

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

**Join Via Webex:** <https://saltlakecity.webex.com/saltlakecity/j.php?MTID=m920e2aee3ad5d7ce66f97deb859f2356>

**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: 2483 314 7293**

## Approved Minutes

<b>1 – Convening the Meeting</b>	<b>5:00 PM</b>
Call to order <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– CJ Whittaker</li><li>– Brianna Binnebose</li><li>– Jenny Hewson</li><li>– Phil Carrol</li><li>– Clayton Scrivner</li><li>– Aaron Wiley</li><li>– Samantha Finch</li></ul>	
Chair comments <p>Ms. Binnebose thanked the Board for their time for the retreat in January. She thanked everyone for participating and for the great discussions. She also thanked Ms. Larsen, Public Lands staff, for helping facilitate the retreat, getting the new year kicked off, and structuring the agenda. She feels Ms. Larsen will be a great asset to the Board and Public Lands staff.</p>	5 mins
<b>2 – Approval of Minutes</b>	<b>5:05 PM</b>
Approve January 5, 2023 meeting minutes <p>Ms. Larsen corrected one comment made by Ms. Finch. Ms. Finch motioned to approve the minutes. Mr. Wiley and Ms. Hewson seconded. Board approved the minutes unanimously.</p>	5 mins
<b>3 – Public Comment Period</b>	<b>5:10 PM</b>
Verbal comments are limited to no more than 3 minutes; 15 minutes total. Written comments are welcome. <p>No members of the public were present for comment.</p>	
<b>4 – Director’s Report</b>	<b>5:25 PM</b>
Summary of current high-priority department items. <p>Ms. Bailey, Public Lands staff, introduced Toby Hazelbaker, the new Parks Director. Mr. Hazelbaker shared his professional background. Ms. Bailey also announced a new Park Ranger director, Nick Fredrick. She let the Board know if they would like to meet him to let Ms. Larsen know.</p>	5 mins

<p>Tyler Murdock, Public Lands staff, shared the Mayor released her 2023 goals. These can be found online. Luke Allen, Public Lands staff, shared his screen with the spreadsheet showing the goals that apply to Public Lands. Mr. Murdock went through and shared some of the goals with the Board. Mr. Murdock also shared Public Lands have made offers for two new City Planners who will primarily focus on the G.O. Bond projects. Mr. Murdock said they would like to share quarterly updates with the Board throughout the year.</p> <p>Mr. Wiley asked how the Board can help. Mr. Murdock responded it may be better to have a dialogue around that in next month's meeting once the Board has time to review those plans. Mr. Murdock shared they can do more in-depth presentations on specific goals the Board may be interested in and ways the Board can help move those forward. Mr. Wiley asked if there were any roadblocks Public Lands sees already. Mr. Murdock said each of them has its own challenges and roadblocks. The biggest one right now is the Cooperative Management Agreement with Indigenous Tribal Leaders for management at the Warm Springs Park at the Gateway. He said it's a new conversation for Public Lands, and they anticipate it's one they'll have to put a lot of work into. It's more political, and Mr. Murdock can see the Board playing a role in that project. Board continued to discuss the details of the Cooperative Management Agreement.</p> <p>Ms. Hewson asked if the two new planners Public Lands hired will focus on the G.O. Bond projects or if they will help with other projects and needs. Mr. Murdock said, for the most part, they will be focusing on the G.O. Bond projects. Currently, those positions are funded by the General Fund. When they receive their first round of funding from the G.O. Fund, which should be around August or September this year, they will be fully funded with the Bond, and their 40-hour work weeks be dedicated to the Bond.</p> <p>Mr. Scrivner shared that this lightning-round recap of what's happening in Public Lands was beneficial. They spend so much time deep diving, but hearing a quick overview of what's been happening high-level the last month is nice to hear.</p>	
<b>5 – Bylaws Subcommittee Discussion</b>	<b>5:30 PM</b>
<p>Discuss proposed Bylaws updates – Ms. Finch</p> <p>Ms. Finch referenced the drafted, revised Bylaws in the packet, and Mr. Allen shared the drafted, revised bylaws on the screen. Ms. Finch said this discussion is intended to get the Board's feedback on these revised Bylaws. Ms. Finch shared some edits Ms. Cannon made under "Powers and Duties". Ms. Cannon added, "...appoint Board members to standing or ad hoc committees of the board..." Ms. Finch said how subcommittees are formed is further explained in the bylaws. When and how they form subcommittees, the Chair is going to go from appointing standing or ad hoc committees to only being able to appoint Board members to the subcommittees. That is Ms. Finch's understanding of Ms. Cannon's addition to the Chair's Powers and Duties. Mr. Whittaker asked when it comes to the Chair appointing Board members to subcommittees, how does that relate to Board members wanting to be on a subcommittee or not? Mr. Whittaker shared that on other Boards he's been on in the City, it's on a volunteer basis. Ms. Finch said that would be in the intent, and they can add that kind of comment to the Bylaws. Ms. Finch walked through the process of how</p>	<p>20 mins</p>

