

Formal Meeting
Thursday, December
4, 2025
5:00 p.m. – 7:10 p.m.

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

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/3703674458?pwd=xigAA5545gKVfbjuBUjQhpOPQfUb20.1>

Meeting ID: 370 367 4458

Passcode: 133477

Approved Minutes

| 1. Convening the Meeting | 5:00 PM |
|---|---------|
| A. Call to order at 5:05 PM The meeting was called to order by Ginger Cannon, Vice Chair, at 5:05 PM | |
| B. Vice Chair Comments Ginger Cannon, Vice Chair, opened the meeting by welcoming all attendees, commending Maria Romero, Board Manager, for the dinner provided, and ensuring the board meeting was conducted. She reminded all the meeting would be conducted by her as Kerri Nakamura, Board Chair, was unable to attend the meeting. Ginger reminded the group that the December and January meetings are important to attend, as those meetings inform the work of the board. | 10 mins |
| C. Welcome New Board Members: Christian Chavez, At Large, Thomas Merrill D4, Austin Whitehead D5 Ginger Cannon, Vice Chair, provided the new board members with a minute to introduce themselves. All new board members provided a brief introduction to the board. Sarah Foran, Board Member, proposed that all those present introduce themselves. Ginger Cannon, Vice Chair, agreed. The following attendees provided a brief introduction at this time: Maria Romero, Board Manager, Kim Shelley, Public Lands Director, Cameron Johnson, Senior City Attorney, Eric McGill, Board Member, Sarah Foran, Board Member, Steve Bloch, Board Member, Meridith Benally, Board Member, Ginger Cannon, Vice Chair, Melanie Pehrson, Board Manager, James Alfandre, Board Member. | |
| 2. Approval of Minutes | 5:10 PM |
| – Approve November 6, 2025, meeting minutes A motion to approve and adopt the Thursday, November 6th, meeting minutes for the Parks, The Natural Lands, Urban Forestry, and Trails Advisory Board was made by Board Member Eric McGill. The motion was seconded by Board Member Melanie Pehrson. The vote passed unanimously, with the Board Members present to approve and adopt minutes from Thursday, November 6 th , Advisory Board meeting. | 5 mins |
| 3. Public Comment | 5:15 PM |
| – Verbal comments are limited to no more than 3 minutes; 15 minutes total. Written comments are welcome. No members of the public are present | |
| 4. Director's Report | 5:20 PM |
| – Summary of current high-priority department items. – Kim Shelley | 5 mins |

Kim Shelley, Public Lands Director, began her report by announcing the Glendale Phase 1 opening scheduled for Saturday, December 6. She shared her excitement about having Board Member Melanie Pehrson provide remarks following Mayor Erin Mendenhall, along with Council Member Eva López Chavez. Kim reminded those who plan to attend to dress warmly, as snow is expected, and to wear a jacket and hat. Hot chocolate will be provided, and a beautiful pavilion will be available for gathering if needed. She added that the department is enthusiastic about the Phase 1 opening, which will begin at 10:00 a.m. and include children's activities such as face painting and a balloon artist. She noted that similar activities were offered at the Jefferson Park opening and were well received.

Kim also shared that Glendale Regional Park will be the first new regional park since Liberty Park, which opened 60 years ago. She explained that the project was made possible through the General Obligation (G.O.) Bond passed in 2022, totaling approximately \$85 million and approved by Salt Lake City residents with a 71 percent margin. She emphasized that the City was transparent that the bond would primarily fund investments on the west side, particularly in Glendale, and that 71 percent of Salt Lakers supported this approach. Kim noted that working with bond-funded projects can be complex, as the City typically does not sell the entire bond at once in order to minimize immediate impacts on property taxes. Instead, funds are staggered over time based on project needs.

Public Lands has completed several projects under Tranche 1 and has advanced through planning and design, positioning the department to move forward with Tranche 2. On November 25, the department sought City Council approval, recognizing the Council's focus on affordability and impacts to residents' property taxes. Kim shared that, due to collaboration between the Council and the administration, the first tranche approximately \$30 million will not impact property taxes. The second tranche would result in an average increase of approximately \$20 per year for the average household, which she described as a modest investment in citywide improvements. The Council selected Option 3, which allows the department to proceed with \$49 million to complete Phase 2 of Glendale, along with additional projects in other districts. Updates on projects in those districts will be provided at a later time.

Kim added that the Council requested additional information regarding shovel readiness of projects, any changes to timelines or scope, and how those updates will be communicated to the public. She shared that the department is actively working on strengthening communication efforts, not only with Board Members but also with Council Members and the broader public.

Taufer Park in District 4 has been closed for maintenance. While the park is heavily used, it has not always been used appropriately, and it is a space the neighborhood relies on that has not consistently been available or safe for families. The park includes what is affectionately referred to as the "Mary Tree," which contains a religious symbol within the tree and has an associated structure on site. Although the park was reopened, the City received serious public safety concerns, and the Salt Lake City Police Department, located nearby, responded to those reports. As a result, the City made an internal decision to remove the structure that allowed access to the platform, which had been in place since the 1990s. This action reflects a long-standing safety concern the City has been considering for nearly 30 years. The steps were not ADA compliant, and combined with cold and wet weather conditions, posed a significant safety risk. This removal is one step toward improving safety at the park.

Kim Shelley noted that if residents notice changes to the structure (removal) at Taufer Park, it is part of a future improvement project planned for 2026–2027. The City hopes to include a more appropriate memorial and create a thoughtful opportunity for reflection on the tree and its symbolism as part of those improvements. Board Member Aaron Wiley asked whether there would be communication or signage at the park, noting that passersby may be curious about the changes. Kim Shelley agreed that this was a good point and shared that maintenance-related information, including QR codes for public feedback, had been posted. She added that staff would work on enhancing communication to residents moving forward.

Richmond Park is located just around the corner and will remain open; however, it is also scheduled to receive bond-funded improvements in 2026. As a result, the neighborhood's level of service is expected to increase significantly in 2026 and 2027.

Kim Shelley then transitioned to reporting on department events, noting for new Board Members that hosting special events is a core part of the department's work. She shared that the City Council has been generous in funding these efforts. Events such as Jefferson Jams, Yoga in the Park, and Yappy Hour are among the department's most attended programs. The department has finalized its events calendar for next year and is excited to introduce activities in spaces that have not been used

previously, particularly in the foothills. Additional details will be shared with the Board in January or February. Kim also noted that a printed events calendar will once again be mailed to city residents, following very positive feedback last year, and that the department will continue to maintain an online events calendar.

