Formal Meeting
Thursday, October 3, 2024
5:00 p.m. – 7:15 p.m.
Join Via Zoom: https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81351485120?pwd=wqT7Y2EKRYpf9pBDMMoaRSuVN149T1.1

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

Join by phone
Phone: +1 669 900 6833
Webinar ID: 813 5148 5120
Access code: 052356

Agenda

1. Convening the Meeting	**5:00 PM**
A. Call to order	
B. Chair Comments	5 mins
2. Approval of Minutes	**5:05 PM**
– Approve September 5, 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. Director's Report	**5:25 PM**
– Foothills: Rocky Mountain Power Project Update. – Tyler Fonarow	5 mins
5. Staff Presentations, Updates & Discussions	**5:30 PM**
A. Emerald Ribbon Update – Makaylah Maponga	30 mins
B. CIP Discussion – Tom Millar	75 mins
C. Staff Update – Ashlyn Larsen	5 mins
6. Board Discussion	**7:20 PM**
A. Committee Reporting	10 mins
B. Board comments and question period	10 mins
C. Next meeting: November 7, 2024	
D. Request for future agenda items	5 mins
7. Adjourn	**7:45 PM**

Formal Meeting
Thursday, September 5, 2024
5:00 p.m. – 7:15 p.m.
Join Via Zoom: https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84607536504?pwd=Zgg6bZD470NoCAaBm0BUZMVpfBchuO.1

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
Webinar ID: 846 0753 6504
Access code: 962617

UNAPPROVED MINUTES

1. Convening the Meeting	**5:00 PM**
A. Call to order – Ginger Cannon – Clayton Scrivner – Jenny Hewson – Samantha Finch – Brianna Binnebose – Michael Dodd – Steve Bloch – Melanie Pehrson – Kerri Nakamura	
B. Chair Comments Mr. Scrivner shared that he has to leave early, so Ms. Pehrson will run the remainder of the meeting. Mr. Scrivner invited Board members to introduce themselves as there are two new Board members, and not everyone was in attendance last month. The Board went around and introduced themselves.	5 mins
2. Approval of Minutes & Action Items	**5:05 PM**
– Approve August 1, 2024 meeting minutes Ms. Nakamura motioned to approve the August minutes. Ms. Finch seconded the motion. The Board unanimously voted to approve the August minutes.	5 mins
– Approve non-PNUT members for the Urban Trails Committee Ms. Nakamura referred to the packet's three applications from the Transportation Advisory Board (TAB). These individuals would like to serve on the jointly created Urban Trails Committee. These are their applications and resumes when they were appointed to TAB. Ms. Nakamura said this raised a question as two different City boards created this committee. Her question is, do they need to appoint their members? Ms. Nakamura shared in her conversations with other PNUT members that knowing who they are is at least a good idea. The question is, should PNUT be appointing them? If so, does PNUT submit their members to TAB for appointment? It felt weird to say that on this joint committee, somehow, PNUT holds the cards for making the appointments to membership. Ms. Nakamura proposed letting their appointment stand, and if the committee chooses to include people who are not on either Board, it would go through the process of appointing members. Mr. Scrivner clarified that the City Council has vetted and approved these TAB members. Ms. Nakamura said one person wants to participate but isn't	5 mins

