TEXAS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM
UNIFIED SCORING COMMITTEE MEETING AGENDA

LOCATION: SAN ANTONIO FOOD BANK
VALERO COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT CENTER

5200 HISTORIC OLD HWY 90 W
SAN ANTONIO, TX 78227

DATE: APRIL 10TH, 2024

TIME: 9:00AM

Agenda Items:

9:00AM – 10:00AM

USC Member Training on Scoring Metrics

Review charter for Unified Scoring Committee

10:00AM – Adjournment

Welcome and introduction of Committee Members

Opening Remarks

Public Comment

Discussion and action to adopt scoring factors for 2025-2026 Community Development (CD) Fund

Adjournment

TDA Announcements and Open Discussion

Next Meeting of the Unified Scoring Committee

Maximum Grant Request Amount

Regional Allocation Formula – proposed updates

Dan Hunter (TDA Assistant Commissioner) calls quorum at 9:15 am

Region	2024 Member	Present	Absent
AACOG	Rob Kelly, County Judge, Kerr County	X	
ATCOG	Lowell Walker, Mayor, City of Dekalb	X	
BVCOG	Joe Fauth, County Judge, Grimes County	X	
CAPCOG	Stephanie Fisher, Mayor, Johnson City	X	
CBCOG	Nominated C.H. "Burt" Mills, County Judge, Aransas County (PROXY-- Leslie Casterline, County Commissioner, Aransas County)	Proxy	
CTCOG	Roger Miller, County Judge, Coryell County (not present)		X
CVCOG			
DETCOG	Bill Stewart, City Administrator, City of Huntington	X	
ETCOG	Wade McKinney, County Judge, Henderson County	X	
GCRPC	Robin Alaniz, Alderwoman, City of Goliad	X	
HGAC	Andrew Isbell, Director of Planning, Walker County	X	
HOTCOG	Megan Henderson, City Manager, City of Hillsboro	X	
LRGVDC	Ben Medina, City Administrator, City of Rio Hondo	X	
MRGDC	Bella Rubio, County Judge, Real County	X	
NCTCOG	Rick Bailey, Commissioner, Johnson County	X	
NORTEX	Bert Cunningham, City Manager, City of Bowie	X	
PBRPC	Foy O'Brien, County Judge, Dawson County	X	
PRPC	Joseph Price, City Manager, City of Canyon	X	
RGCOG	Joanna MacKenzie, County Judge, Hudspeth County	X	
SETRPC	Wayne McDaniel, County Judge, Hardin County	X	
SPAG	Mike Cypert, City Manager, Hale Center	X	
STDC	Sandalio Ruiz, Commissioner, Jim Hogg County	X	
TEXOMA	Monte C. Walker, City Administrator, City of Howe	X	
WCTCOG	Diana Lopez, City Manager, City of Coleman	X	

CVCOG's attendee: Schleicher County Judge Charlie Bradley

9:15 am Mario from San Antonio Food Bank welcomes the committee, provides info about food bank operations, and recognizes members of the committee who have assisted operations.

9:20 am Suzanne Barnard (TxCDBG Director) introduces agenda and provides information about TxCDBG Community Development (CD) fund such as scoring, recent program challenges, primary principles of the application process, two phase application process.

- Andrew Isbell expresses gratitude for the two-phase app process. Then he asked a question about the scoring for the process.
- Johnson City Mayor Stephanie Fisher CAPCOG joins meeting at 9:30 am
- Leslie Casterline asked a question about trends in sewer projects and how it affects their application, leading them to not apply.

Suzanne Barnard (SB) moves on to explain CDBG funding availability/trends and how it may affect applications.

- Sandalio Ruiz illustrates how CDBG projects used to fund 5 city blocks, now they only fund one.

9:38am Aubrey-Ann Gilmore (TxCDBG Staff) begins presentation on verified scoring factors, 2019-2020 historical data re: CD scoring factors by region, types of data and how it is collected as well as their pros and cons.

- Joseph Price asks if TDA staff feels like the methodology is broken. Price believes applications are being penalized unintentionally as result of inflation, and that factor should be up for scoring consideration.

9:57am. Aubrey-Ann Gilmore (AAG) discusses updated methodology for match scoring, moves on to discuss poverty rate scoring, unemployment rate, per capita income, per capita property tax values, trends in the overall data.
Committee members are discuss the potential for a study of 2025-2026 scoring factors and their impact.

10:30-10:45 am Break

10:45 am *Dan begins the meeting again, gives a chance for public comment. No comments are made.*

Discussion of adopting scoring factors 10:48am

Rick Bailey asks for percentage of successful applicants from last USC's adopted scoring factors. AAG explains differences between default scoring priorities and those adopted in the past.

Megan Henderson states they did a good job last time and hit a good balance after a lot of discussion and she hopes they wind up with something very similar. Many members agree.

