

Formal Meeting
Thursday, June 6, 2024
5:00 p.m. – 7:15 p.m.
Join Via Zoom:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84163309156?pwd=nEjv1qq7L3LTQgE0jh0UTC2TJvcRw.DVzAcJ6goGYCTeJW>

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: 841 6330 9156
Access code: 347149

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 May 2, 2024 minutes	5 mins
3. Public Comment	5:10 PM
– Verbal comments are limited to 3 minutes maximum, 15 minutes total. Written comments are welcome.	
4. Action Items	5:25 PM
A. Review and approve updated Bylaws	5 mins
B. Review and approve the Stakeholder Presentation Process	5 mins
5. Director's Report	5:40 PM
- Summary of current high-priority department items. – Kristin Riker	5 mins
6. Staff Presentations, Updates & Discussions	5:45 PM
A. Emerald Ribbon – Makaylah Maponga	30 mins
B. Staff Updates. – Ashlyn Larsen	5 mins
7. Board Discussion	6:20 PM
A. Subcommittee Reporting	15 mins
B. Board comments and question period	10 mins
C. Next meeting: August 1, 2024	
D. Request for future agenda items	5 mins
8. Adjourn	7:15 PM

Formal Meeting
Thursday, May 2, 2024
5:00 p.m. – 7:15 p.m.

Join Via Zoom: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/87187749982?pwd=K2gydXp2VmI0OEczNEpYUThqQzNvdz09>

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: 871 8774 9982
Access code: 591844

UNAPPROVED MINUTES

1. Convening the Meeting	5:00 PM
A. Call to order - Phil Carroll - Clayton Scrivner - Samantha Finch - Ginger Cannon - Meredith Benally - Brianna Binnebose - Talula Pontuti - Melanie Pehrson - Kerri Nakamura - Aaron Wiley - Jenny Hewson	
B. Chair Comments Mr. Scrivner shared that he's been thinking a lot about constituent services/customer services, and he was reading the written public comment regarding the bathrooms and how he appreciated the staff response. He continued to share an example of a friend who had issues at Liberty Park over the past month, and Mr. Scrivner encouraged him to reach out to staff. Mr. Scrivner also asked Board members for feedback on how he could be a better chair.	5 mins
2. Approval of Minutes	5:05 PM
– Approve April 4, 2024, meeting minutes Ms. Nakamura asked Ms. Larsen if she received her comments on updating the minutes. Ms. Larsen said yes. Ms. Nakamura motioned to approve the April minutes. Ms. Pehrson seconded the motion. The Board unanimously voted to approve the April minutes.	5 mins
3. Public Comment	5:10 PM
– Verbal comments are limited to 3 minutes maximum, 15 minutes total. Written comments are welcome.	
4. Board Action Items	5:25 PM
A. Cancelling July Meeting Mr. Scrivner brought up this, which has come up over the years: sometimes, the July meeting gets canceled, and sometimes, it doesn't. He shared with other boards he's served that the July meeting tends to be canceled, especially with everyone out of town. Ms. Cannon motioned to cancel the July meeting. Ms. Cannon asked if canceling the July meeting would impact the latter half of the year with CIP. Ms. Larsen said no, as CIP starts around August/September, with August	5 mins

