| | | | | Florida's Incentive Programs | |
|---------------------|---------------|---------------------|-------------------------|---|--|
| Program | Administrator | Incentive Type | Award Amounts | Eligibility Criteria | Evaluation Criteria |
| Qualified Target | Enterprise | Performance Based | \$3,000-\$6,000 per | Company must be operating in a targeted industry | Enterprise Florida works with the community and company to |
| Industry Tax Refund | Florida/ | Tax Refund. Taxes | new job. No more | (aviation/aerospace; cleantech; financial/professional services; | ensure completeness of the QTI application. Once the |
| (QTI) (Section | Department of | refunded include: | than 25 percent of | homeland security/defense; infotech; life sciences; manufacturing; | application is complete a business analyst from the |
| 288.106, Florida | Economic | corporate income, | the total refund | corporate headquarters; R&D and emerging technology) - Submit | Department of Economic Opportunity is assigned to review |
| Statutes) | Opportunity | sales, ad valorem, | approved may be | an application before making a decision to locate or expand in | the application, complete due diligence on the company and |
| | | intangible personal | taken in any single | Florida, and demonstrate that the tax refund will make a material | ensure the incentive package produces an acceptable Return |
| | | property, insurance | fiscal year. There is a | difference in the company's decision to locate or expand in the | on investment for the state. DEO uses a formula to evaluate |
| | | premium, | \$1.5 million cap for | community; Create at least 10 net new full-time equivalent Florida | ROI that takes into consideration the number of jobs, average |
| | | communications | any business in a | jobs and, if an expansion project, increase employment by at least | wages, operating industry, and other economic impact |
| | | services, and | single fiscal year. | 10 percent (whichever is greater)- For a project located in a rural | information. The project must produce a 5 to 1 return on |
| | | others. | | community (county) or an enterprise zone, the net increase in | investment for the incentives that the state is looking to |
| | | | | employment may be waived in special circumstances; Pay an | contribute in order to be approved. The effectiveness of the |
| | , | | | average annual wage that is at least 115 percent of the state, | formula has been questioned and many have criticized that |
| | | | | metropolitan statistical area (MSA), or the local average wages | the timeframe of investment calculated is too short. It looks |
| | | | | For a project located in a rural city, rural community (county), a | at a 10 year investment period by the company versus a 30 |
| | | | | designated brownfield area, an enterprise zone or a manufacturing | year period. Many other states will evaluate a company's |
| | | | | project paying at least 100 percent of the prevailing average wage, | investment over a 25-30 year period, knowing that once a |
| | | | | the wage requirement may be waived in special circumstances - Sho | company establishes in a community, in most cases they are |
| | | | | | there for a longer period of time due to the cost prohibitive na |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

| Outal Dannana | | C | | et the end of the | 1. 1 |
|------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|
| ļ · | CareerSource | Customized Training | • | | A local, state educational entity – community college, area |
| 1 - ' ' | I ' | Reimbursements | project basis, but | that produce exportable goods or services, create new permanent, | l · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
| ' · | Enterprise Florida | | we've received | full-time jobs and employ Florida workers who require | business to serve as the fiscal agent for the grant funds and is |
| 1 | and the | | quotes up to \$1,500 | | available to assist in the application process, program |
| | Department of | | per job. | at the business's own facility, at the training provider's facility, or at | development and delivery. Training is limited to twenty-four |
| | Education | | | a combination of sites that best meets the needs of the business | months or less After a grant is approved, CareerSource |
| | | | | Program instructors can be either full or part-time educators, | Florida enters into a grant agreement with the business and |
| | | | | vendors, subject matter experts or professional trainers from the | training provider participating in the project If the QRT |
| | | | | business Special consideration will be given to businesses that: | application is approved, the business is required to post the |
| | | | | create high skill/high wage jobs; Are in one of Florida's qualified | new hire positions through one of Florida's nearly 100 locally |
| | | | | targeted industries; Locate in a distressed urban or rural area, | administered career centersCareerSource Florida staff will |
| |] | | | Enterprise Zone, or Brownfield area; Have the greatest potential | communicate to the applicant and/or the fiscal agent within |
| | | | | for economic impact; And contribute in-kind or cash matches. | three working days from receipt of an application as to |
| | | | | | whether or not the application is complete Funding |
| | | | | | recommendations will be made within ten working days of |
| | | | | | receipt of a complete application, unless other action is |
| | | | | | required. |
| | | | | | Tequired. |
| Incumbent Worker | CareerSource | Customized Training | Varies on a per | Open to all Florida businesses that have been in operation for a | Funding priority will be given to business with 25 employees |
| Training Program | Florida (funded | | project basis. Limited | minimum of one year prior to the application date and require | or less; businesses located in rural or distressed inner-city |
| (IWT) (Section | by the Federal | | funds available. | training for existing employees Business must have at least one | areas, businesses in qualified targeted industries, businesses |
| 445.003(a)(3), | Workforce | | | | whose grant proposals represent a significant layoff avoidance |
| 1 ' ' ' ' ' | Investment Act | | | and be current on all state tax obligations Training services can be | |
| | (WIA)) | | | provided through Florida's community colleges, school districts, | significant upgrade in employee skillsWith the high demand |
| |) " | | | area vocational-technical centers, state universities, licensed and | and limited funding available, applicants are encouraged to |
| | | | | certified post-secondary private institutions and from subject | form training consortiums with other businesses to address |
| | | | | matter experts, consultants, or trainers from the business | training for skill sets that are shared across industry sectors. |
| | | | | Training can be conducted at the business's own facility, at the | Training for skill sets that are shared across moustry sectors. |
| | | | | training provider's facility or at a combination of sites Businesses | |
| | | | | must provide a matching contribution to the training project | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | Training must be completed within 12 months from the date of the | |
| | | | | approved application. | |
| i | I | I | I | | |

| Economic | Florida | Grants to local | Up to \$3,000,000 | The unit of government who will own and be responsible for | Funding recommendations are based on: The amount of funds |
|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|----------------------|--|---|
| Development | Department of | governments to | may be provided to a | maintenance of the transportation improvement must apply to | requested; The number of permanent full-time jobs created |
| Transportation | Transportation/ | eliminate a | local government to | Enterprise Florida (EFI) and have approval of funds for its | and/or retained; The economic and demographic conditions |
| Fund (Road Fund) | Enterprise Florida | transportation | implement the | transportation project PRIOR to the final decision of the company | of the community; and, The degree of inducement for the |
| (Section 339.2821, | | impediment to | improvements. | on whose behalf the application was madeIn order for the | project's location/expansion/retention decision. |
| Florida Statutes) | | induce a specific | | application to be considered, that company must estimate and | |
| | | company's location, | | disclose: The capital investment it intends to make in the facility; | |
| | | retention or | | The number of permanent full-time jobs to be created and/or | |
| | | expansion project in | | retained at the facility; The average hourly wage, excluding | |
| | | Florida and create | | benefits, for the new and/or retained permanent full-time jobs. | |
| | | or retain jobs. | | | |
| | | | | | |
| İ | | | | | |

| Expedited | Florida | Expedited/ | Benefits: Central | Business creating at least 50 jobs; commercial or industrial | Projects prohibited form using the expedited process: A |
|---------------------|---------------|----------------|-------------------------|---|--|
| Permitting (Section | Department of | Streamlined | point for filing permit | development project that will be occupied by a business that would | project funded and operated by a local government and |
| 403.973, Florida | Economic | permitting for | applications; pre- | individually or collectively create at least 50 jobs; business creating | located within that government's jurisdiction; A project, the |
| Statues) | Opportunity | competitive | application meeting | at least 25 jobs if the project is located in an enterprise zone, in a | primary purpose of which is to: affect the final disposal of |
| | | projects | of regulatory | county which has a population of fewer than 75,000 or in a county | solid waste, biomedical waste, or hazardous waste in the |
| | | | agencies ad business | which has a population of fewer than 125,000 which is contiguous | state; produce electrical power (unless the production of |
| | | | representative held | to a county having a population of 75,000 residing in incorporated | electricity is incidental and not the project's primary function); |
| | | | within 14 days of | and unincorporated areas of the county; on a case-by-case basis | Extract natural resources; produce oil, or construction, |
| | | | eligibility | and at the request and recommendation of the governing body of a | maintain, or operate an oil, petroleum, natural gas, or sewage |
| | | | determination; | county or municipality in which the project is to be located, DEO | pipeline. Benefits: A |
| | | | identification of all | may allow a business creating a minimum of 10 jobs to use the | central point for filing permit applications; pre-application |
| | | | necessary permits | process At the request of a county or municipal government | meeting of regulatory agencies and business representative |
| | | | and approvals needed | The project is located in a designated brownfield area; - Projects | held within 14 days after eligibility determination; |
| | | | for the project; | that are part of the state-of-the-art biomedical research institution | identification of all necessary permits and approvals needed |
| | | | designation of a | and campus to be established in this state and projects resulting in | for the project; designation of a project coordinator and |
| | | | project coordinator | the production of biofuels cultivated on lands that are 1,000 acres | regional permit action team contacts; identification of the |
| | | | and regional permit | or more or in the construction of a biofuel or biodiesel processing fa | need for any special studies or review which may affect the |
| | | | action team contacts; | | time schedule; identification of any areas of significant concerr |
| | | | identification of the | | |
| | | | need for any special | | |
| | | | studies or review | | |
| | | | which may affect the | | |
| | | | time schedule; | | |
| | | | identification of any | | |
| | | | areas of significant | | |
| | | | concern which may | | |
| | | | affect the outcome of | | |

| Local Ad Valorem | Local | A tax abatement on | Up to 100% of the | A business must meet one of the following definitions of either a | The abatement is at the sole discretion of the governing body, |
|--------------------|-------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|--|---|
| Tax Abatement | governmental | improvements to | improvements to real | new or expanding business: A business or organization establishing | providing that the local property appraiser determines |
| (Section 196.1995, | agency (county or | real and personal | property or new | 10 or more new jobs to employ 10 or more full-time employees in | eligibility and signs the company's application. In Bay County, |
| Florida Statutes) | municipality) | property added as | tangible personal | this state, paying an average wage for such new jobs that is above | factors for consideration include: the type of business; the |
| | | part of a business | property can be | the average wage in the area, which manufactures, processes, | total number of net new jobs to be created; the average wage |
| | | expansion or | abated for up to 10 | compounds, fabricates or produces for sale items of tangible | of the new jobs; the net positive contribution to the local |
| | | relocation. Only the | years. | personal property at a fixed location and which comprises an | economy. |
| | | county or city mills | | industrial or manufacturing plant; or a business or organization | |
| | | can be abated. | | establishing 25 or more new jobs to employ 25 or more full-time | |
| | | | | employees in this state, the sales factor of which, as defined below, | |
| | | | | for the facility with respect to which it requests an economic | |
|] | | | | development ad valorem tax exemption is less than fifty (50%) | |
| | | | | percent inside the State of Florida for each year the exemption is | |
| | | | | claimed; or an office space in this state owned and used by a | |
| | | | | business or organization newly domiciled in this state; provided | |
| | | | | such office space houses 50 or more full-time employees of such | |
| | | | | business or organization; provided that such business or organizatio | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

| Industry | University of | Performance based | \$1M cap per project | Capital investment required, minimum creation of 10 net new jobs | Required ROI: 1.5 (same as DEO's requirment for incentives); |
|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------|----------------------|---|---|
| Recruitment | West Florida | cash grant. | award | in rural areas; 30 job minimum elsewhere; limited to the 8 | projected ability of project to promote and support research |
| Retention and | Office of | | | disproportionately affected counties; must be able to demonstrate | and development, commercialization of research, economic |
| Expansion Fund | Economic | | | local support; and active participation or lack thereof from relevant | diversification and or job creation within one or more |
| (Section 498, | Development and | | | state and local economic development authorities. | disproportionally affected county. Number of net new, private |
| Chapter 2011-142, | Engagement | | | | sector, full-time equivalent direct project jobs created or |
| Florida Statutes) | | | | | retained; sustainability (permanence) of net new, private |
| | | | | | sector, full-time equivalent direct project jobs created or |
| | | | | | retained; wages to be paid of each net new, private sector, |
| | | | | | full-time equivalent direct project job created or retained as |
| | | | | | compared to comparable prevailing wages in the county in |
| | | | | | which the project is to be located; capital investment; project |
| | | | | | addresses one or more of Florida's targeted industry clusters |
| | | | | | or strategic areas of emphasis and/or project addresses an |
| | | | | | export industry (i.e., a minimum of 51% of project revenues |
| | | | | | are generated from outside of the State of Florida); If |
| | | | | | applicable, whether the county or municipality within which |
| | | | | | the project will be located expedites and/or combines its |
| | | | | | permitting processes in order to promote research and develo |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

| Conduit Debt | Space Florida is | Space Florida acts | Varies based on value | For a facility, the property must be publicly owned in order for | Space Florida acts as a financing conduit by creating a Special |
|-------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| Financing through | an Independent | as a financing | of assets and | Space Florida to provide financing. The company seeking financing | Purpose Entity (SPE) that holds title to the assets financed |
| Space Florida | Special District of | conduit by creating | financing rates. | must be involved in the aerospace industry. | (authority for creation of such entities is found at Chapter |
| | the State of | a Special Purpose | | | 331.310(1)(d) Florida Statutes). The availability and cost of |
| | Florida (created | Entity (SPE) that | | | financing is determined by the credit of the company |
| | through Chapter | holds title to assets | | | utilizing the assets; neither Space Florida nor the State of |
| | 331, Part 2 | financed (authority | | | Florida provides a credit guarantee (Space Florida may secure |
| | Florida Statutes) | for creation of such | | | an equity contribution in some cases). Likewise, repayment is |
| | | entities is found at | | | the responsibility of the company utilizing the assets. Based |
| | | Chapter | | | on past experience lenders typically will look for recourse to a |
| ! | | 331.310(1)(d) | | | cash flow(s) as well as securing liens against the assets |
| | | Florida Statutes). | | | financed (commercial) and/or assignment of right of use |
| | | The SPE holds title | | | (federal facilities). |
| | | to the assets, thus | | | |
| | | allowing the | | | |
| | | company benefiting | | | |
| | | from the financing | | | |
| | | to keep the assets | | | |
| | | off balance sheet, | | | |
| | | while still realizing | | | |
| | | the tax benefits of | | | |
| | | depreciation, as | | | |
| | | well as exemption | | | |
| | | from most Florida | | | |
| | | state and local | | | |
| | | taxes. | | | |
| | | | | | |

| Florida Seaport | The Florida | Financing of port | Varies based on | The FSTED Program requires consistency with local plans and | Responsibility for project development through the FSTED |
|--------------------|-------------------|------------------------|---------------------|---|---|
| Transportation and | Seaport | transportation | capital investment. | matching funds from each seaport; thus seaport investments are | Program is initiated at the local level, based on an |
| Economic | Transportation | projects on a 50-50 | | driven by a local commitment to meet the community's strategic | understanding of market demand and local seaport |
| Development | and Economic | matching basis | | objectives. | opportunity and capacity. At the State level, project review is |
| Program (FSTED) | Development | Grant funding under | | | accomplished by state agency partners who are full voting |
| i. | (FSTED) Council | the program is | | | members of the FSTED Council. The FSTED Program provides |
| 1 | within the | limited to specific | | | that program funds will be used to fund approved projects on |
| | Department of | types of port | | | a 50-50 matching basis with any of the public ports which are |
| I | Transportation | facilities or port | | | governed by a public body. An approved project is a project |
| | (Chapter 311, | transportation | | | that has been approved by the FSTED Council. |
| | Flroida Statutes) | projects. | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Florida Ports | Florida Ports | Offers efficiencies in | Varies. | The Florida Ports Financing Commission is to accept a list of | |
| Financing | Financing | financing public | | projects approved by the Florida Seaport Transportation and | |
| Commission | Commission (the | works projects. | | Economic Development Council and implement the bond funding | |
| | Commission) was | , , | | program pursuant to staturotry provisions. The purpose is to | |
| | created by | | | provide a cost-effective means of financing various capital projects | |
| | interlocal | | | for Florida's ports by issuing bonds and transferring the proceeds to | |
| | agreement | | | the individual ports. | |
| | among public | | | | |
| | entities pursuant | | | | |
| | to Section | | | | |
| | 320.20(3) and | | | | |
| | Chapter 163, Part | | | | |
| | I, F.S. | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

| Out-of-State Programs for Consideration | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------|----------------|---------------|------------------|--|--|--|
| Program | Administrator | Incentive Type | Award Amounts | Program Overview | | | |

