

RAP TAC Meeting
3.1.2023

Called to order at 5:02 pm

In attendance: Richard Codd, Neal Clark, Molly Taylor, Annie McVay, Emily Roberson, Kelley McInerney

Absent: Barbara Hicks, Jason Taylor

Citizens to be Heard: None

Approval of the minutes from the 11.29.2022 meeting, passed 4-0.

Approval of Moab Recreation Arts and Parks Technical Advisory Committee Resolution 01-2023 to hold electronic meetings, passed 4-0

Annie McVay– We have received 20 applications totaling over \$220,000. Our available funding for this year is \$93,000.

Discussion of RAP Tax Project Guidelines and Evaluation Process

- Current criteria include:
 - Quality of Proposed Project
 - Demonstrated Community Need
 - Benefits to the Community
 - The Organization’s History, ability to implement project and financial considerations
- Neal - Should we assign values to the ratings rather than just using poor-fair-good-very good-excellent, this will give us a score that we can use to then rank the projects
- Richard - Are we able to give partial funding to a group or project?
 - Yes, this committee will provide a list of the recommendations in terms of projects and funding amounts
 - In terms of awarding partial funding, the group will want to consider the viability of the project if that is the case
- Emily – each member compile projects on a spreadsheet and score them with a number system, then the all members scores could be brought together and they can compare notes on each project as well, including notes on a partial vs full fund preference
- Molly – question about how community contributions committee allocated funds
 - There was the initial recommendation and then there was some moving around and totaling to see where the total number of allocated funds vs available funds was compared
 - We could do this as a larger group after all the projects are reviewed
- Evaluation criteria points system
 - Suggestion to use 1-5 or 1-10
 - Average the committee members scores
 - Some Committee members will have to abstain from scoring projects if there is a conflict of interest so the average scores will be the fairest way to review and score the projects
- Emily – do we want to consider also taking into consideration single/one time projects vs ongoing projects/programs. Also take into consideration high impact and high visibility projects. The group is interested in increasing the lifespan and likability of the RAP Tax and want to fund high impact and popular projects

- Neal – want to also consider funding a diversity of projects, not all arts or all recreation, but a good mix of the categories
- Each application should be labeled as a category so that the committee can see the spread of projects
 - If a project has elements of arts and parks, label as the majority
- If during the review of the applications, the committee members have questions
 - Direct questions to City Staff, Annie
 - Annie will compile the questions and email the group
 - Avoid emailing the whole group so as to avoid any discussion among committee members prior to open public meeting
- The committee would like a spreadsheet with the project scores all combined and averaged to view before the next meeting
 - Committee review deadline: March 22nd
 - Staff will compile and get back to the committee by the 24th so they have the weekend to review
 - During the meeting on the 29th they can discuss and provide recommendations on funding based on the scores
- Neal – recommends taking notes as well as scoring on each application so that during the discussion each member will be able to reference thoughts on why they made scoring decisions
- Should the categories be weighted based on importance?
 - For example, some groups that applied expressed concern that they would score low in the organization history section as they are a new group or just getting started, lack of financial history documents
 - Could use a 100 point total and weigh each category, assign a percentage
- Point system for categories as follows:
 - 10 - Quality of Proposed Project
 - 10 - Demonstrated Community Need
 - 10 - Benefits to the Community
 - 5 - The Organization's History, ability to implement project and financial considerations
 - Perfect score of 35 points

Timeline

- Committee Review & Score, provide to staff: March 22nd
- Next Meeting: March 29th
- Tentative Council Review and Vote: late April meeting
- Checks sent out the latest by the end of the City's Fiscal Year, ends June 30th

Notes for next year, Debrief, Application Feedback

- Groups found that the 500 character limit was very difficult to adhere to
- The budget sheet was confusing to some applicants
 - They were advised to submit a budget sheet they were comfortable with, and the committee could ask follow up questions if needed

- Advised the group to compile notes and feedback on the process so that they can have a debrief after reviewing applications and going the process for the first time

Next Meeting Date: Wednesday, March 29th at 5:00pm

Meeting adjourn: 5:45 pm