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

APPROVED MINUTES

1. Convening the Meeting	**5:00 PM**
A. Call to order – Steve Bloch – Jenny Hewson – Samantha Finch – Aaron Wiley – Michael Dodd – Brianna Binnebose – Dave John – Melanie Pehrson – Ginger Cannon – Kerri Nakamura – Talula Pontuti – Meredith Benally	
B. Chair Comments Ms. Pehrson thanked everyone for being here.	5 mins
2. Approval of Minutes	**5:05 PM**
– Approve September 5, 2024 meeting minutes Ms. Nakamura motioned to approve the minutes. Ms. Hewson seconded the motion. The Board unanimously voted to approve the September 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. No public comment.	
4. Director's Report	**5:25 PM**
– Foothills: Rocky Mountain Power Project Update. – Tyler Fonarow Ms. Riker shared she asked Mr. Fonarow to give an update on this project during her normally scheduled time. Mr. Fonarow shared his screen to display the Public Lands website with the Rocky Mountain Power (RMP) Project information. Mr. Fonarow explained RMP started a wildfire mitigation project two years ago on university property in the Foothills. The City is working closely with RMP to ensure they stay aware of the plan. RMP is on Phase 3 right now, and Phase 2	5 mins

was at Popperton, where Public Lands is the sole landowner. Phase 3 is in most of the Public Utilities property, so the permit was through their office. As the Trail Manager, he has been consulting and ensuring trail users know about the construction. He explained that the map shows the area RMP will be working on and how it will impact large chunks of the Foothills. He went over where the power poles go. He continued to discuss the power pole area coverage. The project will last about three months, and staff will have signs throughout Foothill. The impact will be significant. Ms. Hewson asked if they've been receiving a lot of calls. Mr. Fonarow said no and believes the early communication and signage helped exponentially. The Front Office BCC's Mr. Fonarow on any communication regarding this project, and he's received one email. That said, they've only started on the west side of the Bike Park. He does believe there'll be an uptick as next week, there will be bulldozers driving through the meadow. He highlighted a detour path on the map. RMP has a restoration in place and will work with Public Lands. Ms. Hewson asked if there's a standard response they provide constituents. Mr. Fonarow said they could share that standard response with the Board. The Board and staff continued to discuss the RMP project. There will be a lot of helicopter use in the Terrace Hills area. RMP hopes to change their permit to go straight through rather than cutting out half the hillside to make the sharp switchback turn in their trucks. Ms. Binnebose asked when they thought they'd be done. Mr. Fonarow said in December. Phase 4 would start in the new year, going through Memory Grove. The Board and staff continued to discuss RMP. Ms. Binnebose asked if they'd be doing any preventative treatments. Mr. Fonarow said the staff has been working with the restoration ecologist, Blake Wellard, and he's been consulting on managing the damaged areas best. Mr. Fonarow shared Mr. Wellard's suggestions with the Board. Mr. Bloch asked who the point of contact was. Mr. Fonarow said RMP and contact information are on the Public Lands website. Ms. Hewson commented on how great the Project Update section on the website is. Mr. Fonarow said he gets an email every Thursday or Friday, which he shares with the staff in charge of Foothills communication, and she updates the page regularly. Mr. Fonarow referenced the white section on the website as an overall project update, while the section Ms. Hewson referenced is a week-to-week update. Ms. Finch asked if any city representatives had visited the community councils in the impacted areas. Mr. Fonarow said they have. The Board and staff continued to discuss the RMP project. Ms. Cannon asked if RMP compensates the City for extra communication or operations support. Mr. Fonarow said they've shifted the work to RMP. There are some issues with the signage RMP produces, such as whether it's too small or in the wrong spot. Ms. Riker said they are focusing on advocating for the public. Ms. Riker said there was a newspaper article on Sunday about the maintenance of the parks, and it's something that's been talked about a lot in the City Council meetings. A GRAMA request was made, and Public Lands provided a report containing much of the information the article referenced. Staff presented the report to the City Council two years ago. The City Council has legislative intents, and the Council will ask the department to present how much it would cost to maintain parks adequately. The Board and staff continued to discuss the newspaper article regarding park maintenance.	
5. Staff Presentations, Updates & Discussions	**5:30 PM**
A. Emerald Ribbon Update – Makaylah Maponga Ms. Maponga shared her screen to display the Emerald Ribbon Update presentation. She briefly introduced the project, highlighting the timeline and high-priority concepts (natural wild corridor, highly active and programmed corridor, or a connectivity-focused corridor). A lot of people liked	30 mins

