

## **NDRC NOFA-Specific: Link between Need and Soundness of Approach**

### **Thursday, July 9, 2015**

### **3:00-4:30pm EST**

Sandy Patel: Good afternoon, everyone and thank you for joining us for the NDRC Phase 2 series webinar. Today's webinar topic is NOFA link between need and soundness of approach. My name is Sandy Patel and I am with TDA, a technical assistant provider for HUD. I will be serving as your host today.

I am going to run through some technical instructions on how to ask questions and things like that before I hand it off to our wonderful presenters. Please turn off your cell phones and close the email and all other programs on your computer and give your undivided attention to our presenters today. If you have any technical problems you can call my colleague Vicky Grim[ph] at the telephone number on the screen or you can send a chat message to the host that will come directly to me. I can help you through any issues that you might be having regarding the WebEx.

All participants will be needed during the call. Questions can be asked in two ways. You can ask a written question using the Q&A tool or a verbal question via the conference call. You can ask written questions at any point during the presentation. The panelists will collect those and answer them when we stop for questions. To ask a written question use the Q&A tool. It is located on the right-hand side. You can see a screenshot of what it looks like up on the screen. If you do not see it click on the triangle and it will expand the box. Please ask questions to all panelists then just type the question in the box and hit send. Again you can do this at any point during the presentation.

You can also ask questions verbally. There is one set you will need to do in order to do that. You will need to connect your phone line to your online login and WebEx. If you take a look at the participant panel you will see your name under the attendees. If there is a phone icon next to your name like there is one on my slide here then you are all set. If there is not a phone icon next to your name you will need to look on the event info tab midway down the page. There is an identify code. Pound and then the number and then pound. You can put that into your telephone keypad at any time. When you are ready to ask a question there is a hand icon on the lower right hand corner of the participant panel. If you click on that you will virtually raise your hand and then when we pause for questions we will take questions in the order that they are received. We will unmute your line and ask you to ask your question at that point.

All questions either written or asked verbally will be answered verbally. We may not be able to get to all questions but we will try to answer common questions first. Please send additional unanswered and private questions to the email address on the screen – that is [resilientrecovery@hud.gov](mailto:resilientrecovery@hud.gov). With that I am going to hand it off to Duncan Yetman with HUD.

Duncan: The link between need and soundness of approach. My name is Duncan Yetman. I am a CPD specialist in the Office of Block Grant Assistance here at HUD. I am joined in today's webinar by Jessie Handforth Kome the Deputy Director of the Office of Block Grant Assistance and by other members of the NDRC Team.

Jessie Handforth Kome: Duncan is trying to advance the slides and give a presentation at the same time. Let's see if he can do it.

Duncan: That's right. You know we're –

Jessie Handforth Kome: We're a high-tech squad.

Duncan: We're a high-tech squad here. That's right. So today's agenda if we are going to do it as we have done in the most recent webinars provide an overview of the National Disaster Resilience Competition, get into a description of what need was in Phase 1, what Factor 2 was in Phase 1, describe Phase 2, Factor 2 need has been a problem. Show that link between need and soundness of approach for questions at the end.

The NDRC overview. The National Disaster Resilience Competition. As you know we are making \$1 billion available to communities. The competition encourages communities to consider not only their recovery from a past disaster but how to avoid future disaster losses, to be more resilient. Applicants need to demonstrate a link or tie-back of their proposals to the disaster from which they are recovering. The timeline as we are on right now as you can see we are in Phase 2 the deadline is October 27<sup>th</sup>, 2015 and we have a little over 100 days left to that deadline.

And with that I am going to hand it over to Jessie Handforth Kome.

Jessie Handforth Kome: Okay and we are going to talk about moving from need in Phase 1 to where you need to get in Phase 2.

So in Phase 1 you had to make a compelling case based on how you identified your most impacted and distressed target areas for your unmet housing, infrastructure, economic degradation recovery and ongoing resilience needs. And that was for your MID-URN submission to get through thresholds. So that was the beginning of need.

Then you also responded in narrative to a lot of the factors and you had to develop a science-based comprehensive risk approach to analyzing your need. And you were supposed to take into account risks to your areas to climate change and other hazards and public health and safety, economics, social environmental impact, and you can even talk about community development objectives. It wasn't just risk. But your risk approach is what you started from.

Now some of you are better at doing forward-looking climate change analysis, which is a requirement to get funded in Phase 2. We thought if the panel gave a significant number of people notes on their analysis and especially that – if you give it an especially strong analysis of historical trends, but didn't really look at the analysis or analyze the projections for the future, you got a note about that and we would expect you to strengthen that. We are not requiring you to agree with it or believe it, but we want you to get somebody qualified to take a look at what is projected for your area and see if there is design implications that you should take into account if you are going to make an investment last 20, 30, 40, 50 years. That is a particular one where we saw patterns of weakness in Phase 1. Otherwise people really attacked this I thought pretty thoroughly.