2. Overview

a. Mission: The mission of the Bay County RESTORE Act Advisory Committee is to draft a Multi-Year Implementation Plan (MYIP) for the Direct Component funds from the Gulf Coast Restoration Trust Fund from the Transocean settlement that meets all the requirements of the RESTORE Act and related rules and accomplishes the tasks set forth in the Bay County Board of County Commissioners' resolution establishing the Committee. The Committee may also make recommendations to the Board about projects funded from other sources.

b. Guiding principles

- 1. Process
 - a. Meet all RESTORE Act statutory and rule requirements
 - b. Use a transparent process and engage the public
 - c. Use best available information
 - d. Employ adaptive management consider results and use the information to improve the MYIP and its implementation
 - e. Ensure the MYIP is consistent with the Bay County Comprehensive Plan

2. Strategies

- a. Determine and focus on high priority projects
- b. Use Gulf restoration funds on sustainable long-lasting projects or projects that will have positive long-lasting effects
- c. Favor high impact projects, including environmental, economic and quality of life considerations
- d. Avoid creating undue future burdens for taxpayers
- e. Ensure that every recommended project provides a public benefit

3. Funding

- a. For RESTORE Direct Component funds, favor funding priority projects that do not have adequate sources of funding, such as other Gulf restoration funds or revenue sources from the project that could be used to fund the project
- b. Use Direct Component funds to leverage other sources of funds for the project or to fund other aspects of high priority projects/objectives

DRAFT Bay County Gulf Coast Restoration Trust Fund Multi-Year Implementation Plan July 19, 2016
Page 8

c. Annually consider limits and/or maximums to funding for a single project, reserving a portion of funds to support future priority projects, and/or annual allocations of available funds.

c. Summary of Needs

Bay County is blessed with an outstanding bay system, beautiful beaches and abundant fisheries. It has a solid economy based on tourism, the military and the port. For Bay County to thrive, we need to protect and enhance our environment, and broaden and strengthen our economy.

We need healthy uplands and good water quality. Our stormwater system is inadequate and high rain events wash sediments off our unpaved roads. Many areas rely on septic tanks installed in marginal conditions. The sediment, nutrients and pollutants from these sources threaten our drinking water, the bays and the Gulf where we and our visitors swim, fish and recreate.

We need to ensure our economic progress by strengthening our existing economic base and broadening it through job training, new and improved infrastructure, and diversification of our economy. Although Bay County has done well with our current economic pillars, a more diversified economy will bring increased prosperity and stability.

The Gulf Coast Restoration Trust Fund Direct Component moneys can help Bay County make tremendous progress in these areas. The amount of Direct Component funds will be far from sufficient to accomplish all that is needed. By focusing on the most important projects and leveraging these funds with those from other sources, we can make a significant contribution to Bay County's future.

3. Goals and objectives

Overall Goal: Use RESTORE funds to enhance economic development, job creation, the environment and public infrastructure to improve the quality of life and environment for Bay County citizens and visitors.

GENERAL STRATEGY: View the environment of the Gulf and St. Andrew Bay and its system as intertwined with and vital to Bay County's economy and quality of life which, if not maintained in a healthy condition, can cause missed opportunities for new industry, loss of existing industry, tourism and defense-related jobs, loss of natural resource-based jobs, reduction in property values, increased costs of providing infrastructure services, and decline of the community in general.

a. Economic Development and Job Creation

GOAL: Support the long-term viability, diversity, and sustainability of the economy of Bay County

- Objective 1.1: Diversify the economy in areas of aerospace, medical technology, logistics, and advanced manufacturing, tourism development projects and defense
- Objective 1.2: Provide or contribute to infrastructure to attract new and technology-based industry e.g. high-tech infrastructure, hangars/facilities, industrial sites
- Objective 1.3: Support efforts that expand economic benefits from the airport
- Objective 1.4: Provide in-demand job training and align training infrastructure resources for those jobs that are in the community or are anticipated
- Objective 1.5: Establish a flexible workforce development fund able to rapidly respond to specific job-training needs
- Objective 1.6: Develop and promote additional facilities, attractions, ecotourism opportunities, cultural and heritage resources, and other tourism amenities to foster tourism and economic development
- Objective 1.7: Support recreation (including improved beach and water access), public transportation (including bike lanes), and opportunities for wage improvements that enhance the quality of life of Bay County residents and visitors

Objective 1.8: Conserve and protect those natural resources that form the basis of the tourist industry

Objective 1.9: Promote recreational Gulf fishing by establishing artificial reefs, highlighting recreational fish species that have fewer catch restrictions, and emphasizing the activity and enjoyment of fishing rather than particular fish species

Objective 1.10: Support community resilience planning for locally owned businesses to assist continuity of operations planning for post man-made or natural disasters

b. Environment

GOAL: Ensure that the quality of environmental resources of the Gulf and St. Andrew Bay and its system is maintained or improved

Objective 2.1: Improve and protect the St. Andrew Bay watershed water quality and watershed condition taking into consideration the recommendations and priorities in the St. Andrew Bay Surface Water Improvement and Management Plan, the St. Andrew Bay Stormwater Management Plan (2009), and the Northwest Florida Water Management District Gulf restoration projects list, as well as the priority recommendations of the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, the Florida Department of Environmental Protection, the Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services, and fishery strategies

Objective 2.2: Improve and protect the water quality of the St. Andrew Bay, its watershed, coastal lakes, and the Gulf near-shore waters by advancing acquisition of lands and restoration of wetlands and uplands in proximity to the Bay

Objective 2.3: Protect seagrass beds by partnering with organizations to institute a public awareness program to inform residents and visitors about the value and potential threats to seagrass beds

Objective 2.4: Increase awareness of the beach and near-shore areas as wildlife habitat

Objective 2.5: Support acquisition and active management of properties important to coastal conservation lands in order to protect the natural resources

Objective 2.6: Preserve and restore dune systems and living shorelines, including oyster reefs, seagrass beds and marshes, to improve estuarine habitat and water quality, reduce shoreline erosion, increase coastal resilience and minimize the potential damage to life and property caused by coastal storms

Objective 2.7: Support projects that contribute to the protection and recovery of protected species listed by the state or federal government and that improve the flexibility of local infrastructure management, development, and business operations

Objective 2.8: Support a sustainable approach to long-term collection of water quality and other important environmental data that can be used as indicators of ecosystem health and recovery and provide information for use in adaptive management

c. Public Infrastructure

For this plan, public infrastructure is defined as man-made infrastructure owned by the public and/or for public use. Environmental infrastructure, such as wetlands, the seagrass beds, and other habitats, are included in the Environment section.

GOAL: Provide the public infrastructure necessary to protect and enhance the environment, strengthen and diversify the economy, and improve the quality of life for residents and visitors

Objective 3.1: Maintain water quality in Deer Point Lake, the local potable water supply, at current levels or better through conservation land acquisition, septic tank removal, stabilization of unpaved roads and fertilizer application education

Objective 3.2: Stabilize unpaved roads in Bay County to reduce nutrient and sedimentation input into the St. Andrew Bay system; prioritize efforts based on proximity to water bodies and other factors, including guidance in the St. Andrew Bay SWIM plan

Objective 3.3: Maintain and improve the water quality of the Gulf and the St. Andrew Bay system by upgrading sewage treatment facilities to advanced wastewater treatment levels or greater

Objective 3.4: Facilitate replacement of septic tanks with centralized wastewater treatment, prioritizing efforts based on factors including proximity to the bay system, density of septic tanks, age and condition of septic tanks, and soils

Objective 3.5: Maintain and improve the water quality of the Gulf and the St. Andrew Bay system by installing or upgrading stormwater treatment facilities, using the St. Andrew Bay Stormwater Management Plan (2009) and the SWIM plan for guidance and with emphasis on multi-jurisdictional approaches

Objective 3.6: Promote low impact development (LID) practices

Objective 3.7: Increase coastal resilience and protect key public assets from coastal flooding

Objective 3.8: Support the Port Authority's efforts to add Port capacity and increase trade, including land acquisition for facilities, expansion of port related infrastructure, continued

DRAFT Bay County Gulf Coast Restoration Trust Fund Multi-Year Implementation Plan July 19, 2016
Page 12

development of the Intermodal Distribution Center, maintaining and expanding deepwater access, and the capacity to provide alternative fuels

4. Bay County Direct Component project evaluation criteria and ranking considerations

- a. Criteria for eligible projects a proposed project must meet the all the following criteria in order to be eligible for Bay County's Direct Component funds:
 - i. Within Bay County or adjacent surface and Gulf waters, or with an identified and strong benefit to the County
 - ii. Addresses one or more RESTORE Act eligible activity
 - iii. Addresses one or more Bay County Multi-Year Implementation Plan objectives
 - iv. Is not fully funded by another source of money
 - v. Has a recognizable public benefit
- b. Additional ranking considerations
 - i. General
 - 1. Number of RESTORE Act eligible activities clearly addressed
 - 2. Number of County MYIP objectives clearly addressed
 - 3. Provides countywide and/or regional benefits
 - 4. Long term benefits economic, environmental, social, other and how direct, how much benefit [quantify as much as possible]; how project addresses the root cause of the issue being addressed
 - 5. Project cost
 - a. Overall cost and demonstrated value
 - b. ongoing costs (maintenance, monitoring, other)
 - i. borne by the County
 - ii. borne by other source, reliability of source
 - 6. Matching funds provided, % of project cost
 - 7. Funding is not readily available from other sources
 - 8. Partnerships
 - 9. Complements other funded projects
 - 10. Best Available Science (for projects designed to protect or restore natural resources)
 - ii. Project readiness and feasibility
 - 1. Project implementation readiness is project ready to start when funded, amount of time anticipated after funding is received that the major work of the project can start, and likelihood of major delays due to factors such as permitting requirements
 - 2. Project feasibility
 - a. Likelihood of obtaining necessary permits
 - b. Likely to complete project
 - 3. Likelihood of project success will it do what it is proposed to do
 - 4. Time to completion of the project 0-2 yrs, 3-6 yrs, 7-10 years, 11+ years

- 5. Measuring success of each project/monitoring ability to measure success using meaningful measures
- iii. Capacity of applicant who proposes to manage a project
 - 1. Experience in completing similar projects size, type, cost, length of time
 - 2. Demonstrated applicant experience managing grants and contracts, financial history and track record, etc.
 - 3. Capability to maintain the project after completion technical, fiscal aspects, organization stability
- c. RESTORE Act eligible activities The RESTORE Act requires that Direct Component/Equal-Share State Allocation funds may only be used to carry out specified eligible activities in the Gulf Coast region. See 1.d., above, for list of eligible activities.
- d. Bay County Multi-Year Implementation Plan Guiding Principles see 2.b., above.
- e. Bay County Multi-Year Implementation Plan Goals and Objectives see 3, above.

5. Evaluation and Ranking Process for Proposals for Bay County Direct Component RESTORE Funding

- a. Pre-proposals solicited from public and governments for a 30-day period
- b. Pre-proposals received, logged in, acknowledged
- c. Staff prepares a summary spreadsheet of all proposed projects, determines whether each pre-proposal meets the required eligibility criteria, and compiles a brief evaluation for each project based on guiding principles, objectives, criteria and considerations.
- d. Public comment meeting
- e. During a Bay County RESTORE Act Advisory Committee meeting, the Committee votes to decide which pre-proposals will advance to full proposal stage. An affirmative vote of at least six committee members is required to advance a pre-proposal.
- f. Applicants for selected pre-proposals prepare and submit full proposals within a 30-day window
- g. Staff compiles an **evaluation** for each proposed project based on guiding principles, objectives, criteria and considerations.
- h. **Public comment** meeting(s), not the same day as the ranking so as to allow time for Committee members to consider public comments and incorporate the information into each member's ranking decision
- i. Second vote and ranking
 - i. Committee votes during a meeting to decide which proposals will be placed on the recommended project list. An affirmative vote of at least six committee members is required to place a proposal on the recommended project list.
 - ii. Committee then ranks projects numerically. Each committee member independently assigns a numerical rank to each project, with the combined ranks from all committee members determining the rank of each project. Votes are made by roll call voice vote during a public Committee meeting. (If there are 15 projects, each committee member ranks the projects from 1 to 15, with "1" being the highest. The project with the lowest combined numerical score will be ranked number one, the project with the second lowest would be ranked number two, etc. Ties would be broken by a motion and approval by the committee.)
 - iii. The Committee then votes to approve the ranked recommended projects list and submit the list to the Board of County Commissioners
- j. Recommended projects and ranking are presented to the **Board of County Commissioners for review and approval**. The Board can add or remove projects and can change the rank of projects.

DRAFT Bay County Gulf Coast Restoration Trust Fund Multi-Year Implementation Plan July 19, 2016
Page 16

Notes

- Staff provides objective information describing how each project addresses MYIP objectives and ranking criteria and considerations. Staff will not provide quantitative values unless these are very straightforward.
- Each committee member ranks all projects on the list from 1 to x based on each committee member's interpretation as to how well each project addresses eligible activities, guidelines, criteria and considerations *in toto*, and in relation to other projects being considered and those already on an approved Bay County RESTORE project list.
- Conflicts of interest see the conflicts of interest memo prepared by the County Attorney and provided to each Committee member

Escambia County Project Selection Criteria

The project selection criteria presented below are derived from the Interim Needs Assessment for Escambia County v2.2 and will be used to evaluate projects submitted to Escambia County for funding consideration and inclusion in the Multiyear Implementation Plan (MYIP) required by the RESTORE Act. The criteria are divided into five major categories: Baseline Criteria, Environmental Criteria, Economic Criteria, Infrastructure Criteria, and Bonus Criteria.

Each project will be evaluated for its eligibility for RESTORE funding and the degree to which it addresses the previously defined needs of Escambia County. Therefore, each project will be scored against all criteria in each category. Projects will receive an overall score that will be the accumulation of the points awarded. The criteria in each category contain brief descriptions to serve as guidance examples to the project applicants. This guidance is meant to assist applicants in obtaining the maximum number of available points for each criteria. The guidance is not meant to be an exhaustive listing of all possible strategies to achieve the criteria. Projects will be evaluated by the County based upon the best available science to determine the full range of benefits provided by the project and the feasibility to achieve the described results. Applicants are encouraged to provide a thorough explanation of the project, expected outcomes and include supporting documentation to assist the County in its evaluation.

