INDUSTRIAL COMMISSION OF NORTH DAKOTA

OUTDOOR HERITAGE FUND

Governor
Jack Dalrymple
Attorney General
Wayne Stenehjem
Agriculture Commissioner
Doug Goehring

Executive Director
Karlene Fine

MEMORANDUM

TO: Outdoor Heritage Fund Advisory Board

FR: Wade Moser, Chairman

DT: January 21, 2014

RE: Outdoor Heritage Fund Proposed Guidelines/Revisions

During the Outdoor Heritage Fund Advisory Board's recent meeting we discussed several items related to guidelines for future grant rounds. The following is a list of those items:

- Requiring Match Funding – and if, yes, what level is required and then can the applicant use in-kind and in-direct dollars as that match? Can the match come from any source? *(Any change regarding match funding may impact the scoring form and will impact the application form and budget form.)*
- Funding of projects that are ongoing – or begun before grant approval?
- Funding of projects that are already completed?
- Funding for feasibility studies?
- Funding for staffing?
- Funding for annual maintenance?
- Funding of greenways and if that answer is yes, what is the timing of OHF funding – before Flood Protection Plan has been approved or before Flood Protection has been built?
- Funding of paving projects. Are there any paving projects that would be allowed – a bike path versus a parking lot versus a road? If paving projects are to be approved, is the applicant required to provide information on how they will maintain the paving?
- Funding of equipment? Is playground equipment different from equipment such as snowmobile, computers, augers, tractors, etc.?
- Funding for buildings? Is there a difference between the types of buildings – restrooms versus a community center (all seasons) versus a picnic shelter?
- Funding for research? Is there a difference between demonstration projects versus research projects?
- Funding for projects associated with schools—playgrounds?
- Funding for swimming pools?
- Should funding be authorized to an entity that does not have a financial interest in a project other than serving as a pass-through contractor on the project?

Here are a couple of ways to implement any guidelines that you recommend.

Eric Aasmundstad, Robert Kuylen, Wade Moser, Dan Wogsland, Blaine Hoffman, Jim Melchior
Tom Hutchens, Patricia Stockdill, Jon Godfread, Randy Bina, Kent Reierson, Carolyn Godfread
Terry Steinwand, Mark Zimmerman, Larry Kotchman, Rhonda Vetsdch

Outdoor Heritage Fund (OHF)
State Capitol, 14th Floor - 600 E Boulevard Ave Dept 405 - Bismarck, ND 58505-0840
E-Mail: kfine@nd.gov PHONE: 701-328-3722 FAX: 701-328-2820
"Your Gateway to North Dakota":www.nd.gov

Option One.
For instance the Application Form could be amended and on the front page right after the listing of projects that by law are not eligible the following paragraph could be included:

NO CONSIDERATION: In addition to those specific items in law that are ineligible for funding, the following projects will NOT receive consideration for funding:

- Research Projects;
- Completed Projets;
- Etc.

Option Two:
For instance the Application Form could be amended and you identify some items just for one or two grant rounds. This would imply that these items could be revisited as we get further into the biennium and have a more definite forecast of funding. Again this would be inserted on the front page right after the listing of projects that by law are not eligible for funding:

For Grant Rounds 2 (April 1, 2014) and 3 (August 1, 2014) the following projects will not receive consideration for funding:

- Research Projects;
- Completed Projects;
- Etc.

Whatever option you decide would be completed to reflect your decisions on the topics outlined at the beginning of this memorandum.

One other issue arose during the first grant round relating to the submission process for applications. Currently the application process states:

Review of application by staff to make sure the application is complete. This review does not involve any analysis of the application but rather just a look to make sure all the blanks are filled in and all the information required is provided. If an application is incomplete, the staff will notify the applicant of what is missing and the applicant will have an opportunity to make the correction and resubmit the application within three (3) business days.

It wasn't clear to staff if they could reject an application if they found it incomplete or if it is ineligible. We did give applicants an opportunity to submit information but that process got drawn out. Do you want to see incomplete applications or can staff inform an applicant that their application is incomplete and if, after three (3) business days, it is not complete then staff can indicate that the application will not be considered for this grant round and they are encouraged to resubmit the next round?

The Board's recommendations are scheduled to be considered by the Industrial Commission on January 29.