trails</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multipurpose Trails</td>
<td>64.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal: Proposed Paved Trails</strong></td>
<td><strong>64.4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total Trails</strong></td>
<td>135.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ON-STREET BIKE ROUTES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Bike Routes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
<td>105.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Shared/Separated/Painted Buffered Bike Lanes</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Lanes (signs or markings)</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total Existing Bike Routes</strong></td>
<td><strong>145.5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CONNECTIVITY

The top right analysis looks at how close parks are to existing trails. Parks that are located more than 1/2 mile from a trail are in red. All other parks are located within 1/4 or 1/2 mile of a trail. Buffers for all of the trails are shown in green (1/4 mile) and yellow (1/2 mile). This analysis clearly shows that Central Community lacks trail connections and that implementing currently proposed trails (bottom right) would significantly improve connectivity within the city.
Salt Lake City’s Parks & Public Lands system plays a critical role in “community life” by supporting numerous community events, sports team/league play, filming events and free expression gatherings. Parks & Public Lands maintenance staff works with Salt Lake City Events staff to schedule parks and public space in ways that avoid overuse and negative impacts to surrounding neighborhoods.

COMMUNITY EVENTS
Liberty Park, Washington Square, Library Square and Pioneer Park are key community gathering spaces within the city. Demand for events at these locations is high, and the Division must sometimes limit the number and frequency of events to preserve the integrity of the space, allow vegetation to recover and other non-programmed uses.

SPORTS GROUPS
Currently, the Parks & Public Lands Division schedules practice and game times for 48 different leagues/teams. Sports fields are open to the public during daylight hours seven days per week from mid-March through mid-November, when not reserved by a team or league. Heavy, peak season demand makes it difficult to rotate the fields and allow the turf to rest and recover. The lack of lighting also limits the amount of useable field time. The Division typically only lights fields at sites where there is little impact to the surrounding neighborhoods.

SMALL GROUP EVENTS
The Salt Lake City Parks & Public Lands system has nearly 30 pavilions, 16 of which are scheduled to accommodate small neighborhood and family events.

CITYWIDE USE
A statistically valid survey indicates that the Central, Sugar House, and East Bench planning areas attract significantly more visitors than other planning areas. Residents from all over the city visit parks located in these planning areas, with Liberty Park being the most visited in the Parks & Public Lands system.

HOW FREQUENTLY PARKS ARE VISITED BY PLANNING AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Area</th>
<th>Visits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Creek</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar House</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Community</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Bench</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Salt Lake</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: When survey respondents were asked to “Please select the region(s) where [they] frequently visit parks”, they were allowed to select as many areas as they wanted. As a result, the percentages in the graph do not add up to 100%.
LIBERTY PARK
Liberty Park is the most visited park within the Parks & Public Lands system. Twenty-two percent of residents say they visit it most often. The majority of Salt Lake City residents visit their “most frequented park” because it is close to home, but the residents who gravitate to Liberty Park say they do so because of its “trees and atmosphere” (27% versus 15% citywide). The number is even higher (31%) for people traveling from other planning communities to visit Liberty Park.

EAST SIDE VS. WEST SIDE
Frequency of park use varies in different areas of the city. For example, significant differences exist between east-side residents (those living east of I-15) and west-side residents (those living west of I-15). Seventy-five percent of residents who live on the east side visit parks at least once a month, versus only 60% of west-siders. West-side residents are more likely than east-side residents to visit parks on the other side.

75% of residents who live on the east side visit parks frequently (one time or more a month), whereas only 60% of west-siders frequently visit parks.

Frequently Used Trails
When Salt Lake City residents were asked which trails they used most often, trails in the foothills were three of the top four answers. When residents were asked how they use trails, the top answers were primarily “on-foot” activities such as exercise, walking/jogging, connection to nature and hiking, as opposed biking (road, mountain and commuter) and play.
### Existing Conditions: Division Expenditures

#### Summary of Current Expenses

The Salt Lake City Parks & Public Lands budget for 2017 was $22 million, which covers parks, cemeteries, urban forests, natural lands, additional landscapes and street medians. The total budget figure includes capital expenditures, charges for services, operations and maintenance supplies, depreciation and transfers. The budget also includes projects funded with general fund revenue to address capital needs identified in the city’s Capital Improvement Plan. The operating revenues collected by Parks & Public Lands include user fees and rentals, which totaled $1.7 million in 2017. Impact fees, which are collected based on development within the city and earmarked for specific eligible capital projects, are also a revenue source. The remainder of the Parks & Public Lands revenue comes directly from the city's general fund.

#### Historic Expenditures

The population of Salt Lake City maintained a positive growth trajectory of .72% from 2010 to 2017. The operation and maintenance expenditures for parks and public lands has grown at an annual average growth rate (“AAGR”) of 6.55% from 2010 to 2017. The capital budget has varied widely from year to year. For example, capital expenditures increased from $3.4 million in 2013 to $11.5 million in 2014. This substantial increase highlights the challenges associated with maintaining capital assets and addressing deferred maintenance from year to year. Capital revenue allocated to Parks & Public Lands fluctuates based on specific project needs, legislative priorities and other capital needs throughout the city. Despite ongoing maintenance needs and assets required to maintain the existing level of service, capital revenue is not always available at the level necessary to maintain existing park infrastructure as well as add new assets. This results in unfunded needs from year to year.

### TABLE: 2017 EXPENSES AND REVENUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Per Capita</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTEs</td>
<td>99.0</td>
<td>0.0005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O&amp;M</td>
<td>$14,268,804</td>
<td>$72.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$7,740,094</td>
<td>$39.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>$1,689,705</td>
<td>$8.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### HISTORIC SLC PARKS & PUBLIC LANDS EXPENDITURES

*Spikes in Capital Expenses during the 2014-2015 years were due to the capital investment in several large projects, i.e. the Recreational Athletic Center (2014) and Red Butte Oil Spill remediation related projects (2015)*
Community Engagement Process

A variety of methods were used to involve the public in generating this needs analysis.

**PROJECT WEBSITE**
A project website (www.slcplays.com) was established to encourage members of the public to learn more about the project, get information on how to participate, take a survey and submit comments and ideas.

**OPEN CITY HALL SURVEY**
The Open City Hall online survey about parks and public lands received 675 responses, which is one of the largest responses to any Open City Hall survey to date. Respondents tended to be frequent park and natural lands users, and were generally happy with the parks and natural lands in the city. They expressed concern about crime, safety, maintenance and dogs. The respondents mostly preferred passive activities such as walking and hiking in natural open areas to more active recreation and amenities such as sports fields or sports courts.

**PUBLIC SCOPING MEETINGS**
At two public scoping meetings in April 2017, the comments and ideas reinforced much of the feedback from the Open City Hall survey. Attendees expressed a desire for amenities such as a nature center, more access to water, and additional passive recreation opportunities.

**STATISTICALLY VALID SURVEY**
Y2 Analytics conducted a statistically valid survey in July 2017. They distributed 10,000 invitations and received 768 responses, for a relatively high eight percent response rate and a margin of error of less than four percent. Only 22 percent of the respondents say they have children under the age of eighteen living at home, but 38 percent own a dog. This concurs with demographic information for Salt Lake City. Approximately 42 percent of respondents use parks at least weekly.

**COMMUNITY EVENTS OUTREACH**
Salt Lake City Parks & Public Lands staff conducted 16 community outreach events to promote public participation in and knowledge of the assessment. Events were held throughout the summer of 2017 at neighborhood festivals, farmers markets and city-sponsored events.

**STAKEHOLDER & SPECIAL INTEREST OUTREACH**
In October 2017, preliminary results and findings from this study were presented to four stakeholder groups: representatives from athletic organizations, events programming groups, and city staff. Athletics stakeholders indicated that there is a lack of reservable field space in the city. Events stakeholders stated that many of the existing parks are not equipped with essential event infrastructure.
Community Perceptions, Desires & Preferences

The findings from the community engagement process were used to identify public perceptions, desires and preferences.

Preferred Park Uses & Amenities

In general, residents prefer to use parks and natural lands for more passive activities. Hiking, walking, running and other “non-programmed” activities consistently outranked sports fields and courts. This preference topped the responses to several statistically valid survey questions, including ones about why residents visit parks and natural lands, how they would like to see facilities improved, and how they want their tax dollars to be spent.

Salt Lake City residents go to parks for exercise, trees and the atmosphere.

Desired Improvements

Restrooms, maintenance and safety were the top desired improvements for Salt Lake City parks. Improvements to amenities such as playground equipment and sports fields were seen as less important.

NATURAL LANDS

Salt Lake City residents’ desired improvements to natural lands focus on better maintenance and management of existing properties and amenities. Management to prevent overuse and/or user conflict, better maintenance and better signage are the top desired improvements. Additions such as restrooms, trailheads and rest/viewing points were seen as less important.

TRAILS

Responses to a question about trail improvements were similar to those for natural lands. Better signage, improved maintenance and separate trails for different uses topped the list. More facilities or amenities, such as trailheads, lighting and picnic shelters, were less important to residents.
Safety

The majority of residents feel very safe in their neighborhood parks (89%) and natural lands (71%) during the day. Only 64% feel safe in neighborhood parks and 44% in natural lands at night.

Fewer residents feel safe on the Jordan River Trail than any other location. The perceived safety there is almost half that of the Bonneville Shoreline Trail.

New Amenities and/or Facilities

When asked which special use facilities the city should fund or construct, respondents chose educational facilities such as an urban farm and a nature education center. A climbing park and canoe trails closely followed the educational facilities.

Education-related facilities, such as an urban farm or nature education center, are residents’ top desired special use facilities.

User Conflicts

As Salt Lake City’s population expands, the demands on existing parks, natural lands and trails continues to grow. This sometimes generates user conflicts, including conflicting trail uses, dog-related disagreements and the visual impact of water conservation measures.

While more residents felt that the trail user and dog-related conflicts are not currently a problem, significant numbers disagreed or were undecided. This suggests that these issues could escalate as population increases.

As Salt Lake City’s population continues to grow, so does the demand on its existing parks, natural lands and trails and the potential for user conflicts.

Willingness to Pay

Residents are more likely to support the funding of upgrades and improvements to existing parks, trails, and natural lands than better enforcement, new parks improvements, and new programming and events.

The respondents were asked how they would allocate funds. In addition to increasing maintenance of existing parks and natural lands and increased safety measures, respondents also highly prioritized new walking and bike trails and new neighborhood and community parks.

Residents are more likely to allocate funding to upgrades and improvements to existing parks, trails and natural lands than to new programming and events.
Future Needs

Identifying High Needs Areas

Residents in population-dense areas, residents with low household incomes, children/youth, and seniors (65+) are more likely to experience greater challenges with mobility and financial resources. This can impact their access to the Parks & Public Lands system, especially if a car is required or nearby parks lack key amenities.

As illustrated in the graphic below, these demographic factors, combined with Areas of Potential Growth, can be used to determine High Needs Areas—areas where the city may need to focus its efforts to ensure better service to residents.

HIGH NEEDS AREAS ARE DETERMINED USING KEY DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS AND AREAS OF POTENTIAL GROWTH
High Needs Areas
Combining the characteristics of 1) population density, 2) household income, 3) youth, 4) seniors, and 5) areas of potential growth results in a composite map of High Needs Areas. The darkest areas of the map represent the areas of the city with the greater need for access to the Parks & Public Lands system. The Central Community shows the greatest concentration of High Needs Areas. Several smaller High Needs Areas occur within the Northwest and West Salt Lake planning areas.

Future LOS for Parks, Natural Lands and Trails
Level of Service (LOS) helps to assess current service. Existing LOS serves as a barometer for determining how parks, natural lands and trails service levels will be affected without the addition of new acreage to offset anticipated future growth. According to this scenario, 94 acres of new park land will be required by 2040 to meet future needs at the same levels of service as today. The present LOS is the standard the public currently enjoys and expects. Similar increases may also be needed in the park amenities, natural lands and trails, although these features tend to be acquired and developed as opportunities arise.

Existing LOS for Salt Lake City Owned & Managed Parks
Existing LOS drops to 3.1 in 2040, if no additional park acres are added.

With little vacant land available to meet the future needs and few resources earmarked for the acquisition and development of existing facilities, maintaining existing levels of service in the future will be one of the most challenging undertakings of the master planning process. This process is expected to begin after this assessment has been released to the public.
The Salt Lake City Parks & Public Lands Needs Assessment reviews existing facilities and amenities and indicates existing and future needs for these areas. This lays the groundwork for the next step toward planning for the city’s parks and public lands—preparing the Salt Lake City Parks & Public Lands Master Plan. It also provides key findings on which daily operational decisions can be based. Following are some of the key findings, listed in no particular order:

1. **Salt Lake City parks and natural lands play key roles in making Salt Lake City a unique and desirable place to live.** Salt Lake City residents value and frequently use their parks, natural lands and trails. Having parks and natural lands close to home directly affects how Salt Lake City residents feel about their quality of life.

2. **Few vacant sites are available to accommodate future parks and natural lands in proximity to currently populated areas.** In this aging community, the lack of affordable and accessible land in areas where new facilities are needed presents a clear challenge.

3. **Salt Lake City’s parks are well-distributed throughout residential areas.** Nearly two-thirds are neighborhood or mini parks, which are key contributors to neighborhood identity.

4. **Natural lands and trails play a significant role in meeting the recreation needs of the community.** The city owns and maintains nearly 1,700 acres of natural lands. These lands are supplemented by more than 8,000 acres of state or federally owned natural lands in or near Salt Lake City.

5. **The majority of city residents live within a half mile of a park, natural land or trail.** This aligns with the city’s Plan Salt Lake goal to have “accessible parks and recreation spaces within a half mile of all residents.” Ensuring that the city’s parks provide the right amenities in the correct locations is an ongoing challenge.

6. **Most parks are easily accessible by car, but pedestrian and bike access needs to be improved.** This requires improving and adding both bike lanes and trail connections to parks and natural lands.

7. **The Central Community planning area has the least access to parks and trails and is expected to experience the highest levels of residential growth.** This area also has no direct access to public natural lands and is underserved by multipurpose fields, baseball/softball fields and trails. Special efforts should be made to increase access to parks and trails in this area.

8. **The Avenues and Capitol Hill planning areas rely heavily on adjacent natural lands.** These planning areas have fewer park acres and amenities than other planning areas and lack flat land for park development, particularly athletic fields.

9. **The majority if the city’s softball and baseball fields are in the Northwest and West Salt Lake planning areas, both of which are located west of I-15.** With the RAC located here, the Northwest planning area has far more multi-purpose fields than other planning areas.

10. **Salt Lake City has more than 70 miles of off-street trails that connect to the city’s parks and natural lands, yet some parks and natural lands are still difficult to reach on foot or by bike.** Implementing the currently proposed off-street trails would significantly improve connectivity between parks, natural lands and other destinations.

11. **The Parks & Public Lands system is critical to community life, supporting numerous events, gatherings, and athletic groups.** As the city grows and its density increases, scheduling special events and maintenance and avoiding overuse will become more challenging.
Parks and natural lands in the Central, Sugar House and East Bench planning areas attract more visitors than other planning areas. Liberty Park is the most frequently visited park and is twice as popular as the second most frequently visited park (Sugar House Park).

Residents hold Liberty Park in high esteem. Liberty Park's trees, diverse activities and regular events attract a steady stream of visitors.

Salt Lake City residents particularly enjoy parks and natural lands that support "on-foot" uses such as hiking, walking, running and non-programmed activities.

Salt Lake City residents are more willing to pay for upgrades and improvements to the city's parks and natural lands than for the development of new facilities. They also support good management of the resources that are available, including improvements to the existing trail system.

East-side residents use parks more than west-side residents, even though the west side has high numbers of park acres and adequate amenities. West-side residents are more likely to travel and use east-side parks.

Trails in local parks and in the foothills see more use. Trails in these locations are also perceived to be safer than the Jordan River Trail.

Athletics enthusiasts indicate that there is a lack of reservable field space in the city. Heavy, peak season demand makes it difficult to rotate fields, which provides little time for turf to rest and recover from activities.

Many existing parks lack essential event infrastructure, such as water and electricity. This places pressure on parks with better infrastructure, such as Liberty Park, Washington Square and Pioneer Park.

Education-related facilities, such as an urban farm or nature education center, are the special use facilities that residents would most like to see funded.

Although user conflicts (e.g., conflicting trail uses, dog-related conflict, etc.) have not reached critical levels, they do occur and are likely to escalate as the population increases.

Residents are supportive of reducing water use on public lands. Reducing areas of high water use turf will require major modifications to irrigation infrastructure and the installation of tree specific irrigation. Residents may not be aware of these initial costs.

The Central Community, Northwest and West Salt Lake planning areas are the city's High Needs Areas and are projected to receive the bulk of the city's future growth. The needs of these areas should be carefully considered as parks and natural lands are expanded and modified.

94 acres of new park land will be required to meet future park needs at the same level of service as today.

Citywide Summary: Acreage

Salt Lake City covers nearly 112 square miles (71,571 acres). Forty-one percent of this area is in the seven populated planning areas. The other three planning areas—the Northwest Quadrant, Airport and City Creek—account for the remaining 59% and are predominantly non-residential.
Citywide Summary

Citywide comparisons by planning area can be used to reveal areas of need. For example, the Central Community, the planning area with the largest population, does not have the most park acres and has no direct access to natural lands.

POPULATION - COMPARISON BY PLANNING AREA

Population distribution by planning area is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Area</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Park LOS</th>
<th>Park LOS with County Facilities</th>
<th>Natural Lands LOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Salt Lake</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitol Hill</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>113.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Community</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avenues</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Bench</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar House</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summaries by Planning Area

Detailed summaries (see example below) of the unique facilities and needs of each planning area can be found in Chapter 5. They demonstrate the diversity of the city and can be used to better understand needs and priorities at the neighborhood level.

PLANNING AREA: NORTHWEST

The Northwest planning area is located on the west side of the city between I-15 and I-215. Its southern boundary is North Temple and its northern boundary by the city limits. Salt Lake City International Airport is located just west of I-215. The Jordan River runs through the center of this area and links several key parks and recreation areas including the Salt Lake Regional Athletic Complex (SLAC), Rose Park Golf Course, Cottonwood Park and Riverview Park. Constitution Park, a Salt Lake County owned facility, is also located in this planning area.