Kim also provided an update from the Trails & Natural Lands Division, announcing the hiring of a new year-round, part-time staff member, Grace Wynne. Grace most recently worked with the National Park Service at Yellowstone, Sequoia, and Big Bend, and the department is excited to bring her expertise on board. In 2026, her work will focus on creating vegetation and use maps of the Foothill Natural Area. This effort will support data collection and advance communication goals related to trail use, management, and ongoing mitigation efforts.

Lastly, Kim shared that holiday cards were available for Board Members to pick up before leaving. The cards were designed by local artist Valerie Jar and reflect the diversity and work of the department. Kim expressed her gratitude to all Board Members for their dedication and service, and she thanked the new members for their interest in serving Salt Lake City and helping to make it an even better place to live. She wished everyone a wonderful holiday season and noted that the cards would be distributed before the end of the meeting

Eric McGill, Board Member, commended Kim Shelley on her presentation to the City Council regarding the tranche. He then shared feedback and an idea with the Board, noting that, as Director Shelley mentioned, the Council has expressed some hesitation about any tax-related impacts at this time, despite voter approval, due to rising costs for residents and other unknown factors. He emphasized the importance of advocacy, both with individual Council Members and within the broader community, and shared that this was the first time he had learned that property taxes have not increased in recent years due to other bonds being retired. He stated that this presents a valuable advocacy opportunity, but noted that he is not always aware when Public Lands will be presenting to Council and would appreciate advance notice for both himself and the Board so members can be informed and prepared to advocate as individuals. He reminded Board Members to refrain from representing the Board as a whole, while noting they may share personal comments as residents. He added that the upcoming grand opening on Saturday is a great opportunity for community members to see their investments reflected in current and future projects. Eric also reflected on Tauffer Park, recalling that when he was a junior or senior in high school, the park had a reputation for crime and homelessness. He described how the emergence of the "Mary Tree," particularly after a limb was cut in the spring or early summer, led to a continuous community vigil that transformed the park into a place of shared spirituality and positive energy. He noted that the park became cleaner, more family-friendly, and increasingly used by children and neighbors, shifting its identity into a true community space. While acknowledging the limitations of how far a public entity can engage in spirituality, he encouraged leaning into the park's history and story, suggesting that thoughtful activation, interpretation, and signage could significantly improve the park and preserve its role as a place of reflection and community gathering.

Kim Shelley responded that the department will improve communication regarding when items are scheduled to be presented to City Council so Board Members can be aware and, if appropriate, advocate during formal meetings in their individual capacities. She also addressed the comments on park activation, noting that similar opportunities exist at Pioneer Park and other locations throughout the city that have meaningful histories. She emphasized the importance of continued community support as these improvements move forward and shared that the City has successfully shifted public perception and usage of parks in the past, citing Liberty Park as an example of how intentional investment and activation can positively transform a space.

Aaron Wiley, Board Member, asked whether there will be a list of events at Glendale Regional Park and whether the pavilion will be available for rental. Kim Shelley responded that the pavilion is expected to be available for reservations beginning in February, which is when pavilion reservations typically open citywide. She added that it is a great space with excellent views. Aaron then asked for an update on the fields at Glendale Regional Park, specifically what work may be completed ahead of time before March, and whether any field-related improvements are anticipated to occur in February.

Ginger Cannon, Vice Chair, thanked Kim Shelley for her report.

5. Board Action Items

5:25 PM

- Discuss the Capital Improvement Project application Board Member rankings, and discuss and approve the Letter of Support for the Capital Improvement Projects 2026 - 2027
 - o Vote to approve the letter of recommendation.

30 mins

Ginger Cannon, Vice Chair, provided an overview of key items the Board would be discussing. She explained that one of the Board's most important responsibilities is ranking Capital Improvement Program (CIP) projects, which is completed through a thorough and structured process. Staff present detailed information on each project, which generally fall into two main categories: constituent-led applications and internal applications identified by the department as priority needs. The Board is initially presented with a comprehensive list of projects and meets to discuss them, ask questions, and receive clarification from staff. Between October and the present, Board Members completed the ranking process, and the results are being presented at this meeting. The Board will review the top five internal projects proposed by Public Lands, as well as the top five constituent-led applications. Ginger noted that this summary was intended to help bring new Board Members up to speed and acknowledged the significant level of involvement required. She also thanked Maria Romero, Board Manager, for her support throughout the process and recognized new Board Members who participated in the rankings.

She added that this is where the group is currently at and explained that the Communications Committee typically leads the process by saying, "These are our rankings, and this is what we think we want to present for approval for our top five in these categories." Sarah generally helps lead this effort, and she already has a draft letter prepared. She noted that this process has been used for multiple years and has been tweaked annually based on how projects were ranked. Tonight's board action, she explained, is to discuss what has been ranked, the reasons behind those rankings, and to talk through them as a group to better clarify priorities. The goal is to move forward with an approval letter that can be voted on by the board and submitted to the CDCIP, which is another committee that ranks all projects. She asked the board if this approach made sense.

Ginger Cannon added that she was able to review the projects and found the minutes to be detailed and helpful. She commented that many of the projects appeared to be more maintenance-focused rather than what she would traditionally consider capital investments.

Austin Whitehead, Board Member, asked whether this was a funding opportunity and questioned why maintenance-focused projects were included in capital improvement funding requests rather than addressed through the traditional budgeting process.

Kat Andra apologized for not being present in person, explaining that she was experiencing a cough. She introduced herself as the Senior Planning Strategist for the Public Lands Department and shared that she works in the Planning and Design Division. She added that she serves as the steward of the Capital Improvement Project program as it moves through the pipeline each year. Kat explained that Public Lands goes through an annual operating budget cycle that covers expected operational requirements and maintenance needs for the following year. She clarified that projects included in the capital improvement program are considered capital replacements or improvements, which the City defines as investments over \$50,000 that occur on a less frequent basis. Generally, these projects are high-priority items that cannot be addressed through regular maintenance or repairs and are often assets that have reached the end of their useful life. She noted that this is why some maintenance-related items appear on the list. Austin Whitehead responded that this explanation was helpful.

Ginger Cannon asked to review the ranking sheets for both internal and constituent projects.

Maria Romero, Board Manager, suggested starting with the constituent list since it is shorter and may make the process easier to understand. Board members asked for the screen to be zoomed in.