the natural and wild corridor. She continued to highlight the engagement process. The Emerald Ribbon envisions a future Jordan River Corridor, a ribbon of nature through Salt Lake City, a community crossroads, and the heart of the Westside. It is a model of care for people, wildlife, and ecosystems. They broke up the vision statement into four focus areas: nature, connectivity, culture, and care. She continued to explain the values of the four focus areas and the areas where those values could be implemented along the river. The Board and staff continued to discuss the Emerald Ribbon Project.

She highlighted the five key sites along the river that stakeholders and the public identified as having the potential to succeed in one of the critical values: Rose Park Nature Area, Cottonwood Park, Fairpark Urban Core, Modesto Park, and Glendale Oxbow.

- Nature focused: Rose Park Nature Area and Glendale Oxbow
- Activation focused: Cottonwood Park and Modesto
- Connectivity/Strategy focused: Fairpark Urban Care

The city doesn't have a lot of land around the Fairpark Urban Care (Fisher Mansion and Gatsby Trailhead) area, so Public Lands is exploring how it can work with adjacent developers to encourage them to invest in the river and partnership opportunities. Ms. Maponga highlighted the Phase 1 rough timeline:

Prioritizing the Action Plan's Goals:

- Year 1: Start Deeper Dive Strategies (Plan, Studies, etc)
- Years 1-5: Tackle Short-Term Opportunities
- Years 5-10: Implement Necessary, Hard, Long-Term Changes
- Ongoing: Key Opportunities for Ongoing Evolution

Realizing Transformational Projects:

- Year 1: Pop-Ups
- Years 1-5: GO Bond Priorities
- Years 5-10: Complete Transformational Projects

The Board and staff continued to discuss the Emerald Ribbon Project.

Ms. Maponga highlighted the GO Bond Priorities funding: $14M for Phase 1 priorities ($9M Bond funded).

- **Park Projects: $11.5M**
- Glendale Oxbow: $500k total ($500k Bond funded)
- Bend in the River and Modesto Parks: $4M total ($3M (Bond) + $1M (Addl CIP))
- Cottonwood Park: $7M total ($3M (Bond) + $1.5M (Addl CIP) + ($2.5M (Addl funding needed for Phase 1))

Ms. Maponga further explained the funding plans for each area. The second category of priorities for funding are restoration projects that happen outside of Capital Improvement. She highlighted the estimated funding for those areas.

- **Restoration Projects: $1M**
- Peace Labyrinth: $150K
- 9th S River Park: $200K
- 500 S Riparian: $150K
- Alzheimer's Park: $100K
- Riverside Park: $200K
- Cornell Life Station: $125K
- Fairpark: $50K
- Folsom Funding: $1M

Ms. Maponga highlighted the staff's O&M Guidelines and Restoration Goals and how Public Lands staff should care for the river. She went over the Connectivity-focused priorities:

