

## **Passive Recreation Lands: Subcommittee Questions & Answers**

### **Overall**

- If the committee elects to NOT award all funds requested this round, does the County commission still have the flexibility to allocate the remaining funds without our recommendation or would that money be held over for a next round of funding requests?
  - If there are funds remaining after this round of funding requests, there is no guarantee that the Commission would wait for another application process to allocate the funding. As such, we encourage the Subcommittee to continue basing decisions on the quality of the proposals we've received and their alignment with the goals of the Bond.
- Are we going to require an appraisal so that we are paying proper FMV for land?
  - Yes – If the County is to acquire any land, we would require an appraisal. The final purchase price would be based on the appraisal and negotiations with the seller.
- Does the organization rewarded have the capacity to use the funds in the time window of the bond, and what are the recourses if we exceed the time window?
  - The Bond's timeline requires that all funds be *allocated* by 2030. It does not require that the funds be spent in that time. That said, we obviously do not want these projects to drag on forever, and each proposal included a project timeline. For any project receiving funding, we would work with them to develop a scope and timeline for the use of Bond funds. If they are unable to meet the agreed upon timeline, they would need to request an extension.

### **33 +/- acres on Sandhill Road**

- Has County staff or commissioners expressed an interest in buying and maintaining this property? If so, shouldn't there be a formal appraisal of the value?
  - County staff from the Planning and Recreation departments have confirmed that the County would be able to manage and maintain this property and that it provides synergy with the Sports Park and Enka Heritage Trail. They have refrained from confirming or denying explicit support to allow for objectivity in the PRL process.
  - If the project is approved, we would require a formal appraisal and enter into contract negotiations with the landowner. This would determine the exact purchase price for the acquisition.
- Would County be interested in extending the Enka Heritage Trails for the 1 mile along Hominy Creek?
  - If the project is approved, the County would explore extending the EHT through the property.

### **Ridgecrest Connector**

- Funding for an engineering study is still being sought. Seems a little risky to grant funding for the multi-use trails, if there is no guarantee that an engineering study can be done on time?
  - The Town is still pursuing funding for the engineering study. They are exploring less expensive options that would still allow them to move forward.

### **Riverside Park Improvement**

- The Subcommittee members have heard conflicting statements about whether or not the Wave bypass is funded. Can you please confirm whether this part of the project is funded, or is the Bond request including funds for the bypass?

- “This is understandably confusing – the Riverside Park Expansion project was underfunded by \$900,079, based on our current contract, with \$850,760 of that gap attributed to the Wave by-pass. To keep the Expansion project viable and on-schedule, the Woodfin Town Council agreed to appropriate funds from our fund balance, hoping that Passive Rec would come through and allow those funds to be replenished. If we had to wait for funding, we felt it would pose a serious risk to the project.”
- Will any of the requested Bond funds be used for the completion of the greenway?
  - “Yes. Only the rough grading and gravel subbase for the half of the greenway that is in the Expansion park is currently funded - the paving and guardrails (separating the greenway from the parking and railroad) is not funded, nor is any part of the other half of the greenway included in the Improvement park area. So, our Passive Rec. ask includes completing the greenway in the Expansion park, and all of the greenway in the Improvement park.”

### **Weaverville Watershed Trails and Wildlife Preserve**

- Included in this application is \$220,000 for maintenance. Is that allowable under the guidelines?
  - The guidelines do not disallow short-term maintenance. The budget includes maintenance costs of \$55,000 per year from 2026 – 2029.

### **Woodmen Trailhead & Educational Park**

- Do we know exactly what is for sale and what easements would be available?
  - As of the site visit, there is a developer moving forward with purchasing the property. If the sale goes through, the applicant is asking that we use the acquisition funding to pursue an easement along the property for the trail. The developer has expressed general interest in supporting the project, but there is nothing in writing. If the sale does not go through, the funding would be used for acquisition.
  - If the project is approved, the County would need to pursue purchasing easement rights from the Developer. The cost of the easement rights would be determined by a consultant in an appraisal. The timing for the easements would largely depend on the negotiations with the landowner.

### **Worx Community Development Forest Trail Development**

- Should we subtract \$83,000 for the engineering study and project management/administration?
  - Under the guidelines, permitting/engineering, administrative costs, and long-term operating costs are not permissible expenses. As such, subtracting the \$83,800 for engineering and project admin should be subtracted.