



P.O. Box 3039 • Grand Junction, CO 81502
E-Mail: info@mesaFML.org Web: www.mesaFML.org

BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING

Date and Time: 3:00 PM on Wednesday, June 17, 2020

Location: Zoom Meeting (Replay on our YouTube Channel and our Facebook Page)

Attendees:

Dusti Reimer
Chris McAnany
Craig Springer
John Justman
Quint Shear
Matt Rosenberg
Christine Madsen
Benita Phillips

Agenda:

- I. Call to Order at 3:14 pm.
 - a. C. Springer asked for approval of agenda. Q. Shear made a motion to approve agenda as presented. J. Justman second. Voted. Approved.
- II. General Public Comment.
 - a. None.
- III. Adoption of the May Minutes.
 - a. Q. Shear made a motion to approve. J. Justman second. Voted. Approved.
- IV. Staff Report.
 - a. D. Reimer said for our social media about the meeting minutes being posted, the meeting agenda for the monthly meeting had been posted, Zoom meeting details, we live streamed the May meeting on Facebook, and we shared the news story from the Daily Sentinel in the business briefs on the spring grant award winners, and we also shared photos of the Grand Junction Fire Department Fire Training Facility that was completed with their grant money.
 - b. D. Reimer said we did have two news stories from the press release that was sent out on the spring grant award winners. Goldene Brown from KKCO 11 News did a story on the winners, but the story didn't get uploaded to the website to share, however, the Daily Sentinel did, and I did share that story.

- c. D. Reimer said the grant requesting payment is from the Town of Palisade for their Brush Truck for \$63,000. She shared the photo of the truck that was purchased from Texas.
 - d. D. Reimer said invoices for payment in May were for:
 - a. Dusti Reimer Invoice #147 for services and supplies for \$3,789.97
 - b. Dufford Waldeck Invoice #20447 for \$1,060
 - b. D. Reimer said the upcoming events are the Board Meeting on July 15th, our Audit will be due to the state on the 31st of July. They will most likely be presenting at our next board meeting in July. Our Fall grant cycle opens August 1st and our August board meeting will take place on August 19th.
 - c. C. Springer asked for a motion to approve the two invoices in the report and the grant.
 - d. J. Justman made a motion to approve the two items and the grant. Q. Shear second. Voted. Approved.
- V. Review of Financials for May.
- a. C. Madsen said under the fund balance we have \$713,976.13 and under the permanent fund we have \$1,611,961.49.
 - b. C. Madsen said under grants payable the balance is \$263,000. Moving onto the Profit and Loss statements, which will have our net income for the month, will include the \$200,000 of grants awarded, contract services of \$3,750, dues and memberships of \$24.98 and we also have unrealized gain of \$56,255.87 and dividend income of \$1,269.73 and interest earned of \$0.06. We have a net loss of -\$146,249.
 - c. C. Madsen said the next report, the AP Aging shows the City of Fruita for \$50,000 and the City of Grand Junction Police Department for \$150,000 and the Town of Palisade for \$63,000.
 - d. C. Madsen said the Budget to Actual the main thing that changed was that we included the grants awarded for \$200,000. The total expenses are still under the budget by \$57,763. The rest is pretty much the same from the prior month. That is it.
 - e. C. Springer asked if there were any questions from the Board.
 - f. J. Justman said no.
 - g. Q. Shear made a motion to approve the financials as presented. J. Justman second. Voted. Approved.
- VI. Review of Investment Account for May.
- a. M. Rosenberg said the actual balance on the portfolio, as of close yesterday, was \$1.653 million which is a gain of about \$165,000. We have not really made a lot of changes during the month of May. It was a good month for the markets though. The S&P was up just shy 8%, international developed and emerging markets up and the ten-year treasury stayed flat. Now it is about .75%. Interest on the yield curve has steeped a bit and oil finally