appointed; he wouldn't be a committee member. He's from the Salt Lake City Police Department (SLCPD) and attends all the TAB meetings. There's a lot of crossover with TAB and the SLCPD. He would be more of a staff participant since he's City staff. Ms. Cannon said according to the Bylaws, they're technically not PNUT Board members, so if you take the literal interpretation of the Bylaws, a resume would need to be submitted. Ms. Finch said they could look at making corrections next year. Ms. Nakamura asked if they needed to vote on appointing these TAB members to the committee as the committee or not because the TAB committed to formally appointing those members to the committee that was jointly created. Ms. Cannon said her perspective is they do have to approve them according to PNUT's bylaws. Ms. Binnebose said their credentials have been submitted and demonstrated interest in why they should be on the committee; they've met the requirements of PNUT's bylaws. Ms. Pehrson motioned to approve the non-PNUT members to the Urban Trails Committee. Ms. Binnebose seconded the motion. The Board unanimously voted to approve the non-PNUT members to the Urban Trails Committee. Ms. Cannon asked which PNUT members are interested in the Urban Trails Committee. Ms. Nakamura said Ms. Pehrson, Ms. Binnebose, Ms. Cannon, and Ms. Nakamura. The Board continued to discuss the Urban Trails Committee.	
– Approve Stakeholder Presentation Process Mr. Scrivner shared this process by which a stakeholder can apply or notify their interest in a presentation outside of the public comment period. It's a higher level of opportunity for public engagement. Mr. Scrivner referenced the items in the packet for the Stakeholder Presentation Process. Ms. Finch said Ms. Pontuti accepted a few edits, and Ms. Finch doesn't know if all those changes have been agreed to in a final document and suggested tabling it. Ms. Binnebose said a couple of copy edits were made for the announcement on the website; the suggestions are still open. Ms. Stockwell, substitute Public Lands staff liaison, shared her screen to display the Stakeholder Presentation Process. Ms. Binnebose believes the copy edits were made to the section regarding the public outreach materials. Ms. Binnebose asked if the Board is okay with the suggested edits on the public outreach materials to approve, with the understanding that they get made to the same formalized process. Ms. Finch asked if what was shared on the screen was the same as what was in Google Drive. Ms. Binnebose said that as long as the PDF being shared came from the most recent version of Google Drive, they would match. Ms. Cannon motioned to approve accepting the suggestions, knowing that both documents will be updated, and move ahead to place this on the website. Ms. Nakamura seconded the motion. The Board unanimously voted to approve, accepting the suggestions, knowing that both documents will be updated, and placing this on the website. Ms. Binnebose said the Communications committee could meet when Ms. Larsen returns and schedule one last session. Then, she can put it online and update Google Drive to reflect the final version.	5 mins
3. Public Comment	**5:20 PM**
– Verbal comments are limited to no more than 3 minutes; 15 minutes total. Written comments are welcome. Mr. Bloch asked about the written public comment in the packet regarding Wasatch Hollow and the staff response, which didn't come up in last month's meeting. Mr. Bloch wondered if these comments should have been in the previous month's packet. Ms. Finch said written comments are supposed to be included in the packet. She said she was confused about the responses and that they should have been part of the packet before the staff response came in. Ms. Finch noted that the comments should come to the Board for public comments, whether in person or	15 mins

