

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

Join Via Webex: <https://saltlakecity.webex.com/saltlakecity/j.php?MTID=m114a24b0e21c1ac3b6b9f0c4442823a4>

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: 2490 189 6492

AGENDA

1 – Convening the Meeting	5:00 PM
Call to order	
Chair comments	5 mins
2 – Approval of Minutes	5:05 PM
Approve November 3, 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
Public Lands budget initiatives overview and board discussion about prioritization process – Kristin Riker	30 mins
5 – Board Discussion and Action Items	5:55 PM
Continued Public Lands CIP FY 2023-2024 discussion & PNUT project ranking letter (Action Item)	30 mins
Board chair and vice chair nominations	10 mins
Determine location and topics for January board retreat	15 mins
Approve 2023 meeting schedule (Action Item)	5 mins
6 – Confirmation of Next Meeting, Board Comments & Future Agenda Items	6:55 PM
Board subcommittee updates as needed • Trails subcommittee • Communication subcommittee	
Board comment and question period	
Next meeting: January 5, 2023	
Request for future agenda items	
7 – Adjourn	7:15 PM

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

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 - Melanie Pehrson - Ginger Cannon	
Chair comments	5 mins
Chair Brianna Binnebose thanked the Board for their patience and their work.	
2 – Approval of Minutes	5:05 PM
Approve October 6, 2022, meeting minutes	5 mins
Samantha Finch motioned to approve.	
Ginger Cannon asked for clarification on what the Board’s concerns were regarding the bylaws during the October meeting.	
Jenny Hewson stated that what she wanted was to have a longer discussion at the November meeting about the bylaws.	
Ms. Cannon seconded the motion to approve the meeting minutes. The Board unanimously approved the October 6 meeting minutes.	
3 – Public Comment Period	5:10 PM

Verbal comments are limited to no more than 3 minutes; 15 minutes total. Written comments are welcome.

Ned Skanchy (he/him)

Ned joined the public comment portion from online. He introduced himself and thanked the Board for their service and expressed his enjoyment of living in Salt Lake City with access to such close recreational amenities. Ned continued that he helps coach the East High Mountain Bike Team, is an avid trail runner, hiker, and skier.

Ned stated that, while he understands the Trails Plan is currently on pause, he wanted to voice his support of it. Ned explained that he'd like to see the Plan taken off pause and bring more trails to Salt Lake City residents. Ned stated that mountain biking is probably the fastest growing sport right now in Salt Lake City, particularly amongst youth. Ned explained that mountain biking is a particularly good sport for getting youth off their phones and engaging with nature. He went on to address user conflict that has placed the Trails Plan on hold; he hopes that when we're talking about Dry Creek specifically, we can encourage some action there so there can be a trail for running and hiking, and a trail for biking. Ned stated that when he's out hiking or running, he doesn't like to be interrupted by bikers; when he's out biking, he doesn't like to interrupt hikers and runners on the trail. Ned ultimately wants to voice support for continued development of a trails plan for all SLC residents.

Anne Cannon (she/her)

Anne joined the public comment portion in-person and introduced herself to the PNUT Board. She explained that she was following up from her comments during the October PNUT meeting regarding Wasatch Hollow Park and Preserve. Anne went on to say that residents living near the preserve have formed a committee of concerned volunteers to address the issue of challenges faced with off-leash dogs in the park area. Anne stated that she and the volunteers would like to invite PNUT Board member CJ Whittaker, who represents District 6, to join them in helping find resolutions to diversity of use for Wasatch Hollow Park in ways that will be balanced between non-dog owners and dog owners who want their dogs off-leash. She reiterated that they are concerned mainly about the park portion. Anne also added that the volunteer committee is interested in engaging with some planners or folks who could help them with the ideas that they're considering, and the survey brought up about possibilities with the park. Further, when the committee is ready to submit the CIP – which they have applied for – the application would have more meaningful direction for what they would like to see happen in their community. Anne ended her public comment by saying that ultimately, the committee would like to see the Wasatch Hollow Park and Preserve be rebuilt for the enjoyment of the total community; as of right now, to access the Preserve, folks must pass through the dog park area, which is one of the challenges. She thanked the Board from their time and looked forward to addressing the challenges together.

Ms. Binnebose thanked the public commenters; she asked Luke Allen, Public Lands Community Outreach, Events, and Marketing Manager, to confirm the Public Lands

