

Formal Meeting
Thursday, October 6, 2022
5:00 p.m. – 7:15 p.m.

Join Via Webex: <https://saltlakecity.webex.com/saltlakecity/j.php?MTID=m08f11586fed1f4e2440405b0bb427c9e>

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: 2493 265 4707

AGENDA

1 – Convening the Meeting	5:00 PM
Call to order	
Chair comments	5 mins
Introduce new board member	10 mins
2 – Approval of Minutes	5:15 PM
Approve September 1, 2022 meeting minutes	5 mins
3 – Public Comment Period	5:20 PM
Verbal comments are limited to no more than 3 minutes; 15 minutes total. Written comments are welcome.	
4 – Staff Discussion and Agenda Items	5:35 PM
Salt Lake City Council Chair Dan Dugan Remarks	5 mins
Glendale Regional Park Master Plan Update – Action Item – Kat Maus	10 mins
Preliminary Public Lands CIP FY 2023-2024 Project List for PNUT Board Consideration – Tom Millar	40 mins
GO Bond Update – Kristin Riker	10 mins
5 – Board Discussion and Action Items	6:40 PM
Board Subcommittees – review details of each committee in accordance with new bylaws	15 mins
Board retreat discussion	10 mins
6 – Confirmation of Next Meeting, Board Comments & Future Agenda Items	7:05 PM
Board subcommittee updates as needed • Trails subcommittee • Communication subcommittee	
Board comment and question period	
Next meeting: November 3, 2022	
Request for future agenda items	
7 – Adjourn	7:10 PM

Formal Meeting
Thursday, September 1, 2022
5:00 p.m. – 7:15 p.m.

Join Via Webex: <https://saltlakecity.webex.com/saltlakecity/j.php?MTID=m13eee021857d99ea202e72f2d19ddde7>

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 2482 499 1456

Minutes (**Unapproved**)

1 – Convening the Meeting	5:00 PM
Call to order - Polly Hart - Brianna Binnebose - Samantha Finch - Melanie Pehrson - Phil Carroll - Ginger Cannon - Clayton Scrivner - Aaron Wiley - CJ Whittaker	
Chair comments Polly Hart called the meeting to order and thanked Brianna Binnebose for chairing the meeting in August.	5 mins
2 – Approval of Minutes	5:05 PM
Approve August 4, 2022, meeting minutes Ms. Hart asked if anyone had any edits to the August PNUT meeting minutes. Ginger Cannon moved to approve the minutes; Samantha Finch seconded the motion. The Board voted unanimously to approve the August 4 meeting minutes.	5 mins
3 – Public Comment Period	5:10 PM
Verbal comments are limited to no more than 3 minutes; 15 minutes total. Written comments are welcome.	
4 – Staff Discussion and Agenda Items	5:25 PM
Glendale Regional Park Master Plan Update – Action Item Ms. Cannon asked if Tom Millar and other new Public Lands staff members could please introduce themselves to the Board.	30 mins

Mr. Millar introduced himself as the new Public Lands Planning Manager working with Katherine Maus and Makaylah Respicio-Evans. Mr. Millar will be heading up work on the General Obligation bond that is on the ballot for this November as well as the strategic capital planning over the next five years. Mr. Millar hails from the City's Transportation Division and has been to the PNUT Board meetings in the past working in other projects.

Minerva Jimenez-Garcia introduced herself as the new Civic Engagement Program Specialist. Ms. Jimenez-Garcia completed her master's at the University of Utah's City and Metropolitan Planning Department. Minerva will be working directly on projects while Van Hoover will be working on partnership and volunteer coordination.

Kat Maus introduced the presentation as the final concept plan and Master Plan document. This has been released to the public for review on the SLC Public Lands website in an interactive version as well as a downloadable PDF format (link: <https://www.slc.gov/parks/parks-division/glendale-waterpark/>).

Ms. Maus shared her screen and explained the mission statement and park goals for the Glendale Regional Park Master Plan and emphasized the community engagement pieces that guided the direction of the new park's vision. These included Glendale Neighborhood Community Council, youth engagement among Glendale Middle School and Mountain View Elementary, and citywide engagement via online surveys and in-person open houses. Ms. Maus presented the demographic breakdown from the online survey, which demonstrated that 81% of survey respondents live or work nearby the Glendale Park.

The community feedback received translated into key park features for the development of Glendale Park; Ms. Maus stated that water features were at the top of the list of desirable park amenities. She also displayed the SLC Public Lands webpage that contains the interactive map of the site, showing the board how to navigate it.

Phil Carroll inquired about the walking path. Ms. Maus showed the Board members the areas of walking paths and showed how they connect to various amenities throughout the park.

Ms. Maus explained that year-round use of the site had been carefully thought through, from sledding and ice-skating rinks in the winter to hiking and roller-skating in the summer.

Ms. Maus switched to speaking only about Phase 1 Park Features, which will be developed by April 2024. Phase 1 consists of park elements 1-12. She mentioned that community and event programming was included in Phase 1.

Ms. Cannon asked if any of the programming was done by full-time SLC staff since there is no recreation programming arm of the City; Ms. Maus replied that this was true, and that there is a policy section that goes into programming within the Master

Plan that contains a menu-type formatting that provides options for hiring staff and/or partnering with other existing entities that already have the programming.

Ms. Finch inquired about the cost of Phase 1; Ms. Maus replied that the City currently has \$3.2 million allocated for Phase 1 but would like to expand it to include about \$7 million in work, potentially exploring bond funding to supplement the project cost. If the General Obligation bond does not pass on the November ballot, then Public Lands has a plan to request additional money from City Council.

Ms. Maus then touched on regional access to the site, including exploring partnerships and conversations with UTA and other transit organizations to provide equitable and regional access to the site. This is on pages 13 and 14 of the plan.

Ms. Maus also demonstrated to the Board environmental and community metrics for the plan.

Ms. Hart asked if the native plantings they're going to do now will be in place for the future or if they will just be dug up later. Ms. Maus responded that they will be mostly focusing on ornamental plantings for now and not native restoration due to the active construction that will continue.

Melanie Pehrson asked Ms. Maus about the existing tree maintenance on the site; Ms. Maus replied that the native trees are doing well without any irrigation most likely due to being well-rooted within the water table. Ms. Maus also added that there are quite a few invasive tree species on site as well. Either way, tree protection is tightly built into the plan, Ms. Maus stated.

