

Formal Meeting
Thursday, April 4, 2024
5:00 p.m. – 7:15 p.m.

Join Via Zoom: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/82243100440?pwd=RE5PeUxmdTJQbmRmREpZUTBKNmhsQT09>

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: 822 4310 0440
Access code: 301390

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 March 7, 2024 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. Board Action Items	5:25 PM
A. Review and approve Jordan River Trails Subcommittee non-PNUT Board members.	10 mins
5. Director's Report	5:35 PM
– Summary of current high-priority department items. – Kristin Riker	5 mins
6. Staff Presentations, Updates & Discussions	5:40 PM
A. High-level summary of Planning & Design projects. – Makaylah Maponga	15 mins
A. Staff Updates. – Ashlyn Larsen	5 mins
7. Board Discussion	6:00 PM
A. Subcommittee Reporting	20 mins
B. Stakeholder Presentation Update	15 mins
C. Board comments and question period	15 mins
D. Next meeting: May 2, 2024	
E. Request for future agenda items	
8. Adjourn	7:15 PM

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

Join Via Zoom: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/88436769983?pwd=Y0xPVm5yY3V2ODFzeFNma0dYaXM5Zz09>

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: +1 253 215 8782
Webinar ID: 884 3676 9983
Access code: 179959

UNAPPROVED MINUTES

1. Convening the Meeting	5:00 PM
<p>A. Call to order</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Clayton Scrivner- Aaron Wiley- Melanie Pehrson- Samantha Finch- Meredith Benally- Dave John- Talula Pontuti- Kerri Nakamura- Ginger Cannon- Brianna Binnebose- CJ Whittaker	
<p>B. Chair Comments</p> <p>Mr. Scrivner expressed how well he thought the last meeting was with ideas and discussions, and he wants to see that continue with everyone participating and with equal voice and equal participation.</p>	5 mins
2. Approval of Minutes	5:05 PM
<p>– Approve February 1, 2024 meeting minutes</p> <p>Ms. Finch motioned to approve the February minutes. Ms. Nakamura seconded the motion. The Board unanimously voted to approve the February minutes.</p>	5 mins
3. Public Comment	5:10 PM
<p>– Verbal comments are limited to no more than 3 minutes; 15 minutes total. Written comments are welcome.</p> <p>No public comment.</p>	
4. Director's Report	5:25 PM
<p>– Summary of current high-priority department items. – Kristin Riker</p> <p>Ms. Riker said a grand opening for the Riverside lights will be on Marth 28th at 4 PM this month. The Mayor will be speaking as Council Member Victoria Petro. They are excited to open the new lighting for two fields at Riverside Park. Mr. Wiley shared that one of the fields was used in the movie <i>Sandlot</i> and invited Board members to attend the grand opening.</p>	5 mins

Ms. Riker shared that the Phase One Engagement report for Warm Springs Park and North Gateway Park is on the staff's webpage and invited Board members to look at it. They saw a lot of feedback from Indigenous, Pacific Islanders, and other local communities. Staff collected this through focus groups, site walks, tabling, etc. Mr. Scrivner asked if this was bond funding and if it was for the building. Ms. Riker said it was bond funding for the park. Ms. Riker shared that the sales tax bond for the Cemetery is well underway. They are working on roadways and irrigation repairs. This is a three-year timeline, and Mr. Millar's team is working hard on it.

She also shared that the Regional Athletic Complex (RAC) has had several break-ins. Somebody stole a bunch of copper wire from the big lights on the ballfields. There was over \$100,000 worth of damage, which is unfortunate because that is their threshold for insurance, so they can't get an insurance payout. The maintenance fund will cover the damage they usually use for other projects. Public Lands has been working with police, and unfortunately, the camera died while this happened. This happened last year, and it's hard because since it's not in use, it has become a target. Staff is working with police to devise ways to prevent this from happening next year.

Ms. Riker shared that staff has completed repairs at Liberty Park Pond. The pond was drained so staff could fix the aeration system that broke, and they'll be filling it up again soon. Ms. Carmen Bailey (Public Lands Operations Deputy Director) said they took advantage of the drained pond to clean up some trees on the island and add more dirt. Ms. Riker also shared that in November, her boss, Lisa Shaffer, left the City as she had retired. Jill Robertson-Love has been hired as the new Chief Administrative Officer. She was a City Council member for 12 years. Board members complimented her on how great she is to work with.

