

Formal Meeting
Thursday, November 3, 2022
5:00 p.m. – 7:15 p.m.

Join Via Webex: <https://saltlakecity.webex.com/saltlakecity/j.php?MTID=m9a616f9c51de9bf05ac06c44beebc179>

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: 2486 310 5595

AGENDA

1 – Convening the Meeting	5:00 PM
Call to order	
Chair comments	5 mins
2 – Approval of Minutes	5:05 PM
Approve October 6, 2022 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
PNUT board member stipend update – Luke Allen	5 mins
Continued Public Lands CIP FY 2023-2024 discussion – Tom Millar	45 mins
5 – Board Discussion and Action Items	6:15 PM
Continued discussion about board subcommittees and bylaws	20 mins
Review process for upcoming board chair and vice chair elections	5 mins
Discuss letter of support for Glendale Regional Park Plan – Action Item	10 mins
Determine date and topics for January board retreat	10 mins
6 – Confirmation of Next Meeting, Board Comments & Future Agenda Items	7:00 PM
Board subcommittee updates as needed • Trails subcommittee • Communication subcommittee	
Board comment and question period	
Next meeting: December 1, 2022	
Request for future agenda items	
7 – Adjourn	7:15 PM

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

Minutes (**Unapproved**)

1 – Convening the Meeting	5:00 PM
Call to order - Brianna Binnebose - Meredith Benally - Samantha Finch - Jenny Hewson - Phil Carroll - Clayton Scrivner - Aaron Wiley - CJ Whittaker	
Chair comments Brianna Binnebose called the meeting to order. Ms. Binnebose reminded everyone that she is temporarily filling in as PNUT Chair until elections are held in January 2023. She thanked board members and staff for their patience with her.	5 mins
Introduce new board member Ms. Binnebose introduced Meredith Benally as the new at-large PNUT Board member. Meredith stated that they are Navajo; for most of their life, Meredith has resided in Southern Utah and Utah is a very special place to them. Additionally, Meredith's mom worked as a tour guide for the state of Utah several years ago and knows so much about the state. Meredith expressed the privilege they felt for being on the PNUT Board, thanked everyone, and welcomed board members to ask further questions of them if they would like. Ms. Binnebose replied that the members were happy to have Meredith Benally serving on the Board and asked which part of Salt Lake they were residing in. Meredith responded that they are currently in Taylorsville.	10 mins

Kristin Riker suggested that the PNUT Board go around the table and introduce themselves along with their district or whether they are an at-large member. Samantha Finch introduced herself as the District 7 representative for the PNUT Board, known as the Sugar House area of Salt Lake City. Ms. Finch mentioned that her favorite park is Fairmont and encouraged folks to visit it. Phil Carroll introduced himself as the District 3 representative for the PNUT Board, known as the Avenues and Capitol Hill area of Salt Lake City. Mr. Carroll mentioned that his favorite spaces are Memory Grove and City Creek. Ms. Riker introduced herself as director of Public Lands and she loves all parks. Dan Dugan, visiting Councilperson for Salt Lake City Council District 6, introduced himself to the PNUT Board. Mr. Dugan's favorite space is the Shoreline Trail. Jenny Hewson introduced herself as an at-large representative for the PNUT Board and she resides East of the Avenues. Ms. Hewson's favorite space is the Foothills Trail System, and this is her second term on the board. Clayton Scrivner introduced himself as the District 4 representative for the PNUT Board, known as the Downtown area of Salt Lake City. Mr. Scrivner's favorite park is Gilgal Gardens because it represents the city stepping up and preserving something for generations to come. Ms. Binnebose introduced herself as the District 5 representative for the PNUT Board, known as the Liberty Wells area of Salt Lake City. Ms. Binnebose's favorite park is Liberty Park as she spends quite a bit of time there. CJ Whittaker introduced himself as the District 6 representative for the PNUT Board. Mr. Whittaker's favorite spaces are Davis Park and the Shoreline Trail. Aaron Wiley introduced himself as the District 1 representative for the PNUT Board. Mr. Wiley's favorite park is Riverside.	
2 – Approval of Minutes	5:15 PM
Approve September 1, 2022, meeting minutes Ms. Binnebose asked if anyone had edits to the September PNUT meeting minutes. Samantha Finch moved to approve the minutes; Ms. Hewson seconded the motion. The Board voted unanimously to approve the September 1 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. Anne Cannon Anne Cannon introduced themselves as a resident of District 6 and is present to speak to the board about Wasatch Hollow Park and Preserve. Anne stated that Wasatch	

