

# Outdoor Adventure Commission Agenda

January 9, 2024

**Meeting Location:** Auditorium Room

## Department of Natural Resources

Division of Outdoor Recreation

1594 W. North Temple, Suite 100

Salt Lake City, UT 84116

### Virtual Meeting Information:

Outdoor Adventure Commission Meeting

Tuesday, January 9 · 2:00 – 5:00pm

Time zone: America/Denver

Google Meet joining info

Video call link: <https://meet.google.com/hzv-bnux-ksd>

Or dial: (US) +1 657-258-1785 PIN: 521 689 077#

More phone numbers: <https://tel.meet/hzv-bnux-ksd?pin=9895461987560>

Outdoor Adventure Commission YouTube Playlist

<https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLWlxD5-tnhxrwAb0osnucRKxne2LX0gQW>

**IN PERSON:** Patrick Morrison, Carly Lansche, Shane Stroud, Brandy Grace, Chase Pili, Pitt Grewe, Jason Curry, Jeff Hartley, Tara McKee, Jerry Taylor, Michelle McConkie, Kate Bradshaw, Jack Draxler, Scott Weaver, Sarah Bennett, Lora Anthony, Vicki Varela, Caroline Weiler, Maureen Casper, Tammy Pearson, Jordan Smith, Jared Anderson, Greg Raines, Jorge Vazquez

**VIRTUAL:** Rep. Jeff Stenquist, Josh Van Jura, Scott Linnenburger, Quinn Bennion, John Knoblock, Gabby Blackburn, Evan Beitsch, Clay Crozier, Laura Ault, Lesha Coltharp, Keith Despain, Aaron Averett

## Agenda

1. Welcome - **2:00**
2. Minute Approval - **2:06**

Jason Curry: Motion to approve

Unanimous minute approval

### **3. Notification of New Administrative Rule R650-102 – Adjudicatory Proceedings, Shane Stroud - 2:07**

Rep. Stenquist: Next we have Shane Stroud who will speak on the New Administrative Rule R650-102

Shane Stroud: The Utah Administrative Procedures Act requires the division to enact a rule that speaks under adjudicatory proceedings. We've been proceeding under the old rule that we had when the division split we have now drafted this new rule. Director Ferry has signed it and it's ready to go. The purpose of this rule is just set out procedures for adjudicatory proceedings. That might come before the division the rule before parks had was sufficient for the purpose but it was probably a little bit too complicated. This is more streamlined. We do not anticipate too many adjudicatory proceedings, if any before the division of outdoor recreation, the statute requires us to notify the Outdoor Adventure Commission and it's just a note we do not need to vote on it. It's just a notification.

Rep. Stenquist: Thank you for that notification and if anyone has any questions I will direct you to Shane. Alright, we will move on to this next line item. If Patrick you want to start us off that would be great.

### **4. Outdoor Recreation Initiative - Project Presentations -2:09**

Patrick Morrison: We have a total of five presentations today so to start we will hear from the Sherman Hills project proposal we will close the meeting moment and we will come back and hear from Greg Raines from the Civilian Marksmanship Program, then Laura Anthony from Mountain Trails Foundation then Tammy Pearson from Beaver County and finally Quinn Bennion from Vernal City. So with that go ahead and start the presentation from Sherman Hills.

#### **a. Sherman Hills - Scott Wells, Wellsville City Manager -5:45**

- i. Close meeting for purposes of discussing strategies of property acquisition.

Jack Draxler: Thank you to the commission member and the Mr. Chair we appreciate being here. I'm Jack Draxler and I'm from Cache County. Scott Weaver is with me here representing Cache County. I have served 10 years in the state legislature and all 10 of those years I served on the Natural Resources Agriculture and Environment Standing Committee. I go way back with Kate and Jeff and have a lot of memories and a lot of respect for the organization. I was very excited when the Outdoor Adventure Commission was created. We are here to present on behalf of Wellsville City and have a request to preserve some land and trails as you know there has been a dramatic increase in demand for outdoor recreation and trails that are adjacent to the Natural National Forest. Including in Cache County and specifically, Wellsville City. And we are here to tell you why we seek these funds and what we intend to do with them. We expect to partner with Cache County, the State of Utah, and certainly Wellsville City. A Year ago in Cache County we finally passed an open space Bond and part of the 20 million dollar Bond was created in Cache County an open space advisory committee that will then advise the Cache County Council on prioritized proposed projects. We specifically want to preserve a couple of trailheads and then hopefully create some others. There are two trailheads that are threatened at this time by potential development and other things there are properties that are in private ownership that we would certainly like to have the opportunity to put into either public ownership or conservation easement. I am going to have Scott talk to you about trails in our County and specifically, Wellsville City.

Scott Weaver: by way of introduction my name is Scott Weaver I've been a resident of Cache Valley for 25 years and Wellsville City for 15 years. I'm an avid Trail Runner and hiker and some years ago I created Cache Valley. Trail Runners online community group to facilitate and support that activity if you just go back to the other slide real quick here I've been involved in the pursuit of Wellsville's trails and active Transportation plan for a number of years what we've done over the past couple of years is seeking input from the community as well as of Wellsville as well as the greater area this has been done through door knocking sharing information we've taken surveys and this has culminated in a number or a couple of different open houses in the city of Wellsville. Where we've sought to get that feedback find out of what people want what's of most interest and trails are clearly an important feature and important facility for outdoor Transportation as well as recreation in Wellsville.

This is just one graph that represents Trail data at a trail that's just four blocks from my home from Murray Farm trailhead and as you can see over the past number of years there's quite a bit of usage there the numbers on the left axis are kind of small to read but the average is there. The average there is between 500 and 1,000 uh Trail users per week that's quite a number for this Trail and it obviously fluctuates throughout the year but it's heavily used spring summer fall and winter and I think that's just representative of the interest and the need to support and to preserve trails in Wellsville and in Cache Valley.

This shows the population growth Trends, this is just for Wellsville City but you can see the growth from 2010 to 2020 and the projected growth in 2030 those numbers are increasing there's no question that the number of people is going to increase and the and the usage of those Trails is going to increase as well. So just to conclude or to summarize here this project that we're seeking funding for has a significant scope that represents not only Wellsville. Cache Valley it's the Gateway as Jack mentioned to Cache Valley but other visitors who are going through to Bear Lake to Wyoming to Idaho so it is important that it's visible. As you go through Sardine Canyon and has a significant scope both in visibility as well as in use it benefits a number of local communities obviously we're representing Wellsville but that's just a small number. A small portion of the communities in Cache Valley as well as Box Elder County, Davis County, and Rich County other users and other individuals that come to use our Trails as well.

This project would help to address overcrowding, as represented by the current and past use, as well as the projected population growth. There aren't as many trails on the left side of the Wellsville Mountains as in other recreation areas, particularly the East Side Logan Canyon area. This is really important, visible, and significant. We hope to both preserve that open space and create new trails and trailheads to support that growth and address the underserved. Acquisition of this property would facilitate the connection of trails from nearby communities and make that recreational area accessible to others. It's noted here that this particular area has slopes of less than 20% typically, so it is quite suitable for that use. I think the concluding two slides just represent the activities: summer activities like hiking, horseback riding, and biking, and the last one here, whether it's mountain biking, fat biking, snowshoeing, skiing, it's important. People want it, people need it, and so we appreciate the opportunity to speak on behalf of Wellsville and seek to preserve this open space for everybody.

Jack Draxler: Any questions from the group? We appreciate very much the opportunity to present today. We feel like this is very much in harmony with the goals and the mission of the Outdoor Adventure Commission, and so we appreciate very much the chance to partner with you.

Rep. Stenquist: Thank you very much. So, I think at this point, we are going to go into a closed session portion of our meeting. We're going to hold the closed session in the DNR Auditorium. Also, for those that are going to be in the closed session, they can remain online. So, I am going to ask for a motion to close the meeting for the purpose of property acquisition. I am going to ask for a motion to close the session

Shane Stroud: Let me just say, the closed portion of the meeting will actually take place in room 1010 and online. So, the commission members and invited guests for the closed session will leave this room and go to 1010. We'll come back here when the Open Session resumes.

Rep. Stenquist: Okay, thank you for that clarification. So, can we have a motion to close the meeting for the purpose of discussing potential property acquisition?

Jerry Van: Motion

Jason Curry: I'll second it

Rep. Stenquist: For this motion, we need to take a roll call vote is there someone there in the room that maybe can help the roll call vote?

Shane Stroud: I can ask for a roll call vote. So, let's call the roll.

Unanimous approval to close the session

Rep. Stenquist: Motion to reopen the Session:

Pitt: Motion

Vicki: Seconded

Roll Call vote to reopen the Session:

Unanimous approval to open the session

Rep. Stenquist: Thanks, everyone. We will now resume our meeting. I think the next agenda item is the next presentation on the outdoor shooting range and education center.

**b. Outdoor Shooting Range & Educational Center - Greg Raines, Civilian Marksmanship Program  
-54:44**

Greg Raines: Hey, I want to thank everybody for the opportunity to come out and really present and tell a little bit about what the Civilian Marksmanship Program is. I've got a quick video that I want to show, but I've given everyone my slide presentation. Again, my name is Greg Reigns, I'm the Chief Commercial Officer of the Civilian Marksmanship Program. So, I'm going to play a quick video and you can kind of see what we have in Alabama and what we want to bring here to Utah.

VIDEO\*\*\*

Greg Raines: Well, thank you. That just kind of gives you a quick overview of what we have there in Talladega and what we want to bring here to Payson City, here in Utah. We want to bring the Marksmanship Park to Payson City. I'm going to start with the slideshow now and kind of give you a little background.

To give you a little background about what the Civilian Marksmanship Program is. We are a national organization dedicated to the education of US citizens. We are a 501(c)(3) not-for-profit organization. What we're all about is training, educating with safety, marksmanship, and competition, with our main emphasis being on youth. We really want to bring that, like I said, out here to Payson City. This is going to give you kind of an outline of what we have in Talladega. It's a 500-acre \$28 million facility, the 1300th clubhouse, and you kind of saw on the video that's why I wanted to show the video to kind of give you an overview of what we do have there in Talladega. Because a lot of times with my Southern

accent when I start talking about a range, you think about somebody shooting in the backyard. But really, we're going to bring something that's very unique, that's the most technologically advanced shooting facility in the United States because of the KTS targeting system that we do have, the electronic targets that we offer there in Talladega. We purchased those from the Norwegian military, and it has sensors in the target. When you hear the report of your rifle shooting at that target, it responds and it repeats, it gives you the signal right there at your booth, and it shows you exactly where you've shot. So, that is really providing safety, and it puts people and they can go through the range much quicker. There's no going downrange, no calling the range cold, no saying we got to go change paper or anything like that, it is set right there in front of you. If you're shooting on Lane one or Lane 30, you can have your own, you know, zooming in your rifle, zeroing in your scope, you can do that on your own without disturbing someone else. The operations there in Talladega, we average right around 2,000 customers a month. We have charity events, corporate events, we have national events, regional events. USPSA holds their back-to-back nationals, we have their world speed shooting competitions. When USPSA comes out there, we have shooters from all over the country, the two weeks they are there, we have over 1,500 shooters just for that event. IDPA is another one that comes out there. Glock is our main sponsor, they have a week that they'll bring shooters from all over the United States to come out there. We've had all 50 states visit Talladega and 20 different countries. They're either coming for one of these matches or they've been there primarily to shoot on that KTS targeting system because you just don't see that anywhere in the country. And that's what we want to do here in Payson City. You know, I said before that the Talladega Marksmanship Park was the most advanced, the biggest. Well, Payson City will take over that once we establish that Park in Payson City because it will be even bigger than what Talladega is. And just knowing your marketplace, the NSSF provides us with a study where we can look at a 300-mile radius of what is in the marketplace here in Utah. And the reason we picked Payson City.

