

**Formal Meeting**  
**Thursday, February 1, 2024**  
**5:00 p.m. – 7:15 p.m.**

**Join Via Zoom:** <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84891469146?pwd=d1F4QXJVL0VqcjAvaVMyb3V5VXI6dz09>

**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: +1 253 205 0468 US**  
**Webinar ID: 848 9146 9146**  
**Access code: 897283**

## **Agenda**

<b>1. Convening the Meeting</b>	<b>5:00 PM</b>
A. Call to order	
B. Chair Comments	5 mins
<b>2. Board Action Items</b>	<b>5:05 PM</b>
– Approve January 4, 2024 meeting minutes	5 mins
– Review and approve the Jordan River Subcommittee	5 mins
<b>3. Public Comment</b>	<b>5:15 PM</b>
– Verbal comments are limited to no more than 3 minutes; 15 minutes total. Written comments are welcome.	
<b>4. Director's Report</b>	<b>5:30 PM</b>
-Summary of current high-priority department items. – Kristin Riker	5 mins
<b>5. Staff Presentations, Updates &amp; Discussions</b>	<b>5:35 PM</b>
A. Foothill Trails Presentation – Tyler Fonarow	60 mins
B. Staff Updates – Ashlyn Larsen	5 mins
<b>6. Board Discussion</b>	<b>6:40 PM</b>
A. Review Board goals for 2024	15 mins
B. Discuss new potential subcommittees (Urban Trails, Recreation Policies, Golf, Indigenous)	10 mins
C. Subcommittee Reporting	5 mins
D. Board comments and question period	5 mins
E. Next meeting: March 7, 2024	
F. Request for future agenda items	
<b>7. Adjourn</b>	<b>7:15 PM</b>

## Jordan River Trail Subcommittee

### Members

Melanie Pehrson-Noyce

Jenny Hewson

### Work objective

Due to increased funding through GO Bond and a potential CIP match, the revitalization of the Jordan River Trail Corridor is well on its way to transforming this invaluable asset.

The purpose of the Jordan River Subcommittee is to assist Public Lands staff in the activation and engagement of the Jordan River trail. We will be points of contact for constituents to share their ideas and concerns, and to share with constituents the vision of the Salt Lake City portion Jordan River Trail. We will work in an advisory capacity based on feedback from both constituents and public lands staff—adjusting as necessary and with PNUT board approval—to write letters of support, be present at events, and facilitate communications related to the Jordan River.

### How does this work further goals, strategies of Public Lands

We will work closely with Makaylah with the Emerald Ribbon initiative

### Timeline

Throughout the 2024 calendar year, subject for extension at the next retreat if the mission and work proves helpful and productive to Public Lands staff and PNUT board duties.

Monthly 1 hr-1 ½ zoom or in person meetings

### Schedule for Reporting

Monthly, uploading of minutes into the PNUT board drive

As needed, at meetings when having items to discuss.

## Urban Trail Joint Subcommittee with SLC Transportation Advisory Board (TAB)

### Members

Kerri Nakamura - PNUT

Ginger Cannon - PNUT

??? - PNUT

??? - TAB

??? - TAB

??? - TAB Bicycle Standing Committee

- Sweet Streets member may be a good outside representative for this sbcmte
- SL County has a BAC too
- 

### Work objective

Salt Lake City has developed and continues to add to an impressive network of paved urban trails that are utilized not only for recreation, but are also an important part of the City's transportation network. This urban trail network is different and separate from the soft surface trails that are planned and constructed within the Foothills Natural Area of Salt Lake City.

Coordination between the Transportation, Streets and Public Lands Departments is vital as urban trails serve multiple purposes with sometimes differing goals and objectives.

An Urban Trails Joint Subcommittee might help both Public Lands and Transportation better realize the full potential of the urban trail network as a prized amenity in Salt Lake City. From recommendations on pavement markings and signage, safety, marketing, to the staging of events with a goal of increasing public awareness and use of the urban trail network, a Joint Subcommittee could become an important advocacy group for Salt Lake City.

### How does this work further goals, strategies of Public Lands

Section 4 of the Reimagine Nature: Salt Lake City Public Lands Masterplan centers on the concept of Connect. The goal statement reads:

*"Well-maintained, welcoming trails, streets, public transportation, and sidewalks are interconnected as the city's circulatory system. This system connects pedestrians, cyclists, and riders to the city's green spaces and outstanding natural landscapes of Salt Lake City's Public Lands: mountains, foothills, valley, wetlands, and lakes. The City will continue to enhance these systems and increase connectors to include everyday destinations ranging from the daycare, library, grocery store, pharmacy, and museum. This adds convenient access to walk or ride along a greenway, adding steps to pedometers and enriching health and wellbeing."*

Creation of an Urban Trail Joint Subcommittee will ensure that a community-based group has its eye on this section of the Reimagine Nature plan to help Salt Lake City realize its stated goals and objectives.

### Timeline

**Commented [1]:** Bicycle Advisory Committee

**Commented [2]:** You may consider more members from the BAC since they report to TAB but have a more active role with urban trails

**Commented [3]:** @ginger What do we need to do to allow other people not from TAB to participate? I know of others who would like to participate. Let's discuss.

**Commented [4]:** @kerri.nakamura@gmail.com per our by-laws you can have sbcmte members from outside PNUT - they just need to submit a resume and/or other requirements per our by-laws to make sure there isn't conflict of interest or 'stacking' of the same perspective.

