



P.O. Box 4704 • Grand Junction, CO 81502
E-Mail: info@mesaFML.org Web: www.mesaFML.org

Mesa County Federal Mineral Lease District
May 13, 2015

In attendance:

David Ludlam
Craig Springer
John Justman
Christina Reddin
Andrew BE
Chris McAnany
Derek Wagner, Colorado Mesa University
Jay Moss, Horizon Drive Business District
Mike Harvey, De Beque Fire District
Rich Sales, Town of Palisade
Mike Bennett, City of Fruita
Kathy Portner, City of Grand Junction
Steve Shultz, School District 51
Benita Phillips, Citizen
Davis Farrar , Town of Collbran

Meeting was called to order at 2:00p.m.

Approval of minutes

CSpringer moved to approve the minutes. DLudlam seconded. Minutes approved.

General Public Comment

No public comment

Consent Agenda

CReddin presented a final payment request from the Palisade Fire Station Alert System

CSpringer moved to approve consent agenda. JJustman seconded. Consent Agenda approved.

JMoss presented on the Horizon Drive District project.

SSchultz presented on the School District 51 project.

DLudlam explained to the public why the special districts are presenting on their strategic plans. The goal of the presentations is to create awareness for the district of what plans eligible entities have for future projects and the impacts they will be making on the community.

Approval of Grant Agreements

CMcAnany recommended that the board approve all of the grant agreements with one motion to adopt.

CSpringer motioned to approve the grant agreements for the spring 2015 grant applications. JJustman seconded. Spring 2015 grant agreements approved.

Discussion of the 2015 Spring Grand Cycle

CReddin summarized the feedback she received from the Spring Grant Cycle.:

Make application more clear when asking if the application is a partnership or applying on behalf of someone. Recommended adding a checkbox asking if the application is a partnership. Public questioned if applying on behalf of another entity creates a partnership. Make question clearer when asking if applicant can accept partial funding. Discuss District creating a cap on the grant requests. Adding something in application that values the scope of the impact. Direct vs indirect impact and make clearer in application. Clarify what energy impacts are and what it means to entities applying.

Opened public comment on grant process

DFarrar Town of Collbran recommended instructions being separate from the application form for the mini grants and letters of support separate from number of pages. Small entities like Collbran are at a disadvantage when asked to provide detailed analysis.

KPorter recommended entities or projects that are affected by energy impacts should be weighed heavier. Recommended a board of 5 instead of 3. Recommended making process similar to DOLA's process where the applicant gets a chance to present their project to the board before being scored.

RSales discussed how the flow of capital is a challenge for larger projects. Recommended having one initial project payment, two or three progress payments and a final payment.

MBennett recommended considering a 5 member board. Also recommended using similar questions to DOLA's application's questions and allowing applicants to present before being scored.

Closed public comment on grant process.

Board opened up discussion on what makes an application a partnership

CMcAnany recommended including details in the bylaws.

DLudlam questioned what the difference is between a MOU and an IGA

CMcAnany offered to put together some language to define partnerships.

Board questioned if they should weight partnerships that are benefiting multiple entities. Is there score value to that?

CSpringer explained the downside of weighing a partnership question. If you don't have a partnership you are at a disadvantage, especially smaller entities. Referenced Colbran's application and questioned who they would partner with to improve their score for the partnership question.

DFarrar recommended having two separate applications

The Board directed staff to adjust the application to require an MOU or IGA to document the nature of applications made by a partnership.

DLudlam opened up discussion on partial funding.

CReddin reviewed question that asked if the applicant will accept partial funding.

DFarar recommended including a threshold.

CSpringer explained that this question is important for the funding decisions but not for the scoring. Include at what level an applicant can move forward with the project.

Staff was directed to develop clearer language in the partial funding question as to the threshold at which partial funding will change the nature of the project.

DLudlam opened up discussion on creating a cap on money requests.

JJustman recommended having a percentage scale so that the money can be spread around further.

CSpringer explained that creating a cap on funding request could precludes district from doing something important. Questioned what the point of scoring is if the top scored applicants aren't going to receive full funding.

