

Okaloosa RESTORE Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes
January 8, 2014 – 2:30 pm
Emerald Coast Conference Center – Room Palm1

Meeting called to order at 2:30 PM by the Chair Seevers of the Okaloosa County RESTORE Advisory Committee (ORAC); those present:

- Sam Seevers (Chair) Mayor of Destin (Okaloosa League of Cities)
- Dr. Jack Azzaretto (Vice Chair) FWB Chamber
- Jim Breitenfeld Citizen at Large
- Cindy Frakes Okaloosa County School Board
- Kay Rasmussen EDC Representative
- Capt. Gary Jarvis Fishing and Seafood Representative
- Steve Shippee Environmental Representative
- Jonathan Tallman Citizen at Large
- Brian Haugen Niceville-Valparaiso Chamber
- Sal Nodjomian Matrix Design Group (Okaloosa County Consultant)
- Dr. Rod Lewis Haas Center (Okaloosa County Consultant)
- Lee Lewis AVCON Inc. (Okaloosa County Consultant)

ORAC Member absent:

- Martin Owen Tourism Representative
- Thomas Gordon Councilman (Okaloosa League of Cities)

Others Present:

- Kelly Windes Okaloosa County Board of County Commissioners
- Dave Parisot Okaloosa County Board of County Commissioners
- Jessica Koelsch National Wildlife Foundation
- Jim Trifilio Okaloosa County
- Emily Gibson Destin Resident
- Royce Gibson Destin Resident

Approval of Meeting Minutes

Ms. Frakes motioned to approve the December 5, 2013 minutes. Mr. Haugen seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

Scheduled Presentation: No Presentations

Consultant's Administrative Report – Mr. Sal Nodjomian

Mr. Nodjomian welcomed the committee and indicated Dr. Lewis is leaving the Haas Center as of today but will remain part of the consultant team moving forward. The Consultant team name will be Matrix/AVCON (vice Matrix/AVCON/Haas Center) effective from this point forward.

Mr. Nodjomian met with County Administrator Ernie Padgett this week and received assurance that the hiring of an ORAC Coordinator is “a front burner issue” for him. The County’s ORAC Coordinator will hopefully be announced at next month’s meeting.

At least five members of the ORAC indicated they were still having e-mail issues with their County web addresses. Mr. Nodjomian stated that he would coordinate with County to ensure a full reset of all passwords and to explore ways to facilitate easier access for ORAC members. Chair Seevers provided an example of the process used by the City of Destin. Mr. Shippee noted that the County’s RESTORE Act website allows fairly simple e-mail access.

The ORAC has previously adopted several rules of order for meetings. Mr. Nodjomian presented a draft “Rules of Order” for ORAC consideration. The draft codifies decisions previously made by the committee. Ms. Rasmussen stated her support for the written format of the Rules of Order. Mr. Breitenfeld suggested that a comment should be added to the rules that educational/informational presentations should be allowed on a “first in, first present” basis.

Vice Chair Azzaretto questioned whether rules should be considered to limit members of the public speaking multiple times on an issue; Mr. Haugen made a similar comment, stating meetings could run well beyond scheduled end time. Chair Seevers noted the City of Destin welcomes public comments, but utilizes a “blue card” system to allow speakers to indicate the topic they would like to speak on prior to the meeting. She noted a speaker will be given the option of speaking at the meeting start or wait until the issue comes up on the agenda. Captain Jarvis noted that the ORAC is not a City Council and may get comments that don’t apply to a specific agenda item. He further stated that the ORAC is technically not a government entity of elected officials. He agreed with limiting presentations to three per meeting. Mr. Breitenfeld suggested that the ORAC rules should comply with County rules. Chair Seevers clarified that the ORAC is acting as a committee of a governmental entity. She followed by noting that the Chair of the ORAC should be responsible for maintaining the time limit on presentations and on comments by members of the public. Mr. Nodjomian concluded the item by requesting the ORAC allow the consultant time to review the issue and provide suggestions to the ORAC.

Mr. Nodjomian referenced Section 6 of the County resolution establishing the ORAC. He noted that the Chair is elected at the first meeting in January and there are no term limits for the position. These rules are mirrored for the Vice Chair position. Ms. Rasmussen moved to nominate Chair Seevers as the Chair for CY2014. Vice Chair Azzaretto seconded. Ms. Frakes questioned whether Chair Seevers could serve as her term as Mayor is scheduled to end in April. Chair Seevers confirmed that her term as Mayor of Destin would end in April, but she was appointed by the League of Cities. Mr Nodjomian noted that the original resolution did not technically require the League of Cities appointee to hold an elected position. Ms. Rasmussen amended her motion to include her nomination of Vice Chair Azzaretto as Vice Chair for CY2014. Mr. Tallman seconded. The vote passed unanimously with Chair Seevers and Vice Chair Azzaretto abstaining.

