PARKS, NATURAL LANDS, URBAN FORESTRY AND TRAILS ADVISORY BOARD *of* SALT LAKE CITY

Formal Meeting
Thursday, June 1, 2023
5:00 p.m. – 7:15 p.m.
Join Via Zoom: https://us02web.zoom.us/j/89652439234?pwd=eEsrNEYya0t6TjQxNC9kU25nbTkvUT09
Passcode: 290149

Or Join at the Public Lands Administrative Building: 1965 W. 500 S. Salt Lake City, UT 84104
Upstairs Parks Training Room

Join by phone
1-669-444-9171
Webinar ID: 896 5243 9234
Passcode: 290149

Approved Minutes

1 – Convening the Meeting	**5:00 PM**
Call to order – Samantha Finch – Phil Carroll – Clayton Scrivner – Brianna Binnebose – CJ Whittaker – Aaron Wiley – Dave John – Talula Pontuti	
Chair comments Ms. Binnebose asked Ms. Larsen to thank Minerva Jimenez-Garcia, Public Lands Community Engagement Coordinator, and Kira Johnson, Public Lands Planner, for joining the Communications Subcommittee meeting and providing them opportunities to review and advise on community engagement. Ms. Binnebose also explained they are adjusting their meeting agenda for Ms. Riker's schedule this evening, so Public Comments will be later in the meeting.	5 mins
2 – Approval of Minutes	**5:05 PM**
Approve May 6, 2023 meeting minutes. Ms. Finch motioned to approve the May meeting minutes. Mr. Wiley seconded the motion. The Board unanimously voted to approve the May meeting minutes.	5 mins
3 – 501c3 Presentation	**5:10 PM**
Staff summary report of 501c3. – Kristin Riker Ms. Larsen shared her screen to display Ms. Riker's presentation on staff findings for creating a 501c3. Ms. Riker disclaimed that this is not her presentation but from a consultant that Public Lands hired as part of their Pioneer Park Construction Project to help staff understand what they can do to build a foundation around that park that could expand into a large foundation. The presentation lays out the scope of the work needed to form the foundation. The consultant provided staff with sample documents and agreements to establish an official non-profit and create an understandable	30 mins

working relationship with the City. Ms. Riker continued to explain the consultant's work and background.

Ms. Riker explained they asked the consultant for the context on public non-profit partnerships working in the US city park system, compare Salt Lake City and its park's system to similar size parks, conduct research and analysis of best practices for public non-profit partnerships, and how this could relate to the Pioneer Park Construction Project. Ms. Riker shared high-level details on how other parks manage these sorts of foundations. Some foundations operate a specific park while others are more general.

Ms. Riker said 226 non-profit partnerships are operating in parks in the largest 100 cities in the US. These only provide 6% of spending in the Parks & Recreation Departments in those cities, which is about $559 million, but they are also critical to supporting a variety of parks for people to enjoy and make key differences in the downtown destination parks. Ms. Riker shared some comparison details on the spending and how those organizations are staffed. Ms. Riker said most of these agencies aren't bringing in that much money, around $1 million, and only 30 agencies are bringing in the $5 million, plus.

Ms. Riker said that advocacy, volunteerism, and programming are the three primary functions to assist a municipal organization for a foundation. Ms. Riker said the consultant recommended their initial focus be on downtown parks, like Pioneer Park. Ms. Riker said they are trying to activate Pioneer Park and are focusing on programming, utilizing methods from Reimagine Nature Plan, and having the agency work with Public Lands for capital improvements for Phase 1 of Pioneer Park. Ms. Riker shared a few examples of other cities with active foundations and how the foundations support the City. Staff and Board discussed details of how the foundations support staff. Mr. Carroll asked Ms. Riker about the Pioneer Park coalition with business district-driven foundations. Ms. Riker said the coalition has changed its focus and name, but they are focusing on homelessness. They did try to do some fundraising and donated about $300,000 to Pioneer Park the last time they did an improvement. The coalition has always tried to do advocacy but was never interested in programming that park. Ms. Riker continued to share examples of other cities with active foundations and how the foundations support the City.

