

2009 Salt Lake Countywide Water Quality Stewardship Plan

ADDENDUM STREAM FUNCTION INDEX Herriman City Report



**2009
SALT LAKE COUNTYWIDE
WATER QUALITY STEWARDSHIP PLAN**

**ADDENDUM
STREAM FUNCTION INDEX REPORT**

Herriman City Report

PREPARED BY:

**Flood Control and Water Quality Division
Salt Lake County
2001 South State Street
Suite N3100
Salt Lake City, UT 84190**

April 2010

Printed on 10% Recycled Paper
Elemental Chlorine-Free (ECF)
FSC Certified (mixed sources)



This page intentionally blank.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	Introduction	1
1.1	Components of the Stream Function Index (SFI) and Ecosystem Health Index (EHI).....	1
1.2	Data Collection.....	1
2.0	Herriman City—Information	3
2.1	Water Quality Stressors in Herriman City	3
3.0	Stream Function Index (SFI)	4
4.0	Watershed Function Groups	4
4.1	Water Quality Functional Group Score	4
4.2	Habitat Functional Group Score.....	6
4.2.1	Pool/Riffle Ratio in Herriman City	7
4.2.2	Water Depth in Herriman City	8
4.2.3	Fish Passage in Herriman City	9
4.2.4	Habitat Structure in Herriman City	10
4.2.5	Flow Diversion in Herriman City.....	11
4.2.6	Riparian Width in Herriman City.....	12
4.2.7	Riparian Density in Herriman City.....	13
4.3	Hydraulics Functional Group Score	14
4.3.1	Floodplain Development in Herriman City	15
4.3.2	Floodplain Connectivity in Herriman City.....	16
4.3.3	Hydraulic Alteration in Herriman City.....	17
4.3.4	Bank Stability in Herriman City	18
4.4	Social Functional Group Score	19
5.0	Ecosystem Health Index (EHI) - Herriman City	20
6.0	Stream Function Index (SFI) - Herriman City	21
7.0	Implementation	22
7.1	Site Identification.....	22
7.2	Plan Development.....	22
7.3	Funding	22
7.4	Plan Implementation	23
7.5	Post Construction.....	23

LIST OF FIGURES

1.	Water Quality Functional Group Scores Countywide	5
2.	Habitat Functional Group Scores Countywide	6
3.	Habitat Function—Pool/Riffle Ratio in Herriman City	7
4.	Habitat Function—Water Depth in Herriman City	8
5.	Habitat Function—Fish Passage in Herriman City	9
6.	Habitat Function—Habitat Structures in Herriman City	10
7.	Habitat Function—Flow Diversion in Herriman City.....	11
8.	Habitat Function—Riparian Width in Herriman City.....	12
9.	Habitat Function—Riparian Density in Herriman City.....	13



WATER QUALITY
STEWARDSHIP PLAN

Salt Lake County—Stream Function Index (SFI) Herriman City

10.	Hydraulics Functional Group Scores Countywide	14
11.	Hydraulics Function—Floodplain Development in Herriman City.....	15
12.	Hydraulics Function—Floodplain Connectivity in Herriman City	16
13.	Hydraulics Function—Hydraulic Alteration in Herriman City	17
14.	Hydraulics Function—Bank Stability in Herriman City.....	18
15.	Social Functional Group Scores Countywide	19
16.	Ecosystem Health Index (EHI) Final Score 2009	20
17.	Stream Function Index (SFI) Final Score 2009	21
18.	Diagram of Emergent Bench Design	22

LIST OF TABLES

1.	Stream Function Index Metrics Flow Chart	2
2.	Herriman City Watershed Areas and Stream Lengths	3
3.	Grants for Stream and River Restoration Projects	24

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Armed with the widely supported 2009 Salt Lake Countywide Water Quality Stewardship Plan (WaQSP), regulatory and municipal authorities in Salt Lake County seek to work collaboratively to monitor and improve watershed and stream health. After examining the current conditions, numerous water quality and watershed improvement recommendations were made in the 2009 WaQSP. However, written recommendations and well laid plans are only as good as the implementation efforts that result. With the completion of the WaQSP, Salt Lake County and its partners now enter the most challenging and rewarding phase of watershed management—implementation. A key challenge in the implementation phase is to measure the success and/or failure of implementation efforts. Therefore, to inform future planning decisions, and to assure a successful, iterative, planning and implementation process, Salt Lake County developed a monitoring tool for the WaQSP known as the Stream Function Index (SFI). The SFI was developed in 2006 with the assistance of several environmental consulting firms. The primary consultant on this effort was Cirrus Ecological, based in Logan, UT.

It is anticipated that SFI data will be collected along with each update of the WaQSP that will occur every six years. It is also anticipated that reports, such as this one, will be written for each municipal government at that same frequency. Successful implementation of WaQSP recommendations should lead to improved SFI scores. However, if BMPs do not lead to improved SFI scores, they will be re-examined for effectiveness in the local environment.



Rose Creek flows through western Herriman.

1.1 COMPONENTS OF THE STREAM FUNCTION INDEX (SFI) AND ECOSYSTEM HEALTH INDEX (EHI)

Streams and rivers, although single components of the larger watershed, may serve as indicators of overall watershed health. To maximize resources and time, Salt Lake County decided to focus on monitoring stream and river corridors to indicate overall watershed function. However, a broader examination of watershed function may be accomplished in the future with increased funds and staff. For the purposes of this document, data collected in stream and river corridors are used to indicate watershed function.

To monitor stream and river health, the SFI measures physical, chemical, biological, and social functions of stream and river corridors in Salt Lake County. The four watershed functions that are examined in the SFI include: habitat (aquatic and terrestrial), hydraulics (flood conveyance and stream stability), water quality and social (recreation and aesthetics). Metrics used to determine scores for each of the four watershed functions are included in Table 1. Recreation and aesthetics monitoring is included in the SFI to indicate the degree to which stream and river corridors provide appropriate, or resource compatible, recreation and aesthetic opportunities. However, recreational facilities may, if incompatible with the resource, detrimentally effect stream ecology.

