

Formal Meeting
Thursday, April 6, 2023
5:00 p.m. – 7:15 p.m.

Join Via Webex: <https://saltlakecity.webex.com/saltlakecity/j.php?MTID=mbad5758053984b1dc3bb674ec900b7e0>

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: 2481 016 0537

Agenda

1 – Convening the Meeting	5:00 PM
Call to order	
Chair comments	5 mins
2 – Approval of Minutes	5:05 PM
Approve March 2, 2023 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 – Introduce New PNUT Member	5:25 PM
Welcome Dave John. – Kristin Riker	5 mins
4 – Director’s Report	5:30 PM
Summary of current high-priority department items. – Kristin Riker	5 mins
5 – Urban Forest Action Plan Presentation	5:35 PM
Urban Forest Action Plan Presentation. – Tony Gliot	30 mins
6 – Park Ranger Report	6:05 PM
Park Ranger Report – Nick Frederick	20 mins
7 – Action Item: Bylaws	6:25 PM
Review and approve Bylaws changes.	10 mins
8 – Subcommittee Update	6:35 PM
Trails Subcommittee.	10 mins
9 – Staff Items	6:45 PM
Board Bios, and donation updates. – Ashlyn Larsen	5 mins
10 – Confirmation of Next Meeting, Board Comments & Future Agenda Items	6:50 PM
Board comment and question period.	
Next meeting: May 4, 2023	
Request for future agenda items	
11 – Adjourn	7:15 PM

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

Formal Meeting
Thursday, March 2, 2023
5:00 p.m. – 7:15 p.m.

Join Via Webex: <https://saltlakecity.webex.com/saltlakecity/j.php?MTID=md564c6b0eab5389e951e3d79a9886993>

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: 2481 936 4807

Unapproved Minutes

1 – Convening the Meeting	5:00 PM
Call to order <ul style="list-style-type: none">– Brianna Binnebose– Jenny Hewson– Samantha Finch– Phil Carroll– Melanie Pehrson– Ginger Cannon– Meredith Benally– Aaron Wiley– Clayton Scrivner– CJ Whittaker	
Chair comments <p>Ms. Binnebose thanked staff and the Board members for completing the prioritization process for ranking the FY24 Public Lands Budget Insights. In a perfect world, they would have 100% participation. She invited Members to give any feedback to make that process easier.</p> <p>Ms. Binnebose thanked Ms. Finch and Ms. Cannon for their work on the Bylaws.</p> <p>Ms. Binnebose also thanked Ms. Kristin Riker (Public Lands staff) for the support Ms. Katherine Maus (Public Lands staff) provided regarding Miller Park updates and community engagement.</p>	5 mins
2 – Approval of Minutes	5:05 PM
Approve February 2, 2023, meeting minutes. <p>Board had no feedback for February 2, 2023, meeting minutes. Ms. Hewson motioned to approve the minutes. Ms. Finch seconded. Board unanimously voted to approve the minutes.</p>	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. <p>No public comments.</p>	

