



MAY 2, 2023  
REGULAR MEETING - 5:00 P.M.

**City Council Chambers**  
**217 East Center Street**  
**Moab, Utah 84532**

1. Call To Order
2. Citizens To Be Heard
3. Approval Of Minutes From The March 29, 2023 Meeting

Documents:

[RAP TAC MEETING NOTES 3.29.2023.DOCX](#)

4. Review Of The 2023 RAP Tax Grant Process
5. Adjournment

**Special Accommodations:**

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals needing special accommodations during this meeting should notify the Recorder's Office at 217 East Center Street, Moab, Utah 84532; or phone (435) 259-5121 at least three (3) working days prior to the meeting.

Check our website for updates at: [www.moabcity.org](http://www.moabcity.org)

**RAP TAC Meeting**  
**3.29.2023**

Called to order at 5:01 pm

In attendance: Richard Codd, Molly Taylor, Barbara Hicks, Annie McVay, Emily Roberson, Kelley McInerney

Virtual via Zoom: Neal Clark

Absent: Jason Taylor

Citizens to be Heard: None

Approval of the minutes from the 3.1.2022 meeting, passed 4-0, Barbara was absent from the meeting and abstained from voting.

The group received and reviewed 20 applications totaling over \$220,000, each member scored them and the scores were compiled and averaged.

Available funding for this year is \$93,000.

**Discussion of RAP Tax Project scores and funding allocation**

- Clay Artisans application and Community Cycles eligibility questions clarified by Annie
- The group is open to members changing their scores if the discussion comes to that consensus
- Neal – general comments on applications and scoring, he scored projects low if they had fundraising elements or general operating support was included rather than more specific project expenses
- Emily – suggested separating applications out into one time projects vs ongoing programs, to help the group categorize and review
- Molly – in terms of applications that are looking for yearly programs, they would need to use the funding for this year's projects
- Richard – suggestion to start the fund allocation process, start with the top ten scores and see what funding them fully brings the total too
  - Annie shared her screen to show the scores ranked and funding requested
  - Some other members wanted to have more flexibility to partially fund some projects and see if more could get a portion of the available tax
- Emily – are we trying to fund as many as possible or get applicants fully funded; the group can also start by eliminating projects we don't want to fund
- USARA project
  - One member scored it low because they were under the impression it was only for a small group, however the committee clarified that it is open to the public but put on by USARA and Skate Moab as a free community event
- Two applications were missing their 501(c)3 letters, they had tax exempt letters but not the non-profit letters, Barbara wanted to vote to eliminate these
  - The group consensus was to eliminate these applications due to not meeting the requirements – the Community Cycles and Mountain Bike Association
- Budget sheets missing in some applications
  - Several groups contacted Annie with concerns over the budget spreadsheet provided, they found it confusing. She said it was ok if they did not use it but provided another form of budget information for the committee to review so this should not be counted against them

- Will make a note for next year's applications
- Committee Members Abstaining from scoring and voting on certain applications due to conflicts of interest
  - Emily – Youth Garden Project
  - Richard – Arts Council, KZMU, and Arts Festival
  - Neal – KZMU
- Friends of Anonymous Bike Park
  - Concerns regarding the restoration of a flood plain area and unclear sections on application
  - Counterpoint – the flooding in 2022 was not regular levels and the park gets a lot of use, restoration would be valuable; there are already existing structures at the park including jumps, parking, and restrooms
- This year with the process being new, give some leeway on applications
  - Some applicants are not well established groups or are volunteer operated and do not have staff that could put the application together, they might have lower quality applications but should still be considered and have access to these taxpayer funds
- Funding allocation – start going down the list and do partial, see where it lands the total
- Moab Museum Project – neat project but questions on practicality and reach of vinyl, possibly if we don't have enough this year consider funding at another time
- Canyonlands Arts Council (Moab Arts Council) – eliminated due to lack of clear project presented (Richard abstained from voting)
- Free Health Clinic
  - Fundraiser/donor tree and mural on the back of the building
  - Eliminated 5-0
- Clay Artisans – eliminated due to fundraising element
- The Committee wanted to share that all applications presented great projects but due to limited funds, they needed to narrow down the list based on scores and proposed projects
- In separating out the one-time cost/projects and ongoing annual programs, the one time projects had generally scored lower but the group consensus is that in giving partial funds to annual programs there can still be funding for the projects and give those groups/organizations a chance to get going and provide new opportunities for the community
- RC – in terms of next years applications and scoring, do we want to put a higher weight on new projects to help promote them
  - Emily – not necessarily because this tax is a way to help existing annual programs continue, they are well attended popular events
- List of projects is presented on the screen in order from highest scored to lows with the requested funding amount, the group will go down the list and allocate funding and look at the total at the end to determine if they can add more to each application or if they need to cut
- USARA – circle back to this project if funds remain at the end, its free and open to the community, is promoting diversity and inclusion, lower budget project
- FEM (Fast Pitch Softball for young women) – return to this project as well if funds available, new program, something that does not currently exist in the community
- Anonymous Park Restoration project – Richard was against the project without seeing a proposed site plan due to flooding concerns, the other committee members were in favor of funding as the flooding that occurred in 2022 was not regular and the park gets a lot of use in the community, it was agreed that the application felt incomplete

- Moab Youth Cycling – concerns from Molly and Richard on lack of partnerships but it is a newer group and they say in their application that they are looking to form more partnerships and provided increased access to youth
- Total at the end of going down the list was just shy of the available \$93K, the remainder was added to the USARA application
- Motion to approve the recommended funding allocation to present to the City Council, was approved 5-0

### **Timeline**

- Plan to present to City Council on April 25th
- Tentative next RAP TAC meeting for feedback and notes for next year, not yet scheduled.

### **Review and Lessons Learned from the RAP Tax Application Process**

- Alterations to the budget sheet and application form for ease of use
- Consider separating out projects into categories and allocate a percentage to each (Arts, Parks, Recreation, Trails)
- Consider changing the allocation split of City projects versus external applications, this year was 80/20, maybe next could be 70/30
- Committee members will send some notes they have to Annie for compilation

**Meeting adjourn:** 7:26 pm