

**Formal Meeting
Thursday, January 5, 2023
5:00 p.m. – 9:15 p.m.**

Join at Memory Grove Memorial House: 375 N Canyon Road, Salt Lake City, UT 84103

Approved Minutes

1 – Convening the Meeting	5:00 PM
Call to order <ul style="list-style-type: none">– Phil Carroll– Clayton Scrivner– Ginger Cannon– Samantha Finch– Aaron Wiley– CJ Whittaker– Brianna Binnebose– Melanie Pehrson– Jenny Hewson– Meridith Benally	
Chair comments Chair Binnebose thanked the Board for committing time for this retreat to take a deeper dive into some housekeeping and procedural items to help run 2023 run smoothly. As well as create the opportunity for subcommittees to set their action items for the year.	5 mins
2 – Public Comment Period	5:05 PM
Verbal comments are limited to no more than 3 minutes; 15 minutes total. Written comments are welcome. No public comments.	15 mins
3 – Action Items	5:20 PM
Approve December 1, 2022, meeting minutes. Ms. Ashlyn Larsen, Public Lands staff member, updated some comments made by Ms. Finch for the December 1, 2022, meeting minutes. Ms. Cannon made a motion to approve the previous meeting minutes. Ms. Finch seconded the motion. Board unanimously approved the meeting minutes.	5 mins
Chair and Vice Chair Election. Ms. Binnebose reminded everyone the vote would take place via paper ballot. The members nominated for chair are: <ul style="list-style-type: none">– Brianna Binnebose	5 mins

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Ginger Cannon <p>Board members nominated for vice-chair are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Clayton Scrivner – Melanie Pehrson – Jenny Hewson <p>Mr. Allen reviewed the procedures in the event of a tie with nine Board members present. There must be a majority vote. With nine members present, there shouldn't be an issue with the chair position, but for the vice-chair, they could run into a three-way tie. There are two options if there is a tie: waiting for February to vote for a vice-chair or doing another round of voting this evening. Ms. Cannon asked if Ms. Benally was going to be there. Mr. Luke Allen, Public Lands staff member, confirmed she would be there but late. Ms. Cannon asked if the Board could postpone voting until Ms. Benally arrived. Ms. Binnebose agreed. The rest of the Board agreed.</p>	
4 – Staff Discussion and Agenda Items	5:30 PM
<p>Reimagine Nature Review Discussion</p> <p>Ms. Katherine Maus, Public Lands staff member, presented the Reimagine Nature Master Plan. Ms. Maus used a slide projector to share the presentation. All Board members had a physical copy of the Master Plan. Ms. Maus introduced herself as a city planner, explained her role, and thanked the Board for letting her present to them tonight. Ms. Maus did a high-level overview of the Master Plan and how it is a guide for Salt Lake City to follow for the next 20 years.</p> <p>Ms. Maus shared the inventory of all the types of land Public Lands cares for, such as natural lands, the foothill areas, urban forestry, golf courses, trails, parks, RAC, and the cemetery. Ms. Maus explained how Public Lands completed a Needs Assessment in 2019 to help guide Public Lands to determine how to utilize these spaces to best prioritize and serve the community as Salt Lake City continues to grow. Ms. Maus explained how Public Lands managed the community engagement process, like participating with colleges, to administer in-person and digital outreach attempts. More community engagement details can be found on page 19 of the Master Plan.</p> <p>The plan is centered around three major goals: Sustain, Connect, Welcome, Protect, and Grow; 10 Transformative Projects; and a Set of Actionable Strategies. Themes of Equity, Livability, and Stewardship are values woven throughout the plan. Ms. Maus further defined “Sustain, Connect, Welcome, Protect and Grow” within the Master Plan. Ms. Maus explained how the 10 Transformative Projects, all achieve one or multiple areas of “Sustain, Connect, Welcome, Protect, and Grow”.</p> <p>Mr. Whittaker asked what “increase the provision of green space” means. Ms. Maus stated it's three-fold: increasing acreage of green space downtown, increasing the effectiveness of current green spaces that are underutilized and being creative about how you look at green spaces. Ms. Maus shared the example of exploring how the 'right-away' can increase green space downtown. Ms. Maus asked if there were any additional questions. Ms. Pehrson said she would save her questions for the end. Ms. Maus shared how Pioneer Park is one of the more under-utilized green spaces downtown, and they are currently ongoing some projects to improve the use of that space. Ms. Maus continued to share how Public Lands plans to be creative with their green spaces, like in golf.</p>	<p>30 mins</p>

Ms. Maus asked Board members to turn to Chapter 8 of the Master Plan. She explained this section is the action strategies section and defines the steps that will be taken to achieve the three major goals of the Master Plan. Ms. Maus shared there will be some plans within the Master Plan that the Board will be involved in so she invited them to take a deeper dive into Chapter 8. Ms. Maus explained that from this Master Plan, Public Lands can begin creating a strategic 5-year plan to implement and prioritize all the goals and projects listed within the Master Plan. Ms. Maus opened the floor for the Board's questions.