Ms. Riker highlighted the proposed steps for a non-profit. The initial focus should be on downtown parks and primarily on Pioneer Park. Ms. Riker shared that part of Mayor Mendenhall's 2023 goals, starting the framework of a foundation is part of her goals. She is very interested in doing it. Ms. Riker explained the City has had other foundations in the past and there were some financial challenges with those. Ms. Riker is working with the finance department and the attorney's office to understand the hurdles and create some guardrails around a foundation. Mr. Clayton asked for clarity on the Mayor's goal of creating a city-wide non-profit. Ms. Riker said yes, for a downtown foundation and emphasized it's on building the framework, not that they would have one by 2023.

Ms. Riker went over the steps. Step one would be to create a name, which has not been decided by the City. Step two is to confirm the scope and what will the focus be, aiming to be around advocacy, programming, and fundraising are what the consultant

recommends for primary goals. Step three would be to confirm the initial make-up of the non-profit, having around 3-5 members on the start-up board. Step four would be to complete the action start-up list. The consultant recommended keeping it small at first and having some influential people on the Board. From there, have the influential people find additional people for their replacements. The Mayor will be very instrumental in determining who those people will be. Ms. Riker went over the start-up action list for the non-profit. Ms. Riker shared an example of what an initial agreement could look like and examples of expectations between the non-profit and the City. Ms. Riker reiterated this presentation addresses how to get started and some initial recommendations from the consultant. Ms. Binnebose asked what level of involvement the PNUT Board would have in this foundation. Ms. Riker said she didn't know exactly, but they should be closely tied with at least one PNUT member on that board, but it's not for her to determine. Ms. Riker would like a PNUT member on the board as they represent the community voice by helping Public Lands understand what is needed in the community. Ms. Finch asked if the intent was that the Mayor will go out and find well-connected individuals to create the initial board, and they will be assisted by Public Lands staff; then the Public Lands department will unwind itself from the non-profit and the non-profit will operate more independently. Ms. Riker explained that's what the other non-profits do. The department assists initially and when the non-profit gets their feet on the ground, they get their staff to do some of that work. The Board and staff continued to discuss staffing expectations and City involvement. Ms. Riker explained the initial documents will be an agreement between the organization and the City. The Board and staff discussed the fundraising aspect of the organization. Mr. Wiley expressed excitement about this and thanked Ms. Riker for sharing. Mr. Wiley stated there has been an interest in improving their baseball and softball fields, and specific companies have expressed interest in supporting lights or other improvements. Mr. Wiley asked how that will work for the City and this non-profit. Ms. Riker said they would be working with the foundation and what their scope is, so it would have to be approved by the foundation, but there isn't anything that would stop them from taking a great opportunity and helping facilitate that type of donation and agreement with an organization that is interested. Ms. Riker said there is another foundation in the City that would be willing to work with that group to help facilitate that donation, as long as that is something the City is willing to accept as a donation. The Board and staff continued to discuss the fundraising aspect of the foundation and the Pioneer Park Coalition. Mr. Scrivner asked what this is providing that the City doesn't get in other avenues. Ms. Riker said fundraising, advocacy, and programming, as these are things that the City doesn't do. Mr. Carroll asked how big this would be geographically if there were just starting with the downtown areas. Ms. Riker said they would have to work that out, but it would probably be District Four, and there are not a lot of parks downtown. Mr. Carroll shared examples of little organized groups that are collecting money for certain areas of the City already. Ms. Riker said they are hoping this foundation would be an umbrella to get those smaller groups talking. The Board continued to discuss the foundation.	
4 – Director's Report	**5:40 PM**

