



TEXAS GENERAL LAND OFFICE

Mitigation Competitions - Frequently Asked Questions

2015 Floods (\$46,096,950) and 2016 Floods (\$147,680,760) State Mitigation Competitions

For the 2015 and 2016 Floods State Mitigation Competitions, each separate competition will provide funds to cities, counties, Indian Tribes, and councils of governments (COG) to address risks in the 2015 and 2016 Floods HUD- and state-designated Most Impacted and Distressed (MID) areas.

Hurricane Harvey State Mitigation Competition Round 1 (\$1 billion of \$2,144,776,720 total)

The competition is open to cities, counties, COGs, state agencies, and special purpose districts.

The Mitigation Application Guide is available at:

https://recovery.texas.gov/files/resources/mitigation/cdbg-mit_comp_app_guide_2020.pdf

Answers to frequently asked questions regarding these Mitigation Competitions are provided below. Questions/Answers are presented by the following topics:

- Application Process
- Guidance Clarification
- Procurement Clarification
- Program Eligibility
- Project Eligibility
- TIGR Access and Technical Assistance
- Scoring Criteria and Details

Application Process

A number of inquiries have requested an extension to the Mitigation Competitions application due date of October 28, 2020, 5:00PM in response to:

- a) COVID19,
- b) MIT Application different than previous applications,
- c) Benefit-Cost Analysis documentation,
- d) Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing,
- e) Online TIGR submission process

- a) The GLO will not be granting such an extension because of the critical need to get these mitigative measures in place as soon as possible. We understand there are many challenges facing communities as the result of COVID-19. This sensitivity is one of the reasons why the GLO extended the normal three to four-month time period allowed for the applications. The deadline of October 28, 2020 provides a five-month period to develop projects and complete the application. This application due date is also put in place to meet the federal requirement that half of these mitigation funds be spent in six years. HUD did not grant any time extensions on these funds.
- b) The primary difference between the mitigation competition application and previous applications is that the mitigation application is computerized, whereas previous applications were on paper. Part of the length of our application guide is the inclusion of instructions for the computerized application. It is our assumption that local officials are already aware of the risks that threaten their communities. These should be the focus of your request.

c) While estimated costs must have some basis and supporting information for all applications, official Benefit-Cost Analysis documentation is only required of “Covered Projects” (\$100 million or more, of which at least \$50 million is CDBG funding).

d) Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing, beneficiary identification and justification, and citizen participation are standard requirements of all CDBG funding. Further, the CDBG-MIT application only relates to a single project, so it is likely simpler than any application submitted for Hurricane Harvey CDBG-Disaster Recovery awards.

e) TIGR is designed to be an intuitive system that is user-friendly, easy to navigate, and ultimately serves many of our mutual reporting requirements across all of the CDBG programs. Support for TIGR is available now by emailing TIGRhelp@recovery.texas.gov. While last-minute submissions to TIGR could cause delays in meeting the deadline, applicants that access the system early and build the application over time are less likely to experience technical problems.

The GLO has provided training materials ranging from a thorough Application Guide, answers to frequently asked questions, and procurement webinars. The GLO has worked hard to create an application, an Application Guide, and an automated system that is easy to use and requires the same types of information included in most infrastructure-type applications.

Where is the application on your website?

While the Application Guide and the supplemental information and forms are available on the GLO website at:

<https://recovery.texas.gov/mitigation/competitions.html>

As indicated in the Application Guide, "All applications, along with the completed and signed Application for Federal Assistance SF424 form and all other accompanying documentation, must be electronically submitted via the Texas Integrated Grant Reporting (TIGR) System no later than the applicable competition due date."

For information and instructions regarding TIGR access and application input, visit the website indicated above.

According to the application guide, the State’s Action Plan must be amended to include Covered Projects. Does the Action Plan need to be amended to include these covered projects prior to submitting these applications or can the action plan be amended after applications are submitted?

According to the Application Guide, *"For CDBG-MIT program purposes, a “Covered Project” is defined as any infrastructure project having a total project cost of \$100 million or more, with at least \$50 million of CDBG funds, regardless of source (CDBG–DR, CDBG-National Disaster Resilience (NDR), CDBG–MIT, or CDBG)).*

When a Covered Project is proposed, the action plan or substantial amendment must include a description of the project and the information required for other CDBG-MIT activities (how it meets the definition of a mitigation activity, consistency with the Mitigation Needs Assessment provided in the State Action Plan, eligibility under section 105(a) of the HCDA or a waiver or alternative requirement, and national objective, including additional criteria for mitigation activities).

All Covered Projects must be included in the State Action Plan as a substantial amendment. Applicants should be aware that Action Plan amendments are approved at the federal level and can take time. "

For the Mitigation Competitions, applicants will apply along with non-Covered Project applicants. Upon completion of scoring, GLO will work with those scoring within funding capability to verify scoring accuracy and ensure Mitigation project eligibility. For eligible Covered Projects, GLO will work with HUD to include those via substantial amendment to the State Action Plan. While the GLO will make every effort to expedite the process, ultimate Action Plan approval will be with HUD.

Is there a deadline for the submission of documents?

Completed applications will be due by 5:00 pm October 28, 2020.

Can you provide the following information in order to complete the SF-424? CFDA Number, Funding Opportunity Number/Title, and Competition Identification Number/Title.

The Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance number is: 14.228
Funding Opportunity Number: FR-6109-N-02 OR Federal Register / Vol. 84, No. 169 (Either reference is acceptable)
Funding Title: CDBG-MIT
Competition Identification Number/Title: Not Applicable.

Is the SF-424 form submitted through Grants.gov or TIGR?

The SF-424 form will need to be submitted through TIGR. Do not submit through grants.gov.

When filling out the SF 424 – Are the CDBG-MIT applications subject to executive order 123762?

Applications for federal funding in Texas are currently not subject to E.O. 12372. Please select option "C. Program is not covered under E.O. 12372."

Will applications that are not selected for Round 1 automatically be rolled over to the next Round for consideration?

Applications for Round 1 will not automatically be rolled over to the next Round for consideration.

Guidance Clarification

In the application guidance, Local Preparation, it states “update local processes and procedures, especially regarding financial management and procurement, to prepare for the receipt of federal funding. Does the Mitigation-Local Certifications form, if signed, replace the actual, physical, certifications/policies referenced in the application guidance on page 2? Or is this in addition to uploading all of the local policies/procedures/plans in TIGR for the application? (Citizen Participation, Fair housing, Financial Management, Procurement, etc....)

The Local Certifications identify specific rules, regulations, and details that applicants for CDBG-MIT funding must acknowledge, sign, and follow should their application be awarded. By signing, applicants legally certify that they are and will remain in compliance with each item detailed.

Page 2, Local Preparation, of the Application Guide stresses that local processes and procedures to ensure compliance with the regulations identified in the Local Certification and other requirements for a successful program, such as well-defined and documented financial management and procurement procedures. As such, applicants must be prepared to upload local policies and procedures as identified in the Application Guide.

The application guide talks about posting a substantially complete application for at least 14 days.
Does TIGR have the capacity to allow an applicant to print off an application to post?

As of 06-03-2020, GLO is exploring options for applicants printing their TIGR applications. Information will be forthcoming on that option.

