

Formal Meeting
Thursday, May 4, 2023
5:00 p.m. – 7:15 p.m.

Join Via Webex: <https://saltlakecity.webex.com/saltlakecity/j.php?MTID=m8ae1c791388c4d86a134c59c144e81de>

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: 2492 359 3934

APPROVED

1 – Convening the Meeting	5:00 PM
Call to order - Melanie Pehrson - Samantha Finch - Brianna Binnebose - Clayton Scrivner - CJ Whittaker - Ginger Cannon - Aaron Wiley - Meridith Benally	
Chair comments Ms. Binnebose thanked Ms. Larsen for all her hard work in bringing the Communications Subcommittee goals to life. Ms. Binnebose said Ms. Larsen has gone above and beyond, and they are excited to share with the rest of the Board what she's been working on.	5 mins
2 – Approval of Minutes	5:05 PM
Approve April 6, 2023, meeting minutes. Ms. Binnebose pointed out one line that said, “Keep Your Coo” rather than “Keep Your Cool” on page 5. Mr. Wiley motioned to approve the minutes. Mr. Whittaker seconded the motion. The Board unanimously voted to approve the April 6th minutes. Ms. Larsen shared that given OPMA when it comes to the hybrid format, verbal confirmation is needed.	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. Ms. Binnebose reminded everyone while the Board loves Public Comments, it is only allowed during the Public Comment Period of Board meetings. <u>Anne Cannon</u>	

Anne Cannon is a member of the public in the Wasatch Hollow area. Ms. Cannon understands the Board oversees a lot of restoration, particularly to the preserve, but the park was also affected due to the recent flooding. Ms. Cannon said the park itself needed some work due to the destruction of vehicles at the time of the flooding, but also before, but the park itself has become a de facto dog park. Ms. Cannon would like the Board to look at the whole park (park and the reserve), not just the areas affected by the flooding so that they can find a place for the dog fountain and direct some of the restoration to allow for the park to find a place for people. Ms. Cannon said people can't enjoy the park because of how many hours are designated for dogs. She would like the Board to consider the options available to aid, manage, and meet the needs of the community in this park. The Board and staff had a further discussion about this member's comment. <u>Bianca Shepard</u> Bianca Shepard is a member of the Wasatch Hollow Community Council. Ms. Shepard shared that for the last several years, Wasatch Hollow has had off-leash dog hours in the park. Since this inception, things have changed with COVID and pet ownership skyrocketing, and with this, dog park usage has increased, which has driven other park users out of the park. Ms. Shepard would like the Board to consider the grinding demand for off-leash dog parks and how they can allocate space for them in other spaces so the demand can be decreased in this park. Also, consider sending some funding to Wasatch Hollow Park due to the flooding. She shared that in the Wasatch Hollow Community Council meeting, another person shared their concerns with off-leash dogs and people being chased by dogs. The Board and staff had a further discussion about this member's comment.	
4 – Director's Report	5:25 PM
Summary of current high-priority department items. – Kristin Riker Mr. Allen shared that this will be his last PNUT meeting. He has accepted a position with Granite School District as a Communications and Marketing Administrator. He thanked the Board for their support during his time here. The Board thanked Mr. Allen for his work with the Board. Ms. Riker said they have hired a replacement for a Parks Operations Manager, Joe Ramos; Toby Hazelbaker is the Director, Kyle Shields, and Joe Ramos are the Operations Managers, and the supervisors are below Mr. Shields and Mr. Ramos. Mr. Ramos comes to Public Lands from the Rapid Intervention team with the City. He has a strong understanding of the issues staff face in their parks. Ms. Riker said they received a few complaints regarding the baseball fields. Staff are still hiring. They are between 7-10 full-time staff members at any given time and still hiring seasonal staff. Another issue staff has been facing with getting the parks ready is the long winter we've been experiencing. This caused park bathrooms to open later, and some of the baseball, soccer fields, etc., didn't look as good. The flooding has also pulled staff away to help with flood mitigation.	5 mins