bounced back which is nice. We are around \$38 a barrel for July futures. What's going on now is people are basically buying stocks for 2021 and 2022, because economic conditions are bad this year, but I think a lot of people have made the mistake of pulling out in the past, and now it's like get our money in now and in a few years from now we could see a \$4-6 trillion in stimulus with the economy. So, I think equities are the place to be. Portfolio is almost exactly 65%, which is our max, and I know we have a quarter that if we go over that we can leave it and let it go for a quarter or so, and I'd like to do that. If we get up too high like 68-70%, then I would like to rebalance. But other wise I feel a lot better about the equities in our portfolio than I do the bonds. With the bonds I just throw my hands up in the air and I have no idea what sgoing on in the bond market. The government is buying bonds to keep yields low and they're supposed to end that in September. My main take away is to leave the equities at 65% and it may drift a little bit higher then that, but as long as we have a quarter to balance it out, we will get it back down. I'm happy to answer questions.

- b. C. Springer asked if there were any questions for Matt?
- c. M. Rosenberg said a lot of the slides, I'll point out, is as of the month end of May, but the data I'm giving you is as of close yesterday.
- d. D. Reimer said yes if you look right here it says May 31st.
- e. M. Rosenberg said the portfolio balance say \$1.62 million, but it is actually \$1.65 right now.
- f. Q. Shear and J. Justman had no questions.
- g. Q. Shear made a motion to accept the investment report for May. J. Justman second. Voted. Approved.

VII. Approval of Spring Grant Contract.

- a. D. Reimer said Chris finished up the contracts and they went out on Friday. I dropped them off for you Craig to sign. We did get Fruita's back already and you have that one to sign, and we are still waiting to hear back from the City of Grand Junction, but they are ready to be initiated by the board.
- b. C. Springer asked if we need to approve these contracts themselves?
- c. C. McAnany said to go ahead and approve the contracts if you're comfortable with them. There is always a risk the City of Grand Junction may have a change they want; they have done that in the past. We are close to what our typical contract form is, and I don't anticipate any problem from them. If there was a glitch, we can bring it back next time. The one from Fruita has already been signed by the City of Fruita. If the Board is comfortable, you can approve and sign them.
- d. C. Springer asked if he has the signed Fruita contract?
- e. D. Reimer said yes, he signed it and sent it over electronically and I printed them up for you to sign.
- f. J. Justman made a motion to approve the contracts and sign them. Q. Shear second. Voted. Approved.
- g. C. Springer said I'll sign them and leave them at the drive up.
- h. D. Reimer said thank you and Chris I'll scan them in and send them over to you as well.

- i. C. McAnany said that would be great.

VIII. Discussion and Possible Approval of Grant Application Changes.

- a. C. Springer said there are a couple of things that are bothering me a little bit. Question number one says, "Does energy extraction create physical impacts that affect your organization? Explain these effects and their impact on your organization."
- b. C. Springer said the second question asks, "How do the social impacts of energy extraction affect your organization? Specify if your organization is directly or indirectly impacted."
- c. C. Springer said every time I score an application, and maybe it is just me, but I look at them and say we're asking the same question twice. I get the one is a physical impact and the other is a social impact, but at the end of the day, it seems to me, we want them to describe how energy extraction has impacted their organization. Maybe it is physical, maybe it is social, maybe it's both. Every time I'm in one of these meetings, I get the fact that they may be two different things, but honestly, when I'm scoring, I always just shake my head and ask why are we asking the same questions twice, because we get the same answer. They answer both questions the same way.
- d. Q. Shear said he would agree. I don't understand why we don't have one question that asks how energy extraction impacts your organization. It seems one question would fit that bill.
- e. J. Justman said I agree with that, but I would say they have some very, very creative answers that are hard for me to believe that's the impact that, they portray and sometimes stretch the truth and sometimes make lemonade out of lemon juice. Some of them are pretty creative answers and I'd like to see more justification as to why you're entitled to money.
- f. Q. Shear said I think that's where our scoring comes into effect. I don't know about you guys, but when I get into an application and they're really stretching it, I give them a lower score.
- g. D. Reimer said there is a question she wanted to ask too; would it bother you if they said they no impacts whatsoever. Because we've actually had someone answer that they weren't impacted by energy extraction at all and they were given almost a zero score and it kind of impacted it, and it became kind of a futile grant because they had no impact. Would you guys as the board, want them to have an impact and answer that question or not?
- h. C. Springer said speaking for me, not the board, yes it would impact on how I score that grant. I deem my role here, in scoring these, that we're supposed to be energy extraction dollars that came from that industry that are intended to benefit the communities that are impacted by that. If we went down the road of not having that answer there scored, I am not sure we'd be doing our job correctly, the way I understand it.
- i. Q. Shear said I agree with Craig on that.
- j. D. Reimer said do you think they should be able to show some type of impact to be able to fill out an application?
- k. J. Justman said I think some of them have addressed that and they are very creative in their answers. Personally, I score them on how I see what their answer is. If I think it's stretching