In order to examine ecological health independent of social function, Salt Lake County created an Ecological Health Index (EHI). The EHI is a sub-component of the SFI that includes habitat, hydraulics, and water quality evaluations. The EHI may be compared with the SFI to determine possible effects of social (i.e. recreational and aesthetic) functions on stream ecology.

See the “Stream Function Index Main Report” Appendices for the complete SFI Methodology Report.

1.2 DATA COLLECTION

The majority of 2009 SFI numbers were based on data gathered between 2007 and 2008. However, water quality data spans a greater time period (2001 to 2008). In future SFI updates, it is anticipated that water quality data collected between updates will be used to assess stream



Salt Lake County—Stream Function Index (SFI) Herriman City

Metric	Sub-Group	Functional Group	Ecosystem Health Index	Stream Function Index
Pool/Riffle ratio	Stream Channel	Habitat	EHI	SFI
Water Depth				
Fish Passage				
Habitat Structures				
Flow Diversion				
Riparian Width				
Riparian Density	Riparian Corridor			
Floodplain Development	Flood Conveyance	Hydraulics		
Floodplain Connectivity				
Bank Stability	Stream Stability			
Hydraulic Alteration				
303(d) list	Regulatory	Water Quality		
Macroinvertebrate	Aquatic			
Total P	Monitoring			
Temperature				
TDS				
DO				
<i>E. coli</i>				
Management	Aesthetics	Social		
Visual Aesthetics				
Location	Amenities (Nodes)			
Accessibility (ADA Approved)				
Restrooms				
Resource Compatibility (Nodes)	Amenities (Trails)			
Trail Corridor				
Connectivity				
Resource Compatibility (Trails)				

Table 1. Stream Function Index Metrics Flow Chart

health. Although previous stream stability and fish habitat assessments were conducted on a few streams and the Jordan River in the mid 1980's, the 2009 SFI represents the first comprehensive assessment of all major waterways in Salt Lake County. Therefore, this dataset is considered a baseline.

The SFI is intended to give watershed and stream managers an overview of current stream conditions. However, as improvement projects are identified, more detailed studies may be required to fully assess the condition of the stream.



Woods Hollow is a dry wash in the hills on the east side of Herriman.

2.0 HERRIMAN CITY—INFORMATION

Herriman City, located in the southwestern portion of Salt Lake County, is a relatively new city (incorporated in 1999) and is home to approximately 15,507 residents. Contained within Herriman’s boundaries are sections of Rose Creek, Butterfield Creek, Copper Creek, Midas Creek and Wood Hollow. Portions of three sub-watersheds are also found within Herriman City boundaries: Jordan River Corridor, Midas/ Butterfield Creek, and Rose Creek Sub-Watersheds. This report summarizes the health of the river and stream sections within Herriman City and provides guidance for future water quality improvement and watershed preservation efforts. Herriman City will also receive a copy of the 2009 WaQSP Addendum Stream Function Index Main Report, and will receive electronic files of the report and Geographic Information System (GIS) shapefiles depicting information collected as part of the SFI.

2.1 WATER QUALITY STRESSORS IN HERRIMAN CITY

Although the SFI is a measure of stream corridor health, it is imperative that water quality and watershed health be approached comprehensively. Therefore, this section is provided to review water quality stressors identified in the 2009 WaQSP for the sub-watersheds in Herriman City.

As part of the 2009 WaQSP, a computer-based GIS analysis was conducted in each of the 27 sub-watersheds in Salt Lake County to determine existing and potential future water quality

stressors. In Chapter 5 of the WaQSP document, these water quality stressors are outlined and Best Management Practices (BMPs) recommended to address potential concerns. Below is a review of the stressors and recommendations identified for sub-watersheds within Herriman City.

Water quality stressors that were identified in the Jordan River Sub-Watershed include:

- Stream channel modification
- Lack of developed recreation
- Stream flow diversions
- Loss of open space
- High number of Industrial Stormwater Discharge Permits
- Floodplain encroachment
- Densification of residential land use
- Urban development and redevelopment pressures

Water Quality stressors that were identified in the Rose Creek and Midas/Butterfield Creek Sub-Watersheds include:

- Lack of developed recreation opportunities
- Stream flow diversions
- Lack of stream corridor preservation
- Urban development pressures leading to increased stormwater pollution loads and loss of groundwater recharge capability
- Development in the floodplain

Management Practices that were recommended to address these potential water quality stressors include:

- Bioengineered bank stabilization
- Grade control structures
- Channel restoration/enhancement

Herriman City		8,392 Acres
Sub -Watersheds	Jordan River Corridor	481 Acres
	Midas/Butterfield Creek	3,439 Acres
	Rose Creek	4,472 Acres
Streams	Butterfield Creek	4,129 Feet
	Copper Creek	10,013 Feet
	Midas Creek	14,477 Feet
	Rose Creek	13,871 Feet
	Wood Hollow	9,835 Feet

Table 2. Herriman City Watershed Areas and Stream Lengths



Salt Lake County—Stream Function Index (SFI) Herriman City

- Streambank revegetation
- 401 permitting
- Diversion structures modification
- Canal water diversion
- Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design criteria
- Minimum flow protection
- Water rights acquisition
- Identify community recreation needs and opportunities
- Wetlands restoration/enhancement
- Manufactured treatment systems
- Participate in new and/or existing planning efforts
- Floodplain re-establishment
- Trash racks
- Land acquisition for preservation
- Volunteer programs
- Recreational facilities that are accessible and resource compatible.



Rose Creek is developed as a park amenity with trails for new residential neighborhoods. As development occurs, riparian corridor vegetation is being established along Rose Creek where once only grass/shrub communities existed.

3.0 STREAM FUNCTION INDEX (SFI)

Similar to the WaQSP effort to identify water quality/watershed stressors, four watershed functions were examined for each stream: water quality, habitat, hydraulics, and social/aesthetics services. In order to assess the ability of streams to provide these four functions, Salt Lake County developed what is called the Stream Function Index (SFI). The SFI is a rapid assessment protocol that assesses stream habitat, hydraulics, water quality and social factors. Based on established methodology, the SFI measures 27 metrics to determine overall stream health. These metrics are categorized by watershed function (water quality, habitat, hydraulics, social/aesthetic) and can therefore be examined individually or by functional group.