I should also mention in Phase 1 you would also get notes if we thought that you wouldn't do a really strong look at discussion back and forth with stakeholder groups. And we sometimes flagged additional groups that we were surprised you hadn't talked to that we knew were in your area. Or we mentioned that we couldn't tell how you were going to get to citizens or if you gave us a plan for the future how you are going to get to citizens. You are going to need to look at that in Phase 2.

So starting Phase 2 you have begun Phase 2 with your needs analysis that served as the basis for your sound approach, your idea or concept. And we want you to develop that going forward iteratively, with significant stakeholder consultation. Nobody gets their first draft right. And in a big way your Phase 1 proposal is a first draft approach. Your approach in Phase 2 is a story of how you further refine your need analysis and are going to get to the point where you can pull a project or a program site out of it for your soundness of approach in Factor 3.

So how do you decide where to start? One of the things that we want you to do is, this is described as using hindsight to think resiliently. I describe it as also using Monday morning quarterbacking. We want you to describe to people if you had had a resilient measure in place at the time of the disaster you had experienced, what would have happened? How much less costly would the event have been? And we give you a formulation for walking through this counterfactual.

Allison Heck: Did you do the formulation?

Jessie Handforth Kome: Not yet. We'll get there. So the first part within Phase 2, Factor 2 need to extend the problem if you haven't read the NOFA since we revised it, you need to do that. It is now formatted differently to really bring up what each section is about and where the musts are. There is a lot more things that are musts in Phase 2.

So we are looking for resilience needs within your recovery needs. We want you to try to really get a grip on like key things, that your needs could have been less or altered if you had had a resilience project in place, and to try to really scope out the value of investment and resilience in your area. So some of this may overlap if you have a BCA for a covered project and you can do crosswalks and summaries just the way you did before. Just make sure that the part of this that is page limited answers the question, and the rest is supplementary material, Okay? Because the BCA is not page limited and we are not scoring it.

This is going to help establish the value or a range or order of magnitude level for your unmet resilience needs embedded in your recovery needs in your community development objectives, and all of that. They were specifically looking for the resilience as part of your recovery. This is part of us helping you build the case that these additional resilience needs are fundable and eligible under our law which is a disaster recovery law. Okay? Step forward.

The formulation as follows. We actually give you a sentence to go ahead and use. You can break it down. You don't have to word it exactly like this, obviously. But we want you to say the disaster in my MID-URN area and community if you have a wider area, affected the area, community in A, B and C ways. And remember we told you to always identify MID-URNs and the MID-URNs effects, and then if you have a greater community, the effects in the greater community. Break them out wherever you can. If it is not possible because of your dataset we understand that, but where you can break them out, break them out. So, affected the community in A, B and C ways. It cost individuals D, local government E, insurance F, state government G, the federal government Q.

what did you get in grants or loans or federal assistance? Obviously for some of you, you are going to be including some loss of life here and other things. The BCA can give you guidance on how to discuss that and value that. Then you are going to say, if this policy, this feature, this thing for either your proposed project or your larger idea, your idea or concept from Phase 1, had been implemented prior to the disaster, my MID-URN and greater community would have been affected by the disaster in X, Y and Z ways. If you had already had a law in place that had upgraded your building codes, you built out elevations, or tornado shelters or whatever it was the building code change would do, what actually would have happened if you had been hit by the same disaster you had? This is a way for people to kind of think through what is the value of making this investment?

Now if you want to go beyond this after you step through and describe that second piece, and describe this for your estimates, and say here are the other disasters that happened to us also. This is how we would also protect from them that is gravy. That is absolutely fine to go do. Your formulation is your minimum. Okay?

Let's step forward to the next slide. And just say remember your idea or concept in Phase 1 is both the product and the approach that you took to framing your idea or concepts based on your demonstrated need and your consultation with stakeholders. We took your idea or concept from the soundness of approach factor in Phase 1, and we backed up that overall idea or concept, thought into the end of Factor 2 the need factor in Phase 2 to make room in Factor 3 for you to discuss your project. But we still have it there, and it is still the frame that you are dropping everything else into. You are going to add this counterfactual thing so people can understand some of the benefits, and get a hold of it in a more concrete way, instead of saying it is all about the future. We are using a time frame throughout all of this – past, present, future – to try to communicate really well and to understand very thoroughly what good are these investments.