Ginger Cannon explained that the projects highlighted in green represent the top five. She described the average ranking system as a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being the highest priority, calculated as the average of all board members' rankings. She also explained that the count reflects how many times a project received a particular ranking. She stated that the top five projects are Playground Shade, Nature Park at Bonneville, Glendale Park Sport Court Lighting, Jordan Park Basketball, and Sugar House Park 50/50 Match, which includes multiple

amenities. Sarah Foran, Board Member, asked for clarification on the count. Ginger Cannon responded that the count is weighted based on how many times a project received a ranking.

She added that this system can take time to understand and reminded the group that this would be the last year using this method, as the board will transition to using SCAAMP. She noted that she would work with new board members on SCAAMP, but emphasized that this is the current method for ranking the top five.

Maria Romero, Board Manager, added clarification that a ranking of 1 represents the highest priority and 5 represents the lowest priority.

Sarah Foran asked whether leasing had been explored for the Nature Park project, noting that the cost had not changed on the spreadsheet. Kim Shelley, Public Lands Director, confirmed that the cost had not changed and deferred to Kat Andra for additional explanation. Kat explained that the department is not able to make those improvements without resolving acquisition or lease issues. She stated that the acquisition would require the largest funding request and is likely the path of least resistance at this point. Based on current systems and assumptions, acquisition is considered the most likely scenario. She added that if the project were funded for acquisition and development, and a lease option were later explored and approved, it would be easier to reduce costs down the line rather than returning to request additional funds. For that reason, the department chose the option that provides the most flexibility moving forward. Sarah Foran added that she likes this project and hoped it would have more possibilities of funding. Kat Andra responded that staff have the opportunity for staff to provide comments in a forum to the CDCIP Board. Staff have provided the options that the department is exploring, and the potential to maybe look at other avenues for development as well. Melanie Perhson asked whether Golf is on board with this project, Kim Shelley, Public Lands Director added that they are interested in this particular opportunity, the land would require more work on Golfs end to meet the objectives of the constituent but they are on board to continue to move forward.

Eric McGill, Board Member, commented to Kat Andra that he did not intend to place a major decision on staff. He acknowledged that Kat works full time “in the trenches” and has been in her role for many years, and therefore he would defer to her expertise when it comes to ranking the projects. He thanked Kat for attending recent meetings and asked whether Public Lands has an internal top five list that could be compared to the board’s rankings, and whether that comparison would be relevant. He also asked if this practice has been used in the past.

Ginger Cannon responded that the top projects reflect Public Lands’ internal priorities. She noted that Kat Andra could add additional context, and reminded the board that asterisks in the spreadsheet indicate projects that carry a higher level of priority.

Kat Andra added that she could provide some additional clarification. She explained that the constituent Capital Improvement Program (CIP) application process works well because it allows community members the freedom to propose projects they feel are needed in their neighborhoods. For that reason, staff tries to minimize their influence on shaping those ideas. She explained that the primary area where staff does provide input—indicated by asterisks on the spreadsheet—is in determining whether projects align with or conflict with previously adopted city master plans. She noted that none of the projects conflict with active or adopted plans this year, which is a positive outcome. The projects marked with asterisks were identified by staff as those that most closely align with adopted master plans, which is where that prioritization originates. Beyond that, staff focuses on ensuring applications are accurate, feasible, and not in direct conflict with master planning efforts. Kat emphasized that staff ultimately relies on board members, as community representatives, to share what they are hearing in their neighborhoods and to help determine priorities. She thanked the board for the question and confirmed that this reflects where the process currently stands. Eric McGill, Board Member added he agrees his comment may be more relevant to the internal applications.

Ginger Cannon asked whether there is more discussion on the constituent top 5.

Melanie Perhson, Board Member, asked about the 6th, the rank by count confirms It was voted the most however did not make it to the top 5. And asked if anyone has a comment. Ginger Cannon added this is how it works.

Ginger Cannon added if there is a general consensus on the top five projects, we do not need to go back and restart the process. However, if board members want to re-vote, that would be a separate action the board would need to take, and it would need to happen very quickly, as the approval letter is due in a few days. Melanie Perhson, Board Member, raised a good point that there will always be projects that are right on the edge—those that have a lot of support but were not ranked as highly. We have to establish a cutoff somewhere, and this discussion is intended to address whether anyone feels strongly about changing their rankings.

Sarah Foran, Board Member, asked whether the specific order of the top five priorities matters, particularly given the weighting used in the rankings. She questioned whether the board should view the list strictly as the top five in the order presented and submit it that way, or if the board should reevaluate the order based on prioritization now that the list has been narrowed down.

Ginger Cannon explained that the board has narrowed the list down to the top five projects. She stated that the board has a few options moving forward: the group can discuss the projects together and, if they agree to keep the current top five, include them in the approval letter. If the board decides to change the rankings, that process would need to occur within the next two days and would require a re-vote without additional discussion. Any revised rankings would be reflected directly in the letter. She emphasized that this is why it was important for members to submit their rankings in advance, so the board could have time for meaningful discussion.

Ginger Cannon then asked Melanie Perhson, Board Member, if she was proposing any changes and invited her to share her thoughts.

Melanie Pehrson, Board Member, shared that she was uncertain about the Nature Park project, noting that she was not sure where it currently stands in the process and that she may have overlooked some of the related information. Reflecting on the last board meeting, she expressed some uncertainty about how to weigh the rankings specifically, whether more emphasis should be placed on the number of people who ranked a project or on the average ranking. She observed that the Bonneville Golf Course project and the Curtis Park revitalization project appear to be closely ranked, which she found interesting since Bonneville is technically ranked second. She questioned whether the Nature Park project warrants its current position within the top five. Sarah Foran, Board Member, mentioned that the project is the second highest, adding to the top 6.

Ginger Cannon added a reason why she voted the project as a high priority is that it's an application that's come in more than once, adding that it is a novelty in the 2019 needs assessment, which indicated that a nature playground was one of the highest priorities for Salt Lake City residents. Ginger added that as an at-large board member, she initially thought it was a fantastic opportunity to create one of these spaces. At the time, she adds that she did not fully consider the complexities of land ownership and other logistical factors and instead focused on what a wonderful location it could be. Ginger Cannon added that she is genuinely excited about the project's potential because it aligns so closely with what residents have been asking for.

Sarah Foran, Board Member, directed a question at Kat Andra. She added that Kat could speak to the thing that Curtis Park has in it, which is the ADA compliance, which is being theoretically addressed in ADA compliance.