**Formatted:** Outline numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering  
Style: Bullet + Aligned at: 0.25" + Indent at: 0.5"

February 1: PNUT Board considers proposal and timeline. If PNUT Board supports exploration of the subcommittee concept, the rest of the timeline rolls out as outlined below.

February 2-29, 2024: Public Lands leadership reaches out to Transportation leadership to garner support for the idea of a joint subcommittee.

March 4, 2024: Request time on the TAB regularly scheduled Board meeting for a concept presentation and TAB support of the Subcommittee's creation.

March 7, 2024: If TAB Board approves the concept, PNUT Board formally establishes the Subcommittee and appoints PNUT representatives.

April 1, 2024: TAB Board formally establishes the Subcommittee and appoints TAB representatives.

April 2024: First meeting of the Joint Subcommittee held at a date and time mutually convenient to members and Public Lands/Transportation staff. Subcommittee to determine meeting schedule, establish subcommittee goals, etc.

#### Schedule for Reporting

Formal Joint Subcommittee reports to both PNUT and TAB following scheduled subcommittee meetings.

**Formal Meeting**  
**Thursday, January 4, 2023**  
**5:00 p.m. – 9:00 p.m.**

**Join at the Memorial House at Memory Grove: 375 N Canyon Rd, Salt Lake City, UT 84103**

**UNAPPROVED MINUTES**

<b>1. Convening the Meeting</b>	<b>5:00 PM</b>
<p>A. Call to order</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Samantha Finch</li> <li>- Melanie Pehrson</li> <li>- Phil Carroll</li> <li>- Clayton Scrivner</li> <li>- Brianna Binnebose</li> <li>- Jenny Hewson</li> <li>- Aaron Wiley</li> <li>- Dave John</li> <li>- Talula Pontuti</li> <li>- Kerri Nakamura</li> </ul>	
<p>B. Chair Comments</p> <p>Ms. Binnebose thanked everyone for the past 18 months of being Chair and the opportunity to take over from Ms. Heart and lead the Board. She likes how the Board has grown and prided the Board on all its accomplishments. She expressed pride in the CIP process and how it's shifted over the years. She also expressed excitement to see what next year's leadership will do and what priorities will be set after the meeting.</p>	5 mins
<b>2. Public Comment</b>	<b>5:05 PM</b>
<p>– Verbal comments are limited to no more than 3 minutes; 15 minutes total. Written comments are welcome.</p> <p>No public comments.</p>	15 mins
<b>3. Action Items</b>	<b>5:20 PM</b>
<p>- Approve December 7, 2023 meeting minutes</p> <p>Ms. Larsen received Ms. Finch's comments and updated the minutes. The Board clarified who motioned and seconded the December meeting minutes. With the changes, Ms. Finch motioned to approve the December meeting minutes. Mr. Carroll seconded the motion. The Board unanimously voted to approve the December meeting minutes.</p>	5 mins
<p>- Chair and Vice-Chair Election</p> <p>Ms. Larsen said Mr. Scrivner and Ms. Hewson were nominated for Chair – Ms. Hewson had declined – and Ms. Pehrson was nominated for Vice-Chair. Ms. Finch motioned for Mr. Scrivner to be Chair and Ms. Pehrson to be Vice-Chair. Mr. Carroll seconded the motion. The Board unanimously voted to approve the new Chair and Vice-Chair.</p>	10 mins

4. Boards & Commissions Roles & Ordinance Review	5:35 PM
--	---------

DRAFT

## – Presentation from legal – Katherine Lewis

15 mins

Ms. Lewis introduced herself as a Salt Lake City Attorney. She informed the Board that the city ordinance states that the city attorney will provide legal advice to the board. The Board is here to serve and assist the members with any questions regarding their jurisdiction, acquisition of real property, or conflicts of interest. Members were advised to contact the city attorney's office with questions or concerns. She reminded them they are subject to the OPMA and must receive annual training. General rules about city boards were also discussed, including the term of service for members. The members were advised that they could continue to serve after their term was over until a new person had been appointed to take their place. She highlighted the City's conflict-of-interest ordinance, with members advised not to use their official position for personal gain, vote on something they would benefit from during the financial year, or share confidential information obtained in a closed session or through their role on the board. Ms. Finch asked since the packets and meetings are open to the public unless it's a closed session; if the Department communicates anything, the Board can share immediately. Ms. Lewis said yes, unless it's a closed session.

Mr. Scrivner recalled a conversation where the topic of fiduciary responsibility was discussed and the potential risks associated with it. He asked, "What is our liability? Are we at risk in any way? What is our responsibility as advisory board members?" Ms. Lewis used an example: if the PNUT Board makes a recommendation to the City Council, it gets approved. If someone sues everyone about that recommendation, everyone would be named personally since they were officially acting as a city board member. The city attorney's office would defend them. They would not be defended if they did something criminal, negligent, or outside their official duties. It was also noted that even if the Board members got it wrong, they would still be defended as long as they acted within their official capacity because making these recommendations is part of their role. Ms. Nakamura reflected on Ms. Lewis's earlier comment on board replacement. She asked if the replacement is made six months after your term ends. Is the new term two and a half years, or does it remain three? Ms. Lewis said she thinks it's two and a half years. Ms. Larsen shared her screen to display the City's Powers and Duties for advisory boards. Ms. Finch asked if there was anything the Board wasn't doing that they should be. Ms. Lewis said they don't have to do everything on the list, but the Board's priorities and focuses may shift based on the Board's membership makeup. The Board and staff discussed including a fee and concessions agreement presentation later this year.