In the meantime, the Application Guide (page 34) indicates that "substantially complete application should include at minimum, a scope of work, budget, identification of all sources of funding, maps to identify location and beneficiaries."

Regarding the Grant Management Plan, if a community is preparing multiple applications for multiple competitions, are they required to provide multiple Grant Management Plan's (i.e. per project or per competition program)? Is it required that the Grant Management Plan be officially adopted?

A Grant Management Plan is required with each application. Applicants must assess their local capacity, professional services needs, and their procurement language to determine if the same individuals can/should be identified in every application.

The information in the CDBG-MIT Competition Application Guide appears to conflict with the Texas Survey Guide regarding whether the applicant needs to use LMISD or Survey Data. The Application Guide and HUD CP 19-20 only say all census blocks should significantly overlap the service area without defining “significant”. Further, the Application Guide requires the applicant to use LMISD data to the “maximum extent feasible”, and use census divisions that “best fall” within the service area (page 49 of the revised Guide). This is consistent with HUD guidance (CP 19-02) which allows the use of the census block provided there is significant overlap.

The GLO is assessing currently adopted beneficiary identification methodology standards in order to provide updated and clear guidance. Guidance will be provided in coming days.

For the Grant Management Plan, the Application Guide does not explicitly state extra documentation is needed but the language in that section of the guide suggests a separate write-up is required. Are the elements listed (goals, objectives, timeline, etc.) included in the online application or will a separate Grant Management Plan write-up need to be submitted?

As indicated in the Application Guide, "All applicants are required to submit the minimum Grant Management Plan as defined in the TIGR system to identify stakeholders who will administer and execute an award.

In addition to TIGR Grant Management Plan stakeholder identification, each applicant that does not currently have an active 2015 Floods, 2016 Floods, and/or Hurricane Harvey contract with GLO-CDR must submit a proposed Grant Management Plan. Each Grant Management Plan will be reviewed to assure funding recipients are prepared and have sufficient capacity to administer federal grants.

At a minimum the Grant Management Plan shall include the following elements:

- Detail of each project’s objectives and goals
- A list of actions to achieve the goals and objectives along with a timeline for the various stages of the project defining when actions, objectives, and goals are to be complete and assigning the responsible staff position (not individual names)/ partner
- A process to handle project implementation to include overall tracking, draw coordination, procurement coordination, and progress reporting
- A process to handle financial management and contract administration to include overall tracking, draw processing, procurement eligibility, and contract maintenance (amendments/revisions/etc.)
- Staff/ partner organizational chart showing all key stakeholders and indicating authorized signatories, financial management responsibility, procurement responsibility, and project management responsibility, along with contact information, specific role and responsibility level, years CDBG-DR experience, and time commitment of each individual identified
- A process to handle staff/ partner personnel changes and duty transfers

Can an applicant do all of the online application with the mayor signing and staff providing all engineering, environmental and technical data?

Applicants should carefully assess the Mitigation Application Guide to determine whether there is local capacity to complete the task. GLO does not require applicants to procure grant administration services for application completion. However, an eligible application does require a professional engineer's seal on the required Mitigation Justification of Retail Costs document. Should the applicant have a staff engineer with the authority to provide a seal, then procured engineering services would not be required.

I read that there is no match portion required, unless the city would like to contribute 1% for additional points on the scoring criteria, but I have not been able to find anything distinguishing if the funds allocated will be 100% grant or some makeup of grant and loan.

CDBG-DR and CDBG-MIT are grant funding with no match requirement.

Is there required training for Grant Administrators?

There is no required GLO training for Grant Administrators. According to Chapter 5 of the GLO-CDR Implementation Manual, subrecipients must award contracts only to responsible contractors possessing the ability to perform successfully under the terms and conditions of a proposed procurement. Consideration shall be given to such matters as contractor integrity, compliance with public policy, record of past performance, and financial and technical resources. Beginning in 2016, all state and local governments were required to follow 2 CFR 200 for all procurement of goods and services. In order to ensure the proper use of funds, the GLO continues to provide technical assistance to its subrecipients regarding federal regulations and best practices via our website at: <https://recovery.texas.gov/local-government/resources/procurement-contracting/index.html>. A sample Scope of Work for Grant Administration Services can be found here: <https://recovery.texas.gov/files/resources/contract-procurement/grant-administration-scope-of-work.pdf>

When is the second round of Harvey MIT applications taking place?

The MIT Action Plan indicates we may have multiple rounds for the Harvey-MIT competition. See 4.4.3, page 227.

<https://recovery.texas.gov/files/hud-requirements-reports/mitigation/mitigation-ap.pdf>

The Mitigation Competitions website states “Hurricane Harvey State Mitigation Competition Round 1 (\$1 billion of \$2,144,776,720 total)” <https://recovery.texas.gov/mitigation/competitions.html>

See press release issued May 28, 2020, <https://www.glo.texas.gov/the-glo/news/press-releases/2020/may/cmr-george-p-bush-announces-application-kick-off-for-nearly-1-point-2-billion-in-mitigation-projects-for-texas.html>

Are public hearings a required component of the applicants outreach efforts?

Although public hearings are **not** a program requirement, jurisdictions who choose to hold them or are required by their citizen participation plan should list the date(s) of the hearings and attach appropriate documentation.

An application under the CDBG-MIT program may be awarded only if the locality certifies and provides evidence that, at a minimum, the substantially complete application was publicly posted for at least a **14-day public comment period**, comments received, and responses provided.

Outreach efforts can be accomplished through one or more of the following methods: (a) Publication of notice in a local newspaper—a published newspaper article may also be used so long as it provides sufficient information regarding program activities and relevant dates; (b) Notices prominently posted in public buildings and distributed to local Public Housing Authorities and other interested community groups; (c) Posting of notice on the local entity website (if available); (d) Public Hearing; or (e) Individual notice to eligible cities and other entities as applicable using one or more of the following methods: Certified mail, Electronic mail or fax, First-class (regular) mail, Personal delivery (e.g., at a Council of Governments meeting)

Must the Citizen Participation Plan be published in Spanish?

Please reference page 34 of 82 of the MIT Application Guide for information regarding the Citizen Participation Plan requirements. https://recovery.texas.gov/files/resources/mitigation/cdbg-mit_comp_app_guide_2020.pdf

The new census web site does not have Print capability. What will the GLO accept as beneficiary supporting documentation taken from the Census.gov web site? Specifically concerned about DP05 data.

An acceptable way to compile supporting documentation from the census.gov website is by using the screenshot or print screen feature.

For the application, will the GLO accept a simplified MOU between partnering agencies stating an intent to enter into a formal interlocal agreement (ILA) if selected, with the details noted in the application guideline being included at that later date (if the project is selected)?

Applications that involve multiple entities or jurisdictions must clearly identify all parties and the roles and responsibilities of each party, to include financial involvement and/or liability. Applicants may provide a conditional or draft Memorandum of Understanding, Interlocal Agreement, or other binding vehicle identifying those roles and responsibilities. Applications involving multiple entities or jurisdictions that proceed to award will require a fully executed document signed by all parties. Execution of the document may occur after the application is deemed fully eligible. The contents of any given Memorandum of Understanding, Interlocal Agreement, or other binding vehicle designed to clarify roles and responsibilities will be subject to the specific circumstances of the application/project. Each document should be prepared and written in a manner that best covers the liabilities of all parties involved. The document is ultimately the responsibility of the agreeing parties. The GLO encourages each local entity to consult local legal council regarding contractual matters.