Eric McGill added that he did not want to confuse the discussion, but noted that the Council raised a recurring comment the previous week during discussions about the bond tranche, specifically around the concept of "shovel-ready" projects. He acknowledged that the term can be interpreted differently, particularly in a city context. In reference to the Bonneville Nature Project, he asked how shovel-ready the project currently is, or whether it would instead initiate a broader planning process that could be more prolonged. Kat Andra responded that all of the projects would require detailed design, construction documents, and construction. Depending on the size and scale of a project, the design phase can take anywhere from six months to up to a year for the largest projects, followed by construction. She noted that while planning has historically been included in capital improvement project applications, it is not allowed this year. As a result, all funded projects would begin immediately with design documentation. She added that design would generally take six months to a year before construction begins. Kat also explained that a key nuance is the department's limited number of project managers within Planning and Design. Depending on how many projects are funded, some projects may not be

initiated until up to six months after funding is awarded, as staff complete work on other projects. As a result, project start timelines could vary within that window.

Austin Whitehead, Board Member, asked Curtis Park to trigger a maintenance question, as it is an outdoor and outdated playground. He added that if the funding is not provided by the CIP funding, how would it be funded? He asked whether it would be a routine replacement. Kat Andra responded that it was a great question and explained that it ties into SCAAMP, the department's strategic capital planning effort. She noted that SCAAMP outlines capital replacement needs over the next ten years and provides a general timeline for when assets, such as playgrounds, are expected to be replaced based on their condition. She explained that each playground typically falls within a regular replacement cycle. Kat added that she could pull up where Curtis Park falls within that cycle, noting that it is part of the average annual replacement schedule and that timing depends on where it lands in that rotation. She offered to look up the information immediately and share it in the chat.

Melanie Pehrson, Board Member, mentioned she feels happy and does not have any hesitation towards the project. She added that it is interesting that only 6 people ranked it. Ginger Cannon thanked Melanie Pehrson for her comments, and she invited further comments from the board.

Ginger Cannon asked to entertain a motion. She adds that a motion can be raised for the constituent rankings or both constituent and internal. Ginger Cannon moved the board to continue the discussion of internal CIP's.

Kat Andra commented that during the shifting of spreadsheets, she pulled a document up. She mentioned that, based on other playgrounds that need replacement, Curtis Park would be on deck for 2030 replacement, added an asterisk to data that we're working on improving. Austin Whitehead, Board Member, asked if, on the 2030 replacement date, he asked if it would go through the design process and replace the playground in the year 2030, versus if it enters the design phase in the year 2028. Kat Andra commented that is a great question and responded **that** for funding in 2023, the application would come before the advisory board in 2030. The application would come before you in 2029 for design to begin in 2030.

Ginger Cannon asked whether everyone could see the screen, noting that the text was a bit small and offering to zoom in. She explained that the projects shown were the internal Capital Improvement Program (CIP) projects presented by Public Lands staff. When the board reviewed these projects in October, several were more programmatic in nature, focusing on park assets as a whole and their replacement on a scheduled basis. She noted that what was particularly interesting about the rankings was that many of these programmatic projects rose to the top in the individual rankings. The top priorities identified were ADA compliance, field and sport court replacement, and safe, open, and clean park restrooms. She added that the restroom category includes a design-focused component previously discussed and suggested that Kat may want to provide additional context. The remaining priorities included playground replacement and accessible surfacing, followed by the major downtown project, the Green Loop.

Sarah Foran, Board Member added that she is supportive of the irrigation project as it is good for the City and would save water. Melanie Pehrson added that she ranked that project as her number one priority and noted that she still feels strongly about it. She emphasized that it is a programmatic request and considers it a vital component of programmatic changes, particularly given the drought conditions the region has experienced and is expected to continue experiencing. She stated that, in her view, the project warrants a place in the top five, especially since eight board members ranked it, indicating that many people felt it was an important priority. Ginger Cannon added that is why we calculate with count by rank, so an average of both numbers.

Ginger Cannon noted that the counts show several projects were ranked eight times, but not consistently ranked either very high or very low. She explained that, for her, this project takes priority over the Field and Sport Court project and that she felt similarly when reviewing the rankings. She then invited those who ranked Field and Sport Court higher to share their perspectives, since it currently holds a higher overall ranking.

Maria Romero, Board Manager, asked whether it would be helpful to pull up the written

comments.

Ginger Cannon, responded that before doing so, she preferred that the group talk through the discussion together, noting that everyone can read each other's comments and that she would like to hear members verbalize their opinions if possible, given that the written feedback is already available to the group.

Aaron Wiley shared that the rankings largely aligned with his perspective. While he expressed a desire to see the Green Loop project completed, he emphasized that ADA improvements were a clear priority, describing them as a "no-brainer." He stressed the importance of ensuring park access for community members who may not always have a strong voice. He also highlighted the condition of fields and sport facilities as a significant concern, noting that many people in the community choose to go elsewhere because of the current state of some fields. He described this as unfortunate, as parks should be safe, welcoming, and accessible places for everyone.

Aaron Wiley explained that investing in field improvements is a way to bring more people into parks, create safer environments, and keep spaces active. While some fields are in excellent condition, others—particularly those used for neighborhood sports and community events—are not. He specifically mentioned fields on the east side, including baseball fields, noting that updates and improvements are necessary to prevent injuries and meet the standard seen in other cities. He concluded that continued investment in these facilities would greatly benefit the broader community.

Ginger Cannon added that she thought about fields differently this year, noting that Aaron Wiley, Board Member, helped educate her on their potential, along with insights from presentations the board received related to special events. She referenced discussions about the economic value that could be generated if higher-quality fields were available. She acknowledged the ongoing tension around whether providing that level of investment is the responsibility of Public Lands, and the balance between recreational amenities and preserving open space. She emphasized that these considerations must always be weighed together. Ginger noted that, for the first time, she ranked field and sport court projects higher than in previous years, based largely on feedback the board has heard from the public about what they want to see in their parks. Aaron Wiley mentioned she agrees with the statements.

Melanie Pehrson, Board Member, noted that fields and sport courts are absolutely vital. She also observed that there could be more opportunities to seek funding through sponsorships and partnerships, especially with organizations like Ryan Smith's and Larry H. Miller's showing interest in supporting local spaces. At the same time, she emphasized that Public Lands still has the responsibility to maintain and invest in these facilities.