Ms. Riker shared there have been concerns regarding equity and maintenance on the west side versus the east side. The staff has a work order tracking system they will review to compare. Ms. Riker said the west side has more issues with camping and vandalism, which keeps their staff running around. Some ballfield groups like to change the fields, which staff have to redo and rebuild. Ms. Riker shared that Councilmember Petro brought up an equity concern regarding the equity of some leagues and the way some referees ref. Public Lands are not for recreation; they reserve fields for other groups to hire their own referees and run those games. One way staff can help is to have a stated code of conduct when groups reserve their field to share. Ms. Riker is wondering if the Board, particularly Mr. Wiley, would be interested in working on a brief subcommittee to help Public Lands work on a code of conduct that could be community-supported. It's not enforceable, but it's something parents could point to and say what the City's code of conduct is on the fields. Mr. Wiley thanked Ms. Riker for all the work the staff has done, and he is excited to see how they can improve the experience for everyone. Mr. Wiley said he would be happy to jump onto a subcommittee. Ms. Cannon said she is also happy to explore this. She understands from a recreational standpoint, it's not something that Public Lands has been doing in the past. Ms. Riker said Mr. Nicholas Frederick, the Park Ranger Director, would also be happy to be a part of that group.	
5 – Glendale Regional Park Update	5:30 PM
Glendale Regional Park presentation. – Katherine Maus Ms. Larsen shared her screen to display Ms. Maus' presentation on the Glendale Regional Park Master Plan. Ms. Maus said in March, City Council unanimously approved the Glendale Regional Park Master Plan with no additional comments or input. Two public hearing dates were overwhelmingly positive. She thanked the Board for their help. Ms. Maus said they are nearly complete with the design for Phase 1. Construction documents will be ready to go by the end of next month, and at that point, they will bring a contractor on to begin construction this summer. The playground, basketball court, some lawn space, and pathways near the pavilion will be completed and open to the public by April 2024. The plaza and parking lot will follow shortly after. April 2024 is the Land and Water Conservation Fund deadline that they have to have active recreation open by, so this is why they are phasing it this way. Ms. Pehrson asked if they had a contractor yet. Ms. Maus said they are going out to bid, which takes about a month or two. Ms. Maus continued to share other groundbreaking details and future engagements. Ms. Binnebose asked Ms. Maus to keep the Communications Subcommittee looped in for engagement opportunities. Ms. Maus said once they have a contractor on Board, she would love to have their involvement in this. Ms. Cannon asked if since the playground is being built right along 1700 S, are there any concurrent traffic plans for this first phase. Ms. Maus shared there are current projects that are funded and ongoing on 1700 S. Due to PNUT and TAB's concern with traffic and being a high-priority item for the community, additional funding is being requested to make hawk signals to be red-light-stopping traffic. If funding is received, it will concurrently roll out with phase 1. Ms. Maus continued to share updates for 1700 S.	25 mins

Ms. Maus shared that Public Lands submitted a grant through the Outdoor Recreation Legacy Partnership. The state reached out to Salt Lake City asking about projects. At the end of April, they applied for an additional \$10 million for Glendale Regional Park to support the development of the outdoor pool facility and the water recreation elements along the Jordan River. Staff will be notified in January 2024. If they get the funding, they can begin detailed design. If they do not get the funding, they will use bond funding from the GO Bond to start the design of phase 2 anyways. Ms. Cannon asked if they needed a letter of support from the PNUT Board for the grant. Ms. Maus said they were down to the wire in getting the application submitted, so as a member of the CAC, Ms. Pehrson submitted a resident letter, but the state will not submit their grant until the 31st, so the PNUT Board can submit an additional letter if they'd like. Ms. Maus said she can forward that information along. Ms. Binnebose asked Ms. Pehrson to take the lead on a PNUT letter of support. Ms. Maus said a May 24th or May 25th deadline.	
6 – Og-Woi Gardens Update	5:55 PM
Update on Og-Woi Gardens. – Kristin Riker or Tyler Murdock Mr. Murdock explained that Og-Woi Community Garden was constructed along the Jordan River Parkway. This project was an act of civil disobedience in 2020 by a group of residents that wanted to start a community garden in a public space. At that time, the City began conversations with the garden group to figure out a solution, such as a possible agreement that the City might allow that to continue to exist. A survey was conducted in the Fall of 2021 and found the community was generally supportive of keeping this community garden. However, those closest to the garden raised a lot of concerns about the illegal use of the garden, not being approved by the City, and residents felt that people experiencing homelessness had increased because of it. The City tested the soil, and contamination was found on-site, which complicates the efforts to move forward with an agreement with the community garden users. After working with legal and other departments, the City concluded that the garden needed to be closed. A letter was provided earlier this year to cease operations and growing at the community garden until mitigation was completed. Public Lands recommended to garden users that they go through the CIP process. With how long the process can take, the community garden users asked for leniency, and staff encouraged them to work with Wasatch Community Gardens. They are going through a couple of different steps to gain community support and begin the CIP application process. Wasatch Community Gardens will be conducting additional community outreach starting in the next few weeks. Public Lands will enter into an agreement with Wasatch Community Gardens in working with Og-Woi. Ms. Riker said she is concerned with having agreements with individual groups that want to start community gardens on public property. Right now, Salt Lake City has eight community gardens, and they contract with Wasatch Community Gardens to oversee, work with the community, and work out any issues. Public Lands doesn't have the staff to be able to do it. If Public Lands does this with one group, then they'll have to do it with any other group that wants an agreement directly with the City. Staff continued to share plans regarding Og-Woi and other community gardens with Wasatch Community Gardens.	10 mins