Ms. Hewson asked if the PNUT Board has any kind of responsibility when Public Lands retains consultants. Ms. Lewis can't think of any liabilities, and it's not in the ordinance, but that would be a conversation to have with the Department. Ms. Binnebose clarified that these powers and duties set the parameters for the Board to take action, but we're not required to. Mr. Carroll asked who the Board's boss is. Ms. Lewis said there are a lot of intersecting pieces with the staff involvement, the Chair's role, and the ordinance. Ms. Pehrson shared that in relation to the consultants or contractors Public Lands brings on, constituents come to Board members with questions, comments, or issues related to what those third parties are doing. She wonders if there's a way for the Board to be aware of who's doing what and how that can be communicated, primarily concerning the Foothills and Miller Park. Ms. Riker said she would have to check with purchasing as that's their process, but staff would be happy to have Board members involved, and it would be a closed meeting. Ms. Riker said they usually bring people from other departments with specialists in different areas. The Board and staff continued to discuss consultants and contractors.

Mr. Wiley asked if Board members know about issues specific to people who work in the City or within the parks and trails and how to address and communicate them. Ms. Lewis said there are avenues for that, such as the attorney's office and even bringing other Department Directors into

your meetings to discuss their initiatives; they can do that in a closed session to further discuss some of the security and other issues. Ms. Pontuti asked if there were any conflicts of interest for board members submitting CIP projects. Ms. Lewis said it might be and would encourage Board members to connect with legal on specifics. Conflict-of-Interest ordinance states that you may not make a decision, so you may not vote on something you would benefit from. It's a disclosure and recusal; it doesn't mean you can't do it; there's just a process. The Board and staff continued discussing CIP.

Ms. Nakamura thanked Ms. Lewis, and it was great clarity as in a prior Board meeting, some constituents said the Board needed to do their job and take responsibility on a certain topic. Ms. Nakamura said it seems like they did their duty by listening, and it's up to the Board if they want to take further action. The Board and staff continued to discuss the Board's Powers and Duties.

## 5. Director's Report

5:50 PM

- Summary of current high-priority department items. – Kristin Riker

15 mins

Ms. Riker shared a document with the Board that was previously presented to the mayor two weeks ago. The document outlined potential goals for the Mendenhall administration from the department and was organized around four pillars. One of the contributions the department felt they could make was the completion of phase one for Glendale Regional Park, which is planned for the summer of 2024. Ms. Riker also discussed plans for phase two, which will include pickleball courts and the potential development of an outdoor pool. Another area of focus discussed was the launch of community engagement in design to develop a complete block. This involves multiple cities and city departments, and the department is currently working on coordinating the message to the public. A need for civic space on the fleet block was identified, and the plan is to work together to have a united message and collection of information for the public. The Board and staff continued to discuss the Fleet Block project.

Ms. Riker emphasized the importance of the capital asset management plan and requested an update from Mr. Millar. The current status involves an RFP for a consultant to determine the existing asset conditions and provide a roadmap for the expenditure of impact fees and funding requests based on the new matching nature master plan. The strategic plan will guide the allocation of capital received annually, including property acquisition and other related matters. Ms. Nakamura wondered if, within that plan, staff could go down to the level of playground equipment and assess the playground age and maintenance reports. Ms. Riker said staff uses a system called Categraph that tracks and monitors work done on all Public Lands assets. Some equipment staff don't even know how old it is. The board and staff continued to discuss asset inventory, condition assessments, and funding.

Ms. Riker mentioned that the Green Loop is a significant goal of the mayor. It was acknowledged that this project will require the involvement of multiple departments, including public utilities, community neighborhoods, and transportation. As a result, several of us will be working together to ensure its success. It was also noted that this project is a significant budget focus for us.

Ms. Riker discussed that funding would be sought to prioritize, design, and construct climate-forward projects. The focus would be on irrigation systems, including replacing and evaluating existing ones. Staff is exploring ways to water trees and systems without watering the turf, such as removing turf in certain areas. It was noted that this was one of their CIP requests, and staff hoped the mayor would select it, providing more push to approve the CIP request.

Ms. Riker discussed that the 1000 Tree program has been successful in many ways. However, there have been instances where a tree is planted, but nobody takes responsibility for watering it. To address this issue, Mr. Gliot proposed a new system where \$1,000 would be spent per tree.



