

What was sent to subcommittee members:

“Per the discussion at the subcommittee’s meeting on November 14th, subcommittee members were asked to submit suggestions for a SMART Fund criteria checklist for decision making by the subcommittee and inclusion with future SMART Fund applications.

This is intended to clarify for both applicants and subcommittee members the key screening criteria that will be taken into account and prioritized for proposal selection.

I have included the most current SMART Fund application for you as a point of reference.

Please submit your input to me via email by next Wednesday, December 6th, and I will compile it for consideration by the subcommittee.”

What we received back:

From Dave Ripp:

I question on line 2 if we want to put a number there (2 million). The amount in the fund can fluctuate.

Under examples, we should get rid of the line where we fund the cost difference between conventional and more fuel efficient vehicles. Any department getting a new vehicle should budget for the most fuel efficient vehicle that would work for them. I'm torn on the conversion of older vehicles part of the same example. In most cases, converting an older vehicle isn't cost efficient. The payback on an older vehicle usually is longer than the remaining life.

From Laura Hicklin:

My only thought would be consideration for projects that are willing and able to incorporate an education component to them. There may be projects where the cost savings or payback are not as significant but are offset by an educational component for county staff and the public.