Hollow had a recent off-leash dog survey and that everyone wants something done. Anne stated that the park has deteriorated from its beginning, and they hope the park will return to what it used to be. Anne further explained that off-leash dogs are just part of the issue; the conflict created by the increased amount of time for dogs off-leash and people is very out of balance. The other issue is that there is about to be three preserve entrances; they explained that currently, there are two parts to the Wasatch Hollow area, which are a park and a preserve. The preserve entrances are all into the preserve, which allows no dogs at all. The issue with both areas of the park is enforcement. Anne Cannon continued that, as the city acquires more properties for public space, the ability to enforce rules in those properties is almost zero. Anne stated that signs have been used for years to display rules; however, Anne stated that they find the signs ineffective due to their likelihood of being stolen or vandalized. Anne wants the Board to be made aware that it has an existing park that needs more help in terms of enforcement and that any acquiring of further properties will also need enforcement. Anne added that they believe the Park Ranger Program to be great, but it's very gentle and does not cover Wasatch Hollow Park. Anne encouraged the City to increase the range of the Park Rangers Program and to find a way to enforce the purpose and use of the parks so they can be used by everyone and not just a few. Jim Webster Jim Webster stated that they had sent photos to CJ Whittaker this morning. Jim stated that there was an enormous pile of dead wood in Miller Park where the old oxbow was. Jim stated that a Public Lands staff member had promised to get the pile out but that it had taken about five weeks' time, and much of it ended up in the creek, which was not good. Jim said that they wanted to remind the Board that Miller Park was dedicated by Minnie Miller to the children of the neighborhood. The problem is that a lower path that Jim had written a CIP grant for in years prior – which they state had been approved during a past administration – has not yet been created. Jim further explained that it's unfortunate that nothing has been done on this project and that it is not a priority. Lastly, Jim stated that the doggie bag dispenser has been empty for about six weeks now, which has led to increased dog feces throughout the park. Ms. Binnebose thanked Anne and Jim for their comments and after seeing no further public comment, confirmed that Public Lands staff would have written responses to public commenters available online prior to the November PNUT Board meeting.	
4 – Staff Discussion and Agenda Items	5:35 PM
Salt Lake City Council Chair Dan Dugan Remarks Mr. Dugan thanked the PNUT Board for having him at their meeting and stated that he appreciates the incredible responsibility that comes with overseeing the parks and for the members' time and energy.	5 mins
Glendale Regional Park Master Plan Update – Action Item – Kat Maus Katherine (“Kat”) Maus, Public Lands Planner, introduced herself to the board and stated that she was present today to provide members with a quick update on the	10 mins

Glendale Regional Park Plan and her recent presentation to the Transportation Advisory Board (TAB).

Ms. Maus stated that PNUT member Ginger Cannon had been present at the TAB presentation and solicited collaboration from the TAB during the discussions. Ms. Maus explained that ultimately, the TAB members had requested additional time to formulate any changes or modifications to the plan from a transportation perspective, which they will be finalizing in their November meeting.

Ms. Maus proceeded to share her screen to show the PNUT Board the Salt Lake City Pedestrian Bicycle Master Plan that might alleviate some concerns regarding transportation and access to the forthcoming Glendale Regional Park. Some of the elements of the plan for the 1700 South area included installing new crossings and adding curbs and crosswalks in the area, new lighting in the area, constructing a median down the center of the road, and traffic calming. This information may be found on page 79 of the Pedestrian Bicycle Master Plan; Ms. Maus mentioned that the planning team will also be referencing this section of the Pedestrian Bicycle Plan in the final Glendale Regional Park Plan to bolster its adoption.

Ms. Maus continued that next steps are for PL staff to still present the Glendale Park Plan to the Planning Commission in early November to continue moving through the process; however, this still leaves time for TAB and PNUT to collaborate and create an endorsement of the Glendale Regional Park Plan.

Ms. Binnebose asked a clarifying question on the action item facing the PNUT Board today; Ms. Maus clarified that an appropriate item to act on would be whether the Board recommends to the Planning Commission moving forward with the Glendale Regional Park Plan adoption process. As far as a timeline, Ms. Maus stated that both the TAB and PNUT Board could potentially hold their November meetings and produce a letter of co-endorsement.

Mr. Carroll stated that his interpretation of where things stand are that both TAB and PNUT have expressed similar concerns, and that it's just a matter of ironing out the details to make sure everything connects. Therefore, Mr. Carroll stated that he is comfortable voting on endorsing the plan to the Planning Commission during today's meeting.

Ms. Finch confirmed that she too believed it was a matter of coordinating actions; Ms. Binnebose added that she understood it to also be a matter of determining whether PNUT wanted to write a joint letter of endorsement with the TAB or separate ones. Ms. Riker asked whether Ms. Cannon asked the TAB about a joint letter during the recent meeting; Ms. Maus stated that yes, Ms. Cannon had asked this of the TAB, and should the PNUT want to proceed with this route, then it would be prudent for them to wait until after the TAB's November meeting.

Ms. Binnebose asked the PNUT Board whether they would then like to postpone this item once more for board action until next month (November). Ms. Maus stated that

she would be coordinating with the TAB Chair to obtain their materials from the TAB's November meeting and would pass them along to the PNUT Board. Clayton Scrivner added that TAB's November meeting will be after PNUT's November meeting, so either way, PNUT would have time to endorse the Glendale Plan before the TAB's November meeting. Ms. Riker suggested that PNUT's acting Chair, Ms. Binnebose, could also reach out to the TAB chair to further coordinate a letter. Ms. Binnebose stated that she would be happy to do that, and reclarified that the action item for tonight's meeting could simply be that PNUT Board members will vote on whether to move forward with a letter of support for the Glendale Master Plan. The action item for the PNUT's November meeting would be to vote to approve and send the letter. Mr. Carroll added that he would be more comfortable to vote on any final draft letters with Ms. Cannon in attendance. Ms. Finch added that it would also be key to involve absent member Melanie Pehrson, since she was heavily involved in the Glendale Regional Park advisory committee and serves on the communications subcommittee. Further discussion among the board continued. Ms. Binnebose made a final motion that the PNUT Board approve to move forward with writing a statement of support towards the Glendale Master Plan with the caveat that Ms. Binnebose, as acting Chair, will coordinate with the TAB chair to put together a draft letter of support that will largely be spearheaded by the communications subcommittee, whereupon the PNUT Board will vote to approve the said letter in its November meeting. Mr. Scrivner seconded the motion. The PNUT Board voted to unanimously approve the motion. Ms. Maus thanked the Board and Ms. Binnebose moved onto the next agenda item.	
Preliminary Public Lands CIP FY 2023-2024 Project List for PNUT Board Consideration – Tom Millar Mr. Millar, Public Lands Planning Manager, re-introduced himself to the Board. Mr. Millar asked the Board who has previously been involved in a prior Capital Improvement Program (CIP) process, to which a few board members raised their hands. Mr. Millar explained the CIP as a year-long process that starts with both internal applications from City departments and constituent applications from people who live within Salt Lake City. The CIP process starts around this time of year, with the final applications being submitted in December. Next, a citizen board goes through all the applications around January-February and makes their recommendations to the Mayor, upon which the Mayor includes in her budget that is proposed to the City Council. Finally, the City Council approves the budget and which projects are going to receive what amount of funding and from what source. Mr. Millar went on to say that we are now early in the 2023-2024 CIP process, and he has brought forth a list of prioritized project ideas to run past the PNUT Board.	40 mins