- the truth, it's not going to get a higher score than the one that has an honestly legitimate case as to why they are entitled to money.
- l. C. Springer said I remember when, and I've said this before, but I refer back to what we were told when the FML District was formed. This question was central to the mission we were supposed to be doing. The County Attorney at the time, because when the enabling legislation there was language there and in our bylaws. The question was asked of the County Attorney, what qualifies? He thought about it for a minute and said, "The Riverfront Trail qualifies. And we all asked what that has to do with energy extraction. He said these are dangerous jobs, with long shifts and these folks are away from their families for a long time. You could easily accept the argument that energy extraction affects these folks that they need the Riverfront Trail to be able to relax and enjoy the fruits of their labor a little bit. His point being, if the Riverfront Trail qualifies, find me something that doesn't. It's all about how they answer the question and to John's point, we score them accordingly. We've all scored grants that affected an intersection in a community that was heavily traveled by energy extraction vehicles. That was direct impact there and those grant requests were scored accordingly and awarded. I think we can get there with scoring. So, to answer your question Dusti, just for me not on behalf of the board, I'm ok with them applying for the grants if they legally can. And answering that question and these three scorers will determine on their own, how far that goes towards meeting the mission.
 - m. D. Reimer said that's what they've done. My actual question was I've had someone come to me and say we don't have any impacts, and they would answer no. Would you be ok with that?
 - n. Q. Shear said then we would score that accordingly.
 - o. D. Reimer said and I've told them that. I just wanted to make sure you guys wanted that question to get answered, because those two questions will sink or float any grant. And you're right, however they get answered, then tend to be scored about the same and those tend to be 20 points of the application right off the bat, is on impact. And on a mini grant that's huge.
 - p. Q. Shear said he'd like to go to one question worth 20 points.
 - q. C. McAnany asked if the board wanted to give the applicants any guidance on that question. Craig, you hit the nail on the head. There are a range of impacts from vary direct mineral impacts associated with road projects in De Beque where gas trucks go up and down that road every day, to recreation. Do you want to give some guidance to applicants to say that a range of potential impacts are appropriate for consideration and will be scored accordingly?
 - r. C. Springer said yes, that's good Chris, because that's exactly what's happening.
 - s. C. McAnany said we've never taken the direct point of view, unless you can show a direct impact from oil and gas, you don't qualify. The board has traditionally been fairly liberal interpretation of that saying, as you pointed out, recreation facilities and other facilities in the community where oil and gas workers live, can qualify. Legally they do qualify because they're public facilities. Then it goes back to the Board rate that project relative to others.

