

Minutes of a Meeting of the Outdoor Heritage Fund Advisory Board
Held on January 22, 2014 at 3:00 p.m.
DMR Conference Room, 1000 E Calgary
Bismarck, ND

DRAFT

Present: Wade Moser, OHF Advisory Board Chairman
Eric Aasmundstad, OHF Advisory Board (By Speakerphone)
Randy Bina, OHF Advisory Board
Carolyn Godfread, OHF Advisory Board
Jon Godfread, OHF Advisory Board
Blaine Hoffman, OHF Advisory Board
Tom Hutchens, OHF Advisory Board (By Speakerphone)
Bob Kuylen, OHF Advisory Board
Jim Melchior, OHF Advisory Board
Kent Reiersen, OHF Advisory Board (By Speakerphone)
Patricia Stockdill, OHF Advisory Board
Dan Wogsland, OHF Advisory Board (By Speakerphone)
Larry Kotchman, OHF Advisory Board (By Speakerphone)
Terry Steinwand, OHF Advisory Board
Rhonda Vetsch, OHF Advisory Board
Mark Zimmerman, OHF Advisory Board

Also

Present: Brock Wahl, Department of Mineral Resources Technician

Chairman Wade Moser called the Outdoor Heritage Fund Advisory Board (“Board) meeting to order with a quorum being present.

Mr. Moser called for any additions or deletions to the January 22, 2014 agenda. Mr. Jon Godfread requested that under Section IV of the agenda there be a discussion about the selection process. There is one decision about whether or not to fund a project but he wasn’t sure if the averaging of funding amounts may have given the projects sufficient consideration.

Mr. Moser stated he also wanted to include a review of the 18 approved applications to assure that there was consistency in the awarding of funding.

Ms. Karlene Fine, Industrial Commission Executive Director, presented the financial report as follows:

Outdoor Heritage Fund (294)
Financial Statement
2013-2015 Biennium
January 22, 2014 OHF Advisory Board Meeting

	<u>Cash Balance</u>
July 1, 2013 Balance	\$ 0.00
Interest Revenue through December 31, 2013	\$ 252.25
Revenues through December 31, 2013	\$ 4,107,240.25
Grant Expenditures through December 31, 2013	\$ (000,000.00)
Administrative Expenditures through December 31, 2013	<u>\$ (73,939.11)</u>
	\$ 4,033,553.39
Outstanding Project Commitments as of December 31, 2013	<u>\$ (000,000.00)</u>
Balance	\$ 4,033,553.39

Outdoor Heritage Fund
Continuing Appropriation Authority
2013-2015 Biennium

Uncommitted Balance July 1, 2013	\$ 000.00
Interest Revenue	\$ 20,000.00
Revenues Fiscal Year 2014	\$15,000,000.00
Revenues Fiscal Year 2015	<u>\$15,000,000.00</u>
	\$30,020,000.00
Administration Expenditures	\$ (300,000.00)
Project Commitments 2013-2015	<u>\$ (000.00)</u>
Available Funding	\$29,720,000.00

54-17.8-02 North Dakota Outdoor Heritage Fund – Continuing appropriation

There is created a North Dakota Outdoor Heritage Fund that is governed by the Commission. Any money deposited in the Fund is appropriated on a continuing basis to the Commission for the purposes of this chapter. Interest earned by the Fund must be credited to the Fund. The Commission shall keep accurate records of all financial transactions performed under this chapter.

57-51-15(d). Outdoor Heritage Fund - Deposits.

First the tax revenue collected under this chapter equal to one percent of the gross value at the well of the oil and one-fifth of the tax on gas must be deposited with the State Treasurer who shall: ...

(d) Credit four percent of the amount available under this subsection to the North Dakota Outdoor Heritage Fund, but not in an amount exceeding fifteen million dollars in a state fiscal year and not in an amount exceeding thirty million dollars per biennium;

Mr. Moser presented the following memorandum (Attachment B) regarding Outdoor Heritage Fund Proposed Guidelines/Revisions:

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.

