SKC Master Camp Planning: Meeting Notes

May 4, 2020

16 attendees

Meeting Notes:

• The team took a deeper look at Chief Logan Reservation (CLR). This continued our conversation from last week when we primarily focused on Falling Rock (FR).

• Dave, our architect, shared that in some respects, CLR is a more challenging piece of property to work with. Nearly 100 acres of it will be difficult to build on.

• The committee reviewed a property map with layouts of where campsites and structures might fit (note, the map was for placement purposes only to see what could fit, not final by any means.)
  o Staff cabins in upper left of property
  o Added an outpost in south camp. Could add a small outfitter building nearby.
  o 6 large (40+) and 15 small campsites (20-man). No medium. Approximately 550 campers.
  o If we build a shooting site, would need to remove a few campsites and relocate the OA ring.
  o No shotgun or clay range.
  o Re: a second ranger house, could possibly put by second gate.
  o 10 adirondacks (20 in FR)

• Dave pointed out that most camps include pools in addition to some natural waterfront. We will check to see if there is any data on youth preferences of a pool or a lake (would need to include recent demographics to account for influx of female Scouts.)

• A pool would give us a more versatile option – can be a controlled environment.

• There is a question about an area of land to the left of CLR. Shows up as owned by SKC on some maps but not others. We are looking into it.

• CLR Pros:
  o Bigger lake
  o More central geographically to council
  o Newer dining facility (Capacity is 400. 7 restrooms. Opened in 2008.)
  o County water
  o More compact/shorter walking distances between program areas
  o Larger # of smaller campsites

• Cons:
  o More restrictive in terms of capacity/expansion opportunities
  o Road access is a challenge
  o Could not fit everything on the aspirational list
  o No pool
  o Less number of shooting facilities
• Need to explore expansion capabilities. Does that opportunity present itself with FR and CLR?
• Greenfield option is still in play. Example: 603 acres near Circleville, $1.4 million, undeveloped
• Will present options A, B, C (greenfield, CLR, FR) to Board.
• Need to assess/estimate infrastructure costs – power, sewage, etc. Will be different for each of the three options.
• What else is in the area that might be competition to our property/camp?
• Where are the trends going with what youth will expect in 10 years?
• Awaiting demographic/concentration analysis of youth in our council.
• What currently exists on the properties that can be salvaged? Would impact building/structure costs.
• What endowment would we need to maintain the property?
• For next meeting, Phil and Dave will prepare a side-by-side spreadsheet view of structures/program areas that would fit or not fit within each of our properties, along with estimated costs.
• Will publish minutes and property maps on the CMP website and note that:
  o The maps are for space and terrain purposes/approximations from the best information we have available.
  o The maps are not the proposed camp layouts – they are intended to provide an idea of what could fit on each property.
• Next meeting: Tuesday, May 12 at 6 p.m.

Sample layout of potential program and structure areas at CLR: