

REGION 6 STEERING COMMITTEE

MEETING #13 MINUTES

Date: May 26, 2020 **Time:** 10:00-12:30pm

Location: South Central Planning and Development Commission Video Conferencing

Call to Order – 10:05 by Mart Black

I. Welcome

- Mart Black welcomed everyone to the thirteenth meeting of the Watershed Region 6 Steering Committee. Pat Gordon stated the purpose of the meeting with an overview of the meeting agenda. A video of the meeting can be found [here](#).
- Roll Call
 - Present Committee Members (11/17): **John Boudreaux, Mark Ward, Earl Matherne, Mart Black, Kevin Durbin, Marril McKarry, Andrew Barron, Mike Metcalf, Rene Pastorek, Tim Matte, Theo Sanders**
 - Absent: David Weil, Scott Saunier, John Clark, Michelle Gonzales, Amanda Voisin, Kasey Courville
 - Other: Pat Gordon, Adam Lefort, Chris Pulaski, Jennifer Gerbasi, Nicolette Jones, Jenny Schexnayder, Kyle Galloway, Allison Haertling, Hilda Lott, Beryl Gomez

II. Review and Adoption

Meeting Minutes

- Mart Black went over the minutes from last meeting on April 28, 2021.
- A motion to accept the minutes was by Earl Matherne and seconded by Marril McKarry. The minutes were accepted by unanimous vote.

III. Sub-Committee Update

Floodplain Managers Sub-Committee

- Adam Lefort went over the Floodplain Managers sub-committee. The group held a meeting on April 14. They are starting to plan for a June meeting.

V. Scoring of Round 1 Regional Projects

Overview by Pat Gordon

- Pat Gordon went over the scoring option that was sent to the State. SCPDC developed 4 options and sent them out to the committee prior to vote.
 - o Have all members review and score all projects based on watershed scoring criteria by:
 - Effectiveness in Minimizing Risk
 - Project Cost and Implementation
 - Social Benefits

Note: If a project will exceed the \$5 million, the next eligible project will be selected
*Create a sub-committee to figure out what sub scores to include for region's priorities.
- Pat Gordon then went over the response from OCD:
 - o "OCD has received the Region 6 Steering Committee's proposed method for recommending... and has determined that the proposal adopted by the committee would not provide adequate justification for the selection or recommendation of those projects that do not receive the highest scores according to the state's scoring process. Specifically, the scoring process outlined by the steering committee uses the same objective criteria that the state will be using to score and award projects, and does not provide any distinguishing priorities of Region 6 nor a method to qualify or quantify those priorities when making the committee's funding recommendation...
- There was discussion about what the score breakdown would be based off the State scoring. Rene Pastorek wanted a little more clarification from OCD since the policies did State that the region would be submitted projects with scoring and justifiable by writing and this seems contrary. Kevin Durbin agrees. Nicolette Jones responded that the State interpreted our scoring as we will follow the State scoring criteria and the policy and procedures says that if the Region selects a project that is not the highest scored from the State, it will need justification to why it was selected. Our scoring was nothing unique and we were using the State's priorities. We are prioritizing the three over the other two is unique and is acceptable with the States scoring. Rene Pastorek doesn't see how it makes since the policy says the projects will be submitted to the region for review and that the scoring done by the State is done by people unfamiliar with the region. We could've made our own criteria, but if we are using the States criteria it is very objective and it could be a disagreement from the State. Kevin Durbin said that it could be different because it is a different person looking at the projects. He mentioned the response was poorly written by the State. Nicolette mentioned that the scoring does not leave much room for interpretation. It is based off of calculations and formulas to award points. John Boudreaux disagreed that working with the programs and some LMI is done by surveying that is not on the census but they know at the local level. Nicolette said it would be have been fine but

the scoring we submitted was not distinguishable or different. If we want to change the scoring we will have until close of business today since the announcement is tomorrow. Pat Gordon mentioned that the LMI is different and surveys are done, but those are normally done before the application and not after. Only what was submitted in the application can be used for scoring. Mart Black mentioned that the three categories is enough to go off of to make it more unique with the scorings. This meeting is meant to object to see how the scoring is done but needs to be done today. Nicolette went over the calculations and how we would get the same numbers. Kevin Durbin asked if there could be an extension, but since the projects are being announced at 9 there is none. We went over the policies and procedures for Round 1 selection and continued the discussion about the scoring and possible changes. For future rounds we can look at creating our own criteria, but for Round 1 we are stuck with what we have now. An update on the Round 1 time line was given.

VI. Outreach and Communication

Outreach and Communication

- Pat Gordon went over the outreach and communication SCPDC has completed. He has been meeting with Parish Presidents; including, Terrebonne, Lafourche, St. John, St. Charles, St. James, Assumption, W. Baton Rouge, Iberville, Pointe Coupee, Morgan City, Orleans, and Jefferson. Presentations have also been don't at Council meetings at Terrebonne, Lafourche, St. John, and Assumption, and W. Baton Rouge. Pat also submitted the talking points to the Official Journal of each Parish, our website, and Constant Contact. He has communicated with non-profits including BTNEP, Wetlands Discovery Center, Restore or Retreat, Chitimacha Native American Organization, Upper Delta Soil and Conservation District, Terrebonne Rotary, Houma Rotary, Spears Group, Henry Consulting, Option for Independence, Upper Delta Soil & Water Conservation, Coastal Center at Nicholls, TEDA, West Ascension Drainage Committee, and Henry Consulting reaching out to others. So far SCPDC have received positive feedback.

VI. Committee Members Comments

- Mart Black opened up for any questions from the committee. There was none

- Mart Black opened up for Public Comment at this time. Kyle Galloway asked again for consideration of partial funding for projects that he discussed at the last meeting as long as the project is phased to meet the objectives. Kevin Durbin wanted to clarify that some of his frustration came out today from the State but the reasoning is because WBR submitted an application for stream gauges and it did not meet the threshold but since it was taken over by State they are only getting 2 out of the 10 they applied for which is crucial to the community.

VIII. Overview of Timeline

Round 1 Timeline

- HUD approved the grant agreement on September 18. The deadline to submit project applications was on March 12, 2021, Awards announced for \$60 million in statewide projects on May 27, 2021, and Regional selection recommendations are due to OCD in July/August 2021.

Key Dates and Deadlines

- May 26, 2021- Round 1 Scoring Finalized
- Summer 2021 – Regional Round 1 Project Selection Due

Next Steps

- Plan next meeting for June 23, 2021.
- Plan next meeting
- Complete and circulate minutes
- Incorporate comments and corrections to meeting minutes
- Outreach and Communication
- Round 1 Funding Applications and scoring

Meeting Adjourned: Motion to adjourn the meeting at 11:05 A.M by Earl Matherne and seconded by John Boudreaux.