Mr. Scrivner clarified that this is a prioritized internal wish list; Mr. Millar replied that that is correct. Mr. Millar stated that, of the 13 that he included in the PNUT Board's packet for today's meeting, he does not anticipate that Public Lands will apply for all of them.

Mr. Millar asked if there were any specific questions pertaining to the projects. Mr. Carroll replied that he liked the process they followed last year and would need more information for sure. The board explained to Mr. Millar how each board member preferred to rank each project on their own and then they all came back together to consolidate lists, with those receiving the most "1s" being top (first) priority projects, and those receiving the highest numbers being the lowest priority projects.

Mr. Millar asked what he could provide to the Board to help with that process. Ms. Binnebose responded that it would be most useful to include a spreadsheet ranked by the department with project description, district, costs, a map, and categories the projects fit into. The format from last year was the most helpful.

Ms. Finch asked if there were also comments from the Parks Division that were included in last years'; Ms. Riker replied that last year, they had projects separated out by design projects, natural construction projects, and so forth. Ms. Riker added that Mr. Millar was here to begin the conversation and prep the Board for this year's CIP process, and they'd be able to follow last year's formatting of the CIP projects for the Board, though they would not have the final dollar amounts.

Ms. Binnebose mentioned to Mr. Millar that the Board was also comfortable including a summary of why they ranked projects the way they did once all members had completed their rankings and presenting that to the Public Lands Department. Mr. Millar added that they were also trying to get the list in front of the Board one month earlier than they did for FY 2022-2023.

Ms. Riker added that the PNUT Board also submits a letter to the CDCIP Board (community board) of their recommendations. Mr. Millar also added that another reason they wanted to do it earlier this year was during the month of October Public Lands can put more thought into each of the 13 projects, but not fill out an entire full application for any of them until they've heard from the PNUT Board; after hearing more from the PNUT Board and weighing options, the PL Department can then spend the month of November deciding which of the 13 projects are the ones they'll be applying for and spend energy at that point filling out applications for the chosen projects.

Ms. Binnebose asked if it would be Mr. Millar's preference that the Board return with their ranked projects in time for the November PNUT Board meeting. Mr. Millar replied that yes, that would be preferable. Mr. Millar stated that he could supply all the materials requested by the board by early the second week of October so they could rank the list of CIP projects based on that formatting. The group clarified that there will be a discussion that goes along with their rankings during the November PNUT meeting.

Ms. Binnebose inquired when Mr. Millar and the PL Department would need the letter of recommended CIP projects addressed to the citizen board; Mr. Millar replied that the timeline for the letter is more flexible and just needs to happen by the end of December. Ms. Binnebose confirmed that the December PNUT Board meeting could be where the members finalize the letter, right before the holidays.

Mr. Carroll asked if Mr. Millar could also include in his forthcoming CIP project materials where the project was initiated (constituent applications vs. city department applications). Mr. Millar replied that yes, he could do that. Ms. Riker mentioned that this year, there are 14 constituent applications for Parks, and the department had just received those the day prior to today's PNUT meeting.

Mr. Millar shared his screen with the constituent application list of requested projects combined with the preliminary internal projects. Mr. Millar notified the board that there is a ceiling of \$500,000 per project for constituent applications, so in the case of those projects with more than that requested amount, the department would have to follow up with the constituent applicant.

Group discussion on the list continued.

Ms. Riker mentioned that Mr. Millar and the PL Planning team will be reaching out to each constituent applicant, explaining how the process works, and engaging in negotiations to develop their ideas into professional applications. Ms. Hewson asked without that rich context that comes from talking with the applicants, how the PNUT Board was supposed to rank these projects? Mr. Scrivner asked whether there was a general total amount of money that they should be keeping in mind when ranking projects? Mr. Millar replied that Engineering, Parks, Transportation, and Facilities typically submit CIP projects, and there isn't a set amount that they all work within. Ms. Riker added that Public Lands asks for capital improvement funds as well as impact-fee eligible projects through this process. Mr. Millar and Ms. Riker proceeded to provide some examples of impact-fee eligible projects on the CIP list from the Mr. Millar's screenshare, which included improvements to the Sunnyside pickleball courts, the Wetland Preserve Improvements, and other projects that do not provide additional service or operations.

Ms. Hewson asked if Mr. Millar could also provide on the forthcoming spreadsheet to the PNUT Board whether each project is impact-fee eligible; Mr. Millar replied that he could absolutely do this. Ms. Hewson then asked whether members should rank a project that is impact-fee eligible as lesser priority; Mr. Millar said that they don't necessarily need to do that, as it all goes through the same application process and that the key difference is which bank account the City Council is going to use to fund the project.

Mr. Scrivner asked how long it takes to speak with constituent applicants and gather more information from them about their proposed projects; Mr. Millar replied that it typically takes quite a while, so suggested that members use the approximate amount

input on this list to make their rankings. Ms. Riker added that another option is to exclude the constituent requested applications since there are so many unknowns at this point; she affirmed that it is up to the members what they want to share and include in their rankings but confirmed again that the department has much more information on its own internal project requests than external ones submitted by constituents.