Some best practices to consider when preparing and writing such a document are:

- Clearly state the objective of the document. State the overall intent of the document including a brief statement of the intent of each party.
- Clearly identify each party involved.
- Specify the time period of the agreement with start and end dates.
- Clearly identify the specific duties and responsibilities of each party. Include each entity's sole responsibilities, as well as responsibilities shared by all parties, as appropriate.
- Clearly specify which party is financially responsible for which items, when payments are due (as appropriate), and any other detail that will help to avoid confusion or disputes.
- Confidentiality clauses, as appropriate.
- Indemnity clauses, as appropriate.
- Dispute resolution and settlement clauses should be included in case a breach, invalidation, or termination of the document occurs. Ensure prompt resolution and identify the manner in which the dispute shall be settled.
- Clearly identify termination options.
- Clearly identify final closing activities and completion of the agreement, as appropriate.

These are a basic outline of topics and/or issues that should be considered. Other topics and/or issues may also need to be

For large and complex applications, will the GLO consider project schedules that require contract terms extended beyond the typical 2-year period?

The GLO will consider contract periods longer than 2 years on a case by case basis.

For the CDBG-MIT competitions, is it possible for an eligible entity to be awarded both solo and joint application awards prior to other eligible entities receiving a first award?

- a. This is possible only for the Hurricane Harvey-eligible jurisdictions (see page 29 of the Mitigation Competitions application guide).
- b. For those jurisdictions eligible for the 2015 or 2016 Floods Competitions, only one application, either individual or joint, may be awarded.

If a jurisdiction submitting an application writes a letter of support for another entity's project will it have a negative impact on either application?

Letters of support for another entity will not have a negative impact on either entity's own application.

If a jurisdiction submits a letter of support that also identifies a partnership with another jurisdiction, will this have a negative impact on either jurisdictions project if the applications did not include the partnership?

Letters of support for another entity will not have a negative impact on either entity's own application.

Is there an example Citizen Participation Plan?

There is additional guidance and examples from the HUD Exchange website. Additionally, you may see the GLO's Hurricane Harvey Citizen Participation Plan.

<https://www.hudexchange.info/resource/3817/econ-planning-suite-citizen-participation-and-consultation-toolkit/>

https://recovery.texas.gov/files/housing-guidelines-requirements-reports/harvey_5b_public_participation_plan.pdf

Could grant funds from CDBG-MIT be utilized to condemn property if we encountered property owners unwilling to sell their land?

The ultimate use of the property may not benefit a particular private party and must be for a public use; eminent domain can be used for public use, but public use shall not be construed to include economic development that primarily benefits private entities. Page 216 of 471, CDBG MIT Action Plan.

What is the maximum timeline allowed for a project? I do not see a maximum for an individual project schedule?

The typical contract period is 2 years and the GLO will consider contract periods longer than 2 years on a case by case basis.

We are unable to enter the block groups with the appropriate state prefix. We can either omit the prefix (which might be problematic) or attach an extra document with a table of the information? Please advise?

If TIGR data fields are inconsistent with the beneficiary data format, please input data as allowable and provide support documentation.

Since our projects are located on historic sites, we do not have any fair housing component to these projects. How would you recommend we respond to this particular section of the application?

Fair Housing is not just about housing activities; it is about providing choices and benefits equally to populations. i.e. you can't always build libraries and parks in higher income areas of town and put the wastewater treatment plant in lower income areas. This is a consideration you do to show how protected classes will benefit (not be negatively impacted) by the placement of your project. If it equally serves all of a population you can describe that as well.

Since the applicant is the Texas Historical Commission, would the "County" for the Application be Travis, or should we be using the county specific to each project?

You should use the County where the benefit is being provided.

Are the Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing requirements still applicable given the HUD Secretary's suspension of the rules this summer? and if so, are they applicable to project selection of all CDBG-MIT projects, or just housing related projects?

HUD has not issued any official guidance about AFFH pertaining to CDBG MIT since the press release related to the Secretary's changes. Regardless, the Secretary is only potentially changing how HUD complies with the Fair Housing Act not its overall applicability to federal funds. AFFH is always applicable to housing and to housing activity project selections.

Does "other funds" category apply for this project only, or does it apply to all other grants in general?

The "other funds" category applies for the project in the application only.

Under Environmental what is the exempt form for planning and administrative?

The Exempt or Categorically Excluded Not Subject to Section 58.5 Form can be found here:

<https://www.hudexchange.info/resource/3141/part-58-environmental-review-exempt-or-censt-format/>

Procurement Clarification

Are procurement document templates (RFP/RFQ) available?

Can a community repurpose procurements done for Hurricane Harvey for use on Mitigation?

Beginning in 2016, all state and local governments were required to follow 2 CFR 200 for all procurement of goods and services. If not followed, grantees may be required to repay Federal funds out of the state's General Revenue or local funding sources. In order to ensure the proper use of funds, the GLO continues to provide technical assistance to its subrecipients regarding federal regulations and best practices via our website at

<https://recovery.texas.gov/local-government/resources/procurement-contracting/index.html>

Regarding procurements from previous allocations, applicants should carefully assess the language of those procurements and seek local legal counsel if necessary. Since each procurement is unique, a broad answer cannot be provided.

The guidance requests copies of executed contracts and procurement process details. What is your definition of "process details"?

Procurement process details include (at a minimum): the methods and details of outreach efforts, response intake efforts, scoring criteria used, scoring committee identification, local policy and procedure requirements and how they were met, any potential negotiations that may have been required depending on the particular procurement methodology required, and any other detail required to demonstrate how the final procurement was completed and determined eligible.

Many questions regarding the viability of specific procurements have been received requesting GLO review and/or approval.

Local procurement policies and procedures regarding use of CDBG-DR funding must clearly follow federal 2 C.F.R. 200 regulations. These regulations are designed to ensure fair and equitable opportunity for all potential vendors serving federally funded projects. They also provide the applicant/subrecipient with clear and documented evidence of (1) the specific goods/services they are procuring, (2) their efforts to include as many respondents as possible, and (3) the reasoning behind choices that are made, and other advantages. Both the HUD Exchange website <https://www.hudexchange.info> and the GLO website provide guidance and information to help communities prepare their procurements in a way to best serve local needs. Ultimately, the specific scope of work requested, the scope of work retained by local staff, the language of the given procurement, and the contracts finally executed are the responsibility of the applicant /subrecipient and should be carefully designed to serve the needs of that applicant/subrecipient. Applicants should rely on local legal counsel regarding the applicability of federal regulations to any specific procurement efforts. GLO, as such, will not pre-review and/or pre-approve any local procurements.

Does GLO provide tools for Subrecipients to use when preparing an Independent Cost Estimate?