- **Safety & Connectivity Projects: $1.5M** - Wayfinding Redesign: $700K (Bond) - North Temple St Intersection & Trail Connection: $700K (Bond) - 1700 S & 900 S Trail Intersection: $100K (Bond) Ms. Finch asked when Phase 1 would be completed, in the 1-5 or 5-10 years. Ms. Maponga said ideally, everything in Phase 1 that she presented would be done within the next five years. Ms. Finch asked if Phase 2 and 3 would be in the 5+ out. Ms. Maponga said yes, but those aren't funded yet, and staff still needs to outline what needs to happen in Phase 2 or what that timeline would be. Ms. Pehrson asked what Public Lands processes are used to gather information and discuss with other groups in charge of different portions of the river. Ms. Maponga said they had a Community Advisory Group (CAG) that advised the whole project and an equivalent Technical Advisory Group (TAG) with representatives from the county, state, Public Utilities, and transportation. One of the recommendations is to pursue formal agreements and partnerships to bring this plan to life and ensure they are clear on the delineation of responsibilities. The Board and staff continued to discuss the Emerald Ribbon Project update. Ms. Finch asked if staff could complete most of these projects in the next six years. Ms. Maponga explained that once staff reached this point in the process, another planner, Kira Johnson, would become more involved, and the two would split the load. Ms. Maponga is also working with Tyler Fonarow, Tyler Murdock, and other staff across Public Lands to think about what the implementation of this plan looks like. The best part is that the staff has the funding. Ms. Nakamura asked how much of the Reimagine Nature Plan this project achieved. Ms. Maponga was unsure. The Board and staff continued to discuss the Emerald Ribbon Project update. Ms. Finch asked if the Jordan River Commission contributes more than ideas, such as funding. Ms. Maponga said not yet. She referenced how the Jordan River Committee is exploring creating the Jordan River Foundation and creating funding opportunities there. However, a lot of work still needs to be done regarding implementation. This involves a lot of groups and internal departments. Ms. Pehrson said the Jordan River Committee has compiled a list of individuals and businesses who may have a vested interest in the river and possibly financially contribute. The Board and staff continued to discuss the Emerald Ribbon Project update. Mr. Bloch asked who the leading agency for improving the water quality. Ms. Maponga said the county has a Division of Water Quality, but it's within the jurisdiction of all the cities and the county because we're all downstream. The city has a unique issue: a lot of water is diverted from the river when it hits the city boundary at 21st South. This then concentrates negative pollutants that are in the water in the surplus canal. A lot of what the city can do is improve stormwater systems, and that's what the city is putting into the river. Staff has projects like the Cornell Wetland Project that help, and Public Utilities is interested in those. The Board and staff continued to discuss the Emerald Ribbon Project update.	
B. CIP Discussion – Tom Millar Mr. Millar shared his screen to display the FY25/26 CIP presentation. Mr. Millar said the hope for tonight is to hear more about PNUT's priorities regarding the projects. Today's presentation is the ideas the board came up with at the last meeting, which the staff came up with in the department. There are ideas from past fiscal years that have been funded or not fully funded, and then about 64 individual ideas or locations submitted by parks staff – the on-the-ground employees. The staff has a lot of assets that aren't in good shape, and they would like to take care of them before taking on more projects, especially since the staff has taken on so many new projects in the last couple of years. Ms. Binnebose asked if what they see today will be on the	75 mins

spreadsheet staff sends to help PNUT members rank their priorities. Mr. Millar said yes, and the goal is to send the spreadsheet out no later than October 31st. He said it will take staff a lot to digest the Board's feedback from today and develop those into real projects. That would give PNUT a month to simultaneously prioritize Constituent and staff CIP for a December final prioritization and letter. The Board and staff continued to discuss the timeline for CIP. Ms. Binnebose shared with new Board members the CIP folder in their Google Drive. She shared that the Communications Committee will be sending out deadline reminders to Board members. She encouraged members to get their prioritization and comments in before the deadlines to ensure everyone's comments are included, as the Communications Committee uses the comments to guide the letter of recommendation. The Board and staff continued to discuss CIP deadlines. Mr. Millar highlighted the Board's responsibilities regarding CIP. Mr. Millar applauded the Finance Department, which got staff on the list of all constituent applications on October 2nd. Of those 43 applications, 9-12 are for Public Lands' projects: **1. 1200 E Medians between 300-400 S & 400-500 S (Phase 1)** - Needs new curbing and irrigation. This is a high priority for the department. It's the second application from the constituent. **2. 300 W Under Pass Green Space** - The property belongs to a mixture of departments. Ms. Nakamura said there is a big kick-off for the underpass cleaning her community participated in at 200 W Mead Avenue. Ms. Nakamura said they didn't apply for a constituent application because UDOT owns that underpass. She understood they could apply for CIP funding because it's UDOT's land, even with an MOU. She asked since the City partially owns the 300 W Under Pass, only the City portion is eligible for CIP funding. Mr. Millar said it might only be the eligible city portion. Finance will be meeting to review the 43 applications and determine which are eligible, so some of these projects might change. **3. Concord St to Alzheimer's Jordan River Cleanup** - This project aligns with the Emerald Ribbon Action Plan, though it's not one of the priority recommended projects in that phase. **4. First Encampment Park (3rd or 4th application)** - For improvements and enhancements to that park are largely general funds, just replacements, and restorations of existing assets. **5. Jordan Park Skatepark Expansion** - This would expand the Jordan Park skatepark. **6. Playground Shade (2nd application)** - This is the second application and was partially funded last year. It received $500,000. Staff is asking for another $500,00. **7. Riverside Basketball Court Renovation** - This is eligible for many different kinds of funding. Staff received some court and playground funding last year. This could be eligible for maintenance dollars or Funding Our Future (FOF) dollars). Even if it's not funded, it could come out of funding staff already has. **8. Rose Park Lane Beautification, Trail, and Safety Improvements (3rd application)** - This would focus on trail safety. There's an old trail within the road right-of-way. It has no irrigation, terrible landscaping, and changes direction frequently. It could become a park strip and a trail with tree planting and an irrigation project. **9. The Forest at Bonneville (Golf property between Connor St and the driving range)**	