Mr. Nodjomian noted the resolution requires the planned meetings for the year be published. He presented the dates, times, and locations of the regularly scheduled meetings for the rest of 2014 (see Jan slides for details).

Regional Meeting Updates –Mr. Sal Nodjomian

Mr. Nodjomian indicated that there were no regional meeting updates over the holidays. He recapped the funding eligibility for the various BP funds and stated that the Florida Consortium meets in Tallahassee later this month.

Evaluation Tool

Mr. Nodjomian presented the Roadmap slide to the committee and noted that we intend to stay on the current (red) topic, Evaluation Factors, through at least February.

As previously requested, Mr. Nodjomian recapped the process culminating in the current status of the evaluation tool. In his recap, Mr. Nodjomian noted that the slide on quantitative factors has been updated to reflect the actual economic factors adopted by the ORAC to date. The ORAC Weights are listed as 75% quantitative and 25% qualitative; these are only the consultant team suggestions and will be discussed in more detail in a later meeting.

Mr. Nodjomian presented the scoring charts currently being considered by Santa Rosa County for comparison purposes only. The factors identified for Santa Rosa County are presented in tables with subjective scores; whereas the ORAC process incorporates a more scientific approach to the economic factors. Chair Seevers requested the consultant team review items submitted and share only information pertinent to our process.

Recap of Evaluation Factors: Economic Factors

A slide was presented that summarized the 20+ evaluation factors originally identified by the ORAC in the October meeting (i.e. on yellow “stickies”). Mr. Nodjomian explained these factors were categorized into similar groups as

applicable and the economic factors were reduced down to three broad evaluation factors that captured the many economic topics selected by the ORAC.

Dr. Lewis provided handouts supporting the model for the three broad economic factors: (1) Gross Product; (2) Return on Investment; and (3) Economic Diversification. He reviewed the two fictional cases (i.e. “Road to Riches” and “Fishy Tails”) and walked through the development of the respective economic scores for each example.

Ms. Rasmussen asked whether the percent of importance put on each evaluation factor is the “qualitative score.” Mr. Nodjomian explained the percent of importance that will be applied to each evaluation factor will have a level of subjectivity by the ORAC, but the “qualitative score” will be a separate measurement discussed in a future meeting.

Mr. Breitenfeld suggested that the model being compiled appears to be a great process, but is technical and may be difficult for ORAC members to explain to the public. Chair Seevers asked the ORAC to keep in mind these meetings are public and any one can attend. She suggested the model be developed to include the most detail possible. Ms. Rasmussen commented that it is important the model be defensible and the consultant’s are under contract to defend the model. She is supportive of the process and compared the development of the model to electrical systems: it is important we know how to use it, but we hire experts to understand the science behind it. Capt. Jarvis and Ms. Frakes asked whether the economic factors apply standard economic mathematics which was confirmed by Dr. Lewis. Dr. Lewis added the proposed quantitative factors presented for consideration are “one way to do it” and it is up to the ORAC to decide to apply the economic formula or to opt for a simple subjective score.

New Evaluation Factors: General Factors

After a five minute break, Mr. Nodjomian provided handouts on proposed “General” evaluation factors. In October, the ORAC identified seven individual factors that were general in nature. To keep it manageable, these have been consolidated into two main general categories: (1) Implementation Readiness; and (2) Project Feasibility. The BOCC and the ORAC made it clear early on that they wish to put Pot #1 dollars into action quickly. The Implementation Readiness (IR) factor takes into account information on the proposed project related to permitting status, design status, and land ownership. He presented an initial example of a data collection process for IR factors. In addition to “drop-down” boxes, submitters will have an opportunity to provide a narrative for their project. Similarly, Mr. Nodjomian presented an initial example of data collection for Project Feasibility (PF) that takes into account the relative history of proven success in the type of project (NOTE: the consultant team will expand the initially proposed word count for a narrative on the PF factor from 120 words to 250 words). The answers to most questions will yield scores on a 0 – 4 scale, culminating in a final score for each of the two general factors.

Mr. Nodjomian applied the proposed data collection processes to the two fictional cases (i.e. “Road to Riches” and “Fishy Tails”) resulting in IR and PF scores for each example. He concluded by requesting ORAC approval of the concept before refining the details of these two general evaluation factors.

