



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

January 24, 2014

Board of Directors Workshop

Notice of this meeting was posted on January 16, 2014 at Grand Junction City Hall, 250 N. 5th Street, and at 544 Rood Ave, Grand Junction

In attendance:

David Ludlam, Chair

Craig Springer, BoD

Mesa County Commissioner, John Justman, Secretary

Chris Reddin

Mark Heart

David Frankel

Carley Nelson

DLudlam called meeting to order at 2:00

DLudlam deferred minutes until next meeting.

Opened floor to public comment:

Guest mentioned that meeting wasn't posted on website.

DLudlam asked CReddin to post all FML meetings online on the website.

MHeart questioned whether he was eligible for funding.

DFrankel summarized qualifications for grant process and explained federal mineral lease dollars.

MHeart is a part of a volunteer organization that is a 501 C3, Mesa County search and rescue.

Nonprofits are not eligible for FML dollars.

CReddin noted that fire districts are eligible and his organization could get assistance from them if they applied.

DLudlam opened the floor to discuss improvements and changes on grant process.

Board discussed the reduction of the scoring range.

CSpringer presented board with spreadsheet of scores. Noted that DLudlams highest scored grants were not funded as well as one of CSpringers highest scored grants. One board member has the power to veto the grant with a low score.

Spreadsheet reflected different scoring options 0-10 or 1-3 and how changing the scoring range affects the scores.

Board discussed application questions and what questions they can get rid of or change.

CSpringer thinks there are 3 questions that are repetitive. He tried eliminating those 3 questions and noticed it did not make a difference in scoring. Noted each board member scores differently and eliminating questions isn't going to eliminate the veto factor.

CReddin presented document from Great outdoor Colorado on instructions on how to score. Board could provide feedback on their scores and discuss scores out of the norm.

CSpringer thinks it would be too much work if they were scoring a larger number of applicants but thinks scores should be public information.

JJustman noted some things are subjective. This problem might not happen again and maybe they should keep the process as is and try again.

DLudlam discussed the size of the scale and minimizing it will better the process. The questions are pass fail questions, there doesn't need to be much gray area.

DFrankel noted that only having 1-3 would make a lot of applications have the same score.

CReddin changed the scores on the score sheet to represent 1-3 and the outcome of scoring was exactly the same.

CReddin thinks some discussion on scoring could be beneficial.

CSpringer thinks scoring should still be done independently.

DLudlam noted the size of the board and having a larger sample of people scoring could benefit the process. They could create a scoring committee or something similar to the Incubators loan committee.

CReddin noted only having 3 people voting means each vote carries more weight and has a bigger impact.

CSpringer thinks it would be up to the Commissioners if they wanted to add another board member.

DLudlam encouraged board to go through a few more grant cycles before decided if they need more members

CSpringer noted they should at least reduce the scoring range.

JJustman thought 1-5 is too small of a range and he has struggled in the past with such a small range.

DLudlam asked CReddin to review Great Outdoor Colorado scoring process and tips.

CReddin brought up eliminating some of the questions. She is going to bring a revised application to the next board meeting.

CSpringer noted that questions 1 and 2 are asking the same question. Questions 4 and 5 are asking the same question as well as 7 and 8.

DLudlam noted question of having cash match should be a pass or fail or a standardized score.

CReddin discussed that if someone brings more money to the table that is greater leverage of our funds. The projects that can only bring the minimum cash match are projects that can't go forward without this funding. They don't have a lot of money and that is why they are asking for the money.

CSpringer noted that if you have a bigger cash match it is a stronger application.

CSpringer read questions 1 and 2 aloud and noted they are asking the same question.

CReddin agreed that they can be consolidated into one but they need to keep it tied to the mission.

CSpringer read questions 4 and 5 aloud and noted again they are asking the same question.

CReddin discussed the difference between the two questions and thinks they can consolidate the two and also take care of DLudlam's concern about the cash match.

CSpringer read aloud questions 7 and 8.

CReddin thinks those two questions can be consolidated into one as well, she had based the questions off of GOCO questions.

Questions could be consolidated into "What community support do you have for this project?"

DLudlam discussed how any applicant could relate the questions to any project and the board could add a question referring to the longevity or return on investments.

CReddin noted adding another question on longevity will add more weight to the importance of the mission which could be a good thing.

DLudlam wants to add another question and it should discuss natural resources being finite and a lasting return on investment.

CSpringer disagreed with DLudlam and thinks adding a longevity questions is repetitive. He thinks they can add longevity to one of the questions and not create another question.

DLudlam wants it to be clear but wants to see what CReddin can come up with.

CReddin provided board with timeline for spring grant cycle. If the board chooses to follow this schedule the board needs to approve the new application on the next board meeting. Have the option to push back some things a month. The board only has 3 weeks to review applications.

Board agrees 3 weeks to review applications if plenty of time.

Board discussed having an educational work session and invite eligible applicants to attend.

DLudlam asked CReddin and DFrankel to put together a presentation to walk them through, FML 101.

CReddin noted they can pull the content from the website and be ready for the February 12th meeting and board doesn't have to have a separate meeting to educate applicants.

CSpringer said that the board should be explicit on only awarding \$500,000 in each grant cycle. Half of what is available in the spring and half in the fall and make it public that the amount is concrete.

Board agreed.

DLudlam questioned the logo and whether anyone on the board has a problem with the logo.

CReddin thinks if they can't use same logo as Garfield we might as well keep the logo the same. If we want a different logo we need to spend money on it.

DLudlam noted signage issue and this logo is going to be displayed all over town.

CReddin asked board if there needs to be some sort of award ceremony for chosen applicants.

DLudlam wants to have a simple press conference with DOLA and selected applicants. In the future the press conference can be held the day the applicants are chosen.

DLudlam described why they want to have a press conference to connect the public with the FML dollars

CReddin mentioned they could have the press conference right before the February 12th meeting and make it a luncheon.

CSpringer questioned whether bylaws should reflect the methodology of the grant process.

CReddin encouraged board to adopt policies, and then legally you won't get in trouble for not following your bylaws.

DLudlam reviewed changes to the grant process that the board agreed on.

DLudlam mentioned to board nonprofit membership dues and for the board to consider joining Club20 and other nonprofit organizations.

DLudlam motioned to adjourn. CSpringer seconded. Meeting adjourned at 3:28

Minutes for the January 24, 2014 Federal Mineral Lease District Board of Directors workshop.

Respectfully submitted by the 2014 Board Secretary, Mesa County Commissioner John Justman

Signature_____ Date:_____