Summary of current high-priority department items. – Kristin Riker or Carmen Bailey Ms. Riker said their initial Foothills Consultation was this last week from SWCA Pre-NEPA Report. There were several stakeholder groups in the meeting. This was a presentation for the Pre-NEPA Report, an environmental study that feeds into NEPA. This is required on federal lands, but the Public Lands Department will do this for any land they are constructing trails on. Ms. Riker shared some of the concerns the public raised about the report. The NEPA-level analysis will occur once there are proposed trails. Ms. Riker said they want to move away from phases and focus on trail segments. Ms. Binnebose asked how high they are taking this for NEPA. Ms. Riker said she did not know. Ms. Riker explained that Tyler Fonarow, Public Lands Trails Manager, is the expert in this area. Ms. Riker said that the SE Group has also conducted extensive community engagement since January, and their focus is on information intake. They are looking at the Phase 1 trail plan and holding a presentation on June 5th. The final meeting will be in August and will focus on specific trail planning. This isn't a trail alignment recommendation; it is a trail planning recommendation. From there, staff will begin working on a trail management plan. Ms. Riker shared that Public Lands is doing a soft launch of the Be W.I.L.D. campaign. W- Welcoming, I- Inclusivity, L- Limited Impact, D- Do What You Can. Ms. Riker continued to share Foothills Trails updates. Ms. Riker invited the Board to sign up for the Foothills Trails Newsletter. Ms. Riker said they are still working on an agreement with Blue Sky related to the Og-Woi Gardens. They have been working closely with sustainability on soil issues and concerns. They are trying to work out a way so the Og-Woi gardeners can continue gardening while mediating the existing gardening plots that they have and allow them to do that until we get a CIP application and funding to remediate the site, including a water meter, and clear the area of any contamination. Ms. Riker continued to share updates for the Og-Woi Gardens. Mr. Whittaker asked why SWCA's presentation in their report concentrated on pedestrians and ignored cyclists. Ms. Riker said this was an environmental report. Ms. Riker suggested any questions to send to Ms. Larsen. Ms. Riker said the report that is coming out on Monday night deals more with the human impact. The SWCA report was an environmental study looking at what's there in the Foothills, it's a pre-NEPA report, to feed into the NEPA process. The Board and staff continued to discuss Foothills.	5 mins
5 – Public Comment Period	**5:45 PM**
Verbal comments are limited to no more than 3 minutes; 15 minutes total. Written comments are welcome. **<u>Jim Webster</u>** Jim Webster is a landscape architect, and he submitted the CIP application seven years ago for Miller Park. His background is in trials and design. He put together a parkway trail above the University. He wants to point out that for seven years, this CIP was awarded primarily to restore the trails that had been destroyed. Currently, there are 12 projects, and he wants to point out that none of those, except for one being done by the streets department, have nothing to do with CIP. He explained most of it is maintenance. He finds it unfortunate that seven years down the road, nothing has been done. He pointed out that one thing that has been done was a consultant being	

hired. He raised some issues of invasive species and animals that have been impacted or are impacting the park. He was aware that the PNUT Board was going to hear a presentation on Miller Park tonight. He invited the Board to contact him for any additional information. Ms. Binnebose explained there is a written summary in the packet. **<u>Anne Cannon</u>** Anne Cannon thanked the Board for the continuous job they are doing. She said the maintenance that is now required has begun for the preserve in Wasatch Hollow, and she hopes there will be enough time and money to continue this work. She brought up parts of the preserve that were severely damaged due to the flooding, like the children's playground and the south end of the park.	
5 – New Board member introduction.	**6:00 PM**
Introduce Talula Pontuti. – Carmen Bailey Ms. Riker introduced Ms. Talula Pontuti as the newest Board member. Ms. Pontuti is a graduate student at the University of Utah studying Geography. She is passionate about sustainability and environmental justice, and community engagement. She has worked with many diverse organizations within the community. Ms. Riker said she is very excited to have Ms. Pontuti on the Board.	5 mins
7 – Wasatch Hollow/Emerald Ribbon Updates	**6:05 PM**
Project updates. – Makaylah Respicio-Evans Ms. Respicio-Evans shared her screen to display the Wasatch Hollow and Emerald Ribbon presentation. She explained the background of how and why the off-leash area was established: as a pilot park for establishing off-leash dog times. The City Council adopted Wasatch Hollow as an off-leash dog times park in 2019. All new off-leash areas must go through a 1-year pilot and be approved by the City Council. In 2022, Public Lands met with community members to discuss concerns about off-leash dogs. They requested new signage and engagement to better understand the sentiment around off-leash dogs in the park. Ms. Respicio-Evans shared additional concerns. Ms. Respicio-Evans shared the survey results that were put around for three weeks in August-September 2022. Over 70% of survey respondents were somewhat or very supportive of the current off-leash area. She overviewed the survey results. Improved signage was the top response for what actions survey respondents would like to see, which is unfortunate as when the survey was opened, Public Lands installed new signage. Unfortunately, they were unable to capture responses with the newly installed signs. Fencing to separate park users was another big request. Ms. Respicio-Evans reiterated that Wasatch Hollow is a time-limited off-leash dog area in the ordinance. She explained that what Public Lands can do is restricted. They can adjust the location, hours, and boundaries; install features that delineate the off-leash area from on-leash; and partially fence. Public Lands cannot permanently close the off-leash area and fully fence the off-leash area or make the off-leash area full-time. She shared some examples of partial fencing. She said Public Lands continues to work closely with the community council on this issue. She explained some ways the community council can go about addressing the off-leash dog issue. Mr. Carroll asked if there was any flooding in the park. Ms. Respicio-Evans said the preserve flooded, which also affected the parking lot and the road. Ms. Binnebose said she liked how	15 mins

