

Formal Meeting
Thursday, June 2, 2022
5:00 p.m. – 7:00 p.m.

Join Via Webex: <https://saltlakecity.webex.com/saltlakecity/j.php?MTID=m9c9b666bf01d2e3fb4b28a095184565c>

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

Join by phone
1-408-418-9388
Access code: 2497 334 5760

Minutes (Approved)

1 – Convening the Meeting	5:00 PM
Call to order <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Polly Hart- Brianna Binnebose- Samantha Finch- Melanie Pehrson- CJ- Frances Ngo	
Chair comments <p>Polly Hart referenced the Code of Conduct in the newly approved Bylaws, reminding all meeting attendees to please be polite and civil.</p>	5 min
New board members update and/or introductions <p>Ms. Hart introduced Frances Ngo as a newly appointed board member.</p> <p>Frances Ngo introduced herself as a recent transplant to Salt Lake City who is a biologist interested and excited to get to know more about SLC and natural lands.</p> <p>Ms. Hart requested everyone to please introduce themselves to Frances.</p> <p>Melanie Pehrson introduced herself to Frances. Ms. Pehrson represents District 2 and has served on the PNUT Board for about one year.</p> <p>Brianna Binnebose introduced herself to Frances. Ms. Binnebose represents District 5 and has served on the PNUT Board for about 3 years.</p> <p>Samantha Finch introduced herself to Frances. Ms. Finch represents District 7 and has served on the PNUT Board for four years and is in her second term.</p>	15 min

Ms. Hart introduced herself as the outgoing chair representing an at-large position and explained that her term ends this month and will be filled with a new member presumably in July.

CJ introduced himself to Frances. CJ represents District 6 and has served on the PNUT Board for about one year.

Ginger Cannon introduced herself to Frances. Ms. Cannon represents an at-large position with the PNUT Board and looks forward to working with Frances for their remaining term times.

Ms. Hart stated that, prior to the start of the meeting, some Board members had been introduced to Janessa Edwards, Ranger Program Manager, and Suzy Lee, Ranger Program Coordinator, about the new Parks Ranger Program for SLC Public Lands. Ms. Hart had Kristin Riker, Director of Public Lands, provided an update to the PNUT Board on the Program.

Ms. Riker announced that the Parks Ranger Program staff have hired four of the park ranger leads who started this week. Staff are also doing another round of interviews to fill twelve more ranger positions and have been doing site visits, training, and manual development with the leads. Staff would like to present to the July PNUT Board meeting.

Ms. Hart agreed that the Park Rangers Program crew should visit the Board during its next meeting.

Ms. Cannon mentioned that she wanted to reserve some time to provide feedback to the Park Rangers Program staff based on what the Board members have heard from the public about the Program.

Ms. Hart agreed that reserving 15-20 minutes to provide feedback during the July meeting would be good, and Ms. Cannon agreed. Ms. Hart stated that she believes that this agenda item should be a priority agenda item for July.

Ms. Pehrson asked which parks the Rangers would be stationed in.

Ms. Riker replied that there are four home locations: Liberty Park, Jordan River Carriage House at Fisher Mansion, Pioneer Park, and Fairmont Park. She explained that those four places will serve as the rangers' home hubs where their work offices are stationed. From those main hubs, the rangers will have work vehicles and bikes to do outreach to all city parks at a frequency that is still to be determined depending on differing parks' needs.

Ms. Hart asked if rangers would also be in the Foothills trail systems, too.

<p>Ms. Riker replied that the Parks Ranger Program staff will not be in the Foothills area, but that she would share a bit more of an update about the Foothills in her upcoming budget presentation.</p> <p>Ms. Hart asked if there were any other questions from the PNUT Board; seeing none, she moved on to the next agenda item.</p>	
2 – Approval of Minutes	5:20 PM
<p>Approve May 5, 2022, meeting minutes</p> <p>Ms. Hart asked if there were any changes that had not yet been addressed in the May minutes or if members were ready to make a motion.</p> <p>Ms. Finch motioned to approve the May meeting minutes. Ms. Binnebose seconded the motion. The minutes were unanimously approved by the PNUT Board.</p>	5 min
3 – Public Comment Period	5:25 PM
<p>Verbal comments are limited to no more than 3 minutes; 15 minutes total. Written comments are welcome.</p> <p>Ms. Hart called for public comment. Seeing none, she moved onto the next agenda item.</p>	
4 – Staff Discussion and Agenda Items	5:30PM
<p>Service Recognition for Polly Hart – Kristin Riker & PL Team</p> <p>Ms. Riker presented a service recognition to Polly Hart for her service to the Public Lands Department and commended Ms. Hart for all the changes she has seen the Department through. Ms. Riker and the PNUT Board thanked Ms. Hart for her influence and contributions to the Public Lands Department.</p> <p>Ms. Hart thanked Ms. Riker and the PNUT Board and assured everyone that she would still be active and engaged in the Department’s activities.</p> <p>Lee Bollwinkel, Parks Division Director, spoke to Ms. Hart’s service as well and requested a group photo.</p> <p>Ms. Riker stated that the Department still had not found anyone to fill Ms. Hart’s at-large position but are working diligently to find someone and confirm them, particularly someone who is Native American or Indigenous. Ms. Riker reiterated that Ashley Cleveland, Deputy Director of Community Outreach in the Mayor’s Office, was still looking into adding a requirement to the PNUT Board composition that two members of the board must be Native American or Indigenous.</p> <p>Ms. Binnebose inquired about a member who was supposed to be confirmed named “Nathan Manuel.”</p> <p>Ms. Riker replied that Nathan ended up having some medical issues and needed to resign due to this.</p>	20 min