For your sound approach, you developed a wealth of evidence that you drew some logical conclusions, or you would not be in this invitation round about the types of actions that are likely to succeed and ultimately lead to the best actual project or program type to undertake in your MID-URN area, in the greater region, or state as applicable. In your need factor, when you talk about the idea or concept, and restate it and iterate it, do not talk about a specific program or project. Talk about your greater idea or concept that is going to drive resilience into your community forever. Not just the project. You can even discuss part of your sound approach overall, and the long-term commitment. Obviously you can reference your Factor 5 response there if you want.

Then in the Phase 2 need factor you are going to iterate your unmet recovery needs. You are going to scope your resilience needs and you are going to succinctly iterate the overall approach before you move onto the Phase 2 soundness of approach factor and your individual project or activity description. We have known that quite a few of you are sticking with your CDBG language and talked about activities rather than the way we would talk about projects. Either is fine. We define project as a group of related activities, so either kind of language is fine. And project is a more common term in federal usage outside of the CDBG world.

Okay so that is the link. And here is the appropriate approaches where you are going to update your framing. This is the actual language from the NOFA. And once again, I note that we have page numbers, yay. And one of the questions that we have already been getting are why are we talking about CDBG-NDR eligible and ineligible actions and approaches here? This is just because, again, we are building up. Inside your idea or concept, a lot of you had things that are both eligible and

ineligible. There were some eligible things and ineligible things to come out of it. So here is where you start tearing apart a little bit – we have this greater idea or concept. This is what would be eligible. We could tie-back. These approaches possibly have some tie-back components we could look at. These approaches are maybe outside of our MID-URN and we have to get leverage, or they will be in a longer-term thing, or maybe we will be looking at regular CDBG, or maybe doing funds, or whatever it is. Some of your things will be eligible, some ineligible for these funds because these funds must tie-back to your MID-URN and they are time-limited.

Some of you are saying clearly on some of your concepts that you have time constraints that go beyond our time constraint of 2022 at the absolute longest if you get all the extensions possible.

Okay. Jump forward. Just one more time this is not the place and the need factor is not where you describe specific projects that is going to be in the soundness factor. You are trying to persuade your citizens and your reviewers at HUD and the other agencies helping us. What are the logical conclusions about? What is the right approach given the data that you have and analyses you have done? What is the most appropriate thing to do that will both meet your unmet recovery and revitalization needs? Address your community development objective and also includes all of this resilience to future unidentified hazards and threats.

Okay? Okay we are back to you.

Duncan: Very good. So just to reiterate there are several NDRC resources available to you beginning with the Rockefeller workshops for Phase 2. Rockefeller Foundation is once again supporting the goals of NDRC by convening two resilience workshops in July. Further details are forthcoming about that. We understand the White House has issued a press release in reference to that. You can see that on their site for more information. And there are also as well the standard other NDRC resources that we have available to you. The quick links that we have here to the resilience website at HUD links to the NOFA, to the fact sheet, and most importantly at the bottom here it will link to our NDRC webinar series.

Allison Heck: And we are about to release a whole bunch of pre-recorded webinars with basic information so you will be getting an email if you subscribe to our email mailing list for CDBG and CDBG-DR you will be getting an email that they will be posted on the HUD Exchange any second now.

Duncan: We will be posting those to the HUD Exchange and then issuing a listserv just to remind you, alert you that they are there.

Jessie Handforth Kome: And there will be a Phase 2 walk through, a design presentation, and a benefit-cost analysis that got pre-recorded rolling out. Allison is nodding; I must have gotten that right.

Duncan: We are ready to take your questions and we will be answering those verbally. Sandy, I see a question here about – I think we can answer it given the influence of stakeholder consultation. If you have had ongoing stakeholder consultation prior to the NOFA CDBG–NDR can that be used or are you only looking for stakeholder consultation that was after the release of the NOFA?

Jessie Handforth Kome: That is in the FAQs. We have answered this. We are interested in hearing about the stakeholder consultation you did before the NOFA but what is required for the NOFA is stakeholder consultation specifically about the NDRC itself and getting people to consult what you are going to commit to and apply to and to get their feedback and so you have to also have stakeholder consultation after the release of the NOFA. The FAQ words it more eloquently, and it is posted, and we can work on pulling that up closer to the – makes it easier to ask us. We ended up with a lot of FAQs after Phase 1 we are working on sorting them into categories.

Duncan: Next question – if we qualified in our target area and the threshold requirements through housing can we use the housing tie-back from the covered disaster in another community in the same target area that did not have housing damage from that covered disaster?