The Northwest planning area is home to one-third of all city owned park land. This is largely due to the recently completed 118-acre RAC being located at the northern end of the planning area. Additionally, the area contains nearly seven percent of the city owned natural lands, all of which are located along the Jordan River.
6 Moving toward a Master Plan

This study reviews existing facilities and amenities and indicates existing and future needs and desires for parks and open lands in the city. It lays the groundwork for the *Salt Lake City Parks & Public Lands Master Plan*, the next step in planning the city’s parks and public lands.

As Salt Lake City grows and changes, the master plan should indicate how the parks, natural lands and trails will evolve to meet future needs and desires. It should reflect clear goals and policies that dovetail the anticipated requirements of the city with public expectations.

The challenges are great, but so are the opportunities.

AN OPPORTUNITY TO ESTABLISH A NEW VISION

The new master plan should establish a clear vision on which to base future decisions. Model plans from other cities focus on sustainability and equity, and identify new ways to think about parks, natural lands, trails and recreation. They address parks and natural lands as critical infrastructure for maintaining and improving quality of life.

Such cutting-edge thought processes and paradigms are encouraged as the master plan is developed. This will help ensure that park-poor neighborhoods receive the attention they deserve, and that new parks and natural lands meet the needs and desires of city residents.

There is a real opportunity to go beyond focusing on the numbers, and to address parks and natural lands as essential elements for better air quality, climate change mitigation, energy efficiency, and environmental justice. Parks can help improve the health of the city.

The new master plan should distinguish Salt Lake City as a community that deeply values parks and natural lands. In addition to describing the physical needs, it can also show how park and natural lands assets can be leveraged to increase economic and social benefits.

*The new master plan is an opportunity to distinguish Salt Lake City as a community that understands the importance of parks and natural lands.*

Photo Credit: SLCTV Media
1.0 INTRODUCTION

Salt Lake City has a rich tradition of parks and public lands. Beginning in the earliest days of settlement with the creation of Pioneer Park—the city’s first public park—and continuing with the establishment of new parks and natural lands, the city has demonstrated its commitment to providing great public parks and gathering places.

Throughout this time the city has responded to changing needs and desires. Different types of parks have been provided to meet the needs of a growing community, the range of amenities and assets has been modified to address changing demographics, and new processes and routines have been established that address changing demands and funding challenges.
1.1 Parks, Natural Lands & Trails
Create a Sense of Place

What makes a place unique? Those features that can’t be found anywhere else! The following elements are just a few pieces of Salt Lake City’s Parks & Public Lands system that make Salt Lake City unlike anywhere else.

LIBERTY PARK
There is no doubt about it, Liberty Park is the crown jewel of Salt Lake City's park system. This nearly 97.5-acre park—located in the center of the city—is one the state's oldest and most prominent, having served as a central community gathering space since 1882. Today, the park hosts 78 community events each year including many that are long-standing. This is a place where people come to enjoy the shade under a canopy of majestic trees, to play lawn games, barbecue, have parties and take part in a range of other activities such as jogging, bicycling, swimming, tennis, rowing, horseshoes and volleyball.

CITY CEMETERY
Located in the Avenues, the 121.3-acre City Cemetery is the largest municipally owned cemetery in the country. With the first burial taking place in 1848, the cemetery has served as a special place within the city for 170 years. Now with 130,000 burial sites, the cemetery is not only historically significant—serving as a place for tours and genealogical research—but it is also an arboretum and space for stargazing, walking, jogging, and wildlife watching (see the recently completed SLC Cemetery Master Plan for more information).

JORDAN RIVER PARKWAY
The Jordan River Trail runs adjacent to the Jordan River from Utah Lake to the Great Salt Lake. The 45-mile multi-use trail is predominantly located in Salt Lake County, linking with other major trail systems in Davis County (Legacy Trail) and Utah County (Murdock Canal Trail). The 9 miles of the parkway that fall within the city link a range of great destinations, including two municipal golf courses, nine city parks and one Salt Lake County park.

FOOTHILLS
Located along the northeast edge of the Salt Lake Valley, Salt Lake City is tucked into the Wasatch Mountains. Residents and visitors have access to the multitude of recreation trails in the foothills of the Wasatch Mountains within minutes of their home, including the flagship Bonneville Shoreline Trail. Many residents have nearby access to a foothill trailhead, making these trails particularly important recreation facilities.

REGIONAL ATHLETIC COMPLEX (RAC)
Completed in the fall of 2015, the Regional Athletic Complex (RAC) offers 16 premier multi-purpose playing fields. The 120-acre complex attracts local, regional and national sporting events and is conveniently situated at the northern end of the city, near I-215. In 2017, the RAC hosted six regional and national tournaments that had over 17,000 out-of-state players and spectators with an estimated $10 million impact to Salt Lake City and Salt Lake County.

URBAN FOREST
Salt Lake City’s urban forest consists of 85,000 publicly owned and managed trees. With nearly two-thirds of those being street trees, the remaining one-third are growing in public parks and natural lands. Some of those trees are 150 years or older. The city’s urban forest helps create the city’s identity. It also helps clean our air, reduces ambient temperatures, the amount of energy needed to cool buildings, and increases property values—making Salt Lake City an overall better place to live and work.

NEIGHBORHOOD & MINI PARKS
Seventy-five percent of Salt Lake City’s Parks & Public Lands are neighborhood or mini parks and play a key role in establishing community identity at the neighborhood level. Ranging anywhere from under an acre to just over 24, these smaller parks are integral green spaces that many city residents can easily walk to within a matter of minutes.
Salt Lake City is unlike anywhere else

**Neighborhood & Mini Parks**—such as Westminster Park—play a key role in the daily lives of nearby residents.

**Liberty Park** is the crown jewel of Salt Lake City’s parks system and is home to many of the City’s oldest and best tree specimens.

Salt Lake City’s 120-acre **City Cemetery** is the largest municipally owned cemetery in the country.

Salt Lake City’s **foothills** provide a multitude of recreational trails, reachable within just minutes.

Salt Lake City’s **Jordan River Trail** links 9 city parks and 3 golf courses to a 45-mile multi-use trail system.

Salt Lake City’s **Regional Athletic Complex** has 16 premier multi-purpose fields and attracts sporting events from across the country.
1.2 SLC Parks, Natural Lands & Trails are Highly Valuable to SLC Residents

As part of this needs assessment, a statistically valid survey was conducted in July 2017 (for more information, see Chapter 3). Not surprisingly, Salt Lake City residents frequently use their parks and natural lands, and report that **having parks and natural lands close to home is an important factor in their quality of life.**

### SLC Residents Use Parks, Natural Lands and Trails

The statistically valid survey shows that parks and natural lands are a regular part of life for Salt Lake City residents. Approximately 42% of respondents use parks at least weekly and 72% visit parks once a month or more. These numbers rise for those residents that have children at home, with 53% visiting parks at least weekly and 87% visiting once a month or more.

According to the statistically valid survey, Salt Lake City’s trails are also well-used. Nearly 30 percent of respondents use paved trails at least weekly and 58% use them once a month or more. These numbers are only slightly lower for unpaved trails, with 27% of respondents using them at least weekly and 56% percent once a month or more.

**Question.** Within the last 12 months, approximately how many times have you visited a park in Salt Lake?

**Question.** Within the last 12 months, approximately how many times have you used a paved, fully separated trail for walking, biking, running, etc. in Salt Lake?

**Question.** Within the last 12 months, approximately how many times have you used a paved, fully separated trail for walking, biking, running, etc. in Salt Lake?
PROXIMITY OF PARKS, NATURAL LANDS AND TRAILS IS IMPORTANT

Having a park close to home is important to residents. Close proximity was the number one reason for residents visiting their most frequented park and was more important than atmosphere or exercise.

Primary reason for visiting their most frequented park:

- **39%** Close to home
- **15%** Trees & Atmosphere
- **15%** Exercise

Known for its cat sculptures, Steenblik Park is a 0.6-acre mini park nestled in a neighborhood on the northwest side of the city.

The importance of proximity is solidified when residents were asked how important it is to have a public park within walking or biking distance of their home. A majority of residents believe it is extremely important to have public parks within walking distance (1/2 mile or ten minutes) of their homes. Over one-third indicated it was extremely important to have a park within biking distance (two miles or ten minutes) of their home.

**97% of SLC residents think it’s important to live within walking distance of a park**

**Question.** In your opinion, how important is it to have public parks within...
- **walking distance** of your home (i.e. within half a mile or 10 minutes)?
- **biking distance** of your home (i.e. within 2 miles or 10 minutes)?
According to the statistically valid survey, Salt Lake City residents rate their quality of life high, with an average score of 78 on a scale of 0-100. Ninety-five percent of residents surveyed say their quality of life in Salt Lake City is above a 50 on the 0-100 scale.

**AVERAGE QUALITY OF LIFE IN SLC IS HIGH**

![Average Quality of Life in SLC is High Graph]

**Question.** All things considered, on a scale from 0 to 100, with 0 being very low and 100 being very high, how would you rate your quality of life in Salt Lake City?

Residents who report visiting Salt Lake City parks once a week or more rate their overall quality of life in the city higher.

On average, residents throughout the city who report visiting parks once a week or more rate their overall quality of life three points higher on the 0-100 scale than those who do not, even after demographic variables and socio-economic indicators are taken into consideration. A three point shift is statistically significant when quality of life scores are clustered as tightly as they are in Salt Lake City. This suggests that city parks have an important, positive impact in the daily lives of Salt Lake City residents.

![Parks Contribute to Quality of Life Graph]

**SLC PARKS INFLUENCE SLC RESIDENTS’ QUALITY OF LIFE**
1.3 Why Parks, Natural Lands & Trails are Essential

Parks, natural lands and trails are not only important to Salt Lake City residents, they are a critical piece in a dynamic city that nearly 200,000 residents call home.

SENSE OF PLACE
Salt Lake City’s parks, natural lands and trails are integral components of what makes Salt Lake City a unique place. They are part of history, born out of the geography and an important part of the city fabric. Salt Lake City just wouldn’t be the same without them.

COMMUNITY GATHERING
Spend time in Liberty Park, at the Living Traditions Festival in Washington Square, or a Sunday in Memory Grove, and you’ll easily see that parks are places where the community gathers. Research indicates that when parks are programmed with events such as team sports, athletic activities, and exercise groups, they are more likely to be used than those that don’t.1

The Living Traditions Festival is an annual, three-day cultural celebration with traditional music, dance, foods and crafts of ethnic communities. The event is held at Washington Square every May.

---

1 The Trust for Public Land, 8 Ways the Parks Improve Your Health, 2013
QUALITY OF LIFE
Parks, natural lands and trails are places of refuge. They provide a break from the built environment and daily life. Whether people exercise in parks or not, studies have shown that people who live closer to parks report better mental health, and that exposure to nature reduces stress, promotes relaxation, and boosts concentration. Since our public parks, natural lands and trails are open to anyone, they provide opportunities to recreate and enjoy nature at little or no cost. When designed well, they can provide opportunities for people of all ages and abilities.

PUBLIC HEALTH
People are living longer and regular exercise is a key factor in staying healthy. Public parks provide free access and diverse recreational opportunities to people of all ages, income levels and abilities. According to the Trust for Public Land, the more parks there are in a community, the more likely people are to exercise. People are more likely to exercise if parks are closer to home.

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE
Salt Lake City’s parks, natural lands and urban forest provide essential environmental benefits to the urban environment—including the provision of stormwater detention and retention, habitat for wildlife and pollinators, the reduction of the urban heat island effect (an increase in temperature that is created by urban elements and activities) and the creation of carbon sinks (vegetated areas that help absorb carbon dioxide from the atmosphere). As urban development within the city increases, the importance of protecting and enhancing the city’s parks, natural lands and urban forest does too.

ECONOMICS
A park or natural area can be found on almost every tourism guide list for Salt Lake City. Well-maintained parks and natural lands not only help bring in the tourism dollars, but also increase property values of nearby properties. Parks and natural lands help offset the costs of healthcare by providing places for people to exercise, reduce infrastructure costs, help mitigate air pollution, and generally reduce the physical and economic cost of operating a city.

People who live closer to parks report better mental health, and that exposure to nature reduces stress, promotes relaxation, and boosts concentration.

---

2 The Trust for Public Land, 8 Ways the Parks Improve Your Health, 2013
3 The Trust for Public Land, 8 Ways the Parks Improve Your Health, 2013
4 The Trust for Public Land, Measuring the Economic Value of a City Park System, 2009
1.4 Why Assess Our Parks, Natural Lands & Trails?

Salt Lake City is growing at a fast rate, yet has a lack of vacant lands and inadequate funding to acquire new acreage and develop parks to meet growth. Overcoming these obstacles and planning for the future requires a coordinated effort between city departments and elected officials. To make informed policy decisions that will result in tangible improvements to the city’s Parks & Public Lands system, it is essential to measure the quantity and quality of existing parks and natural lands.

GROWTH

Looking at historic growth and building permit data, Salt Lake City’s estimated 2017 population of 196,307 is anticipated to increase by 27,052 by 2040. The city recently experienced a development boom between 2014 and 2016, with a dramatic increase in the number of new housing units permitted. If growth continues in a similar direction, it could rise much more quickly, reaching the projected threshold within ten years (see Chapter 4 for more information).

VACANT LANDS

Salt Lake City is nearly built out. As indicated in the vacant lands map on the following page, there are very few vacant sites to accommodate future parks and natural lands in proximity to currently populated areas. With the majority of vacant land located in the west-lying industrial areas of the city, future development will most likely occur through infill, redevelopment and densification. The city’s parks and natural lands are beginning to experience the challenges that come with density—such as conflicts between user groups (bikers vs. hikers and runners on trails, and dog owners and their dogs vs. those without dogs, for example). The pressure on the city’s parks and natural lands resources will continue to increase as the city grows and density increases.

FUNDING

Although the Operations & Maintenance Budget of the Parks & Public Lands Division has grown at an annual average growth rate (“AAGR”) of 6.55% from 2010 to 2017, it nevertheless continues to experience challenges with budgets that doesn’t stretch far enough. Over the years, acreage (additional parks, trails, medians, streetscapes and freeway interchange landscapes), inflation and utility increases have grown at a faster rate than Division budgets.

Annual funding allocated for capital replacement and capital renewal needs—such as playground and restroom replacement, and large amenity repairs—as well as new investments that directly address new population growth, falls far behind projected needs calculated in the Capital Facilities Plan (an estimated $17.9 million). If funding and subsequent investments in new and existing facilities do not increase, the level of service for each resident of the city will reduce over time. The city continues to see increasingly higher levels of demand on existing resources making it harder for residents to access recreation facilities and increasing wear and tear on assets.

Additionally, due to competing needs within the city, the Parks & Public Lands capital budget varies widely from year to year, making it a challenge to keep up with the needs of the Parks & Public Lands system.

* Spikes in Capital Expenses during the 2014-2015 years were due to the capital investment in several large projects, i.e. the Recreational Athletic Center (2014) and Red Butte Oil Spill remediation related projects (2015)
Vacant Lands

The bulk of vacant and agriculturally-zoned land is located in the western portion of the city, primarily within the mostly-undeveloped Northwest Quadrant planning area. The city owns large portions of land in the foothills for watershed protection and for the Salt Lake International Airport and its associated protection zone. There is little vacant land near established neighborhoods and proposed growth areas to meet future demand for parks and recreation needs.
1.5 Purpose of the Needs Assessment

With nearly 700 acres of parks and 1,700 acres of natural lands, this study documents what the city has, identifies gaps and underserved areas, and highlights considerations for future improvements. With the last parks master planning effort being nearly 50 years ago (in the 1970’s), this Needs Assessment is the first step toward the creation of a new Parks & Public Lands Master Plan. It will serve as a primary source of research for master planning efforts, which will be completed as a separate project slated to commence in 2019.

More specifically, the following chapters of the Salt Lake City Parks & Public Lands Needs Assessment explore the following:

- **Chapter 2: Existing Conditions Analysis** evaluates the existing conditions of the city’s parks and natural lands network and associated facilities AND establishes existing and future level-of-service conditions.

- **Chapter 3: Community Values and Desires** articulates community values and priorities to inform planning and project prioritization.

- **Chapter 4: Future Needs** explores population projections and future needs.

- **Chapter 5: Summary of Findings** identifies unmet needs and future opportunities with a focus on underserved neighborhoods and districts.

- **Chapter 6: Moving Toward a Master Plan** identifies challenges and opportunities discovered as part of the Needs Assessment and key questions and considerations moving forward to the Master Plan.
2.0 EXISTING CONDITIONS

In order to get a comprehensive understanding of the city’s existing parks, natural lands and trails system, data was collected and a series of analyses were completed, as follow:

1. EXISTING PARKS, NATURAL LANDS & TRAILS
   All of Salt Lake City’s parks and natural lands were mapped, and their size and role within the community analyzed. Additionally, the unique characteristics of each planning area, including the park types and their variation from planning area to planning area were investigated, helping to provide a clear picture of Salt Lake City’s Parks & Public Lands system. Detailed planning area information can be found in Chapter 5: Summary of Findings.

COMPARISON CITIES OVERVIEW
   Two nearby cities of similar size—Boise, Idaho and Fort Collins, Colorado—were looked at as comparables to get a clearer understanding of Salt Lake City’s Parks and Public Lands system. Comparison data for these two cities is introduced in this chapter and presented throughout the Needs Assessment.

LEVEL OF SERVICE FOR PARKS & NATURAL LANDS
   Level of service calculations were completed to provide a better understanding of the number of park and natural land acres in relation to Salt Lake City’s population. Specifically, the number of parks and natural lands acres the city has per 1,000 people was calculated and then compared with the comparable cities.

DISTRIBUTION ANALYSES
   Distribution analyses indicate how parks are distributed geographically and where service gaps exist. They also indicate underserved areas and how accessible parks and natural lands are by foot, bike and car.

AMENITY LOS & DISTRIBUTION ANALYSES
   Since each park is unique and the amenities provided vary, a closer look at individual amenities (e.g. multi-purpose fields, playgrounds, tennis courts, and so on) was undertaken. Amenity distribution was mapped and the level of service of amenities calculated to better understand where gaps exist in the city.

TRAILS & CONNECTIVITY
   Off-street trails and on-street bike routes connect people to parks and natural areas. An analysis of the proximity of parks to existing trails was undertaken in conjunction with the determination of trail proximity to city residences.

2. EXISTING PARK USE
   Understanding how parks are used provides another layer for understanding Salt Lake City’s Parks & Public Lands system. This effort focused on community events, sports uses and the challenges associated with meeting public demands.