Ms. Maus continued that, with the Glendale Park site, Public Lands is pursuing Sustainable Sites Initiative (SITES) certification, which would be the first time for the City. This is akin to LEED certification for buildings, but for landscaping during and after the site build.

Ms. Cannon mentioned that this is one of the most exciting things to her in the Master Plan and that she is happy to see how it works out for other future city sites.

Ms. Maus touched on the Policies, Operations, and Maintenance section of the Plan, which covers the day-to-day operations of the site once it is constructed, such as janitorial. The next steps for the plan are:

- Presentation to the Community Advisory Committee and the Glendale Community Council: September 21, 2022, in-person/virtual
- Brief to City Council: October 4, 2022
- Tentative presentation to Planning Commission to recommend adoption: October 2022
- Tentative Adoption by City Council: Winter 2022

In terms of action requested of the PNUT Board, Ms. Maus explained that nothing is needed from the Board until early October, whereupon a letter or even a motion would be welcome to signal the Board's support of the Plan to the City Council.

Mr. Carroll asked if there is transit near that property; Ms. Maus stated that currently, there is neither transit nor off-street parking in the space. However, the Transportation Division would be amenable to removing the “no parking” signs once the Park is up and running and there is also another lot across 1700 S at the 17th South River Park asset.

Ms. Cannon asked whether, after the 45-day period of public notice, Ms. Maus will come back to the PNUT Board with the final draft of incorporated public comments so that the PNUT Board may procure a joint letter of support with the Transportation Advisory Committee (TAB) or vote on a motion to support. Ms. Cannon then asked Ms. Maus if she could get onto the TAB’s agenda to present the plan to them in effort to advocate for transportation improvements for the site’s build-out. Ms. Maus replied that most likely she could do that, but would need to check with the TAB.

Mr. Millar stated that TAB’s next meeting is on September 12, so Ms. Maus would need to coordinate this with TAB staff in time for the TAB’s agenda’s public posting requirements per the Open and Public Meetings Act.

Ms. Maus also offered an alternative option where the PNUT Board could submit a letter of support and Ms. Maus could present the letter of support at the TAB’s October meeting and request a letter from TAB at that point, too.

The PNUT Board informally agreed that this was another viable option in case Ms. Maus could not get onto TAB’s September agenda in time. Ms. Hart asked if Ms. Cannon would be fine with heading up the communications and letter-writing between PNUT and TAB; Ms. Cannon accepted.

Ms. Finch asked the purpose for having TAB’s explicit support; Ms. Cannon replied that part of the reasoning has to do with what the Plan is trying to promote. For instance, with pedestrian crossings, pulling their attention to the Master Plan to see the implications to transportation – which is in the PNUT Board’s bylaws – will invite their support to advocate for future public transportation or other infrastructure improvements in the 1700 South area.

Ms. Finch and Ms. Cannon clarified their vision for support of the Plan between both departments. Ms. Cannon stated that she believes City Council will also pay more attention to a joint letter from two advisory boards.

Mr. Carroll stated that residents in the area will need to have access to safe crossing points along 1700 South.

Ms. Cannon asked if the street in question was UDOT-owned; Mr. Millar stated that it is a City-owned street East and West of Redwood Road. Ms. Hart clarified that it would be the City who the Board would be advocating for a tunnel or bridge crossing, and Mr. Carroll stated a street-level crossing is what he envisioned. Ms. Hart replied that she did not believe that that would work in that area, safety-wise.

Kristin Riker, Director of Public Lands, asked if Mr. Millar had any knowledge of the Streets Division's plans for 1700 South. Mr. Millar responded that Streets was going to resurface 1700 S, which adds an opportunity to redesign the street. He also added that reducing lanes on streets and redesigning it in other ways often decreases the amount of traffic, perhaps eliminating the need for bridges over the street and so forth. Mr. Millar added that it does have the opportunity to change some of Transportation's conversations about this area. Ms. Maus seconded Mr. Millar's points made about Transportation and re-affirmed that she had been working with Transportation and neighborhoods throughout the development of the Plan.

Mr. Carroll stated that he would prefer the PNUT Board not be slowed down by waiting for the TAB's response and support, as he is supportive of the Plan. Board discussion on the Plan and timeline continued. Ms. Maus clarified that the Department is targeting an October 26 Planning Commission date; therefore, any time prior to that would be ideal for obtaining advisory board support from PNUT and TAB.

Ms. Hart re-stated the reasons for her nervousness regarding 1700 S and safe pedestrian crossings; Ms. Cannon responded that this is exactly why it is a good idea to work closely with TAB so that these safety concerns are addressed. Ms. Riker also stated that this was a similar concern when the water park was first built in this original area.

Ms. Finch asked if there are other pools managed under Salt Lake City, and what the plan was for recreational management; Ms. Maus replied that Sorenson, which is an indoor pool, is one that is technically City-owned the City has been in conversations with Salt Lake County about this. Ms. Riker stated that the County had been looking at this site in their own master plan but had initially encouraged a splash pad over a pool; however, public opinion favored a pool over a splash pad. There is also currently no outdoor pool on the City's Westside.

Ms. Finch clarified that if they followed the plan, they should be able to attain the stated goals; Ms. Maus replied yes, this is true. Ms. Finch then asked if there were any lessons learned from Liberty Park, the City's current popular regional park, that were applied to the Glendale Regional Park's Plan. Ms. Maus replied that parking was a big one, and then Tracy Aviary and the concessionaire are successful public-private partnerships that they also considered.

Mr. Carroll and Ms. Maus also discussed the running and walking aspects planned for the Glendale Regional Park.

Ms. Cannon asked if there were any goals directly connected to the goals in the Reimagine Nature Master Plan. Ms. Maus replied that many of the goals overlap, but that the Glendale Regional Park Plan did not explicitly refer to the Reimagine Nature Master Plan.

Mr. Carroll asked if adding a bridge or a tunnel came up on public comment; Ms. Maus replied that crossing at 1700 South was probably one of the top issues that people voiced. Mr. Carroll stated that he would like to see a bridge incorporated into the Plan. Ms. Maus stated that she wasn't certain if Public Lands can make a formal recommendation for a Transportation-related project, such as a bridge, which is outside of Public Lands' jurisdiction; she would have to investigate this further.