Jessie Handforth Kome: The answer is maybe. You cannot – your tie-back is to the effect of the disaster. If you had housing damage in, say, a low-lying community that has been suffering from repeated flooding, and you don't want to rebuild or do anything in that space because you want to clear that flood plain, and you need someplace for those people to go, maybe in the same labor market area, and you are going to go build somewhere that was not affected, your new construction project will still have a tie-back to the loss of housing from the covered disaster. But you will need to make the case of how they are related and talk about how they are related and why you are doing it. A classic example that has happened if a mud slide has destroyed housing, and there is no place to rebuild the housing because the mud slide has taken over the land, and you need to build housing somewhere else to make up for the loss of say 50 or 100 units of housing, then that is fine. Normally your case is going to be the strongest if you stay in the same labor market area, but you can make the argument other ways. There are some examples in our history where we have gone further when forced to, particularly in rural areas. You have to make the case from tie-back to the disaster that you had. You can't just say hey we got our ticket to ride for this county because we [were impacted] we are going to go do something really related to the impact over there. You have to have that tie-back relationship.

Duncan: Alright, next question. When looking at the resilience needs within recovery needs should we play out scenarios for both eligible approaches?

Jessie Handforth Kome: We don't put the eligible, ineligible approach piece in that scenario section and it is interesting calling them scenarios. If you want to do it that way, or if you want to explain within your explanation and say that we know that, you know, this piece that we want to do building market rate housing is not necessarily going to be eligible, that we might have trouble with the national objective or something, but this piece of building doing economic development that would work because it is going to be low mod job. You can say that. That actually advances your thinking I think. What we are trying to do is just build up to where you are going to be pitching projects to us where you really do have to hit the hard line or ask for waivers for ineligibility, national objectives, and overall benefits. We found over the years that it is incredibly helpful for citizens to understand that CDBG is incredibly flexible, but there are some things it can't reach. And you don't want to make expectations so high that you can't even be a part of them. That is why we added eligibility and ineligibility to the discussion, but we added it at the very end.

We didn't put it in a scenario. But again, if you want to shift it there and then build to it – to the final answer you can do that too. It's an interesting question.

Duncan: Next question – does each specific project have to demonstrate how it addressed unmet need identified in the Phase 1 application.

Jessie Handforth Kome: Every activity within your project is going to – that you fund with CDBG NDR funds, ultimately is going to have to demonstrate tie-back. So the answer to that is yes. But you can be creative with the logical pivot. It is possible and it has been done to say we lost a lot of housing and we are going to build economic development over here and this is how it addresses that loss of housing need and the revitalization needs of the community as it is now. You have to think about what is the situation you have and find the eligible activity with tie-back, the eligible project in there. There will be parts of your project that will be CDBG-NDR ineligible. You won't be able to invest funds in them and you are going to have to bring leverage for that. We are not requiring that the supporting leverage demonstrates a link to the unmet recovery need. We are requiring that the leverage is directly into the CDBG-NDR assisted project, so it is going to get caught in needing to demonstrate the tie-back.

Duncan: Okay. Alright.

Jessie Handforth Kome: I hope that answers that. I know tie-back can be something that is hard to wrap your brain around until you have a specific project that you are looking at.

Duncan: The next question is how do we qualify a potential project involving a storm water retention area off of a creek further upstream where impacts may be less but will create much greater resilience downstream reducing much greater flood impacts?

Jessie Handforth Kome: I think the closest I can come to an answer without advising you of how to do this so - it is competitive which is a problem we are not allowed to- we need to look at how does that work in that smaller stream address or tie-back at all to your demonstrated need? One of the things that we did if you are a regular CDBG-DR grantee, and I am guessing this question came from somebody that has CDBG-DR in this appropriation, actually said you have to meet the identified needs. We slightly altered that, and it is nuanced but we said you have to address that need. So we didn't say you have to go after the worst needs, we said you have to go after a need you demonstrate and meet the MID-URN threshold which we actually set fairly low. So you can go after a lesser need if it will give you greater resilience. You need to explain how that project ties back and ties back to the MID-URN that you demonstrated in some way. You are going to have to show how it addresses your identified MID-URN that is what tie-back does. It doesn't say meet. That is actually a fair amount of running room once you start thinking about these – you are going to have to make the logical connection.

Duncan: In Phase 2 can we introduce an additional MID-URN area that was impacted by the qualifying disaster through downstream impacts but is not located in the county included in the federal disaster declaration?

Jessie Handforth Kome: Unfortunately, no. We can only consider the counties that were within the declaration. But here is the caveat – say you have two counties one upstream from the other. The upstream one is in the MID-URN qualify area. The downstream one is not a declared county. If you have to work to protect the MID-URN area, you have to work in the other county, that is possible if you can establish tie-back, and we know upstream, downstream problems can result in you crossing a county line. It is also possible that you will do some of your CDBG-NDR part of

your investment in the qualified county and get leverage for the other part of it outside the declared county. But, by law, we are bound into only counties that were declared under the Stafford Act for the qualified disaster, and further than that, even into most impacted and distressed areas. And for their benefit. But you don't actually have to spend in those areas you have to spend for their benefit. It depends; I don't know exactly what your problem is.