Ms. Riker said the budget amendments proposed last month to the Council were approved. Tom Millar has been appointed the new Division Director for Planning and Design. Additionally, the Council approved improvements for the Liberty Park Greenhouse and transferred some funding for the fleet. Lastly, the Council approved the public benefits analysis, not the agreement, for the proposed project with the University of Utah and Sunnyside Park. The Board and staff continued to discuss the Sunnyside Park project.

Ms. Nakamura asked if there was a planner for Jefferson Park. Mr. Millar said that Makaylah Maponga is the project manager. There are three funding sources, and staff is working on getting all that sorted; part of the funding is from the GO Bond, CIP, and lastly, funding staff already had to replace the playground. Staff is working on determining the best approach to begin this project. Whether that's installing the playground first as a kickoff or doing all the work at once to refresh the entire park. Staff will be presenting at Town Hall on Tuesday. The Board and staff continued to discuss this project.

5. Staff Presentations, Updates & Discussions

5:30 PM

A. Budget Proposal FY24/25 – Kristin Riker or Gregg Evans

30 mins

Ms. Larsen shared her screen to display the Budget Proposal for FY24/25. Ms. Riker said they received budget direction on Tuesday last week, and some things changed, so staff had to change their formatting for the presentation. Everybody in the City now has this budget template. She will have a more polished version when she presents on March 19th.

Ms. Riker gave a high-level overview of all the divisions that comprise Public Lands and the breakdown of FTEs, Part-Time, and seasonal staff. She explained the hours Part-Time and seasonal employees can work during a fiscal year. She also shared the Public Lands organizational chart with everyone under both her and the two Deputy Directors, Tyler Murdock

and Carmen Bailey. Ms. Riker explained their current budget and proposal for the next fiscal year. Their General Fund request is \$1.9 M, and their Funding for our Future is \$169,000, which makes their total budget around \$29,957,000 M. This is subject to change based on cost-of-living adjustments for personnel. They have five budget insights (Inflationary & Contractual, New Property Maintenance, Trails & Natural Lands Division Director Appointment, Accelerating PL Projects, and Park Project Coordinator (FOF Transfer)). She also shared how they score their budget requests. The staff hasn't scored their initiatives yet as they want on Council goals. Ms. Riker continued to discuss the scoring matrix. She reviewed the summary of requested programs and the general fund cost.

She shared that the administrative budget is around \$3.5 M, which includes finance, communications, front desk team, and utilities. The department forecasts inflationary and contractual increases each year, requesting \$796,000. She explained the percentages and dollar amounts associated with utility expenses on one slide. The service provider provides Most of these, except for the contractual increases and increases negotiated with their existing agreements. Ms. Finch asked if they are paying Salt Lake City to Salt Lake City with utilities. Ms. Riker said yes, and they pay the market rate. Sometimes, they spend more when it's really dry. The Board and staff continued to discuss utilities.

Mr. Scrivner asked for clarity on the Contractual services. Ms. Riker used the example of Urban Forestry. They have a contract with a company that provides additional services for trees per unit of tree removal. These contracts include the Consumer Price Index or annual increases, like their contract with Tracey Aviary. The Board and staff continued to discuss utilities.

One slide gives an overview of the current and proposed changes to the Parks Division. Ms. Nakamura asked about the repurposed full-time employee. She assumes that's a position staff found in a different division. Ms. Riker said yes, and they'll be taking two from Parks. Ms. Riker explained that the number of insights is their priority and grouped them by division. So far, Parks' second priority is New Property Maintenance, and the fifth priority is a Park Project Coordinator. Ms. Riker said that Public Lands acquires new or rebuilt properties through CIP, impact fees, and bond funds. Some new properties were acquired from Transportation, Public Utilities, and even RDA. Examples are Marmalade Park (contractual agreement with RDA), Glendale Park Phase I, 300 West, and I Street Bike Park. Public Lands has acquired 245,288 sq/ft of new landscape and urban trails through Transportation. Public Lands is requesting funding to maintain these newly acquired properties. Ms. Riker continued to discuss new properties and growth. She also shared that Public Lands manages weed abatement requests for the City on land outside any department's portfolio. They've done this for eight years and have never been provided funding for eight years, so she is asking for the bare minimum to maintain these properties.

