



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, November 17, 2020

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

Attendees:

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

Agenda:

- I. Call to Order by Craig Springer at 3pm.
 - a. Q. Shear made a motion to approve the agenda. J. Justman second. Voted. Approved.
- II. General Public Comment.
 - a. None
- III. Adoption of the October Meeting Minutes.
 - a. Q. Shear made a motion to approve the meeting minutes. J. Justman second. Voted. Approved.
- IV. Staff Report.
 - a. D. Reimer said November social media had posts for our meeting minutes being posted, meeting agenda posted, Live Stream of the October meeting, November Zoom Meeting Details, the three news articles that mentioned the Districts, the news release on the grant awards, and Happy Veteran's Day post. We also uploaded our October Meeting to our YouTube page.
 - b. D. Reimer posted the links to the news media we received from KKCO – CMU & D51 Receive Partial Grant for COVID-19 Phase Two Testing, KREX – CMU & D51 Rewarded Grant, and The Business Times – Mineral Lease District Awards Grants. The Business Times published the full press release with all the grant awards.
 - c. D. Reimer said there are no invoices requesting payment at this time.

- d. D. Reimer said the invoices for payment for October are for Dusti Reimer Invoice #152 for services and supplies for \$3,789.97, Dufford Waldeck Invoice# 22574 for \$880 for services and Eide Bailly Invoice# Elo1044781 for \$1,910.52 for Quick Books fees and services for October.
 - e. D. Reimer said we will be dealing with our DOLA disbursement and budgeting. As a reminder it was for \$495,556.20.
 - f. D. Reimer said our upcoming dates and events are December 16th for the Board meeting, which sounds like it will be a Zoom meeting. We will need to have a 30-day public notice for our budget published in the newspaper, so people have an opportunity to review it before that meeting, and we have to have it approved by December 31st.
 - g. C. Springer asked Dusti if she contacts the media outlets when there is news or how does that happen?
 - h. D. Reimer said I type up press releases and send them out on different news sources when they come out. Sometimes they contact me about new stories, and sometimes they run them as is and sometimes I don't hear from them at all.
 - i. J. Justman made a motion to approve the staff report. Q. Shear second. Voted. Approved.
- V. Review of Investment Account for October.
- a. M. Rosenberg said it was basically a good month and keeps getting better. Markets are at all time highs and the portfolio was at it's all time high at \$1.83 million. We're at about 62% equities right now. We're still at our threshold. We did that rebalance a few months ago to get back within our investment restraints and that's where we are at the time being. No major changes, but I can answer questions if there is any.
 - b. J. Justman made a motion to approve the financial report. Q. Shear second. Voted. Approved.
- VI. Review of Financials for October.
- a. C. Madsen said for the balance sheet under fund balance we have \$1,114,534.90 and for the permanent fund we have \$1,716,580.10. For the net income we have \$200,000 in grants awarded, contract services for \$3,750, dues and memberships \$265.97, supplies \$22.14 and operation expenses of \$609.40. We have unrealized loss in the permanent fund of -\$40,014.72 and realized gain of \$17,945.25, interest earned of \$0.05, Dividend income of \$1,787.57 and investment fees of -\$3,691.84 that gives us a net loss of \$228,621.20.
 - b. C. Madsen said under A/P Aging Summary I've added the three grants. We have City of Fruita for \$50,000, Colorado Mesa University for \$88,400, East Orchard Mesa Fire Protection District for \$61,600, Grand Junction Police Department for

\$150,000, and Lands End Fire Protection District for \$50,000. Which gives us a total of \$400,000 in grants.

- c. C. Madsen said for the budget to actual we are still under the budget for outside services and other expenses. The rest is still pretty much the same as the prior month.
- d. Q. Shear made a motion to approve the financials. J. Justman second. Voted. Approved.

