NORTHEAST OHIO AREAWIDE COORDINATING AGENCY

MEMORANDUM

TO: Finance and Audit Committee Members

Armond Budish, County Executive, Cuyahoga County
William Cervenik, Mayor, City of Euclid
Julius Ciaccia, CEO, Northeast Ohio Regional Sewer District
Ann Marie Donegan, Mayor, City of Olmsted Falls
William D. Friedman, President and CEO, Cleveland-Cuyahoga County Port Authority
Susan Infeld, Mayor, City of University Heights
Matt Lundy, Commissioner, Lorain County
Valarie J. McCall, Chief of Government and International Affairs, City of Cleveland

FROM: William Cervenik, Chair

DATE: November 6, 2015

RE: Finance and Audit Committee

Friday, November 13 from 8:30 a.m. to 10:00 a.m.

NOACA Offices
1299 Superior Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio

Please note that in addition to the members listed above, any interested Board members are welcome to attend.

I look forward to seeing you on Friday, November 13th at 8:30 a.m. at the NOACA offices.
NORTHEAST OHIO AREAWIDE COORDINATING AGENCY
Friday, November 13, 2015, 8:30 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.
NOACA Offices
1299 Superior Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio 44114

FINANCE AND AUDIT COMMITTEE AGENDA

1. Minutes of August 14, 2015 Meeting 1-1

2. Public Involvement Oral

3. Chair’s/Executive Director’s Report Oral

4. Action Items
   a. Procurement: Legislative Services Consultants 4-1
   b. State Infrastructure Bank (SIB) Loan Authorizations 4-3
      i. Carpenter Road, Medina County
      ii. Royalton Road, Cuyahoga County
      iii. Tower City Bridges, Cuyahoga County
   c. Toll Credits Request
      i. CUY – Redline Public Right of Way Improvements

5. Presentations/Discussion Items:
   a. Future Action:
      i.
   b. Information:
      i. ODOT Capital and Planning Programs Budget Adjustments 5-1

6. Reports/Updates
   a. Financial Report 6-1

7. Old Business
   a. None

8. New Business
   a. None

9. Adjourn

Next Regular Meeting: Friday, February 12, 2016 at 8:30 a.m.
NOACA Offices, 1299 Superior Avenue in Cleveland, Ohio
Finance and Audit Committee Meeting
August 14, 2015
NOACA Offices
1299 Superior Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio 44114

Present: Please see the attached attendance sheet.

Mayor William Cervenik, Chair of the Finance and Audit Committee, convened the meeting at 8:30 a.m. He stated that public notice of the meeting and its agenda were issued.

Meeting Minutes
A motion was made by Mr. Julius Ciaccia to approve the May 8, 2015 Finance and Audit Committee meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Mayor John Hunter. The motion passed by voice vote.

Public Involvement
No one signed up for public comment.

Chair / Executive Director’s Report
No reports were presented at this meeting.

ACTION ITEMS

SFY 2015 Overall Work Program Completion Report
Mr. Jonathan Giblin stated that each year NOACA does a work plan and budget, and at the end of the year, the agency is required by external oversight agencies to do a completion report and a year-end budget.

Ms. Gallucci stated that the completion report is something NOACA would do anyway. Staff thinks it is a good idea to review the work that has been done against the plan and to report that out to the Board. However, it is required that the completion report be approved by the Board and sent to the Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)

Mr. Giblin added that staff does a quarterly analysis of both the budget and the work products to ensure that NOACA stays on track.

Mr. Giblin stated that the SFY 2015 OWP and budget was approved by the Board in April 2014 and it was last amended in March 2015.

Mr. Giblin stated that the SFY 2015 OWP contains 33 staff projects and presented staff accomplishments and an overview of each product.
Mr. Giblin stated that pending Board approval, the SFY 2015 OWP Completion Report will be sent to ODOT and the appropriate federal agencies for review.

Mayor Cervenik asked members if they had any questions.

Mayor Hunter asked when the end of the year is for the projects to be completed and expenditures paid out.

Mr. Giblin stated that NOACA’s fiscal year is from July 1 thru June 30.

Mayor Hunter asked if the incomplete projects will be carried over into the next fiscal year and what is the status of the funding for those projects.

Mr. Giblin stated that 94% of the products within the OWP projects were completed in SFY 2015. The incomplete projects were carried over into SFY 2016. He noted that staff used 71% of the project budget last year and the remaining money has been carried over into SFY 2016, so nothing is lost.

Mayor Hunter asked if all the fiscal money (29%) will be carried over until June 30, 2016. Mr. Giblin stated that staff has until the end of December to spend the money down.

Mayor Hunter asked if any of the incomplete projects are in jeopardy of not spending the money down. Mr. Giblin said no and noted that the projects will be financed and completed.

Mayor Hunter asked if there has been any problem with sponsors not being able to come up with their local share for projects. Mr. Giblin said no.

Mayor Cervenik asked the Finance and Audit Committee for a motion on the SFY 2015 OWP Completion Report.

A motion was made by Chief Valarie McCall to recommend the SFY 2015 OWP Completion Report to the Executive Committee. The motion was seconded by Mayor Hunter. The motion passed by voice vote.

SFY 2016 Overall Work Program and Budget Amendment

Mr. Giblin stated that the action being requested of the Finance and Audit Committee is to recommend the SFY 2016 OWP and budget amendment to the Executive Committee for placement on the September 2015 Board of Directors’ agenda.

Mr. Giblin stated that the Board approved the SFY 2016 OWP and budget in March 2015. The OWP outlines and budgets for NOACA staffing and operations. The purpose of this amendment is to show additional revenue received since the OWP was approved in March; to increase the budget to allow for expenditures related to the additional revenue; and to amend project narratives to show the expanded scope of work related to additional revenue.

Mr. Giblin stated that the amendment shows $112,500 in additional Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) program funds, which will be used to expand NOACA’s corridor-level signal timing and coordination work at 100% funding (no local
match required). NOACA received $116,320 in additional Ohio Consolidated Planning Grant (OCPG) funding. The additional OCPG funding is the result of a statewide adjustment in OCPG from ODOT. NOACA is planning to use those additional funds to implement an online platform for “Big Data.” NOACA’s Research, Analysis and Policy Division will be working to incorporate land use, employment, population, infrastructure, economic development and housing-related data into an online, user-friendly structure. NOACA received $50,000 in additional funding from Cleveland Neighborhood Progress (CNP) that will be used to administer the Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) study, which is under NOACA’s Technical Assistance project. Mr. Giblin noted that CNP is a partner in the TOD study.

Mr. Giblin stated that the budget changes amount to $278,820. He noted that no projects were decreased in funding and the following three projects were increased in funding:

- Air Quality Planning would be changed from $450,000 to $562,500
- GIS data collection and management would be changed from $100,242 to $216,562
- TOD consultant would be changed from $250,000 to $300,000

Mr. Giblin stated that the item will be presented to the Executive Committee. Pending Board action, the SFY 2016 OWP and budget amendments will be sent to ODOT and the appropriate federal agencies for review.

Mayor Cervenik asked the committee if they had any questions. No comments were made by the committee.

Mayor Cervenik asked the committee for a motion on the SFY 2016 OWP and budget amendment.

A motion was made by Chief McCall to recommend the SFY 2016 OWP and budget amendment to the Executive Committee. The motion was seconded by Mayor Hunter. The motion passed by voice vote.

SFY 2015 Capital Programs Summary and Carry Forward

Mr. Randy Lane stated that action is being requested of the Finance and Audit Committee to recommend an approach for the expenditure of funds that become available due to prior or current state fiscal year carry forward to the Executive Committee for placement on the September 2015 Board of Directors’ agenda.

Mr. Lane stated that ODOT allocates FHWA funds to NOACA for capital transportation programs for the management of the Surface Transportation Program (STP) in the amount of $27.5 million; the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) in the amount of $2.75 million; and the Statewide CMAQ program in the amount of $57.5 million. NOACA directly manages the STP and TAP budgets. NOACA participates, along with seven other large metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) across the State of Ohio, through the Ohio Association of Regional Councils (OARC) in the management of the Statewide CMAQ program.

Mr. Lane stated that NOACA’s SFY 2015 budget summary for the STP and TAP is as follows:
• Adjusted budget amount of $49.4 million
• Encumbered amount of $44.5 million for projects in the region
• Carry forward projected at $4.9 million (9% - the percentage is well below the 50% that is allowable by the ODOT MPO Carry Forward Adjustment Policy)
• $3.9 million of the $4.9 million in carry forward is needed for two projects that were delayed to SFY 2016 due to high bids in the 4th quarter of SFY 2015 (between May and June)
• Encumbered $15.3 million from the Statewide CMAQ program for projects in the region.

Ms. Gallucci asked Mr. Lane to explain why the adjusted budget of $49.4 million is so much higher than NOACA’s annual allocation.

Mr. Lane stated that in SFY 2015, the Finance and Audit Committee recommended the execution of a budget exchange with other MPOs across the state. NOACA borrowed funding in SFY 2015 to be repaid in SFY 2016 in the amount of $14.1 million.

Ms. Gallucci stated that NOACA’s overall allocation became significantly higher in SFY 2015 and will be significantly lower in SFY 2016.