- This is a Golf Enterprise Fund-owned property. It is not currently used for any golf function besides one small maintenance facility on the property. There's a worn walking path that the surrounding neighbors frequently use. Ms. Riker said Golf owns it, they want it to be a park, they don't use it, and they don't want to maintain it because they don't have funding. Ms. Cannon asked if the constituent mentioned the trail through Bonneville Golf Course or integrating that into the project. Mr. Millar shared he hasn't had the chance to dive into the specifics of each project, and he's only gotten the names. He shared that Transportation and Public Lands determined earlier this year that simply due to the number of projects they each have and the lack of funding for that trail, it would not be a high-priority project on their list to pursue now unless other funding was acquired. Ms. Cannon asked if there is still CIP for that trail set aside or if it went to other projects. Mr. Millar said the CIP was set aside as that was only a match to a Wasatch Front Regional Council grant, which was only around $30,000, most of which was spent on the feasibility study done by Transportation. The Board and staff continued to discuss the Forest at Bonneville project.

10. **Downtown Farmers Market – Updated Electrical Service**

- This would move events more into the street and less in the park, which would need upgrading electrical service in the medians and park strips to run tents and generators. The Facilities Department also maintains all the park strips and medians downtown.

11. **Fisher Mansion Restoration**
12. **Memorial House Improvements**
13. *MAYBE: 700 E/Coatsville Ave Community Garden (2nd application, WCG)*
14. *MAYBE: Foothill Drive Path Improvements (UDOT ROW)*

10, 11, and 12 might be led by either the Facilities Department or the Engineering Division. Public Lands would support, but it may not be on the list for the Board to rank. 11 and 12 would be improvements to buildings, which Public Lands does not do but would support because they're either in a park or essential to the Department. Then 13 and 14 are of questionable eligibility. 13 would be a third community garden space in five blocks on 700 E. 14 is multi-use trail improvements on Foothill Drive but would require widening the road since they can't reduce any vehicular capacity. Ms. Hewson asked if they could have the district number associated with each project for when they're ranking.

Mr. Millar displayed a list of previous unfunded applications from the last three or four fiscal years to give the Board a sense of what's been prioritized before. He asked if any of these are still priorities for the Board:

1. Regional Athletic Complex buildout/expansion and existing building improvements
2. Pavilion replacements
3. Jordan Park and Peace Gardens CLR and Master Plan
4. NW Quadrant Trails and Greenway Planning
5. ADA walkway and Asphalt Replacement/Repairs
6. **Native Plant Center**

- Ms. Finch asked about the greenhouse CIP project. Mr. Millar said staff received funding through two applications last year for basically everything staff needed to get through the development of the construction documents for the greenhouse at Liberty Park. It's not necessarily for a larger native plant center but an additional service for that partner.
- Ms. Finch asked about having Blake, the ecologist, on staff and if this center is still necessary, given that Blake makes use of other properties to grow native plants. Mr. Millar said that he could find property for it, and Blake would plant it. Ms. Finch asked if Mr. Miller could speak to staff regarding whether this Center is still necessary now. Ms Finch wondered if this is a project to revisit in 1-3 years.

7. **Rose Park GC Driving Range Planning**
- Ms. Nakamura asked if this project competes with the General Fund or if it's the Golf Fund. Mr. Millar said anything from CIP is either General Fund, parks and back fees, etc., and would not receive any Enterprise Fund dollars. Ms. Nakamura asked why they wouldn't use the Enterprise Fund for this project. Mr. Millar said the planning is not to improve the driving range but to determine the feasibility of converting the range into public open space.