The GLO website is an ever-updating resource for local procurement tools and reference materials. Some of the items currently available on the GLO website are:

HUD Exchange's Buying Right CDBG-DR:

<https://www.hudexchange.info/resource/5614/buying-right-cdbg-dr-and-procurement-a-guide-to-recovery/>

Procurement: A Guide to Recovery and Quick Guide to Cost and Price Analysis for HUD Grantees and Funding Recipients:

https://www.hud.gov/program_offices/cpo/grantees/cstprice

HUD Exchange Procurement FAQ's:

<https://recovery.texas.gov/files/resources/contract-procurement/hudexchange-procurement-faqs.pdf>

E-Bid Procurement Guidance:

<https://recovery.texas.gov/files/resources/contract-procurement/e-bid-guidance-for-sealed-bid.pdf>

Crosswalk Template for e-Bid:

<https://recovery.texas.gov/files/resources/contract-procurement/crosswalk-template-e-bid-platform.docx>

An Independent Cost Estimate is also available on the GLO website at:

<https://recovery.texas.gov/files/resources/contract-procurement/independent-cost-estimate.pdf>

Applicants should utilize readily available resources, such as past project costs, input from other communities who have conducted similar projects, independent research, and/or other data that can be provided to support cost estimates used for procurement efforts. Once an applicant has made their best supported effort to determine a cost estimate, the information can be used to help identify the scope of work required to complete the project, seek engineering services to complete that scope of work, and have a pre-determined estimate of how much the final project should cost in order to determine if proposals received are reasonable/too high/too low/etc. Should all proposals come in vastly different than the original estimate, applicants should compare the proposals to original estimate to determine if critical elements were omitted or added unnecessarily.

The purpose of the Independent Cost Estimate is to provide the purchaser with the best information regarding the costs of needed goods and services and to ensure the purchaser understands the goods and services they are procuring.

Request technical assistance on Rating Committees for MIT funding procurement.

Local procurement rating/review committees must be prepared to review offers received for both technical and legal responsiveness and capacity to furnish the products and/or services requested and required. Applicants must fully document all decisions made.

Does an applicant need both a Federal and Local procurement policy?

Applicants must assess their local needs in order to determine if separate Federal financial and procurement policies and procedures are required. Applicants receiving federal funding must address those requirements, whether within local policies and procedures or as a separate set of procedures. Subrecipients may be assessed in a file review or audit situation to produce their procedures regarding the specific funding and show how those policies and procedures meet Federal requirements and are being followed.

Will justifications be accepted for sole source procurement, so long as the justification follow the standards in 2CFR 200.320(f) (sole sourcing)?

Applicants must maintain thorough documentation for all procurement efforts and include justifications as necessary. Sole Source procurement can be used as needed, but applicants must follow the standards identified in 2 CFR 200.320(f) and indicate why the particular need can only be provided by one source.

Is a licensed landscape architect acceptable to certify cost associated with Green Infrastructure Activities?

Yes, a licensed landscape architect is acceptable to certify cost associated with Green Infrastructure Activities.

Is the design/engineering/grant firm which assisted the applicant with the project application excluded from bidding on the CDBG-MIT Competition project?

Federal requirements state the following:

"§200.319 Competition.

(a) All procurement transactions must be conducted in a manner providing full and open competition consistent with the standards of this section. In order to ensure objective contractor performance and eliminate unfair competitive advantage, contractors that develop or draft specifications, requirements, statements of work, or invitations for bids or requests for proposals must be excluded from competing for such procurements."

Based on the federal requirements, any vendor assisting a community in developing the design or specs on a project, including the submission of the application resulting from the development of the project, is prohibited from submitting a bid/proposal on the project. The development of the specs/design is an unfair competitive advantage to the vendor assisting in that endeavor.

What are Financial Interest Reports?

Financial Interest Reports can be found here:

<https://recovery.texas.gov/files/resources/housing/s2-financial-interest-report.pdf>

Program Eligibility

Could you provide a definition for special purpose districts?

For Hurricane Harvey State Mitigation Competitions, special purpose districts shall include:

- municipal utility districts;
- water control and improvement districts;
- special utility districts;
- flood and drainage districts;
- freshwater supply districts;
- levee improvements districts;
- irrigation districts;
- municipal management districts;
- navigation districts;
- port authorities; and
- river authorities.

All eligible applicants must have the authority to implement a CDBG mitigation project. In addition, applicants must have the authority and management and financial capacity to implement a CDBG mitigation project, if awarded. The GLO will review the management and financial capacity as part of the Hurricane Harvey State Mitigation Competition application review. Other entities with taxing authority with a primary purpose toward mitigation activities may submit justification to the GLO to be allowed into the competition on a case by case basis.

Is it possible for a city/county and a hospital to partner and apply hospital improvements?

Yes, in general. The city/county would be the responsible entity and would need to include clear documentation, such as a Memorandum of Understanding or other appropriate legally binding document, identifying the roles and responsibilities of each partner. Further, applicants should carefully assess the particular improvement requested to ensure it is an essential element to their overall Mitigation project.

Does a Council Of Government need to have all of its counties as one disaster or another for it to apply?

If the council of government (COG) includes any given county identified in a particular disaster, then it is eligible to apply for that competition. Of course, the COG will be required to identify all beneficiaries of the proposed mitigation project, regardless of what county they are in.

How do you qualify for the planning programs?

Planning is not an eligible activity for the Mitigation Competitions.

Will the October 2018 flood event be included in a future Mitigation Action Plan.

The 2018 flood allocations are in a separate action plan currently under review with HUD. All state mitigation activities are required to address risks identified in areas affected by the 2015 Floods, 2016 Floods, and Hurricane Harvey. <https://recovery.texas.gov/files/hud-requirements-reports/mitigation/mitigation-ap.pdf>

Will an eligible project be funded through the reimbursement method or the cash advance method?

Transfer of CDBG Mitigation funds will be based on the reimbursement method based on actual expenditures by the subrecipient.

Project Eligibility

Are there grant funds to pay for payment to contractor to research and write a local Hazard Mitigation Action Plan?

This type of planning activity is not eligible for these competitions.

Can you provide guidance on the documentation that would be required or sufficient to demonstrate the Urgent Need Mitigation national objective? Specifically, that the project would result in measurable and verifiable reduction in the risk of loss of life and property. Should this be documented with flood modeling data of project performance or should a post-project performance monitoring program be developed?

The beneficiary identification methodology used by each applicant will provide measurable and verifiable data regarding the number of beneficiaries being removed from risk. Applicants must provide sufficient data and justification to support the methodology as well as the risk being mitigated.

Must all projects be new projects? Or can they be in planning stages or already underway eligible?

Regarding Regional and State Planning, the State Action Plan indicates, "The GLO is committed to the purposes of planning in the areas that are eligible for CDBG-MIT funds, and to the completion of some of the projects identified as a result of the studies. Because of the vast scope of the eligible area and the recurring nature of disasters throughout the state, the GLO may concentrate on regional approaches in addition to specific local solutions to promote sound mitigation practices. In order to provide an efficient and effective method of selecting and executing planning studies, the GLO will work with Texas universities, state agencies, federal agencies, regional planning and oversight groups - including councils of governments, river authorities, and drainage districts - and/or vendors (terms which shall include, but not limited to other governmental entities, and non-profit and for profit firms, entities, and organization) to conduct studies with CDBG-MIT funds. The GLO has previously utilized a local community input process that included public meetings, requests for information, listening sessions, and written surveys that helped determine the specific needs for planning studies. This process pointed to the need for more regional-based planning studies."

As such, planning studies as a proposed activity in a Competition application are not eligible.

However, as indicated in the Application Guide, "Applicants must develop their community mitigation projects in a manner that considers an integrated approach to housing, fair housing obligations, infrastructure, economic revitalization, and overall community resiliency. Consideration of the long-term planning process is required.