written, and then the following month, the staff's response would be included in the packet. She thinks these comments must have come in for the August meeting. Mr. Murdock said he would confirm with Ms. Larsen when these comments came in. Ms. Nakamura assumed they came in after the meeting. The Board and staff continued to discuss written public comments.	
4. Director's Report	**5:35 PM**
– Summary of current high-priority department items. – Tyler Murdock Mr. Murdock shared that today was the grand opening of new pickleball courts in Rosewood Park. This project was completed in collaboration with Public Utilities and is a great example of city government working across departments to deliver something desirable. This was a major sewer line project, and it saved the project about a million dollars by removing all the tennis courts. The courts are now available for us, giving a total of 22 pickleball courts in the city inventory; there are 12 to 16 that are currently under design and are planning to be built in 2025. Mr. Scrivner asked about letting PNUT know about these sorts of events. Ms. Hewson brought up there is a calendar for PNUT highlighting Public Lands events. Mr. Murdock said it was also a unique project because Public Utilities, not Public Lands, led it. Mr. Murdock shared staff has been solicited by the Trust for Public Lands to work on a policy incubator project with other cities throughout the country. Staff will be applying tomorrow and will focus the policy study on how the City and Public Lands can improve how the city is funding the maintenance of new assets in the city. This is important for staff, and they develop new parks like Glendale, as well as for the city's transportation division, as they look to implement streets. There's a maintenance backlog regarding how staff address those new assets coming into the city. Staff is hopeful to start in October and would be a topic to bring back to the Board in November or December to talk about the progress, what staff is focusing on, and the outcome of that is to make recommendations to the Administration and City Council how staff gets funding allocation for maintenance associated with large network projects. Ms. Cannon asked since they were solicited by the Trust for Public Lands if they would fund the project. Mr. Murdock said yes, and with all the work the City has done with the Bond, Trust for Public Lands sees a lot of capital investments the City's trying to make in public spaces, and they reached out to a handful of cities they felt best suited to be part of that policy. Mr. Murdock shared that staff presented to the City Council on the Foothill Trails Evaluation. He invited the Board to watch that meeting. The staff has presented this topic to the Board previously, and the staff's primary request of the City Council was to allocate funding for the Open Space Zone planning effort needed for both the upper avenues, Twin Peaks, and Dry Creek. The City Council allocated that funding to establish a formal agreement with all five landowners in the Foothills. Public Lands is partnering with the Environmental Dispute Resolution Program at the University of Utah Law School. Today, they started interviews with all landowners to formalize that agreement. Another upcoming City Council item is Allen Park on September 10th. That will be a briefing related to the action plan that was recently completed. Rocky Mountain Power has begun construction on two significant projects starting this week. The first is a distribution line project focused primarily on burying underground utility lines. They plan to start a larger transmission project on renovations, replacing all the existing power poles from the Twin Peak area into Memory Grove. That work is scheduled to begin on September 16th. There is an entire website on Rocky Mountain Powers regarding this project. Public Lands and Public Utilities have worked closely with them and updated construction easements where they can and can't work. This will significantly impact the Foothills from September to December, and staff will be working with Rocky Mountain Power to provide weekly updates on all trail closures posted on the staff's website. The Board and staff continued to discuss the Foothills updates.	5 mins

Mr. Murdock shared that the State Fair Park has worked with the City to close the parkway trail at North Temple through the State Fair Park area. This is a temporary closure of the police department and UDOT. There will be a lot of activity in that area related to work there. He does not have a timeline for when that will be open. Mr. Scrivner asked what they were building, and Mr. Murdock said they weren't building anything; it was a people experiencing homelessness issue.

Mr. Murdock said there may be a few community questions regarding the development happening at Curtis Park. The City is working with the ASANA developers in Foothill Village to build a stairway into Curtis Park to connect the community to the Foothills better. The developer started construction on Friday without any approvals from Salt Lake City, so the entire park is currently fenced off without any authorization for them to conduct work. The City will work with the developer to issue a cease of assist. Construction has stopped, but there has been a significant impact. The Board and staff continued to discuss the construction at Curtis Park.

5. Staff Presentations, Updates & Discussions	**5:40 PM**
A. Green Loop Update – Nancy Monteith & Jesse Dean	20 mins

Ms. Monteith introduced herself as a Senior Landscape Architect at Public Lands, and Jesse Dean as a Senior Advisor of Real Estate and Capital Projects. Mr. Dean shared that he started about a month ago, stemming from a direct outgrowth of the Mayor's vision for some key projects, like the Green Loop. Some additional projects are Grant Boulevard (the Sports Entertainment District) and the main street pedestrian. Ms. Monteith shared her screen to display the Green Loop presentation. Ms. Monteith explained that they shared this presentation with the City Council two weeks ago. It was before they approved the CIP because the staff had a funding application for $31.4 million for design on request. The Green Loop is about 5.3 miles surrounding downtown on 200 E, 900 S, 500 W, and either North or South Temple. Staff is still working on some technical analysis on North and South Temple, as well as 500 S. Staff is exploring both North and South Temple because it provides many benefits that have been requested through public input focusing on building a downtown urban forest, creating outdoor plazas and social spaces, fostering and building an active transportation network connecting the citywide for a growing downtown community. Additionally, the Green Loop brings in opportunities for more biodiversity and native plantings, as well as stormwater management. This project was fostered by the Salt Lake City of Commerce in 2007. Ms. Montieth highlighted the Green Loop history. There are a lot of adopted plans that support and propel this project. In the 2019 Needs Assessment, staff learned that the downtown has the city's highest need for park space. Ms. Monteith continued to discuss the history of the Green Loop. Ms. Binnebose asked how public green space is defined. Ms. Monteith referenced Washington Park, libraries, and other publicly accessible areas. The Board and staff continued to discuss the Green Loop.