members get on subcommittees. Ms. Finch also shared that subcommittee Board membership cannot be the majority. With there currently being 10 Board members, there can't be more than 6 Board members on one subcommittee. She said it's the idea of rotating who's on the subcommittee if it's wanted. She asked Mr. Whittaker if that section remedies his concern. Mr. Whittaker said the language sounded a little top-down, and dictatorial, but he understands the intent. Board continued to discuss the specifics for adding and removing Board members on subcommittees.

Ms. Finch briefly discussed the "Special Meetings" section. Ms. Finch said her edits were primarily around the subcommittee section. Ms. Binnebose said she liked the addition of "Board members" to subcommittees. Ms. Binnebose suggested adding some language to avoid it feeling too top-down, and too much executive power from the Chair. Ms. Finch shared that subtitles have been numbered and 'Order of Business' is under "Agenda". Board continued to review some of the minor changes. Mr. Wiley shared it was helpful for new people to understand what the expectations are.

Ms. Finch shared updates to "Board Member Responsibilities", and the subcommittee section is under this now. Ms. Finch advocated that subcommittees should be their own section, and she said Ms. Cannon was firm that it should be included under "Board Member Responsibilities." Mr. Wiley said this is what they would like to get everyone's feedback on. Mr. Whittaker and Ms. Binnebose said they think it's fine where it is because subcommittees are a part of their responsibilities as Board members. Ms. Finch walked through the additions to the subcommittee section. Mr. Whittaker said he thinks it should say 'should' rather than 'shall'. He didn't think there were enough subcommittees for all Board members to participate. Ms. Binnebose shared there are four subcommittees. Mr. Whittaker said he doesn't understand why it's a requirement to serve on a subcommittee every year outside of their other Board member responsibilities. He said it sounds like you can get kicked off the Board if you don't serve on a subcommittee. Mr. Wiley asked what everyone's thoughts on that were. Mr. Carroll suggested the word 'encouraged'. He does not support this current language. Ms. Hewson shared she could go either way. Ms. Binnebose shared the time equity portion of doing work outside of regular Board meetings to avoid having the same people doing extra work. Mr. Scrivner said he does not mind 'shall', and he agreed with the time equity issue. Board continued to discuss specific language around participating on subcommittees.

Mr. Whittaker shared that it seems like the time commitments for serving on the Board are higher than before because now there's this requirement for serving on subcommittees. Ms. Finch said the Bylaws are not laws, but guidelines for the Board to follow. She advocates for 'must' as projects will come up that will need to occur outside of regular Board time. She reminded the Board they can always request to be removed from a subcommittee in an ad hoc motion. Mr. Wiley said he can see both sides and he leans more towards the 'encouraged' side. This is based on his lack of experience on the Board, the equity side of things, as well as the workload.