Luke Allen mentioned that member Aaron Wiley had added a few questions and one comment to the Webex chat feature during the Board's discussion:

- "Access to outdoor pools on the westside is important to the community."
- "Does that mean that this master plan needs to be updated to show safer access at one of stages?"
- "Within the plan how will you address lighting?"

Ms. Maus replied that this vision plan does not go into the details of lighting specifically, but as they move forward with more detailed designs in Phase 1, they will be reaching out to the public for comments and feedback on what they'd like to see with lighting. Tyler Murdock, Deputy Director of Public Lands, replied in the Webex chat, that page 15 of the Vision Plan does discuss pedestrian crossings and need.

Mr. Allen shared more member comments from the Chat from Board members and staff.

Ms. Maus stated that next steps will be for her to work with Luke to prepare for returning to the Board's October meeting to update members with anything further; she will also see if she can get on a TAB agenda in either September or October.

Ms. Pehrson asked Ms. Maus how Public Lands was currently accepting public comment; Ms. Maus replied that they have an email address dedicated to this along with the community engagement touch points allowing for robust public comment.

Ms. Cannon asked if there was anything that Board members could do to promote the public comment period, and Ms. Maus replied that if the Board would like to share the webpage, that would be great. She also added that folks can attend the September 21st Glendale Community Council meeting to receive an overview of the Vision Plan like today's and could also ask questions on that day.

Ms. Pehrson and Ms. Maus discussed budget considerations and the hired consultant for the Vision Plan.

Board members commended Ms. Maus on her work and dedication to the Glendale Park Regional Park Vision Plan. Ms. Maus responded with gratitude for the Board's feedback throughout the process as well.

5 – Board Discussion and Action Items

5:55 PM

N/A (Potential Recess)

20 mins

6 – GO Bond

6:15 PM

GO Bond Presentation – Jason Swann, Trust for Public Land

q

Boyd Ferguson, City Attorney, shared the guidelines around advocacy versus education when it comes to the PNUT Board discussing the General Obligation bond. Three applicable state statutes are:

- The City may not spend public funds to campaign or advocate for or against a ballot proposition.
- A municipal officer or employee may not use municipal equipment while engaged in political activity.
- A person may not send an email on the city email system to advocate for or against a ballot proposition.

These rules apply to city employees, appointees, elected officials, and anyone else who is supported by City funds, including boards and commissions.

Mr. Ferguson noted three scenarios for folks in the room to concern themselves with:

1. For example, at a PNUT Board meeting, the Board may not advocate for or against a ballot proposition in the city meeting because for one, it is held within a City building and secondly, the PNUT Board is supported to some degree by city funds.
2. Suppose you are invited to attend a City Council meeting in your capacity as a PNUT Board member. You may not advocate for or against the ballot proposition in that setting, even though the meeting may not be held in a City building, as PNUT Board members are still supported by city funding.
3. You attend a community council meeting as an individual, not as a PNUT Board member. In that case, you may advocate for or against the ballot proposition, as another part of the law covers people retaining their individuals first amendment rights to speak.
 - a. In that third scenario, if someone were to ask the attending member if they are on the PNUT Board, then it would be advisable for the member to respond, "Yes, I am, but I am not here in that capacity, I am here as an individual at this time."

Mr. Carroll asked if it was then correct that the PNUT Board cannot make a resolution in favor of the ballot proposition; Mr. Ferguson replied that this was a correct interpretation. Mr. Ferguson further explained his interpretation of what constitutes an educational material positive in tone versus materials that encourages someone to vote for or against a ballot proposition. He stated that you can provide neutral information; but, if someone asks whether the board member considers the ballot proposition a good idea or not, then that is where you draw the line.

Ms. Hart asked a question regarding advocating as a private citizen, and Mr. Ferguson clarified that they may advocate as a private citizen. He further acknowledged that at times, this line may be blurry for Board members depending on the context; Mr. Ferguson also stated that Board members need not initiate that the conversation stating that they are PNUT Board members, but *if* they are asked, respond in the appropriate way that he has laid out above.

Ms. Cannon asked if the PNUT Board were to establish a subcommittee within the Board whose purpose was to disseminate general information about the GO Bond, if that would be going against ordinance. Mr. Ferguson replied that such a subcommittee would be subject to the same concepts that he just described for the PNUT Board itself; the subcommittee would need to be conscious just like the Board needs to be and stick to neutral information-sharing when acting in the capacity of a subcommittee member, though they would be able to advocate in their capacity as an individual.

Mr. Ferguson went on to state that the outside consultant hired by the City is being paid by the City and acting as the City's agent, taking the same care for how they interact with the ballot proposition as the PNUT Board, and its subcommittees must do.

Mr. Ferguson clarified that community councils, which are not connected to the City, may advocate for a ballot proposition within their meetings so long as the meeting is not held in a City-owned building.

Ms. Riker thanked Mr. Ferguson for the guiding information and proceeded to introduce the GO Bond project consultants Will Abberger, Vice President and Director of Conservation Finance, and Jason Swann, Intermountain West Program Director for Conservation Finance. Ms. Riker shared with the Board that she had been working with these folks with the Trust for Public Lands since March 2020, and they have helped Public Lands develop the vision about the bond and have provided a great deal of advice.

Jason Swann shared their screen with accompanying presentation slides. Jason thanked the PNUT board for having them and introduced themselves. Jason proceeded to speak to the board about the Trust for Public Land's (TPL) work with municipalities and what TPL's work has entailed thus far. Jason explained that TPL is a national nonprofit with 35 offices across the United States that has generated over \$85 billion in public funding for parks and access to lands and waters, has completed over 5,000 projects in parks, trails, schoolyards, and iconic outdoor spaces, and has created access to over 3.7 million acres of public land for over 9 million people.

Jason emphasized that what connects communities together is green space, and this is where TPL comes into play, protecting land conservation and restoration through research, design, policy advocacy, and thought leadership in the field.

Jason presented a table to the Board that illustrated Utah's local conservation finance ballot measures between 1996 and 2020, sourced from TPL's LandVote database, which has led to the creation of roughly \$100 million in conservation finance in various jurisdictions throughout Utah. Jason then presented a breakdown of public funding for land conservation within the United States between 1998 and 2021, illustrating that most of this funding – 51% -- comes from local government. The reason for this is due to the level of interaction and closeness local government has with the issues impacting them.