Mr. Lane stated that NOACA used the borrowed funds to advance projects from SFY 2016 to SFY 2015 to accomplish those projects sooner.

Ms. Gallucci commented that it would be nice if NOACA could get $49.4 million every year.

Mr. Lane presented program accomplishments that were funded in SFY 2015.

Mr. Lane stated that in SFY 2015, NOACA’s total available budget for STP was about $52 million, which consisted of the previous fiscal year’s carry forward amount that was uncommitted or re-released back into the program. The funding is needed for projects that were delayed heading into SFY 2016. NOACA’s adjustments equal the $14.1 million from the MPO budget exchange. The total project commitments and change orders represent NOACA’s total commitments. Using the budget summary table for STP funds, Mr. Lane asked members to focus on the cumulative balance for the SFY 2015 final budget and the projected amounts for the SFY 2016–2019 approved TIP.

Mr. Lane stated that the total available budget for TAP was about $3.8 million in SFY 2015, which consists of the previous fiscal year’s carry forward and NOACA’s original allocation. He noted that the budget includes an adjustment of $650,000 that was borrowed through the MPO exchange for this program.

Ms. Gallucci stated that the STP balance of $4.5 million is higher in SFY 2019 because the Finance and Audit Committee directed staff to change the programmed SIB loans from 5 year to 10 year repayment schedules in order to increase available funding for other projects during the next TIP’s development.

Mr. Lane stated that $600,000 in carry forward funding is projected for SFY 2016 for the TAP. However, some of that funding is needed for future TIP project commitments through SFY 2019. At the end of SFY 2019, NOACA has a total projected balance of $153,000.
Ms. Gallucci stated that the annual ending balances result from timing differences in the delivery of projects. Although some years show negative balances while others show a positive balance, the result over 4 years is a balanced program with a limited balance.

In reference to the TAP, Mr. Lane stated that the program is a low dollar amount program of $2.8 million. The commitments in that program are typically $500,000 to $1 million. He noted that there may not be sufficient funds in one year to advance a project, so funds for several years may be needed to advance a project.

Mr. Lane stated that there is currently $1.1 million in uncommitted carry forward funds that are available in SFY 2016. The STP has an ending balance of $961,000 for SFY 2016. None of that funding is needed for project commitments in the SFY 2016-2019 TIP. Finance and Audit Committee can make a recommendation of what to do with these funds. The TAP has an ending balance of $600,000 for SFY 2016, of which $447,000 is needed for future project commitments in the TIP, with an available uncommitted balance of $153,000. Mr. Lane reiterated that overall, there is about $1.1 million available in the TIP that is uncommitted currently towards projects.

Mr. Lane explained that carry forward funding is funding that was originally planned for expenditure in the previous state fiscal year or the current fiscal year that is now available. Carry forward funding results from project delays, bids awarded under the estimate that makes funds available and adjustments for actual material and/or labor quantities as the construction project progresses and is closed out.

Mr. Lane stated that carry forward funding will first be prioritized towards delayed SFY 2015 project commitments that must be honored and second for ensuring that there is fiscal constraint for the SFY 2016-2019 Board-approved TIP.

Mr. Lane stated that the remaining prior or current state fiscal year available funds can be prioritized in accordance with one or a combination of the following approaches:

1. Reduce planned debt requirements
2. Advance future TIP projects into SFY 2016
3. Fund new projects
4. Reserve the funds for potential project cost increases

Mr. Lane asked the committee to discuss the above-referenced options and establish a hierarchy that staff can use to guide expenditure of the available uncommitted funds in SFY 2016.

Mayor Cervenik asked the committee if they had any recommendations.

Mayor Hunter asked if the committee can recommend a combination of approaches 2 and 3. He stated that he likes holding the reserves, but he does not like carrying over a lot of money because of the risk of ODOT taking back unused funding. He suggested looking at advancing future TIP projects and funding small new projects.

Ms. Gallucci suggested that the quickest way to reduce the balance would be to apply the funding to the planned debt requirements, so that NOACA would not have to issue as
much debt. She noted that NOACA does have plans to issue debt for some projects, so
the funding could be applied to those projects to reduce the debt amount and move
forward. She stated that the first approach would be the quickest and most efficient way
to expend funds.

Mayor Hunter asked Ms. Gallucci if she could provide an example of a project.

Ms. Gallucci asked Mr. Lane if he could provide an example.

Mr. Lane stated that in SFY 2016, as contained in the Board-approved TIP, NOACA has
project financing for the SFY 2016 Provisional Transportation Asset Management
Program (PTAMP). NOACA has funds reserved to repay debt over a 10-year period
beginning in SFY 2016. Any funds that are available in SFY 2016 could be applied to
those projects in lieu of establishing debt for those projects.

Ms. Gallucci stated that there is $961,000 available for SFY 2016, which is almost $1
million. She asked Mr. Lane the debt amount that is planned for the PTAMP.

Mr. Lane said the debt is $24 million spread out over 10 years.

Ms. Gallucci asked Mr. Lane if the amount for SFY 2016 is $24 million.

Ms. Kathy Sarli stated that the amount for SFY 2015 is $12.5 million and the amount for
SFY 2016 is $24 million.

Ms. Gallucci stated that $24 million would be the debt amount for SFY 2016. She noted
that NOACA has authority to move forward with a SIB loan or a loan from the Cleveland-
Cuyahoga County Port Authority, so rather than issue $24 million in debt NOACA could
issue $23 million in debt.

Mr. Lane noted that the amount can be further reduced if additional funding becomes
available in SFY 2016.

For clarification, Mr. Ciaccia stated that when it comes to reducing planned debt
requirements, staff is not referring to reducing existing debt, but future debt.

Mr. Lane stated that NOACA's existing debt is already under agreement and under a
repayment contract.

Ms. Gallucci stated that most of the debt referenced by Mr. Lane is early enough in the
process where NOACA would pay penalties if the loan is paid off early.

Mr. Ciaccia stated that interest rates are probably better now than they will be going
forward.

Mr. Ciaccia stated that the first approach of reducing planned debt requirements would be
the best approach.

A motion was made by Mayor Hunter to adopt the approach to reduce planned debt
requirements. The motion was seconded by Mr. Ciaccia.
Mayor Cervenik asked the committee if there was any further discussion. No comments were made by the committee.

The Finance and Audit Committee voted and the motion passed by voice vote.

Mayor Cervenik stated that the recommendation of the Finance and Audit Committee is to adopt the approach of reducing future planned debt.

Mr. Lane pointed out that the TAP does not have any future planned debt. He asked the committee if they would like to recommend a hierarchy of all potential approaches.

Mr. Ciaccia asked Mr. Lane to provide some options to the committee.

Mr. Lane stated that the TAP does not have planned debt, so the committee is being asked to establish a hierarchy for staff to follow. For example, if there is no planned debt requirements, staff would use approach 2, which is to advance future TIP projects. If there are no TIP projects, staff would use approach 3, which is to fund new projects. Mr. Lane reiterated that the Finance and Audit Committee is being asked to establish a hierarchy of the approaches to allocate the funds.

Ms. Gallucci stated that the hierarchy is the approaches listed in the presentation. Mr. Lane said that was correct.

A motion was made by Mr. Ciaccia to adopt the hierarchy presented by staff. The motion was seconded by Mayor Hunter.

Mayor Cervenik stated that the recommendation of the Finance and Audit Committee is to adopt the hierarchy presented by staff.

Ms. Gallucci stated that the hierarchy applies to the $961,000 that is currently carried over, available and uncommitted. She also noted that the hierarchy will apply to any additional funds that are made available this year for whatever reasons.

Mr. Lane stated that staff will program SFY 2016 available funding consistent with the recommended approaches. He noted that there would not be any financial impact to existing TIP projects as funding made available is in excess of the programmed TIP commitments. Staff will continue to report the status of available funding to the Finance and Audit Committee at its quarterly meetings.

Mayor Cervenik asked the committee if there was any further discussion. No comments were made by the committee.

Mayor Cervenik called the question. The motion passed by voice vote.

**Introduction of Ms. Susanna Merlone**
Ms. Gallucci introduced Ms. Merlone to the Finance and Audit Committee. She stated that Ms. Merlone is NOACA’s Senior Director of Finance and Performance Management. Ms. Merlone will be responsible for NOACA’s finance functions as well as the compliance,
planning, programming and administration functions that were spread throughout the agency. Ms. Merlone has a number of years of experience and an EMBA from CSU.

**Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Plan Consultant**

Ms. Merlone stated that the action being requested of the Finance and Audit Committee is to recommend to the Executive Committee the TOD Plan Consultant for placement on the September 2015 Board of Directors’ agenda, which in turn would give the Executive Director authorization to execute a contract with the selected consultant.

Ms. Merlone stated that the TOD was included in the SFY 2016 OWP and budget that was approved by the Board. Ms. Merlone provided background information on the TOD program. She said the TOD program is a scorecard and regional program that focuses growth around transit stations to promote ridership, affordable housing near transit, revitalized downtown centers and neighborhoods, and encourages local economic development.