Ms. Finch shared the addition of how subcommittees. Ms. Binnebose asked about the expectations of the final report, specifically for the communications subcommittee. Part of the work this subcommittee does is reviewing ongoing projects throughout the year to support the City and provide feedback. She asked if each time they meet with

staff if they should be preparing a report for the Board. Ms. Finch said it's a report or presentation for Board review and approval. Ms. Finch asked for clarity on what the communications subcommittee is writing. Ms. Binnebose shared that sometimes staff asks the communications subcommittee to review some of the community engagement plans they might be working on to get feedback. Ms. Finch said her thought process was to then define when they will report. Mr. Scrivner said this bullet point may not be a one-size-fits-all for standing committees vs. ad hoc. Ms. Finch shared she would like monthly or quarterly reports on what projects subcommittees are working on. Ms. Finch shared that Ms. Cannon viewed this as you have a start date and an end date. You report based upon a scope that's narrow enough to accommodate an end date and start date. Ms. Finch said she feels like the Board is leaning more toward scheduled reporting dates, monthly or quarterly. Mr. Wiley shared he initially didn't understand the purpose of a standing committee so he's glad that Ms. Finch pointed that out because he feels the whole point here is for people who are new or who aren't on those subcommittees to get a quick update on what's going on.

Mr. Carroll suggested adding a section stating that if the subcommittee meets in the month, it will provide minutes of that meeting and if the subcommittee wraps up its business, it will provide a final report. Ms. Finch said that is getting into something she and Ms. Cannon were addressing: if they should require subcommittees to keep minutes or a written and/or verbal, monthly update Ms. Finch shared that subcommittee reportings at Board meetings are getting short, cursory reports that are sometimes getting entered into the meeting minutes and sometimes it's not. Her concern is that if someone were to ask her what's going on in a subcommittee she's not involved in, she'd like to see something tracked somewhere where she can see what the subcommittee is doing. She said it would be helpful to have it in written form, especially in case they are running long on their PNUT meetings. Board discussed specifics around what should be reported in subcommittee reports and how they should be reported.

Ms. Hewson asked Ms. Finch what she sees being in the summary report. Ms. Finch said she wants to know what was said, who said what, where the conversation went, the topic of the meeting, and what was accomplished. Mr. Carroll said that's minutes. Ms. Binnebose agreed that sounds like minutes. Ms. Finch said she would like to know what non-Board members are saying in meetings and why they are there. Mr. Whittaker asked why she is putting more emphasis on what non-Board members are saying. Ms. Finch said that's getting into whether they are dealing with subject matter experts and what value they are bringing to the table. Mr. Whittaker said it's not a requirement to be a subject matter expert to be on a subcommittee. He said it feels like their input is under more scrutiny. Ms. Finch said she feels it should be under more scrutiny. She wants to know why as a subcommittee you feel the need to bring on non-PNUT Board members. Mr. Whittaker said that's different from what Ms. Finch was saying earlier. What they are saying in a meeting is different than why they are on the subcommittee. Board continued to discuss non-Board members being on subcommittees.

Ms. Binnebose reminded everyone this discussion is not to focus on a subcommittee but to establish a framework for the Board and how subcommittees operate in the

future to maintain consistency. Ms. Finch wants a written summary identifying what a non-PNUT Board member is saying. Mr. Whittaker said this feels biased. He shared an example of using a lawyer on the Bylaws subcommittee. Mr. Carroll shared a summary of the most recent Trails Subcommittee. Mr. Carroll suggested before a member is selected for a subcommittee they provide a resume. He continued to say to have to keep track of what non-Board members say or their opinions in a summary to the Board every month, he doesn't think it's appropriate. Mr. Carroll said the Board should trust the subcommittee Board members enough to report on what's happening in subcommittee meetings. Ms. Hewson said if a written summary is going to be required for subcommittees, having some information on the level of attribution would be helpful. Mr. Scrivner suggested a rundown of who attended the meeting and a summary of what occurred is sufficient. Mr. Scrivner's said his concern is subcommittees report to the Board and not outside groups; how they report outside of the Board is his main concern, and he wants to see how that's addressed.