being the earliest. Ms. Cannon resubmitted her motion to cancel the July meeting. Ms. Nakamura seconded the motion. The Board unanimously voted to cancel the July meeting.	
B. Urban Trails Subcommittee Creation Ms. Larsen shared her screen to display the Urban Trails Subcommittee write-up. Ms. Nakamura said she got her dates wrong when presenting to the Transportation Advisory Board (TAB) for their approval concerning PNUT's approval. Ms. Nakamura suggested that they could approve the Urban Trails Subcommittee with the contingency of TAB wanting to participate. That way, in June, the Board can approve the non-PNUT subcommittee members to avoid delays. Ms. Nakamura said Ms. Cannon and Mr. Whittaker attended the Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC) in April. The biggest issue they had initially raised was wanting to include soft trails in addition to urban trails. They informed the BAC that they already have a subcommittee working on those trails and that they focus on hard urban trails. Ms. Cannon shared some feedback they received from BAC to tighten the scope of work. She said they'll make those modifications in the document. Ms. Nakamura said they could ask the committee to help tighten that scope and then come up with a SMART goal, which she is excited about as the SMART goal is one of the Reimagined Nature Plan. Ms. Nakamura said it would be helpful to approve the subcommittee creation today, subject to TAB's meeting following Monday, so they can begin moving forward with the following steps rather than waiting to create the subcommittee in June. The Board is off in July, and then they're through the end of the summer. The Board continued to discuss the Urban Trails Subcommittee. Ms. Pehrson motioned to approve the Urban Trails Subcommittee subject to the approval from TAB's meeting on Monday. Ms. Finch asked if the write-up included non-PNUT Board members. Ms. Nakamura said that's what she would bring back in June from TAB and BAC. Mr. Scrivner asked if the hard surface trails included hard surface trails within parks. Ms. Nakamura said it would be in public right-of-way, 9-Line, McClelland, etc. Ms. Cannon said it's focusing on what the Bicycle Master Plan to the City indicates, which is hard service trails. Ms. Pontuti seconded the motion. The Board unanimously voted to approve the formation of the Urban Trails Subcommittee, subject to TAB's participation. Ms. Pehrson would like to participate in this subcommittee.	10 mins
5. Director's Report	5:40 PM
- Summary of current high-priority department items. – Kristin Riker Mr. Murdock was present in place of Ms. Riker. Mr. Murdock shared that the staff is working out a way to support subcommittees most effectively and efficiently. Mr. Murdock reminded the board of the request form Ms. Larsen shared, and he told board members that if they want staff to attend that monthly meeting, they should submit it via the form. Ms. Binnebose asked whether she would only attend the Communications Subcommittee meetings if they requested it. Ms. Larsen said the agenda can be resolved via email, and they can use the form if they want something specific outside of the agenda. Ms. Binnebose said they've always had a standing request to have staff come if there are opportunities for the Communications Subcommittee to provide input. Ms. Larsen said the Communications Subcommittee could identify specific things they'd like staff to share and communicate; it would help the subcommittee lead their agendas more rather than staff coming and not having something specific to address; this is the direction staff is heading. Ms. Binnebose asked if the staff would tell the Communications Subcommittee when the staff was planning for communications, planning, and engagement. This was the advantage of having staff at those meetings. The Board and staff continued to discuss the staff request form.	5 mins

Mr. Murdock shared that the Mayor will release her proposed budget on May 7th at 7 PM. This will include much information related to recommended and approved CIP projects. Several Public Lands projects were recommended for the CDCIP Board and then formally recommended to the Mayor's budget. He also shared a handful of recent break-ins to the building. There was one break-in and two attempted break-ins, so staff is considering locking the door on the evenings of PNUT starting at 5:30 PM. They'll place a sign on the door with information on who to call if they come after.

There are a few updates for Planning. One is Rotary Playground at Liberty Park is getting a makeover using funding from the Reimagine Neighborhood Parks General Obligation Bond. Last summer, staff engaged with the community to learn what additions and improvements park users want to see. Much of the feedback was for a playground that is accessible for all children, all ages, and all abilities with features that encourage exploration through imaginative play, as well as natural open space concepts, shade structures, improving lines of sight for children's safety, etc. Using this feedback, the team created three design concepts. This survey went live yesterday. There will be in-person planning exercises on May 17th from 4-6 PM, May 20th from 11 AM – 1 PM, and May 25th at the playground as an opportunity to talk with the planners and design team on site.

Mr. Murdock said that as part of the Reimagined Neighborhood Parks Project, the staff is trying to leverage that funding source as best they can. So planners often seek matching funds, which they have done with Taufer Park due to a donation from Kaboom, Delta Airlines, and the Jazz to fund a new playground at Taufer Park. This will begin this summer and is an intro to future improvements that will happen next year. There is a volunteer callout for anyone interested from May 30th – June 1st. Mr. Scrivner asked if someone from the Board could be there as he won't be able to attend as he's the D4 representative.

Mr. Murdock shared some events over the last month, including the grand opening of the 9-Line Community Orchard. This is the first of two phases of the new community orchard project along the 9-Line Trail with TreeUtah. Staff is currently looking for donations and fundraising for phase two. He reminded the Board that special event season is here and invited the Board to visit the event's website. Ms. Larsen added those events to the PNUT calendar. Mr. John said that the orchard update needs to be corrected because it's not the first orchard space, and he listed a few. Mr. Murdock said that's fair and was probably intended for City-sponsored and funded community orchards.