Planner assigned to work with the Wasatch Hollow resident committee. That Planner is Makaylah Respicio-Evans.	
Seeing no further public comment, Ms. Binnebose moved onto the next agenda item.	
4 – Staff Discussion and Agenda Items	5:25 PM
PNUT board member stipend update – Luke Allen Mr. Allen explained that Mayor Mendenhall signed Executive Order No. 2 of 2022 on September 30, 2022. He went onto explain the purpose of the document, which essentially establishes the basis for adopting a citywide policy to offer stipends to City board and commission members. Mr. Allen further explained that the Finance Department wanted Public Lands staff to announce this to the PNUT Board, though they are still working on the required IRS documentation to implement the stipend payments. Mr. Allen stated that staff is keeping track of attendance at each meeting as of the date of this signed executive order so that when required financial and tax documentation is complete, Board members will be paid from October’s meeting onward. Finally, Mr. Allen mentioned that Board members could decline this if they wanted. Ms. Cannon asked if a member could decline this for all meetings but one meeting; Mr. Allen stated he would investigate this question.	5 mins
Continued Public Lands CIP FY 2023-2024 discussion – Tom Millar Tom Millar, Public Lands Department Planning Manager, reminded the Board that during its October meeting, they had started the discussion regarding the FY 2023-2024 internal CIP applications as the Department’s preliminary list. Tom continued that, during that meeting, the Department had requested the Board’s prioritization of the internal project list for today’s meeting, and mentioned the constituent (external) project list for board overview during today’s meeting. Multiple board members expressed the desire to view each other’s prioritized lists of proposed internal projects. Ms. Binnebose shared her screen displaying the Google spreadsheet containing the internal CIP projects along with board member rankings of each. She explained how the spreadsheet worked, reminding everyone that the lower the number assigned to a ranking signifies a “higher priority” while the higher number assigned to a ranking signifies a “lower priority.” Ms. Binnebose listed the top 10 prioritized projects by average ranking; from highest to lowest priority, they are: 1. Fire Station Tennis and Pickleball Park Court Restoration and Amenities 2. Jefferson Park Enrichment Playground 3. Jordan Park and Peace Gardens Cultural Landscape Report and Master Plan 4. Memory Grove and Freedom Trail Cultural Landscape Report and Master Plan 5. Cottonwood Park Trailhead and Parking Lot 6. Rose Park and Jordan River Recreational Concept Design 7. Pollinator Landscape Enhancements 8. 11th Avenue Park Pavilion	45 mins

9. Rose Park Lane Promenade Implementation and Open Space Study
10. 337 Park Development

Ms. Cannon asked clarifying questions of the ranking spreadsheet, and Ms. Binnebose responded, explaining that the board's priorities represented a combination of the "Count" column and the "Average Rank" column. Ms. Binnebose showed the members the five internal projects that were not thus far included in the top 10 priorities, which are the following:

11. Park Strip, Median, and Park Irrigation/Water Reduction Strategy
12. Parks Signage Replacement (10 Parks)
13. Library Plaza Repair, Improvements, and Activation
14. Warm Springs Park Tennis Court Renovation
15. Community Playground at Richmond Park

Further questions between Ms. Binnebose and the rest of the board ensued about the ranking and those projects receiving double votes during the analysis. Aaron Wiley mentioned that he still needs to enter his rankings.

Ms. Binnebose mentioned that they could make the final deadline for these rankings sometime the second week of November; Mr. Millar asked if it was possible to complete these prioritizations by end of the day November 8th. The board agreed that this deadline was doable and continued to discuss logistics of taking the survey.

Mr. Millar and Mr. Allen also discussed the due date of November 30th for the board to return its rankings of the external constituent project lists.

The board continued to discuss the ranking process.

Mr. Millar inquired about how the board wanted to handle scenarios where there was a two-way tie for the number 10 spot; in that case, would the board prefer to extend the list of supported projects to 11? Ms. Cannon responded that that might change with the addition of Mr. Wiley's rankings and the revision of Ms. Benally's ranking survey, so she would prefer to stand by and see. Ms. Binnebose agreed.

Mr. Millar then proceeded to ask about the few projects that were not prioritized – particularly the Warm Springs Park Tennis Court Renovation and Community Playground at Richmond Park -- which are at the bottom of the list yet closely resemble the two most-prioritized projects at the top of the list.

Kristin Riker, Public Lands Director, explained that the Department has asked for the Library Plaza Repair in prior years and expects that project to be approved regardless due to critical failures at that site and its significance in the case that Salt Lake City wins the Olympic bid. She also mentioned that the Parks Signage Replacement is part of the Department's Master Plan that it would really like to begin work on. Regarding the Richmond Park Playground project proposal, Ms. Riker explained that the Department is working hard on replacing Park playgrounds little by little as their

concern is that they will have approximately 60 playgrounds to replace or shut down all at once when they all age out at the same time in the future, since their average lifespan is approximately 30 years. She said that for this reason, they're trying to replace two playgrounds per year. Ms. Riker also stated that the Park Strip, Median, and Park Irrigation/Water Reduction Strategy project is very important to the Department. She stated that, while she could argue the great significance of all these projects and many more, she wanted to take some time to provide a bit more information on those few that were ranked lower on the board's priority list.

The board continued discussion about their ranking system for the CIP lists and alternative ways of ranking, along with pros and cons of different ways.

Mr. Wiley mentioned that having a picture of the asset(s) in question accompanying each project proposal would be helpful; secondly, he added that as far as the ranking is concerned, they could approach it through assigning points to each project.

Ms. Benally added that the question she kept returning to in her mind during the ranking process was the level of activation desired for each project.

Board members mentioned reaching out and talking with each other about parks in their respective districts and to visit parks they haven't been to.

Ms. Riker added that the Department can always provide the board with more context, if needed; Ms. Cannon thanked Ms. Riker and the Department for all the information they provided to the Board, from the spreadsheet to the presentation. Mr. Millar mentioned doing a tour in the future of all the parks and sites might also be a good idea. The board also stated that in the future, they could also spend time going through each other's comments as to why they ranked a project the way they did. Ms. Binnebose stated that during last year's CIP ranking process, the board was presented both internal and constituent/external projects together, whereupon the board ranked all 40-something projects and discussed them in-depth over the course of a two-round ranking process.