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.

The Board discussed each of the items in the memorandum based on their experiences during the first round and the information they heard from Representative Porter regarding legislative intent:

- Have a 25% required match - up to 75% could be provided by the Outdoor Heritage Fund but the applicant needed to show there is 25% match -- there is a need to show that the applicant has some "skin in the game". The match could be in the form of in-kind, etc. If the applicant provides more than a 25% match then they will get additional points in the scoring process.
- Should not fund projects that are already completed. Allow projects that are done in phases. If there is a project that has started but not totally finished and it is a phased project and the applicant is applying for Phase 3 of a three phased project the Board could consider the funding of Phase 3 but not provide funding for Phases 1 and 2 that are already completed. It was noted that this was consistent with other State grant programs. It was also pointed out that some projects are done in stages and that would be considered as phases. Key is will not consider projects that have already been completed.
- Feasibility or Research projects should not be funded -- at least not at this time. Perhaps in future years there could be a portion of funding made available for feasibility studies or research projects but for right now these should not be considered. This was made clear in the information the Board received from Representative Porter. This might be an area for discussion with the Legislature.
- It was indicated that staffing should be provided through the project applicant match rather than the Outdoor Heritage Fund dollars being used for staffing and consultants. It was noted that there might be instances where it is clear that staffing is needed to assure that the project goes forward. There was discussion on not using the Outdoor Heritage Fund dollars to increase the staffing of government entities, non-profits, etc. -- did not want staff to think there would be funding after the project is completed. Purpose of the fund is not to be a job source for people -- purpose is to put habitat on the ground but sometimes you need to hire people to facilitate that happening. There is no clear cut line...Suggestion was made to allow a certain percentage for staffing and consultants. Concern was that if you say there will be a percentage for staffing it will be an automatic add-on to every application. It was noted that whatever the decision is, the Board needs to be consistent.
- Discussion was that the Outdoor Heritage Fund not provide any on-going annual maintenance dollars; if the applicant can't maintain the project after the Outdoor Heritage Funds are expended then the Fund should not have provided funding in the first place. The Board is looking for projects that have longevity and if the project can't be maintained then the application shouldn't come to the Fund. It was noted that the Board

has a weighting factor in the scoring process regarding sustainability but the Board needs to make it clear to applicants that they need to be able to maintain the project.

- In regards to greenways the Board discussed the applications that had been submitted for Grant Round 1. Some Board members indicated that what had been submitted were good projects but had been submitted too early in the flood recovery process -- would be willing to look at those types of projects after the flood control has been built or when the flood control project is nearing completion. It was also pointed out that there are greenway projects that are not related to flood control. If the Board is going to say something about greenway projects it needs to be clear on what type of greenway projects it is referring to. The consensus seemed to be that in regards to greenway projects related to flood control, the Outdoor Heritage Fund dollars will not be used for flood control (phase 1) but the Fund dollars could be used for conservation or recreational projects after the flood control is done (phase 2). It was noted that there are parks that are built in flood plains where there is no flood control so the Board should have some flexibility depending on the project. If the presentation is complete and spells out the status of the flood protection plan then there will be enough information for the Board to decide on a case by case basis whether to recommend the project for funding.
- In regards to paving projects, it was noted that Representative Porter had stated that the OHF should not be a road fund. There seemed to be a consensus not to fund roads as there are other programs that fund roads. There was some discussion regarding parking lots. In order to provide access to some of the projects you need to have a parking lot (whether it is paved or has gravel on it) that is accessible for all citizens. There was support for paved bike and walking trails but there also has to be information provided that the applicant will be able to maintain these trails whether it is paved or gravel. In response to a question, it was indicated that for some other grant programs there is a signed agreement between the applicant and the entity providing the funding stating that the applicant is responsible for maintenance of the trail.
- Equipment - It was stated that should the Board recommend funding of playground equipment the contract should include provisions stating that the Fund does not assume any liability for the equipment and any liability is the responsibility of the applicant. Also the equipment must meet the national standards. It was pointed out that playground equipment if properly installed should have a life of fifteen to twenty years so it should be considered as permanent equipment. The suggestion was made that playground equipment funded by the Outdoor Heritage Fund should somehow be related to a natural area/conservation aspect. The statement was made that playground equipment should not be removed from consideration. In response to a question it was indicated that there are other programs that do fund playgrounds but the dollars are very limited.
- Non-permanent equipment such as tractors, four wheelers, tools, tree planters, etc. The statement was made that until there is clarification as to liability and who would own the equipment at the end of the contract period, the Outdoor Heritage Fund should not fund non-permanent equipment. An exception was noted that equipment that is used to assist individuals with disabilities so they can enjoy the outdoors such as lifts on boat docks, etc. should be considered permanent equipment.
- Buildings - The Board discussed the need for some flexibility on this point. Perhaps in the right park situation it is appropriate to do a building structure. But this Fund isn't to be used for wellness centers that are heated and operated year round, ice arenas, etc. However, outdoor shelters, restrooms to support the trail usage, etc. could at least be