If applicable, applicants must identify where the proposed project type or activity is referenced and detailed in a current local adopted plan for the area where the project is seeking to be implemented. If multiple entities are submitting a joint project that crosses jurisdictional boundaries, the proposed project type or activity must be referenced within a plan, or multiple plans, that cover the multi-jurisdictional area where the project is being implemented."

Therefore, applicants are expected to have already assessed their risks and resulting needs and, if possible, identified mitigation efforts needed or proposed in local adopted plans. Local adopted plans may include but are not limited to: Master Plans, FEMA-Approved Local Hazard Mitigation Action Plans, Comprehensive Economic Development Strategies, Capital Improvement Plans, or Transportation Improvement Plans.

Regarding projects in planning stages or already underway, applicants may propose such projects, but - should they be awarded - only those elements proven to be CDBG-eligible will be reimbursable.

For the "Local Plan" requirement, does the project have to be listed in a Mitigation Plan or Master Plan or would we be able to get credit for the fact that the project is included in the Bond Program?

Local adopted plans may include but are not limited to: Master Plans, FEMA-Approved Local Hazard Mitigation Action Plans, Comprehensive Economic Development Strategies, Capital Improvement Plans, or Transportation Improvement Plans.

Applicants referencing Bond Programs (or any other adopted plan) will be required to provide evidence, identification of how it applies to and affects the proposed mitigation projects, and indicate (as appropriate) how budgets are impacted by use of other funding.

An applicant appears to be eligible for 2015 Floods State Mitigation Competition (HUD MID), 2016 Floods State Mitigation Competition (HUD MID), and Hurricane Harvey State Mitigation Competition (HUD MID). How should they determine which competition to apply in? Should they attempt to divide the project into separate parts?

Applicants must assess the entire scope of their Mitigation project need and compare it to the requirements of each Competition program. Some key questions to consider:

1. Does the cost of the total proposed Mitigation project fit within one application (consider application minimums and maximums)?
2. If the proposed Mitigation project exceeds the maximum available in one Competition program, it be broken out into separate Mitigation project proposals that (a) each provide a separate and distinct scope of work, (b) fully serve the beneficiaries identified for that application, and (c) meet the requirements of the specific program.

Can an activity with multiple sites and different beneficiary groups still be considered one project? For instance, if a County would like to elevate a road in each precinct, could that be considered one project?

As indicated in the Application Guide, "For application purposes, a project is a combination of eligible activities working together to reduce the risks of identified natural hazards for a defined geographic area and population. All proposed activities must support the overall mitigation project and the overall project will meet only one CDBG-MIT national objective.

- Project Service Area: Area(s) defined by the applicant that either have an urgent mitigation need or are comprised of 51% or more of low to moderate income individuals. It is critical that the service area determined by the applicant include the entire area served by the activity.
- Reducing risks of natural hazards: As outlined in Mitigation Needs Assessment section of the Action Plan, hurricanes, tropical storms/ depressions, severe coastal/riverine flooding, storms, and tornadoes are among the top risks to which Texas has the greatest exposure. Each proposed project must mitigate against one of these identified risks."

In the example provided, it will be the responsibility of the applicant to demonstrate how the proposed project benefits every individual identified. If the various street projects serve a larger Mitigation effort that the applicant can clearly identify and demonstrate the benefit claimed, then the proposal may be possible, as it is an eligible activity.

For a municipal management district whose jurisdiction is entirely within one city, does the city need to be a joint applicant with the municipal management district based on overlapping geographical jurisdiction? Or can the municipal management district be a lone applicant, assuming they have jurisdiction and authority to fully implement an awarded grant project? The proposed project is entirely within the municipal management district's jurisdiction, which by definition is also within the city.

Each Mitigation Competition application will be completed by a lead entity. Any other jurisdictions/parties whose interests may somehow be affected by the proposed project should be engaged by the applicant and any appropriate Memoranda of Understanding, Interlocal Agreements, etc. should be carefully crafted and executed to identify the roles, responsibilities and rights of each stakeholder.

A municipal management district is considering a project involving both green infrastructure in the right-of-way and acquiring a property adjacent to the right-of-way to build a stormwater detention park. The municipal management district has full jurisdiction and authority to implement projects in the right-of-way, however, they do not have authority to acquire property for the stormwater detention park. The municipal management district would like to partner with the city, which does have authority to acquire property for the park. An MOU would be developed indicating that the city agrees to acquire property and that the municipal management district would implement the stormwater detention park on the acquired property. In this case, does the city need to be a joint applicant with the municipal management district or is the city just considered a partner?

Each Mitigation Competition application will be completed by a lead entity. Any other jurisdictions/parties whose interests may somehow be affected by the proposed project should be engaged by the applicant and any appropriate Memoranda of Understanding, Interlocal Agreements, etc. should be carefully crafted and executed to identify the roles, responsibilities and rights of each stakeholder.

The TIGR application is broken down by Project, Activity, and Site, and I am seeking clarification on what constitutes a "Site." If a project is proposed to include a set of storm drainage infrastructure improvements on individual streets throughout a neighborhood, "Activity" would be "Flood control and drainage improvements," but would the "Site" be the neighborhood or the individual streets where improvements are proposed?

During the development of a Mitigation project, applicants should also consider how each element of the overall project will likely be bid out and completed. In the example provided, the sites would most likely be the individual streets, but applicants could also justify identifying the neighborhood as the site if the whole neighborhood was bid in one package. Ultimately, applicants should identify their sites based on the specifics of the individual project.

Can an eligible drainage district determine beneficiaries by using census data?

Yes, census data is an eligible option to determine beneficiaries. Another option is the survey of potential beneficiaries. The beneficiary identification methodology used by each applicant will provide measurable and verifiable data regarding the number of beneficiaries being removed from risk. Applicants must provide sufficient data and justification to support the methodology as well as the risk being mitigated.

Can prison populations be included for LMI calculation. The census information is not picking up these institutions' populations. We'd just like to confirm with GLO that including prison population is appropriate.

Prisoners are not eligible as part of an area benefit calculation.

For an elevation application, is the cost estimate required to have an engineer seal?

The applicant may leave the engineering seal blank on an application for an elevation program. Please ensure while estimating the budget that the engineering expenses do not exceed the cap for engineering services.

Is there a "Buy America" requirement?

There is no "Buy America" requirement for the CDBG Program. <https://www.hudexchange.info/faqs/2173/is-there-a-buy-american-requirement-for-cdbg-funded-construction-or-public/>

For the Harvey State & HUD Mitigation Competitions – how much CDBG-MIT funding can each applicant apply for?

Maximum Amount - \$100,000,000

Minimum Amount - \$3,000,000

NOTE: the maximum CDBG-MIT funding available should not be interpreted as a limit on the overall project cost. The minimum amount is to encourage applicants to submit projects that have the ability to have a significant impact and to encourage applicants to submit joint applications.

Which vintage of the American Community Survey should be utilized for the Race/Gender/Ethnicity data?

Please use the most recently available American Community Survey (ACS) 5-year estimates

How should applicants accurately provide the Beneficiary data that is requested in the Race/Ethnicity table in the TIGR portal if the format is inconsistent between the Census American Community Survey data available and the TIGR portal format?