The Green Loop would dramatically improve access and would double the land area. The current percentage of park area downtown is 1.9%, and the Green Loop would add 52 acres and increase the rate to 5.7%. Ms. Monteith continued to share the transportation benefits of the Green Loop. She spoke to the community engagement efforts. They worked heavily with department directors, a technically advisory committee to dive into the technical aspects, and one-on-one department workshops. Since the project is in the right-of-way, many departments have a role (Compliance, Downtown Alliance, Economic Development, Emergency Management, Engineering, Facilities, Fire, Planning, Police, Private Utilities, Public Lands, Public Utilities, Redevelopment Agency, Salt Lake City Arts Council, Streets, Sustainability, and Transportation). Mr. Dean highlighted the responsibilities of each department. Responsibilities ranged from Management, Funding, Construction Management, Maintenance, Security, Reservations, programming, and

Communications/Marketing. Ms. Monteith said that part of the design discussion was about whether the Green Loop should be at the center of the road or on one side. She referenced all the underground utilities and how these options impact the utility access. They learned you can get more green space if you put the Green Loop on one side (West Align) of the street. The goal is to get about 70% public and green space. In that 132-foot right, they dedicated about 80 feet to the public realm. She shared aspiration images of what the Green Loop could look like for stormwater and creating retention areas. Staff learned they could use many of these project ideas without moving any utility, which saves a lot on costs. Some things may need to be moved in some sections. The Board and staff continued to discuss the Green Loop.

Ms. Monteith shared that the high-level cost estimate for the entire Green Loop is around $250-350 million. The 200 E construction cost estimate is around $85-90 million, with the average target cost per block around $9-10 million and the civic block cost estimate (the area between the City & County and the library) around $13 million. Mr. Dean said the Central Business District is about $200/per square foot. He referred back to Ms. Monteith's comment on using 132 feet right of way, which is something they have to look at, whether they own that land versus purchasing the land and building a park. Mr. Dean says a common question when people see these numbers is how we will pay for them and maintain them. Mr. Dead explained the Mayor's vision is not to have this project done in the next three to four years but as a decades-long project, taking a block-by-block perspective and focusing on areas where there's a lot of opportunity or growth already occurring. The Board and staff continued to discuss the Green Loop.

Mr. Dean continued on the maintenance side of this project, and Public Lands has a ton of work already. The next steps are related to helping us show a comprehensive plan on how it's designed, paid for, and maintained. He shared there could be creative ways that don't put all the onus on the Public Lands team but leverage other groups. Mr. Bloch asked if the 200 E block is the first proposal and tranche of the project. Ms. Monteith said they designed 30% for only 200 E to understand the full implications for technical operations, maintenance, and cost. They are not funded for construction at this time. One of the team members in transportation has an in-depth understanding of roadways and roadway reconstruction, and the two worst are the highest priority roads within the Green Loop for reconstruction: the north half of 200 E and the section along 500 W. The hope is since there's already an obligation to reconstruct the road, they can put these two projects together and build things together. The Board and staff continued to discuss the Green Loop.

The project breakdown is as follows:

- Street Reconstruction & Public Utilities: 34-43%
- Active Transportation: 8-22%
- Green Space: 35-44%
- Private Utility Trench: 14%

Ms. Monteith, the project breakdown speaks to the current funding systems, and they think they'll have to package multiple funding streams to piece this all together. It could be part of impact fees and grants, for example. Mr. Dean continued to speak about the budget and discussed prioritizing where the money is spent and seeking opportunities. Ms. Cannon asked if they would also be looking at tourism. The staff said yes. The Board and staff continued to discuss the Green Loop. Ms. Pehrson asked about the Rio Grand Plan. Mr. Dean said there's not a funding mechanism. The development would impact concerns about that area around 500 W area; the development is happening now. The City is trying to maximize those opportunities for what is now. The Board and staff continued to discuss the Rio Grand Plan and the Green Loop.