considered. If there is a project that fits under the directives then the Board should at least look at it and see if there is a case for that particular facility.

- Projects associated with schools. The suggestion was made that the Outdoor Heritage Fund might be the avenue of last resort. For those projects that are associated with a school the applicant needs to show that the project meets at least one of the directives and that they exhausted all other funding sources. It was noted the Board should also consider if the awarding of the funding to an applicant would require taxpayer dollars to be expended for maintenance of the project in the future that would be more than the jurisdiction could afford. It was suggested that playground equipment associated with a school should be funded by a mill levy. The suggestion was made that if there is a project whether it is on school property or elsewhere, the Board needs to take a look at the directives and the plan needs to show how it ties into the directives. Schools are an eligible entity to apply for grant funds because the law says political subdivisions so they should not be excluded. The first round the Board was recommending a project that involved a school because there was a lot of conservation and outdoor recreation issues related to it. Mr. Moser noted that this is an area where applicants should review these minutes to understand the importance of every project having to meet the directives but also knowing that the Board may be reluctant to fund some projects.
- Mr. Moser noted that the Board has been pretty clear that swimming pools should not be considered.
- On the issue of whether an entity should be allowed to submit an application if their only role is to be a pass-through contractor for a project. The consensus of the group was that the applicant should have a direct interest in the project they are submitting.
- It was noted that the Technical Committee had the question posed to them about religious affiliation. It was decided that this did not seem to be a significant issue so it did not need to be acted on.

Mr. Reiersen said he is looking at the legislation and they said certain things could not be funded – he has heard things he is in agreement with but there are always those exceptions – he thought they should put “in the absence of exceptional circumstances the following projects would not be considered”. There is not a black and white line in the sand on some of these projects.

In regards to the question of how the public and future applicants should be made aware of the issues discussed today, Ms. Fine indicated that the minutes of the meeting would be available on the website. In the past when she has been contacted by potential applicants, she encourages them to read the minutes to get an understanding of what the Board’s position is on a certain type of project. For that reason the minutes are quite detailed.

The Board then reviewed the two options outlined in the memorandum for recommended wording to be placed in the application form.

Mr. Moser stated that his preference was option one, it was straight forward where option two may give someone the idea that if they don’t apply this time they can wait and come another time which is always possible but at the same time he thinks we get through a couple more rounds, people will start talking to legislators or we can visit with the legislators and they can fine tune this and give us further direction.

It was moved by Mr. Hoffman and seconded by Mr. Kuylen to recommend to the Industrial Commission that the following language be included on the application form:

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

Mr. Reiersen suggested an amendment to include “in the absence of exceptional circumstances”. Mr. Reiersen indicated that the Legislature stated certain things would not be allowed and the Board may be overstepping its authority by saying that it will absolutely not consider certain projects. However, he indicated it was important to provide more guidance to applicants so they don’t waste their time submitting an application that will most likely not be funded. He suggested the wording “in the absence of exceptional circumstances” be included in the motion.