Eric McGill commented that while the discussion focused on sports facilities in the current CIP, it's important to consider future implications, particularly regarding reservations and field usage. He noted that scheduled events occur almost every night, often for multiple hours, and rain or lightning can disrupt these activities. He observed that grass fields, in particular, tend to suffer damage under wet conditions, and while leagues prefer to maintain their schedules, this frequent use contributes to field wear and tear. McGill suggested analyzing the true cost of field maintenance and considering how much the city subsidizes through CIP or the general fund versus how much could be covered through rental fees. He referenced the annual report, noting that reservations generated around \$600,000–\$700,000, and proposed that more of these funds might be allocated to field upkeep to reduce ongoing maintenance and CIP pressures. Ginger Cannon commented and redirected the conversation to CIP rankings as presented.

Kat Andra explained that she would be happy to provide more context. She noted that some projects are marked with asterisks and, as Ginger Cannon mentioned, the board will eventually have a more robust prioritization system through SCAMP. For this year, however, the focus was on health and safety issues, including ADA compliance and fire risk. Projects were also prioritized if they were direct results of master planning efforts adopted by City Council, such as Reimagine Nature, which includes irrigation upgrades, Jordan River rest stops, and wayfinding improvements. Additionally, Mayor's priorities, like the Civic Center and Green Loop, aligned with recommendations from the Reimagine Nature Public Lands Master Plan. Finally, projects addressing urgent operational needs—those requiring significant financial or manpower

resources from the maintenance and operations team or posing safety risks to the public—were also prioritized.

Ginger Cannon said she wanted to make a proposal. Since there's been a lot of back-and-forth regarding the internal CIPs, she suggested considering supporting a top 10 for the internal projects. She noted that the letter would be longer than two pages and framed this as a possibility for the board to consider, since in past years they have only submitted a top 5 for both internal and constituent projects. She then asked Kat how this might affect potential funding, given that adding more projects could influence the CDCIP board's decisions, and requested her response to the proposal.

Kat Andra responded that it was a great question. She explained that the board can officially propose as many recommended projects as they like. Generally, the CDCIP board makes recommendations that are fiscally constrained, meaning they work within a set budget and must consider all other divisions and departments submitting projects. Kat noted that they are not fully privy to how CDCIP uses recommendations from PNUT, so she could not definitively say how submitting a top 10 might affect funding compared to a top 5. However, she emphasized that there is an opportunity to propose more projects if the board wishes. She added that while the process will always be fiscally constrained, it is ultimately the board's choice whether to show a top 10 versus just what made the cut. Kat also mentioned that the projects' prioritization will likely be considered regardless. Additionally, she noted that although the letter is currently structured as a single document, the board could separate it into internal and constituent sections if that approach made more sense. Either option would work.

Melanie Pehrson, Board Member, recommended including the top 8. Austin Whitehead asked if there is a project that did not get rankings, except for the irrigation project. Sarah Foran, Board Member, added that the Foothills project did not rank as high as she hoped.

Ginger Cannon added that this discussion was exactly the reason for the conversation. She reflected on Kat's points and suggested a different approach, offering it as an idea: if the board were to submit a top 10 for internal projects, they would likely need to do the same for constituent projects, as it wouldn't seem fair to treat the constituent applications differently. Sarah Foran, Board Member, responded, commenting there might be worth providing internal applications to the top 10 projects as they are informed, and keep the constituent applications. Sarah noted that, to Kat's point, it is unclear how the letters are ultimately used. There was concern that overwhelming the board could reduce the impact of the recommendations—if everything is recommended, the value of identifying a top five may be diminished. This could detract from the priorities the group has collectively identified.

Melanie Pehrson, Board Member, asked if any board members' rankings changed after the discussion. Sarah Foran added that all voted their top 5, so changing would not skew the results, she added. Ginger Cannon asked whether the board members' votes changed in the categories. Aaron Wiley, Board Member, commented that he would not change his votes and recommended a motion to add the top 10. Adding that people may not read the letter, but the information about the top 10 can be informative. Aaron added that he believes the top 5 were accepted last year, he recommends pushing the luck, highlighting the top 5, but adding special attention to all 10 recommended projects.

Aaron Wiley, Board Member, made a motion to increase the recommended projects in the letter to the top 10. Meridith Benally, Board Member, seconds the motion. The motion passed with all votes in favor of the attending board members.

Ginger Cannon, Vice Chair, commented that the next step is voting to approve the letter of recommendation for the top 10 internal projects and the top 5 on the constituent. Adding that the communications committee will finalize the letter, and submit it to Maria Romero, Board Manager, to submit to the CDCIP Board.

The letter of recommendation was discussed by the following Board Members: Ginger Cannon, Sarah Foran, Melanie Pehrson, and Steve Bloch. On grammatical errors and including additions of the comments provided by board members.

| 6. Board Nominations | 5:55 PM |
|---|---------|
| <p>– PNUT Advisory Board, Board Chair and Vice Chair Nominations</p> <p>Ginger Cannon announced that the board was moving on to agenda item number six. She noted that the meeting was slightly behind schedule but expressed confidence that some time could be made up. This agenda item involves requesting board nominations for chair and vice chair. She invited members to submit any public nominations they wished to make. Ginger reminded the board that the formal vote for chair and vice chair occurs during the January retreat. She explained that this preliminary step allows the board to indicate its preferences for next year's leadership, with the official voting taking place at the retreat. Maria Romero, Board Manager commented that no nominations were made via email.</p> <p>Aaron Wiley, Board Member, nominated Ginger Cannon as Vice Chair.</p> <p>Ginger Cannon nominated Aaron Wiley for Chair.</p> <p>Ginger Cannon made a nomination for Steve Bloch for Vice Chair. Ginger Cannon added that this is a nomination and may be declined.</p> <p>Steve Bloch, Board Member, nominated Aaron Wiley for Vice Chair.</p> <p>Melanie Pehrson, Board Member, asked if the Chair and Vice Chair's terms expire or continue. Ginger Cannon responded that both Chair and Vice Chair need to be voted for a term again.</p> <p>Melanie Pehrson, Board Member, nominated Kerri Nakamura for Chair.</p> <p>Ginger Cannon explained that if anyone has nominations between now and January, they can email or call Maria Romero, or reach out to her or Kerri Nakamura directly. She reminded the board that, according to the bylaws, members are allowed to nominate themselves.</p> <p>She added that the voting in January is conducted in a lighthearted, engaging manner—"put everything into a hat, and like a magic rabbit comes out"—but clarified that the process is fully outlined in the bylaws and is conducted seriously. She encouraged anyone interested to review the bylaws to understand exactly how the voting is carried out.</p> <p>Eric McGill, Board Member, asked whether the nominees would have time to provide remarks. Ginger Cannon further provided information of past voting procedures.</p> | 10 min |
| 7. Staff Presentations, Updates & Discussions | 6:05 PM |
| <p>A. Salt Lake City Cemetery Update – Keith Van Otten, City Sexton</p> <p>Keith Van Otten, Salt Lake City Sexton, noted that, among the many engaging topics discussed that evening, the cemetery had also been included. He introduced himself as Keith Van Otten and stated that he serves as the City Sexton at the Salt Lake City Cemetery. He explained that he was present to share several updates and provide information about the cemetery.</p> <p>He added that, although it was not originally part of his presentation, after listening to the earlier discussions, he realized that many of the themes already raised such as accessibility, activation, and safety directly relate to the cemetery as well. He described the cemetery as a very special place and encouraged anyone who had not visited to do so. He invited board members to come in the spring for a tour, noting that the cemetery is much more enjoyable when the weather is nice.</p> <p>He then outlined the topics he would be discussing that evening. These included a general overview of the cemetery for those unfamiliar with it, an update on a current construction project involving roadways and irrigation, a recent tree-planting effort completed in partnership with the mayor's office and Urban Forestry, and several other ongoing initiatives at the cemetery.</p> | 30 Min |