Mr. Carroll mentioned that, in the case of Warm Springs Park, which is in his district, he knows that the Community Council is working diligently to maintain and improve that park since the neighborhood is changing so rapidly due to increased housing units and so forth. Mr. Wiley added that it would be great to have discussions like this prior to ranking so he could have a better understanding of what's at stake in each district.

Ms. Riker asked the board if they'd like to meet twice in October or November just on CIP. Mr. Millar also added that they could also do the ranking in real time during the meeting, and then hold board discussion. Ms. Hewson inquired how far in advance Department staff knows of internal CIP projects ready for the board's ranking; Mr. Millar responded that they could probably have the internal CIP project list ready for the board's review by August or September next year.

Mr. Millar introduced the 15 constituent/external CIP projects by sharing his screen with the group; he and Ms. Riker provided key descriptions and context to each project, including whether they overlap or relate to any projects on the internal CIP list. The projects include, in no order:

1. 11th Ave Park Pickleball Expansion
2. Ensign Peak Nature Park Improvements
3. Jefferson Park Improvements
4. Liberty Park Greenhouse – Previsioned
5. Madsen Park Improvements
6. Rose Park Lane Improvement Project
7. Salt Lake City Petanque (Glendale Park)
8. Sunnyside Pickleball Courts
9. Fairmont Park Restroom Reconstruction
10. First Encampment Park
11. International Peace Gardens: Historic Restorations, Replacements, Conservation Work, and Visitor Center/Reading Room
12. Poplar Grove Park Full Court Basketball Expansion
13. Wasatch Hollow Park Restoration and Improvement
14. Fred and Ila Rose Wetland Preserve Improvements
15. New Liberty Park Crosswalks and Trails

These projects and their descriptions are also located on the Parks, Natural Lands, Urban Forestry & Trails Advisory Board webpage in the Board Packet link for the November 2022 meeting.

Clayton Scrivner asked clarifying questions about the CIP process, next steps, and whether the Department had the responsibility to rank the external/constituent CIP projects. Mr. Millar explained that the PNUT board's rankings help inform the Mayor, City Council, and CDCIP Board ideas of what is of most interest to the board, though all projects on both the internal and external/constituent lists will be submitted for their final review and decision-making. Mr. Millar stated that no, the Department does not rank the external/constituent application project list. Mr. Scrivner asked if the Department could provide a feasibility ranking for each external/constituent application. Mr. Millar and Ms. Riker reiterated the boundary that City staff must respect in terms of influencing policy decisions as well as staff's limited capacity but agreed that many of these factors plus others make the board's evaluation of these projects more challenging. Ms. Riker also added that staff does a lot of research and exploration regarding the external/constituent CIP application lists to provide all decision-makers with the most information possible.

Ms. Cannon mentioned that she'd hoped there was a better criteria or decision-making framework that constituents had to go through in order to get their project on the application list; for example, the constituent had to undergo the necessary research to determine whether their project proposal was part of a Master Plan or in congruence with the long-range planning that has already occurred. Ms. Riker replied that many of these questions are asked during the applicant process.

Mr. Millar assured that board that the Public Lands Department is allowed to lobby for its internal CIP project application list, just as constituents can lobby for their own. Ms. Hewson mentioned that she felt it would be ideal if the CIP process was split into two separate processes: internal (departmental) applications and external (constituent) applications; many board members agreed. Ms. Pehrson stated that she appreciated the current process as it provided good insight as to which project proposals on either list are overlapping as well as what Department staff versus constituents are considering. Ms. Hewson clarified that she'd just love if there were two separate pots of money that the internal and external lists were drawing from, so they wouldn't be competing against each other through the process. Ms. Riker emphasized that Salt Lake City is really unique in allowing constituent CIP applications. Mr. Millar also mentioned that the Department usually does not receive constituent applications until early October, which would limit the amount of time the board would get to spend on that portion of the ranking process. Mr. Millar wrapped up the agenda item and reiterated that rankings for the external/constituent CIP application list were due on November 30th, then in the PNUT Board's December meeting, he would love to help facilitate whatever discussion necessary in time for the final application submission on December 16th. This final application will include all the applications plus a letter from the PNUT Board detailing the board's supported projects; this means that Monday, December 12th, is the hard deadline for the PNUT's letter of support. Ms. Binnebose confirmed with Department staff that the Board's internal/departmental CIP application list rankings are due on November 8th.	
5 – Board Discussion and Action Items	6:15 PM
Continued discussion about board subcommittees and bylaws Ms. Binnebose asked if Ms. Hewson wanted to kick off this agenda item, which is a follow-up from the board's October meeting. Ms. Hewson expressed that there were six items she felt would be helpful to chat about: 1. Membership 2. Who sets the schedule and the agenda? 3. What are the procedures for the meeting? 4. Code of conduct 5. Expected time commitment for individuals in the subcommittee 6. How to ensure the subcommittee stays on topic and accomplishes what is needed without being overly cumbersome on city staff Ms. Hewson's suggestions for each of these six items are as follows: 1. Membership – referencing the Trails Subcommittee, Ms. Hewson stated that her key concern is around inclusivity. She explained that, in the case of an external subcommittee member representing one stakeholder group, they're not including other stakeholder groups.	20 mins

Ms. Hewson stated that the Membership item was of most importance to her; Mr. Scrivner also expressed concern on this item point.

