

**RESTORE ACT  
RANKING SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARY**

**22211 US HWY 19 N, CLEARWATER, Building 6 Conference Room  
MARCH 16, 2015, 1:30-4:40 p.m.**

**ATTENDEES:**

Ranking Subcommittee

Liz Freeman	Pinellas County Planning
Kelli Hammer Levy	Pinellas County Natural Resources
Steve Harper	Pinellas County Parks & Conservation Resources
Elliot Shoberg	City of Clearwater
Mike Colby	Clearwater Marine Association
Cathy Harrelson	St. Petersburg Sustainability Council
Ernst Peebles	USF College of Marine Science
Mark Rachal	Audubon Florida

Facilitators

Lindsay Cross	Tampa Bay Estuary Program
Andy Squires	Pinellas County Natural Resources

Score Keeper

Sue Myers	Pinellas County Natural Resources
-----------	-----------------------------------

No one from the general public attended.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

Andy Squires welcomed and thanked the group for agreeing to participate in the ranking process and for the necessary homework involved in reviewing each of the 17 proposals. Andy also handed out a copy of guidelines (attached) describing how the ranking process and meetings are to be managed and carried out.

PROJECT RANKINGS

Lindsay Cross then facilitated the process to obtain a ranking score for each criterion in each project beginning with Project 1, Cooper's Point Education Observation Tower. A complete list of submitted projects can be viewed below in Table 1. The Ranking Subcommittee members (Members) were provided all the time they needed to discuss the project among themselves prior to providing scores. Once the Members completed their discussion and comments about the proposal, each of the eight Members provided a score for each criterion. Additional discussion was allowed while each Member provided their scores. Once all the Members scored each criterion, each Member was provided the opportunity to adjust any of their scores for that project, knowing that once moving on to the next project, their scores were final and could not be revised.

A similar process was followed for ranking the remainder of the projects in the following order: projects 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 11, 10, and 6. Projects 8, 9, and 11 were ranked simultaneously since they were similar project types submitted by the same entity. Only one Member had a different score for two criteria of Project 11. Members with potential conflicts with a project left the room during the discussion and ranking of the project. Elliot Shoberg left the room for Project 1, and the three Pinellas County Members left the room for Project 6. Furthermore, other County staff present did not make any comments about Project 6 while it was discussed and ranked. Project specific Member comments are listed separately below in a section of this summary (see Member comments during the discussion and ranking of projects).

At the end of the meeting, Members asked for clarification about the possibility of recommending partial funding for projects. Andy referred to Guideline #7 provided as a handout and reiterated that once all the projects were scored, the Members will have a chance to recommend which projects to fully fund and which to partially fund based on their review and overall evaluation of the projects. Andy also reminded the Members that the final ranking of projects by mean scores is a tool to help determine what will be included in the Multiyear Implementation Plan (MYIP), and that the final ranking will not be the only way to determine which projects will be in the MYIP for eventual funding. Furthermore it's anticipated that the County Natural Resources staff will work with some project submitters to offer, and/or negotiate, partial funding of their projects.

The meeting adjourned about 4:40 p.m.