4 – Director’s Report	5:25 PM
<p>Summary of current high-priority department items.</p> <p>Ms. Riker shared that she has spent a lot of time on the budget, and the first budget presentation is on March 13th with the Mayor’s budget committee. This year they are doing program-based budgeting, which is different from line-item budgeting. She shared that event expansion will be added to the budget. This comes from the Mayor, and it is to expand some of Public Land’s events that go out to the public. Due to air pollution, drought, and fire hazards, Public Lands is looking to do a drone show rather than fireworks this year. They will be asking for more funding for two drone shows and an FTE. Ms. Riker shared that the Mayor is wanting to focus on neighborhoods that are having issues, like the Ballpark and North Temple. Mayor has asked them to evaluate if requests are a ‘must’, ‘could’, ‘should’, or ‘want’. Most Public Lands fall into the ‘should’ category, except for the special events, which are a Mayor’s ‘want’.</p>	5 mins
<p>Introduce two new planners – Tom Millar</p> <p>Tom Millar (Public Lands staff) introduced and shared the backgrounds of the two new planners, Ronnie Pessetto and Kira Johnson. Mr. Millar shared that the Engineering Division will be hiring a Senior Project Manager who will manage consultant designers and specialties to implement the design and construction of those projects. Mr. Carroll asked if these roles were funded through the GO Bond. Mr. Millar confirmed yes.</p>	5 mins
<p>Ordinance Update: Indigenous Board Members – Kristin Riker</p> <p>The ordinance request to have two additional Board members on the PNUT, bringing the Board max to 13, and leaving space for two indigenous Board members, was presented to City Council. That went very well. Mr. Luke Allen (Public Lands staff) shared that based on his interpretation of the minutes, it's approved. This should be approved or will be in the next Council meeting.</p> <p>Ms. Riker shared some items in the queue for Council. One is the Urban Forest Action Plan. This was done through the planning department. Urban Forestry Director, Tony Gliot, has worked side-by-side with them. There's been a few meetings, and they accepted public comments. Tentative Council action is March 7th to adopt the Urban Forest Action Plan. Another project is the Bridge to Backman regarding some land they're going to exchange. City Council was supposed to take action on February 21st for this project. Mr. Allen will look into it. Arbor Day is April 28th, but the Mayor will celebrate her Arbor Day event on April 27th from 5 PM – 7 PM, and the location is to be decided.</p> <p>Ms. Cannon asked for more information regarding the Urban Forest Action Plan and if anything was needed from the Board. Ms. Riker said that next month, Mr. Gliot wants to do a presentation on the plan. Ms. Riker asked the Board how much time they would like Mr. Gliot to spend on the presentation. Staff can get the information over to the Board before the next meeting. Ms. Cannon said as long as they get the information before the next meeting, 30 minutes should be enough time for Mr. Gliot to present.</p>	5 mins
5 – Action Items: Subcommittees, Bylaws, FY24 Budget Initiatives	5:40 PM
Discuss Subcommittee proposals.	25 mins

Ms. Binnebose explained the purpose of this discussion is not to solve anything today but to create consistency for subcommittees moving forward. She also brought up the possibility of creating stakeholder workgroups for scopes of work that could be too large for a subcommittee. The purpose of this action is for each subcommittee to review the information identified in the Bylaws and present it. Ms. Ashlyn Larsen (Public Lands staff) shared her screen to display the subcommittee reports.

501c3

Ms. Hewson said their write-up hasn't changed much from the last Board meeting presentation. Ms. Hewson read their defined bullet points from the Bylaws (committee type, committee membership, work objective, relation to Reimagine Nature Master Plan and/or other Public Lands actions, timeline, and final reports). Ms. Hewson would like to share with the rest of the Board what they learned in the process of creating a 501c3 in May. Ms. Cannon asked if this subcommittee's work is done. Ms. Hewson explained this was a summary of what the subcommittee did and they will do a final presentation to the Board in May. Ms. Finch said they do not have a scope reshaped until they coordinate more with the Parks Department and hear more about the Mayor's initiative, but under the original scope, the 501c3 has completed its work. This final summary is to educate new Board members and to prepare for the new 501c3 subcommittee they anticipate forming, but further discussion is needed with other groups. Ms. Cannon asked if they are voting on establishing this subcommittee or not because the work is complete and will be presented. Ms. Binnebose said in the future, once they give their presentation and coordinate with staff, then they'll go through the same process in their next phase to vote for Board approval for another calendar year. Board discussed what needs to be done to establish this subcommittee's next phase. Ms. Riker said she would like to schedule a time to give an update on what Public Lands has done. They did hire a consultant to help staff figure out how to start this and gave recommendations. Their scope of work is complete, and staff has that presentation they can share with the Board. She shared it's one of the Mayor's goals, and they are trying to create some sort of Parks Conservancy before the end of the year. Ms. Binnebose suggested April or May. Ms. Hewson asked for it to be in May as Ms. Finch won't be at the meeting in April. Board continued to discuss the work the consultant did for Public Lands. Ms. Finch asked if the 501c3 could present first on the agenda in May. Ms. Binnebose suggested deciding if a new 501c3 subcommittee should form after hearing the staff's presentation of the consultant's findings or if they should nominate a Board member to represent the PNUT Board for that possible Parks Conservancy. Ms. Binnebose suggested there be no action item on this subcommittee as they will be wrapping up their scope of work in May.