One of the reasons we picked Payson City, we were looking at the potential growth for the area moving south from coming out of Salt Lake, moving down I-15 going toward Las Vegas. And the place that we picked on West Mountain to establish our shooting range, you can see from I-15. Our facility in Talladega, even though it is on I-20 between Birmingham and Atlanta, and the population there is much larger, it is a little bit harder to get to our range there and it's harder to direct people to come out. Five miles from the interstate to get out there. But with Payson City sitting right there on the hill on I-15, you can visualize that from the interstate. We'll have signage being able to get there and a little bit different we're going to do in Payson with the range, not only having the same targets and the same distance as we have in Talladega, we're going to do a little bit different because where our electronic targets in Talladega only went out to 600 yards, we're going to go out to a thousand yards here in Payson City. And also on our unknown distance range where we only went out to 600 yards, we're going to go out to one mile. So it's going to be much bigger, much better, more advanced. And even the clubhouse is going to be a little bit bigger. We're going to do that at 15,000 square feet instead of the 13,000 like we have in Talladega. Going to establish, we got things in the works as far as what are we going to do really different there. We're thinking about maybe a restaurant to draw in more people. Some of the things we do in Talladega, we have corporate meetings that come out there, they use our corporate meeting spaces, and they don't even use the shooting range. So we're really looking to bring in all of the people that we can here to Payson and looking at, you know, averaging that 2,000 a month and really can bring that number up to 3,000. I'd like to see it to 3,500 to 4,000 after a couple of years that's been in place. Because of the place that it is going to be situated is going to be something very unique. Very unique for the city of Payson, very unique for Utah County, and very unique for the state of Utah. And we'll be able to bring the CMP (Civilian Marksmanship Program)'s name here. The name that's been around since 1903. Not only we have the shooting range, but you saw in the video, we'll be able to bring the M1 Garands that we'll sell out there. That is a contract that CMP has had with the US Army and the US government that we are the only entity that can bring those back to Anniston, Alabama, to our armories. We break those down, refurbish those guns, and are able to sell those to the public. And they really are so popular that we've had to limit those to where the

individuals can only buy six per year. So we look to have that. We'll also be having a commercial gun shop at the range there in Payson. So it's very exciting. It is going to be upwards of a \$30 million facility that we are going to be bringing out here to Payson. So, like I said again, I appreciate you guys letting me come before you and being able to present and to show you this exciting, really this exciting range that we're going to bring to the city and to the county and to the state and what a huge economic impact this will bring to the area. So, I'm going to close that out, and if you have any questions, please, I'll be happy to answer any question that you have about the Civilian Marksmanship Program or the range that we are planning on developing. And same thing with Payson City.

Rep. Stenquist: Alright thank you Greg.

Kate Bradshaw: I have a question, yes. Can you explain to me the connection with the city of Payson? Will you just be locating within the city of Payson, or will there be some type of um part of the program that or the land that Payson City will own or operate?

Greg Raines: Operate. It will not be part of the city of Payson, but we have formed a relationship with the city of Payson. I have the mayor and the city manager here from the city of Payson now. The land is going to be adjacent to Payson City. It is BLM land right now. We are going through the Recreational and Public Purpose Act to acquire that land, and since we are a 501(c)(3), we are qualified to be in that act. With the help of the city of Payson, and they've been there from the very start with us, the city of Payson has, and we have their full support. We had the full support of the County as well, of Utah.

Jerry Taylor: How long have you been at the RPP process?

Greg Raines: I've been doing the application now. This is going on about 18 months. I started filling out the application, I guess that's been about 15 months ago.

Jerry Taylor: Have they given any indication?

Greg Raines: the first indication back in October. We've been doing monthly Zoom calls with the BLM. Back in late September, we were taken off the RPP because they said that they could not have us on there and give away, basically sell us, contaminated land. Because we did a land survey and there are small parcels of lead out there due to shooting activities. So, they said they had to take us off that land because they could not sell us in good conscience dirty, contaminated land. Well, the thing is, if they do sell it to us, that's one of our clauses. We go in there and we clean the land completely. Then we set up berms throughout the property, collection ponds, and our BMS are not just earthen berms, ours have our ballistic sand in them. So when a bullet is fired, the ballistic sand in that BMS captures that lead and holds it. It will not leach out into the system, the water table, or the environment. Every 10 years by EPA standards, CMP has to go in and do lead mitigation. We pull all the berms out, we take all the lead out of the property. Again, it is clean. Again, after 10 years, we rebuild the BMS and start all over. So, in essence, what the BLM is doing is they took us off. I met with them again, and Dave, the city man, we met with them again yesterday. Now they have put us back on there because they see that it would be in their best interest to keep us on there and sell us the land because we're going to clean it. Because right now, it is a dirty land. But once we acquire those 537 acres, we can go in there and we will clean the lead out, then we'll go in and start building our BMS, and then start, you know, clean from there. 2025, the land in Talladega will go through lead mitigation there as well. That range will be there in 2025, 10 years will be its anniversary, so we'll do that in Talladega.

Jason Curry: Can you just give use more detail as far as the transaction the real estate so is 537 acres correct?

Greg Raines That's correct.

Jason Curry: What you are asking the commission for is \$2 million amount for property acquisition solely?

Greg Raines: No sir. That 2 million would either go through the property acquisition or it could go towards some of the building, okay? Because we are not coming in, like I said, we are 501(c)(3), we are not looking for any taxpayer dollars to build this. We have an endowment over \$250 million that we'll be able to come in and we are going to buy that. But any help that we could get from you, from the state of Utah, to be able to build this, then that just helps us further our mission of educating the public and the mission of educating the youth of America because that is in our mission statement.

Jason Curry: Thank you

Greg Raines: Yes sir.

Jeff Hartley: Tell us about the education partnerships you have with schools or with children, youth in the State of Alabama currently that would be used here in Utah in the existing facility that you highlighted. What do you have, what do you anticipate in terms of education for the youth in Utah?

Greg Raines: Yeah, what we will do, we have a scholarship program that is set in right now. We have \$300,000 that we give away in college scholarships. And what we do in Alabama right now, we have partnerships with most every high school shooting team. We bring those in, we educate youth as far down as even before they're 10 years old. They have to be 10 years old to come out and shoot at our range, which we put them through an education of gun safety, marksmanship, and then we want to get those kids involved in the high school programs because there are college shooting teams. We also give scholarship money even if they're not going to a shooting team in college, we give that. But kids even below the age of 10, we have blow-up BB gun ranges that look like large bouncy houses. We bring those kids out to the range. We also take that BB gun range around to different locations throughout Birmingham, Montgomery, Mobile, Nashville, Atlanta. We take that BB gun range out there and teach those kids safely how to use a BB gun. And you're educating those kids. We like to say it's BB guns, and then we also have an air rifle facility there in Aniston, indoor air rifle facility that we move those kids into the air rifles. There's a lot of money available in college programs for air rifle teams. This past weekend there in Aniston, we had the Paris Olympic trials for the United States air rifle teams.

Jeff Hartley: I don't know if anyone from the state can help us understand what kind of need DWR has for more shooting facilities, but in my experience, it's our state is willfully under inadequate in what we offer for rifle and pistol and shotgun training and practice. If you ever go to the Le Center any weekend after July, it's just overwhelmed, and we don't offer enough facilities for those who hunt and shoot to get that type of training and education. We have like 27,000 hunting licenses issued in the state of Utah, and we don't have facilities to allow that. So I think this could be a really great opportunity.

Greg Raines: And thank you, because that's one of the things all of our range officers, our ROs, go through our certification process of teaching. They go through an NRA certification process. They're in Talladega, we have weekly, I'm not weekly, daily classes, and they are full for rifle, pistol, shotgun, and we just started our archery classes there in Talladega. So you're seeing that those classes fill up and each day those classes are going through training. They're going through classroom training, and then we actually take them out on the range, and they have to qualify to pass that class.

Rep. Stenquist: I appreciate all the questions, but let's maybe keep our questions brief and, unless there's something really pressing, let's move on to the next presentation. Let's try to keep these next three to 10 minutes each total. Thank you.

Patrick Morrison: so I'd like to welcome up Sarah and Laura. And then just a quick note of correction, I think on the project list you all have. I accidentally wrote "The Wasatch Trails Foundation," but is actually the Mountain Trails Foundation and has done an amazing job, Laura is actually with the Mountain Trails Foundation.

**c. Wasatch Mountain Trail: Feasibility Assessment - Lora Anthony, Mountain Trails Foundation**  
**1:13:57**

Lora Anthony: The presentation is for the Wasatch Mountain Long Distance Trail. It's a request for feasibility study funding. Utah is known around the world for its outdoor recreation, and yet when we look at this map of the National Scenic Trails, the map of the National Non-Motorized Backcountry Trails, we notice that Utah is missing a non-motorized backcountry Scenic Trail from its quiver of outdoor recreation amenities. We do, however, have a fractured system of motorized and non-motorized trails. The Great Western Trail is Utah's Centennial Trail. It is also one of 16 National Millennial Trails. The Wasatch Trail proposes to connect and create non-motorized trails through the Wasatch using parts of the existing non-motor Great Western Trail.

The development of the Wasatch Mountain Trail can and should be folded into the greater Great Western Trail concept. This will help boost awareness and funding, and aid with the implementation of completing the Great Western Trail with support from nonprofits, Trails Utah, my colleague Sarah here next to me, Mountain Trails Foundation, the Division of Outdoor Recreation, and recreation enthusiasts across the state. We're here today to request funding for a professional feasibility study for the Wasatch Mountain Long Distance Trail, a possible yurt and/or overnight camp system.

The Wasatch Mountain Trail concept has its roots in a master's thesis out of Utah State University and actually came out of Terra's office a couple of years ago. Thank you, Tara. While the thesis provides the initial scaffolding upon which to hang the vision for this trail, it does not suffice as a planning document. As you can see from the map, considerations for the alignment of this trail are numerous and they include elements such as the environmental, economic, social, and aesthetic factors. Each one of those different colored alignments is addressing something, you know, one of those elements of the trail alignment. So, you know, you can see that there's a lot to consider when you're doing a trail of that magnitude. Land ownership, amenities to be included such as shelters, trailheads, a long-term management strategy for the trail, and eventually, a budget for all of this needs careful planning and professional consideration to affect the best outcome for all of these elements. We need consultants, and for that, we need money.