Keith shared several quick facts about the Salt Lake City Cemetery. He stated that it is the largest municipally owned cemetery in the nation, a fact many people do not realize. The cemetery encompasses approximately 125 acres of burial space and includes about 130,000 grave sites. Of those, 127,765 are currently occupied, with the remaining sites pre-sold and awaiting future use. Technically, the cemetery is sold out. However, he explained that the cemetery still has long-term capacity due to the use of double-deep graves and the allowance of up to six cremains on top of each grave. He noted that Utah has historically lagged behind in cremation rates, but the state surpassed 50 percent cremation last year.

Regarding staffing, Keith explained that the cemetery employs 11 full-time staff members and two part-time staff members. One part-time employee focuses on irrigation, while the other works in the office and is new to the team. That individual is assisting with a project that would be discussed later in the presentation.

Keith then moved on to the cemetery construction project. He explained that roadway conditions have historically been one of the most frequent complaints from visitors, as the roads are in very poor condition. He noted that the project was originally funded to address irrigation needs, but because irrigation lines run beneath the roadways as they cannot be placed in turf areas where they would be frequently disturbed the project also provided an opportunity to replace the roadways in the affected sections.

In 2022, the cemetery received \$11.2 million through a sales tax bond, with an original completion date of November 2025. That deadline was not met due to multiple issues with the project, and an extension was filed. In addition, the cemetery received a \$3 million state bond through Cultural and Community Engagement, which has a deadline at the end of the following year. Keith explained that this allows some flexibility to shift funding among different areas of the project in order to meet that deadline.

He described the project area as the northeast quadrant of the cemetery, which accounts for approximately 25 percent of the total area and constitutes Phase 1 of the work. He stated that the newly completed roadways in this section are very well received and have generated many compliments. However, approximately 5–10 percent of those roads experienced significant cracking. This damage was attributed to heavy construction traffic, including vehicles that are not typically allowed on cemetery roadways, as well as traffic occurring too soon after the concrete was poured.

Keith explained that the contractor is warranting the damaged sections and that those roadways are being removed and repoured. As a result, some of the newly completed roads are temporarily being reconstructed again, a process expected to continue over the next few months. Despite the setbacks, he emphasized that the finished product will be very high quality.

He explained that once cracking was observed, staff conducted coring in multiple areas to determine whether the issue was isolated or widespread. The investigation revealed that many sections of roadway were thinner than specified. While the contract required six inches of concrete, some areas were found to be as thin as four inches. Random sampling throughout the project showed that sections measuring 5.5 inches or greater are being evaluated for cost reductions, while any sections below 5.5 inches are being fully removed and replaced.

Keith clarified that the cracking occurred specifically in areas where the concrete was thin and subjected to heavy vehicle loads. In some cases, concrete trucks were driving over newly poured concrete less than a month after installation, further contributing to the damage. He acknowledged that the project has been difficult but reiterated that the end result will be worth it.

He explained that inspections should have been conducted by both the design consultant and City Engineering. However, the deficiencies were not identified until cracking appeared. He added that the road base was crowned, but the concrete was not, resulting in thinner concrete in the center of the roadways.

Keith also discussed irrigation issues associated with the project. Some substandard materials were installed that did not meet approved submittals. These issues were identified during inspections, and portions of the irrigation system still require rework as part of the project's completion.

Moving forward, Keith stated that mandatory inspections will occur before anything is buried, particularly during concrete installation. Measurements will be taken continuously by both City Engineering staff and the design consultant to ensure compliance. He emphasized that improved project oversight will continue over the next six months.

He again invited the board to tour the cemetery, noting that the photos shown reflected the condition of roadways outside the construction area. He explained that the cemetery lacks dedicated funding for roadway maintenance, and the Streets Department is not funded to maintain cemetery roads. As a result, roads deteriorate over time, and only limited pothole repairs are performed, primarily ahead of Memorial Day weekend to address safety concerns.

Keith stressed that the lack of ongoing maintenance funding affects even the newly constructed roadways. He expressed hope that future funding could be secured through the Streets Department to maintain the roads moving forward, though such funding does not currently exist.

He then transitioned to discussing digitizing cemetery records. Keith explained that despite being the capital city and the largest municipally owned cemetery in the nation, the cemetery still relies heavily on paper records. Staff regularly search physical books to process burial requests. He described concerns about the vulnerability of these records to disasters such as fire or flooding.

To address this, the cemetery hired a new office facilitator (Michelle Barney) earlier in the year with expertise in records management. She previously worked in the City Recorder's Office and is leading efforts to digitize and secure records. Keith showed examples of the files used for each grave and described the extensive filing system that staff must navigate daily. He explained that decisions are still being made regarding what to do with original physical records once digitized. Options include City Archives or the State Archives. He noted that sending records to the state would mean losing physical access to them permanently, which presents challenges if digital systems fail. As a result, many records will likely be retained by the city, with only select materials sent to the state.

Keith then discussed the cemetery's new online mapping system, which launched around Memorial Day 2024. The system allows users to search for loved ones by name or grave location through the cemetery website. Future enhancements will allow users to upload photos and stories. The platform will also support self-guided tours highlighting notable individuals, LDS Church figures, arboretum features, and other historical points of interest. He noted that the system will also include a public calendar to help visitors locate burial services without needing to visit the office for directions.