VII. Approval and Execution of Fall Grant Contracts.

- a. D. Reimer said in the board packet, I sent over a copy of the resolution that Chris sent over. If you want to read off that, if everything is ok. I know Craig has a copy of it to sign, along with other contracts. They have been submitted to everyone. They have been signed by Lower Valley and Orchard Mesa, just not D51 or CMU.
- b. C. Springer said first of all, Chris is not on this call, right?
- c. D. Reimer said that is right.
- d. C. Springer said they way this happens it that the grantee signs first and we sign last, right?
- e. D. Reimer said not always. We have had a few cases where a couple of different times where the City of Grand Junction has had issues with the contract, typically just with wording, but typically the contract amounts are reviewed and approved. We don't have to sign the contracts, but you could just approve the resolution, maybe. I'm not going to speak on what to approve and what not to approve. All I know is if you are comfortable with the contracts, we can sign them.
- f. C. Springer said East Orchard Mesa has signed and Lower Valley has signed, but CMU has not.
- g. D. Reimer said we have not gotten their signature back, and D51 hasn't signed either. It was a joint application. Derek was responsive, they were eager to get it.
- h. Q. Shear said that it seemed someone hadn't signed last time and Chris said last time we have all the power we don't have to pay, if they don't meet their requirements.
- i. D. Reimer said yes, it was the city, because they wanted to change the terms of the contract. We did approve that and then we had a special meeting for them, where you signed a different contract later on because we did change it. The resolution says you approve grant contracts and grant agreements, are approved.

- j. C. Springer in the board packet, did you send out the grant contracts?
- k. D. Reimer said I did not.
- l. C. Springer said I have a problem with saying the board has reviewed them and found them to be in order, when we have not reviewed them and don't find them to be in order. We can't agree to number two.
- m. J. Justman asked if we can approve the two that signed and wait until they sign it?
- n. Q. Shear said we don't have the copy of the agreements.
- o. C. Springer said I don't like it. There for a minute, I was thinking we could amend item number two, to say something along the lines that the board authorizes the president to review the agreement, but I'm not the attorney for the Board. I think that's a dangerous precedent for the board to sign something that hasn't been seen.
- p. Q. Shear asked if this holds up any funding for anything or anyone?
- q. D. Reimer said we've always said to hold off on doing any purchasing until contracts are signed.
- r. J. Justman asked who signed?
- s. D. Reimer said Lowe Valley and East Orchard Mesa.
- t. Q. Shear said we don't have the documents to review them.
- u. J. Justman said they submitted their documents in a timely matter, I don't know why we wouldn't just approve those two and let the other two decide what they want to do.
- v. C. Springer said the answer to your question John, is I don't see, I understand what they did, I'm trying to figure out how we can execute these without the board being in possession of the agreements. How can we approve something we haven't seen?
- w. J. Justman said we could sign the agreements of the two-we got two back correct? If they want to move forward with their project, they will move, wouldn't they?
- x. D. Reimer said I can pull them up and we could go through them. I just emailed them to you, and I know it doesn't change anything, but we could go through them online now.
- y. J. Justman said I'm not sure if they're ready to do anything or not, but why should they wait another month, for the other two?
- z. C. Springer said I don't like the precedent of changing the rules as we go. Some grants cycles we have this documentation and some we don't. I don't like that.

- aa. J. Justman said we don't do it then.
- bb. Q. Shear said I agree we hold off. Unless someone is in a hurry and we need to have a special meeting to approve it, we could have a special meeting.
- cc. C. Springer said if this is doing harm to someone Dusti, I think you reach out to us and we request a special meeting, but I think we stick with the way we do this. It's a bumpy road if every single one of these grant cycles we do it different. I think we do it uniformly and fairly. If there is pain out there, then they can reach out to you and we can schedule a special meeting for that one item. I would enter a motion to table the execution of grant contracts to a subsequent meeting.
- dd. Q. Shear made the motion. J. Justman second. Voted. Approved.

VIII. Discussion and Review of Budget for 2021.

- a. D. Reimer said I am actually going to differ this to Christine, she has a spreadsheet to work off of to move forward.
- b. C. Madsen said she is ready for any changes necessary. She has 2021 pulled up. Any changes that you're seeing?
- c. Q. Shear asked if you had the accounting fees revised to \$2400. Oh, I'm looking at a different worksheet.
- d. D. Reimer said yes, that's the other worksheet that we sent out.
- e. C. Springer said the one that Dusti sent out has a flaw. It was only set up for 10 months. Can you pull that up on screen?
- f. D. Reimer said yes, Christine, can you let me share that? I apologize for the delay; I'm pulling it up. Can everyone see that?
- g. C. Springer said yes.
- h. D. Reimer said that Chris had sent over there was the possibility of getting rid of the audit. That we could potentially apply to the state to allow us not to have to an audit. We'd have to apply for that every year.
- i. C. Springer said we've had some discussions. Quint had discussions with Eide Bailly. I had a lengthy conversation with Chris McAnany and asked him if he would consider some sort of a guarantee or agreement with the district, that unless there was litigation, his legal fees would be limited to \$5,000 next year. He said he was amenable to that agreement. I met with Dusti, and she said she was willing to work with us in any way needed. That's very much appreciated. These numbers we are just playing with. Quint was going to talk with Eide Bailly.
- j. Q. Shear said I talked with Eide Bailly and they do bill us for hours for the meetings and they can either show up for limited time and go through budget or