Here is the budget. There are a couple of elements in the budget here that you can scan through. I don't need to read them. I'd like to leave more time for Q&A. Basically, we have an estimate of about 1800 hours of work to go into this feasibility study at a cost of \$111,000 and some change. The feasibility study will be a six-month process, it's estimated, and the consultants, Kane Consultants, I believe Scott is on Zoom here so if we have questions he can answer specific questions as to the consultant's job. They are experts and one of very few in the country who specialize in long-distance and backcountry trail implementation. And we will be examining the physical, social, and managerial feasibility of this project. The physical assessment would take into consideration a gap analysis; it would help us to identify terrain and land ownership constraints, physical impediments such as roads, private property, wilderness areas, etc., and then opportunities. This kind of falls under the "we don't know what we don't know" headlines so the consultants can help us recognize opportunities that we don't currently have identified. The social assessment would look at use patterns and current use patterns of existing trails.

We've got pattern use patterns, conflict, needs, and wants of trail users, gateway communities, stakeholders, desires, and concerns for all those groups. And then moving on to the managerial assessment that would look at the partner's capacity. For some reason that did not transfer, okay, well, we'll just run through it really quickly. Partners, resources contributed through the partnerships with the US Forest Service, the nonprofits, the state, management structure among the partners, who does what and where and why. And then stewardship, public interfacing, volunteerism, and



programming opportunities for this project. Utah already has a Bonneville Shoreline Trail and it stands as a proof of concept for a long-distance trail; however, the BST is largely an urban experience, not a backcountry experience. And partnerships, as we lift this project up out of the dust, the partners committed to giving it wings as of today are the Utah Division of Outdoor Recreation, Mountain Trails Foundation, and Trails Utah. We hope with Vicki in the room that she will really get behind this before she leaves the Utah Office of Tourism. As we're moving through the process of approaching the US Forest Service and expect to get support from them, as the Great Western Trail, which will be part of what we are trying to develop, is named as a priority in the US Forest Service documents. Again, we believe that the Wasatch Trail will be comprised of great swaths of the Great Western Trail. This is our priority checklist, and I think if you want to take the time to read through that or I can read through it, up to you guys. It shows that each one of the prioritization priorities has been met with a pretty substantial key part of the Wasatch Mountain Trail. So now we are open to question and answer, and I will have Sarah take the mic from here.

Pitt Grewe: Question. I have multiple questions, so the study will help to identify how many trails, how many trails will need to be built to make connections, everything else, right? Is that the kind of the point of the assessment? Do you guys have any, or maybe this will be part of the assessment as well, but collecting data on other long trails? Because I know, for example, you know, I talked to the Idaho Trails Association about the Centennial Trail and the struggles they have with either maintenance or funding, maintenance, you know, like sections that get abandoned or whatever, right? So I'm guessing that's part of the assessment as well, like the ongoing maintenance.

Sarah Bennett: Yeah, so this is really, you know, the 50,000-foot look at whether this concept really can fly. We know there are sections of the trail out there, and we know that long-distance trails are difficult to realize on the ground. I mean, the Great Western Trail concept has been around since the late '80s. There are only really fragments of that that exist; some are motorized. There are a few that are non-motorized, but we think that that structure, the greater kind of Great Western Trail concept, is a really ideal, sort of broader idea to plug this Wasatch Mountain Range Trail into. I think with that level of recognition as a Centennial Trail, it's also identified in Forest Service charters for districts all the way through the state as a priority for implementation. So we feel like there are some good gears in place, but we just need to start pulling it apart and figure out what kind of fuel it needs. And it's a very high-level treatment at this point.

Pitt Grewe: okay. And then, yeah, I fully agree with everything you're saying. I've been on sections, not in the Wasatch, but I've been on sections of the Great Western Trail where the map says you're on the trail, but there is no trail to be found, where it's just been difficult to find. And so, I know that'll be a challenge moving forward.

Sarah Bennett: We think that this effort also will really help with trail maintenance. You know, that's really something that, as you have noticed throughout Utah and on trails even in fairly populous areas, without maintenance and attention, they'll fall apart. Trails are living things; they need input and care.

Lora Anthony: And yeah, I would also just state that there are two pretty experienced nonprofits sitting at this table, and we are very interested in figuring out a system, with guidance from the consultants, on how to make this Wasatch Mountain Trail, and even maybe, you know, the greater Great Western Trail, a priority of the nonprofits. So, if there has to be another nonprofit developed that is the eventual management agency for the trail, we're prepared to do that.

Sarah Bennett: And that's the case in Arizona, you know, the Arizona Trail has really been done well. It's totally complete, it's well-maintained, there's a lot of buy-in along the way from communities, and we really hope to see that. We think that Utah as a state and its 29 counties and all the municipalities along the way are ready to embrace the concept of a border-to-border trail in the Great Western Trail. And you know, the Wasatch Trail would be the crown jewel of such a Great Western Trail.

Pitt Grewe: I agree 100%. Like, I think Utah has the community to make something like this happen, the key organizations and things like that, and that's what it's going to take to make a trail like this.

Sarah Bennett: We've definitely had the conversation about if this really gets some legs and gets going, like, could our organizations really manage it? It may take creating another organization whose sole mission is the health and welfare and connecting of this trail.

Lora Anthony: Of this trail, and that wouldn't be the first time it's ever happened. Has its own nonprofit, and the Appalachian Trail has its own nonprofit. All that, yeah. So, we're not reinventing the wheel, but right now, we've been asked to kind of give this thing some legs.

Pitt Grewe: Yeah, and I know you're just asking for the money for the assessment. I think that'll be the necessary first step. So, like, support for that. Obviously, my hesitancy then are the next steps. But we have to do an assessment to figure this out, right? Like, I don't want to run into the Bonneville Shoreline Trail. It has been a great project, but it's also been like there were, you know, now we're deep into difficulties to get that completed. The High Desert Trail was another great idea. It was great, but then like ran into difficulties from the motorized world, right? So, you know, we want to make sure that we definitely do the due diligence on this, and I think that the assessment is the first step to do that due diligence before we can actually figure out we get there.

Sarah Bennett: And another piece of this, something that we're asking as a takeaway from this study is a path forward with land management agencies. Like, we really want the Forest Service to thoroughly vet this concept, to look at the potential alignments, to look at the use going on on existing alignments. We want a path to approval with this feasibility study, so that's a big piece.

Pitt Grewe: Very cool thank you.

Rep. Stenquist: Let's go on to the next presentation.

Patrick Morrison: Next We got Tammy from Beaver County

**d. Puffer Lake Property Acquisition and Improvements - Tammy Pearson, Beaver County  
Commissioner -1:29:38**

Tammy Pearson: Good afternoon. I brought my timer so I'm respectful of your time here. I'm Commissioner Tammy Pearson from Bieber County, and this is my cohort, Commissioner Brandon Yardley. What we would like to propose is this the thing with the arrows. I have to apologize because this is an old redneck hick that put this together, so you're just gonna have to bear with me. There's nothing fancy.

So, Puffer Lake is located 22 miles east of Beaver City. The lake is at 9672 feet elevation, surrounded by forest property on the Tusher Mountain in Beaver County. The property is easily accessible by the Piute Trail and State Road 153, which is one of Utah Scenic Byways. Beaver County is proposing to purchase the private property there in Beaver County.

The lake property comprises 589.38 acres and includes spring and underground water rights. With the purchase, there can be year-round access to fishing on the lake and hunting. Improved public access and opportunities will be facilitated, as currently, it is private property with no trespassing signs. Other interested parties have considered fencing it off and blocking the Piute Trail, causing various issues. There's an opportunity to preserve history and restore historic cabins for lakeside access. The lake is surrounded by small fishing cabins that will need to be replaced, but there is ample room for new cabins, restrooms, pavilions, and dispersed campsites.

The Puffer Lake properties urgently require healthy forest management and are part of the Beaver District shared stewardship program's plan in the near future. Beaver County is concerned about the Forest Service's intention to acquire the property using federal funding. The property has been neglected for approximately 50 years, leading to its deterioration. Beaver County, with 87% public land and around 7,500 residents, does not require more federally owned property. Visitation to other recreational properties managed by Beaver County, such as Tusher Lake and Minersville Lake Campground, has increased by 75% in recent years, resulting in higher revenue. Beaver County has effectively utilized Outdoor W grants to make infrastructure improvements, such as installing cabins at Minersville Lake, which have been well-received by visitors.

Okay, our success story involves investing in our communities and county, which benefits both our souls and theirs. Visitation from residents and non-residents has increased dramatically. Maintaining public access and affordability is crucial for Beaver County. Recreation has become a vital economic driver for our county and communities. Unfortunately, the past year and a half has been devastating due to the closure of Smithfield, our largest employer, resulting in a significant loss of jobs. Despite this setback, we've seen entrepreneurial initiatives thrive, such as equipment rentals, thanks to public lands. The middle picture shows our popular paddle boards at Minersville Lake. As for the timeline, it depends on the property acquisition, which we aim to complete this year. Engineering work would follow, and the shared stewardship project with the Forest Service is planned for the next three years. We've also been in talks with federal representatives regarding infrastructure funding, which would contribute significantly to power, water, and road improvements. Dispersed campsites could be established this summer, followed by H sites and cabins, pavilions, and RV sites in different phases. Beaver County aims to retain management authority and partnerships with various entities, including the Outdoor Adventure Commission, Forest Service, State Forestry and Fire, DNR, PLPCO, and more.

Okay, so the purchase price is listed between 6.9 to 7.2 million, including all water rights. We may negotiate on this. Here's a rough breakdown of project expenses: project design and engineering, road improvements, new cabins, historic cabin restoration, campsites, water development, restrooms, power, pavilion, and boat docks. We have existing boat docks that we can move up there without investing in new ones. Additionally, we need storage space and other equipment. Our county has a million dollars in cash reserves, but considering the estimated costs, we'd need funding in the range of 6 to 7 million. We're also seeking shared stewardship funds, federal infrastructure funding, and possibly a state grant down the road. The scope of this project is vast, extending beyond Beaver County. Our contribution would be 1 million. The property will provide year-round public access and improved camping facilities, benefiting visitors to Utah. We have a good working relationship with the Forest Service for management. We're shovel-ready for acquisition funding and have been coordinating with the Beaver Ranger District on shared stewardship programs to address forest health.

Outdoor Adventure Strategic Plan Alignment: We've formed a planning coalition led by Beaver County, which includes the Beaver Ranger District, Beaver City, Elk Meadows Service District, Eagle Point Ski Resort, PPCO, DNR Forestry and Fire. We hold regular meetings with these stakeholders. One thing we've struggled with is tourism; our local community prefers to maintain our rural character. When developing our tourism branding, we emphasized responsible travel to protect our home and the places visitors are exploring. We promote traveling carefully and respecting both personal safety and the environment. That's all I have. Any questions?

Jason Curry: How many acres?

Tammy Pearson: Just shy of 600 to 500 acres it was in the first slide.

Jason Curry: Is it locked in private property now?

Tammy Pearson: No you have pure access.

Pitt Grewe: I'm going to ask on behalf of Scott, who's not here, but I think Parks would be interested in co-managing or managing this. Also, Eagle Point as a private entity might be interested in this development. That's great for Eagle Point!

Tammy Pearson: Eagle Point doesn't have the bandwidth for it right now. Okay, State Parks might be willing to take it on. And no, I have not talked to State Parks.

Jason Curry: So another question what is the seasonality of the accessibility in the road and maintenance?

