

## **NDRC NOFA-Specific: Lessons Learned- Phase I**

**Thursday, June 25, 2015**

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

Sandy Patel: 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 have. All participants will be muted during the call. Questions can be asked in two ways. You can ask written questions using the Q&A tool or a verbal question via the conference call. You can ask a written question 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 screen shot of what it looks like up on the screen. If you do not see it, click on the triangle and it will extend the box. Please ask questions to all panelists, then just type your question in the box and click send. Again, those you can ask at any point during the presentation.

You can also ask questions verbally. There is one step that you need to do in order to do that. You will need to connect your telephone line with your online login in 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 show, then you are all set. If you do not see a telephone icon next to your name, you will need to look on the event info tab. Midway down the page there is an identify code; it says pound then a number then pound. You can put that in your telephone keypad at any time. When you are ready to ask questions, there is a hand icon on the lower right hand corner of the participant panel. If you click that, you will virtually raise your hand. 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, whether written or asked verbally, will be answered verbally. We may not 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 Jessie Handforth Kome [PH] with HUD.

Jessie Handforth Kome: All right. This is great. Welcome to our first Phase 2 webinar for the National Disaster Resilience Competition. Greetings. We have a lot of people on the line and that is really exciting because we gave you really short notice. We are sorry for that; we were just really eager to get started the second that we could. But of course, we will be walking with you all the way until the October deadline with a series of webinars both live...

Computer voice: Conference record has joined the conference.

Jessie Handforth Kome: Oh, conference record has joined the conference, are we not glad to hear that. A lot of the team members that have been helping us with the National Disaster Resilience Competition here at HUD are in the room and Carey Whitehead [PH] from our Office of General Counsel is going to be talking about one of the lessons learned that we have already embedded in the NOFA. We have reissued the NOFA if you have not already found on grants.gov to restart Phase 2. It has an A or an A2 after the number just like the number that you used to have. Okay, can we go ahead and move ahead Lynsey?

Lynsey Johnson: Yes.

Jessie Handforth Kome: So, this is an overview, the agenda of what we are going to run through today. We are going to start with just where we are on the timeline and remind you of overall goals and objectives for the competition. Then we are going to tell you a little bit about; we are very constrained about we can talk about in terms of lessons learned from Phase 1. But we wanted to share some general observations in addition to the specific comments that each applicant got privately in a letter from their panel comments from Phase 1. We want to talk about sort of the general overall things that we learned from Phase 1. Then we are going to cover resources available to you in Phase 2 and take questions.

So overall timeline we have adjusted; you can see that now your deadline for Phase 2 is October 27, 2015 at a minute to midnight, also through grants.gov. Remember that just before the end of Phase 1, we had reduced the citizen comment time for Phase 2 to 15 days from 30. So that is one of the changes that is still reflected in the NOFA. We are still shooting for January announcement of Phase 2 winners. Our time shift to October 27 is not enough to knock us out of our overall timeframe, which we still are heading for.

Our competition goals are on the next line. They remain the same. You know we have a billion dollars that we want to fairly allocate. We want to apply science based and forward looking risk analysis to address recovery, resilience, and revitalization needs. We are very interested in leaving a legacy of implementing thoughtful, innovative, and resilience approaches to future risk, not just past disaster affects. We want to help provide resources to help communities plan and implement disaster recovery that is resilient that also makes communities stronger and more able to deal with other kinds of stresses like economic stresses or just plain old severe weather. We want to fully engage all the stakeholders all the way down to citizen stakeholders about the impact of climate change and develop pathways to resilience that are based on consideration of science. We want to leverage investment from philanthropic community and we are modeling that through our own partnership with the Rockefeller Foundation, which continues into Phase 2.

So on advancing the goals, we want to say a little about what are the ways that Phase 1 responders did help advance the NDRC goals already. First, the MID-URN submissions, your most impacted and distressed and unmet recovery needs submissions did give an awful lot of what we call best available data with much greater geographic precision and complexity than we have been able to use simply using FEMA damage data as the assigned data. We learned that the range of available science on topics related to resilient recovery is definitely expanding. Quite a few of you brought in scientific studies and information and data that we were not even aware existed or that was further along than the last reports that we had seen. We do believe, though, that much more emphasis on examining future risks that might occur during the life of an investment is still needed.

