

Draft Minutes
Barnstable County Economic Development Council
Grants Subcommittee
Cape Cod Commission
3225 Main Street, Barnstable, MA
February 14, 2020

Subcommittee members present: Tammi Jacobsen and Duane Fotheringham. Rob Brennan participated remotely via Teams

Cape Cod Commission staff present: Erin Perry, Jen Clinton, Kristy Senatori, Siobhan Cavacco

Call to Order

Meeting was called to order at 10:18 am

License Plate Grant Program Proposals

Subcommittee members reviewed and discussed applications for seven Major Grant full proposals (requests for up to \$150,000) in order to forward its recommendation(s) to the Barnstable County Economic Development Council for consideration.

Ms. Perry began the meeting by first confirming that Mr. Brennan was able to hear and participate from his remote location. She then explained the process of reviewing the full proposals. Ms. Perry informed the committee the Commission staff reviewed the proposals internally to be able to provide any feedback, if necessary, and that Ms. Senatori would be joining the meeting at some point.

Ms. Perry suggested before the members start discussing each of the of the proposals for Ms. Clinton to go through an overview to put everything in the perspective of the grant program, then go proposal by proposal and discuss each, with a second round of discussions if needed.

Ms. Perry stated there is no chairperson for the subcommittee meeting. She informed the group that Peter Karlson had functioned in that role in previous meetings. Ms. Perry asked the members if they felt they needed a chairperson for the meeting today. There was consensus from the members that a chairperson would not be necessary.

Ms. Clinton began her overview of the full proposals, stating the License Plate Grant Program issued the initial RFP in August of 2019. The major grant requests could be up to \$150,000 and the projects could span up to three years. In addition, the major grants require a one to one match in cash or in kind. Ms. Clinton informed the committee that \$30,000 was allocated for micro grants and they were awarded in November.

Ms. Clinton continued, informing the subcommittee they can award one applicant for the full amount of \$150,000 for the major grants or award multiple applicants as long as the sum total is \$150,000. For all license plate grant fund projects the funding is intended to support regional priorities for economic development and achievement of long term economic diversity and sustainability. The project specifically should align with the CEDS (Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy) that was developed last year. The CEDS action plan initiatives that were identified through stakeholders and working groups are: local business development, blue economy sector development, comprehensive and activity center planning, housing access and affordability, climate change innovation, regional infrastructure planning, transportation and air quality improvement, infrastructure development and infrastructure funding.

In October 2019, when the BCEDC Grant subcommittee last met, the group was comprised of Sheryl Walsh, Peter Karlson, and Rob Brennan and they recommended seven major grants to be invited to submit full proposals and those are the ones that are being reviewed today. At that same meeting, they also recommended the three micro grants that were awarded. The Town of Yarmouth was awarded \$10,000 to conduct a feasibility study, and to perform identified building upgrades to accommodate expanded use at the former Lawrence MacArthur Elementary School building in Yarmouth. The second \$10,000 award was to FORWARD (Friends Or Relatives With Autism And Related Disabilities) to fund a task force and market analysis to evaluate the level of need for new affordable supportive rental housing for individuals with intellectual and development disabilities, to determine the most effective use of resources and addressing the built environment and the surface support needs of this population. The third \$10,000 award was to WCAI to fund a radio and online reporter covering the human impacts of climate change across the Cape Cod region.

Across the board for all types of grants, the total requested funds equaled just over \$1.6 million, with an overall match of nearly \$1.9 million, 29 applicants total. For the major grants, the sum of requested funds was \$1.49 million with an overall match of \$1.82 million. For the seven applicants being discussed today, the requested funds total \$835,000 with an overall match of nearly \$1.4 million.

Before Ms. Clinton continued with a brief description of the seven full proposals, Mr. Fotheringham asked how many pre-proposals had been submitted in total. Ms. Perry responded there were 15 major proposals submitted.

