



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:** 2:00 PM on Wednesday, April 12, 2017

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

In attendance:

Craig Springer  
John Justman  
Chris McAnany  
Dusti Reimer  
Scott Olsen  
Benita Phillips  
Libby Collins  
Lance Stewart  
Rob Schoeber  
Richard Sales  
Brian Lurvey  
Ty Minnick  
Ted Balbier

### **Meeting Minutes:**

- I. Call to order at 2:00 p.m. by David Ludlam.
- II. General Public Comment.
  - a. There was no public comment.
  - b. D. Ludlam took a moment to thank staff, applicants and Board for shepherding the piece of legislation through the Colorado House and Senate. It was the first piece of legislation that D. Ludlam had been involved, and was pleased with the bipartisan help to move forward with giving the Districts the ability to think big and think ahead for the future of the counties they serve.
  - c. C. Springer said we now have the authority to create a permanent fund and that is where the risk starts. We want to be very careful to generate an investment policy that captures the flexibility of the spirit that's in the bill, but also mitigates the risk for this board and future boards for how those funds are invested. We are putting a lot of thought into the investment policy it will be discussed at length at future workshops and meetings. We are working a draft investment policy now that will offer the board options going forward. C. Springer also said that he appreciates that David Ludlam isn't taking credit for this, but he really does get 100% of the credit. This was his idea, he

worked with the ones who decided to carry the bill, made sure the public was along with it, and being 61 years old, this is the first time that he knew a person who had an idea and watched it go all the way to the governor's desk and watch a bill get signed. So from the people in the state of Colorado, congratulations and great work David.

- d. David Ludlam thanked C. Springer for his comments. He remarked that we will move forward with the drafted policy and have a minimum of a 30 public review, with perhaps additional workshops related to the new investment policy in hopes of getting something in place in the next few months.
  - e. Public Comment Closed.
- III. D. Ludlam asked Board to for permission to move the Staff Updates to the Consent Agenda.
- a. Board agreed.
- IV. Consent Agenda:
- a. Request for payment for:
    - 1. Dufford, Waldeck, Milburn & Krohn - \$980 for legal services in March;
    - 2. Dusti Reimer - \$2,562.16 for services and supplies for March
- V. Staff Updates.
- a. D. Reimer gave an update on Staff Updates:
    - i. Social Media postings were thanking the grant applicants, posted about upcoming board meetings and grant award dates.
    - ii. No requested grant payments at this time; however the City of Grand Junction/CMU Law Enforcement Training Center grant deadline is approaching and is expected within the next few weeks.
    - iii. Bills for the MCFMLD for the past month are:
      - 1. Dufford, Waldeck, Milburn & Krohn - \$980 for legal services in March;
      - 2. Dusti Reimer - \$2,562.16 for services and supplies for March
    - iv. Upcoming Events for the District:
      - 1. May 10<sup>th</sup> Monthly Board Meeting all Grant Contracts will be due
    - v. Giving Presentation:
      - 1. D. Reimer went through all the past grant funding cycles since the beginning of the District in 2011. Lightbulb Media has been contacted and asked for a quote for producing video segments for each of the communities to showcase how Mesa County Federal Mineral Lease District grants have impacted their areas and all the Mesa County residents. This is the breakdown of giving to each community since 2011:
        - a. Fruita - \$560,000 in grants.

- i. City of Fruita \$460,000 for three grants.
  - ii. City of Fruita has received three grants totaling \$460,000 for:
    - 1. Park and Public Works Facility
    - 2. Downtown Utility and Streetscapes Improvements
    - 3. Aspen Avenue Alley Improvements
  - iii. Lower Valley Fire Department has received two grants totaling \$100,000 for:
    - 1. Fire Station Remodel
    - 2. Fire Station Access Upgrade/Repair
- b. Whitewater/Land's End - \$32,485
- i. Land's End Fire Protection District has received two grants totaling \$323,485 for:
    - 1. Fire Station Upgrades
    - 2. SCBA Bottles Repair/Replace
- c. Grand Junction - \$ 4,258,278.49
- i. City of Grand Junction
    - 1. Salt Shed
    - 2. Fire Station 4-Alerting System
    - 3. Colorado Law Enforcement & Fire Training Center (Joint CMU)
  - ii. School District #51
    - 1. Caprock Permanent Parking lot
    - 2. Security Classroom Lock Replacement
    - 3. Safe & Secure Schools
  - iii. Colorado Mesa University
    - 1. Tomlinson Library
    - 2. Ground Source Heat Exchange
    - 3. Unconventional Energy Epicenter

