

**Boulder County Collaborative Meeting for CDBG DR Allocation
Minutes
Friday, February 27, 2013**

Members Present: Tony Cavalier (phone), Aaron DeJon for Heather Balsler, Rosi Dennett, Harold Dominguez, Kathy Fedler, Eva Forberger for Alisha Reis (phone), Deb Gardner, Leslie Irwin, Michelle Krezek, Dale Rademacher, Victoria Simonsen, Joel Wagner (phone), Deborah Siefert, Yolanda Abram

Meeting Called to Order at 2:00 pm

Kathy discussed minor revisions to the agenda that was originally emailed. Final revisions included: debrief of state meeting; determine indicators to set proportionality; review of unfunded projects; and if time permits discuss housing development project prioritization.

1. Debrief State meeting:

Kathy Fedler provided the following update: Wednesday's meeting was a small group that included Leslie, Kathy, Deb and the State. The State asked why we did or did not use the multiplier to determine both unmet need and resiliency needs? We did another analysis and compared our data to the data using the multiplier. The comparison of resilience with the multiplier was not a good correlation but the point was made that the multiplier used or suggested by the State and HUD is usually broader and uses earliest data for a "back-of-the-envelope" estimate of damages for housing and infrastructure. Further, HUD has said in their notices that it's always better to get as close to the local data and as detailed and up to date information as possible. This is what we did through our Unmet Needs Assessment by looking at project, scope, cost, etc. We feel our data is better and more reflective of our needs through our methodology rather than using the multiplier. The State seemed to get more comfortable with our methodology and found it to be helpful. Since DOLA is responsible for writing the substantial amendment, they are more concerned about how much or how little housing is documented. Still, the State seemed to get our methodology and know that we are not just making this up and that the numbers are more reflective of our community.

The State cancelled the follow-up meeting (should have been earlier today). They have not sent any new approach out yet, but say that they have been meeting and trying to get something together to present; we feel like they are genuinely trying to get something to us.

Regarding the 80/20 infrastructure/housing needs distribution that we are showing and the State's 50/50 distribution, we feel they are not trying to hold onto the multiplier; the Unmet Needs Assessment determines the percentage. Our data has to be hard and fast, very specific and explain why there is a difference between our data and the State's. As a side note, the State asked "why do we have so much in housing and infrastructure resiliency"? We had to remind them that we put it there because this was their directive. We will focus on tying everything down and making sure we have projects in the appropriately designated areas. The State cautioned that HUD will scrutinize how we got to 80/20, therefore, we must provide explanatory text that explains why our numbers are so big and insure that the list is tight. An example is to explain that their data uses FEMA and FEMA doesn't include work on restoring rivers; however, that is a great need we have, so we will include supportive language of the consequences behind not addressing or funding a "resiliency" project. Another comment from the State was, that when they were looking at the multiplier it was not their intention to increase the housing stock. This is counter to what DOH wants to use the Housing Development designated funding for.

The issue we are trying to work on with the State still is funding and getting Housing Development funding restored to our sub-allocation. Round 1 has unspent funds of approximately \$300 million. We feel that the State can find additional \$14 million for our projects as we have requested.

2. Determine which indicators to use to set the proportionality between communities (see Collaborative Funding Options attachment-Tables 27 and 29).

Kathy suggested that we choose a method of distribution, a formula we can live with. She explained that the goal is not to guarantee any specific percent of the funds to each community, but to get to some level of proportionality in the DR regional and direct funding. Asked if we should average the two tables, she noted that the percentages came out fairly the same. One of the members advocated to keep it simple. The group was directed to the two methods: 1. FEMA PA Damages by Category and Community (Table 26); and 2. Unmet Need for FEMA PA Category and Community (Table 28). The proportionality for these two methods is shown on Tables 27 and 29. There was discussion regarding numbers that should be larger and areas where there were no data. Everyone was encouraged to check their numbers so that we can review and fill in the gaps. Stressed that it is important for all to get numbers in because this will determine proportionality.

The meeting continued by discussing the challenge with finding projects that meet the CDBG criteria. It was asked if we can meet LMI criteria; one concern is that the Buyout Program will meet eligibility but not LMI. The County is implementing Buyouts for Jamestown. It was asked if someone can look at all buyouts for LMI. Deb from Hagerty Consulting shared that she found a 2014 up-date from the HUD database that may help to meet LMI; felt may meet the criteria by area – this will be sent to the County to see if that helps with increase LMI for Buyouts.

