

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

Join Via Zoom: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84891469146?pwd=dlF4QXJVL0VqcjAvaVMyb3V5VXl6dz09>

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

APPROVED MINUTES

1. Convening the Meeting	5:00 PM
A. Call to order - Dave John - Meredith Benally - Phil Carroll - Melanie Pehrson - Ginger Cannon - Jenny Hewson - Samantha Finch - Clayton Scrivner - Aaron Wiley - Kerri Nakamura - Talula Pontuti - CJ Whittaker	
B. Chair Comments	5 mins
Mr. Scrivner shared that everyone's time participating on the Board is volunteer time, and he wants to ensure their time isn't wasted. He also wants the Board to think about how they can turn their Board goals into a reality. He said one thing he thinks about is how everyone comes from diverse backgrounds, experiences, and comfort levels of speaking up in meetings, and he wants to focus on voice equality on this Board.	
2. Board Action Items	5:05 PM
– Approve January 4, 2024 meeting minutes	5 mins
Ms. Cannon and Ms. Finch provided a few small edits for the minutes. Ms. Finch motioned to approve the January minutes. Ms. Cannon seconded. The Board unanimously voted to approve the January minutes.	
– Review and approve the Jordan River Subcommittee	5 mins
Ms. Larsen shared her screen to display the Jordan River Subcommittee write-up. Ms. Pehrson thanked everyone for their comments. She shared that some board members wondered if this should be a standing or an ad hoc committee. She said Ms. Hewson and Mr. Wiley also offered to be on the committee. She let Ms. Cannon know she had reached out to some community members. She referenced the scope of work, and how there are so many projects on the Jordan River currently, some of which will take years to finish, so with it being such a project-based area, she thinks a standing committee is a way to go. Ms. Pehrson added they can review quarterly and yearly to see if it's still observing the needs of the public and staff. She shared that Mr. John had expressed interest but hadn't confirmed. Mr. Scrivner said it would be nice to have some	

<p>indigenous representation and suggested reaching out to the homeless advocacy. Ms. Finch reminded Ms. Pehrson that any non-PNUT Board members' planning needs to be approved by the Board on the subcommittee. The Board continued to discuss the process of adding non-PNUT Board members to subcommittees.</p> <p>Ms. Cannon motioned to approve the Jordan River Subcommittee. Mr. Carroll seconded the motion. The Board unanimously voted to approve the Jordan River Subcommittee.</p>	
3. Public Comment	5:15 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>August Walker</p> <p>August Wachter, president of the Foothill Youth Baseball Association, expressed concern about the significant increase in Tier B baseball rental fees in Salt Lake City. Since 2015, fees have risen from \$2 to \$17 per hour, putting strain on their nonprofit organization. Despite the higher fees, the condition of their facilities has deteriorated, with rodent infestations, damaged infrastructure, and safety hazards. Wachter highlights the stark contrast in rental costs between city and county-operated fields, citing superior facilities at a fraction of the cost in county leagues. This discrepancy threatens the sustainability of youth baseball in the city and puts them at a competitive disadvantage. Wachter urges the board to reconsider the fee structure, emphasizing the need for equitable access to recreational opportunities and community engagement in youth sports.</p>	
<p>Bart Cocke</p> <p>Bart Cocke is with Avenue Baseball. He wanted to stress how much time and effort they put into creating a positive youth baseball experience for the kids of their community. They manage around 400-500 kids as a group and have volunteered over a thousand hours of their own time yearly to make a good community service available to the kids. He shared that community members have spoken highly of the baseball program. He wants to see the costs lowered, and they're happy to go out and help make the fields playable.</p>	
<p>Sam Haddadin</p> <p>Sam Haddadin is the president of Central City Baseball. He spoke to the comments Mr. Walker made. They don't consider themselves just baseball; they consider themselves a service to the community, which is important to them and the City. He shared that he came from a background in public health and spoke to the positive mental health impact that baseball provides to the children who play in their leagues. He shared that the fees are going up so dramatically, and the economic pressures families feel impairing their ability to provide a phenomenal baseball experience to Salt Lake City. He worries they'll lose kids to Riverton and other long-distance baseball teams.</p>	
<p>Ms. Finch let the public comment speakers know that staff will be responding to their comments, and they will be released at next month's meeting when their minutes are posted.</p>	
4. Director's Report	5:30 PM
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary of current high-priority department items. – Kristin Riker <p>Ms. Riker shared a report showing how the fees have increased over the last two years. She explained that they have gone up with consumer pricing, and the City Finance Department does that. Public Lands does not request any fee increase, and the City Council approves the fees. She</p>	5 mins