3. CITY EXPENSES
   In order to get a sense of the financial challenges the Parks & Public Lands Division faces, current expenses were compared to those of the comparison cities, as well as historical budget and spending patterns.
2.1 Existing Parks, Natural Lands & Trails

Existing Parks & Natural Lands Acres
Salt Lake City has 689.8 acres of existing park land and 1,693.7 acres of city owned natural lands. Parks are well-distributed throughout the residential areas of the city, with natural lands concentrated in the foothills and along the Jordan River.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Parks</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acres of Park</td>
<td>689.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Parks</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Park Size</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Acres per 1,000 Residents</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing City Owned Natural Lands</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acres of Natural Lands</td>
<td>1,693.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acres of Urban Natural Lands</td>
<td>526.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acres of Non-Urban Natural Lands</td>
<td>1,167.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Lands per 1,000 Residents</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By the numbers...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Salt Lake City</th>
<th>Boise</th>
<th>Fort Collins</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>196,307</td>
<td>218,677</td>
<td>157,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acres of Park</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>2,213</td>
<td>1,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Acres per 1,000 Residents</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acres of Natural Lands</td>
<td>1,694</td>
<td>4,386</td>
<td>36,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Lands per 1,000 Residents</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>229.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The map below shows the location of parks and public lands owned by Salt Lake City, as well as by Salt Lake County and other public agencies. With the exception of the Modelport located on the southwest edge of the city, all parks are concentrated within established population areas, east of the Salt Lake International Airport.
## Existing Parks by Type

As illustrated in the chart below, Salt Lake City has a range of different parks that, when considered as a whole, create a robust and varied park system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Parks</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty Park</td>
<td>88.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Athletic Complex</td>
<td>118.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal: Regional Parks</strong></td>
<td><strong>207.1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Parks</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th Ave Park</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700 South River Park</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottonwood Park</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairmont Park</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendale Park</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herman Franks Park</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan Park/Peace Gardens</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan River Par 3</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memory Grove Park</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside Park</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosewood Park</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorenson Multi-Cultural Center</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnyside Park</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm Springs Park</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Park</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal: Community Parks</strong></td>
<td><strong>280.1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighborhood Parks</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900 South River Park</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Creek Park</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donner Trail Park</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensign Downs Park</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson Park</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindsey Gardens</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madsen Park</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadows Park</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Hill Ball Diamond</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parleys Way Park</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poplar Grove Park</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popperton Park</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reservoir Park</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond Park</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotary Glen Park</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherwood Park</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratford Park</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasatch Hollow Park</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westpointe Park</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal: Neighborhood Parks</strong></td>
<td><strong>148.4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mini Parks

- 337 Garden Park
- 5th Ave & C Street Pickleball
- 600 East Park
- Almond Park
- Artesian Well Park
- Beatrice Evans Park
- Beldon Park
- Cotten Park
- Curtis Park
- Davis Park
- Elizabeth Sherman Park
- Ensign Peak Nature Park Entry
- Faustine Gardens Park
- Fire Station Tennis
- First Encampment Park
- Galagher Tot Lot
- Guadalupe Park
- Imperial Park
- Inglewood Park
- Jackson Park
- Jake Garn Park
- Kay Rees Park
- Kletting Park
- Laird Park
- Miami Park
- Modesto Park
- Nelli Jack Park
- People’s Freeway Park
- Post Street Tot Lot
- Pugsley Ouray park
- Redwood Meadows Park
- Ron Heaps Park
- Shields Park
- Shipp Park
- Silver Park
- Stanton Park
- Steenblik Park
- Swede Town Park
- Tauffer Park
- Van Ness Tot Lot
- Victory Park
- Weseman Park
- Westminster Park

### Special Event Parks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library Square</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pioneer Park</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Square</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal: Special Event Parks</strong></td>
<td><strong>30.1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Grand Total Parks

- Salt Lake City Parks & Public Lands Needs Assessment
Existing Parks by Type

City staff has classified the parks into several categories, based on the parks’ characteristics and roles in the community—not just size.

A  REGIONAL PARKS - 2 TOTAL
Regional parks are the largest in Salt Lake City. Their size and amenities make them regional attractions, and include swimming pools, cultural venues, and special events facilities. The two regional parks in the city total 207 acres. Liberty Park is the flagship, and the Regional Athletic Complex is a large, sports-specific venue.

B  COMMUNITY PARKS - 15 TOTAL
Like regional parks, community parks are large parks focused on meeting the major park and recreation needs of the city. They range in size from three to 29 acres and encompass a total of 280 acres. They often include a special amenity or recreation facility, such as athletic courts, sports fields and playgrounds.

C  NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS - 19 TOTAL
Neighborhood parks are generally smaller than community parks and primarily serve neighborhood needs. They typically mix large and small amenities, such as open lawns and grass play areas, pavilions, playgrounds, sport courts and fields. They range from less than one to over 24 acres in size and encompass a total of 148 acres.

D  MINI PARKS - 42 TOTAL
As the name indicates, mini parks are small sites that range from less than one to nearly two acres in size. They are the most prevalent park type in the city and predominate in older, urbanized areas. Mini parks encompass 24 acres in total.

E  SPECIAL EVENT PARKS - 3 TOTAL
Centered in the downtown core, the three special events parks provide non-traditional park/plaza experiences. They each encompass an entire city block, which is equal to 10 acres (30 acres total), and primarily serve as settings for passive recreation or community events and festivals.
Existing Natural Lands by Type

Natural lands were classified into two categories—urban and non-urban. The categories were developed with participation from city staff, and reflect the role they serve within the community, as well as the amount of care, maintenance dollars and resources they require. Parks & Public Lands also maintains lands along major trails, such as the McClelland, 9 Line and Jordan River Parkway Trails, and dirt jump/pump track areas at three locations (9 Line, Parleys Historic Nature Park and the foothills behind the Upper Avenues).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban Natural Lands</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2200 West Farm</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Line</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bend in the River</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaine Preserve</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannon Greens Urban Farm</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Creek Natural Area</td>
<td>130.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fife Wetland Preserve</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garfield School</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hidden Hollow &amp; the Draw</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan River Parkway Habitat</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan River Parkway Trail Side</td>
<td>67.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller Bird Refuge</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parleys Historic Nature Park</td>
<td>85.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popperton Preserve</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAC Restoration Area</td>
<td>53.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverview Open Space</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasatch Hollow Preserve</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Urban Natural Lands</td>
<td>68.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal: Urban Natural Lands</strong></td>
<td>526.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Urban Natural Lands</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Foothills Open Space</td>
<td>322.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensign Peak</td>
<td>116.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Foothills Open Space</td>
<td>676.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Foothills Open Space</td>
<td>53.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Subtotal: Non-Urban Natural Lands</td>
<td>1,167.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total Natural Lands</strong></td>
<td>1,693.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**URBAN NATURAL LANDS VS. NON-URBAN NATURAL LANDS**

Urban natural lands are typically surrounded by urban development or adjacent to manicured parks and often serve a park-like function. These natural areas require a higher level of maintenance and resources. Non-urban natural lands—such as the foothills above the U of U or Avenues—require much less maintenance and, therefore, maintenance dollars. They often provide direct connections with other public lands and are dominated by trails and trail-type uses.
Special Use Parks

Special use parks are non-traditional parks which vary in size and tend to serve a special interest. Several of the city’s special use parks—the Dee Glen Smith Tennis Center, Seven Peaks Water Park and Tracy Aviary—are owned by the city, but are leased or operated by others, and require entry fees. Others—the Modelport (an ‘airport’ for model airplanes) and Gilgal Gardens (a unique sculpture garden)—are maintained by Parks & Public Lands Division and do not require an entry fee.

### Special Use Parks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dee Glen Smith Tennis Center</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilgal Gardens</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modelport</td>
<td>69.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven Peaks Water Park</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy Aviary</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total Special Use Parks</strong></td>
<td><strong>99.7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Landscapes Maintained by Parks & Public Lands

### CITY CEMETERY

Salt Lake City’s Parks & Public Lands Division also maintains the 121.3-acre City Cemetery. The City Cemetery serves as an arboretum and a critical park land where people come to stargaze, walk/jog, and watch wildlife.

### OTHER LANDSCAPES

The Parks & Public Lands Division maintains 83.4 acres of other city owned landscapes, including those surrounding senior and recreation centers, the Public Safety Building, other city office/storage buildings, museums, and historic properties (such as Fisher Mansion). The Division also maintains a large number of retention ponds, roadway medians and islands, and interstate on and off-ramps throughout the city.

### Additional Landscapes Maintained by PPL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landscapes</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Cemetery</td>
<td>121.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Use Parks (Gilgal Gardens &amp; Modelport)</td>
<td>70.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscapes Surrounding City Buildings</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention Ponds, Medians, On-Ramps, etc.</td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total Additional Landscapes</strong></td>
<td><strong>275.6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contributing Lands Not Maintained by Parks & Public Lands

### COUNTY AND JOINTLY OWNED PARKS

There are two Salt Lake County parks that lie within the Salt Lake City’s boundary—Constitution and Tanner Park. Sugar House Park, a nearly 110-acre park in the Sugar House planning area, is jointly owned by Salt Lake City and Salt Lake County. In 1957 the city and county jointly transferred the property to the Sugar House Park Authority in a 99-year trust effective until December 31, 2055. A representative from Salt Lake City and Salt Lake County sits on the Park Authority’s Board of Trustees, along with seven volunteer members. Together these three parks add just over 137 acres of park lands to the total.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County &amp; Jointly Owned Parks</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constitution Park</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar House Park</td>
<td>109.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanner Park</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total County &amp; Jointly Owned Parks</strong></td>
<td><strong>137.2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CITY GOLF COURSES

Salt Lake City currently owns and operates golf courses at six different locations. The golf courses are operated by the city’s Golf Division, as an independent enterprise. They provide valuable recreation opportunities to Salt Lake City residents and contribute just over 1,010 acres of visual natural lands.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Golf Courses</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bonneville Golf Course (18 holes)</td>
<td>178.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Dale Golf Course (9 holes)</td>
<td>60.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendale Golf Course (18 holes)</td>
<td>169.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Dell Golf Course (Two 18-hole courses)</td>
<td>394.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nibley Park Golf Course (9 holes)</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose Park Golf Course (18 holes)</td>
<td>155.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total City Golf Courses</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,010.8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Lands Owned and/or Maintained by Salt Lake City Parks & Public Lands Division

When combined, the Salt Lake City Parks & Public Lands Division owns and/or manages nearly 2,688 acres of land. It is interesting to note that natural land acres are overwhelmingly dominant, accounting for nearly three times more land than parks and other landscapes combined.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lands Owned and/or Maintained by PPL</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Parks</td>
<td>207.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Parks</td>
<td>280.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Parks</td>
<td>148.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini Parks</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Event Parks</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal: Parks</strong></td>
<td><strong>689.8</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Lands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Natural Lands</td>
<td>526.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Urban Natural Lands</td>
<td>1167.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal: Natural Lands</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,693.7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Landscapes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Cemetery</td>
<td>121.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Use Parks</td>
<td>99.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscapes Surrounding City Buildings</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention Ponds, Medians, On-Ramps, etc.</td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal: Additional Landscapes</strong></td>
<td><strong>304.4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,687.9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When combined, the Salt Lake City Parks & Public Lands Division owns and/or manages nearly 2,688 acres of land. It is interesting to note that natural land acres are overwhelmingly dominant, accounting for nearly three times more land than parks and other landscapes combined.
In order to get a clear picture of Salt Lake City’s Parks & Public Lands system, two cities were looked at as comparables:

1) **Boise, Idaho**
2) **Fort Collins, Colorado**

These cities were selected based on their population, western locale, and their role as regional population centers. As of 2017, the population of Salt Lake City was 196,307. As a prominent western capital, Salt Lake City is a population center and a hub for business and recreation for residents along the Wasatch Front. As of 2017, the population of Boise—the Idaho state capital—was 220,923. Fort Collins is the most populous city in northern Colorado with a population of 159,578.

### Comparison City Populations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Salt Lake City</strong></td>
<td>196,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boise</strong></td>
<td>218,677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fort Collins</strong></td>
<td>157,251</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparison data for these cities is introduced here and presented throughout the Needs Assessment.

Salt Lake City’s Parks & Public Lands system serves a residential population of 196,307. Some estimate that this population doubles during the daytime, due to individuals coming into the city to work.

**Salt Lake City**

Up until recently, Salt Lake City’s Parks & Public Lands Division was a maintenance only facility. Over the last five years, planners were added and the department was renamed Parks & Public Lands Division. The Division now manages and oversees the city’s parks, a city owned cemetery, the urban forest, natural lands (foothills, gullies, and lands adjacent to the Jordan River and other waterways), landscapes for city properties, and a number of street medians and freeway interchange landscapes throughout the city. Beyond scheduling sports fields and events within its parks, the city does not oversee recreation programs and facilities within the city (these are run by Salt Lake County).

Salt Lake City is nestled in the foothills of the Wasatch Mountains and provides access to an amazing network of recreational trails. The crown-jewel of Salt Lake City’s parks system is the 89-acre park Liberty Park, which is centrally-located and is a major hub for community events. Salt Lake City has one of the largest municipally owned cemeteries in the country and the city recently completed a challenging section of the Jordan River Parkway to create a 45-mile long continuous trail through the Salt Lake Valley.

**COMMON ISSUES/CHALLENGES**

Salt Lake City’s Parks & Public Lands has several major challenges:

1) Homeless populations in parks and natural lands—An increase of homeless populations living in parks and natural lands has created a new, unanticipated use which often causes discomfort to other users and makes daily maintenance more challenging.

2) Deferred maintenance—Maintenance budgets have not increased, but the number of lands to be maintained has consistently grown.

3) The amount of affordable, available land to develop new large parks within the city is hard to find.
Boise

The Boise Parks and Recreation Department oversees cemeteries, parks, golf courses, ice rinks, urban forests, natural lands, recreation and right of ways.

The City of Boise has a collection of parks along the Boise River known as the ‘Ribbon of Jewels.’ All of the parks along the River are named after influential Boise women, including the newest which is named Esther Simplot Park. In addition, many of the parks are connected by the Boise River Greenbelt, which is one of the most beloved “parks”. The pathway along the Boise River gives cyclists and walkers an up-close look at visiting wildlife. Boise manages about 25 miles of the Greenbelt, with interconnectivity to other nearby cities (about 50 miles of connected path in all).

Boise Parks and Recreation’s natural lands system is unique in that it encompasses more than 190 miles of trails spread out across the Boise Foothills. Boise residents have passed levies on two occasions to pay for preservation of natural lands within the city.

**COMMON ISSUES/CHALLENGES**
The City of Boise’s Parks and Recreation Department faces several major challenges including:

1) Deferred maintenance—Maintenance budgets have not increased, but the amount of park land and natural lands to be managed/ maintained has consistently grown.

2) The amount of affordable, available land to develop new, especially large scale parks is becoming increasingly hard to find.

3) Catering to multiple uses of park amenities. For example: managing the use of e-bikes on city managed paths and trails.

Fort Collins

The City of Fort Collins Parks Division is responsible for parks, trail systems, the downtown core, city grounds, forestry, cemeteries and golf courses. With one exception, all Fort Collins parks, golf courses, and cemeteries are Audubon Certified Sanctuaries. Fort Collins is a leader in the application of water conservation techniques along Colorado’s Front Range. A large percentage of their Park Techs are certified landscape water auditors, and the Division is routinely invited to share information on current practice and processes. The city is also recognized for consistently high quality and well-maintained sports fields, hosting several tournaments a year as a result.

Fort Collins has two “World Class” playgrounds and five unique water features, all maintained at the same level as public pools, which require certified Pool Operator or certified Park Techs. City trails include a network of hard surfaced trails that connect with Loveland, a neighboring city to the south, and will connect with Greeley, a city to the southeast, within the next five years.

The City of Fort Collins also manages 40 natural areas covering more than 36,000 acres.

**COMMON ISSUES/CHALLENGES**
The City of Fort Collins Parks Division experiences similar issues to Salt Lake City, including:

1) A transient population in the parks

2) Budget constraints

3) High public expectations

4) Vandalism and graffiti

5) Meeting increasing demand for pickle ball facilities
2.1.2 Level of Service (LOS) for Parks & Natural Lands

Level of Service (LOS)

LOS analyzes the provision of parks as a function of park acres in relation to population.

**LOS** = Existing Parks Acres per Person x 1,000

When combined with a distribution analysis (see Section 2.1.2), LOS can help provide an understanding of how well the city’s current parks and natural lands meet the needs of its residents.

LOS can also be used as a starting point to determine how much additional park and natural land acreage will be needed as the city’s population continues to grow (see Chapter 4: Future Needs).

**LOS for Parks**

The existing Level of Service (LOS) for parks is **3.5 acres per 1,000 people**. This includes regional, community, neighborhood, mini and special event parks. Special use parks such as Tracy Aviary, the Modelport, the City Cemetery, and Salt Lake County and jointly owned parks were excluded from this calculation as they do not serve traditional park functions, are pay-to-play facilities, serve only a small segment of the population, or are not controlled by the city.

There are three Salt Lake County or jointly owned parks (Sugar House, Constitution & Tanner) that lie within Salt Lake City’s boundary. When acreage from these parks are factored in, the existing LOS for the city for parks climbs to **4.2 acres per 1,000 people**.
LOS for Natural Lands

Salt Lake City Parks and Public Lands owns a total of 1,693.7 acres of natural lands, which equates to an LOS of **8.6 acres per 1,000 people**. Additional land owned by the United States Forest Service (USFS), University of Utah, Salt Lake City Public Utilities and other landowners in the foothills add several thousand more acres of functional natural lands, making the actual LOS for the city substantially higher.

In comparison to park land which has typically been acquired and developed specifically to meet traditional park needs, natural lands tend to have been acquired more opportunistically, as part of preserving hillsides, ravines and similar features of the city’s natural systems.

**Existing LOS for Salt Lake City Owned Natural Lands**
8.6 acres per 1,000

### By the Numbers...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Salt Lake City</th>
<th>Boise</th>
<th>Fort Collins</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park LOS</td>
<td>3.5 ac/1,000</td>
<td>10.1 ac/1,000</td>
<td>6.8 ac/1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Lands LOS</td>
<td>8.6 ac/1,000</td>
<td>20.0 ac/1,000</td>
<td>228.9 ac/1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total LOS</td>
<td>12.1 ac/1,000</td>
<td>30.1 ac/1,000</td>
<td>235.7 ac/1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More than 8,000 acres of state or federally owned natural lands supplement Salt Lake City owned natural lands to make up an impressive natural lands system, much of which is interconnected by trails.