they are pursuing options with Salt Lake County Animal Services and using the Rangers to educate. The Board and staff continued to discuss Wasatch Hollow. Ms. Respicio-Evans explained that the Emerald Ribbon Master Plan will provide a vision and implementation strategy for Salt Lake City's 10 miles of the river corridor, the public open spaces along it, and all the 12+ public spaces around the river. She shared the project goals, which are to develop a framework and roadmap for achieving the Transformative Goal Revive our River, establish a community-supported vision for the Jordan River Corridor, outline maintenance and operation guidelines that build cohesion and support on the ground staff, identify priority projects for GO Bond funding; and the key focuses are sustainability and ecological health, connectivity and access, recreation and safety, equity and community healing, and community ownership. She reviewed the core components of the plan: existing conditions analysis, public engagement, concept alternatives, community vision, maintenance and operations guidelines, and capital improvement project list. She shared the high-level timeline for this project and key advisory groups, both a technical advisory group and a community advisory group. She would love to have a member of the PNUT Board be a part of the community advisory group. Ms. Binnebose asked what districts are involved with this project. Ms. Respicio-Evans said the project will take place in Districts 1 & 2, and she added the river touches everyone so any input would be appreciated. Mr. Carroll expressed the importance of involving the indigenous groups in this project and their story needs to be told, too. The Board and staff continued to discuss the Emerald River Project.	
8 – CIP Presentation	**6:20 PM**
FY24/25 CIP project presentation. – Tom Millar Mr. Millar explained that CIP is the City's biggest internal funding source. The dollars flow from the general fund and impact fees. Public Lands applies for it every year, and the projects can be $50,000 up. They must have a useful life of five years and not be considered regular maintenance. Mr. Millar shared some examples of CIP projects. Mr. Millar said the Public Lands Department and constituent applications together submitted 26 applications; they totaled close to $10 million. Of those 26, eight were recommended for funding by the CDCIP, which is an advisory group to review CIP applications from all City departments. They then make a recommendation to the Mayor. The Mayor includes her recommendations and budget, which is reviewed by City Council. The City Council will approve a budget by the end of June and then will decide which CIP projects will be funded by the CIP budget in August. Mr. Millar shared the applications that were recommended by the CDCIP and the Mayor, which are the same projects. 1. Library Plaza 2. Poplar Grove basketball courts 3. Cottonwood Park Trailhead 4. Fire Station Tennis and Pickleball 5. 337 Pocket Park 6. Jefferson Park, this one is also recommended for funding from the Bond 7. Parks bilingual signage standards, this would be phase 2 8. Improvements to the Peace Gardens One Public Lands-related project, but not submitted by Public Lands, is recommended and this is to extend the 9-Line Trail from Redwood Road to where the other side village is planned. There were 18 applications not recommended for funding. Mr.	20 mins