The SFI is a tool to help identify the results of water quality stressors along main stream channels and the Jordan River. These areas are candidates for enhancement projects. The SFI provides the framework for a more detailed baseline and monitoring techniques that may be used on those projects. The first complete dataset was collected during the 2007 and 2008 field seasons and is considered the baseline. The SFI will be repeated every 6 years in conjunction with the Water Quality Stewardship Plan Update.

4.0 WATERSHED FUNCTION GROUPS

This section summarizes scores for the four watershed functions countywide and reviews data and scores within Herriman City boundaries. Additional information on SFI methodology can be found in the SFI Main Report.

4.1 WATER QUALITY FUNCTIONAL GROUP SCORE

The SFI water quality functional group is comprised of seven metrics or measures: 303(d) list status, macroinvertebrates, Total Phosphorus, Temperature, Total Dissolved Solids (TDS), Dissolved Oxygen (DO), and Coliform (*E. Coli*). Based on 2009 SFI scores, the streams with the best water quality are concentrated in the upper regions of both the Wasatch and Oquirrh streams, with the notable exception of upper Little Cottonwood Creek (currently listed as water quality impaired by the State Division of Water Quality) for zinc. Additionally, lower Emigration Creek and Red

Salt Lake County—Stream Function Index (SFI)
Herriman City




Figure 1. Water Quality Functional Group Scores Countywide

Butte Creek received high rankings for water quality. Notably, these scores are based entirely on data contained in the Environmental Protection Agency's STORET database. Although this data represents a large portion of water quality data collected in Salt Lake County, it does not represent all data. However, it was decided that the SFI would rely on STORET data to assure consistent methodologies and that certified water quality assurance (QA) and water quality control (QC) measures were taken.

In addition to noting areas of high, or good, water quality, it is important to note areas of low, or poor water quality. As can be seen from the Countywide data presented in Figure 1, segments with low water quality values include: upper and lower Jordan River, lower and upper Little

Cottonwood Creek, lower Big Cottonwood Creek, and upper Emigration Creek. All of these segments scored as meeting water quality standards in <50% of samples taken. Many of these water quality concerns are currently being addressed through the State Division of Water Quality's (DWQ) Total Maximum Daily Load program.

Water quality opportunities in Herriman City are focused on maintaining existing water quality through Rose, Butterfield and Midas Creeks. This may be done by monitoring new development and proposed discharge permits. Additionally, it is recommended that Herriman City work with local regulatory agencies and Kennecott Copper to monitor and improve water quality in Copper Creek.

Salt Lake County—Stream Function Index (SFI)
Herriman City




Figure 2. Habitat Functional Group Scores Countywide

4.2 HABITAT FUNCTIONAL GROUP SCORE

In the SFI, the habitat function was characterized by: pool/riffle ratio, fish passage, habitat structure, flow diversion, riparian width, and riparian density. Of note, stream channel habitat metrics were only assessed for streams that have been identified, by the State Division of Wildlife Resources (DWR) as supporting fish habitat. Flow diversion and riparian metrics were assessed for all streams.

Similar to the Water Quality Functional Group Score, the streams with the best, or highest scoring, habitat function are concentrated in the upper regions of both the Wasatch and Oquirrh mountains. However, in contrast to water quality,

not all sections of upper Oquirrh Mountain streams rank high for habitat. Of note, Copper Creek and Rose Creek both scored <60% for overall habitat function. Other areas of particular habitat concern include lower Big and Little Cottonwood Creeks and the section of Butterfield Creek upstream from its confluence with Midas Creek.

As can be seen from Figure 2, Herriman City does contain sections of Rose and Butterfield Creeks that received an overall poor rating for habitat function (between 30 and 39.9). Midas and Copper Creeks scored slightly higher (between 50 and 69.9). This section explores causes for these scores by examining the metrics for this watershed function.




Figure 3. Habitat Function—Pool/Riffle Ratio in Herriman City

4.2.1 Pool/Riffle Ratio in Herriman City

An important component of stream habitat function is the ratio between pools and riffles. For the SFI, the number of pools and riffles were counted for each stream reach. Pools were defined as mid-channel areas with low velocity that were at least 1 foot deep. Riffles were defined as mid-channel shallow turbulent areas of higher velocity. The number of pools was compared to the expected number for the given stream type (see SFI Main Report for an explanation of stream type.) Subsequently, the pool/riffle ratio was determined. A score of “Not Applicable” (N/A) indicates that the stream does not support a fishery.

Herriman City boundaries do not contain fisheries as designated by the Division of Wildlife Resources (DWR); therefore, no recommendations are made regarding this metric at this time. However, if the DWR decides to change the beneficial use designation of these streams at any point, it is recommended that Herriman City be actively involved in that decision.

As can be seen in Figure 3, the streams within the

Salt Lake County—Stream Function Index (SFI)
Herriman City




Figure 4. Habitat Function—Water Depth in Herriman City

4.2.2 Water Depth in Herriman City

In Salt Lake County, many streams have experienced altered or reduced stream flow or may naturally have minimal stream flow. In order to assess the extent to which streams have sufficient water depth to support aquatic habitat, Salt Lake County staff measured stream depth at representative locations within each stream reach during late summer low flow. Targets for this metric were set based on minimum depth requirements for trout and native sucker species established by the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources (DWR).

recommendations are made regarding this metric at this time. However, if the DWR decides to change the beneficial use designation of these streams at any point, it is recommended that Herriman City be actively involved in that decision.

As can be seen in Figure 4, the streams within the Herriman City boundaries do not contain fisheries as designated by the DWR; therefore, no




Figure 5. Habitat Function—Fish Passage in Herriman City

4.2.3 Fish Passage in Herriman City

For the purposes of the SFI, fish passage was scored based on the distance between barriers to fish passage. Barriers were tallied for each stream reach and analyzed for overall function during late summer low flow. Barrier criteria included height of barrier, depth of plunge pool, water depth, and beaver dam density. The optimum value for this metric was to have at least 1/4 of a mile between barriers.

