

Memo from Chair

MEMO: **Agenda Item #8**
To: **LSOHC members**
From: **David Hartwell (Chair) and Ron Schara (Vice Chair)**
Date: **September 28, 2021**
Re: **Chair Recommendations**

All of the allocations are in from the Council Members. They have been tallied and averages figured out, with each figure then lowered to the nearest \$1,000 as we provide round numbers in our final recommendations.

There were all but 5 projects that received 8 votes or more (three received 7 votes but one of those had an average allocation of \$280,000, one received 6 votes and one received 4 votes). The cumulative total of those (8 votes or more) average allocations was \$136,779,000. If you add the administrative costs of \$1,057,000 to that the cumulative total is then \$137,836,000.

As the council decided to allocate \$139,690,000, this leaves us with \$1,854,000.

We recommend that the Council fund all projects receiving 8 or more votes at the average allocation and the four administrative items with the following exceptions:

- We recommend full funding to the CPL program which reaches projects around the state which would allocate another \$1,409,000.
- The WMA and SNA Acquisition request has imbedded into it an IDP coordinator position for 3 years at a cost of \$270,000 plus DSS costs attributable to it of \$24,850 for a total of \$294,850. While the IDP program does serve a purpose, we question why those requesting funds do not do this work themselves and why there is a staff position that is not focused on the project proposed imbedded into the HA08 proposal. The issue of IDP needs discussion by the Council with some long-term resolution but this will not happen in the next few weeks. So, we recommend removing this staff position (and the DSS associated with it). To do this, since the proposal received 42% of the request, we would remove 42% of the \$294,500 (\$123,000) from the total recommended for this and instead then allocate that to a separate line item just for the IDP staff cost with the understanding that in the future, the Council wants to look at this differently.

The two exceptions are highlighted in yellow on the Chair's proposal.

This would then leave \$446,000 unallocated. We are recommending that we hold off allocating that amount until we have the December forecast as it is likely we will be making some further adjustments at that time.

While we recommend this as a starting place, we feel it is important to put the numbers in greater context. So, the spreadsheet with the Chair's proposal also includes individual member's comments for consideration by the council. It also includes the information on where this recommendation would allocate funds by both region and activity.

Rather than focus first on allocation amounts and then on comments as we have in the past, we intend to begin the discussion on the proposal by discussing comments first and then allocation amounts. The discussion on comments will perhaps then influence allocation amounts or decisions about specific components of a proposal.