Ms. Cannon responded that when the PNUT Board revised the bylaws on page 5, they really wrote those applying to subcommittees as only being applicable to appointed PNUT members serving on the subcommittees.

Ms. Hewson reiterated that this is helpful in understanding how the bylaws apply to PNUT Board members serving on subcommittees, but again, her concern is specific to external, non-PNUT members who represent stakeholder groups. Mr. Scrivner asked if it was common for other city boards to also have external members on their subcommittees. Mr. Whittaker replied that having external members serving on subcommittees is a common practice, but that he understood Ms. Hewson's concern to be specifically addressing bias (e.g., a hiker representing a hiker stakeholder group, or a mountain biker representing a mountain biker stakeholder group).

Mr. Whittaker reminded the board that the reason the Trails Subcommittee was formed was because it was taking up so much of the PNUT Board's time. He also stated that it was a means for the Trails Subcommittee to move faster since it doesn't require a quorum, hold space for experts in geology and soil mechanics, and so forth. But, as far as representing one group or another, he believes that is a good question to bring forth.

Ms. Cannon confirmed that the bylaws are indeed silent on membership from those external to PNUT, but reiterated that the guidelines for PNUT members serving on the subcommittees are fairly robust.

Ms. Finch stated that she hears the idea on the table being whether there needs to be development of rules or guidelines around subcommittee external membership.

Mr. Whittaker expressed concern in managing bias on the subcommittees, when citizens – including PNUT members – can freely be members of stakeholder and lobbying groups. Ms. Hewson responded that she is not necessarily talking about bias; she stated that as a subcommittee, those members of the PNUT board hold a responsibility to ensure the subcommittee is inclusive in representation from the different stakeholder groups that hold a vested interest in the trails.

The board continued discussing the subcommittee issue. Ms. Riker mentioned several of the various special interest groups applicable to the Trails Subcommittee, including e-bikers, off-leash dog owners, hikers, mountain bikers, and so forth.

Mr. Whittaker expressed his concern that if the PNUT Board were to write guidelines for subcommittee representation, they might become so granular and take away the inherent nimbleness of subcommittees.

Ms. Cannon added that this is exactly the reason that the board decided within the bylaws to have very prescriptive guidelines around a subcommittee's project-level description, timeline, dates, who is involved, and when the work will be completed. She added that she agreed with Mr. Whittaker's take on subcommittee roles.

Further discussion continued between board members. Mr. Whittaker stated that the objective of the Trails Subcommittee is to execute the governing code of the PNUT Board in context of the trails project, which is advising the city on what people in the respective districts want to see happen with that project. Ms. Cannon asked if Trails Subcommittee members could bring forth the items outlined on page 5 of the PNUT Bylaws to the Board so they could have a better understanding of the subcommittee. She mentioned that it might be helpful to all Trails Subcommittee members if they further defined the committee's scope.

Ms. Riker added that subcommittees are not recognized in City Code, and are thus not subject to the PNUT Board Code; in extension to that, staff cannot provide the same level of support to the subcommittees as they do with the PNUT Board due to lack of bandwidth. She added that, in discussing the operations of the Trails Subcommittee with Department staff, she has understood there to be a heavy reliance on this staff person for information gathering, agenda-setting, and so forth. Ms. Riker stated that she has asked this staff person to pull back from the Trails Subcommittee due to a lack of bandwidth and would also appreciate if the committee members brought forth the information that Ms. Cannon requested so that the PNUT Board could help them with narrowing down their purpose and answer any questions.

Ms. Cannon asked if both the subcommittees could submit the information found on page 5 of the PNUT Board Bylaws to the board for review. Ms. Binnebose asked if the question the Board wants to be pondering is what the role is of non-advisory board members in its subcommittees. She also mentioned that this may be a good discussion for a Board retreat, and wondered if this might be the impetus for modifying the Board's bylaws. Ms. Finch replied that she agreed with everything Ms. Binnebose stated.

Mr. Scrivner asked for more background on the past-existing Bylaws Subcommittee, which Ms. Cannon and other members provided. Discussion continued among the Board about the various definitions, memberships, and purposes of working groups, ad-hoc committees, and subcommittees.