Ms. Clinton continued, providing a brief description of each the full proposals:

0079 – Lewis Bay Research Center – Project title: Cape Cod Watershed Institute. Proposed relocating a research facility to the Dennis-Yarmouth High School campus creating a K-16 educational platform in experiential learning.

0076 – Association to Preserve Cape Cod. Project title: A Collaboration to Advance the Regional Growth Policy. Proposed supporting a two-year joint project with the Housing Assistance Corporation to identify key places where development of affordable housing can be supported by the Association to Preserve Cape Cod and where key natural resources are protected from development.

0080 – Entrepreneurship for all CC - Project title: EforAll and CC Tech Council: Launch and Connect New Business. Proposed partner with Cape Cod Technology Council to provide training and technical assistance to under-resourced, targeted aspiring entrepreneurs and early stage business owners.

0082 – Open Cape – Project title: Connecting Downtown Hyannis. Proposed installing a transceiver hub in a Hyannis colocation center which will allow small businesses in the Mid Cape area to connect affordably to 100% fiber network and take advantage of a shared gigabit service.

0081 - Cape Cod Community College – Project title: Science & Engineering Building. Proposed contributing to building new science & engineering center to address the college's need for modern educational facilities in order to provide educators and students with state-of-the-art resources needed to achieve contemporary educational standards in STEM related subjects.

0083 – Cape Cod Commercial Fisherman's Alliance – Project title: Blue Economy Workforce Development through Crew Training for Commercial Fishing. Proposed funds for multi-year implementation for an innovative and regional crew training program which will build capacity for

the next generation of fishermen on Cape Cod by providing emerging maritime workings with the basic skills they need to succeed in the New England groundfish, lobster, scallop, skate, and dogfish fisheries.

0084 – Home Builders & Remodelers Association of Cape Cod – Project title: Accessory Dwelling Unit Building Development. As accessory dwelling unit bylaws are implemented across Cape Cod, the Home Builders & Remodelers Association of Cape Cod seeks to partner with young professionals and seniors to develop market rate attainable housing by building accessory dwelling units.

Ms. Perry asked if the members had questions about the overall review process or if they were ready to begin the discussion. Ms. Jacobsen stated she will have to recuse herself from the Cape Cod Community College proposal discussion since she works for the college. Ms. Jacobsen also questioned how firmly the proposals had to fit all of the criteria on the review worksheets. She stated she didn't find one proposal that met all the criteria. Ms. Perry agreed with Ms. Jacobsen but added there is some flexibility and through discussion can determine if they meet a lot of the criteria or if they are lacking on one or two. Ms. Perry suggested maybe these are areas for improvement, which could be provided in feedback or they could potentially ask for more information. Ms. Perry continued it is hard to meet all of the criteria but they should identify applicants that are most in line with the priorities.

Mr. Brennan then added that he will have to recuse himself from the Home Builders and Remodelers Association of Cape Cod because he serves as their state director to the Mass Board. He also has to recuse himself from the OpenCape proposal because he is one of the developers that they reference and a prospective beneficiary. Ms. Perry asked for confirmation from Mr. Fotheringham that he doesn't have to recuse himself from any of the proposals and he confirmed that to be true.

The committee began discussing the full proposals in the order provided by Ms. Clinton, starting with Grant 0079 – Lewis Bay Research Center. Mr. Brennan started the conversation, stating he knows the Executive Director, Brian Braginton-Smith, and that he fully supports their vision and their work. He continued that they completed the grant criteria but didn't address how the project aligns with the regional goals or specific economic development priority. Overall, the narrative felt like it was for relocation rather than growth in the workplace. Ms. Jacobsen added the proposal mentioned Cape Cod Community College as a partner but there was no letter of support and no funding in the budget from this partner. Mr. Fotheringham stated he agreed with their comments and that the detailed budget narrative provided with leveraged funding was a positive. Ms. Perry asked the committee if they would like to make a decision on the grant or first discuss all the proposals. The committee agreed to discuss each proposal first and moved Lewis Bay to the maybe pile.