Bylaws

Ms. Cannon said per the Board's suggestions from the last meeting, to change this subcommittee to a standing subcommittee. She said they added some of their notes from work in 2022 into the shared folder. Ms. Cannon and Ms. Finch shared the amended updates per the last meeting's discussion regarding committee type, committee membership, the scope of work, timeline, relation to Reimagine Nature Master Plan and/or Public Lands actions, and the final report. Mr. Carroll shared that from a previous committee he was on, the Bylaws subcommittee was always there, and they put the past chair or past president as a chair of the Bylaws committee. From time to time, it expanded, but you have someone very familiar with the information so if questions came up at a Board meeting, they could answer those questions. Ms.

Binnebose thanked Mr. Carroll for the suggestion to maintain some continuity. Mr. Carroll said it expands and contracts based on the needs of the group. It constantly keeps someone on the subcommittee who has historical knowledge of the subcommittee. Ms. Binnebose asked if the Board would like to vote to keep this subcommittee active with the amendments discussed this evening. Ms. Cannon made a motion to make this an active standing subcommittee. Ms. Binnebose seconded the motion. Board voted unanimously to approve this subcommittee.

Communications

Ms. Binnebose presented the subcommittee bullet points per the Bylaws (committee type, committee membership, work objective, relation to Reimagine Nature Master Plan and/or other Public Lands actions, and final reports). Not any changes from the presentation given in the last Board meeting. Ms. Cannon asked if there was anything related to the Board's website page that could be included under the subcommittee's scope of work. Ms. Cannon said she wasn't sure if it falls under Ms. Larsen's duties or if that could be an additional piece for the subcommittee. Ms. Larsen said she is currently working on an internal, staff process to ensure all the information on the Park's websites is accurate and up to date. Ms. Cannon asked if this subcommittee would be appropriate to help with that. Ms. Larsen said that occasionally there may be things the Board could help with. Mr. Allen said one of their goals is to bring together more communications plans for upcoming engagement projects to the subcommittee so they can get feedback. A lot of that would include web content and reading it from a resident's perspective to make sure it makes sense, in addition to getting involved with the PNUT page. Ms. Binnebose included digital communications under their scope of work. Ms. Finch asked if they would submit a written report to the Google drive. Ms. Binnebose said yes. Ms. Finch asked if they would provide updates at the end of Board meetings when they have their subcommittee updates. Ms. Finch asked if they would also be providing an annual summary. Ms. Binnebose said they could. Ms. Hewson motioned to keep the communication subcommittee. Ms. Pehrson seconded the motion. Board unanimously approved keeping the communications subcommittee in its current form. Ms. Finch asked if there is an expiration date for all the standing subcommittees they approved tonight. Ms. Binnebose said she is fine with a yearly check-in.

Trails

Mr. Whittaker presented the subcommittee bullet points per the Bylaws (committee type, committee membership, work objective, timeline, relation to Reimagine Nature Master Plan and/or Public Lands actions, and final report). Ms. Benally wants to get on the trails subcommittee or if membership was already voted on. She didn't know the process. Ms. Cannon said they haven't voted on this iteration so she assumes the request will go to the other subcommittee members. Mr. Carroll said the only limitation is not getting to a quorum size. Mr. Whittaker asked what process Board members go through to add a member to a subcommittee. Ms. Cannon said in the Bylaws. They can add Ms. Benally right now during this subcommittee approval process or make an ad hoc motion during any Board meeting. Mr. Whittaker said he's fine adding her right now. Mr. Carroll agrees. Ms. Binnebose supports it. Ms. Cannon asked what the time commitment was each month. Ms. Cannon said she would like to see more of a defined work objective. She said the scope is so big. She's wondering if