finances and leave or they can just show up once a quarter. If we have questions, we can send them to them. I don't see any reason why we have someone go through financials every month. I think we could cut back to a quarterly thing. She said there is also something they can look at to do to write off part of their fees as a contribution.

- k. C. Springer asked if you got down to a number?
- l. Q. Shear said we did not.
- m. C. Madsen said she would ask Kathy if there was a number specific, she has in mind.
- n. Q. Shear said that would be great.
- o. C. Springer said I think the audit issue is a separate and potentially bigger issue. In my mind, our financials are not complicated in any way shape or form. There is nothing exciting going on there. I was worried about Matt's investment fees as being considered admin, and they aren't. What has me concerned now is the financials and the different supplies and that kind of stuff that is on there. I'm wondering if we shouldn't figure that into a line item. Do you understand what I'm saying? We've got, I don't know, I didn't ask Chris if insurance fits into that. And we have dues and memberships. Who do those dues and memberships belong to, Dusti?
- p. D. Reimer said dues and memberships are the Special District Association and I believe also is the monthly email hosting, security for internet, Microsoft, Adobe and Zoom all falls into that category.
- q. C. Springer said it seems like that I've always recused myself from anything having to do with insurance, because it's purchased through, I think Home Loan Investment Company, because I am a shareholder and an officer, so I don't have anything to do with the insurance division, but I'm not sure, but it seems like in a meeting once we got a better rate on insurance because we belong to that Special District Association. Will you check on that, Dusti?
- r. D. Reimer said yes.
- s. C. Springer said getting back to the worksheet, if we can get a number that Eide Bailly is comfortable guaranteeing us, I guess from my perspective, if we have Eide Bailly preparing the financials, and I agree with Quint, I don't think they need to be presented at the meeting. They are just not that complicated. If there was a question, we could have someone like Christine or someone from Eide Bailly come to the next meeting and give us the answer to that question, but I think having them is a luxury and I don't think we can afford. I don't feel that way about Chris, because there is too much stuff going on all the time that we have to ask questions for. If we can get a refined number from Eide Bailly about what they are willing to contract for, for the next year, then I think we

take a good long look at that audit number and see if we have Eide Bailly preparing our financials, and if they are as simple as they are, is it necessary to spend \$3,700 or \$3,800 a year on an audit, when that comes out of people's hides. Specifically, Dusti's. If you see there, if we got Chris down to \$5,000 and I'm not sure where we got that \$2,400 came from, maybe that was my estimate, and I hope we don't have drop Dusti to \$32,000 and if she does, maybe we eliminate the audit to do something. If we get this settled, what cushion is this board comfortable with. And those \$3,100 in dues, supplies and operations, is this included in there as well? Because I would be very uncomfortable getting under \$5,000 as cushion. I don't know how my fellow board members feel, but something could happen, and I don't know. I think it's irresponsible to drive that bus so close to the cliff.

- t. Q. Shear said based on our limited budget I could see going a little lower than that, and just because we have a limited budget, but not a lot. I wouldn't feel comfortable going less than \$3,000. That gives us a little buffer if we run up against some legal expenses somewhere. That would be my preference.
- u. C. Springer said one thing I forgot to report. There is a question, that Dusti had, about previous grant cycles that is unused, that for one reason or another, either the grantee didn't need the money or came in lower or whatever, we have couple hundred thousand dollars. The question is, can we use that. Chris's response was, as I recall it, and intending to simplify everything, there is a legal argument to be made on both sides of that. That is dirt that I have no desire to walk on whatsoever. This District has been black and white since its inception. He said given the statues you can make an argument on either side of that. Why we would want to do that, I have no idea.
- v. J. Justman said I imagine we'll see declining review next year in 2021?
- w. C. Springer said yes, sir.
- x. J. Justman said we get a spring grant, correct?
- y. D. Reimer said that is up to you guys if you want to do spring and fall, or do one big one, or not do one at all. That's always been up to the board.
- z. J. Justman said as our revenue goes down, will the auditing going to drop correspondingly?
- aa. Q. Shear said probably not.
- bb. C. Springer said it hasn't.
- cc. Q. Shear asked if we just have one grant cycle, does it cut down on your efforts and expenses considerably, each year?
- dd. D. Reimer said expenses yes, it can. We don't make a lot of binders, that's what we get supplies to. The other thing is billables for contracts being made, which

would be Chris. The other thing is we still have five grants to be paid out, that we would still have to potentially be around to pay off this next year. So, it can.

