

**RESTORE ACT
RANKING SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARY**

**22211 US HWY 19 N, CLEARWATER, Building 6 Conference Room
MARCH 23, 2015, 1:30-4:30 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

Others

Jessica Koelsch	National Wildlife Federation
Brendan Mackesey	Pinellas County Attorney's Office

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

Andy Squires welcomed Jessica Koelsch as a public participant and thanked the group once again for agreeing to participate in the ranking process and for the preparation required in reviewing and ranking the proposals. Andy informed the group that Jessica has been recommended by David White, a former Working Group member that has left the National Wildlife Federation, has stepped down from the Working Group, and has recommended Jessica to replace him on the Working Group. Without further discussion, Andy turned the meeting over to Lindsay Cross to facilitate the ranking of the remaining projects.

PROJECT RANKINGS

Lindsay Cross then facilitated the process to obtain a ranking score for each criterion in each remaining project to be ranked beginning with Project 7, Pinellas County Assessment of Vulnerability to Sea Level Rise Impacts & Infrastructure Resiliency Plan (see the attached table of projects). A complete list of submitted projects can be viewed below in Table 1. The process adopted during the March 16th meeting the previous week was adopted once again. The Ranking Subcommittee members (Members) were provided all the time they needed to discuss the project prior to providing scores. Once the Members completed their discussion and comments about the proposal, each 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.

The process was followed for ranking the remainder of the projects in the following order: projects 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17. The Pinellas County Members left the room while project 7 was ranked, and Ernst Peebles left the room while USF projects 16 and 17 were ranked. Project specific Member comments are listed separately below in a separate section of this summary shown below (see Member comments during the discussion and ranking of projects).

At the end of the meeting, Members were asked for recommendations on which projects to fully fund and to partially fund and at what amount. The consensus results of the Members are shown below in Table 2. Members with conflicts, although present during this discussion, were not allowed to speak or otherwise participate when their projects came up for discussion. Andy reminded the Members that the final recommendations and project rankings by mean scores is a tool to help determine what will be placed in the Multiyear Implementation Plan (MYIP), and that the final ranking and funding recommendations will not necessarily be included in the MYIP as County staff, County Commission, and the public will have opportunities to provide input as the process proceeds to approval by the U.S. Treasury.

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

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

	APPLICANT <i>Project Contact</i>	PROJECT NAME <i>Duration</i>	FUNDS (\$) REQUESTED
1	CLEARWATER PARKS & RECREATION <i>Leroy Chin</i> <i>Admin Support Mgr</i>	COOPER’S POINT EDUCATION OBSERVATION TOWER <i>1 year</i>	450,000
2	LARGO <i>Irvin Kety</i> <i>Environmental Services Director</i>	RESILIENT & SUSTAINABLE NUTRIENT CONTROL STRATEGIES <i>2 years</i>	274,749
3	MADERIA BEACH <i>Shane Crawford</i> <i>City Manager</i>	JOHN’S PASS TRANSIENT DOCK <i>15 months</i>	330,000
4	OLDSMAR <i>Al Braithwaite</i> <i>Director of Administrative Services</i>	BROOKER & MOCCASIN CREEK TMDLs <i>52 months</i>	250,000
5	OLDSMAR <i>Al Braithwaite</i> <i>Director of Administrative Services</i>	GRAVITY SEWER REHABILITATION <i>14 months</i>	600,000
6	PINELLAS COUNTY <i>Debbie Chayet</i> <i>Sr. Grants Specialist</i>	FT. DE SOTO DUNE WALKOVERS <i>3 years</i>	1,117,043
7	PINELLAS COUNTY <i>Liz Freeman</i> <i>Planning Division Manager</i>	PINELLAS CO ASSESSMENT OF VULNERABILITY TO SEA LEVEL RISE IMPACTS & INFRASTRUCTURE RESILIENCY PLAN <i>3 years</i>	300,000