- iv. Western Colorado Community College
  - 1. Electric Lineworker School Building
- v. Mesa County Library
  - 1. 970 West Studios
- vi. Grand Junction Regional Airport Authority
  - 1. Terminal Safety and Security Upgrades
  - 2. Passenger Demand Analysis and Business Survey
  - 3. Public Access Automated External Defibrillator Program (AED)
  - 4. Aircraft Rescue Fire Fighting Personal Protective Equipment
- vii. Grand Valley Drainage District
  - 1. Section 106 Cultural Resource Study
- d. Clifton - \$759,000
  - i. Clifton Sanitation District has received five grants totaling \$705,000 for:
    - 1. Wastewater Master Plan Update
    - 2. System Upgrade and Strategic Plan for I-70 Service Area
    - 3. Collection System Replacement/Upgrade
    - 4. Closed Camera Inspection Equipment/GIS
    - 5. Manhole Liner Protection
  - ii. Clifton Fire Protection District has received two grants totaling \$54,000 for:
    - 1. Feasibility Study and Design
    - 2. AVL/Fire Mobile Project
- e. Palisade - \$ 793,615
  - i. Town of Palisade has received three grants totaling \$672,000 for:
    - 1. Voorhees Drain Improvement

2. Palisade Downtown Street Reconstruction
    3. Palisade Fire Station Alert System
  - ii. Palisade Police Department has received one grant totaling \$36,540 for:
    1. Patrol Vehicle
  - iii. Palisade Fire Protection District has received two grants totaling \$85,075 for:
    1. Self-Contained Breathing Apparatus
    2. Cardiac Monitors
- f. De Beque - \$331,530
  - i. Town of De Beque has received two grants totaling \$83,935 for:
    1. De Beque Street Repairs
    2. De Beque Street Repair Project
  - ii. De Beque School District one grant totaling \$50,000 for:
    1. Master Plan/Resurface Entrance
  - iii. De Beque Fire Protection District has received two grants totaling \$197,595 for:
    1. Planning for New Fire Station
    2. Construction of New Fire Station
- g. Collbran - \$512,652
  - i. Town of Collbran has received two grants totaling \$100,000 for:
    1. Collbran Downtown Improvements
    2. Collbran Street Maintenance & Repair
  - ii. Plateau Valley School District two grants totaling \$412,652 for:
    1. District Heating & Cooling Project
    2. School Building Internet/Wireless/Technology Project

h. Since 2011 \$7,247,560.49 has been given to organizations in Mesa County. Almost every community, within Mesa County, has received mineral lease dollars. To date, these funded projects have directly, or indirectly, impacted every citizen in Mesa County.

vi. C. McAnany updated that he will be working on Grant Award contracts after the Board awards today. Also, speaking with Craig Springer on fine tuning the investment policy for the next meeting.

vii. S. Olsen waiting to update/speak on audit services that is listed on the agenda.

viii. Public Comment on Staff Report/Consent Agenda.

1. Rich Sales asked for a copy of the Giving Presentation so he could share it with his Board.

2. Benita Phillips asked if this could be put on the website.

3. D. Ludlam asked if we could go into the different municipalities and give this presentation.

ix. Motion to approve the Staff Report and Consent Agenda by J. Justman, second by C. Springer. Voted. Approved.

VI. Adoption of the March Board and Workshop Meeting Minutes.

a. Motion to approved by J. Justman, second by C. Springer. Voted. Approved.

VII. Awarding of the Spring Grant Awards.

a. D. Ludlam gave overview of grant program. Staff creates binders of the eligible applications for the Board to review. The applicants give a presentation, if they wish, to the Board. The Board then reviews and scores the applications. The scores are given to Staff. These scores are being shown to the Board and public for the first time right now.

b. D. Reimer showed the average scores for all the traditional and mini grant applications. They were ranked from highest to lowest in scoring for the Board presentation.

c. D. Ludlam asked the Board if there were any questions about the scores.

d. C. Springer asked how much was available for awarding.

e. D. Reimer responded that the District has approximately \$350,000.

f. D. Ludlam asked if the columns F and L were apples to apples comparison.

g. S. Olsen and D. Reimer responded that it was.