*The City of Fort Collins manages 40 natural areas covering more than 36,000 acres. These areas are managed using a separate budget from the Parks Division budget.*
LOS by Planning Area

Salt Lake City is comprised of ten unique planning areas, established by the city’s Planning Department for neighborhood planning purposes. Three of these planning areas—the Northwest Quadrant, Airport, and City Creek—are predominantly non-residential and make up nearly 60% of the city’s area. The remaining seven planning areas, highlighted in the figure below, encompass significant residential neighborhoods and are the focus of this study. More detailed descriptions of each of the residential planning areas can be found in Chapter 5.

When taking a closer look at parks and natural lands by planning area, the Central Community has the lowest park LOS and no natural lands within its boundary. As covered in Chapter 4, the Central Community is the planning area slated for most of the future growth within the city. It is also interesting to note how dramatically Sugar House Park impacts existing LOS for parks in the Sugar House planning area, raising it from 1.1 to 4.7 acres/1,000. Four of the seven planning areas have significant state or federally owned natural lands within or adjacent to their boundaries, which enhances their natural lands acreage.
2.1.3 Distribution Analysis

The distribution of parks, natural lands and trails was mapped and analyzed according to walk distance and by bike/drive time and then correlated to residential development. The Central Community and Sugar House planning areas have more gaps in service than other areas. However, access to parks within a five-minute drive from home is well distributed throughout the city.

Individual park amenities were also evaluated for distribution. This analysis indicates that the Central Community lacks multipurpose fields and has fewer ball fields compared to other planning areas.
Parks, natural lands and trails are shown with different service area radii that reflect the function of the feature. As detailed in the figure below, special use parks, and regional and community parks serve a larger area of the community, and are therefore represented with a larger service area radius. This analysis indicates that the city is well-covered, with the exception of a gap in the Sugar House planning area, indicated in yellow.
Distribution Analysis: 1/4-Mile Service Area

When looking at areas of the city that are within a 1/4 mile of a park, natural lands or trail, the biggest gaps in distribution occur in the Central Community and Sugar House planning areas. These are some of the densest urban areas of the city (see Chapter 4), where walkability is most needed. Yellow areas indicate residential areas outside of the quarter-mile service area. Purple areas are within the quarter-mile service area. The darker the purple hue, the more facilities that there are overlapping.
When looking at areas within 1/2 mile of a park, natural lands or trail, the Sugar House planning area continues to have the most significant gaps. The darker the purple distribution color indicates facilities within a half-mile service area that overlap, with more than one park, natural land or trail. City’s citywide vision document through 2040, calls for “accessible parks and recreation spaces within a half mile of all residents”, and this assessment indicates areas where attention, to achieve that goal, is required.
This map illustrates areas that are within a half-mile walking distance from parks, natural lands and trails using existing roads and trails. A half mile is a common standard for a walkable distance to a park or trail. Even though the majority of residents of the city live within a half mile of a park, natural land or trail (as seen in the map on page 28), the physical environment can sometimes make walking to those places challenging. This is particularly true in the Central Community, Sugar House and East Bench planning communities, which all have significant gaps when you consider how residents might get to a park or trail by foot.
Distribution Analysis: 5-Minute Bike Time

This map illustrates the coverage for a five-minute bike ride (assuming a 10 mile/hour speed) from parks and natural lands along existing bike lanes, bike routes and multipurpose trails. Parks and natural lands not intersected by a highlighted trail are currently more difficult to get to by bike. The city is generally well-served, although there are some parks throughout the city that are not easily accessed by bike.
Distribution Analysis: 5-Minute Drive Time

This map illustrates areas within a five-minute drive to parks, natural lands and trails along existing streets. As indicated, the city is well covered within a five minute drive, although only for residents with access to personal vehicles.
Each park is unique and varied in its amenities. In this section we take a closer look at the individual amenities that comprise the Parks & Public Lands system, assessing the distribution of amenities and the levels of service for each. Amenities within County facilities are also included to help provide the full picture and a better understanding of where any gaps exist.

Salt Lake City meets or exceeds amenity levels of service when compared to national standards, and that service levels are more variable in comparison to the comparison cities.

### City Park Amenities Totals:

- **61** Playgrounds
- **43** Multi-purpose Fields
- **18** Baseball Fields
- **3** Softball Fields
- **12** Sand Volleyball Courts
- **9** Dog Parks
- **71** Tennis Courts
- **14** Pickleball Courts
- **18** Basketball Hoops
- **3** Skate Parks

The Skate Park at Jordan Park is one of three city skate parks.

Pickle Ball Courts are a more recent trend. The city has 14 courts.

The majority of the city’s Baseball/Softball Fields are located on the west side of the city.

The city has 61 playgrounds distributed throughout the city.
Amenity: Playgrounds

Playgrounds are well-distributed throughout the city, although gaps are larger in the Sugar House and East Bench planning areas.
Amenity: Multi-purpose Fields

Multipurpose fields include soccer, football, and other fields and are well distributed in the Northwest, Capitol Hill, Avenues, East Bench and Sugar House planning areas. The Central Community planning area has no multipurpose fields, and the West Salt Lake community is minimally served.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Salt Lake City</th>
<th>SLC + County</th>
<th>National</th>
<th>Boise</th>
<th>Fort Collins</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MP Fields LOS</td>
<td>2.2/10,000</td>
<td>2.4/10,000</td>
<td>1.2/10,000</td>
<td>2.3/10,000</td>
<td>1.7/10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Amenity: Baseball Fields**

The Northwest and West Salt Lake planning areas are the best served by baseball fields. The Capitol Hill planning area lacks baseball fields entirely, and the remaining planning areas each have at least two fields.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Salt Lake City</th>
<th>SLC + County</th>
<th>National</th>
<th>Boise</th>
<th>Fort Collins</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baseball Field LOS</strong></td>
<td>0.9/10,000</td>
<td>1.0/10,000</td>
<td>0.4/10,000</td>
<td>1.5/10,000</td>
<td>0.7/10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Amenity: Softball Fields

The Northwest and West Salt Lake planning areas are the most well-served with softball fields. The Central Community planning area lacks softball fields completely, while the remaining planning areas are served with at least one field.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Salt Lake City</th>
<th>SLC + County</th>
<th>National</th>
<th>Boise</th>
<th>Fort Collins</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Softball Field LOS</td>
<td>0.2/10,000</td>
<td>0.4/10,000</td>
<td>0.5/10,000</td>
<td>0.5/10,000</td>
<td>0.7/10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Amenity: Volleyball Courts (Sand)

Sand volleyball courts are well-distributed in the Northwest, West Salt Lake, Central Community and Sugar House planning areas. The Capitol Hill, Avenues, and East Bench planning areas have no sand volleyball courts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salt Lake City</th>
<th>SLC + County</th>
<th>National</th>
<th>Boise</th>
<th>Fort Collins</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball LOS</td>
<td>0.6/10,000</td>
<td>0.8/10,000</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td>0.4/10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Amenity: Dog Parks

Dog parks are well-distributed throughout the community. Salt Lake City provides more dog parks per capita than the national average and more than any of the comparison cities.
Amenity: Tennis Courts

Tennis courts are well-distributed throughout the community. Each planning area has access to at least two tennis facilities.
Amenity: Pickleball Courts

The Avenues planning area contains the majority of pickleball courts, with two complexes. Six courts were recently added to Fairmont Park in the Sugar House planning area. All other planning areas currently lack pickleball courts.
Amenity: Basketball

Basketball courts are generally well-distributed throughout the city, with the greatest concentration in the Northwest planning area. Each planning area has access to at least one facility. Many of the courts, however, are half courts.
Amenity: Skate Parks

There are currently three skate parks that serve the city, located in the Northwest, West Salt Lake and Sugar House planning areas. Since these are special draws, it is not expected that each planning area would have its own.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total #:</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No additional County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skate Park LOS</th>
<th>SLC + County</th>
<th>National</th>
<th>Boise</th>
<th>Fort Collins</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.5/100,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td>1.4/100,000</td>
<td>1.8/100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Amenity: Pavilions

There are currently 29 pavilions in Salt Lake City Parks which are distributed fairly well throughout the city.

Note: Comparison data for the nation and the two comparable cities is not available.
Amenity: Restrooms

The city currently has 38 restrooms, most of which are distributed among its 36 regional, community and neighborhood parks. Restrooms are important amenities, particularly for community and regional parks where athletic and community events are held.

Note: Comparison data for the nation and the two comparable cities is not available.
Amenity Distribution by Planning Area

A side-by-side comparison by planning area shows some interesting patterns that may provide insight for future planning:

The majority of playgrounds are located in the Central Community and Northwest planning areas, which also happens to be two planning areas with the greatest population of children (0-17 years).

The Northwest planning area far outweighs the other planning areas when it comes to the number of multi-purpose fields, which is due to the RAC being located here. The Central Community is “field-deprived”, with only three baseball fields and no softball or multi-purpose fields.

When looking at the combined number of softball and baseball fields, the majority are located in Northwest and West Salt Lake planning areas, both of which are west of I-15. There are a total of 18 fields in these two areas, with the remaining 15 spread among the five eastern planning areas.

With the exception of pickleball and tennis courts, the Avenues and Capitol Hill planning areas are on the lower end in most amenity categories. This is most likely the result of these two areas leaning heavily on their natural lands, having fewer park acres, and lacking flat land more conducive to park development than other planning areas.

### AMENITIES BY PLANNING AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Master Planning Area</th>
<th>Playgrounds</th>
<th>Multi-purpose Fields</th>
<th>Baseball Fields</th>
<th>Softball Fields</th>
<th>Sand Volleyball Courts</th>
<th>Dog Parks</th>
<th>Tennis Courts</th>
<th>Pickleball Courts</th>
<th>Basketball Hoops</th>
<th>Skate Parks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avenues</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitol Hill</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Community</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Bench</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar House</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Salt Lake</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>63</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>69</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* There are 2 playgrounds in Washington Park (located up Parley's Canyon), which does not fall into a planning area

** Parley's Historic Nature Park is a city-owned and managed natural area where dogs are allowed. It is located just east of the Sugar House Planning Area and outside of the City boundary
2.1.5 Conditions Assessment

In addition to assessing level of service and distribution characteristics, the condition of the amenities and facilities is also important for future planning purposes. Parks & Public Lands staff conducted its first asset condition assessment of parks and individual amenities in 2017 in correlation with this planning effort. Amenities such as playgrounds, ball fields and infrastructure were evaluated using the following definitions:

Evaluation Definitions:

**Good**
- Full functionality
- Do not need repairs
- Playable sports surfaces and equipment, working fixtures, and fully intact safety features (railings, fences, etc.)
- Minor cosmetic defects
- Encourage area residents to use the park

**Fair**
- Largely functional but need minor or moderate repairs
- Play surfaces, equipment, fixtures, and safety features that are operational and allow play, but have deficiencies or time periods where they are unusable
- May slightly discourage use of the park by residents

**Poor**
- Largely or completely unusable
- Need major repairs to be functional
- Park features that have deteriorated to the point where they are barely usable
- Discourage residents from using the park

ASSESSMENT RESULTS
The results indicate that 37% of amenities are in good condition, 53% are in fair condition, and 10% are in poor condition. The Division intends to conduct this assessment on a bi-annual basis to track the condition of assets over time. Doing so will assist staff as they make decisions regarding where to spend maintenance dollars, how to prioritize capital facility requests, and how to maintain or improve their current level of service and distribution of park amenities.

Tracking the conditions of amenities and assets over time will assist the city as they make decisions of where to spend maintenance dollars.
City Trails System

Trails are popular amenities, helping to create a well-connected parks and natural lands system. This assessment looks at both off-street trails (paved and unpaved) and on-street bike routes. The City currently has 70.7 miles of off-street trails, 47.1 miles of which are paved, multipurpose trails. The remaining 23.6 miles are unpaved trails primarily used for hiking and/or mountain biking. Additionally, the city has 64.4 proposed or planned future multipurpose trails. The majority of the city’s existing 145.5 miles of bike routes are bike lanes (105 miles) with a smaller portion (40.5 miles) comprised of shared lanes that are specially signed and marked or buffered.

### OFF-STREET TRAILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Paved Trails</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multipurpose Trails</td>
<td>47.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal: Existing Paved Trails</strong></td>
<td><strong>47.1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Unpaved Trails</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiking Only Trails</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiking/Mountain Bike Trails</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal: Existing Unpaved Trails</strong></td>
<td><strong>23.6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total Existing Trails</td>
<td>70.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Trails</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multipurpose Trails</td>
<td>64.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal: Proposed Paved Trails</strong></td>
<td><strong>64.4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total Trails</td>
<td>135.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ON-STREET BIKE ROUTES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Bike Routes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
<td>105.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Shared/Separated/Painted Buffered Bike Lanes</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Lanes (signs or markings)</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total Existing Bike Routes</strong></td>
<td><strong>145.5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The map below shows the location of existing and proposed trails and bike routes. When taken together, the existing and proposed trail system represents a robust, interconnected and comprehensive network that will serve a wide range of users.
Salt Lake City has more than 70 miles of off-street trails that connect residents to the city’s parks and natural lands.

The city has 0.4 miles of existing off-street trails per 1,000 people. Well-known examples include the Jordan River Trail and the Bonneville Shoreline Trail. When currently proposed off-street trails are included, LOS increases to 0.7 miles per 1,000 population.

There are currently 0.7 miles of on-street bicycle routes per 1,000 residents. When evaluated by planning area, Central Community has the least miles of off-street trails per population, and the Avenues area has the least miles of on-street bike routes per population.

### Level of Service for Trails & Bike Routes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>trail/bike route</th>
<th>miles</th>
<th>LOS per 1,000 population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Off-Street Trails</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Routes</td>
<td>145.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed On-Street Trails</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>280.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If proposed off-street trails are implemented, LOS would increase to 1.4 miles per 1,000.

LOS with on-street bike routes increases LOS to 1.1 miles per 1,000.

**LOS for Existing Off-Street Trails**

\[
\text{LOS} = \frac{70.7}{196,307} \times 1,000 = 0.4 \text{ miles per 1,000}
\]
# Trails & Bike Routes Miles by Planning Area

When comparing trail and bike route miles by community, the Central Community planning area has the least off-street trails per population, while the Capitol Hill planning area has the most. Additionally, the Capitol Hill planning area also has the most on-street bike route miles. The Avenues planning area has the least on-street bike route miles per population, which is likely a reflection of the steep terrain.

## Off-Street Trails

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Master Planning Area</th>
<th>2017 Population</th>
<th>Multipurpose Trails (miles)</th>
<th>Hiking Only Trails (miles)</th>
<th>Hiking &amp; Mountain Biking Trails (miles)</th>
<th>Total Existing Trails</th>
<th>LOS Existing Trails (miles per 1,000 pop.)</th>
<th>Proposed Multipurpose Trails (miles)</th>
<th>Total Existing &amp; Proposed Trails (miles)</th>
<th>LOS Existing &amp; Proposed Trails (miles per 1,000 pop.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avenues</td>
<td>15,917</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitol Hill</td>
<td>7,677</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Community</td>
<td>55,312</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Bench</td>
<td>24,677</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>34,545</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar House</td>
<td>33,212</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Salt Lake</td>
<td>24,815</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## On-Street Bike Routes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Master Planning Area</th>
<th>2017 Population</th>
<th>Bike Lanes (miles)</th>
<th>Green Shared/ Separated/ Painted Buffered (miles)</th>
<th>Shared Lanes - Signs &amp; Markings (miles)</th>
<th>Total Bike Routes</th>
<th>LOS Bike Routes (miles per 1,000 pop.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avenues</td>
<td>15,917</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitol Hill</td>
<td>7,677</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Community</td>
<td>55,312</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Bench</td>
<td>24,677</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>34,545</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar House</td>
<td>33,212</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Salt Lake</td>
<td>24,815</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On-Street Bike Routes Miles Comparison

As indicated below, Salt Lake City has fewer bike lane miles than cities of similar size and similar bike lane miles as much larger cities, particularly Los Angeles and Phoenix. While these larger cities differ in development patterns from Salt Lake City, they are all new, western cities that have been developed according to automobile-dominant models.

### BIKE ROUTES MILES COMPARED TO OTHER CITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Miles of On-Street Bike Lanes</th>
<th>City Square Miles</th>
<th>Miles of Bike Lanes Per Square Mile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>141.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesa</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>133.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>189.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>114.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuscon</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>226.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>180.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York City</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>304.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>372.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>517.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake City (existing on-street bike routes)</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>110.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>503.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Salt Lake City has fewer on-street bike lane miles than cities of similar size. This could possibly be a product of the city’s large city blocks.

INFLUENCE OF GRID SYSTEM

The limited amount of bike route miles could possibly be a product of Salt Lake City’s grid development pattern. Salt Lake City has large blocks in comparison to other cities, which creates fewer streets to locate bike lanes (see graphic below).
The following analysis looks at how close parks are to existing trails. Parks that are located more than 1/2 mile from a trail are indicated in red. All other parks are located within either a 1/4 or 1/2 mile of a trail. Buffers for these are shown in green (1/4 mile) and yellow (1/2 mile). This analysis clearly shows that Central Community lacks trail connections.
Implementing currently proposed trails will significantly improve connectivity within the city. The implications of constructing the proposed trails can clearly be seen by comparing the map below with the map on the previous page.
2.2 Existing Park Use

Salt Lake City’s Parks & Public Lands system plays a critical role in “community life”, by supporting numerous community events, sports team/league play, filming events and free expression gatherings. The Parks & Public Lands Division has a full-time staff member who schedules all field and pavilion uses at the parks. Working closely with Parks & Public Lands maintenance staff and Salt Lake City Events staff, parks and public spaces are scheduled in ways that avoid overuse and negative impacts to surrounding neighborhoods.

Community Events

During 2017, Salt Lake City hosted 188 special events, 71 free expression events, and 69 filming events. Fifty-one additional spontaneous activities (non-major events) were also scheduled during 2017. The majority of those events occurred in Salt Lake City Parks & Public Lands.

SPECIAL EVENTS

Special events include organized walks/runs, festivals, concerts, car shows, movies, markets, food truck events and firework shows. In 2017, city parks hosted a total of 95 organized walk/run events (14 of which were competitive), 51 festivals and 14 concerts. Liberty Park hosts the majority of those events by far (42 in 2017), with Memory Grove (16), Library Plaza (18) and Jordan Park (14) also hosting a reasonable share.