	APPLICANT <i>Project Contact</i>	PROJECT NAME <i>Duration</i>	FUNDS (\$) REQUESTED
8	ST. PETERSBURG <i>Phil Whitehouse</i> <i>Parks Superintendent</i>	MAXIMO PARK BEACH RESTORATION <i>3 years</i>	300,000
9	ST. PETERSBURG <i>Phil Whitehouse</i> <i>Parks Superintendent</i>	BAY VISTA PARK BEACH RESTORATION <i>3 years</i>	300,000
10	ST. PETERSBURG <i>Evan Mory</i> <i>Transportation & Parking Mgmt</i>	HISTORIC BOOKER CREEK TRAIL PHASE IIA <i>1 year</i>	1,497,000
11	ST. PETERSBURG <i>Phil Whitehouse</i> <i>Parks Superintendent</i>	LASSING PARK BEACH RESTORATION <i>3 years</i>	300,000
12	ST. PETERSBURG <i>Michael Connors</i> <i>Public Works Administrator</i>	NEW ST PETE PIER MARINE SCIENCE/ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION CENTER <i>18 months</i>	1,500,000
13	ST PETE BEACH <i>Ian Wade</i> <i>Project Manager</i> <i>Public Services Dept</i>	BLIND PASS ROAD IMPROVEMENTS <i>2 years</i>	311,734
14	TAMPA BAY ESTUARY PROGRAM <i>Holly Greening</i> <i>Executive Director</i>	2016 TAMPA BAY ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION FUND <i>Duration project dependent</i>	100,000
15	TREASURE ISLAND <i>Michael Helfrich</i> <i>Public Works Director</i>	PUBLIC BEACH ACCESS RESTORATION <i>10 months</i>	300,000
16	USF COLLEGE OF MARINE SCIENCE <i>Robert Weisberg</i> <i>Professor</i>	VERY HIGH RESOLUTION ESTUARY CIRCULATION NOWCAST/FORECAST MODEL FOR TAMPA BAY AND VICINITY <i>5 years</i>	942,646
17	USF COLLEGE OF MARINE SCIENCE <i>Robert Weisberg</i> <i>Professor</i>	COASTAL OCEAN MONITORING & PREDICTION SYSTEM (COMPS) <i>5 years</i>	415,910
	TOTAL REQUESTED	ALL PROJECTS	9,293,082

Member comments during the discussion and ranking of projects

Project 7:

- There is some Homeland Security (HS) GIS data overlap.
- Would HS be contacted prior to doing the project?
- Final product needs to be a living-breathing document that is periodically updated. Not sure value will last over 10 years.

- I think it will have a very long-term value.
- Project participants need to coordinate with other agencies including, GOMA, HS.
- Digital terrain models are available for the City of Clearwater.
- GIS component needs to be reviewed carefully.
- Final products need to be fully accessible by the public.

Project 12:

- How was the cost derived without a design being done?
- Education Center was a big selling point as part of the Pier project.
- It was assumed that the Ed Center would be built-in to the Pier budget, Ed Center cost was part of all three final designs.
- Good project, but a building shell doesn't really "do" anything related to the ranking criteria.
- No detail on what is really included; no commitment from other partners.
- It's unclear whether if this amount is already budgeted for.
- May be too early for this project; are they asking for funds too soon?
- More clarity needed about matching funds.
- Application needs to be stronger.
- Project components do align with criteria.
- Some indirect benefit to restoration by educating.
- Not sure if or how it will mesh with the "Discovery Center;" others think the Ed Center is the Discovery Center.
- Is building shell for just outside walls, or what is going to be built inside? Members in general thought it (the requested funds) would pay for what will be build inside the building.
- Several members liked the idea, but an Ed Center may not be the best use of RESTORE funds.
- Have interest in project, but a better and more complete application is needed.

