

MEETING NOTES

Hillsborough County LMS Working Group

SPECIAL MEETING: HAZARD MITIGATION GRANT PROGRAM PROCESS

Wednesday, November 10, 2021; 1:00 PM

Via GoTo Webinar

Attendees

Facilitators: Troy Salisbury (Hazard Mitigation Manager), Monica Martin (Hazard Mitigation Planner & LMS Coordinator)

Officers: Elizabeth Dunn (Chair), Whit Remer (Vice-Chair)

Committee Members: Bart Weiss, Kyle Dollman, Bill Twaite, Simon Bollin, Jose Dejesus, Derek Doughty, Daniel Gessman, Matthew Goolsby, Diego Guerra, Catherine Hayes, Ian Kemp, Celeste Lau, Brian McCarthy, Sheila McNamara, Trinity Miller, Inaki Rezola, Angela Salter, Kayla Smart, Barbara Spaulding, and Allison Yeh.

Guest Attendees: Taylor Dillon, Mikhal Moberg, and Chris Zambito.

I. Welcome

a. Discuss purpose of meeting and format

Meeting started at 1:30 p.m. The Vice-Chair, Whit Remer, introduced himself, welcomed the group, and advised the Working Group members they have the opportunity to be a part of the County receiving funding from the State and also learning more about the projects submitted from the local governments. Troy Salisbury added logistical information (ex: time limits for the Q&A, the hard stop for the meeting, documents provided to assist with preliminary scoring methods, number of questions allowed by each department/division, projects will be reviewed in the order within the PowerPoint presentation within the 11.10.21 agenda packet), and reminded the group that questions should be directly related to the scoring sheet that will be used for ranking the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP)-eligible projects.

II. HMGP Projects

a. Q&As

- **City of Tampa (COT) – Retrofit/Hardening of Fire Stations #3, 12, 13, 16, 18**
Trinity Miller noted the narratives are nearly identical for all the projects and asked how members should differentiate between the scores besides the location. Mr. Salisbury advised these projects are being ranked based on the information the applicants provided on their summary sheets/checklists and therefore scores for projects with the same HMGP eligible activity type will be similar. He emphasized specific questions are encouraged, and the COT may be able to answer their questions to help provide greater differentiators.

Derek Doughty asked if members are supposed to determine if these

projects are in a low-to-moderate income (LMI) area themselves, or is there a map for viewing? Mr. Salisbury highlighted there is a map, however, he suggests reviewing the information provided by the applicants and they were advised to include this and other scoring sheet-related criteria within their summary sheets/checklists. He advised for those applicants who did not provide the necessary information, for all members to do their due diligence before scoring. Monica Martin added if members had a specific question regarding the LMI, the members can ask the COT if they are on the line. Catherine Hayes, from the COT, provided the link to the LMI map in the chat feature

(https://www.huduser.gov/portal/sadda/sadda_qct.html?locate=12057000101). Ms. Miller added within the chat feature a link to an additional LMI web viewer

(<https://hud.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=ffd0597e8af24f88b501b7e7f326bedd>).

Barbara Spaulding mentioned typically grants ask for more than one alternative to making no changes, and she was unsure if these were supposed to be added to the applications. Ms. Spaulding added most of the projects are linked to the LMS plans, however, she believes the projects would be more highly-rated by FEMA and the State if the projects were linked to other plans. She added she would like to see an opportunity to also emphasize multi-jurisdictional agreements/cooperation in the applications in the future. Mr. Salisbury advised we will be updating the process next year, as this year the timeline was very short, the FDEM HMGP Briefing webinar the day before, and the group was provided with important highlights from that meeting. Additionally, he added we will be encouraging and assisting where we can as we move forward to include these suggested items.

Brian McCarthy asked if all of the stations housed the same amount of people. Ms. Hayes advised the stations that house more staff are #'s 13 and 18. She highlighted stations #'s 3, 12, and 18 have the same staff levels. And Ms. Hayes also noted all of them are in the LMI, except for station #18, which is at 47% within the area, so it's just below the 50% while the others are well above it.

- **City of Temple Terrace (TT) – Retro fit/Hardening of Fire Stations #1/EOC and 2**

No questions were asked.

- **Unincorporated Hillsborough County (HC) – Stormwater Management/Flood Mitigation of Lindawoods Street and Casey Road**

Mr. Remer asked if there were any planned green infrastructure improvements that will be a part of the stormwater projects. Mikhal Moberg, from HC's Stormwater Planning team, advised no, not at this time for these projects.

- **Unincorporated Hillsborough County (HC) – Infrastructure Protection/Wind**

Mitigation of Span Wires and Phased Span Wires.

No questions

- **Unincorporated Hillsborough County (HC) – Retro fit/Hardening of Fire Stations #1 [Progress Village], 2 [Lithia], 3 [Summerfield], 9 [Sabal Park], 11 [Brandon], 12 [Gibsonton]**

No questions

- **Unincorporated Hillsborough County (HC) – Retro fit/Hardening of Fire Stations #14 [North Hillsborough], 16 [Riverview], 17 [Riverview], 18 [Seffner], 19 [Carrollwood], 23 [Dover]**

No questions

- **Unincorporated Hillsborough County (HC) – Retro fit/Hardening of Fire Stations #24 [Lutz], 26 [Cork/Knights], 28 [Sun City Center], 30 [Midway (Plant City)], 33 [Falkenburg (Palm River)]**

No questions related to these specific projects.

Jose De Jesus asked within the chat feature if members are voting for all fire stations or by jurisdiction. Mr. Salisbury advised each station is listed as an individual project, which results in all fire stations being ranked individually.