B. Capital Improvement Projects Presentation – Tom Millar	60 mins

Mr. Millar shared his screen to display the Capital Improvement Project (CIP) presentation. Mr. Millar explained that the CIP is an annual mechanism through which the City has to fund capital projects, new projects, or capital maintenance projects. Staff uses the Board to recommend projects to apply for, and those applications are due at the end of December. Mr. Millar highlighted the Board's Duties regarding CIP. Ms. Binnebose let new board members know about the onboarding presentation on their Google Drive and how the board's process for prioritization works. The Board and staff continued to discuss what CIP is and the process. Mr. Millar said they receive stakeholder and citizen requests at forums, letters the staff gets, calls, and emails to staff providing input on what the public sees and what they would like staff to do, and that can help staff know the highest priorities. City Council directives and land acquisition opportunities also drive project ideas. Mr. Millar highlighted the four funding sources for CIP. Not all of them are the same, and not all of them are eligible for the same. – Parks Impact Fees: must increase the level of service (charged to developers) – General Fund: may but doesn't need to increase level of service (all local taxes, fees) – Funding Our Future (FOF) (1/2 Cent Sales Tax) for parks maintenance: capital maintenance – ¼ Cent Sales Tax (Transportation): for trails, sidewalks, bike lanes, roadways Projects can be a combination of these funding sources. Ms. Nakamura said impact fees have to be used within around six years. She asked if they've ever run into having to return impact fees. Mr. Murdock said no, but there was a situation a couple of years ago where there was a project that didn't use all the funds, and once funds are allocated, it gets problematic to put those back in the general pool. There was a time in 2016 when they refunded around $2,000.00. Staff is not in an impact refund situation. The Board and staff continued to discuss CIP. Mr. Millar shared a recent change to state law: when impact fees are collected, they need to be assigned to a specific project instead of waiting six years to assign them. Staff is unsure what they will look like, but it may limit their ability to be creative in years five and six. It will take a little more forethought. Ms. Nakamura asked if there's any limitation on where staff needs to spend the funds. Mr. Millar said a ton of impact fees are being collected from the Green Loop, and he thinks it's appropriate to put those funds into places where more people are without park service. The Board and staff continued to discuss CIP. Mr. Millar highlighted the projects funded for the last two years. **Past Funded Projects** <u>FY 22/23 ($4,582,086)</u> 1. Three Creeks West Roadways, Trail, & Bank Stabilization ($1,359,086) 2. Rose Park Neighborhood Center Community Garden ($160,819) IF 3. Public Lands Asset Management Plan ($160,160) 4. Urban Farm Development at 2200 West ($425,040) 5. RAC Playground Phase II ($521,564) IF 6. 900 S River Park Soccer Field ($287,848) IF 7. Memorial Tree Groves Design & Infrastructure ($867,962) IF 8. Gateway Triangle Property Park ($499,563) IF 9. Lighting for NE Baseball Field at Riverside Park ($300,000) IF Ms. Nakamura asked which of these were constituent projects. Mr. Millar said 1, 2, 6, 8, and 9. Ms. Pehrson asked how many are done. Mr. Millar said two are under construction, three are under contract, four staff are working on a potential property, five are going to construction this fall, six will be in construction this fall or early next year, seven are incorporated into two Bond projects, 8 has some environmental issues, and nine are done. <u>FY 23/24 ($4,835,689)</u> 1. Library Plaza Structural Assessment & Visioning ($190,000)	