Ms. Pehrson asked if the levels of services around the 94 acres needed in parks to sustain Salt Lake's growth include or exclude properties that are already obtained or not developed, for example, Glendale. Ms. Kristin Riker, Public Lands Director, said Glendale, Allen Park, and Fleet Block take from the 94 acres; this totals 27 acres. The 94 acres were determined with the Needs Assessment in 2017, and Public Lands didn't have those things then. Ms. Maus also shared that some parcels in Public Land's inventory are not developed and publicly accessible and are not counted towards the 94 acres, such as the 200 West Urban Farm, which is funded.

Ms. Pehrson asked if there will be a higher priority to updating the bilingual signage in high-use bilingual areas. Ms. Maus explained there are two outstanding projects regarding signage in high-use bilingual areas. One has funded 10 parks that have been selected based on size, amenities, and signage for navigation. Applications are in for an additional 10 parks updating signage. Those parks have not been determined, but are recommended based on the same criteria for the other 10 parks that were funded. Ms. Maus said more information would be shared come fall 2023. Ms. Riker shared that any new projects would have the bilingual language standard. Ms. Pehrson asked if the bilingual signage is officially now the standard practice. Ms. Maus said it's nearly formalized.

Ms. Pehrson asked if there would be a Public Lands employee who manages the "Coming Soon Near You" program and those partnerships. Ms. Maus shared there are specific action strategies that determine Public Lands policies and staff. Public Lands currently has a programming partnership management employee, Van Hoover, but there are other initiatives. Ms. Riker said the City had a recreation component at some point and got rid of it several years ago. As Public Lands brings on new parks, they have asked for new programming directors for specifics. Council denied that request, but Public Lands will continue to ask. It is in the Master Plan to have a full-time programming director for the Glendale facility. However, it is not in the budget or portfolio currently.

Ms. Pehrson asked if a county person could oversee it. Ms. Riker explained the county does a lot of recreation programs, like sports. They run those facilities and leagues within the city for Public Lands. Mr. Allen shared that Park Rangers would be involved to some degree, as well. Mr. Scrivner asked if the Master Plan addresses the relationship between Public Lands and Salt Lake County or if REC was left off the table. Ms. Riker said REC was left off the table. Ms. Riker explained that the "Welcome" goal addresses activating parks, Public Lands has focused on building relationships and having stakeholder groups that activate their parks. For example, Liberty Park is very

active, and the City permits people to use that space. Mr. Scrivner shared that the County is the same way. They rely on community-based programs and areas to run parks. Ms. Riker pitched to the Mayor that if you were an established group with Public Lands, you could apply for a \$1,000 grant to activate a park. It encourages the community to help run the park. Ms. Pehrson shared that this is especially relevant for Glendale.

Ms. Pehrson asked if there were any partnerships with developers for downtown. Ms. Riker said there is an impact fee when they do residential development. She explained they have tried to work with developers, but it hasn't quite worked. This is something that is on economic development's radar. Ms. Riker shared they have pitched a few of Public Land's 2023 goals to the Mayor on ways for Public Lands to build up partnerships. Ms. Pehrson commented on how amazing the Master Plan document is and how proud she is of Salt Lake City. Ms. Cannon expressed she's proud of the Board and the work they've done to help make this happen and their input. Ms. Riker shared reviewing the Master Plan is something that could be done once a year at the retreat.

Ms. Cannon asked: how actionable items in Chapter 8 of the Master Plan will be accomplished, how that will be reported publicly and to the Board, how will progress be tracked, and whether will it be a part of the five-year strategic plan. Ms. Riker said after five years they will do an update as needed. Mr. Allen shared the plan is to update some of the metrics for the annual report for general things and items part of the Master Plan.