As can be seen in Figure 5, the streams within the Herriman City boundaries do not contain fisheries as designated by the Division of Wildlife Resources (DWR); therefore, no recommendations are made regarding this metric at this time. However, if the DWR decides to

change the beneficial use designation of these streams at any point, it is recommended that Herriman City be actively involved in that decision.

Salt Lake County—Stream Function Index (SFI)
Herriman City




Figure 6. Habitat Function—Habitat Structures in Herriman City

4.2.4 Habitat Structure in Herriman City

or the purposes of the SFI, habitat structures are defined as instream natural, or man-made, objects that provide cover, resting, and feeding resources for fish species. To measure the function of habitat structures, the number of embedded logs, rootwads, boulders, undercut banks, beaver dams, and man-made structures were tallied for each reach. Targets were set based on the number of habitat structures anticipated to occur in specific stream types.

As can be seen in Figure 6, the streams within the Herriman City boundaries do not contain fisheries as designated by the Division of Wildlife Resources (DWR); therefore, no recommendations are made regarding this metric

at this time. However, if the DWR decides to change the beneficial use designation of these streams at any point, it is recommended that Herriman City be actively involved in that decision.

Salt Lake County—Stream Function Index (SFI)
Herriman City




Figure 7. Habitat Function—Flow Diversion in Herriman City

4.2.5 Flow Diversion in Herriman City

In the arid environment of Salt Lake County, many streams have been greatly impacted due to altered surface and groundwater flows. To include potential effects on habitat in the SFI, Salt Lake County developed a flow diversion metric. The flow diversion metric measured the degree to which natural surface stream flows have been reduced or interrupted. This metric includes both the amount of time over a year and the length of stream that is maintaining natural flows. The target for this metric was set at 100%, i.e. a natural flow for 100% of the year.

(between 26 and 50). All others scored 100.

To improve instream flows within Rose and Butterfield Creeks, it is recommended that Herriman City work with adjacent municipalities, water rights owners, and the State Division of Water Rights (DWRi) to identify opportunities to purchase and/or exchange waters that may be dedicated to instream flows.

As can be seen in Figure 7, Rose Creek and part of Butterfield Creek within Herriman City boundaries scored low for flow diversions

Salt Lake County—Stream Function Index (SFI)
Herriman City




Figure 8. Habitat Function—Riparian Width in Herriman City

4.2.6 Riparian Width in Herriman City

The SFI also examined habitat beyond the stream channel with Riparian habitat metrics. The first metric examined was the width of riparian corridors. For the purposes of the SFI, riparian width was measured as the continuous and contiguous areas of uninterrupted vegetation growth along streams. The target riparian width was established by Salt Lake County to be 100 feet, i.e. ideally, all streams/river in the County would be bordered on both sides by 100 feet of uninterrupted vegetative growth. The actual amount of riparian vegetation was then compared with the target.

As can be seen in Figure 8, all of the creeks within Herriman City scored quite low for this metric, with

most sections between 1 and 25, and part of Copper Creek at 0. Although the SFI is limited in its ability to score riparian habitat for intermittent streams, it is recommended that Herriman City seek to improve this score.

To improve riparian habitat function of the streams in Herriman City, it is recommended that: Herriman City pass a land use ordinance to limit development within 100 feet of streams and river (this may also be included in development codes), and again work with other authorities to promote vegetative growth along the streams and river.

Salt Lake County—Stream Function Index (SFI) Herriman City



WATER QUALITY
STEWARDSHIP PLAN




Figure 9. Habitat Function—Riparian Density in Herriman City

4.2.7 Riparian Density in Herriman City

In addition to riparian width, the density of riparian vegetation is a strong indicator of overall stream health. This metric scores the percent coverage of the canopy, middle story, and understory to determine overall riparian density. As opposed to examining plant species, this metric assumes that the highest functioning riparian areas will have at least 80% coverage at all levels of the canopy.

As can be seen in Figure 9, sections of Wood Hollow, Rose Creek, and Midas Creek all scored between 26 and 50 for this metric. Most of Midas, Copper and Lower Butterfield Creeks scored even lower, between 1 and 25. Therefore, significant opportunities exist to improve riparian density within Herriman City.

To improve stream function and augment habitat resources, it is recommended that Herriman City participate with other State and local authorities to: sponsor river/stream restoration efforts that incorporate robust re-vegetation and irrigation efforts, notify residents of tree planting efforts and encourage their participation. In addition to working with other authorities and nonprofit organizations, it is recommended that Herriman City actively manage recreation areas to encourage growth of riparian vegetation.

Salt Lake County—Stream Function Index (SFI)
Herriman City




Figure 10. Hydraulics Functional Group Scores Countywide

4.3 HYDRAULICS FUNCTIONAL GROUP SCORE

The third watershed function examined for the purposes of the SFI was hydraulics function. This functional group is comprised of four metrics: floodplain development, floodplain connectivity, bank stability (as scored using Pfankuch methodology), and hydraulic alteration.

As can be seen in Figure 10, the majority of streams in Salt Lake County scored > 50 for the hydraulics function; however, an appropriate target for this functional group is closer to 75. Countywide, the streams with low hydraulics function scores were concentrated in the lower sections of the Wasatch Mountain streams.

Namely, City Creek, Red Butte Creek, Emigration Creek, and Parley’s Creek showed low hydraulics function. This may be due to the highly developed nature of these streams and the extensive culverts on each of them.

Rose, Wood Hollow, and Midas Creeks all scored between 70 and 79.9 for hydraulics. The following information is provided to review hydraulics function metrics within Herriman City and identify opportunities to improve stream function by addressing concerns.