Jason also presented a chart that displayed proof that voters will approve tax increases in the name of conservation, no matter the political party currently at the helm. Jason then moved on to discuss the three key ingredients for a conservation funding foundation, through TPL's perspective, which are: Community Support, Demonstrable Need and/or Risk, and Elected Leadership.

Regarding measuring community support, Jason said that TPL was able to conduct feasibility studies and received statistically significant survey responses that constituents were interested in voting for a conservation funding measure. Additionally, TPL wanted to understand what both the public's and elected official's conservation priorities were.

Regarding elected leadership, TPL was also able to work with the SLC Mayor and City Council to coordinate the city referendum process.

Lastly, regarding gauging a demonstrable need and/or risk, it was very vital for the TPL to lean on the partners and community connections on the ground, including the PNUT Board, to inform the information-gathering process.

Jason then touched on the critical steps for obtaining a successful ballot measure, with TPL currently being in the final stage of the process, the Campaign stage. Jason reiterated that 75% of the work is done in prior stages, such as the Community Engagement stage. It has taken over two years of work to get to the final stage, Jason mentioned.

Jason stated that the next steps in the Campaign stage include procuring communications and educational materials for the public.

Ms. Finch asked if a three-page memo that FM3 Research sent to Jason and that Jason then forwarded to the PNUT Board was something that Board members could disseminate? Jason stated that yes, it was; Ms. Riker clarified that everything that comes from TPL is not City-produced or vetted. She further emphasized that every single material that she and other staff send to the PNUT Board is first sent to City Attorney Boyd Ferguson for review and final approval. She added that anything sent to PNUT Board members by anyone other than Salt Lake City can be shared by a Board member in their capacity as an individual, and not as a city board member. This is also true for anything coming from the City-contracted consultant on the project, who also need to operate under the purview of guidelines set forth earlier by City Attorney Ferguson.

Ms. Finch asked several clarifying questions, including another prior measure that was pulled from the ballot, which both Jason and Ms. Riker answered.

Ms. Cannon confirmed that there is less than 60 days left until the GO bond vote. She then asked if it would be beneficial to begin forming a subcommittee to devise a targeted response at this time. Mr. Carroll clarified that, because each member represents diverse districts with their own active community councils, this may be

appropriate for community councils to begin discussing prior to the November elections; Mr. Carroll then asked for confirmation that this would be something he would have to do as an individual, rather than as representing the PNUT Board. The Board and staff confirmed that yes, this is an example of something Mr. Carroll and all PNUT Board members would have to do in their capacity as individuals.

Ms. Riker replied to Mr. Carroll's and Ms. Cannon's comments that members are always welcome to reach out to anyone present in today's Board meeting for ideas on how to navigate that, but she reiterated that tonight, the Board is strictly covering the educational side of the issue.

Ms. Finch stated that she had another question for the TPL Team about their polling questions – one of them being about the public's confidence in the government to spend the funds appropriately. Ms. Finch noted that this question produced one of the lower-percentage responses; she also noted that the polling questions were broad in nature (e.g., "Do you love clean air?" etc.). Ms. Finch went on to ask if there was any discrepancy or daylight concerns about the city spending the money appropriately regarding that concern that was highlighted in their polling? Jason Swann thanked Ms. Finch for the question and said that they believed this is typical of what one sees in polling the public regarding government spending, regardless of jurisdiction: local, county, state. Jason mentioned that, if TPL's polling responses were bad – which in this case, they didn't believe it was – TPL would then suggest that accountability provisions be added to the ballot language, such as a citizens oversight committee, sunset provisions, and so forth. Will Abberger added that there is a high degree of distrust amongst all voters towards government in the nation right now, and that it is good that groups like the PNUT Board exist to ensure that the city is spending the funding in congruence with what voters expect.

Mr. Carroll asked if the GO Bond was for capital investments and improvements or if programming was also included; Jason responded that it was just for capital and that bonds are not allowed to do any kind of maintenance or anything like that. Jason also mentioned that there is a project list that has been circulating, and they would be happy to send it again.

Ms. Finch asked if the actual ballot language has already been released to the public; Ms. Riker responded that it was released on August 16, 2022, in the City Council meeting as part of their meeting materials. Ms. Riker stated that she was happy to send the Board the link to this Council page.

Ms. Finch continued that she was assuming that the language chosen for the GO Bond was language most successful across all jurisdictions wherever they've tried this type of bond measure, and that she imagines there must be equation more conducive to obtaining a "yes" vote than a "no" vote. Jason responded that TPL was not directly involved with ballot language creation in this instance, though it is something that TPL does. Will Abberger added that there are liability requirements under Utah law that a city must meet regarding ballot language.

Ms. Riker added that the Bond Council made their own decisions about they wanted the language to read; Public Lands provided them with TPL's language suggestions, but it was not utilized. Jason and Will confirmed that TPL thought viewed the language as fine to use.

Mr. Carroll asked questions regarding about a budget campaign for the GO Bond and whether an opposition group had come forward. Ms. Riker responded that an opposition group has not come forward at this time, though Public Lands is aware of some con-GO Bond comments following press coverage of the Bond. She added that when Public Lands releases the public information pamphlet, it will contain a "pro" argument as well as a "con" argument. Thus, the City has put out a call to anyone who would like to create the "con" argument to contact the City by September 5, with the closing of that by September 9. Pending the City does not receive any responses to their call, Public Lands consultants will do their best to develop a transparent "con" argument based on the information they have from the public.

Mr. Carroll stated that he is deeply involved in his community council, and so if he or another Board member wanted to present on the GO Bond in a community council meeting, could they call upon city staff to do so? Ms. Riker responded that Public Lands staff can try to attend community council meetings to deliver GO Bond informational presentations; though, Ms. Riker added that Public Lands is currently working with its consultant to put together an educational video that will include information that can be shared in newsletters and meetings. She added that Public Lands and the City want to ensure that they equitably disseminate information in the short amount of time between now and the election on November 8 and aren't certain they will be able to schedule time to go to every single community council meeting. Thus Ms. Riker stressed that equitable information dissemination is key to informing Public Lands' strategy for creating a video and so forth.