they've thought about how much they can take on this year based on what the City's doing and how they can best concentrate their efforts and reflect that in this scope. She thinks one of the work objectives could fill the whole year. Mr. Whittaker said he thinks the assumption being made is that what they're posing is a problem-solving subcommittee, which is not what the Board generally is. The subcommittee is doing what the Board was doing before it formed; having these long discussions with the City that are anywhere from 30 to 90 minutes per month. Then if the subcommittee feels they should make a recommendation, they will write a letter and go to the Board to discuss it. There aren't trying to solve problems or push the City into solving the dog leash problem or trails. They are discussing things and the goal is to make recommendations. Ms. Cannon said that's what she's looking for and what they are anticipating in the subcommittee: the work you will be doing to help the City. Mr. Whittaker shared one example where they brought in a subject matter expert to discuss how other groups count users. The next goal would be to recommend to the City to utilize one of these tools to count users because that's a problem right now. Ms. Cannon said that's a problem-solving example. Mr. Whittaker said it's not a problem-solving example, but it's a hey City, here's a problem you need to solve, and here are some methodologies on how to do it. Board continued to discuss the trail's scope of work.

Ms. Finch asked about stakeholder groups. Ms. Riker explained the presentation that was shared with Board members was a consultant asking stakeholder groups for input. Ms. Riker said the City doesn't currently have a stakeholder group for the Foothills. It is something she has talked to Tyler Fonarow (Public Lands staff) about; form a group to grapple with a specific topic, such as e-bikes or dogs off-leash in the Foothills. Ms. Finch asked for more clarity on the consultant presentation. Ms. Cannon clarified the presentation done by the consultant was just an open meeting, not a stakeholder group or anything formed by the City. Ms. Riker said they've been meeting with a lot of different groups and stakeholders to get input. Mr. Carroll said his understanding is that these bigger issues are more of an interdepartmental working group, such as e-bikes and dogs off-leash. Board continued to discuss the scope of work for the trails subcommittee and stakeholder working groups.

Ms. Finch suggested the subcommittee include a member of Public Lands staff as part of their membership. Mr. Whittaker said they have a staff member they work with every month, Mr. Fonarow. He comes on his own accord. This is where the subcommittee gets a lot of their information that they report back to the Board. Mr. Carroll said you'd find Mr. Fonarow's comments in their minutes, but he does not want to be an official member of the trails subcommittee. Ms. Riker said he is the liaison. Ms. Cannon asked if Mr. Fonarow has had the chance to review this write-up. Mr. Whittaker said he hasn't but agreed it's a good idea.

Ms. Finch said some Board members have expressed reservations about having non-PNUT Board members and staff on subcommittees. It's something they can talk more about in the Bylaws discussion. Ms. Finch referenced Polly Hart and Eric Edelman listed under subcommittee membership. Ms. Finch would like to see something from them regarding their expertise and a case made on why they should be subcommittee members. Ms. Finch said if they are going to go with their current bylaws and current discussion around the subcommittee, one of the items that came up for discussion was