Figure 11. Hydraulics Function—Floodplain Development in Herriman City

4.3.1 Floodplain Development in Herriman City

The floodplain development metric evaluates the percent of impervious surface within the 100 year floodplain as defined by the FEMA Flood Insurance Program. For the purposes of the SFI, the target was that 100% of the floodplain be pervious, or free from development that would limit groundwater infiltration.

As can be seen in Figure 11, the streams within Herriman City scored between 76 and 99 for floodplain development, meaning that some amount of the FEMA floodplain still contains pervious surfaces. Therefore, it is recommended that Herriman focus efforts on preserving the undeveloped areas along its waterways. Of note,

the 2009 WaQSP recommends that all cities within Salt Lake County develop and adopt ordinances that will both limit impervious surface and development along stream and river corridors. This is seen as the best means by which cities may minimize impervious surfaces within stream corridors. However, it is recognized that numerous cities have similar regulations in their development codes.

Salt Lake County—Stream Function Index (SFI) Herriman City




Figure 12. Hydraulics Function—Floodplain Connectivity in Herriman City

4.3.2 Floodplain Connectivity in Herriman City

The floodplain connectivity metric is essentially a measure of stream entrenchment (or eroded streambed). Entrenchment disconnects the stream from its historic floodplain, lowers the water table, and increases the intensity of flood events. For the purposes of the SFI, floodplain connectivity was measured and scored against targets established by stream type (see SFI Main Report.) Any score falling within the appropriate entrenchment range for a stream type was given a score of 100. If the entrenchment ratio was outside the appropriate range, the reach was given a score of 0.

As can be seen in Figure 12, streams in Herriman City generally fell outside the appropriate entrenchment range. Therefore, it is recommended that Herriman City focus its efforts on improving floodplain connectivity where possible. If concerns or opportunities arise, it is recommended that Herriman City partner with other authorities to conduct stream/river restoration efforts that may reconnect the stream with its historic floodplain. For example, Salt Lake County has successfully used an emergent bench design for similar sections of the Jordan River (see Figure 18 on page 22).

Salt Lake County—Stream Function Index (SFI)
Herriman City




Figure 13. Hydraulics Function—Hydraulic Alteration in Herriman City

4.3.3 Hydraulic Alteration in Herriman City

Although bank stability is key to the hydraulics function of an urban stream, artificial bank configurations that reduce riparian and floodplain areas and the types of artificial materials used may cause stability and habitat problems. For the SFI, hydraulic alteration was evaluated as the percent of culverts and man-made bank stabilization structures and built with materials such as concrete riprap or gabion baskets within a reach. The percent was based on visual observation by field personnel and computer-aided mapping of culverts.

for this metric (between 76 and 100). Butterfield and one small section of Rose Creek did score lower (between 51 and 75). Therefore it is recommended that Herriman City investigate opportunities to improve bank stability in these areas.

Overall, it is recommended that when upgrading bank stabilization structures or when new bank stabilization projects are necessary, Herriman City partners with Salt Lake County Flood Control Division and State agencies to employ ecosystem restoration techniques.

As can be seen in Figure 13, sections of Wood Hollow, Rose Creek, Copper Creek and Midas Creek within Herriman City scored relatively high



Salt Lake County—Stream Function Index (SFI) Herriman City




Figure 14. Hydraulics Function—Bank Stability in Herriman City

4.3.4 Bank Stability in Herriman City

In addition to measuring the condition and frequency of man-made stability structures in Salt Lake County’s streams and river, an established bank stability method was also employed to characterize overall stream stability.

The Pfankuch Stream Stability Evaluation protocol—developed for the U.S. Forest Service—was slightly modified for use on the urban streams of Salt Lake County. Although the Pfankuch rating is only one of the metrics contained in the SFI, it, in itself, examines 18 stream characteristics. This metric therefore contains abundant information that may be used in stream restoration and enhancement projects. “Hot spots”, or actively eroding sites, were also identified and mapped.

Although the presence of a hot spot did not contribute directly to the score, they give an indication of where to perhaps prioritize bank stabilization projects.

As can be seen in Figure 14, the majority of the streams in Herriman City had a “Good” score for bank stability. However, a few “Hotspots”, or areas of extreme concern exist near Herriman City’s boundaries. It is recommended that Herriman City work collaboratively with adjacent municipal governments to mitigate concerns associated with these hotspots.




Figure 15. Social Functional Group Scores Countywide

4.4 SOCIAL FUNCTIONAL GROUP SCORE

Social watershed function was measured by examining recreational facilities: management, aesthetics, location, Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compatibility, restroom facilities, trail connectivity, and resource compatibility.

Social function is probably the most difficult function to measure because there is a broad range of preferences by recreationists for different types of facilities. Therefore, the SFI focused on assessing the availability of all types of recreation facilities along the waterways, the minimum requirements for a positive user experience, and impact that the use of those facilities may have on the stream ecosystem. Although recreation may

have detrimental impacts on stream and river corridors, it is the opinion of Salt Lake County staff that the best way to promote stewardship of local resources is to provide appropriate facilities and access.

As can be seen in Figure 15, many opportunities exist within Herriman City boundaries to improve recreational access to streams. It is recommended that the City work with local residents and regulatory agencies to identify specific locations suitable for improved access to streams.



Salt Lake County—Stream Function Index (SFI) Herriman City




Figure 16. Ecosystem Health Index (EHI) Final Score 2009

5.0 ECOSYSTEM HEALTH INDEX (EHI) - HERRIMAN CITY

In order to determine the physical, chemical, and biological health of streams in Salt Lake County, the County has developed an Ecosystem Health Index (EHI) score. This score is meant to reflect the ecological health of the stream. Although the County's position is to promote responsible and appropriate recreational access along the stream corridors, it is also understood that recreational activities may counteract ecological function. Therefore, it is important to examine the combined EHI score outside of the overall Stream Function Index (SFI) score which includes the Social Function.

As can be seen in Figure 16, Rose and Midas Creeks both had relatively high EHI scores (between 70 and 100). However, Butterfield and Copper Creeks scored lower (between 60 and 69.9). In review of the EHI components, it appears that these scores are largely driven by low water quality and habitat scores. To address concerns, it is recommended that Herriman City partner with adjacent cities and other agencies to improve understanding of water quality concerns and explore stream/river restoration efforts. Additionally, it is recommended that Herriman City establish zoning ordinances and/or regulations that will limit development along their streams and river.