The goal of TOD is to bring together people, jobs, and services designed in such a way to make it efficient, safe, and convenient to travel by foot, by bicycle, by transit, by car or by any other mode of transportation. The funding amount approved for the TOD plan in the SFY 2016 budget was $250,000. An additional $50,000 in local funds is pending Board approval, which is included in the budget amendment presented by Mr. Giblin. She said the $50,000 being funneled through Cleveland Neighborhood Progress (CNP) is a combination of donations from CNP, GCRTA, the Saint Luke’s Foundation and the Cleveland Foundation. Ms. Merlone pointed out the commitment from all the entities.

Ms. Gallucci pointed out that NOACA is partnering with atypical organizations to expand what it can accomplish.

Ms. Merlone stated that the commitment from the entities shows that the TOD is a regional program.

Ms. Merlone stated that the TOD will also receive $150,000 from OCPG and $100,000 from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) (Section 5310). She noted that the total amount allocated for the consultant of the TOD project will not exceed $300,000.

Ms. Merlone discussed the background of the request for proposal (RFP). NOACA originally issued the RFP on May 1, 2015. Responses were due to NOACA by June 4, 2015. Seven proposals were received and the cost and hours varied greatly. Upon review by NOACA’s executive staff, it was determined that requested tasks were not clearly understood by all the entities that submitted proposals. NOACA staff decided to reissue the RFP on July 24, 2015 to include improved clarity for the tasks, the cost, the evaluation criteria and the Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) requirements.

Ms. Merlone presented the remaining timeline for the selection of the TOD consultant.

Ms. Merlone stated that pending Board approval, the Executive Director will execute the contract with the selected consultant.

Ms. Gallucci stated that it was staff’s intent to bring to the Finance and Audit Committee the name of the selected vendor and the final cost, but because of the timing of having to
reissue the RFP, staff did not have that information in advance of this meeting, but will have it in advance of the Board meeting.

Mr. Ciaccia asked how cost is evaluated.

Ms. Merlone stated that staff will use four criteria to evaluate and score the proposals. The qualification of the firm’s staff is valued at 20 points, the firm’s experience is valued at 20 points, the project approach is valued at 40 points, and the project budget (cost) is valued at 20 points.

Mr. Ciaccia asked if the evaluation will be based on the total cost or an hourly cost.

Ms. Merlone stated that the consultant will be required to submit a proposal that has one to three pages of the actual budget, which would include the costing of the hourly rates for whomever they have selected. NOACA staff will be able to identify the tasks, the hours, who will be doing the work and for how much per hour.

Ms. Gallucci stated that staff will be evaluating the cost component based on the best value, not just the dollar amount. Staff will look at the level of employees that will be assigned, whether it is senior or junior level employees, for the prices the consultant is offering.

Mr. Ciaccia stated that when costing is brought into the evaluation process, the public sector has to be careful because sometimes it may appear that someone is lowest in cost, but when the proposals are presented to the Board, the question may be raised why the consultant with the lowest cost was not selected.

Mr. Ciaccia stated that with engineering contracts, from his standpoint, costs are not allowed to be taken into consideration. Costs are negotiated after the most qualified firm has been selected.

Ms. Merlone stated that Mr. Ciaccia is correct and noted that NOACA has asked the consultants to provide a detailed explanation of all the costing being broken out.

Ms. Gallucci stated that one of the problems staff had with the RFP issued in the first round was that the cost varied so much from proposal to proposal. It was difficult to concur that the highest costing was the best or that the lowest costing was not the best, so staff tightened up the scope to get better results.

In reference to Ms. Gallucci’s comments, Mr. Ciaccia stated that is the problem when evaluating professional services. The number of hours the consultant is going to submit and the level of effort they are planning to put into the project can be looked at by NOACA, but when those elements are attached to the cost, it creates an unclear picture. He stated that if NOACA is not going to do this project for over $300,000, staff should negotiate to the point where the most qualified firm has been selected, and if an agreement cannot be reached, staff should go to the next firm.

Chief McCall asked that if the Finance and Audit Committee approves the TOD consultant contract, would the item would go directly to the Board in September.
Ms. Gallucci stated that the item would go to the Executive Committee to be placed on the Board agenda. The next time the Finance and Audit Committee would see this item would be in a memo to the Board. She noted that staff could send the outcome of the selection process and the negotiation process to the Finance and Audit Committee prior to preparing that memo to the Board.

Chief McCall stated that it appears the Finance and Audit Committee would be giving staff a blanket approval without being given a presentation on the vendors and what the vendors’ proposals will entail. She said that there needs to be another step included in this process. She said she would not want to see NOACA start a precedent by leaving steps out of the process. She said she supports staff having the authority to execute the contract, but she would want to know the consultant being selected so that the committee has the ability to have some discussion.

Ms. Gallucci asked if it would be the pleasure of the Finance and Audit Committee to have another meeting prior to the item going to the Board.

Chief McCall stated that from what she read, the item would not go to the Executive Committee, but directly to the Board.

Ms. Gallucci stated that the recommendation would go to the Executive Committee.

Mayor Cervenik stated that the Executive Committee would place the item on the Board agenda.

Chief McCall asked when the Executive Committee would look at this item.

Ms. Nancy Griffith stated that prior to the Board meeting there would not be any review in any more detail. Ms. Gallucci said that was correct.

Chief McCall stated that the next Board meeting is on September 11. Ms. Gallucci said that was correct.

Chief McCall stated that the recommendation would be included in the memo to the Board that will be sent out on September 4. Ms. Gallucci said that was correct.

Chief McCall asked when the Executive Committee would look at the item. She noted that the Executive Committee meets today. Ms. Gallucci said that was correct.

Ms. Gallucci stated that the action being requested of the Finance and Audit Committee is to have the item placed on the Board agenda and for the contract not to exceed $300,000.

Chief McCall read the recommendation as follows: “Authorize the Executive Director to execute a contract with the selected consultant.”

Chief McCall said she did not have an issue with the execution of the contract, but that the Finance and Audit Committee would not have an opportunity to review the proposals. The proposals will not be presented to the Executive Committee because that committee does not meet again before September. She asked when the Finance and Audit
Committee would have an opportunity to review the proposals. She stated that she understands that the quarterly rotation would delay the proposals from coming back to the Finance and Audit Committee.

Ms. Gallucci stated that the timing is such that this item would go to the full Board for review, but there would not be a detailed level of discussion. She mentioned that NOACA does not typically issue large contracts that have to go to the Board and noted that it is unclear how much information would be released to the Board. She said typically, in the past, the Board has not gone through the discussion of who proposed and what they proposed in the selection process. The name of the vendor is usually presented to the Board. She said that staff can look at changing that process.

Chief McCall stated that even in this instance, there is no proposed vendor. Ms. Gallucci agreed with Chief McCall’s comment.

Chief McCall stated that she did not have an issue with the action or the study or staff’s ability to pick the right person. She said she is concerned with agreeing to something that will come up at the Board meeting that the Finance and Audit Committee has not discussed.

Mayor Cervenik stated that the Finance and Audit Committee is being asked to recommend that the Board executes a contract not to exceed $300,000, so the committee would be agreeing to approve creating the TOD plan. However, the Finance and Audit Committee would not be recommending a specific consultant because that consultant is unknown. Ms. Gallucci said that was correct.

Ms. Gallucci stated that the due diligence performed by the Finance and Audit Committee would be to ensure that there is a budgeted project. The project was budgeted and the funds are there and staff is taking action to ensure that there are local funding sources. She said normally, staff would have preferred to bring to the committee the names of the vendors and all the other important items, such as DBE participation. Ms. Gallucci stated that if the committee is not comfortable with the recommendation, then there are two options to consider: 1) postpone the item until the next Finance and Audit Committee (in 3 months), or 2) have a special meeting prior to the Board memo being sent out to advance the item.

Chief McCall stated that if the item is presented to the Board, the following questions will be asked:

1. Why did NOACA rebid?
2. Who were the previous seven consultants who responded?
3. What was the issue with the DBE that needed to be clarified?

Chief McCall stated that she would not be able to answer any of the above-referenced questions.

Ms. Gallucci stated that staff can answer questions at this meeting, but noted that until the procurement has been concluded, staff cannot put forth some of that information.
Chief McCall stated that staff cannot put forth information on this particular bid, but who were the responders to the first bid. She said that she may be thinking too hard on this issue, but that could be due to not knowing. She mentioned she could see someone at the full Board asking if the consultants were local vendors or what the DBE issue was and did it get clarified with the second bid. She said that in the past, NOACA did not go through this level of detail, but now requests are discussed, reviewed and supported by the committees.

Chief McCall stated that it would be hard to schedule another Finance and Audit Committee meeting prior to September 11.

Mr. Ciaccia stated that he agreed with Chief McCall’s concerns and noted that he cannot vote to authorize a contract without knowing the name of the consultant.

Mayor Cervenik stated that the Finance and Audit Committee has a number of options. The committee can turn down the recommendation and wait until the next meeting. He said he was certain that the administration would not be thrilled with that decision, but that would be the committee’s authority. He noted that the item could be postponed and the Finance and Audit Committee could have a special meeting or the committee could approve the item.

Mayor Hunter asked if the Finance and Audit Committee has until September 4 or September 11 to make a decision.