said that the avenue for advocating for adjusting fees might need to be directed in a different area, and she would love to help the public comment speakers with that. She explained that the handout is only a small selection of their fees, some of which have gone up over the past five years. The Board and staff continued to discuss fees.

Ms. Larsen shared her screen to present a website sharing information regarding the University of Utah and Sunnyside Park. Ms. Riker shared that Salt Lake City is considering leasing 1.175 acres of Sunnyside Park to the University of Utah for a new baseball stadium. In exchange for a discounted rate, the University will enhance amenities within the park, avoiding the need for a 35-foot wall in the stadium's outfield. She shared that the public benefits analysis concerns the proposed lease of 1.175 acres of Sunnyside Park to the University of Utah. The City would retain ownership, with the University paying \$1.00 per year for 99 years. However, this lease would lose one softball field and one multi-use/lacrosse field. The University has offered \$4.2 million to replace fields and enhance Sunnyside Park amenities, in addition to potential bond funding. The specific park amenities will be determined through community engagement. The City also seeks access to the baseball field and stadium when not in use by the University, along with maintaining public access to restrooms and concessions.

Ms. Riker said she wanted to make the Board aware as this was a bit of a bombshell of information. Some people are very supportive, and others aren't, but no decisions have been made. This is an analysis the City did, which the attorney's office and finance did. Public Lands helped provide information. The analysis will be forwarded to the City Council for review. There will be a hearing on February 6th and a public hearing on February 20th. Mr. Wiley asked if these meetings would be on the calendar. Ms. Riker said they will be on the Council calendar. She invited the Board to read further on the website. Staff continued to discuss this proposal.

Mr. Scrivner asked if there was an opportunity for community benefit with this proposal. Ms. Larsen shared her screen to display the design concept for the new field. Ms. Cannon asked how the \$4.2 million was a potential investment based on feasibility. Ms. Riker said they were asked what rebuilding a softball field and a multi-purpose field would take. The U offered a certain sum, and the City countered for more. Ms. Cannon said that it's just looking at the disruption of amenities and if the GO Bond would put in for additional connectivity and other issues slated for that park. Ms. Riker said there is \$750,000 from the GO Bond and the \$4.2 million if approved. The Board and staff continued to discuss the proposed project.

Ms. Riker said that the University would build this, whether or not the City agreed to any public benefits analysis. If they move forward without any extra property, there would be a 35-foot wall between the lacrosse field and the baseball stadium. The stadium would also be skewed, impacting the public right of way on Guardsman Way, which they can take as a state agency. Mr. Scrivner asked what benefit would be made to the Parks Department outside the \$1 for 99 years. Ms. Riker said use of that field and \$4.2 million to invest in the park and replace the lost fields. Ms. Cannon asked if the agreement was public. Ms. Riker said there's no agreement yet, and what's public is what's shared on the Council's webpage. The Board and staff continued to discuss the proposed projects.

5. Staff Presentations, Updates & Discussions	5:35 PM
A. Foothill Trails Presentation – Tyler Fonarow Mr. Fonarow shared his screen to display the Foothill Plan Evaluation Presentation. He handed out some handouts with some presentation information and Be WILD business cards. He introduced himself as the Recreational Trails Manager for Salt Lake City Public Lands and Trails	60 mins

and Natural Lands. He asked the Board members to hold their questions to the end unless it was a clarifying question.