LIBERTY PARK

Demand for community events in Liberty Park are so high that Parks & Public Lands has limited reservations to one event per weekend, which reduces impacts to the neighborhood and creates “days off” for general use. Reservations are made up to a year in advance, with grandfathered events (those that have a history of being held at Liberty Park on an annual basis in the past) getting first priority. Approximately 30-40% of events at Liberty Park are grandfathered events. In 2017, a weekly Friday farmers market was introduced into the mix.

WASHINGTON SQUARE

Home of the historic City and County Building and Salt Lake City offices, this civic square is limited to four, high-impact events a year, in an attempt to preserve lawn areas and trees. These events include the Living Traditions Festival, Pride Festival, Utah Arts Festival and Days of ’47 Family Festival. Even with these limitations, multiple days without water and hundreds of people, tents and hot temperatures impact the turf and trees. Lawns are reseeded every summer and fall and given time to recover between events.

LIBRARY SQUARE

Located to the east, Library Square joins Washington Square during the four major annual events. Demand at Library Square has been high and increasing at such a pace that the Division is considering limiting events to every other week to offset the increased maintenance demands. The plaza of the Public Safety Building, located just east of Library Square, is a newer venue with limited shade which gets a few requests for events.

PIONEER PARK

Pioneer Park continues to serve as an important community gathering space. The park is home to the summer Downtown Farmers Market, which is held every Saturday from June through October and Tuesday...
evenings in August and September. In recent years, the park has hosted the Salt Lake City’s Twilight Concert Series, a concert series that attracts thousands of people several times each summer. This event was recently moved to a more suitable, centrally-located site.

**FILMING**

Filming events range from TV series and movies to commercials and student film projects. Of the 69 permitted filming events in 2017, 14 were filmed in Liberty Park and 29 used other city parks as their setting.

**FREE EXPRESSION**

Free expression events include marches/processions, demonstrations, religious gatherings, and homeless outreach campaigns. The majority of these events impact civic and downtown locations, such as Washington Square, Library Square and Pioneer Park.

**Sports Groups**

Currently, the Parks & Public Lands Division schedules practice and game times for 48 different leagues/teams throughout their playing season. These include a variety of sports, including youth and adult soccer, youth lacrosse, youth rugby, ultimate frisbee, quidditch, youth football, youth and adult baseball, youth softball, cricket, adult kickball, adult flag football, youth and adult sand volleyball, and youth sports camps. There are additional organizations that schedule fields on a less consistent, as-needed basis. Fields are used from mid-March through mid-November.

Sports fields are available to the public during daylight hours seven days per week when not reserved by a team or league. Prime reservation hours are Monday-Friday from 5-8 pm and Saturdays and Sundays from 8 a.m. to 8 p.m. Heavy, around-the-clock use makes it difficult to rotate the fields, providing little time for the turf to rest and recover from activities. Currently there are ten lighted fields in the Parks & Public Lands system: four softball fields (three at Sunnyside Park; one at Jordan Park) and six of the RAC’s multipurpose fields. The RAC has an additional 80 acres on the north end of the complex available for expansion and could offer four more lighted multi-purpose fields. This expansion would help host larger out-of-state tournaments. There are also three lighted volleyball courts at Liberty Park, with three more to come at Fairmont Park in 2019. The Division typically only lights fields at sites where little impact to the surrounding neighborhoods is demonstrated.

**Reservations for Small Group Events**

The Salt Lake City Parks & Public Lands system has nearly 30 pavilions, 16 of which are scheduled to accommodate small neighborhood and family events. Liberty Park currently has one large pavilion that can be rented by the half day in order to support use by multiple groups. Other popular pavilions include Washington Park, which is located several miles east of the city boundary in a natural location up Parley’s Canyon. This pavilion is also scheduled by the half day in order to accommodate a greater number of groups.
Frequently Used Parks & Natural Lands

CITYWIDE USE
According to the results of the statistically valid survey, the Central, Sugar House, and East Bench planning areas attract significantly more visitors than other planning areas. Residents come from all over the city to visit parks located in these planning areas. Liberty Park is the most visited park within the Parks & Public Lands system, with 22% of residents saying they visit it most often. Liberty Park is twice as popular as the second most frequently visited park (Sugar House Park). As popular as these regional parks are, families with children tend to frequent smaller parks, such as Riverside and Fairmont Parks.

Note: When survey respondents were asked to “Please select the region(s) where [they] frequently visit parks”, they were allowed to select as many areas as they wanted. As a result, the percentages in the graph do not add up to 100%.

Liberty Park is the most visited park within the Parks & Public Lands system, with 22% of residents saying they visit it most often.
75% of residents who live on the east side visit parks frequently (one time or more a month), whereas only 60% of west-siders frequently visit parks.

**EAST-SIDE VS. WEST-SIDE**

Frequency of park use varies in different areas of the city. For example, significant differences exist between east-side residents (those that live east of I-15) versus west-side residents (those that live west of I-15). Specifically, 75% of residents who live on the east side visit parks frequently (at least once a month), whereas only 60% of west-siders frequently visit parks.

**EAST-SIDE RESIDENTS USE PARKS MORE THAN WEST-SIDE RESIDENTS**

- **75% of east-side SLC residents visit parks 1x or more each month**
- **60% of west-side SLC residents visit parks 1x or more each month**

Question. Within the last 12 months, approximately how many times have you visited a city park in Salt Lake City?
MOST FREQUENTLY USED PARKS: WEST-SIDE VS. EAST-SIDE

As illustrated in the two graphs below, West-side residents are more likely to visit east-side parks than east-side residents are likely to visit west-side parks. Liberty Park and City Creek Park pop up in the top used parks list for west-side residents. Jordan Park/International Peace Gardens, Riverside Park and the Jordan River Trail are the most frequently used parks/natural lands/trails on the west side. Liberty Park, Sugar House Park and the foothills (natural lands) above the Avenues and the U of U are the top used areas on the east side. With park use being higher on the east side, it’s not surprising that the top three east side areas are also the most utilized parks citywide.

MOST FREQUENTLY USED PARKS BY WEST-SIDERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park</th>
<th>Visits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jordan Park/Peace Gardens</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside Park</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan River Trail</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty Park</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westpointe Park</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poplar Grove Park</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Creek Park</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Open Space</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosewood Park</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottonwood Park</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MOST FREQUENTLY USED PARKS BY EAST-SIDERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park</th>
<th>Visits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liberty Park</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar House Park</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foothills above Avenues and U of U Open Space</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memory Grove Park</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Creek &amp; North Foothills Open Space</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emigration Canyon &amp; South Foothills Open Space</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairmont Park</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donner Trail Park</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pioneer Park</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindsey Gardens</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question. Which is the park or natural lands your household visits most often?
LIBERTY PARK
Liberty Park clearly serves an important role in the community. In order to understand why people gravitate here, a closer look was taken. While the majority of Salt Lake City residents visit their “most frequented park” because it is close to home, more residents visit Liberty Park because of its “trees and atmosphere” (27% versus 15% city). This is especially the case for people traveling from other planning communities to visit Liberty Park, with 31% citing “trees and atmosphere” as their primary reason for visiting the park.

RESIDENTS OUTSIDE OF THE CENTRAL PLANNING AREA VISIT LIBERTY PARK FOR ITS TREES AND ATMOSPHERE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary reason for visiting their most frequented park:</th>
<th>Primary reason Liberty Park users visit Liberty Park:</th>
<th>Primary reason Liberty Park users outside of Central Community visit Liberty Park:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Close to home</td>
<td>Close to home</td>
<td>Community Events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees &amp; Atmosphere</td>
<td>Trees &amp; Atmosphere</td>
<td>Trees &amp; Atmosphere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise</td>
<td>Exercise</td>
<td>Exercise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Frequently Used Trails

When asked what trails are used most often, those located in the foothills were most popular. Trails within Salt Lake City Parks were the third most selected answer. When asked how residents use trails, the top answers were primarily “on-foot” activities such as exercise, walking/jogging, connection to nature and hiking, as opposed to biking (road, mountain and commuter) and play.

**MOST FREQUENTLY USED TRAILS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trail</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treadle above Avenues and University of Utah</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Creek and North Foothills</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails in SLC Parks</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emigration Canyon and South Foothills</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan River Parkway</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLC Urban Area Commuter Trails</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport and Salt Lake Marina Vicinity</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question. Which trail(s) do you use most often?**

**RESIDENTS USE TRAILS FOR "ON-FOOT" ACTIVITIES MORE THAN ACTIVITIES THAT REQUIRE SPECIAL EQUIPMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exercise</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking/jogging</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection to nature</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiking</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road biking</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain biking</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter biking</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skating/skateboarding/rollerblading</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sailing</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laundry</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equestrian</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question. Why do you use trail(s)?**
Summary of Current Expenses

The Salt Lake City Parks & Public Lands budget for 2017 was $22 million, which covers parks, cemeteries, urban forests, natural lands, additional landscapes and street medians. The figure includes capital expenditures, charges for services, operations and maintenance supplies, depreciation and transfers. The budget also includes projects funded with general fund revenue to address capital needs identified in the city’s Capital Improvement Plan. The operating revenues collected by Parks & Public Lands include user fees and rentals. The revenue collected in 2017 was $1.7 million. Impact fees, which are collected based on development within the city and earmarked for specific eligible capital projects, are also a revenue source. The remainder of the Parks & Public Lands revenue comes directly from the city’s general fund.

By the numbers...

Comparison data was gathered from parks departments in similarly sized cities located in the Intermountain West, in order to benchmark the city’s expenses and revenue on a per capita basis. Parks departments vary widely with regards to scope of services and jurisdiction responsibilities. Some cities operate parks in concert with recreation programs while others maintain professional stadiums and facilities, amidst a number of other variables. As a result, it is difficult to make meaningful comparisons between local entities. In addition, levels of service vary across communities which makes comparisons very difficult. The following provides a summary of the information received from the two comparison cities.

BOISE

The Boise Parks and Recreation Department oversees cemeteries, parks, golf courses, ice rinks, urban forests, natural lands, recreation and right of ways. The operations and maintenance expense related to parks and cemeteries for 2017 was $20.2 million with a capital expense of $12.7 million. Total revenues for parks and cemeteries was $1.7 million.

FORT COLLINS

The City of Fort Collins Parks Division is responsible for parks, trail systems, the downtown core, city grounds, forestry, cemeteries and golf courses. The division’s operations and maintenance budget is $17 million, of which $13.6 million is attributed to parks and cemeteries with revenue of $1.3 million. The golf courses are an enterprise fund which do not receive funding from the general fund.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Salt Lake City</th>
<th>Boise</th>
<th>Fort Collins</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTEs</td>
<td>99.0</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTEs per Capita</td>
<td>0.0005</td>
<td>0.0004</td>
<td>0.0005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O&amp;M</td>
<td>$14,268,804</td>
<td>$20,158,769</td>
<td>$13,637,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O&amp;M per Capita</td>
<td>$72.69</td>
<td>$91.25</td>
<td>$85.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$7,740,094</td>
<td>$12,747,376</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital per Capita</td>
<td>$39.43</td>
<td>$57.70</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>$1,689,705</td>
<td>$1,695,183</td>
<td>$1,264,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue per Capita</td>
<td>$8.61</td>
<td>$7.67</td>
<td>$7.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Historic Expenditures & Population

The population of Salt Lake City maintained a positive growth trajectory of .72% from 2010 to 2017. The operation and maintenance expenditures for parks and public lands has grown at an annual average growth rate ("AAGR") of 6.55% from 2010 to 2017. The capital budget has varied widely from year to year. In 2013, capital expenditures were $3.4 million and increased to $11.5 million in 2014. This substantial increase highlights the challenges associated with maintaining capital assets and addressing deferred maintenance from year to year. Capital revenue allocated to Parks & Public Lands fluctuates based on specific project needs, legislative priorities and other capital needs throughout the city. Despite ongoing maintenance needs and assets required to maintain the existing level of service, capital revenue is not always available at the level necessary to maintain existing park infrastructure as well as add new assets. This results in unfunded needs from year to year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historic Expenditures &amp; Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O&amp;M Expense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Expense</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Spikes in Capital Expenses during the 2014-2015 years were due to the capital investment in several large projects; i.e. the Recreational Athletic Center (2014) and Red Butte Oil Spill remediation related projects (2015)*
3.0 COMMUNITY VALUES & DESIRES

Establishing the community’s values and desires is a vital component of the needs analysis. This chapter details how data was collected as part of a thorough community engagement process, and the key messages heard and ascertained. The result is information that will help inform city staff as they move forward with preparation of a future Master Plan, as well as inform their daily planning efforts and decision-making processes.

A WIDE VARIETY OF METHODS WERE USED TO ENGAGE THE PUBLIC DURING THE NEEDS ASSESSMENT

A Project Website kept residents informed and connected them to the online survey and other resources.

Public Scoping Meetings, held in April 2017, provided an engaging, in-person format where residents could share their ideas and concerns.

Public Scoping Meetings, held in April 2017, provided an engaging, in-person format where residents could share their ideas and concerns.

Tell Us - How do you use Parks? Are there enough of them near you?

An educational video was distributed via social media to encourage participation in the assessment.
3.1 Community Engagement Process

A variety of methods were used to involve the public in the needs assessment process, including a survey on the city’s Open City Hall site, two public scoping meetings, outreach at 16 community events by Parks & Public Lands staff, and a statistically valid survey. A project website (www.slcplays.com) was established to encourage members of the public to learn more about the assessment, get information on how to participate, take a survey, and submit comments and ideas.

Open City Hall Survey

This online survey was conducted on the Open City Hall portal of the Salt Lake City website. The survey received 675 responses, which is one of the largest responses to any Salt Lake City Open City Hall survey to date. Respondents tended to be frequent park and natural lands users, and were generally happy with the parks and natural lands in the city. They expressed concern about crime and safety, maintenance and conflicts with dogs. Passive activities such as walking and hiking, and natural open areas were stated to be the most frequented, compared to more active recreation activities and amenities such as sports fields or sports courts.

Public Scoping Meetings

Two public scoping meetings were held, one on April 26, 2017 at the Sorensen Multicultural Center and another on April 27, 2017 at the Forest Dale Golf Course clubhouse. While attendance at the public scoping meetings was relatively low, participants provided significant input through a range of engaging activities that were used to solicit ideas and identify needs. Comments and ideas reinforced much of the feedback from the Open City Hall survey. Attendees expressed a desire for amenities such a nature center, more access to water, and additional passive recreation opportunities.
Community Events Outreach

Salt Lake City Parks & Public Lands staff conducted 16 community outreach events to promote participation in and knowledge of the assessment, and to receive additional layers of input and ideas. Events were held throughout the summer of 2017 at various neighborhood festivals, farmers markets and city-sponsored events. Several of the events were co-hosted with Partners in the Park (PIP), a multi-week summer program that brings University of Utah faculty, staff and students together with community partner organizations and west-side residents in local neighborhood parks. The events aim at not only connecting potential students with the University of Utah and other higher education institutions, but also to provide residents with access to local resources and organizations.

Statistically Valid Survey

Y2 Analytics conducted a statistically valid survey in July 2017. They distributed 10,000 invitations and received 768 responses, for a relatively high response rate of eight percent and a margin of error of less than four percent. Examples of telling results include the fact that only 22 percent of the respondents indicate they have children under the age of eighteen living at home, while 38 percent own a dog. These numbers align with the overall demographic results, which indicate that Salt Lake City is an older community with fewer children and a smaller household size than the rest of the county and state.

Approximately 42 percent of respondents use parks at least weekly, which is nearly half the rate indicated by respondents to the Open City Hall survey. This difference is not surprising, as participation in the Open City Hall survey was voluntary, and respondents were presumably interested in the topic.

Stakeholder & Special Interest Outreach

Preliminary results and findings from this study were presented to four stakeholder groups in October 2017. These groups included representatives from athletic organizations, events and programming groups, and city staff.

Athletics stakeholders indicated that there is a lack of reservable field space in the city, and that the city needs to consider creative ideas as it moves into the master planning phase if needs are to be met. Specific suggestions included adding lighting to existing fields to extend the available hours of play, and considering the use of artificial turf fields to extend the playing season. They also suggested conducting a detailed study of each park to determine whether they are being used to their greatest potential. Discussions also included the pros and cons of locating a large regional park on the west side of the city, and the possibility of turning golf courses into parks.

Events stakeholders stated that many of the existing parks are not equipped with essential event infrastructure, such as water and electricity. This lack of essential infrastructure places pressure on the parks that have these amenities, such as Liberty Park, Washington Square and Pioneer Park, which are overused for events. They also indicated that public education and outreach should be considered to drive events to different locations.

Only 22% of survey respondents indicate they have children under the age of eighteen living at home, while 38% own a dog.
3.2 Community Perceptions, Desires & Preferences

The findings from the community engagement process were used to identify public perceptions, desires and preferences, a summary of which follows. More detailed and specific information is available in the Appendices.

Preferred Park Uses & Amenities

In general, residents prefer to use parks and natural lands for more passive activities. Hiking, walking, running and other “non-programmed” activities, consistently outranked sports fields and courts. This preference rose to the top on several different statistically valid survey questions, including those about why residents visited parks and natural lands, how they would like to see facilities improved, and how they want their tax dollars to be spent. At the Public Scoping meetings, when asked the following question: “What types of parks & natural lands facilities do you and your family currently use?”, the following images were the top nine selected from a board of images. For a full summary of the results, see Appendix 2.

SALT LAKE CITY RESIDENTS USE PARKS FOR PASSIVE ACTIVITIES

Scoping meeting participants were asked to place five dots by images of activities they do in Salt Lake City’s Parks & Public Lands system. The top nine responses are shown below, in order of most-used to least-used. They primarily consist of passive uses such as hiking, walking, or just natural lands. Less popular activities included soccer, skateboarding, baseball, dog parks, among others. Note: Although written descriptions of the photos below were not included at the Public Scoping meetings, they are included here for summary purposes.

Question. What types of parks & natural lands facilities do you and your family currently use?
As mentioned in Chapter 1, people who have parks close to home are more likely to use parks. According to the statistically valid survey, Salt Lake City residents are no different. When asked what the most important reason they used their “most visited park”, respondents overwhelmingly said it was because it was close to home. Non-programmed, exercise opportunities and visual features (trees/atmosphere) were the second and third top responses, supporting the input received at the public scoping meetings.

**SALT LAKE CITY RESIDENTS VISIT PARKS FOR EXERCISE OPPORTUNITIES AND THE ATMOSPHERE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Close to home</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees, atmosphere</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers market</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community events</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground equipment</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports fields/courts</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feels safe</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closest to work</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic facilities</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exercise opportunities, such as the trail around Liberty Park, are some of the publics’ top desired amenities for parks and natural lands.

