

Formal Meeting
Thursday, October 5, 2023
5:00 p.m. – 7:15 p.m.

Join Via Zoom: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81344405499?pwd=ZnpybnN0eHNMQmpOUWZSS210d1dxdz09>

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

Join by phone
Phone: 1-669-444-9171
Webinar ID: 813 4440 5499
Access code: 275031

Agenda

1. Convening the Meeting	5:00 PM
A. Call to order	
B. Chair Comments	5 mins
2. Approval of Minutes	5:05 PM
– Approve September 7, 2023 meeting minutes	5 mins
3. Public Comment	5:10 PM
– Verbal comments are limited to no more than 3 minutes; 15 minutes total. Written comments are welcome.	
4. Director’s Report	5:25 PM
- Summary of current high-priority department items. – Kristin Riker	5 mins
5. Staff Presentations, Updates & Discussions	5:30 PM
A. Emerald Ribbon Master Plan updates – Makaylah Maponga	10 mins
B. CIP – Tom Millar	60 mins
C. Staff updates – Ashlyn Larsen	5 mins
6. Board Discussion	6:45 PM
A. Retreat agenda	10 mins
B. Subcommittee Reporting	5 mins
C. Board comments and question period	10 mins
D. Next meeting: September 7, 2023	5 mins
E. Request for future agenda items	5 mins
7. Adjourn	7:15 PM

Emerald Ribbon Action Plan

Focus Groups August 2023 Synthesis

Introduction

We spoke to 50 people representing over 38 government agencies, city, county, and state departments, community-based organizations, professional associations, corporations, and advocacy groups.

“The Jordan River does not feel like it belongs to the community right now, does not belong to anyone - we need to start rebranding and make it a destination so that people want to protect it.”

– Policy & Economy Focus Group

Key Themes

Make Everyone Welcome

How can we make the corridor safe enough to attract women and children, inclusive enough to attract people of all cultures, and vibrant enough to engage a diverse group of users?

Fair Care

How can we develop internal maintenance strategies that work for staff, work for the natural ecosystem, and look and feel fair to the public?

Share the Trail

How can we mitigate conflicts between people who stay and people who pass through, walkers and bikers, kids and adults?

Keep It Wild

How can we magnify the Jordan River’s incredible natural beauty and wildlife while also making it more accessible to people?

Secondary Themes

Harness People’s Passion

Create systems of stewardship and cultural activation that value the existing community’s passion and years of investment.

Standardize Education & Expectations

Clearly communicate how to use the trail and surrounding park lands across languages. Educate the public through cohesive and diverse programming.

How do stakeholders relate to the river today?

What we heard the most often:

- School and community programs are nurturing relationships with and love of the river. Many stakeholders from across the board had been out on the river in a volunteer capacity to pull invasive species or clean up in canoes.

We also heard:

- Folks who grew up nearby might remember walking it as kids fondly but worry that it's not safe to do so (then or now).
- Many spoke of great times at Jordan River Park in particular.
- Community events bring people out to the Peace Gardens and Peace Labyrinth.
- Cyclists use it to commute and do recreational rides (sometimes with family).
- A handful of people have been out by boat (but rarely did it twice).

Mobility + Connectivity Deep Dive

Recent investment has increased the number of people cycling on and commuting through the corridor. Because it's so circuitous, it's not considered an efficient route for serious cyclists – while there's interest in improving mode-sharing for faster cycling, there's hesitation whether that is the right future for the JRC (as opposed to improved connections to other trails or more direct on-road paths). This group talked a lot about the need for better wayfinding and safer (faster) street crossings. The demographic commuting by bike is much whiter and wealthier than most West Side residents: this group recognized that tension.

What is working?

What we heard the most often:

- Jordan Park, Riverside Park, Three Creeks are considered successes. Three Creeks is considered a precedent to learn from.
- People love how natural the river is today: its wildness is appealing to many we spoke to. The ability to see so much wildlife within the city is the most commonly mentioned theme in what is working today, and people (while also desiring more activation) love that it's not overdeveloped.

We also heard:

- The length of the trail is a unique asset and people love that it connects multiple cities.
- The West Side community is engaged in the cleaning of the river and the improvement of parks. Many volunteer efforts exist but need more support.
- There is an amazing number of parks along the river; while not all maintained, it's recognized as a unique quality.
- The shade is amazing.
- There's an increase in boat ramps and people love the recent improvements to paved trails.