<p>Homeowners would then be asked if they would allow tapping into their irrigation system to ensure the tree is watered every time they water their yard. Although this method is more expensive, the group agreed to pilot it. If the system proves effective over the next couple of years, it was suggested that the group would increase the cost of planting a tree from the current \$300 to \$1000, including the cost of the irrigation system. Ms. Binnebose asked about homeowners rejecting the program or receiving a water credit from the City. Ms. Riker said the estimated increase is about \$0.35 per month. The Board and staff continued to discuss the tree-watering pilot program.</p> <p>Ms. Riker discussed the current structure of the Trails and Natural Lands Team and how it's grown. They are looking to add a division director and increase FTE on the Trails and Natural Lands Teams. She also highlighted the launch of the "Keep Your Cool Campaign," staff had received the first tranche of the GO Bond, Glendale Regional Park groundbreaking, staff has completed the Allen Park adaptive reuse and management plan, and has lots of progress on other GO Bond projects. Staff will also be opening its first urban orchard this spring; the RAC had an estimated \$15 million in Economic Development Impact, hired a new Park Division Director and Parks Operations Manager, and has made progress on their weather track irrigation controller systems. The Board and staff discussed the over-spraying in some parks, park strips, and the Cemetery. Ms. Riker shared that all these projects align with the Reimagine Nature Master Plan, and this year, staff will be revamping their Annual Report to reflect that progress better.</p> <p>Ms. Finch said during the first annual meeting, Board members review Bylaws, calendar events, and department projects. She inquired if any additional topics were to be addressed, even monthly. Ms. Riker said the staff is working on a calendar of events. The Board and staff continued to discuss the calendar.</p>	
<b>6. Recess for Dinner and Ice Breaker Activity</b>	<b>6:05 PM</b>
<p>- Ice Breaker Activity &amp; Dinner</p> <p>The Board took a recess to eat dinner and had a round-table discussion, answering questions related to "Would You Rather" and general "Ice Breaker Questions."</p>	<p>30 mins</p>
<b>7. Staff Presentations, Updates &amp; Discussions</b>	<b>6:35 PM</b>
<p>A. Emerald Ribbon – Makaylah Maponga</p> <p>Ms. Maponga shared her screen to display a presentation on the Emerald Ribbon Project. She referenced the reports included in their packet, the first being the Phase One engagement summary and the second being the existing conditions analysis. The study area covered the entirety of Salt Lake City's segment of the Jordan River, which is approximately 10 miles, along with the Jordan River Parkway Trail and the adjacent parks and open spaces. The first phase involved outreach through various modes, including two focus groups, two advisory groups, and two public workshops. Over 350 members of the community and stakeholders provided input through these focus groups, river events, public workshops, and advisory groups.</p> <p>The feedback from the outreach was summarized in three primary ways, including a game board where people voted on their top 10 priorities, towers that recapped the past and present of the Jordan River, and key questions that people answered on postcards. The top priorities from the feedback included increased safety at night, which will restore natural habitats, reduce trash in the corridor, support houses and neighbors, and improve water quality. The least important priority was investing in regional manganese and drawing visitors.</p> <p>The top 10 options were provided to the technical advisory group, who prioritized improved water quality as their top priority. The stakeholders' key priorities were activating the corridor, making new</p>	<p>20 mins</p>

recreation resources, creating more partnerships to achieve critical goals, prioritizing natural nature, variety, and nature with new best practices, and strategically balanced uses. The community feedback highlighted the need for a well-maintained natural and cultural sanctuary, a vibrant community destination, and a place that fosters long-term multi-generational use.

Additionally, the attendees heard that 46% of feedback highlighted the need for a safe and clean quarter that fosters a healthy habitat and community refuge. People feel uncomfortable or unsafe along the river due to the perception that illegal activities happen there due to people experiencing homelessness. People would like to see nature thrive along the Jordan River. Water quality was a significant concern for the attendees, as they felt the cleanliness and trash in the river were huge concerns. They also want to see better signage. The attendees want more programming, commercial activity, and things that attract people to the river.

Ms. Maponga shared that 37% of feedback for the second theme, which focused on making the Jordan River a vibrant community destination, revolved around new ideas for programming on the river, the trail, and within the corridor. People expressed their desire to swim, fish, paddle, and kayak in the river, as well as religious groups who believe the river to be holy as it flows south to north. The community also wants more leisure education and amenities suited for all modes of travel on the trail. They want a well-connected, easy-to-navigate trail and more commercial activation and programming adjacent to the corridor. The third theme focused on making the Jordan River a place that fosters long-term, multi-generational use, with 80% of comments highlighting memories of the river. The community wants improvements that facilitate opportunities to make memories with future generations, such as special tours, playgrounds, and adult activities for seniors.

The existing conditions analysis was discussed, which used a lens that examined the Jordan River as both an ecological and cultural center. The six categories: context, communities, connectivity, capacity, activity, and awareness were examined from a natural and cultural perspective. For context, the Jordan River should represent the Westside communities more explicitly, build trust through action-oriented strategies, and model best practices to address broader watershed issues. For communities, the focus should be on enhancing habitat and species quality, engaging and supporting neighbors, and increasing programming that relates more specifically to the identity and needs of the river. Connectivity should improve wayfinding through orientation and placemaking. Capacity should improve riverbanks, simplify corridor maintenance, and establish care, cleanliness, and capital investment standards. Activity should create more natural parks, promote a more substantial visual connection between the urban fabric of the Westside and the corridor, and exploit slow traps, lower trails, and unpaved trails for a diversity of trail experience. Awareness should focus on creating a cleaner river, revising maintenance strategies to address waste in and out of the water, and thoughtfully addressing the house with community partners. The team is well underway in developing concept alternatives and will launch Republic in March with more content about work, jobs, and open houses. The team hopes to wrap up the project by the end of April and begin the final writing in the summer and spring.

Ms. Binnebose thanked Ms. Maponga for all her work on this progress. She suggested that staff also consider the priorities that were ranked lower. Even though programming ranked low, many comments were still present on turning the Jordan River into a destination area with activities surrounding it. Mr. Wiley shared he was involved with some of these focus groups and was blown away by the diversity and how many people are connected to the river. Mr. Wiley said the people in this community already see the Jordan River as the City's crown jewel, and their concern is that the rest of the City doesn't view it that way. Ms. Hewson asked Mr. Wiley which advisory board he was on. Mr. Wiley said the community advisory board.