Mr. Allen added that Minerva Jimenez-Garcia, Public Lands Community Partnership and Engagement Coordinator, had sent a factual, informational letter to every community council chair prior to today's PNUT meeting regarding the GO Bond. Mr. Allen stated that Minerva encouraged chairs to reach back out to Public Lands with any questions and we will be sure to address them in the voter information materials that we will answer the most frequently asked questions. Lastly, Mr. Allen informed the PNUT Board that Public Lands is setting up an informational website on the GO Bond and that staff will send the website link to Board members as well as community council chairs when it is live and ready to share.

Ms. Hart asked if every City Council district seat is currently represented by the PNUT Board; Mr. Allen confirmed this. Ms. Hart then said that every member who is a non-at-large seat could make it their duty to reach out to the community council(s) within their district to ensure public discussion of the GO Bond gets on the community councils' agenda. Ms. Riker assured Mr. Carroll and the rest of the Board that Public Lands is moving as quickly as possible with developing informational materials with its consultant team; Ms. Riker believes that staff will be able to send out information and get the website live prior to the Board's next meeting, though they've only had one

week so far to dive into everything. Ms. Riker also mentioned that the City's constituent liaisons are also always at the community council meetings and will be provided with all the GO Bond information as well.

Ms. Hart and Ms. Riker affirmed that the Mayor's Office is also involved with the GO Bond efforts via their constituent liaisons being present at the community council meetings. Mr. Carroll asked whether City constituent liaisons can advocate for the GO Bond, to which Ms. Riker's responded that they are not; however, the Mayor can advocate because she is an elected official. Ms. Riker clarifies that any elected official may advocate for or against the GO Bond so long as they are not using city funds, facilities, vehicles, or equipment. Mr. Carroll asked if lawn signs would be available; Ms. Riker and Ms. Allen stated that they were uncertain if lawn signs were in the scope, but anything that staff must share with PNUT in the coming months they will absolutely do.

Ms. Hart inquired about TPL's involvement going forward and whether they can coordinate signage with citizens. Will replied that TPL certainly has the expertise and experience in this area, but unfortunately, not the funding to provide for an SLC campaign. Will added that this money would need to be raised locally. Ms. Cannon mentioned that it would be great if there was a Parks 501(c)(3) that existed so that organization could take on a lot of the additional fundraising and advocacy work.

Mr. Carroll asked more clarifying questions relating to lawn signs; Tyler Murdock, Deputy Director of Public Lands, replied in the Webex Chat, "Lawn signs are included in our consultant's scope of work. I am not sure on the qty yet. We can update the board on how many we will have."

Ms. Hart added that because the lawn signs are being paid for by the city, the lawn signs can only contain factual, non-persuasive information. Ms. Riker and Ms. Pehrson confirmed that any GO Bond educational materials sent to the PNUT Board have already been vetted and cleared by City attorney Boyd Ferguson.

Ms. Hart asked whether the informational materials could also go up at trailheads; Ms. Riker responded that Public Lands tries to refrain from doing this so that people are not encouraged to place ever more items at our trails.

Ms. Finch asked TPL if PNUT Board members if they have any advice for the members or can think of questions unasked. Jason reiterated that working with community councils within members' representative districts to ensure that the GO Bond makes it onto their agendas is a good approach; secondly, Jason also offered TPL strategizing services to advocacy groups if Board members wanted to pass that information along to community leaders in their districts. Will added that as individuals, members have their own networks, individual email addresses, and social media platforms where they have a right to advocate for the Bond.

Mr. Carroll asked if the Bond just covers Salt Lake City; Ms. Riker replied that yes, the GO Bond just concerns SLC residents.

Ms. Cannon reminded the Board that in terms of projects in the Public Lands’ queue list—such as Glendale Regional, which is just \$27 M on its own—the GO Bond funding would really help with all the projects on that list. Will Abberger mentioned that another no-cost way for members to get the word out would be to write letters to the editor or via op-eds to local media sources as individuals. Ms. Riker added that if Board members want to discuss more with Jason and Will about how to personally advocate, they can follow-up with Will and Jason on their own outside of this meeting. Ms. Cannon reminded everyone that public hearings for the GO Bond were on October 11 and October 18 at the City Council; Ms. Riker added that this notice will be on the public information packet as well, and that there would also be 4X6 cards mailed along with ballots educating voters about the ballot measure. Mr. Carroll asked when members will know when lawn signs are available; Mr. Allen and Ms. Riker assured him that they will email him when the lawn signs are available. Ms. Riker mentioned that she had just emailed all members the link to the August 16 City Council meeting that included GO Bond materials. Mr. Carroll asked Jason Swann and Will Abberger about the Nature Conservancy’s and Huey Johnson’s relationship to the Trust for Public Lands. Will explained that TPL is a basically an offshoot of the Nature Conservancy, which is focused on the protection of biological diversity; Huey and other founding members of the TPL felt that there was also a need for an organization to focus on land for people. Ms. Riker thanked Jason and Will for the TPL’s efforts and time; Ms. Hart moved onto the next agenda item.	
7 – Confirmation of Next Meeting, Board Comments & Future Agenda Items	7:00 PM
Board subcommittee updates as needed - Trails subcommittee Mr. Allen mentioned that Board member Brianna Binnebose had dropped off the meeting, but that he had met with Ms. Binnebose and Ms. Pehrson a few days prior about both the Trails and Communications Subcommittees. Mr. Carroll mentioned that the subcommittee had discussed e-bikes. - Communication subcommittee Ms. Pehrson stated that Communications had discussed with Mr. Allen adding to the Public Lands monthly newsletter which district each project is taking place in, having the Communications Subcommittee review a few of the Public Lands Communications Staff’s communications plans, and providing PNUT Board members with PNUT email addresses, phone numbers, and file-sharing capabilities so that they are accessible to the public yet can also maintain some privacy.	