Note regarding regulatory compliance: Project submittals must conform to all applicable federal, state, and local laws and codes including, but not limited to American's with Disabilities Act, Rehabilitation Act of 1973, U.S. Access Board, National Environmental Policy Act, National Historic Preservation Act, Davis-Bacon Act, Florida Building Code, and the Escambia County Land Development Code. Projects that do not comply will not be considered for scoring and will be returned to the submitter.

| Baseline Criteria (Regulatory and Programmatic) ALL submitted projects must meet the minimum criteria in this category | BC Subtotal 12 |
|---|----------------------|
| 1. Project Justification. Proposed project is adequately described to determine feasibility and the budget includes reasonable and justifiable costs. | # of av. Points |
| Criteria Guidance Project budget provides detailed expenditure plan Costs are practical and are appropriately aligned with project activities Proposed project includes all supporting documentation to justify proposal | 3 |
| 2. Timing. Proposed project can be implemented and benefits realized within a reasonable and acceptable timeframe. | # of av. Points |
| Applicable permits and permissions have been identified Project timeline is sufficiently detailed to determine duration of design and construction and anticipated milestones for completion and monitoring | 3 |
| 3. Public Interest. Proposed project is in the public interest. | # of av. Points |
| Projects performed by a public entity on public property or property under public control are deemed to be in the public interest Projects performed, in part or whole, on private property must provide evidence of public benefit as determine by Escambia County | 3 |

| 4. Monitoring Plan. Proposed project includes a comprehensive monitoring and succe measurement plan. | ess # of av. Points |
|---|------------------------|
| | 3 |
| Criteria Guidance | |
| Proposed project includes applicable periodic maintenance Proposed project establishes monitoring plan and applicable success measures | |

| and the second s | 20 |
|--|--------------------|
| 1. Habitat Restoration. Proposed project improves, enhances, or restores the structure and function of upland, coastal, bays, bayous, wetlands, rivers, lakes, streams, or marine natural systems, benefiting native flora and fauna. | # of av. Points |
| Restores, improves, or enhances ecological function – natural hydrological function, tidal connections, soil composition, vegetation diversity and renewal Restores, improves, or enhances community structure – Increases native vegetation, biodiversity, or beneficial substrate Removal of non-native species Removal of fish passage barriers Benefits fish and wildlife, especially listed species (threatened and endangered) | |
| 2. Habitat Conservation and Preservation. Proposed project maintains or improves the structure and function of upland, coastal, bays, bayous, rivers, lakes, streams, or marine natural systems, benefiting native flora and fauna. | # of av. Points |

Criteria Guidance Establishes conservation easement or wildlife corridor Reduces unnatural disturbances Implements or establishes habitat management plan or other best practice 3. Water Quality Improvement. Proposed project reduces point and nonpoint sources of # of av. pollutants entering local waterways, provides treatment to improve water quality, or **Points** proposes other measures which will improve water quality. 5 Criteria Guidance Point Source reduction – reduces pollutant loading from point sources, installation of Best Management Practices (BMP's) • Nonpoint Source reduction – reduces pollutant loading from nonpoint sources - reduces impervious surface coverage, implementation of BMP's (such as bioretention, vegetated buffer preservation, etc.), reduces sedimentation • Treatment – provides treatment for nutrients or legacy contaminants • Improves impaired (303d or evidence of impairment) waterway

| 4. Natural Systems Resiliency. Proposed project increases ability of natural systems to withstand disasters and adapt to changing environmental conditions due to climate change, associated sea level rise, and other factors. | # of av. Points |
|---|--------------------|
| | 5 |
| Criteria Guidance | |
| Stabilizes shoreline/provides natural wave | |
| attenuation | |
| Increases species and/or ecosystem adaptability to changing conditions | ı |
| Provides for natural successional progression | |
| Improves air quality | |
| | |
| | |

| Economic Criteria | EC |
|--|----------|
| LCOHOTTIC CITICITA | Subtotal |
| | 20 pts |
| | # of av. |
| 1. Tourism and Tourism Opportunities. Proposed project provides for increases in tourism | Points |
| activity through new or additional marketing efforts, improvements to existing attractions, | |
| or addition of new destinations or attractions. | 4 |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| Criteria Guidance | |
| Provides increased or additional public access | |
| to the waterfront or other tourism | |
| destinations | |
| | |
| Enhances existing attractions or destinations | |
| Increases total annual visitor count | |
| Increases access to cultural tourism or local | |
| historical assets | |
| Promotes tourism destinations through | |
| marketing or promotional efforts | |
| 보고 보고 있는 것이 되었다. 그는 사람들은 사람들은 사람들은 사람들은 사람들이 되었다. 그는 사람들은 사람들은 사람들이 되었다. 그는 사람들은 사람들은 사람들이 되었다. 그 사람들은 사람들이 되었다. | |
| | |

V 1.8 June 3, 2015 5

| of local recreational fishing and seafood, removal of barriers to recreational fishing, and increases in fishing stock/habitat. Criteria Guidance Improves opportunities through addition of artificial reefs, oyster reefs, Submerged Aquatic Vegetation (SAV), or similar Increases access to fishing opportunities through addition of fishing piers, boat ramps, or similar Promotes recreational fishing and/or local seafood consumption through marketing and promotional activities 3. Job Creation. Proposed project provides for new seasonal, temporary, part time, full time, and/or higher wage jobs within the County. Criteria Guidance Creates temporary, seasonal, or part time jobs Employs 1-10 people with equal to or more than average annual median wage | Points 4 |
|--|------------------|
| Criteria Guidance Improves opportunities through addition of artificial reefs, oyster reefs, Submerged Aquatic Vegetation (SAV), or similar Increases access to fishing opportunities through addition of fishing piers, boat ramps, or similar Promotes recreational fishing and/or local seafood consumption through marketing and promotional activities 3. Job Creation. Proposed project provides for new seasonal, temporary, part time, full time, and/or higher wage jobs within the County. Criteria Guidance Creates temporary, seasonal, or part time jobs Employs 1-10 people with equal to or more than average annual median wage | 4 |
| Criteria Guidance Improves opportunities through addition of artificial reefs, oyster reefs, Submerged Aquatic Vegetation (SAV), or similar Increases access to fishing opportunities through addition of fishing piers, boat ramps, or similar Promotes recreational fishing and/or local seafood consumption through marketing and promotional activities 3. Job Creation. Proposed project provides for new seasonal, temporary, part time, full time, and/or higher wage jobs within the County. Criteria Guidance Creates temporary, seasonal, or part time jobs Employs 1-10 people with equal to or more than average annual median wage | 4 |
| Improves opportunities through addition of artificial reefs, oyster reefs, Submerged Aquatic Vegetation (SAV), or similar Increases access to fishing opportunities through addition of fishing piers, boat ramps, or similar Promotes recreational fishing and/or local seafood consumption through marketing and promotional activities 3. Job Creation. Proposed project provides for new seasonal, temporary, part time, full time, and/or higher wage jobs within the County. Criteria Guidance Creates temporary, seasonal, or part time jobs Employs 1-10 people with equal to or more than average annual median wage | |
| Improves opportunities through addition of artificial reefs, oyster reefs, Submerged Aquatic Vegetation (SAV), or similar Increases access to fishing opportunities through addition of fishing piers, boat ramps, or similar Promotes recreational fishing and/or local seafood consumption through marketing and promotional activities 3. Job Creation. Proposed project provides for new seasonal, temporary, part time, full time, and/or higher wage jobs within the County. Criteria Guidance Creates temporary, seasonal, or part time jobs Employs 1-10 people with equal to or more than average annual median wage | |
| 3. Job Creation. Proposed project provides for new seasonal, temporary, part time, full time, and/or higher wage jobs within the County. Criteria Guidance Creates temporary, seasonal, or part time jobs Employs 1-10 people with equal to or more than average annual median wage | |
| Employs 1-10 people with equal to or more than average annual median wage | of av. Points |
| Employs 1-10 people with equal to or more than average annual median wage | |
| Employs 11-25 people with equal to or more than average annual median wage Employs more than 25 people with equal to or more than average annual median wage Jobs created are in local targeted industries or supporting infrastructure industries as identified by the Pensacola Community Economic Development Association (CEDA) and amended periodically | |

| . <i>Industry and Business Growth</i> . Proposed project directly contributes to expansion of xisting industry/business or siting of a new industry/business in local targeted industries. | # of av |
|---|-------------------|
| Criteria Guidance • Provides for expansion of existing business in | 4 |
| Provides for new business(es) in local targeted industries Measurable Gross Domestic Product (GDP) increase Project Return on Investment (ROI) is: 3:1 or better Between 1:1 and 3:1 1:1 or less | |
| | |
| Workforce Development. Proposed project provides innovative higher education, job aining, or other workforce training/career development which increases the total skilled orkforce pool and advances opportunities for higher wage employment. | l. |
| aining, or other workforce training/career development which increases the total skilled | Point |
| aining, or other workforce training/career development which increases the total skilled orkforce pool and advances opportunities for higher wage employment. | # of av Points |

V 1.8 June 3, 2015 7

| Infrastructure Criteria | IC Subtotal 20 |
|--|----------------------|
| 1. Transportation Network Improvements. Proposed project improves components of existing transportation network or adds new features to transportation network such as roads, sidewalks, bike lanes, multi-modal paths or trails, streetlights, and urban/street landscaping. | # of av. Points |
| Criteria Guidance | |
| Improves existing roads and bridges or provides new roads and bridges Provides additional bicycle and pedestrian improvements Incorporates complete streets design including street lighting, traffic calming, and pedestrian safety Adds to or improves multimodal network including waterways, ports, railways, and mass transit Improves existing or adds new greenway paths and trails | |
| 2. Flooding Improvements. Proposed project provides structural improvements or additions which will reduce flooding to homes and businesses, thereby reducing overall disaster costs and increasing economic resilience. | # of av. Points |
| Criteria Guidance | |
| Proposed project will decrease frequency and/or intensity of flooding events (i.e. through reduction of impervious surface coverage or increased storage/retention) Retrofits, repairs or replaces existing stormwater management infrastructure Strategically adds new stormwater management components such as attenuation | |
| 3. Community Resiliency. Proposed project increases community resiliency by strategically retrofitting, upgrading, or replacing critical infrastructure, utilizing renewable energy, or by implementing other disaster preparatory mechanisms. | # of av. Points |

| Criteria Guidance | 7 |
|--|---|
| Repairs or upgrades existing infrastructure Repairs or upgrades existing critical infrastructure Strategically adds new critical infrastructure, which reduces community vulnerability to natural and manmade disasters Includes disaster planning measures Includes necessary addition of shelters or evacuation routes | • |

| Bonus Criteria (Additional Points) | BNC |
|--|----------|
| DOTTUS CITICITA (Additional Points) | Subtota |
| | 34 |
| 1. Benefits Traditionally Underserved Persons or Areas. Proposed projects improves | # of av. |
| opportunities for disadvantaged or traditionally underserved persons or areas, such as | Points |
| low-income areas, areas of minority concentration, persons with disabilities, persons with | |
| limited English proficiency, etc. | 2 |
| | |
| Project is located in low income, very low income, or primarily minority neighborhood (as defined by U.S. Census tract) Project incorporates universal or creative ADA design beyond the minimum requirements, | |
| Project is located in low income, very low | |
| income, or primarily minority neighborhood | |
| (as defined by U.S. Census tract) | |
| Project incorporates universal or creative ADA | |
| design beyond the minimum requirements, | |
| providing increased access for persons with | |
| disabilities | |
| Training and job creation benefits | |
| disadvantaged or traditionally underserved | |
| persons | - |
| Project benefits disadvantaged or traditionally | |
| underserved groups in other ways | |
| | |
| Table 1 | |
| 2. Community Health. Proposed project improves physical or mental health of the | # of av. |
| community through health improvement programs or health education. | Points |

| | 3 |
|---|----------|
| Criteria Guidance | |
| Project provides affordable access to healthy food Project proposes to improve public health, disease, or mental health issues Project provides the public with opportunities for increased physical activity | |
| 3. Neighborhood Benefits. Proposed project provides neighborhood benefit such as | # of av. |
| increased affordable housing, reduction in crime, or significant aesthetic improvements. | Points |
| moreasea anoradore nodame, reduction in crime, or significant destricte improvements. | 1011103 |
| Criteria Guidance Increases access to affordable housing Helps reduce crime / increases safety Project is located in Community Redevelopment Area (CRA), brownfields area, Enterprise Zone, etc. | 3 |
| 4. Local Preference. Proposed project utilizes local labor force or promotes local small | # of av. |
| businesses. | Points |
| Criteria Guidance • Utilizes local labor • Promotes small local businesses | 3 |
| 5. Education and Awareness. Proposed project enhances childhood education. | # of av. |
| - 5. Ludeudon una Awareness. Proposea project enhances chilanooa education. | Points |
| | Points |
| | , |
| | 2 |

| Criteria Guidance ● Project includes pre-k – 12 education or outreach | |
|---|--------------------|
| 6. Environmental Outreach. Proposed project includes environmental outreach component. | # of av. Points |
| Criteria Guidance Proposed project engages citizens in the active preservation, protection, or restoration of natural resources Proposed project provides for environmental education signage at the project site | 2 |
| 7. Cultural and Historic Resources. Proposed project provides for preservation, protection or restoration of cultural, historical, or archaeological significant resources above and beyond minimum regulatory requirements. | # of av. Points |
| Criteria Guidance Project may include adaptive reuse of buildings or other existing assets | _ |
| 8. Consistency with Local Plans. Proposed project is consistent with or implements existing adopted plans. | # of av. Points |
| | 2 |

| | <u> </u> |
|---|-------------------------|
| Project is identified in an adopted plan such as the Surface Water Improvement and Management (SWIM) Program, Basin Management Action Plan (BMAP), Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy, Capital Improvement Plan (CIP), or other City, County, State, or Regional plan | |
| 9. Green Design. Project incorporates green design elements such as Leadership in Energy & Environmental Design (LEED) principles or other energy and water efficiency/conservation measures. | # of av. Points |
| Project integrates LEED principles or other energy efficiency and conservation design features Project integrates water conservation design features beyond minimum standards Project includes renewable energy component Project integrates recycling and reuse of materials Project includes other sustainable or low impact design feature | _ |
| 10. Leverages funds. Proposed project leverages funds by qualifying for additional cash or in-kind matching funds; submitter can demonstrate additional funding commitment connected to the project. | # of av. Points 7 |

| Criteria Guidance In-kind matching funds provided Other local/state grant matching funds provided Parallel other matching grant funds provided Parallel federal matching grant funds provided | |
|---|--------------------|
| 11. Sustainability and Efficiency. The project approach utilizes efficiency measures and provides long term benefits. | # of av. Points |
| Proposed project links outcomes, partners, or lands to leverage overall impact Proposed project provides long-term benefit(s) beyond life of funding period Proposed project builds upon existing community assets Proposed project does not produce negative environmental impacts | 2 |
| 12. Planning and Partnerships. Project planning and design are complete; project includes beneficial partnership. | # of av. Points |
| Criteria Guidance Project includes beneficial partnership Project planning and design is complete / project is shovel ready | 2 |

| 13. Enhanced Tourism Opportunities. Proposed project provides for enhanced tourism opportunities during the "off season" of September 1 through March 31. | # of av. Points |
|---|--------------------|
| Criteria Guidance | 2 |
| Project includes sustainable tourism development strategies targeted towards "off season" tourism such as sports and adventure tourism, cultural tourism, ecotourism, and business and conference tourism | |

Max Points = 72
Bonus Points = 34
Max Total Points = 106

Definitions

- 1. <u>Project Applicant</u> an individual, company, agency, organization, or other entity which submits a project proposal or idea to the project portal for consideration in the Escambia County MYIP; a project applicant can be anyone
- Award Recipient an organization or company which has been selected to receive funds for purposes of implementing a project included in the adopted MYIP; an award recipient must meet all federal and local grant and procurement requirements
- 3. <u>Natural successional progression</u> the specific process by which the structure of a biological community evolves over time; stages of succession depend on community type
- 4. <u>Average annual median wage</u> the estimated total annual wages of an occupation divided by its estimated employment
- 5. <u>Community Economic Development Association of Pensacola (CEDA)</u> an organization formed in 2015 whose core mission is creating, growing and retaining good paying jobs for the community
- 6. <u>Gross Domestic Product (GDP)</u> the total value of goods and services provided over a period of one year in Escambia County
- 7. Return on Investment (ROI) a metric used to evaluate and project the returned benefits of a project compared with the monetary inputs
- 8. <u>STEM fields</u> Science, Technology, Engineering and Math
- 9. <u>"At-risk" groups</u> (as applicable to workforce development) groups of persons who are unemployed, underemployed, working poor, or disenfranchised due to disability, place