**Salt Lake City residents go to parks for exercise, trees and the atmosphere.**

Trees and the overall atmosphere of a park are highly desired by Salt Lake City residents.
Desired Improvements

The Open City Hall survey brought several key issues to light, such as conflicts with dogs, crime, drug and homeless activities. The statistically valid survey dove into the question of what improvements residents would like to see in the Parks & Public Lands system. Each type of recreational space—parks, natural lands and trails—came with its own unique answers.

PARKS

Restrooms, maintenance and safety were the top desired improvements for Salt Lake City parks. Improvements to amenities such as playground equipment and sports fields were seen as less important.

TOP DESIRED PARK IMPROVEMENTS ARE
RESTROOMS, MAINTENANCE AND SAFETY FEATURES

Twenty-one percent of all Salt Lake City residents who use or visit city parks selected “other” when asked what improvements should be made to the park they visit most frequently. The graphic on the following page indicates the words most commonly mentioned in these “other” responses. Concerns with homeless people living in parks, problems with dogs, and unmaintained or unclean areas were commonly mentioned in the Open City Hall survey and at the public scoping meetings (see Appendices 1 & 2 for more information).

Question. What improvements should be made to [park name]. Select up to three.

As Salt Lake City’s homeless population numbers increase, the city’s parks continue to see an increase of homeless encampments and daily living activities.

Restrooms, the top desired improvement for Salt Lake City parks, are also one of the Parks and Public Lands Division’s biggest challenges, often attracting illegal activities and crime.
The following word cloud represents the ‘written in’ comments in the other category when asked, “What improvements should be made to [park name]?” Most common words appear larger and bolder than less common ones, but do not represent the positivity or negativity of the comments. That said, sample comments were included to give a general feel for the actual responses.

**COMMON WORDS EXPRESSED IN THE “OTHER” CATEGORY FOR DESIRED PARK IMPROVEMENTS**

- The pond needs to be dredged and the fountains turned back on in the pond
- Dog owners do not respect rules
- Limiting the increasing homeless population taking over the park
- More nature is always good. Parks tend to get too far away from nature and become more about playgrounds and concrete structures.
- Kick out the vagrants please. They’re ruining the park. It’s a park, not a homeless shelter.
- Off-leash dog area
- Dirty restroom, too many homeless, mulch path is too narrow.
NATURAL LANDS
When it comes to natural lands, Salt Lake City residents’ top desired improvements focus on better maintenance and management of the city’s existing properties and amenities. Management of uses to prevent overuse and/or user conflict, better maintenance and better signage are the top desired improvements, while additions such as restrooms, trailheads and rest/viewing points were seen as less important in these areas.

THE TOP DESIRED NATURAL LANDS IMPROVEMENTS ARE IMPROVED MANAGEMENT, MAINTENANCE AND SIGNAGE

TRAILS
Responses to a question regarding Salt Lake City trail improvements were similar to those for natural lands, with better signage making its way to the top of the list, followed by improved maintenance and separate trails for different uses. More facilities or amenities, such as trailheads, lighting and picnic shelters were of lesser importance.

THE TOP DESIRED TRAIL IMPROVEMENTS ARE ALSO IMPROVED MANAGEMENT, MAINTENANCE AND SIGNAGE

Question. What improvements should be made to [natural lands name]. Select up to three.

Question. Which, if any, of the following improvements should be made to the trails in Salt Lake City? Select up to three.
Safety

When asked about perceived safety in the Parks & Public Lands system, the majority of residents feel very safe in their neighborhood parks (89%) and natural lands (71%) during the day. Only 64% feel safe in neighborhood parks and 44% in natural lands at night.

Fewer residents feel safe on the Jordan River Trail than any other location. In fact, the perceived safety on the Jordan River Trail is almost half of levels indicated along the Bonneville Shoreline Trail.

**PERCEIVED SAFETY IN/ON SALT LAKE CITY PARKS, NATURAL LANDS AND TRAILS VARIES BY LOCATION**

**Question. How safe do you feel walking alone in...?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood Parks &amp; Natural lands</th>
<th>Bonneville Shoreline Trail</th>
<th>Jordan River Trail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>89%</strong> of respondents state they feel safe* during the day</td>
<td><strong>71%</strong> Safe during day</td>
<td><strong>43%</strong> Safe during day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>64%</strong> Safe during night</td>
<td><strong>44%</strong> Safe during night</td>
<td><strong>16%</strong> Safe during night</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentages indicated as “Safe” here indicate responses of “Very safe” or “Somewhat safe” on the survey question.
New Amenities and/or Facilities

As indicated in the chart below, educational facilities such as an urban farm and a nature education center are the top special use facilities respondents think the city should consider funding/constructing. A climbing park and canoe trails closely followed the educational facilities.

EDUCATION-RELATED FACILITIES ARE THE TOP DESIRED NEW SPECIAL USE FACILITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Type</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban Farm / Demonstration Farm</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Education Center</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climbing Park</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canoe Trail</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptive Recreation Trails</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing Pond</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA Accessible Playgrounds</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disc Golf Course</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclocross Course</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equestrian Park</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foot Golf Course</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Polo Court</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question. Which of the following special use facilities should Salt Lake City consider funding/constructing? Select up to three.

Education-related facilities, such as an urban farm or nature education center, are residents’ top desired special use facilities.

DESIRED ADDITIONS TO SLC PARKS & NATURAL LANDS

Scoping meeting participants were asked to place five dots by images of features that might be missing Salt Lake City’s Parks & Public Lands system. The top nine responses are below. Note: Although written descriptions of the photos below were not included at the Public Scoping meetings, they are included here for summary purposes.

Nature Center
Multi-use Park Trails
Write-in: Wetland/wildlife preserve with native plants and some access for people
Dog Parks with Water Features
Fishing Spots
Boardwalks & Viewing Areas
Perennial Gardens
Interpretive Signage
Outdoor Climbing Wall

Question. What are Salt Lake City’s Parks and Natural lands missing?
NEW AMENITIES AND/ OR FACILITIES BY PLANNING AREA

When considering a location for additional facilities, it is beneficial to understand which areas of the city support funding/constructing specific facilities. The following graphs illustrate support for the top three special use facilities the city should consider funding/constructing by planning area.

URBAN FARM/DEMONSTRATION FARM

Residents throughout the city are interested in a potential urban farm or demonstration farm, although those in the Central Community and West Salt Lake planning areas are slightly more interested than in other planning areas.

The Central Community supports funding/constructing special use facilities.

NATURE EDUCATION CENTER

Residents throughout the city are also in favor of building a nature education center, although it is less popular in the Capitol Hill and East Bench planning areas.

CLIMBING PARK

Residents in the Capitol Hill and Central planning areas highly prioritize a climbing park, although such a facility would be well-received in most areas.
ADDITIONAL INSPIRATION AND IDEAS

In order to get a better sense of what people might want to see in the Parks & Public Lands system as it expands and grows, residents were asked what they have seen elsewhere that they would like to see in Salt Lake City. The following answers provide a quick snapshot of some of the ideas that emerged.

A SNAPSHOT OF INSPIRATION AND IDEAS FOR A BETTER PARKS & PUBLIC LANDS SYSTEM

Sugar House Community

Balboa Park in San Diego. It’s a nice walkable mix of museums, gardens, theater and restaurants, and has plenty of open space. There’s something for everyone there.

Canyon View Park in Grand Junction, CO has the best kids playground equipment I have ever seen. Tons for all ages to do, safe zip line, etc.

West Salt Lake Community

Loy Blake Park in West Point Park. A park meant to learn, play, look at the web site for what is found in this park; there is music test, dexterity activities, from walking to 14 years a great park.

The South Dows Recreation Center has a great pool/swimming area that would be fun to have at the Sorensen.

Central Community

Barton Creek Greenbelt in Austin, TX, because it’s an urban waterway that has been protected from development.

Mountain Trails Foundation in Park City does a fantastic job with their trails. Sun Valley Idaho has great separated paved trails in the summer and groomed ski trails in the winter.

East Bench Community

Arboretum in Pittsburgh. Because we do not have many (if any) such places to visit.

East Bench Community

Question. Are there any parks, natural lands, recreational amenities or trails in other cities that you think Salt Lake City should emulate? Why?
User Conflicts

As Salt Lake City’s population continues to grow, demands placed upon its existing parks, natural lands and trails will also continue to grow, resulting in the potential for user conflicts. Parks & Public Lands staff identified several areas of conflict (conflicting trail uses, dog-related conflicts and the visual impact of water conservation measures). Questions were then formulated for the statistically valid survey to understand residents’ perception around these issues. While more residents felt that the trail user and dog-related conflicts are not currently a problem, significant numbers disagreed or were undecided. This suggests that these issues could escalate as population increases. Additional questions were asked about how these potential conflicts might be resolved. The top solutions are indicated in the green boxes at the bottom of each topic.

As Salt Lake City’s population continues to grow, so does the demand on its existing parks, natural lands and trails and the potential for user conflicts.

TRAIL USERS

Forty-four percent of residents do not believe trail user groups conflict with one another, while twenty-nine percent feel the opposite.

MORE RESPONDENTS DISAGREE THAN AGREE THAT DIFFERENT TRAIL USERS OFTEN CONFLICT WITH EACH OTHER

29% TOTAL AGREE

44% TOTAL DISAGREE

Question. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement? Various user groups (e.g. cyclists, runners/joggers, walkers/hikers, dogs/their owners) on Salt Lake City natural lands trails often conflict with one another.

Top-Selected Solutions for Potential Trail User Conflicts:

- create separate, designated trails for different users (40%)
- limit specific trail uses to specific days of the week (27%)
CONFLICTS WITH DOGS AND THEIR OWNERS
Residents are split on whether dogs and/or dog owners cause conflicts with other park and natural lands users in the city. While 30% of all residents agree that dogs and/or dog owners cause conflicts, only 17% of those residents who are dog owners agree with that statement.

MORE RESIDENTS DISAGREE THAN AGREE THAT DOGS AND/OR THEIR OWNERS CAUSE CONFLICT

30% total agree
47% total disagree

Question. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement? Dogs and/or their owners often cause conflicts with other users in Salt Lake City parks and natural lands.

Top-Selected Solutions for Potential Dog-related Conflicts:
- increase enforcement/fines for not following current regulations (49%)
- create more off-leash dog areas (36%)

WATER CONSERVATION
A majority of residents would prefer to conserve water rather than bear the burden of increased water costs. Using less water on existing lawns is the most popular strategy with about one-third of residents supporting this approach, while 28% of residents support reducing lawn areas in city parks.

MOST RESIDENTS FAVOR WATER CONSERVATION MEASURES

62% favor water conservation measures

Question. Suppose Salt Lake City were considering different measures to conserve water and account for potential increases in water costs. Which of the following measures would you most prefer?

- Use less water on existing lawns, even if that means lawns are yellow and dry in summer months (34%)
- Reduce the lawn area within city parks (28%)
- Maintain current practices and pass the increasing water costs along to Salt Lake City residents (22%)
- Other, please specify (17%)

Top-Selected Solutions to Mitigate Potential Increases in Water Costs:
- use less water on existing lawns, even if that means lawns are yellow and dry in summer months (34%)
- reduce the lawn area within city parks (28%)
Willingness to Pay

When asked what types of improvements they would be willing to fund for an extra cost of $25 per year, residents were most likely to support the funding of upgrades and improvements to existing parks, trails, and natural lands. Better enforcement and new parks followed, with improvements over new programming and events coming in last.

Residents are more willing to pay for upgrades and improvements to parks and natural lands.

Question. Suppose you had $100 to spend on additional parks, recreational programs, facilities, or trails in Salt Lake City. How would you divide your $100 among the following?

Residents' top priorities for spending are maintenance and improvements:

- Increased maintenance for existing parks, trails, and open spaces
- Walking and bike trails
- Increased safety measures in existing parks, trails, and open spaces
- Neighborhood and community parks
- Improvements to existing parks and playgrounds
- Open spaces
- Other
- Lighting for fields and trails
- Programming and events
- Athletic fields or courts for games and practice

Question. How willing would you be to pay an additional $25 per year if you knew the funding would be used for...

Increases and upgrades to existing parks and natural lands were also more supported when respondents were asked how they would allocate funds. An increase in maintenance of existing parks and natural lands was the top priority, with other improvements such as increased safety measures and upgrades to existing parks and playgrounds all falling in the top five items for budget allocation. Respondents also highly prioritized new walking and bike trails and new neighborhood and community parks.

Residents are more likely to allocate funding to upgrades and improvements to existing parks, trails, and natural lands than new programming and events.

1 Individual’s responses were required to equal $100. The above totals represent an average of responses and will not total a $100.
WILLINGNESS TO PAY BY PLANNING COMMUNITY

UPGRADES AND IMPROVEMENTS
The Northwest and Avenues planning areas are the most willing to pay a fee to upgrade or improve existing parks, trails and natural lands at an annual increase of $25. The Avenues planning area is even quite willing to pay $50 for such upgrades.

NEW PARKS, TRAILS AND NATURAL LANDS
The Central Community planning area is most willing to pay a fee for new parks, trails and natural lands at $25, with the Avenues and Sugar House planning areas closely following. The Central Community also has the greatest need for additional parks, trails and natural lands. The West Salt Lake planning area is the least willing to pay for new parks, trails and natural lands at $25.

BETTER ENFORCEMENT
The Avenues and Northwest planning areas are, once again, more willing to pay for better enforcement in parks, trails and natural lands at $25. Interest drops in those two communities as the fee increases, while it stays relatively stable in the Central Community, Sugar House, and West Salt Lake planning areas.

NEW PROGRAMMING AND EVENTS
When it comes to new programming and events, the Sugar House and Avenues planning communities are most willing to pay $25, with the East Bench planning area being the least interested.
Stakeholder & Special Interest Group Input

Preliminary results and findings from this study were presented to four stakeholder groups in October 2017. The groups included representatives from athletics teams and organizations, events and programming groups, and city staff.

Athletics stakeholders indicated that there is a lack of reservable field space in the city, and that the city needs to look for creative ideas as it moves into the master planning phase to better meet the needs of sports groups. Specific suggestions included adding lighting to existing fields to extend the available hours of play and considering the use of artificial turf fields to extend the playing season. They also suggested conducting a detailed study of each park to determine whether all areas are being used to their greatest potential. Discussions also included the possibility of locating a large regional park on the west side of the city, and the conversion of golf courses to parks.

Events stakeholders stated that many of the existing parks are not equipped with the proper infrastructure, such as water and electricity, which are necessary for hosting events. This places pressure on Liberty Park and Washington Square, which are overused for events. They also indicated that education efforts should be considered to get the public to accept different locations for hosting events.

A VARIETY OF ATHLETIC AND EVENTS GROUPS AND ORGANIZATIONS REGULARLY USE AND RELY UPON SALT LAKE CITY’S PARKS

Representatives from the following athletic teams and organizations and events groups attended the Stakeholder meetings held in October 2017:

- Judge Athletics Department & Youth Lacrosse
- Avenues Baseball
- Impact Soccer
- Central City Baseball
- Catholic Youth Baseball
- West High Ultimate Frisbee and Lacrosse
- Utah Cricket Association
- Utah Tunnel Runners (Disc Golf)
- Native American Celebration in the Park
- Metasport FC
- Rocky Mountain School of Baseball
- US Soccer
- East High Lacrosse, Rugby and Youth Football
- Utah Pride
- Best Friends
- Utah Soccer Association
- Beehive Sport and Social Club
- Downtown Farmers Market
- Urban Food Connections of Utah
- Utah Refugee Sports
- National Tongan American Society
4.0 FUTURE NEEDS

Facilitating equitable access to Salt Lake City’s Parks & Public Lands system is key to ensuring the system meets the quality of life city residents expect. In order to better understand the current trends and future needs of the city’s residents as the city continues to grow, a Needs Areas assessment was conducted. This began by looking at key indicators such as age, the number of children, and ethnic diversity, each of which will have an impact on the types of amenities required to meet existing and future needs. We then assessed how those demographic characteristics are geographically distributed and correlated the results with future areas of growth. The result is the identification of “High Needs Areas” where Parks & Public Lands should carefully consider as they expand and modify the Parks & Public Lands system.

Areas identified in the High Needs Areas Assessment should be carefully considered as the Parks & Public Lands Division continues to expand and modify the Parks & Public Lands system.

Demographic Overview

In order to provide adequate parks, natural lands and trails it is critical to know the population being served. For example, an aging population often requires more park walking trails and frequently-placed benches for resting. The following provides a quick snapshot of Salt Lake City’s population.

According to the 2010 Census, the city is more ethnically-diverse than the state and county, as shown in the chart below. Almost 25% of Salt Lake City’s population is non-white and 22.3% are Hispanic or Latino ethnicity of any race.1

---

1 Note: Hispanic or Latino ethnicity spans multiple races and, therefore, does not appear in the above chart.
There are fewer children in Salt Lake City than in the rest of the county or the state. The percentage of youth (0-17 years) is 20.9 percent, which is significantly lower than the Salt Lake County’s average of 27.9 percent, and approximately one-third lower than the state average of 30.2 percent. The percentage of seniors 65 and older is 15.2 percent, which is slightly higher than Salt Lake County (14.1 percent) and state (14.7 percent) rates. The median age of 32.7 is approximately two years older than statewide averages.

The city’s average household size is 2.43 persons. This is significantly lower than Salt Lake County (3.03) and the state (3.19) average. This supports the survey findings that Salt Lake City has less children compared to county and statewide averages.

Salt Lake City is an older community with fewer children and a smaller household size than the rest of the county and state.
4.1 High Needs Areas Assessment

Identifying High Needs Areas

The following maps illustrate key factors that may impact residents’ access to the Parks & Public Lands system. Communities that have limited resources often rely more heavily upon neighborhood parks, natural lands or trails to recreate or enjoy open, green space. For example, residents in population-dense areas, with low household incomes, children/youth, and seniors (65+) are more likely to experience greater challenges with mobility and financial resources.

When these demographic factors are combined with Areas of Potential Growth, they can help determine High Needs Areas, or areas where the city may need to focus its efforts to ensure it better serves its residents as the city grows.