Mr. Millar pointed the Board's attention to number 6 of the constituent requested projects, entitled "Rose Park Lane Improvement Project" for \$65,000. This project was also requested by the Department as Preliminary Internal Project I for \$650,000. He noted that since this is an overlapping project request, one of those requests would be coming off and the department would be working closely with the constituent applicant to determine which one and develop a robust final application for this mutual project.

Mr. Carroll mentioned that he felt strongly that they include the constituent list in their rankings; Ms. Finch mentioned that she felt strongly that they exclude the constituent list within their rankings. The Board continued discussion.

Ms. Hewson mentioned that, for her, the cost column in the constituent application section is the most unrefined, except for a few projects. Mr. Carroll added that a constituent applicant should feel like they have equal opportunity to accessing this funding. Mr. Millar added that constituent applications are granted more grace than the internal applications are; the City Council, CDCIP Board, and Mayor love to see the constituent applications and provide a lot of leeway regarding expectations for their formatting and layout.

Mr. Scrivner asked if it would be helpful for the PNUT Board to just focus on ranking the internal project list at this point, and then perhaps later after the Planning Team has engaged with the constituent applicants, the Board can follow-up on the constituent project proposals. Mr. Millar and Ms. Riker stated that this would be great.

Further discussion about the lists continued among board members. Mr. Millar suggested that the Board focuses on ranking the internal CIP projects list now to maintain their month-early timeline, and that the Board sticks to the same schedule with ranking the constituent CIP list as they did last year. Mr. Millar explained that this will give the Public Lands Department Planning Team the month of October to meet with the constituent applicants and flesh that list out a bit better; then for the Board's November meeting, Mr. Millar will provide them with a spreadsheet like what they've been given in the past for ranking the constituent CIP projects, as he will also do for the internal CIP projects the second week of October.

Mr. Millar recapped the plan for the Board's review of both sets of CIP project lists as September being the month for the internal CIP list development and October being the month for PNUT prioritization for the internal CIP list; then for the constituent CIP list, October is the development month and November is the PNUT prioritization

month for that list. Mr. Millar added that he believes that this revised timeline works and still meets all deadline requirements for applications. Ms. Binnebose asked whether, in terms of the master list that will be a finalized combination of both internal and constituent project lists, the Board could expect the procedure to entail a weeding out of some projects due to the Board's ranking and prioritization. Mr. Millar responded that yes, this is an expected part of the procedure. Ms. Binnebose asked further process and procedural questions, and discussion between Mr. Millar, Ms. Riker, and Ms. Binnebose continued regarding potential options for combining lists and keeping them separate. Other Board members weighed in regarding the process and procedure, expressing support to move forward and that the process would become clearer as it unfolds in the coming months. Further discussion continued. Mr. Millar asked if there were further questions from the Board. Mr. Carroll stated that at some point in the previous year, the Board was given a status update on how CIP projects were progressing and asked if they could be presented with that status update this year; Mr. Millar responded that yes, they could potentially present that in January 2023 or later when things slow down a bit. Mr. Millar thanked the Board and Ms. Binnebose moved on to the next agenda item.	
General Obligation Bond Update – Kristin Riker Ms. Riker stated she would pass the presentation of this agenda item onto Mr. Millar. Mr. Millar referred to a prepared presentation on the board room screen and reminded the Board of the legal requirements pertaining to City ballot initiatives and general obligation (GO) bonds barring advocacy for or against the GO bond. Mr. Millar proceeded to explain that there are eight projects proposed in the Park Trails and Open Space GO Bond. They are the following: 1. Improvements to the Jordan River – this includes irrigation, cleanup, and restoring ecological function of the river and other improvements along it to make sure it's activated, safe and preserving water quality and safety. 2. Reimagine Neighborhood Parks – this includes at least seven projects in one as it calls for improving and reimagining neighborhood parks with at least one project in each of the seven city council districts. This could take several years' time and is slated to cost approximately \$10.5 million. 3. Glendale Regional Park – this includes the multiple Glendale Regional Park Vision Plan presentations given by the Public Lands Planning team to the Board over the past few months. 4. Folsom Trail – this includes connecting the Folsom Trail to the Jordan River as well as landscaping the existing trail with focus on the intersections. This entails the area between 500 West and 1000 West. 5. Fleet Block Park – this includes developing the nearly entire 10-acre block of City-owned property off 300 West that was a former City Fleet vehicle facility by incorporating some buildings plus a park.	u

6. Liberty Park Playground – this includes reimagining the Northwest rotary park playground to serve all ages and abilities as the playground is currently nearing the end of its lifetime.
7. Fairmont Park – this includes enhancements to Fairmont with special focus on the North portion of the Park where the tennis courts and Boys and Girls Club are located.
8. Allen Park – this includes about \$4.5 million to implement the upcoming adaptive reuse and management plan recommendations pertaining to the creek, buildings, use, and other amenities.

Mr. Millar then went on to present on the opportunities that the GO Bond will bring to the entire city and not just in one area, including but not limited to updating aged facilities and trails, improving water quality, pollinator habitat, and migratory nesting grounds, and increasing tree canopies, plant diversity, and natural landscapes that utilize less water, decrease temperatures, and improve air quality.

Mr. Millar continued that the four projects that are farthest along in their implementation are the Glendale Regional Park, Allen Park, Liberty Park Playground, and Jordan River Enhancements. The four projects that will require additional community engagement but also planning and design prior to construction readiness are Reimagine Neighborhood Parks, Trails, and Open Space; Folsom Trail; Fleet Block Park; and Fairmont Park.