- ee. Q. Shear said what are your thoughts on that, Craig?
- ff. C. Springer said all three of us have been concerned for several years about the grant applications we have been receiving. We also know those grant applications are directly related to the amount of money that is available. If you want things to get applications that matter, have enough money to do something that matters. I'm actually and have always been a proponent for two grant cycles, and now I'm seeing the efficacy of us just having one grant cycle next year. I feel compelled to continue to invest in the permanent fund. I think that it is serving the people of Mesa County very well with where it's at. It won't be long to where we'll have that up to \$2 million dollars. It wasn't that long ago that it was a dream that we could get that to there. I think with Matt's good work, we need to continue to invest in that, however, my number would be not more than \$100,000 this next year.
- gg. Q. Shear said I would agree with that.
- hh. C. Springer said if we give \$100,000 that's basically saying, with one grant cycle, we'll be giving away \$350,000, holding back the money needed for administration. Right?
- ii. D. Reimer said yes.
- jj. C. Springer asked John if he had any comments.
- kk. J. Justman said I don't like looking at declining money. But I guess that's what we what we have. If some of things happen the way the talk out of Denver, where we are headed it's just going to continue to decline.
- ll. Q. Shear said until the attitude towards investing in oil and change, we're not going to see this go up. There is not going to be anymore drilling, therefore, there won't be more money for us. Right now, all of the private equity companies and investors in oil and gas are not investing in oil and gas until our regulatory environment gets fixed.
- mm. J. Justman said a lot happens on what happens in Washington. Three or four years ago I was at a meeting and 71% of the BLM's operating money comes from the extraction industries. I am sure BLM knows that, and I mean Joe Biden talked about no more fracking on federal lands and I guess they can keep shooting themselves in the foot until they have nothing left and maybe lay off some bureaucrats, but that's probably not likely either. In my mind, it's not a real pretty picture.
- nn. Q. Shear said it probably won't change until we have people are having to sit in lines at the gas station and have black outs, you probably won't see this change.

- oo. C. Springer asked what their feels were towards the audit question.
- pp. Q. Shear said I don't want to skip multiple years. I can see doing it every other year. I had to skip for multiple years. Budgeting each year for an audit everything three years? How do you feel about that?
- qq. C. Springer said I have two things that I think about it. One, it shoves some risk over in the risk of board members, that without having an audit that oversight is a good protection for the public's money and us. Again, that's a good question for insurance, are we insurable if we don't have audits.
- rr. Q. Shear said I'm sure they probably have a requirement.
- ss. C. Springer said I would think it's an in or out. My experience with audits is, if you miss a year, you're going to pay for cleaning that up. They're going to have to go back to the last audit. Would you agree with that Christine?
- tt. C. Madsen said I do agree with what Craig said. I think that a yearly audit would still be actually relevant. Unfortunately.
- uu. J. Justman said can we get bids from other companies to do the audit?
- vv. D. Reimer said we just did that two years ago. We put out the RFP and we only got one response, which is our current auditors. I should say that even though Chris said we do potentially have an option, the state would still have to approve us not doing it. You could potentially apply and they could say no. If I read that correctly.
- ww. C. Springer said we have to approve this budget in December, correct?
- xx. D. Reimer said yes, by December 31st? Do we want to ask some questions and come back together next week to put this back into a package for the public to review?
- yy. C. Springer said I agree with that. I think maybe Dusti and I would ask the board's permission to let us work on this for a couple of weeks to reach out and get an answer from Eide Bailly on what they can do, our auditor to see if they can help us, Chris was willing to help and we can circle back on those other expenses and then come back to the board with a product that fits within the constraints that we're operating under.
- zz. J. Justman said that is good with me.
- aaa. Q. Shear said I'll have an Eide Bailly number by tomorrow, I'll follow up.
- bbb. C. Springer said I'll circle back with Chris to see if he's comfortable with that \$5,000. If he wants to go lower, we'll certainly accept that. He said he deemed it as public service, rather than profit stimulator.
- ccc. Q. Shear asked if he needed someone else to check with insurance.