<p>Ms. Hewson asked how the makeup of the community advisory board was created. Ms. Maponga said they had an initial round of eight focus groups, and they cast a wide net to every partner they knew and asked them to share with their friends. The people who came to those focus groups and were engaged became part of that initial focus group. Ms. Hewson asked if Ms. Pehrson was part of that focus group and PNUT representation. Mr. Wiley said he was initially there to get more people active and part of the process and to connect with more constituents. Ms. Pehrson said she would reference her position on the PNUT Board and as a community resident.</p> <p>Ms. Finch asked about the consultants on the project and if Mr. Wiley or Ms. Pehrson interacted with them. Ms. Pehrson said there was a representative at one of the focus groups. Ms. Finch asked if they were from the Salt Lake area. Ms. Maponga said they are located in Boston and Texas and have university departments on their team, a local organization. The Board and staff continued to discuss the consultants.</p> <p>Ms. Nakamura brought up the population growth chart in the report in the PNUT packet. Ms. Nakamura wondered if the golf courses along the Jordan River could help maintain the parts of the Jordan River that cut through their golf courses. Ms. Riker said there's an invisible line where the golf maintenance ends, and the kind of work on the river is a different maintenance team.</p> <p>Mr. Scrivner asked what the next steps of the action plan are and when the board will see this again. Ms. Maponga said they are finishing up the reports shared in the packets and will release them to the public. This first phase has been focused on building awareness of the project and what people currently think of the river, so they've focused on Westside and those using it. From that feedback, they'll build out a few concept alternatives and have people focus on what they like or dislike about the concept alternatives. That process will be around March-April, and then the team can synthesize all that feedback into one final concept plan and put that into a list of projects and maintenance guidelines. Mr. Scrivner asked what the role is for people outside this area. Ms. Maponga said this next phase will be pushed out to all city-wide residents. Ms. Pehrson asked what role the PNUT Board has in this. Ms. Maponga said she would love any help pushing the word out, or she can help them gather groups of people who want to have these conversations. The staff is currently developing materials and should have those in early February. Ms. Maponga is happy to create a packet that the Board can share with organizations they work with or post on social media.</p> <p>Ms. Hewson found it curious of the disinterest of drawing visitors to the river, and it is an interesting thing to navigate. Ms. Maponga said she thinks it's not that they don't want people coming, but around the language of investing in the corridor, and these are going to change, and a fear that it will not change in a way that reflects the community and demographic who live there. Ms. Pehrson asked what adopting the plan would look like. Ms. Riker said the advisory board will usually look at it, make recommendations, and advise the Council that you support the adoption of the plan. A transmittal will go to the Mayor; if the Mayor supports it, it will go to Council. The Board and staff continued to discuss the Emerald Ribbon plan.</p>	
<p><b>B. Miller Park Presentation – Kat (Maus) Andra</b></p> <p>Ms. Andra shared her screen to display a presentation on Miller Park and thanked the Board for requesting an update on the current project. She acknowledged varying levels of familiarity with the project and briefly explained how they got to where they are now. The project is called ADA Access Improvements and Historic Structure Preservation. It originated from a constituent CIP request submitted in 2017, with funding points in 2018. The application highlighted two main goals: preserving the historic structures within Miller Park and improving the accessibility of trails. The request stemmed from the oil spill that occurred in 2010, which ran through the creek. Chevron gave the city \$1 million to mitigate the impacts, and as a result, many creek improvements were made in</p>	20 mins

2014. The proposed projects to fulfill these two goals were to restore a trail limit to Creekside, install a walking bridge over Riverview Creek, and engage in various projects to stabilize WPA walls. Ms. Nakamura said as she read the information from the packet, it sounded like the lower trail alignment was inconsistent with how trails are normally built along the water. Ms. Andra said yes. The Board and staff continued to discuss the trail alignment.

Ms. Andra said they hired Alta Planning and Design Landscape Architecture Firm to undertake some projects. The firm conducted an initial round of community engagement to determine the community priorities. Also, it engaged a structural and geotechnical engineer to assess the walls and the Creekside trail alignment. After receiving the reports from these engineers, it was determined that the proposed three projects would not improve the stability of the walls, and the trail wasn't impacting their stability either. Therefore, the firm proposed 12 new projects to improve ADA access and preserve the historic walls. These new projects would make corrections to the existing trails to enhance accessibility at the entrances for wheelchair access. Wall Foundation projects were also proposed to manage structural loads caused by erosion and tonic chairs. The walls were not initially designed to bear the weight currently on top of them, and invasive trees and vegetation are causing further issues. To address these problems, many projects were proposed, including future trail protection to mitigate erosion and maintain level slopes. A revision was done between March and June 2023, and the public engagement report was included in the packet.