Mr. Millar explained that about 26% of the city's General Fund budget comes from property taxes, and of that total General Fund budget, about \$18 million is allocated to the Public Lands Department. Much of that \$18 million is dedicated to maintenance, whereas most of the projects and activities covered under the GO Bond pertain to new projects or enhancements and could not be funded under that maintenance funding. In addition, in the last 10-12 years, Salt Lake City has grown by about 7% adding 13,000 new residents; the 2019 Public Lands Needs Assessment identified the need for an additional 94 acres of public lands and open spaces to avoid overcrowding of our existing parks and trails.

Mr. Millar added that if the GO Bond is not approved this year by voters, the PL Department will continue to receive its annual budget for maintenance and small improvements while continuing to seek opportunities to fund the proposed improvements under the GO Bond. Essentially, if the GO Bond passes, those proposed projects will be able to be built in a generally short timeframe over the next ten years; if not, those same projects will just take longer to fund and build.

Mr. Millar displayed a slide depicting how many acres per 1,000 SLC residents, the amount of spending per SLC resident – which is \$79 – and the maintenance expenditures per acre. Mr. Millar emphasized that these figures are all current. If approved, the average cost per SLC residential property would be approximately \$53.80 per year or about \$5 per month; and per commercial property, second + home, the average cost would be approximately \$97.83 per year. Mr. Millar explained that a

good rule of thumb in calculating average costs is that per \$100,000 of value, the cost is roughly \$9.34 per year. This cost would be excised through property taxes.

Mr. Carroll asked if this will be a line item in property taxes; Mr. Millar replied that property taxes do not specify exactly which bond is being paid for, but there is a line item for the bonds and there are currently outstanding bonds listed on the property tax assessments. If this year's GO Bond is not approved, the property tax burden will decrease by about that same amount; but if it is approved, the tax burden will stay about the same as those bonds from previous years expire and sunset.

Ms. Riker emphasized that these are all estimates and not exact amounts. Mr. Millar then presented a slide containing important dates pertaining to the GO Bond process this year, including public hearing times, meetings, postmarked ballot dates and deadlines, and this year's date for the general election, which is November 8.

Mr. Millar further presented ways for the public to stay involved and informed, including via social media, phone, website, and email:

www.SLCParksBond.com | ParksBond@slcgov.com | 888-556-0232. | @SLCPublicLands (same handle for Facebook, Twitter, Instagram)

Mr. Millar wrapped up his presentation and asked the Board if there were any questions. Mr. Scrivner asked if there was a sunset date for the GO Bond money to be used by, particularly regarding the Fleet Block project, should the GO Bond be approved by voters. Mr. Millar replied that the GO Bond monies will form part of the individual and property tax burden for approximately 20 years, which is the time it takes the City to pay off the bonds. Mr. Millar added that he believes there is a limitation on how long you can spend the money based on when the bonds are issued to the city and how they're structured, etc.

Mr. Carroll asked what percentage of the total GO Bond proposed amount the "shovel-ready" projects are. Mr. Millar stated that the total GO Bond proposal is \$85 million; of that \$85 million, Glendale Regional Park is requesting \$27 million, Jordan River Improvements is requesting \$9 million, Allen Park is requesting \$4.5 million, and Liberty Park Playground is requesting \$2 million. This adds up to \$42.5 million, or 50% of that total GO Bond proposal.

Mr. Scrivner asked how much flexibility is allowed in the funding should a currently proposed project not work out as time goes on; Ms. Riker replied that in that situation, we need to build the projects that are identified by and portrayed to the public, and if there is leftover money, we can use it for other things. Ultimately, we must use the funds to build what is polled to the public, which includes Fleet Block; the flexibility comes into play regarding the details of the park itself (e.g., will Fleet Block be a half-acre or 10 acres?). Ms. Riker mentioned that Fleet Block is making great progress with the Mayor's Office.

Mr. Carroll inquired about rising interest rates and overall accounting for inflation of the GO Bond funds in years to come; Mr. Millar replied that he will ask the Finance Department and get back to Mr. Carroll with the answer to that.

Ms. Hewson stated that it would be helpful to have cheat sheet containing some of the statistics that Mr. Millar presented regarding SLC's increasing population and so forth; she also expressed interest in having a map that displays the coordinates of each project. Mr. Millar replied that this information is all available on the www.SLCParksBond.com website. Mr. Millar showed the Board the website and navigated to where the information is coming from. Ms. Binnebose added that it would be helpful to have all this information included on a one-pager, if possible. Ms. Riker replied that everything Mr. Millar talked about in his presentation to the Board is on the GO Bond website, and that the Department had to go through an extensive approval process with City attorneys and administration in preparation of today's presented materials.

Mr. Millar also noted that every single residential and commercial property within Salt Lake City will receive a voter information packet the second week of October. These will be in English and Spanish and have all the same information that is on the website. Ms. Riker added that there will also be an informational post card included in ballots that pushes people to view the webpage for further information.

Mr. Scrivner inquired about the advocacy role of the Board pertaining the GO Bond, if any, as he was absent during the September meeting during a City attorney presentation on that piece. Ms. Riker responded that in the context of PNUT Board meetings, the Board is prohibited from talking about how they advocate in their personal time. Ms. Riker added that Board members may talk about advocacy and advocate on their own time when they are not on City property, eating food funded by the City, and receiving support from paid City staff. Mr. Millar added that the same applies to the Mayor and City Council.