Mr. Wiley asked how to get on a subcommittee. Ms. Binnebose and Ms. Finch explained that any new Board member not currently serving on a subcommittee can reach out to the following members to get involved in their committee of choice: • Trails Subcommittee: Jenny Hewson, Phil Carroll, CJ Whittaker • Communications Subcommittee: Brianna Binnebose, Melanie Pehrson, Clayton Scrivner • 501(c)(3) Subcommittee: Samantha Finch Ms. Finch mentioned that the 501(c)(3) Subcommittee is ready to provide a report to the Board. Ms. Finch and Ms. Cannon mentioned that, like the disbanded Bylaws Subcommittee, that 501(c)(3) Subcommittee has not been a standing subcommittee. Ms. Cannon mentioned that if all the current, active subcommittees do a write up of those items on page 5 of the PNUT Board Bylaws, Department staff can post them to the PNUT Board webpage and then send them to new Board members. Ms. Binnebose noted the time and the remaining agenda items, moving onward in the agenda. Before she did so, she thanked Ms. Pehrson for working very hard on the Glendale Regional Park letter of support and Ms. Cannon for attending the Transportation Advisory Board (TAB) regarding the Glendale Regional Park Plan.	
Review process for upcoming board chair and vice chair elections Ms. Binnebose explained that by December 2022, the PNUT Board will be accepting nominations for PNUT Board chair and vice chair; self-nominations are also welcome. She added that the Board's December meeting is when the Board will begin reviewing and formally accepting the nominations. Ms. Binnebose said that the January 2023 meeting will be the actual election. She mentioned that the Powers and Duties of Officers section of the Bylaws reflect the roles and responsibilities of the chair and vice chair positions. Lastly, Ms. Binnebose mentioned that one can submit their nomination by sending it via email to herself and Department staff member Luke Allen, whereupon they will confirm that the nominee accepts the nomination. The actual voting will take place during an in-person meeting in January, though members can also participate virtually.	5 mins
Discuss letter of support for Glendale Regional Park Plan – Action Item Ms. Binnebose turned the time over to Ms. Pehrson, who mentioned that she had just sent out another updated version of the PNUT Board's letter of support for the Glendale Regional Park Plan. Ms. Cannon asked if someone could share their screen so all members could view the final version of the letter. Mr. Allen shared his screen displaying the letter with the board. Ms. Binnebose pointed out that the TAB had shared its letter of support with the PNUT Board; Ms. Pehrson had then incorporated those recommendations that the TAB's letter of support had included in the PNUT's letter of support.	10 mins

Ms. Cannon confirmed that TAB would also be incorporating PNUT's recommendations in its letter of support as well; Ms. Pehrson confirmed this. Ms. Pehrson presented the letter to the PNUT Board, explaining its format and purpose. Mr. Carroll made a motion to accept the letter of support pertaining to Glendale Regional Park Plan and submit it to City Council. Board members continued to review the letter. Mr. Scrivner asked what the due date was for the letter. Katherine Maus, Public Lands Planner, stated that the due date is prior to the December 9 public hearing with the Planning Commission. She thanked all the members for their help and collaboration on the letter of support. The Board completed its editing and review and thanked Ms. Pehrson for her work on the letter. Ms. Cannon seconded the motion made by Mr. Carroll, pending everyone was good with name spellings and final edits. The PNUT Board voted unanimously to approve the motion.	
Determine date and topics for January board retreat Ms. Binnebose asked Mr. Allen to provide the group with potential dates and times for the Board's retreat, based on the Doodle poll results. Mr. Allen stated that the date that seems to work with the most people is the same day as the group's January 2023 meeting, either starting a little earlier or going a little later time-wise on that day. The one member whose schedule that did not work for was Ms. Benally; Ms. Benally replied that she may be able to attend the retreat on January 5, 2023, if she no longer has a conflict. Ms. Binnebose announced that the group will tentatively plan on holding its retreat on January 5, 2023, from 5pm – 9pm, pending they hear from Ms. Benally that it works for her schedule. Ms. Binnebose encouraged members to email her their proposals for the January retreat agenda, and acknowledged that the group has some topics for discussion already. Mr. Carroll shared that he would like to see the board formalize their CIP process on that retreat agenda. Ms. Cannon inquired about the GO Bond and whether the group would have anything to discuss pertaining to it at the retreat; Ms. Riker replied that the Department would keep in communication with the board regarding anything further they needed to discuss, but that it would mainly be logistical items at that point.	10 mins

The group began discussing potential locations for the January retreat, including the Tracy Aviary and the Memorial House.	
6 – Confirmation of Next Meeting, Board Comments & Future Agenda Items	7:00 PM
Board subcommittee updates as needed • Trails subcommittee Mr. Whittaker stated that Trails did not meet over the past month so they do not have an update for the board at this time. • Communication subcommittee Ms. Binnebose stated that, aside from the Glendale Regional Park letter of support and the CIP ranking process, the subcommittee received an overview of another potential agenda item and subcommittee topic from Public Lands Community Partnerships and Engagement Coordinator Van Hoover. Mr. Hoover is trying to establish a criteria for partnership with parks to help with the maintenance of community-based assets, which may be directly related to the scope of work under the 501(c)(3) Subcommittee. Mr. Allen added that once Mr. Hoover has established a tiered strategy for partnership development over the winter, he will report back on that to the PNUT Board and Communication Subcommittee, who will also report this to the 501(c)(3) Subcommittee. Mr. Wiley asked what the goals was; Mr. Allen explained that there are many organizations that wish to partner with the Public Lands Department, and since the nature of each partnership is unique, the Department is trying to develop certain criteria and strategies so when someone approaches it for a partnership, the Department has certain buckets it can place those partnerships in to streamline the process. Mr. Allen referenced the City of Austin, Texas, as a good example of this: Austin has some partnerships that are deemed “operational partnerships” where the partner manages the space, akin to how Friends of Gilgal Gardens manages the Gilgal Gardens space for the City of Salt Lake. Mr. Allen explained that the City of Austin has a couple other tiers, but it’s mostly to streamline the partnerships process so the Department can make it more scalable and handle more partnerships rather than trying to handle one-hundred unique agreements with one-hundred unique partnerships, which is not sustainable for the Department to keep doing. Mr. Wiley asked if any of the Department’s current partnerships are recreational; Mr. Allen replied that yes, they could be, but he wasn’t aware of any now. He expects that this type of partnership would lend itself well to a programming/recreational partnership where the partner is running their activities in one of the City’s spaces.	
Board comment and question period Mr. Wiley stated that he had the opportunity to visit the Regional Athletic Complex (RAC) and stated that one of the things he would love is to figure out he can bring in more recreation from a Salt Lake City perspective, specifically in terms of economic	