Ms. Andra said staff took the 12 recommended projects to the public and asked for their priorities. The top priorities were to protect the walls, improve and protect the existing trails, and correct trail slope improvements. The team also addressed concerns about environmental impact and safety issues within the park. The team also mentioned irrigation heads within the trails that must be addressed for tripping hazards and to establish native plants. The neighboring property owners had concerns about the property line, and the team assured them that the current projects would not impact it. There was also a strong desire to see the creek-side trail alignment reinstated. Still, after conducting feasibility assessments and interviews with industry experts, the team concluded it was not feasible. The team presented the projects with the highest public ranking to the city council and requested a change in the scope of work for the funding. The council approved the new scope of work. It limited the projects to repairing and protecting the historic walls, increasing wall and trail stability, stabilizing exposed wall foundations, covering the foundations of walls to prevent erosion, improving running and cross slopes for wheelchair accessibility, and addressing irrigation issues. The team's next steps are to utilize the remaining \$360,000 to fulfill as much of this work as possible within Miller Park. The team will work closely with the State Historic Preservation Office to ensure appropriate engagement in this work, and the design and construction phase will start in February or March.

Ms. Finch asked how the staff deals with a CIP project approved by the City Council but that the specific projects diverge substantially from what the constituent wants. Ms. Finch referred to the reports on the project's webpage. Ms. Andra displayed the project's website page. The Board and staff discussed the map images on the project page. Ms. Andra said the maps aren't very digestible. She referenced on the map where the lower and upper trails were. A structural engineer shared their reports with staff, and staff assessed the environmental impact, accessibility improvements, and historic structure preservation of each proposal. Ms. Andra referenced the red lines of the map indicate what will never be accessible via wheelchair by ADA standards, and the green shows what is accessible in the revised proposal. Ms. Finch asked if the revised proposal was shared with Mr. Webster or if a community sign-off to the revised proposal was not feasible. Ms. Andra said staff met with Mr. Webster onsite several times, sharing the findings from the engineering staff worked with. The Board and staff continued to discuss Miller Park.

Ms. Nakamura asked when Mr. Webster applied if he applied to reinstate the lower trail or to improve the ADA access. Ms. Andra said the goal of the application was to improve ADA access to preserve the historic retaining walls. Ms. Nakamura asked if he described how improving ADA access meant reinstalling the lower trail in his application. Ms. Andra said yes, and that's why they had to go to the City Council to change the scope of work for this project because that was originally approved. Ms. Finch referenced the geotechnical and structural reports on the project's website. She asked if these were the reports Ms. Andra referenced when they came out with the revised CIP proposal. Ms. Andra said yes, and they provided a letter as well. The Board and staff continued discussing the Miller Park reports and letters.

Ms. Riker asked Ms. Andra to discuss the cost in feasibility. Ms. Andra shared that when looking at 12 alternative projects, Alta Planning and Design also did a cost estimate to see if they were feasible, safety-wise, trail-sustainability-wise, and what they would cost. It was an excess of \$1.5 million. This project was only funded by about \$360,000, which is now remaining. Just in terms of cost alone, it's infeasible. Ms. Riker added a retaining wall would be required. Ms. Andra shared a boardwalk would have to be installed to elevate the trail above the floodplain. She shared that while staff didn't specifically look into this, back in 2014, there was \$1 million worth of restoration work, which would be undone to implement this new project.

Ms. Binnebose shared that the root of this problem is a huge disconnect between the CIP concept and what's feasible. So essentially, the City Council and the CDCIP approve concepts that haven't completed any feasibility work. So you're taking what people think is feasible based on their subject matter expertise, as opposed to the City, which has legal jurisdiction to implement these projects. You're taking an idea, funding it, and running it through technical analysis. Ms. Riker said this isn't the only project that Public Lands has had to go back to Council on to amend the scope. She shared that the constituent CIP process has been approved a lot, and now the constituent works with staff to go through this process, and staff helps them make it feasible, but sometimes it's not. Ms. Binnebose said it's not necessarily the fault of the CIP applicant or staff; it's just a disconnect in the application process from a concept level to taking it into preliminary engineering and design. The Board and staff continued to discuss the Miller Park project.

Ms. Finch recommended more transparency on their website referencing studies and reports to the staff. Ms. Finch asked if there should be some sort of guidelines in the constituent CIP application for when a constituent project diverges from what the department can do. Ms. Riker said it would be wonderful for the Capital Asset Committee to have that process. Public Lands aren't the ones who do that process. The Board and staff continued to discuss CIP.

Ms. Nakamura shared that 30 years ago, the constituent application process was created to address the issue of the CIP process being inaccessible to the public. The council was charged with creating a mechanism for individuals to voice their ideas without directly lobbying their council members. This prevented the council from cutting administrative projects to fund their desired projects. The goal was to create a process where the public could put forward their ideas and have them considered without relying solely on the council. While some members suggested that the process may be flawed, it was pointed out that people can often apply for projects without providing real numbers. In such cases, staff works with the applicant to arrive at a realistic number. It is important to note that the maximum amount an applicant can apply for is \$500,000, which may not be enough to cover certain projects. In addition, it was discussed that sometimes constituents prescribe a solution to a problem that is not feasible or may not be the best solution. For example, while the project may be called an ADA realignment, it may be a desired trail. At this point, it was suggested that a timeout be called and the constituent be asked if they still want the project, as it may not be possible to accomplish it as the constituent prescribes. Ms. Finch added the degree to which they have control