Ms. Finch asked about the Public Lands consultants that presented at the September PNUT meeting and their role in the GO Bond advocacy process; Mr. Millar responded that the consultants are like extra PL staff working on communications for the Department. Ms. Riker added that, as of the date of this meeting, the department finally had its media plan approved, so there will be educational materials being released on five different radio stations and four different television stations. Additionally, the Mayor put together a video that the Department will try to push out to community councils, and Mr. Millar's presentation will be shown at all community councils. Lastly, there has been extensive social media, streaming, email, mailer, and newsletter coverage of the GO Bond as of late, as the month prior to an election is the time when folks start thinking most about it. The Trust For Public Lands consultants ensured the Department that the most important thing the City can do to inform the public is to release voter education and information materials during the month of October. There has also been stenciling and signage with the GO Bond website done within all the busiest parks of Salt Lake City, including Memory Grove.

Mr. Millar thanked the Board for its time and Ms. Binnebose moved onto the next agenda item.	
5 – Board Discussion and Action Items	6:40 PM
Board Subcommittees – review details of each committee in accordance with new bylaws Ms. Binnebose referred to the Board meeting packets for the current bylaws and stated that at this time, the Board will go through current subcommittees and simply touch on member responsibilities for those subcommittees. Mr. Binnebose reminded members that under the recently amended Bylaws, Board members are required to actively serve on one subcommittee at minimum each year of their board term. She stated that the two subcommittees currently active are the Trails Subcommittee and the Communications Subcommittee. Ms. Finch added that it would be great to provide a brief presentation in the coming months to bring all the new members and everyone up to speed on what the 501(c)(3) has done in terms of collective knowledge and hopefully cultivate more member involvement. Ms. Hewson inquired whether the Board needs a longer discussion at a later meeting regarding the subcommittees as there are a few things she remains unclear about, particularly regarding external membership, formalities, equity in representation, and so forth pertaining specifically to the Trails Subcommittee. She expressed the need for further guiderails pertaining to this. Mr. Whittaker weighed in with his perspective on the Trails Subcommittee structure and bylaws; Ms. Hewson mentioned that it would be good to have greater discussion of this during an upcoming Board meeting. Ms. Riker suggested that such a discussion might come sooner on the agenda so that the Board has guaranteed time to talk about it, or to even reconvene the Bylaws Subcommittee and dig deeper into the questions that Ms. Hewson raises regarding external member representation on the subcommittees. Discussion on this agenda item was blended in below with agenda item 6.	15 mins
Board retreat discussion Ms. Binnebose discussed board retreat ideas, where a potential agenda item could be what Ms. Hewson has raised regarding clarifying external member representation and equity on subcommittees. Mr. Scrivner asked if a board retreat has been scheduled yet; Ms. Binnebose stated that no retreat for this year has yet been scheduled and this agenda item serves as a basis to discuss whether one should be scheduled. Mr. Whittaker inquired about the purpose of board retreats. Ms. Binnebose and several board members echoed that the purpose of board retreats was to work through issues (such as subcommittees) in-depth as well as get to know each other on a more personal level. More discussion ensued regarding last year's board retreat held in Tracy Aviary, logistics and scheduling, and agenda-setting.	10 mins

The Board agreed to hold a retreat sometime within a designated two-week period in early January 2023 and PL Department staff will then send out a Doodle poll to coordinate the exact date. The Board will go through the regular Open and Public Meetings Act process to spread notice of the meeting.	
6 – Confirmation of Next Meeting, Board Comments & Future Agenda Items	7:05 PM
Board subcommittee updates as needed • Trails subcommittee CJ stated that the Trails Subcommittee has been working closely with Public Lands Department staff on the I Street Bike Park and things are progressing. Mr. Whittaker and Ms. Binnebose inquired whether the Board was still on agenda item 5 or if they'd moved onto agenda item 6; Ms. Binnebose mentioned that appreciates any updates on what the subcommittees are working on and for members getting the Board back on task if she inadvertently skips around the agenda as acting chair. Mr. Scrivner also added that they are trying to align bylaw subcommittees standards for the new subcommittee, and that they have a draft about ready for that. Mr. Whittaker, Ms. Hewson, and Mr. Carroll are all working on that document at present, and they expect it to be complete in November. • Communications subcommittee	
Board comment and question period Mr. Carroll mentioned that it would be nice sending a letter to former member Polly Hart thanking her for her service; Ms. Riker stated that this is totally up to the board and reminded members of a recent past meeting where they all presented Ms. Hart with a thank you gift and had dessert in her honor.	
Next meeting: November 3, 2022	
Request for future agenda items Ms. Binnebose requested that during the Board's November meeting, they review board subcommittee bylaws at the top of the agenda. The Board will also review their internal CIP project list prioritization rankings during November meeting. The Board will also need to approve the draft letter initiated by the Communications Subcommittee in support of the Glendale Regional Park Plan during the November PNUT meeting.	
7 – Adjourn	7:10 PM
Mr. Scrivner motioned to adjourn the meeting; Ms. Finch seconded the motion. The PNUT Board voted to unanimously adjourn the October PNUT Board meeting.	



Staff Responses to Public Comments from the October 6, 2022 PNUT Board Meeting

Anne Cannon

Anne Cannon introduced themselves as a resident of District 6 and is present to speak to the board about Wasatch Hollow Park and Preserve. Anne stated that Wasatch Hollow had a recent off-leash dog survey and that everyone wants something done. Anne stated that the park has deteriorated from its beginning, and they hope the park will return to what it used to be. Anne further explained that off-leash dogs are just part of the issue; the conflict created by the increased amount of time for dogs off-leash and people is very out of balance. The other issue is that there is about to be three preserve entrances; they explained that currently, there are two parts to the Wasatch Hollow area, which are a park and a preserve. The preserve entrances are all into the preserve, which allows no dogs at all. The issue with both areas of the park is enforcement. Anne Cannon continued that, as the city acquires more properties for public space, the ability to enforce rules in those properties is almost zero. Anne stated that signs have been used for years to display rules; however, Anne stated that they find the signs ineffective due to their likelihood of being stolen or vandalized. Anne wants the Board to be made aware that it has an existing park that needs more help in terms of enforcement and that any acquiring of further properties will also need enforcement. Anne added that they believe the Park Ranger Program to be great, but it's very gentle and does not cover Wasatch Hollow Park. Anne encouraged the City to increase the range of the Park Rangers Program and to find a way to enforce the purpose and use of the parks so they can be used by everyone and not just a few.

