

November 9, 2011

Mesa County FML District Board Meeting

Present: Craig Springer
Craig Meis
David Ludlam

Members of the Public: Laura Bradford
Representatives of U.S. Congressman Scott Tipton
Steve Aquafresca

Meeting was called to order by Craig Springer

As posted Monday November 7th, 2011 the agenda items considered were:

1. Approval of prior meetings minutes.
2. The review (the process) of grant applications.
3. Consideration of unscheduled business and public comment

Craig M. moved to approve the agenda and David L. seconded it. Motion carried.

The approval of meeting minutes for both August 12th and September 14th.

Craig M. moved to approve the minutes and David L. seconded it. Motion carried.

Agenda item two (2): Chris Reddin in her capacity as board staff highlighted the FML board grant process to-date and distributed copies and additional documentation of the application scoring process and application process to date.

Reddin noted that the deadline was November 17th, 2011. As of the 7th no application has been received at the GJEP office.

Review of Documentation: ***Tips for reviewing FML District Grant applications:***

Reddin: staff attempted to make this process as simple and clear as possible. It is simply taking the existing information and organizing it in a manner that is clear and easier to understand. FML Board members will individually score the applications and then come together to review the collective scores. It is my recommendation/suggestion that in addition to scores the board members provide comments as well. I have looked at the benchmark for about five other processes that provide comments to applicants that do not get awards. Reddin noted that she would deliver the score sheets and summarize the comments and give them to the applicants that do not receive an award.

The second hand out is the *FML District Grant Award Process*:

Craig S. - To clarify the process... so each of us will receive copies of the applications by November 17th and will then have until December 12th to individually score them and then we would meet on December 14th to make the awards? I really feel like there should be a workshop somewhere in-between. They have until 5:00 on Thursday November 17th to turn in applications. Let's meet on Friday November 18th at 9:00.

David L. moved to have a workshop to go over the applications received on Friday November 18th at 9:00. Craig M. seconded it. Motion carried.

Chris- Other items I have been working on in this process: what happens after the money is awarded? I will contact everybody. Unsuccessful applicants will be provided feedback and successful applications will receive a grant agreement. Almost everybody seems to have some kind of document that's signed that says- yes I am doing what I said I would do in my application.

Once project is underway, grantees may request funds for completed work. To receive funds grantees will submit:

- FML Expense Report Form
- Approved Project Budget
- Actual Expense Worksheet, signed by finance department
- Copies of invoices for all cash expenditures over \$1,000 paid to date
- Statements detailing the value of donated services/materials/equipment (in-kind)

Craig M. wanted to make sure that all of the paperwork was being reviewed by David and Marsha, in particular the \$1,000 provision to make sure that all t's are crossed and i's dotted.

Craig S. - For fairness we need to agree on the published tips, the published process and the published scoring sheet needs to be moved on if they are going to be official documents of this district.

David L. – Could we have David review them and pending no changes we could approve these today?

Craig M. - I agree David should review these. The scoring sheet is very similar to the application and so I do not have any problem with it. The Tips for Reviewing the Application are just guidelines and I think applicants would want to review this information.

David L. - I would move pending approval of the Mesa County legal counsel that we adopt the FML District Grant Scoring Sheet for publication on the web, the Tips for Reviewing FML District Grant Applications for publication on the web and the amended

FML District Grant Award Process with the addition of the workshop on November 18th, 2011 as official documents for the FML District.

Craig M. Seconded and motion carried.

Unscheduled business:

Craig S. – Let’s review Chris Reddin’s original proposal. Chris presented two invoices. One for the original scope of work for \$3,000.00 and the other for the work completed in October for \$1,135.25 which is hourly billing for work completed after the original scope of work. This would be considered the second phase.

David L. – Would like to state for the record that Chris “hit it out of the park” as it related to her scope of work. The governor’s office is very excited about the work that we have done taking a leadership role as a county. The whole idea of bringing the economic development process full circle is something that they were congratulatory on and that they wanted to talk to Chris about how we were able to do this so for the record. So I would like to give props to Chris on her work here. I definitely think we need to talk about phase II to make sure that she is being compensated for her time.