- of residence, geographic location, age, race, sex, or socioeconomic status; may include, but not limited to, public assistance recipients, ex-offenders, persons with disabilities or chronic health issues, single parents, domestic violence victims, dislocated workers, homeless, multi-generational poverty, minorities, veterans, disconnected youth (ages 16-24 not in school, unemployed/ underemployed), older individuals (ages 55+), persons with limited English proficiency, or transportation disadvantaged
- 10. <u>Community resilience</u> a measure of the sustained ability of a community to utilize available resources to respond to, withstand, and recover from adverse situations, including disasters
- 11. <u>Critical infrastructure</u> the assets, systems, or networks considered essential to Escambia County's public health, safety, security, or economy; may include energy transmission, communications, water supply, hospitals, etc.
- 12. <u>Traditionally underserved persons or groups</u> a group of individuals who, because of disability, place of residence, geographic location, age, race, sex, or socioeconomic status, have historically faced barriers to participation in the decision making and public policy process; may include, but not limited to, elderly people, culturally diverse populations such as African-Americans, Native American Indians, non-English speaking persons, persons living in rural, isolated areas, persons with disabilities such as deafblindness, and persons who are medically fragile such as persons with AIDS
- 13. <u>LEED</u> Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design; a development rating system of the U.S. Green Building Council
- 14. <u>Beneficial partnership</u> a well-defined relationship entered into by two or more organizations to achieve a common goal of project implementation; includes outline of jointly developed structure, shared responsibility, accountability for success, and sharing of resources
- 15. <u>In-kind matching funds</u> non-cash donations in the form of real property, equipment, supplies, services, and qualified salaries and wages (including volunteer labor) consistent with federal guidance

Sources / References

- Alabama Gulf Coast Recovery Council (AGCRC). Draft Project Selection Process Framework for First Round MIP Development. Draft. December 2014. http://www.restorealabama.org/documents/MIP%20Proposed%20Process%20Flow%20Chart.p df
- 2. Alabama Gulf Coast Recovery Council. Restoration Project Suggestion Form. February 2014. http://www.alabamacoastalrestoration.org/pdfs/ProjectSuggestionFormGuide.pdf
- Bay County RESTORE Act Advisory Committee. Gulf Coast Restoration Trust Fund Partial Multi-Year Implementation Plan for Bay County, Florida. September 2, 2014. http://new.co.bay.fl.us/uploads/documents/1252/file/BaypartialMYIP20140902.pdf
- 4. Collier County. RESTORE Act Project Evaluation Form and Explanation of Evaluation Form. July 2013. http://www.colliergov.net/modules/showdocument.aspx?documentid=49075
- 5. Dewberry Watershed Improvement Plan Selection Matrix. 2007.
- Escambia County Community Redevelopment Agency. Brownsville Redevelopment Plan. 2004.
 Cantonment Redevelopment Plan. 2014. Englewood Redevelopment Plan. 2009. Palafox
 Redevelopment Plan. 2007. Warrington Redevelopment Plan. 2010.
- 7. Escambia County. Escambia County Comprehensive Plan 2030. May 2014.
- 8. Escambia RESTORE Advisory Committee. Interim Needs Assessment for Escambia County RESTORE Planning. Version 2.2. Adopted January 5, 2015.
- 9. Florida Department of Environmental Protection. Bayou Chico Basin Management Action Plan. August 2011.
- 10. Gulf Coast Ecosystem Restoration Council "Final Initial Comprehensive Plan." August 2013.
- 11. Hernando County. RESTORE Act Resources and Ecosystems Sustainability, Tourist Opportunities and Revived Economics of the Gulf Coast States Act 2012, Guiding Principles. Feb 2014. http://www.colliergov.net/modules/showdocument.aspx?documentid=47094
- 12. Lee County, RESTORE Act Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes. April 16, 2014. http://www.leegov.com/RestoreAct/Documents/Restore%20-%20April%2016%20%202014%20Minutes.pdf
- 13. Levy County, Florida. Pot 1 RESTORE Act Scoring Criteria Guide. No Date. http://www.levycounty.org/restoreact.aspx
- 14. Monroe County. RESTORE Act Project Funding Submittal Form. August 2013. http://www.monroecounty-fl.gov/index.aspx?NID=632
- 15. National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (NFWF). Gulf Environmental Benefit Fund Funding Priorities. Accessed January 2015. http://www.nfwf.org/gulf/Pages/fundingpriorities.aspx

V 1.8 June 3, 2015 16

- 16. Natural Resource Damage Assessment (NRDA) Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill Early Restoration Project Selection Criteria. Spring 2013. http://www.doi.gov/deepwaterhorizon/upload/TC Toolkit EarlyCriteria FINAL 6 12 13.pdf
- 17. Northwest Florida Water Management District and Florida Department of Environmental Protection. The Pensacola Bay System Surface Water Improvement and Management Plan. October 1997.
- 18. Okaloosa RESTORE Advisory Committee. Draft Environmental Factors Scoring Sheet. November 2014. http://www.co.okaloosa.fl.us/doc/news/2014/restore 11-05-14 presentation.pdf
- 19. Okaloosa RESTORE Advisory Committee. Draft Evaluation Tool and Quantitative Factor Significance. September 29, 2014. http://www.colliergov.net/modules/showdocument.aspx?documentid=47094
- 20. Pensacola Economic Development Association. Key Industries. Accessed February 4, 2015. http://www.choosegreaterpensacola.com/Key-Industries-/Key-Industries-(2).aspx
- 21. Pinellas County. RESTORE Act Project Priorities. Accessed December 2014. http://www.pinellascounty.org/restore/pdf/Goals Priorities Eligible Activities.pdf
- 22. Restore Escambia. Proposal for Selection of RESTORE Act Projects in Escambia County, Florida. January 6, 2014.
- 23. Restore Escambia. Competitive Preference Priorities. January 5, 2015.
- 24. Santa Rosa County Local RESTORE Council Project Scoring Sheet Environment, Economic Development, Workforce Development, Infrastructure, and Tourism Selection Criteria.

 December 2014. http://www.santarosa.fl.gov/bocc/restore.cfm
- 25. University of West Florida HAAS Center, email dated October 30, 2014.
- 26. U.S. Department of the Treasury. Resources and Ecosystem Sustainability, Tourist Opportunities, and Revived Economies of the Gulf Coast States Act of 2012 (RESTORE Act). Federal Register Vol. 79, No. 158. August 15, 2014.
- 27. Walton County. RESTORE Act Project Submittal Form. No Date.

Gulf County Multiyear Implementation Plan (MYIP)

Selection Criteria

| Programmatic | Total: |
|---|--------|
| | 12 |
| 1. Project Feasibility. Proposed project is adequately described to determine feasibility, including references to best available science where appropriate, and the budget includes reasonable and justifiable costs. | 2 |
| 2. Public Interest. Proposed project clearly demonstrates public benefit. | 2 |
| 3. Project Timing. Proposed project can be implemented and benefits realized within a reasonable and acceptable timeframe. | 2 |
| 4. Partnerships and Leveraging. Proposed project is supported by multiple partners and leverages funds by including cash or in-kind matching funds towards the project. | 2 |
| 5. Monitoring Plan. Proposed project includes a comprehensive monitoring and success measurement plan, including a maintenance plan, if applicable. | 2 |
| 6. Sustainability and Efficiency. Project approach utilizes efficiency measures and provides long term benefits. Proposed project builds upon existing assets, links outcomes, partners, or lands, and does not produce negative environmental impacts. | 2 |

| Environment | Total: |
|---|--------|
| | 26 |
| 1. Habitat Conservation and Preservation. Proposed project maintains or improves the structure and function of uplands, bays, bayous, wetlands, rivers, lakes, streams, or marine natural systems, benefiting native plants and wildlife. | 5 |
| 2. Habitat Restoration. Proposed project improves, enhances, or restores the structure and function of uplands, bays, bayous, wetlands, rivers, lakes, streams, or marine natural systems, benefiting native plants and wildlife. | 5 |
| 3. Water Quality. Proposed project reduces point and/or nonpoint sources of pollutants entering local waterways, provides treatment to improve water quality, or proposes other measures which will improve water quality such as watershed BMPs. | 10 |
| 4. Natural Systems Resiliency. Proposed project increases ability of natural systems to withstand disasters and adapt to changing environmental conditions due to climate change, associated sea level rise, and other factors. | 6 |

| Economy | Total: |
|---|--------|
| | 26 |
| 1. Tourism and Tourism Opportunities. Proposed project provides for increases in | _ |
| tourism activity through new or additional marketing efforts, improvements to existing attractions, or addition of new destinations or attractions. | 5 |
| 2. Recreational Fishing and Local Seafood. Proposed project increases recreational | |
| fishing opportunities through increased or improved access to waterfront, marketing and promotion of local recreational fishing and seafood, removal of barriers to recreational fishing and increases in fishing stock (habitat | 5 |
| fishing, and increases in fishing stock/habitat. 3. Job Creation. Proposed project provides for new full time higher wage jobs within the | |
| County. | 6 |
| 4. Industry and Business Growth. Proposed project directly contributes to expansion of existing industry/business or siting of a new industry/business in marine commerce, seafood processing, commercial fishing industries, aviation & aerospace, high tech manufacturing, information technology/cyber security, telecommunications, renewable energy, or other locally targeted industry as identified in the Apalachee Region Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy. | 5 |
| 5. Workforce Development. Proposed project provides innovative higher education, job training, or other workforce training/career development which increases the total skilled workforce pool and advances opportunities for higher wage employment. | 5 |

| Infrastructure | Total: |
|---|--------|
| | 26 |
| 1. Port Development. Proposed project enhances port usage and diversity, operability, expansion, dredging, and marketing/promotion. | 9 |
| 2. Transportation Network Improvements. Proposed project improves components of existing transportation network or adds new features to transportation network such as roads, bridges, sidewalks, bike lanes, multi-modal paths or trails, streetlights, right of way landscaping, and public access to the waterfront. May also include services for the transportation disadvantaged. | 6 |
| 3. Essential Services. Proposed project provides for new or improved wastewater treatment and management, solid waste management, stormwater management, technological upgrades such as Wi-Fi and broadband, and/or beach stabilization and nourishment. | 7 |
| 4. Disaster Resiliency. Proposed project increases community resiliency by strategically retrofitting, upgrading, or replacing critical infrastructure, utilizing renewable energy, improving emergency services and response, or by implementing other disaster preparatory mechanisms. | 4 |

| Community Preferences | |
|--|----|
| | 10 |
| 1. Cultural and Historic Resources. Proposed project provides for preservation, | |
| protection, restoration, and/or promotion of cultural, historical, or archaeological significant resources. | 2 |
| 2. Community Health. Proposed project improves community health through increase in healthcare services, health improvement programs or health education. | 2 |
| 3. Affordable Housing. Proposed project provides additional workforce and affordable housing units, beautification of neighborhoods, and/or programs which promote affordable and/or workforce housing. | 2 |
| 4. Educational Opportunities. Proposed project provides for local new or improved educational and public outreach opportunities, including environmental education and awareness. | 2 |
| 5. Youth Opportunities and Child Care. Proposed project provides for local new or improved youth opportunities in sports, arts, education, and music or affordable child care services to assist working families. | 2 |

| Bonus Opportunities | Total: Varies |
|--|--------------------|
| 1. Leverages Funds. Proposed project leverages overall funding by providing additional cash or in-kind funds to the project, such as additional federal, state, and/or private matching funds. An additional two (2) points will be added to the project score for every 10% of the total project funding that is leveraged. | Up to 18 points |

Max Available Points:

Programmatic: 12
Environmental: 26
Economic: 26
Infrastructure: 26
Community: 10
Total: 100
Bonus Points 18

Grand Total 118



Santa Rosa County Local RESTORE Council Project Scoring Sheet Category 1 – Environment



Purpose

- Restoration and protection of natural resources, ecosystems, fisheries, marine and wildlife habitats, beaches and coastal wetlands
- Mitigation of damage to fish, wildlife habitats, beaches and coastal wetlands
- Implementation of a federally approved marine/coastal management plan, including fisheries monitoring

| | Selection Criteria | Points | Point Scale |
|---|---|--------|--|
| 1 | Does the proposed project align with one or more of the four Priority <u>Evaluation Criteria</u> described in the Gulf Coast Ecosystem | 20 | Four criteria met- 20 points Three criteria met - 15 points |
| | Restoration Council's Initial Comprehensive Plan? | | * Two criteria met - 10 points |
| | * | | One criteria met - 5 points |
| | | | Zero criteria met - 0 points |
| 2 | Does the proposed project align with the "watershed approach" | 20 | Strongly aligns with watershed approach, "Fix it" and "Prevent it" projects - 20 points |
| | being envisioned for RESTORE projects within the State of | | Aligns with watershed approach "Fix it" or "Prevent it" solution only - 10 points |
| | Florida? | | Aligns w/ watershed approach "Prevent it" through educational/outreach only - 5 points |
| | | | Doesn't align with Pensacola Bay Watershed approach - 0 points |
| 3 | To what degree is the proposed project feasible and/or | 15 | High (Feasible with long term sustainability)- 15 points |
| | anticipated project outcome(s) sustainable over the long term? | | Moderate (Feasible but moderate long term sustainability) - 10 points |
| | | | Low (Feasible but outcomes not sustainable) - 5 points |
| | | | Not Feasible or sustainable - 0 points |
| 4 | Does the proposed project provide direct or indirect health | 15 | High: Project directly mitigates areas with recurring health warnings -15 points |
| | benefits to humans? | | Moderate: Project directly mitigates problems that create potential health issues -10 points |
| | | | Low: Project offers indirect benefits in of areas not prone to health warnings - 5 points |
| | | | Project offers no recognized health benefits -0 points |
| 5 | To what degree does the proposed project contribute to | 10 | Very High − 10 points |
| | potential leveraging ability to allow greater overall environmental | | High – 7.5 points |
| | or natural resources benefit to accrue as a result of the project? | | Moderate – 5 points |
| | | | Low −2.5 points |
| | | | Does not provide leverage – 0 points |
| 6 | Does the proposed project have public support and acceptance? | 10 | High Support: Including resolutions of support and no objections -10 points |
| | | | Moderate support: Support with no resolutions but no significant objections -5 points |
| | | | Low support: Significant opposition (with signature resolutions against) -0 points |
| 7 | Does the proposed project provide an appropriate return on | 5 | High ROI -5 points |
| | investment? | | Medium ROI - 2.5 points |
| | | | Low ROI – 0 points |
| 8 | Is the proposed project a "Legacy Project"? Will it have a lasting | 5 | Project provides long term positive impact to large area of the community -5 points |
| | impact on Santa Rosa County? What is the proposed project area | | Project provides long term positive impacts for a smaller area of the community -3 points |
| | of impact? | | Provides short term positive benefits to the community -1 points |
| | Total Points | 100 | |

12/5/2014

"Leveraging the future together... responsibly"