<p>Ms. Hart mentioned that she had texted Ashley Cleveland recently who had expressed optimism at having Ms. Hart's position filled by July, but in the case that does not happen, Ms. Hart will return in July to continue helping.</p> <p>Ms. Riker thanked Ms. Hart for this additional support.</p>	
<p>Budget and Bond Update – Kristin Riker</p> <p>Ms. Riker started this presentation by asking if any members had viewed her budget presentation to the Council during the past working session?</p> <p>PNUT Members responded that they had not yet viewed the recorded budget presentation.</p> <p>Ms. Riker stated that she would provide an overview of that same presentation and began to share her screen with her City Council Budget Presentation with the PNUT Board. Ms. Riker started with the key values and mission statement of the Department and explained that when making new master plans and budget proposals, the Department looks to the key values of Stewardship, Livability, and Equity for guidance.</p> <p>Ms. Riker's presentation included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organizational structure of the Public Lands Department, where the Park Rangers Program will eventually be housed under Tyler Murdock's purview of Planning, Trails, and Natural Lands; • Highlights from the Public Lands Department 2021 Annual Report from the Parks, City Cemetery, Special Events Office, Recreational Athletic Complex, Natural Lands, Trails, and Urban Forestry Divisions; • Survey responses from the public to the City regarding preferred initiatives in order of importance, where the following ranked highly on that list: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Increase investment in the current parks, trails, and open spaces; ○ Increase safety in city parks, trails, and open spaces; and ○ Increase number of parks, trails, and open space; • The Master Plan's "Big Goals" list (Sustain, Welcome, Protect, Grow, and Connect); • Budget Requests Presented to Council: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Workforce and nondiscretionary items as priorities; Utilities, Inflationary Contractual Increases and Fleet Fuel and Maintenance ○ Seasonal positions competitive wage increase approval to from \$13.15/hour to \$17/hour; ○ Urban Forestry's Tree Planting and Preservation Initiative; ○ New Properties and Amenities derived from the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) process; ○ The Board and Community Engagement full-time position and associated costs; and ○ 2 additional Park Ranger FTE's for the Foothills. 	<p>20 min</p>

Ms. Cannon and Ms. Pehrson asked clarifying questions of Ms. Riker pertaining to the Urban Forestry item in her presentation.

Ms. Riker pivoted to the General Obligation (GO) Bond Projects presentation and thanked Makaylah Respcio-Evans for her assistance in putting the presentation together. Ms. Riker explained that the Public Lands Department has proposed an \$80 million GO Bond to fund several projects throughout the city, which constituents will vote on in November 2022. If constituents vote to pass the bond, the tax impact for a homeowner with an average home value of \$583,858 will be approximately \$41.

Ms. Riker reiterated that all the GO Bond projects are still proposals at this time, meaning that proposed items could still change.

GO Bond Project Selection criteria includes:

- Alignment with the Public Lands Master Plan and the Mayor's 2022 Plan;
- Geographic distribution and equity in level of services in the city; and
- Community priorities identified in the preliminary polling: air quality, water quality, and access to open space.

The Seven Proposed Bond Projects include:

- Glendale Regional Park Construction (\$30M)
- Jordan River Corridor Improvements and Activation (\$9M)
- Allen Park Revitalization and Access (\$9M)
- Reimagine Seven Neighborhood Parks (\$7M)
- Fleet Block New Park Establishment (\$5M)
- Liberty Park Playground Replacement (\$2M)
- Folsom Trail Completion and Landscaping (\$5M)

Ms. Riker also mentioned that the Central Neighborhood of Salt Lake City has the least access to green space, yet it is currently slated for the most residential growth.

Board members asked clarifying questions of Ms. Riker throughout her GO Bond Project presentation.

Ms. Finch referred to the PNUT Board's proposed budget recommendations for CIP projects that the Board had sent to the City Council in the past and inquired whether Ms. Riker knew the status of those recommendations being funded.