HIGH NEEDS AREAS ARE DETERMINED USING KEY DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS AND AREAS OF POTENTIAL GROWTH

1 Note: The High Needs Areas Assessment maps only the planning areas where city residents reside.
High population density areas often lack ready access to parks and open lands. **The darkest areas in the following map indicate the densest areas of the city.** The Central Community planning area has the greatest concentration of population density, with additional areas in the Northwest, Capitol Hill, Avenues and West Salt Lake planning areas.
**HOUSEHOLD INCOME**

Residents with lower household incomes often rely on publicly owned parks and public lands to help keep recreation and leisure activities affordable. **The darkest areas in the following map represent the areas of the city with lowest household income.** The Central Community planning area has the greatest area of low household median income, followed by the West Salt Lake and the Northwest planning areas, with additional pockets of concentration around the University of Utah.
Households with young children often rely on publicly owned parks and public lands to help keep recreation and leisure activities affordable. Additionally, parks are often places children participate in organized sports and activities. **The darkest areas in the following map represent the areas with the greatest number of children and youth (0-17 years) per acre.** Children & youth (0-17 years) are concentrated in the Northwest and West Salt Lake planning areas, with additional pockets found in the Central Community, Sugar House and East Bench planning areas.
SENIORS (65+ YEARS)

Seniors also often rely on publicly owned parks and public lands to help keep recreation and leisure activities affordable. The darkest areas in the following map represent the areas of the city with greatest number of Seniors (65+ years) per acre. Seniors are well-distributed throughout the community.
Population Projections

Accurate population and household data and projections are required to determine park and natural lands needs. Salt Lake City is projected to grow from an estimated 2017 population of 196,307 to 223,359 by 2040, a 14% increase, or an additional 27,052 residents. Traditional patterns and rates of growth are changing, however, and it is possible that population may grow much more rapidly than projected, with the possibility of reaching the 2040 projections within ten years (2027).

Since the City is nearly built out, the majority of growth and development is slated to occur through infill, redevelopment and densification. Areas of potential growth are focused in the Central Community planning area, with isolated portions of the Sugar House, Capitol Hill, West and Northwest planning areas also projected to receive significant new residential growth.

2040 Population Estimate:

196,307 + 27,052\(^1\) = 223,359

\(^1\) Several data sets were utilized to determine future population growth within the city. These include the Governor’s Office of Management and Budget (“GOMB”), Wasatch Front Regional Council (“WFRC”), Traffic Area Zone Data (“TAZ”), impact fee data and building permit data. It is important to note that much of this data is dated information. WFRC is currently revising TAZ data, which will influence the GOMB projections. The city should review this section as new data becomes available to determine revised growth assumptions.
Areas for Potential Growth

New areas of population growth will require additional parks and open lands to help meet the needs of future residents. The areas indicated below are growth areas established in the Salt Lake City Transit Master Plan. Growth areas were determined by analyzing Traffic Area Zone Data (‘TAZ’) data. For more detailed descriptions of these areas, see Appendix 5. As seen below, the Central Community planning area is projected to receive the bulk of new growth, with additional growth projected for the Northwest and West Salt Lake planning areas.
High Needs Areas

Combining the characteristics of 1) population density, 2) household income, 3) youth, 4) seniors, and 5) areas of potential growth results in a composite map which shows High Needs Areas. **The darkest areas of the map represent the areas of the city with the greater need for access to the Parks & Public Lands system.** The Central Community shows the greatest concentration of High Needs Areas with several smaller areas occurring within the Northwest and West Salt Lake planning areas.
4.2 Future LOS for Parks, Natural Lands & Trails

Level of Service (LOS) helps to assess current service. Existing LOS can serve as a barometer for determining how parks, natural lands and trails service levels will be affected without the addition of additional acreage to offset the significant growth anticipated for the future. According to this scenario, **94 acres of new park land will be required to meet future needs at the same levels of service as today**, which is the standard the public currently enjoys and expects. Similar increases could be inferred in the park amenities, natural lands and trails, although these features tend to be acquired and developed as opportunities arise.

Chapter 2 indicates where access to parks, trails and natural lands are deficient, and specific gap areas where new facilities might be located. As established in Chapter 1, there is little available land to meet these future needs, and few resources earmarked for acquisition and development of existing facilities. Therefore, determining how or even whether to maintain existing levels of service in the future will be one of the most challenging undertakings of the master planning process, which is slated to follow this assessment.

**In 2040, 94 acres of new park land will be required to meet future needs at the same level of service today.**

**PARK ACRES NEEDED TO MAINTAIN EXISTING LOS IN 2040**

- **Current LOS** = 3.5 acres per 1,000
- **Population Growth** (2016 - 2040) = 27,052
- **Acres Needed** = Population Growth / 1,000 x LOS
- **Acres Needed** = 27,052 / 1,000 x 3.5 = **94 acres**
5.0 Summary of Findings

The Salt Lake City Parks & Public Lands Needs Assessment provides an in-depth review of existing facilities and amenities, as well as an indication of existing and future needs and desires for parks and natural lands in the city. This information and data not only lays the groundwork for the next step toward planning for the city’s parks and public lands—preparing the Salt Lake City Parks & Public Lands Master Plan—but also provides key findings upon which daily decisions can be based. With that in mind, the following are some of the key findings that emerged, listed in no particular order:

1. Salt Lake City parks and natural lands play key roles in making Salt Lake City a unique and desirable place to live. Salt Lake City residents value and frequently use their parks, natural lands and trails, and having parks and natural lands close to home directly relates to how Salt Lake City residents feel about their quality of life.

2. There are few vacant sites available to accommodate future parks and natural lands in proximity to currently populated areas. As an aging community, the lack of affordable and accessible land in areas where new facilities are required is a clear challenge.

3. Salt Lake City’s parks are well-distributed throughout the residential areas of the city. Nearly two-thirds of those parks are neighborhood or mini parks and these parks play a key part in establishing neighborhood identity.

4. Natural lands and trails play a significant role in meeting the recreation needs of the community. The city owns and maintains nearly 1,700 acres of natural lands which are supplemented by more than 8,000 acres of state or federally owned natural lands.

5. The majority of city residents live within a half mile of a park, natural land or trail. This is in alignment with the city’s Plan Salt Lake goal to have “accessible parks and recreation spaces within a half mile of all residents”. Ensuring the city’s parks provide the right amenities in the correct locations is an ongoing challenge.

6. While most parks are easily accessible by car, pedestrian connections to parks and natural lands need to be improved. This includes improving and increasing both bike lanes and trail connections to make parks and natural lands more accessible by foot or bicycle.

7. The Central Community Master planning area has the least access to parks and trails, yet is slated to receive the highest levels of residential growth. It also has no direct access to public natural lands, and is underserved by multipurpose fields, baseball/softball fields and trails. Special efforts should be made to increase access to parks and trails in this area.

8. The Avenues and Capitol Hill planning areas rely heavily on adjacent natural lands. These planning areas have fewer park acres and amenities than other planning areas and lack flat land more conducive to park development, particularly the development of athletic fields.

9. The majority if the city’s softball and baseball fields are located in Northwest and West Salt Lake planning areas, both of which are located west of I-15. With the RAC located here, the Northwest planning area far outweighs the other planning areas in its number of multi-purpose fields.

10. Salt Lake City has more than 70 miles of off-street trails that connect residents to the city’s parks and natural lands, yet there are still parks and natural lands that are difficult to get to on foot or by bike. Implementing the currently proposed off-street trails would significantly improve connectivity between parks, natural lands and other destinations.
The Parks & Public Lands system plays a critical role in community life, supporting numerous community events and gatherings and athletic groups. As the city grows and density increases, scheduling special events, maintenance, and avoiding overuse will become more challenging.

Parks and natural lands in the Central, Sugar House and East Bench planning areas attract more visitors than other planning areas. Liberty Park is the most frequently visited park and is twice as popular as the second most frequently visited park (Sugar House Park).

Residents hold Liberty Park in high esteem. Liberty Park’s trees, diverse activities and events that take place on a regular basis attract a steady stream of visitors.

Salt Lake City residents particularly enjoy parks and natural lands that support "on-foot" uses such as hiking, walking, running and non-programmed activities.

Salt Lake City residents are more willing to pay for upgrades and improvements to the city’s parks and natural lands over the development of new facilities. They also support good management of the resources that are available, including expansion of the existing trail system.

East-side residents use parks more than west-side residents even though the west side has high numbers of park acres and adequate amenities. West-side residents are more likely to travel and use east-side parks.

Trails located in local parks and in the foothills are used more often. Trails in these locations are also perceived to be safer than the Jordan River Trail.

Athletics enthusiasts indicate that there is a lack of reservable field space in the city. Heavy, peak season demand makes it difficult to rotate fields, which provides little time for turf to rest and recover from activities.

Many of the existing parks are not equipped with essential event infrastructure, such as water and electricity. This places pressure on parks with better infrastructure, such as Liberty Park, Washington Square and Pioneer Park.

Education-related facilities, such as an urban farm or nature education center, are residents’ top desired special use facilities to be funded.

Although user conflicts (e.g. conflicting trail uses, dog-related conflict, etc.) have not reached critical levels, conflicts do exist and are likely to escalate as the population continues to increase.

Residents are supportive of reducing water use on public lands. Reducing areas of high water use turf will require major modifications to irrigation infrastructure and the installation of tree specific irrigation. Residents may not be aware of these initial costs.

The Central Community, Northwest and West Salt Lake planning areas are the city’s High Needs Areas and are projected to receive the bulk of the city’s future growth. The needs of these areas should be carefully considered as parks and natural lands is expanded and modified.

94 acres of new park land will be required to meet future park needs at the same levels of service the public currently enjoys and expects today.
5.1 Citywide Summary

CITY ACREAGE
Salt Lake City is nearly 112 square miles (71,571 acres), 41% of which are located in the seven populated planning areas. The remaining three planning areas—the Northwest Quadrant, Airport and City Creek—encompass the remaining 59% and are predominantly non-residential.
### POPULATION - COMPARISON BY PLANNING AREA
Population distribution by planning area is as follows:

- **Avenues**: 27%
- **Capitol Hill**: 12%
- **Northwest**: 39%
- **West Salt Lake**: 13%
- **Sugar House**: 29%
- **Central**: 29%
- **East Bench**: 27%
- **Community**: 51%
- **City Creek**: 56%

### PARK AND NATURAL LAND - DISTRIBUTION BY PLANNING AREA

#### PARK ACRES*

- **Avenues**: 3%
- **Capitol Hill**: 2%
- **Northwest**: 2%
- **West Salt Lake**: 2%
- **Sugar House**: 2%
- **Central**: 4%
- **East Bench**: 4%

*With SL Co./Jointly owned parks included

#### NATURAL LAND (NL) ACRES

### CITYWIDE FREQUENCY OF USE
The following illustrates how frequently parks are visited by planning area.

- **Avenues**: 27%
- **Capitol Hill**: 12%
- **Northwest**: 39%
- **West Salt Lake**: 13%
- **Sugar House**: 29%
- **Central**: 29%
- **East Bench**: 27%
- **Community**: 51%
- **City Creek**: 56%

**Note:** When survey respondents were asked to “Please select the region(s) where [they] frequently visit parks”, they were allowed to select as many areas as they wanted. As a result, the percentages in the graph do not add up to 100%.

### PARKS BY TYPE
Total acreage by park type is as follows:

- **Community Parks**: (280 acres)
- **Regional Parks**: (207 acres)
- **Neighborhood Parks**: (148 acres)
- **Mini Parks**: (24 acres)
- **Special Event Parks**: (30 acres)
LEVEL OF SERVICE

CITYWIDE LOS

3.5 ACRES
Park land per 1,000 persons

94 ACRES
Park land required to maintain LOS in 2040

LOS BY PLANNING AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Area</th>
<th>Park LOS</th>
<th>Park LOS with County Facilities</th>
<th>Natural Lands LOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Salt Lake</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitol Hill</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>113.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Community</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avenues</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Bench</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar House</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 Summaries by Planning Area

The following summarize the unique facilities and needs of each planning area. They demonstrate the diversity found throughout the city and should be used to better understand needs and priorities at the neighborhood level. Each summary contains the following information:

EXISTING PARKS & NATURAL LANDS TABLE
A table that includes a list of the planning area’s parks and natural lands by type and illustrates total acres and percentages (also by type).

PARK AND NATURAL LAND ACRES*
Quick snapshot graphics of the percentage of citywide park and natural lands acres located within the planning area. Also includes planning area LOS for both parks and natural lands.

PLANNING AREA STATISTICS
A summary of population, land area and overall frequency of use for the planning area.

FREQUENCY OF USE
A bar graph illustrating the breakdown of most frequently used park or natural land by planning area.

WALKABILITY
A map showing how much of the planning area is a ½-mile walking distance from parks, natural lands and trails when using existing roads and trails.

HIGH NEEDS AREAS
A composite map which shows High Needs Areas or areas with a greater need for access to the Parks & Public Lands system.

PLANNING AREA SUMMARY + OPPORTUNITIES
A summary of key facts and potential opportunities for the area.
PLANNING AREA: NORTHWEST

The Northwest planning area is located on the west side of the city between I-15 and I-215. Its southern boundary is North Temple and its northern boundary at the city limits. Salt Lake City International Airport is located just west of I-215. The Jordan River runs through the center of this area and links several key parks and recreation areas including the Salt Lake Regional Athletic Complex (RAC), Rose Park Golf Course, Cottonwood Park and Riverside Park. Constitution Park, a Salt Lake County owned facility, is also located in this planning area.

The Northwest planning area is home to over one-third of all city owned park land. This is largely due to the recently completed 118-acre RAC being located at the northern end of the planning area. Additionally, the area contains nearly seven percent of the city owned natural lands, all of which are located along the Jordan River.

[Diagram showing Northwest planning area with parks and natural lands highlighted]
FREQUENCY OF USE

Riverside Park is the most visited park in the Northwest planning area. Several of the area’s most used parks and trails—Jordan River Par 3 Disc Golf, the Jordan River Parkway and Cottonwood Park—emphasize the importance of the Jordan River Parkway and its neighboring park lands to this planning area.

WALKABILITY

When looking at areas that are \(\frac{1}{2}\)-mile walking distance from parks and natural lands using existing roads and trails, the Northwest planning area has two main gaps: 1) Adjacent to I-215 in the 800-900 North vicinity and 2) A mid-community area: east of the Jordan River and just south of the Rose Park Golf Course.

New trails, currently in the planning stages, for the Rose Park Golf Course will fill a critical need in this area.

PLANNING AREA SUMMARY:

- The Northwest planning area has largest percentage of park acreage (due to the RAC), yet has relatively low park visitation.
- The Jordan River connects most of the Northwest’s parks and natural lands to create a vibrant, recreation network.

OPPORTUNITIES:

Parks located within the Northwest’s high needs areas should be maintained and upgraded with the surrounding population in mind (e.g. the addition of age appropriate amenities, such as benches and pathways for the senior community and engaging play elements for youth).

HIGH NEEDS AREAS\(^1\)

Several of the city’s High Needs Areas occur within the Northwest planning area. Fortunately, these high needs areas are well-served by existing parks and natural lands and appear to be easily accessible—within a 1/2-mile walking distance— to residents.

The Northwest planning area has a high concentration of children & youth (0-17 years) as well as a fairly high concentration of seniors (65+ years). When park improvements are made within this planning area, these two demographic groups—and how park amenities serve them—should be carefully considered.

\(^1\)The High Needs Area map combines 1) population density, 2) household income, 3) youth, 4) seniors, and 5) areas of potential growth to create a composite map which represents areas for greatest need for access to the Parks & Public Lands system (darkest areas).
PLANNING AREA: WEST SALT LAKE

The West Salt Lake planning area is located between I-15 and I-215 and just south of the Northwest Community. Similar to the Northwest planning area, the Jordan River runs through the center of this planning area. Two key park groupings are located along the Jordan River. The first grouping—near 900 South—includes Jordan Park, the International Peace Gardens, 900 South River Park and the Fife Wetland Preserve (also known as the 900 South Oxbow). The second grouping is near 1700 South and includes 1700 South River Park, Glendale Park, the Glendale Golf Course and Seven Peaks Water Park (a city owned/privately operated facility).

The West Salt Lake planning area captures nearly 16% of all the city owned park acres and includes Salt Lake City’s only urban pump track, located along the 9 Line trail at approximately 500 West and 900 South.

West Salt Lake Parks

- 1700 South River Park
- Glendale Park
- Jordan Park/Peace Gardens
- Sorenson Multi-Cultural Center

Subtotal: Community Parks

- 900 South River Park
- Poplar Grove Park
- Sherwood Park

Subtotal: Neighborhood Parks

- Jake Garn Park
- Modesto Park
- Nelli Jack Park
- Post Street Tot Lot
- Weserman Park

Subtotal: Mini Parks

- Seven Peaks Water Park

Subtotal: Special Use Parks

- 9 Line Pump Track
- Jordan River Parkway Trail Side
- Jordan River Parkway Habitat
- Fife Wetland Preserve
- Cannon Greens Urban Farm
- Bend in the River
- 9 Line

Subtotal: Urban Natural Lands

- 1700 South River Park

Subtotal: Natural Lands

Grand Total Parks

West Salt Lake Natural Lands

- 9 Line
- Bend in the River
- Cannon Greens Urban Farm
- Fife Wetland Preserve
- Jordan River Parkway Trail Side
- Jordan River Parkway Habitat

Subtotal: Urban Natural Lands

- 1700 South River Park

Subtotal: Natural Lands

Grand Total with Co./Jointly Owned Parks

West Salt Lake Statistics:

- 2017 Population: 24,815
- City Area: 4,182 Acres
- PARK/NL**/TRAIL FREQUENCY OF USE: 5.8% (4 OF 7)
FREQUENCY OF USE
Jordan Park is by far the most popular park in West Salt Lake. Several other sites—such as the 900 South River Park and Jordan River Trail—are linked to Jordan Park, making this area critical to the West Salt Lake planning area community.

WALKABILITY
When looking at areas that are 0.5-mile walking distance from parks and natural lands using existing roads and trails, the West Salt Lake planning area is well-covered with only two small gaps on its western fringes.

PLANNING AREA SUMMARY:
- Jordan Park is historic park and is well-loved by the community.
- Even with the west side’s largest and most visited park (Jordan Park) located here, the West Salt Lake planning area has relatively low park visitation.
- Several of the city’s unique amenities are located within this planning area. These include the only urban pump track and one of only three city skate parks.

OPPORTUNITIES:
With improvements and some redesign, the Jordan River and its contiguous park spaces have the opportunity to be transformed into a well-connected, regional asset.

HIGH NEEDS AREAS\(^1\)
Several of the city’s High Needs Areas occur within the West Salt Lake planning area. Unfortunately, some of these high needs areas are also areas where gaps in the walkability analysis occur.