SCORING VALUE WORKSHEET

| Does the proposed project align with one or more of the four Priority <u>Evaluation Criteria</u> described in the Gulf Coast Ecosystem Restoration Council's Initial Comprehensive Plan? 20 points maximum | |
|--|-----------|
| Projects that are projected to make the greatest contribution to restoring and protecting the natural resources, ecosystems, fisheries, marine and | 5 points |
| rightife habitats, beaches, and coastal wetlands of the Gulf Coast region. | 3 points |
| arge-scale projects and programs that are projected to substantially contribute to restoring and protecting the natural resources, ecosystems, | 5 points |
| sheries, marine and wildlife habitats, beaches, and coastal wetlands of the Gulf Coast ecosystem. | 3 points |
| rojects contained in existing Gulf Coast State comprehensive plans for the restoration and protection of natural resources, ecosystems, fisheries, | 5 points |
| narine and wildlife habitats, beaches, and coastal wetlands of the Gulf Coast region. | 0 po |
| rojects that restore long-term resiliency of the natural resources, ecosystems, fisheries, marine and wildlife habitats, beaches, and coastal wetlands | 5 points |
| nost impacted by the Deepwater Horizon oil spill. | |
| 2. Does the proposed project align with the "watershed approach" being envisioned for RESTORE projects within the State of Florida? | |
| 20 points maximum | |
| roject or program that strongly aligns with the Pensacola Bay Watershed approach. Addresses more than one of the identified priority actions | 20 points |
| water quality, habitat/resource protection, education/outreach, community resilience). Project or program addresses root causes of major | 20 00 |
| ssues identified for the Pensacola Bay Watershed (sedimentation, nutrient loading, contaminants, storm-water quality and quantity, protect, | |
| estore, and create natural habitat and resources and Increase buffer areas) with either a "Fix it" and/or "Prevent it" approach. | |
| Type of project: "Fix it" and "Prevent it" projects. Dirt road paving in high erosion areas near wetlands, reducing point source waste water | |
| discharges, septic tank abatement, retrofit existing planned developments pre-storm-water regulations, etc. | |
| roject or program aligns with the Pensacola Bay Watershed approach. Addresses at least one of the identified priority actions (water quality, | 10 points |
| abitat/resource protection, education/outreach, community resilience). | |
| Type of project: "Fix it" or "Prevent it" type projects. Same projects as above including land protection, conservation project/program. | |
| roject or program aligns with the Pensacola Watershed approach but does not directly address the root causes of major issues identified for the | 5 points |
| Pensacola Bay Watershed (sedimentation, nutrient loading, contaminants, storm-water quality and quantity, protect, restore, and create natural | |
| nabitat and resources and increase buffer areas). | |
| Type of project: Educational/Outreach programs that provide a "Prevent it" approach but not an actual "Fix it" solution | |
| Projects do not conform to Pensacola Bay Watershed approach. Does not address any of the identified priority actions (water quality, | 0 points |
| habitat/resource protection, education/outreach, community resilience). Does not address major issues or their root causes. | |
| 3. To what degree is the proposed project feasible and/or anticipated project outcome(s) sustainable over the long term? | |
| 15 points maximum | |
| igh - Normal permitting, straight forward construction, self sustaining or low long term maintenance. Project will result in significant long term | |
| neasurable benefits to environment. No R/W required or R/W will be donated. Chance of success is high. Project will provide sustainable, long | 15 points |
| esting benefits to Santa Rosa County. The group or organization sponsoring the project has a proven track record in managing and delivering similar | |
| rojects while adequately reporting results. Project is technically sound from an engineering/environmental science perspective | |
| Noderate - Normal permitting, straight forward construction. May require specialized equipment to maintain. Additional easement or R/W may be | 10 points |
| equired but with friendly take (no eminent domain). Project will provide sustainable, long term measurable benefits to environment. The group or | == p+ |
| rganization sponsoring the project has some experience in managing or delivering similar projects. Project is technically sound from an | |
| ngineering/environmental science perspective | |
| ow – Projects that are difficult to permit and/or construct but provide some lasting benefits to the environment. Requires significant recurring or | 5 points |
| ong term maintenance to function properly. The group or organization sponsoring the project has no experience in managing or delivering similar | |
| rojects. Chance of success is low to moderate. | |
| rojects that have very little chance of being permitted by Federal and State agencies (USACE, FEDP, NWFWM). Projects that have the potential to | 0 points |
| lo more harm to the environment (impact to endangered or threatened species). Projects that are very difficult to construct or maintain. R/W | F |

| required by eminent domain. | |
|--|------------|
| 4. Does the proposed project provide direct or indirect health benefits to humans? 15 points maximum | |
| High — Project directly mitigates <u>documented</u> health issues to humans. Reduces recurring health warnings from Health Department, reduces negative impacts to drinking water, reduces aquatic toxins, reduces point source or non point source nutrient loadings, improves community resiliency (reduces likely hood of reoccurring flooding) | 15 points |
| Moderate – Project directly mitigates problems that <u>create</u> potential health issues within the community and directly improves water quality conditions within the Pensacola Bay watershed. Reduces sediment, nutrient or metal discharges Pensacola Bay system | 10 points |
| Low – Project offers indirect benefits to water quality of areas not prone to health warnings | 5 points |
| Project offers no recognized health benefits | 0 points |
| 5. To what degree does the proposed project contribute to potential leveraging ability to allow greater overall environmental or natural | |
| resources benefit to accrue as a result of the project? 10 points maximum | |
| Leverage greater than or equal to 4:1 - Very High | 10 points |
| Leverage greater than or equal to 3:1 - High | 7.5 points |
| Leverage greater than or equal to 2:1 - Moderate | 5 points |
| Leverage greater than or equal to 1:1 - Low | 2.5 points |
| No leveraging presented. No matching funds or in-kind match. | 0 points |
| 6. Does the proposed project have public support and acceptance? 10 points maximum | |
| High - Significant support including resolutions of support and no objections or very minor objections from public. Project or program demonstrates coordination and cooperation among nonprofit organizations or community groups. Large in-kind support or services. Greater than or equal to 1:1 | 10 points |
| Moderate - Support with no resolutions but no significant objections or very minor objections from public. No vocal opposition to the project. Some minor public participation or minor in-kind services. | 5 points |
| Low - Significant opposition (significant vocal opposition or signature resolution opposing project) | 0 points |
| 7. Does the proposed project provide an appropriate return on investment? 5 points maximum | |
| High - Project costs sufficiently detailed, realistic and commensurate with the project needs and time frame versus benefits to the community. Jobs created short term/long term. Other benefits documented by sponsor. High return on investment. | 5 points |
| Moderate - Project costs sufficiently detailed, realistic and commensurate with the project needs and time frame versus benefits to the community however return is moderate versus other projects, Greater than or equal to .5: 1 | 2.5 points |
| Low - Project costs and benefits adequately detailed but return is low versus investment. Project costs or benefits not sufficiently detailed or realistic to develop an accurate measure of return on investment. ROI less than <.5:1 | 0 points |
| 8. Is the proposed project a "Legacy Project"? Will it have a lasting impact on Santa Rosa County? What is the proposed project area of impact? 5 points maximum | |
| Project is a major difference maker for the community. Project provides long term positive impact to large area of the community. (significant acres impacted or restored, miles improved/preserved, neighborhood stormwater quality/flooding potential reduced) | 5 points |
| Project provides long term positive impacts for a smaller area of the community (subset of larger community, neighborhood improved, smaller acreage restored/improved/preserved/flooding potential reduced) | 3 points |
| | |





Santa Rosa County Local RESTORE Council Project Scoring Sheet Category 2- Economic Development

Purpose: Job Creation

| | Selection Criteria | Points | Point Scale |
|---|---|--------|--|
| 1 | Does the proposed project provide an appropriate return on investment? | | Greater than or equal to 5:1 - 35 points |
| | | | 4:1 – 28 points |
| | | 35 | 3:1 – 21 points |
| | | 35 | 2:1 – 14 points |
| | | | 1:1 – 7 points |
| | | | Less than 1:1 does not provide and appropriate ROI – 0 points |
| 2 | Will the project or program leverage other funds? | | Leverage greater than or equal to 10:1 – 20 points |
| | | | Leverage 8:1 – 15 points |
| | | 20 | Leverage 6:1 – 10 points |
| | | | Leverage 4:1 – 5 points |
| | | | No leveraging – 0 points |
| 3 | The proposed project's annual payroll after full job creation. (Quality/Quantity) | | QUALITY: Based on Average Wage Rate for Jobs created versus SRC average wage rate |
| | | | Greater than 150% - 9 points |
| | | | Greater than 125% to 150% – 7 points |
| | | | Greater than 115% to 125% – 5 points |
| | | | From 85% to 115% - 3 points |
| | | | Less than 85% - 0 points |
| | | | QUANTITY: Annual payroll created |
| | | 15 | Greater than or equal to \$6,000,000- 6 points |
| | | | Greater than or equal to \$4,000,000- 5 points |
| | | | Greater than or equal to \$2,000,000 - 4 points |
| | | | Greater than or equal to \$1,000,000- 3 points |
| | | | Greater than or equal to \$500,000 - 2 points |
| | | | Greater than or equal to \$100,000 – 1 point |
| | | | Less than \$100,000 - 0 points |
| 4 | Is the proposed project approved for state incentives? | 10 | Yes – 10 points |
| | | 10 | No – 0 points |
| 5 | Does project include land purchase and building construction in Santa Rosa | 5 | Yes – 5 points |
| | County? | 5 | No – 0 points |
| 6 | Will new jobs associated with the proposed project be created in three years or | 5 | Yes – 5 points |
| | less? | 5 | No – 0 points |
| 7 | Santa Rosa County Economic Development Office and public support? | | SRCEDO support and solid public support with no objections – 5 points |
| | | _ | SRCEDO support with minor public opposition – 3 points |
| | | 5 | SRCEDO support but significant public opposition – 1 point |
| | | | No support from SRCEDO – 0 points |
| | | | a)Yes – 3 points |
| 8 | Targeted or special emphasis industry? | | |
| 8 | Targeted or special emphasis industry? | 3 | b)Other industry – 1 point |
| 8 | | - | The state of the s |
| 8 | Targeted or special emphasis industry? Does project help diversity Santa Rosa County's work force? | 2 | b)Other industry – 1 point |

12/4/2014

"Leveraging the future together... responsibly"

1

REVISED SCORING VALUE WORKSHEET

| 1. Does the proposed project provide an appropriate return on investment? (Use EFI or Haas Center ROI formula) | 35 points maximum | |
|--|-------------------|-----------|
| Greater than or equal to 5:1 | | 35 points |
| Greater than or equal to 4:1 | | 28 points |
| Greater than or equal to 3:1 | | 21 points |
| Greater than or equal to 2:1 | | 14 points |
| Greater than or equal to 1: 1 | | 7 points |
| Less than 1:1 does not provide an appropriate ROI | | 0 points |
| 2. Will the project leverage private funds? | 20 points maximum | |
| Leverage greater than or equal to 10:1 | | 20 points |
| Leverage 8:1 | | 15 points |
| Leverage 6:1 | | 10 points |
| Leverage 4:1 | | 5 points |
| No leverage | | 0 points |
| 3. The proposed project's annual payroll after full job creation. (Evaluate BOTH sections a) and b) below) | 15 points maximum | |
| a) QUALITY: Based on Average Wage Rate for Jobs created versus SRC average wage rate* | 9 points maximum | |
| Greater than 150% | | 9 points |
| Greater than 125% to 150% | | 7 points |
| Greater than 115% to 125% | | 5 points |
| From 85% to 115% | | 3 points |
| Less than 85% | | 0 points |
| b) QUANTITY: Annual payroll created | 6 points maximum | |
| Greater than or equal to \$6,000,000 | | 6 points |
| Greater than or equal to \$4,000,000 | | 5 points |
| Greater than or equal to \$2,000,000 | | 4 points |
| Greater than or equal to \$1,000,000 | | 3 points |
| Greater than or equal to \$500,000 | | 2 points |
| Greater than or equal to \$100,000 | | 1 point |
| Less than \$100,000 | | 0 points |

| 4. Is the proposed project approved for state incentives? | 10 points maximum | |
|--|-------------------|-----------|
| a)Yes | | 10 points |
| b)No | | 0 points |
| 5. Does project include land purchase and building construction in Santa Rosa County? | 5 points maximum | <u> </u> |
| a)Yes | | 5 points |
| bjNo | | 0 points |
| 6. Will new jobs associated with the proposed project be created in three years or less? | 5 points maximum | |
| a)Yes | | 5 points |
| b)No | | 0 points |
| 7. Santa Rosa County Economic Development Office (SRCEDO) and public support? | 5 points maximum | |
| SRCEDO support and solid public support with no objections | | 5 points |
| SRCEDO support with minor public opposition | | 3 points |
| SRCEDO support but significant public opposition | | 1 point |
| No support from SRCEDO | | 0 points |
| 8. Targeted or special emphasis industry? | 3 points maximum | |
| a)Yes | | 3 points |
| b)Other industry | | 1 point |
| 9. Does project help diversity Santa Rosa County's work force? | 2 points maximum | |
| a)Yes | | 2 points |
| b)No | | 0 points |

^{*}Average wage rate is determined by Enterprise Florida's Annual Incentives Average Wage Requirements Information Sheet.



Santa Rosa County Local RESTORE Council Project Scoring Sheet Category 2 – Economic Development



Purpose: Workforce Development

| | Selection Criteria | Points | Point Scale |
|---|---|--------|---|
| 1 | Is the program needed to support existing industry expansion and continued | 25 | Yes – 25 points |
| | support for current needs as well as recruitment of new jobs? | | No - 0 points |
| 2 | What is the number of new full-time jobs requiring customized training? | 15 | Greater than or equal to 100 jobs – 15 points |
| | 1 - 10-2 (10-4) (10-1) (10-4) | | 50-99 jobs – 12 points |
| | | | 25-49 jobs – 9 points |
| | | | 10-24 jobs – 6 points |
| | | | 1-9 jobs - 5 points |
| 3 | What are the wages of the positions being trained? (current County wage is | 15 | Greater than 150% of County wage rate – 15 points |
| | \$15.28 per hour) | | Greater than 125% to 150% of County wage rate - 10 points |
| | | | Greater than 115% to 125% of County wage rate - 5 points |
| | | | Less than 115% of County wage rate – 0 points |
| 4 | What is the timeline for implementation of the program? | 15 | 0 - 3 months - 15 points |
| | | | >3 - 6 months - 10 points |
| | | | >6 - 12 months - 5 points |
| | | | >12 months - 0 points |
| 6 | Will the program leverage other funding? | 15 | Leverage 3:1 or greater - 15 points |
| | X 200 | | Leverage 2:1 - 10 points |
| | | | Leverage 1:1 - 5 points |
| | | | No Leveraging – 0 points |
| 5 | a. Will the trainee earn an industry recognized certification, degree or | 5 | Yes – 5 points |
| | licensure? | l | No – 0 points |
| | b. Will the degrees, certificates, etc. transfer to a post secondary | 5 | Yes – 5 points |
| | school? | | No – 0 points |
| 7 | *Is the training for demand occupations? | 5 | Yes – 5 points |
| | | | No – 0 points |
| | Total Points | 100 | |

^{*}As determined by SRC EDO



Santa Rosa County Local RESTORE Council Project Scoring Sheet Category 3 – General Infrastructure



Purpose:

- Infrastructure projects benefitting the economy or ecological resources, including ports
- Flood protection and infrastructure
- Improvements to State Parks affected by the oil spill

Eligibility:

- Does the project create jobs or economic benefits to SRC?
 - Yes = project is retained for further evaluation.
 - No = project is removed from further evaluation.

| | Selection Criteria | Points | Point Scale |
|---|--|--------|--|
| 1 | Does the proposed project contribute overall to SRC's economic and environmental resiliency and ability to weather disasters (natural or manmade)? | 20 | Economic contribution high - 10 points Economic contribution medium – 5 points Low economic contribution – 1 point |
| | | | High environmental resiliency – 10 points Medium environmental resiliency – 5 points Low environmental resiliency – 1 point |
| 2 | Ease of implementation for the proposed project (feasibility, permitting difficulty, right-of-way needs) | 15 | Feasible, permit in hand/no right of way required -15 points Feasible, routine permitting required, no R/W needed - 10 points Feasible, routine permitting, R/W or easement required - 7 points Difficult permitting, no R/W required - 5 points Very difficult permitting with R/W needs - 0 points |
| 3 | What is the proposed project's potential leveraging ability? | 15 | Leverage 3:1 or greater - 15 points Leverage 2:1 - 10 points Leverage 1:1 - 5 points No Leveraging – 0 points |
| 4 | What is the proposed project's efficiency of maintenance? | 15 | Low, long term maintenance – 15 points Moderate periodic long term maintenance – 10 points Intense periodic maintenance – 5 points Long term continuous maintenance – 0 points |
| 5 | Does the proposed project have public support? | 10 | High Support (including resolutions of support and no objections)-10 points Moderate (support with no resolutions but no objections)-5 points Minimal support (with significant opposition)-0 points |
| 6 | Does the proposed project provide an appropriate return on investment? | 10 | High ROI – 10 points Medium ROI – 5 points Low ROI – 1 point |
| 7 | Is the proposed project consistent with the local Comprehensive Plan and local zoning ordinances? | 5 | Yes – 5 points Consistent with comp plan but requires zoning modification – 2 points Not consistent with comp plan or zoning - 0 points |
| 8 | Is the proposed project ready for implementation? (Construction plans complete and permits in hand.) | 5 | Construction documents and specs completed with permits in hand - 5 points 60% construction plans with no permit – 2 points Concept plans with cost estimate – 1 point No concept plans, construction plans or permits – 0 points |
| 9 | Is the proposed project a "Legacy Project"? (Will it have lasting impact on Santa Rosa County)/What is the proposed project's area of impact? | 5 | Project addresses significant area with lasting impacts – 5 points Provides long term positive impacts for a smaller area of the community -3 points Provides short term positive benefits to the community -1 points |
| | Total Points | 100 | |