Mr. Fonarow reminded the Board that before the SE Group came in to work on the evaluation, the evaluation project team had an additional consultant, SWCA. They came and did a baseline environmental and cultural evaluation report. Mr. Fonarow spoke about the background of the consultant groups. The SE Group created the process and started a technical committee in the summer of 2022 comprising the Public Lands team and City staff representatives. The technical committee primarily consisted of the Public Utilities and Engineering teams directly involved with implementing and managing the trail system. Public Utilities own many properties, and Engineering oversees any trail construction. SE Group worked with internal stakeholders, consisting of representatives of various city departments, who may be stakeholders in the plan but are not directly involved in implementing and managing Public Utilities, including the Fire Department, Police Department, Transportation Department, and Sustainability Department.

The SE Group team evaluated two subjects: the trail system plan and the implementation of Phase One. The SE Group hosted ten intake sessions with community stakeholders and groups to discuss community engagement. These groups were community councils, accessibility advocacy groups, environmental and trail user advocacy groups, the University of Utah, Utah State Parks, the US Forest Service, tribal community members, and underrepresented user groups. The attendees discussed the following key trends:

- Minimizing ecological impacts on trails, especially in sensitive areas.
- The consideration of tread erosion and water management in the design of trails.
- Retaining the physical form of trails over years of use and natural forces.
- The minimization of conflict among trail users.
- Providing a clear way of finding and navigating the trail system.
- The provision of efficient access to desirable locations.
- There is a requirement for little maintenance for trails, but they receive ongoing maintenance and management over time.

The SE Group created a working definition for sustainable trails so stakeholders could understand what makes a trail sustainable. SE Group identified four aspects that are vital to proper ecological sustainability.

- Aspect 1: the land itself. SE Group emphasized minimizing ecological impacts and trails, especially in sensitive areas.
- Aspect 2: the physical sustainability of trails. Trails must retain their physical form over years of use and natural forces.
- Aspect 3: the social sustainability of trails. Trails need to provide a straightforward way of finding and navigability through the trail system and provide efficient access to desirable locations.
- Aspect 4: the maintenance and stewardship sustainability.

Mr. Fonarow shared the summary of SE Group's report on evaluating the plan for an expanded managed trail system in the foothills. SE Group identified three significant strengths of the plan.

1. The plan included significant input from stakeholders and the public.
2. The plan identified the need for an expanded managed trail system to increase accessibility, safety, and enjoyment for users while protecting the environment.
3. The plan identified the diversity of potential users in the foothills and their needs.

SE Group also identified areas for improvement in the plan. Mr. Fonarow shared the strengths and improvements of the implementation process. He highlighted the strengths that Phase One provided, such as new trail corridors and enhanced access to new and existing users to desired destinations. Mr. Fonarow shared an example with the Bonneville Shoreline Trail (BST). It was pointed out that trenching was inappropriate for that area, and a better method was needed. It was emphasized that trails can be built on steep or challenging soils but should not be both. Mr. Fonarow discussed some of the issues that happened during Phase One implementation.

Mr. Fonarow discussed that SE Group presented seven key recommendations in their report. The report will be released online at the end of this week or early next week. These seven recommendations were categorized into three themes.

1. Theme 1: planning a more thorough process to help the project succeed. SE Group recommended conducting restoration and recreation, planning by zone, and adopting a zone-by-zone planning and implementation process.
2. Theme 2: communication process. They suggested developing and implementing a consistent public communication strategy that integrates clear wayfinding signage and information sharing.
3. Theme 3: the future maintenance and management. SE Group recommended preparing for future maintenance and management needs by increasing data use to inform decision-making and developing management plans for specific zones.