Keith spoke about the Friends of the Cemetery group, which he described as one of the strongest friends groups in the city. He credited them with organizing major volunteer efforts, including the Memorial Day cleanup, which was previously managed entirely by staff. He explained that while waste separation practices have evolved, volunteer support remains critical.

He highlighted spring and fall tree-planting efforts, noting that the most recent fall planting followed a windstorm that resulted in the loss of 265 trees—the highest loss at any single city site. The recent planting commemorated the 265th replanted tree and coincided with the fifth anniversary of the cemetery's arboretum. The mayor participated by planting a tree and delivering remarks.

Keith outlined the Friends group's goals, including continued volunteer work, pursuing designation on the National Register of Historic Places, fundraising for consultants, and installing benches in strategic locations starting with the newly renovated project areas. He reviewed 2025 events and milestones, including the Wreaths Across America event on December 13, with a goal of placing 3,000 wreaths. He noted that the program has grown steadily since its inception. He also mentioned notable burials, the Christmas Fox Angel event, annual burial totals, hillside restoration in the Japanese section led by Amy Barry, and the leveling of a long-standing dirt pile.

Keith closed with a discussion of wildlife management, including the installation of kestrel boxes to address gopher issues naturally. He explained that within months, multiple boxes were occupied, with successful nesting observed. The project is coordinated with HawkWatch,

| | |
|--|----------------|
| <p>Urban Forestry, and Parks staff, and avoids the use of poisons to protect avian species.</p> <p>Keith Van Otten thanked the board for their time and support and welcomed further questions.</p> | |
| <p>B. Staff Updates. – Maria Romero, Board Manager</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ PNUOT Advisory Board Retreat Thursday, January 8th. <p>Maria Romero, Board Manager, reviewed the tentative agenda items for the Thursday, January 8th, retreat-style meeting, including a review of the board’s activities over the past year. She reminded the board that a formal end-of-year report would be submitted to the mayor.</p> <p>Austin Whitehead, Board Member, asked if he could access prior years’ goals and priorities. Maria Romero explained that there is no formal board document containing that information, and Ginger Cannon added that each committee maintains its own annual SMART goals. Sarah Foran noted that it can be overwhelming for new board members and suggested that making such data available could be formalized in the board rules. Ginger Cannon emphasized the importance of providing time for board members to network. The group also discussed the meeting time and agreed to explore starting earlier to allow for an earlier adjournment.</p> | 10 Mins |
| <p>8. Board Discussion</p> | 6:45 PM |
| <p>A. Committee Reporting</p> <p>Sarah Foran, Board Member, and Melanie Pehrson provided an update for the Communications Committee. They shared that they provided communication to all board members about the CIP Project Ranking Form and completed the draft letter of recommendation.</p> <p>Steve Bloch, Board Member, provided an update on behalf of the Foothills Committee. Steve Bloch explained that the targeted deadline is for the memorandum of understanding (MOU) with stakeholders. He clarified that the deadline is tentative and may require additional context. He noted that the anticipated timing is in January.</p> <p>He explained that the foothills are often thought of as belonging solely to Salt Lake City, but in reality they are made up of multiple landowners. These include Salt Lake City lands and utilities, the U.S. Forest Service, State Parks, the University of Utah, and adjacent private landowners. Together, these entities collectively make up what is commonly referred to as the Salt Lake City foothills.</p> <p>Steve stated that a memorandum of understanding has been in development for some time to help align the various stakeholders. The intent of the MOU is to place public lands in a leadership role, with the understanding that the other stakeholders will generally allow public lands to guide decision-making, subject to their sign-off and approval.</p> <p>He noted that the University of Utah’s Environmental Dispute Resolution Center has been assisting with this effort for an extended period and is now in the final stages of facilitating the agreement.</p> <p>Steve also explained that, at the board’s request, Kim and the department formed a stakeholder group. In addition, a second contract was established with the Environmental Dispute Resolution Center to work directly with stakeholders throughout the city. As part of this process, approximately three dozen interviews have been conducted. The goal of this outreach is to avoid missteps that occurred several years ago, when the city moved forward before stakeholders felt adequately heard or listened to.</p> <p>He stated that this stakeholder engagement is being conducted in advance of the Foothills Open Space Zone planning, which is occurring concurrently. The initial focus of that planning effort is</p> | 10 mins |

| | |
|---|----------------|
| <p>the Dry Creek area. He clarified that this area extends from the Jewish Community Center and the hospital, across to Upper Avenues and East City Creek, down into City Creek Canyon. This corridor represents one of the most heavily used sections of the foothills for biking and running.</p> <p>Steve explained that the city has been working on this planning effort for some time through the department. He stated that new planning for the area is expected to unfold in 2026.</p> <p>He added that the department has been in discussions with Tyler Fonarow, Trails & Natural Lands Division Director, whom some board members may not have met, and who serves as the department's point person for rolling out the plan. The department has also been coordinating with Tyler Murdock, Deputy Director, regarding the planning process.</p> <p>Steve described the timing as a fortuitous intersection of efforts and explained that discussions have focused on what is being incorporated into the planning effort. He concluded by noting that this work will continue to unfold throughout 2026. He reminded the group that the committee consists of the following board members: Meridith Benally, James Alfandre, Sarah Foran, and Steve Bloch.</p> <p>Ginger Cannon noted the Urban Trails Committee does not have an update this month.</p> <p>Ginger Cannon provided an update for the SCAAMP committee, adding that there are responses awaiting from the consultants. She added that there is no update from the bylaws committee.</p> | |
| <p>B. Board comments and question period, & request for future agenda items\</p> <p>Sarah Foran, Board Member stated that her comment should be taken lightly and not interpreted as a formal or serious proposal. She offered it simply as an idea. She noted that parks, particularly park fields, continue to come up in discussions in various ways, and she expressed curiosity about whether there might be any traction or value in pursuing some type of committee to review the fee structure related to those fields. She emphasized that she was not personally advocating for this approach and reiterated that it was meant only as a preliminary thought. She added that, while such an effort would be a large undertaking, there appears to be significant interest, and she offered the comment for consideration rather than as a formal suggestion.</p> <p>Ginger Cannon stated that, in response to the comment, it was a good opportunity to remind new board members about the process for establishing a committee, as outlined in the board's bylaws. She noted that if members have not reviewed the bylaws, the typical process involves a member bringing forward a proposal to the board that outlines the intent to establish a committee, the committee's goals, and the potential members. The board then votes on whether to establish the committee.</p> <p>Ginger Cannon explained that the board currently has four or five committees in place. Some of these committees are ad hoc and are formed to work on a specific project for a limited period of time, while others are standing committees that continue on an ongoing basis.</p> <p>Kim Shelley, Public Lands Director, noted that there is a gap in the process and that staff have been helping to guide fee development, including reviewing revenue considerations and coordinating with the City Council. She stated that she would be happy to provide additional information about the current process. She added that if there is interest, she would welcome the opportunity to return and share that information with board members to determine whether there is further interest in pursuing the topic.</p> <p>Steve Bloch stated that he would like to renew his standing request. He expressed appreciation for having Grace on board and noted that he would welcome the creation of a map for board members. He explained that he does not know the location of every park, trail, or city asset, and</p> | <p>10 mins</p> |