Mr. Allen also reminded members to reply to his email regarding their bios and pictures. Member bios are to be 200 words or less. Ms. Pehrson inquired about the potential usability of Slack and other messaging platforms for the group to explore; Ms. Cannon replied that she believed subcommittees could determine that on their own, referencing the power given to subcommittees in the Board's bylaws. Ms. Pehrson clarified that she was referring to a general Slack for PNUT to use, where there could be different channels for each subcommittee. Ms. Cannon replied that she is open to that, personally. Mr. Allen mentioned that implementing a file-sharing system may help with this.	
Board comment and question period Ms. Binnebose rejoined the meeting and inquired about a new board member joining PNUT. Ms. Riker stated that there is another board member on the City Council's agenda for approval on Tuesday, September 6th. This would be for Ms. Hart's position; pending Ms. Hart's replacement is approved, the PNUT Board would need to add "voting of a new PNUT Chair" as an agenda item to its October agenda. Board discussion on chair election and Ms. Hart's replacement continued. Ms. Binnebose will be prepared to chair next month's meeting.	
Next meeting: October 6, 2022	
Request for future agenda items Ms. Finch mentioned Capitol Improvement Projects; Ms. Riker replied that Mr. Murdock and his team are planning a CIP presentation for October. Ms. Finch also mentioned another discussion around the GO Bond ballot measure. Ms. Cannon mentioned it would be good to have such a discussion revolve around educational materials available plus updates from individual members about what they've been doing in their districts relating to the measure. Mr. Carroll also confirmed that the Glendale Regional Project Plan will also be on the October agenda.	
8 – Adjourn	7:15 PM
Ms. Finch motioned to adjourn the meeting; Ms. Pehrson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously, and the September PNUT Board meeting was adjourned.	

Webex Chat

to Aaron Wiley (privately): 5:39 PM

Aaron, I'm going to lower your hand, but feel free to raise it again if you have any questions.

from Millar, Tom to everyone: 5:44 PM

I should note that TAB deals with all transportation, and not just public transit.

from Bra Binnebose to everyone: 5:52 PM

I like where Ginger is going with this, it's a great opportunity to address moving people to this new facility safely and through multiple modes. I'd like for our board to work with TAB on this and other projects

from Aaron Wiley 2 to everyone: 5:54 PM

Does that mean that this master plan needs to be updated to show safer access at one of stages?

from Allen, Luke to everyone: 5:54 PM

Thanks, Aaron, I'll bring that question up momentarily.

from Aaron Wiley 2 to everyone: 5:55 PM

Access to outdoor pools on the westside is important to the community.

from Aaron Wiley 2 to everyone: 5:58 PM

Within the plan how will you address lighting?

from Millar, Tom to everyone: 6:01 PM

Thanks, everyone. I've gotta take off. I look forward to next month.

from Murdock, Tyler to everyone: 6:02 PM

Page 15 of the Glendale Plan does discuss pedestrian crossings and need. If board members are looking to review that section.

from Murdock, Tyler to everyone: 6:48 PM

2015

from Murdock, Tyler to everyone: 7:05 PM

Lawn signs are included in our consultants scope of work. I am not sure on the qty yet. We can update the board on how many we will have.



Memorandum

To: Parks, Natural Lands, Urban Forestry, & Trails Advisory Board
From: Tom Millar, Planning Manager, Salt Lake City Public Lands Department
Date: September 29, 2022
Re: Preliminary Public Lands CIP FY 2023-2024 Project List for PNUT Board Consideration

Overview:

The following 13 projects (labelled A through M) are being considered (in no particular order of priority or preference) by the Salt Lake City Public Lands Department for application to the City's Capital Improvement Program (CIP) for fiscal year 2023-2024. All costs and descriptions in this document are generalized and very preliminary. They will be updated after the Board's prioritization. Final applications are due in December.

Suggested PNUT Board Action:

The Department requests the PNUT Board's prioritization of these projects (and potentially a letter for the projects that the Board supports) at or before the November 3, 2022, meeting.

Projects:

A. Court Resurfacing (City Council Districts 1 and 3)

Replace or resurface tennis and/or pickleball courts (depending on public engagement) at two locations: the Fairpark/Fire Station Tennis Courts in District 1 and Warm Springs Park in District 3, or courts of similar condition.

Project Cost: \$1,000,000

B. Playground Replacement (D4 and D5)

Replace aging and outdated playgrounds at two locations: Richmond Park in District 4 and Jefferson Park in District 5, or playgrounds of similar condition.

Project Cost: \$600,000

C. Jordan Park and Peace Gardens Cultural Landscape Report (CLR) and Master Plan (D2)

Begins with a CLR, followed by and informing a Master Plan. The plan will include potential recommendations for how/if Salt Lake City should expand the Peace Gardens and additional amenities for Jordan Park. Work will include robust public engagement, visioning, and implementation strategies.

Project Cost: \$300,000

D. Memory Grove and Freedom Trail Cultural Landscape Report (CLR) and Master Plan (D3)

Begins with a CLR, followed by and informing a Master Plan. CLR could be more extensive than normal considering the greater number of existing monuments and structures. Work will include robust public engagement, visioning, and implementation strategies.

Project Cost: \$350,000

E. Cottonwood Park Trailhead and Parking Lot (D1)

Acquisition of a property adjoining Cottonwood Park is in final stages. Once acquired, the Public Lands Department would develop a trailhead and parking lot, with signage and amenities that better serve the park's current and future users. This project would fund design and construction.

Project Cost: \$600,000

F. Rose Park and Jordan River Recreational Concept Design (D1)

Planning and redesign of the existing driving range at the Rose Park Golf Course and enhancements to Jordan River Roots Disc Golf Course. Expands public open space and determines preferred site developments, activation, restoration, and landscape improvements for the largest open space along the Jordan River within Salt Lake City (north of 1000 North, east of Redwood Road).

Project Cost: \$500,000

G. Pollinator Landscape Enhancements (D1/2 and D3)

Design and construction of pollinator garden projects along the Jordan River in Districts 1 or 2 and Lindsey Gardens in District 3. Project includes all earthwork and irrigation infrastructure, identification of exact locations and garden sizes, and implementation. Plants would be grown at Liberty Park Greenhouse through the SLC Native Plant Propagation Program.

Project Cost: \$500,000

H. 11th Avenue Park Pavilion (D3)

Due to cost escalations, the pavilion was not able to be constructed as part of the previously funded project for 11th Avenue Park. This request would provide the funding needed to construct the pavilion, accounting for inflation and soft costs (design, construction management, contracting).

Project Cost: \$350,000

I. Rose Park Lane Promenade Implementation and Open Space Study (D1)

Design and implementation of irrigation, street trees, and completing a short 600' gap in the existing trail/sidepath on Rose Park Lane near the Regional Athletic Complex (RAC). Improvements would occur within the public right-of-way, beginning at 1700 North and continuing north to and inclusive of the entrance to the RAC (approximately 3,000 linear feet). The project would also include community engagement and conceptual design for desired, possible uses of the newly rezoned, publicly-owned open space property (roughly 2.7 acres) located on Rose Park Lane, south of the RAC.