Mr. John asked if there were any updates for Liberty Park and the unsheltered with all these improvements going on. If the Board would like that discussion, Mr. Murdock said that's a topic staff could return and present. Mr. John noted some feedback he heard about police vehicles driving on the grass and affecting the landscaping. Mr. Murdock said there's a lot of inappropriate vehicle use at Liberty Park, and staff is looking at a few options to mitigate that. Mr. Scrivner told Mr. John that if he had a topic he'd like to hear more from staff, he should let the Communications Subcommittee know as they prepare the agenda. The Board and staff continued to discuss Liberty Park.

Ms. Nakamura said a list of CIP projects was circulated that they thought was the Mayor's recommended budget. She asked if that list was going to be dramatically different. Mr. Murdock said he needed to figure out what list she saw, but what typically occurs is when the CDCIP Board list is released, and they make their recommendations in February. Most often, the mayor closely follows the list recommended by the CDCIP Board. On average, there are probably one to three

projects either added by the Mayor's administration or City Council staff at a later point. It's rare to see anything removed from the list, but Mr. Murdock only wants to share the final list once the Mayor's budget comes out. The Board and staff continued to discuss the CDCIP applications.

Mr. Scrivner asked if there were any updates on Sunnyside Park. Mr. Murdock said, in short, the City Council approved a below-market lease for Sunnyside Park. The City is still working with the University on a lease agreement, which has yet to be finalized.

6. Staff Updates

5:45 PM

A. Urban Forestry Update – Tony Gliot

30 mins

Ms. Skaggs shared her screen to display the Urban Forestry presentation. Mr. Tony Gliot introduced himself as the Urban Forestry Division Director. Urban Forestry has two separate but complementary work groups. The first group is the arborist team, the boots to the trees, and the ones physically maintaining trees and completing service requests. The second work group is the service coordination team, service writers, and program and policy administrators. They are vital in ensuring the operations team functions effectively and efficiently. They are the connection between the lives of trees and people in this city. They will introduce themselves later on, as well as their favorite trees. Mr. Gliot said his favorite tree is a Bur Oak Tree.

Ms. Megan Roy introduced herself as one of the Service Coordinators; she's been with the City for about two years. She relocated to Salt Lake City from the Boston area for the mountains and to pursue her arboriculture career. Her favorite tree is a Ginkgo. She shared that she will be presenting what an urban forest is and why Salt Lake City's urban forest is so unique and special. Urban Forestry manages the trees in City parks and the city streets. Urban Forestry has an inventory of 91,000 trees; this doesn't include trees in natural areas, trails, and private residences. There are 69,000 street trees and 22,000 parks and golf course trees. The operations team regularly deals with the street trees. Salt Lake City's urban forest is unique because people plant 250+ unique species. Ms. Roy continued to discuss the history of Salt Lake City's urban forest. She went on to list all the benefits trees provide.

Ms. Makenzie Skaggs introduced herself as a Service Coordinator. She has been with the City since April 1st. She is originally from a small town in Illinois called Maple City, so her favorite tree is the Maple Tree. Ms. Skaggs shared that she will be discussing what the urban forest needs and what service coordinators do to fulfill the needs of the urban forest. The top things trees need are sunlight, water, and maintenance. She said there are many movements to conserve water in the Salt Lake Valley, which is essential, but she informed everyone that any water given to a tree is well-spent. Trees do a great job of regulating water and giving it back to the community. Urban Forestry strives to create an environment for trees and humans to coexist. Part of this is keeping the trees maintained. Ms. Skaggs, the most essential trees need people to participate in watering trees and communicating with Urban Forestry if a tree needs maintenance. She explained the role of service coordinators. They are the first point of contact for service requests; they inspect every request and ensure proper maintenance, provide personalized tree care to resident needs, and are the decision-makers. Ms. Skaggs continued to discuss the role of service coordinators.