<p>that if a non-PNUT Board member is to join a subcommittee, an explanation of their expertise should be presented for approval. She mentioned Mr. Carroll also recommended they possibly submit a resume. Ms. Finch would like to see that before she feels comfortable approving the trails subcommittee presentation. Mr. Carroll said both people are making a substantial contribution to the work. He spoke about Ms. Hart's background and knowledge. Ms. Cannon said it's not a question of their background, but to document their expertise. Mr. Whittaker said they can document that and add it to the Google drive. Ms. Finch wants to understand why they want Ms. Hart and Mr. Edelman. Ms. Pehrson wants to know if they've considered bringing other subject matter experts. She thinks the documentation part is the important part. Ms. Pehrson asked if it's just the Foothills Trails subcommittee or the Public Land's Trails subcommittee; does it include other trails? Mr. Whittaker said it's just the Foothills trails subcommittee regarding the Foothills Master Plan. Ms. Cannon suggested having the write-up, including the full name of the Master Plan, and then however they want to term themselves. When they say trails, it makes her think of other trails outside of the Foothills. Mr. Carroll suggested the Foothills Trails Subcommittee. Mr. Whittaker suggested the Foothills Subcommittee as it's a lot larger than just trails. Ms. Cannon said this is a request of hers before she can vote for approval, as she wants to know more about what their role is. Ms. Riker asked how the Bylaws handle members being voted onto subcommittees. Ms. Finch read through the Bylaws explaining that add-on. Mr. Whittaker asked if the Board feels comfortable voting to allow Ms. Benally on the subcommittee now or wait until the document is approved. Ms. Cannon suggested adding her to the document now and then the Board can vote on the new document next month. Ms. Binnebose said they will table this discussion for now and the subcommittee will continue to refine its scope of work. Ms. Cannon thanked the subcommittee for taking the feedback.</p>	
<p>Discuss Bylaws changes.</p> <p>Ms. Larsen shared her screen showing the amended Bylaws. Ms. Cannon referenced subcommittees under Board Member Responsibilities. The first is the discussion around if Board members "must" or are "encouraged" to participate on a subcommittee. Ms. Cannon referenced it seemed to split in the discussion last month, and they are seeking feedback on it now. Mr. Scrivner likes the idea of it being a "must" from a time-equity standpoint for everyone to contribute. Mr. Carroll was worried about subcommittees having too many members and there being a quorum. Mr. Scrivner suggested a clause regarding space on a subcommittee. Mr. Carroll asked what the point of being on a subcommittee, like Bylaws, if you aren't doing any work. Ms. Binnebose said for institutional knowledge. Ms. Cannon reemphasized these are internal guidelines. Board took a straw poll for "must, with clause" or "encouraged. Most Board members liked "must, with clause". Board continued to discuss subcommittee participation expectations and time commitments. Board voted and approved for the language to be "must, with clause".</p> <p>Ms. Cannon said there are a few different ways to add members to subcommittees. They can make an ad hoc motion in a Board meeting. She wants to ensure they are clear in the Bylaws of how a non-Board member gets on a subcommittee. Ms. Cannon referenced Ms. Finch's point of being able to speak to why you are inviting a non-Board member and their expertise. Ms. Finch clarified she was asking for documentation of their expertise. Mr. Carroll asked for clarity on the level of expertise.</p>	<p>20 mins</p>

Ms. Cannon said it all depends on the outcomes of what the subcommittee is working on. Mr. Whittaker asked if it will be assumed or documented if there was a discussion about this individual. Ms. Cannon referenced the Bylaws saying an explanation of their expertise must be presented and approved by the PNUT Board. Mr. Whittaker said so it assumes there will be a discussion about that person. Ms. Cannon referenced back to what Mr. Scrivner has said subcommittees are to serve the Board, so why have outside members on subcommittees? Mr. Scrivner stands by that; it's the same reason they don't have staff on subcommittees. You can consult with staff and other outside parties, but his idea is that they don't get into these murky waters and they report back to the Board. Mr. Whittaker said the City ordinance says subcommittees may have non-Board members and that non-Board members can provide such valuable input. Mr. Whittaker advocates keeping both of the trails subcommittee non-Board members on. Mr. Scrivner clarified he's not saying they are just booted off; he's saying recognizing them as a formal subcommittee member. He referenced the communications subcommittee as an example. Board continued to discuss subcommittee membership.

Ms. Benally asked what the duration of the appointment would be: as long as the committee exists or until their expertise is utilized. Ms. Cannon said she thinks it's up to the committee and it is addressed in the Public Involvement section of the Bylaws. Ms. Cannon said subcommittees may want to invite members of the public for a limited engagement to gain more knowledge. Ms. Finch clarified that's different from being an actual member of the subcommittee. Ms. Benally asked if that's equal to someone coming in and making a public comment on the subject and what comes of that comment or them wanting to be engaged on the subcommittee. Ms. Finch said subcommittee meetings aren't open to the public, but you can invite a member of the public to get their insights. As long as it's for a limited engagement, she requests it's just in some sort of summary to the Board. Subcommittees can seek out all the expertise they want, they just don't want that person becoming a de facto member of the subcommittee by constantly appearing and showing up. Mr. Whittaker said if that person could provide regular feedback that is helpful for a project, that gives you a case to have them be a part of the subcommittee formally. Mr. Scrivner clarified he's onboard for having non-Board members on subcommittees with a formal process.