He explained how they separated the Foothills into seven different zones, called Foothills Open Space Zones (FOSZ). Proposed trail alignments assess each zone, recommended land restoration and unsustainable trail closures, wayfinding informational signage plan, proposed amenities, communications and public engagement process, maintenance plan, and budget. He gave an example of Mount Van Cott, right behind the University of Utah and others. The FOSX Planning and Implementation Process would follow:

1. Planning Process (Initiating the Project and Baseline Area Review)
2. Design Process (Site Design)
3. Implementation

SE Groups recommending existing trail evaluation should consider whether the value of existing trails outweighs natural resource impacts, whether partial or full corridor relocation can occur outside the riparian corridor, and if existing trails are to remain in place. Mr. Fonarow shared that SE Group recommended developing and implementing a consistent communication strategy alongside what staff is already doing: Rangers and Trails Maintenance Team, improving trailheads, wayfinding, and field signage, Foothills communications channels, PNUT and Community Council Coordination, and Key Stakeholder Groups for planning. Mr. Fonarow shared SE Group's suggestions for developing a unified wayfinding system. SE Group also suggested increasing data collection to be used to inform decision-making. Mr. Fonarow shared some of the practices they're using. Mr. Fonarow continued to discuss SE Group's recommendations and what Public Lands staff have done – Park Rangers dedicated to the Foothills, increased Foothills team staffing, the BeWILD campaign, and trailhead improvements underway.

Mr. Tyler Murdock, Public Lands Deputy Director, shared Public Land's next steps. Some next steps are the PNUT Board Presentation, setting up presentations with targeted stakeholder groups, briefing the Mayor's Administration, submitting a transmittal to the City Council, and a City Council presentation in March or April. Additionally, Public Lands is working towards adjusting processes as directed by the Mayor and City Council, requesting to revise the scope of work from the City Council for the remaining implementation funding, beginning a joint

Memorandum of Understanding discussion with landowners, establishing a Community Working Group (CWG) with key stakeholder groups – a PNUT representative, City Councils, environmental organizations, etc. -, and begin the process to develop first FOSZ plan. Mr. Murdock continued to discuss the next steps.

Ms. Finch asked if they would work in multiple zones at a time. Mr. Fonarow said it would be one zone at a time. When addressing the zones, Ms. Cannon asked if they would move from north to south. Mr. Fonarow referred to the report regarding the ease of implementation. He used the example of Meridian Peak as a NEPA report completed by Davis County, which is a border. Meridian Peak already has a functioning trailhead; the barriers to entry are lower from an implementation standpoint. Mr. Fonarow continued to discuss how staff will go about implementing. The Board and staff continued to discuss trail implementation. Mr. Fonarow again used Meridian Peak as an example, as multiple groups are involved in land ownership. Public Lands would work with the CWG to determine alignments, which existing trails remain open, which segments remain open, or which existing trails get restored segments. Davis County had a trail to nowhere because they needed to go through the correct due diligence to build on Salt Lake City property, which was supposed to connect to the radio tower, so that would then be finished. Then, other trails that connect merge to wherever the desired destination would be, and then any trails that should be closed.

Ms. Benally asked how involved the Indigenous Community is regarding these trials. She went on to say how there are many indigenous plants in these areas that they harvest. Mr. Fonarow wants their involvement as much as possible. He shared that staff has been working with many tribal communities with the Urban Indian Center, Division of Indian Affairs, and Ashley Cleveland from the Mayor's office on building relationships. The Board and staff continued to discuss the involvement of the indigenous community. Mr. Fonarow shared it would be beneficial to get the contacts of key individuals. Ms. Benally said the indigenous community is safeguarding a lot of indigenous knowledge where it doesn't translate, and she spoke to some of the cultural backgrounds of places in the Foothills area. Mr. Murdock said having an indigenous member on the CWG would be helpful. Mr. John said it would be good to get a list of the staff members with whom they have interacted. Mr. Fonarow said he could work with Ms. Cleveland to get that list.