History & Culture Deep Dive

While perceived as a beautiful place to see wildlife, the River is mired in frustration about the unbalanced and hard to understand distribution of financial investment, especially for maintenance. West Side residents feel changes are slow coming and there's little follow through. That said, this group sees big opportunities to shift perception of the river towards something worth preserving. What works today: the increase in public art, the role of the river as a unifier throughout the West Side, and the number of public spaces (places to meet your neighbors, which are lacking on the West Side as a whole).

What is not working?

What we heard most often:

- Trash mitigation is a big problem (on the trail and in the water when fallen trees are not removed).
- There's inequitable maintenance investment and poor maintenance once parks are built (ie. limited funding after capital investment). The maintenance focus group felt this was improving, but that lack of cohesive strategy and limited funding were barriers.
- The unhoused population makes people feel unsafe and generates trash on the corridor.
- Safety concerns (real and perceived) came up often; there are few women and children using the trail today.

We also heard:

- Canal water management reduces flow unexpectedly.
- There's no cohesive maintenance strategy around natural versus manicured lands.
- The trail is confusing at certain sections (at crossings especially: people mentioned North Temple, 1300 S and 6th N).
- The West Side community struggles to get the level of response, investment, and funding that East Side does.
- Signage is only in English.
- Cyclists and pedestrians struggle to share the path when it gets narrow.

Maintenance & Management Deep Dive

The maintenance focus group was particularly optimistic about the progress made in recent years, whether about the sales tax to fund repaving, new dedicated funds for maintenance, or recent improvements to the trail and the increase in usage that has resulted. The challenges they face include the overwhelming and previously unchecked growth of invasives, lack of cohesive management vision, and unclear expectations amongst the public. They're acutely aware of the need for a better communications & education strategy and the need to improve safety along the trail so that more women and children feel safe using it. Rangers who are out and about regularly on the trail have become a front-line team for the unhoused population: they don't have enough staff or the right resources to serve in this role today.

What are the biggest opportunities?

“The Jordan River is my backyard, it’s my second home. We do a lot of trail clean up. We want to continue doing what we do. Nothing works until you make it work. We are making it work.”

– Community Leaders Focus Group

What we heard most often:

- Embrace the mix of urban + wild (especially the shade and the corridor’s service as a cooler water habitat in a changing climate). Magnify the beloved natural qualities of the river (balance activation with restoration).
- Increase activation to make people feel safer (and reduce human encampment).
- Harness the growing shift in perception (ie. the increasing feeling that the Jordan River is worth preserving as investment increases).
- Improve lighting.
- Increase public education (ie. rules around access for dogs, how to care for the natural landscape etc).

We also heard:

- Improve connectivity (entry points, street crossings, pave on both sides of the river).
- Improve boat access (unclear where to put in / out today).
- Increase biodiversity and tree cover.
- Increase youth education (harness community interest in sharing stewardship).
- Increase public amenities: bathrooms, trash cans, water fountains.
- Maintain and expand access to parks from the river trail.
- Better connect it with increasing investment in transit.
- Create more public art.

“Building a trail works, but building a trail culture is difficult.”

– Maintenance & Management Focus Group

“The unhoused population are our best patrons – some do try to clean up but have nowhere to take trash.”

– Education & Stewardship Focus Group

What are the biggest challenges?

What we heard most often:

- There’s tension between the needs of nearby residents versus the needs of cyclists and people passing through (people identified a big need to resolve mode conflicts).
- The unsheltered community is struggling; also impacting water quality.

- There is not much wealth along the river: limited ability for the communities to fund "friends of" etc. There is also long-standing frustration in the West Side community that even after initial investments, the city has not maintained their parks the way they have on the East Side.

We also heard:

- How can we counter existing perceptions of the Jordan River?
- How to resolve the complex water situation with the canal, which creates challenges to planting etc?
- Demand may be overwhelming after improvements are made - it's already high!
- How to develop without displacement?