Mr. Wiley asked if the City is the one doing the work for these projects and building the parks. Ms. Maus said the City will. She explained that there are many action strategies for implementing the Master Plan, and goals are directed at the Public Lands Department and Board. It is a document to hold everyone accountable for the actions we committed to taking. A lot of the projects deal with collaboration with other divisions, departments, and outside the organization, but it is all driven by the Public Lands department. Mr. Wiley asked for clarity on who is building the project, for example, on a slide. Ms. Maus explained that the planning team works with the community to determine the needs. Public Lands then submits an internal request to City Council, and they allocate funds out of the city budget. Public Lands has been exploring external opportunities for funding projects. Mr. Wiley asked for clarity on if Public Lands has a team that then builds the slide. Ms. Maus explained that it depends on the project and if it's something that they can take on as a department can take on, the size and scale of the project. Ms. Riker also explained projects done by the Public Lands team are based on staff capacity. Ms. Riker further explained Public Lands' role is to maintain the parks while planning should oversee what else does park need, how we can improve upon it, and planning oversight. Mr. Wiley asked how as a staff they determine where to start and what to focus on. Ms. Maus explained the five-year strategic plan and CIP process will be a good starting part for building that criterion. Mr. Whittaker asked what Public Lands is doing to help individuals from the West side get to these outdoor recreational activities access points and trailheads. He shared that UTA doesn't seem to be very cooperative with outdoor recreational sports. He asked if it was possible to get UTA stops near these trailheads. Ms. Cannon explained unfortunately, Public Lands doesn't have the funding, and it's on the public to put pressure on UTA to add additional stops for public use. Ms. Cannon also shared the

<p>Board can put pressure on the Transportation Advisory Board to adhere to the public's needs. Board continued to discuss UTA.</p> <p>Mr. Millar, Public Lands staff member, shared they are working with UTA when lane usage changes, like when a business location changes and UTA changes routes. Mr. Millar further explained Public Lands staff is working on keeping their websites up to date with information on how to access public spaces with public transportation, as well as, increasing awareness and usage around the public transit app. Mr. Millar shared that UTA is a fully public organization, not private. Ms. Maus said the Master Plan had heavy involvement from almost every division and department. Some of the strategies loosely hold divisions and departments accountable to do some work, too. Mr. Scrivner shared, based on Ms. Maus' comment, that the City is better off ensuring that the Bike Plan gets implemented with this stuff, and you can feel safe getting your mountain bike to the trailhead rather than waiting for UTA to step up with mass transit. Ms. Riker shared that the City has been looking at Fleet Block and needing three acres on the corner for a park, but because of the Master Plan, they are bound to make it happen. Ms. Maus thanked everyone on the Board for their support.</p> <p>Ms. Binnebose asked if the Board would like to take a break for dinner or soldier on with the rest of the agenda items. Mr. Whittaker and Ms. Binnebose would like to soldier on. The rest of the Board agreed. The Board did take a brief break to eat dinner.</p>	
5 – Chair and Vice-Chair Election Action Items	6:00 PM
<p>Ms. Binnebose asked Ms. Larsen to introduce herself and review the election procedures. Ms. Larsen shared her background before coming to Public Lands working in the financial sector as a Financial Coach for a non-profit organization. She is very excited to join the Public Lands team and help support the Board. She will also be helping with the internal Employee Advisory Board within Public Lands focusing on employee recognition. Ms. Larsen handed out paper ballots for the chair and vice-chair election. She reviewed the election procedure again in the event of a tie: they can either re-vote or wait until the next meeting. Ms. Binnebose stated that per the bylaws, "The current chair shall solicit two members of the Board who are neither officers nor a nominee to conduct the vote and count ballots." Ms. Binnebose asked Ms. Finch and Mr. Wiley to count the ballots. Ms. Hewson asked if members could vote for themselves. Mr. Scrivner said yes. Mr. Wiley and Ms. Finch each counted for chair and vice-chair to confirm the ballot count.</p> <p>Mr. Wiley shared the chair votes. Ms. Binnebose was elected chair.</p> <p>Ms. Finch shared the vice-chair votes. Since there is a Board of 11, the vice-chair needs to have at least six votes to be nominated. Mr. Allen shared that the Board is now 10 as Ms. Ngo resigned from the Board the day prior. The member with the highest votes for vice-chair had five in the count. Ms. Finch suggested dropping the member with the lowest vote count and voting again. The Board agreed. The two new vice-chair nominations are Ms. Pehrson and Mr. Scrivner. Ms. Larsen passed out new ballot forms with Ms. Pehrson and Mr. Scrivner on the ballot. Mr. Wiley and Ms. Finch recounted the ballots. After the recount, Mr. Scrivner was elected vice-chair.</p>	10 mins
6 – Board Discussion and Action Items	6:20 PM
Review Bylaws. Discuss Board Member Responsibilities and Subcommittee requirements.	40 mins

