



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

BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING

Date and Time: 2:00 PM on Wednesday, February 8, 2017

Location: Home Loan Building, 205 N. 4th Street, Grand Junction, CO 81501, in the Community Room on the Basement level

In attendance:

David Ludlam
Craig Springer
John Justman
Chris McAnany
Dusti Reimer
Scott Olsen
Benita Phillips
Janet Johnson

Meeting Minutes:

- I. Call to order at 2:00 p.m.
- II. General Public Comment.
 - a. Benita Phillips, community member, wanted to know if there would be more information about the investment legislation that was discussed at the previous meeting.
 - b. D. Ludlam said yes.
 - c. Public Comment Closed.
- III. Adoption of the January Board Meeting Minutes.
 - a. Motion to approved by C. Springer, second by J. Justman. Voted. Approved.
- IV. Election of Officers.
 - a. D. Ludlam took a moment to congratulate C. Springer on his re-appointment to the Board for another three years, by the Mesa County Commissioners in January 2017.
 - b. D. Ludlam said we need to elect a secretary.
 - c. C. Springer made a motion to approve J. Justman as secretary, and D. Ludlam as president. J. Justman second. Voted. Approved.

V. Consent agenda and Staff Report:

- a. Motion to approve the staff report and the consent agenda by C. Springer, second by J. Justman. Voted. Approved.

VI. Staff Updates.

- a. D. Reimer shared the MCFMLD had great media coverage with both local newspapers, and two television stations covering the opening of the spring 2017 grant cycle. These were posted to the social media channels and increased our Facebook followers from 202 to 203.
- b. D. Reimer presented the three current bills needing approval for payment were: Philadelphia Insurance- \$2,408 for board insurance; Dufford, Waldeck, Milburn & Krohn - \$1,866 for legal services in January; Dusti Reimer - \$2,524.98 for services and supplies for January.
- c. D. Reimer pointed out the upcoming events: February 24th D. Reimer will be doing a community presentation to the Mesa County Communication Officers Association, March 3rd all spring grant applications are due, March 8th is the next board meeting.
- d. D. Reimer said she would like the board to pick the date for the grant cycle presentations. The board discussed that doing the presentations on the same day as the board meeting would be the best. March 8th was decided for the grant cycle presentations. C. Springer asked if that would be enough time for D. Reimer to put together all the grant applications in time for the meeting. D. Reimer said she would make it work and she would get that information out to the public via our website, emails, and social media.
- e. D. Ludlam reiterated that the standard board meeting would go first at 2 pm on March 8th and then would immediately proceed into the presentation workshop, following the same format as last time. Each presenter would be allowed 5 minutes for presentation, with the Board allowed to ask follow up questions.
- f. S. Olsen said the Budget was submitted to the state and approved. S. Olsen asked when they started things with the audit last year. He wanted to know if he needed to contact the auditors to get the process started.
- g. D. Ludlam asked the other board members how they had handled that in the past.
- h. C. Springer stated in the past they had always followed Mesa County's lead. Dalby had it first and then Chadwick did the audit last year. C. Springer asked if we needed to do an RFP for a multi-year contract for audit services.
- i. C. McAnany said that we do not have a formal policy on RFP requests, and that one might good to have for contracting public services, however, these professional services are more specialized services, so there is more to evaluate other than price. It might make sense to do a three-year RFP for auditing services.
- j. C. Springer asked what had been paid last year.
- k. S. Olsen believed it was somewhere between \$4,000 and \$5,000.
- l. C. Springer asked when the audit needed to be submitted.
- m. S. Olsen said it needs to be submitted by July 31st.