Education & Stewardship Deep Dive

There is a mix of organizations doing community work on the river today, but it's not cohesive: for example, some schools work with the Jordan River Commission, others with libraries along the river. This group expressed interest in creating a database of educational materials and more creative opportunities for people to get involved, like a gear library at SLC Libraries, more art opportunities, and more signage and kiosks to communicate expectations on the trail. Much of what this group identified as not working is tactical: narrow paths, lack of bathrooms and drinking water, need for more trash cans and waste management, need for greater accessibility, need to better balance bikers and pedestrians, and a desire for more access points.

What projects should we know about?

What we heard most often:

- The North Temple area is undergoing a lot of planning; opportunity to connect to increasing development in this area, including a new transit hub.
- Excitement and trepidation about the Glendale Regional Park (ie. regarding equity and long-term maintenance)

We also heard:

- Rocky Mountain Power company.
- State Fair Park is looking to develop its parking lots.
- Existing ecological restoration working groups are underway (JRC tree planting effort and phragmite working group).
- New trail connections are in progress.
- An accessibility report for all SLC parks is underway in the Mayor's office (will be available next spring).



Public Lands

Parks | Trails & Natural Lands | Urban Forestry | Golf

Staff Responses to Public Comments from the September 7, 2023, PNUT Board Meeting

Anne Cannon

Ms. Anne Cannon thanked the staff for their work with Wasatch Hollow in the preserve. She shared concerning the new plans for the park that were presented; she hopes as staff progresses with the repair and restoration of the park, there will be more opportunities to discuss these proposals in more detail. Whether it's a special meeting called with the Board or with Wasatch Hollow Community Council, she hopes it happens as there are lots of concerns and recommendations to the plan that are presented.

Staff Response:

This summer, Public Services hired two Landscape Architecture interns that were tasked with evaluating existing conditions at Wasatch Hollow Park and developing several site concepts for discussion and engagement only. The interns presented directly to members of the Wasatch Hollow subcommittee, and Makaylah Maponga presented their work to Wasatch Hollow Community Council (WHCC) on August 23rd. There have been no other actions taken on these concepts. The Constituent CIP application from WHCC was not selected for funding in the 2023-24 cycle, so there is not a funding source for improvements at Wasatch Hollow Park beyond the flood repair work. However, Public Lands recognizes urgent needs in the park and aims to continue working closely with WHCC to identify the best path forward.

Formal Meeting
Thursday, September 7, 2023
5:00 p.m. – 7:15 p.m.

Join Via Zoom <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/87247444485?pwd=cnoweG5pT3BrZ1BKYjI3SnYyMDBLQT09>

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

Join by phone
Phone: +1 346 248 7799
Webinar ID: 872 4744 4485
Access code: 890381

UNAPPROVED MINUTES

1. Convening the Meeting	5:00 PM
<p>A. Call to order</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Aaron Wiley – Dave John – Meridith Benally – Talula Pontuti – Jenny Hewson – Samantha Finch – Phil Carroll – Brianna Binnebose – Ginger Cannon – CJ Whittaker 	
<p>B. Chair Comments</p> <p>Ms. Binnebose thanked Ronnie Pessetto (Public Lands Planner) and Tyler Fonarow (Trails Manager) for attending the last Communications Subcommittee meeting. She shared it was nice to learn more about what's happening in the future and utilize the Communications Subcommittee's expertise.</p> <p>Ms. Binnebose explained the purpose of the Board CIP discussion for this meeting is to refresh Board members on their CIP process and introduce the Board's process to newer Board members.</p> <p>Ms. Binnebose informed Board members Ms. Ashlyn Larsen (Public Lands Staff) sent out a calendar invite for the annual retreat, so please accept the invitation as they have received plenty of notice and would like everyone to attend in person.</p>	5 mins
2. Approval of Minutes	5:05 PM
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Approve August 3, 2023 meeting minutes <p>Ms. Larsen added Ms. Pontuti to the "Call to Order" section of the minutes. Ms. Finch motioned to approve the August meetings. Ms. Hewson seconded the motion. The Board unanimously voted to approve the August minutes.</p>	5 mins
3. Public Comment	5:10 PM
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Verbal comments are limited to no more than 3 minutes; 15 minutes total. Written comments are welcome. <p>Ms. Anne Cannon thanked the staff for their work with Wasatch Hollow in the preserve. She shared concerning the new plans for the park that were presented; she hopes as staff progresses with the repair and restoration of the park, there will be more opportunities to discuss these proposals in more detail. Whether it's a special meeting called with the Board or with Wasatch Hollow Community Council, she hopes it happens as there are lots of concerns and recommendations to the plan that are presented.</p>	