Ms. Binnebose said they are some summaries of the latest subcommittee meetings in the shared file drive. She encouraged members to review what's in the shared drive to see if that information is sufficient for reporting.

Ms. Finch continued to read through the Bylaws and share the small updates made. She shared that according to the Salt Lake code, a subcommittee can have non-Board members. She read from the Bylaws, "When a Board member's term expires or is no longer a current Board member, their participation on the subcommittee ends." She shared the Salt Lake City code regarding non-Board members' participation on subcommittees. She shared Ms. Hewson's comment from the drafted, revised Bylaws shared drive stating that non-Board members should be included as SMEs (subject matter experts) vs. subcommittee members. Ms. Hewson shared having subject matter experts would be valuable to be included in subcommittees. Ms. Finch asked if Ms. Hewson meant she wants them termed as SMEs and not subcommittee members. Ms. Hewson said she thinks that would be preferable. Mr. Whittaker and Mr. Carroll did not agree. Mr. Scrivner said the law says they aren't required to have non-Board members on subcommittees, it says they may. Mr. Scrivner said, to him, it reads as if they can delineate between a Board member and subject matter expert, and they're not a member of the subcommittee, they are just guests or consultants; they could elect to do that. They go through a process to be a PNUT Board member and he thinks to be a member of a subcommittee, you should be a Board member. Ms. Hewson would also support this from an equity aspect, as well. Mr. Carroll asked Ms. Hewson to clarify what she meant by equity. Ms. Hewson said there can be a wider net cast on who participates in a subcommittee. Mr. Carroll said with these small subcommittees they can't always have every point of view. Ms. Finch added there is a section further in 'Community Engagement' of the Bylaws that subcommittees will attempt to invite competing perspectives from other members of the public. Ms. Finch read through other updates on the drafted, revised Bylaws. Board continued to define specifics around non-Board members participating on subcommittees.

Ms. Finch read through the drafted, revised Bylaws about working groups and asked the Board for their thoughts and input on working groups. She clarified these are steps to take if a Board member decides work being done should go beyond just a subcommittee. The Board would make a motion and recommend to Public Lands to

<p>put forth a working group. Mr. Scrivner said it would be a group that doesn't work under the Board's jurisdiction. Ms. Finch said yes. Ms. Binnebose said the Board can recommend a working group if the scope of work is too big for a subcommittee alone to handle. Then they would make the formal recommendation as a Board to the Public Land Department to form a stakeholder working group, which of course, should represent a diversity of opinions and stakeholders. They do not report to the Board or subcommittees, but maybe they would provide updates to the Board. Ms. Finch said she's taken in their comments and the Bylaws subcommittee will meet again and come back with round two. Ms. Binnebose suggested it would be helpful to have the third member of the Bylaws subcommittee present before they move forward with approving or not approving the suggested edits. Ms. Binnebose asked if this discussion can be tabled and made an additional agenda item for March as a potential action item. That way the group can continue to review the comments, add suggested changes and languages, and be prepared to discuss and/or move forward with a formal motion next month. Ms. Finch agreed to table this discussion for next month. Ms. Binnebose made a motion to table this discussion until the March meeting. In the interim time, all Board members should continue to review the working Google doc, and they will put this on the agenda for March for a potential action item to approve. Mr. Wiley seconded the motion. Board approved unanimously.</p>	
<b>6 – Subcommittee Discussion</b>	<b>5:50 PM</b>
<p>Board subcommittees present written details in correspondence with Bylaw Subcommittee requirements.</p> <p>Ms. Binnebose stated the purpose of this discussion is to be a quick overview with a description of each subcommittee's scope as it sits now. She added if they move forward with any changes to the Bylaws, these descriptions can be modified in the future to reflect those changes. Mr. Allen shared his screen showing the brief descriptions each subcommittee provided.</p> <p><u>Trails Subcommittee</u></p> <p>Mr. Carroll asked if the name should be 'Foothills/Trails' or 'Foothills and Trails' rather than just 'Trails' because it entails the Foothills in a broader sense. Mr. Carroll said for a standing subcommittee it didn't make sense to have a final report. They did not include that in this subcommittee description, but he's fine with doing an annual report. Upon reviewing the membership, Ms. Finch would like to make a motion to remove Ms. Polly Hart, former PNUT Board Member, from the subcommittee. Ms. Finch stated Ms. Hart was an ex-member of the PNUT Board and she got that from being a Board member. Ms. Finch would like to make a motion to replace Ms. Hart's membership with Ms. Cannon's. Ms. Finch said they don't know if they should approve these descriptions tonight, but they are great first drafts. Ms. Binnebose said the purpose of this discussion was to go through potential amendments and, particularly, those bullet points with the required information per the Bylaws. This agenda item is for subcommittees to present their current scopes and objectives so when they move forward to March and April meetings to determine if they would like to vote to approve these subcommittees as are or with modifications for the 2023 calendar year, that would be future action items. Moving forward, it should be the responsibility of each subcommittee to ensure that their goals and objectives reflect what is in the Bylaws. Ms. Binnebose would like everyone to have an opportunity to talk about their scope of work and reporting. Mr. Whittaker said he thought they were just discussing,</p>	<p>30 mins</p>

