

**Boulder County Collaborative Meeting for CDBG DR Allocation**  
**Minutes**  
**Friday, January 23, 2015**

**Members Present: Tony Cavalier, Rosi Dennett, Joel Wagner, Alisha Reis, Michelle Krezek, Tara Schoedinger, Dale Rademacher, Harold Dominguez, Leslie Irwin, Kathy Fedler, Victoria Simonsen, Deb Siefert, Yolanda Abram**

**Meeting Called to Order at 2:16 pm**

**1. Review of Draft Unmet Needs Assessment (UNA)**

The UNA was revised to separate infrastructure projects that had some source of funding (i.e., FEMA, FHWA, etc.) from unfunded “resiliency” projects. Main change was redistribution of how things were allocated and summary. The new draft also includes comments from Boulder County Transportation. The Consultant explained that transportation comments were added and additional narrative will be included. Explained that changes can still be made but that a deadline for comments need to happen so that the UNA can be finalized and put with the Action Plan to go to the State.

The Boulder County Collaborative (Collaborative) also reviewed the summary of PA projects and unmet need. Discussed that Jamestown was showing zero PA match based on the current tables. Other FEMA data from the County showed approximately \$3 million. Jamestown requested a meeting with the Consultant; a meeting will be scheduled.

The Collaborative attendees were asked if they had concerns or comments regarding the assessment. It was stated that they liked it and it was clear. It was emphasized to the Collaborative to limit changes so the UNA can be finalized.

**2. State Planning Grant Deadline**

Explained that the Planning Grant is due January 30<sup>th</sup>. Everyone will submit their own grant applications (individually) and the Collaborative will not prioritize them. The Collaborative felt that a letter of support for each other’s projects would be helpful. Leslie agreed to do the letter. Harold volunteered to check with Mayor Coombs on signing the letter. Suggested a letter and sending it via email. The Town of Nederland stated that they are not applying. It was decided that the letter will say that everyone is applying separately with support and consensus for each project from each community.

Kathy discussed the need for “resilience performance standards”. She explained that each Round 2 infrastructure project has to meet these standards to be eligible for funding. She asked if everyone agreed to a Plan for a County-wide standard and a Resilience Standards position to implement the Plan and that she would request both through Longmont. In addition, the resilience performance standards needed a cost estimate. Kathy said that the cost of both UNAs (Longmont and Boulder County) was around \$150,000 and that an increase of 25% would be added to cover additional data gathering costs. She said the plan would look at everyone’s COOP Plan and supplement them.

**3. Discussion on Housing Development Programs**

Explained there is a new glitch; originally understood \$63,276,230 was allocated for Boulder County based on UNA as stated in the Amendment to the Action Plan. Instead \$18 million remains under the State’s control for new housing construction. It was thought that the \$18 million was part of Boulder County’s sub-allocation and if based on need, it could go to infrastructure as originally conveyed in

earlier discussions with the State. The new direction from the State Division of Housing is that they will make funding decisions based on applications submitted. Thus, lowering the amount under the control of the County and limiting what can be spent on infrastructure projects.

The Collaborative discussed that others are tapping into the allocation seeking funding for housing such as non-profits and private developers. These changes are creating a critical need because the county and local governments will not get the flexibility promised. There is a feeling that State agencies are trying to integrate the County's sub-allocation into their own program. It was stated that during a conversation with Molly Urbina (Recovery Office), she stated that "we should have known". The bigger issue is that local governments were told that they could have the funds as needed. Funds will not necessarily be used for flood recovery, rather, building new rental housing that is not flood related. The issue is not who administers, the problem is the State is dictating where the money should go, rather than there being an emphasis on the actual needs identified by local governments. Stated, that not sure where the direction is coming from; if someone does not get a handle on this matter, the issue will get out of hand. Explained, that conversations with Molly have already been made; decided that Molly should be provided with what was promised and then move on to providing the assistance needed. Explained that Molly keeps saying to go back to the Action Plan but everyone read it and no one realized this; therefore, need a discussion on the proposal with Molly. The County's Proposal will be put in the Action plan. The expectation is that they will agree as stated in October 2014. Allocation will match the Boulder County's UNA. The meeting attendees, agreed. Emphasized that the same will be replicated in Round 3. Need to fast track the Action Plan, Unmet Needs Assessment and method of distribution so that the State can include it in its upcoming Substantial Amendment for Round 3.