Ms. Binnebose explained the purpose of this discussion was for the Board to have a chance to review their Bylaws and allow for subcommittees to review subcommittee requirements. Ms. Binnebose asked the Bylaws subcommittee if they had anything they'd like to share or if it should just be an informal, open discussion. The Board members all had a paper copy of the Bylaws. Ms. Cannon referenced page five of the bylaws and reiterated the Bylaws were written for the Board. She reminded the Board that subcommittees are allowed to be formed and should be presented to the chair for approval with the following details (referenced Bylaws bullet points): Committee Type, Committee Membership, Work Objective, Timeline, and Committee Reporting. Any new subcommittee formations should be on the agenda. Ms. Cannon explained that work gets done on boards through subcommittees. Mr. Whittaker asked for clarity on the Board Chair establishing a subcommittee versus a Board member establishing a subcommittee. Ms. Cannon explained that sometimes the Chair is aware of things in advance and that they may have some insights on opportunities for subcommittees to form. Mr. Whittaker shared that he feels like the Bylaws read as though the Chair can create a subcommittee without bringing it to the Board. Ms. Cannon said it's something that could be modified. Ms. Finch added that this subsection on subcommittees could be further flushed out after their experiences with subcommittees now being formed and work being done outside of the Board. Ms. Finch proposed that the subcommittee section be removed from the Board Member Responsibilities section and be its own section within the Bylaws. She offered some suggestions for how this new section could be written.

Mr. Whittaker shared he felt it could be challenging to meet the Board Member Responsibilities of serving on a minimum of one subcommittee each year, especially since there are currently only two active subcommittees. Ms. Cannon shared it's not hard if you are doing your work on the subcommittee. She referenced the new Board member packet and newly appointed members are given an outline of their responsibilities. Mr. Whittaker stated he feels there are not enough subcommittees established for Board members to join. Ms. Binnebose stated there are three subcommittees: communications, trails, and 501c3. Mr. Whittaker asked if everyone on the Board was involved with a subcommittee. Ms. Cannon said there are technically no subcommittees formed since none of the subcommittees submitted their official request as stated by the Bylaws to the Board. Ms. Finch asked if it was written or verbal. Mr. Whittaker referenced his submission for a subcommittee during the November 2021 meeting. He said they are updating their written document via what the Bylaws state. Ms. Finch said they could refine the section under Board Member Responsibilities for Board members participating on an active subcommittee. Board continued discussing details and responsibilities around subcommittees.

Ms. Finch referenced City code 2.9 involving Boards and Commissions. She shared that under City ordinance 2.07.13 for all Boards within the City, committees (subcommittee under PNUT) may include non-board members. However, it's a further opportunity for the Board to refine how they want to permit non-board members. Ms. Cannon said some subcommittees will involve an expert, and while they are not part of the decision-making process, they are there to provide information for the final product. She likes the idea of having other points of view to enhance the work a subcommittee is doing, and, what she worries about, is those folks who aren't PNUT members. Ms.

Pehrson addressed the concern of them advocating for only certain types of groups. Mr. Whittaker shared the examples of the Arts Council and Design Board. They have subject matter experts or they are on other related boards. Mr. Whittaker went on to express that Eric Edelman is their subject matter expert for the trails subcommittee. He feels they are integral as voting members because of their expertise. He used the example of fundraising done on the Arts Council allowed for a lot of work to be done for that board. Ms. Hewson agreed that having an expert on a subcommittee is crucial. Her concern is whether they are a voting member. She finds this to be problematic and inclusive to have one subject matter expert when there could be others out there. She feels the trails subcommittee could be better defined as a working group, and as a working group, they should engage with other stakeholder representatives to make sure it is more holistic. If the trails subcommittee continues forward under its current conditions, Ms. Hewson feels she cannot participate in that subcommittee any longer. Mr. Whittaker shared Ms. Hewson can invite another subject matter expert. Ms. Cannon said she feels like this conversation is getting into the weeds and to circle back to the purpose of this discussion for subcommittees: to better define their subcommittee outlines.

Ms. Cannon expressed that she doesn't understand the scope of work the trails subcommittee is doing and asked for someone to share. Ms. Hewson reminded everyone that the Bylaws were written before the formation of the trails subcommittee. They should take this opportunity to flush out some of these points in the Bylaws and further attribute subcommittee expectations. Mr. Whittaker continued to share about the trails subcommittee. Ms. Finch said she felt like they were getting into the weeds of the trails subcommittee, and that the Board did vote to have the subcommittee be in existence. The larger issue now is the concerns of non-board members on subcommittees. She would like some high-level guidelines to be on a subcommittee. She suggested the idea every four months, subcommittees come to the Board for a full vote again for affirmation and confirmation from the whole PNUT Board, as well as, rotating Board members on subcommittees. She would like more authority as a PNUT Board member over subcommittees and approve non-Board members. Board continued to discuss the trails subcommittee. Ms. Benally reminded the Board they can utilize an ex officio as an expert for a subcommittee. She suggested utilizing the 501c3 subcommittee to answer any additional questions a member may have to partner with an expert. Board reviewed the 2.90 City code again for Boards & Commissions. Board continued to discuss details around their Bylaws. Ms. Pehrson proposed they create a file-sharing system where the Board and subcommittees can share their work for everyone on the Board to review. Ms. Cannon stated they can establish this on their own without staff. The Board currently utilizes Google. Ms. Binnebose proposed each subcommittee define its guidelines per the bylaws. She said the bylaws subcommittee could reform to add a bullet point for subcommittees to identify specific deliverables and define a working group versus a subcommittee, using an ex officio member as an expert. The goal is to establish a framework where it doesn't matter what the trails subcommittee looks like in five years, but better a better framework for forming new subcommittees. Ms. Cannon asked Ms. Binnebose to confirm if she wants the subcommittees to type up their subcommittee details per the bylaws to submit in the next meeting. Ms. Binnebose confirmed yes. Ms. Binnebose suggests that having all this typed out for everyone to have access to and review, could speed up board meetings, and everyone would