Millar said this is not to say they will not receive funding, as the City Council has the ultimate say. Ms. Finch asked if it was unusual to have the CDCIP and the Mayor have the same recommendations. Mr. Millar said it's very common. Ms. Binnebose shared that of those recommended projects, five of them were in the Board's top 10 for a recommendation. The Board and staff continued to discuss the CDCIP recommendations. Mr. Millar shared he will be taking parental leave starting next week, so hopefully they can get the creative juices flowing and come back. Mr. Millar would like the Board to start brainstorming the projects the Board is interested in that haven't got funded or haven't been in recent years or needs that have come up in the last 8-12 months that should be included in this year's request. Mr. Millar said Mr. Murdock will follow up with the Board next month to discuss what ideas the Board came up with. Staff will combine the Board's ideas with staff. Staff plans on coming back to the Board in October with a list of internal Public-Lands, the city submitted CIP applications. These will be much more fleshed out than they were last year. Staff would ask the Board to prioritize throughout the month of October and in November, staff would then present the constituent applications the Board can use the month of November to flush out their prioritization. The goal would be to have the letter of support in December. Ms. Binnebose asked for the timeline to be shared with the Board. Mr. Millar said he will draft one up to have sent out. The Board and staff continued to discuss CIP.	
9 – Trails Subcommittee – Action Item	**6:40 PM**
Review and approve Trails Subcommittee. Ms. Larsen asked Board members if they said they will come to the meeting, to strive to stay the whole time, especially if there is an action item. Mr. Scrivner said they could also adjust the action item during the meeting if people need to leave early. Mr. Whittaker appreciated everyone's feedback on the Trails Subcommittee description. Mr. Whittaker said he answered some people's questions today in the document. Ms. Binnebose said they can review it today and table this as an action item for the next meeting. Ms. Larsen shared her screen to display the Trails Subcommittee description. Mr. Whittaker explained how quickly the work can change, which makes it challenging for the subcommittee to define a highly specific work objective, and there's no way to determine the deadline. Ms. Finch requested more detailed notes on what happens in the meetings, what was discussed, and explanations of qualifications as to why they have non-PNUT Board members on their subcommittee. Mr. Whittaker said they can do a better job of providing those and he provides those explanations of non-PNUT Board members. The Board continued to discuss the Trails Subcommittee description. Ms. Binnebose requested for the Trails Subcommittee action item to have a clean document of their Trails Subcommittee description ready to vote on in the next Board meeting.	5 mins
10 – Donations – Action Item	**6:45 PM**
Approve donation threshold. The Board no longer had a quorum at this time, so they decided to table this for the next meeting.	5 mins
11 – Staff Items	**6:50 PM**
Onboarding presentation, donation report, and OPMA. - Ashlyn Larsen	10 mins

Ms. Larsen shared her screen to display the new PNUT member onboarding presentation. She explained this presentation is to help new Board members learn the Board's process and act as a resource hub of information for existing Board members. She said she met with tenured members and newer Board members to determine the topics to have in this presentation. She gave a high-level overview of the main topics to share with new Board members and existing members. The Board and staff continued to discuss the onboard presentation. Ms. Larsen invited Board members to review the packet for acceptable political activity. This is some information she received from the attorney's office. Mr. Scrivner asked for more specifics on Board members' expectations as this document referred more toward staff. Ms. Larsen said she can follow up again with the attorneys. Ms. Larsen said there have been a few invitations extended to the Board to attend presentations where the topics fall under their jurisdiction, especially from third parties. Ms. Larsen shared she has gone back and forth with the attorneys about what exactly that looks like. The simplest way to put it is when an invitation, no matter how formal or informal, is presented to the Board, it can become too hard to justify if a Board member is attending as a Board member versus a citizen. It creates too much grey area. Another issue that comes out is if a quorum says they'll attend, but then isn't present for the meeting, according to OPMA, the meeting should be canceled. This becomes challenging when it's a meeting hosted by a third party that the City doesn't have jurisdiction over. In summary, whenever the Board member is invited to attend a meeting, it's easier to keep it under a quorum. It can also pose a challenge to the City on how to obtain a recording of that third-party meeting, especially if it's an in-person or hybrid format. Ms. Larsen asked if Board members funnel these invitations through her to then determine how to share this formal or informal invitation with the rest of the Board. The Board and staff continued OPMA.	
12 – Confirmation of Next Meeting, Board Comments & Future Agenda Items	**7:00 PM**
Board comment and question period. Mr. Scrivner welcomed Ms. Pontuti to the Board. Mr. Carroll shared some of his takeaways from the SWCA meeting this last week concerning the Foothills and focusing on the commonalities. The Board continued to discuss the Foothills trails.	
Next meeting: July 6, 2023 Ms. Larsen shared that the next Board meeting is right after the 4th of July so we should determine if we need to cancel the July meeting. Mr. Scrivner said a lot of the public boards he's been on don't have July meetings. Ms. Larsen said she will create a poll to determine who will attend the July meeting.	
Request for future agenda items.	
13 – Adjourn	**7:15 PM**
Ms. Finch motioned to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Binnebose seconded. The Board unanimously voted to adjourn the meeting.	