Tammy Pearson: Road maintenance is a struggle for UDOT. It's a challenge to keep the road clear to the ski resort, just past the property. However, that's part of their contract - they are supposed to keep it clear year-round. The road leads to the end of the oil, which is right at this property and serves as a significant snowmobile trailhead. Huge and we're in the process of purchasing a snowcat for the county to help with this. The access is great, especially in winter as long as the trails are tracked. Additionally, the Forest Service has been working on maintaining the roads past this property, extending to a big meadow on top where they plan to establish significant parking for both summer and winter. This would enhance access to ATV trails and snowmobile routes.

Pitt Grewe: "Inaudible" 1:42:18

Tammy Pearson: Huge and we're in the process of purchasing a snowcat for the county to help with this. The access is great, especially in winter as long as the trails are tracked. Additionally, the Forest Service has been working on maintaining the roads past this property, extending to a big meadow on top where they plan to establish significant parking for both summer and winter. This would enhance access to ATV trails and snowmobile routes. Okay well thank you.

Rep. Stenquist: Thank you for that presentation. We'll now move on to the final presentation, and I think we have Quinn from Vernal is here to present it.

e. **Regional Outdoor Adventure Launchpad in Vernal Land Acquisition - Quinn Bennion, Vernal City Manager -1:44:10**

Quinn Bennion: Yeah, so thank you. I'm Quinn Bennion, the city manager of Vernal. We really appreciate your time and service on this commission. I'm joined here today with Leisa, our tourism director, and others on our Dino Trails committee. We're really excited about our proposal to share a regional recreation project. It's actually in the heart of downtown Vernal, which is a little bit unique but very exciting to show the use and accessibility to our amazing outdoor amenities in the area. This project's been many years in the making, and it has a lot to share, plan, schedule, fund, and partner with, but we have our 10 minutes today, so we'll just share the portions that are applicable to this committee.

As a genesis of the concept, this came from a successful event that we've been holding in Vernal each summer. We flood the library's drainage detention and turn it into a paddle pond for three days. It's amazing how many locals and visitors that come through that have never experienced a paddleboard canoe or kayak, and this is a safe, accessible place to experience it. And then we hear back from dozens of DOR who report that they went and bought their children enjoyed it so much they went and bought a paddleboard kayak to use in the area reservoirs. So we want to take this concept and extend it to all the other wonderful amenities that we have through this Launchpad idea. So this is our request is for property acquisition assistance with this property it's 4.22 Acres right and currently it's a vacant hotel and a vacant motel it's right in the heart of downtown right at there's Highway 191 up to Flame Gorge then Highway 40 with 100 with 25,000 cars passing through this is a rendering of the Launchpad and the features over the four acres and this would be you know multiphase um we again we want to showcase this wonderful and amazing recreational features of our region um this would include sort of teaser experiences kind of like the pond and then kiosk of information how people can experience those uh out in our Great Outdoors um the first phase I won't go through all these elements um you can see them there on the screen the first phase would include the open green space water feature climbing feature a mountain bike track.

This is very accessible to youth, people in town, but also the visitors that come through. Our theme for it is "Come and learn and then go and play" as you experience it. Our public engagement for this project was part of our downtown plan in 2020, and it included robust engagement. Dozens of entities were involved, and over a thousand residents participated in this 9-month process. The plan is highly supported by the community and our political leadership, and we have significant coordination with all these entities listed here, including businesses and particularly the Outfitters County tourism County development. It's been a great process, and the plan identified nine blocks in the downtown that we need to give attention to both public and private investment. Our plan is not going to sit on the shelf; it hasn't been sitting on the shelves since it's been approved. We are revitalizing block by block. The block that we represent today is block number three and embraces the recreation tourism aspect of the plan.

A few quick more details of some of the features as part of phase one. We're hopeful to do a climbing feature, replicated after Moonshine Arch, which is within a short drive of Vernal and a very popular attraction. The next one's a water feature; this one would be similar to the one in St. George downtown and again showcases all the water that's available in the area, in our state parks, Flaming Gorge, the Green River, and some may know that we are the birthplace of commercial whitewater rafting and again showcase the water recreational amenities we have in the area. Another feature would be the mountain bike pump track. This shows the one in Kanab, which also has a skate park. We're just looking at the pump track, which would then showcase our local wonderful mountain bike complex, Red Fleet with Flats, buckin Hills, and many others.

Others, this slide again shows the momentum from not only capturing our downtown revitalization but then moving it into a recreation tourism component. I show the next few slides just to show that we are committed to this plan, and our community supports it. We are bringing it forward even though it's a large-scale plan for our community. This is a picture of block one as of today actually. The work that's going on. This is block number two, right across the street from our subject property. Here's what it looked like last year. The city acquired these two properties. That's what it looks like today. And here's what it would look like by next year. This is an illustration of how the recreation Launchpad, the acquisition site, is labeled. The four acres we own the property now across the street, and we anticipate vacating that city street to provide upwards of seven acres for this project.

Our project timeline again focuses specifically on the acquisition. Secure funding in the first part of this quarter of this year. We are working with State brownfields partnered with them. They've completed phase one and they are working on phase two right now. Environmental and we have been negotiating with the owner for about a year and a half. He is willing to sell, we just haven't crossed that finish line with the purchase amount. Then we look for a purchase contract mid-year and acquisition by summer if the funding's there. The role of the state, what we're requesting from this commission, and your consideration for helping and assisting with the acquisition. Then we hope to bring a future facility application as well. Budget overview, we have completed the plan and public engagement. You can see our partners there. The environmental I just mentioned and then the orange highlighted portion is what we're looking at for today.

County through a grant has secured 2 million. We're putting in 500,000 and we're seeking 1.1 million from the commission. The outdoor Venture commission and represents about 30, just over 30% of our total project cost. We believe it fits your prioritization checklist well. I identified this with some pluses and how well it fits, one through three. We do believe it addresses overcrowding; we have some capacity that we are inviting and want people to come to Vernal and recreate. We don't want to be overrun, but we do have capacity. Our address is letting people know we are here and what's available so that they may come from other locations that are overcrowded. Underserved, again very accessible, easy to find. It's shovel-ready for the acquisition, and then we feel like it does meet the strategic plan that you're looking at for projects.

Benefits improve our tourism and recreation experience. Responsible for timeline and planning. Economic definite heavy economic impacts to increase our outdoor recreation use and help just that momentum that's built with our downtown revitalization. And there we're here for questions and comments.

Rep. Stenquist: Okay any questions? Okay if there are none then thank you very much for the presentation

Quinn Bennion: Thank you

##### **5. Outdoor Recreation Project Approval - Vote -1:54:20**

Rep. Stenquist: Okay, now we come to the exciting portion of our meeting to discuss prioritization. I don't know if there are specific discussions that we want to have around these projects or if there's specific discussion that we want to have around these projects. I know that we presented the scoring sheets. I know some people have been able to fill those out. Not everyone on the commission has fully filled out those scoring sheets. I'll open it up for discussion or Patrick if you got some comments on the scoring, please go ahead.

Patrick Morrison: Thank you, Representative Senquest. So, I guess to start, the scoring sheets that I had sent out, I mean, those, you know, I tried to make it known, you know, those aren't necessarily official. They were just to kind of help you all, um, just to kind of help steer your discussion. Um, you know, it wasn't my intention to kind of share those with the public, more just so you can have your own notes as we do have this discussion. So, if, if, in those who did do the scoring, as you're going through and you can identify like these ones were the ones that really stood out to me, um, you know, kind of bring those up. Um, and then I thought just through discussion, through motions, you know, we can kind of work on, on some, you know, funding priorities for this. Um, I also have, um, a live scoring sheet I can share at any point if people are curious on how much funding, um, is being allocated, um, you know, like where it's being distributed across the state. And that was pretty much it. Um, I, I think there have been a few comments about, uh, a few folks requesting a 5-minute break for bathroom and snacks as well. I don't know how you feel about that

Rep. Stenquist: Perfectly reasonable request to take a short break its been a long meeting already so lets take a break and come back in 10 minutes.

Pitt Grewe: Can I ask one question before we break? Maybe you need to think about this while on the break. But, we talked about this last meeting. We have 19 million from the last session that was appropriated, and then we also have suggestions for this upcoming session. So, maybe when we come back, let's be clear on which funds we are appropriating projects to. Because potentially, you know, we're catching up from the appropriation last year to try to figure out how that money is going to be spent, what's left there, plus whatever suggestions we want to make to be run in a bill or in an appropriation this coming session. We don't need an answer right now. Let's discuss that when we get back from our break. Just to think about it.

Patrick Morrison: Do we want to do a five or a ten minute break?

Rep. Stenquist: Lets do a ten minute break.

"Break"

"Back from Break" -2:09:02

Rep. Stenquist: Okay, welcome back to commission members. So, this next portion, I guess, is the part we've all been waiting for. I think we're going to maybe do our best with this. Hopefully, we can keep it streamlined and have an opportunity to discuss this. So, what I, and hopefully in future years, you know, this is our first time really going through this process. In future years, I really hope that we wouldn't want to wait until the week before the session to do this and that we wouldn't feel so rushed because it does feel a little bit rushed at this point, because we're up against a deadline. So, my thinking with this is that we can have Patrick display a kind of a list of projects so that we can all have a visual of the prioritization list. And then we can entertain, you know, discussion.

Okay, so if we, uh, let's just talk about how we want to prioritize these things. Some of the, you know, I don't know, you know, we can entertain motions one by one, discussions, uh, to vote to put things on the priority list. I'll, yeah, I'll take a little bit of, uh, privilege as the chair to suggest that some of these items that are, you know, kind of smaller dollar amount asks, I think, are maybe a little bit easier. There's something that clearly, you feel like, 'Hey, that's a good project'.

You know, if someone wants to propose, you know, especially something that's not taking a large funding request, those are maybe a little bit easier to include in the list. And then other proposals or motions for larger dollar amount proposals, we can then also discuss.

Jason Curry: Mr. Chair any thoughts on the question that was posed before the break on what is the target amount were actually looking at here?

Rep. Stenquist: I think that we should perhaps look at. I mean, we can divide this into two tranches, one for the current fiscal year and one for the upcoming fiscal year. And we don't, I don't know that. I mean, we can suggest, you know, given that these are recommendations, we could recommend that we use the full funding amount. So, for example, in the current fiscal year, if we wanted to recommend, you know, if it's roughly \$19 million, if we wanted to recommend the full amount, we could do that. Although we certainly don't need to do that if we wanted to keep some funds in reserve from the current fiscal year, even if that means that those funds could potentially be available for future fiscal years, that's perfectly all right as well. So, I'm not going to necessarily say that, well, this is, you know, a hard amount that, you know, we're only allowed to do up to, you know, a portion of the full amount. I guess, really it's, you know, it's the full amount that would be the maximum and let, you know, but if the commission doesn't want to allocate the full amount.

Josh Van Jura: I recommend that we hold some value in contingency solely because these are preliminary cost estimates, and to get some of these projects to the finish line with the inflation that we've seen and whether that being in consultant and/or construction dollars, I think overruns at these early stages of projects are probably likely. I would

say, and to make sure we can get them to the finish line, I think we should probably hold some portion available for additional funding with projects.

Rep. Stenquist: Good point, Josh. I will point out, though, that we're not really funding the project. This is just a grant amount. So, contingency or cost overruns, I think that's something that the receiving party needs to worry about. And if they have those cost overruns, then they would then need to figure out how to cover those themselves. So, how much of a grant allocation are we providing them would be the question

Josh Van Jura: I think that's really important, especially in RightWay Acquisitions, where there are unknown price tags even more so.