Craig S. - I agree. I think Chris is doing an extremely good job. My only concern, in my mind, is that we are operating outside of what we agreed to. For visibility purposes and in fairness to Chris, and to make sure the county is comfortable in what we are spending in admin that we set up the parameters for this second phase. What the limitations are and how it’s going to work.

David L. - The second phase was an hourly rate not to exceed \$2500.00 per month. So I move to approve phase II of Long View LLC’s original proposal that would allow pre-approved billing up to \$2,500.00 per month for things outside the original scope.

Craig M. seconded. Motion carried.

Craig S. – We have an invoice #607 for \$1,135.25 from Long View LLC. David L. moved to approve it. Craig M. – wanted to change the motion to pay both invoices #605 for \$3,000.00 and #607 for \$1,135.25 in one check for \$4,135.25. David L. seconded it. Motion carried. Craig M. will get the invoices to Marsha to get a check cut.

Chris R. stated where she was in the process and what her role might be moving forward.

Craig M. noted Chris’s role going forward: Once we get the grant applications in, Chris will help with organizing the process and after that, we’ll figure out what is needed; maintenance etc... Chris did not feel like there would be much maintenance needed once the applicants understood the process and how to apply for money and everything was in place. From there someone.

David L. – Stated that he talked to congressman Tipton’s office about some of the challenges that we have as a board. Tipton was anxious to help.

Craig S. – We just want to make sure we are not spending too much on admin services and most of the money is going to the grants. That gets us updated on Chris.

Craig M. – Commented on the e-mail from David Frankel. David had wanted us to postpone this meeting but we had a lot to go over. It is a good thing we are going to have the workshop and have David F. there to give us ideas and his legal opinion going forward. There is a lot of discussion going on as far as the other counties and how they want to go forward. There are some counties that just want to take the PILT deduction.

They want so much control over these dollars that they are not willing to budge on the legislative changes. The two main counties in this are us and Garfield that have the true dollar impact. Garfield is really pushing for a legislative fix but trying to get the Dept. of Interior to give us an opinion. The model that we are implementing here in Mesa County is different than the Garfield County model. Ours is closer to the Utah model.

Craig M. and Public participant Steve Aquafresca discussed having the ability to appeal the Solicitor Generals office should we receive a PILT deduction or asking the Solicitor Generals office to do an audit. The benefit to this would be sure that the criteria surrounding the FML dollars is being met and be approved at the Federal level as this district moves forward and disperses the grant dollars. The worst thing that could happen would be not only does Mesa County not get its FML deduction back filled, which is where we stand today, but beyond that would be if the Interior or Solicitor General were to determine that the money dispersed and being used in a manner that was inconsistent with the criteria that surrounds FML dollars. It is a concern that we need to be aware of. The discussion continued as to whether or not they could stop the FML dollars or even take back the 2011 FML dollars.

David L. – In looking at this from the political side the Fed's coming back and taking PILT dollars away from the county that has gone thru a grant application process that included every single relevant economical development entity in their community. What a political nightmare that would be, taking money away from a county. Especially the way we have crafted the grant application. The verbiage is tied back to the statute. I just don't see how they could do it.

Steve- Interior shows a history of messing with PILT and FML dollars and maybe down the road there is a political solution for this. As it stands today, the county is budgeting as if we are not going to get the \$1.6mm back filled.

David L. – Question to the board; as I move forward with discussions with the congressman's office and the senate's office and how they can help us with the Department of Interior moving forward, if it okay with this board, I will start being aggressive with that and start engaging in conversation with them.

Craig M. – I think we have to. I believe it is imperative that if we are going forward with this district and with grant program, we have to be more politically active than ever and largely to make sure that they understand what we are doing here in Mesa County separating ourselves from the other counties or highlighting what we are doing here in

lieu of what possibly everyone else is and making sure that they understand that if they decide to something different that we will have to make some changes on the county level.

The discussion continued on whether or not there would be legislation and if that legislation would help the FML Districts.

Craig S. - Any other unscheduled business? None

Craig M. moved to adjourn. David L. seconded it. Motion carried

Meeting adjourned.