Project 13:

- Couldn't get dollars to work out.
- It's a CIP project; it would be done anyway without RESTORE funds.
- Wish this was a project just for the baffle boxes.
- The costs and amount requested is not clear.
- Project was previously rejected by the public.
- Match is difficult to determine, they are asking for \$311,734, but do not know the total project cost.
- Assume >50% match.

Project 14:

- Very good program; good use of RESTORE funds.
- Wish they were asking for more funds.
- Only problem, funding is just a pass through, so don't know exactly what to score.
- Projects typically done by TBERF are the types that should be RESTORE Act projects.
- It's somewhat of a leap of faith in that you do not know what projects will be funded.

Project 15:

- This is about putting concrete down for parking lots.
- It does address beach access for the public.
- Replacing shell with pavement not the best solution.

Project 16:

- Liked many aspects, but should not fund for travel to conferences and PC's; overall, however; a good project.

- Should be a great tool to help protect our resources.
- Should not pay for PC's every year, etc.
- Since staff costs from graduate students, project should be cost effective compared to consultants.
- Good project.
- Asked for 15% indirect costs, but RESTORE only allows for up to 3% administrative costs.
- Red tide, storm surge evaluation useful, many fisherman would appreciate the system.
- \$900,000+ cost too much, could offer partial funding for 1 or 2 years.
- System is for the public, is a form of public education and outreach.
- Could fund phases 1 and 2, which would be first three years.
- This project may not work unless Project 17 (COMPS buoy) is funded.

Project 17:

- Could fund year 1 and year 2.
- It is successfully demonstrated technology previously implemented.
- Is well aligned with RESTORE Act goals and for emergency responses and future monitoring.
- Is very consistent with House Appropriations Committee priorities.
- Collaborations will occur with charter boat captains, dive shops, NOAA, and SECOORA initiatives.

Table 2. Final Subcommittee Rankings and Funding Recommendations.

#	PROJECT NAME	AVG SCORE	Requested Funding Amount	Recommended Funding Amount	Subcommittee Comments (3/23/15)
14	2016 TAMPA BAY ENV REST FUND	25.57	\$100,000	\$100,000	Unanimous support.
7	PINELLAS CO SEA LEVEL RISE IMPACTS	22.00	\$300,000	\$300,000	Utilize outside resources as much as possible.
17	USF COMPS SYSTEM	21.86	\$415,910	\$233,934	Fund years 1 and 2.
16	USF NOWCAST/FORECAST MODEL	21.14	\$942,646	\$474,029	Fund phases 1 & 2 at 3% indirect costs.
6	FT. DeSOTO DUNE WALKOVERS	20.80	\$1,117,043	\$617,042	Priority 1, complete phase 2 and 3 with outside funding. Utilize volunteer groups to help out to save funds. Keep dune walkovers and reduce boardwalk lengths.
13	BLIND PASS ROAD IMPROVEMENTS	15.00	\$311,734	\$0	
3	JOHN'S PASS DOCK	13.63	\$330,000	\$0	
1	COOPER'S POINT	12.86	\$450,000	\$0	
2	NUTRIENT CONTROL STRATEGIES	12.00	\$274,749	\$0	
11	LASSING PARK BEACH RESTORATION	11.00	\$300,000	\$0	
10	BOOKER CREEK TRAIL PHASE IIA	11.00	\$1,497,000	\$0	
12	ST PETE PIER EDUCATION CENTER	10.88	\$1,500,000	\$0	
5	GRAVITY SEWER REHABILITATION	10.88	\$600,000	\$0	
4	BROOKER & MOCCASIN CREEK TMDL'S	10.88	\$250,000	\$0	
9	BAY VISTA PARK BEACH RESTORATION	10.75	\$300,000	\$0	
8	MAXIMO PARK BEACH RESTORATION	10.75	\$300,000	\$0	
15	PUBLIC BEACH ACCESS RESTORATION	8.88	\$300,000	\$0	

Total Recommended	\$1,725,005
Total Available	\$1,542,888
Tot Rec - Tot Avail	\$182,117