to negotiate the project once the City Council approves funding. She wonders if those guidelines and policies from the Mayor's office should be more prominent. Ms. Pontuti suggested this topic could be further discussed in the Board's priorities and goals for this year. The Board and staff continued to discuss the CIP process.	
<p>C. Staff Updates – Ashlyn Larsen</p> <p>Ms. Larsen reminded the Board to complete the OPMA training every calendar year. She asked if they would like to have legal come and present or complete the training online. The Board chose to complete it online. Ms. Larsen asked the Board to submit their certificates of completion by the April PNUT meeting. Ms. Larsen shared her screen to display the new public-facing calendar. She explained this calendar was created so the board could view all of the Public Lands events, survey timelines, volunteer events, etc., and they could add the event to their personal calendars if they wanted to go. Ms. Larsen shared that Ms. McCain is working on updating their website page to make it more user-friendly. Ms. Larsen said she will share the calendar once it's live. Mr. Wiley asked if it could be color-coded. Ms. Larsen said they can look into it. Mr. Carroll asked if it would include community events. Ms. Larsen clarified that this calendar is only for Public Lands-run events. There is an external calendar with all events happening on Public Lands. The Board thanked Ms. Larsen for this work.</p>	5 mins
<b>8. Break</b>	<b>7:20 PM</b>
<p>- 10-minute break</p> <p>The Board took a 10-minute recess.</p>	10 mins
<b>9. Board Discussion</b>	<b>7:30 PM</b>
<p>A. Creating new subcommittees (Jordan River, 501c3, Rec Policies, Golf, Indigenous)</p> <p>Ms. Binnebose clarified that this topic is to begin creating new subcommittees. Ms. Pehrson shared a document a while ago presenting her idea of having a Jordan River Trails Subcommittee and role that could benefit Public Lands. This sparked from the dramatic increase in funding and interest from the GO Bond and potential CIP matches. This committee could be a point of contact for constituents to share their ideas and concerns and disseminate information. The Emerald Ribbon Plan would probably be the committee's first project with staff. Ms. Pehrson believes this is a hidden gem that needs to be supported by the Board. She invited other Board members to participate. She asked if this could be an action item for next month to establish the Jordan River as a subcommittee. She said the commitment for this subcommittee would be about 1-1 ½ hours outside of their regular Board meeting. Ms. Binnebose invited the Board to review the subcommittee description created by Ms. Pehrson in the Board's shared drive, coordinate interest, and provide feedback to Ms. Pehrson before the next Board meeting.</p> <p>Ms. Binnebose reminded the board that the other subcommittees that had been brought up were the 501c3, recreation and policy, golf, and indigenous. These weren't as fleshed out, but the floor is open for discussion if the Board wants to flush these out more. Ms. Nakamura is interested in an urban trails subcommittee. Ms. Hewson asked if this would be another subcommittee. Ms. Nakamura originally suggested putting it under the Jordan River, but that creates too large of a scope of work for the Jordan River. Ms. Nakamura thinks it could be the first subcommittee that cross-pollinates with Transportation because urban trails are closely tied to transportation, so she wants to flesh that out more. Ms. Binnebose suggested presenting the subcommittee description in February and the action item in March.</p> <p>Mr. Wiley said the 501c3 and recreation policies speak to him because he's been trying to figure out ways and how to get businesses to make contributions, and because of all the red tape, it's been</p>	15 mins



challenging. Regarding the recreation policies, there have been concerns on many different levels, such as access to the fields. One part of this is that some organizations can be first in line when accessing certain fields, which leads to the concepts of diversity, equity, and inclusion. He shared an example of a kid who couldn't put on his hat because his hair was too big, and they were told you can't play if you can't put on your hat, which has not only impacted Mr. Wiley's team but also the West Side community because it's so diverse. Ms. Riker said Ms. Bailey has been working on this and creating policies. This is something the staff is working on. Ms. Binnebose asked if Mr. Wiley was interested in pursuing either of these subcommittees. Mr. Wiley said both, but he would need support because he lacks understanding of how to trailblaze some things.

Ms. Hewson asked what Mr. Wiley would hope to achieve out of a recreation policy subcommittee. Ms. Hewson also wondered if the staff had further discussed a 501c3. Mr. Wiley said there's a need to establish policies that ensure equal access to parks for all children. It was emphasized that certain rules and regulations must not discriminate against kids based on their economic status or cultural practices. The point was raised that a lot of kids who couldn't afford uniforms were being turned away from playing leagues. These kids should not be excluded from playing because they can't afford the uniforms. Mr. Wiley highlighted that parks should not prohibit kids from playing because they don't have the appropriate gear like cleats or hats. It was agreed that everyone should have equal access to the parks and that the rules should not be enforced differently for different children. Mr. Scrivner added that these leagues are managed by third parties occupying the fields, so these would be policies that would be enforced on people who can rent or use the field. Ms. Riker said they would be recommended guidelines, not something Public Lands would send people out to enforce. Ms. Binnebose suggested reviewing other subcommittees' descriptions to summarize a scope of work and/or description for some new subcommittees.

Ms. Riker shared that the city is uncomfortable initiating a 501c3 Conservancy due to other conservative fundraising efforts and purchasing policies. It was felt that it would be in the best interest not to make this a city-led effort. The possibility of asking an outside party to help was explored, and further information will be shared after the next meeting in February. Salt Lake County created a foundation outside of the county government structure, which was later voted as a governmental foundation by the County Council. This was done to make it a public charity. The city also has a foundation, which is a governmental nonprofit that allows the town to collect funds. However, it is not an advocacy group. An idea was proposed to create a foundation for fundraising, advocacy, and programming within the parks. The Board and staff continued to discuss a 501c3 subcommittee.