4. Director's Report	5:25 PM
<p>– Summary of current high-priority department items. – Kristin Riker</p> <p>Ms. Riker had a handout of the approved CIP list from FY23/24 year. This handout has the 12 projects that the Mayor and Council approved. The top section of the report contains pieces Ms. Riker pulled from the Mayor's recommended CIP budget book, so it's a little incomplete. She will share copies once it's available. The second page of the handout displays ongoing projects. Public Lands gets sales tax money for trail maintenance that can be used on active transportation lines, such as the Jordan River or 9Line. Additionally, they receive \$250,000 annually for this maintenance. Ms. Riker continued explaining the projects the Mayor and City Council approved. Three projects not included in the packet were Ensign Peak Nature Park Improvements, North Temple Arts and Tourism District Improvements, and the Rose Park Beautification Trail, which were all constituent applications that the City Council was able to find extra money to add those to CIP. Mr. Millar said that the Rose Park one was partially funded for the transportation improvements, which moved to the Transportation Division. Richmond Park playground was also partially funded, supplementing what Ms. Pessetto will talk to them about.</p> <p>Ms. Cannon asked if this handout could be displayed electronically. Ms. Riker explained she pulled these specific pages out of a 200-page document. The entire report is available online. Ms. Larsen will send this handout to all Board members electronically.</p> <p>Ms. Riker shared that Public Lands has proposed to the Council a structural change for the department. This change would bring over landscape architects to work under a new division within Public Lands called the Planning and Design Division, run by Tom Millar (Planning Manager). The hope is to streamline the park project process to make it more efficient. Currently, Public Lands "hire" architects from the Engineering Division, and they must keep track of their hours for each project to bill Public Lands appropriately, which then, in turn, comes from the project budget. Four landscape architects will come over and report to Mr. Millar. This transition will help with role definition – who's in charge of the project and the control for which planner and which landscape architect or planner should be lead over a project.</p> <p>Ms. Riker also shared they are working to change how fees are charged for capital projects. The City charges itself for Capital Projects, and Public Lands build that into the cost of what they request for their Capital Projects. Then, the landscape architects in Engineering keep track of all their hours for every project; Engineering bills Public Lands, and Public Lands bills into the project, which doesn't make much sense as it all goes back in CIP. Public Lands is proposing to do away with those fees, so none of that work has to be done. It's a significant change, and Ms. Riker said they hope they'll find more efficiency this way. Council will hopefully approve this in October with Budget Amendment number two.</p> <p>Ms. Riker shared some progress on the Emerald Ribbon Master Plan, considered the Jordan River Corridor. This Master Plan is to help oversee and design what the Jordan River can look like. The GO Bond included \$9 million for Jordan River improvements, and this Master Plan will help inform all those improvements. Public Lands is looking for feedback on this Master Plan from the public. Ms. Riker shared that if the Board wants more information, they can have the project manager, Makaylah Maponga, come and present. Mr. Wiley would like more information on this. Ms. Millar said there is a survey where people can provide their email addresses to receive updates through a newsletter and other updates.</p>	<p>5 mins</p>
5. Introductions	5:30 PM
<p>A. Introduce Mia McCain, Communications Manager – Kristin Riker</p> <p>Ms. Riker introduced Mia McCain as Public Lands' new Communications and Engagement Manager. Ms. Riker shared Ms. McCain used to work for Public Lands years ago. She started as an office tech and took on marketing and communications material. Ms. McCain went to school to learn more about marketing and communications. She left Public Lands to get more experience and now has come back. Ms. McCain shared she will be working with Mr. Millar on engagement with projects; she is also over the events manager as well as volunteer outreach, social media, design, and overall, all the Public Lands communications.</p>	<p>5 mins</p>
6. Staff Presentations, Updates & Discussions	5:35 PM
<p>A. GO Bond: Taufer and Richmond Parks – Ronnie Pessetto</p>	<p>10 mins</p>

