

Boulder County CDBG-DR Collaborative

March 6, 2015 Meeting Minutes

Members Present: Heather Balsler, Tony Cavalier (phone), Rosi Dennett, Kathy Fedler, Deb Gardner, Leslie Irwin, Michelle Krezek, Chris Meschuk, John O'Brien, Dale Rademacher, Alisha Reis, Victoria Simonsen, Jeff Yegian

Staff Present: Phuoc Lam, Yolanda Abram

Agenda and Discussion Items:

1. Housing Prioritization Discussion/Approval:

- Provided the draft housing development prioritization letter
- Want to only fund housing that replaces lost housing, but if DOH is going to fund housing projects, want to prioritize other desired projects
- Noted the readiness factor and whether projects will be able to proceed
- Noted that requesting this list only be for this March 2015 funding round, and that we be consulted in future rounds and funding opportunities.

Funding gap from Housing Development funds being removed from sub-allocation is \$12.9M (\$18.6M less \$4M for Lyons and \$1.7M for Boulder's Spark West projects).

2. Debrief Tuesday's March 3rd meeting with the State:

Michelle reported to the group about the State meeting. Molly's follow-up email from the state was shared at the meeting. The State meeting was considered very negative. Michelle noted that we also reached out to the Legislators to let them know we had a meeting and thought things would be resolved. Michelle provided them with a copy of the letter that was received from the state to demonstrate that the issues were not resolved at this time. The letter made it feel like there was no analysis of options for providing the housing "gap" funding that we agreed to at the February 12 meeting and were to be brought back.

Rather than re-programming housing construction money, Michelle said the State could look at re-programming unspent Round 1 funds or shift around Round 3 funds. A problem is that there is no certainty with this approach.

Also, the Collaborative needs to know about Round 1 now, if those funds are to be expended by April 2016. Should prepare our project pipeline with projects that are ready to go and could be spent by April 2016 so we are ready if/when Round 1 funds are reallocated.

Need to write our Action Plan with both approaches (with and without the ~\$12.9M gap). Regarding Round 3 funding, we might not want them to use the 49% as a sub-allocation, because the unmet need might be greater in Boulder County than in other counties and they should acknowledge that.

Shared a conference call discussion regarding HMGP that discussed the buyout and Duplication of Benefits. Inquired about the hierarchy and not quite understanding FEMA requirement. Was told that since in the Collaborative for the 2nd Round will be under DOLA, Dave Brown. This not knowing has gone on too long (can't

spend money until have contract); the program is like a real-estate program have to do DOB and appraisal (some haven't put together DOB process); DOB not on some folks radar. Can't spend money until have contract, but can use the HMGP handbook because the state doesn't have standards.

Concern regarding a statement made that Boulder County has a lot of resources because we were the only ones to do an unmet needs assessment. Everyone should have had to do one. For Round 3, the substantial amendment should require that some level of an unmet needs assessment be done and not punish us for doing a credible study. Larimer County is going forward or considering doing an unmet needs assessment.

The State said they may not want to do a sub-allocation for Round 3. We may shift and have 49%. This is why it is so important to have a good unmet needs assessment. The statements regarding us having resources and thinking that everyone will flip to vacation homes is ridiculous. Weld County has \$100 million in reserves.

They asked us to submit a project pipeline so that they will know what projects we are proposing. Decide which projects in our pipeline that we want in \$44 million; this should be a robust list that will need to be included in the sub-allocation and action plan. The state has said that they will go ahead and initiate environmental reviews although haven't awarded the highest projects. If they have Round 1 money say yes we can spend. The Round 1 money has to be spent by April 16th of next year.

Priority List: 1 through 20

1 through 5 Start Environmental Review: fund these with Round 1;

Have to look at the ones can do immediately

We do not want the State to ask for extensions, should give raptured funding to Boulder;

3. Discussion on moving forward with Sub-Allocation:

Asked the group if they still want to continue in the hope that the gap will be filled, even though we don't have certainty that will happen and nothing in writing?

Pros: Certainty, control over what gets funded and in what order, through collaborative, we can set our own guidelines as well. Pace of projects – Which could be faster, sub-allocation or state? Handed out two timelines which estimated sub-allocation would be faster, but many caveats and unknowns.

Cons: There might be opportunity for more funding going in competitively, but again no certainty.

Is Longmont willing to still administer?

We need to keep an eye on what the state is funding paying attention that they fund disaster and flood related unmet needs projects. Is there a need to throw some projects into the competitive round in case state decides it needs to fund infrastructure and not warn us; they may forget we have them. How do we set policy on projects such as buyouts; the state policy on acquisition is to determine the post flood value (not federal but state policy). The state did say that when you do a collaborative, can come up with own policy.