2. Poplar Grove Park Full Court Basketball Expansion ($507,000) 50% IF
3. Cottonwood Park Trailhead & Parklet ($850,000) 76% IF
4. Fire Station No. 7 Tennis & Pickleball ($855,000) 49% IF
5. 337 Park Development ($500,000) IF
6. Jefferson Park Improvements ($530,000) IF
7. Parks Bilingual Signage Installation ($414,000) 80% IF
8. Restorations/Conservation Work at Peace Gardens ($325,000)
9. Richmond Park Community Playground ($212,000)
10. North Temple Arts & Tourism District Improvements ($192,689)
11. Ensign Peak Nature Park Improvements ($210,000)

Mr. Millar told the Board that these rollovers are so staff does not have to spend them by the end of the fiscal year. About 65-70% of these are capital maintenance asset replacement projects. The Board and staff continued to discuss FY 23/24 CIP projects.

<u>FY 24/25 ($13,283,990)</u>

1. Liberty Park Greenhouse Restoration ($1,045,700) 23% FOF
2. Sugar House Park Pavilion Replacement ($960,000)
3. Adapting Irrigation Systems, Waterwise Landscaping ($500,000)
4. Citywide Park Restroom Study, Fairmont Concept Design ($100,000)
5. Courts & Playgrounds ($1,508,090) 3.5% FOF, 60% Cap Maint
6. Memory Grove Park Urgent Repairs, Pres and Maint Plan ($1,910,000)
7. Amplifying Jordan River Revitalizations ($1,500,000) 87% IF
8. Jordan River Trail Food Forest + Partner Garden ($20,000)
9. Green Loop Implementation ($3,140,000) ¼ Cent Sales Tax
10. Riverside Park Pathway Loop ($530,000) IF
11. Fairmont Park Basketball Court ($754,000) 90% IF
12. Street Futsal Courts 1:1 Match ($350,000) IF
13. Playground Shade ($500,000) IF
14. Jake Garn Way Pocket Park Community Space ($330,000) IF
15. Equal Grounds Project (Calisthenics) ($86,200) IF
16. 5th West Commons Conversation Centers ($50,000) IF

Mr. Millar said their approach from last year was to stop having so many small projects that take years to implement and to focus their effort on programmatic requests and more significant ticket items that will show more impact and benefit the public with about the same amount of time. These were the projects funded last Tuesday by the City Council. Many of these projects are impact fee eligible, and many were constituent projects. The Board and staff continued to discuss FY24/25 projects.

Mr. Millar overviewed the current PNUT timeline. Mr. Millar opened it to the Board's comments, questions, concerns, and ideas. Ms. Cannon said a few years ago, they had asked if either districts or sections could map capital expenditures. She said you don't see how much money is being in each. Sometimes, two or three projects in one district and other districts have regional parks, so they need more. Mr. Millar said the finance department has a map of previously funded projects where they're located. Some of them are a little difficult because items like court and playground applications are very general, and until staff spends the money, they don't know where it would be on the map. He thinks it's a great idea as they're doing capital strategic planning and any investment, learning how much they spend in each area and how that relates to existing service levels. Mr. Murdock said they can share that data with the Board broken down by district and the amount of capital investment into each. The Board and staff continued to discuss CIP.

Ms. Nakamura said she would like to see how projects might align with the Reimagine Nature Plan and a layer of that being how far staff is progressing within the plan – like where the plan might need some push. Mr. Millar said that information is generally in the applications because part of the application process asks for alignment with master plans. Mr. Murdock said that Ms. Larsen has done a lot of work on how the department is accomplishing the Master Plan. She meets with each Division Director quarterly, and each division has specific things they're working on that year and who's responsible. The Annual Report from last year was directly tied back to the Master Plan and what's been accomplished. Mr. Murdock said that CIP is slightly different because the Master Plan says the city needs a 10-year capital strategic plan and identifies the specific projects that should be done. That project is starting in about two weeks to determine that, and it would be a great opportunity to weigh in on how CIP aligns with that. Mr. Bloch asked if there is a target acquisition for something like the Foothills. Mr. Murdock said the staff does have an open space acquisition strategy. It's an internal document that outlines priority properties, Foothills, and other open spaces. Part of the plan he's referring to is also in the scope of work for a consultant to take the internal documents to share staff's key priority areas. Still, staff knows they may have a low level of service in open areas, which should be a target area for acquisition. The City handles acquisition through the CIP process. When acquisitions become available, staff goes outside the CIP process. It requests specific budget amendments from the City Council to be funded throughout the year because the CIP process doesn't lend itself to moving quickly. Mr. Bloch said it's like a second pot of money. The Board and staff continued to discuss CIP.