Ms. Gallucci stated that the September 4 deadline is when the item would go to the Board. She noted that the name of the vendor as well as the dollar amount would be included in that memo. Ms. Gallucci reiterated that September 4 would be the deadline.

Mayor Hunter stated that seven consultants submitted bids on this project and the bids ranged from $182,000 to $327,000 and staff is asking for $300,000. He asked if the bids were closer to the $300,000 range or were most of the bids at the bottom or throughout the range. He noted that sometimes there is one bid at the bottom of the range and the rest of the bids are all grouped together.

Mr. Ciaccia stated that Mayor Hunter's comments illustrate the problem. Mr. Ciaccia said that Mayor Hunter is reading the proposal cost as a bid, but it is not a bid, it is a request for professional services and there could be a wide range of how the consultants see the project. Mr. Ciaccia stated that the cost of professional services is not a sealed bid, which makes it harder to evaluate on a cost basis unless staff sits down with the consultant and negotiates the cost of professional services. He noted there are a lot of questions that need to be answered before the committee can move forward with this item. He said he would be available for a special meeting.

Mayor Susan Infeld stated that she did not remember the committee ever going to this level of detail for prior items. The committee knows that a service needs to be provided and a cost figure not to exceed $300,000 has been suggested. She said she did not know why the committee would need to get into this level of detail to see why there was a variation in cost. She said she would think the committee could trust staff to make the selection as long as they are given a dollar amount. She noted she was having a hard time understanding the issue.
Mr. Ciaccia agreed with Mayor Infeld and suggested that the Finance and Audit Committee recommend a contract not to exceed $300,000. He asked if that amount has already been authorized.

Mayor Cervenik said technically that amount has been authorized.

Ms. Gallucci stated that the budget is $300,000 and noted that NOACA cannot enter into a contract greater than $50,000 unless the Board approves it. She said this item needs to go to the Board. Staff is asking the Finance and Audit Committee to recommend that this item goes to the Board for discussion, debate and potential approval.

Mr. Ciaccia said the presentation stated the following: “Authorize the Executive Director to execute a contract with the selected consultant.”

Ms. Gallucci mentioned that above the statement read by Mr. Ciaccia, it states “the September 2015 Board of Directors’ agenda.” Ms. Gallucci said the Board would be asked to approve the Executive Director to execute the contract. The Finance and Audit Committee would be recommending that the item goes to the Board for that discussion.

Ms. Griffith stated that what staff is hoping to accomplish is perhaps a one-time exception to the committee process of having this detailed discussion here before the Board, and take the detailed discussion that the committee would like to have here to the full Board because of this timing issue.

Chief McCall stated that she can see the Finance and Audit Committee authorizing the expenditure of the funds, but before the item is presented to the Board, there should be some discussion somewhere else on the details. Chief McCall asked if the Finance and Audit Committee will have to address the same issue with the next agenda item, Legislative Services Consultant. She stated that she wanted to make sure that NOACA is not setting a precedent with this item. She said she knows that staff is going to do what they need to do so that is the least of her concerns. She stated that her concern is not knowing the name of the consultant who will be selected.

Mayor Cervenik asked members if they were available to attend a special Finance and Audit Committee meeting on Friday, August 21 at 8:30 a.m.

Chief McCall said she has a meeting on that day.

Mayor Cervenik stated that the special meeting does not have to be on a Friday, but some time should be given to review the proposals.

Chief McCall asked if the proposals are due on September 1.

Ms. Merlone stated that the RFP closes today at noon.

Mayor Cervenik suggested that the Finance and Audit Committee meet on Friday, September 4. He noted that the TOD will be the only item on the agenda and the meeting should not take longer than an hour.
Chief McCall said she will be on vacation on September 4.

Mayor Hunter asked if there will be an Executive Committee meeting on September 11 before the Board meeting. Ms. Gallucci said no.

Mayor Cervenik asked Chief McCall if she is on vacation on September 3.

Chief McCall said she is not on vacation that day.

Mayor Cervenik asked members if they were available to meet on September 3 at 8:30 a.m.

Chief McCall said yes, but noted she is not available at 8:30 a.m. on that day.

Mayor Hunter asked if the Finance and Audit Committee can approve the item at this meeting and staff can send out some documentation to the committee for review. If members have an exception to that information, a special meeting can be scheduled.

Mayor Cervenik asked members if they were okay with Mayor Hunter’s suggestion. He stated that it sounds like there is enough concern that the committee should meet if members are available. Mayor Cervenik said he would accept whatever the majority of the committee would like to do. He noted that he is available to attend the special meeting on September 3 or 4.

Mayor Cervenik asked the committee if there was any further discussion on this item.

Mayor Infeld stated that if the committee is going to the trouble of discussing the need to review this item, then the committee should meet in person rather than discuss the issue by email. She noted that she is available to attend the meeting on September 3.

Mayor Hunter stated that the information and proposal could be sent out to the committee for review and if the committee feels that a special meeting needs to be called, then it could be scheduled.

Ms. Gallucci suggested an alternative to schedule a meeting and staff will send the information to the committee in advance. If members are comfortable with that information, the meeting can be cancelled.

Mayor Cervenik stated that in order to have a meeting scheduled the committee would not vote on this item today, but will still need to meet.

Mayor Cervenik asked members if they are available to meet on September 3 at 8:30 a.m.

Mayor Cervenik asked staff to provide the Finance and Audit Committee with the information prior to that meeting.

Mayor Hunter stated that he was unable to attend the meeting on September 3.

Mayor Cervenik asked Mayor Hunter to communicate any concerns he may have once he receives the information.
Mayor Hunter stated that if he has concerns, but couldn’t attend the meeting, it will not help him out or the committee with getting a quorum.

Mayor Hunter asked that another day be considered for the meeting.

Mayor Cervenik suggested Wednesday, September 2.

Mayor Hunter said he is available on September 2. He noted that the meeting does not have to be in the morning, it could be in the afternoon or any time that day.

Mr. Nate Kelly suggested that the Finance and Audit Committee meet before the Board of Directors meeting on September 11. If there is a problem, it can be addressed at that time. If there is not a problem, the committee does not have to meet.

In reference to Mr. Kelly’s suggestion, Mayor Cervenik stated that the committee would have to pass the legislation contingent upon there being no issues.

Ms. Gallucci stated that the material has to go in the package to the Board.

Mr. Ciaccia stated that he would be fine with a contingent solution.

Mayor Cervenik stated that the committee will do a contingent approval and if members have discussion issues, the committee will schedule a time for a special meeting.

Mr. Ciaccia commented that he was sure that the committee will be satisfied with the information and noted that the committee needs to know what is being approved before it is presented to the Board.

Mayor Cervenik asked the Finance and Audit Committee for a motion to recommend the TOD Plan Consultant to the Executive Committee contingent upon members receiving the appropriate information.

A motion was made by Mr. Ciaccia to recommend the TOD Plan Consultant contract to the Executive Committee. The motion was seconded by Mayor Hunter.

Mayor Cervenik stated that if more than 3 members have a concern, a special meeting would be arranged.

For clarification, Ms. Linda Sternheimer restated the motion which is the Finance and Audit Committee is approving to send the item to the Executive Committee contingent upon members getting the information.

Ms. Sternheimer asked what the course of action would be if members are not satisfied with the information.

Mayor Cervenik reiterated that if more than 3 members are not satisfied and have concerns and feel that a special meeting should be held, the committee agrees to meet before the Board meeting.
Ms. Merlone asked Mayor Cervenik what is meant by appropriate information. She noted that until the Board votes on the appropriate vendor, she cannot give out all the information on the people who submit a proposal, etc.

Mayor Cervenik stated that it would be appropriate to provide members with that information. He said the administration will be making a recommendation to the Board that day and the information will include the name of a specific vendor. Ms. Merlone said that was correct. Mayor Cervenik stated that the Finance and Audit Committee wants that information so that it can recommend to the Board that NOACA enters into a contract with that selected vendor. The Finance and Audit Committee is looking for information on the proposals and the prices. He said he knows some of that information is proprietary.

Ms. Gallucci clarified that Ms. Merlone meant that the information cannot be made public. She noted that the information will not be sent out in any public document, but the information can be shared with the Finance and Audit Committee.

Mr. Ciaccia stated that he does not want to see the proposals. He only wants to see the name of the selected consultant and how staff came up with that particular selection. For example, NOACA received seven proposals from these firms, of which, Firm X is the one being recommended to the Board at whatever price is being negotiated.

Mayor Cervenik asked members if what Mr. Ciaccia suggested is the appropriate information the committee would want. He noted that if any members have a concern with that information, they should contact Ms. Gallucci.

Chief McCall commented that the committee should have information on the consultants. She said that NOACA’s meeting packet is public information and noted that in the conclusion next steps it states “…recommended by the Finance and Audit Committee and to the Executive Committee on August 14, 2015.” Chief McCall stated that a selected consultant has not been presented. She said she would feel better knowing the information, as stated by Mr. Ciaccia, met the established requirements. She said she wanted to make sure that NOACA is not setting a precedent in which the committee cannot turn back and have a discussion. She said she is not trying to stop anything, but if there were concerns there needs to be some dialogue between the Finance and Audit Committee and the Board so that the committee can verify due diligence with the process and selection. She noted that the committee could pass the item, but she would still want the item to go to the Executive Committee, if the Finance and Audit Committee did not bring it back, because that would be the normal process. That would require item to be discussed at a special Executive Committee meeting before it goes to the Board. She reiterated that she knows that staff does a good job and that is not her concern.