**Table 1. Projects Submitted for “Pinellas County RESTORE Act Direct Component Funding.**

	<b>APPLICANT</b> <i>Project Contact</i>	<b>PROJECT NAME</b> <i>Duration</i>	<b>FUNDS (\$)</b> <b>REQUESTED</b>
1	<b>CLEARWATER PARKS &amp; RECREATION</b> <i>Leroy Chin Admin Support Mgr</i>	COOPER’S POINT EDUCATION OBSERVATION TOWER <i>1 year</i>	<b>450,000</b>
2	<b>LARGO</b> <i>Irvin Kety Environmental Services Director</i>	RESILIENT & SUSTAINABLE NUTRIENT CONTROL STRATEGIES <i>2 years</i>	<b>274,749</b>
3	<b>MADERIA BEACH</b> <i>Shane Crawford City Manager</i>	JOHN’S PASS TRANSIENT DOCK <i>15 months</i>	<b>330,000</b>
4	<b>OLDSMAR</b> <i>Al Braithwaite Director of Administrative Services</i>	BROOKER & MOCCASIN CREEK TMDLs <i>52 months</i>	<b>250,000</b>
5	<b>OLDSMAR</b> <i>Al Braithwaite Director of Administrative Services</i>	GRAVITY SEWER REHABILITATION <i>14 months</i>	<b>600,000</b>
6	<b>PINELLAS COUNTY</b> <i>Debbie Chayet Sr. Grants Specialist</i>	FT. DE SOTO DUNE WALKOVERS <i>3 years</i>	<b>1,117,043</b>
7	<b>PINELLAS COUNTY</b> <i>Liz Freeman Planning Division Manager</i>	PINELLAS CO ASSESSMENT OF VULNERABILITY TO SEA LEVEL RISE IMPACTS & INFRASTRUCTURE RESILIENCY PLAN <i>3 years</i>	<b>300,000</b>
8	<b>ST. PETERSBURG</b> <i>Phil Whitehouse Parks Superintendent</i>	MAXIMO PARK BEACH RESTORATION <i>3 years</i>	<b>300,000</b>
9	<b>ST. PETERSBURG</b> <i>Phil Whitehouse Parks Superintendent</i>	BAY VISTA PARK BEACH RESTORATION <i>3 years</i>	<b>300,000</b>
10	<b>ST. PETERSBURG</b> <i>Evan Mory Transportation &amp; Parking Mgmt</i>	HISTORIC BOOKER CREEK TRAIL PHASE IIA <i>1 year</i>	<b>1,497,000</b>
11	<b>ST. PETERSBURG</b> <i>Phil Whitehouse Parks Superintendent</i>	LASSING PARK BEACH RESTORATION <i>3 years</i>	<b>300,000</b>
12	<b>ST. PETERSBURG</b> <i>Michael Connors Public Works Administrator</i>	NEW ST PETE PIER MARINE SCIENCE/ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION CENTER <i>18 months</i>	<b>1,500,000</b>
13	<b>ST PETE BEACH</b> <i>Ian Wade Project Manager Public Services Dept</i>	BLIND PASS ROAD IMPROVEMENTS <i>2 years</i>	<b>311,734</b>
14	<b>TAMPA BAY ESTUARY PROGRAM</b> <i>Holly Greening Executive Director</i>	2016 TAMPA BAY ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION FUND <i>Duration project dependent</i>	<b>100,000</b>

	<b>APPLICANT</b> <i>Project Contact</i>	<b>PROJECT NAME</b> <i>Duration</i>	<b>FUNDS (\$)</b> <b>REQUESTED</b>
15	<b>TREASURE ISLAND</b> <i>Michael Helfrich</i> <i>Public Works Director</i>	PUBLIC BEACH ACCESS RESTORATION <i>10 months</i>	<b>300,000</b>
16	<b>USF COLLEGE OF MARINE SCIENCE</b> <i>Robert Weisberg</i> <i>Professor</i>	VERY HIGH RESOLUTION ESTUARY CIRCULATION NOWCAST/FORECAST MODEL FOR TAMPA BAY AND VICINITY <i>5 years</i>	<b>942,646</b>
17	<b>USF COLLEGE OF MARINE SCIENCE</b> <i>Robert Weisberg</i> <i>Professor</i>	COASTAL OCEAN MONITORING & PREDICTION SYSTEM (COMPS) <i>5 years</i>	<b>415,910</b>
	<b>TOTAL REQUESTED</b>	<b>ALL PROJECTS</b>	<b>9,293,082</b>

### **Member comments during the discussion and ranking of projects**

#### Project 1:

- Project cost is very optimistic, it may cost much more for ADA compliance.
- I gave it a low value, project doesn't preserve anything, land already preserved.
- Would not have much environmental benefit or create many jobs.
- Could cause more visitor traffic.
- Could be a tourism destination.
- Overall, the group had varied opinions on Criterion 7 with regard to countywide or regional benefits.
- Lindsay recommended each member be consistent on how they interpret and apply each rank criterion to all projects to be ranked.

#### Project 2:

- This is a research project.
- Could be a useful and good technology.
- There are other funding sources for research projects.
- Some members thought it was a very good project, that nutrient reductions strategies are important.
- Some members agreed it could be a good "research" project, but it didn't implement anything, thus they would not score it high due to the many uncertainties in what results may or may not be achieved. It is a big unknown if the technology would work.