Ms. Nakamura asked if the staff could share what wasn't awarded last year that was put forward, which remains a priority. She thinks it could be a great place for the Board to start understanding. She understands other priorities can jump in, but those were priorities for a reason. Mr. Millar said he could look it up. Ms. Cannon said they could review their prioritization lists in Google Drive. Ms. Binnebose noted that part of their ranking process as a Board is if the application has come up before. Ms. Binnebose said they could ask Ms. Larsen to update the onboarding packet with a direct link to the CIP folder. She invited board members to review the CIP folders of prior years. Mr. Millar said last year was very successful, with seven internal applications being funded. Some of the applications were partially funded, less than what was requested, and many were programmatic requests that Mr. Millar thought they should apply for year after year. The Board and staff continued to discuss CIP.

Ms. Nakamura asked if the asset project staff are working on that project will get a ballpark number of court replacements that the department needs. That way, when staff presents these projects, they plan to replace everything on an ongoing, rolling basis. Mr. Millar said park structures that are typically funded through CIP last between 20-30 years, and staff has approximately 60 playgrounds, so they know approximately how many to ask for each year. Still, they are working on dialing that in to make sure they are asking for the right amount. Ms. Hewson wondered if there's any feedback on why projects aren't funded. Mr. Millar said parks are incredibly popular, and it's rarely the case that the Mayor or City Council says it's a bad idea. It's usually a matter of whether they only have a specific size budget to spend. There were 80 CIP applications this year, so getting 16 of the 35 approved for funding is pretty good, as they come from Facilities, Transportation, Engineering, Police, and Fire. Ms. Hewson asked about the irrigation project, in which the staff asked for $3 million and only received $500,000. Mr. Millar said there wasn't a lot of feedback or discussion on that item. Mr. Murdock said to his knowledge. Generally, those projects are challenging because they're not impacting the public. There has been a shift in Public Lands to focus their applications on asset replacement. Replacing a tennis court or playground isn't adding services to the City, so there's a lot of competition for general funds. The Board and staff continued to discuss CIP.

Mr. Millar said the timeline is compressed because the staff is a little later in discussing CIP than last year. Staff haven't developed any application, and they are waiting for the results of the City Council meeting last Tuesday. Mr. Millar said they hope to know what staff will apply for and approximate funding at October's meeting, but they won't have the applications to review. The hope is that between November and December's meeting, the Board can review internal and constituent applications in whatever draft they’re in, finalize any prioritization or ranking, and send the letter in December. The constituent application is open, and it closes on the 30th. Mr. Murdock said the applications don't need to be complete. Still, they're assigned to someone on Mr. Millar’s team to work with the constituent from September/October through December to finalize the application. Ms. Cannon noted that two internal applications that weren't funded last year were the property acquisitions and the irrigation one. The Board and staff continued to discuss CIP.

Mr. Bloch asked if the staff were soliciting additional funds. Mr. Millar said whether staff can go to private organizations or individuals to raise funds is questionable. Ms. Pehrson noted a more extensive discussion about the Parks Foundation. The mechanisms of soliciting donations and funding are the difficult part. Mr. Murdock said that when staff reviews projects, they could do with other State and Federal grants or match projects. The Jordan River is an example of a project supplementing funds from additional grants. Mr. Murdock said the Board would see a smaller list of projects from Public Lands in October because staff currently have a lot of projects on their plate; the projects they'll see primarily focus on urgent satisfying needs and infrastructure. Regarding constituent applications and matching funds, one of those projects was the Street Futsal Court. An applicant said they were willing to match 1:1, which City Council thought was fantastic to double the dollars and investment into that space. The constituent approached the staff. Another application of match funding projects is the Sugar House pavilion. The Board and staff continued to discuss CIP.