not nominating to kick people off. Ms. Binnebose said they will need to add that as an action item after everyone has the opportunity to explain what they're working on so the Board has a better understanding moving forward when we decide if they are going to continue all these subcommittees or not.

Mr. Carroll asked if anyone had any issues with the Trails subcommittee description. Ms. Binnebose suggested how to make it a narrower scope as their current defined scope of work is quite large. She used the example of a topic that's been brought up before around a specific topic, such as e-bikes. Ms. Hewson suggested the focus should be on sharing. Mr. Carroll asked if they wanted more specifics. Ms. Binnebose said that based on the Bylaws discussion, the recommendation is to try and narrow these scopes to focus on some action items. That's not to say you can only pick one topic, with the inclusion of a stakeholder working group. Perhaps subcommittees can narrow that to focus on specific things to take on as a project or priority each year. Board continued to discuss defining the scope of work for Trails and the work the Board and subcommittees do as an advisory board.

Mr. Wiley asked if the Trails work would be a good opportunity for a working group. Mr. Whittaker asked how they would make that recommendation and who would own it. Ms. Binnebose explained the Board would write a formal letter of recommendation to the Public Land's Director suggesting a stakeholder working group. At that point, it would be up to the staff to manage the working group. It would not fall under the jurisdiction of the PNUT Board, but they could request regular updates to be shared and presented. This could allow the Trails subcommittee to focus on some of those small scopes of work like dogs off-leash and e-bikes. She also suggested having a working group for a future agenda item as they continue to flush out the Bylaws.

#### Communications Subcommittee

Ms. Binnebose shared the purpose of the Communications subcommittee is to support the Park's Department staff on public involvement, communication, and outreach. Ms. Binnebose continued to summarize the scope of work, timeline, etc. of the subcommittee. Ms. Binnebose said all this additional information can be found in the shared Google drive.

#### Bylaws Subcommittee

Ms. Finch did an overview of the Bylaws subcommittee. She stated it's ad hoc, but it could be standing and silent, a suggestion for the floor. Ms. Finch continued to share the purpose of the Bylaws subcommittee, their scope of work, etc. Mr. Carroll suggested that the Bylaws subcommittee be standing. Ms. Binnebose would second that, especially, since there has been a lot of conversation around updating their bylaws. Ms. Finch also said they could be a resource. Ms. Finch made suggestions about when the Bylaws subcommittee could present to the Board. Ms. Finch said the goal is to make the Board an effective, cohesive group. Ms. Binnebose reiterated she believes they should be a standing committee.