- t. C. Springer said I'm following Quint's idea there. I guess my problem is, we have always tried to avoid situations where a score could push an application over the top. Having that 20-point emphasis on that one question, could literally decide a grant. If one of us scored that a zero, mathematically, it would not get funded. And if one of us scored it a 20, it would. I'm worried it gives one scorer the opportunity to use too big of a hammer.
- u. D. Reimer said yes, that would affect the median.
- v. C. McAnany said that has been the potentially derail a project by giving is a zero on any given project.
- w. D. Reimer said or giving it a one. If they were to give a score a zero, they have to explain why it's been given a zero and since I've been on board, I've never seen that. Even if everyone else scores it a 15 and they give it 1, it's kind of a done deal.
- x. Benita Phillips said she would like to make a suggestion, you could free float the points so whatever you score the total will be 100%, then no one question will necessarily hold that 20-point advantage.
- y. C. Springer said so in other words, instead of having a potential for 80, the potential would be for 100.
- z. B. Phillips said you would take all the questions you have 4 or 5 of them?
- aa. D. Reimer said there are 8 for the traditional and 6 for the mini grant.
- bb. B. Phillips said in total that is 100%. So, you as commissioners would give any specific question a total, maybe 15 points or 23 points, it's all free floating, but the total at the end should be 100% at the end.
- cc. D. Reimer said the total score would all be 80 or 60 at the end, but the total scores would just be in different categories? So, then it wouldn't actually give us a score then.
- dd. B. Phillips said you're giving your whole question panel 100 points and you free float the questions as to what you think they're worth. I might think a question is worth 15 points, but you Dusti, might think it's 23 points. The next question we might agree on and it's 20 points, but at the bottom we'll have 100 points we've given out. Does that make sense? So there is no specific amount of points per question that's hard and fast, concrete. That gives you guys a lot more leeway to determine what particular question you've determined to be more important for this particular contract. It gives these people who are writing these things more leeway to explain from a more liberal point of view of how to interpret whether there is impact.
- ee. C. Springer said thank you, Benita. I guess my concern is the way we are going at it right now, each question has the same point value. When we do that average score, between the three of us, when Dusti presents that to us, that it's meaningful. That's the average of what the three of us has decided. It doesn't give anymore weight to one of us than the other. It seems to me that your idea makes it even worse that somebody could say, on question eight, I'm giving that 100% and so that can shoot it out of whack. Where as the way we're trying to do this, is weight the scores across the three of us to come to something that's fair. Whether we're doing that or not is subject to question.
- ff. B. Phillips said Craig if you gave one question 100% then the others would have to get zero.

- gg. C. Springer said yes, but that particular grant would get a 100% score from somebody.
- hh. C. McAnany said Craig this is slightly off topic, but your point was to combine questions one and two. If we did that we would have one less question in the mix. The question for the board would be, is there another question that would be more appropriate to give you more information in scoring. One thing I was thinking was the time that applications where it's pretty clear only a few people are going to be benefitted and I can think of examples where and entity that would only benefit a few households in a particular area. Would questions that describe the number of people who might use or benefit from the improvement be helpful to you?
- ii. Q. Shear said yes, maybe something along those lines.
- jj. C. Springer said yes that's a good idea.
- kk. Q. Shear said maybe not just a number, but explain how it affects the community overall, or what parts of the community it affects.
- ll. C. McAnany said if it's road improvements the city or town could say this road has 10,000 average vehicle trips every day and that's why we need to fix it. As opposed to another grant application that would say we serve 100 people, or this facility is used by 200 people a month. To some degree you're dealing with apples and oranges, but that might be something that would be helpful, particularly if it's a heavily used facility that might help influence where you spend the money as opposed to something that is peripheral and not used very much.
- mm. C. Springer said I think that's a good idea.
- nn. D. Reimer asked if that was question three?
- oo. C. McAnany said let's see. Yes, that talks about how it will enhance our community. I supposed you will get people that will say well, we serve 10,000 people a year or 100,000. Do you get those kinds of numerical responses, Dusti?
- pp. D. Reimer said we get them all over the board and honestly the people who have done really well in qualifying and quantifying that have been City of Fruita and have done exactly as you have said and Clifton Sanitation District has been really good about putting in those numbers of how many households per line in the area. They do a really good job of putting the data and numbers in to show that, verses an essay format of "we believe it will create positive" feel good feelings verses we know it really will impact this many people in this area. There are a couple of them that do a really good job of showing that when they fill out their grants.
- qq. C. McAnany said we can try to rejigger those questions and combine one and two and ask some kind of numerical quantification question and keep three as a qualitative question.
- rr. D. Reimer said it's almost as if one is a separate physical one and two and three look like they deal with the social part of it.
- ss. C. Springer said you could argue that questions one, two and three are all asking the same things, but if we collapsed one and two into what Quint said of how does energy extraction affect your organization, and then do the next question is "How will this project will help the MCFMLD fulfill its mission to "enhance positive social and economic impact in Mesa