6. Board Discussion	**7:00 PM**
A. Committee Reporting	10 mins

Urban Trails

Ms. Nakamura said Ms. Cannon thought having their first committee meeting on an urban trail would be great. Their goal is to have their first meeting before the next PNUT meeting.

Communications

Ms. Binnebose said Ms. Pontuti would get the stakeholder presentation dialed in. Mr. Clayton is working on connecting with Ms. Benally on the Indigenous support letter. The Communications Committee would like guidance from her on what needs to go into the letter to support her vision for the Indigenous Commission best. Ms. Binnebose acknowledged the staff's work in answering everyone's questions regarding the North Temple tree issue. From the Board's perspective, getting a heads-up on these issues would be nice before reading about them in the news. They can better offer support, assistance, and clarifying information. In that same vein, a little more coordination. She said the committee has always tried to provide their support for reviewing strategic plans, but it goes both ways because they don't always get a lot asked of them. The Board continued to discuss the Communications Committee. The Communications Committee will begin shifting gears to prep for CIP items. Mr. Murdock said he would work with Ms. Larsen to ensure current engagement and event calendars.

Foothills Mr. Bloch is interested in joining this committee. Ms. Cannon suggested resubmitting a targeted, structured scope of work. **Jordan River** Ms. Pehrson said she met with Mr. Murdock and Ms. Maponga to get some options to go along with the Emerald Ribbon Action Plan and support them in several ways. One is creating a document or list of geographically relevant within the area of each of the five focus areas. Additionally, a working group of interested and engaged people, comprising a lot from the Community Advisory Group, should be part of those discussions and advocate for citizens. In addition to a physical kiosk at locations along the river, the public can scan to understand better where the project is, as the public doesn't see much of the behind-the-scenes work. The Board and staff continued to discuss the Jordan River Committee.	
B. Board comments and question period Mr. Bloch said he's mystified that there's no GIS analyst on staff. Mr. Murdock said that, following the CIP process, the department looks at budget initiatives throughout the year, including priority positions. Staff presents around January to talk about these and solicit feedback. There is a member of staff who works heavily with GIS. Ms. Hewson said she has a network of potential students at the University of Utah. Ms. Cannon is also connected with resources, as well. Students who could help with the lighter needs. She thinks students would jump at that. They need to articulate what they need, and Ms. Hewson is happy to provide guidance and discuss that. The Board and staff continued to discuss GIS. Ms. Nakamura said she's unsure what happens after constituents submit requests in the mobile app, but some trees on 400 S are in distress. She submitted a photo in the request. Mr. Murdock will work with Urban Forest on a response. Staff have received a lot of comments regarding London Planetrees, which have Anthracnose throughout the entire City. Ms. Pehrson asked if staff broke ground at Glendale Park yesterday. Mr. Murdock said yes. Mr. Millar said they set up stormwater protection, tree protection fencing, and heavy machinery, which will be out there in a week or two. Ms. Pehrson commented on how lovely the Peace Gardens are. Ms. Cannon commented on how great the events have been. Mr. Murdock shared they have a new full-time events position. The Board and staff discussed some upcoming Park Ranger programming. Ms. Finch thanked the staff for sending Ms. Andra to update Friends of Allen Park.	10 mins
C. Next meeting: October 3, 2024	
D. Request for future agenda items Ms. Pehrson suggested an update to the Master Plan and the work Ms. Larsen has been doing towards that to hear at the retreat. Mr. Murdock said Ms. Larsen and Ms. McCain would meet with Division Directors to compile everything. Ms. Hewson said CIP will be another October agenda item. The Board and staff continued to discuss CIP. Ms. Binnebose motioned to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Finch seconded the motion. The Board unanimously voted to adjourn the meeting.	
7. Adjourn	**7:15 PM**