Jeff Hartley: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, I'm wondering if there's a way, and maybe staff already knows this. Is there a way for us to know on some of these Federal projects, that most of them are the bigger price tags, and do, is there a way for us to know whether the matching funds that they've suggested are available have been appropriated, or are those in a budget request somewhere, are they on a dream list somewhere? Because if the funding for those hasn't been appropriated by the federal government yet, the odds of that happening couldn't happen before September when the new fiscal year begins for the federal government, but they may not ever get funded. And I'm not sure if we want to obligate our funds to projects that don't yet have the federal match.

Pitt Grewe: Jeff I had the same question, when I was reviewing them, I had that exact same question. So, you know, the ones that, I don't know if this is accurate, but the ones that definitely ranked higher in my eyes were the ones that had mentioned they'd either started work using GOA money. So, like, you know, there were a lot of those, like Fish Lake projects and whatever, that were like, 'Let's finish it, we need to get over the finish line.' Those rose in priority to me, as opposed to the ones that, like, were starting a new project and we do have potentially some allocated, right? Like, that was a red flag in a way. So, I think to at least starting to get this list and seeing what amount we come to, like the prioritization of those ones that were maybe GOA projects, that they're just asking for money to complete or finish a phase, like those, now you're asking me.

Jason Curry: Yeah, Lake Creek, um, Big Flat, Navajo, Navajo Lake, Spruces. Yeah, category where, yeah, we're not, there's no contingency. The GO funds are already there, and they are just looking to cross the finish line due to overruns. This is basically an ask for this fund to cover the overruns.

Rep. Stenquist: I don't know if that answers your question Jeff. I think it's by case basis.

Michelle McConkie: I noticed that on the sheet it says 3.1 million for Kent Lake but on the Power Point it said 500,000 do we know if that was just a typo or if that number has changed?

Patrick Morrison: That looks like it was just a typo the project cost is 3.1 million.

Michelle McConkie: So the funding request was 500,000.

Patrick Morrison: Correct

Vicki Varela: A metric that would be useful to me, I don't think we've captured, is what the local collective contribution that the request is bringing to the table and how that fits with what they're asking for us because there were a couple where, well, one, the Bieber County where they wanted 7 million and they had a \$1 million contribution, and then contrasting that with others where there was a lot more of a contribution they were bringing to the table. How do we weigh all of that?

Jason Curry: Yeah, I think that's a good point. For example, the Sherman Hills one, there's a 75% match ratio. Yeah, good to keep in mind. I think I kind of sorted all of these and did a little quick math on the match ratio. We got everything



from 93% to zero. But I think that's just one factor. For example, the trial feasibility study, a zero match but very low cost, so there's kind of a fine line.

Pitt Grewe: Yeah. There was a Forest Service project, I can't remember which one it was, that basically was they were asking to start the project, right? So, there's like two red flags there. There was no match from the Forest Service. There was also no indication that there would be any funding requests going to DC or from the federal offices, right?

Jason Curry: One I think that's Kent Lake 3.1 Million and the applicant cash match was zero.

Rep. Stenquist: Yeah, and some of these, that I mean, some, a lot of it's quite subjective. We may feel like they might have some matching funds, but it, you know, really is it a need for the state to provide additional funds, or is it something that we feel the entity should be able to cover their costs without state funds available? So, you know, that's part of the question. And, you know, the appropriateness of the request, it all comes down to how each of the commission members feels about it. And if you want to advocate for or against a particular project being included or moved up on the priority list, then feel free to speak up on that. Do we have any? Oh, and then also, I will point out that on some of these, we may feel like it's maybe we don't feel that we can contribute the full amount of the funding request, but maybe we can provide a portion of it, and then they could then have that portion that, you know, they might have to come back for a little bit over multiple years to get where they're going. So, that might be an option. You know, I'm thinking specifically, for example, like the one in Beaver County. Maybe we don't feel like we could allocate the full seven million, but maybe we could do a portion this year, with the idea that maybe we come back in future years and add a little bit more to help them over time get to the full amount. That's one question that I don't know if we know how long they feel like they can wait and if this, if in the future years that money falls through, then certainly we would want to have any money back to the state if they weren't able to use it over a certain period. I don't know if we put rules in place about that, saying, you know, after a certain amount of time, then we want that money back. However other projects may not have the luxury of waiting a few years and getting funding over multiple years.

Michelle McConkie: I have a question on that isn't there some level of commitment or more certainty before we actually disperse funds?

Jason Curry: I would say yes. Like the next step, it's allocated, awarded basically. Secured, some of it would be based on reimbursement. You know, these land acquisitions would obviously operate a little bit differently, but it's more of a commitment than it is just yes, here's \$2 million, yeah

Michelle McConkie: And another thought I had is on the, I took into consideration the percentage of contribution in comparison to the total project cost in my ROI score. But, there's a big difference when you're looking at an ask from a fifth or sixth-class county versus a second or third-class county, even in the resources that are, so yeah, or a nonprofit

Pitt Grewe: Yeah, I know in the past I was thinking that same thing that Brandy was thinking, right? Like, I know in the past, like with UORG grants and all of that, right? We've taken that highly into consideration for the split between rural and urban projects. And I don't know if that's again throwing another wrench in the system. I don't know if that's something we want to consider as a commission when we are thinking about how we split out the allocation of these or at least our recommendation for the allocation of these, but yeah.

Michelle McConkie: Or potentially even regionally so we make sure that we've got reach across the state.

Jason Curry: At least avoid concentrating it all into one place or in one use.

Michelle McConkie: Yes

Jason Curry: Speaking of Jeff's district may I make a motion? I would make a motion that we put as our first project the Wasatch Trail feasibility study on the list.

Vicki Varela: Second

Rep. Stenquist: We have a second motion to include the Wasatch feasibility study any discussion on that motion?

Jason Curry: I think that is a good point and really good point to really keep in mind. There is a fine line there.

Josh Van Jura: I absolutely support that, and that was also my first priority because I think it's important to think of long-range projects and short-range.

Jeff Hartley: Jason can you give us your argument for it?

Jason Curry: I think it's something that's missing from Utah. You know, the popularity of thru-hiking is just soaring. Pacific Crest Trail, Great Divide Trail, or Continental Divide Trail, Appalachian Trail, that activity is extremely popular. I think it also has the potential to put a lot of tourism dollars on the ground in some areas where they typically aren't.

Jeff Hartley: It also seems that they don't really have another source of funding for this right? I don't know where else they would go to get this funding. Who else is going to fund this if we don't.

Jason Curry: We don't. Yeah, it would be. There's probably very few places other than this.

Jeff Hartley: I support that.

Rep. Stenquist: So, I'll just ask for a voice vote. All in favor of that motion to include that project, say aye.

Everyone "Aye"

Rep. Stenquist: Anyone opposed?

Unanimous approval for funding "Wasatch Trail feasibility study"

Rep. Stenquist: Alright let's put that on the list.

Pitt Grewe: I'd also like to make a motion. We probably could have combined these two, but just again, I'll make a motion here to keep it clean. I make a motion to also fund the Zion Regional Collaborative for the Guacamole Trail, which was for \$182,000. If I can get a second.

Vicki Varela: I'll second that.

Pitt Grewe: Okay, thank you. So, for discussion, it's kind of the same thing we were just talking about. Like, there's no other place to get funding for NEPA. And here was my notes on this that I thought was fascinating. I think this is a great example of a, I don't want to say a social trail, but a trail that is getting heavily used that isn't an authorized trail or may be called an illegal trail. And this is a step that they're taking to instead close it down, to reinforce it, do the right thing to make it useful because the community already loves it and is using it. And what we find oftentimes with these trails that are maybe unauthorized, a lot of times the easiest step either by the Forest Service or BLM or whatever is just to close it, and then it becomes a bigger issue to manage. So, at this point, they're, I think they're being proactive in the solution to say let's make it an actual trail, let's reinforce it, let's make it useful because it is a resource to the community that's already being used and already known out there. And again, that NEPA, there isn't a funding source to get that NEPA and design done efficiently or, you know, that's a lot harder to come by than the construction dollars and grants to make this an actual trail.

Rep. Stenquist: Alright are there any comments against this?

Jason Curry: Not necessarily against it, just a question on the statutory limitations on the funding. Planning isn't specifically mentioned as a use. Is there any need to amend the statute?

Patrick Morrison: I mean maybe I can give a little comment. You know, I've been working with our Assistant Attorney General rep, and we do have language. I believe we may have you may be in context about this, Representative Stenquist. Just to clean up some of the language in the outdoor adventure restricted fund because right now it is pretty exclusive of all things except for a list, but we're opening up for these like planning and NEPA and these types of things.

Rep. Stenquist: I was going to say, it falls within the intent of the bill. I don't know if the language fully reflects that, and if there's ambiguity, I'm happy to make some efforts to change that. But I'm comfortable with it. Although, as a side note, it looks like you've highlighted and read there the request from the Utah Avalanche Center is something that you feel like is really not eligible for this funding.

Patrick Morrison: I mean, that's one, once again in conversations with Shane, that he couldn't find a way that we could justify it as infrastructure, you know, and I know for outdoor recreation, I think within the code in the outdoor recreation initiative House Bill 224 that has a pretty inclusive definition of recreation and the needs. However, the funding source for all of this is going to be the Outdoor Adventure fund, and that's the one that does have that more restrictive language. So if we are going to be pulling funding from that, that's going to be the code that we need to clean up. But with that one, with the Avalanche Center's application in particular because it is infrastructure, but it's, you know, like we use a trail that's infrastructure for a lot of us. However, this would be kind of infrastructure that they're using, you know, certainly many people would benefit from having the Avalanche forecasting, but just the tie wasn't there.

Rep. Stenquist: So since this one wasn't red were going to assume that it is eligible.

Patrick Morrison: Yeah, assuming that we do get that language clean up in this next session, so some of these, yeah, we would need to wait.

Jeff Hartley: Before we leave the discussion about the Avalanche Center funding, I'm wondering if maybe Josh could tell us if UDOT funds the Avalanche Center or where do they draw funds for Avalanche safety from the state or do they?

Jason Curry: Its the division.

Jeff Hartley: So is there another mechanism that could fund that request?

**Brandy Grace:** Ive met with them a couple months ago I know they were working on an appropriation. 2:31:05

Pitt Grewe: Yeah do pull from us and from DOR and alittle bit form UDOT.:

Jeff Hartley: I just see that as a critical need, but if there's another mechanism to fund it since it doesn't fit into the definition of our fund, then maybe we let that one go.

Rep. Stenquist: I think that like right now, like for example, UDOT contracts with them to provide services. So that's different than like an appropriation. It's really that they're just contracting with UDOT.

Vicki Varela: I would like to make a motion to fund all of the BLM projects at the requested amount. And my thinking is that they're all.

Rep. Stenquist: Vicki, before we make another motion, we still have that motion on the Guacamole Trail. So if there's no further discussion on that, let's go ahead and take a vote on that trail on that motion. All in favor of including that request from Zion Regional Collaborative, say aye.

Everyone: Aye

Rep. Stenquist: Anyone apposed?