Joseph Price appreciates TDA staff and Sid Millers leadership, and that he agrees with Henderson. Price again mentions the inflation factor and why this should be a consideration during discussion. Price then describes the effect of inflation on a project in his community. Also addresses lift station being built costing 1 million dollars. Price also mentions that ACS data is not great, but it is the best possible data available.

SB explains that the Committee is not setting the max grant amount, but if they want to change the match amount they may.

Megan Henderson believes it may make sense to remove the match tier system regardless of community size.

Lowell Walker mentions old infrastructure in retirement communities and how the tax base is high but communities are small. Any communities with a population over 1000 has a certain tax percentage and similar for communities over 15000. His community can't keep up with match percentages changing, and he thinks we should keep the match percentage where it is.

10:58 am Andrew Isbell mentions a big change in rural projects' match, which used to be based on the project, but now if the project is based on population the required match is going to be a large percentage, which smaller communities may not be able to keep up with.

Isbell presumes that county wide data will be used for project population, which may have an affect on smaller projects (ex: 500 person community in a 60,000 pop county ->20% match based on pop. Isbell's insinuation is that smaller communities cannot afford this). Proposes that match is not based on population.

Bert Cunningham asks for clarification re: the verified scoring factors and what was decided last time. AAG clarifies. Isbell says we changed the match criteria from last time- SB says only for counties.

Megan Henderson makes a motion that USC eliminates from consideration all other scoring factors except for those used in 2023-2024, which can be discussed further. Motion is seconded by Rick Bailey.

Isbell says the match percentage was based on city population, but not county. Megan says that the population criteria for city applicants was established last time and that should stay. Isbell agrees.

Sandalio Ruiz proposes getting rid of all match requirements for everybody. AAG says that is up to the Committee to decide.

Price explains the concept of entitlement communities, seeking to clarify that the impact massive communities may have on other projects is moot.

11:08 am Dan Hunter initiates a vote- all in favor of Henderson's proposal, except for Charlie Bradley

Rick Bailey requests that the next Committee meeting include data on the successes and failures related to the newly adopted match percentage scoring system, with the intention of establishing a formula to determine strengths and weaknesses. Bailey wants to compare previous systems with the newly adopted one.

Joseph Price recommends an increase in project amount to be considered by staff for at least $100,000.

Joe Fauth discusses funding availability trends and asks if it is nationwide or Texas specific. AAG says it is nationwide, but it follows a similar trajectory to Texas' data. Fauth wants to see how we compare to the rest of the country. Fauth then states Republicans won't give his county money because they already vote red, and Democrats won't give them money because they don't like counties who vote red. Another member of the committee states that part of their responsibility is to pressure congress to change allocations. SB discusses overall funding in the country.

Mike Cypert says that a rural "frontier county" with a small population cannot compete if the match percentage is going to be based on population.

11:16 am Andrew Isbell asks for data on population size among applicants. SB explains that the data exists but may not be usable at the moment.

Bailey asks for a way to prioritize emergency situations because communities are growing rapidly while their infrastructure is red taped because it is aged. Some of this infrastructure includes projects that have been denied in the past. Megan Henderson says there theoretically is a way to prioritize these situations, but in the past they have not approved that proposal.

Henderson then proposes a motion that the match percentage tier for counties be set at 2%. Rick Bailey seconds.

After a follow-up question from Andrew Isbell, Henderson then suggests that any county with a population less than 1500 gets full points regardless of match.

Joanna Mackenzie disagrees that match scoring should not be the same across the board because every county is different. Mentions colonias specifically. Mackenzie proposes to keep the current system

Henderson asks Mackenzie what she suggests, Mackenzie says keep the same system.

Bert Cunningham mentions Bon Wier and his new program(s) that moves faster for emergency situations such as the ones Rick Bailey described earlier. Dan Hunter also explains similar opportunities available through TDA.

Joseph Price leaves the meeting.

Megan Henderson explains to Wayne McDaniel that the counties are being treated differently due to the effect that the two phase application will have on applicants.

Diana Lopez clarifies that this is for counties only.

Wade McKinney asks Mackenzie if her concern is the creation of further competition which may affect smaller counties and Mackenzie confirms this concern. SB clarifies that the same number of projects will be funded.

Existing motion is the first bracket remains and rest of the table changes. Existing motion will dispense with the lower three tiers in match scoring. Counties will do a 2% match or less.

Dan Hunter initiates a vote- 6 oppose:

11:36 am Dan Hunter creates motion to adopt all scoring criteria as presented on screen. Bill Stewart seconds.

11:40 am Dan Hunter calls a vote on the motion to adopt scoring the criteria as presented. No one opposes- motion passes.

11:42 Dan Hunter initiates motion to adjourn meeting. Motion passes, meeting adjourned.