Ms. Skaggs highlighted the services provided in 2023, around 5,600:

- Planting: 2,501 new trees
- Pruning: 3,596
- Removals: 1,775
- Stump Grinding: 968
- Emergency Response: 501

Mr. Nathaniel Orbock introduced himself as the Services Supervisor. He emphasized the importance of growing and maintaining the urban forest, which relies on the community's citizens. He explained that success for his team is measured by getting people involved and engaged. Much of this engagement is done through written communications, formal communications such as the watering calendar, daily interactions with citizens, and maintaining friendly, responsive, and professional services. Mr. Orbock said he changed their new tree planting program. They used to plant twice a year, in spring and fall, which led to several issues when people turned on or off their irrigation early or late. The team has switched to a dormant planting program from November to April. He shared that this has been successful in Colorado, and they hope to emulate that program here. Mr. Orbock said they've also updated their tree planting application. It's not significantly more complicated, but they're asking people to commit to caring for a tree by filling out an application; it's one more step in getting engagement. Urban Forestry plants around 2,000 trees annually.

Ms. Nakamura asked if someone wants a street tree and needs irrigation to their park strip and if staff teaches them how to water their tree so they can still participate. Mr. Orbock said yes, and part of the application is asking the constituent how they will water their tree, and there's a bulleted list you can choose from, from hand watering with a hose, watering with a bucket, or dedicated tree watering. Staff will also walk people through how to do all of those. Mr. Orbock reemphasized that the hard part is getting the community to buy into taking care of the trees. Last year, the "Keep Your Cool" campaign was launched as an educational and outreach campaign. The main focus is getting people to be a part of the legacy of tree planting. Mr. Orbock highlighted some of the projects and programs:

- Removals and Wood Reutilization
- Pruning and Plant Health Care
- Classes and Continuing Education
- Tabling, Volunteer Events, Tree Tours, etc.
- Cemetery Arboretum

He explained that the Cemetery Arboretum is their biggest educational tool, and an arboretum is a collection of trees explicitly grown for scientific education and aesthetic purposes. Staff designed a collection of trees at the Salt Lake City Cemetery, the Mark Smith Memorial Arboretum. They have 111 unique species, each with its tag with the tree's name and a QR code that links to a web page with more information. Staff also does educational tours there.

Mr. John shared that TreeUtah partners up with KRCL to sponsor a tree for part of a fundraiser, and he said it'd be nice to have something similar in place if someone wants to plant a tree for a relative or someone and include a plaque. Mr. Orbock said people wish to put plaques on trees, and the City has its own rules regarding where to put plaques, and that's a separate discussion. Mr. Orbock highlighted the discussion and explained that the next step is to protect what we have. He introduced Mr. Rick Nelson as the Tree Preservation Coordinator. Mr. Nelson shared that he'd lived in Salt Lake City his entire life and began his career with the City in 2001 as an operations arborist. A lot of what he does is:

- Review building permits to try and ensure the plan developments include a tree preservation plan
- Site inspections and meetings
- Issue tree work permits
- Risk assessment and appraisals
- Technical advisory committees

Mr. Carroll asked if Urban Forestry puts the blue dots on the trees. Mr. Nelson said those are placed there by the Mosquito Abatement Group, and they're trying to find where mosquitoes

breed. He highlighted some tree preservation challenges, such as 'the trees are in the way,' 'we'll replace it when the project is done,' limited spacing requirements to grow trees, internal conflicts, and water-saving campaigns. He emphasized that trees are very efficient water users, and the benefits received from trees are far more than the cost of water. Mr. Scrivner asked what the power company does to the trees if that's an aesthetic or actual threat. Mr. Nelson said it could cross the line. He shared that many trees can be planted beneath power lines; they try to ensure their planting of suitable species in the right place. The Board and staff continued to discuss the issues with trees and the power company.

