

Notes for 2nd day of RecRAP Application Presentation. 10-24-23

Present committee members - Jessica Kirby, Keren Mazanec, Amy Yost, Ian Hartley, Leonard McGee and David Darcey. Amy Jones from Summit County present. Breke Harnagel not present.

Presentations at 9am, 9:30am, and 10am. 10:30am until 4:30pm discussion regarding applications with 30 minute break for lunch.

RAPREC 14-23 South Summit Trails

South Summit Bike team sent 75% of their team to state

Ask \$135,000.00

Howard Sorensen on Zoom. Doug Evans and Tom Smart present.

Pit Toilet, Pavilion, natural playground - no grass, logs and stones only, pump track and bike park. The toilet would be the only one within a few miles. This will be done on 8 acres that Oakley owns. Water access and camping close by. Oakley city largest ask is more trails.

Committee thanked the applicant for all his handwork on project and getting so many donations for construction.

RAPREC 16-23 910 Cattle Ranch

Jess Kirby

15mm down payment and a lease to do work on it now

8588 acres (1000 of it is in Morgan County)

Management plans

They want support Summit County Ambassador programs, could ask for equipment, asking for funding half of a position for 3 years, approx \$35/hr. 12 mile road - e-bike would be nice

Highest priority is the Baseline, second priority is the employee

Tomorrow the grant Forest Legacy will be submitted for 40mm. Full purchase is \$55 mm county has put down \$15mm.

RAPREC 6-23 Mountain Trails

Ian Hartley

Ask \$250,000

Widening RV main trails for better water run off and smoother surfaces

The price varies depending on where they get the product from, which quarry.

They are looking for other grants as well. Any partial funding would help them get grants from other sources.

If you give people an option for wider nicer path, this will work better on muddy days, they can't destroy it.

Discussions regarding funding.

There were 17 applications asking for a total of \$3,8777,194.89. RAP Tax monies totaled \$1,790,000.00. With asks of over \$2mm the amount allotted it was extremely difficult to decide how to disperse these funds among all the applications.

The committee graded every application based on if the ask was a true recreation facility, the number of people it served, the community benefit of the project, the viability of the project, and the urgency of the project. These criteria were taken from the application itself. All these

areas were mentioned in the application. We gave each criteria a possibility of 5 points. The members scores were averaged, and the applicants were put in order from highest score to lowest score. This helped us prioritize the 17 projects. This was not the end all be all but it helped us recognize which applications best met the goals of the RAP Grant.

There was a lengthy discussion regarding NSSD. We questioned the feasibility. Due to the amount of the funding and approximately 20% of funding is true recreation. It is nebulous. We would like to see a better track record on their project management. We would like to see defined phases instead of one large project all at once. Oakley red barn did theirs in pieces. We funded as they go along.

The NSSD application represented 54% of all the money we had to allocate.

There was no real breakout of how to fund in pieces. They also did not have parking regarding this facility and no plans for parking. This is a huge project that is not appropriate for RAP TAX to fund - they need to have a different funding source that is more adequate.

We did not fund the Summit County bike share for many reasons. One, we did not believe that it was mostly used by residents of summit county but by tourists and the applicant did not have that data when we asked this question. We also felt it was incorrect to spend close to 90k on a system that protects \$2400 worth of helmets. It was concerning how a \$12 helmet would hold up for a year, would a rider really report a fall, and would the helmets actually end up in the locker vs. left in various areas.

The Kamas project was discussed at length and the majority of committee members did not feel that their ask served a recreation purpose.

All applications were discussed at length. Information about each project will be reported when we submit our recommendations to the council.

Meeting closed at 3:48.