Duncan: Okay. Alright. The next question we have here is if you have previously received CDBG-DR funding and your action plan contains similar but not the same projects as in the Phase 2 application do you provide a justification?

Jessie Handforth Kome: If you have tender ears close your ears now. Hell yes. Yes, we can't read your minds. We do not know. It is one of the major, major, major problems that we had and argued over a lot was for the existing CDBG-DR grantees, where they were similar. We were as open and believing as we could be but you need to tell us for sure, absolutely lock down, that you don't have enough money with your existing CDBG-DR to reach the projects that you are proposing because you must have unmet recovery need for us to fund you. And if we have already funded you for a need, or if you have a similar product it definitely raises the question. Assume we don't know and tell us. Justification not so much, although it would be nice if you explain it at least a little in your NDRC application. That is a sore point. Duncan is laughing at me.

Duncan: The next question – can you discuss briefly how the MID-URN threshold calculation needs or does not need to be updated for Phase 2?

Jessie Handforth Kome: Yeah, everybody doesn't want to do this work again, but what we are telling you to do and it is at the top of the need directions in Phase 2 is to reiterate. Look and see if there any more information? Can you talk to more stakeholders? Is there anybody you missed? See if you can make this investment get more needs. Find out if there are any more needs by investing in this area addressed. If you don't know what the problem is, you can't solve it. So we want you to say – I know quite a few of you had other needs pointed out to you since you submitted your Phase 1 application because I read blogs in a lot of your communities, and I can tell and field offices tell me stuff. I want you to look at your MID-URN. If you resubmit exactly the same thing without reiterating that is certainly possible, but we are giving you a chance to make your first draft better and to reiterate and to really think about it. So it needs to be resubmitted. Ideally for all the areas that you want to actually be considered for funding, and we are urging you to update it. We are prompting you to update it.

Duncan: Okay. So the next question – if the entire county was identified by HUD as most impacted and distressed what do we need to include for the projects to identify MID, most impacted and distressed qualifications?

Jessie Handforth Kome: There is actually – it is addressed to some extent in the prompt. Let me just take a quick look at the exact language here. Duncan has really staffed me well. He has left me a copy of the NOFA. Let me just see what we – what we said was we are looking for you to focus on the sub areas that will be served or most affected by your Phase 2 projects or programs based on best available information from reputable sources. So this is in the narrative that you could also put it in your MID-URN submission by showing us some of the sub-levels at the areas that other people had to submit.



Duncan: Can you provide the page number there, Jessie?

Jessie Handforth Kome: 40, 56. Page 40. I think there is another place but this is the one that I am spotting right now. Where it talks about updating your Phase 1 analysis, I was reading a sentence out of the middle of the paragraph there. Your project may or may not serve a whole county. A few of you are probably looking at things that will. We talk about sub areas there.

Duncan: Okay. Great. The next question is a follow up to storm water retention question. Do you have advice on how to define the benefit area to qualify the activity as meeting a CDBG national objective?

Jessie Handforth Kome: Okay so the benefit areas for storm water retention is actually a known thing that people who build these things draw concentric circles showing different amounts of benefit when they do this kind of analysis. You need to hunt yourself down an expert who does that. If you are just talking about a drainage ditch that is maybe a block, that's your benefit area. But if you are talking about storm water retention on the order of say the Hoboken Proposal that is in the Rebuild by Design then you know you may be talking about a whole city. This is a technical expert and engineer type of question.

Duncan: This is a science-based approach.

Jessie Handforth Kome: This is part of your science stuff.

Duncan: Okay.

Jessie Handforth Kome: Not like service area if you are a retail store or a park.

Duncan: That is all the questions we have right now. Any other questions you might have for us? We got plenty of time available if you have been wanting to ask us a question.

Jessie Handforth Kome: This is your last chance at me for a couple of weeks. I'm going on vacation. Thank you.

Duncan: We have another one here. So our target areas are composed of several communities and one community, the documented damage was to the community's primary transportation routes, are boardwalks and docks. This particular community is in the process of relocating to a new, more resilient –

Allison Heck: There is a character limit.

Jessie Handforth Kome: Put in another comment.

Duncan: Put in another comment.

Jessie Handforth Kome: You are relocating someplace new and more resilient. Yay. My dream in life, by the way and this is me speaking as me and not HUD is that we never have to talk to any of you again about any of these communities. You will make them so resilient that you will never come back. Even if you get subsequent disasters. That's my dream.

Duncan: More resilient location. The wisest action for long-term resilience would be not to rebuild boardwalks and docks in the current community which is not sustainable, but to apply resources to the community relocation site. Would a project including – we got another 256 limit – Maybe this is a better question you pose –

Jessie Handforth Kome: To [resilientrecovery@hud.gov](mailto:resilientrecovery@hud.gov).