access for those in District 1, where the RAC is also located. Ms. Riker replied that she would love to connect Mr. Wiley with Chris Laughlin, the RAC Director. She stated that what Mr. Wiley had just described has always been on of Mr. Laughlin's and her goals, to increase community involvement at that site. Mr. Wiley would really like to add baseball fields, and wondered if looping in Mr. Van Hoover in his quest to develop partnership strategies and criteria and communicate that to the 501(C)(3) Subcommittee, would be a good fit for the conversation. Ms. Riker agreed that this would be an area of relevance for Mr. Hoover's work. Mr. Wiley encouraged everyone to check the RAC out when they have a chance. Ms. Riker added that Department staff had brought to the meeting more educational yard signs with the GO Bond webpage link on them, free for members' taking. Ms. Binnebose thanked Ms. Riker and the Department for all the work they'd done with the GO Bond on public education materials, community outreach, consultant work, and other city partnerships.	
Next meeting: December 1, 2022	
Request for future agenda items Discuss and vote on location and agenda items for the board's January retreat. Receive an update on partnership development strategy and criteria from Mr. Van Hoover.	
7 – Adjourn	7:15 PM
Ms. Finch motioned to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Pehrson seconded the motion. The PNUT Board voted unanimously to adjourn the November meeting.	



Staff Responses to Public Comments from the November 3, 2022 PNUT Board Meeting

Ned Skanchy

Ned joined the public comment portion from online. He introduced himself and thanked the Board for their service and expressed his enjoyment of living in Salt Lake City with access to such close recreational amenities. Ned continued that he helps coach the East High Mountain Bike Team, is an avid trail runner, hiker, and skier.

Ned stated that, while he understands the Trails Plan is currently on pause, he wanted to voice his support of it. Ned explained that he'd like to see the Plan taken off pause and bring more trails to Salt Lake City residents. Ned stated that mountain biking is probably the fastest growing sport right now in Salt Lake City, particularly amongst youth. Ned explained that mountain biking is a particularly good sport for getting youth off their phones and engaging with nature. He went on to address user conflict that has placed the Trails Plan on hold; he hopes that when we're talking about Dry Creek specifically, we can encourage some action there so there can be a trail for running and hiking, and a trail for biking. Ned stated that when he's out hiking or running, he doesn't like to be interrupted by bikers; when he's out biking, he doesn't like to interrupt hikers and runners on the trail. Ned ultimately wants to voice support for continued development of a trails plan for all SLC residents.

Staff Response:

Public Lands acknowledges and appreciates this comment from Ned. We have been making great strides during the pause between Phase I and II with ecological research, trail alignment design, and planning with stakeholders and partners to improve upon the goals of the Trails Plan and continue implementation as soon as possible.

Anne Cannon

Anne joined the public comment portion in-person and introduced herself to the PNUT Board. She explained that she was following up from her comments during the October PNUT meeting regarding Wasatch Hollow Park and Preserve. Anne went on to say that residents living near the preserve have formed a committee of concerned volunteers to address the issue of challenges faced with off-leash dogs in the park area. Anne stated that she and the volunteers would like to invite PNUT Board member CJ Whittaker, who represents District 6, to join them in helping find resolutions to diversity of use for Wasatch Hollow Park in ways that will be balanced between non-dog owners and dog owners who want

their dogs off-leash. She reiterated that they are concerned mainly about the park portion. Anne also added that the volunteer committee is interested in engaging with some planners or folks who could help them with the ideas that they're considering, and the survey brought up about possibilities with the park. Further, when the committee is ready to submit the CIP – which they have applied for – the application would have more meaningful direction for what they would like to see happen in their community. Anne ended her public comment by saying that ultimately, the committee would like to see the Wasatch Hollow Park and Preserve be rebuilt for the enjoyment of the total community; as of right now, to access the Preserve, folks must pass through the dog park area, which is one of the challenges. She thanked the Board from their time and looked forward to addressing the challenges together.

Staff Response:

Public Lands staff is continuing to collaborate closely with the Wasatch Hollow Community Council (WHCC) working group on Off-Leash Dogs. In the coming weeks, staff will be meeting on site with members of the working group to discuss ideas for various portions of the park. Following this meeting, WHCC intends to submit additional details on projects throughout the park in the constituent CIP process.

Draft FY 2023-23 Budget Initiatives

Inflationary & Contractual Increases

Background:

Each year the Public Lands Department has operational expense increases related to inflationary and other contractual price increases. This budget initiative addresses cost increases to multiple expense categories related to utilities, fleet fuel and maintenance, operational contracts, and supplies. If these cost increases are not fully funded this would essentially be a budget reduction to the department and respective programs.