Ms. Riker suggested another presentation for the PNUT Board's July meeting pertaining to the CIP Projects recommended by the Mayor to move forward. She then clarified between three different items: the budget initiatives (the Public Lands' ongoing operating expenses and budget); the CIP Projects (one-time money to improve facilities or planning projects that are greater than \$50K that the PNUT Board ranked); and the \$80M general obligation bond.

Ms. Riker stated that the capital improvement projects were recommended by the CDCIP Board to the Mayor, who then forwarded those recommendations to the City

<p>Council. Council has not discussed these yet, as they are not a part of the budget process. They will be addressed by September 2022. Ms. Riker further clarified that it may be a good idea to cover recommendations that were forwarded by the Mayor, since there will be an opportunity for the public and the Board to approach the Council regarding these recommendations.</p> <p>Ms. Binnebose located the letter of recommendations that the PNUT Board had drafted to the Council and read the recommendations from the Board aloud: living wage adjustment, preservation of properties and amenities, increasing climate resiliency and environmental health, golf course tree maintenance, public lands signage maintenance and graphic design, board and community diversity and equity, and weed abatement program. Ms. Riker responded which ones were not recommended.</p> <p>Ms. Cannon asked whether staff could provide the Board with a table that distinguishes projects as budget initiatives, CIP projects, or general obligation bond projects. Ms. Cannon also requested a link to Ms. Riker's presentation and/or date of the presentation given to the City Council. Ms. Riker responded yes to these requests.</p>	
<p>Glendale Waterpark Update – Kat Maus</p> <p>Kat Maus, Public Lands Planner, introduced herself and explained that she was going to provide the Board with a quick update on the Glendale Waterpark Project and its timeline.</p> <p>Ms. Maus stated that the project was in the middle of Engagement Window 3 and Window 4, and that Engagement Window 4's completion would most likely be pushed back by a few weeks to mid-July 2022. She stated that there are a few more revisions they need to incorporate from the latest community advisory committee meeting into the plan and then Public Lands will begin sharing the plan out with the public.</p> <p>Ms. Maus provided a recap of engagement events that had been conducted for the purposes of the Glendale Regional Park Vision Plan. This included, but is not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Three Glendale Neighborhood Community Events involving approximately 110 participants; • Youth engagement at Glendale Middle School and Mountain View Elementary School involving approximately 128 participants; • Four Community Advisory Committee Meetings involving fourteen participants; and • Two citywide engagement events, including an open house where approximately one hundred attendees were present and an online survey where 1,361 folks participated. <p>Ms. Maus then expanded on the survey questions and results and displayed the highest interest features expressed from both the in-person open house and the online survey, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hiking and biking trails • Swimming/outdoor pool 	<p>15 min</p>

- pursuing SLCo. Partnership regarding the pool's operation
- Skateboarding features
- Riverside features
- Food trucks
- Multi-use sports court
- Ice- and roller-skating ribbon

Ms. Maus presented the Glendale Regional Park Vision Plan with the caveat that she will be editing it since a few more recommendations followed from the latest committee meeting on the plan. Ms. Maus further stated that the final Vision Plan will contain interactive buttons that readers can click on and pull up the image.

Ms. Maus presented the Vision Plan from East to West, and briefly went through all the proposed Park Features numbered on the plan.

Ms. Binnebose and Ms. Cannon inquired about transit stations, crosswalks, and alternative modes of transit; Ms. Maus answered that the City will continue collaborating with Transportation and the Utah Transit Authority on the project and spoke in-depth about the parking lot, safety, and other features.

CJ asked what the rationale was behind limiting the pavilion gathering for the Glendale Regional Park to 5,000 versus more than this. Ms. Maus responded that the Community Advisory Committee had strong feelings about the space not exceeding a certain number or growing to a concert-size, and the public also responded that 1,000 – 5,000 was the preferred range.

Ms. Cannon asked Ms. Maus to talk a bit more about creating a large regional park but still honoring the neighboring community's feedback; Ms. Maus responded that the City wanted the park to embody the character of this area but recognized that in order to obtain the funding needed to transform this area and to fit within the Master Plan's parameters, they needed to look at the park through a regional lens as well.

Ms. Maus mentioned the possibility for volleyball courts to be added to the Vision Plan.

Ms. Binnebose and Ms. Maus discussed the prospects of a kayak share program.

Ms. Cannon asked if disc golf raised to the top of the features for the Glendale Regional Park Vision Plan. Ms. Maus responded that it had not.

Ms. Maus proceeded to show the Board a few renderings for some of the features, including the Playground for All Ages & Abilities, the Hillside Sledding & Mountain Views, and the Community Plaza & Promenade.

Ms. Maus reminded the Board that they had to have some element of recreation for this site open to the public by April 2024; thus, considering current funding allocated

for the project, Ms. Maus explained some of the elements determined for the City to move forward with Phase 1.