Ms. Cannon asked if there has been discussion around changing ordinances to allow public spaces like this to exist. Ms. Riker said it's not against the ordinance to have a community garden on public lands. This group wasn't permitted by the City to create this garden on public land. The Board and staff continued to discuss the Og-Woi Garden. Staff shared how Wasatch Community Gardens has been helping with this issue.	
7 – Go Bond Update	6:05 PM
Update on Go Bond Projects. – Tyler Murdock Ms. Larsen shared her screen to display a presentation for the GO Bond. Mr. Murdock explained this presentation goes over the first tranche of funding from the GO Bond and what projects will be addressed. The first request is \$19 million. Mr. Murdock said the City normally issues multiple tranches, and Public Lands anticipates the GO Bond will be between 3-4 different issuances over the next 6-8 years. The first request will be \$9 million for Glendale Park, \$2 million for the renovation of the Liberty Park playground, \$850,000 for Allen Park, \$5 million for Folsom Trail, \$600,000 for public space at Fleet Block, \$500,000 for engagement for Fairmont Park, \$1 million for Reimagine Neighborhood Parks, and \$600,000 for the Jordan River Corridor. Mr. Murdock explained how the funds will be used for both the implementation and community engagement of all these projects. Mr. Murdock said the Reimagine Neighborhood Parks project spans the largest and has multiple parks in each council district. \$1,050,000 has been requested for the planning and engagement of these parks. During the bond process, there weren't parks identified so Public Lands has been working closely with the City Council to develop criteria on how these parks would be selected, and four criteria established: 1. Asset condition and quality: lack of diverse activity generators, poor infrastructure condition, and lack of significant capital investment in the past decade. 2. High need/high reward: the park is in or adjacent to a greater need area identified in the 2019 Public Lands Needs Assessment, higher density of nearby users (current or expected), and opportunities for a significant increase in usage. 3. Safety and community ownership: potential to better highlight neighborhood identities and site histories and a history of elevated criminal activity and frequency of SLC mobile requests. 4. Economies of scale: opportunities to enhance already funded projects. For District 1, the parks selected and approved by the City Council are Cottonwood Park and Steenblik Park. District 2, Madsen Park and Peace Labyrinth, and if funding allows, International Peace Gardens. District 3, Warm Springs and North Gateway Parks, and if funding allows, Freedom Grove in Memory Grove. District 4, Taufer and Richmond Park. District 5, Jefferson and Ida Cotton Park. District 6, Donner and Sunnyside Park. District 7, McClelland Trail. Mr. Murdock explained more about why these parks were selected. Mr. Scrivner asked what the design or amenities phase was for Taufer and Richmond. Mr. Murdock said right now they are just in the information gathering and public engagement standpoint. The Board and staff continued to discuss public engagement. Mr. Murdock continued to share how the first tranche of the funding will be allocated and when funding allocation should be approved by the City Council. Mr. Murdock assured the Board that just because they haven't received	20 mins