Cost

Utility Cost Increase	\$139,500
Fleet Maint. & Fuel Cost Increase	\$26,000
Inflationary & Contractual Cost Increase	\$188,500
Total Ongoing Cost	\$354,000- \$360,000

New Properties & Amenities | Parks + Trails & Natural Lands Divisions

Background:

Each year SLC Public Lands acquires new property and or amenities through the City's CIP process. Budgeting for ongoing maintenance (supplies and staff) of these facilities is requested once the Division understands the date the project will be turned over to that Division for management. This year we have multiple sites that will need various amounts of funding and staffing to steward the new amenities, as well as several semi-administrative positions to activate new facilities, support communications and engagement and maintain critical assets including signage.

New Properties:

- Cornell & North Riverside Natural Area
- Mountain View Corridor Trail (Parks)
- Foothill Trailhead
- Glendale Park
- Fisher Mansion Grounds
- Kilyon Canyon Property
- Allen Park

Expanded Restoration Area

- 100 South Islands (parks)
- 9Lie Urban Orchard (parks + T&NL)
- Fairmont Park Springs
- Folsom Trail (Parks)
- Three Creeks Wetlands

Staff Needs

Cornell & North Riverside Natural Area
• Sr Natural Resource Technician .66 FTE • Seasonal Staff • Contractual Vegetation Management Services
Mountain View Corridor
• Sr Natural Resource Technician .33 FTE • Seasonal Staff
Fairmont Park Springs
• Sr. Groundskeeper .33 FTE • Seasonal Staff
Three Creeks Wetlands
• Sr. Groundskeeper .33 FTE • Seasonal Staff
Folsom Trail
• Sr. Groundskeeper .33 FTE • Seasonal Staff
9 Line Urban Orchard
• Seasonal Staff • Community Partner
100 South Islands (Parks)
• Seasonal Staff

Cost

Seasonal Staff	\$137,537
Materials	\$19,950
One-time Cost	\$119,086
Total Cost for New Properties and Expanded Restoration	\$503,473

Park Maintenance Staff Seasonal to Fulltime Conversion

Background:

Parks require continuous maintenance year-round. During winter times, full-time staff are busy clearing snow from sidewalks and trails and removing fallen tree branches when heavy wet snows come in the spring. Full-time staff would offer a reliable and consistent workforce where orientation training is only required once. This is the first of a three-year phased approach to increase full-time park maintenance staff.

How it relates to the Reimagine Nature Master Plan:

Protect: Action 2.1 A Provide additional maintenance, activation and improvement resources to west-side parks in order to promote a similar degree of attractiveness and usability compared to east-side parks (equity, not equality). Secure maintenance funding for Jordan River Parkway to make it equivalent to other regionally-significant assets such as Liberty Park.

How it relates to the Mayor's Plan: We will support our employees' physical, mental, and economic well-being and prioritize our workforce to recruit and retain the best public servants.

Staff Needs:

- 8 Park Maintenance Techs (grade 19)

Cost

Total One-time costs for equipment	\$520,000
Total Ongoing Costs (Includes staff and materials)	\$640,400-\$721,000
Total Department Request	\$1,160,400

Foothills Trail Maintenance Expansion Program**Background:**

In 2020 Salt Lake City Public Lands initiated the Foothills Trail System Plan in the 6000 acres of open space designated as the Foothills Natural Area. While construction of trails may be funded through CIP funding and grants, the long-term care for the open space ecology and recreational amenities requires proactive and responsive maintenance.

Long-term care includes weed removal, native planting, trail corridor maintenance, trailhead and access maintenance, wayfinding and interpretive signage installation and maintenance, minor trail construction. The current program operates under requests of Recreational Trail Manager using Trails & Natural Lands' maintenance funds and equipment.

How it relates to Reimagine Nature Master Plan:

Connect: Action 1.1B, Action 1.2 D, Action 2.3 B - Protect Action 1.1E

Staff Needs:

- One FTE Senior Natural Resources Technician (Grade 19)
- Two FTE Natural Resource Technicians (Grade 16)
- Four seasonal staff at scheduled locations with increased weed and trail maintenance

Cost

Total One-time Equipment Cost	\$172,500
Total Ongoing Cost (includes staff and materials)	\$271,300- \$307,000
Total Department Request	\$443,800

Trails and Natural Lands Maintenance Enhancement**Background:**

This budget initiative will help support the Public Lands Department in its efforts to improve the ecological health and resiliency of public green spaces, and provide a dedicated budget for biodiversity and habitat enhancement. Currently the Natural Lands team has two full-time field staff who oversee a seasonal team of eight technicians in managing almost 2,000 acres of open space properties.

How it Relates to the Mayor's Plan:

- Our Community: Inclusive, Equitable Opportunities, Safe and Affordable Neighborhoods
- Our Environment: We will lead the way on resilience and stewardship, protecting our natural systems while addressing social inequities, advancing development, and addressing climate change.