- County from the development, processing and energy conversion of fuels and minerals leased under the Federal "Mineral Lands Leasing Act" through strategic grants, partnerships and leadership." And add please be specific with numbers if possible, or statistics.
- tt. C. McAnany said we can try to parenthetically say that we are asking for quantitative data to explain that enhancement.
- uu. C. Springer said number four-is it ok to move on. Number four has always been one of my favorites, because we get to decide the long-term benefit. As my predecessor as chairman, David Ludlam used to say, these are finite resources with a limited life and we need to have our head in the game and eye on the ball and do what's good for the long term right thing with these scarce dollars we have.
- vv. J. Justman said are you referencing the first section in section four. David made a statement today that the industry has changed so much that stuff that was impossible to extract when he made that statement, today its possible today. He said the biggest threat is that we'll be regulated out of business before we run out of natural gas.
- ww. C. McAnany said I think David's position was always that because each molecule when it comes out of the ground it gets sold once and used and we get a royalty off it, that, that money never comes back once it's been sold. I think David's approach was always lets' since our grant resources into projects that have a long useful life, as opposed to equipment that would wear out in two or three years. The difference between building a building and buying a police car.
- xx. J. Justman said I understand that, but its just irritating to me that you can't tell me when we're going to run out, because 15 years ago, they knew that oil, not in the state of Colorado, but in the Dakotas, they knew the product was in the ground and couldn't get to it. And when they figured out how to get to it, we went from in the late 90's early 20's, we had experts in the energy expo telling everybody, almost gleefully, we were going to be out oil production in the US by 2005 or 2007. Guess what, we are energy independent, so when you make statements long term, it's kind of erroneous, I think.
- yy. Q. Shear said well, John, it is not necessarily so. Every day, fewer and fewer of those minerals are accessible. Every time we have a wilderness act, fewer of those minerals are accessible. Under the ground there are a huge amount of gas and oil available, but every day I come to work, more and more of it has become inaccessible. So, yes that statement is not, untrue.
- zz. C. Springer said so John do you want to do something with number four?
- aaa. J. Justman said no when I read it, I know what it is saying, but form what David made that statement to today, we can't say we're closer to the end of the product because we've done ten years of extracting out of the ground and I'm not so sure we're ten years closer to running out. It makes sense to me probably.
- bbb. C. Springer said it if it's ok we move on, then my next problem is the way we do number five and number seven. Number six is a perfectly legitimate question. How are you going to maintain this in the future. They can answer with number five, here's how our part of this is being funded. And you say that sounds good, that's a ten, and then you get down to seven