Mayor Hunter stated that if staff had the process completed and was making a recommendation to the Finance and Audit Committee today, staff should have given the committee the information that it would normally be given as well as the recommendation in the form that it would normally be done so that the committee has a chance to review the information before it is moved on to the Executive Committee. For example, staff should have provided the name and the reason for the selection.

Ms. Gallucci mentioned that staff will provide the Finance and Audit Committee with that information in the future. She assured Chief McCall that this request will not become a
standard practice in the future. If staff does not have procurements completed by the time the Finance and Audit Committee meets, the item will not be requested to be advanced. The item will wait until the next quarter.

Chief McCall stated that she wanted to make sure that due diligence has been included in the process.

Mayor Cervenik asked the Finance and Audit Committee for a vote.

The Finance and Audit Committee voted on the motion. The motion passed by voice vote.

**Legislative Services Consultant**

Ms. Merlone stated that the action being requested of the Finance and Audit Committee is to recommend the legislative services consultant to the Executive Committee for placement on the September 2015 Board of Directors’ agenda, pending which the Board would decide whether or not to authorize the Executive Director to execute a contract with the selected consultant(s).

Ms. Merlone stated that the legislative services procurement was budgeted in the SFY 2016 OWP. The RFP for state/federal legislative services was discussed at the External Affairs Committee in July.

Ms. Merlone stated that existing legislative services contracts expired in July 2015. To support the legislative agenda, staff requires procurement of lobbying services in pursuit of state and federal legislative goals. She said that the legislative services were included in the OWP budget and noted that the allocated funds will not exceed $110,000.

Ms. Merlone reviewed the timeline for the selection of the federal/state consultant(s) as follows:

- Scope of services inclusive of federal and state
- RFP was issued on July 24th
- A pre-submittal conference was held on August 11th
- Responses are due to NOACA on August 17th at noon
- Negotiation with the selected vendor(s) with costs not to exceed $110,000
- Selection and final costing will be included in the memo to the Board for final review on September 4, 2015

Ms. Merlone stated that pending Board approval in September the Executive Director will execute a contract with the selected consultant(s).

Mr. Ciaccia asked if the Finance and Audit Committee is the body that approves contracts.

Ms. Gallucci stated that the Finance and Audit Committee is the body that recommends the approval of contracts.

Mr. Ciaccia asked if the Finance and Audit Committee approves procurement contracts.

Ms. Gallucci stated that every procurement contract will come to the Finance and Audit Committee. The committees that are responsible for the content of those contracts will...
review the scope, the general budget item and the approach. The Finance and Audit Committee will always review the recommendation of the contract to ensure that it is in fact budgeted and that an appropriate procurement process was held.

Mr. Ciaccia asked the ending date of the current legislative services contract.

Ms. Gallucci said July 31 and noted that the contract has expired.

Mr. Ciaccia asked if the committee is in the same boat as the previous agenda item. Mayor Cervenik said yes.

Ms. Gallucci stated that NOACA had two separate contracts, one for state and one for federal. The contracts were timed so that both would expire in July. She noted that staff did speak with the External Affairs Committee to devise an approach to move forward. Unfortunately, because of the timing of the meetings, this procurement was not able to be completed in time for the Finance and Audit Committee meeting.

Chief McCall stated that this procurement is the lobbying contract and noted that NOACA had two separate lobbyists. Originally, NOACA had one lobbyist on the federal side, which was Ms. Virginia Ainslie. The Board approved issuing a contract that would allow blending of the two services so that one agency can propose both federal and state legislative services or an agency can propose federal or state legislative services. Chief McCall said she did not have her notes from the External Affairs Committee, but she thought this item was going to come back to the External Affairs Committee for review and discussion. She said while the Finance and Audit Committee may approve the contract, the External Affairs Committee is still part of that process. By having the contract presented to the Finance and Audit Committee, it is skipping the External Affairs Committee, which is important. She noted that the lobbying efforts are part of the agency’s advocacy, which is why the External Affairs Committee was created. The procurement contract would be sent directly to the Board without the External Affairs Committee having any discussion. She said that NOACA just changed its policy.

Ms. Gallucci stated that this item is being presented in terms of the timing. It is the desire of staff to have the contract executed as soon as possible. She noted that unlike the TOD contract that was being expedited because NOACA’s local partners wanted to move it forward in September, there is the potential to delay the legislative services contract and send it back to the External Affairs Committee.

Chief McCall stated that NOACA went through a process of setting up the committees for a reason. NOACA used to have a Board where items were presented once a month and people complained. She said that the year she chaired the Board that approach was changed. She noted that the process is there for a reason and it works well. She said the committee does not always agree on issues, but at least members can say they vetted those processes. In the past, NOACA would allow for a month-to-month agreement until the procurement was done, which has been done for Ms. Ainslie. Chief McCall noted that this procurement contract is different and it should go through the proper processes.

Ms. Gallucci stated that she would take responsibility for presenting this procurement contract to the Finance and Audit Committee. Staff did not think this procurement needed to go to the External Affairs Committee. Staff thought that the External Affairs Committee
assisted in developing the concept, and the next place to discuss this item was at the Finance and Audit Committee meeting for contract purposes. She said if staff erred then the item can be delayed and sent back to the External Affairs Committee.

Mr. Ciaccia stated that it would be appropriate to send the item back to the External Affairs Committee. He said he would be willing to make that motion and include in that motion to extend the existing contracts for the period of time staff needs to resolve this issue.

Mayor Cervenik asked Mr. Ciaccia if he wanted to make a motion to table the item. Mr. Ciaccia said yes.

A motion was made by Mr. Ciaccia to table the legislative services contract and send the item back to the External Affairs Committee and to extend the existing contracts for the period of time staff needs to resolve this particular issue. The motion was seconded by Mayor Infeld.

Mayor Cervenik asked the committee if there was any further discussion. No comments were made by the committee.

The Finance and Audit Committee voted. The motion passed by voice vote.

Mayor Cervenik stated that the legislative services contract will be on the next Finance and Audit Committee agenda.

Ms. Gallucci stated that the item will be sent to the External Affairs Committee. She noted that when staff actually has the procurement completed, it will be presented to the External Affairs Committee and staff will make the recommendations. Once the External Affairs Committee has approved the recommendations, the contract will be presented to the Finance and Audit Committee.

**Authorization to Execute Project Financing Documents: CUY-Highland Road Bridges**

Mr. Lane stated that the action being requested of the Finance and Audit Committee is to recommend to the Executive Committee for placement on the September 2015 Board of Directors’ agenda authorization to the Executive Director to execute loan-related documents for the Cuy-Highland Road Bridges project in the City of Euclid. Mr. Lane stated that the Board of Directors passed Resolution No. 2015-040, dated June 12, 2015, approving the 2016-2019 TIP utilizing the SIB to finance the Highland Road Bridges project.

Mr. Lane stated that the Board previously approved the following TIP projects identified for SIB loans:

- LOR Lear Nagle Road (2016 – $5.3 million) (submitted)
- CUY Highland Road Bridges (2017 – $7.8 million)
- CUY Royalton Road (2017 – $10.3 million)
- CUY Tower City Bridges (2017 – $8.3 million)
- MED N Carpenter Road (2017 – $9.7 million)
Mr. Lane stated that ODOT SIB procedure and the Ohio Attorney General’s Office require a joint loan agreement between ODOT, Cuyahoga County and NOACA. The requirements include certified resolutions from each party authorizing execution and delivery of the loan documents.

Mr. Lane stated that the total construction cost estimate for this project is $10.8 million. NOACA’s current project cap is $7.8 million. The $7.8 million would be advanced in FY 2016 and would be repaid with NOACA funds over an 11-year period, with the first year being interest free. The first payment would not be due until the 19th month after the loan closing date. Repayment of the loan is bi-annual. ODOT automatically deducts that funding from NOACA’s annual allocation on July 1 and January 1. The pre-payment penalty is 3% if the debt is repaid in whole or part within 36 months. The final maturity of this loan is estimated to be July 1, 2027.

Mr. Lane stated that NOACA staff will work with Cuyahoga County to execute the SIB loan documents and send them to ODOT. The loan-related documents will be executed by Cuyahoga County and NOACA’s Executive Director, Ms. Gallucci. The project is anticipated to award to contract in June 2016.

Mayor Cervenik asked the committee if they had any questions. No comments were made by the committee.

A motion was made by Mr. Ciaccia to recommend to the Executive Committee for placement on the Board agenda authorization for the Executive Director to execute the financing documents for the Cuy-Highland Road Bridges. The motion was seconded by Mayor Hunter. Mayor Cervenik abstained from voting because the project is located in the City of Euclid. The motion passed by voice vote.