h. D. Reimer gave funding option scenarios:

i. Funding Option A: Fund top two traditional grants, no minis

1. D. Ludlam: Asked why no funding minis.

2. D. Reimer: This was just an option-to be heavy funding on the traditional.

- ii. Funding Option B: Fund all the mini grants, no traditional.
  - iii. Funding Option C: Fund top traditional, and top four mini grants.
- i. Board Discussion:
- i. C. Springer said he does not like Option A, or Option B for funding. C. Springer liked Option C. If you look at the percentages for scoring, Option C seems fair.
  - ii. Benita Phillips, community member, asked during the Board discussion if they had a formal protest in place.
  - iii. D. Ludlam asked for more specific clarification on what she meant by a protest.
  - iv. Benita Phillips said she wanted to know how the public could file a formal protest the awarding of the public funds to certain grant awards.
  - v. D. Ludlam said they do not. He continued to address Mrs. Phillips by saying, Mrs. Phillips, with all due respect, we have been deferential to you for three years.
  - vi. B. Phillips said that D. Ludlam should be because she represents the public.
  - vii. D. Ludlam continued addressing Mrs. Phillips by stating that this time was open for Board discussion, and they had public comment when they opened the Board meeting, which she was late for.
  - viii. B. Phillips said she was not late, but that the Board meeting started five minutes early because she was in here exactly at 1400 hours. She said she knows that the Board does not like what she is about to say, but she really thinks the Board needs to look at this from a different perspective, and that perspective is health and safety. According to her, from what she has been able to discern, no analysis of that or fund basis. She asked if there was any discussion on the Stocker Stadium natural vs synthetic turf. No, you did not. She did. It's cheaper, it's cheaper to maintain, it's healthier for the participants. Once Stocker Stadium gets hot, that DOCs that come off that prove to be lethal in the long term. I'm trying to prevent you from a lawsuit, which you are looking at, and is happening throughout this nation. So, I do not know why you would find this to be a problem.
  - ix. D. Ludlam asked if she would like him to explain why.
  - x. B. Phillips said sure.
  - xi. D. Ludlam said they have been deferential to her, we have allowed you to have open discussion, outside of protocols, because we wanted to error on the side of public involvement and engagement. Throughout the course of the meetings you have seen the progresses of transparency and openness that we have created. We always error on the side of inclusion. I think all the members in this room, including the Board, have seen your public remarks outside of these meetings, referring to us, the Board members, being inbred and embedded and all kinds of other disparaging remarks.
  - xii. B. Philips interjected that was not true.

- xiii. D. Ludlam continued saying the remarks you've (B. Phillips) have made online are inaccurate and are misrepresented of the actual deliberations that happen in this room over the past few years. I'm happy to take your comments that you submit to us in writing, I'm happy to take your comments during the scheduled public comment time during our meetings and public comments using our discretion that we make available to you during these meetings. I think you know that we always make public comment available before we take action. To address your question about a formal protest policy, no we do not have one and we probably won't. But, all of our deliberations are available for open records request through Colorado Open Records Act. As soon as we are done having Board discussion we will open it back up to Public Comment, where you can finish making the remainder of your remarks.
- xiv. B. Phillips said ok.
- xv. C. Springer said it seems obvious to him that the highest percentage of scoring is in the top five projects that are highlighted in Option C. We can fund that additional \$2,700 for this overage, correct?
- xvi. S. Olsen we have the funds to cover this. We have had a few projects that have come in under budget, which makes this acceptable for funding.
- xvii. D. Ludlam said that Option C also makes the most sense to him. The 62% is basically the cut off with the traditional and mini scoring.
- xviii. J. Justman said he wondered if he could take some off the \$200,000 to allow for the Fill Bottle Station funding at the airport, but that to start to break it up, might not be easy. This would seem like the best scenario.
- xix. D. Ludlam said before the Board votes, that they would like to open public comment.
- xx. B. Philips the Stocker Stadium project does not alleviate social, economic and public finances act resulting in development of natural resources. So it does not meet the criteria. I am really concerned. I did a lot of research of what this astro turf is doing in our nation in terms, even the tertiary level of astro turf that you're looking at. Even the best kind of astro turf you can put down, during the hot season, is giving off DOCs which, the fat products in our bodies hold these DOCs, especially in women who play on these fields. They are finding that down the line they are finding higher cases of female cancers. I think that we need to really look at this. The whole point of this is to promote jobs. If we do this on a natural turf, there are at least three turf companies in town that would benefit from the job increase, because the natural turf would have to be replaced on a regular basis because of play. There are turfs out there that are very amendable to hard play. I'm sure we can find something that would work that would be safer for the kids, safer for the decision of this Board, and the county and school in the long run. I'm not trying to stop you for doing anything for Stocker stadium. It is a big draw for this county, but I believe this needs to be looked at from a different perspective.
- xxi. D. Ludlam thanked Mrs. Phillips for her comments. Any response from the school board or public comment.