<p>Ms. Pessetto shared her screen to display the Taufer and Richmond Park Updates Presentation. Ms. Pessetto is over some of the parks from the GO Bond and is currently working on Taufer and Richmond Park, located in District Four. Ms. Pessetto said the first phase of community engagement for both the parks are closed. Those engagements have been analyzed, and the summary has been released on the projects' websites and social media. Ms. Pessetto explained how she broke down the community engagement effort for these parks (Preliminary Exploration, Observation and Information Gathering, Informing, and Post-Exploration).</p> <p>For the Preliminary Exploration, Ms. Pessetto did park visits, reviewed the community's thoughts through Google reviews, and walked the park with Neighborhood Council stakeholders and the police department to hear their thoughts; she volunteered at Volunteer Cleanup and engaged with volunteers. For the Observation and Information Gathering phase, surveys were sent out to the public, researched the park's namesake and historical movements of the park, interviewed staff at the Senior Tower Apartments and the Taufer family, partnered with the Hadithi Foundation and Better Days (for Richmond Park), and hosted tabling events at the park. Over 75 interviews were collected both at Taufer and Richmond Park. For the Informing stage, yard signs and mailers were sent out; staff canvassed the surrounding neighborhoods; hard copies of the surveys were dropped off at the Senior Tower, Senior Center, Central City Recreational Center, and St. Marks Tower (16 hard copies of surveys were collected); partnered with Neighborhood Councils to share the engagement and tabling events. Ms. Pessetto shared some highlights of the Taufer and Richmond Park engagement results.</p> <p>For the final phase, Post-Exploration, Ms. Pessetto shared she interviewed experts and department staff to obtain more knowledge about specific amenities as well as amenity placements, and she helped a Potluck Dream Session to help residents understand the budgets for the parks and understand what amenities the community wants to see in the park. Ms. Pessetto highlighted the Potluck Dream Session. She is still analyzing the findings from this exercise.</p> <p>Mr. Wiley asked for clarification on the population ages for the parks. Ms. Pessetto said the population ages are relatively young for both parks. Mr. Wiley asked if she has found other ways to get more people involved to get more input from the community. Ms. Pessetto did a lot of interviews with next-door neighbors. Many of the interviews were her starting a conversation as people walked by. Ms. Pessetto continued to share her engagement process. Ms. Binnebose shared she enjoyed the Potluck Dream Session activity. She asked if there would be a way in the future to take the in-person activity to an online survey. Ms. Pessetto said they couldn't find a platform to host the activity on. She continued to discuss her engagement approach.</p> <p>Ms. Finch asked if any data was collected on the zip codes of individuals taking the surveys. Ms. Pessetto said yes, that is something they collect. Ms. Finch asked if that impacts the vision for the park with the respondents' zip code. Ms. Riker noted that parks are for everyone, and they aren't going to exclude their ideas as people may still use the park even if they're not in the immediate area. Ms. Finch asked if some of these smaller parks for the GO Bond are using outside consultants or if it's all in-house. Ms. Pessetto said the engagement for Taufer and Richmond was all in-house. Regarding external consultants, they will be bringing on a design concept team. The Board and staff continued to discuss engagement. Ms. Cannon thanked Ms. Pessetto for her efforts on this project.</p>	
<p>B. GO Bond: Steenblik Park and Donner Trail Park – Kira Johnson</p> <p>Ms. Kira Johnson (Public Lands Planner) shared her screen to display a presentation on Steenblik and Donner Trail Parks. She visually represented where each park is located and described their surrounding areas. Ms. Johnson's engagement for these parks is open until Sunday, and then she will write engagement reports. She hopes to do those concept designs in-house, depending on the workload. Ms. Johnson shared her engagement tactics: surveys, yard signs, community council, tabling events, neighborhood-specific events, intercept surveys, canvassing/door-knowing, and targeted ads on social media. She saw an increase in survey respondents after the targeted ad went out. Ms. Johnson shared the survey results for both parks. She hasn't done an engagement report since the surveys are open.</p> <p>Ms. Johnson shared some of what she would do differently. Such as a more significant kick-off event, not after the survey was launched, as many people already took the survey. She also learned that people aren't "reimagining" to the level she was hoping for. She would like to think of ways to get people to think bigger through online activities, etc. Ms. Binnebose said she would rather see the parks with nicer grass and more</p>	10 mins