Mr. Hoffman and Mr. Kuylen agreed to the suggestion and restated their motion to be:

It was moved by Mr. Hoffman and seconded by Mr. Kuylen to recommend to the Industrial Commission that the following language be included on the application form:

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

Dr. Hutchens joined the meeting at this time.

On a roll call vote, Dr. Hutchens, Mr. Kuylen, Ms. Stockdill, Mr. Moser, Mr. Godfread, Mr. Wogsland, Mr. Bina, Mr. Hoffman, Mr. Reiersen, Mr. Melchior and Ms. Godfread voted yes with Mr. Aasmundstad absent and not voting. The motion carried unanimously.

It was moved by Mr. Godfread and seconded by Mr. Hoffman to recommend to the Industrial Commission that the application form be amended to include the following language listing what will not receive consideration for funding in the absence of exceptional circumstances:

- **Projects that are already completed;**
- **Projects that are on-going (Phased projects would be considered);**
- **Staffing;**
- **Feasibility Studies;**
- **Annual Maintenance;**
- **Paving projects for roads and parking lots;**
- **Swimming pools;**
- **Non-permanent equipment;**
- **Research;**
- **If the applicant is not directly involved in the project.**

Requiring a minimum of 25% match

Mr. Godfread clarified that the 75/25 percent match – it will not change the scoring form in terms of signaling 25 is the minimum but you will get more points for the more match that you have.

On a roll call vote, Dr. Hutchens, Mr. Kuylen, Ms. Stockdill, Mr. Moser, Mr. Godfread, Mr. Bina, Mr. Hoffman, Mr. Reiersen, Mr. Melchior and Ms. Godfread voted yes, Mr. Wogsland voted no and Mr. Aasmundstad was absent and not voting. The motion carried.

Mr. Moser asked if they wanted to clarify a time certain so once the applications are submitted and put online or give the staff the authority to reject an application if they are not complete. We need some flexibility because there are sometimes when there is just a simple mistake made and you need to get it fixed but last round we ran into it being several weeks out before people got back and he didn't think it was fair to the entire process. We have to have some kind of way to handle that.

It was moved by Mr. Kuylen and seconded by Ms. Godfread that staff give an applicant, once notified, three business days to respond if the application is not complete.

Mr. Moser said if they fail to do that, the application will be rejected and they will have to submit it the next round, so we are giving staff the authority to do that without hesitation. That will help eliminate one or two amended versions coming online and once we get through the process and having to go back through a second or third time.

On a roll call vote, Dr. Hutchens, Mr. Kuylen, Ms. Stockdill, Mr. Moser, Mr. Godfread, Mr. Wogsland, Mr. Bina, Mr. Hoffman, Mr. Reiersen, Mr. Melchior and Ms. Godfread voted yes, no one voted no and Mr. Aasmundstad was absent and not voting. The motion carried.

Mr. Moser discussed the language to be included in Outdoor Heritage Fund contracts regarding recognition of funding source which is Attachment C. Attachment C is as follows:

RE: OHF Recognition Requirement

At your recent meeting there was discussion about whether recognition of OHF funding should be a requirement in the contracts with the applicants receiving funding. I asked the Game and Fish Department, North Dakota State Forester and North Dakota Parks and Recreation what they require.

ND Forest Service. For those projects that include federal funds there are federal government requirements regarding civil rights. This requires any of their publications using federal funds to include the statement "This publication is made possible through a grant from the USDA Forest Service." Other agreements include "Highlight the US Forest Service and ND Forest Service as primary sponsors of the XXXX event on all correspondence and promotional materials."

Game and Fish Department stated that their requirements were similar to the ND Forest Service. There is no requirement other than to recognize the contribution in publications. Most of the work we do is with federal aid funding and there is a requirement there to recognize Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration as a source of funding on signs. The language is generally "funded by Sport Fish Restoration" or "funded by Pittman-Robertson Act".