Ms. Maus reiterated the that next steps for the project will be to revise the concept plan to reflect all the Community Advisory Committee's recommendations, sharing the plan out with the public with an interactive map to solicit feedback, and the project consultant is finalizing the Vision Plan which is a Master Plan. Public Lands will likely have a transmittal ready to send to City Council by end of June so it can continue through the Master Plan adoption process on the Council's July 2022 agenda.

Ms. Cannon asked if the \$30M bond does not go through and we only have the \$3.2M to proceed forward with Phase 1, what is the Public Lands Department's thinking regarding phasing this next part of the Vision Plan?

Ms. Maus replied that the Department has intentionally had their consultant build the Vision Plan into phases for this exact reason and would pursue this through the Capital Improvement Project (CIP) process. Additionally, there are other external funding sources the Department could explore that would help reduce the number of CIP requests in such an instance. Worst-case scenario, Ms. Maus stated that it would be a phased buildout.

Ms. Cannon expressed her concern if the \$30M bond does not pass. Ms. Maus affirmed that the amount of investment will determine the success of this park, which will take several years to build out and complete regardless of funding stream.

Ms. Pehrson asked if there was continued capacity for the Community Advisory Committee on this project. Ms. Maus replied that transitioning the advisory committee into the Friends of Glendale Park group is being pursued; a member of the committee will be reaching out to the Glendale Community Council to pursue this.

Ms. Pehrson expressed gratitude for being part of the community advisory committee process and that that group's perspective is so valuable.

Ms. Maus mentioned that the subconsultant, Agora Partners, have been working with local nonprofits, organizations, and community members to create capacity for programming the park.

Ms. Cannon asked whether there was anything more that the PNUT Board could do to place pressure on Transportation and/or Engineering to ensure that 1700 S is fully accessible and safe for all ages and abilities to get to this park. Ms. Maus responded that it is important for each Board member to speak to their councilpersons and that shared a few other ways they could support.

Ms. Cannon mentioned working with the Transportation Advisory Board (TAB) to align their goals, including having Ms. Maus present this same presentation to the TAB on a future agenda. Ms. Maus stated that she would look into this.

The PNUT Board continued to discuss the Plan and other opportunities to collaborate on the 1700 S issue.	
Ms. Maus shared that the Folsom Trail Grand Opening is Tuesday, June 7 th .	
<p>Election Discussion – Board members</p> <p>Ms. Hart asked if there is anyone interested in being Chair or nominating a Chair to take Ms. Hart's place.</p> <p>Ms. Finch mentioned that she would like to nominate Board member Jenny Hewson, and Ms. Hart stated that she would send Ms. Hewson an email notifying her that she had been nominated and will also email the rest of the board asking nominations.</p> <p>Ms. Hart reminded the Board that the new bylaws do allow members to nominate themselves.</p>	5 min
5 – Board Discussion and Action Items	6:20 PM
Ms. Binnebose mentioned one open Action Item pertaining to the Communication subcommittee while Luke Allen is out of office.	
6 – Confirmation of Next Meeting, Board Comments & Future Agenda Items	6:25 PM
<p>Board subcommittee updates as needed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Park Rangers Program (Janessa Edwards & Suzy Lee) <p>This will be an agenda item for the July 7, 2022, meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trails subcommittee <p>Ms. Hart stated that two weeks prior, Eric Edelman joined the committee and they discussed off-leash within the Foothill Trails area.</p> <p>CJ added that they researched places in California, Canada, and Colorado with different spectrums for dog leash policy; right now, the subcommittee is in its research gathering phase and nothing formal has been proposed.</p> <p>CJ also mentioned a few other items on the subcommittee agenda that are to be continued.</p> <p>Ms. Binnebose asked whether most of the research they are focused on is educational or enforcement-based?</p> <p>CJ and Ms. Hart responded that they are looking at both, and the Board continued its discussion on the variety of options they are looking into regarding dog leash policies.</p> <p>Ms. Cannon asked about the scope of the Trails Subcommittee and discussion continued. Members are invited to attend the subcommittee if they would like to.</p>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bylaws subcommittee <p>Ms. Hart stated that there is nothing further to report at this time.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Communication subcommittee <p>Ms. Binnebose mentioned setting up the email file sharing hotline to be more accessible to the community for engagement purposes as well as scheduling a standing meeting for this subcommittee.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Capital Improvement Program Projects Presentation <p>Staff will provide a presentation of those CIP projects that the Mayor has recommended to the City Council to move forward.</p> <p>This will be an agenda item for the July 7, 2022, meeting.</p>	
Board comment and question period	
Next meeting: July 7, 2022	
Request for future agenda item	
7 – Adjourn	6:45PM
Ms. Finch motioned to adjourn the June PNUT Board meeting. CJ seconded the motion. The meeting was unanimously adjourned by the PNUT Board.	