Duncan: Or verbally okay?

Jessie Handforth Kome: Including transportation would the community transportation site be eligible? What we can't do is maintenance and running an ongoing service. That is not what these grants are for. If you need housing and a community is relocating we would see that as we would be funding part of essentially a buyout project or a relocation project and you should be able to create tie-backs. Even if you are picking up another phase of an ongoing project because you are enhancing resilience, you can move businesses using CDBG, you can do an optional relocation plan, a buyout plan. You can just acquire property at market value. You can build new housing in the community in which they are going. These things are eligible, and if you can show you can meet a national objective which low mod, slum blight, and urgent need all play. Your trick would be establishing tie-back clearly to whatever you want to fund. But paying for transportation going back and forth building a road or building a – the infrastructure is more of a CDBG thing. The ongoing operations and running the service you would definitely have to find another source.

Duncan: Okay. There is a follow-up to that question about the particular area was qualified through housing although not in this particular area could housing also be part of the project.

Jessie Handforth Kome: You definitely have to show that you have tie-back to MID-URN need that you demonstrated. You are going to have to show tie-back and that you are addressing it somehow. Anything that you put CDBG-NDR funds in. You might be breaking your project apart into eligible and ineligible portions based on tie-backs. I really don't – I mean CDBG practitioners are used to things breaking because almost everything is eligible, they are used to things breaking apart based on national objectives, but a lot of CDBG-NDR hangs on tie-back. Has your project got tie-back or not? We are letting you do a bigger pivot than usual by saying addressed instead of meet. Anybody who goes back in CDBG DR in 97 knows that we did that back then too. We have tried this before. We know it can work. You really have to make a logical run and test it on a total percent off the street. Does this sound reasonable to you? We run by the reasonable person test on tie-back. We are looking for you not telling us something that is clearly unreasonable. Yeah, that's whooeey. It's not the answer you want when we read this is how this ties back.

Duncan: There was a previous question.

Jessie Handforth Kome; I want to finish the thread.

Duncan: Okay. Finish the thread here.

Jessie Handforth Kome: Yes, if the damage was to transportation systems you need housing at a new site that is fine. You can establish tie-back. The transportation system in the whole community was trashed and you are putting the community back here. You can talk through that on

tie-back. We are not going to rebuild a road to a place that we need to move because of resilience needs. That is certainly – I mean we are big on buyouts. We like buyouts. Get people out of harm's way forever. I'm there.

Duncan: We had an earlier question about whether HUD would be at the resilience academy. I don't know if you want to address that in our role?

Jessie Handforth Kome: I am going to be in Denver and Chicago. We are probably – well, I am going to be in Denver and Chicago. Duncan is going to be in Denver. Chris is going to be in Chicago. Sara Jensen who is our benefit cost analysis whiz is going to be in Chicago. I am going to stand in for BCA in Denver. I think Frank McNally the Disaster Recovery specialist who is Deputy Director is going to come to Denver. We have pretty good coverage. Then Allison –

Allison: Allison and Danielle will be in Denver at that Academy. And then we have our two senior analysts Sunaree and Kevin will be in Chicago as far as I know.

Jessie Handforth Kome: Our role is going to be very similar to what we did in the earlier academies. I will be making a presentation on the general stuff and sitting on a panel taking questions as well as I can. One of the members of our team will be taking notes and stuff and trying to get FAQs up on questions that we get up so everybody knows the answers. We are not going to be in the critique session. We are not going to be helping and can't advise you on anything, like how to score better, things like that. What we can do is say I want to do this. Is it eligible? We need a national objective if we do it this way how do I request a waiver? Anything you want to ask about the NOFA, we will be there and we will answer all of the questions that we can as well as we can from the information that is already public. We are still very heavily bound by the HUD Reform Act, and we don't want to show any favoritism we are not allowed to. So we are going to have to be really, really careful but we wanted to be present to be able to answer technical questions that you might raise.

We also know among the lot of us, a lot of previous projects so we can give you CDBG-DR examples or point you off into directions that you might look for additional information and stuff like that. There is also going to be a lot of federal people there that are less bound from other agencies. You should take advantage of them too. I think like the previous academies you are going to find it is almost a one to one ratio of experts to applicant attendees which is pretty cool.

Chris Narducci: One other potential resource is the CDBG-DR main program is going to be conducting trainings this summer for current grantees, but we will be posting all of the materials from those trainings on our website soon. You want to keep a look out for those materials. That will provide you more information about how the main program typically operates, eligible activities, national objectives, reporting requirements. All of these things may apply more for existing grantees than for this NOFA application process, but still useful nonetheless.

Jessie Handforth Kome: And that was Chris Narducci.

Duncan: Next question is – if my highest hazard is completely unrelated to the declared disaster, for example an earthquake, how can I tie-back mitigation?

Jessie Handforth Kome: Mitigation and resilience aren't the same. What we are saying to you is whatever you want to fund with CDBG NDR has got to be tied back to the current disaster in some way. But when you build it, if you are going to build a house in an area that had a terrible fire but is also prone to floods. You were declared as fire, you would be foolish not to build that house to flood plain guidance because it is also prone to flood. We want you to make smart investments. That is why we want you to look forward. If you are in an area that might have earthquakes in the next 50 years in the useful life of whatever it is you are building then build the project that ties back to your current disaster. Maybe it was a flood – so that it has a tie-back to meeting an unmet recovery need, but at a quality level and with design features that deal with the risks that everybody is subject to. That is a co-benefit. We want really smart investments. All of this talk that we are doing is really about thinking really comprehensively so you invest incredibly scarce federal dollars and you get all the benefits you can possibly get for as long as possible and they make your community stronger, better. That is how I am going to tackle mitigation.

We could tell when – the best applications that we saw clearly had a partnership between people who knew mitigation and people who knew about community development. You got to have that. And the stakeholder consultation people who knew about communities. You need all three really strongly in there. And get a design professional. Try to get all the needs addressed. It really showed if you are just driven by only mitigation. Tie-back is a real like mental block for some reason. So you got to establish tie-back and then build from there to mitigate against your other risk with the project. But you still have to have that activity is bound by tie-back. And that is a statutory thing. I can't undo that. We are bending a law that wasn't meant for this.

Duncan: Okay. Next question is – we want to fund several engagement education programs that will lead to resilience. Could it be an eligible CDBG public service activity?

Jessie Handforth Kome: Yes. It is possible. I would again urge you to take a look at some of the Rebuild by Design projects. We would be very interested in you making the case as to why it is going to lead to resilience, why this is important. A lot of the Living with Water ideas that we saw include some public service, public engagement. Training people to be able to do that public engagement. So that is possible. Just remember it can't be your ongoing source. The funds are going to run out. But it is possible – it is possible to establish tie-back services. We don't see it often, but it has been done; it can be done.

Duncan: Okay. The next question for an applicant in which the entire county was declared a disaster but the Phase 2 focus is on a specific pilot area consisting of several communities. How should this be reflected in MID-URN and needs section? The Phase 1 MID-URN was for the whole county.

Jessie Handforth Kome: Well one of the things that we say at the top of the needs section we highlighted a little earlier was that we do want you to reiterate your MID-URN response on need. And if your project is going to affect a sub area more, to give us more information about that sub area. I would say the stakeholder consultation, the science-based analysis, anything special in that sub area that is your pilot area. You want to highlight the needs for that area. You want to strengthen the response. And that is all the advice I will give you.

Duncan: We have another question here. Would an emergency notification system be a CDBG eligible activity? Would it have to qualify only as a CDBG area benefit? If the system is designed to especially reach out to vulnerable populations, will it qualify as limited clientele?

Jessie Handforth Kome: Emergency notification systems might be CDBG eligible, but they are not eligible for this competition. It is in the list of ineligible activities. We are not interested in new ones. We ruled them out. Give me a second and I will find that citation and page number for you. This question is being asked a lot. I am guessing there is sort of short funding for emergency notification systems. Where did we put it in eligible activities? First person to post wins. Write in the chat boxes. Who isn't reading their notebook? This is what I get. I saw it the other day. Reminders. Design. It is way up front under, maybe, definitions. It was definitely one of the items that is listed under ineligible activities. Emergency operations centers are in there. Oh look 16/17. Thank you. Who wins the prize for that? Who was that? It is Alaska. I ought to know. It is under cross cutting that is my problem. So ineligibilities blah, blah, blah. Temporary measures, sandbags, emergency operation centers, equipment is generally eligible and we are just not interested in doing also response activities, equipment training, electronic evacuation road signs, interoperable communications equipment. We are not doing response. We are long term recovery and resilience in that sense.

Duncan: Here is the next question – there are systematic links between my highest hazard, drought, and declared disaster, flood. How detailed of a scientific case must be made for this if any projects are close that address drought?

Jessie Handforth Kome: What we have walked you through in Phase 1 and Phase 2 I can't go much beyond the directions. We tell you to look at your climate risk and design for what you see. We don't expect you to lay out the entire series of studies necessarily in great detail as if it were a scientific journal, but tell us what is your basis for thinking how that drought is going to affect your flood area other than the fact that you are probably under a drought right now if you are asking this question, and why you should design for it and give us that science-based forward-looking risk analysis. Here is where you will be building on, what you gave us for Phase 1.