Ms. Nakamura asked regarding permitting a developer's plan to require street trees in the plan and what authority the City has to go back later and say they didn't maintain the trees. Mr. Nelson noted that they have little authority to do things right now. Mr. Nelson shared and highlighted what Urban Forestry is doing for the future of tree protection:

- Updating the Urban Forestry code and policy
- Creating new specifications
- Changing fees
- Gaining enforcement authority

Mr. Gliot let the board know if they want a deeper dive into any of these topics, and the staff is happy to come back and give another presentation. He reemphasized how great Mr. Nelson is at dealing with developers and engineers. Ms. Hewson thanked Mr. Gliot for the wonderful presentation and complimented how well his staff did. Ms. Hewson asked if there's a revisitation process when a tree is planted in a park strip or in front of someone's house after it's been planted to assess how well it's doing. Mr. Gliot said yes, and that process is constantly developing. The staff's process is that after they plant a tree, a few months later, they'll drop off a watering bag; once the season is underway, they put a tree tag on it that tells you how to water, and they also engage residents at that time. The staff also pushes out regular social media posts with educational content. Around year two, they complete a mortality survey to assess how well the trees are doing. He shared that most of the time, when a tree doesn't make it, 95% of the time, it's because it wasn't watered appropriately. He shared that the staff is out daily in the summer assessing the trees and will share educational content with residents.

Ms. Hewson asked if there's anything in the City code regarding a permitting review and if PNUT can do anything to help. Mr. Gliot said there are a few ordinances that pertain to City trees. The one Urban Forestry administers directly is the street tree ordinance, which covers who can do what to a tree and where responsibility lies. Still, there's no enforcement Urban Forestry can do now, but they are actively working on requesting updates to the code. He shared a recent update to a park strip landscaping code that requires any new development to have space for trees and design watering. The board and staff continued to discuss ordinances related to tree enforcement.

Ms. Benally asked what staff does with trees that need removal, as Indigenous communities often use those for ceremonial purposes, specifically Cottonwood trees. It would be great to have those available for them to utilize as they understand what the purpose is and what they use it for. Mr. Gliot said he would love to connect on this as they love giving trees a second life. Currently, staff is participating with Hogle Zoo to provide them with wood from the forests for new exhibits. He shared that the staff took a delivery of Cottonwood trees that they had grown from the biggest, oldest Cottonwood tree in Fairmont Park. They took cuttings from those trees and developed new trees out of them; 11 will be going to different places around the City.

Ms. Finch asked about the water bags, if the design has changed if it is proving to be more effective, or if the staff is experimenting. Mr. Gliot shared that his biggest concern with the tree bags is how people think they should water the tree, fill it, and leave it. He shared that staff educates the community to fill the bag by watering the tree and filling it as it will continue to water over the next few hours. The team doesn't love the bag, but it's a great opportunity for staff to keep watering people's minds, and the messaging on the bag has evolved because of it. Ms. Cannon said the Board would like to know when staff will go before the City Council regarding code and policies so that the Board can write a letter of support or testify in front of them. Mr. Gliot said staff has been working on code updates and getting those ready for the public to see, and they will be bringing this in front of the Board before it's taken up before the City Council. He said they hope they'll be ready to bring that forward by the end of summer. They have a new employee starting next month with direct experience in code administration, and their primary projects will be comparing effective codes in the country to draft a code for Salt Lake City. Ms. Cannon asked about the value of the entire inventory of trees and if that's something the public can see to help them understand the value of their single tree and how it fits into the whole urban forest. Mr. Gliot spoke to the current mapping on their website and the database shown. The Board and staff continued to discuss tree data. Mr. Orbock shared that the annual return of benefits trees provide is around \$5 million; it's not the value of the tree but the value of shade, stormwater mitigation, etc. The Board and staff continued to discuss tree value. Mr. Carroll asked what the best way to water a tree is. Mr. Gliot shared that there's no one right way to water a tree. The Board and staff continued to discuss tree watering. When discussing the code with the City Council, Ms. Binnebose discussed ensuring they get an appropriate value on a tree based on its intrinsic benefits. She talked about providing education about how to plant trees better to avoid loss in the future. The Board and staff continued to discuss code updates and the value of trees.	
B. Staff Liaison Update. – Ashlyn Larsen Ms. Larsen said she's still awaiting OPMA certificates from Mr. John and Ms. Benally. She shared that she is working with division directors to create a schedule outside of CIP for directors to come and give regular updates to the Board. Ms. Nakamura commented on how engaging the Urban Forestry presentation was. The board commented on how well all the Urban Forestry presenters did and how supportive Mr. Gliot is of his team.	5 mins
7. Board Discussion	6:20 PM
A. Indigenous Presentation Ms. Larsen shared her screen to display the Indigenous Presentation. Ms. Benally explained that she's sharing this information and requesting the Board's support to create a commission with the overall City. The mission statement would be something like "Building and strengthening Indigenous representation and Indigenous Knowledge" and then incorporate that into any department or division they speak to. Ms. Benally explained the differences between a committee and a commission. She shared some of the tribal seals that are part of the State of Utah. She shared that they do not understand borders but share the space. The purpose of the commission is to make recommendations to City Departments, City Council, and the Mayor on issues directly affecting the tribes of Utah. She shared that the proposed commission would want the tribes of Utah relationships honored to incorporate indigeneity, serve as culturally grounded advisors, guide system transformation, plan & evaluate, and foster thriving communities. Mr. Scrivner asked what indigeneity means. Ms. Benally said it's learning to understand what indigenous communities are. The Board continued to discuss indigeneity.	10 mins