funding yet, work is still happening on some of these Bond projects for engagement. The Board and staff continued to discuss public engagement and Bond projects.	
8 – 501c3 Subcommittee Presentation	6:25 PM
Presentation and discussion of 501c3 subcommittee findings. – Samantha Finch Ms. Larsen shared her screen to display the 501c3 Subcommittee Presentation. Ms. Finch explained this is a final summary of the 501c3 exploratory subcommittee and that it's a collection of all the discussions and resources. Ms. Finch thanked everyone who helped. Ms. Finch explained the frequency with which they met, and it was before their current process of subcommittees. Ms. Finch said the objective of this subcommittee was to identify and engage with key community members and hold exploratory discussions regarding the viability of a Parks Foundation formed as a 501c3 to support the Public Lands Department; the scope was not to pursue the creation of a 501c3. Ms. Finch defined what a 501c3 was, how they pursued their objective, why they were exploring a 501c3 and an initial list of action items. She shared they met with different groups, such as the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board (MPRB) and Salt Lake City residents. She thanked Ms. Cannon for introducing them to her connections with the MPRB. Ms. Finch explained who was in that discussion, the questions the subcommittee had, and some answers and feedback from the MPRB. Some questions asked were: what level of involvement was needed from the City to support a Parks Foundation in the initial stages, how did they navigate the politics associated with a City being involved in a 501c3, what was the major catalyst for forming, who took the lead, what were first steps, what guidance can be provided on timing, and how long did it take to form. Ms. Finch explained the difference between the MPRB and Salt Lake City Public Lands. The Minneapolis Parks Foundation is the primary philanthropic partner of the MPRB. It began in 2002/2003 when the city received seed money from Toyota. It eventually developed from just fundraising to including a programming element. The Minneapolis Parks Foundation has since funded several multi-million-dollar capital projects. Ms. Finch shared the MPRB's answers to their initial questions and advice. From these answers, the subcommittee created the next steps: should we initially pursue a foundation or partner with another 501c3 group, do we need to set up the administrative functions of the 501c3 first, could we start under the umbrella of another administration (partner with another nonprofit) while we attempt to formally establish the 501c3; how to balance timing, how do we balance the immediate funding needs like the Glendale Water Park versus longer-term goals like the 20-year Reimagine Master Plan, is there an urgency due to the explosion of city growth, is there a foundation in SLC that is willing to take on parks into its portfolio; and what is our catalyst, is there a West Side partnership that has a connection, is there an opportunity to involve Friends of Groups. Ms. Finch shared that Ms. Binnebose helped them create a mission and priority actions. The mission is to improve and sustain Salt Lake City parks and resources through partnerships, volunteerism, communications, and advocacy to support Public Lands' values of stewardship, livability, and equity. Priority actions would be organizational development, community outreach, advocacy, and fund development. Ms. Finch defined the goals, objectives, and strategies. She encouraged the Board to view all the goals, objectives, and strategies in their shared folder online. The goals Ms.	20 mins

Binnebose helped create based on the findings were: develop a non-profit organization to advocate and raise funds for Public Lands projects; conduct community outreach on the mission of the SLC Parks Foundation of the local key stakeholders to gain support and advocacy for the development of the foundation; support the long-term sustainability of Public Lands resources by increasing awareness and understanding among local decision-makers of the importance of providing appropriate funding, legislation, and resources; and identify and secure initial funding sources to sustain the board and support implementation of projects identified in the Salt Lake City Parks Master Plan. Ms. Finch shared the conversations they had with residents of Salt Lake City and what they learned. She said Michael Hughes was one of the first people they spoke to, and he did a presentation that is in the subcommittee's shared folder. The PowerPoint goes over the legal compliance in terms of 501c3 as well as the requirements of a 501c3. Ms. Finch continued to summarize conversations they had with SLC residents and their feedback. Ms. Riker thanked Ms. Finch for her work and time. Ms. Riker said she liked the outline and the effort they put into this, not having previous knowledge. Ms. Riker agreed the conversation with the MPRB was insightful and she's glad that those comments were captured. Ms. Riker liked the idea of involving Friends of Groups. The Board and staff continued to discuss the 501c3 presentation.	
9 – Trails Subcommittee Update	6:45 PM
Trails Subcommittee update. Ms. Binnebose said this wasn't an action item just for the subcommittee to share an update on the description, refine the scope, move forward to make it an action, and what support is needed from the Board. Mr. Whittaker said they had a meeting with Mr. Fonarow to define the scope and what their workload is. He said it's a long-term project and is like how Ms. Finch described the 501c3, where the work ebbs and flows. Right now, the staff is waiting for consultants to finish their work, and there's not a lot for the subcommittee to do. Mr. Whittaker said he updated the description. He said they've been looking into e-bike policies in the West. He shared that as an individual, he's been speaking to someone in California who is trying to solve the same problem for California state. He shared that Mr. Fonarow expressed there are not a lot of projects being made at the national level from the conferences he's attended. Otherwise, the subcommittee is still in the research phase, and the goal of that would be to report back to the Board to then decide what to do from there. Ms. Binnebose asked Mr. Whittaker to walk the Board through some of those changes. Ms. Larsen shared her screen to display the Trails Subcommittee description. The Board continued to discuss work being done during Trails Subcommittees. Ms. Cannon asked Mr. Whittaker for a timeline for the Board to establish the Trails Subcommittee under their new bylaws. Mr. Whittaker said the Board could vote on it today. Ms. Cannon said as the subcommittee that's proposing, the Board needs to be communicated with as to what the subcommittee is ready to do. Ms. Cannon said she's submitted feedback but hadn't heard anything back. Mr. Whittaker said it's ready to go for the Board to vote on it and that this is an update to their vision and scope. Mr. Whittaker said he could pose the question back to the Board if they need a Trails Subcommittee. The Board continued to discuss the Trails Subcommittee.	10 mins