Ms. Cannon spoke about the reporting requirements for subcommittees. That can be taken care of as notes included in the Google drive. Ms. Cannon said it was originally written to be entered into the minutes. She doesn't feel it needs to go to scope if they have the written updates in the Google doc. Ms. Finch's explained her intent is to get a written update every month or whenever there's activity. Ms. Larsen asked if that's something they'd like to include in the packet. Ms. Hewson feels if the subcommittee has met and they put a written report in the Google drive if a Board member is interested, it is their responsibility to go and look at that report. Ms. Cannon said subcommittees are not public meetings, so they don't need to be documented in the same way, this is just internal reporting. Ms. Pehrson asked what the accountability factor is. Ms. Binnebose said she and Mr. Scrivner, as Chair and Vice-Chair, can poke their heads in and see who's reporting what. Board continued to discuss reporting and subcommittees' expectations.

<p>Ms. Finch asked how the Board would like to move forward with the part of the Bylaws saying if a subcommittee contains a non-Board member or input from the public, their contribution must be summarized. Mr. Whittaker said it seems laborious. It would already be in the meeting minutes, and why single out a single person the Board has already approved. Mr. Whittaker made a motion to remove that sentence from the Bylaws. Ms. Finch asked if they were to have a neighbor come over, they wouldn't include a summary of what that neighbor might have said. Mr. Whittaker said he was referencing a non-PNUT subcommittee member that the Board voted to approve. Ms. Finch said she was trying to make the distinction between someone inviting a neighbor versus a non-PNUT Board subcommittee member. Mr. Whittaker clarified that a non-PNUT, approved subcommittee member is different from just inviting a member of the public to give input so as the Bylaws stand now, it seems redundant. Mr. Wiley said it was to help a newer PNUT Board member understand the value of what a special guest brought to the subcommittee. Mr. Whittaker motioned to have the rewrite the sentence to clarify its notes taken on what a subject matter expert said or a special guest who's not a subcommittee member. Ms. Finch asked if it could say if the subcommittee invites a member of the public for comment, that be summarized in the notes. Mr. Whittaker said yes. Board unanimously approved the edits to that section of the Bylaws.</p> <p>Ms. Cannon motioned to move the amended Bylaws as discussed this evening with these particular changes. Ms. Hewson seconded the motion. Mr. Carroll said he thought they would bring them back next time. Ms. Cannon clarified she was making that motion. The Bylaws have been before the Board twice, and there's been ample enough time for review. Board voted unanimously to approve the amended Bylaws as discussed this evening with the changes.</p>	
<p>Discuss FY24 Budget Initiatives letter of recommendation.</p> <p>Ms. Binnebose thanked Ms. Pehrson for working on the letter of recommendation. Ms. Pehrson asked if she should incorporate consideration of Reimagine Nature Master Plan into the letter. Ms. Binnebose said she could put it in right now as they are reviewing it. Other Board members agreed. Ms. Binnebose stated they didn't get the full participation of Board members, but they did get the majority. She asked if anyone had additional thoughts or suggestions or if would they like to put this to a motion for approval. Ms. Cannon suggested an edit to change a word to 'resilience'. Ms. Cannon motioned to approve this change. Ms. Binnebose seconded the motion. Board discussed how the sentence should read. Ms. Finch asked if the Powers & Duties were incorporated in the letter. Ms. Cannon was wondering where the reference to the Powers & Duties came from. Ms. Binnebose and Ms. Finch said the current language in the letter probably came from previous letters of support. Ms. Cannon motioned to adopt the letter and get it to Council. Mr. Carroll seconded the motion. Board unanimously voted to approve the letter of support. Ms. Pehrson said she saw a letterhead in the Google drive. Ms. Binnebose asked if it could include the Public Lands logo. Ms. Larsen explained since the letter is coming from the Board and not the City, they opted to remove any City or Public Lands logo from the letterhead.</p>	20 mins
6 – Staff Items	6:45 PM
OPMA, GRAMA, Conflict of Interest, Board bios, Headshots – Ashlyn Larsen	5 mins