understand what's happening on each subcommittee. The Board discussed possible updates to the Bylaws, how to incorporate Public Lands staff, and other expectations. Mr. Wiley inquired about the purpose of a subcommittee. Ms. Cannon explained how subcommittees worked.

Mr. Wiley asked how the subcommittees impact staff. Mr. Whittaker shared an example of dog policy and how they research to advise staff. Ms. Riker shared an example of dogs being off-leash and a stakeholder committee/group formed, and they selected different people from different stakeholder groups and staff to attend. Then as a group, they decided what the recommendation should be to the City. She also used the example of the Bike Park on "I" street and how they selected a group of people to discuss further. She shared that some things may be bigger than a subcommittee, and it doesn't just affect the Public Lands Department. Her recommendation would be for the Board to suggest a stakeholder group form for larger projects, like the example with e-bikes. Mr. Whittaker asked if the Board could write a letter proposing a stakeholder group. Ms. Cannon added that as a subcommittee, they could do the research around e-bike policies and share that. This would help staff and inform the stakeholder group about bigger policy decisions. Ms. Riker expressed that dogs in the Foothills and e-bikes are bigger than the PNUT Board, but subcommittees could help by researching to feed that to a larger stakeholder group. Board continued to discuss how subcommittees can help Public Lands tackle issues around these examples given and further discussed how subcommittees form. The Board discussed how the staff will use the PNUT Board as a sounding board.

Mr. Whittaker shared how Tyler Fonarow, Public Lands Recreational Trails Manager, presented to the trails subcommittee ideas for some trail alignments to get their feedback. Mr. Scrivner asked if that meeting's discussion should have come to the rest of the Board. Mr. Whittaker expressed that if the rest of the Board had been a part of that presentation, getting everyone's feedback would've caused the meeting to run long, and it takes away the work the trails subcommittee is doing and puts it back on the PNUT Board. Ms. Cannon reiterated this is why it's important to define your scope of work and present it to the full Board for approval. Mr. Whittaker agreed.

Mr. Carroll shared he came to be on the Board with the biggest issue in his mind with trails is e-bikes. He is hearing tonight it might be too big of an issue for the PNUT Board or trails subcommittee to tackle, and it needs to be a part of a bigger agenda for the City-sponsored group. He feels it's hard to break into the agenda for meetings. Mr. Scrivner brought up that they have a subcommittee section on the agenda. Mr. Whittaker said he may want to present something that could take 90 minutes, and he asked if that was the time to do so. Mr. Carroll was also concerned as it sounds like, to him, the trails subcommittee isn't an official subcommittee. Ms. Finch reaffirmed that's not what the Board is saying. Ms. Finch went on to ask if Board and non-Board members have been on a subcommittee for over a year now and if is it time to switch people out. Mr. Carroll asked how the Board would determine who would be a good or bad expert to bring onto a subcommittee. Mr. Whittaker added the question of how the Board determines how long an expert can participate on a subcommittee. Board continued to discuss the trails subcommittee and how they would like to see a revised subcommittee with better-defined outlines per subcommittee bylaws. Ms. Hewson believes the trails issue is bigger than a subcommittee. She thinks it needs a working

group where they bring in subject matter experts, and however well-intentioned the trails subcommittee members are, they are not covering all the bases. She fully recognizes that subcommittee member Eric Edelman is an expert, but he can't be an expert in everything. She thinks a subcommittee has to be specific and targeted with these concrete outcomes and time defined. She feels the topic of the Foothills is broader. Mr. Whittaker added he has been on other City boards he's been involved in and has had standing committees that have no timeline because the nature of the project doesn't have a timeline.