How it Relates to Reimagine Nature Master Plan:

- Sustain: 1.1E, 1.2E, 2.2C, 2.2E, 2.3B
- Protect: 1.1E, 1.2A

Staff Needs:

- One FTE Restoration Ecologist (Grade 24)
- One FTE Senior Natural Resources Technician (Grade 16)
- Two Seasonal Natural Resources Technicians (Grade 12)

Cost

Total One-time cost for Equipment	\$147,500
Total Ongoing Cost (includes staff and materials)	\$194,100-\$219,000
Total Department Request	\$341,600

Parks Events / Afterhours Crew**Background:**

General Park operations, mowing, irrigation repairs, trash removal and restroom cleaning happen between 6:00 am and 3:00 pm when the park is not active, and these activities do not disrupt visitor use. However, because visitor use happens primarily between 2:00 pm and 8:00 pm, and on weekends a second crew to manage visitor use such as garbage removal and restroom cleaning could result in a cleaner, safer park and deter criminal activity.

How it Relates to Reimagine Nature Master Plan:

Protect: Action 2.1 A Provide additional maintenance, activation and improvement resources to west-side parks in order to promote a similar degree of attractiveness and usability compared to east-side parks (equity, not equality).

How it Relates to the Mayor's Plan:

Our Community: Inclusive, Equitable Opportunities, Safe and Affordable Neighborhoods

Staff Needs:

- One Lead Parks Maintenance Technician (formerly Groundskeeper) Grade 21
- Five Parks Maintenance Technician II (Formerly Sr. Parks Groundskeeper) Grade 19

Cost

Total One-Time for Equipment	\$197,500
Total Ongoing Cost (staff and materials)	\$461,300 - \$534,000
Total Department Request	\$658,800

Public Way Beautification (formerly Weed Abatement)**Background:**

In 2012 Salt Lake City Public Lands was assigned the weed abatement program, and transferred to PL from Sanitation. The program provided weed removal, mowing and spraying of herbicides in right of ways, alleys, medians and undeveloped City properties. There are no weed abatement funds in the PL budget for this program. Since 2016 PL has requested funding for this program annually. Currently, the program operates on a complaint basis using Park's maintenance funds to hire two seasonal staff.

How it Relates to Reimagine Nature Master Plan:

Welcome: Action 2.2 E utilized the Project for Public Spaces model and Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) standards for thinking about the factors that influence active and safe public spaces.

Staff Needs:

The weed abatement program will operate year-round

- Two FTE Park Maintenance Tech (formerly Sr. Groundskeeper) (Grade 19) dedicated to weed abatement throughout the City on scheduled abatement program (District 5).
- Six seasonal staff at scheduled locations with increased mowing.

Cost

Total One-time Cost for Equipment	\$290,000
Total Ongoing Cost (staff and materials)	\$288,400- \$327,000
Total Department Request	\$578,400

Public Lands Tree Maintenance**Background:**

Over the last 5 years the City's urban forest has benefited from increased focus and funding to plant more new trees and better preserve and maintain older trees. However, high service request demand and substantial backlogs for tree removal and pruning work have necessitated the vast majority of the

Urban Forestry Division's tree maintenance resources to be directed toward servicing of neighborhood street trees. As a result, capacity for maintenance pruning of park, golf course, and other public lands property trees is lacking.

The additional arborist crew could provide the staffing and equipment capacity to prune between 1,000 and 1,500 public lands property trees annually. The new equipment will also provide additional capability the UF Fleet does not currently have. Overtime the increased maintenance will improve the health and safety of trees growing in the city's parks, golf courses, and other public lands.

Staff Needs:

- Two FTE Arborists(1 Grade 19 and 1 Grade 21), constituting one tree pruning crew

Cost

Total One-Time Cost for Equipment	\$457,500
Total Ongoing Cost	\$181,700- \$203,000
Total Department Request	\$639,200

Additional Planning Team Capacity (3 Planners)

Background:

The Public Lands Department's Planning Team (3 FTEs) is tasked with funding applications, project engagement and development, cross-departmental coordination, and project implementation tasks required to deliver public lands projects. These additional full-time planners are required to better manage the existing project backlog of approximately 100 projects. The current ratio of projects per planner leads to project delivery delays and, therefore, budget overruns and missing opportunities to meet community expectations. In addition, greater demands on our public lands system, higher standards for public involvement, more opportunities to collaborate with external partners, and dramatic increases in capital funding mean that planning and project management needs far outstrip this team's current capacity.

How it Relates to Reimagine Nature:

- Strategy G-1: Be proactive and strategic about growth of the Public Lands System
- Action 1.1 A Increase staffing to meet capacity demands of planning & projects team, achieve reasonable project loads for Public Lands PMs, and free up capacity for the many policy and programmatic planning documents recommended as action items.

Staff Needs:

- Three FTE Public Lands Planners (grade 28)

Cost

Total One-Time Cost for Equipment	\$52,500
Total Ongoing Cost	\$319,641- \$374,000
Total Department Request	\$372,141



Public Lands

Parks | Trails & Natural Lands | Urban Forestry

Parks, Natural Lands, Urban Forestry and Trails Board

2023 Meeting Schedule

January 5, 2023

February 2, 2023

March 2, 2023

April 6, 2023

May 4, 2023

June 1, 2023

July 6, 2023

August 3, 2023

September 7, 2023

October 5, 2023

November 2, 2023

December 7, 2023

Meetings start at 5:00pm.

Location

Public Lands Building

1965 West 500 South, 2nd Floor Parks Training Room

Meetings may also be held electronically.

****Meeting date is not confirmed until meeting notice is provided****