



P.O. Box 3039 • Grand Junction, CO 81502  
E-Mail: [info@mesaFML.org](mailto:info@mesaFML.org) Web: [www.mesaFML.org](http://www.mesaFML.org)

## **BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING**

**Date and Time:** 3:00 PM on Wednesday, July 29, 2020

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

### **Attendees:**

Dusti Reimer  
Chris McAnany  
Craig Springer  
John Justman  
Quint Shear  
Doug Shoemaker  
Christine Madsen  
Greg Canton

### **Agenda:**

- I. Call to Order at 3:00 pm.
- II. General Public Comment.
  - a. No public comment.
- III. Presentation of the 2019 Audit for Approval by Chadwick, Steinkirchner and Davis.
  - a. D. Reimer said the Board packet had the audit that was finished. Did you all have an opportunity to look at that?
  - b. C. Springer said I did.
  - c. D. Reimer said she (Lisa) had said in the meeting two weeks ago there was nothing that stuck out. Everything was straight forward. She sent over our letter and said if you had any additional questions, to let her know and she would be happy to answer them.
  - d. C. Springer said bottom of page 5, please. The paragraph above there, "the federal mineral lease is estimated to increase by 10% for the 2019-2020-year fulfillment." Federal mineral lease, I think we're lacking revenue. That sentence doesn't make sense to me.
  - e. D. Reimer said my estimated guess is revenue check, but I will have her clarify that.
  - f. C. Springer said we need to get this approved, right Chris?
  - g. C. McAnany said that's right. If you are satisfied with the audit and you don't have any further questions, you can approve it and we'll forward it on to the state audit that is required by law.
  - h. C. Springer asked if there was a motion to approve it.

- i. Q. Shear made a motion to approve the audit, with the corrections mentioned by Craig. J. Justman second. Voted. Approved.
- IV. Discussion and Possible Approval of Change in City of Grand Junction Police Department Grant Contract for Spring 2020.
- a. D. Reimer said Mr. Canton, along with Chief Shoemaker, are on with us. They applied for the spring grant cycle and they were awarded in May a partial award of \$150,000. We submitted the grant contract and Mr. Canton replied back that they would like to make some changes to the grant contract. So, I will turn it over to Mr. Canton or Chief Shoemaker, if you would like to go ahead.
  - b. G. Canton said thank you Board for the grant and support. It makes a big difference and quite frankly we would have not moved forward, particularly given the financial situation with COVID, the project would have been cancelled had we not receive the grant dollars. Given the grant dollars, the other challenge is finding the matching funds, which we can do and will do. We just asked for a little more time to program out that project. We started off with a little bit of a suggestion of a time frame modification, and that seemed supportable, and we changed the end date, and that is probably what pushed it too far and brought on more questions. We're certainly amenable to certain parameters that are placed on it by the board, it's really just bringing matching dollars, and specifically for 2020 we stopped all capital expenditures, unless emergency or critical. What we are doing is programming it into 2021 which we can do and will do. Given the delayed start, we were concerned we'd be out of contract for the finished. So, the suggestion was to change the bookends. The project is needed, and we appreciate the support and we're just looking for that time frame.
  - c. C. Springer said thank you Greg. Anything else from the City?
  - d. D. Shoemaker said I'll jump in, but I can't add too much more to what Mr. Canton said, but from our stance, we've had it in a two-phase project. It's certainly doable in a three-phase project, must a different time frame. We can start next month. We can start the barriers, the safety barriers between the ranges, the dirt work and the remediation and those types of things. We have to work, but because we're all under this situation with COVID and how our budgets are affected, we're going to push it out a little further. This project is, especially now more than ever, is an essential one. We appreciate your support and your wiliness to listen.
  - e. C. Springer said you're not asking for an indefinite recess, you're intended to move forward with it this year, you just need an extension.
  - f. J. Justman said did you say, Mr. Chairman, they'll start in the spring of 2021?
  - g. C. Springer said no, they said they will start it next month.
  - h. C. Springer said I'm sure you gentleman understand this, but here is our dilemma. It's certainly not your fault the way the application was designed, or the verbiage in it, but whether or not you have that matching funding is a big deal with how scoring is. Because of this, we have actually changed our application to make it from a scoring question to a qualifier. Or we in the process of changing that, for the simple reason that, if we award a grant and then we're subsequently notified the successful applicate, for matching reasons needs to change something, if you're number two on our scoring list, you could have a case