Ms. Benally said if you can answer the question, "Why are we the ones to solve the problem we identify?" you'll understand how language and indigenous plants, traditions, and culture are incorporated. She referenced back to the Urban Forestry discussion regarding trees and indigenous uses. All of these points are wrapped up in culture. Indigenous land stewardship is generational knowledge. They already know how to take care of the land because the land has always taken care of them. Ms. Benally continued to discuss indigenous language, plants, traditions, and culture. She shared the topics of interest the proposed commission would address:

- Public Art Commission
- Indigenous events
- Education (language, culture, tradition)
- Indigenous library
- Website
- Rights of individuals or community (restoration, repatriation, conservation lease)

She highlighted some of the issues they face:

- Indigenous ceremonies (providing space, protection, education)
- Bias (approach, address of issues, resolution)
- Decolonization & Visibility (psychological, economic freedom of expression)
- Correction of Utah's history with Indigenous communities

Ms. Benally shared some examples of US cities that have successful Indigenous Commission:

- Duluth Minnesota
- Seattle Washington
- Flagstaff, Arizona

Ms. Benally said it would be great to get a letter of support from the PNUT Board to take to the City to form a commission and keep the PNUT Board representation here. Ms. Binnebose asked if the commission would address not only open space but all the other potential impacts of some of the issues Ms. Benally shared on a larger scale. Ms. Benally said yes. Ms. Nakamura asked if Ms. Benally has thought about how a city commission might interface with the State of Utah and their work through the Tribal Council. Ms. Benally said there is a Utah Division of Indian Affairs, and what they do is more politically driven so that federal legislation is affected. In contrast, this commission would be urban grassroots, with more community involvement. Ms. Cannon asked what Ashley Cleveland thinks of the commission, how it fits within the ordinance, or if something is in place. Ms. Benally said she'd reach out to Ms. Cleveland so she could help with getting it to the mayor and passing, but otherwise, they can speak for themselves and get the process going. They need to be educated on those processes. The Board continued to discuss a letter of support to form an Indigenous commission and the presentation.

Ms. Nakamura asked if other Boards and commissions have indigenous representation membership requirements. Ms. Benally said just the PNUT Board. Ms. Cannon confirmed that the website said PNUT is the only board with a required indigenous representation. Ms. Finch asked if they are still considering an Indigenous Subcommittee within PNUT. Ms. Benally said it would be great since she and Mr. John are already here, but she thinks it would be best to work with the commission, too. The board offered its support to help with this.

B. Bylaws Discussion

Ms. Larsen shared her screen to display the Bylaws draft. Ms. Finch said the Bylaws subcommittee will meet soon to accept the changes and comments from Board members and bring a final draft to be approved by June. Ms. Larsen referenced her comment regarding PNUT members participating virtually in meetings. She shared that when she submits the meeting

10 mins

recording to the recorder's office, she can only upload the audio so that when the board is voting, it doesn't catch board members raising their hands. She suggested changing the language to "must." The Board and staff discussed remote participation. Ms. Finch referenced Ms. Hewson's comment regarding SMART goals and putting together a template for creating a subcommittee. Some people don't know their SMART goal until they've formed their subcommittee. Ms. Finch said adding a footnote indicating the SMART goal can be updated. The Board continued to discuss SMART goals. Ms. Finch said the link referencing the form template is incorrect, but they will update it. Ms. Larsen shared her screen to display the template for subcommittee creation. The Board discussed the template.