Ms. Riker brought up they should address Mr. Carroll's concern about not being able to get a topic onto the agenda. Even if it's a massive thing, like e-bikes, it should be brought to this Board to discuss. Sometimes when they have a massive thing, like their Master Plan, it's too big for even their department to deal with. They then put in a CIP request and ask a consultant to help them develop that. They'll talk to City Council and do public engagement and other groups involved to do a lot of that work. Public Lands is still involved in it just like the Board was with the Master Plan, but it's so big that can't be tackled. Ms. Cannon brought up that every month she gets an email asking what she wants on the agenda. Ms. Cannon invited Mr. Carroll to put in his request then. Ms. Finch spoke about her time as a chair and requested agenda topics from Board members. Ms. Riker said she is aware that Public Lands staff have taken a lot of their time to discuss certain topics, like CIP. Ms. Benally brought up their Bylaws and if a member wants an amendment, they need to do it in writing. That would clarify what questions they have and how the Board will address them. She continued to say it's important for subcommittees to define those subcommittee bullet points, as after 2-3 hours of work, those subject matter experts may start charging a fee.

Mr. Wiley agreed with Mr. Carroll that he doesn't know when to bring up issues happening in his community. Ms. Binnebose said it should be brought up during the "Board Comment" period and that it is a standing agenda item. In reference to Ms. Finch's point, "Request for future agenda items", these are standing agenda items where Board members should speak up to share what's happening in their communities and this is what you want on the agenda. Mr. Wiley shared that as a new member, he didn't know that was the appropriate place or time to bring up his issues and concerns. Ms. Binnebose asked if this is an onboarding issue for new members and if they should sit down with staff or the chair, go through line-by-line on-standing agenda items, and explain what each item means. Ms. Riker shared that now that Ms. Larsen is in the role of department liaison, she could do a first stab at what an onboarding process looks like and bring it to the Board for feedback. Ms. Riker added it might be helpful to rearrange the agenda items. Ms. Pehrson asked if there could be a subcommittee for onboarding.

Mr. Carroll asked how they are going to reestablish the Bylaws. Ms. Cannon made a motion to reestablish the bylaws subcommittee to update subcommittee five bullet point requirements. Mr. Carroll seconded the motion. Ms. Cannon, Ms. Finch, and Mr. Wiley would be members of the bylaws subcommittee. Ms. Hewson asked when the Board would have the opportunity to provide comments on the updated Bylaws. Ms. Cannon said with the re-establishment of the bylaws subcommittee, they would bring by the next Board meeting, the items in the Bylaws that indicate what they are supposed to do and that will include a timeline. To add to Ms. Hewson's question, Mr.

<p>Wiley asked where they can give additional feedback on changes. Ms. Cannon said they would have a Google folder that everyone can review and see by the next Board meeting. Ms. Hewson said she is concerned about when they can provide feedback and how soon the bylaws subcommittee wants that information. Ms. Finch said once they come out with a first draft, they can share it before the next Board meeting for members to review. Board discussed further details on a shared Google folder and drive. Board voted on Ms. Cannon's proposal to reestablish the bylaws subcommittee to update the Bylaws. The vote carried unanimously. Ms. Binnebose summarized the action items for the Board, and subcommittees, and updated the Bylaws. A Google folder will be shared with everyone to more easily track and review what current subcommittees are working on and give feedback on amending the Bylaws. Ms. Binnebose would like to table this discussion.</p>	
7 – Break	7:00 PM
8 – Board Discussion and Action Items Continued	7:15 PM
<p>Discussion of board powers, duties, and values.</p> <p>Ms. Binnebose said this section is similar to their discussion on Bylaws. Ms. Binnebose mentioned Mr. Carroll had mentioned values and passions as it pertains to the Board. Mr. Carroll said where that had come from was when Mr. Wiley was talking about recreational use before CIP. He shared how recreational sports are a big part of his life. He went on to say that when they went to rank the CIP items, recreational projects were at the top of his list because of his passion for recreational sports. Knowing people's passions and where they are on the Board is important to him. He appreciates all the Board members' viewpoints and wants to be able to honor those and better understand them.</p> <p>Ms. Finch asked if they would like to discuss the Powers and Duties section. Ms. Binnebose explained this discussion is a refresher of what their Powers and Duties are within the Board and to bring that energy to what they can do. Ms. Binnebose acknowledged Mr. Carroll's statement. Ms. Finch encouraged members to familiarize themselves, read, and reflect on them as this defines their responsibilities as Board members and whether they are doing everything they can as a Board. The Board had a paper copy of these Powers and Duties. Ms. Cannon thinks they have done a really good job this last year. She brought up a point, and it could be a question for staff, Item E under Powers and Duties, operation and management policies, and best practices for things like special events. She would like to see more of the operational side of things and data and if there needs to be any more advisory in this. Mr. Scrivner shared that this ties into Item C, discuss priorities for 2023, and things you'd like to hear and review from staff. Mr. Scrivner shared he doesn't have any concerns with the high-level responsibilities of the Board. What Mr. Scrivner is looking for moving forward are what kind of items can we ask of staff.</p> <p>Mr. Carroll shared he is appreciative of the information staff has provided and he would like to be more proactive in getting topics on the agenda that he's passionate about. Mr. Scrivner asked for an example. Mr. Carroll said he believes the City is facing a major issue around e-bikes, and the City should be ahead of this issue, and they aren't. Ms. Riker said this is the place for Board members to talk about those issues. Board continued to discuss some aspects of e-bike issues and the Park's involvement. Ms. Binnebose asked Ms. Larsen to add Mr. Carroll's passion for e-bikes as an agenda</p>	60 mins