<p>Ms. Larsen thanked everyone who had already completed the open tasks. Mr. Wiley said he send his Conflict-of-Interest soon. Ms. Larsen said she is still waiting on Ms. Benally, Ms. Pehrson, Mr. Scrivner, and Mr. Wiley for OPMA. Ms. Larsen said Board members can either upload their open tasks to the Google drive or email them to her. Ms. Larsen said she is still waiting for Mr. Wiley's and Mr. Scrivner's bios. Ms. Larsen poised the option of including Board headshots on their website page. Ms. Cannon said she thinks they'd be the only Board with headshots. Board discussed including headshots on the PNUT page. Board voted not to include headshots of the PNUT page.</p> <p>Ms. Larsen shared there's no official training for GRAMA for Boards & Commissions because it doesn't quite follow all City jurisdictions like City employees do. She said any Board or City-related texts or emails on personal devices are subject to GRAMA. Personal items stay private, but if using your personal email for Board or City-related topics, they are GRAMA-able. Ms. Larsen said the Conflict-of-Interest is GRAMA-able. She invited Board members to email them to her directly if they don't feel comfortable uploading those to the Google drive. Ms. Larsen also explained there's no actual ethics training. How the ethics training could be incorporated would be if an attorney presented the OPMA training to the Board. Since the Board opted to complete OPMA virtually, there wouldn't be any ethics training.</p>	
7 – Confirmation of Next Meeting, Board Comments & Future Agenda Items	6:50 PM
<p>Board comment and question period.</p> <p>Ms. Binnebose asked Board members if they'd like to request any time on the next agenda. Mr. Carroll asked for five minutes to share. Mr. Carroll said the trails subcommittee recently had a presenter come and speak to them. Unfortunately, the recording was not saved for them to share with the rest of the Board. He shared his takeaways from the presentation. He explained how their emphasis was on how they managed high-use trails. He said he will share the handouts with everyone he received during this presentation.</p> <p>Mr. Wiley asked about park usage fees; if there was an increase and how much the increase has been from last year to this year. Ms. Riker said they don't charge for park use and asked if he meant pavilion rentals. Mr. Wiley said for something like the baseball fields. Ms. Riker asked if he meant reservations. Mr. Wiley explained they'll reserve the park for little league baseball, and he's curious how that works with how much the increase has done from year-to-year. Ms. Riker said they can pull that information. She said she doesn't think they've done an increase in quite a while. Ms. Riker explained the City's consolidated fee schedule. Ms. Riker said the public can always pull those current fees up, and if they're looking to see the changes, staff can try and pull that data. Mr. Wiley said that would be helpful.</p> <p>Ms. Cannon thanked the staff for the annual report. She noticed it in the newsletter and asked if there's a place where it's online. Mr. Allen said they probably haven't published a link on their site, but they've included it in the newsletter. Ms. Cannon wants to make sure other members of her community know it's there so it would be helpful to have a link at some point.</p>	
<p>Next meeting: April 6, 2023</p>	
<p>Request for future agenda items.</p>	

Ms. Binnebose referred to the discussion during the beginning of the meeting for future agenda items regarding subcommittees, the Urban Forestry Plan, and Conservancy. Ms. Binnebose asked if there was anything further to email Mr. Sriver, Ms. Larsen, and herself. Ms. Binnebose motioned to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Wiley seconded. Board voted unanimously to adjourn the meeting.

8 – Adjourn

7:15 PM

DRAFT

April 6th PNUT Board Meeting- Urban Forestry Update

Presentation Narrative:

Salt Lake City's Urban Forestry Division is responsible for maintenance of the more than 90,000 public property trees throughout parks, trailways, facility properties, and residential neighborhoods across the City.

Combined, our city's public and private property trees comprise a vast, living, infrastructure that offers an array of amazing benefits that are vital to our health and comfort. It is the Urban Forestry Division's mission to maximize these benefits, that trees afford, while minimizing the risks that they pose.

This presentation to the PNUT Board will deliver an overview of Urban Forestry Division services, capabilities, and production metrics while also sharing insight on recent accomplishments, current challenges, and the crucial role that trees will play in our city's promising future.