Ms. Larsen shared her screen to display the Bylaws draft. Ms. Cannon said she would like to flesh out subcommittee members who are not PNUT Board members. Ms. Finch referenced Ms. Hewson's concerns regarding this. The total number of PNUT Board subcommittee members must be less than a quorum. Ms. Cannon said that in the last meeting, they discussed people who aren't on the PNUT Board as subcommittees. She said they have specific requirements the Board asks of them, but they don't go through the same training nor have the same kind of restrictions. She thinks there's a philosophical divide in the Board around including non-board members and if they take their recommendations back to the Board or if it's PNUT alone. This doesn't mean they can't consult other experts, but not having them as official members. Ms. Finch said it's her understanding they have non-Board members on the subcommittee, and the Bylaws outline the expectations when a subcommittee wants to bring on non-Board members, such as "...must hold specific and unique expertise that warrants their inclusion as a subcommittee member". Ms. Nakamura thinks they should include non-board members as it broadens the voice and the thought process for the subcommittee work. Ms. Pehrson said there's more buy-in/investment if they're on the subcommittee as an official member. The Board continued to discuss non-board members on subcommittees.

Ms. Finch suggested they could have something written to share with non-Board members, informing them that being on a subcommittee does not make them a PNUT member; they can be revoked from the subcommittee and defining a time limit. Ms. Nakamura agrees about the time limits, as PNUT members are limited in time. Ms. Cannon said she thinks having a template for these people to complete outlining all this could be helpful. The Board continued to discuss non-Board member time limits and non-Board members on subcommittees. Ms. Finch referenced the section of department staff taking part in a subcommittee and are subject to the approval process, which has never taken place, so they will change that to say staff may be members of a subcommittee period. They will also include a note about requesting staff at their subcommittee meetings and include the link to that form.

Ms. Finch referenced the section within public involvement regarding public comment and having the Chair read some sort of public involvement expectation during PNUT Board meetings. They Bylaws will work on shortening it. Ms. Cannon asked where this section came from. Ms. Finch said it was from the original first set of bylaws the Bylaws subcommittee worked with the City attorneys. Ms. Finch said it pertains to Board members, but why reinvent the wheel when it can also be outward-facing when taking public comments? Ms. Cannon added that it's also language they can adapt for their subcommittees for non-Board members. Ms. Finch said they could add it to the template. The Board thanked the Bylaws subcommittee for their work on the bylaws.

C. Stakeholder Presentation Review

5 mins

Ms. Larsen shared her screen to display the Stakeholder Presentation Process write-up. Ms. Pontuti thanked everyone for their comments and said she's responded to all the comments that have been submitted. She hopes to pass some of the language on to the Bylaws group and further develop the forms. This would be basic information to know how the Board wants to communicate this information to the public and what they want upfront in the request form. Ms. Pontuti shared Ms. Hewson's comment on having a notice period. Ms. Hewson asked when the agenda has to go out. Ms. Larsen said that according to OPMA, it needs to be posted within 24 hours. The Board requests the agenda within their bylaws at least once in advance. Ms. Pontuti said that within this process, the request must come at least a month before the meeting. The Board liked this expectation. Ms. Pontuti referenced the comments of multiple presenters. She thinks they should keep it one per meeting. Ms. Cannon asked if there would be a time limit. Ms. Pontuti said yes, and it would be 10 minutes on a first come first serve basis. Ms. Pontuti referenced the section on ensuring the Board is hearing various topics from various voices. Ms. Larsen asked if defining organizations and stakeholder groups would be helpful. Ms. Cannon said that's a great question. Ms. Cannon wants to ensure they aren't setting themselves up to make community members angry that they can't get on the agenda. Ms. Hewson said that if they limit it to a defined organization or stakeholder group, they won't necessarily hear all the voices because certain groups won't fit into that category. Mr. Scrivner said that as long as the Board has discretion and the information presented is pertinent to Board business. The Board continued to discuss the stakeholder presentation process. Ms. Pontuti will bring a final draft for approval at the next meeting. Ms. Cannon shared that she doesn't think it needs to go into the bylaws and that she'd like to see it on a pilot basis. The Board continued to discuss the stakeholder presentation process in relation to the Bylaws.	
D. Subcommittee Reporting <u>Foothills Subcommittee</u> Mr. Carroll said Mr. Fonarow has been great to work with and hopes they've provided staff with some helpful input to do his job better. There was no meeting this last month. <u>Communications Subcommittee</u> Ms. Larsen shared her screen to display the last Communications subcommittee meeting notes. Ms. Binnebose said they shared their agenda comments with Ms. Larsen. They continued to work through the stakeholder presentation process and are ready for discussion tonight. She said they had a general discussion about notifying the public about this new process. They suggested sending it out in monthly newsletters and social media posts and discussed how the subcommittee might assist the City with getting this tool out. Ms. Larsen said this is an excellent example of using the staff request form for subcommittee meetings. Ms. Binnebose shared that they are working on their SMART goal, and she said it would help prep for the annual retreat to have a Google form to track each subcommittee's SMART goals. She also suggested automated reminders to remind Board members to update their SMART goals. Ms. Nakamura asked if the Communications subcommittee plays a role in the staff newsletter. Ms. Binnebose said no, but they could. The Communications subcommittee continued to share updates. <u>Jordan River Trail Subcommittee</u> Ms. Larsen shared her screen to display the notes from the last Jordan River Trail subcommittee. Ms. Pehrson said Mr. Soren Simonsen shared some resources to help them with their goals for the year, which she would like to run past staff. Ms. Hewson said they have detailed notes from	15 mins