#### 501c3 Subcommittee

Ms. Hewson stated this committee is currently ad hoc and has been silent. She shared the membership, the objective being to identify and engage with key community members and hold exploratory discussions as to whether a 501c3 could be a good

<p>option to pursue to allow this entity to go after funding that isn't necessarily available through Public Lands. It's not to create a 501c3, but to explore. Ms. Hewson and Ms. Finch continued to summarize the 501c3 description per Bylaw's bullet points. Ms. Finch said they could provide a final summary of the work they've done so far and if they decide to go forward, they will need to work with the Mayor's initiative and what Public Land has discovered so far. Ms. Finch would like to do a presentation to the Board in the upcoming months. Ms. Binnebose asked if they could move their work into the shared folder drive. Ms. Binnebose suggested depending on Ms. Cannon's workload, she may be a good addition to the 501c3 subcommittee given her background. Ms. Finch clarified it's not ending, but ending in its current scope, and they can reconstitute it with a new scope of work. Mr. Carroll said this is a great segue that aligns with the Mayor's goal and having a Public Land Trust. Ms. Finch said if the Mayor's office needs help from the Board, they can form a new subcommittee with a differently defined scope. Mr. Wiley asked if it would be easier to solely redefine the scope without having to redefine the other aspects to streamline the process. Ms. Finch said yes, but the current scope is complete, and they should reconstitute for a new scope.</p>	
<b>8 – Staff Items</b>	<b>6:20 PM</b>
<p>Discuss FY24 Budget Initiatives and Q&amp;A session with staff.</p> <p>Ms. Binnebose thanked everyone who submitted comments and questions in the Budget Insights. Ms. Binnebose also invited members to update their priorities based on the discussion they're about to have around budget insights. Ms. Binnebose reminded members they have until February 7th at 4 PM to ask any final questions of staff so they can respond within 24 hours. Thursday, February 9th at 4 PM is when all prioritizations are due with comments. This will give the Communications subcommittee enough time to review those responses and draft a letter of support. This way they can get that out for everyone to review by the next Board meeting. They would like to have the approval for the agenda for the March 3rd meeting. Ms. Binnebose reminded everyone to assign a numerical value to each item. Lower numbers mean higher priorities.</p> <p>Ms. Finch shared how she rated her selections on what she thinks the priorities should be and would like to recommend why she thinks certain budget priorities should rate higher than others. Ms. Finch shared her top three initiatives for budget insights: the planning department, trees, and making seasonal team members full-time to help with maintenance projects. Mr. Wiley asked if when Public Lands is considering what resources they might need if they are considering having various resources on learning and development for their current staff. Essentially supporting the people who make it all happen. Mr. Murdock referenced the budget for planning and the request for additional ongoing expenses for resources. This is focused on training and other opportunities for growth within the planning team. It is similar to the Trails and Natural Lands team. Mr. Wiley asked if there are any other things staff can think of to help retain the talent the staff currently has. Ms. Bailey said this is a lot of the work they do regularly. She shared they recently updated the job description for the parks maintenance position and created different tiers. The third level is new, and it adds a career step. Staff worked with HR to do a deep-dive market analysis to remain competitive. They plan to do this for other positions. Ms. Bailey continued to share current practices in place the divisions are doing to promote teamwork and provide</p>	<p>25 mins</p>



