

## Appendix 1 – PUBLIC COMMENT LIST

<b>Name</b>	<b>Entity</b>
Toby Powell - Mayor	City of Conroe
Kassie Laughlin – Emergency Management	City of Conroe
Ken Kreger – Emergency Management	City of Conroe
Paul Verdagamo – City Manager	City of Conroe
Galen Mansee - Mayor	City of Stagecoach
Terry Rutt – Public Works	City of Stagecoach
Brenda Rutt – City Secretary	City of Stagecoach
James Osteen – City Council	City of Stagecoach
Kirk Jones - Mayor	City of Montgomery
Jake Yates – City Manager	City of Montgomery
Chris Roznousky – Project Engineer	City of Montgomery
Leah Tarrant - Mayor	City of Patton Village
Todd Kana - Mayor	City of Magnolia
Paul Mendes – City Manager	City of Magnolia
Mathew Dantzer – City Council	City of Magnolia
Lynne George – City Secretary	City of Magnolia
Pat Riley – Public Works Director	City of Willis
Deb Capaccioli – Engineering Technician	Oak Ridge North
Diane Lincoln - Mayor	Town of Woodloch
Eric Yollick	Private Citizen – Pct. 3
Pam Dickson	Private Citizen- Pct. 4
Mildred Ashworth	Private Citizen- Pct. 2
Harry Moynidan	Private Citizen- Pct. 2
Faye Moynidan	Private Citizen- Pct. 2

**Comment #1: How Funding Should Be Split Between Housing and Infrastructure**

The Fair Housing Committee voted that the funds should be split 60% to infrastructure to prevent future damage and 40% to housing to assist current victims.

The Homeless Coalition voted that the funds should be split 50%-50%

The Montgomery County Community Assistance Recovery Efforts and Services Committee voted that 60% of funds should go to infrastructure and 40% to housing repair.

**Staff Response #1:** Based on this extensive feedback, the County set 40% of funds aside for housing repair, and established 60% of total funds for infrastructure projects that would directly impact housing.

**Comment #2: Data From Only One Storm Was Used.**

It was pointed out that data from only one storm had been used in the calculations.

**Staff Response #2:** This oversight was immediately corrected and a revised allocation schedule was released the next day including both storms in the calculations for award.

**Comment #3: Concern When Only One Storm Impacted An Area**

One City expressed concerns because it only had damage in one storm.

**Staff Response #3:** Because of the way the Allocation Weighting Factors were implemented, this city still scored well due to the severity of the damage it received in the one storm. This bore out the validity of the Weighting Factors, as it demonstrated a direct tie between severity of damage and funding award.

**Comment #4: Thank You For Keeping Cities Informed**

Several cities and one nonprofit organization thanked Community Development for its work, and for keeping the cities informed about funding availability and processes.

**Staff Response #4:** You're very welcome.

**Comment #5: Request for Modification of Breakdown for Allocation Weighting Factors**

The Mayor and representatives of one city in the county wrote two letters and attended both Public Hearings to request that changes be made to the Allocation Weighting Factors that were used in the

determination of funds that should be received by the cities. The city requested that raw population data be used instead of percentages of low income.

**Staff Response #5:** The County appreciates the work done by the city to calculate alternate distributions based on different weighting factors. However, the County worked extensively to ensure that the funding breakdown was the most equitable and fair based on data available for amounts of damage and impact on the low income residents of the various cities. The current scoring system was established after much consultation with groups representing homeless, low income, minority and other vulnerable segments of the population, and after a planning meeting at which eight cities participated. The weighting factors were chosen to ensure that low income residents throughout the county would benefit, rather than the bulk of funding concentrating on residents of one central area. The County will not be able to modify the scores to accommodate the request of one city.

**Comment #6: Request that the Proposed Method of Distribution be Upheld**

Mayors of four cities wrote letters, and Mayors of seven cities attended one or both public hearings to ask for approval of the Method of Distribution as proposed by the county. Comments were made that this funding is 1) the only “pot” of funding which prioritizes benefitting low income persons, 2) is an opportunity for small cities with little or no sales or corporate tax base to get needed repairs done, 3) is the result of a great deal of citizen input by the county and 4) takes into account the level of damage in the small cities.

**Staff Response #6:** The County concurs. While the eighth funded city has a valid point that its total low income population exceeds that of several of the other seven funded cities, this does not necessarily equate with larger expenses to repair damage. In a more densely populated low income neighborhood, more individuals will be served by the same number of feet of drainage improvements (for example) than will be impacted in a more rural setting, but at the same cost. Per capita calculations do not take density into account. In addition, not all low income areas of the large city were impacted, whereas in some of the small cities, almost the entire jurisdiction was impacted by flooding.

**Comments #7 & #8: Request That An Extension Be Asked Of GLO For More Discussion Of The MOD and Request That The Court Vote Timely On The MOD**

A representative of the one dissenting city requested more time to discuss the matter with the County, necessitating a request for an extension from the State. A City Councilman from one of the other seven cities stated there had been ample opportunity to discuss this and several other entities agreed that the County’s “expert” has come up with a system that was fair and equitable, and requested that the Court move forward to get the funds into the hands of those who need it.

**Staff Response #7 & #8:** The County concurred that there had been much discussion and consensus regarding the proposed MOD, and the consensus outweighed the dissension.

**Comment #9: Praise of Court and Community Development Department**

A County Citizen thanked the Commissioners' Court for the outstanding oversight in management they had done in the CDBG department, and that the Court should be proud of the work done, because "this is a great example of government bringing federal money back into the County for people that genuinely need help."

**Staff Response #9:** Thank you.