The committee moved onto Grant 0076 – Association to Preserve Cape Cod. Mr. Brennan started the conversation stating, as a building developer, APCC and HAC have identified the “log jam” in housing development on the Cape. He thinks the Cape is perceived as being a complex region for housing development. He sees this grant proposal as developing a tool to help alleviate the complexity and he put it at the top of his list for the proposals. Ms. Jacobsen agreed and said she was able to check off every box in the review worksheet for this proposal but did question the detailed budget and narrative format used in the proposal. Aside from that, Ms. Jacobsen stated the proposal was well thought-out and was at the top of her list. Ms. Perry addressed Ms. Jacobsen's question on the budget format used. She said they did not follow the format but they did fill in the

requested budget information. She stated they could be a bit flexible on the budget format and if necessary request more information. Mr. Fotheringham agreed with Mr. Brennan and Ms. Jacobsen. His initial reaction was that he was surprised it didn't already exist. As for the budget, he felt they provided enough detail to see where the funds would go. This proposal was at the top of his list, too.

Grant 0080 – Entrepreneurship for All Cape Cod was the next proposal to be discussed. Mr. Brennan stated he liked the collaborative aspect of this proposal and thinks the STEM focus is critical to the economic development of the region. He felt the budget narrative could have had more details. His biggest question was wondering if they would go ahead with the project even if they do not receive the grant funds. Aside from that, he put it in his top 3. Ms. Jacobsen said she agreed with Mr. Brennan's comments and added the proposal identified CEDS and the blue economy aspect. She continued they are dynamic and have a model that works and has been successful in the past in different regions. Ms. Jacobsen did add she was confused with the budget details and where the money was directed. Still, she felt they hit all the marks on the criteria review worksheet. Mr. Fotheringham stated his thoughts on the proposal were aligned with Mr. Brennan's comments, wondering if the work would continue without the grant funds. He said he is highly supportive of the STEM aspect but questions the regional impact. Also, the budget allocated a lot of funds for staff. So, although a worthy cause, if he had to pick one proposal, this one doesn't seem to have the impact and he would put it in his maybe pile. Mr. Brennan added he might consider the proposal for partial funding and Mr. Fotheringham agreed. Ms. Jacobsen added banks will often fund this type of project.

Grant 0082 – OpenCape. Mr. Brennan reminded the committee he is one of the developers they reference so he recused himself from the discussion but did add he felt it had a narrow focus. Ms. Jacobsen began the discussion, agreeing it has a narrow focus and added she didn't think the proposal was customized for this grant. Also, she did not see a budget proposal or narrative. Ms. Perry stated they did fill out the budget form as part of the application. Mr. Fotheringham commented that he put this proposal at the bottom of his list because it seemed very narrow and would affect a small number of people.

Grant 0081 - Cape Cod Community College. Ms. Jacobsen reminded the committee she was recusing herself from the discussion. Mr. Brennan stated he fully supports the proposal and it marked off all the criteria in the review worksheet. His concern however, is the full \$150,000 would be such a small piece of the \$3.4 million needed to bring the building to fruition. Mr. Fotheringham added his comments, stating it checks all the criteria boxes on the review worksheet but he questioned as well if the \$150,000 would make an impact since it is only .4% of budget needed. Still, with the STEM aspect and keeping students on the Cape it would be in the top 3 for him if he could get past the question if it will make a difference.