8. **Rose Park Lane Beautification Improvements (north of 1700 N)**
- Ms. Hewson observed this project was listed in both sections of the projects. Mr. Millar said this is the first third time they've asked for funding for this project. Staff included it in a larger internal request last year, which was not funded. The first request was through Constituent CIP; the second time, staff put it in as theirs, and now this is the third request. Ms. Pehrson asked what would be more beneficial in ranking this project: under Constituent CIP or staff CIP. Mr. Millar said the good thing about constituents applying is that staff doesn't have to add it to their list. The limitation is that staff can't just take over the application; they still have to follow whatever the constituent is applying for.

9. **Pollinator Landscape Enhancements**
- Mr. Bloch asked if this would be on the map provided. He observed that it seems like more of a city-wide request. Mr. Millar said it's similar to the irrigation and landscaping application, where they want to repurpose areas for better use and create better habitats. The Board and staff continued to discuss the pollinator landscape enhancements project.

10. **Courts, playgrounds, irrigation, and landscaping (partially funded)**
- Ms. Nakamura said she loves everything on the list. She would like to see courts, playgrounds, irrigation, and landscaping separated and to prioritize these items highly. She would love to see put forward the plan they've discussed on how much is needed every year to replace all the courts and playgrounds on a rotating annual basis. She thinks pavilions could be rolled into this. She doesn't think irrigation and landscaping lend quite as easily to that. Mr. Millar thanked Ms. Nakamura for her comment and apologized, as those applications were not all in one. Ms. Binnebose asked if the irrigation was part of the resiliency project the Board prioritized last year. She agrees with Ms. Nakamura that irrigation should be separate.

Mr. Wiley said he would like to see these added to the list so everyone can decide whether or not they're a priority. He would also like a map similar to what they received last year. Mr. Millar said they can do a map of the ones that the Board will need to prioritize. The Board and staff discussed what additional information would be present for the Board to prioritize projects.

The staff has been working on a three-pronged philosophy for how the department would prioritize or limit itself to certain applications.

1. Alignment with "Reimagine Nature"
2. Programmatic
- Capital maintenance (e.g., asset replacement/repair) = General Fund
- Support existing projects needing more funding = Impact Fees
3. Urgent safety and asset protection needs

Mr. Bloch said he loved the onboarding document and how it presented all the funding sources. Ms. Binnebose said there's another one in Google Drive specific to CIP. Mr. Bloch, how can projects be eligible for multiple funding sources? Mr. Millar said it has to be a trail, sidewalk, bike lane, and transportation-focused project to qualify for the ¼ cent. It has to be a new level of service for impact fees. It has to be related to park maintenance or asset replacement/repair to qualify as Funding our Future (FOF), and anything goes for General Fund as long it's eligible for

CIP. The Board and staff continued to discuss project funding. Ms. Binnebose invited Board members to review prior CIP ranking documents.

Mr. Millar shared the Programmatic Requests from Public Lands staff. These are items staff see need additional funding for, which staff is continually having to fix.

Irrigation (parks, islands/medians + curbs, water savings, native plants)	Surfacing (bridges, sidewalks, parking lots, playground floors, trails, roads, pavers)	Playgrounds
Courts	Lighting/Power	Monuments & Historic Structures
Pavilions	ADA	Restrooms, drinking fountains, sinks
Cemetery	Maintenance facility replacements & security upgrades	Foothills Trails Master Plan implementation
Property acquisition	Natural, wetland, and riparian area restoration & implementation	

Ms. Riker asked Mr. Millar to discuss the funding options for these projects.
Mr. Millar said these projects would be largely eligible for the General Fund—you're not adding a new level of service but replacing something that exists. Some of these may qualify for FOF for parks and maintenance. About 7% of the City's General Fund budget is set aside yearly for CIP, so there's only so much money to ask. The Board and staff continued to discuss funding.