<p>item for the 2023, general city discussion on e-bikes. Mr. Whittaker shared that this was a topic he wanted to discuss in their next meeting. Ms. Binnebose asked if the Board would like to discuss their passion more or move on to the next agenda item of CIPs. Mr. Wiley stated he would like to know everyone's values and know his fellow Board members better.</p> <p>The Board members went around and shared a little bit about themselves and why they decided to be on the PNUT Board.</p>	
<p>Create a written process for annual CIP and budget initiatives prioritization + Formalize standard plan for the annual retreat.</p> <p>The Board had a paper copy for a written process for the annual CIP prioritization review. Ms. Hewson thanked the Board member who had already gone into the shared Google Doc to review it. Ms. Hewson asked the Board if they thought any major sections are missing. She added that in the version the Board has, since then, she's added a couple of sections; one around acronyms and the roles of City Council, CDCIP, and Mayor. That is her first question if any other sections are missing. She stated it needs to reflect all the PNUT Board member's input and to serve as a gap for new members on how the ranking process for CIP works and developed over the last few years. Her main questions are if a subcommittee should be formed or if people would volunteer to take on different sections. Ms. Riker said staff can help with the roles section of the City Council, CDCIP, and the Mayor. Ms. Cannon said she is looking for a simple process to make it easier, especially for new members. She thanked Ms. Hewson for putting it together, and she doesn't know if it's something they need a subcommittee for or for the Board to finish out.</p> <p>Mr. Carroll said he feels CIP has been a big success for the Board. Mr. Carroll said he would like to build on their success and how to determine how they can make it better. Ms. Hewson agreed and said they need to define what is the process of completing this and how to improve on it in the future. Mr. Whittaker shared his experience on another board he was on. When they had grants to fulfill, which were on a predictable timeline, they had a subcommittee to deal with it. It made Board meetings go faster, it was really efficient, and it was a rotating board that people served on for like a year. Mr. Whittaker recommended a standing committee since CIP is one of those topics that take up so much of the Board's time. Mr. Millar wanted to make the Board aware of the 5-year capital plan that will be developed and how it will do a lot of the monotonous groundwork for the Board. It may require a subcommittee with staff for developing that plan every five years. He stated the goal of the plan is to make CIP and other funding application processes easier because they would have already developed their priorities and timelines. He supports whatever approach the Board wants, but wanted to make the Board aware. Board continued to discuss improving the CIP process.</p> <p>Ms. Hewson expressed that another reason to have a process in place is for new Board members to understand the CIP ranking process, but also the rationale for why they do it and how it's done. Ms. Hewson agreed with having a step-by-step process, but it's only one piece of it. She thinks what it needs is collective head input from the PNUT Board to flush this out and does it address the gaps that new members felt in the process. She asked how to engage the PNUT Board members to complete the</p>	<p>25 mins</p>

document. Ms. Finch asked if newer members could read it through to see if it makes sense to them and that staff could help fill in the missing pieces. Ms. Riker said it would be great if the Board could come up with the why of their selection process and establishing criteria. She shared some criteria she follows when making these kinds of decisions. Ms. Pehrson said they have the justification part of their survey and that may be part of the process is to go through each of those comments. Ms. Binnebose asked if the staff are looking for more established criteria. Ms. Riker said what she would like to see is a consensus from the entire Board of why they put forth their suggestions to the Council. Mr. Whittaker agreed. He felt overwhelmed with how long it took to give a detailed response on top of everything else he was doing. Ms. Riker said it could take a subcommittee to put together established criteria. Board continued to discuss how to establish criteria for the CIP ranking process.

Mr. Wiley said when he was going through the ranking process, one of the things he was concerned with was not having enough information about the projects and knowing the staff's viewpoint. He said the staff knows more about the projects and he understands there are certain things he wasn't privy to knowing. If he could have a better understanding of the projects and their impact, it would help better advise the staff and create define reasoning. Ms. Riker said another option is for staff could share how they've ranked, what they've ranked them on, and why. The Board could give feedback and this could alleviate Board confusion. Mr. Millar said it really is a matter of time. Staff is coming to the Board not wanting to take up a quarter of every PNUT meeting for the entire year as soon as they have the information about the CIP applications. He explained it takes a couple of months for staff to review applications as they come before they could present their prioritizations to the Board. He thinks the rationale and the impact does take more time than just the October, November, and December meetings to discuss. He said he would support the Board if they want to start it earlier or change the process, but the staff's limitation is on the contingency CIP applications, which they don't see until October.