Staff Response:

Salt Lake City Department of Public Lands has worked closely with Wasatch Hollow Community Council to discuss options for mitigating conflicts between off-leash dogs and other park users. Several staff members met on site with community council members in April to discuss next steps. At that meeting, it was decided that Public Lands would design and install new signage and would execute a survey to understand community sentiment around the dog park.

More user-friendly signage was designed installed at three locations around the off-leash area in August 2022. A survey was developed in collaboration with the Community Council and was available for three weeks in August and September 2022. A majority of survey respondents live within 0.5 miles of the park and visit the park on a weekly basis. Nearly 70% of visitors bring a dog every time or most of the time they visit the park. Over 60% of users indicated they were either somewhat or very supportive of the existing off-leash regulations. The full engagement report is available [here](#). Based on the survey results, Public Lands is continuing to explore potential actions to mitigate conflict between users. Public Lands

will be working with the Park Rangers to increase presence in Wasatch Hollow Park in order to spread awareness and educate park users on the off-leash rules and restrictions.

The Wasatch Hollow Community Council submitted a constituent CIP application to fund improvements for the park. Makaylah Respicio, a Public Lands Planner, is working closely with the community council to determine the scope of the request which may include modifications to the off-leash area and the addition of other amenities to the park.

Jim Webster

Jim Webster stated that they had sent photos to CJ Scrivner this morning. Jim stated that there was an enormous pile of dead wood in Miller Park where the old oxbow was. Jim stated that a Public Lands staff member had promised to get the pile out but that it had taken about five weeks' time, and much of it ended up in the creek, which was not good. Jim said that they wanted to remind the Board that Miller Park was dedicated by Minnie Miller to the children of the neighborhood. The problem is that a lower path that Jim had written a CIP grant for in years prior – which they state had been approved during a past administration – has not yet been created. Jim further explained that it's unfortunate that nothing has been done on this project and that it is not a priority. Lastly, Jim stated that the doggie bag dispenser has been empty for about six weeks now, which has led to increased dog feces throughout the park.

Staff Response:

Public Lands crews removed the large woody debris piles located next to the trail and hauled them off in early October. Following this Public Lands staff placed educational signage to discourage the piling of debris in Miller Bird Preserve and the benefits of leaving some woody species in our urban natural areas. Public Lands will continue to evaluate debris that may increase flooding risk or fire hazards and remove those as needed.

CIP and Creek Side Trail: Please review our webpage for updates on the CIP project:

<https://www.sl.gov/parks/miller-bird-refuge-and-nature-park-capital-improvement-program-projects/>

Dog Bags: Public Lands was made aware of the dog bag issues several weeks ago. This dispenser has been added to our Trails and Natural Lands crews list and it will get refilled weekly.