Unanimous approval for funding "Zion Regional Collaborative"

Rep. Stenquist: Okay, that passes unanimously. So let's include that on the list. Okay, go ahead, Vicki, and by all means, feel free to include multiple projects in your motion if you feel that's appropriate and confident enough that we can approve all of them at once. That's efficient. But we'll see if the commission supports a bulk motion.

Vicki Varela: Okay, so bulk motion for the BLM projects. They're geographically diverse, they're all well thought through, they're almost to completion, and they address critical issues ranging from overcrowding to protecting resources.

Pitt Grewe: Ill second.

Rep. Stenquist: So we have a motion and a second on those. Looking at just a quick glance for myself, most of them are fairly modest dollar amounts except for maybe the river pathway, which is kind of large. What's the total amount?

Jason Curry: It looks like 6.7 million, Im looking at all of them.

Rep. Stenquist: Did you say 6.7?

Jason Curry: That's what it looks like to me if I'm looking at all the ones that say BLM. That's including so that's House on Fire, McCoy Flats, Iron County mountain bike trails, Calf Creek, and Colorado River pathway.

Josh Van Jura: So, I do want everybody to recognize that the Colorado River pathway is available for Utah Trail Network Funding. We do not have a prioritized list at this point, so I can't even say if it's on the list other than it was proposed to be part of the Utah Trail Network. So, I just want everybody to be aware of that.

Pitt Grewe: Josh read my mind because in discussion that was my in my notes to this, right? The Colorado River Project, I thought was a very viable option for Josh's program, or I guess I shouldn't call it Josh's program, but the UDOT program, and so I that I think those are my concerns in this as far as discussion goes. That one project, what could we do? I'm fine if we support some of it, but is there other options through UDOT to look at supporting that large amount? The second, my second concern with these projects was the Cedar City field office, and I know I like told you how much I love these trails when we heard these presentations, but also, I thought the match was poor from the city and the county, which is really benefiting from this trail system, and so that was a bit of a warning flag to me. I think, you know, in that case, even though it's not a crazy high amount, the trails were really expensive. I think it was like \$50,000 a mile or something, they're like pretty high cost for a trail. But also, I was hoping that Cedar City would come in a little bit more this since they really are benefiting from that. So those are my only two concerns with the BLM projects. The rest I agree with. I agree with Vicki and like the diversity of these, the different types of recreation, the different parts of the state, the multiple counties that they represent as well was incredible, and I think any help we can give the BLM is good help in a lot of cases around this state for recreation.

Jeff Hartley: So does the SR9 and US89 from Kane County, that's also NEPA, right? So that would fall under the question of expanding our authority to include NEPA.

Pitt Grewe: Yeah, I think at least one of them was, and also again another ideal candidate for the UDOT program potentially. I don't know about the NEPA side of things, but the actual construction of things like, right.

Carly Lansche: Chairman Id liek to add that we have materials from Stephanie Tomlin that showcased how those projects have ranked, particularly the Moab section of the trail, and how it's ranked actually fairly low through their prioritization model. Just for context, I'm happy to forward that to anyone if you want to review those materials.

Rep. Stenquist: So you're saying that the Moab paved trails are ranked low for the Active Transportation Fund?

Carly Lansche: Last, and please Josh correct me if I'm wrong, but in talking to Stephanie, she relayed that the project ranked low in their prioritization model last year. I don't know how much that will change this year.

Josh Van Jura: that's exactly true, Carly, and we haven't prioritized projects this year. We are using the same prioritization model, so it really becomes what subset of projects is being ranked. But that's a true statement that in previous funding allocations, it didn't rank particularly high because it's really expensive per mile. But it's also the reason that nobody's built it because it's the last section that's really hard to do.

Carly Lansche: I'll also add, too, that they're making their decisions on the Utah Trail Network in the next, I think, two weeks at the UDOT Commission meeting. So, we're in talks with their staff, with Stephanie, to figure out how we can align these processes moving forward so that we don't have this question mark of okay, will this be funded through the UTN or will this be coming out of the OAC, or how do we work together with these two programs? So, since they're both kind of new, can we split it? Yeah, we'll be able to, I think, handle that a little bit more effectively next cycle. But right now, we're just aware of the kind of odd timing.

Josh Van Jura: Timing, so it'll be the February Transportation Commission when the list will be ready. So, a little more than two weeks, but not horribly long.

Vicki Varela: I'd say we wait and see.

Rep. Stenquist: Yeah, so I wonder if, if we were to allocate a portion of the money, that maybe that would lower the cost per mile and might improve their scoring, their criteria that's what they're using, perhaps. I think that's a really good project. I fully support it, but I also would like to see that coming out of the Active Transportation Network funding. But if that's not going to happen, that would, you know, I think we miss an opportunity.

Christa Hinton: Could we make like a contingent approval of the project if they don't get the funding or maybe a match if we did have, and on the other half the other way.

Rep. Stenquist: I think we could certainly maybe include that and have that as a footnote in our recommendations to the legislature, and then maybe that could be since the legislature is going to look at that, maybe we could juggle that in the appropriation process.

Jeff Hartley: Chairman, I kind of like Christa's idea that we make it a match and contingent upon matching funding from Active Trails or Active Transportation, but I'm wondering, how do we structurally, what are our Rules of Engagement for that? Do we make a list with contingency projects that if that doesn't go through, then the projects on the B list get funded? Is that the right approach?

Rep. Stenquist: You know, unfortunately, we're making up the rules as we go along. So if we want to do it that way, I would entertain a substitute or a motion amendment.

Jason Curry: Substitute motion is that we approve all of the BLM projects except for the Colorado River pathway and consider it next.

Vicki Varela: Okay, can I make a substitute to the substitute with the addition of, I think it's very reasonable to go back to Iron County and say we'd like you to increase your contributi

Pitt Grewe: Your contribution. So, just I looked that up. An increase would be any contribution. Right now, it's a \$730,000 project. They're requesting \$500,000. The BLM has invested \$270,000 already, and that's the only match here. So, there is no match from Cedar City yet. Again, this is another one of those discussions where it could be, "Alright, we'll give you \$250,000," as an example or something like that. And then the BLM's like, "Well, great. What do we do with that?" And then we give the heads up to Cedar City that says the BLM's sitting on a bunch of money. You guys can apply for a UDOT Grant, to? Like, there's strategies there that we can help with to help Cedar City to get there. I don't know if that makes a difference because it's all money coming from different pots from the Division of Outdoor Recreation.

Jason Curry: The Division of Outdoor Recreation. But, I think any of these could be looked at through that lens. You could look at the Pine View ones and say, "Well, why isn't Huntsville or Weber County?" You could look at the Moab one and say, "Why isn't Moab... I mean".

Rep. Stenquist: we could simply approve the amount that we're comfortable with. Maybe it's \$250,000. Then, send them a message saying, "Well, we didn't allocate the full \$500. We're going to give you \$250,000, and we expect you to go back and find the \$250,000 from somewhere else, like Iron County or Cedar."

Pitt Grewe: Then, Cedar City can figure out how they get that, whether that's a mix of their budget and a grant or something like that, right?

Jason Curry: I would like to withdraw my substitute.

Vicki Varela: So, what's easiest at this point? I mean, I think a lot of this involves a lot of staff follow-up, so maybe that's something we need to sort out. Is that reasonable to you? I'm not the person staffing it in this case, so what seems reasonable to you in terms of us giving?

Jason Curry: I don't want to get too into the weeds of putting contingencies and conditions on this. I think there may be a case for it here and there

Vicki Varela: I hear you.

Jerry Taylor: Mr. Chair, I have a question. A comment when we look at these applicants and we look at that one, the Iron County mountain bike, they're asking for \$500,000. In the applicant does have \$270,000 match. We can start looking for more matches all the way around, but are we going to do that on every project if you go down to the BLM on in Garfield County, there's no way Garfield County can come up with any kind of a match that goes back the applicant has a match.

Brandy Grace: Yeah, that goes back to my point on the ROI that some communities have additional funds available where others do not. I am concerned about just doing a blanket BLM appropriation. I think it's a little bit concerning to some of our other applicants who may feel like at least let's talk about each project specifically and the merits of each project instead of just a blanket that would take a significant chunk of the money that we have available. I think that we're I don't love the message that we're sending to other applicants to do abroad we're just going to approve BLM.

Rep. Stenquist: Well, I don't think that's really the, I mean, you could make a motion to approve three projects that are all from different agencies where it's just really the efficiency of the approval of the motions and discussion at this point. And if you're not comfortable with even one of the projects or a portion of it, you can either make a motion to remove that project out for separate discussion, or we can or vote no. So, it sounds like, is anybody comfortable making making a motion kind of maybe wrap up this discussion?

Pitt Grewe: I'll give it a shot. And I'll keep it simple. I make a motion that we fund the House on Fire project with the BLM, the McCoy Flats New Campground, and the Calf Creek Recreation Site improvements.

Jerry Taylor: I would like to second that

Rep. Stenquist: Okay, we have a motion to approve those three projects. Any further discussion on that motion? Right, seeing none, let's take a voice vote. All in favor of that motion, say "aye".

Unanimous approval for funding "House on Fire project BLM, the McCoy Flats New Campground, and the Calf Creek Recreation Site improvements"

Rep. Stenquist: Those three projects are approved, further motions?

Jeff Hartley: I'd like to make a motion that we fund the request from Beaver County at \$3.5million and encourage them to seek a direct appropriation from the state or otherwise find some funding. The reason that I'm sympathetic to their challenge is because they have such a small population and they're not like Grand County or Moab; they don't have the ability to fund big projects, and their tourism is truly limited. This seems to be something that could benefit not only them but the whole Paiute Trail system. Not to mention the forest health that benefits from better management, things like that. It's a huge number that they're asking for, but I think if we funded part of it, they could try to get a direct appropriation from the state or find other ways to fund the rest of it. But again, I don't know how you make that half funding contingent on the rest of their funding.

Brandy Grace: Ill second this motion. I agree. It's a big ask, but there's a huge need for Beaver County.

Pitt Grewe: I honestly think there's a huge opportunity here. Now that Scott's back in the room, for Scott to figure out how to make this work. Whether it's a direct appropriation from the state or maybe it's a state park funded to take over management of this as part of the agreement. I think there's a huge opportunity to make that Puffer Lake a really cool destination for Beaver County.

Rep. Stenquist: So are you speaking in favor for the motion?

Pitt Grewe: Yeah for the 3.5 Million, yes.

Rep. Stenquist: Okay so so we have a motion and a second more discussion on the motion?

Chase Pili: This is Chase here and maybe Tara can clarify. We have that OHV land acquisition grant up to a million dollars. I don't know if that can supplement that with the pyute trail system and trail head opportunities so close for both snowmobile as well as the dirt side of OHV, and our agency also provides another 30 grand for plowing, in addition with UDOT up there with the contract. So that's what we provide for that. Is that something that could also supplement?

Tara Mckee: Yes that could supplement

Scott Strong: Chair, I'd like to speak in support of it as well. I appreciate Pitt and his pitch for state parks. It would be excellent to have a property or a facility within Beaver County for state parks. We don't currently have a state park in Beaver County.

Jason Curry: I also speak in favor of Beaver County's ability to make this work. They've demonstrated through the Minersville project and others that they have the ability to make something like this actually pretty successful.

Rep. Stenquist: Okay, any further discussion on the motion? If not, I'll take a voice vote. All in favor, say aye.