The committee moved on to Grant 0083 – Cape Cod Fisherman's Alliance. Mr. Brennan stated the proposal checks a lot of the criteria on the review worksheet and he thinks the grant funds will make a difference to the proposal. Also, the grant match was actual where most of the other proposals had matching funds in kind. Mr. Brennan concluded that he felt it would have a near-term as well as long-term payoff on the regional economic development. Ms. Jacobsen added her comments, stating they met a lot of the criteria, but she was still left with a few questions. The proposal states the graduates will have full-time employment with livable wages but it doesn't specify the wage. Also, she would like to have seen a partnership with an educational institution to help with a path

for them to advance in their career. Ms. Jacobsen continued with her concerns, adding they were very aggressive with the number of trainees that will go through the program and they did not identify their recruitment strategies. Mr. Brennan asked if anyone knows the actual wage they will make. Ms. Jacobsen said she wondered if they didn't list a specific wage because it is not a livable wage and it is hard to sustain oneself in the field. Ms. Clinton added a lot of the data resources track employment but not self-employment so it might be hard to identify. Mr. Brennan stated it is a great perspective and something he hadn't thought about.

Mr. Fotheringham said he had similar thoughts. On the positive side, the budget is good and they have great partnerships plus it involves job creation and job training. Mr. Fotheringham questioned, however, the level of need for people doing this type of work. He said boat captains often pay their deckhands and deck fishermen. The grant states they would be training the next generation of captains but does this level of work really continue on the path to the level of captain. Ms. Jacobsen added the six day training is pretty quick with no forward pathway so she questions how impactful it will be.

Ms. Clinton asked the question if the program would still happen if they did not get the funding. She stated they already have funding for the first two years so they have a broad network of support and funding. Ms. Perry added, with all the information provided so far, if the proposal still ranked high on everyone's lists, it would be possible to provide feedback for future rounds of funding. Mr. Brennan asked how mobile the profession is and what would prevent participants from moving to another region after they are trained. He would like the statistic on that if they end up providing feedback.

The last full proposal to be discussed was Grant 0084 - Home Builders & Remodelers Association of Cape Cod. Mr. Brennan recused himself from this discussion. Ms. Jacobsen said she felt they checked off most of the boxes on the review sheet but she still had three concerns. First, she thinks they need more partnerships. Second, they did not indicate a match. Ms. Clinton added they flagged this as well. She stated they listed a sum of \$120,000 for a match so they would only be able to receive \$120,000 from the grant. Ms. Perry added the match is in kind. Ms. Jacobsen's third concern is they did not provide a timeline. Overall, she thinks it could be impactful if they had more partners but it is on the lower end of her list. Mr. Fotheringham added his comments, indicating this proposal was at the bottom of his list because the impact is so small and there is no guarantee or timeline on how long a unit has to be a rental. Also, there is no guarantee the rental rate will be maintained for the demographic they are trying to reach.

Ms. Perry summarized for the committee that it looks like they should review again the APCC, EforAll, Lewis Bay, Cape Cod Community College, and Fisherman's Alliance. Mr. Fotheringham stated Cape Cod Community College proposal is definitely in his top three but when he weighs it against the APCC proposal, it seems that is more impactful for the Cape. Mr. Brennan added he would put APCC at the top of his list. He asked if APCC and HAC reached out to the Commission for assistance for GIS or other work. Ms. Perry responded they haven't asked the Commission for help but they could consider GIS help. She continued there is real advantage of these two advocacy organizations working together and identifying the conflict and leveraging and expanding on CEDS and the Regional Policy Plan. Mr. Fotheringham added having these two stakeholders bring this forward is very impactful and added this is his first choice for full funding. Ms. Jacobsen agreed, stating this is a deliverable that can happen and is impactful with the full funding of \$150,000.

Upon a motion by Rob Brennan to move that the license plate grant application submitted by APCC for their collaborative project with HAC should be funded for the full requested amount of \$150,000, and seconded by Duane Fotheringham, the motion was approved unanimously.

New Business

No new business

Public Comment

No public comment

Adjourn

Upon a motion by Rob Brennan, seconded by Duane Fotheringham, the meeting was adjourned at 11:38 am.

Documents Used

BCEDC License Plate Major Grants Full Proposals

BCEDC License Plate Major Grant Criteria Review Worksheet