Please use the most recently available American Community Survey (ACS) 5-year estimates

Must beneficiary data be provided if applying for the UNM National Objective?

Yes, beneficiary data must be provided for the UNM National Objective. The beneficiary identification methodology used by each applicant will provide measurable and verifiable data regarding the number of beneficiaries being removed from risk. Applicants must provide sufficient data and justification to support the methodology as well as the risk being

Are Project Beneficiary Map(s) required for all applicants (including urgent need)?

The beneficiary identification methodology used by each applicant will provide measurable and verifiable data, to include maps as applicable, regarding the number of beneficiaries being removed from risk. Applicants must provide sufficient data and justification to support the methodology as well as the risk being mitigated.

Does "Target Area Project" have a defined meaning?

"Target Area Project" is defined by the community's needs assessment that identifies specific locations and or populations that are to be served the project.

TIGR

Questions regarding TIGR access or data entry issues.

[Refer all TIGR access or data entry issues to tigrhelp@recovery.texas.gov](mailto:tigrhelp@recovery.texas.gov)

Do I need separate accesses to sign in to TIGR for each competition? If I already have access to TIGR do I need an additional sign on to complete competition applications?

A single sign on is required for all access to TIGR. An existing user should submit a user access request form to tigrhelp@recovery.texas.gov to have permissions added for each competition.

Do vendors working with more than one applicant need more than one account?

While a single sign on is required for all access to TIGR, each applicant must identify via TIGR access documentation whom should be allowed access to that specific disaster. Applicants should submit a user access request form to tigrhelp@recovery.texas.gov to have permissions added for each competition and application.

In the "General" Tab of the TIGR application it asks for us to specify the Fiscal Year End Date. Our agency has a fiscal year end date of August 31st, however I know this varies between different government agencies.

Please enter the Fiscal Year End Date of the lead agency submitting the application.

How should applicants accurately provide the Beneficiary data that is requested in the Race/Ethnicity table in the TIGR portal if the format is inconsistent between the Census American Community Survey data available and the TIGR portal format?

Please input all Race/Ethnicity data included in the most recent American Community Survey (ACS) into TIGR and upload supporting documentation from ACS. If TIGR data fields are inconsistent with the ACS format, please input ACS data as allowable and provide support documentation.

All race categories are not contained within the TIGR portal?

The TIGR portal has been updated to include all race categories as of 10/21/2020. The added categories are:

Black African American
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander
American Indian/Alaskan Native/White

If this update affects applications that have previously been submitted, please send in a request to the TIGR helpdesk (TIGRHelp@recovery.texas.gov) with all the necessary information and the TIGR helpdesk can make the appropriate modifications in TIGR for the applicant.

We would like to export our draft document into a PDF or Word file so we can clearly view all content and verify we have entered it in the format required and desired. How would we go about doing that?

The system does not have that capability at this time. One suggestion is to download through the browser and convert the document.

If I uploaded a duplicate file and am trying to delete it, but the system tells me I don't have permission to do that. I am an authorized user, not the signatory. Who among our authorized TIGR users would be able to remove the file?

Send a request with pertinent information (screenshots, project number/name) to the TIGR help email (TIGRHelp@recovery.texas.gov) and they can remove the duplicate file.

There are several documents we prepared for this plan that I don't see a place to upload. For example, we prepared a full Citizens' Participation Plan and Grant Management Plan and the County's Procurement Policies. Is there an opportunity to share these through the application?

Please upload in the "Notes and Activities" tab.

What should I do if I receive an error message in TIGR that says “we’re sorry but something went wrong”?

Log off of TIGR, waiting a minute or two, and log back in. This will allow you to get back into the system.

Please note, don’t log in and stay inactive in the system for long periods, this may cause you to get the above error message. If you experience any other errors while using TIGR, please reach out to tigrhelp@recovery.texas.gov.

What is the estimated start date to be entered in TIGR?

The date entered in TIGR will serve as a place holder until the contract is executed. The start date will be adjusted to correspond with the executed contract documents. January 1, 2021 can serve as an estimated start date for applications.

What do I do if I cannot submit information/documents in TIGR before the deadline?

Email tigrhelp@recovery.texas.gov & CDR.Mitigation@recovery.texas.gov before the deadline (5pm, October 28, 2020) and include screenshots of the application page in TIGR that displays the problem alongside a detailed explanation.

Scoring Criteria and Details

On the scoring sheet in the Application Guidance, under Project Impact, what are the perimeters to know how much of the 15 and 10 points, respectively, will be received? Are there different tiers of points depending on the population and beneficiaries?

Project Impact: 25 Points Possible

Total project application amount per total project beneficiaries 15 Points

Percentage of total project beneficiaries out of the total population within a jurisdiction(s)

10 Points

Detailed Scoring information is available per Competition on the GLO website at:

<https://recovery.texas.gov/mitigation/competitions.html>

After reviewing the Action Plan and application guidelines, I didn’t find any specific information detailing the cost per beneficiary or % of jurisdiction served criteria. In the past, there has been a range of costs per beneficiary with points assigned to each or a formula for calculating points upon receipt by the scoring agency. I also couldn’t locate any information regarding whether or not the % of jurisdiction served is an “all or nothing” or tiered point system.

Considering the project impact category is that with the highest possible points of all scoring criteria, this information is needed to develop the most competitive applications on behalf of our communities. Any guidance or information you could offer would be greatly appreciated.

Detailed Scoring information is available per Competition on the GLO website at:

<https://recovery.texas.gov/mitigation/competitions.html>

In GLO’s Supplemental Material regarding scoring, page 17 refers to what constitutes full points on contract performance.

If a current grantee received a GLO timely expenditure letter, but the delay had a valid justification, what do the grantees need to provide to GLO to avoid the loss of points?

Example reasons for delay include:

Environmental issues, Contractor or Engineer dismissal/resignation, Covid-19, GLO delay in providing approval on: housing guidelines, extension requests, monitoring delays.

If an applicant receives a timely expenditure letter, then the points will be determined based date of that letter and what contract is it related to. Justifications will not be considered.

Has the "MIT Application Data Supplemental" been updated and loaded on the GLO Competition Website?

Yes, the MIT supplemental data has been updated and loaded to the GLO CDBG-MIT Competitions website. You can access this information by clicking the "MIT Application Data Supplemental" once you have reach the following website:

<https://recovery.texas.gov/mitigation/competitions.html>

May I please have guidance in locating the county charts showing the service area's Composite Disaster Index, Social Vulnerability Index (SoVI), and Per Capita Market Value?

This information is found within the "MIT Application Data Supplemental" document and is located on the following website:

<https://recovery.texas.gov/mitigation/competitions.html>

Regarding scoring criteria, how can I determine what score my city's application would receive for "management capacity" and for "mitigation/resiliency measures"?