ND Parks and Recreation does have a requirement regarding signs:

“Permanent signs. Permanent signs shall be installed to acknowledge the federal-state-local partnership role in providing new high quality outdoor recreation areas and facilities.” States may determine the type, size and placement of the sign as long as the LWCF logo is used. “Display Requirement: All projects funded through LWCF must display the required signage provided by North Dakota Parks and Recreation Department.” Attached is a copy of one of the signs they use.

What are the wishes of the Advisory Board -- do you want staff to develop a logo and sign to be posted on all sites where OHF dollars are spent?

Here is some draft language, subject to review from the Attorney General’s Office, which could be included in OHF contracts depending on the project:

The Contractor agrees to include in all publications and promotional materials that the North Dakota Outdoor Heritage Fund is a primary sponsor of XXXXX.

The Contractor agrees to display a permanent sign provided by the North Dakota Outdoor Heritage Fund acknowledging the State of North Dakota’s partnership role through the Outdoor Heritage Fund.

Mark Zimmerman from State Parks indicated that the costs of their signs was in the \$5.00 range although they ordered a significant number of signs a number of years ago and costs may have gone up.

Mr. Steinwand distributed a sample of the sign/logo that is used for the PLOTS program - it is a decal that can be affixed to a sign and the cost is approximately \$.50. He offered the services of his staff to design a logo -- he suggested that having a logo is beneficial because after a few years individuals see it and know right away that this is an Outdoor Heritage Fund project. Mr. Zimmerman indicated that he likes the idea of having a decal (sticker) that could be affixed to the trail signs rather than having a whole new sign. Ms. Vetsch indicated that having a sign at every tree planting could be problematic for the Soil Conservation project--they could do it but the costs may be prohibitive and it takes away from the natural habitat.

Mr. Godfread said he shares their concerns, some projects a sign would work very well but the tree project he is not sure how they would do that without becoming intrusive and that defeats the purpose of the conservation fund. Could this be something that is added into the application as far as letting the applicants determine - this is how we will recognize the OHF and that could leave some creativity to the applicants whether it is on their website or a post in the ground? Then at the same time, the Board could have a discussion on a project by project basis – it makes sense that the Hankinson School District has a sign somewhere on their property denoting this but it doesn’t make sense for the tree planting. It leaves discretion for the Board – not that the Board needs to set a policy that every project needs to have a sign or some sort of recognition but including in the application “how are you going to recognize the OHF dollars”. It could create some creative options and the Board could get some ideas it hadn’t even thought of.

Mr. Bina said he agrees with Mr. Godfread. With their program they have their local matching grant program and in their application they ask that some type of recognition be given for the partnership effort on a project. They have had people that have had small ribbon cutting ceremonies versus a sign or just stating it in their newsletter – those types of things. He thinks signs are good but they may not fit all projects, he agrees with Mr. Godfread.

Mr. Bina left the meeting at this time.

Ms. Vetsch described how recognition is given with some of the projects she had been involved in. Mr. Hoffman said one thing they do with their landowners if they want signs, their company asks them to furnish the posts and the company furnishes the sign.

Mr. Godfread said he likes the idea of someone from Mr. Steinwand's staff potentially developing a logo, he thought it was important that the Outdoor Heritage Fund have a logo – a consistent design look and the applicant can choose to implement that design however they wish into their project but the logo needs to be consistent. He likes the idea of having a few different graphics to look at, picking one and then here is our logo how are you going to implement it in your project, if at all.

Mr. Moser said we could leave this topic open and take Mr. Steinwand up on his offer to get a logo design and have it as an agenda item at our next meeting. He liked the suggestion of allowing the applicant to be creative in how they would provide the recognition. He would prefer that they do not have to spend a lot of money putting signage up but at the same time, he thought there was a way for the applicant to come forward with how to best recognize their sources of funding.