One slide gave a financial overview of the growth of public land. Staff needs to get maintenance funding for the upkeep and appearance, not only for these properties but also for their existing properties. This year, they are asking for \$864,850, including some upfront and one-time costs. This is why the annualized costs are a bit less. She said they had hoped this year to request an additional office technician to help with answering phones, emails, etc., to manage the growing influx of calls that they get due to increased properties. Since departments were asked not to ask for new support staff, the staff is asking to transfer one of their employees from the Cemetery. They currently have three office techs, while the Public Lands building has two. Sometimes, the cemetery needs three people so that they will work collaboratively with the cemetery. This staff member will be helping the front desk team in the Public Lands building. Ms. Nakamura asked

for clarity on the delivery date. Ms. Riker said it's the date Public Lands begins maintaining that property. Some of the listed properties were from 2023, and Ms. Riker explained that sometimes they get properties and don't have the chance to ask for funding, so they'll stretch their existing funding. Mr. John asked if there was a way for someone to purchase these unused properties. Ms. Riker said many are rights of way or green strips along the road. She said if the City does release property, it goes through a surplus property process, which then goes to the public. Mr. John said they are looking to start an Indigenous Cultural Center and are looking at different lands to see if the city could help. The board and staff continued to discuss the growth of Public Lands.

One of their asks is for a Funding Our Future (FOF) transfer to create a Parks Project Coordinator position. Two years ago, FOF received \$2M from the voter-approved tax. Last year, staff used some of that money to go towards 11 new positions in maintenance. Like Public Utilities, the Parks Division needs a Project Coordinator to develop projects. Staff was given \$2M to maintain parks, but they didn't give staff anyone to help spend that money. Last year, they used most of the funds for equipment and supplies. Public Lands gets money for asset renewal, like deferred maintenance each year. This position would help staff coordinate using that funding and get projects moving. Tyler Murdock (Deputy Director) juggles this work with his other duties. In addition, this person would also look at new projects that come to the City, such as the redesign of 2100 S or 300 W projects. Currently, one of the staff's operations managers attends those meetings to hear what they're building and ensure staff can take care of it. This position will be two-fold: 1. They'll do plan reviews and input for outside department projects. 2. They will be leading inside-department projects. Ms. Cannon asked if they've looked at what the project looks like because, in her experience, this looks like a job for at least four people. Ms. Riker said yes, but the budget is very tight. Hopefully, they'll get more money for more positions in the coming years. The Board and staff continued to discuss the Parks Project Coordinator position.

Ms. Riker said the only change for the Trails and Natural Land team is a request to repurpose one FTE for reclassification. This is the other FTE from Parks. This will be a Trails & Natural Lands Division Director appointment. Departments can reclassify positions without asking the Council unless it's an appointment position. This position is a florist position within the Parks Division. There are three full-time positions at Greenhouse, and their operations have significantly changed. About ten years ago, the Council decided that Parks would no longer propagate their plants and would purchase plants instead. This team was initially designed to grow plants and put them in the City, and they thought it would save money; it's pretty much sixes. The florist position is currently open, and it mainly focuses on planting. Staff can use part-time employees to fill that person's hours because it's not highly technical. Staff will fill that with two part-time positions from Trails & Natural Lands to cover Parks so they can take that FTE and create a Trails & Natural Lands Division Director. Ms. Riker continued to discuss the Trails & Natural Lands Division Director position.