he believes others may feel the same. He suggested that a comprehensive rollout map be made available, either displayed on a wall or placed on the table, for members to review. He added that he suspects many people are not familiar with the locations of all the parks being considered for voting as part of the Capital Improvement Program. Melanie Pehrson, Board Member, commented utilizes Google Maps. Kim Shelley, Public Lands Director, responded that staff could work with their cartographer to identify ways to provide board members with greater access to some of the existing map layers. She added that, from an interpretive and visual standpoint, it would be valuable to think creatively about how the information is presented. She noted that while there are existing photos from the parks and park system, those materials do not clearly convey the locations of specific features. As an example, she stated that it is difficult to identify where the labyrinth is within the city, as its location is not easily recognizable in the current materials.

Eric McGill stated that earlier in the year, during one of the board meetings, there was an update regarding a property acquisition. He noted that this was approximately six months prior and that he had not heard any follow-up since then. He explained that, having attended about eight meetings so far, he would find it helpful to receive a recap of prior agendas and updates. He suggested that a brief status update—possibly organized month by month—could help track where items stand, particularly unresolved issues.

He expressed interest in understanding the current status of real estate transactions and other agenda items that were introduced but not fully resolved at the time. He cited the donation policy as an example, noting that it appears to have reached closure or may be returning for further discussion. He emphasized that having visibility into the progression of these items would be helpful as the board looks ahead to 2026, particularly to know whether certain topics may need to be revisited or brought back before the board.

Eric added that this type of update would be especially beneficial for newer board members, as there were items discussed three or four months earlier in the year that he was not fully familiar with at the time. When asked if there were specific items he had in mind, he reiterated the property acquisition as a key example and noted that identifying additional items would likely require reviewing past agendas individually.

Eric McGill concluded by expressing appreciation for the board and staff, noting that the meeting period fell between Thanksgiving and the end of the year. He thanked everyone for the opportunity to serve, mentioning that he and another member started on the same day. He described the experience as a positive one and specifically thanked Maria Romero for stepping in and carrying the work forward, expressing gratitude for the hard work and dedication shown throughout the year.

Ginger Cannon stated that, in reference to Board Member Eric McGill's comments, Maria Romero has already prepared a compilation of all the actions the board has taken over the course of the year. Ginger noted that the document could be expanded to include outstanding or unresolved items that were discussed but not fully resolved. She added that this effort already partially fulfills the request and explained that the information will be included in the board's annual report, along with a summary of all items that were approved.

Austin Whitehead, Board Member, stated that, as a new board member, he was curious about long-term, multi-year projects that the board should be aware of. He noted that the Foothills Master Plan process has been underway for nearly a decade and asked whether there are other large, multi-year initiatives currently in progress.

Austin also referenced the 2019 needs assessment and the Reimagined Nature effort that followed from it. He asked whether Reimagined Nature was formally adopted and, if so, whether the department is already in the process of updating that strategic plan or if it is expected to

| | |
|--|----------------|
| <p>remain in place for several more years. He concluded by asking whether there are other significant, long-term projects that the board should be aware of as they move forward.</p> <p>Kim Shelley responded that this was a very good point. She explained that the master plan is currently around its fifth year and that these types of plans are intended to be long-lived documents. She noted that there are additional planning and implementation documents, such as the Emerald Ribbon Action Plan, which the department has been working on with Melanie. She explained that these documents help implement the broader policy goals outlined in the master plan.</p> <p>Kim Shelley stated that these are the types of efforts that could be brought back to the board in the future. She also identified SCAMP as another multi-year strategic initiative. Kim added that staff could return with a list of these ongoing efforts and noted that, if the board is interested in receiving more detailed briefings on any of them at various stages of their planning processes, staff would be happy to provide those briefings.</p> <p>Kim Shelley concluded by noting that Austin Whitehead would continue to gain familiarity with these long-term initiatives, pointing out that he had already gained insight through the Capital Improvement Program process that year and would gain further understanding as the board moves through the budget process.</p> <p>Ginger Cannon noted that the GeoBond projects had also come through during that process, and that many major projects currently under construction are part of that initiative. She explained that serving on the board for about six months to a year allows members to work through the full processes, providing a solid understanding of the direction of the park system. She reflected that it felt surprising, in retrospect, that the board had written the approval letter for the master plan five years ago, emphasizing that participating in each iterative process gradually gives members a clearer sense of the scope and trajectory of the work. She added that completing that master plan had been a significant undertaking, as it was the first in approximately forty years.</p> <p>Sarah Foran remarked that she had previously commented on the project tracking tool that is currently being developed. She suggested that it could serve as a useful tie-in, as the projects are expected to become more visible online. While reviewing the link, she noted some difficulty in navigating it, though she believed it was live. She added that the tool could be valuable for visualization purposes and offered to include it in the recap. Additionally, she proposed that it might be helpful to provide the link within the board's discussion area for easier access.</p> <p>Ginger Cannon asked if any Board Members have questions about the written updates. Reminded the board that Maria Romero will be sending information and a form to prepare for the January meeting. Ginger Cannon commended staff and the Board Members on the successful completion of the CIP process.</p> | |
| C. Board Engagement Opportunities/Requests | 5 mins |
| D. Written Update: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parks Division Updates: Redwood Meadows Cinder Block Fence • Park Ranger Program New Ranger • Urban Forestry • Trails & Natural Lands Division – Utah Outdoor Adventure Commission Grant Funding | |
| E. Next meeting: Thursday, January 8, 2025 | |
| 9. Adjourn Aaron Wiley, Board Member, made a motion to adjourn the meeting, and Thomas | 7:10 PM |

| | |
|--|--|
| Merrill seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 7:10 PM | |
| | |