Mr. Godfread suggested that Ms. Fine include language regarding the source of funding in the application and have the applicant figure a way to include it but it is not required for them to include it – “how would you recognize the OHF for its contribution”, that would start the plan going.

Ms. Fine suggested language such as: “If you are a successful recipient of Outdoor Heritage Fund dollars, how would you recognize the Outdoor Heritage Fund partnership?”

In regards to the first grant round applications, Mr. Moser said when the Board got to the final vote on funding it used averages. In some of those applications, there were some staffing and other items we wanted to restrict but yet there was not a specific motion to restrict. He didn't want to go over all the 18 applications but he had identified the following items that OHF funding should not be used for in order for the Advisory Board to be consistent in their recommendations to the Commission:

- 001-00T Bismarck Trailhead/Neighborhood Park – parking lot for \$21,000
- 001-0KK - Warwick Dam - engineering fees and legal fees for about \$14,000
- 001-0LL - Aquatic Habitat Infrastructure Enhancement - Ducks Unlimited - professional fees for \$150,000 that is staffing
- 001-0QQ - Natural Resources Stewardship in ND's Parks, Preserves and Natural Areas (Parks and Recreation) – 3 technicians for \$71,000
- 001-AAA - Enhanced Grazing Lands & Wildlife Habitat (Phase I) - Ducks Unlimited - communication and outreach \$15,000 and staff, benefits, travel and indirect of \$80,400
- 001-MMM - ND Hen House Project I - staffing to do some reporting and surveys \$2,000; \$1,000 and \$5,000
- 001-TTT - Recreational Trail Reconstruction in Response to Mineral Development at Little Missouri State Park - staffing - \$600

Mr. Moser said if the Board were to restrict those dollars, it would not impact the bottom line because there are other areas where the applicant could use that money and it would not restrict them but the Board may want to include those restrictions that eliminate staff and a parking lot.

It was moved by Mr. Hoffman and seconded by Ms. Godfread to add those restrictions to the projects and forward it to the Industrial Commission for their approval.

In response to a question, Ms. Fine discussed the wording that would be included in the contracts noting that funding could not be used for the purposes outlined by the Board. In response to another question, Ms. Fine commented on the reporting that is required in the contracts and the review she will be doing to make sure that the funding is utilized as outlined by the Board/Commission.

In response to a question, Mr. Moser said the original dollar amount awarded is what the applicant will receive but the restrictions would be put in place regarding where those dollars can be spent. In his review, the restrictions would not impact the total amount that the Board is recommending be awarded; there is enough room in all of the awarded projects to spend OHF dollars on unrestricted things.

On a roll call vote, Dr. Hutchens, Mr. Kuylen, Ms. Stockdill, Mr. Moser, Mr. Godfread, Mr. Wogslund, Mr. Hoffman, Mr. Reiersen, Mr. Melchior and Ms. Godfread voted yes, no one voted no and Mr. Aasmundstad and Mr. Bina were absent and not voting. The motion carried.

Mr. Godfread suggested the need to improve the process for determining the final funding amount. There are two questions -- the first question is do you want to fund the project "yes or no" and that was determined by the # of zeroes. Then there is a different question on the dollar amount -- the average of the dollar amount he can accept but he believes that resulted in some situations where some of those who chose not to fund the project at all skewed that average a little bit. Mr. Moser stated that he would look at that issue prior to the next meeting.

Mr. Moser noted that the Board's recommendations will be presented to the Industrial Commission on January 29 and the Board members are welcome to attend.

In response to a question, Ms. Fine stated that she has been asked about the scoring sheets and will provide the information to the individuals making the requests.

Ms. Fine apologized to the Board for the difficulties experienced with the call-in system today and thanked the Board members that were on the phone for their patience in redialing into the meeting. In the future she will find an alternative entity to provide the conferencing service.

Being no further business, Chairman Moser adjourned the meeting at 4:30 p.m.

Wade Moser, Chairman

Recording Secretary