

Okaloosa RESTORE Advisory Committee (ORAC) Meeting Minutes Summary
December 4, 2014 – 6:00 P.M.
Northwest Florida State College

Meeting called to order at 6:00 PM by the Chair of the Okaloosa County RESTORE Advisory Committee (ORAC).
Those present:

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| • Sam Seevers (Chair) | Citizen at Large (Okaloosa League of Cities) |
| • Dr. Jack Azzaretto (Vice Chair) | FWB Chamber |
| • Jim Breitenfeld | Citizen at Large |
| • Dewey Destin | Okaloosa County School Board |
| • Kay Rasmussen | EDC Representative |
| • Martin Owen | Tourism Representative |
| • Thomas Gordon | Crestview Councilman (Okaloosa League of Cities) |
| • Dr. Steve Shippee | Environmental Representative |
| • Jonathan Tallman | Citizen at Large |
| • Brian Haugen | Niceville-Valparaiso Chamber Representative |
| • Sal Nodjomian | Matrix Design Group (Okaloosa County Consultant) |
| • Lee Lewis | AVCON (Okaloosa County Consultant) |
| • Rick Owen | Okaloosa County ORAC Coordinator |

ORAC Members absent: Capt. Gary Jarvis

Others Present:

- Kelly Windes, Okaloosa County Commissioner, District 5
- Jessica Koelsch, National Wildlife Foundation
- Bill McCartney, City of Niceville
- Paul Maryeski, Armament Museum
- Roy Petrey, City of Valparaiso
- Drew Petrey, Okaloosa County Resident

Chair Seevers asked the members of the audience to introduce themselves.

Approval of Meeting Minutes:

Ms. Rasmussen motioned to approve the October 21, 2014 minutes. Mr. Tallman seconded the motion. Passed unanimously. Motion to approve November 5, 2014 minutes withheld at the request of Mr. Nodjomian until more detail could be covered later in the meeting.

Consultant's Administrative Report – Mr. Nodjomian:

Mr. Nodjomian stated that the remainder of the scheduled meetings will not change and next meeting will be held on January 7th at 2:30 PM at the Emerald Coast Convention Center.

Mr. Nodjomian updated the committee on the status of the County's RESTORE website, stating that a productive meeting was held with the vendor hired by the County. He further stated that as a result of this meeting, some of the application forms needed minor amendment to meet electronic criteria. Mr. Nodjomian then briefed the group that he and Chair Seevers gave a presentation to the Okaloosa League of Cities Executive Council, and Mr. Lewis gave a similar presentation to the Valparaiso City Commission Workshop on December 1, 2014.

Dr. Azzaretto requested the slides used in local presentations be distributed to the committee members. Mr. Breitenfeld made a recommendation that the committee's "Roadmap" include a step to develop the rules of engagement on how the project submission portal for the data collection tool gets advertised. Mr. Nodjomian noted this was considered in the "project submission protocol" step.

Approved ORAC Summary Minutes December 4, 2014

Mr. Lewis then handed the committee members a summary sheet reflecting the changes to evaluation instrument and Data Collection Tool Parts A and B as identified, motioned, and adopted at the November 5, 2014 ORAC meeting. He explained to the committee that the motions made to adopt the various factors in the instrument had some ambiguity and for clarification provided the summary.

Mr. Lewis provided an overview of the evaluation tool revisions in Part B, explaining that some confusion existed as to what the motions from the November 5, 2014 meeting actually meant. He then explained that the summary he handed out to the committee reflected the changes that were believed to be motioned, along with the associated modifications to minutes from the meeting. Mr. Nodjomian clarified that the changes do not affect the factor significance identified for each of the nine factors. Mr. Lewis provided further clarification of the content of the handout and a discussion ensued.

Ms. Rasmussen stated the minutes should clarify the revisions being made to the factors. The amended minutes include clarification of the committee's approvals by denoting the specific slide or slides which showed the proposed changes in red font that were approved by the committee.

Mr. Tallman made a motion to approve the amended minutes from November 5, 2014. Ms. Rasmussen seconded. The motion passed unanimously with Mr. Haugen abstaining due to his absence from the November 5th meeting.

Evaluation tool:

Mr. Nodjomian provided an update to the committee on the data collection forms stating that no additional comments from public were received, and it was his opinion that Parts A and B were ready for approval.