- ddd. D. Reimer said I can check and email over to Jamie and Ann and see what their response is. We need to ask if we need an audit for our insurance and if we get a discount from the Special District Association.
- eee. C. Springer said great, Dusti will handle that. Quint will do Eide Bailly. I'll tal with Chris again and I'll reach out to our Auditor and see what we can do there.
- fff. D. Reimer said do we want to try and meet again. I know next week again. I know its Thanksgiving next week, but we have to have a 30-day public notice, that this is a proposed budget. The sooner the better, so any day we can meet next week would be great.
- ggg. Q. Shear said I'm not going to any Christmas party's, so I have lots of time.
- hhh. C. Springer said that's an issue.
- iii. D. Reimer said it has to be published for 30 days, so we're looking to moving the regular December meeting as well.
- jjj. C. Springer said do we need to notice the next meeting. How many days' notice do we need for a meeting?
- kkk. D. Reimer said for a public meeting we need 24 hours. But we need a 30-day notice and have the budget posted for viewing.
- lll. C. Springer asked what everyone's schedule looked like.
- mmm. J. Justman said Monday afternoon or Tuesday. We have our administrative hearing from 9-10 am on Monday morning.
- nnn. Q. Shear said I'm good on Monday. Even that meeting on Tuesday, my attendance is not required, so I can skip that one to take care of this.
- ooo. C. Springer said I think Tuesday works better for me.
- ppp. J. Justman said I have an early morning Tuesday and then open later.
- qqq. C. Springer said 3 pm on Tuesday.
- rrr. D. Reimer said the 24th.
- sss. C. Springer said yes.
- ttt. Q. Shear said I bet the meeting on Tuesday gets cancelled anyway. It's an update on regulatory stuff that's not going to happen then.
- uuu. C. Springer said you'll post that meeting and we've all got our assignments, because we have to figure that out next Tuesday at 3 pm.

- vvv. D. Reimer said let's talk about the December meeting. If we get that taken care of next Tuesday, and it has to be posted for 30 days which brings us to December 24th. Our meeting on the 16th, could be a moo point.
- www. C. Springer said yes, it is a moo point. We could move it to Tuesday the 29th.
- xxx. D. Reimer said ok.
- yyy. Q. Shear said that makes the most sense.
- zzz. J. Justman said I have a meeting at 3:30pm. Could we move it up to 2pm?
- aaaa. Q. Shear said I can make that work.
- bbbb. D. Reimer said 2pm on December 29th.
- cccc. C. Springer said yes. Unless there is anything left on that matter, that moves us to item number nine.

IX. Discussion of Request for Grant Scores.

- a. C. Springer said let me lay the groundwork. Dusti received a request for individual grant scores from one of the applicants from the fall cycle. Dusti reached out to Chris and Chris' response was those are individual work papers and his opinion were protected from a FOIA request? Or informal?
- b. D. Reimer said it was informal.
- c. C. Springer said this is only the second time, in all these years, that we've had that request. We've agreed to table that request until the Board could meet and discuss that matter, which we will do right now. Did I miss anything, Dusti?
- d. D. Reimer said no, that was it.
- e. J. Justman said I remember back when, I think it was the City of Grand Junction, we put all our scores individually up there and I didn't appreciate the comment that I had to listen to everyone complain because I didn't do this quite right and that quite right. I guess if you don't want to hear that kind of bickering you just turn over the scores, but personally I am not very favorable of doing that. We did the scoring the best we can do. When the city did that, I was not very thrilled and happy about it. At that point was where we came up with, we weren't going not do this anymore.
- f. Q. Shear said I complete those scores with the thought people are going to see them I complete them thinking if they could be reviewed at any time. So, I don't have a problem with my scores being shared, but I'm like John, where I don't want to get into this evaluating our scores every cycle. We provide the scores, and we don't have to answer to them or discuss them.