- to say wait a minute. We had the matching. We like your project, and it scored very highly. We just need to make sure that from the Federal Mineral Leasing District standpoint we're doing this correctly. That's the question and that's why we want to do this right.
- i. G. Canton said that makes a lot of sense. Let me say here that we can give this some comfort, like Chief said, let us start this project this fall. That would initiate the spending of those dollars, because they are already authorized. We certainly wouldn't be completed with the project in 2020, and then all of those dollars and the budgets just roll to 2021 and then the project is wrapped up in 2021.
  - j. C. Springer said start the project in the fall of 2020, and it wraps up in 2021.
  - k. G. Canton said yes. Chief, you good with that?
  - l. D. Shoemaker said that works.
  - m. J. Justman said what is your projected completion date?
  - n. D. Shoemaker said if we started in the next month, to month in a half we can be finished by calendar year of 2021.
  - o. C. Springer said any further questions for these gentlemen?
  - p. Q. Shear said as long as we can wrap this up in 2021, I'm comfortable with this.
  - q. D. Reimer said I just have one this to say the original contract that we sent out would have the start time from May 2020 with an end date of May 2022. Are the terms still ok, or do you want the date shifted? Because it seems like the original parameters of what we agreed on.
  - r. C. Springer said are you asking the City or the Board?
  - s. D. Shoemaker said we certainly felt, that regardless of the situation we would certainly be finished by the original contract date of 2022. We feel we can certainly get it finished by calendar year of 2021. I'll defer to City Manager Caton to confirm that.
  - t. G. Canton said that seems like a little bit of an adjustment there, and just given COVID the start is the delay, but given what we're hearing from the Board here on the comfort level and wrapping up in 2021, verse May of 2022, we're comfortable to moving that closer for the Boards direction.
  - u. C. Springer said thank you.
  - v. C. McAnany said I can circulate a revised grant agreement with an end date of calendar year 2021 for the grant. That's not a problem and that's well within our established time frame for the traditional grant program.
  - w. C. Springer said thank you. Any comments or questions?
  - x. J. Justman said as long as you're going to get it started, and given the conditions in the country, I'd really like to see it getting wrapped up in 2021. I sympathize with the City. It's a good opportunity to get this grant money and you don't want to jeopardize or have it get to the point it's so drug out we can't live with that either. If you can shoot for December 2021, I think that's enough time to complete it, barring some unforeseen circumstances.

- y. Q. Shear said the key with this is to have something started in 2020. They needed to have a start date or funds available in 2020, is that correct, Chris?
  - z. C. McAnany said no, the original thing is the traditional grant program has a two-year window and the city told us after they were awarded, they couldn't complete it in that window. They wanted to extend it a few months to August of 2022. We've now learned today they won't need to go that far. They can expend the money within the time frame anticipated. I don't see any problems on our end.
  - aa. C. Springer said as long as the contract between the District and the City reflects that the project will be stated in 2020 and completed by December of 2021, is that right Chris?
  - bb. C. McAnany said yes.
  - cc. C. Springer said is that agreeable to everyone at the City?
  - dd. D. Shoemake and G. Canton said yes.
  - ee. C. Springer asked for a motion.
  - ff. Q. Shear made a motion to approve the changes to the date in the grant contract to be completed in 2021. J. Justman second. Voted. Approved.
  - gg. C. Springer said we have a deal and thank you for helping with this. We look forward to the completion of the project and being invited to the ribbon cutting.
- V. Review and Possible Approval of Grant Application Changes.
- a. D. Reimer said we went through and made those changes you had asked for at the last meeting. I struggled a little with the wording, because Craig you had said you wanted the funding question to be a go, no go question in the eligibility questions and I wasn't sure where you wanted it to fall, and if it was worded legally and correctly. I also put in that last question, Craig, that you said you would like to have in there. I moved it under the eligibility questions in the traditional grant section. It says "Excluding the funds sought in this grant application, do you have all funds needed for the completion of the project? Please provide all details to the sources of the funding for the completion of the project. If the answer is no, we will unfortunately be unable to accept your grant application for this grant cycle.
  - b. C. Springer said that's a qualifier. Anyone want to weigh in on that?
  - c. C. McAnany said that's what you had asked for at the last meeting, it was just moving it to that section.
  - d. Q. Shear said he liked it.
  - e. J. Justman said he liked it.
  - f. D. Reimer said the next one was the question you wanted Craig. If your organization is not successful in securing grant money for your project from the Mesa County Federal Mineral Lease District this cycle, what is the future of this project? How does this project fit into your organizations long-term capital improvements plan? The discussion was that sometimes these projects come out on a wing and prayer and some of the projects seem like they just wanted to see if they could get money for the project and if it doesn't happen it was just a shot. Would they just keep coming at it and was it an essential project they needed to have.

- g. C. Springer said I think you did well with it, but my initial reaction is you have two questions. That capital improvements plan is another question. I'd leave #5 where it is and make that last one #6.
- h. Q. Shear said sometimes when you have those combined questions, they only answer one of them.
- i. C. Springer said he liked that.
- j. J. Justman said that's good.
- k. D. Reimer said I will take this one here and make it #6.
- l. C. Springer asked if he had any issues with it?
- m. C. McAnany said no, not at all. It is two different questions and breaking it out you'll get meaningful information.
- n. D. Reimer said ok, this will become question #6. Now there will be six questions. On the mini grant we don't have the qualifying question for the mini grant. Do you want it in there? I have it down below as a funding question.
- o. C. Springer said I like #5 from the traditional grant is in there.
- p. D. Reimer asked if they wanted the capital improvements question in the mini grant as well?
- q. C. Springer said no. There isn't much capital improvement you can do with that money. These are typically smaller projects.
- r. Q. Shear said these aren't long term projects.
- s. D. Reimer said I'll remove this question and leave the rest there.
- t. C. Springer said I like it. Do we need a motion to approve this, Chris?
- u. C. McAnany said this is an in house clean up thing. Dusti wanted to run this by you to use it in house for the fall grants. It isn't something that we have to formally approve the content. I'm assuming Dusti might want to tinker with the application. It's up to you, but not required.
- v. J. Justman said we would have a record of when we updated it in the minutes.
- w. C. Springer asked for a motion.
- x. J. Justman made a motion to approve the changes to the grant application for the traditional and the mini. Q. Shear second. Voted. Approved.

VI. **Unscheduled Business.**

- a. J. Justman made motion to adjourn. Q. Shear second. Voted. Approved.
  - i. Meeting adjourned at 3:28pm.