All CDBG-MIT competition scoring criteria factors and methodologies can be found in the MIT Scoring Competition Criteria documents associated for each competition. The "mitigation/resiliency measures" criteria are only applicable for the Hurricane Harvey State Mitigation Competition. Please see each MIT Scoring Competition Criteria at the links below:

2015 Floods State Mitigation Competition:

<https://recovery.texas.gov/files/resources/mitigation/2015-mit-competition-scoring-criteria.pdf>

2016 Floods State Mitigation Competition:

<https://recovery.texas.gov/files/resources/mitigation/2016-mit-competition-scoring-criteria.pdf>

Hurricane Harvey State Mitigation Competition:

<https://recovery.texas.gov/files/resources/mitigation/harvey-mit-competition-scoring-criteria.pdf>

Localized treatment of scoring criteria – The Hurricane Harvey MIT Scoring Criteria document (Harvey-mit-competition-scoring-criteria) appears to constrain an applicant to using Poverty Rate, Social Vulnerability, and other criteria at the city or county level only. For projects serving areas within a very large city or county, this approach fails to consider local variability in populations and may unduly harm the competitiveness of applications for projects serving particularly low-income and vulnerable populations in smaller areas within a large city or county. Please clarify whether census tract-level data may be used for Poverty Rate and Social Vulnerability.

The city and county data measurement levels have been determined to be the appropriate scope of analysis regarding the Poverty Rate and Social Vulnerability Index (SoVI) criterion.

Per Capita Market Value (PCMV) – Is the PCMV score intended to be based on the project service area or the applicant's jurisdiction?

Per Capita Market Value (PCVM) is determined by if the project service area is wholly within one (1) city, one (1) county, multiple cities, or multiple counties. If the project service area is wholly within one (1) county or wholly within one (1) city, then the Total Market Value and Total Population of the individual county or city will be used. If the project service area is in multiple cities and/or multiple counties, the Total Market Values and Total Populations of the applicable cities and counties will be used. Please see each MIT Scoring Competition Criteria.

How are the 15 available points for the cost per beneficiary calculated?

The method and example for this question can be found in section 7.A (Project Impact) of each respective competition's MIT Scoring Competition Criteria PDF found on the following page:
<https://recovery.texas.gov/mitigation/competitions.html>

Some of the scoring is based on the percent of total population served (e.g. Project Impact). Is it possible for to map out census tracts and block groups to show the project service area and use that total population number rather than having to use the total population in a jurisdiction?

Answer is two part: Section 7.A) For "Total project application amount per total project beneficiaries" - Yes, the applicant can map out census tracts and block groups to show the project service area and use that total population number. However, for Section 7.B) "Percentage of total project beneficiaries out of the total population within a jurisdiction(s)", applicant must follow the method outlined in the Criteria doc, i.e., either the city or county.
- See Competitions Criteria documentation linked above.

If a project spans 3 counties are we able to use the places & consolidated cities rather than blocks for the cdi/sovi/market calculations? Similar can we use this for LMI or does it have to be blocks?

The County Composite Disaster Index (CDI) outcomes are only available at the county level. If the proposed project service area is in multiple counties and have the same CDI rank, the CDI rank will be that of the counties. If the proposed project service area is within multiple counties with different CDI ranks, the overall project CDI rank will be calculated as a multi-county prorated CDI rank based on project beneficiaries between the multiple county area.

The Social Vulnerability Index (SoVI) outcomes are only available at the county or city level. If the proposed project service area is wholly within multiple cities, then the overall project SoVI rank will be calculated as a multi-city prorated SoVI rank based on project beneficiaries between the multiple cities. If the proposed project service area is in multiple counties (either in the unincorporated areas or both the unincorporated areas and incorporated areas), then the overall project SoVI rank will be calculated as a multi-county prorated SoVI rank based on project beneficiaries between the multiple county areas.

The Per Capita Market Value (PCMV) outcomes are only available county or city level. If the proposed project service area is wholly within multiple cities, then the aggregate PCMV rank of the cities will be calculated. If the proposed project service area is in multiple counties (either in the unincorporated areas or both the unincorporated areas and incorporated areas), then the aggregate PCMV rank of the counties will be calculated.

The Low- and Moderate- Income (LMI) outcomes are based off the most recent low- and moderate- income summary data (LMISD) information or by conducting a survey of the area with approved CDBG-MIT forms. The method(s) used by the applicant to identify the beneficiaries of a project are based on the type of project proposed and the persons that are projected to benefit from the proposed project. For project service areas that cover multiple jurisdictions, scoring will require beneficiary identification per jurisdiction. When an applicant project will only benefit a portion of a Census Geographic Area (CGA), the applicant must demonstrate that a significant number of the persons in the CGA will benefit from the project. The CDBG-MIT program will not allow an applicant to use the HUD calculated low- and moderate-income percentage for a block group unless a significant portion of the persons located in that block group will benefit from the project. The CDBG-MIT program will only allow the use of the Census-based information to qualify an activity and to document the activity beneficiaries under the following conditions:

- a) The project will benefit all of the persons within a CGA or a significant number of the persons within a CGA. The CGA could be a county, place, census tract, block group, or logical record number.
- b) If only Census-based information is used to document the LMI beneficiaries of an application project, the low- and moderate-income benefit percentage must be at least 51 percent (not 50.99 percent) for a single CGA, or for combinations of two or more CGAs.
- c) The Census-based information may be used in combination with CDBG-MIT survey beneficiaries, income eligible beneficiaries, and condition-eligible beneficiaries to document the LMI beneficiaries of an application project. Again, the project must benefit at least 51 percent low- and moderate-income persons.

Please view the 2015 Floods, 2016 Floods, and the Hurricane Harvey State Mitigation Competition Applicant Eligibility and Scoring Criteria documents and the CDBG-MIT Competition Application Guide on the Competitions webpage.

The scoring criteria allocates up to 20 points for meeting the LMI National Objective. No points are shown for meeting the Urgent Need Objective. Does this mean that the Total Possible Points for a project under the Urgent Need Objective is 80 (*for the 2015 and 2016 Mitigation Competitions*) and 85 (*for the Harvey Mitigation Competition*) points?

Yes, the state is prioritizing funding, and projects, for Low- and Moderate- Income (LMI) persons and is therefore only providing points for the LMI national objective. Projects are still eligible under the Urgent Need Mitigation (UNM) national objective, but applicants will not receive points for UNM national objective projects, i.e., total possible points for a project under the UNM national objective is 80 (for the 2015 and 2016 Mitigation Competitions) and 85 (for the Harvey Mitigation Competition).

The application guidelines address multi-jurisdictional applications by specifying that one of the participating entities must take the "lead." The assumption here is that the lead entity's information will be used for the application (Disaster Composite, SVI, Per Capita MV, etc.). However, the application guidelines do not address multi-jurisdictional entities (COGs, river authorities, etc.) and which data will be used to score these applications.

If the Project Service Area covers a multi-jurisdictional location, no matter if the application is a single applicant application covering multiple jurisdictions or a joint applicant application covering multiple jurisdictions with a lead applicant identified, Project Service Area information will be used as the basis for determining scores under the following criteria.

- a) County Composite Disaster Index (CDI)
- b) Social Vulnerability Index (SoVI)
- c) Per Capita Market Value (PCMV)
- d) Low- and Moderate- Income (LMI) National Objective
- e) Project Impact

If the application is a single applicant application covering multiple jurisdictions or a joint applicant application covering multiple jurisdictions with a lead applicant identified, non-Project Service Area information will be used as the basis for determining scores under the following criteria:

- a) Project Type Identified in Local Adopted Plan
- b) Management Capacity
- c) Leverage
- d) Mitigation/Resiliency Measures (Hurricane Harvey State Mitigation Competition only.)