Ms. Cannon asked what the main features that will unite that trail system are since they're working on it section-by-section – what's the continuity? Mr. Fonarow said it goes back to the Master Plan's goals mission, vision, and goals: sustainable, low maintenance, enjoyable, and accessible. He shared the example of the BST. Mr. Murdock said there is a lot of value in the goals outlined there. He thinks it'll be important as we start looking at the small area zones that they take the goals that are outlined in the Master Plan and make sure that everything is done for that area, but also how it interconnects listed with all the other areas. Ms. Cannon also asked how the PNUT Trails Subcommittee will be involved. Mr. Fonarow said there will be a PNUT representative at the CWG, and staff will work in whatever capacity is necessary. The Board and staff continued to discuss the CWG and community engagement. Ms. Finch asked if the CWG would have the same makeup of all the zones. Mr. Fonarow said they're still working out those details. The Board and staff continued to discuss groups and functionality options for CWG and FOSZ.

Mr. Scrivner asked what the next steps are. Mr. Murdock referenced the slideshow about Public Land's next steps. Mr. Scrivner and Ms. Cannon asked what the Board needs to do. Mr. Murdock says this would be a great discussion in the next Trails Subcommittee meeting and get feedback on what the CWG looks like. Ms. Cannon asked if there was any GO funding for the Foothills. Mr.

Murdock said no, but there is for urban trails. The Board thanked Mr. Fonarow for his work. Mr. Whittaker is excited to continue to work with them further in the Trails Subcommittee.	
B. Staff Updates – Ashlyn Larsen	5 mins
<p>Ms. Larsen reminded Board members to complete their OPMA training and submit their certificates of completion to her by the April meeting. Ms. Larsen shared her screen to display the PNUT's City webpage. Some feedback she has received was from constituents wanting the PNUT agenda. She has added a sign-up form for people to receive the agenda via email. She referenced the other websites the agendas are posted to. She invited Board members to share this link. Ms. Larsen said they also added a Public Comment section for constituents to reference on how the Public Comment section works and how to submit written comments.</p> <p>Ms. Nakamura asked if people could also get their agenda on the state's public meeting website. Ms. Larsen said yes. Ms. Cannon asked if she would want to add any deadlines for submitting comments for them to be included in the packet. Ms. Larsen said she's thought about it but wants to gauge how many she receives.</p>	
6. Board Discussion	6:40 PM
A. Review Board goals for 2024	15 mins
<p>Ms. Larsen shared her screen to display the goals the Board created during the retreat. Mr. Scrivner said it would be nice to have some formal goals the Board is working towards throughout the year and prioritize them. Ms. Cannon asked how this discussion of Board goals came to be since the Board has powers and duties it needs to fulfill. Mr. Scrivner said it could be nice to have something to go back to that the Board wants to work on. Ms. Cannon suggested having each subcommittee establish a SMART goal. Ms. Finch said she thought this discussion would be more about what's important to each Board member and why they're serving time on the Board. Mr. Carroll added he likes to know how people feel and their backgrounds. He said that the subcommittees are a part of the bigger picture of what the Board is working towards, and he wonders how they can measure their progress. Ms. Nakamura said what she took away from the retreat is that, in code, they have a broad list of things they can be more or less involved in. She thought where they were headed with the goals was to narrow down what things they wanted to spend their time working on, knowing it could be broad or narrow. Mr. Scrivner said priorities could be another way to view it, but things can change as circumstances change. Ms. Hewson asked if the subcommittees were the Board's priorities. Mr. Scrivner said that maybe the goals naturally reside in the subcommittees. Ms. Cannon said the subcommittees are their focus areas. The Board continued to discuss Board goals.</p> <p>Ms. Pehrson said a broader Board goal could be for each subcommittee to develop a goal. She also wonders what the measurable defining factors of success would be. Ms. Hewson said the goals could scale up. Within the subcommittees, you have these SMART goals, which can lead to and satisfy three large goals the Board could establish. Mr. Carroll suggested a goal that everything they do ensures acknowledgment of the indigenous groups. Mr. Scrivner asked the subcommittees to add a SMART goal to their write-ups within Google Drive. Ms. Hewson suggested looking for themes that may come out of the subcommittee goals. Mr. Scrivner asked the subcommittees to have these SMART goals by the next meeting.</p>	
B. Discuss new potential subcommittees (Urban Trails, Recreation Policies, Golf, Indigenous)	10 mins
Ms. Benally said she knows there have been talks about their being an Indigenous Subcommittee, but she would like it to have more teeth. Instead of an advisory committee or subcommittee because, as a subcommittee, they don't have a way of pushing anything forward	