We learned that many long-term commitment actions were already taken or were already underway. But that a lot of them were taken without a lot of thoughtfulness or intention about measurable outcomes of changes or policy goals or the interest of the whole community to aim action toward. Sometimes they were only taking actions for one purpose based on only one group of stakeholders and had not maybe considered a full action.

There was not a lot of leverage. That was another thing we learned. There was not a lot of leverage yet, but there were many, many, many different funding sources explored, mentioned, including consideration shown to making changes in routine investments and funding streams ensures business interest investors. The idea of resilience in the sense of being an effective reaction of not just the physical environment, but of social and economic systems to an extreme event really seems

to have caught the imagination and the interest of a lot of stakeholders for a lot of you. And that it is different from simple physical mitigation alone. That seems to have drawn interest across a lot of sectors where there were applicants that used that as an organizing principle. There were some very interesting things that are starting to happen. So that was interesting.

Rockefeller Foundation involvement from our viewpoint now clearly strengthened not just the applications, it helped applicants think resiliently, think about resilience in a leveled up kind of way from when we first started the effort. We are partway along the path and so far, we are really excited about how far we got.

Okay, so there is a lot of type on here and it is going to hurt your brain. But this is just straight out of the NOFA. The first lesson learned that we want to talk about is long-term commitment. This one is a particular bug for me. This is in NOFA language and the underlined parts here where we are talking about what we would reward points for and that we wanted a baseline, a goal outcome measure for at least one metric expected to be positively protected by each action or commitment. We wanted to see all of those elements present. Lynsey, if you can pop me forward to the next slide.

Our biggest issue around long-term commitment, and we viewed Phase 1 as a good start but we have clarified the NOFA for Phase 2 and you need to clearly, you know go and look at the parts of the Phase 2 factors that are talking about long-term commitment and about outcome and about values. We are not talking about counting the number of households that get housed. We are talking about taking a long-term commitment, not doing a project, taking a long-term commitment of some kind of policy action or a program of activities that will continue for a long duration. Not a mitigation project. A long-term commitment that has an action, an outcome, a duration, an effective date that is clearly stated, committed to, and can be reasonably expected to protect, and measurably protect, and create resilience for a lot of people. Examples are given at length in Factor 5 of the NOFA.

We noticed also that there are actually cases in which actions were described in other factors and not in the long-term commitment factor that clearly met the long-term commitment act that we were making. So some communities have taken actions without realizing that the action was going to improve their resilience, or considering it in that way. They may have taken it for another action, but the description shows a protective effect of the policy. We want—the thinking needs to be more cohesive and really come together and really just directly aim at achieving a resilience outcome, not an output widget. And we realize that people were thinking of like passing a law as an outcome. But you pass a law because why? To have a protective action of some kind. You have to go that next step. Phase 2 is all about going the next step. On long-term commitment, this is going to be really important for virtually the entire field of everybody we looked at. There were a lot of really great ideas. Things that we had not thought of and that would be in the general category of long-term commitment. So do not be disheartened or anything, but just really think about this again. You need to iterate, level up, move on, all that design thinking language needs to happen on long-term commitment.

Okay, what do we have next? Cross-disciplinary greater regional approaches. This one I am not as totally demented on. Everybody I think did give it a shot to try greater regional approaches. And everybody tried cross-disciplinary. There are sort of a number of things that we can say about the greater regional approaches. We tweaked just a little bit the formatting to make clearer what we are getting at without changing the wording. Do not forget that Phase 2 is built on top of Phase 1. So your MID-URN areas, where your CDBG-NDR assistance can be used for the benefit of that area, but we are also talking about expanding that area through leverage, through long-term commitment, through involvement, consultation. There are a lot of places that reach out to greater regional and

not everybody caught all those places. So, really, think about filling in any gaps where you were not think about greater regional.

On cross-disciplinary, partly because we had—there were at least eight reviewers for every application. Partly because we had so much cross-disciplinary here, reviewing we realized we saw gaps in places where you could have been more cross-disciplinary. You could have included more partners and really talked about it. Anyway, the cross-disciplinary is a chance for you to bring in maybe more partners, fill in some more gaps, and really look at which stakeholders you may have missed. A lot of you actually were aware that you could not quite get everything in the six months that you had. We are saying really keep working on filling in those whole teams because there is a lot more that people can bring you that can really help you be more resilient in the long run if you sew this all together. Does anybody else have anything on cross-disciplinary?

