



MINUTES

SPECIAL MEETING: CHASE PART GRANTS WORKSHOP

Oregon Coast Community College
October 5, 2015
6:00 p.m.

PRESENT: Tina French, vice chairman
Bill Sexton, treasurer
Brian Green
David Skirvin

ABSENT: Kent Norris

PRESENTATION: Tia Cavender, Chase Park Grants

STAFF: Paul Robertson, Lake Manager

(Audio: 0:00:30)

Vice Chairman Tina French convened the meeting at 6:05 p.m.

Tia Cavender, president and founder of Chase Park Grants, presented information on the grant application process.

SEE STAFF REPORT for links to Chase Park Grants' website, to three proposals for grant services, and to sample reports.

Cavender's talk, illustrated with a PowerPoint presentation, noted:

- Chase Park Grants (CPG) is based in Denver; most of its work is in Oregon; a new office has opened in Portland.
- In June 2015, Newport hosted a Protecting Coastal Waterways Summit, inviting representatives of area agencies involved in water issues and funding agencies from state governments; this is where Cavender met Lake Manager Paul Robertson and former Lincoln City city manager David Hawker, and she learned about Devils Lake and the proposed aeration and sewer projects; included live demonstration of "salmon cannon" that Newport is using to shoot bass into Big Creek Reservoir.

- CPG’s approach is to build relationships with funding agencies, so project representatives can learn about grant programs and funding agencies learn about projects; in this way, the funding agencies can be engaged in a project and give advice; in this way, people in the funding agencies become proponents of the projects.
- CPG evaluates projects, identifies and recommends likely grant opportunities.
- Waterways Summit was a way to cultivate funders, which are regulatory agencies that provide permits for projects, but also are a source of grants.

FRENCH: Why do we need CPG if funding agencies are looking for projects?

CAVENDER: Permitting folks don’t share info with the people who decide on grants, so building that relationship connects the dots. Mentioned David Waltz of the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, who made adjustments in guidelines that helped Newport design a project.

CPG presentation continued:

- The “Deliverable” that CPG provides includes collection of data to home in on specific grant opportunities, collection of application materials, technical assistance documents, funder meetings.
- Would help DLWID understand how to piece together a comprehensive funding plan; pieces of a project might be funded by specific grantors; can find low-interest loans, principal-forgiveness loans; can suggest cost-shifting (if a fundable portion of the project is already financed, CPG can recommend shifting those funds to a piece that does not have a funding source); similarly in-kind contributions can be shifted to work that is hard to fund.
- CPG’s proposed costs (see proposals): aeration project alone, \$17,000; Lincoln City sewer, \$22,000; aeration and sewer combined, \$30,500.

DLWID board discussed next step and how to proceed with a decision with the city. Cavender said too much delay might cause a project to miss a funding cycle.

FRENCH: Hawker had been pushing the idea of hiring CGP, but he’s retired, so his effort might fall flat.

GREEN: Next step could be Paul going to the next City Council meeting to summarize what we’ve learned; there’s a better chance for funding if a partnership approaches funders.

Board discussed possibility of partnering with city. Would aeration project be delayed if DLWID has to wait for the sewer? Could be 3 years or longer.

SKIRVIN: If the city doesn’t get involved, will our information still be valid six months from now?

CAVENDER: We can help design the project to be as fundable as possible; strategy can incorporate emerging technology, which attracts funding for the collection of empirical evidence.

(Audio: 0:30:00)

FRENCH: Permitting agencies prefer to hear that all facets of a project are being addressed; is that true of funders?

CAVENDER: Yes, funding agencies are suspicious if other partners are not involved; no agency wants to be the only one involved in a project; Obama administration has issued a mandate to target green environmental issues.

STEVE BROWN (audience): DLWID can move faster than the city; a partnership could be a handicap; is there a way to split the proposed discount so the aeration project can move ahead, giving CPG an advantage when working on the eventual sewer project.

CAVENDER: CPG could consider working with DLWID first; would not necessarily have to have simultaneous aeration and sewer grant proposals.

Board discussed whether the city is distracted by other issues; how familiar city staff is with sewer; how willing the city is to proceed; should DLWID pursue grants until it knows aeration will be permitted; can DLWID get lake easements for free before the aeration project is designed.

CAVENDER: History of client success; CPG has generated over \$2 million in grants and over \$2 million in low-interest loans. Clients have received an \$80 return for each \$1 invested in CPG. DLWID would not be competing with Newport for the same grants. Suggested incorporating fundable features, such as floating islands of vegetation. Emerging technology that can be tested attracts funding; water quality is a hot area in every state; habitat restoration opens funding possibilities; CPG would work with aeration project engineer to learn about potential for different funding sources. CPG expects a return on investment, assuming DLWID acts on the report, in about 12-18 months.

(Audio: 1:00:00)

CAVENDER: CPG team includes technical advisors who can suggest ways to make a grant more likely; CPG can review a grant proposal but not write the proposal. CPG takes about 4 months to generate a report.

ROBERTSON: Discussed potential engineering plan by Alexander Horne and state requirements for engineering in order to proceed with aeration project. A fundable feature would have to be separate from the Horne plan.

FRENCH: Cited Norris-Luebke shoreline restoration project, which became easier to permit when changes were incorporated into the plan.

CAVENDER: A fundable feature could exist if DLWID wants to do more habitat restoration, like a floating island wetland; sometimes attracting a grant can be a matter of terminology or packaging; suggested involving tribes to obtain grant opportunities.

FRENCH: Asked about splitting discount in CPG bid proposal.

CAVENDER: Cannot provide bigger discount, but can pare down proposal for a lower bid. CPG is paid a fee for service and cannot work on a contingency basis. Grants are not necessarily funded even if a proposal scores 100%.

Board and Cavender again discussed possible benefits and disadvantages of a partnership with city to seek grants, considering difference in timing and likely permitting of sewer and aeration projects.

(Audio: 1:30:00)

FRENCH: Asked about possible need for a formal Request For Proposals before hiring CPG.

ROBERTSON: Personal Services Contract policy allows board to ask for a specific proposal from a vendor. Other opportunities would have to be investigated before a proposal from CPG could be formally accepted.

CAVENDER: CPG could submit a revised proposal in a week with options for full versus reduced service.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

French adjourned the meeting at 7:44 p.m.

The next regularly scheduled board meeting will be November 12, 2015, at 6:00 p.m.

| Respectfully submitted,
Rick Mark