Ms. Riker shared that the City is also working on criteria for constituent applications and all of the CIP applications. They hired a new capital asset manager who is going to compile all the components from all the different master plans to help determine should this project be done or not. Ms. Pehrson asked if they could use those criteria. Ms. Riker stated that Public Lands has its own criteria and they could share those with the Board. She continued to say that Parks would know more about why a certain park needs activation in it, how those activation elements are based on proximity to other parks, and what those needs are. Ms. Riker shared she feels like the process doesn't have that backbone. Board continued to discuss criteria and determine how to update the CIP process throughout the year.

Ms. Hewson motioned to keep the CIP prioritization document as is for now to potentially consider forming a subcommittee if needed, as the year evolves. Ms. Cannon seconded the motion. Ms. Finch asked who would take ownership of the document to make sure it was in the right shared Google folder. Ms. Hewson said she would coordinate with Ms. Binnebose to put it in a central location. Ms. Pehrson said she would like a calendar or tables that would list when, generally, things happen, and this is when we need your recommendation. Ms. Hewson agreed. Ms. Binnebose said she feels like they have the implementation pretty well dialed in and a good system to

<p>replicate. It's now the criteria they need to be focusing on. Ms. Cannon asked if they could add that as an agenda item as they get toward the next CIP process. Board continued to discuss the timeframe of the CIP process. Ms. Cannon said the criteria should be established by August.</p>	
<p>Discuss 2023 staff presentations and agenda items.</p> <p>Ms. Riker shared some recurring things on the agenda (some can move):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • January: Board elections • February: Review full write-up for budget initiatives, Board recommendations for the annual budget, Open Meetings Law training, GRAMA training • March: Annual Report, Goal Accomplishment Metrics • September: Consolidated fee schedule review, Ethics training • October: Initial CIPS projections discussions, CFS recommendations • November: Final CIP projection review • December: Board nominations, Board overview, Initial department priorities budget <p>She would like to add Legislative Intents as it's not something that has been brought to the Board as often. She said every year Council has legislative intents for staff. Council will ask departments ask them questions and staff has a year to contemplate and answer them. Two years ago, Council asked Public Lands, what's it going to take to improve the maintenance of our parks. This year Council asked them about reducing the use of fertilizer and pesticides.</p> <p>She also shared ad hoc agendas that can come up randomly throughout the year:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budget amendments • Constructions concepts and design • Land acquisitions and dispositions • Master plans • Operation and management policies • Donations <p>The Board suggested building a monthly calendar. Ms. Riker added she would like to share next month the Mayor's 2023 plan and how it impacts Public Lands.</p> <p>The Board went around and shared their requests for staff presentations and future agenda items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 501c3 presentation • Riverside • Recreation access • Park Rangers • Trails Subcommittee • Glendale Park • Bond project updates • Specific events happening in each district • Current issues • E-Bikes • Indigenous plants • Pesticide use • CAPRA 	<p>15 mins</p>

Ms. Riker shared that the staff has been working with a consultant and have a presentation ready for the Board for 501c3. Ms. Riker asked if the Board wants a staff presentation, and if they could write up their concerns or things Board would like staff to address, that would be great. She needs as much detail to make sure she gets the right people there. Ms. Finch shared that Board members are allowed to do presentations to the Board on their concerns. Ms. Binnebose reminded Mr. Wiley that if there is one certain topic he would like to address, he could form a subcommittee. Board rediscussed the action item for subcommittees to complete by the next Board meeting. Mr. Scrivner requested a quarterly update from staff about the bond projects. Ms. Riker said a dashboard will be coming out for the bond projects. Board continued to discuss agenda item request topics. Ms. Riker shared that Public Land has a newsletter and webpage that has updates for each district. She asked the Board if they see a district that hasn't been updated recently to let staff know and it will get updated. Board discussed options for different meeting locations.	
9 – Confirmation of Next Meeting, Board Comments & Future Agenda Items	8:55 PM
Board subcommittee updates as needed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trails Subcommittee • Communication Subcommittee • 501c3 Subcommittee 	
Board comment and question period	
Next meeting: February 2, 2023	
Request for future agenda items Ms. Binnebose said she feels they addressed the other agenda items, board comment and question period, and request for future agenda items, covered. Ms. Binnebose motioned to adjourn. Mr. Wiley seconded the motion.	
10 – Adjourn	9:15 PM