Okay, let us try stakeholder consultation. I do not think it would be going too far to say that in the minds of almost all the reviewers, this was the make or break between a good and a great application. One of the interesting things that happened for people who really went all in on stakeholder consultation as opposed to CDBG style citizen participation alone, where you really went in and talked to your vulnerable population is that even in the six months that were allotted for Phase 1, we were getting descriptions of iterations that were driven by feedback loops that definitely and clearly in the eyes of the people who talked about that made big differences. And Rockefeller was also telling us this independently. That stakeholder consultation going beyond just pushing information out. Actually getting into sessions or discussions or some committees or whatever your structure was to get information coming back in was definitely very enriching for applications. It made the consciousness of how important social cohesion elements are for resilience. And that piece of resilience that reaches beyond mitigation to just being cohesive in the first place so that not only survive better, but react better. Stakeholder consultation and how it was thought of and executed was just really, really important. I do not even know how to emphasize that enough. Definitely while you are doing Phase 2, look back at what we asked you to do in Phase 1 and iterate again and move forward on that is just our best advice.

Lynsey Johnson: And then one other thing is next week we will be having a stakeholder consultation webinar. That will be the NOFA-specific webinar next week, Thursday same time. So what Jess is speaking of here, we are going to get a little further in depth next week.

Jessie Handforth Kome: Okay, let us jump to the next one. If I had to summarize on MID-URNs, I would say two things. One is congratulations because the MID-URN performance was so much better than the 45 day review. It was not even close. It was just much, much, much better. But the second thing I would say is that vagueness is not your friend here. Our policy and development and research people did all of the reviews on the MID-URNs submissions. We just have a few comments. One is for existing CBGDR grantees, the MID-URN requirement in the NOFA is more specific than a CBGDR action plan. You must address why existing CBGDR grant or grants will not meet the identified NDRC unmet recovery need. Really specific. The other lesson learned there is that we think the timeframes are really, really tight on a lot of you to produce the required data and documentation. We thought you did a really excellent job in the time allotted, but I think that all of us need to think about why we would know so little about unmet recovery needs given that the ones we are talking about were in a lot of places pretty severe.

On your letter, if we did not comment on MID-URNs, then your MID-URN submission passed. If we did comment, your MID-URN submission had an issue. There is already some questions in the mailbox about this and I will be answering them as we go. In general, we tried to be very, very specific about individual areas that did not pass. But if you were a CDBG-DR grantee and the

policy development and research people were concerned that you were not specific enough about why your CDBG-DR grant would not meet the unmet recovery needs, they may have only approved one of your areas. Because they were able to verify fortunately that there was enough unmet recovery need based on your submission to cover one or maybe two of your areas, but that they felt that you were not sufficiently specific for them to get all of them. On others, I think there is a number of one off issues with specific MID-URN areas and they describe very specifically for those individual areas exactly which piece of documentation did not pass. If you have any questions about those, send them to [resilientrecovery@hud.gov](mailto:resilientrecovery@hud.gov) and I will pass them on to the policy development and research people to see if they can be more specific or explain something if you do not understand it. Yes, Lynsey?

Lynsey Johnson: Just one thing. In your letters, if you are unsure of whether you received a MID-URN comment or not, it is listed at the end of the table. So go all the way to the end of the letter and if you have any MID-URN comments, they are listed at the very end separate from the table.

Jessie Handforth Kome: But in general, just way, way better, way more thoughtful and concise than the 45-day review. Really made the case for the recovery needs and I think extraordinary work on some parts on the environmental degradation one. We simply were not expecting as much science and backup data to be there. People really did their homework.

Okay, leverage, and we are up to Carey because all of the leverage documentation is being reviewed by our attorney partners.

Carey Whitehead: Hi, this is Carey Whitehead. I am in HUD's Office of General Counsel. We did as Jessie mentioned coordinate review in consultation with our partners in CPD on the leverage factor. We gave great attention to each individual application and all the submitting, the additional submissions. There are a few lessons learned here, too. But the good news is that you (unintelligible)\_\_\_\_\_ [00:24:07] took them because they are at least available to you because we really took the time to update the Phase 2 factor for leverage rating factor in the amended NOFA that was published on June 22. So I encourage you all to look at that later. The two slides that we have on leverage here are just direct excerpts from that amended NOFA. But I am going to hit the highlights.