Everyone: Aye

Rep. Stenquist: Any opposed?

Unanimous approval for funding "Beaver County Project"

Patrick Morrison: If I can just interject real quick, I'm very happy we have Shane here. He can help kind of explain what we need to do really quick and then give you more reasoning for the Avalanche Center application.

Shane Stroud: So, let me just preface by saying the Avalanche project sounds like a fantastic project that would benefit the residents of the state and visitors. It would actually, I think, increase access to both the backcountry and maybe some of the near-country. I talked with P about this, and there are some limitations under the section of the code that pertains to the Outdoor Recreation Initiative. The initiative can fund outdoor recreation infrastructure, and that definition is rather limited under the code currently. Outdoor recreation infrastructure is defined as trail or trailhead infrastructure, like signage and trail crossings, campgrounds and day sites, water recreation infrastructure, and outdoor recreation facilities accessible to visitors with disabilities. So, when we're talking about projects funded with Recreation Initiative money, it's those types of actual on-the-ground infrastructure accessible to visitors. This is definitely something that would benefit visitors to outdoor recreation sites and would increase the ability of folks to access that infrastructure. But under a strict reading of the code, it's probably not subject to funding by the Outdoor Recreation Initiative as it's currently drafted. Now, that calls into question maybe... Patrick said a code change might be necessary to increase the types of projects for which this funding could be used to allow it to be used for these types of projects that increase the ability of people to access these outdoor recreation facilities, even if the project itself is not classified as outdoor recreation infrastructure. Just to make clear, there is a pending piece of legislation this session, House Bill 90, sponsored by Representative Stenquist, that does broaden the definition of outdoor recreation infrastructure to include other types of on-the-ground infrastructure. But it probably still would not be broad enough to capture this particular project. Additionally, to the extent the commission wanted to use this type of money for specific purposes pertaining to, for example, NEPA planning, it would probably be better to have that as an explicit allowance under the code. Currently,



the code doesn't seem to anticipate necessarily that these monies might be used for planning expenses. I'm happy to answer any questions that the commission might have.

Rep. Stenquist: I think that probably provides good clarity. So, thanks for that. And we can talk more in the future about whether or not we want to include that in the statute. Are there any additional motions? Do we have

Michelle McConkie: I would make a motion to include the Experiential Corridor for the Zion National Park Discovery Center. This would address a huge need, the overcrowding in Zion. It opens up a new area. There's a large number of stakeholders who have already put a lot of time, planning, and money committed to this. I think it's a well-planned project that could really change that part of the state.

Vicki Varela: I would like to second this motion

Pitt Grewe: In discussion, I fully support it. The state's all in on this and has been for years, so we should continue the investment

Rep. Stenquist: I'll just speak about my views. To me, it seems like an experiential trail landscaping, but it doesn't really seem like a recreation trail per se. It's mostly just enhancing that Visitor Center. So, I didn't consider that very highly because it just seemed like it wasn't traditional outdoor recreation necessarily

Vicki Varela: I was just reviewing the budget, and I understand your point. I think that goes to perhaps some discussion because I had questions along the same lines about the Vernal proposal.

Rep. Stenquist: Yeah, I kind of felt the same way. That one's... I mean, it seems like a fantastic project, but it's more of a city park, and I'm not really, that's not really in my mind the vision of where these funds should go towards, you know? And the Visitor Center, I think, is great, but it's not really building recreation trails. It's just an experiential thing that's, you know, like a nature walking trail around the Visitor Center that enhances the Visitor Center itself. But I just don't know that that's really the best use of this funding.

Vicki Varela: I understand what you're saying, and I thought about that myself. Because they're doing so much on trail buildout, in an ideal scenario, you might have said to the Zion Forever group, "You should apply for the trail portion of what you need." The reason I came to feel comfortable with this one is that it is part of the fabric of a comprehensive, expanded recreation network that is essential to alleviating overcrowding and providing a high-quality recreation experience.

Jeff Hartley: Does anyone know if there are other funding sources available for that? Are there grants or other sources they could seek funding from, since it's part of the expanded Visitor Center experience?

Tara Mckee: we have now the Utah Outdoor Recreation Grant, but we don't have \$5 million to give. Now, could we get you to turn on a mic, please? Sorry. I was just going to say that since Goyo moved, our office was taken over there with the grant, which is the Utah Outdoor Recreation Grant that you're referring to. The most that we can provide at this point for any one grant is \$750,000. The Iron County mountain bike trails would be a perfect opportunity for them to come to and apply for the UORG grant. This one with a \$5 million ask is a little too rich for that particular grant program.

Wondering, and could I also add that, just on the trail side of things with the experiential, this is just opinion, that we've got a lot of city folk, to them, that's their first experience with the trail and kind of call it Trail Lite

Rep. Stenquist: There's no further discussion on the motion. I'll go ahead and take a voice vote. All in favor, say "I". I will take a voice vote.

\*Roll Call Vote because of opposition\* - Jason Curry took this roll call vote

5 "yes" votes and 4 "no" votes. The "yes" votes were from Michelle, Jerry, Jeff, Vicky, and Scott. The "no" votes were from Brandy, Rep. Stenquist (Chair), Josh, and Christa. So the tally is 5 yes votes and 4 no votes, meaning the motion passes with a vote of 5-4.

Motion Passed for funding "Experiential Corridor for the Zion National Park Discovery Center"

Rep. Stenquist: I'd like to make a motion to approve the Puffer Lake property acquisition.

Jason Curry: I would like to second it.

Rep. Stenquist: I think that there's some urgency around that project, and it's an area that needs, you know, I think it's some land worth preserving for recreation.

Jeff Hartley: I actually will vote in opposition to that. I wonder why they couldn't, through the rezoning process they'll have to go through with the city, get the trail access that they'll need. They could do that with the wildlife corridor, which would also have to be negotiated. And I also don't see the land mass itself, the bulk of land they're talking about, as benefiting recreation. These two trails exist, but the bulk of that land isn't dedicated to recreation. It's just going to be preserved as open space. And while that has value, I don't know who's going to maintain it and create something that's recreation-related. So, I think that they could otherwise preserve the trail network or get the trails established, the trailhead access established, through negotiations with the landowners. And it's just a very expensive way to do it, I think. So, that's my piece.

Brandy Gace: that's how I felt. I thought a conservation easement might be better suited for what they're trying to accomplish. It seemed like a significant price tag for what really is conservation, at least immediately.

Jason Curry: And keeping in mind that the ask from this body is two million, which is small in comparison

Brandy Grace: I would just say, too, I don't know all of the zoning issues there, but I don't know how much they could negotiate that. Like, I don't know what kind of leverage they would have with the city. If it's an entitlement and they have that zoning and they can get the water, I'll just throw that out there, not knowing all of the circumstances. I'm not sure how much leverage they really would have with the city there.

Jason Curry: Right. The other thing that bears in my mind is that it's a small price tag for this account to pay in order to secure access onto the adjacent public lands. The land itself may not be high value in terms of outdoor recreation as it is now. We don't know the future of that, but the fact that it would allow people to access the adjacent lands is foremost in my mind.

Vicky Varlea: In my mind, I think I support it. Kate made a very good point that we don't have any formal commitments from the city or the Cache County group, and I think this is one that I'd like to have asked staff to follow up on to get those commitments. So, my vote would be contingent on that.

Jerry Taylor: I think that if I was doing this project, the first thing I would have done is I would have taken a survey of my community to see how many of them wanted it kept in open spaces rather than have it developed. I'd like to see them have done that as well.

Rep. Stenquist: Well, okay. So, I think we'll go ahead and take a roll call vote on this one. Someone could conduct that.

Michelle McConkie: First question: Are we following Vicki's motion to have it be contingent on what exactly?

Rep. Stenquist: I'm not sure how you would like to make your vote contingent

Vicki Varela: I am going to assume that it doesn't happen unless the local commitments are made on this.

Rep. Stenquist: So, just to follow our maybe some procedures here, Vicki was saying that she would like to have her vote contingent. Vicki, I don't know how you can make your vote contingent. It's either going to be a yes or a no, yeah, unless you want to make a motion. Right? Unless you want to make a motion to, you know, or substitute motion that it's somehow contingent on. I mean, and certainly, you know, we can say that they're awarded this, but if they don't go through with it, I think our staff would hold on, you know, wouldn't actually write them a check back until they had closed the deal, um, or in order to close the deal. So it would be contingent on them closing the deal, regardless. I think that's kind of a given.

Vicki Varela: Yeah, I will leave it at that. I'm going to assume that it doesn't happen unless the local commitments are embodied in all of this. And so, I don't need to change my motion. Okay? Okay, I'm not asking to change the motion.

\*Roll Call Vote\* - Jason Curry took this roll call vote

So the tally is 6 yes votes and 5 no votes, meaning the motion passes with a vote of 6-5.

Brandy Grace: No, and if I could just say, Mr. Chairman, a couple of thoughts. Is there's a sense of urgency based on the possibility that water is allocated, but the land... I mean, the landowner is trying to recover money based on the possibility of the city releasing additional water. And so, I think we're paying a price tag based on a sense of urgency that's been created that may or may not be accurate because if there's no water, it's undevelopable land, nothing's going to happen. I would like to, if there's maybe a possibility because I am interested in protecting access to the trails, and I think Pit made a comment about even Box Elder County and how they're impacted by this. So, if there were a smaller amount of land that maybe could be purchased to provide access to that trail, I would be interested in knowing if that's maybe something that we could go back and visit with them

Motion Passed for funding "Puffer Lake property acquisition"

Rep. Stenquist: What do you have to on our totals again? I don't know if I saw that. Oh, here we go, \$15,000. Okay, \$15 million. Sorry, we're getting up there.

Josh Van Jura: I'm interested in everybody's thoughts on the shooting range. I think it's a really interesting concept. It differs from the other projects and might serve as a gateway for the younger generation to explore the shooting range and just get into the greater outdoors. But I have mixed emotions on it also, so that's why I'm not making a motion.

Jason Curry: Okay, here's my thought on it, if I can. I think it's a great project. I think there's some really good merits. There is a need there for sure. I just don't know if it's ripe yet in terms of the land acquisition and how that's going to take place. And it's going to be there, you know, as a possibility for us to consider in the future, possibly.

Brandy Grace: I think there's absolutely a need. I think the amount of money that they're asking for in comparison to the investment is like... that's a really good deal. I ranked it very high on the ROI. I just wondered if there wasn't another funding source that might be better suited. I don't know if they're providing a number of employees where maybe based on new employees to pay, and there might be some other incentives that they would be eligible for.

Jeff Hartely: I'll weigh in on this. I love this so much. All I care about is hunting, so I think what they're doing is great. However, they said that they don't have their land acquisition in place with BLM, and it's been sticky. So, it could take some time before they actually are able to get their land. And while that, I think that's geographically, it's a smart location because the West Front is going to continue to expand south, there may be other locations that they could find down the road, could get some land from Michelle, be a great partnership with Trust Lands. But they also mentioned that they have a huge foundation that is well endowed, which tells me they may not need our money to complete the project. It'd be nice to have but not a need to have.

Rep. Stenquist: I thought this as well.