<p>more internal growth opportunities. Mr. Murdock shared what they're doing to provide more opportunities for part-time staff to encourage people to stay.</p> <p>Mr. Wiley asked if there was a timeline for which projects make the biggest impact but may take longer to accomplish versus projects that are easier to accomplish. When he's advising, he understands how staff prioritizes projects. Mr. Murdock shared that what's in the budget insights is a first-year approach. Staff continued to speak about the year-one plan and what's on the way for a three-year plan. He shared it's hard for them to prioritize projects. Their main focus from the administration this year has primarily been on operations. Staff and Board continued to discuss budget insights prioritization. Ms. Hewson asked if there were other creative ways to accomplish some of these goals, like volunteer groups who could be engaged to help. She used tree maintenance as an example. Ms. Hewson brought up how much effort had gone into residential trees, so maybe there's an opportunity there for some kind of means of testing for how the trees are distributed and if people can afford to maintain the trees, maybe there's an opportunity there. She shared her ranking process. Mr. Carroll asked if they should review what they've submitted and enhance their comments. Ms. Binnebose said yes, and a nice part is they can keep a time stamp of their submissions. She reminded everyone of the final days for comments (February 7th) and final submissions due February 9th. She encouraged everyone to take the opportunity to refine their responses based on the discussions with staff this evening. Ms. Binnebose also reminded everyone to take advantage of the open response sections, as well. Staff and Board continued to discuss budget insight prioritization.</p>	
<p>OPMA, GRAMMA, Conflict-of-Interest, Board bios.</p> <p>Ms. Larsen reviewed the training Board members are required to complete each year. Ms. Larsen sent out the Conflict-of-Interest paperwork to all the Board members to complete and return to her to submit to the recorder's office. She said she is waiting for more information regarding GRAMMA, but it will be an upcoming agenda item. Ms. Larsen shared the options for completing OPMA: have an attorney come to a Board meeting and administer the presentation, or members can complete a virtual training on their own time. Ms. Larsen did a high-level overview of what OPMA training covers. The Board decided they would do the training on their own time. Ms. Larsen requested once they complete the training to send the certificate over to her to submit to the recorder's office. She also requested Board bios for the PNUT Advisory Board page. Ms. Binnebose suggested a hard deadline for all these options. Board decided on a hard deadline of March 2nd, the next Board meeting.</p> <p>Ms. Larsen shared the Board has been invited to a presentation by a consultant for the Trails subcommittee on Thursday, February 16th, from 6 – 8 PM. She shared that staff needs to know if Board members are interested in coming to ensure they stay in compliance with OPMA guidelines. Ms. Binnebose asked if that meeting is recorded. Ms. Larsen said yes. Ms. Larsen shared that Tyler Fonarow, Public Lands staff, shared this meeting for the 16th with her the prior week, and she has been emailing one of the consultant members confirming the PNUT Board invitation. This is for the Trails Sustainability Training. Ms. Hewson suggested that Ms. Larsen send an email with all this email. Ms. Larsen said she can send an email out tomorrow with all that information.</p>	<p>5 mins</p>
<p><b>9 – Confirmation of Next Meeting, Board Comments &amp; Future Agenda Items</b></p>	<p><b>6:50 PM</b></p>

<p>Board comment and question period</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>File sharing</li> </ul> <p>Ms. Binnebose said if anyone has additional feedback for the agenda structure, to please let the staff and herself know. Ms. Binnebose highlighted some of the file-sharing features she has set up to make it easier for everyone to access documents, subcommittee meeting notes, etc. She reminded everyone to review file restrictions as they upload shared documents, and they may put together a training for that. Ms. Binnebose shared a few other highlights for file-sharing. Ms. Hewson complimented how great the file-sharing is, and she requested a copy of the Reimagine Nature Plan there, as well. For now, the chair, vice-chair, and staff will be responsible for managing file-sharing.</p>	20 mins
Next meeting: March 2, 2023	5 mins
<p>Request for future agenda items</p> <p>Ms. Binnebose reminded everyone to email any agenda requests over. She reviewed some requested agenda topics from the meeting: Bylaws comments and revisions, for subcommittees to review their scopes of work, the hard deadlines Ms. Larsen will email over, and budget insight prioritization so they can write the letter of support. Ms. Binnebose asked if anyone else would like to add anything. Mr. Carroll would like to add to a future agenda a discussion of creating a working group for e-bikes. Ms. Larsen shared a request from Kat Maus, Public Lands staff, to discuss the Millar Park project update.</p> <p>Mr. Carroll and Ms. Finch motioned to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Hewson seconded the motion. Board voted unanimously to adjourn the meeting.</p>	5 mins
<b>10 – Adjourn</b>	<b>7:15 PM</b>