Project Cost: \$650,000 (\$590,000 for Rose Park Lane Promenade Implementation; \$60,000 for the Open Space Study)

J. 337 Park Development (D4)

An existing park, first established as a community garden, that needs significant development to add public land service to District 4 (downtown). Funding would facilitate planning, design, and construction.

Project Cost: \$600,000

K. Park Strip, Median, and Park Irrigation/Water Reduction Strategy (Various Districts)

Design recommendations (20% of the budget) and implementation at up to 4 pilot locations of water reduction strategies for typical park strips, medians, and larger park areas that are not used for active recreation.

Project Cost: \$500,000

L. Parks Signage Replacement (Various Districts)

Replace existing signage and add new multi-lingual signage in approximately 10 parks. This would be the second phase of implementation (first 10 parks started in 2022) using the City's new multi-lingual signage standards. Specific sites to be determined before December 2022.

Project Cost: \$500,000

M. Library Plaza Repair, Improvements, and Activation (D4)

Planning and design to solve complex drainage issues before maintenance or capital budgets are spent on alteration or construction. Would consider the Library Plaza's block wedge wall, fountain, retaining wall, and pavers. The project would also include a study to identify solutions for activating the site (mitigating barriers for use, primarily direct sun during the summer months) for a public event space as originally intended.

Project Cost: \$300,000

SALT LAKE CITY PARKS, NATURAL LANDS, TRAILS, AND URBAN FORESTRY ADVISORY BOARD

BY-LAWS

Updated May 2022

AUTHORITY

The Salt Lake City Parks, Natural Lands, Trails, and Urban Forestry Advisory Board (the “Board”) will operate pursuant to Salt Lake City Code Chapter 2.94, Parks, Natural Lands, Trails, and Urban Forestry Advisory Board.

The Board was created in 2012 for increased stewardship and public participation for the Open Space Program. The City’s Parks Division, Trails and Natural Lands Division, Golf Division, and Urban Forestry Division are now part of the City’s Public Lands Department (the “Department”). The City Council has determined that one advising board for those divisions will lead to efficiencies and remove duplication and confusion as to the respective roles and responsibilities and has determined that Chapter 2.94 is in the best interest of the City and its citizens. The Mayor and the City Council recognize the need to acquire, preserve, and protect these critical resources within Salt Lake City and its environs. They have adopted multiple plans to identify, protect, and manage open space lands and have established the Board to facilitate the City’s acquisition, management, promotion, preservation, protection, and enhancement of public lands.

The Board has established the following By-Laws for the conduct of Board business:

PRINCIPAL OFFICE

The Board’s principal office is at the Public Lands Building at 1965 West 500 South, Salt Lake City, Utah.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS AND TERMS

The Board’s officers will be a chair and a vice-chair. The term of those positions will be one year. No person may serve more than two consecutive terms as chair. The vice-chair may be reelected one or more times successively. The vice-chair will not automatically succeed to the position of chair, except that the vice-chair will succeed the chair if the chair vacates the office before the chair’s term is completed; in that event the vice-chair will serve as chair for the unexpired term of the vacated office. The Board shall elect a new vice-chair at the next regular Board meeting.

If the vice-chair is unable or unwilling to serve the remaining term of the vacated office, the Board shall meet as soon as practicable to elect a new chair for the remainder of the term.

Any Board member may nominate themselves or any other Board member for the positions of chair and vice-chair. The Board may nominate and elect members to other offices as deemed appropriate by a majority of the Board. Oral nominations from the floor as well as written or digital nominations will be accepted. Written, digital and oral nominations must be made in the month of December or at the last Board meeting of the year. All nominees must be contacted and state their availability and willingness to serve before being placed in nomination.

The election will be by written, oral, or digital ballot. Subject to City Code Section 2.07.120, the Board, at its first regular meeting of each calendar year, shall select a member as chair and another as vice-chair. Proxy votes will not be allowed. Officers will be elected by an affirmative majority vote of the Board members in attendance. The current chair shall solicit two members of the Board who are neither officers nor a nominee to conduct the vote and count ballots. The officers-elect shall assume their duties at the next regular Board meeting.

POWERS AND DUTIES OF OFFICERS

Without limiting the foregoing, the duties and powers of the officers of the Board are as follows:

A. Chair:

- (1) Preside at all meetings of the Board.
- (2) Call special meetings of the Board in accordance with the By-laws.
- (3) Sign Board documents.
- (4) See that the Board complies with the By-laws and applicable law.
- (5) Appoint standing or ad hoc subcommittees of the Board.
- (6) May be an ex-officio member of any or all subcommittees with a voice but no vote.
- (7) Act as official spokesperson for the Board in matters of which the Board has taken a formal vote or position.

B. Vice-Chair:

The vice-chair shall assist the chair, and during the absence of the chair, shall exercise or perform all the duties and be subject to all the responsibilities of the chair.

REGULAR MEETINGS

The Chair will govern the conduct of all regular and special meetings of the Board and ensure agenda items are to involve a motion, a second, any pertinent discussion, and a vote.

The Board shall meet on an as needed basis but at least twice per quarter as specified in City Code Section 2.94.050. The Board shall establish a schedule specifying the times,

dates, and locations of regular meetings. The Board may alter the schedule at any regular meeting, and shall comply with the Utah Open and Public Meetings Act (“OPMA”). A quorum will consist of the majority of filled Board positions.

The Board may hold an electronic meeting in accordance with OPMA. A Board member who attends an electronic meeting remotely by electronic means will be counted as present for purposes of calculating whether a quorum of the Board is present at the meeting. The length of a Board meeting can extend for the length of time necessary to complete Board business and/or discussion.

All Board meeting agendas and minutes will be posted and provided for public review according to OPMA.

SPECIAL MEETINGS

Special meetings may be called by a majority of the Board, by the chair or by the mayor and shall comply with OPMA. The call for a special meeting must be signed by the member calling such meeting and, unless waived in writing, each member not joining in the order for such special meeting must be given not less than 24 hours’ notice. Said notice must be served personally through email, phone, or by hand delivery at a member’s residence or business office. Attendance by a Board member will constitute the waiver by that Board member of any defects in the notice.