The West Salt Lake planning area has one of the highest concentrations of children & youth (0-17 years) in the city. Future planning efforts should focus on park amenities that will serve children & youth.

\(^1\) The High Needs Area map combines 1) population density, 2) household income, 3) youth, 4) seniors, and 5) areas of potential growth to create a composite map which represents areas for greatest need for access to the Parks & Public Lands system (darkest areas).
PLANNING AREA: CAPITOL HILL

The Capitol Hill planning area extends from the west side of City Creek Canyon to I-15 and from South/North Temple on the south to the city limits on the north (which are located just south of the Chevron Refinery). This planning area includes the State Capitol Building and Temple Square in addition to several well-known parks and natural lands, including Memory Grove and the historic landmark, Ensign Peak.

The Capitol Hill and Avenues planning areas are tied for the smallest percentage of park acres in the city. That said, both planning areas more than make up for the shortfall with natural lands acreage, which together comprise over 75% of all of the city owned natural lands.
FREQUENCY OF USE
Memory Grove is the most popular park in the Capitol Hill planning area, followed by City Creek Park and the City Creek/North Foothills. Ensign Peak Nature Park and Warm Springs Park are also popular, both of which have distinct historic value to the city.

WALKABILITY
When looking at areas that are ½-mile walking distance from parks and natural lands using existing roads and trails, the Capitol Hill planning area has two main gaps: 1) the neighborhood just north of the Capitol and 2) the neighborhood at the north end of Capitol Boulevard. These neighborhoods likely have limited access due to the challenging terrain and road layout.

HIGH NEEDS AREAS
A significant High Needs Area lies in the middle of Capitol Hill’s residential area (Marmalade District area). Marmalade District residents are all within walking distance of an existing park. However, most parks within the planning area are mini parks (under one acre), offer tot lots only, and have no athletic fields. With existing density and topography creating major hurdles in this planning area, the city should actively keep an eye out for acquiring larger parcels as if redevelopment occurs.

1The High Needs Area map combines 1) population density, 2) household income, 3) youth, 4) seniors, and 5) areas of potential growth to create a composite map which represents areas for greatest need for access to the Parks & Public Lands system (darkest areas).

PLANNING AREA SUMMARY:
- The Capitol Hill planning area is one of the largest planning areas, yet it has the smallest population.
- Nearly half of city owned natural lands are within the Capitol Hill planning area.
- One the city’s most loved parks—Memory Grove—is shared between the Capitol Hill and Avenues planning areas.
- The Capitol Hill planning area is tied with the Avenues planning area for the fewest acres of parks. The Marmalade District area of the planning area is a high needs area that also lacks substantial park acres within walking distance.

OPPORTUNITIES:
Providing better connections to and between natural lands as part of creating a unified natural lands system.
PLANNING AREA: AVENUES

The Avenues planning area is bounded by City Creek Canyon on the west, South Temple on the south, the University of Utah and City Creek planning area on the east. Although not included in park estimates in this assessment, the 120-acre City Cemetery is a central feature of this planning area. Several other large community and neighborhood parks serve as key gathering and recreation spaces—including historic Lindsey Gardens, Popperton Park and the 14.3 acre 11th Ave Park.

As with the Capitol Hill planning area, the Avenues area includes large amounts of city owned natural lands, approximately 29% total.

EXISTING PARKS & NATURAL LANDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parks</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>% of Total System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th Ave Park</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal: Community Parks</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindsey Gardens</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popperton Park</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal: Neighborhood Parks</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini Parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Ave &amp; C Street Pickleball</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay Rees Park</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kletting Park</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shields Park</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipp Park</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal: Mini Parks</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total Parks</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County/Jointly Owned Parks</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal: Co./Jointly Owned Parks</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total with Co./Jointly Owned Parks</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Natural Lands</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>% of Total System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban Natural Lands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Creek Natural Area</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popperton Preserve</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal: Urban Natural Lands</td>
<td>108.3</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Urban Natural Lands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Foothills Open Space</td>
<td>322.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal: Non-Urban Natural Lands</td>
<td>322.1</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total Natural Lands</td>
<td>430.4</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AVENUES STATISTICS:

2017 POPULATION: 15,917
8.1% OF CITY (6 OF 7)
CITY AREA: 3,042 ACRES
4.3% OF CITY (7 OF 7)
PARK/NL**/TRAIL FREQUENCY OF USE: 29% (4 OF 7)

*With SL Co./Jointly owned parks included
**NL = Natural Lands
FREQUENCY OF USE
Memory Grove Park is the most popular park in the Avenues, followed by Lindsey Gardens. The Foothills above the Avenues is just behind in popularity, with the rest dominated by local parks and amenities.

### WALKABILITY
When looking at areas that are **1/2-mile walking distance** from parks and natural lands **using existing roads and trails**, the Avenues planning area has three main gaps: 1) the neighborhood south of the City Cemetery, 2) the west side of the Upper Avenues and 3) an undeveloped, residentially-zoned area above Arlington Hills. While the City Cemetery is not officially a park, it often serves recreational purposes and may fill the needs in Gap 1. The Upper Avenues neighborhood (Gap 2), is not walkable by design (steep topography and few interconnected roads). Although not city owned, this neighborhood does have easy access to the Hilltop Road trailhead of the Bonneville Shoreline Trail.

### HIGH NEEDS AREAS
The High Needs Areas in the Avenues planning area are primarily located in the lower Avenues, near South Temple. Most of these areas are within walking distance of an existing park.

1 The High Needs Area map combines 1) population density, 2) household income, 3) youth, 4) seniors, and 5) areas of potential growth to create a composite map which represents areas for greatest need for access to the Parks & Public Lands system (darkest areas).

### PLANNING AREA SUMMARY
- The Avenues planning area has the smallest land area with the second smallest portion of the population, yet it ranks in the middle as far as frequency of park and natural lands use.
- Memory Grove is the most popular park and serves a critical role as it provides a park with walking distance of the planning area’s high needs areas.
- When combined with the Capitol Hill planning area, natural lands within these two areas comprise over 75% of all of the city owned natural lands.

### OPPORTUNITIES
The Cemetery provides the Avenues with a unique opportunity for passive natural lands. Implementing improvements outlined in the City Cemetery Master Plan add significantly to this planning area while also filling the walkability gap.
PLANNING AREA: CENTRAL COMMUNITY

The Central Community planning area is the largest of the seven planning areas and has significant residential neighborhoods. This planning area is bound on the north by South Temple, the south by 1700/2100 South, the west by I-15 and on the east by 1300 East. It is the center or core of Salt Lake City, and includes the downtown district as well as key civic and community gathering spaces such as Washington Square, Library Square, Pioneer Park and Liberty Park. Liberty Park is Salt Lake City’s only non-sports centric regional park.

This city-center location has its challenges. For example, it is located away from the city’s primary natural amenities—the foothills and Jordan River—and contains no city owned natural lands. This area is slated for the most of the city’s future growth, yet is the planning area with the least access to parks and trails.
FREQUENCY OF USE
Although Liberty Park is the predominant destination, three special use parks—Library Square, Pioneer Park and Washington Square Park—are also located within the Central Community and are among the most popular sites used by residents.

WALKABILITY
When looking at areas that are ¼-mile walking distance from parks and natural lands using existing roads and trails, the Central Community planning area has less walkable access to local parks than any of the other planning areas. While the Central Community has a highly walkable street network and easy access to a good public transit system, it also has the lowest LOS (park acres per 1,000) which creates more frequent and larger gaps in walkability to parks within the planning area.

HIGH NEEDS AREAS
The Central Community has a significant amount of the city’s High Needs Areas. These High Needs Areas are spread throughout the planning area. When considering both walkability and high needs, the Central Community is the planning area with the greatest deficiencies. As the planning area with the highest density, a fair amount of children & youth (0-17 years) and the greatest potential for future growth and further densification this area currently has and will continue to have a great pressure on its parks.

PLANNING AREA SUMMARY:
• The Central Community has the highest population of the planning areas. It is also the largest planning area and has the highest frequency of park use.
• This planning area has no city owned natural lands and no direct access to surrounding natural areas. It also has the most gaps in walkability to a local park or natural land.
• The Central Community contains most of the city’s cultural gathering centers and is home to Liberty Park—the city’s most frequently used park.

OPPORTUNITIES:
Due to the built out nature of this planning area, there is little opportunity for the construction of new parks. Improvement efforts should be focused on fulfilling the needs of the neighborhoods through better utilization of existing parks. Requiring park space as part of large redevelopment projects should also be considered.

1 The High Needs Area map combines 1) population density, 2) household income, 3) youth, 4) seniors, and 5) areas of potential growth to create a composite map which represents areas for greatest need for access to the Parks & Public Lands system (darkest areas).
PLANNING AREA: EAST BENCH

The East Bench planning area is bounded by the University of Utah to the north, the foothills to the east, 1300 East to the west and 1700 South/Parley’s Way to the south. Two major canyons and their associated creeks—Red Butte and Emigration—are major features of this planning area.

The East Bench planning area contains 11.6% of city owned parks, which is only slightly more than the Avenues and Capitol Hill planning areas. However, unlike the Avenues and Capitol Hill planning areas, the city owns significantly less natural lands in the area (only 4.1% of all city owned lands). Even though the city owns less acres within this planning area, the foothill trail network clearly serves the area and the city at-large. Additionally, there are several key urban natural lands within this area, including Wasatch Hollow and Miller Bird Refuge, both of which provide East Bench residents with close and immediate access to natural lands and nature.
FREQUENCY OF USE
The foothills (above the Avenues/UofU) and Sunnyside Park are the most used park and natural lands in the East Bench planning area, each providing a different appeal. The top remaining used parks and natural lands provide a range of experiences, from access to the Foothills to small local parks.

WALKABILITY
When looking at areas that are ¼-mile walking distance from parks and natural lands using existing roads and trails, the East Bench planning area has one small walkability gap (1) on its western edge, east of 1300 East and between Red Butte Creek and 1700 South and (2) one large walkability gap on in the Foothill Drive area. Both gap areas are devoid of any nearby significant park or natural land acres. The second gap, above Foothill Drive, is not walkable due to topography and roadway design (few interconnected roads).

HIGH NEEDS AREAS
The East Bench community has few High Needs Areas, with the University of Utah housing area near Sunnyside Park the only identified high needs area in the planning area.

The East Bench has a notable seniors (65+ years) population, which should be considered as parks and public lands improvements are planned and implemented.

1 The High Needs Area map combines 1) population density, 2) household income, 3) youth, 4) seniors, and 5) areas of potential growth to create a composite map which represents areas for greatest need for access to the Parks & Public Lands system (darkest areas).

PLANNING AREA SUMMARY:
• The East Bench has the second largest planning area, yet it is the 5th lowest in population.
• While the percentage of park lands and LOS for the East Bench planning area is one of the lowest, parks in the area are fairly well used.
• With Red Butte and Emigration creeks intersecting the area and the foothills, Natural Lands (urban and non-urban) play a significant role in the East Bench planning area.

OPPORTUNITIES:
There are significant areas within the East Bench planning area where residents do not have easy access to parks or natural lands. The city should consider looking for opportunities for new parks in these areas or enhancing connectivity through on or off-street trails and finding ways to overcome significant barriers, such as Foothill Boulevard.
PLANNING AREA: SUGAR HOUSE

The Sugar House planning area lies just south of the Central Community and East Bench planning areas. It is dissected by I-80 and its southern border jogs through the neighborhoods south of the freeway. Westminster College and Sugar House Park are central features within the planning area. The well-known Parleys Historic Nature Park—a city owned natural area—is located just out of the city’s eastern boundary.

The main park in the area is Sugar House Park, which is jointly owned by the city and Salt Lake County and is currently managed by the Sugar House Park Authority. This 110-acre park provides a key service for the neighborhood, the city and the region. Without this park the planning area would have the smallest percentage of parks in Salt Lake City. Parleys Historic Nature Park, located just outside the city boundary, is also an important regional draw.

EXISTING PARKS & NATURAL LANDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sugar House Parks</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>% of Total System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairmont Park</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal: Community Parks</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parleys Way Park</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratford Park</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal: Neighborhood Parks</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini Parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Sherman Park</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Park</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster Park</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal: Mini Parks</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total Parks</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County/Jointly Owned Parks</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>% of Total System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sugar House Park</td>
<td>109.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanner Park</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal: Co./Jointly Owned Parks</td>
<td>119.2</td>
<td>86.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total with Co./Jointly Owned Parks</td>
<td>156.1</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sugar House Natural Lands</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>% of Total System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban Natural Lands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaine Preserve</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hidden Hollow &amp; the Draw</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parleys Historic Nature Park*</td>
<td>85.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garfield School</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal: Urban Natural Lands</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Urban Natural Lands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal: Non-Urban Natural Lands</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total Natural Lands</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Located just outside of city boundary

SUGAR HOUSE STATISTICS:

2017 POPULATION: 33,212
16.9% OF CITY (3 OF 7)

CITY AREA: 3,361 ACRES
4.7% OF CITY (6 OF 7)

PARK/NL**/TRAIL FREQUENCY OF USE: 51% (2 OF 7)
FREQUENCY OF USE
Sugar House Park is a large, regional park with diverse uses and spaces that attract local, citywide, and regional users. Fairmont is a key park for families and others, while the Tanner Park/Parleys Historic Nature Park area attracts hikers, cyclists, and dog walkers.

WALKABILITY
When looking at areas that are a 1/2-mile walking distance from parks and natural lands using existing roads and trails, the Sugar House planning area has several large walkability gaps, one at the western edge of the planning area—between 500 East and Highland Drive (1) and another between Parley’s Way and Sugar House Park (2). While the western gap may be lacking in park acreage, there are two golf courses—Nibley Park Golf Course and Forest Dale Golf Course—in the area. There are also no parks in this planning area north of I-80 and east of Sugar House Park, creating the second gap.

PLANNING AREA SUMMARY:
- Although it is jointly owned with Salt Lake County and managed by Sugar House Park Authority, Sugar House is the second most frequently visited park by city residents and plays a key role in this planning area and the region.
- The Sugar House planning area is in need of more parks. Residents within the area are fairly supportive of paying for new parks (see Chapter 3, Community Values & Desires).
- Investigate the opportunity to incorporate general public access—through the addition of simple amenities such as perimeter pathways—into the existing golf courses to help bridge walkability gaps.
- Look for new park opportunities between I-80 and Parleys Way.

HIGH NEEDS AREAS
The Sugar House planning area has a few High Needs Areas, most of which are located between I-80 and 2100 South on the west side of the planning area. Some of these areas also lack access to a park within walking distance.

While currently not a notably dense planning area, major future growth and densification is currently underway in the downtown Sugar House area. Planned improvements to parks within this area (Fairmont and Sugar House) should consider the increase in population.

1 The High Needs Area map combines 1) population density, 2) household income, 3) youth, 4) seniors and 5) areas of potential growth to create a composite map which represents areas for greatest need for access to the Parks & Public Lands system (darkest areas).
6.0 Moving toward a Master Plan

The Salt Lake City Parks & Public Lands Needs Assessment provides an in-depth review of existing facilities and amenities, as well as an indication of existing and future needs and desires for parks and open lands in the city. It lays the groundwork for preparing the Salt Lake City Parks & Public Lands Master Plan, which is the next step toward planning for the city’s parks and public lands.

As Salt Lake City continues to grow and change, the master plan should indicate how the future parks, natural lands and trails will also grow and change to meet future needs and desires. It should be based on a clear vision grounded by clear goals and policies that match the requirements of the future city with the expectations of the public.

OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES
The challenges are great, but so are the opportunities. Some of the opportunities and challenges identified as part of this Needs Assessment are:

- Accommodating future growth in an aging community that lacks affordable and accessible land in areas where new facilities are needed most
- Maintaining and managing existing resources in a manner that is more aligned with public needs (There is currently a significant backlog of projects and more funding is needed to adequately maintain the city's existing parks and natural lands.)
- Adjusting park, natural land and recreation resources to meet the changing needs and desires of the community
- Identifying underutilized park assets and adding desired facilities
- Enhancing connectivity to and between parks to encourage active transportation
- Transforming park landscapes to be more water-wise to preserve critical resources
- Finding ways to be more efficient in the way the Division manages and take care of parks, natural lands and trails
- Identifying innovative ways to close the gap for walkability
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Entryway into Salt Lake City’s “Crown Jewel,” Liberty Park
As a new master plan is developed, it is critical that a **clear vision** is established upon which decisions are based. Recent model plans developed by other cities focus on achieving **sustainability** and **equity**, and identify new ways to understand and think about parks, natural lands, trails and recreation. They address parks and natural lands as critical infrastructure for maintaining and improving quality of life.

Similar thought processes and paradigms are encouraged as the new **Salt Lake City Parks & Public Lands Master Plan** is developed. This will help ensure that park-poor neighborhoods receive the attention they deserve, and that new types of parks and natural lands are provided for meeting the needs and desires of city residents.

There is a real opportunity to go beyond focusing on the numbers, and to address parks and natural lands as essential elements for better air quality, climate change mitigation, energy efficiency, and environmental justice. Parks can help improve the health of the city.

The new master plan is an opportunity to truly distinguish Salt Lake City as a community that understands the importance of parks and natural lands. In addition to describing the physical needs required, it can also show how park and natural lands assets can be leveraged to increase economic and social benefits.

**KEY QUESTIONS AND CONSIDERATIONS**

Based on the results of this study, the following are some questions and considerations to address as master planning efforts move forward:

- 94 acres of additional park land is required to maintain the existing level of service. Where should additional parks be located, what size should they be, what form should they take, and what type of role should each new park play?

- How do you balance the desire for improved maintenance for existing parks, natural lands and trails with the need to provide additional park land?

- Is Salt Lake City willing to accept lower levels of service as population continues to grow? If not, is the existing LOS adequate as a future target for parks and public lands?

- How do you balance the general desire for passive parks and uses with the perceived need for additional sports fields and active park uses by advocate groups?

- How do you improve access to parks and natural lands in underserved areas such as the Central Community?

- How do we maintain the health of our urban forest with growing water costs and antiquated irrigation systems?

- Are there new types of parks and public spaces that will serve existing and future park and recreation needs?

- Is development community providing adequate parks and public lands as part of their city-building efforts?

- What is the vision of the future parks and public lands system?

- Is funding sufficient to meet the vision, needs and expectations of the public?

*The new master plan is an opportunity to truly distinguish Salt Lake City as a community that understands the importance of parks and natural lands.*