the last meeting in their folder. Ms. Pehrson is excited about the possible projects moving forward.	
E. Board comments and question period Ms. Finch asked about the truck that tipped over, and an oil content spilled into Parley's Creek. Mr. Murdock said the damage was more minimal than was initially thought. Public Utilities did some testing in Parley's. He said he received a report yesterday, and everything has been mitigated to this point; staff removed all the warning signs yesterday. He said the water that goes into Fairmont is not from Parley's. Mr. Carroll shared that the annual Memory Grove clean-up is on Saturday, with lunch served at 11 AM. This has been a project that's been happening for the last 25-26 years. Ms. Hewson shared that an upcoming tree planting at the Cemetery is coming up. Mr. Carroll and Ms. Hewson brought up the post-Memorial Day clean-up at the Cemetery. She shared that last year, they were able to divert over nine tons of waste from the landfill in terms of recyclable plants and such. Green waste was around 11 tons, and they diverted. Mr. Scrivner asked if a Board member would be willing to attend the Taufer Park event at the end of the month. Ms. Nakamura shared that she went to Ballpark Bites at Jefferson Park. She shared that it's every Wednesday through the end of June but invited the Board to stop by. She shared how fun it was and that the park is getting new park equipment. Ms. Larsen said this is the first year Public Lands has hosted this event. Ms. Pehrson asked where the information was posted. Ms. Larsen said it's online and all over their social media pages. Ms. Cannon asked if there could be a section in the minutes outlining the tasks Board members need to do to prepare for the next Board meeting. Ms. Larsen said she highlights all the action items and important topics to review when she sends the calendar invite and links all the relevant information in the invite.	10 mins
F. Next meeting: June 6, 2024	
G. Request for future agenda items Ms. Larsen shared her notes regarding future agenda items: - Golf Subcommittee: Ms. Cannon said she needs to meet with Golf. This will be tabled for a future discussion - Approval of new Bylaws - Approval of Stakeholder Presentation Process - Homelessness in Liberty Park - Sunnyside Ballpark - Urban Forestry code changes. Possibly closer to the end of the summer with a letter of support. - Indigenous letter of support Ms. Nakamura requested an action item to approve the non-PNUT Board members to the Urban Trails Subcommittee. Mr. Murdock suggested having the Trails & Natural Lands Division provide an update, as that team is growing a lot. He shared that staff received recommended funding for a new division director. Mr. Murdock said that divisions come to the Board with updates that they're hoping to share with the community, and how the Board may be able to share that throughout the year. Ms. Larsen said that since the planners present updates on projects regularly, they have yet to have a standard month for them to present. Ms. Cannon said they should come when there are significant updates.	

Ms. Cannon motioned to adjourn the meeting, and Ms. Nakamura seconded it. The Board unanimously voted to adjourn the meeting.	
8. Adjourn	7:15 PM

DRAFT