12/4/2014

"Leveraging the future together... responsibly"

SCORING VALUE WORKSHEET

| Does the proposed project contribute overall to SRC's economic and environmental resiliency and ability to weather disasters (natural or man-made)? | |
|---|-----------|
| Economic Resiliency – maximum 10 points | |
| Economic contribution high - Project that significantly protects or enhances the economy or significantly reduces the potential negative economic impacts from a weather disaster (natural or man-made). Project that creates long term economic benefits to the community. Sample projects: Safety improvement to a roadway network, system or area. Flooding mitigation projects, nutrient pollution projects, beach re-nourishment, economic development infrastructure projects, Park construction done in a sustainable way. | 10 points |
| Economic contribution medium – Project is sound and contributes moderately to enhancing the economy or improving resiliency. Sample project: Comprehensive retention pond maintenance program, new signal, new turn lane. | 5 points |
| Low economic contribution – Project is a sound project but doesn't benefit the economy or help the community become more resilient. Sample projects: Repair, rehabilitation and replacement projects, resurfacing roads, filling pot holes, replacing damaged culverts, bridge painting, etc | 1 point |
| AND | |
| Environmental Resiliency – maximum 10 points | |
| High environmental resiliency- Helps environmental systems absorb impacts from events without long term negative affects Sample Project: Nutrient pollution abatement projects, constructing oyster beds, new stormwater management system in old neighborhood, septic tank abatement project, stream restoration to combat erosion. Enhancing environmental buffer zones through conservation easements/friendly land purchases, dirt road paving in or near wetland areas. | 10 points |
| Medium environmental resiliency – Project is sound and contributes moderately to improving environmental resiliency. Sample projects: Retention pond maintenance program, hydro-dynamic separator system, dirt road paving away from wetland areas | 5 points |
| Low environmental resiliency – Project doesn't improve the environment's ability to repair itself. Not a sustainable project. Sample project: Parking lot that impacts wetlands. Project that reduces part of a buffer zone | 1 point |
| 2. Ease of implementation for the proposed project (feasibility, permitting difficulty, right-of-way needs) 15 points maximum | |
| Feasible, permit in hand/no right of way required | 15 points |
| Feasible, routine permitting, no R/W or easement required | 10 points |
| Feasible, routine permitting, R/W or easement required | 7 points |
| Difficult permitting, no R/W required | 5 points |
| Very difficult permitting with R/W needs | 0 points |
| 3. What is the proposed project's potential leveraging ability? 15 points maximum | |
| Leverage greater than or equal to 3:1 | 15 points |
| Leverage 2:1 | 10 points |
| Leverage 1:1 | 5 points |
| No leveraging | 0 points |
| 4. What is the proposed project's efficiency of maintenance? 15 points maximum | |
| Low long-term maintenance (properly constructed retention ponds, sewer system) | 15 points |
| Moderate periodic long term maintenance (Hydrodynamic separators, beach re-nourishment, roadway paving) | 10 points |
| Intense periodic maintenance (dirt roads) | 5 points |

| Long term, continuous maintenance | 0 poin |
|--|---------|
| 5. Does the proposed project have public support? 10 points maximum | , |
| High - Significant support including resolutions of support and no objections or very minor objections from public. Project or program demonstrates coordination with community or other groups. | 10 poi |
| Moderate - Support with no resolutions but no significant objections or very minor objections from public. No vocal opposition to the project. Some minor public participation. | 5 poin |
| Low - Significant opposition (significant vocal opposition or signature resolution opposing project) | 0 poin |
| 6. Does the proposed project provide an appropriate return on investment? 10 points maximum | |
| High - Project costs sufficiently detailed, realistic and commensurate with the project needs and time frame versus benefits to the community. Jobs created short term/long term. Other benefits documented by sponsor. High return on investment. Greater than or equal to 1:1. | 10 poi |
| Moderate - Project costs sufficiently detailed, realistic and commensurate with the project needs and time frame versus benefits to the community however return is moderate versus other projects, Greater than or equal to .5: 1 | 5 point |
| Low - Project costs and benefits adequately detailed but return is low versus investment. Project costs or benefits not sufficiently detailed or realistic to develop an accurate measure of return on investment. ROI less than <.5:1 | 1 point |
| 7. Is the proposed project consistent with the local Comprehensive Plan and local zoning ordinances? 5 points maximum | |
| Yes, Consistent with Comprehensive plan and zoning codes | 5 point |
| Consistent with Comprehensive plan but requires zoning modification | 2 point |
| Not consistent with comp plan or zoning | 0 point |
| 8. Is the proposed project ready for implementation? (Construction plans complete and permits in hand.) 5 points maximum | |
| Construction documents and specs completed with permits in hand | 5 point |
| 60% construction plans with no permit | 2 point |
| Concept plans with cost estimate | 1 point |
| No concept plans, construction plans or permits | 0 point |
| 9. Is the proposed project a "Legacy Project"? (Will it have lasting impact on Santa Rosa County)/What is the proposed project's area of impact? 5 points maximum | |
| Project is a major difference maker for the community. Project provides long term positive impact to large area of the community. (significant acres impacted or restored, significant economic enhancement, reduced flooding potential) | 5 point |
| Project provides long term positive impacts for a smaller area of the community (subset of larger community, neighborhood improved, smaller acreage restored/improved/preserved/flooding potential reduced) | 3 point |
| Provides short term positive benefits to the community in a confined or targeted area. | 1 point |



Santa Rosa County Local RESTORE Council Project Scoring Sheet Category 4- Tourism



Purpose:

- Promotion of tourism including recreational fishing
- Promotion of Gulf seafood consumption
- Improvements to State Parks affected by the oil spill

| | Selection Criteria | Points | Point Scale |
|---|---|--------|---|
| 1 | Does the proposed program or project support destination tourism to | 20 | High – 20 points |
| | SRC? | | Medium 10-15 points |
| | | | Low- 5 points |
| | | | Doesn't support destination tourism - 0 point |
| 2 | Does the proposed project fill a gap in the existing SRC tourism market or | 15 | High – 15 points |
| | create demand in new SRC tourism markets? | | Medium -10 points |
| | | | Low - 5 points |
| | | | Doesn't fill gap or create demand – 0 points |
| 3 | What is the proposed projects expected magnitude of positive tourism | 15 | High – 15 points |
| | benefits and sustainability to SRC? (jobs created, local goods and services | | Medium – 10 points |
| | purchased) | | Low – 5 points |
| | | | No positive benefits – 0 points |
| 4 | What is the proposed project's potential leveraging ability? | 15 | Leverage 3:1 or greater - 15 points |
| | 30 3007 89 99 99 90 9607 0002 40 | | Leverage 2:1 - 10 points |
| | | | Leverage 1:1 - 5 points |
| | | | No Leveraging – 0 points |
| 5 | Does the proposed project or program promote eco-friendly tourism? | 10 | Strongly promotes eco-friendly tourism – 10 points |
| | | | Moderately supports eco-tourism - 5 points |
| | | | Doesn't support eco-tourism - 0 points |
| 6 | Does the proposed project have TDC and public support? | 10 | High Support (including resolutions of support and no objections) - 10 points |
| | | | Moderate (support with no resolutions but no objections) -5 points |
| | | | , Minimal (No TDC support and significant objection) -0 points |
| 7 | Does the proposed project provide an appropriate return on investment? | 10 | High ROI – 10 points |
| | | | Medium ROI – 5 points |
| | | | Low ROI – 0 point |
| 8 | Does the proposed program promote recreational fishing or Gulf seafood | 5 | Yes – 5 points |
| | consumption? | | No – 0 points |
| | Total Points | 100 | |

12/5/2014

"Leveraging the future together... responsibly"

1

SCORING VALUE WORKSHEET

| 1. Does the proposed program or project support destination tourism to SRC? 20 points maximum | |
|--|-----------|
| Event, project or program is part of, or consistent with, a destination strategy for Santa Rosa County and <u>creates a large number of primarily overnight stays</u> . Strongly improves SRC brand as a destination tourism market. Diversifies SRC events calendar by adding a unique event that presents the community and tourists with a diverse calendar of events from sporting events, to arts, cultural, historical, and community events. | 20 points |
| Event, project or program is part of, or consistent with, a destination strategy for Santa Rosa County and creates a mixture of overnight and day trips to SRC. Strongly improves SRC tourism brand. Helps diversify SRC events calendar | 15 points |
| Event, project, or program is part of a destination strategy but encourages primarily day trips from outside Santa Rosa County. Creates moderate revenue for community. Moderately improves SRC brand as a destination tourism market. Helps diversify SRC events calendar. | 10 points |
| Event, project, or program is not part of a destination or tourism strategy but will generate moderate day trips to the county. Minimal improvement to SRC brand. Helps diversify SRC events calendar. | 5 points |
| Project not part of a destination strategy. Doesn't really encourage any trips to Santa Rosa County. Creates minimal revenue for community. Doesn't enhance SRC brand. | 0 Points |
| 2. Does the proposed project fill a gap in the existing SRC tourism market or create demand in new SRC tourism markets? 15 points maximum | |
| Project or program strongly targets off season or shoulder season tourism or creates events for attracting visitors during off season or shoulder season or creates a new tourism market during any season or increases the frequency of events (event staged on a regular basis during off or shoulder season) that create tourism demand. Off season and shoulder season events are defined to occur between Labor Day weekend and Memorial Day weekend. | 15 points |
| Event, project, or program that strongly increases tourism within <u>any</u> season and attracts visitors to SRC or enhances an existing underperforming tourism market. | 10 points |
| Event, project or program with limited reach or impact but does create some tourism demand in SRC and could possibly grow in size. | 5 points |
| Event, project or program does not fill tourism gaps nor does it create a new tourism market. | 0 points |
| 3. What is the proposed projects expected magnitude of positive tourism benefits and sustainability to SRC? (The magnitude of benefits for an event, project or program should incorporate the number of participants, spectators, support teams and others, length of stay and their estimated daily expenditure for the event. Where possible, previous events are analyzed to obtain verification of potential numbers. Where an event is being held for the first time, a credible estimate of its potential economic impact is gauged through discussions with the applicant and other sources) 15 points maximum | |
| Event, project or program expected to generate significant participants, significant daily expenditures and will have a direct impact on job creation or sustainability within SRC. Minimal risk with event, project or program. Experienced management team. Involves the local community in a significant way. Event provides significant positive media coverage and/or high event prestige. Significantly involves local communities within SRC. Sponsored by SRC resident or business. | 15 points |
| Event, project or program expected to generate moderate participants with moderate daily expenditures that will have a moderate positive impact on job creation or sustainability within SRC. Minimal risk with event with moderate expected media coverage or branding for SRC. Helps diversify SRC events calendar. Experienced management team. | 10 points |
| Event, project or program expected to generate modest participation (focused event) and minimal impact on job creation or sustainability. Some positive media coverage expected. Minimal risk and but management team has limited experience. | 5 points |
| Event, project or program with high potential risk, the potential for injury, event cancellation. Very inexperienced management team. No media | 0 points |

| coverage and minimal expenditures expected. | 1 |
|---|-----------|
| 4. What is the proposed project's potential leveraging ability? (The percentage of event budget provided by 15 points maximum | |
| Non-RESTORE funds, especially private sector funding is an important consideration when analyzing events, projects or programs) | |
| Leverage 3:1 or greater, significant private sector investment that matches funding request. | 15 points |
| Leverage 2:1 | 10 points |
| Leverage 1:1 | 5 points |
| No leveraging | 0 points |
| 5. Does the proposed project or program promote eco-friendly tourism? 10 points maximum | |
| Event, project or program strongly promotes eco-friendly tourism by providing positive experiences for visitors. Extends the positive impacts, | 10 points |
| through a special focus on conservation, benefits the local SRC community, and contributes to the education of visitors. Provide direct financial | |
| benefits for conservation and provides financial benefits and empowerment for SRC residents or companies. Utilizes sustainable principles. Minimal negative environmental impacts. | |
| Event, project or program that promotes eco-friendly tourism in a developmental way or focused approach. Has the potential to grow into a larger | 5 points |
| eco-friendly event or program. Based on sustainable principles with minimal negative environmental impacts. | |
| Event, project or program does not support eco-friendly tourism. | 0 points |
| 6. Does the proposed project have TDC and public support? 10 points maximum | |
| TDC support and high public support including resolutions of support – no public objections | 10 points |
| TDC support with moderate public support (no support resolutions) but no significant public objections | 5 points |
| No TDC support and minimal public support and/or significant public objection | 0 points |
| 7. Does the proposed project provide an appropriate return on investment? 10 points maximum | |
| Greater than or equal to 1:1 | 10 points |
| Greater than or equal to .5: 1 | 5 points |
| Less than .5:1 | 0 points |
| 8. Does the proposed program promote recreational fishing or Gulf seafood consumption? 5 points maximum | |
| Yes - The event, project or program strongly emphasizes or promotes Gulf seafood consumption or encourages recreational fishing. | 5 points |
| No – The event, project, or program does not promote recreational fishing or Gulf seafood consumption. | 0 points |



Santa Rosa County Local RESTORE Council Project Scoring Sheet Category 1 – Environment

| Reviewer: | | | |
|------------|--|---------|----------|
| Date: | | | |
| | | , | |
| Project: | | | |
| Applicant: | | | |
| Contact: | | | |
| | Selection Criteria | Scoring | Comments |
| 1 | Does the proposed project align with one or more of the four Priority <u>Evaluation Criteria</u> described in the Gulf Coast Ecosystem Restoration Council's Initial Comprehensive Plan? | | |
| 2 | Does the proposed project align with the "watershed approach" being envisioned for RESTORE projects within the State of Florida? | | |
| 3 | To what degree is the proposed project feasible and/or anticipated project outcome(s) sustainable over the long term? | | |
| 4 | Does the proposed project provide direct or indirect health benefits to humans? | | |
| 5 | To what degree does the proposed project contribute to potential leveraging ability to allow greater overall environmental or natural resources benefit to accrue as a result of the project? | | |
| 6 | Does the proposed project have public support and acceptance? | | |
| 7 | Does the proposed project provide an appropriate return on investment? | | |
| 8 | Is the proposed project a "Legacy Project"? Will it have a lasting impact on Santa Rosa County? What is the proposed project area of impact? | | |
| | Total Points | 0 | |



Santa Rosa County Local RESTORE Council Project Scoring Sheet Category 2A - Economic Development/Job Creation

| Reviewer: | | <u>J</u> ļ | |
|------------|---|------------|----------|
| Date: | |] | |
| | | - - | |
| Project: | | | |
| Applicant: | | | |
| Contact: | | | |
| | Selection Criteria | Scoring | Comments |
| 1 | Does the proposed project provide an appropriate return on investment? | | |
| 2 | Will the project or program leverage other funds? | | |
| 3 | The proposed project's annual payroll after full job creation. (Quality/Quantity) | | |
| 4 | Is the proposed project approved for state incentives? | | |
| 5 | Does project include land purchase and building construction in Santa Rosa County? | | |
| 6 | Will new jobs associated with the proposed project be created in three years or less? | | |
| 7 | Santa Rosa County Economic Development Office and public support? | | |
| 8 | Targeted or special emphasis industry? | | |
| 9 | Does project help diversify Santa Rosa County's work force? | | |
| | Total Points | | |