and talking about things – they can't put anything into resolution. Mr. John said having something established with a little more say where they can go to the City and propose things. Ms. Benally suggests having a commission rather than a subcommittee. That way, they have a grouping of indigenous advisors doing and putting forth the work. Mr. Scrivner said this is a great idea. He asked if this is something Ms. Benally proposes to umbrella under the PNUT Board. At the retreat, they went through their powers and duties, and they didn't have the power to establish a commission like that. Ms. Benally said the request would be if the PNUT Board could write a letter of recommendation to the City Council, letting them create a commission to help other groups connect within indigenous groups. Ms. Cannon asked Ms. Benally if she could explore this option with Ms. Cleveland and bring back her findings. Ms. Cannon added that she sees indigenous knowledge and experience well connected with Public Land's purview and wants to ensure that the Board maximizes that. The Board continued to discuss an indigenous sub-committee or commission.

Mr. Wiley said having a subcommittee could still help the City and departments connect with the proper individuals and groups in projects and discussions. Mr. Carroll said he thinks they need to tell the story that an indigenous subcommittee could help tell the story and that Public Lands is a great canvas to start sharing that. He thinks everything that's done should involve an element of education in describing the history of these indigenous groups. Ms. Benally added that people don't see how these groups use the space because they keep it private for the client and want to be respectful to these groups. The Board continued to discuss an indigenous sub-committee or commission. Ms. Cannon suggested having a SMART goal to ensure more focus on the involvement of indigenous groups. Ms. Nakamura agreed, and there should be more of a lens present. Mr. Scrivner said he thinks a subcommittee would still be beneficial. The Board continued to discuss an indigenous sub-committee or commission.

Ms. Larsen shared her screen to display the draft golf's subcommittee scope of work. Ms. Cannon shared that she spoke with the director and assistant director of golf and put together a draft scope of work. She thinks it would be an ad-hoc committee as it's project-specific. She shared that they talked about the value of golf outside of just the game and the ecological value they have for the city. The subcommittee could put together a data set that quantifies the full ecological value, from water quality, tree cover, stormwater management, etc., that golf courses provide outside of just that recreational and community experience. If they can use known tools and methods to do that, the subcommittee could work with the communications subcommittee to hopefully create something that looks like an infographic or can clearly explain the full ecological benefits to everyone who lives within the city boundaries and beyond. Ms. Cannon continued to explain the work objective of the draft golf subcommittee.

Mr. Wiley asked if the benefit would be from an education standpoint or something like activating it more. Ms. Cannon said it would be twofold: educational, helping the public understand the benefits, and being able to provide some tool that quantifies that benefit in a monetary value and then have that tool available so that the public from the plant staff could potentially use it and maybe expand upon it or use it and change it. Ms. Riker said this is a way to protect green space in their urban core. She added she's learned so much about how golf courses provide natural habitats for wildlife, plants that could be harvested, etc. The Board and staff continued to discuss a golf subcommittee.

Ms. Larsen shared her screen to display the draft urban trail subcommittee. Ms. Nakamura said if people like the direction the urban trail subcommittee is heading, the next step is for Ms. Riker to talk to Transportation to see if they are interested because this subcommittee is premised on