RSales explained that in some cases it might be better to not be funded then receive partial funding. Would rather apply again in the next grant cycle so that the project can be fully funded.

JJustman discussed winning applicants not being able to apply for the next grant cycle to give other applicants a chance to win.

DLudlam asked for input from the public

RSales agreed with JJustman an explained that most entities probably couldn't have two grants running in a year.

DLudlam asked for input from bigger entities.

KPortner explained that the money should go where it is needed and whether or not they already received funding shouldn't play into the scoring.

MBennette questioned the benefit of not letting winning applicants apply again.

CSpringer recommended leaving the process as is.

The Board made no changes to the process regarding funding caps and did not exclude funded entities from applying in future cycles.

CReddin reviewed recommended changes to the application questions.

CSpringer explained his frustrations with scoring the current questions. Still feels the questions are repetitive.

DLudlam recommended separating questions out by asking what the direct and indirect impacts are and get rid of the third questions. Each board member would have a different perspective.

CReddin reviewed and explained the first 3 questions in the application. DFrankel recommended always having a question that ties back to the district's mission.

CMcAnany agreed that the mission question is important but how it is structured and scored is up to the board.

DLudlam revised first two impact/mission questions from direct vs indirect impacts to social vs physical impacts.

Public agreed with DLudlam's recommendation and KPorter recommended including a question about the urgency of the project or including it in another question

The Board directed staff to revise the mission/impact questions by leaving the mission question in place and adding questions about physical impacts and social impacts .

Board discussed the mini grant application and agreed to separate the directions from the application and decided the number of pages is not an issue and the applicants are allowed plenty of pages.

Board opened up discussion about the size of the board

CMcAnay explained that is a decision that would have to be made by the County Commissioners. Board could make a recommendation to the Board of Commissioners.

Board agreed this isn't a decision for the board and should be presented to the Commissioners

Board opened up discussion about applicants presenting before board scored applications.

KPortner explained benefits of presenting before scoring. Gives applicants a chance to be clearer and inform the board of more details and let applicants figure out areas that need improvement.

RSales referred to AGNC's process. Applicants give presentations over the phone.

CSpringer questioned if the presentations would be weighted or if it is only to answer questions.

DLudlam favored this idea and thinks it would help with the scoring process and give answers to questions that might never have been answered or answered incorrectly.

CSpringer recommended scoring the applications first and then giving presentations and have an opportunity to change scores if they want.

Board decided to host another meeting before funding decisions and allowing 5 minutes presentations from applicants.

The Board directed staff to modify the payment request process to allow traditional grant applicants to ask for special requests for addition payments.

Board opened up discussion on implementing questions from the DOLA grant application.

MBennett explained that this was already addressed by modifying the current questions.

CSpringer reviewed questions 5 and 6 from grant application. Both questions should be yes or no questions and not scored.

Board agreed to delete both questions and include another question asking if there is opposition to this project.

CSpringer does not want the guidelines to include a recommended range for the board to use. Staff was directed to revise the guidelines accordingly

Instituting a COGCC LGD

DLudlam presented the idea of designating staff as the LGD of the Colorado Oil and Gas Conservation Commission.

DLudlam motioned to appoint CMcAnay as the LGD of the Colorado Oil and Gas Conservation. JJustman seconded. CMcAnay appointed.

Staff updates

CReddin informed the board that she has contacted the known eligible entities by mail to inform them about the next grant cycle.

CReddin presented request from the public to attain information on all of the entities that have applied. Board allowed CReddin to share information.

DLudlam asked for feedback from grant recipients as to if they have received any questions about where the money is coming from or feedback from the exposure.

RSales explained that the awareness is spreading but isn't sure if the community completely understand where the money is coming from. The press is informed and seems to have a good understanding.

DLudlam would like the board to have more interaction with the municipalities. Questioned if the rest of the board agrees with the importance.

Board agreed.

CSpringer motioned to adjourn. JJustman seconded. Meeting adjourned