Salt Lake County—Stream Function Index (SFI)
Herriman City




Figure 17. Stream Function Index (SFI) Final Score 2009

6.0 STREAM FUNCTION INDEX (SFI) - HERRIMAN CITY

To include social/recreational functions in the overall SFI score, Salt Lake County combined the EHI with social scores.

As can be seen in Figure 17, Rose, Midas, and Wood Hollow Creeks scored between 60 and 69.9 for overall stream function. However, Butterfield and Copper Creeks had lower SFI scores (between 50 and 59.9). In review of the SFI components, it appears that these scores are largely driven by low water quality and habitat scores and lack of recreational opportunities.

To address these concerns, it is recommended that Herriman City partner with adjacent cities and other agencies to identify opportunities for enhanced recreational opportunities and improved understanding of water quality concerns. It is also recommended that Herriman City seek partners and explore stream/river restoration efforts. Additionally, it is recommended that Herriman City establish zoning ordinances and/or regulations that will limit development along their streams and river.

7.0 IMPLEMENTATION

Because many of the recommendations included in this document suggest stream/river restoration efforts, this section is written to provide some general guidelines/suggestions with such projects.

7.1 SITE IDENTIFICATION

Salt Lake County encourages local cities to consult the data collected as part of the SFI effort to identify appropriate restoration sites. In addition to the GIS data that each city will be provided, Salt Lake County staff are available for consultation and assistance with grant application efforts.

7.2 PLAN DEVELOPMENT

Salt Lake County has used an “Emergent Bench” design for restoration projects along the Jordan River (Figure 18). This design is appropriate for

reaches with large easements/access. If easements are not available, other designs may need to be developed. Currently, Salt Lake County is working to develop ideas for entrenched, urban reaches.

7.3 FUNDING

As with most municipal functions, a major hurdle to stream/river restoration projects is funding. Some municipalities have elected to use stormwater utility fees or bond efforts to fund such projects. However, the majority of projects that have been completed in Salt Lake County have relied heavily on Federal grants. Fortunately, numerous Federal grants are available to support stream restoration efforts. However, the cost of site identification and plan development usually fall to the sponsoring agency.

Although application deadlines and typical amounts awarded vary greatly, there are some common characteristics of successful grant applications:




Figure 18. Diagram of Emergent Bench design used along the Jordan River

Salt Lake County—Stream Function Index (SFI) Herriman City



- A clear, precise work plan
- Demonstrated involvement of many partners
- Inclusion of a monitoring effort
- Strong financial match

A list of some grants that may be appropriate are provided in Table 3, Grants for Stream and River Restoration Projects.

7.4 PLAN IMPLEMENTATION

With robust planning, established partnerships, and sufficient funding, stream and river restoration efforts may be highly successful. However, some pitfalls do exist. Things to be aware of during a stream restoration effort:

- Flow diversions may occur unexpectedly. Please assure that all permits (namely stream alteration and flood control permits) have been acquired and appropriate entities notified to avoid the unexpected destruction of restoration work.
- Order your plant and rock material early as many of these materials are in high demand.

- Notify the public. Although stream and river restoration efforts are a great benefit to the local stream health, the process of restoration may at times appear destructive. Post notices explaining the project in order to prevent public misunderstanding.

- Allow enough time. As with most projects, stream and river restoration projects may take longer than expected. Be sure to plan for unexpected delays in your scheduling.

- We're not the only ones that love trees. In many of the restoration efforts that Salt Lake County has overseen, beaver activity has been highly destructive. Be sure to consult local experts to prevent the destruction of your newly planted trees.

7.5 POST-CONSTRUCTION

One of the most important components of a successful stream or river restoration project is the long-term maintenance of the restoration site. Especially in the arid Salt Lake Valley, be sure to plan for irrigation of planted vegetation, and weed control to assure that the monies spent on the restoration project are used to their fullest extent; budgeting for a two-year establishment period for vegetation is ideal.



Example of before (above) and after (right) river restoration project completed in 2009 using Emergent Bench model along the Jordan River. This site in Riverton will be irrigated for 2 years to establish vegetation.



GRANT	SPONSOR	ELIGIBLE	TYPES OF PROJECTS	MATCH	\$ RANGE	DEADLINE	MORE INFORMATION
Targeted Watershed Grant	Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)	States, local governments, public and private nonprofit institutions/ organizations, federally recognized Indian tribal governments, U.S. territories or possessions, and interstate agencies.	Eligible Activities Activities that will result in the protection, and restoration of a watershed that incorporates a watershed-based approach, and meets the prescribed criteria. Ineligible - Development of TMDLs - Phase II Stormwater Projects - Construction of buildings or major structures - Purchase of equipment of machinery NOTE: Watershed nominations must be submitted by either a Governor or a Tribal Leader.	25% Non-federal match	2005 Grants ranged from \$600,000 to \$850,00	Typically October through November	http://www.epa.gov/twg
Environmental Education Grants	Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)	Local education agency, state education or environmental agency, college, or university, not-for-profit organization as described in section 501(C)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code, noncommercial educational broadcasting entity, tribal education agency (which includes school and community colleges controlled by an Indian tribe, band, or nation)	Environmental education projects that enhance the public's awareness, knowledge, and skills to help people make informed decisions that affect environmental quality.	25% Non-federal match	Applications may be up to \$50,000; however, typical awards are between \$15,000 and \$20,000	Typically in December	http://www.epa.gov/enviroed/grants.html
Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration (Section 206 of WRDA)		Nonprofit Groups, Conservation District, Water and Wastewater Utilities, Local Government, State/ Territorial Agency	Financial and technical assistance to promote the conservation and improvement of soil, water, air, energy, plant and animal life, and other conservation purposes on Tribal and private working lands.	35% Non-federal match	Typical awards are ~\$300,000	None - these allocations are through Section 206 of the WRDA	www.usace.army.mil/cw/
Conservation Security Program	Note: Upper Weber has received this	The agricultural operation must be privately owned land or Tribal land, the majority of which must be located within a selected priority watershed. The applicant must be in compliance with highly erodible and wetland compliance provisions, have an active interest in the agricultural operation, and have control of the land for the life of the contract. The applicant must share in the risk of producing any crop or livestock and be entitled to a share in the crop or livestock marketed from the		None required	Not available; however, in FY 2007 this program was awarded \$259 Million	1. The CSP sign-up will be offered in selected priority watersheds across the Nation. 2. Producers completed a self-assessment to determine eligibility. 3. Eligible producers within these watersheds submit an application. 4. Base on the application, description of conservation activities, and a follow up interview, the Natural Resources Conservation Service	www.nrcs.usda.gov/programs/csp