<p>the fact that it's a joint subcommittee. If not, she'll have to rethink it. Ms. Riker said they can also talk to the Transportation Advisory Board (TAB). Ms. Nakamura thanked everyone who's been able to provide comments and feedback. Ms. Nakamura continued that if Transportation reacts favorably, the next steps would be to get a vote of support from TAB and then PNUT. Ms. Cannon asked Ms. Nakamura if she had asked Mr. Millar for input. Ms. Nakamura said no. Ms. Cannon said he would be a good person to speak with. Ms. Nakamura spoke to Ms. Finch's comment in the draft on whether it will be an ad-hoc or standing committee. She continued that based on the conversation tonight, she could see it being a longer-term subcommittee, but it's also narrower in focus, so it could be ad-hoc. Ms. Riker brought up the Mayor's State of the City last week and the Green Loop, a 10-year urban trail project, so she thinks it could be a standing committee. The Board and staff continued to discuss the urban trail subcommittee.</p>	
<p>C. Subcommittee Reporting</p>	5 mins
<p><u>Bylaws Subcommittee</u> Ms. Cannon said Bylaws may need to meet based on the evening conversations to adjust the template of proposing new subcommittees. Ms. Finch asked about the project regarding stakeholders. Ms. Larsen said they had to push it to next month because of how full the agenda was this month. Ms. Finch asked if that would be incorporated into the Bylaws and, if so, whether the Bylaws Subcommittee should wait to make any changes. Ms. Cannon said no matter, it's good for the members to meet and review the Bylaws.</p>	
<p><u>Communications Subcommittee</u> Mr. Scrivner shared that they met with Mia McCain, Communications and Engagement Manager, to review Public Land's website, all the updates she's been making, and the barriers they face with their website.</p>	
<p>D. Board comments and question period</p> <p>Ms. Pehrson said she feels they need more time for Board comments and discussion in general. Mr. Scrivner said this is more a future, quick hit discussion, something they want to do, a little deep dive on and discuss, or stakeholders might want to be here. Ms. Finch added it could be what's happening in the community they want the Board to know about, something that you want to support. Mr. Scrivner added that they won't have a robust discussion for a new topic; it's not designed to be long. Ms. Hewson asked if Ms. Pehrson had something time-sensitive. Ms. Pehrson said, for instance, when they were talking about baseball, they should save that for the Board discussion time. Ms. Hewson has the same comment on things that come up during the Public Comment. She goes through the written responses and tries to get up to date that way. That was time-sensitive. Ms. Finch agreed with Ms. Pehrson.</p>	5 mins
<p>Mr. Wiley said they saw a lot of representation here tonight regarding the baseball leagues, and he said you can imagine how this impacts the Westside regarding the fees. Mr. Wiley asked if Finances considers the maintenance of the fields. For example, you go to the Avenues and other fields, and he can see why they do when the leagues say they have to put in a lot of work. He spoke about the flooding challenges last year and asked if it was a problem, like the maintenance, or something that could be resolved. Ms. Riker agreed that last year was tough, not only with the flooding but also with how long the snow stayed so they couldn't get out there, which put staff behind all year. She spoke about how the staff gets pulled away with other stuff coming up, like vandalism in parks or park clean-up after homeless camps. She shared that one of the things they did was request 11 new staff; some went to trails, an electrician, and grounds maintenance crews. The staff has talked about using vacancy savings and requesting it to move from personnel into the operating budget. This should be on the Council agenda for a budget</p>	

amendment. The Board and staff continued to discuss operations and maintenance regarding the baseball fields.	
E. Next meeting: March 7, 2024	
F. Request for future agenda items	
Ms. Riker brought up the budget proposal for FY24/25. She asked if they wanted a presentation on the Consolidated Fee Schedule. Ms. Cannon said she'd like a link to look at it but doesn't need a presentation. Ms. Cannon asked for an updated subcommittee membership document. Mr. John brought up an unsheltered subcommittee and tapped into the skills of people on the streets. He shared some of the work he does with the unsheltered communities. Ms. Riker suggested Mr. John coordinate with the Unsheltered Services Coordinator. The Board and staff continued to discuss the unsheltered communities.	
Mr. Carroll motioned to adjourn the meeting. Mr. John seconded the motion. The Board unanimously voted to adjourn the meeting.	
7. Adjourn	7:15 PM