The big thing that I want to highlight for you all today is the difference between direct financial commitments and supporting commitments. If you take away nothing else from this conversation, it is important to understand that direct financial commitments are cash committed by an applicant or a partner to the CDBG-NDR assisted eligible project itself. The funding would be available to the applicant to directly carry out its CDBG-NDR proposal. So we are talking about funds that are available to the applicant entity and all of the direct leverage must be included in your budget for the project. So it is really something that is part of the source of the (unintelligible)\_\_\_\_\_ [00:25:21] and you have to address that as part as Factor 3 Phase 2. If it is not in that budget, it will not be considered direct leverage. Direct leverage has a few special considerations but one of them—they are all in the amendment. One that I really want to highlight for you is that a pledge of planning and administrative costs incurred by the applicant, which would include costs incurred under a contract that was procured by the applicant, will count as direct leverage. But your pledge of planning and admin or in kind costs incurred by partners or sub recipients or other entities that are not the applicant, are not going to be direct leverage.

Supporting commitments are funds that may be available to you the applicant or might be available to your partners, but the point is that it is to carry out activities that support the overall proposal but

they are not really part of the budget for the proposal. They are not part of the sources and uses. They are not going to be in Factor 3 Phase 2 budget. And it does not include in kind contributions. So the big thing here, and this is the lesson we took away from our review during Phase 1, is that sometimes it is not enough to just say this is a great idea, we are moving forward on it. You really need to make the connection between a supporting commitment and how it supports your overall proposal that is your CBDG-NDR assisted project. So just make that connection. And again, all of this is in the amended NOFA. But we really wanted to point out that the difference between those two is now directly contrasted in the NOFA.

There are three other quick highlights that I want to highlight for you. The first is that leverage commitments get assigned greater weight in Phase 2 than in Phase 1. So, as resources may not have been assigned to that area in Phase 1, you really want to focus on the dollar amounts. You do not get points in Phase 2 for your narrative the way that you did in Phase 1. So you get up to ten points based on leverage commitments that are relative to the amount of your CBDG-NDR funds requested. There is a chart in Phase 2 Factor 4 that pretty clearly lays out how HUD is awarding points in this rating factor. I want you to keep in mind when you are deciding how you are going to expend resources that general letters of support from organizations or individuals are not leverage. The NOFA itself says they should not be included in the application. But I call this to your attention because the danger is if you spend so much time seeking general letters of support, it is going to take away from your resources that are available to seek actual dollar leverage that counts towards points.

The second point I want to make is that across the board it is really necessary to talk about the pledge of existing resources because generally these are not considered leverage. So HUD, when we amended the NOFA, we made this crystal clear. Leverage is generally pledged after the initial publication of the NOFA, which is September 17, 2014. There is one exception. It is in the amendment. If the applicant can show that the applicant made a determination about the use of a particular source of funds or an award to basically bring those sources of fund into your target area for your CBDG-NDR activity and they are now going to be a part of this target geography and that happened after September 17, 2014, HUD may count a pledge of some resource that was actually available to the applicant prior to the date of the NOFA, which is September 17. But the applicant documents in its application, then that documentation is going to be critical that you said, "Oh, now I've got CBDG-NDR funds that are going to be potentially available to me. I really want to combine those two sources of funds. Let me now make a final commitment of this particular award to the area that is receiving CBDG-NDR." So pay attention to the date – that was clearly a question that was raised during Phase 1.

The last piece that I really want to focus on is the content of your leverage documentation. What we have done for you in this amendment, is to consolidate and try to clarify the requirements for the content and the form of your leverage documentation. And this is going to apply both to your direct commitments and to your supporting commitments. You really need to pay extremely close attention to these requirements because if you have a leverage commitment it would be really unfortunate to not get the points for it because for example it was not on letterhead. Or you the applicant made a statement about funds that are not in the control of you, the applicant, and they were pledged by a foundation. You should have the pledge from the foundation saying we are making these funds available. There is a whole list. They really address firm commitments, the contents of the documentation, who can sign that commitment, the sources of the commitments themselves, and limitations on the types of commitments. I think they are pretty straightforward and you are not going to have any trouble reading through them. Those are really the primary lessons learned. Jessie, I will turn it back over to you.