- down there, and they say we are going to get this last part of the grant that we talked about in number five, we are going to get it in September. At that point, they don't have the funding. You get the gist of the plan, but you can actually score five a ten and seven a zero. You'd have to explain it to Dusti, but you can do it. Again, I think the question should be, how is this project being funded and have all funds been secured? Just ask the one question.
- ccc. Q. Shear said and just make that number five? I would agree with that.
- ddd. C. Springer said it doesn't matter what their dream of how its funded, because if they don't have it in place, we can't give that a good score, because it's not in place.
- eee. C. McAnany said it goes back to the policy of having a shovel ready project.
- fff. J. Justman said well, if they had all the money in place, they wouldn't need a grant they could just do it.
- ggg. C. McAnany said well, that's the other side of that.
- hhh. C. Springer said I'm talking about the match.
- iii. D. Reimer said we've had numerous times where they say we're applying for DOLA and we'll find out in September if DOLA has awarded our money, so it's in the works, they're planning on it, but it hasn't been committed.
- jjj. C. Springer said ok, so here is my problem with that.
- kkk. D. Reimer said, oh no, I'm just re-stating what you said. That's what you're saying, that's what we get a lot of times.
- lll. C. Springer said right. And what that does is, you may love this grant, and you're going to score it well and you hope the rest of the board members score it well, and if it takes two years to get the rest of the money, that's ok because this is worth it. Meanwhile, we may be excluding, with their scoring, as Chris says, a shovel ready project that is ready to go. We say no to them, and that other one we scored well may never happen if they don't get matching funds. I think it leads us down a road we may never want to go down. So, I think it is one question-ask the whole thing and we will score it accordingly. But, if they don't have the funding in place for it, I don't see how we can give it a very high score. Gentlemen?
- mmm. Q. Shear said Craig, I agree with you. I look at these and I hate the idea of giving money to project that all the other money isn't lined up, because it goes to waste and someone else could be using that money.
- nnn. C. Springer asked John if he had anything he wanted to add?
- ooo. J. Justman said no.
- ppp. C. Springer said I don't think we want to take formal action, but what we would like is for you guys to take our suggestions here and sort of propose a new scoring questions.
- qqq. C. McAnany said we will tinker, and I've been taking some notes and I know Dusti has too. Let's tinker with this draft and come back to you with a revised set of questions and you can decide if you like it or if you want further changes.

- rrr. C. Springer said I like question eight. I think that's an important question. It would also be nice, because we're going from eight questions to six, if we could come up with two additional questions, or something like that.
- sss. D. Reimer said ok.
- ttt. Q. Shear said so after Dusti and Chris are done we'll get a sample to review. Do we want to have some comment online, via email, or should we just address this at the next meeting, right?
- uuu. C. Springer said if necessary. If Chris and Dusti want us to have a workshop we could do that, but I think we've done a pretty good job at this formal meeting. It's not a grant cycle and its taken us a little bit of time, but I'm alright with dealing with this in our July meeting, if Chris doesn't see a problem with this.
- vvv. C. McAnany said I don't see a problem with that at all. If you want we could circulate a revised draft and if you wanted to get comment from the grantee community, we could do that, but to me, the question is really what information does this Board need to make good decisions. We're trying to package that for you. If you think of something else or another question or something, we're just not touching on that we should, please put a bug in our ear. I always think about you guys are looking at these projects, and you're trying to score them, and maybe there is a question we are not asking that we should be.
- www. C. Springer said I'm sure there is.
- xxx.C. McAnany said to some degree a lot of this is always going to be imperfect and all we can do is package this uniformly so each Board member can apply what he or she thinks is the best criteria.
- yyy. C. Springer said speaking just for me, the presentations have helped me more than anything. I've always tried to drive out wherever it is and look at it, but to have them actually present it, that has helped me immensely when scoring. I know it's a pain for them, but it sure helps me to score and get a better handle on what they want to do with that application.
- zzz.J. Justman said I think the presentation have been a good idea.
- aaaa. C. Springer said they have helped us and it's made us better. Any more questions on item eight?
- bbbb. D. Reimer said my suggestion is that anyone that turns in an incomplete application or any questions are missing to not accept it. Change the wording of that. They should be able to tell us who they are and what they want and if everyone has does it and have done it we should continue moving forward and we should change the language in the application to make sure that's straight forward.
- cccc. C. Springer said I agree with you. I don't think we should have to go through the trouble of a presentation and scoring it if it is an incomplete application. Do you gentlemen agree?
- dddd. Q. Shear said I agree.
- eeee. J. Justman said yes.
- ffff. C. Springer said are we good?

gggg. D. Reimer said those were my only ones. Whatever traditional grant questions we change, we will have to change the mini grant questions too, because they are all the same. There are just a few less. They aren't asking a whole lot more, but the first two-four are all the same question that we have for the traditional grant. Maybe that's what we look at-number six has the funding all put in there. Change that one too.

