The Board of Directors met at 2:00 PM on Monday, August 1, 2016 in the Regional Asset District office located in the Kopper’s Building at 436 7th Avenue. Present were Board Members: Chair, Ms. Dusty Kirk, Mr. Daniel Griffin, Ms. Sylvia Fields, and Mr. Don Linzer. Dr. Danny Rosen, Mr. Tony Ross and Ms. Jackie Dixon participated via telephone. Chief Counsel Mr. James Norris and Executive Director Mr. Richard Hudic were also present. Notice of the meeting was published in accordance with the Act and By-laws and the agenda was posted on the District website the week prior to the meeting.

Ms. Kirk confirmed with Ms. Dixon, Mr. Ross and Dr. Rosen that they could hear the Board Members present in the room and that the Board Members could hear those who were participating by phone.

Public Comment/Hearing Period

The Chair opened the meeting for public comment. No one registered to speak.

Report of Ad Hoc Committee

Ms. Kirk noted that this temporary committee was created to look at our hearing process and make recommendations to enhance it as we continue into RAD 2.0.

Since no funding decisions are involved, this report only requires a majority of those board members present in order to be adopted.

Ms. Kirk called on Mr. Griffin to read the report.

Board members:

In January, Chair Kirk appointed an Ad Hoc Committee to examine and recommend ways to enhance our annual application and hearing process. The committee is composed of Chair Kirk, Dan Griffin and Danny Rosen.

As stewards of taxpayer dollars, the committee carefully considered RAD’s role in impacting the region and the best way to continue to make strategic investments in assets within our communities.
In an effort to streamline hearing presentations and enhance their effectiveness for participants and board members, we are recommending applicants follow a uniform template. This template will ensure information is presented consistently and systematically, and is meant to be forward-looking rather than a historic review. All applicants will be asked to present their case for RAD funding by providing answers and explanations to the following three items:

1. How does your organization demonstrate regional impact?

   Applicants will be asked to justify the data that is presented in their application – this includes audience size and composition (including outreach programs); location of programming; ticket sales among other factors. They will also need to discuss their goals for the upcoming year and how they specifically plan to address them.

2. Discuss your current financial status. What are the major challenges facing your organization in the next year? What strategies do you have in place to become or remain fiscally sound?

   The Data Task Force’s recommendations to improve the materials we receive as board members will be incorporated into this process.

3. If you are seeking an increase in funding from the current year, explain specifically how the funds would be used.

   We encourage applicants to stay within the confines of these three items and discourage them from providing any collateral materials during the meeting. In addition, contractual asset presentations will be adjusted to provide sufficient time to successfully fit within the recommended template.

The Rad Citizen Advisory Board is a group of active community leaders whom we believe can significantly enhance the application process by expanding our diversity of input and review. For several years, we’ve engaged members of this board as a panel to review new applicants and provide an assessment to the board. Their evaluations have been thoughtful and helpful. This committee recommends that they now take a more prominent role in the hearing process by serving as a panel on our last scheduled hearing date to evaluate the following applicants:

1. Those who have applied, but have not received funding;
2. Those who are first-time applicants;
3. Those who have received funding in the amount of $2500 or less for 2016.

To enhance this new approach, the board’s Citizen Advisory Board liaison will attend as an observer. RAD Board members, of course, are invited to observe the process if they choose. The panel’s recommendations will be used by the RAD board to make funding decisions. Any funding decisions, as ever, reside exclusively in the hands of Board.
We believe these recommendations in addition to the digital formatting of all board materials using Board Book it will advance our goal of providing excellent customer service to our partners while being strong stewards of taxpayer dollars.

Respectfully submitted,
Dusty Kirk, Dan Griffin, Danny Rosen

Ms. Kirk noted that this is a change in what we have done in the past. She said we wanted to figure out a way to more deeply involve the citizen advisory board. Mr. Griffin noted that as the Citizen’s Advisory group liaison, he will be involved in the hearing process to essentially advise the group and provide answers to their questions. He recommended a brief training session prior to the actual hearing date so that the volunteer advisory board members can become comfortable with the boards expectations and process. In response to Dr. Rosen’s question, Mr. Hudic said that the citizen advisory board would review 24 applicants (six current assets who receive $2,500 or less, six new applicants and 12 previously applied but not funded assets.) Ms. Fields asked how the amount of $2,500 was derived. Ms. Kirk said this is the lowest funding level provided to assets and also allowed the number of applicants to be reviewed by the citizen advisory board to be manageable. Ms. Kirk wanted to make it clear to the advisory board that they were providing recommendations and it was the RAD board’s final decision. Dr. Rosen remarked that we have used the citizen advisory board in the past, this was expanding their role. Ms. Dixon said although we are now expecting the applicants to answer three questions, we needed to provide time limits. Ms. Kirk said there would be the same time limits for applicants, with the exception of shortening the time for the contractual assets. Mr. Linzer stated that we needed to be inclusive in recruiting the advisory board.

The motion to accept to the Ad Hoc Committee’s recommendation was made by Mr. Linzer and seconded by Ms. Fields. The motion carried with seven votes in the affirmative.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 2:25PM.