<p>trees rather than a large, new amenity. Mr. Wiley suggested a way to share what “reimagine” could look like with examples. Ms. Hewson agreed with Mr. Wiley, but it’s also a balance because you don’t want to guide people into an answer. The Board and staff continued to discuss park maintenance. Ms. Johnson wants to continue partnering with well-connected organizations in those communities. She would like to continue doing targeted ads. Targeted ads allow staff to reach people who would use the park if it were improved. She will be working on the engagement report next week. She spoke to additional outreach to target the Steenblik Community’s demographic, and they’ve had difficulties rendering that buy-in. The Board and staff continued to discuss the engagement for Steenblik and Donner Trail.</p>	
<p>C. Staff Updates – Ashlyn Larsen</p> <p>Ms. Larsen shared she made some updates to their Google Drive. She uploaded a staff member contact page, a spreadsheet with the current subcommittees, their scope of work, and current membership; the resource guide from the onboarding presentation has its own page; and the new signed Bylaws are uploaded. Ms. Larsen is still working with Ms. Jimenez-Garcia, the Community Engagement Coordinator, on ways to involve the Board with engagement support.</p>	5 mins
<p>7. Board Discussion</p>	6:00 PM
<p>A. PNUT CIP Process</p> <p>Ms. Larsen shared her screen to display the PNUT CIP Prioritization Process. Ms. Binnebose explained the purpose of this presentation to help newer Board members understand the Board’s CIP process. Ms. Binnebose defined the roles of the PNUT Board, the Community Development & Capital Improvement Project (CDCIP) Advisory Board, the Mayor, and the City Council. Ms. Binnebose explained their role is to review all the projects to rank all the projects presented to the Board by staff and then write a letter of support outlining the Board’s rankings. Ms. Binnebose explained the City code behind the Board’s role. She explained the Board is there to provide advice and make recommendations, but at the end of the day, staff will still have to prioritize things to the best of their abilities for what they need. The Board is a sounding Board. Ms. Binnebose defined the CIP as a minimum amount of \$50,000. The process is: Initial proposals development, submission of proposals, review of proposals by the Community CIP Board, Review by the City Council, Final recommendation by the Mayor, and awarding of successful proposals. Ms. Binnebose shared a visual timeline of the CIP process. The Board comes into play from September/October to December. The Board goes through the process twice, once for internal CIP and then for constituent applications. Ms. Binnebose and the Board continued to explain the PNUT Board’s timeline.</p> <p>Ms. Binnebose encouraged the Board to review the speaker notes of this presentation in Google Drive. She also added that any image on the slide is linked to last year’s document in Google Drive. Staff will provide detailed scopes around each project, such as the district the project is in, how it’s connected to the Reimagine Nature Master Plan, etc. Ms. Binnebose added another great piece staff provided last year: a Google map that described the project and the location so Board members could take a virtual field trip of all the projects. Ms. Binnebose shared an example of last year’s Google Maps and the Board’s rankings spreadsheet. The Board continued to discuss the Board’s CIP ranking process. Ms. Binnebose reminded everyone they can only rank ten projects. The goal is not to rank all the projects but to spread your picks over 10. Ms. Binnebose explained how the ranking system works. The Board discussed their ranking system. Ms. Binnebose shared last year’s letter and shared the Board’s due dates for actions.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. October 5: Internal CIP applications will be shared with the Board 2. November 2: Prioritization of internal CIP applications complete 3. November 2: Constituent CIP applications will be shared with the Board 4. December 7: Prioritization of constituent CIP applications complete 5. December 7: Draft letter of support for internal and constituent CIP applications 6. December 14: Final letter of support for internal and constituent CIP applications <p>Ms. Finch asked if any new members wanted to help the Communications Subcommittee with this. Ms. Pontuti offered to help. Ms. Binnebose welcomed Ms. Pontuti as a defacto member of the Communications Subcommittee.</p>	30 mins