Jessie Handforth Kome: Actually, I think we are going to let Lynsey run.

Lynsey Johnson: All right. This is Lynsey from the Office of Economic Resilience. I am going to talk a little bit about some of the resources going forward for Phase 2. As has already been mentioned, there is an update to the NOFA. So please go and visit grants.gov to download the application instruction package. Then at that point, you are going to get the zip file. It is the same process as last time. So if you had issues getting in, make sure you are clicking on the application instruction package. One of the other things that we want to make sure you know is that you need to read everything carefully. Go back through the NOFA, especially if you have read it once before and you are really familiar with it from Phase 1, go back. Go back and look at what is exactly required for Phase 2 and read it with a really careful eye. There are a couple of changes that you are going to see with the NOFA update, specifically the formatting. We tried to clarify the formatting a little bit in Factors 2 and 3 so that you fully understand what is going to be evaluated.

Jessie Handforth Kome: [cross talking] Page numbers! Yahoo!

Lynsey Johnson: Yeah [laughs]. That is a huge thing. The next thing I want you to make sure you look at Carey already just spoke about it is the leverage section, making sure you pay careful attention to those changes. Another change that you are going to see is valuation within the BCA appendix page, which talks a little bit about the value of life. So take a look at that because that number was updated. Then, as Jessie already mentioned, the deadline set for submission of Phase 2 applications is October 27 of this year.

Jessie Handforth Kome: You did not mention that we also defined program level BCAs in there because we were getting questions on that. They showed up again during Phase 1 reviews in some of the submissions. We could see those coming so we put a definition in there.

Lynsey Johnson: A couple of other things. Rockefeller is still going to be involved in this process and going through and providing technical assistance. More information is going to be released on that shortly. But we do want you to recognize that that TA is still available and will be clarified in a couple of days. The next part is I want to make sure that I highlight all of the NDRC resources that we have made available to you, that HUD has made available to you. We have the link to just the resilience, a lot of these are very familiar to you from previous. But we have an updated fact sheet. The webinar series and that specific link. One thing I want to note about the webinar series is we have archives. All of the Phase 1 topical and NOFA specific webinars are on the webinar series page. But we have also now added to that. We are now doing approximately 18 more webinars for Phase 2, both technical, rather NOFA-specific and topical.

You are going to see that they are separated out on the website by NOFA-specific for Phase 1 and 2 and topical specific for Phase 1 and 2. So please take a look at that. Go back and look at those Phase 1 topical webinars for additional resilience information. The date did get sent out yesterday for all the upcoming Phase 2 webinars. Again, all of them are going to be archived on the website including the slides, the recordings, the transcripts. We have a couple of prerecorded webinars that are going to be released within the next week or so providing a Phase 2 overview as well as two BCA webinars and a design innovation webinar, which is a general resilience webinar that we have recorded for you. So please make sure to check that website frequently for updated resources.

With that, we will open it up to questions. I know that we are getting—we have at least one in that we will answer, but please feel free to start typing in your questions that you may have at this point for us. The first question I will read is can a grant or transfer of land to the state for the project be considered direct financial commitment for leverage?

Carey Whitehead: So I think it would be important here to go back to the language about in kind donation. So we have actually prohibited in kind donations in the NOFA itself. I think that I would just start with that as a caution. If you got funds for buying land, it would be different than the transfer of land.

Lynsey Johnson: Are there any other questions at this point? I know you have all been inundated with information this week and may have not started to formulate some yet. Again, we are going to be having lots of webinars coming up, a lot of live Q&A webinars to kind of help you through the process.

Jessie Handforth Kome: And the mailbox is back open and we have a team now handling answers for [resilientrecovery@hud.gov](mailto:resilientrecovery@hud.gov). Some of you never really stopped asking questions [laughter]. We are not trying to overwhelm you with all the webinars. If you look on the NOFA series in particular, we are just going to walk through each section of the NOFA, the critical parts. But a lot of them are what Todd Richardson affectionately started calling, “Stump the Chump,” sessions. If you do not need them, we will not impose on your time with them. But we do want to make ourselves available to answer your questions so that you can all hear the answers.

Lynsey Johnson: We do have one question come in. It says if we had no comment from HUD about our MID-URN, does that mean we do not address this again in Phase 2?