Santa Rosa County Local RESTORE Council Project Scoring Sheet

Category 2B - Economic Development (Workforce Development)

| Reviewer: | | | |
|------------|--|---------|----------|
| Date: | | | |
| | | _ | |
| Project: | | | |
| Applicant: | | | |
| Contact: | | | |
| | Selection Criteria | Scoring | Comments |
| 1 | Is the program needed to support existing industry expansion and continued support for current needs as well as recruitment of new jobs? | | |
| 2 | What is the number of new full-time jobs requiring customized training? | | |
| 3 | What are the wages of the positions being trained? (current County wage is \$15.28 per hour) | | |
| 4 | What is the timeline for implementation of the program? | | |
| 5 | Will the program leverage other funding? | | |
| 6 | a. Will the trainee earn an industry recognized certification, degree or licensure? b. Will the degrees, certificates, etc. transfer to a post secondary school? | | |
| 7 | *Is the training for demand occupations? | | |
| | Total Points | 0 | |



Santa Rosa County Local RESTORE Council Project Scoring Sheet Category 3 – Infrastructure

| Reviewer: | | | |
|------------|---|---------|----------|
| Date: | | | |
| | | - a | |
| Project: | | | |
| Applicant: | | | |
| Contact: | | | |
| | Selection Criteria | Scoring | Comments |
| 1 | Does the proposed project contribute overall to SRC's economic and environmental resiliency and ability to weather disasters (natural or man-made)? | | |
| 2 | Ease of implementation for the proposed project (feasibility, permitting difficulty, right-of-way needs). | | |
| 3 | What is the proposed project's potential leveraging ability? | | |
| 4 | What is the proposed project's efficiency of maintenance? | | |
| 5 | Does the proposed project have public support? | | |
| 6 | Does the proposed project provide an appropriate return on investment? | | |
| 7 | Is the proposed project consistent with the local Comprehensive Plan and local zoning ordinances? | | |
| 8 | is the proposed project ready for implementation? (Construction plans complete and permits in hand.) | | |
| 9 | Is the proposed project a "Legacy Project"? (Will it have lasting impact on Santa Rosa County)/What is the proposed project's area of impact? | | |
| | Total Points | 0 | |



Total Points

Santa Rosa County Local RESTORE Council Project Scoring Sheet Category 3 – Infrastructure

| | | 79 | |
|------------|---|---------|----------|
| Reviewer: | | | |
| Date: | | | |
| | | ٥ | |
| Project: | | | • |
| Applicant: | | | |
| Contact: | | | |
| | Selection Criteria | Scoring | Comments |
| 1 | Does the proposed project contribute overall to SRC's economic and environmental resiliency and ability to weather disasters (natural or man-made)? | | |
| 2 | Ease of implementation for the proposed project (feasibility, permitting difficulty, right-of-way needs). | | |
| 3 | What is the proposed project's potential leveraging ability? | | |
| 4 | What is the proposed project's efficiency of maintenance? | | |
| 5 | Does the proposed project have public support? | | |
| 6 | Does the proposed project provide an appropriate return on investment? | | |
| 7 | Is the proposed project consistent with the local Comprehensive Plan and local zoning ordinances? | | |
| 8 | Is the proposed project ready for implementation? (Construction plans complete and permits in hand.) | | |
| 9 | is the proposed project a "Legacy Project"? (Will it have lasting impact on Santa Rosa County)/What is the proposed project's area of impact? | | |



Total Points

Santa Rosa County Local RESTORE Council Project Scoring Sheet Category 4 – Tourism

| Reviewer: | | | |
|------------|---|---------|----------|
| Date: | | | |
| | | _ | |
| Project: | | | |
| Applicant: | | | |
| Contact: | | | |
| | Selection Criteria | Scoring | Comments |
| 1 | Does the proposed program or project support destination tourism to SRC? | | |
| 2 | Does the proposed project fill a gap in the existing SRC tourism market or create demand in new SRC tourism markets? | | |
| 3 | What is the proposed projects expected magnitude of positive tourism benefits and sustainability to SRC? (jobs created, local goods | | |
| 4 | What is the proposed project's potential leveraging ability? | | |
| 5 | Does the proposed project or program promote eco-friendly tourism? | | |
| 6 | Does the proposed project have TDC and public support? | | |
| 7 | Does the proposed project provide an appropriate return on investment? | | |
| 8 | Does the proposed program promote recreational fishing or Gulf seafood consumption? | | |

APPENDIX F. Walton County RESTORE Act Scoring Criteria, Guidelines, and Evaluation Matrix

For Guidance Purposes Only

Pot 1 – RESTORE Act Scoring Criteria Guidelines

Evaluation Matrix

Application Questions

1. Project Description:

- 0 Applicant did not provide a project narrative.
- 1 Applicant provided a narrative that indirectly meets the priorities established by the County.
- 2 Applicant provided a narrative that directly identifies how it meets the priorities established by the County, but the benefit does not fully correct a deficiency or restore a function (assume that the project meets no more than 25% of such goals).
- 3 Applicant provided a narrative that directly identifies how it meets the priorities established by the County and the benefit does not fully correct a deficiency or restore a function (assume that the project meets at least 50% of such goals).
- 4 Applicant provided a narrative that directly measures a benefit to the priorities established by the County and the benefit corrects a deficiency or restores a function to at least 75% of such goals.
- 5 Applicant provided a narrative that directly measures a benefit to the priorities established by the County, and the benefit corrects a deficiency or restores a function to a least 90% of such goals.

2. Budget Narrative/Financial Feasibility/Cost-Effectiveness:

- 0 Applicant did not provide a budget for the proposed project.
- 1 Applicant provided a budget that is not feasible or cost effective or did it include matching funds.
- 2 Applicant provided a budget that is 25% feasible or cost effective however did not provide matching funds.
- 3 –Applicant provided a budget that is 50% feasible or cost effective and provided documentation for matching funds.
- 4 Applicant provided a budget that is 75% feasible or cost effective and provided documentation for matching funds.
- 5 Applicant provided a budget that is 95% feasible or cost effective and provided documentation for matching funds.

3. Technical Feasibility:

- 0 The proposed project is not technically feasible.
- 1 The proposed project has never been implemented, however documentation provided shows a probably of at least a 25% success rate.
- 2 The proposed project has a prior implementation and a 25% success rate.
- 3 The proposed project has prior implementation and a 50% success rate.
- 4 The proposed project has prior implementation and a 75% success rate.
- 5 The proposed project has prior implementation and a 90% success rate.

4. Management Capacity:

0 – Applicant did not provide any response to the question.

- 1 Applicant provided a personal resume, however did not demonstrate the ability and experience of the organization to implement/administer the proposed project.
- 2 Applicant provided documentation that the organization has little experience in the project subject and ability to implement/administer the proposed project.
- 3 Applicant provided documentation that the organization has experience in multiple projects with similar background and the ability to implement/administer the proposed project.
- 4 Applicant provided documentation that the organization has experience in many projects with similar background and the ability to implement/administer the proposed project.
- 5 Applicant provided adequate documentation demonstrating the organization regularly functions using the methodology to be applied towards the proposed project, clearly demonstrating the ability and experience of the organization to implement/administer the proposed project.

5. Readiness for Implementation/Permitting Considerations:

- 0 The project is in the conceptual stage.
- 1 Applicant has developed a detailed scope of work, however, has not applied for required agency permits.
- 2 Applicant has developed a detailed scope of work and conceptual drawings, however, has not applied for required agency permits.
- 3 Applicant has submitted permit applicants for the proposed project.
- 4 Applicant has submitted an application for the proposed project; appropriate agency has reviewed and provided an estimated permit issuance date.
- 5 Applicant has provided valid agency permits and has a contract developed to hire a contractor.

6. Project Completion Timetable:

- 0 Applicant does not provide a timetable.
- 1 Applicant provided a timetable, however, provides no reassurance that the project can be completed within the specific timeframe.
- 2 Applicant provided a timetable with less than 25% reassurance that the project can be completed within the specified timeframe.
- 3 Applicant provided a timetable with 50% reassurance that the project can be completed within the specific timeframe.
- 4 Applicant provided a timetable with 75% reassurance that the project can be completed with the specific timeframe.
- 5 Applicant provided a timetable with 90% reassurance that the project can be completed with the specific timeframe.

7. Environmental Benefits:

- 0 Project has a negative impact or no net benefit to the environment.
- 1 Project has an indirect, but measurable benefit to the environment. The benefit does not fully correct a deficiency or restore a function.
- 2 Project has a direct measurable benefit to the environment, but the benefit does not fully correct a deficiency or restore a function (assume meets no more than 25% of such goals).

- 3 Project has a direct measurable benefit to the environment and the benefit does not fully correct deficiency or restores a function (assume it meets at least 50% of such goals).
- 4 Project has a direct measurable benefit to the environment and the benefit corrects a deficiency or restores a function to at least 75% of such goals.
- 5 Project has a direct measurable benefit to the environment and the benefit corrects a deficiency or restores a function to at least 90% of such goals.

8. Economic Benefits:

- 0 Project has a negative impact or no net benefit to the economy.
- 1 Project has an indirect, but measurable benefit to the economy. The benefit does not fully correct a deficiency or restore a function.
- 2 Project has a direct measurable benefit to the economy, but the benefit does not fully correct a deficiency or restore a function (assume it meets no more than 25% of such goals).
- 3 Project has a direct measurable benefit to the economy and the benefit does not fully correct a deficiency or restores a function (assume it meets at least 50% of such goals).
- 4 Project has a direct measurable benefit to the economy and the benefit corrects a deficiency or restores a function to at least 75% of such goals.
- 5 Project has a direct measurable benefit to the economy and the benefit corrects a deficiency or restores a function to at least 90% of such goals.

9. Community Economic and/or Environmental Resilience Benefit

- 0 Project negatively impacts or has no net benefit to the economy or the environment.
- 1 Project has an indirect, but measurable benefit to the economy or environmental resilience. The benefit does not fully correct a deficiency or restore a function.
- 2 Project has a direct measurable benefit to the economy or environmental resilience, but the benefit does not fully correct a deficiency or restore a function (assume it meets no more than 25% of such goals).
- 3 Project has a direct measurable benefit the economy or environmental resilience, however, the benefit does not fully correct deficiency or restore a function (assume it meets at least 50% of such goals).
- 4 Project has a direct measurable benefit to the economy or environmental resilience and the benefit corrects a deficiency or restores a function to at least 75% of such goal.
- 5 Project has a direct measurable benefit to the economy or environmental resilience and the benefit corrects a deficiency or restores a function to at least 90% of such goals.

10. Complements to Existing Efforts/Public Acceptance

- 0 The project does not align with the County's priorities nor does it have public acceptance.
- 1 The project is aligned with 10% of the County's priorities, however, does not have public acceptance.
- 2 The project is align with 25% of the County's priorities, however, does not have public acceptance.

- 3 The project is aligned with 50% of the County's priorities and has public acceptance.
- 4 The project is aligned with 75% of the County's priorities and has public acceptance.
- 5 The project is aligned with 100% of the County's priorities and has public acceptance.

11. Educational Benefits

- 0 The project does not provide a source of education and/or a facility for educational events.
- 1 10% of the project either has an education component and/or a facility dedicated for educational events.
- 2 25% of the project either has and education component and/or a facility dedicated for educational events.
- 3 50% of the project includes an educational component and/or a facility dedicated for educational events.
- 4 75% of the project includes an education component and/or a facility dedicated for educational events.
- 5 100% of the project includes an education component and/or a facility dedicated for educational events.

Application Questions

| Application Scoring Criteria | Score (1-5) | Maximum Percentage | Points Awarded |
|---|----------------|-----------------------|-------------------|
| Project Description | | 15% | |
| Budget Narrative/Financial Feasibility/Cost-Effectiveness | | 15% | |
| Technical Feasibility | | 10% | |
| Project Management Capacity | | 10% | |
| Readiness for Implementation/Permitting Considerations | | 10% | |
| Environmental Benefits | | 10% | |
| Economic Benefits | | 10% | |
| Project Completion Timetable | | 5% | |
| Community Economic and/or Environmental Resilience Benefits | | 5% | |
| Complements to Existing Efforts/Public Acceptance | | 5% | |
| Education Benefits | | 5% | |
| | App | olication Score | |

Application Score (Out of 100)

Pot 1 – RESTORE Act Scoring Criteria Guidelines Evaluation Matrix Ranking of Allowable Uses

Workforce development and job creation:

- 1. Workforce Development and Job Creation:
 - 0 Project does not provide any opportunity for additional jobs within the private or public sector. Work can be performed through existing roles or jobs are lost through the termination of a job provider.
 - 1 Projects provide an increased backlog of available work for existing workers within the County and maintain the current number of public and private sector jobs.
 - 2 Project demands that part-time jobs be created to perform necessary work within the project schedule.
 - 3 Project creates 5-10 full-time positions which are necessary to perform work related to the project within the schedule determined for project execution. Upon project completion, 1-5 jobs (part-time or full-time) are created to staff any long-term result of the project.
 - 4 Projects provide for the creation of 20-30 jobs related to the construction/implementation of the project or as a result of the project's completion.
 - 5 Project provides a significant increase of quality/substantive jobs.

Infrastructure projects benefitting economy or ecological resources, including ports:

- 2. Infrastructure Projects Benefitting Economy:
 - 0 Project has negative impacts or has no net benefit to the economy and/or ecological resources.
 - 1 Project provides an indirect revenue generating mechanism for either the public or private sector. Growth provided in the short term with no sustainable effects and/or the project has an indirect, but measurable benefit to an ecological resource. The benefit does not fully correct a deficiency or restore a function.
 - 2 Project provides a direct revenue generator that bolsters the local economy more significantly. One specific local industry becomes more robust through job creation, increased revenue or increased patronage. However, project results in an increase of local jobs and/or the project has a direct measurable benefit to an ecological resource, but the benefit does not fully correct a deficiency or restore a function (assume meets no more than 25% of such goals).
 - 3 Project provides a direct revenue generator that bolsters the local economy significantly. One or more specific local industry becomes more robust through job creation, increased revenue or increased patronage. There is a projected increase in other local jobs and/or the project has a direct measurable benefit to an ecological resource with benefit, enhancement or restoration goals, and the benefit does not fully correct deficiency or restore a function (assume meets at least 50% of such goals).
 - 4 Project provides a direct revenue generator that bolsters the local economy significantly. One or more specific local industries become more robust through job creation, increased revenue or increased patronage and there is a project increase in other local jobs. Some new long-term residents are projected and/or the project has a direct measurable benefit to an ecological resource

with benefit, enhancement or restoration goals, and the benefit corrects a deficiency or restores a function to at least 75% of such goals.

5 – Project provides a sustainable revenue generator that significantly bolsters the local economy with two or more local industries becoming more robust through job creation, increased revenue or increased patronage. Project results in a definite increase in local long-term residents and/or the project has a direct measurable benefit to an ecological resource with benefit, enhancement or restoration goals and the benefit corrects a deficiency or restores a function to at least 90% of such goals.

Restoration and protection of natural resources, ecosystems, fisheries, marine and wildlife habitats, beaches and coastal systems:

- 3. Provides Restoration and Protection of Natural Resources (NR):
 - 0 No increase or net increase in protection of natural resources is anticipated by the project or program actions.
 - 1 Identified NRs to be protected but Project only projected to cause a minor increase in NR protection through implementation of exiting Best Management Practices (BMPs). No new services provided to the public and no public land set aside or placed into conservation easements. Protective and/or restorative measures estimated to have limited long term beneficial effect (less than 5 years).
 - 2 NRs identified for protection and/or restoration. However, lands are not protected in long term ownership or easements in public trust. The life of the protective and/or restorative measures expected to be viable for at least 10 years, but will require maintenance and/or substantial repairs within that time frame.
 - 3 NRs identified and will be protected and/or restored and project designates specific lands to be set aside for long term protection in easements or title ownership. Lifespan of protective measures more than 10 years with only minor repairs and maintenance anticipated.
 - 4 New lands set aside and conservation easements and encumbrances recorded in perpetuity or complete ownership in public domain engaged. Public education and benefit elements from the resources have been included in the project. Lifespan of protective measures is estimated to be at least 20 years with only minor repairs and maintenance required and more substantial repairs or maintenance after 20 years.
 - 5 New conservation lands created providing wildlife corridors set aside and owned by public or state lands. Actively protects native species especially Threatened and Endangered (T&E) Species or Species of Special Concern; and/or long term protection of other natural resources such as minerals, archeological sites, etc. The protected or restored NR are fully sustainable with no maintenance or repairs anticipated after 20 years.