Ms. Riker said this year, Urban Forestry is budget-neutral. Planning and Design Division asks for two positions – one senior planner and one senior landscape architect. The Planning and Design Division will deliver nearly \$200M in currently funded Public Lands projects in the next 3-20 years, excluding the Green Loop's estimated cost. The team has four planners, four landscape architects, and a Planning and Design Division Director. They do the planning, apply for funding, design, engage the public, manage consultants, coordinate across departments, oversee construction managers' work, and perform all other project oversight tasks for the department. Currently, each person has about 10-15 projects, and having two more will reduce everyone's projects to 10-12. This would help staff meet two critical goals for the City – complete landmark

<p>projects and add 94 new acres of park space from the Needs Assessment. Ms. Riker highlighted the Mayor's 2024 plan and how it relates to the Planning and Design Division:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Livability: make downtown a place for everyone 2. Capital Projects: work that needs to be done over the next ten years to manage our existing assets, help Salt Lake City grow into a major American city, and prepare for the Olympics. 3. Resiliency: We constantly strive for environmental and economic resilience to maintain our quality of life in the future. <p>Mr. Wiley asked if these requests would be year after year or one-time/temporary. Ms. Riker said it's year after year. It's not temporary, even though the bond is a 10-year situation, but impact fees keep growing, same with donations and grants and all those things that create more projects for the design team. Mr. Wiley pointed out that it seems like staff is asking for the bare minimum, and if there's a reason, they're not asking for way more and hoping to find somewhere in the middle. Ms. Riker said it's a strategy and has tried different strategies over the years. This is probably the most conservative budget she's ever asked for. The Board and staff continued to discuss the budget.</p> <p>Ms. Finch asked about how Urban Forestry's didn't request anything and how that's impacted with wage increases. Ms. Riker said wage increases have yet to be determined. There's sometimes an increase in the cost of living that the Council and Mayor approve. Since those percentages haven't been determined, they aren't included in this presentation. Ms. Riker doesn't ask for wage increases; she can ask for seasonal salary increases. Ms. Finch asked if those numbers would change based on a cost of living adjustment. Ms. Riker said yes.</p> <p>Ms. Pehrson asked where the ratings metric rubric is rated against the Reimagined Nature Plans. Ms. Riker said that most years, besides this one, since they were given a defined template, she has said how these insights relate to Reimagine Nature; this year, she didn't. This is because of the strict template. The matrix applies to every department's budget. The Board and staff continued to discuss the matrix.</p> <p>Ms. Cannon asked how Golf's budget needs are integrated into the rest of Public Land's ask. Ms. Riker, since Golf is an enterprise, its budget is presented separately from all the other divisions. Mainly, their revenues cover their expenses, so they don't ask for General Fund. Some things Public Lands does ask for are Information Management System (IMS) charges, as Golf gets charged for these. The mayor and council approve of how public land spends any extra revenue that golf has within the golf budget. Extra revenues generally go towards projects that can't ask for CIP. The Board and staff continued to discuss the Golf budget.</p>	
<p>B. Staff Updates. – Ashlyn Larsen</p> <p>Ms. Larsen reminded Board members to complete their OPMA training and to submit their certificates to her no later than the April Board meeting.</p>	5 mins
<p>6. Board Discussion</p>	6:05 PM
<p>A. Stakeholder presentations</p> <p>Ms. Larsen shared her screen to display Ms. Pontuti's write-up with suggestions on allowing stakeholders to give a longer presentation to the Board outside of the 3-minute Public Comment Period. She would love for the Board to decide if this needs to be in the Bylaws, and the other part is the language within this process. She reminded the Board that this would be available to stakeholders during regular Board meetings based on Board approval and the availability on the</p>	20 mins

agenda. This would be no longer than a ten-minute presentation, and this process would be allocated on a first-come-first-serve basis. They would only allow one presentation per meeting, with preference given to stakeholders who haven't presented to the Board within the last calendar year. All requests would have to be made online, and they would work with the Public Land's liaison. Ms. Larsen suggested adding the Chair and Vice-Chair since they help with the agenda, too. Ms. Pontuti also suggested building time for the board to discuss the stakeholder presentation afterward.