- g. C. Springer said I have learned from some pretty smart people a long time ago that withholding public information is a slippery slope so we have never done that. There was some issues about whether or not the scoring sheets were private. I'm with you Quint, every time I fill those out, I expect they will be made public and I have never, that I can remember, that I cared whether or not it went public or not. I am like John, we do the best that we can when we score. Having said that I'm not an elected official with my phone ringing off the hook every night with people complaining. I'm sensitive to what John is saying, but I'm absolutely with you Quint. It's one thing to disclose them, it's another to do a Q & A about them. I have no interest in reploughing the field. It's hard enough scoring these grant applications, let alone having to sit down and explain every number you put down there. We've developed a fair system and an open system. The three of us don't discuss stuff away from these meetings. The scores are done independently, Dusti puts them all together and I'm fine with the results being made public, but as far as having a workshop or meeting or agenda item where we do an explain this or explain that about the scores, no. That's not where we are. But, I am sensitive to where John is as a public official. I get that.
- h. Q. Shear said that would be a complete waste of our time if we did that.
- i. C. Springer said John, what's your preference.
- j. J. Justman said it appears to me that when they want to know, they want to pick issues over something. The comment of they wanted to do a better job applying, I don't buy into that. I think we were transparent. We gave the scores of the three of us. The average scores that everyone scored for all the applicants and that's about as transparent as I want to be. Maybe that's not enough. I remember the incident with the City, and I didn't really appreciate some of the comments I got. When I pointed out the verbiage in the federal mineral leasing district is where you have energy impacts. As I remember my comments where, when Collbran and de Beque and you can see the beat up roads that's really energy impact. I know there are other things, but some of it's more subjective than that and that's why I feel like I do.
- k. C. Springer asked which grant request that was?
- l. J. Justman said I think it was maybe the water line for the law enforcement training center from 32 Rd up. I thought we had a lot at that time for items that were definitely much more physical impacts.
- m. Q. Shear said it seems like that was done just before I got on. IT seemed like you funded that water line just before I came on board.
- n. J. Justman said I think it was in 2014 or 2016. Sometime between those years and I know the Mayor was not very happy to me and she pointed it out to me three or four years later how I wasn't strong enough on public safety. I do know

on our way back the County Administrator Mr. Tom said the City Manager wasn't very happy and I said have him come up to my office and we can have a talk about it. No one ever showed up.

- o. Q. Shear said the group that requested that was CMU and I did reach out to them and I did explain to them what I thought they could have brought up about their project that could have garnered a better score. If they would have mentioned the longevity and the use of that equipment that would have probably gotten them a better score. Instead of talking about the COVID testing. They said they understood. I said our Federal Mineral Lease money we want to invest in the biggest bang for our buck and projects that are remembered more than 6 months from now. Hopefully they got something out of that.
- p. J. Justman said I think their intent is good, but on the other hand I thought we wanted to do long term stuff. This medical testing stuff, the latest testing stuff in a year or two from now, could be so obsolete it wouldn't be funny. I know they're doing some testing now and I don't know what kind of system they have now.
- q. Q. Shear said they have actually been testing now for three months.
- r. J. Justman said some of the testing is more accurate than others and no one knows for sure. So who knows. I'm sure this medical testing equipment, like everything, in two years will be obsolete. There will be a newer, better system. But, then you also have to start somewhere.
- s. C. Springer said I'm happy to entertain a motion regarding this matter.
- t. J. Justman made a motion to not disclose our individual scoring. We can disclose our aggregate scoring or total scoring, and that's what we put out there. I am not in favor for handing out how we individually scored.
- u. C. Springer said to refine your motion, we are going to consider our individual scoring sheets to be private work papers.
- v. J. Justman said yes. The county calls it a work in progress. There is some at the county that we don't have to disclose everything, and when it gets finalized, when Dusti averages out the three scores that's the final product.
- w. Q. Shear said I would second that we consider those work papers. Voted. Approved.
- x. D. Reimer said to quickly recap, I can send the average scores and the best scoring options.
- y. C. Springer said yes, that's the motion.

- z. D. Reimer said I will send that over as a PDF form, that way we don't damage the spreadsheet because it's all linked together.
- X. Unscheduled Business.
- a. C. Springer said let's make sure that Chris looks at the motion we just approved. If need to refine it at a later meeting, when can put it back on the agenda and refine it. We all three understand what our intent is.
 - b. C. Springer said this has been a fairly lengthy meeting, I appreciate all of you working with us to squeeze under the budget constraints for this next year.
 - c. J. Justman made a motion to adjourn. Q. Shear second. Voted. Approved.
 - i. Meeting adjourned at 4:13 pm.