For a joint applicant application, the only criterion where the identified “Lead Applicant” will be solely scored, without the consideration of the other applicants, is the Management Capacity criterion. If multiple entities are submitting a joint project, a “Lead Applicant” must be identified and will be responsible for the applicable management capacity questions.

Please view the 2015 Floods, 2016 Floods, and the Hurricane Harvey State Mitigation Competition Applicant Eligibility and Scoring Criteria documents on the competitions website.

What is the scoring methodology for Houston’s Harvey DR 17 contract?

The State of Texas Action Plan: Hurricane Harvey (\$5.6 Billion) Amendment 7 has been submitted to HUD for review and approval. Once approved by HUD, the GLO will initiate the contract termination process for the city of Houston.

Will Houston’s Harvey contract be assessed differently than the scoring criteria of the Hurricane Harvey “Local Buyout and Acquisition Program” and “Local Infrastructure Program” contracts? If so, how?

The State of Texas Action Plan: Hurricane Harvey (\$5.6 Billion) Amendment 7 has been submitted to HUD for review and approval. Once approved by HUD, the GLO will initiate the contract termination process for the city of Houston.

Will the scoring criteria for “2015 Floods, 2016 Contracts, and/or Hurricane Harvey \$57.8 million” apply to Houston’s 2016 CDBG DR contract?

The city of Houston’s 2016 Floods CDBG-DR contract will follow the scoring criteria presented under the “2015 Floods, 2016 Contracts, and/or Hurricane Harvey \$57.8 million” scoring methodology.

In criteria #5 of Management Capacity, what is the definition of “in line”?

“In line” refers to milestones achieved and a percentage of the funds expended as outlined in the contract performance statement. Project milestones address the percentage of a given project/recovery activity completed.

The City has grant agreements with other state entities besides GLO. Will GLO consider the City’s performance on other state contracts funded by state or federal dollars? If so, how?

The GLO will not consider an applicant’s performance on other state contracts funded by state or federal dollars.

Will the GLO allow census tract level SoVI data to be used for these competitions as described in the HUD approved Acton Plan?

This quoted Action Plan language in the response to the public comment appendix preceded finalizing the 2015, 2016, and Hurricane Harvey State Mitigation Competitions Applicant Eligibility and Scoring Criteria methodology. During the finalization of the scoring methodology, it was determined that the city and county data measurement levels were the most appropriate scope of analysis regarding the Social Vulnerability Index (SoVI) criterion. The census tract level data measurements are not the most appropriate scope of analysis regarding the SoVI criterion and will not be used in CDBG-MIT competition scoring methodologies.

SB 2 constrains the ability of local governments to raise property tax rates without expensive elections. Special assessments on project beneficiaries might be preferable. Will GLO accept PCMV for the project service area?

The GLO will not accept the project service area as a basis for calculation in determining the Per Capita Market Value (PCMV) criteria score. Project service area is used to determine the appropriate methodology when calculating the PCMV criteria as seen below:

Method 1:

- If the proposed project service area is wholly within one (1) city, then city's PCMV rank will be used;
- If the proposed project service area is wholly within one (1) county (either in the unincorporated areas or both the unincorporated areas and incorporated areas), then the county's PCMV rank will be used.

Method 2:

- If the proposed project service area is wholly within multiple cities, then the aggregate PCMV rank of the cities will be calculated;
- If the proposed project service area is in multiple counties (either in the unincorporated areas or both the unincorporated areas and incorporated areas), then the aggregate PCMV rank of the counties will be calculated.

Will the GLO accept as a measure of Project Impact the number of persons benefiting within the project service area?

The GLO will not consider the number of persons benefiting within the project service area as a basis for calculation in determining the Project Impact criteria score for B. Percentage of total project beneficiaries out of the total population within a jurisdiction(s).

The total project beneficiaries must equal the number of persons benefiting within the project service area. If this is not the case, then the total project beneficiaries are incorrect, or the project service area is incorrect.

The Project Impact criteria score will be determined by:

- A. Total project application amount per total project beneficiaries;
- B. Percentage of total project beneficiaries out of the total population within a jurisdiction(s).

Will GLO accept as a measure of Project Impact the number of structures removed from the floodplain?

The GLO will not consider the number of structures removed from the floodplain as a basis for calculation in determining the Project Impact criteria score. The Project Impact criteria score will be determined by:

- A. Total project application amount per total project beneficiaries;
- B. Percentage of total project beneficiaries out of the total population within a jurisdiction(s).

What is the scoring methodology for Houston’s Harvey DR 17 contract?

The State of Texas Plan for Disaster Recovery: Hurricane Harvey (\$5.6 Billion) Amendment 7 has been submitted to HUD for review and approval that eliminates funding for the city of Houston. Once approved by HUD, the GLO will initiate the contract termination process for the city of Houston. The Hurricane Harvey city of Houston executed contract may not be available to score for the CDBG-MIT competitions.

Will Houston’s Harvey contract be assessed differently than the scoring criteria of the Hurricane Harvey “Local Buyout and Acquisition Program” and “Local Infrastructure Program” contracts? If so, how?

The State of Texas Plan for Disaster Recovery: Hurricane Harvey (\$5.6 Billion) Amendment 7 has been submitted to HUD for review and approval that eliminates funding for the city of Houston. Once approved by HUD, the GLO will initiate the contract termination process for the city of Houston. The Hurricane Harvey city of Houston executed contract may not be available to score for the CDBG-MIT competitions.

When determining the cost person ratio under Project Impact scoring for a citywide benefit, will GLO use current B01003 or LMISD to determine the number of project beneficiaries? These population numbers often differ.

Regarding scoring in the Project Impact section, the GLO will use the most recently available American Community Survey (ACS) 5-year estimates Table B01003 to determine the jurisdiction's population. Beneficiary numbers must be identified through either CDBG-MIT surveys, LMISD, direct benefit, or limited clientele methods.

Why is the National Objective for UNM not given the same 20 point preference as the LMI criterion?

The National Objective is scored in accordance with federal law. A cornerstone of this law also requires that CDBG-MIT funds prioritize Low- and Moderate- Income (LMI) households over and above the National Objective. Therefore, the scoring set up by the GLO and approved by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has been set forth accordingly. Please see the following scoring links for additional information
<https://recovery.texas.gov/files/resources/mitigation/2015-mit-competition-scoring-criteria.pdf>
<https://recovery.texas.gov/files/resources/mitigation/2016-mit-competition-scoring-criteria.pdf>
<https://recovery.texas.gov/files/resources/mitigation/harvey-mit-competition-scoring-criteria.pdf>

Which vintage of the American Community Survey should be utilized for the Race/Gender/Ethnicity data?

Please use the most recently available American Community Survey (ACS) 5-year estimates

Can TxWDB funding be used as leverage for CDBG-MIT?

Yes. TxWDB funding can be used as leverage for CDBG-MIT.

Is the applicant required to submit a self scored score sheet with the application?

The applicant is not required to submit a self score sheet with the application.

Disclaimer: The Texas General Land Office has made every effort to ensure the information contained on this form is accurate and in compliance with the most up-to-date CDBG-DR and/or CDBG-MIT federal rules and regulations, as applicable. It should be noted that the Texas General Land Office assumes no liability or responsibility for any error or omission on this form that may result from the interim period between the publication of amended and/or revised federal rules and regulations and the Texas General Land Office's standard review and update schedule.