Cost Increase Request: MED-SR 94 (High Street)

Mr. Lane stated that the action being requested of the Finance and Audit Committee is to give consideration of a recommendation to the Executive Committee for placement on the September 2015 Board of Directors’ agenda a cost increase for the MED-SR 94 (High Street) project. Mr. Lane stated that the committee’s future action to allocate available TIP funds in SFY 2016 towards debt requirements will need to be taken into consideration for this request.

Mr. Lane stated that the Wadsworth SR–94 Street improvements project is a reconstruction to improve SR-94 to include a bridge over IR-76 (0.7 miles in length). The June 2015 estimate and funding sources were as bid. The total estimate for construction was about $10 million. NOACA’s share in that contract is nearly $2.4 million. ODOT has $6.25 million committed to this project through its safety program and its urban paving program for the eligible items. The local share was estimated to be about $1.4 million. Two bids were received for this project. Both bids were greater than 30% of the state’s estimate. The bids were rejected by the ODOT Awards Committee as an ODOT led project in accordance with the Ohio Revised Code 5525.10. The Ohio Revised Code states that ODOT cannot award a contract greater than the state estimate plus 5% if the bids are determined not to be fair and reasonable. As a result, the project has been delayed from SFY 2015 to SFY 2016.
Mr. Lane stated that the City of Wadsworth and ODOT are working to revise the plans and develop a new estimate. The following project revisions are being pursued in an attempt to lower cost before going out to rebid:

- Simplified Maintenance of Traffic (MOT) plan from a 6-phase plan to a 2-phase plan
- Rebid the project during the winter season to shorten construction duration (from 2 ½ years to 2 years) because the completion date will remain the same and to attract more competition for this project
- Reduce the scope of the work at several alleys and intersections from a full depth replacement of that pavement to minor rehab/resurfacing depending on what is warranted at those locations

Mr. Lane stated that ODOT’s Safety and Urban Paving program funds will not be increased for this project. The City of Wadsworth is seeking additional funds through the Ohio Public Works Commission (OPWC) Issue I, ODOT Jobs and Commerce, and a SIB loan application would be submitted directly to ODOT (NOACA would not be involved with this SIB loan).

Mr. Lane stated that although not yet available, the anticipation of a higher estimate has led the sponsor to request the maximum allowable under NOACA’s Cost Increase Policy. Per that policy, consideration of the request is contingent upon the availability of funds in the TIP, which is the first filter a project goes through in NOACA’s evaluation process. Given that the Finance and Audit Committee advanced the recommendation to expend first any available funds towards debt service requirements, it would impact the ultimate decision of this request, as well. If funding is determined to be available the request must meet the following additional eligibility conditions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conditions for Eligibility</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Due to unforeseen conditions</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Limited to no more than 15% of original commitment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Approved for Stage 3 Plan completion through ODOT</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Utilizing all other fund sources to capacity</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. Lane stated that approval of the city’s request would increase NOACA’s funding commitment by $353,840. The Finance and Audit Committee may recommend action to deny the request given the information provided, approve the request in full, or approve the request under one or more of the following conditions: a partial increase with an increase in local share or a share from another funding source or reschedule the project in a state fiscal year that has adequate funding available.

Mr. Lane stated that NOACA staff will inform the project sponsor of the approved action if the item goes to the Board or if the item stops at this committee’s eligibility review. Staff will coordinate any needed amendment to the NOACA TIP if funding is awarded.

Mr. Lane asked the Finance and Audit Committee if they wish to deny the request, approve the request in full or approve the request under one or more of the conditions.
Mayor Cervenik asked the committee for discussion on this request.

Mr. Ciaccia stated that the project has red flags. The original estimate obviously was not sufficient. He noted that based on the information included in the packet, the sponsor went 50% over what they submitted.

Mr. Lane stated that the final project bid came in around $13 million, which is 30% over the estimate.

Mr. Ciaccia stated that the sponsor agency contract information shows that the total cost of the project is estimated to be $15,655,852.18.

Mr. Lane stated that the estimated cost includes contract cost and construction engineering. He noted that the sponsor did not include a formal itemized cost estimate that is available as a result of the revised plan numbers.

Mr. Ciaccia stated that contractors know when a bid is going to exceed the state statute. One or two of the contractors will bid very high in order to set a new bar for the rebid, which would result in more bidders. Mr. Ciaccia noted there is a lot at play and recommended that the Finance and Audit Committee deny the sponsor’s request. He said he did not think the additional funding would make or break this project. He noted that the Finance and Audit Committee set the hierarchy and suggested that the committee stick with that hierarchy.

Mr. Lane stated that if the project is determined not to be eligible, the request would not be advanced to the Board for consideration. The request would stop at the Finance and Audit Committee as an ineligible request.

Mayor Hunter agreed with Mr. Ciaccia’s comments about the project having red flags. Mayor Hunter noted the following: the sponsor has already delayed the project until next year; the committee does not know how much the bid is actually going to be; and the committee does not know how much money will be put in by other entities. Mayor Hunter stated that he is in favor of denying the request or allowing the sponsor to resubmit their request after they can get all the figures together, so the Finance and Audit Committee can review the information.

Mayor Hunter asked Mr. Lane for a recommendation.

Mr. Lane stated that staff has determined there is not really an unforeseen condition; therefore, the request is ineligible as it stands citing that the estimate was insufficient given the complexity of the work.

A motion was made by Mr. Ciaccia to deny additional funding for the MED-SR 94 (High Street) project. The motion was seconded by Mayor Hunter.

Mayor Cervenik asked the committee if anyone had any further comments. No comments were made by the committee.
Mayor Cervenik stated that it is clear that this project only qualifies for one of the four NOACA eligibility standards. The Finance and Audit Committee did not feel if the pending issues were resolved, it would make a difference.

The Finance and Audit Committee voted and the motion passed by voice vote.

PRESENTATIONS/DISCUSSION ITEMS
No presentations were presented at this meeting.

Financial Report
Mayor Cervenik stated that the financial report was included in the meeting packet.

Old Business
No old business was discussed at this meeting.

New Business
No new business was discussed at this meeting.

Adjournment
Mayor Cervenik stated that the next meeting will be held at the NOACA offices on November 13, 2015 at 8:30 a.m. There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:02 a.m.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEETING DATES</th>
<th>02/27/15</th>
<th>05/08/15</th>
<th>08/14/15</th>
<th>11/13/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Armond Budish (Nate Kelly, Alternate)</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Cervenik (Lee Bock, Alternate)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julius Ciaccia (Darnella Robertson, Alternate)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Marie Donegan (Rosann Jones, Alternate)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Friedman (Linda Sternheimer, Alternate)</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Infeld (Jeffrey Pokorny, Alternate)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Lundy (John D. Hunter, Alternate)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valarie J. McCall (Frank Jackson, Alternate)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL MEMBERS PRESENT:** 4 8 7
CHAIR'S/EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT
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ACTION ITEMS
NORTHEAST OHIO AREAWIDE COORDINATING AGENCY

MEMORANDUM

TO: NOACA Finance and Audit Committee

FROM: Grace Gallucci, Executive Director

DATE: November 6, 2015

RE: Procurement: Legislative Services Consultants

ACTION REQUESTED
The Committee is asked to consider recommending this item to the Executive Committee for placement on the Board of Directors’ December 11th, 2015 agenda. Specifically, it would award contracts to McDonald Hopkins for NOACA’s State Legislative Services and Squire Patton Boggs for NOACA’s Federal Legislative Services.

BACKGROUND/JUSTIFICATION FOR CURRENT ACTION
The NOACA region, representing Cuyahoga, Geauga, Lake, Lorain and Medina counties, contains 670,795,906 square feet of federal aid roadways and 3,053 bridges. This is $6 billion in infrastructure assets that are to be maintained in a state of good repair. It is estimated that $1 Billion is needed in order to address the asset management needs of the NOACA region.

In light of these significant needs, NOACA staff analyzed the government relations capabilities that were required to advocate funding for a project of national and regional significance such as this. Staff shared an integrated scope of services for Federal and State representation with the NOACA External Affairs Committee on July 10th. The External Affairs Committee asked that the scope of services be inclusive of consultants who could provide State or Federal services combine or individually as well.

The request for proposals was released on July 24th and proposals were due on August 17th. NOACA received 12 proposals. After evaluating the proposals, the NOACA review team interviewed three final teams. Staff provided an overview of the process and selection status to the NOACA External Affairs Committee on October 9th, 2015. The External Affairs Committee recommended the selection of McDonald Hopkins for the State portion of services and Squire Patton Boggs for the Federal portion.

FINANCIAL IMPACT
The proposed contracts will be executed for one year with two option years that can be exercised at the discretion of NOACA. The first year of both contracts will run January 1st, 2016-December 31st, 2016 at a cost...
not to exceed $165,480. NOACA will not exceed the FY2016 budgeted amount of $110,000 but will need to budget the full annual amounts in future fiscal years. Three years of contracting with McDonald Hopkins for NOACA’s State Legislative Services would cost $180,000. Three years of contracting with Squire Patton Boggs for NOACA’s Federal Legislative Services would cost $332,520. The total amount of both contracts is not to exceed $512,520 over three years.