Mr. Breitenfeld suggested that the IR factor consider any other public approvals or action that may be required, such as interlocal agreements. Chair Seevers added that under the IR factor a project may not require permitting per se, but may require a quasi-judicial process. Mr. Haugen agreed that the data collection presented results in a qualitative “collect-all” and suggested additional technical questions be considered.

Mr. Shippee expressed concern that some important projects that require additional time will be penalized in favor of projects that can be implemented quickly. Mr. Nodjomian replied that important projects requiring additional time should be penalized under this factor, but should score high on the other factors. Mr. Shippee added that the data collection needs to include input on the long-term success and sustainability of the project. He suggested we better define “success” and note “resilience” is a term used throughout the RESTORE Act law. As an example, will the project be rapidly able to bounce back from a future hurricane event? Mr. Breitenfeld concurred that a box should be added to address “long-term sustainability.”

Capt. Jarvis indicated most projects will require some type of permitting. He believes the narrative portion of the data collection will be important in applying the committee’s qualitative scores and wondered whether the ORAC weight for the qualitative score should be higher than the suggested 25%. Mr. Haugen offered that the data

collection process will require the submitter to “self-grade” the proposed project. He believes it is important for the consultant team to apply expertise in reviewing the data to recommend qualitative adjustments to the quantitative scores developed in the model. Mr. Breitenfeld asked if the data collection should consider other funding sources. Mr. Nodjomian indicated that the economic factors already consider the leveraging of other funding as well as in-kind services. Ms. Frakes suggested that at the end of the data collection for the general factors, it may be wise to simply ask generally “are there any other obstacles?” or “is there anything else we should know?”

Dr. Azzaretto noted high cost projects can potentially limit funding available for small projects and questioned whether the ORAC needs to distinguish between large and small projects from a cost perspective. Capt. Jarvis indicated his support for considering splitting the funding pot between different sizes of projects and asked the consultants to consider what splits might be most appropriate. He proposed a possible split between small, medium, and large projects. Mr. Nodjomian stated that splitting the funds could work, but could introduce new challenges. Chair Seevers asked the ORAC members to give thought to the concept of separating pots of money and Mr. Nodjomian stated that the team will review the concept and will report to the ORAC in March (or sooner).

Mr. Breitenfeld asked if an update to the BOCC would be appropriate at this time. Mr. Haugen felt that it may be more appropriate to test the model before sharing details with the BOCC. Ms. Rasmussen recommended that the “Roadmap” slide would be a level of detail for briefing the BOCC. Mr. Nodjomian reported that he met earlier in the week with Mr. Padgett and updated him on the status; he will follow-up on whether the BOCC desires an update.

Dr. Azzaretto asked the ORAC for their thoughts on whether they deemed it reasonable to request BOCC guidance on the ORAC process at this point. Chair Seevers stated that the BOCC gave authorization to form the ORAC for the purpose of providing our recommendations to them.

Mr. Shippee suggested the ORAC recall the original rankings of the eligible uses as voted on by the ORAC and the BOCC and added members may wish to consider these rankings in determining scores.

ORAC Open Discussion

Ms. Frakes stated the ORAC is six months into the process and—despite the large amount of information presented to the ORAC members—the “big picture” strategy has become clear to her. She recognized the consultant team for a great job getting to this point. The general sentiment was agreed by several other members.

Public Comment

Jessica Koelsch, National Wildlife Foundation, stated our process is coming together and brought up the following:

- (1) NRDA meetings in Pensacola (Jan 28) and in Panama City (Jan 29); Okaloosa will be affected by the Phase III projects that will address estuarine restoration, Norriego Point Restoration, and a near shore reef project;
- (2) For data collection under general factors, it is important that if someone says “no” for permitting as an example, then the points that correspond with “no” must be more than the total points for answering all of the follow on questions. Mr. Nodjomian confirmed this will be the case;
- (3) It is important to review and “ferret out” any bogus information submitted; and
- (4) Transocean has settled their portion of the civil penalties at \$1 billion, equating to approx. \$6.4 million for Okaloosa County through Pot#1. These funds could be available to the County relatively soon; however, the BP funds to be applied to Pot#1 are still in court and may still be a while.

No other public comments were offered. Chair Seevers adjourned the meeting at 4:30 pm.

Minutes transcribed by notes taken by Lee Lewis (AVCON, INC.) and are not verbatim.

//signed – ss – Jan 22, 2013 //
Sam Seevers, Mayor of Destin
Chairperson