Some project staff has asked for funding in the past: irrigation, playgrounds, courts, ADA improvements, Cemetery funding, and Foothills. Some of these are new. Ms. Pehrson asked about the current condition of ADA accessibility. Mr. Millar said an ADA Coordinator from the Mayor's office completed an ADA assessment of every park and all its corresponding amenities. Staff is trying to use that assessment to prioritize their highest accessibility needs in parks and ensure they don't wait for another project to assess things that can be fixed quickly. The Board and staff continued to discuss ADA in parks. Ms. Binnebose asked if that could be an added column to the list of projects staff will share with the Board. Mr. Millar said yes. The Board and staff continued to discuss CIP projects.

Ms. Binnebose asked if the staff had undergone an asset condition assessment and had ever been funded. Mr. Millar said staff expects this list to guide the CIP process in a year or two. They're doing a soft launch of what they could be asking for in the future, and it's not the first time that the Council has seen some of these requests. Ms. Binnebose asked if they could see any of that supplementary information. Mr. Millar said not yet, but hopefully next year. Ms. Pehrson said irrigation improvements would be something to focus on. It's not pretty, but it seems like a big priority. They hear from staff and constituents that a sprinkler is consistently broken. Mr. Wiley asked about the restrooms they discussed last year and the pilot staff was launching at Fairmont Park. Mr. Millar said it was just funded a month ago. Mr. Millar said they want to put it on the list because, by next August or September, staff will have good outcomes from the pilot to apply to some of the higher-priority parks, so they aren't waiting. Ms. Pontuti would like to emphasize the importance of the ADA and restroom projects. Ms. Pontuti asked about ADA legality to stay compliant. Mr. Millar said there are no ADA police, but the City does these ADA assessments to create a transition plan to support the City if they get sued. The Board and staff continued to discuss CIP projects.

Ms. Cannon shared she highly supports anything necessary for the park to stay open. She agrees with Ms. Pontuti regarding ADA components. She would like to prioritize the maintenance facility replacement upgrades. Many times, as the City builds new capital projects, the needs of the people on the ground maintaining those assets are overlooked and for staff to do their job efficiently and do their jobs better. Mr. Bloch asked if that included equipment. Mr. Millar said

the equipment does not qualify for CIP. Mr. Millar said CIP can't be mobile or require regular maintenance, like fuel. The Board and staff continued to discuss CIP projects. Ms. Hewson shared that irrigation is critical; this project significantly impacts tree survival efficiencies and time management for personnel. She also likes the lighting and power project and how this project would spread the love and not concentrate everything in one park. Ms. Hewson asked if this would impact the fee eligibility. Mr. Millar said it would be impact fee eligible as you're adding a power service that didn't exist. Regarding monuments and historic structures, Ms. Hewson added there are surely philanthropic options for those. Ms. Pehrson said playgrounds could be the same. The Board and staff discussed the KaBoom project. Mr. Millar said there are some past projects they've had partnerships with that don't necessarily require a General Fund. Mr. Bloch asked if staff aggregated five charging stations spread throughout the city and if that would still qualify for CIP. He mentioned he'd discussed park operations with Ms. Bailey regarding charging stations at the RAC. Mr. Millar highlighted existing sites that may need additional funding: - Glendale Park - Warm Springs/North Gateway Parks - Fleet Block - Jordan River/Emerald Ribbon Action Plan - Cottonwood Park - Peace Labyrinth - Bend in the River/Modesto Park - Green Loop - Allen Park - Foothills Trails - Madsen Park These are lower than the staff's prioritization. Ms. Riker asked which ones are impact fee eligible. Mr. Millar said besides Bend in the River/Modesto Park and Madsen Park, the rest could be eligible for other funding. Ms. Pehrson asked for more information on the Foothills Trails. Mr. Millar said once staff is done with the master plan for this space, they will do an update with Council. Once the Council is satisfied that the staff has followed all the steps of engaging, staff will then lay out a plan for implementation, identifying costs, trail alignments, etc. Staff will need more money to build the rest of the trail plan. Ms. Pehrson said Warm Springs has been on the list for a long time, and it feels like it could be beneficial to prioritize Fleet Block in addition. She thinks if there's movement in that area, it could placate some of the questions and concerns in those areas. The Board and staff continued to discuss CIP projects. Mr. Millar shared that Green Loop has been funded for $31.4M for design and potentially partial implementation for 500 W (600 S to 900 S). That got funded by the ¼ sales tax, assuming it would fund the design of the roadway and active transportation elements of the Green Loop. The adjacent property developers would fund the other elements as they are often required to rebuild the street anyway. It was a strategic investment in offering a match to create a bigger project. In this next round of CIP, one idea is to develop a larger funding package with public and private contributions, figure out the per linear foot cost of what the developers would be investing, and then possibly request parks and impact fees for implementation. The Board and staff continued to discuss CIP projects. Mr. Wiley asked if, from a priority standpoint, the Green Loop is a bigger priority than other items on CIP. Mr. Millar said it is a big priority of the Mayor to improve access to green space in Council District Four, which has the least access to green space. Ms. Riker said downtown is also where the most impact fees are collected. The Board and staff continued to discuss CIP projects.	