The specific costs for each firm is listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>McDonald Hopkins</th>
<th>Squire Patton Boggs</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$105,480</td>
<td>$165,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$110,748</td>
<td>$170,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$116,292</td>
<td>$176,292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
<td>$332,520</td>
<td>$512,520</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONCLUSION/NEXT STEPS
Pending Board approval, NOACA will contract with the selected consultants to advance our federal and state legislative agendas.

GG/sm/7007c
NORTHEAST OHIO AREAWIDE COORDINATING AGENCY

MEMORANDUM

TO: NOACA Finance and Audit Committee

FROM: Grace Gallucci, Executive Director

DATE: November 6, 2015

RE: State Infrastructure Bank (SIB) Loan Authorizations

ACTION REQUESTED
The Committee is asked to consider recommending this item to the Executive Committee for placement on the Board of Directors’ December 2015 agenda. Specifically, it would authorize the Executive Director to execute SIB loan related documents for the existing projects planned for the SIB program in the NOACA Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

BACKGROUND/JUSTIFICATION FOR CURRENT ACTION
The Ohio SIB was authorized by the Ohio State Legislature in 1996 for the purposes of funding highway, rail, transit, intermodal and other transportation facilities and projects. Assistance provided by the SIB is in the form of loans, loan guarantees, letters of credit, leases, interest rate subsidies, debt service, cash reserves, and other forms ODOT determines to be appropriate. NOACA has previously utilized SIB loans, most recently in 2015 for the Lear Nagle Road Improvements project in Lorain County. Authorization is requested for the following projects:

CUY ROYALTON ROAD: PID 80961, sponsored by Cuyahoga County. The project is currently estimated at a cost of $14.7 M for construction and construction administration, with a Board approved NOACA share of $11,714,135 for loan principal and interest.

CUY TOWER CITY BRIDGES: PID 95557, sponsored by the City of Cleveland. The project is currently estimated at a cost of $12 M for construction and construction administration, with a Board approved NOACA share of $9,384,529 for loan principal and interest.

MED CARPENTER ROAD: PID 14821, sponsored by the City of Brunswick. The project is currently estimated at a cost of $13.8 M for construction and construction administration, with a Board approved NOACA share of $10,982,002 for loan principal and interest.

All projects are listed in the state fiscal years (SFYs) 2016 - 2019 NOACA TIP, approved by the NOACA Board of Directors on June 12, 2015 via Resolution No. 2015-040. Advancing these projects with
assistance through the SIB program maintains fiscal balance and flexibility while enabling the projects to advance into the TIP during the year requested by the sponsor. Funding for the projects in the requested year is dependent upon sufficient balances available in the SIB program to finance the full NOACA share.

The Ohio Attorney General’s Office, on behalf of ODOT, requires certified resolutions from the City and NOACA, that authorize the execution and delivery of all documents and performance of the loan requirements thereunder, as applicable.

FINANCIAL IMPACT
NOACA will be financially responsible for the repayment of principal, interest, and administrative costs, up to the Board of Directors approved project funding caps and any future Board approved funding increases, over the term of the loan. The loan will be repaid through bi-annual installments to the SIB drawn from the NOACA-attributable STP funds that are apportioned annually to NOACA per federal transportation law. The standard terms of the ODOT SIB program, as portrayed include:

- Term of Loan – 11 years (1 year interest-free period / 10 years of amortization)
- Repayment Schedule – Biannually (July and January of each year)
- Interest – 0% for months 1-12, 3% for months 13-132
- Initial Payment: 19th month after loan closing date
- Prepayment Penalty – 3% premium charged for any prepayment of the loan, in whole or in part, prior to the 36th month following closing

CONCLUSION/NEXT STEPS
Pending Board approval, SIBs will be advanced for these projects at the appropriate time for project delivery.
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MEMORANDUM

TO: NOACA Finance and Audit Committee
FROM: Grace Gallucci, Executive Director
DATE: November 6, 2015
RE: Toll Credit Requests – CUY – Redline Public Right of Way Improvements Project

ACTION REQUESTED
The Committee is asked to consider recommending this item to the Executive Committee for placement on the Board of Directors’ December 2015 agenda. Specifically, it would authorize the use of Toll Credits (TC) for the CUY – Redline Right of Way Public Right of Way Improvements project to increase the NOACA funding participation share.

BACKGROUND/JUSTIFICATION FOR CURRENT ACTION
ODOT has allocated $7,584,649 in TC authority to NOACA for to use at its discretion to increase the federal payable share of projects financed through the Surface Transportation Program (STP) ($6,878,189) and Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) ($706,460). In September, 2015 the Board of Directors approved a Toll Credits Policy to define requirements and eligibility criteria to guide the evaluation of NOACA funded projects for TC application.

The City of Cleveland has requested TC to increase the NOACA TAP participation share for the CUY-Redline Public Right of Way Improvements project to eliminate matching requirements. The matching funds that have been committed to the project have specific conditions and uses required by the grantor that do not readily comply with federal project development procedures. Applying TC will allow for the committed matching funds to be used toward those components of the project without impacting the federal NOACA dollars. The submitted request will not result in increased funding for the project. Instead, the TC will be applied to increase the NOACA participation rate from 80% to 100% for the $357,253 Board of Directors approved funding commitment, while maintaining the $89,313 matching funds contributed to the project, as demonstrated in the tables below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participating Total Cost</th>
<th>NOACA $</th>
<th>NOACA %</th>
<th>Local $ Match</th>
<th>Local % Match</th>
<th>Additional Local $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>NOACA Funding Commitment: $357,253</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 446,566</td>
<td>$357,253</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>$ 89,313</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participating Total Cost</th>
<th>NOACA $</th>
<th>NOACA %</th>
<th>Local $ Match</th>
<th>Local % Match</th>
<th>Additional Local $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requested</td>
<td>NOACA Funding Commitment: $357,253</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 446,566</td>
<td>$357,253</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$89,313</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Staff have evaluated the request and have determined that it is eligible under the policy requirements, as summarized below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Requirements</th>
<th>Met?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Request complies with ODOT Program Requirements</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project is eligible under one or more of the following programs:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- NOACA Urban Core Community (90%)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- NOACA Environmental Justice Community (100%)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- NOACA TLCI Study or Implementation (100%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding available to in the current TIP</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate balance of TCs available in the proposed SFY</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project is not a capacity expansion</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The project is already contained within the NOACA 2016-2019 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), therefore the application of TC does not require a formal Plan and TIP amendment. The Committee will be asked to evaluate the request and information presented by staff and recommend an appropriate action at its November 13, 2015 meeting.

**FINANCIAL IMPACT**
The application of TCs does not result in increased funding, therefore there is no financial impact. The Board of Directors approved funding in the amount of $357,253 will continue to be the project maximum. The request would utilize $71,451 in TC designated for use in the TAP program, leaving the available balance at $635,009.

**CONCLUSION/NEXT STEPS**
Pending Board approval, TCs would be utilized for this project.
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Agenda Item
No. 5

PRESENTATIONS/DISCUSSION ITEMS
MEMORANDUM

TO: NOACA Finance and Audit Committee
FROM: Grace Gallucci, Executive Director
DATE: November 6, 2015
RE: ODOT Planning and Capital Programs Budget Adjustments

ACTION REQUESTED
No action is requested at this time. This item is being presented for information and discussion.

BACKGROUND/JUSTIFICATION FOR CURRENT ACTION
The Ohio Department of Transportation distributes Federal Highway Administration funds to NOACA for regional planning and infrastructure improvement programs. Funding is suballocated by formula based on population directly to NOACA for the Consolidated Planning Grant Program (CPG), Surface Transportation Program (STP) and Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) and to the eight large urban areas for the statewide Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Program (CMAQ). ODOT estimates annual program budgets based on anticipated federal apportionment and obligation limitation figures. Budgets are then adjusted each year to reflect actual apportionment and obligation limitation for the past Federal Fiscal Year and estimates for future annual budgets allocations are recalculated.

ODOT has completed the adjustments of actual SFY 2015 and estimated SFY 2016-2019 budgets based on final FFY 2015 federal apportionment and obligation limitation figures. The result is a reduction of actual SFY 2015 and estimated 2016-2019 program budgets. Since these adjustments are being announced after completion of SFY 2015, the adjustment for SFY 2015 will be made to SFY 2016 budgets. This is the fourth straight year NOACA has seen a reduction in total program balances based on ODOT adjustments.

FINANCIAL IMPACT
The adjustments will result in a total reduction of $190,821 between the NOACA STP ($173,473) and TAP ($17,347) programs for actual SFY 2015 and estimated SFY 2016-2019 program budgets. The adjustment will result in a $17,802 reduction to CPG 2016-2019 estimated budgets. The impact is that there will be fewer funds available for staff planning and implementation of projects programmed for the SFY 2016-2019 NOACA TIP based on adjusted budgets.

CONCLUSION/NEXT STEPS
Staff will keep the Committee apprised of future budget adjustments and impacts.