hhhh. C. Springer said I like number six the way it is. Just speaking for me. We're trying to fund things that matter, and the dollars we are funding with are so small, that they don't matter as much as they used to, but hopefully we get back to bigger grants. I think it's important for them to think about and respond to us on how they are going to pay for the operating costs going forward.

iiii. Q. Shear said you're talking about six on the mini grant.

jjjj. D. Reimer said yes.

kkkk. C. Springer said oh I'm sorry.

llll. D. Reimer said yes, it's the same question on both I believe.

mmmm. Q. Shear said yes, it's the same.

nnnn. D. Reimer said you're good. Do you have anything different that you consider with the grants when it comes to looking at a mini grant verses a traditional grant – I know the money is different and so is the timeline, but are there any big impacts that you wish you could ask, like Chris had said.

oooo. C. Springer said with question number four on useful life, I think we can agree that we all understand that a mini grant is not going to be the same useful life than a traditional grant. It's still an important question to ask, but I think it's a different question.

pppp. Q. Shear said we're going to score it based on the other mini grants.

qqqq. D. Reimer said one more question are you guys still ok with having entities submit two grants for both a mini and traditional.

rrrr.C. Springer said I am.

ssss. Q. Shear said I think is fine. I think that has worked out before.

tttt. J. Justman said I think it's ok. What I like about the mini grant is they have to have more of their own money and its smaller projects. A lot of times these smaller projects to me are just as important as the large ones that one entity gets a lot of money and this spreads it around more and I like that.

uuuu. D. Reimer so if we ever get to a point where everyone submits both a traditional and a mini if its for the same stuff?

vvvv. C. Springer asked if we have ever funded a traditional and a mini to the same?

wwww. D. Reimer said no, because you can't. If you win one, then you can't get the other. But, if they are duplicating so they turn in one for traditional, even though they need a hire match, verses a mini, there are no issues if they are doing both?

xxxx. C. Springer asked for the same project?

yyyy. D. Reimer said yes.

zzzz. C. Springer said yes, I have a problem with that. I think they need to be for different projects.

aaaaa. D. Reimer said ok.

bbbbb. J. Justman said I guess they can apply for two, but I don't want to award one organization for both a mini and a traditional in the same cycle.

ccccc. D. Reimer said, they can't. They get one versus another. Our instances are the Town of Palisade where they applied for a traditional grant for a brush truck and mini for radio equipment. They got the brush truck, so they were automatically disqualified for the radio equipment, and they were in the high running for the mini grant as well. This last time was the town of De Beque School District applied for a minibus in both the traditional and the mini. It was the same project, in both grant categories. It's just something to be aware of, if people are going to start doing that. It may become a trend.

ddddd. C. McAnany said it is kind of hard to score those projects, you need to score if it's a mini grant or do you want to score it as a traditional grant. It may make it harder for the board to add one more criteria in. They have a second bite, if they don't get it for the traditional grant, maybe you might want to discourage that kind of gaming.

eeee. J. Justman said it's not like we have a bunch of money waiting for people to apply.

ffff. D. Reimer said it's just something to think about. We've seen it come up twice now, with our most recent grant cycles. We may not need to do anything, people may just not do it, but it's starting to pop up now.

ggggg. Q. Shear said do you think we might see more and more of this?

hhhhh. D. Reimer said I'm not sure, potentially. It's just something to keep on the horizon. The only thing it says in there is that you can apply for both a traditional and a mini from the same entity, it doesn't say it has to be for different projects. It does say, if you win one, you can't win the other. If you win the traditional you can't win the mini. And if you get the mini, you're not going to get the traditional. I'm not sure if people, now that people are seeing you can apply for both, if they will do it, but it's something to think about. Could be a discussion for another grant cycle next year.

iiii. C. Springer said you think it might be beneficial for us to clear that up and say you can apply for the traditional or the mini, but the same entity cannot apply for both in the same grant cycle.

jjjj. D. Reimer said that's for you to discuss. It seemed a little strange when it came through.

kkkkk. Q. Shear said when it was the same project?