Mitigation of damage to fish, wildlife and natural resources:

- 4. Mitigates damage to fish, wildlife or natural resources:
 - 0 No change in current status to mitigate to fish, wildlife or NR.
 - 1 Project indirectly halts any existing impacts to fish, wildlife or natural resources. No action is planned to restore or repair any previous damage that has occurred. Any mitigation will occur

naturally and over a long duration. No change in current wildlife or fish status. Long term water quality improvement achieved.

- 2 Project intentionally halts existing impacts. Has some limited direct impact as well as long to mid-term indirect impact? Positive impact noted on recreational fishing and wildlife use. Natural resources benefit to a limited degree. Some short term water quality achieved.
- 3 Minor immediate impact seen to correcting damage. Fish, wildlife and natural resources damage is immediately mitigated although on a minor scale. Invasive species are eradicated or significantly reduced. Water quality is improved in the short term.
- 4 Immediate impact noted and indirect effects permanently felt. Public health is positively increased to some degree. Growth or recovery from previous damage noted immediately. Economic growth due to actions noted. Long term water quality improvement is achieved.
- 5 Action results in immediate, long term correction of damage. Public health is positively increased. Invasive species removed. Long term potential to correct endangered or threatened status. Other benefits such as economic growth are realized as a result.

Coastal flood protection and related infrastructure:

- 5. Coastal Flood Protection and Related Infrastructure:
 - 0 Project does not reduce flood protection to a portion of the community or has no net increase in flood project to a known flood prone area.
 - 1 Project identifies areas potentially affected by floods, but provides no measure for increasing the flood protection for those areas; project may indirectly provide benefit to flood prone area.
 - 2 Project identifies areas potentially affected by floods and provides means for measuring the increase in flood protection for those areas (Level or Service (LOS)); project may indirectly provide a fairly significant LOS benefit to flood prone area.
 - 3 Project identifies areas potentially affected by floods and there is more than 50% increase in the LOS to a large flood prone area (more than 100 residents) or a 75% increase to an area with less than 100 residents.
 - 4 Project identifies areas potentially affect by floods and there is more than 75% increase in the LOS protection to a large flood prone area (more than 100 residents) or a 90% increase to an area with less than 100 residents.
 - 5 The project's primary goal is to improve stormwater level of service for the local community. The project includes sustainable solutions that include long term, large scale drainage improvements that do improve known flood prone areas to acceptable LOS with 90% LOS improvement to large scale (more than 100 residents).

Promotion of tourism; including recreational fishing:

- 6. Promotes Tourism and Recreational Fishing:
 - 0 Does nothing to promote Tourism. No impact on current status.
 - 1 Project spending anticipated having little effect on tourism. May affect local tourism on an event level basis. Some income generated for local business only and only for a short time period.
 - 2 Some effect on tourism expected on a seasonal basis. Some economic income for the local area created as well as for small businesses.

- 3 Multi-seasonal impact. Generates some significant economic activity for the local area.
- 4 Multi- seasonal to year round impact. New generation of economic income created. Income affects multiple communities in the county.
- 5 Year round draw of new people to the area. Large amounts of economic income created. Entire county benefits.

Implementation of federally approved marine, coastal or comprehensive conservation management plan; including fisheries monitoring:

- 7. Implements a federal or state approved marine or coastal conservation plan:
 - 0 Does not implement a federally approved Marine or Coastal Conservation plan.
 - 1 No growth of the current status. Fisheries monitoring created on a minor basis. Recreational fishing areas developed.
 - 2 No growth on status, however, fisheries status is monitored for greater than the short term. Recreational fishing and other watersports develops as result.
 - 3 Some increase in the size and scope of the current conservation plan. Fisheries monitoring completed on a regular basis. Seasonal recreational use rises significantly as well as other watersport use.
 - 4 Conservation plan increases in both size and scope. Fisheries monitoring is conducted on a routine basis with positive results noted. Annual increase in recreational use.
 - 5 Broad increase in the fisheries development as a result of the project. Monitoring occurs on a frequent basis. Conservation areas are significantly increased in size resulting in a positive impact on the aquaculture industry.

Promotion of consumption of seafood harvested in the Gulf Coast region:

- 8. Promotes Seafood Consumption Harvested from Gulf Coast Region:
 - 0 No additional seafood consumption created or project has the potential to negatively impact the seafood industry.
 - 1 Small amount of seafood consumption created. Anticipated that the local seafood market increases sales of seafood consumption by less than 5% and catch rates do not increase noticeably.
 - 2 Increase amount of seafood consumption created (more than 5%). Little positive effect on the seafood industry occurs; in general, but catch rates increase some.
 - 3 Noticeable positive effect on the seafood industry. More than 10% increase in seafood consumption anticipated. Includes habitat restoration and anticipated increase in catch rates of identified species by 5% or more.
 - 4 Industry growth experienced. Some positive effect on the local economy seen because of seafood consumption increase. Anticipated increase more than 15%. Catch rates of identified species more than 10%.
 - 5 Industry experience new growth and invigoration. Measurable positive impact on the economy as evident by more than 20% increase in seafood consumption. Significant increase in the catch rate and production of new seafood products (by more than 15% in identified species).

Planning Assistance:

- 9. Planning Assistance:
 - 0 Project does not provide any planning assistance.
 - 1 A portion of the project indirectly provides planning assistance for proposed RESTORE Act projects.
 - 2 Less than 50% of the project provides planning assistance for proposed RESTORE Act projects.
 - 3 A significant portion of the project (more than 50%) directly provides planning assistance for proposed RESTORE Act projects.
 - 4 A significant portion of the project (more than 75%) directly provides planning assistance for proposed RESTORE Act projects.
 - 5 Project is specifically designed to provide planning assistance for proposed RESTORE Act projects.

Improvements to state parks in coastal areas affected by the Deepwater Horizon spill:

- 10. Improvements to an impacted coastal state park:
 - 0 Project does not provide any benefits or improvements to a state park impacted by the Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill.
 - 1 A portion of the project indirectly provides benefits to a state park which has been impacted by the Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill.
 - 2 Less than 50% of the project provides improvements to a state park impacted by the Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill; and the project is not specifically designed for the purpose of improving the impacted portion of the state parks.
 - 3 A significant portion of the project (more than 50%) directly provides improvements to a state park impacted by the Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill; but the project is not specifically designed for the purpose of improving the impacted portions of the state park.
 - 4 A significant portion of the project (more than 75%) directly provides improvements to a state park impacted by the Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill; and the project is specifically designed for the purpose of improving the impacted portions of the state park.
 - 5 Project is specifically designed to improve a damaged state park (100%) and provides significant improvements to the affected portions of the state park. An education component is included in the project. The public experience within the state park is significantly improved. The project adds improvements that relate to the principal feature of the state park.

Allowable Uses

| Project Category | Score (0-5) | Ranking Percentage | Total Points Per Category |
|--|----------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|
| Workforce development and job creation | | 27 | 0 |
| Infrastructure projects benefitting economy or ecological resources, including ports. | | 22 | 0 |
| Restoration and protection of natural resources, ecosystems fisheries marine and wildlife habitats, beaches, and coastal systems | | 16 | 0 |
| Mitigation of damage of fish, wildlife, and natural resources | | 7 | 0 |
| Coastal flood protection and related infrastructure | | 7 | 0 |
| Promotion of tourism, including recreational fishing | | 7 | 0 |
| Implementation of federally approved marine, coastal or comprehensive conservation management plan, including fisheries monitoring | | 5 | 0 |
| Promotion of consumption of seafood harvested in the Gulf Coast region. | | 4 | 0 |
| Planning assistance. | | 3 | 0 |
| Improvements to state parks in coastal areas affected by the Deepwater Horizon spill. | | 2 | 0 |

Allowable Uses Total 0

Pot 1 – RESTORE Act Scoring Criteria Guidelines Evaluation Matrix Walton County Project Priorities

1. Economic Benefit:

- 0 Project has a negative impact to the economy or has no net positive benefit to the local economy.
- 1 Project provides an indirect, revenue generating mechanism for either the public or private sector. Growth provided in the short term with no sustainable effects.
- 2 Project provides a direct revenue generator that bolsters the local economy more significantly. One specific local industry becomes more robust through job creation, increased revenue or increased patronage; however project results in an increase of local jobs.
- 3 Project provides a direct revenue generator that bolsters the local economy significantly. One or more increased patronage and there is a projected increase in other local jobs.
- 4 Project provides a direct revenue generator that bolsters the local economy significantly. One or more increased patronage and there is a project increase in other local jobs. Some new long-term residents are projected.
- 5 Project provides a sustainable revenue generator that significantly bolsters the local economy with two or more local industries becoming more robust through job creation, increased revenue or increased patronage. Project results in a definite increase in local, long-term residents.

2. Environmental Benefit:

- 0 No increase or net increase in protection of natural resources is anticipated by the project or project actions.
- 1 Identified natural resources to be protected, but project only projected to cause a minor increase in natural resource protection through implementation of existing BMP practices. No new services provided to the public and no public lands set aside or placed into conservation easements. Protective and/or restorative measures estimated to have limited long term beneficial effect (less than 5 years).
- 2 Natural resources identified for protection and/or restoration. However, lands are not protected in long term ownership or easements in public trust. The life of the protective and/or restorative measures expected to be viable for at least 10 years, but will require maintenance and/or substantial repairs with that time frame.
- 3 Natural resources identified and will be protected and/or restored and project designates specific land to be set aside for long term protection in easements or title ownership. Lifespan of protective measures more than 10 years with only minor repairs and maintenance anticipated.
- 4 New lands set aside and conservation easements and encumbrances recorded in perpetuity or complete ownership in public domain engaged. Public education and benefit elements from the resources have been included in the project. Lifespan of protective measures is estimated to be at least 20 years with only minor repairs and maintenance required and more substantial repairs or maintenance after 20 years.

5 – New conservation lands created providing wildlife corridors set aside and owned by public or state lands. Actively protects native species especially threaten and endangered species or Species of Special Concern; and/or long term protection of other natural resources such as minerals, archeological sites, etc. The protected or restored natural resources are fully sustainable with no maintenance or repairs anticipated after 20 years.

3. Ability of Leverage Other Funding Sources:

- 0 No other funding is available for the proposed project.
- 1 The applicant has applied for other funding sources to supplement the proposed project cost.
- 2 The applicant has provided documentation that other funding sources have been obtained to cover less than 50% of the proposed project.
- 3 The applicant has provided documentation that other funding sources have been obtained to cover the cost of more than 50% of the proposed project.
- 4 The applicant has provided documentation that other funding sources have been obtained to cover the cost of more than 75% of the proposed project.
- 5 The applicant has provided documentation that other funding sources have been obtained to cover 90% of the funding for the proposed project.

4. Long Term Implications Benefits (Value or Cost):

- 0 Initial effects of the project benefits projected to be realized more than 10 years away.
- 1 Initial effects of the project benefits projected to be realized 7 to 10 years away.
- 2 Initial effects of the project benefits projected to be realized 4-7 years away.
- 3 Initial effects of the project benefits projected to be realized 2-4 years away.
- 4 Initial effects of the project benefits projected to be realized 1-2 years away.
- 5 Initial effects of the project benefits projected to be realized 0-1 year away.

5. Comprehensive Plan Projects:

- 0 The proposed project does not benefit the Walton County Comprehensive Plan.
- 1 The proposed project indirectly benefits the Walton County Comprehensive Plan.
- 2 Less than 50% of the proposed project provides improvements associated with the Walton County Comprehensive Plan.
- 3 A significant portion of the project (more than 50%) directly provides improvements associated with the Walton County Comprehensive Plan.
- 4 A significant portion of the project (more than 75%) directly provides improvements associated with the Walton County Comprehensive Plan.
- 5 Project is specifically designed to provide improvements associated with the Walton County Comprehensive Plan.

6. Capital Improvement Plan Projects:

- 0 The proposed project does not benefit the Walton County Capital Improvement Plan.
- 1 The proposed project indirectly benefits the Walton County Capital Improvement Plan.

- 2 Less than 50% of the project provides improvements associated with the Walton County Capital Improvement Plan.
- 3 A significant portion of the project (more than 50%) directly provides improvements associated with the Walton County Capital Improvement Plan.
- 4 A significant portion of the project (more than 75%) directly provides improvements associated with the Walton County Capital Improvement Plan.
- 5 Project is specifically designed to create improvements to the Walton County Capital Improvement Plan.

7. Shovel Readiness:

٠.

- 0 The proposed project is conceptual.
- 1 The planning has begun for the proposed project.
- 2 Planning and design for the proposed project is less than 50% complete.
- 3 A significant portion (more than 50%) of the planning and design is complete for the proposed project.
- 4 A significant portion (more than 75%) of the planning and design is complete for the proposed project and applications have been submitted to the appropriate agencies.
- 5 The proposed project has been permitted by all the appropriate agencies.

8. Area of Impact:

- 0 The proposed project does not provide any benefit to Walton County or the ecosystems impacted by the Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill.
- 1 The proposed project indirectly provides benefit to Walton County or the ecosystems impacted by the Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill.
- 2 Less than 50% of the project provides improvements to Walton County or the ecosystems impacted by the Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill.
- 3 A significant portion of the project (more than 50%) directly provides improvements to Walton County or the ecosystems impacted by the Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill.
- 4 A significant portion of the project (more than 75%) directly provides improvements to Walton County or the ecosystems impacted by the Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill.
- 5 Project is specifically designed to provide improvements to Walton County or the ecosystems impacted by the Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill.

9. Funding Amount Requested:

- 0 The funding amount requested does not appear to be appropriate for the proposed project. No documentation or estimates provided.
- 1 The funding amount requested appears to be appropriate, however no estimates or documentation are provided with the application.
- 2 The funding amount requested appears to be appropriate and one estimate/similar project example is provided with the application.
- 3 The funding amount requested appears to be appropriate and two estimates/similar project examples are provided with the application.

- 4 The funding amount requested appears to be appropriate and three estimates/similar project examples are provided with the application.
- 5 The funding amount requested appears to be appropriate and four or more estimates/similar project examples are provided with the application.

10. Comprehensive Plan Compliance:

- 0 Project is not in compliance with the Walton County's Comprehensive Plan.
- 1 Project is indirectly in compliance with the Walton County's Comprehensive Plan.
- 2 Project is 25% in compliance with the Walton County's Comprehensive Plan.
- 3 Project is 50% in compliance with the Walton County's Comprehensive Plan.
- 4 Project is 75% in compliance with the Walton County's Comprehensive Plan.
- 5 Project is 100% in compliance with the Walton County's Comprehensive Plan.

Walton BCC Project Priorities

| Project Category | Score (1-5) | Ranking Percentage | Points Awarded |
|---|----------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| Economic Benefit | | 23% | |
| Environmental Benefit | | 21% | |
| Ability to Leverage Other Funding Sources | | 10% | |
| Long Term Implications (Value or Cost) | | 9% | |
| Comprehensive Plan Projects | | 9% | |
| Capital Improvement Plan projects | | 8% | |
| Shovel Readiness | | 6% | |
| Area of Impact | | 5% | |
| Funding Amount Requested | | 5% | |
| Comprehensive Plan Compliance | | 4% | |
| | Proj | ect Priorities Score | |

(Out of 100)