And to give a sense overall, probably, is that the page limits we gave you are not quite double the number of pages for Phase 2. So we are looking for more detail and not necessarily a book.

Duncan: Here is the next question. Would the strongest application that has a regional target area resilient project score higher than a resilient project that just benefits one community?

Jessie Handforth Kome: If you go bigger than your MID-URN area you will, according to the NOFA, probably score higher in at least some of the factors. We say that very specifically in long term commitment. I believe that we stated it very clearly in several places in Phase 1 and there is at least one other place in Phase 2 that is getting away from my brain. So read the NOFA, find those places and think about it. The way we treat it though is definitely we are driving in a lot of places for a greater regional involvement. The way we sorted out the scoring for those of you looking at your letters is there is basically a four level scoring in most places. Where we ask for regional, there is a high level scoring. So there is high, moderate, low, zero and they are sort of like an extra high. If we are asking for regional where we put on sort of internally what we are calling internally the frosting points or frosting point depending on how many points are in the factor. So you can see from your letters most likely you know the words that describe those levels in the scoring. And you

can see in the NOFA where we are – we just say it and we like to say if you go beyond the MID-URN area that is how you get the highest points. But it is not for every factor. It is not everywhere.

We would also be intensely interested in a really great pilot program or project that is just benefitting one community if it could be replicated or if it was holistic really solved the problem forever.

Duncan: This next question is a follow up on the last disaster response question that we had. I think the answer is still no, though. Can a call-in system for disaster response be eligible under public service if it is targeted as vulnerable populations under CDBG NDR?

Jessie Handforth Kome: The problem is that the response systems like interoperable communications equipment and things like that are not eligible. If you – I mean we are just – we are not a response program. If your calling system was damaged by the disaster and it is in a facility or something then we can probably talk. If you are doing a new one that is not what funding is for.

Alaska may rule but I'm sure there are other places that are really nice too.

Duncan: If that system addresses their unmet recovery need what you are saying in some respects if they demonstrated –

Jessie Handforth Kome: If it was itself the URN the facility or whatever I don't remember seeing one that was – it has – I worked a case in Wilmington, North Carolina where they had just built all the towers for their system and Hurricane Fran came and made them not work. Damaged them and stuff. Putting them back can be done and we were just a match I think in those projects. Take a look on pages 16 and 17 on the ineligible activities they are not going to be familiar to your CDBG practitioners necessarily. Some of the CDBG-DR practitioners have seen them before.

Do we have any other questions out there?

Duncan: Those are all the questions we did have one question that was posted a little bit earlier about registration information for the resilience academies.

Jessie Handforth Kome: Rockefeller. These aren't HUD events; these are Rockefeller events so we have been doing all of the outreach to all of the eligible applicants not just the invitees to Phase 2. So if you haven't been contacted by Rockefeller you can send me a note at [resilientrecovery@hud.gov](mailto:resilientrecovery@hud.gov) and I will boomerang it over to Rockefeller. That is pretty much the extent of my involvement other than showing up answering your questions at the academies. Rockefeller runs the academy. That is their thing. As I said before, in some ways they believe they own the resilience space – the space on doing all kinds of things driving resilience nationally. We just happen to be here right now visiting their space. It has been great working with them. It is a different world for us. It is very interesting. Do I have any other questions?

Duncan: No other questions now. Any other questions from anybody? Once, twice.

Jessie Handforth Kome: There is about a 100 of you out there.

Duncan: Okay. Assuming that there is nobody that wants to ask us a verbal question we are going to go to our concluding slide here.

Jessie Handforth Kome: Thank you.

Duncan: To note for you the schedule change in the webinar series. There will be no live webinar next week. The approaches in infrastructure financing topical webinar that was originally scheduled until next week has been postponed. The date and time we will be announcing that. Our next live webinar will be a NOFA specific webinar on benefit cost analysis on July 23<sup>rd</sup>. We would ask you just to regularly watch the NDRC webinar series page for further updates and we provide the link again to that news page on this slide.

Jessie Handforth Kome: I think Allison has something.

Allison: This is Allison. I just want to speak to the rescheduling of approaches to infrastructure financing. We are just making it so we can have it when we get the best panel as possible. It is going to be a really great topical webinar. It will be rescheduled tentatively right now for August 6<sup>th</sup>. We will make adjustments to reflect those changes to the topical webinar series that Duncan provided the link to. It doesn't show up yet, but it will catch up shortly.

Duncan: Just keep going back to that page. Put it on your desktop. Put a link to it on your desktop and keep checking it regularly. That is it for today. Thank you for joining us. We will see you again and talk with you again and be available to answer your questions on benefit-cost analysis on July 23<sup>rd</sup>. Thanks. Bye-bye.