GG/r/l/7010c
### Fiscal Year 2016 - Financial Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SALARIES &amp; FRINGES</th>
<th>2016 BUDGET</th>
<th>EXPENDED THROUGH 10/31/15</th>
<th>TARGET BUDGET (YTD)</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF TARGET (YTD)</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF TARGET (ANNUAL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SALARIES</strong></td>
<td>$3,549,990</td>
<td>$1,088,733</td>
<td>$2,461,257</td>
<td>$1,183,330</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FRINGE BENEFITS</strong></td>
<td>$1,181,859</td>
<td>$314,432</td>
<td>$867,427</td>
<td>$393,953</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$4,731,849</td>
<td>$1,403,165</td>
<td>$3,328,684</td>
<td>$1,577,283</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCCUPANCY &amp; EQUIPMENT</th>
<th>2016 BUDGET</th>
<th>EXPENDED THROUGH 10/31/15</th>
<th>TARGET BUDGET (YTD)</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF TARGET (YTD)</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF TARGET (ANNUAL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEASE/BUILDING IMPROV</strong></td>
<td>$174,225</td>
<td>$4,045</td>
<td>$170,180</td>
<td>$58,075</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UTILITIES</strong></td>
<td>$58,000</td>
<td>$14,792</td>
<td>$43,208</td>
<td>$19,333</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TELEPHONE</strong></td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>$2,378</td>
<td>$15,622</td>
<td>$6,600</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BUILDING MAINTENANCE</strong></td>
<td>$32,500</td>
<td>$5,641</td>
<td>$26,859</td>
<td>$10,717</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EQUIPMENT LEASING</strong></td>
<td>$2,900</td>
<td>$1,973</td>
<td>$3,927</td>
<td>$2,217</td>
<td>125%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$581,025</td>
<td>$70,450</td>
<td>$510,575</td>
<td>$193,675</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSULTING SERVICES</th>
<th>2016 BUDGET</th>
<th>EXPENDED THROUGH 10/31/15</th>
<th>TARGET BUDGET (YTD)</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF TARGET (YTD)</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF TARGET (ANNUAL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEGISLATIVE LIAISON</strong></td>
<td>$110,000</td>
<td>$11,450</td>
<td>$98,550</td>
<td>$36,667</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRIVATE CONSULTANTS</strong></td>
<td>$2,301,207</td>
<td>$175,667</td>
<td>$2,125,540</td>
<td>$767,069</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TLCI - COMMUNITY SHARE</strong></td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$83,333</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGENCY AUDIT</strong></td>
<td>$19,926</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$19,926</td>
<td>$6,642</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$2,681,133</td>
<td>$187,117</td>
<td>$2,494,016</td>
<td>$893,711</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OTHER OPERATING EXPENSES</th>
<th>2016 BUDGET</th>
<th>EXPENDED THROUGH 10/31/15</th>
<th>TARGET BUDGET (YTD)</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF TARGET (YTD)</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF TARGET (ANNUAL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NARC/MEMBERSHIP DUES</strong></td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$18,379</td>
<td>$5,621</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>230%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUPPLIES</strong></td>
<td>$23,000</td>
<td>$18,116</td>
<td>$14,884</td>
<td>$7,667</td>
<td>106%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POSTAGE</strong></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$129</td>
<td>$4,871</td>
<td>$1,667</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADVERTISING/RECRUIT/MEETINGS/LEGAL</strong></td>
<td>$2,900</td>
<td>$2,729</td>
<td>$171</td>
<td>$967</td>
<td>282%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OUTSIDE REPRODUCTION</strong></td>
<td>$3,250</td>
<td>$1,957</td>
<td>$1,293</td>
<td>$1,083</td>
<td>181%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEETING EXPENSE</strong></td>
<td>$13,500</td>
<td>$12,143</td>
<td>$1,357</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>270%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRAINING</strong></td>
<td>$45,500</td>
<td>$41,133</td>
<td>$4,387</td>
<td>$15,167</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRAVEL</strong></td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$7,184</td>
<td>$17,816</td>
<td>$6,333</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INSURANCE</strong></td>
<td>$24,500</td>
<td>$19,660</td>
<td>$4,840</td>
<td>$1,167</td>
<td>241%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PUBLICATIONS</strong></td>
<td>$1,800</td>
<td>$839</td>
<td>$961</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>140%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACCOUNTING SERVICES</strong></td>
<td>$2,250</td>
<td>$643</td>
<td>$1,607</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER MISCELLANEOUS</strong></td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$333</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$171,700</td>
<td>$75,892</td>
<td>$95,808</td>
<td>$57,233</td>
<td>133%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **TOTAL**                         | $8,165,707  | $1,736,624                | $6,429,083          | $2,721,902                | 64%                           |

* These line items will be within budget as the fiscal year progresses toward June 30, 2016.
** The Agency has expended approximately 21 percent of the fiscal year 2016 budget.
**CASH POSITION AS OF OCTOBER 31, 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>RECEIPTS</th>
<th>DISBURSEMENTS</th>
<th>BALANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BEGINNING BALANCE</td>
<td>$120,672.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEDERAL TRANSIT AGENCY</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUNSWICK</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANNUAL MEETING</td>
<td>3,075.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOACA DUES</td>
<td>229,744.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT/FHWA</td>
<td>307,449.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOBILITY MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRCPO</td>
<td>1,255.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISCELLANEOUS</td>
<td>54,777.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTEREST ON ACCOUNTS</td>
<td>498.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATURED CDARS - TRISTATE CAPITAL</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSFER FROM STAR OHIO</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSFER FROM CITIZENS MRA</td>
<td>398,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VENDORS</td>
<td>$156,293.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAYROLL</td>
<td>284,479.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSFER TO TRISTATE CAPITAL - CDARS</td>
<td>248,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSFER TO TRISTATE CAPITAL - CD</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSFER TO CITIZENS MRA</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSFER TO STAR OHIO</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUD FUNDS TO NEOSCC</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENDING BALANCE</td>
<td>$426,699.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** $994,799.90 $688,772.96

**ADDITIONAL CASH BALANCES:**

**INVESTMENTS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INVESTMENT</th>
<th>RETURN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CITIZENS BANK MRA (1-26-16)</td>
<td>0.000%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRISTATE CAPITAL CD (1-28-16)</td>
<td>0.800%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRISTATE CAPITAL CDARS (1-28-16)</td>
<td>0.400%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRISTATE CAPITAL CDARS (3-31-16)</td>
<td>0.450%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** $820,432.46

**GRAND TOTAL** 1,247,132.24

Interest Earned in FY 2016 = $1,362.98
## FY 2016 NOACA DUES RECEIVED/RECEIVABLE

**As of October 31, 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CUYAHOGA COUNTY</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Dues</th>
<th>Received</th>
<th>Receivable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cuyahoga County</strong></td>
<td>$435,542</td>
<td>$141,195</td>
<td>$259,504</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cuyahoga County</strong></td>
<td>$435,542</td>
<td>$141,195</td>
<td>$259,504</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GEauga COUNTY</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Dues</th>
<th>Received</th>
<th>Receivable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geauga County Commissioners</td>
<td>$15,886</td>
<td>$15,886</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geauga County Engineers</td>
<td>9,532</td>
<td>9,532</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geauga County Sanitary Eng</td>
<td>6,355</td>
<td>6,355</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Geauga County</strong></td>
<td>$31,773</td>
<td>$31,773</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lake County</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Dues</th>
<th>Received</th>
<th>Receivable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lake County Commissioners</td>
<td>$46,960</td>
<td>$46,960</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake County Engineers</td>
<td>15,654</td>
<td>15,654</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Lake County</strong></td>
<td>$62,614</td>
<td>$62,614</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lorain County</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Dues</th>
<th>Received</th>
<th>Receivable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lorain County Commissioners</td>
<td>$42,038</td>
<td>$42,038</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorain County Engineers</td>
<td>14,354</td>
<td>14,354</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amherst</td>
<td>1,850</td>
<td>1,850</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amherst Township</td>
<td>1,053</td>
<td>1,053</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avon</td>
<td>3,262</td>
<td>3,262</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avon Lake</td>
<td>3,476</td>
<td>3,476</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton Township</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brownhelm Township</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden Township</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlisle Township</td>
<td>1,154</td>
<td>1,154</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia Township</td>
<td>1,084</td>
<td>1,084</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eaton Township</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elyria</td>
<td>8,394</td>
<td>8,394</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elyria Township</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grafton Village</td>
<td>1,022</td>
<td>1,022</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grafton Township</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henrietta Township</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington Township</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kipton Village</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaGrange Township</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaGrange Village</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorain</td>
<td>9,867</td>
<td>9,867</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Russia Township</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Ridgeville</td>
<td>4,536</td>
<td>4,536</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oberlin</td>
<td>1,275</td>
<td>1,275</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penfield Township</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsfield Township</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester Township</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester Village</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheffield Village</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheffield Township</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheffield Lake</td>
<td>1,406</td>
<td>1,406</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Amherst Village</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington Township</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington Village</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Lorain County</strong></td>
<td>$102,532</td>
<td>$85,401</td>
<td>$17,131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medina County</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Dues</th>
<th>Received</th>
<th>Receivable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medina County Commissioners</td>
<td>$58,633</td>
<td>$58,633</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2015 Dues Outstanding</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of East Cleveland</td>
<td>$2,309</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaGrange Township (2013)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Received/Receivable</strong></td>
<td>$706,748</td>
<td>$379,616</td>
<td>$292,289</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OLD BUSINESS
NEW BUSINESS
ADJOURN