<p>Mr. Millar shared that the internal and constituent applications in the past followed the same application and answered the same questions. Staff asked the Finance Department for a blank application so staff could know what they were working towards. The Finance Department shared that the constituent application is the same, but they don't know what the internal applications will look like. The planners and landscape architects are writing a few paragraphs of what the project would entail with enough detail. More information will be shared than the Board has gotten in the past, but it won't be as staff anticipated. Mr. Millar will share more details once he gets it. Ms. Riker wants to applaud Ms. Binnebose and the Communications team for flushing out this process, and she appreciates how much more sophisticated and intuitive it has ever been. The Board and staff continued to discuss CIP.</p>	
<p>B. Discussion to create new subcommittees (501c3, Jordan River, Rec Policies)</p> <p>Ms. Binnebose explained the purpose of this discussion was for the Board to discuss creating new subcommittees. Ms. Binnebose recalled Ms. Pehrson wanting to pursue a Jordan River subcommittee, a possible new scope for a 501c3, and equity in the recreation space. Ms. Riker suggested having this as an agenda item for the retreat, but reminding people to get those ideas flowing is good. Ms. Riker suggested that the Board's involvement with the engagement for the GO Bond projects is a retreat agenda item. She also suggested that next month's agenda is the retreat agenda. Ms. Larsen added that part of the reason for this agenda item was to get everyone thinking about having a more in-depth discussion in January. The Board and staff continued to discuss agendas and subcommittees.</p>	5 mins
<p>C. Subcommittee Reporting</p> <p><u>Communications Subcommittee</u></p> <p>Ms. Binnebose reminded everyone that the subcommittee meeting summaries are in Google Drive. Ms. Finch suggested giving verbal highlights would still be suitable for those who haven't had the chance to review the summaries in the Drive. Ms. Binnebose shared that Mr. Fonarow (Trails Manager) attended, and he shared some information regarding their communication for the trails and what the consultants are working on. She added that Ms. Pessetto also participated and shared some of her engagement tactics. Ms. Binnebose continued to share some highlights from the Communications Subcommittee meeting. Ms. Binnebose encouraged staff to tap into more virtual options for engagement. The Board and staff continued to discuss engagement.</p> <p><u>Trails Subcommittee</u></p> <p>Mr. Whittaker shared he has been talking with Mr. Pitts, who works with AllTrails, one of the most popular trail apps. Public Lands and AllTrails have been working together, and Mr. Fonarow controls AllTrails for the Foothills; information regarding trail closures and everything regarding the Foothill area is an extremely powerful communication tool. Mr. Whittaker shared the website at www.publiclands.alltrails.com. Mr. Whittaker said the next big milestone is that the consultants are wrapping up their final reports and hopefully meeting by late September to review all the existing work from all the groups. Mr. Whittaker continued to discuss highlights for the Trails Subcommittee. Mr. Whittaker shared that the Federal Government is doing unexploded ordnance searches. Some subcommittees noted that they've been receiving complaints, so if anyone on the Board has noticed anything, that's what's happening. Mr. Whittaker shared that Mr. Fonarow has requested the Board review the links in the Trails Subcommittee folder to give the City feedback on how best to provide updates around the trails and such. The Board continued to discuss Trails Subcommittee updates.</p>	5 mins
<p>D. Board comments and question period</p> <p>Mr. Carroll said a street fair is happening in the Avenues on Saturday. It's an annual event that's been happening for 40 years. He invited the Board to attend.</p>	15 mins
<p>E. Next meeting: October 5, 2023</p>	5 mins
<p>F. Request for future agenda items</p> <p>Ms. Finch said she and Ms. Hewson met with Jim Webster and walked through Miller Park. Ms. Finch mentioned that individuals from this community have come to the Board and voiced their concerns during the Public Comment Period. Ms. Hewson shared some of the issues Mr. Webster shared with Ms. Finch and herself during the walkthrough. Ms. Hewson thinks one of the biggest things they can do is listen. The Yalecrest Community Council has some concerns with the plan and would like to present their concerns to the PNUT</p>	5 mins

Board. They have requested to be on the agenda in October. Ms. Hewson replied that it would depend on the agenda and need to be a discussion for the Board to have internally. Ms. Riker would welcome them to come and ask that the Public Lands group have equal time to share because this has been an ongoing discussion for about six years. The Board and staff continued to discuss the Miller Park CIP project. Ms. Finch explained Mr. Webster isn't a lone wolf, but the local community council endorses it. She asked if the Board would be open to having them come and present to the Board in October. Mr. Whittaker asked if this would be a public comment or a presentation. Mr. Whittaker shared he's had multiple interactions with this group regarding Miller Park. Mr. Whittaker is confused about what the desire is for the PNUT Board to do. It seems like the Board is being asked to get involved in an argument between two entities. Mr. Whittaker asked Ms. Hewson and Ms. Finch about the Board's role in this issue. Ms. Hewson said their role is to listen. Ms. Finch thinks it would be good for the Board to have that public engagement where we permit them to interact with the Board beyond the Public Comment Period. Then, the Board could write a letter of support depending on what they decide, based on the presentation from the Yalecrest Community Council. The Board and staff continued to discuss the Miller Park issue.

