



MONROE COUNTY RESTORE ACT LOCAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MINUTES

June 28, 2013; 9AM

Marathon Government Center

(Draft-To be approved at Nov 8, 2013 meeting)

Present: Chair Mike Cinque, Vice Chair David Makepeace, Ed Swift, Todd German, Bill Kelly, Ted Blackburn, Patrick Rice, William Murchie, John DeNeale

Absences: Mark Finigan, John Halas

Staff: Lisa Tennyson, County Attorney Bob Shillinger

Commissioners Present: Commissioner Sylvia Murphy

Chair Mike Cinque called the meeting to order at 9AM, followed by the Pledge of Allegiance and introductions of committee members.

Committee staffer Lisa Tennyson began by reviewing the format and each question in the draft application with the Committee.

The Committee discussed the financial overview section on the application cover page. The Committee discussed matching and timeframes for matching funds. The committee approved a motion that the order of questions in the financial overview box be switched and that matching funds promised or anticipated actually be received within one year of receiving Restore funding. So that we avoid awarding Restore funding to projects that do not ever get all the other funding they need, and never get off the ground.

The Committee reviewed the application's budget format. The Committee discussed the 3% cap on administration costs. L. Tennyson said the cap is in the legislation, but that the details such as what constitutes administrative expenses has not been provided yet, and that these details will hopefully be provided when the rules come out from the Treasury. The Committee asked that that the 3% administrative cap in expenses language be bolded in the application.

The Committee discussed the draft Project Application, going question by question. Various committee members made various comments and recommendations. Those motioned on were incorporated into the final application document. The Committee discussed the various evaluation criteria and points for each question. Those motioned upon were reflected in the final application document.

The Committee discussed the points to be awarded for a project's financial plan. There was consensus that match should be made part of the formula in the budget question, but not required. There was a discussion as to whether the budget question should be 15 points maximum, with individual members deciding how to award the 15 points among the various components of the question (match, economic value, financial feasibility); or to specify that the 15 points should be broken up into 5 points for financial feasibility, 5 point for economic value, and 5 points for match. The final motion, passed 5-4, was to remove points for the specific sub-categories and combine the 15 points, but keep the sub-categories in there to let applicants know those components will be evaluated in the question and assignment of points.

The Committee discussed the possibility of the need for expert peer review. The committee discussed and determined that the expertise was already reflected in the current committee membership.

Committee discussed and modified question 14 on resilience.

Committee discussed the merits of projects being consistent with public comprehensive plans, capital plans, stormwater master plans, etc.

Ms. Tennyson discussed that the grant dollars would likely be structured as a federal grant program and the requirements for such are significant, rigorous and resource-taxing. The final question discussed relates to organizational capacity to manage/administer projects that will have to comply with federal grant requirements. L. Tennyson recommended that applicants should be evaluated on their knowledge, experience and capacity to manage a federal grant program.

The committee discussed procurement and bidding regulations that would likely apply, and asked that more detailed information be provided.

The Committee discussed the importance of project sustainability, in other words the project lasts beyond the funding period, and approved a motion that the questions on economic and environmental impacts (questions 12 and 13) include a sustainability component.

Committee members ranked each of the allowable uses and the Committee discussed how the ranking list should be utilized or applied. Environmental uses were prioritized. Committee discussed whether points should be applied for these, and agreed not to. Committee agreed it should be used as "guidance". Committee discussed whether it should be included in application, and approved a motion to include the ranking list as a reference in the cover sheet.

The Committee discussed and determined the Application solicitation process and timeline.

Committee agreed it didn't need to meet again until such time to evaluate proposals unless something comes up.

Committee discussed the notion that it could be a long time before we see funding from RESTORE for these projects, and that we don't know how much funding we will receive. Committee suggested bolding that information on the application.

Committee discussed the issue with small organizations handling this type of program and funding.

Public comments.

The meeting adjourned at 11:07AM.

(The meeting was video-recorded and is available on the County's Restore Act webpage.)