Mr. Remer requested in the future for the forms to include if the project is within the LMI. He also suggested for the fire stations, since there are so many hardening projects, to list on their forms in the future if they are/are not in the wind-born debris zone to help prioritize projects. Elizabeth Dunn also recommended adding to the forms if the project is/is not in the storm surge areas. Ms. Spaulding also asked if there was a map showing where all of the projects and Mr. Salisbury highlighted this is not available due to time constraints, and is the reason why County staff took Allison Yeh's recommendation of adding a Google map link to the forms. He added it is the County's intention to create a map to showcase where all active LMS projects are located. Ms. Spaulding also asked within the chat feature how many of the projects were being planned on being submitted. Mr. Salisbury advised all 38 projects being reviewed are anticipated to be officially submitted by the applicants, as we have Tier I and possibly Tier II funding available.

- **Unincorporated Hillsborough County (HC) – Safe Room Construction/Hardening of Fire Stations #9 [Sabal Park], 20 [West Hillsborough], 28 [Sun City Center], 42 [Henderson]**

No questions related to these specific projects. Inaki Rezola, from HC's Fire Rescue – Emergency Management department, advised their applications included Social Vulnerability Index (SVI) information.

- **Unincorporated Hillsborough County (HC) – Critical Facility Generation/Generators for McLane, Pizzo, Pride, Tomlin, Turkey Creek, and Valrico.**

Ms. Miller, with the County's Affordable Housing department, advised Pizzo

comes up as 0% LMI, however, that is only because it is in the USF census track which shows “0” residents there but all adjacent census tracks are showing as LMI. She wanted to confirm if this generator would be servicing beyond the USF campus and therefore should be awarded the points for that category. Mr. Renzola advised these shelters are not only serving their specific area, they are serving people from surrounding areas and SVI areas. He added shelters like McLane house special needs residents/evacuees and therefore need additional funding. Ms. Dunn added, historically, Pizzo, is one of the County’s largest housing shelters for residents (ex: Hurricane Irma). Mr. Renzola added Pizzo is where special needs families go when they are unable to go to Yuengling, so it is a support site as well.

b. Review of voting eligibility, process/timelines, and online ranking form

- **Voting Process for LMS WG Members**

Ms. Martin reiterated there are notes underneath the slides in the PowerPoint presentation the working group members received, and reminded members to do their due diligence as it includes information regarding their scores being disqualified, highlights timelines, etc. She reviewed the participation requirements, which included voting eligibility that is based off of the attendance roster post-11.04.21 meeting, only (2) eligible voting members are allowed to vote per department/agency per organization, and members must score all 38 projects for their scores to count.

Ms. Martin highlighted the final list will alternate jurisdictions (in no particular order – HC, TT, COT) per the process approved by the working group on 10.14.21, and members should make sure they are not submitting any ties to minimize the chances of additional voting needed to be had. She added that the live link for the online ranking form will be sent to all eligible voting members post-meeting and will close on 11.17.21 at 11:59 pm EST. She added if there are no ties, the final ranked HMGP project list will be forwarded to the group for approval by e-mail vote on 11.19.21 and close on 11.29.21 (11:59 pm EST). Lastly, she highlighted the letter from the Chair and the approved final ranked HMGP list will be signed and sent to all LMS members and attendees on/by 12.10.21.

Ms. Martin noted, for the applicants, their official HMGP application must be submitted via the online portal by 12.21.21, and as mentioned within the e-mail the group was sent the day before, applicants should apply for access to the portal as soon as possible. She advised the e-mail also included the FDEM contacts and resource links that were provided during the State’s webinar the day before.

- **Online Ranking Form**

Ms. Martin reminded voting members to review the project information, preliminary score the projects using the scoring sheets/preparatory information provided. In regard to the online ranking form, it must be completed in one session and scores for all 38 projects are required to be

completed. Members must adhere to the point ranges listed on the scoring sheet. She highlighted not completing scores for all 38 projects will disqualify the entire submission and it will not be counted, and if point ranges are not adhered to, those lines items are disqualified and will not be tallied.

Ms. Martin reviewed the e-mail that was sent to the group the day before, including reiterating the project numbers do not have any meaning other than being used for organizational purposes (matches the order in the PowerPoint presentation), and the items provided are to assist them with doing preliminary scoring prior to submitting their awarded points for each of the 38 projects via the online ranking form.

Mr. Salisbury reiterated Mr. Doughty's comment within the chat feature stating there is a great potential for several ties to occur based on the scoring sheet/the information being asked. Mr. Salisbury advised the group to use their judgement and rank similar projects from the highest to the lowest so they will not have the same total for each of the lines, and we will improve the process in the future. Ms. Martin noted members should not submit projects with the same number of awarded points, but if we do receive ties, an additional vote will be required and the timeframe for that is located within the PowerPoint presentation.

Mr. Salisbury wanted to thank the group for their efforts, especially with the timeframe we were under this year, their time commitment to ranking these projects, the time invested by the applicants for completing these forms in such a short amount of time. He reiterated the County is here to guide and assist where we can now and throughout the year. Mr. Remer thanked Ms. Martin and Mr. Salisbury for their work and reiterated the importance of taking full advantage of the money as this is important to our local communities. He recommended to dedicate some time to looking over the information/ranking the projects, to be mindful of the disqualifiers, and hopes the process to be smoother/easier for everyone in the future as we expand upon the process.

Mr. Salisbury wanted to thank Ms. Dunn one last time for her leadership as Chair, as this is the last official meeting that she will be chairing and expressed the group's appreciation.

III. Adjournment

- a. Meeting was adjourned at 1:57 p.m.