Ms. Riker said they could share the Miller Park report with the Board again. The City has also consulted with seven different consultants on this project. Some are internal, and there are multiple experts on what should be with this park. This was done in 2011 when the first project was done. Staff also did a community survey, and overwhelmingly, the community supports the direction the City is taking. Ms. Riker cautioned the Board to hear from a few folks who might be more vocal and listen to the entire community. The Board and staff continued to discuss the Miller Park CIP project.

Ms. Finch asked if the Board would be open to the Yalecrest Community Council and Public Lands staff to present on Miller Park again, with time limits. Ms. Cannon thanked the other Board members for meeting with members of the public. Ms. Cannon added she wants to be cautious about the PNUT Board as an advisory board becoming a mediator between what individuals in the City want for their parks and what the City staff has done to try to make sure those concerns are addressed through a lot of money and time from staff and public dollars. She does not support this as an agenda item. Ms. Binnebose said that's a similar concern she has. The Board should be responsive and respectful to all our community members. Still, the Board's role isn't to be a mediator or to try to force the City into going against what their subject matter experts have suggested. The Board continued to discuss the Miller Park CIP project and the Yalecrest Community Council to come and present to the Board.

Ms. Hewson said one of the Board's roles is to listen and have this type of discussion. Ms. Cannon reflected on Ms. Riker's suggestion of listening to both sides of the argument. Ms. Cannon asked if the Board is being asked to decide or if they are coming to the Board saying they have these concerns and don't feel heard. Ms. Finch said that would be the topic for them to present to the Board as a future agenda item. Ms. Finch reiterated she was not asking for an action item but whether the Board would permit the group to come and speak. Ms. Benally asked if this would be an invitation to other groups that want to do presentations. She shared that other groups have approached her regarding trials with questions and concerns and pointed out issues, too. She asked if we should keep them in the agenda's Public Comment Section or how the Board wants to handle these requests. Ms. Finch mentioned that City staff has had outside organizations come and present to the Board, so to her, this would be another stakeholder group presenting to the Board. Ms. Riker added that the Miller Park CIP project is a complex issue that would take longer than 10 minutes. She thinks the Board should invite outside people, especially when Community Councils want to present. As for the Miller Park issue, the Board should give it the appropriate time for its complexity. The Board and staff continued to discuss inviting stakeholder groups to present to the Board. Ms. Binnebose said not for the next few months because their agendas are packed, and CIP is a priority. Ms. Binnebose mentioned the points Ms. Benally mentioned and Mr. Carroll's comment on using the retreat to discuss controversial topics. Ms. Binnebose also said Ms. Cannon's comment on reviewing the Board's powers and duties. The Board and staff continued to discuss inviting stakeholder groups to present to the Board.

Ms. Cannon requested that staff could provide some updates to the Mayor's 2023 goals found in the Google Drive and asked if the Board could get an update at any time. Ms. Cannon asked if it were possible to discuss the Board's collaboration with the Golf Advisory Board and the potential for having better collaboration between PNUT Board members and Golf Members and potentially cross-pollinating so someone sits on both.

Ms. Riker said the Golf Advisory Board decided to disassemble. Ms. Riker thought about asking PNUT to include Golf, and this Board already has much to do. Including Golf would double everything the Board does because they have their own CIP projects, budgets, and issues. The Board and staff continued to discuss Golf. Ms. Cannon suggested this as a retreat agenda item. Ms. Binnebose suggested a Golf Subcommittee.

Ms. Binnebose summarized some agenda requests for the October meeting: CIP, Urban Forestry, Foothills, Wasatch Hollow, and Emerald Ribbon Master Plan. Some of these agenda items may be pushed back until later.

Ms. Finch motioned to adjourn. Ms. Hewson seconded the motion. The Board unanimously voted to adjourn the meeting.

8. Adjourn

7:15 PM

DRAFT