Public Lands Constituent Project Proposals - CIP FY 2023-2024

Proj	Project Name	Application Lead	Engineering Support	Council District	Estimated Project Cost	General Fund	Estimated Impact Fee Eligibility	Planning	Design	Acquisition	Construction	Program	Repeat Application	Project Source	Scope	Justification
1	11th Ave Park Pickleball Expansion	Kat	Bruce	3	\$250,000		100%	•	•		•	Parks		Constituent CIP Application	Adds 4 new pickleball courts and associated amenities, including benches, paddle racks, fencing, just east of the current pickleball courts at 11th Avenue Park. Lighting will be added to courts as funding is available. Cost estimate includes design, demolition of current site (including tree relocation, demolition of picnic table and grading), construction and soft costs.	Increases capacity for pickleball play at an already-popular area, reducing wait times and increasing tournament capacity.
2	Ensign Peak Nature Park Improvements	Makaylah	Troy	3	\$206,314	100%			•		•	Parks; Trails & Natural Lands		Constituent CIP Application	Increases safety and preservation of the Ensign Peak trail through restricting access in off-hours through fencing and pedestrian turnstile, increasing lighting, and removing overgrowth.	Addresses community concerns about safety and other community impacts.
3	Jefferson Park Improvements	Makaylah	Troy	5	\$500,000	100%			•		•	Parks	•	Constituent CIP Application	Safety, amenity, and capacity improvements including a walking path, dark sky lighting, fencing around the playground areas, and additional trash bins throughout the park.	Increases level of service in an underutilized park in the Ballpark community. May overlap with internal project proposal; must determine best approach.
4	Liberty Park Greenhouse - Revised	Tyler M	Dat	5	\$150,000	100%			•			Parks		Constituent CIP Application	Visioning and engagement around the complete renovation of the Liberty Park Greenhouse (LPG).The LPG is a prominent, iconic landmark that serves the Salt Lake community by providing seasonal floral displays that enhance the park's overall beauty and visitor experience. Presently, the facility is showing signs of aging requiring renovation in order to help make Utah's oldest and most celebrated park one of the area's top attractions.	Accommodates both Public Lands use and future community use to make the Greenhouse more functional and provide more publicly available space through education and community activation of this iconic structure.
5	Madsen Park Improvements	Makaylah	Bruce	2	\$500,000	100%			•		•	Parks	•	Constituent CIP Application	Improvements to increase activation and safety, including lighting, sealing, playground replacement, and the potential creation of an off-leash dog park.	Increases level of service in an underutilized park on the west side.
6	Rose Park Ln Improvement Project	Makaylah	Stephanie	1	\$500,000		100%		•		•	Parks; Trails & Natural Lands		Constituent CIP Application	Removes weeds, upgrades irrigation, and provides new trees and waterways landscaping throughout the park strip of Rose Park Lane from 1700 N to approximately 2100 N. It would also add two new solar speed feedback signs.	Beautifies an underinvested community trail. May overlap with internal project proposal; must determine best approach.
7	Salt Lake City Petanque (Glendale Park)	Kat	Bruce	2	\$400,000		100%	•	•		•	Parks		Constituent CIP Application	Adds up to 16 Petanque courts to Rosewood Park due east of the current dog park. Construction will consist of gravel and perimeter boundaries for courts, benches and 8 shade structures. Costs include design, demolition and grading of current site, construction and soft costs.	There is currently no service for petanque play in Salt Lake City's public lands system. This project would allow for tournament play in Salt Lake City and recreational use for residents.
8	Sunnyside Pickleball Courts	Kat	Bruce	6	\$500,000		100%	•	•		•	Parks		Constituent CIP Application	Adds up to 6 new courts near Sunnyside Park just west of Steiner Aquatic Center's outdoor pool. Funding request includes site prep and grading, design and construction of fencing, paddle racks, and up to 6 post-tension pickleball courts, and soft costs. Inclusion of shade sails will also be considered as cost allows.	Adds capacity and facilities for pickleball at a recreational and tournament level in an area of the city with limited pickleball access.
9	Fairmont Park Restroom Reconstruction	Kat	Dat	7	\$75,000	100%		•	•			Parks		Constituent CIP Application	Planning, typologies and design document for restrooms in Public Lands utilizing Fairmont Park as a pilot. This project would fund a planning and investigation document outlining best practices for urban public lands restrooms, a typologies guide for restrooms in Salt Lake City parks and public lands, and would provide schematic design for one to three restrooms/restroom configurations at Fairmont Park.	Restroom facilities on public lands in Salt Lake City pose many concerns for communities and for Parks staff. This project would investigate nationwide best practices for safe, efficient and effective urban park restroom facilities. Detailed design for pilot implementation of proposed solutions would be at a restroom at Fairmont Park which historically has had many challenges.
10	First Encampment Park	Kat	Troy	5	\$364,000	100%			•		•	Parks	•	Constituent CIP Application	Funding would provide waterwise, art-sensitive irrigation upgrades and replacement to minimize damage to stonework and allow for more effective watering of drought-tolerant plantings; improve drainage in the dry riverbed to reduce standing water issues; add lighting to improve safety; repair damaged monuments to improve the perception that the park is valued; upgrade park signage; adding historical placards with interpretive content; repairing engraved pioneer names damaged by water on the rocks. Funding would include design and implementation.	Enhances climate resilience to the site by upgrading irrigation and increasing drought-tolerant plants. It also restores art features on the site. The addition of lighting to the park pathway would also increase safety and utility at night.
11	International Peace Gardens: Historic Restorations, Replacements, Conservation Work, and Visitor Center/Reading Room	Kat	Nancy	2	\$500,000	100%		•	•		•	Parks		Constituent CIP Application	CIP funding is needed to replace or replicate, conserve, and conceive a plan and trust fund for future upkeep of this trove of art, ethnic and botanic diversity. This project proposes funding the replacement, recreation and installation of new and refurbished features to the gardens at the International Peace Gardens. Funding would include planning, design, and improvements up to \$500,000.	Repairs, replaces, and restores features of the Peace Gardens that have previously failed, been removed, or been stolen.
12	Poplar Grove Park Full Court Basketball Expansion	Makaylah	Troy	2	\$500,000	50%	50%		•		•	Parks		Constituent CIP Application	Expands the existing half basketball court to a full court, including amenities such as fencing, benches, and landscaping.	Expands level of service in a well-utilized west side park.
13	Wasatch Hollow Park Restoration and Improvement	Makaylah	Nancy	6	\$500,000	50%	50%	•	•		•	Parks; Trails & Natural Lands		Constituent CIP Application	Design and construction of improvements for the off-leash dog area, in line with desires of the community council. Also adds amenities for diversified activation of the park.	Addresses community concerns around off-leash dogs.
14	Fred and Ila Rose Wetland Preserve Improvements	Tyler M	Bruce	2	\$336,000	100%			•			Parks		Constituent CIP Application	Improved public access for intended non-consumptive nature users through 1) the installation of boulder manways and low fencing (two entrances at 1100 West) and a gate (northwest entrance), 2) complete removal of split-rail fencing around the entire preserve, 3) complete removal of rock-filled gabion baskets at both pond-side access points, and 4) creation of sloped cracked gravel beaches at both pondside access points. Design and installation of a trash-rack in front of the wetland pond outlet to facilitate water exchange while still allowing in-and-out migration of Jordan River wildlife, especially fish.	Improve access, natural features, and maintainability.
15	New Liberty Park Crosswalks and Trails	Tom	Stephanie	5	\$125,000	50%	50%		•		•	Parks		Constituent CIP Application	Adding two new crosswalks to 500 East and two new walking/bicycling entrances to Liberty Park, at Edith and Williams Avenues.	Improve connectivity from the neighborhoods west of Liberty Park into the park itself.

PNUT Prioritization (1 = Highest Priority; Low Total Score = High Priority)

[illegible]

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