Table 3. Grants for Stream and River Restoration Projects

GRANT	SPONSOR	ELIGIBLE	TYPES OF PROJECTS	MATCH	\$ RANGE	DEADLINE	MORE INFORMATION
Conservation Security Program - Continued		<p>operation. There are certain tier eligibility and contract requirements, as well:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -For Tier I, the producer must have addressed soil quality and water quality for eligible land uses on part of the agricultural operation prior to application. -For Tier II, the producer must have addressed soil quality and water quality for eligible land uses on the entire agricultural operation prior to application and agree to address one additional resource concern by the end of the contract period. -For Tier III, the producer must have addressed all resource concerns to a resource management system level for all eligible land uses on the entire agricultural operation and adequately treat riparian zones before application into the program. 				(NRCS) will determine which program tier and enrollment category are available for the applicant.	
Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP)		<p>Business, Community/Watershed Group, Nonprofit Groups, Educational Institution, Private Landowner, Water and Wastewater Utilities, State/Territorial Agency, Tribal Agency, Agricultural producers who face serious threats to soil, water, and related natural resources, or who need assistance with complying with Federal and State environmental laws. A participant may be an owner, landlord, operator, or tenant of eligible agricultural lands. Limited resource producers, small-scale producers, producers of minority groups, Federally recognized Indian tribal governments, Alaska natives, and Pacific Islanders are encouraged to apply.</p>	<p>These contracts provide incentive payments and cost-shares to implement conservation practices. Persons who are engaged in livestock or agricultural production on eligible land may participate in the EQIP program.</p>	Typically 25 to 50%	Limited to \$10,000 per person per year and to \$50,000 over the length of the contract. Not available in FY 2007 this program was awarded \$739 Million		http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/programs/equip
Five-Star Restoration Program		<p>Business, Community/Watershed Group, Nonprofit Groups, Educational Institution, Private Landowner, Conservation District, Water and Wastewater Utilities, Local Government, State/Territorial Agency, Tribal Agency</p>		Typical projects include at least five diverse partners. Most partnerships contribute more than \$40,000 for every \$10,000 Five Star grant.	Typically range between \$5,000 and \$20,000	Typically in February or March	http://www.epa.gov/owow/wetlands/restore/5star/index.html

Table 3. Grants for Stream and River Restoration Projects (continued)

GRANT	SPONSOR	ELIGIBLE	TYPES OF PROJECTS	MATCH	\$ RANGE	DEADLINE	MORE INFORMATION
Land and Water Conservation Fund (Outdoor Recreation, Acquisition, Development and Planning Grants)	National Park Service (NPS)	Local Government, State/Territorial Agency, Tribal Agency			Typically range between \$1,000 and \$3 million - median is \$150,000		http://www.nps.gov/nrc/programs/wcwf/
Natural Resources Conservation Service: Conservation on Private Lands	National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (NFWF)	Community/Watershed Group, Nonprofit Groups, Educational Institution, Conservation District, Local Government, State/Territorial Agency, Tribal Agency, Federal Agency	Grants are awarded to projects that: (1) address priority actions promoting fish and wildlife conservation and the habitats on which they depend; (2) work proactively to involve other conservation and community interests; (3) leverage available funding; and (4) evaluate project outcomes.	NFWF funds must be matched on at least a 1:1 basis, although 2:1 is encouraged, and higher ratios are more competitive.	Typically range between \$10,000 and 150,000 - median is \$60,000	Varies each year.	http://www.nfwf.org/AM/Template.cfm?Section=Home
Nonpoint Source Implementation Grants (319 Programs)	Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) through the Utah Division of Water Quality	Business, Community/Watershed Group, Nonprofit Groups, Educational Institution, Conservation District, Local Government, State/Territorial Agency, Tribal Agency, Federal Agency	Restoration, Information & Education, Planning, TMDL implementation	States required to provide 40% non-Federal match for whole grant. Recipients within state typically required to provide 40% match for each project, but this may be negotiable with a given state.	Varies		Mike Reichert; Utah Division of Water Quality (DWCQ)
North American Wetlands Conservation Act Grants Program	United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)	Business, Nonprofit Groups, Private Landowner, Local Government, State/Territorial Agency, Federal Agency	Long-term protection, restoration, and/or enhancement of wetlands and associated uplands habitats.	Cost-share partners must match grant funds 1:1 with U.S. non-federal dollars	Funding amounts vary; however in 2007 this program was awarded 39.4 Million	Typically in early spring (March)	http://www.fws.gov/birdhabit/Grants/NAWC/index.shtml
Not-for-Profit Acid Mine Drainage Reclamation	U.S. Department of the Interior Office of Surface Mining, Division of Reclamation Support	Community/Watershed Group, Nonprofit Groups, Conservation District	Support the efforts of local not-for-profit organizations, especially watershed groups, to complete construction projects designed to clean streams impacted by Acid Mine Drainage	Partners are encouraged to make monetary contributions or provide in-kind services; however, a specific match is not specified.	Typically range between \$25,000 and \$150,000 - median is \$50,000	Applications will be accepted until all available funds have been awarded	http://www.osmre.gov/osnaml.htm

Table 3. Grants for Stream and River Restoration Projects (continued)