The Collaborative will determine its Individual Assistance needs and look at the sub-allocation and apply the \$17.7 million to all housing (both new construction and individual assistance) and have \$45.5 million for infrastructure. It was asked, if the problem is money or control? The final decision of the Collaborative is to provide Molly the information regarding the allocation plan and move forward to meet the needs of the County. For Round 2 need to get County to \$45 million; \$63.2 million identified in the Unmet Needs Assessment (infrastructure, watershed and housing); apply \$17.7 to housing and \$45 million to infrastructure.

#### **4. FEMA PA**

Discussed FEMA PA approved and ineligible and how distributed in the UNA. Concerned that people putting everything in such as resilience; this is not a representation of damage and it skews the numbers.

Concerned PA numbers off; actuals much higher (10% to 20%). Explained to the Collaborative that the assessment's data was originally gathered in October and November and that it is a challenge to keep adjusting numbers as FEMA PA revisions changed. Everyone agreed to get in the final changes and agree to live with it. Asked, if there can be a united front and how quickly can the FEMA PA numbers be obtained from the State? Michelle agreed to call to get them and Kathy will work to refine.

## 5. Method of Distribution Options

Kathy presented Sub-Allocation Method of Distribution Options as follows:

### Option 1

- Each collaborative member receives \$250,000 of funds to put toward an infrastructure project or FEMA match project in their community. Only requirement is that the project must be CDBG-DR eligible. Total \$2,250,000
- Set-aside funds for priority regional projects. Total: \$20,000,000 (\$10 million if no housing \$)
- Remaining \$23,308,886/\$19,901,973 for eligible infrastructure projects that qualify for low-moderate benefit.

### Option 2

- Each collaborative member receives \$250,000 of funds to put toward an infrastructure project or FEMA match project in their community. Only requirement is that the project must be CDBG-DR eligible. Total: \$2,250,000
- With remaining funds (\$43,308,886/\$29,901,173) vet everyone's 1st priority against all requirements,
- Then vet everyone's 2<sup>nd</sup> priority against requirements and go through until the collaborative has projects that meet LMI and all requirements

### Option 3

- Each collaborative member proposes projects to meet its share of the allocated funds, provided that projects are CDBG-DR eligible (excepting low-mod benefit)
- Collaborative will review proposed projects and calculate low-mod benefit of proposed slate. If low-mod is not met, the following factors will be considered in finding substitutions:
  - Low-mod benefit
  - Regional benefit

### Discussion & Comments:

- Stated that regional projects (mostly Watershed projects) would try first for competitive grants through the State
- Discussed difference in definition of acquisition and buyout. Properties in an acquisition left to redevelopment and buyout left as open space
- Suggested another potential option: prioritize based on categories i.e. property acquisition and matching HMGP funds. Have to meet low/mod benefit
- One community center flooded, discussed how options would help them
- If any entity with Round 1 or competitive Round 2 funding can't meet certain criteria then we should work collaboratively to keep the funding in Boulder County
- Stated that if Boulder hits LMI will be mostly housing
- Sub-allocation table for housing is estimated at \$17.7 million-will hit LMI; another 22%, \$15 million of infrastructure will have to hit LMI
- LMI on buyout can calculate by household or area; how many can hit LMI
- If first priority project does not meet LMI, may have to drop down to a 45<sup>th</sup> priority project to meet the criteria
- Can base LMI on the census tract, can go down to block group, and must be based on the project's service area. Should be confident the allocation is correct

- For some activities with multiple users, Seniors are presumed LMI, if seniors primarily use community center then can count as LMI
- HMGP match can be done by household or service area, whichever is applicable
- If don't have project completed by May 16, 2014 Davis Bacon applies to all construction projects
- Need 2 timelines in the Needs Assessment; need to provide one for the PA numbers
- Need Action Plan and to get hard PA numbers

The Collaborative decided to Vet Option 2; add dialogue around Option 1 regional emphasis.

Adjourn 3:47

Next Meeting Scheduled for February 6, 2015