#### B. Review current subcommittee membership (Trails, Communications, Bylaws)

5 mins

##### **Communications Subcommittee**

Ms. Binnebose shared that the current subcommittee members are Ms. Pehrson, Mr. Scrivner, Ms. Pontuti, and herself. With the size of the board, she invited more members to join.

##### **Bylaws Subcommittee**

Ms. Binnebose said the Bylaws subcommittee is ad-hoc and isn't currently active, and their members are Ms. Finch, Ms. Cannon, and Mr. Wiley.

##### **Trails Subcommittee**

Mr. Carroll said the current subcommittee members are Mr. Whittaker, Ms. Benally, and himself. Some of their other members have left. Ms. Binnebose suggested updating their current membership list in the shared drive.

<p>Ms. Nakamura asked if non-PNUT Board members can be on subcommittees. Ms. Binnebose said they also go through a vetting process, similar to how board members get on the PNUT Board. Ms. Binnebose referred to their Bylaws. Mr. John said he's interested in the Jordan Trail, golf, and indigenous subcommittees. Ms. Binnebose encouraged Mr. John to review the descriptions of the other subcommittees to understand what to do if he's interested in establishing a new subcommittee. Ms. Larsen added it was staff who also suggested an indigenous subcommittee to work with the planners and their projects and when to get indigenous group involvement. Ms. Larsen said she can help board members connect with the planners to help identify a scope of work. The Board and staff continued to discuss subcommittees.</p>	
<p>C. Discuss the process for stakeholder presentation requests</p> <p>Ms. Pontuti shared she has been creating some ideas for how the Board can handle requests from the public who want to present to the Board outside of the typical public comment period. She suggested a process to be created to explore ideas around this matter and discuss possibly incorporating it into the bylaws. She proposed some ideas, such as allowing community members to request a 15-minute presentation slot between February and September during a designated time frame. Repeat project discussions per calendar year will be at the discretion of the Board. Ms. Pontuti suggested that presentation requests should be made at least a month before the meeting. In the less busy months, information could be posted on the website with detailed instructions on requesting a presentation. Mr. Carroll motioned to put this into place. Mr. Scrivner said they can't make a motion for this meeting since it's not an action item, but it is open for discussion.</p> <p>Ms. Larsen suggested not having it as a standing item on their agenda because their agendas can be packed. Many Board members agreed. Mr. Scrivner asked how often they get requests from the public. Ms. Larsen said the only ones she's aware of have been the Yalecrest Community Council, and Ms. Benally had mentioned that somebody brought up to her that they wanted to present to the Board. Ms. Binnebose thinks there should be a formal form on the website that goes to Ms. Larsen, and the request can be reviewed by those who make the agendas. Ms. Pontuti clarified that it should only happen during the less busy months. She also suggested having a place on the website instructing people on submitting public comments. The Board and staff continued to discuss stakeholder presentation requests.</p> <p>Ms. Riker mentioned that staff will release their Foothills Trail Evaluation soon, which might spur interest and get multiple requests on the same topic. She wonders if it would be helpful to ask them to write something up, and then the Board can read those and decide which ones to hear from. Ms. Binnebose said this is something the communication subcommittee could probably take on. The Board and staff continued to discuss stakeholder presentation requests. Ms. Binnebose said that because of time constraints, please submit all your comments and feedback to the shared drive, and the board will continue to discuss this topic at a later time.</p>	15 mins
<p>D. Establish Board goals for 2024</p> <p>Ms. Binnebose will do a quick rundown of possible goals she's heard throughout the night and can put them in the shared drive for a starting point. Mr. Scrivner said he would like to see these goals adopted into an action item for 2024 goals. Ms. Binnebose suggested that everyone take some time to add to the document and provide comments. She proposed having a bigger discussion and review in February and putting some time on the agenda. The goals will be adopted in March, and the group can bump up timelines to shave off one more month. This can be done by establishing new subcommittees and being more involved in RFPs where appropriate and feasible to work with staff. She also discussed making a recommendation to the Capital Asset Committee to help with decision-making when dealing with feasibility versus constituent proposal analysis. She also discussed the Board's response to hot-topic issues. The Board and staff continued to discuss Board goals for 2024.</p>	20 mins



<p>E. Subcommittee Reporting</p> <p><b>Communications Subcommittee</b>  Ms. Binnebose shared the year's big accomplishments: the new member onboarding process, continuing to improve the CIP process, and having staff visitors to the communications subcommittee meetings.</p> <p><b>Trails Subcommittee</b>  There are no major updates to share.</p>	<p>15 mins</p>
<p>F. Board comments and question period</p> <p>The Board had no further comments or questions.</p>	<p>10 mins</p>
<p>G. Next meeting: February 1, 2024</p>	<p>5 mins</p>
<p>H. Request for future agenda items</p> <p>Ms. Larsen said the Board should decide if they want staff to present the budget or the Foothills for February. Ms. Riker said staff could be ready to present the Foothills in February and budget whenever the Board would like to hear about it. Ms. Riker said the budget process is changing. Ms. Hewson asked if they could hear about the budget in March. Ms. Riker said that would be fine. The Board and staff continued to discuss agenda topics.</p> <p>Ms. Funch motioned to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Binnebose seconded the motion. The Board unanimously voted to adjourn the meeting.</p>	<p>5 mins</p>
<p>10. Adjourn</p>	<p>9:00 PM</p>