Special meetings will be held at the Department’s building, or remotely using an electronic meeting, or at such other public place as may be designated by the Board.

VOTING

All official Board business that results in a recommendation to the Mayor, the City Council, or any other public agency or commission must be approved by an affirmative vote of a majority of the Board members, and must comply with City Code Section 2.07.150.

The Board must take a roll call vote of record upon request of any Board member. Each Board member will only have one vote and a record of each vote within the roll call must be included in the meeting minutes.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

At any regular meeting of the Board, the order of business will generally be as follows:

- A. Call meeting to order.
- B. Approval of minutes.
- C. Invite public comment.
- D. Public Lands Department - staff presentation(s) and discussion

- E. Board Discussion
- F. Voting on official business.
- G. Confirm date for next meeting; reporting of sub-committees.
- H. Adjournment.

AGENDA

The meeting agenda will be prepared by the Department liaison and the chair, working together. The agenda must be given as part of the meeting notice in accordance with OPMA. The Department liaison will provide the agenda to Board members seven days prior to a regularly scheduled Board meeting, with an exception for urgent circumstances as approved by the chair. Any member of the Board may request topics for discussion at the meeting through communication with the chair.

At the first regularly scheduled meeting of each year, the Board shall review a calendar of anticipated Department projects for the forthcoming year. For any agenda, the priority order for agenda items will be (1) staff presentation and discussion; (2) Board discussion; and (3) vote on official business.

Out of respect for members of the public in attendance, if a closed session of the Board is necessary, the closed session will be the last item on the agenda. Except in the case of an emergency meeting, the Board may not take final action on a topic unless the topic is listed under an agenda item and included with the advance public notice of the meeting.

Each topic considered at the Board meeting must be included in the agenda except topics raised during the public comment period. If a member of the public raises a topic, the majority of the Board may request, and the chair may allow, Board discussion of the public comments. The Board may discuss public comments or advise staff to respond to public comments made within a public meeting during the Board comment and question period.

The public will be invited to speak during a 15 minute public comment period on issues that pertain to parks and public lands. Public comment speaking limits will be prescribed by the chair, and the chair will have discretion to extend the public comment period beyond the allotted time period.

MINUTES

In accordance with OPMA, the Department liaison shall keep written minutes and a recording of each Board meeting. Pending minutes will be provided to the Board members for their review within two weeks after a Board meeting and will contain a clear indication that the Board has not approved the minutes or that the minutes are subject to change until the Board approves them. Board members may return amendments and corrections to the minutes at or before the next regularly scheduled Board meeting. The

updated minutes will be included with the agenda for approval at the next regularly scheduled Board meeting.

Within three days after approving the minutes, the Department Liaison must make the approved minutes available to the public in accordance with OPMA.

BOARD MEMBER RESPONSIBILITIES

Board members are expected to attend all Board meetings. Board members are expected to actively serve on a minimum of one subcommittee during each year of their Board term and assist with drafting letters and recommendations to the Mayor and City Council under Chapter 2.94.060 paragraph J.

Any Board member failing to attend two Board meetings in one calendar year without advance notice to the chair of the Board member's absence will be subject to removal by the Board in accordance with City Code Section 2.07.090.

Board members are expected to review all agenda items or other provided materials in advance of each scheduled meeting.

Board members shall be respectful of the public, staff, and each other.

The Board chair shall ensure that all Board members have a fair, balanced, and respectful opportunity to share their knowledge, opinions, and perspectives.

The role of the Board is to advise the Mayor and the City Council and/or staff. Board appointment does not empower Members to make final decisions or to supervise staff.

Board correspondence written to the Mayor and the City Council as prescribed under Chapter 2.94.060 paragraph J must be made through the Chair to ensure that the consensus opinion of the Board is represented. The Department liaison fulfills an important role in assisting the Board with this regard.

If a Board member, other than the chair, gives their opinion to the media or in a public forum about Board business, that member must also clarify that this is their personal view or opinion and not the opinion or view of the Board or another Board member.

Subcommittees of the Board will be established by the chair, or by majority vote of the Board when proposed by any Board member. The chair shall cause the following details to be placed on the agenda for Board consideration:

- Committee type (standing or ad-hoc)
- Committee membership (who is involved and the expected time commitment)
- Work objective (the purpose or scope of the subcommittee work)
- Timeline (when and how the work will be accomplished)

- Committee reporting (a presentation and/or written summary of committee work for Board review and/or approval)

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

Public comment is invited during Board meetings as part of the general agenda.

Board meetings are intended to be a place for people to feel safe and comfortable in participating in their government. A respectful and safe environment allows Board meetings to be conducted in an orderly, efficient, effective, and dignified fashion, free from distraction, intimidation, and threats to safety. We welcome everyone and ask all meeting participants to keep comments free of discriminatory language referring to a person or group based on their religion, ethnicity, nationality, race, color, descent, gender, sexual orientation, disability, age or other identity factor.

In order to support a respectful meeting, items that disrupt the meeting, intimidate other participants or that may cause safety concerns are not allowed. If any person fails to conduct themselves in a civil manner, the chair can direct that person to leave the meeting. The chair may elect to terminate a Board meeting if Board business cannot be conducted due to continued disruption or threats to safety.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Board members must avoid and disclose conflicts of interest in accordance with applicable conflict of interest laws, including City Code Section 2.07.080. If any member wonders whether a particular set of circumstances might involve a conflict of interest, that member shall notify the Director of Public Lands requesting an opinion of the City Attorney on whether there is a conflict and how to avoid or otherwise resolve it.

AMENDMENT

These By-Laws may be amended in writing at any meeting by a vote of a majority of the entire membership of the Board, provided prior notice has been given to each Board member.

MOTION FOR ADOPTION OF RULES AND REGULATIONS

Upon motion duly made and seconded and by unanimous vote of the Board at its regularly scheduled meeting held on _____, 2022, the By-Laws of the Parks, Natural Lands, Trails, and Urban Forestry Advisory Board, dated _____, 2022, were formally adopted.

CHAIR

CERTIFICATION

_____, in my capacity as chair of the Parks, Natural Lands, Trails, and Urban Forestry Advisory Board hereby certify that the foregoing document is a complete, accurate, and current copy of the By-Laws of that Board.

CHAIR