Pitt Grewe: I had the same thoughts as Jeff, like the BLM land acquisition was like an inti like big red flag, um, just because we don't know. As opposed to working with the city or the county or the state and Michelle, you know, like whatever the opportunity is, like why they went straight to the hardest nut to crack was interesting, in my opinion, as far as land acquisition goes. And then, yeah, the private sector funding possibility for Southern Utah County is kind of through the roof, right? So why isn't that being kind of the first point to ask with their foundation?

Rep. Stenquist: I'd like to make a motion that we allocate \$2.5 million for completing the Colorado River Parkway Trail. I'll throw that out for consideration.

Jason Curry: I will second that. And Mr. Stroud and I had an opportunity to experience that shortfall on the Colorado River this last year.

Rep. Stenquist: Yeah, I've experienced that many times. And there is a nexus with unpaved trails in the sense that, yeah, it's a paved trail, but it really allows people that are completing the whole enchilada trail to safely get back to town.

Shane Stroud: The one thing I'll say about that portion of the road that is not complete is you're so exhausted by the time you get there that you don't really realize what you're doing. So, it would, to that end, it would be nice to have that completed because it would be much safer for exhausted trail riders.

Jeff Hartley: Did the matching funding that's available for this is Grant County putting anything into this? And maybe I'd ask Commissioner Taylor and Brandy to weigh in on the ability for Grant County to participate. Unlike Beaver County, Grant County has the ability to raise and use funds because their tourism is so strong, and the completion of this trail certainly adds to their tourism dollar availability. So, I just wondered that question.

Jerry Taylor: Well, first off, I don't have any idea about Grand County, so I think they've got a lot of money.

Brandy Grace: Yeah, a lot of tourism-related dollars. Um, a good portion of it's restricted for certain uses.

Rep. Stenquist: So, yeah, that's probably a good point is that, you know, for example, TRT taxes probably couldn't be used for a project like this, I would imagine.

Tara Mckee: Question for Josh If this two and a half million was all that was needed to complete this project, would that up its score potentially with the Utah Trails group within your organization?

Josh Van Jura: Certainly, lower funding dollars would help. Price is not a huge component, and I don't have the prioritization network in front of me. Certainly, it would help, right, just because it's a lower allocation of the total dollar value. Chair, can I ask to abstain from any votes that might put me in an employment conflict?

Rep. Stenquist: You absolutely can abstain.

Vicki Varela: It does say in their application, Grand County is also pursuing funding to support this project. We don't really know what that means. I think they could use their portion of TRT for development for this, couldn't they, Brandy?

Brandy Grace: Yeah. Um, I also wondered about if we could also talk about not remembering the one that I believe was a campground near Wayne County, um, similar situation where a development near Wayne County could really be helpful to them.

Pitt Grewe: We have gotten to the forest service yet.

Brandy Grace: Yeah, that's a Forest Service project, the Kent Lake, maybe?

Pitt Grewe: No that was Mesa, but I think we need to vote on this motion before we move on.

Jeff Hartley: Can we look at totals before we move on?

Rep. Stenquist: 15, so this would take us up to 17 and a half, and we're almost to the max.

Pitt Grewe: Let me ask again, this is for appropriation in the coming fiscal year.

Rep. Stenquist: I think we're probably talking about the current fiscal year.

Pitt Grewe: so we still have room for projects that maybe aren't that might need a little more time to negotiate or do preparation or whatever for recommendations for next fiscal year, correct, right?

Rep. Stenquist: Correct.

Pitt Grewe: Roll call vote for that?

Rep. Stenquist: Yeah lets do a roll call vote.

Michelle McConkie: So are we asking for the entire 5 million for this or was it 2.5.

Rep. Stenquist: I suggested 2.5.

\*Roll Call Vote\* - Jason Curry took this roll call vote

6 "yes" votes and 3 "no" votes. The "yes" votes were from Michelle, Jerry, Vicki, Jason, Christa, and Rep. Stenquist. The "no" votes were from Jeff Hartley, Pitt, and Brandy. So the tally is 6 yes votes and 3 no votes, meaning the motion passes with a vote of 6-3.

Motion Passed for funding "Colorado River Parkway Trail."

Pitt Grewe: So, I want to make another motion, but I want to also mention that these Forest Service projects are all pretty large ticket items now. We're running out of money on that. For discussion of the Forest Service projects, I think the one that was most intriguing to me was that Meeks Mesa because of the county that it lies in. It just has not been able to take advantage of our grants very much, and it hosts a very popular National Park. That was just a huge need for that, which I thought was fascinating. That being said, it's one of the bigger requests minus the Pine view project. So, there are lower hanging fruit in the Forest Service projects. There were a handful. I think the Kent Lake and maybe the Spruces were also ones that I think are like 75% done. They're just asking for money to help cover the inflation costs and from the GOA money that they got, federal money they got. So, those are also the other ones to take into consideration as priority instead of leaving those projects partially unfinished that have already made so much progress and can be done probably as soon as the snow melts this year. It would make an impact really quickly.

Jason Curry: Yeah, the Duck Creek and Spruces, that's about a \$2.5 million request. Those are both shovel-ready, high match ratio due to the Great American Outdoors Act funding. I was unclear about the Meeks Mesa one if there is NEPA required on that.

Brandy Grace: I would move that we put the Meeks Mesa campground next on the prioritization after we go through the next phase of working with the applicants and making sure that we know exactly what money's being distributed. That this be next on the list for consideration. I would move that we put

Jerry Taylor: Ill second that

Rep. Stenquist: That's so, to clarify, do we want to put that in the recommendation for fiscal year 24-25?

Brandy Grace: Well, I would say sooner if one of these other projects falls off or they're not able to secure other funding that's anticipated, and if not, then carry it to the next year.

Pitt Grewe: Yeah. And just to review, Patrick had that up. NEPA is scheduled to be done. It started. It's scheduled to be done in June 2024. Cultural inventory scheduled to be done early 2024. Engineering's done, but there is still a handful of traffic study, geotechnical stuff. Um, and so it's saying construction 2026 is what it's saying right now is the plan.

Rep. Stenquist: Yeah, so if we allocated that out of the 2024-2025 fiscal year, it's still ahead of when they could actually use that money.

Pitt Grewe: Yeah, I don't know which part of the money they're using for construction versus they might be using some of this money for the geotechnical, you know, and engineering plans and stuff like that, but maybe they can get it, maybe partial funding, maybe they can put it on their AMX and pay it off.

Brandy Grace: So maybe partial funding

Rep. Stenquist: Especially if they're talking about June, and I mean because the fiscal year starts July.

Vicki Varela: I'm having trouble finding the link. What is the price tag again?

Brandy Grace: 4.5 million.

Jason Curry: Yeah, they've secured funding for the traffic study and the geotech. It has been secured.

Pitt Grewe: Oh yeah, funding secured.

Rep. Stenquist: I'll mention too, I mean, we talked about allocating money in the current and future fiscal year, but if I think we could have, you know, a future meeting in a few months to, you know, basically we could start putting together recommendations for next year. We don't really have to have all those, all of that money recommended for the upcoming fiscal year because that money, you know, just like now we're, you know, we're already in 2024 and we're, we're just now providing recommendations. So, um, that is a consideration that we could, um, we could have additional meetings for additional project recommendations in the future, I suppose. We don't necessarily need to feel like we have to do all of that, you know, for both fiscal years tonight.

Josh Van Jura: That seems like another opportunity for a new project nomination period as well, potentially.

Carly Lansche: Would that mean the meeting on March 12th would be the next date for this commission to get together?

Rep. Stenquist: I mean, if we meet after the session, then really we're looking at next year's legislative session for that allocation. But so I guess it just depends on what the feeling of the commission is if we want to allocate those now. Of course, we could take a vote now and then in next year's as we're considering recommendations for next year's session, we could always make modifications.

Jeff Hartley: Mr. Chairman. Do we have an appropriation ask for the commission for next year?

Rep. Stenquist: No so money is going into the fund, and so what we're really doing is we're providing a recommendation for the legislature to allocate that money out of the fund. You know, whatever money is in the fund, we're just recommending these are the projects that we are recommending the legislature fund out of the restricted account.

Jason Curry: Just to clarify, the restricted account is funded through a sales tax, several miscellaneous codes in sales tax

Rep. Stenquist: The money is going into the restricted account automatically. Yes.

Pitt Grewe: A motion. Can take another low-hanging fruit here. I make a motion that we fund the Spruces Campground at \$412,000. Do I have a second?

Jason Curry: Ill second that

Jeff Hartley: I'd like to make a substitute motion that we fund the Spruces Campground at the requested amount and allocate the balance of what we have left to the Duck Creek Campground.

Pitt Grewe: I can second that

Jason Curry: That, I think, is a good motion.

Pitt Grewe: As far as discussion, what was the status of the Duck Creek? I didn't look at the status of the Duck Creek as far as shovel ready.

Jason Curry: it's just a shortfall basically, and they're just looking for money to fill in the gaps for that.

Pitt Grewe: How much will we have remaining?

Jason Curry: 1.5

Pitt Grewe: Yeah, remaining, we'll have close to a million, maybe remaining.

Jeff Hartley: I thought we had. Did we vote on the Meeks Campground? What do we do with that?

Brandy Grace: For next year, next year's funding because they're not ready.

Patrick Morrison: I do not have Meek Mesa on this list. Is that correct

Rep. Stenquist: Okay, so to clarify the motion is to fund the Meeks Mesa out of the next fiscal year's allocation. Is that correct?

Brandy Grace: Yes

Jeff Hartley: The next available TR funding.

Rep. Stenquist: Yeah, okay. So, um, there's no further discussion on that motion. I'll take a voice vote on that one. All in favor, say "I." Any opposed?

Unanimously passed to fund "Meeks Mesa out of the next years allocation"

Rep. Stenquist: So, let's go. Pit, do you want to restate your motion?

Pitt Grewe: I'll actually just restate Jeff's motion, but I'll make a motion to fund the Spruces Campground at its full requested amount, and then allocate the remaining balance of our appropriated dollars to go towards the Duck Creek Campground project.

Jason Curry: Ill second that vote

Rep. Stenquist: Does your motion include that the additional funding request for Duck Creek be funded out of next year's allocation?

Pitt Grewe: Sure, I won't add it to my motion, but will somebody take note that we want to do that?

Rep. Stenquist: More discussion on that. I'll take a voice vote on that one. All in favor, say "I." Any opposed?

Unanimously passed to fund "Duck Creek Campground Project"

Pitt Grewe: So, to be clear, we'll add the Spruces first and see what the remaining amount is.

Patrick Morrison: So, just to clarify, are we trying to allocate the remaining funds to reach a total of 19 million?

Pitt Grewe: So, unless there is more than 19 million available, we're looking to allocate the remaining funds accordingly.

Rep. Stenquist: There's more than I think there is more than 19 million.

Pitt Grewe: More than 19 million. Unless there's enough to cover all of it, but I don't think there's that much interest.

Patrick Morrison: Currently, it's going to be \$764,900 if we're getting to that 19 million mark.

Pitt Grewe: That's what's left?

Patrick Morrison: Yeah

Pitt Grewe: Could be more though if there a little more in there?

Patrick Morrison: But I don't have those numbers on me though.

Jeff Hartley: Representative, I'd like to make a motion to adjourn.

Rep. Stenquist: There's a motion to adjourn all in favor of that motion say "aye"

Everyone: Aye

Unanimously passed "to Adjourn the meeting"