Mr. Wiley asked with the stakeholder presentations if the purpose for them to engage with the Board or with staff. Ms. Pontuti said it could be both. He referenced the baseball concerns and asked for an example. Ms. Pontuti referenced how, in the past, groups have requested to give a presentation to the Board. Mr. Wiley asked what the outcome from the Board or the staff would be. Ms. Pontuti said it could vary. Mr. Scrivner sees it as a more robust engagement exercise. Mr. Scrivner added he's concerned about the time and the pre-work. He thinks it would be a promising avenue for specific situations. He cautioned on a real-time reaction from the Board and suggested a template they could set up to respond to constituents, like the Staff Responses to Public Comment. Mr. Wiley asked if it would be the Board's responsibility to respond. He's interested in the responsibilities the Board would have and if it's something they'd need to update in their Bylaws. Ms. Finch said it allows a stakeholder or group to talk to the Board. It doesn't mean the Board has to take action or have a discussion. The Board continued to discuss stakeholder presentations.

Mr. Scrivner expressed concern about whether someone wants to present something irrelevant to parks. Ms. Pontuti said in the document that it's up to the Board's discretion. Ms. Benally asked if the stakeholders wanted a result from their presentation to the PNUT Board. Is the Board a box for them to check off? Ms. Pontuti said that could vary. Mr. Scrivner worries about tying the Board's hands and making them do something. Ms. Benally suggested including in their request if they want action from the Board. The Board and staff continued to discuss the stakeholder presentation process.

Ms. Nakamura suggested changing the language so it's a different topic each calendar year rather than the same person not coming twice. Because then you run into different people from the same group presenting back-to-back on the same subject, focusing on a different topic. Ms. Finch asked if they wanted to leave it to the Chair and Vice-Chair when creating the agenda to set the presentation on behalf of the Board. Ms. Nakamura thinks so, or else it feels a little bureaucratic, and now it's two months out until they can present. Mr. Scrivner said they could try it out.

Ms. Cannon thanked the Communications Subcommittee for their work on this. She had some concerns about how it relates to their Powers and Duties. She agrees that it may be difficult to provide this opportunity, especially when they require a presentation. That might be a format that's more familiar to some folks than others. Her concern is how they react as an advisory board to ensure that the people who have taken the time to present their concerns have those concerns addressed. Ms. Pontuti agrees and thinks they should discuss it some way as a Board. Ms. Pontuti clarified that they don't need an official text and slides—just ideas and thoughts prepared to discuss, whatever the format. Ms. Larsen mentioned that some people may bring a physical handout, and that's a disservice to Board members who may be participating online. She added that there's another level of complexity for the stakeholders, who need to get all the materials to her promptly to get those into the packet. Ms. Larsen said she could see people treating this more like an extended public comment, so there should be examples. Ms. Pehrson

said there needs to be more clarity on what a public comment is versus a presentation and what sorts of responses, if any, fall under their powers and duties. The Board and staff continued to discuss the stakeholder presentation process.

Ms. Nakamura said that once applicants in the CIP process learn that the Board is providing this opportunity, the Board will get requests during CIP. She shared that applicants were sharing CIP applications during her community council meetings because they sought community council support, even though the project wasn't in her community. Applicants knowing that the Board goes through and ranks projects, she asked how you react to that if all of a sudden you have 15 different people with 15 different projects that want ten minutes each to present. Mr. Scrivner said they could tell applicants they prefer CIP projects to go through Public Comment. The Board and staff continued to discuss the stakeholder presentation process.

Ms. Pontuti asked if this was even something the Board wanted. Ms. Riker said they might not want individual presentations, but this could be for organizations. She asked if the Jordan River Commission wanted to come and talk about what they do, the Tracey Aviary, or neighborhood parks. She added they would get Save Our Foothills, which would be great because then it would be that organization representing everyone rather than one person representing their perspective. Ms. Riker brought up Ms. Larsen's comment on that line between Public Comment. Public Comment is for individual opinions; this stakeholder presentation process could be more for organizations. Ms. Binnebose liked the idea Ms. Riker suggested, and organizations will be literate concerning the barriers to participation. She doesn't think it would be a huge barrier for them to go through a formal request process and get information, like handouts, to Ms. Larsen and the Board. She added that the individuals aren't limited because there's still that Public Comment Period. Ms. Pehrson mentioned that constituents aren't limited to Public Comments; they can talk to Board members individually and submit written comments. Mr. Scrivner said they can return these comments to the Communications Subcommittee and adjust the current write-up.