- n. C. Springer said this might seem easy for us to say, but that seems like a lot of money for our small entity, for an audit.
- o. J. Justman asked if we currently just have a one year contract.
- p. C. McNany said that currently we have just done this year to year.
- q. C. Springer said that he knows it might create a little more work, but that it would worth it to put an RFP out for a three-year contract for auditing services.
- r. J. Justman said he felt comfortable with three-year.
- s. D. Ludlam asked staff to put together the RFP for a three-year term for auditing services.
- t. C. McNany said House Bill 17-1152 has been introduced. The bill is set for preliminary hearing before the house with the Energy and Transportation Committee on February 15th. We now need to think about the presence we would like to have at that meeting. He had spoken to D. Ludlam about doing a fact sheet for the committee about what the bill does and does not do. Most of the time, there are so many bills being presented they do not have time to read through them all, and a fact sheet would help pull out the bullet points of what the bill would do. This would also help to alleviate any misinformation that would be out there.
- u. C. McNany wanted to know if any members of the board would also be physically present to also talk about the bill. He did just get word today that the meeting was set for Feb. 15, 2017.
- v. C. Springer asked if we had picked up a co-sponsor in the Senate.
- w. C. McNany said no, but Rep. Mitch Bush from Steamboat Springs is a House co-sponsor. C. McNany said that is something to look at, but the immediate hurdle is to get this passed through the committee.
- x. D. Ludlam said Rep. Willett was going to establish remote testimony either from the Chamber of Commerce or the University, if he was able to.
- y. C. Springer and D. Ludlam asked what the time would be.
- z. C. McNany said he needed to check, he was unsure of the time. He also asked if the Board would like him to go ahead and create that fact sheet-either a formal letter from the board, or something less formal for the board to sign.
- aa. J. Justman said Mesa County was working on something also, but perhaps have them work together with Garfield County. The remote testimony would work well and we want to show all the local support including Garfield County for the remote testimony, if possible.
- bb. D. Ludlam said that the board would like the fact sheet. Either as a board memorandum.
- cc. D. Ludlam asked D. Reimer to reach out to other stake holders and notify them about the testimony option. D. Ludlam knows that Colorado Mesa University, City of Grand Junction, the Mayor of Grand Junction, all three Mesa County Commissioners, Rich Sales, Davis Farrar, and Garfield County, Town of De Beque and several others are in support of the bill. We would need to work with Rep. Willett.

- dd. C. McAnany wanted to know if there was any follow up with Garfield County Mineral Lease District with their Executive Director about the misconceptions in the email.
 - ee. D. Ludlam said he and Commissioner Justman spoke with their Executive Director this morning. They were all at the same meeting and he said their Executive Director is on board now. They are already doing what we are asking in this bill to do. They have established a permanent fund and have a funding policy in place. D. Ludlam said they did their best to put any concerns to rest. If they support it, they support it. If they kill the bill, they kill the bill and we will just try again next year. D. Ludlam spoke with the Garfield County FML Board members and they did not share the same level of concern as their counsel did.
 - ff. Benita Phillips asked if the public was allowed to be part of the testimony.
 - gg. D. Ludlam said all public is allowed, as long as they sign up. All committee hearings are open to public testimony.
 - hh. C. McAnany said he would get in touch with Rep. Willett and be in touch with the board.
- VII. Unscheduled business.
- a. D. Ludlam wanted to make sure the board had an opportunity to see that the Denver Post had posted an editorial on Sunday essentially saying that they want the state level of what they are trying to do on the local level with the bill. We might have had some influence over that editorial.
 - b. D. Reimer said it looked like they wanted to get rid of the grant program with their proposed funding article.
 - c. Benita Phillips asked if this would all go into the big state government account.
 - d. D. Ludlam said yes, that ultimately their design would be to eliminate the grant programs to distribute funds. It would lead to more money to distribute. Currently, they receive about 15% to allocate out for the grant program. This would increase to 30%, eliminate the grant program that doesn't run very well, and create a trust fund like all the other states do that would do meaningful projects like highways, infrastructure, etc.
 - e. Benita Phillips asked if it legislators would have sway over all that money entirely, not locally.
 - f. D. Ludlam said the only way that local governments would support it, is if legislature would refer to it as a ballot initiative to make it permanent so the fund couldn't be raided. Otherwise this would just be another trust fund to be raided by legislature. The idea of getting rid of the grant program in lieu of increase direct distribution of local communities.
- VIII. Motion to adjourn from C. Springer, second by J. Justman. Voted. Approved.
- IX. Adjourned at 2:30 p.m.