There have been a lot of changes, such as home repair. Our staff have spent several hours researching, having internal meetings and traveling to figure out regulations because the state's guidelines are contradicting themselves. There is a constant battle over state regulation rather than helping households. When developing policy keep in mind not to go against Action Plan, HUD regulations and Federal Register. Basically there is no reason not to do the Collaborative.

- The Collaborative decided to move forward
- Start the public comment period on Monday for 10 days
- Public meetings set-up; March 12 and 17, Boulder, 4:30-5:30 Longmont 5:30-6:30

- Need to get a good draft of the Action Plan and send out copies to Lyons and Jamestown
- Language and times for the public hearing will be shared;
- Will work on a joint PowerPoint presentation.
- Set up rooms as necessary

4. Action Plan:

- Round 2: We need to prepare our priority list with completion dates of April 2016 through 2019.
- Look at LMI for each home access/buyout areas across the County, most of Lyons will be LMI.
- One of the top infrastructure projects will be LMI.
- Our plan should mimic the state plan except where we want to make changes: Housing- will look at current requirements: at or below 80% of the AMI; Targeted beneficiaries (elderly, disabled, MH owners), require at least 75% of beneficiaries served to be LMI
- Qualify as much as can under LMI, then look at Urgent need, then slum and blight;
- Go back and look at FEMA PA Section and get with Deb or Phuoc for any changes.

In the Action Plan communicate the need and first priority. Let the state know that we are going with the reduced funding and will look to them to find the gap funding. Explain that Round 1 funds turned in should come to Boulder County. We want to competitively apply for Round 3 in addition to a sub-allocation.

We should write the Action Plan with \$44.6M and with \$57.5M, but not specify where will come from, “any additional moneys that come available.”

Folks should tag their priority projects that could be completed by April 2016 (including environmental review and contracting). Staff will create a project pipeline, including which projects could be completed by April 2016 and then phasing of Round 2 projects.

Need to plan on \$18 million in housing new construction, we are moving forward with the robust Action Plan allocation of \$44 million, adding in a section to deal with money that may come in. Incorporate Unmet Needs Assessment into Action Plan, reserve the right to apply for additional money in the state-wide competitive process. Have conversations with the state to determine when we will be notified and able to apply.

5. Discussion on Proportionality and Method of Distribution:

PA Program: At some point we have to pull the trigger; look at and get back to Deb;

Not much to reconcile;

Boulder has better data; what was received from state did not match up;

FEMA numbers may be larger;

If there is another funding source that the state doesn't know about need to address it;

Sub-Allocation Distribution (need to decide which one)

- Page 3 Table 27 or Page 4 Table 29 (Table 29 summarizes total percent of PA unmet need; or
- If someone has a suggestion on something else.
- Total unmet needs unfunded (see Table 1)
- Noted, that PW numbers change daily
- Concerned about Lyon's share
- Need to look at the communities and the level of devastation and ask the counties if they can live with less.

- Everybody should be able to go back to their elected officials and be able to say they got a priority out of this deal.
- Boulder concerned about not including housing projects in the infrastructure proportionality.
- If it's a good project, we should support it as a collaborative. It's more about the projects than the math.
- We need to settle on numbers.

Discussion: Asked if as a Collaborative can we allocate outside, tweak and shift to get closer to other needs. Suggested that everyone review numbers, data, look at them now; there will be a point where everyone can flex a little; everyone has to go back to their own Boards. Lyons and Jamestown most impacted. Review data strive for IGA and Action Plan. City of Boulder has flexibility with housing, top priority is infrastructure, will remove homes from floodplain; stated, just because there is an IA claim doesn't mean an unmet need. The City of Boulder's #1 project is something we support as needing to be done. It is much more about projects than math but have to have math. Try to distribute as needed but strive to balance and support.

The collaborative members worked to settle on proportionality, discussed the proposed allocation, need and supporting the unmet needs of the collaborative members. All 9 communities to receive \$250,000, in addition to the allocation as shown below based on Table 27 percentages.

Proportionality Determination:

Community	Allotted	Need	%
Boulder County	\$17,007,000	\$15,000,000.00	2
City Longmont	7,103,000	11,000,000	-4.1
City of Boulder	2,215,000	5,000,000	-2.7
Town of Lyons	4,757,000	7,739,000	-3
Town of Jamestown	782,000	500,000	2.82
City of Louisville	554,000	554,000	0
Other	163,000	163,000	0
Total	\$ 32,581,000.00	\$ 39,956,000.00	

**Next Meeting – March 13 – cancelled
March 20**

Longmont will send out a Checklist for reviewing projects against, each community look at top 3-5 priorities check for LMI, when they could be ready to go, when could be completed and bring to next meeting.