B. Subcommittee Reporting (SMART Goals)

Ms. Larsen shared her screen to display the subcommittee's SMART goals and write-ups.

Bylaws Subcommittee

Ms. Cannon went over the Bylaw's SMART Goal:

- By the end of June 2024, they will review and revise the existing bylaws for the Board, incorporate the input from relevant stakeholders, and present changes to the Board for approval.

Mr. Scrivner asked when the Bylaws made an update to the Board last time. Ms. Cannon said no and that the bylaws were passed in May 2023, and one of their commitments was to review the bylaws annually, so this timing is excellent. Ms. Nakamura complimented the Bylaws on their SMART Goal structure. Mr. Scrivner asked if there was anything else they wanted to report on. Ms. Finch said they've been discussing the Chair and whether or not there should be a statement for the Chair to say during Chair Comments regarding civility and conduct and that public comments will be addressed, provided by Public Lands staff, and will be in the meeting minutes. She shared that the City Council made a similar statement during their meetings with public comments. She said it doesn't necessarily need to be part of the bylaws but something that is said at every meeting. Ms. Riker said that the staff is working on a civility policy and wants to share it with the Board because it will apply to this meeting and have nothing to do with the bylaws. It has more to do with people being in a public building and how they treat staff and City representatives, as Board members are volunteers. It gives staff a tool to tell people they're not

30 mins

allowed to come back if staff need to. Ms. Riker said she would share it with the Board as the Policy Committee finalizes it. She added once staff gets it, they will have a sign that talks about it, like a QR code, saying, please look at the civility policy, and make sure people sign saying they have read it and agree to it. The Board and staff continued to discuss a policy and statement regarding civility and conduct. Ms. Riker will work on getting the civility policy to the Board, and Ms. Cannon said the subcommittee will make some changes with these comments. She invited the Board to review the subcommittee's notes in the folder in the shared drive. During their full presentation, Ms. Larsen asked if these changes would be an action item in April or June. Ms. Finch suggested bringing a draft for approval in June.

Jordan River Subcommittee

Ms. Pehrson said they are meeting on March 19th to hash out some SMART Goals. To report on the subcommittee, she said there's a lot of optimism, and many people are excited to get into the community. She shared that those who want to participate but aren't on the Board have their bios in the subcommittee write-up. Ms. Pehrson said they hope to get feedback from staff to ensure they best support staff. Ms. Finch asked if Ms. Pehrson would eventually ask for the Board's approval on non-board subcommittee members. Ms. Pehrson said yes. Ms. Cannon said their subcommittee could provide a template within the bylaws for board members to use when submitting these bios.

Foothills Subcommittee

Mr. Whittaker said he wasn't aware of the SMART Goal, so he didn't have one prepared. He shared they spent their last meeting discussing the SE Group reports and the public meeting the City held to talk to stakeholder groups about it. He invited the Board to review his notes. Mr. Whittaker said they still have a long way to go. The staff hasn't made trail alignments, and they acknowledge they don't have a conservation or management plan yet. There haven't been a lot of changes in the last year, and he complimented the work Mr. Fonarow has been doing. Mr. Whittaker said the Board could still advise the City on four basic topics.

1. Inventory and transparency: He shared that the subcommittee thinks there needs to be better transparency and better inventory of the trails. He suggested mapping it in GIS and is aware of other organizations doing this.
2. Recommending a conservation plan in the Foothills Trails Master Plan.
3. Education about the history: the flora and the fauna.
4. Recommend a maintenance plan: he understands developing a maintenance plan without an accurate inventory is hard.

Mr. Whittaker said that based on the presentations from Mr. Fonarow and the City, he thinks these four points are areas the Board should discuss more, and then a formal letter from the Board with their thoughts because the City starts digging. Mr. Scrivner asked if the subcommittee would like to do a ten-minute presentation to the Board. Ms. Finch said if they're asking the Board to adopt a resolution or a letter, it's appropriate that they should give a presentation to persuade the rest of the Board to adopt a resolution. Mr. Whittaker agrees but doesn't think it should be a presentation since presentations have been given, and all that information is on the City's website. He said they could give a presentation on the presentation, but the subcommittee would appreciate a discussion about the state of the Foothills. The Board and staff continued to discuss the Foothills Subcommittee.