Jessie Handforth Kome: No. The MID-URN submission there has pretty clear directions in the need factor in Phase 2. It is factor two. It is talking you through on MID-URNs that we want you to update your Phase 1 analysis by providing an unmet recovery need narrative and other needs. We want you to update and go back to it. If you have any additional information, more stakeholder information, or more data. So this is your chance to go one step better. If you choose to resubmit what you had at your exhibit on MID-URNs that is your choice. But we are asking specifically for an update.

Lynsey Johnson: I would just add that if you go to Appendix G, it speaks to this issue specifically. It says, “For Phase 2, you will update the Unmet Recovery Need and most impacted and distressed submission, as necessary. HUD will award more points to a more accurate, detailed, and robust description that addresses the criteria in Phase 2 Factor 2. You may reference specific portions of your Phase 1 submission in your Phase 2 submission rather than repeating information previously provided.”

Jessie Handforth Kome: We have them downloaded and all that but we definitely—and you also for some of you are going to need to make sure that your links are live. If you are going to link to Phase 1, you need to double check with your data people that your links stay live or made live again. Because some of them went dead and we had to ask for them to be made live while we were doing quality assurance and quality control. That is something else if you are going to do that. But think about how you are going to update, what is the best way to update. I think you are going to find when you are lifting a project out of your framing that there are going to be just sort of naturally [audio drops]. That is definitely what happened with the Rebuild by Design effort. Do we have another question?

Lynsey Johnson: Yes, we have a couple more. Really quick, I know some of you did not necessarily see the slides from the beginning due to a technical issue. Do not worry. We will be posting these slides within the next couple of days on the HUD Exchange on the webinar series website. So you will be able to get them. So do not fear; they are coming. We will get them to you.

The next question we have is: Is our final score our Phase 1 points plus Phase 2 points? Will we know our Phase 1 score?

Jessie Handforth Kome: Your final score is not your Phase 1 points plus your Phase 2 points. Phase 2 is scored independently. [audio drops] You can find out your Phase 1 score at the end of Phase 2 by requesting a debrief. But you did get a letter and your letter has pretty specific comments in it. If you take a look at the top line in each box. It is going to say high, moderate, or low. But the reason it sums it together in the NOFA is that is just the way the NOFA software works. But your Phase 2 score is going to be your Phase 2 score. We are not summing them. You will be selected, rated, and ranked in the Phase 2 round against your Phase 2 scoring.

Lynsey Johnson: All right, we have another question regarding the MID-URN areas. We would like to expand previously qualified or add new areas in Phase 2. Would we follow the Appendix G protocol to qualify areas in Phase 2?

Jessie Handforth Kome: Yes. The way the NOFA guide says is that we want your Phase 2 areas to be substantially the same or inclusive of your Phase 1 areas. But we do as we have said repeatedly anticipate being generous in our understanding of what “substantially” means. (unintelligible). If you need to add areas or new data has become available where you can add areas, then we also have the overall goal of the NOFA that we want to extend resilience to the widest possible geography.

Lynsey Johnson: All right, the next question. Will awards be made based on HUD’s selection of individual projects within the proposal or as block funding?

Jessie Handforth Kome: What we say in the NOFA is that we will be reserving the right to scale or scope to fund partially or in full. We ask that you provide an indication of where scaling and scoping is possible in your proposal. You are allowed, if you like, to provide your priorities for that scaling and scoping. Although your priorities are not a required submission, I would suspect that you should do that. We do not know yet what we are going to get and we have not decided whether we are going to be block funding every single thing or do scaling and scoping stuff. I do not know. We will see what proposals we get, how well they score, and how far a billion dollars goes.

Lynsey Johnson: One other question. Some of the questions that are coming through Sandy right now are involving reviewers’ comments regarding the Phase 1 letters. I do not know if we want to address that, what we can and cannot say.

Jessie Handforth Kome: Let them pass through and let me.

Lynsey Johnson: Okay. Feel free to push them through, Sandy.

Jessie Handforth Kome: If I cannot answer them, I mean the panels are not together at this point. What do we have?

Lynsey Johnson: So yeah, if you guys have questions about review comments, you can submit them to the Q&A.