Mr. Owen motioned to approve Part A as amended. Mr. Tallman provided a second. Mr Shippee asked if further consideration had been given to including an itemized budget in the form. A brief discussion followed with no further amendments. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Haugen made a motion to approve Part B. Mr. Owen seconded motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Nodjomian noted that Part C represents the U.S. Treasury grant requirements which will be required for projects that are ultimately accepted into the approved Multi-year Implementation Plan. This portion has therefore not changed and no motion is needed.

Process Discussion:

Mr. Nodjomian shared information on the formulation of a frequently asked questions (FAQ) page that can be amended as the process proceeds. In doing so, he shared some examples that the consultants have included thus far and requested the committee send submissions for inclusion in the list. Dr. Shippee suggested that including a glossary could help with the FAQ. Mr. Nodjomian explained that the on-line form will feature "hover over" technology where the definition of terms will appear when the submitter places the cursor over a word or term in the application.

The discussion then turned to the subject of public engagement, with Mr. Nodjomian asking the committee to keep the community updated on the successes achieved. Mr. Nodjomian noted that the committee members should continue to inform the public of what we are doing and that the process continues to be a transparent, replicatable process—a process that appears rather unique across northwest Florida. Chair Seevers encouraged the committee to voice only the items that the committee has voted on to date.

A discussion followed with several committee members asking for a calendar of future educational presentations and project-specific presentations. Dr. Shippee suggested a process similar to Impact 100 where presenters would be invited to present their projects by request; this will limit the number of presentations the committee would need to hear to those with projects that have a possibility of making the final list. Chair Seevers continued by stating that the top-ranked proposals, including several that may or may not make the ultimate cut, would be contacted to see if they wanted to present to the committee.

Mr. Nodjomian proceeded to review the data collection form. A lengthy procedural discussion followed on the method of transmittal to the committee as well as the timeline for evaluating projects both quantitatively and qualitatively. Chair Seevers suggested the committee fine-tune the process over the next two meetings. Mr. Nodjomian clarified that an end date for the data collection process will need to be identified because the process is a relative ranking process. Additional discussion focused on whether proposers will have the opportunity to modify their application once submitted. Mr. Haugen expressed concern that the committee and consultants should not “coach” proposers to ensure a level field for all proposers. Mr. Destin suggested the process allow the proposer to submit their project without a back-and-forth process. The committee agreed in concept to consider a one-time submission process for project proposals, similar to a typical RFQ or RFP process.

Dr. Shippee questioned whether a pass/fail process should be considered. Ms. Rasmussen suggested an exercise with sample projects be considered where the committee can walk through the evaluation process. Mr. Breitenfeld cautioned that the committee may be over-complicating the process.

Dr. Azzaretto asked if a summary of all NFWF and NRDA grants with dollar amounts could be provided so the committee could have a basis on what these grants have covered to date. *The consultants will present this at the January meeting.*

Public Comment:

Mr. Petrey questioned setting the quantitative weight 70% and whether some proposers might attempt to “game the system.” He further stated that, for the purpose of economic diversification, a rubric should be included in the model to help guide accurate data.

Ms. Koelsch shared that she appreciated the dialog of the committee. In addition, she proposed that the scheduled educational presentations to the ORAC should be to set a baseline of expertise on areas, not to promote projects. Ms. Koelsch continued that an important part of the evaluation process is to allow applicants to give presentations to the committee; Bay County is allowing five minutes for project presentations. Finally, she recommended that a summary table of all projects submitted for consideration be made available to the public.

Commissioner Windes provided some advice to the ORAC on compliance with the Sunshine Law stating the importance of not having two committee members in the same room when the RESTORE Act is the subject of discussion. He encouraged committee members to “err on the side of caution.”

Mr. McCartney recommended the committee accomplish the evaluation process step of “adjudicating quantitative scores and vote for approval” before the step of “reviewing projects and hearing presentations.” He also suggested the “confirm” should replace “adjudicate” in the first of these two steps.

Meeting adjourned at approximately 8:07 PM. Minutes transcribed by Rick Owen from notes and audio recording of the meeting and are not verbatim.

//signed – ss – January 7, 2015//

Sam Seevers, Destin Representative
Chairman