Ms. Binnebose said she thinks the Board sees value in the Trails Subcommittee, and most of the discussion has been around refining and clearly defining the scope of work because it is such a large topic. She said it's mostly about focusing on and identifying issues that may be too big to propose working groups. Mr. Scrivner said he wanted to understand the scope and doesn't view the subcommittee negatively. Ms. Binnebose suggested having this as an action item for the next meeting and giving everyone time to review everything. Mr. Whittaker suggested writing a letter to the City to have a working group formed. The Board continued to discuss the Trails Subcommittee. Ms. Finch said she doesn't have a problem with a broad, general scope. Ms. Binnebose suggested an action item for Board members to review the Trails Subcommittee description, offer any last final suggestions, and get this on the next agenda for an action item. Ms. Binnebose suggested a deadline for additional feedback within the next two weeks to give the subcommittee time to review the feedback in preparation for the next meeting. Mr. Whittaker asked for the feedback to be submitted before May 18th. Ms. Binnebose said she will send an email with review deadlines.	
10 – Staff Items	6:55 PM
Donations, stipend updates, and Zoom transition. – Ashlyn Larsen Ms. Larsen said she went through and reviewed back to 2018 to see how many donations have been coming to the Board and what the average donation size was. She shared the number of donations from 2018 to 2023, so far, and the donated amounts. The average donation has been about \$2,000. Her recommendation, based on her findings, is for the Board to review \$2,000 or more and, however frequently the Board would like, to present all the donations made. Ms. Riker offered that alternatively, they don't have to approve donations. Ms. Finch liked the suggestion of \$2,000 or more. Ms. Cannon said she thinks it's still too minimal, and they should be focusing their attention on larger items. She would rather see those donations come through as reviews rather than action items. Ms. Binnebose asked what the frequency of donations was. Ms. Larsen said it varies. Ms. Riker suggested just when they come up. Ms. Binnebose liked the suggestion of just reviewing and not needing to approve. Ms. Finch suggested having an action item to vote on if the Board should only review, not approve, donations unless they exceed a certain threshold of around \$20,000-\$25,000. Ms. Binnebose suggested a threshold of historic donations, which was around \$10,000. The Board continued to discuss donations. Ms. Larsen said the finance department is still working on how they are administering stipends and working on a process for Board members who want to opt out. Ms. Larsen explained how the City is structuring Board members within their current system to properly pay Board members for their attendance in board meetings. Ms. Larsen asked the Board to let her know if they would like to opt-out so she could let the City know. The pay will date back to when the ordinance passed. Ms. Larsen said they will transition into the Zoom platform for future board meetings. Ms. Larsen said while she was going through the Zoom training, the liaison for the Boards and Commissions for the Mayor's office explained that Board members use chat features and that they don't want them doing that for OPMA. The next board meeting will be over Zoom. Ms. Larsen shared that some boards will only allow public comments if they come in person but can still join virtually. Ms. Larsen explained how the meetings are recorded, it doesn't save the chat so if a Board member is making	5 mins

comments, it won't get added to the minutes, and it doesn't align with OPMA. The Board and staff discussed the virtual aspects of board meetings and public comments.	
11 – Confirmation of Next Meeting, Board Comments & Future Agenda Items	7:00 PM
Board comment and question period Ms. Binnebose thanked everyone for their work today and asked for any last comments. Ms. Riker said on May 16th and June 6th at 7 PM that the Council will take public comments on the FY23/24 budget. Mr. Scrivner said Central City Neighborhood Council is doing a Taufer Park Block Party on May 13th from 10 AM – 3 PM.	
Next meeting: June 1, 2023	
Request for future agenda items Mr. Murdock mentioned acquisitions. Ms. Riker said depending on the status it may be either an open or closed Board update. Ms. Pehrson motioned to adjourn. Ms. Finch seconded. The Board unanimously voted to adjourn the meeting	
12 – Adjourn	7:15 PM