Jessie Handforth Kome: There are so many that we have a little back and forth in the chat window right now. We are just trying to get through it and see what the incoming question is. But in general, the comments that you got in your letters were comments that the panel that was assembled that reviewed your application wanted you to have as well as that those are used to justify their score. So there were dual purposes. We normally would not show those kind of detailed comments

to anyone until after the end of a competition and only if you requested a debriefing. But in the interest of helping everybody iterate between Phase 1 and Phase 2, we designed the competition to allow the comments to go out to you. Our ethics attorneys have deemed those comments to be covered by the HUD Reform Act so, unlike most letters that go outside HUD, they are not considered public documents so we cannot reveal them. So we have to treat them as if they are covered by the HUD Reform Act and just be careful. So I guess we got will our points for Phase 1 add to Phase 2 since we do not know our Phase 1. We have been asked the question again. They are not added in.

Lynsey Johnson: The next question is how do we get a copy of the letter if it went to the Governor's Office and we have not seen it yet.

Jessie Handforth Kome: That is not good. We sent the letters to the Points of Contact that we were given. We emailed them and we mailed them to the Point of Contact on the SF-424. If that Point of Contact have not given you the letter yet, you can email [resilientrecovery@hud.gov](mailto:resilientrecovery@hud.gov) and some way show me that you are actually from that applicant and I can send it to you. We have already had to do that a couple of times for people who have had some change of office things happen. In some cases, I am asking our field offices to verify that you are actually the person for that applicant. But I can do that. It is easier if you can get it inside your own organization, but there are ways where we can. These things happen. The person on the SF-424 turned over in at least three of the applicants and they notified us during Phase 1 actually.

Lynsey Johnson: but when you emailed out the letters from resilient recovery you not only sent it to the AR, but you also sent it to the listed Point of Contact on the SF-424. So the emailed letters actually went out to two emails if you put it on the SF-424 that way.

Jessie Handforth Kome: I did get one bounce from Kansas. But I think everything else went through or I did not get a bounce message anyway.

Lynsey Johnson: We do not have any more in the chat function right now. Sandy, do you want to open up the phone lines and see if anyone wants to submit a verbal question.

Jessie Handforth Kome: If anyone wants to ask a question verbally, go ahead and press pound six on your telephone keypad. I do not see any hands raised.

Jessie Handforth Kome: Okay, you can go ahead while we are talking if you want to type in some more questions. How many jurisdictions applied to Phase 1? Can we reveal that publically? But we did say that 83 percent got through and 40 were selected. You can pretty much do that math. When the Secretary reveals things publicly, like in a press release, we are allowed to talk about that. But otherwise, our hands are tied, unfortunately. That is one of the covered points. I want to say I am really psyched about this. I am so excited that so many applicants got through Phase 1. I want to welcome you. This is going to be kind of a crazy four months. Like I said, we want to be there and help you walk this as much as we are allowed under the restrictions that we have. I know all the other federal agencies that have been working on this are also very excited. For those of you who are listening to our representing invited applicants, we will be scheduling some conference calls to talk with you directly. We will be contacting you again through those points of contact. So make sure that those points of contact that we have that were on the SF-424, the name of the person on the SF-424 and the contact person that were on in some cases on the executive summary or on the SF-424. We need to know that those are good because that is who we are going to contact to invite to our conference calls. We're just talking about a cadre of invited applicants and Rockefeller will be joining us on some of those calls. As I said, we are very excited to be in a much more familiar

NDRC NOFA-specific: Lessons Learned: Phase 1 6/25/2015

territory in some ways to us around here where we are talking about projects and moving forward toward implementation. With that, feel free to send in questions to [resilientrecovery@hud.gov](mailto:resilientrecovery@hud.gov) and we will do our best answer them. Off we go.

Lynsey Johnson: We look forward to seeing you guys next week on the stakeholder consultation webinar at three PM Eastern Daylight time. Oh, we have another question. Can you please confirm that you will always contact the authorized representative in addition to the POC?

Jessie Handforth Kome: Our protocol is that we contact the authorized representative and then we have added the POC. So that is what we plan to do, yes.

Lynsey Johnson: Join us next week for another live Q&A stakeholder consultation webinar. Again, this is going to be archived on the website within the next couple of days. There is always [resilientrecovery@hud.gov](mailto:resilientrecovery@hud.gov) to kind of lend you its therapy I guess. [laughter]

Jessie Handforth Kome: I do not know if it is therapy, but yeah.

Lynsey Johnson: Thank you guys.

Jessie Handforth Kome: Thanks guys.