#### Project 3:

- Two members said they liked the project.
- Only addresses economy.
- Another questioned the ability to obtain a permit. Andy noted that the National Fish and Wildlife Service issued a Biological Opinion in 2007 about concerns of boat-related manatee fatalities in western Pinellas County, especially in Boca Ciega Bay. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) in turn has been withholding approvals of multi-use and commercial dock permits since 2007. Recently, the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC) has developed a set of proposed new slow speed zones in western Pinellas waters. Formal rule

making is expected later this year, and if the speed zones become law, permitting of multi-use and commercial docks could again be on a case-by-case basis. So the ability of obtain a permit is unknown at this time, but with new speed zones to help protect manatees, there is a good chance such a dock could be permitted. Furthermore, since the proposed floating dock is near the Gulf of Mexico, the very short distance to the Gulf may also minimize the potential risk of a boat-related taking of a manatee.

Project 4:

- Project is a NPDES permit requirement, only a one-year study; and Pinellas County has already done the study.
- It is a good project and should be done.

Project 5:

- This is a project to rehabilitate old sewer pipes that most cities and counties must do and budget.
- Project is in their CIP budget.
- They have a utility (stormwater) fee.

Projects 8, 9, 11: (these 3 projects were ranked simultaneously since they all were very similar)

- These projects mainly provide economic benefits and very little environmental benefits.

Project 10:

- Trail a good idea, but results in loss of lots of trees, do not think RESTORE funds should pay for it, thus I am not supportive of it.
- Design costs are very high, could be due to public opposition.

Project 6:

- Walkovers cover many of the RESTORE goals, wondered why Alternative 1 cost so high, and thought "Friends" groups or other non-profits should help contribute to the cost.
- At least one other member thought cost was high, a couple of others agreed and wondered if partial funding could be awarded. Andy said he would be looking for ranking members to make recommendations as to which projects should be considered for partial funding once all the projects have been scored.
- Others noted, as stated in the proposal, by breaking up the project into separate phases, the total cost for the project will likely be higher.
- Most thought it was a good project.

Project 7: (Discussion was initiated, time ran out, and the project was not scored)

- One member thought much of the GIS data were already available from the Department of Homeland Security. And same person wondered why the project would take three years.
- One member asked if the project was reinventing the wheel.

## **RESTORE Ranking Subcommittee Guidelines for Ranking Projects**

### **March 16, 2015**

1. The ranking subcommittee will operate in the “Sunshine.” Subcommittee members cannot discuss the proposals with any of the other committee members. Since Andy Squires is not a ranking subcommittee member, you may contact Andy for clarification on project proposals or the ranking process.
2. The public may attend ranking subcommittee meetings. Once the meeting starts and ranking discussions begin, the public must only “observe” and will not be allowed to speak and/or be involved in the discussion or process.
3. The outcome of the ranking process serves as a tool to help the ranking subcommittee, the Working Group, County staff, and the Board of County Commission determine which projects should be funded. The final rank of each project will not necessarily determine whether or not a project will be included for funding in the Multiyear Implementation Plan. As an additional guideline, projects not achieving at least a mean score of 12.0 may not be recommended for funding. This is based on the following minimum scores by criterion.

Criterion:Score: 1:2, 2:1, 3:2, 4:1, 5:1, 6:1, 7:1, 8:0, 9:1, 10:2, 11:0 Total Score = 12.0

4. The mean ranking score by project will be used to rank projects.
5. A ranking subcommittee member that has a conflict or potential perceived conflict with a project to be ranked must step out of the room while the project is being discussed and ranked.
6. The ranking of all submitted projects may take more than one ranking meeting. If a ranking subcommittee member misses a meeting, their preliminary ranking scores sent/mailed to the County (Andy Squires, [asquires@pinellascounty.org](mailto:asquires@pinellascounty.org)) prior to the beginning of the missed meeting will be used for that person’s final ranking scores for projects that were ranked that meeting.
7. At the end of ranking all projects, a consensus will be sought from the ranking subcommittee members as to which projects should be funded or partially funded. The projects recommended for full funding will not necessarily be ranked higher than those to be considered for partial funding. County staff anticipates working with some submitters to negotiate partial funding for submitted projects.