Mr. Millar highlighted some urgent, safety, and asset protection (AP) projects that came from parks staff: **Urgent, Safety, and AP Projects** - Library Square post-assessment construction/implementation - Liberty Park Greenhouse construction funding - Liberty Park Pond dredging and new aeration system - Urgent repairs of "nuts and bolts" infrastructure - Parley's Historic Nature Park drainage issues - Memory Grove Freedom Trail re-construction - Asset management plan data collection - Stormwater fees **Other Project Ideas** - Kay Rees Park upgrades - 9th S River Park playground (activate park beyond soccer and farm, funded) - 9-Line Bike Park – greenery and additional amenities Ms. Binnebose asked regarding safety and urgency that these would be the staff's priorities. Mr. Millar said if they had to have applications that were new projects, most of the ones discussed before aren't necessarily new projects that are either programmatic requests or adding funding to existing projects. Staff will focus on these if they need to have new projects. The feedback staff wants if the staff should focus on asset management and existing projects, getting more funding, focusing on these virgin safety projects, or a combination of them all. Ms. Binnebose asked if staff would want to focus on the more urgent needs. Mr. Millar said some of the programmatic requests are urgent as well. The few listed here didn't fit neatly into the other lists. Mr. Millar said the top ones are all asset management. The Board and staff continued to discuss CIP projects. Ms. Pehrson asked when the staff needed the letter of support. Mr. Millar said by December 10th to give staff enough time to incorporate it into all the applications. Ms. Hewson asked if the Board could have a copy of the slides. Mr. Millar said yes and that Ms. Larsen would get it to them. Ms. Binnebose noted the Board should receive the applications no later than October 31st. November 7th is the next meeting and opportunity for Q&A. Ms. Binnebose said that board members should submit their prioritizations by December 4th for the Communications Committee to review. Ms. Binnebose will remind everyone via email about the timeline. The Board and staff continued to discuss CIP.	
C. Staff Update – Ashlyn Larsen Ms. Larsen shared she heard some feedback regarding some written comments included in last month's packet. She shared that all those comments came in after the August meeting. When there's a verbal public comment, staff and the Board are there to hear the comments; staff can then respond to comments available in the next month's packet. With written comments she felt it would slow down the process if a written comment came in; it was shared with the Board during the following meeting, and then the staff's response would come to the meeting after that. Mr. Bloch and Ms. Finch shared they were confused about when the comments came in. Ms. Larsen said all comments came in after the August meeting. The Board and staff continued to discuss written comments. The Board was fine with Ms. Larsen's process of written comments coming in after a meeting.	5 mins
6. Board Discussion	**7:20 PM**
A. Committee Reporting Jordan River Trail	10 mins

Ms. Pehrson said she shared much of what their committee was doing during the Emerald Ribbon Update and has no further items to share. Foothills Mr. Bloch said the committee revised the scope of work. He invited the Board to review it and would also like to meet with staff to review it. Urban Trails Ms. Pehrson said the committee met recently; all their notes are on Google Drive.	
B. Board comments and question period Ms. Pehrson asked if there were any updates regarding the Indigenous Committee or letter. No one on the Board had any updates. Mr. Wiley thanked the staff for the pickleball courts that were recently installed in his district.	10 mins
C. Next meeting: November 7, 2024	
D. Request for future agenda items Mr. Bloch asked about having a park operations update. Ms. Riker suggested doing that in January or February after CIP is done. Ms. Finch motioned to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Hewson seconded the motion. The Board unanimously voted to adjourn the meeting.	5 mins
7. Adjourn	**7:45 PM**