



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

November 19, 2014

Board Workshop

Notice of this meeting and workshop was posted on November 7, 2014 at Grand Junction City Hall, 250 N. 5th Street, and at 544 Rood ave, Grand Junction

In attendance:

David Ludlam
Craig Springer
Dave Frankel
Pam Noonan
Chris Reddin
Carley Nelson

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

Opened the floor to public comment:

Lois Becker, Mesa County Libraries discussed application for production studio and would like feedback from the board about improvements to their application.

CReddin reviewed feedback and potential changes for next grant cycle.

Rich Englehart, the City of Grand Junction, mentioned the improvements he noticed since the last grant cycle and believes the board took into consideration their feedback and recommendations.

CSpringer discussed his view on increasing the size of the scoring board. He does not think increasing the size will improve the process.

CReddin reviewed payment process. Discussed challenges smaller entities face with budget and the payment process.

CSpringer questioned if the district could add a question asking if the entity requires special payment requests and deal with as a case by case basis.

JJustman discussed all entities wanting payment up front and not having the option available to bigger entities.

Board questioned if the special payment requests should only be available to mini grant applicants.

DLudlam reviewed application and thinks the applicant needs to have skin in the game to be accountable.

JJustman agreed that applicants will be less proactive if they already have the money and not be as accountable.

CCreddin explained that payment options are not part of the application but part of the grant agreement

DFrankel reviewed reimbursement options. DFrankel presented board options on how to modify payment options to better address the payment process problem.

CRreddin recommended adding another payment option and creating a form for special applicants to fill out and board could ask for a balance sheet with payment request.

Shaunalee Kronkright from the Drainage District explained how it was just a question because the appendix D wasn't clear and only seemed like it applied to the big grants.

DLudlam asked CReddin to present options at the next board meeting to make special requests.

Board reviewed question on whether applicants applying for a grant with other entities are eligible to also apply separately.

CSpringer questioned how letting applicants apply as partners and separately hurts the process.

DLudlam discussed partnerships weighing the score and applicants taking the risk creating partnerships.

REnglehart recommended creating tears and adding another category besides the large and mini.

DLudlam asked CReddin to present options for allowing eligible applicants with partnerships to be able to apply individually and together.

Board reviewed question 7 of application and discussed changes.

DLudlam discussed question two and weighing length of impacts

JJustman discussed having a cap on money requested.

CSpringer explained his concern about capping money requests. In the future an application might come in that has the largest need and largest impact and it won't be selected because of the cap.

DLudlam questioned if the board should decide ahead of time how much money should be distributed to traditional grants and mini grants so that applicants know ahead of time.

CSpringer agrees that making the decision at the funding meeting is a hard meeting.

Board discussed entities that already get direct distribution from impact funding and questioned if they have an advantage.

REnglehart shared his view on the option and he believed those applicants would then be at a disadvantage.

CReddin questioned if the board would like to add a question asking if the applicant receives a direct distribution and what are they doing with that money.

Board did not think it was necessary.

CSpringer reminded the board that he does not want the board to have to explain scores out of the recommended range. He thought the board already took care of this and does not want this part of the funding process.

LBecker discussed feedback from the board and

CReddin asked the board to provide notes with their scoring. The board needs to provide feedback in order for applicants to understand reasoning and to know how to improve their application.

REnglehart explained his reasoning for wanting feedback and thinks the board has improved since the last cycle by decreasing the range.

DFrankel discussed the open records act and how applicants can ask to see scores.

Meeting adjourned at 3:25

Minutes for the November 19, 2014 Federal Mineral Lease District Board of Directors meeting.

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

Signature_____ Date:_____