Communications Subcommittee

Mr. Scrivner said they're looking at the next year, what they want to do, and what they want to articulate from their subcommittee to impact the board and interact with the community. Their goal:

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Elevate the Board's capacity to lift the Communication team's mission by connecting with constituents that the Board members may have a unique ability to reach. <p>He mentioned how they can reach people who aren't always showing up or getting involved. This board represents a lot of different interests, and he said they wanted a goal that encourages board members to access their unique connections and reach more constituents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Searching for opportunities to assist staff and elevate engagement with sectors not often heard from. - Make an effort and identify at least one opportunity to forward this goal at some point in the calendar year - Actively coordinate with other Board members when it makes sense - Reach out to staff for assistance identifying opportunities and remember to set attainable goals for yourself. - Track your efforts with the Communications Subcommittee and report once a year at the annual Board retreat. <p>Mr. Scrivner referenced when Ms. Cannon had an "Ask Me Anything" jacket and interacted with members of the public. This is just one idea of how board members can get creative when interacting with constituents. Ms. Cannon asked about the timeline. Mr. Scrivner said by the end of the year.</p>	
<p>C. Board comments and question period</p> <p>Ms. Nakamura shared she's been working with the Transportation Division on the Urban Trails Subcommittee. They asked her if she could expand her subcommittee to include soft surface trails. She told them no, that's not what this subcommittee focuses on; it's for hard surface trails that connect as part of the transportation system. Ms. Nakamura will present to the Bicycle Advisory Committee on March 18th, and there is a Foothills Subcommittee. She said the Bicycle Advisory Committee wants to be involved with the Foothills Subcommittee. Ms. Nakamura invited Mr. Whittaker to join that meeting to speak about what the Foothills Subcommittee is doing and have representation on his subcommittee. Mr. Whittaker said he is happy to join. Ms. Nakamura said that after meeting the Bicycle Advisory Committee, she will meet with the Transportation Advisory Committee Board in April and can submit her subcommittee for approval to the Board in May.</p> <p>Ms. Pehrson asked regarding the budget and if there's an action the Board needs to take to support staff. Ms. Riker said they can put in a letter if they want. It's been done in the past. Her presentation to the Budget Committee with the Mayor's office is March 19th, and she imagines her presentation to the Council will be sometime in May, possibly June. By that time, the budget is pretty well set.</p> <p>Mr. Wiley shared that he met with Ms. Bailey today, and they are putting together a Recreational Athletics Subcommittee. They are working to submit all the information and are hoping to discuss it at the next board meeting.</p>	5 mins
<p>D. Next meeting: April 4, 2024</p>	
<p>E. Request for future agenda items</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Recreational Athletics Subcommittee - Approval for non-PNUT Board members on the Jordan River Subcommittee - Urban Forestry update for May <p>Ms. Pehrson said having an overarching status report on major projects would be nice. It doesn't need to be detailed. Ms. Riker said staff will bring things to the Board they have designed. It's not</p>	

<p>precisely what Ms. Pehrson is asking for, but the staff has made updates on Glendale, the Green Loop, and various other projects. The staff has presented on projects as they go towards the design and even public engagement. Ms. Pehrson said she would like a virtual or an actual trip to see the places. Ms. Larsen said this request has been brought up before, and we have run into OPMA issues, quorum issues, transportation, etc. She said they could schedule smaller groups, which is a lot of staff time.</p> <p>Ms. Cannon said she has still been working through the golf-related work on an environmental evaluation of the courses. She still needs to have some conversations, and she hopes that April is when she can bring that committee forward to the Board for approval.</p> <p>Ms. Benally requested to be on the agenda in May regarding the Indigenous Subcommittee/Commission as she wants to educate and get support from the Board.</p> <p>Ms. Nakamura motioned to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Pehrson seconded the motion. The Board unanimously voted to adjourn the meeting.</p>	
<p>7. Adjourn</p>	<p>7:15 PM</p>