GRANT	SPONSOR	ELIGIBLE	TYPES OF PROJECTS	MATCH	\$ RANGE	DEADLINE	MORE INFORMATION
Partners for Fish and Wildlife Program	U.S. Department of the Interior, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Branch of Habitat Restoration, Division of Fish and Wildlife Management and Habitat Restoration	Business, Community/Watershed Group, Nonprofit Groups, Educational Institution, Private Landowner, Conservation District, Local Government, Tribal Agency	The partners for Fish and Wildlife Program provides technical and financial assistance to private landowners to restore fish and wildlife habitats on their lands.	Typically an applicant contributes 50% of the total project cost through matching funds or in-kind services but this amount is negotiable.	Typically range between \$300 and \$25,000 - median is \$25,000	Funds available year -round	http://ecos.fws.gov/partners/viewContent.do?viewPage=home
Urban and Community Forestry Challenge Cost-Share Grants	USDA Forest Service	Business, Community/Watershed Group, Nonprofit Groups, Educational Institution, Conservation District, Water and Wastewater Utilities, Local Government, State/Territorial Agency, Tribal Agency	The program works to achieve a number of goals, including (1) effectively communicating information about the social, economic, and ecological values of urban and community forests; (2) involving diverse resource professionals in urban and community forestry issues; and (3) supporting a holistic view of urban and community forestry. In particular, the program supports an ecosystem approach to managing urban forests for their benefits to air quality, stormwater runoff, wildlife and fish habitat, and other related ecosystem concerns.	All grant funds must be matched at least equally (dollar for dollar) with non-federal source funds.	Typically range between \$3,000 and \$250,000 - median is \$125,000	The annual Request for Pre-Proposals is released the first week in September. Pre-proposals are due the second Tuesday of November	http://www.freelink.org/nucfac
Water 2025 Challenge Grant Program	Bureau of Reclamation, Office of Program & Policy Services	Nonprofit Groups, Educational Institution, Conservation District, Water and Wastewater Utilities, Local Government, State/Territorial Agency, Tribal Agency	The goal of Water 2025 is to prevent crises and conflict over water in the western United States. The Challenge Grant Program is administered by the Bureau of Reclamation and is designed to contribute to this goal by providing 50% funding for projects that will conserve water, increase water use efficiency, or enhance water management, using advanced technology, improvements to existing facilities, and water banks and markets.	A match is required, but the % is not specified.	Typically range between \$19,000 and \$300,000 median is \$140,000	Visit the Department of the Interior Water 2025 website, www.doi.gov/water2025/ , for current information on any upcoming RFP dates and deadlines	http://www.doi.gov/water2025
Water Resources Research National Competitive Grants Program	U.S. Geological Survey	Educational Institution	Proposals are sought in not only the physical dimensions of supply and demand, but also quality trends in raw water supplies, the role of economics and institutions in water supply and demand, institutional arrangements for tracking and reporting water supply and availability, and institutional arrangements for coping with extreme hydrologic conditions.	A match is required, but the % is not specified.	Typically range between \$5,000 and \$250,000 - median is \$120,000	February 16, 2007 (for investigations); March 2, 2007 (for institutes)	http://water.usgs.gov/wrri/institutes.html

Table 3. Grants for Stream and River Restoration Projects (continued)

GRANT	SPONSOR	ELIGIBLE	TYPES OF PROJECTS	MATCH	\$ RANGE	DEADLINE	MORE INFORMATION
Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Program	USDA	Conservation District, Local Government, State/Territorial Agency, Tribal Agency	Projects related to watershed protection, flood mitigation, water supply, water quality, erosion and sediment control, wetland creation and restoration, fish and wildlife habitat enhancement, agricultural water conservation, and public recreation are eligible for assistance. Technical and financial assistance is also available for planning new watershed surveys.	Approximately 75%	Typically range between \$5,000 and \$2.16 Million - median is \$650,000	Eligible project sponsors may submit formal requests for assistance to the NRCs state conservationists in each state at any time.	http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/programs/watershed/
Wetlands Program Development Grants	EPA	Nonprofit Groups, Local Government, State/Territorial Agency, Tribal Agency	The EPA's Wetland Program Development Grants are intended to encourage comprehensive wetlands program development by promoting the coordination and acceleration of research, investigations, experiments, training, demonstrations, surveys, and studies relating to the causes, effects, extent, prevention, reduction, and elimination of water pollution. Projects build the capacity of states, tribes and local governments to effectively protect wetland and riparian resources. Projects funded under this program support the initial development of a wetlands protection, restoration or management program or support enhancement/refinement of an existing program.	25% Non-federal match	Typically range between \$11,000 and \$500,000 - median is \$250,000	Deadlines are determined annually and vary from region to region.	http://www.epa.gov/owow/wetlands/grantguidelines/
Wetlands Reserve Program	USDA - NRCS	Business, Community/Watershed Group, Nonprofit Groups, Educational Institution, private Landowner, Conservation District, Water and Wastewater Utilities, Local Government, State/Territorial Agency, Tribal Agency	Through this voluntary program, the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) provides landowners with financial incentives to restore and protect wetlands in land.	For restoration cost-share agreements and 30 year easement participants, up to 25% of the cost of restoring the acreage must be provided.		Applications are accepted year-round.	http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/
Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program	USDA - NRCS	Nonprofit Groups, Private Landowners	The Wildlife Habitat Incentive Program (WHIP) is a voluntary program for people who want to develop and improve wildlife habitat on private lands. It provides both technical assistance and cost sharing to help establish and improve fish and wildlife habitat. Participants work with USDA's Natural Resources Conservation Service to prepare a wildlife habitat development plan in consultation with a local conservation district. The plan describes the landowner's goals for improving wildlife habitat, includes a list of practices and a schedule for installing them, and details the steps necessary to maintain the habitat for the life of the agreement.	25% Non-federal match	Not available; however, in FY 2007 this program was awarded \$259 Million	Continuous sign-up process	http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/programs/whip/

Table 3. Grants for Stream and River Restoration Projects (continued)