Decided to postpone proportionality until we can get better figures. It was stressed that we have to get numbers in before the March 13th meeting. We will continue with proportionality at our next meeting on March 6th.

3. Timeline for Citizen Participation and Action Plan submission

The recommendation on the timeline for our Action Plan is designed to align with State's timeline to submit their next Substantial Amendment:

- March 9-19 - 10 day comment period (Action Plan needs to be fairly drafted by then);
- March 12 or 13 - Public Hearings locally (Longmont and Boulder);
- March 20 - Goal to send Action Plan and comments to the State before their comment period is posted on March 25;
- March 25- April 25 - the State will post 30-day comment period for Substantial Amendment #2 for Round 3 funding;
- May 15 - State to release 2nd Substantial Amendment for Round 3 with our partial Action Plan; Want to get them our intentions first of next week (preferably sometime Monday, March 2nd)

Need to get PW#s in; Unmet Needs Assessment should be closed by the end of next week (March 6th).

The plan to get the IGA approved is to demonstrate how the Collaborative works, the Unmet Needs Assessment and Action Plan. The IGA needs to be approved before the Action Plan goes to the State as

long as done **by 2nd week in April. Need IGAs all approved by April 17th.** We have a draft and will send it back out; will see what the comments are and then send back out again. Kathy will draft language for IGA and will send language that states by signing the document you agree to the proportionality and the submission of the Action Plan.

Public meetings and comment period have to be complete before March 20th. Everyone should let us know the times can be put in the paper and on the website. Want to have communities present, not all at each meeting necessarily, but a collaborative front. The Action Plan needs to be fairly done, some tweaking but mostly done.

When asked how far will the Action Plan drill down, it was explained that general program areas will be put in and as much project information as we can include by community with a disclaimer if a project doesn't work then will have to substitute; therefore, it may not be very project specific but projects will be chosen based on Method of Distribution. We have been doing a project assessment on the St. Vrain River project and will be designing forms with an answer tree that other communities can use to vet their projects for DR requirements. Might do a half-day workshop for communities to help with determining eligible projects.

4. Review of Unfunded Projects

Since our ratios are at 80% Infrastructure and 20% housing, we need to make sure the list of projects contributing to those ratios are tight in order to address concerns from the State or HUD. Reviewed and commented on the Unfunded Resiliency Infrastructure Needs: Table 28: Boulder County Unfunded Projects. This list should be directly related to flood damage, we can then create a separate list for "Other Unfunded Projects". The list has to be tight, this means that we have to look at what the State provided (see the State's Methodology, Resiliency and Mitigation actions and the top portion from the State's Action Plan approved by HUD in Table 20). Make sure projects have long-term resiliency, meaning are permanent.

The Collaborative members also reviewed the lists by community in Table 28 and discussed items and the significance of tying them down. Taking out items may not change the percentages that much but will speak to ensuring our numbers are tight. Make sure projects in Table 28 are related to flood even if they are small projects, some may be resilient but not related to the flood and therefore, shouldn't factor into the split. They will not be put in the 80/20 split; will take out any duplications. Kathy explained that we want to do a thorough job of putting in unmet needs. It was suggested that we may need to up-date numbers if necessary because a few of them may not be correct. If they are consistent with the methodology keep them in. Everyone should revisit and tighten up projects and numbers.

When asked if we can do phases with CDBG, it was stated that there are two issues to look at:

1. Is it an unmet need attributed to the flood?
2. Can it be done within the time frame; this is a separate discussion related to timing, LMI or with a piece of the project.

Discussed concerns with adding new projects. Recommended that we do not want to get above 80/20 with projects that were not there previously, that may bump up the percentage. Another discussion was on emergency needs, related to flood and if the request is permanent. An example/explanation was generators for buildings used as Shelters; resilient maybe, needed yes, comes up every single time and is used over and over.

Other discussion: Also discussed Buyouts as an area benefit and as individual households.

5. Housing Development Project Prioritization-up-date-coming back for full review at March 13 meeting.

Meeting Adjourned:

Next meeting March 6, 2015 at 2:00 pm.