- xxii. Rich Sales said from his perspective, when he looked at this, was whether the City of Grand Junction could phase or take a partial, but then I remembered during the presentation that the time was so tight and that they really need to be fully funded to get this done. I sit on the Outdoor Recreation Coalition and GJEPs Board and know that Outdoor Recreation is part of economic development. Stocker Stadium is a key piece of how we demonstrate that in this community. It's not a mountain bike mecca, but track, football, soccer, and graduations take place there and is a big community asset and as such deserves to be funded with these monies. Palisade is at the bottom of the pile, and I regretfully respect that the staff and board have been diligent with their decision and deliberations. I support funding Option C.
- xxiii. D. Ludlam thanked Rich Sales for his comments.
- xxiv. B. Phillips said I am not saying not to fund Stocker Stadium. I'm asking for it be funded for natural turf. It's much safer and healthier for the players. Since other leagues are all going to natural turf, my question is, why did you decide to do Astro Turf? Did you make that comparison?
- xxv. D. Ludlam said we are a distribution policy body. The policy making entities for the city, university and school district make those kind of policy decisions, not us. That is not to take away from your earnest sincerity, but I believe these questions and concerns should be raised and directed to them for answers. My recommendation would be to have those questions offline. We can take those questions online today and pass those along if that would be good. But that is not the type of policy that our Board makes.
- xxvi. C. Springer said to dove tail what D. Ludlam just said thinking about what Mrs. Phillips has said. There is a lot of trust in this room. When we fund defibrillators for the airport, we assume they have done their due diligence and homework and we are going to trust they are going to pick the best defibrillators for that area and what they need done. When the City of Palisade comes to us and asks for funding for a police vehicle, we don't ask them is it a Ford, Chevy, Dodge? That's not up to us. As David said, we are in distribution. Where the turf issue is concerned, we have a lot of faith that the people involved in those decisions have put in the time and research to find the best product for their needs and that these are the best for our community. For us to not make award needs based on the product that is being requested would be way outside of our curfew. We have to think about the best interests of Mesa County. That's what we are trying to do here. Whether we accomplish this or not, only time will tell. But that's what we are trying to do.
- xxvii. B. Phillips asked if they Board goes with funding Option C, how much money would be left over for investment.
- xxviii. C. Springer said there would be none left for investment.
- xxix. D. Ludlam closed public comment.
- xxx. Motion to adopt Funding Option C for the Spring 2017 Grant Awards from C. Springer, second by J. Justman. Voted. Approved.

VIII. Audit Services.

- a. S. Olsen wanted to recommend as soon as possible. The actual audit may not take that much time, but the scheduling of it all might. The deadline is at the end of June. Essentially we just need to make a choice for either continuing with our current auditors or creating a quick RFP for an auditor and making a quick turnaround to get our audit done.
  - b. D. Ludlam said that he remembered that the initial RFP said that they had the option of using the selected auditors services for up to an additional four years.
  - c. D. Reimer said the original RFP went out in 2014, which would extend the contract until 2018.
  - d. C. Springer asked S. Olsen, knowing what we are paying for the audit, would it be in the best interest to continue with the current services or look at other options. This is in your line of work, so we are looking at your expertise.
  - e. S. Olsen said he was not sure what the other options were, but that he does know that audits are not cheap, whether they deserve to be as much as they are is debatable. But, from the accepted agreement with our current auditors they had it broken down by so many hours per staff for pre, so many hours for partner review, that had an hourly rate similar to the invoices we receive for legal and accounting. Without having seen the other proposals from other companies, it's hard to say what we thought would be reasonable. I know that is not a very good answer on what I think other companies offer.
  - f. Lance Stewart, community member, said he isn't sure if this would help the Board or not, but in his experience with audits and auditing companies that to do an acceptable job are the ones that have held the contracts for a long period of time. Their experience is that a new contractor can't come in the following year and be as competitive, because they don't have the background knowledge and information that has established and understand already with long term companies. He has not had to replace a current auditor unless they have gotten out of that line of business.
  - g. D. Ludlam said that was helpful.
  - h. C. Springer said it seems we should take staff recommendation and renew for another year, look at the numbers and review it earlier next year. C. Springer made a motion to continue audit services with our current company.
  - i. J. Justman agreed with C. Springer and said we do not have to change auditors each year. J. Justman second the motion. Voted. Approved.
  - j. S. Olsen said he would get in touch with the auditors to get started.
- IX. Unscheduled business.
- a. None.
- X. Motion to adjourn from J. Justman, second by C. Springer. Voted. Approved.
- XI. Adjourned at 2:40 p.m.