llll. D. Reimer said yes, for the same project. I thought it was a little strange, but if you were ok with it, I'm ok with it. I just wanted to make you guys aware of it. That it is starting to happen more often. If you have a feeling one way or the other, or if you don't, that's ok. I just wanted to throw it out for discussion to see how you felt about it.

mmmmm. C. Springer said the more I think about it, if they are trying to sell us on this application and project, this concept for this project, and they think enough of it to go to all

- the trouble to fill out all the paperwork and come to the presentation and do all that, I think they should pick one or the other. They should either apply for the mini or the traditional, but not both, for the same project.
- nnnnn. J. Justman said I concur with that.
- ooooo. Q. Shear said not for the same project.
- ppppp. D. Reimer said they can still apply, but it has to be for different projects. I think the last one to talk about is projects in process.
- qqqqq. C. McAnany said the ones where they already have the money.
- rrrrr. D. Reimer said they have already started it, and wanted to know if they can apply for it, they are in the middle of the project, and they wouldn't get an award until the month after, was a question we actually got this last time around we hadn't had before. It's up to you guys, we've never done it before, but we wanted to have an open discussion, and wanted to know from you.
- sssss. C. McAnany said when we talked about this on a staff level, this was the admission on behalf of the applicant that they didn't need the money, if they had already started construction of it. I could see why waste the boards time trying to score an application where there are people who desperately need the money and can't do a project without the grant as opposed to another project who has the money because they've already started building whatever it is they wanted money for.
- ttttt. C. Springer said very legitimate point. I don't think they should be able to apply for a grant for an in-progress project. Just speaking for me.
- uuuuu. Q. Shear said I agree with that.
- vvvvv. J. Justman said if you have enough money to start your project and you're under way, then go ahead and spend your money. But that also goes back to the question do you have enough money to do the project and we're willing to look at though, I guess.
- wwwww. D. Reimer said yes, but they could score really well on that, because they had the money, so are they shovel ready, yes.
- xxxxx. C. McAnany said there is kind of the sweet spot there, because you don't want to have all the money you need to commence construction, but you also don't want to a speculative project because there is no way to do it, because you don't have all the funds committed from other sources. You want something in the middle. Pretty close to being able to do it if the grant goes forward. I guess that's what we'll have to balance in these questions.
- yyyyy. C. Springer said an additional question just popped into my head, that might be interesting, and it might not be. Because we've asked them, or we're going to ask them, how their organization is impacted and please try and give us numbers, what about a question that just said, please describe how everyone in Mesa County will benefit from just this project.
- zzzzz. J. Justman said there aren't any of those.
- aaaaa. C. Springer said yes there are. Make them think how is this going to benefit Mesa County. And if it doesn't maybe that's something the scorers need to look at. I'm just

throwing that out there for discussion. Because I don't think, with the elimination of two questions, I don't think we're asking enough questions. Just a thought. Judging from my fellow board members, I don't think it was a good one.

bbbbbb. Q. Shear said I like where it's going, I'm just thinking there might be a better way to ratchet it down.

ccccc. C. Springer said I was going to use the "e" word and say how does this project economically benefit everyone in Mesa County, but there are other benefits besides economics.

dddddd. J. Justman said if we do a thing for Collbran, we have many people that never go to Collbran every year. And Fruita, with their railroad crossing or whatever they did, there are a lot of people in Mesa County aren't going to go down there and use it. Its not something everyone in the community is going to benefit from.

eeeeee.D. Reimer said that's when you start getting into those social impact's verses direct impact. The Riverfront Trail is a good example, or the library. The things we do with the Mesa County Library. Everyone has access to the library, if they are a resident, but if they use it or not is different.

ffffff. C. Springer said I think we need to come up with at least one more question and we have plenty of time to do it. Anything else on this agenda item?

gggggg. J. Justman said no.

IX. Unscheduled Business.

X. J. Justman said no additional business.

a. J. Justman made a motion to adjourn. Q. Shear second. Voted. Approved.

i. Meeting adjourned at 4:17 pm.