



Texas General Land Office

Published February 17, 2026

2024 Disasters: Local Communities Program (LCP)

Call for Projects Frequently Asked Questions

General

Question: When is the Call for Projects submission for the 24 Disasters Local Communities Program (LCP) due?

Answer: The Call for Projects submissions are due Monday, March 23, 2026, at 5:00 p.m.

Question: What is the minimum award amount per project?

Answer: The minimum award amount per project is \$500,000.

Question: What is the maximum award amount per project?

Answer: The maximum award amount per project is \$5,000,000.

Question: How many projects can be submitted for the Call for Projects?

Answer: A maximum of two projects may be submitted per eligible entity.

Question: What is the required leverage amount?

Answer: Leverage is not required for submissions. A leverage amount of at least 5% of the CDBG-DR funds requested is required to receive the ten points for leverage, as outlined in the scoring criteria.

Question: Do communities need to submit a submission resolution with the call for project survey showing the local entity is committing funds for the project?

Answer: Communities are not required by the GLO to submit the commitment of funds resolution with the call for project survey due on March 23, 2026. If the eligible entity is invited to apply for a project that received points for leverage, the commitment documentation will be required with the project application.

Question: Do generators and communications equipment need to be permanently affixed?



Texas General Land Office

Published February 17, 2026

Answer: Yes. Generators need to be mounted or attached to a facility (not mobile generators). Examples of permanently affixed communication equipment may include a tower, associated hardware, and units mounted within the emergency vehicles.

Question: Will entities be required to pass an application submission resolution for the Call for Projects portion of this process?

Answer: The Call for Projects Submission does NOT require an application submission resolution from the submitting entity.

Question: Will GLO allow the funding of pre-award costs with 24D-LCP funds to cover pre-award administrative, planning, and professional services?

Answer: Pre-award costs are eligible under 24D-LCP so long as all program eligibility requirements are met and services are properly procured.

Question: Can an eligible entity use in-kind services, rather than cash, to meet the 5% leverage scoring criteria?

Answer: For purposes of this criterion, leveraged funds include equipment, materials, and cash from the applicant and/or sources from other than the requesting entity or entities if the submission contains a joint project that crosses jurisdictional boundaries. CDBG-DR and CDBG-MIT funds used as leverage are ineligible for scoring purposes. In order to receive points under this criterion, the leverage documentation must identify the amount and type of funds being leveraged. Acceptable Leverage Documentation (including but not limited to): commitment letters from an elected or appointed official with the ability to allocate the funds, resolutions from the applicable governing body, and meeting minutes indicating the amount and approval from the applicable governing body. Documentation on leverage will be provided at the application stage.

Eligibility

Question: If we apply for a fixed generator could it be for any public building that we deem as a critical facility?

Answer: A permanently affixed generator may be eligible as long as it supports an eligible activity.

Question: What equipment would be eligible on the Communications Equipment grant and would equipment and software to set up a CAD system be included?

Answer: Any permanently affixed emergency communications equipment would be eligible. A Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) system, provided it includes hardware components, is eligible.



Texas General Land Office

Published February 17, 2026

Technical

Question: Where can I find the 2024 FEMA per capita numbers that will be used for the project scoring?

Answer: Data tied to project scoring, which will include the 2024 FEMA per capita numbers, are posted on the Program Call for Projects section of the 2024 Disasters Local Communities Program (LCP) webpage.

Question: Which web browser is the GIS Viewer compatible with? E.g. Google Chrome?

Answer: The ESRI GIS Viewer is compatible with any Internet browsers such as Google Chrome, Microsoft Edge, Internet Explorer, and Firefox.

Procurement

Question: Can a Grant Administrator submit this information on behalf of the community if they are not procured?

Answer: Contractors that develop or draft specifications, requirements, statements of work, or invitations for bids or requests for proposals must be excluded from competing for such procurements. Confer with your entity's local purchasing agent or legal counsel.

Question: Is it possible for an engineering firm to help a community identify and cost out projects without conflicting themselves out from the grant-funded work?

Answer: Contractors that develop or draft specifications, requirements, statements of work, or invitations for bids or requests for proposals must be excluded from competing for such procurements. Confer with your entity's local purchasing agent or legal counsel.

Documenting Beneficiaries

Question: Could you please define Urgent Need?

Answer: "Activities designed to meet community development needs having a particular urgency. In the absence of substantial evidence to the contrary, an activity will be considered to address this objective if the recipient certifies that the activity is designed to alleviate existing conditions which pose a serious and immediate threat to the health or welfare of the community which are of recent origin or which recently became urgent, that the recipient is unable to finance the activity on its own, and that other sources of funding are not available. A condition will generally be considered to be of recent origin if it developed or became critical within 18 months preceding the certification by the recipient." [24 CFR 570.208(c)].



Texas General Land Office

Published February 17, 2026

Environmental Review

Question: What would be the environmental requirements for leveraging new HUD funds for an existing HUD-funded project?

Answer: 1. If the Responsible Entity (RE) is adding HUD funds to a previously HUD-funded project and nothing has changed except adding additional HUD funds (i.e., scope, location, and environmental circumstances are still the same), then a CENST level of review for supplemental assistance could be applicable.

There are some caveats for CESNT reviews: It must be the original RE for a previously approved during Part 58 review; Any additional projects/activities must not change the original proposal's scope, magnitude, location, or environmental circumstances; It requires a determination by the original RE under 24 CFR58.47 as to whether re-evaluation of the original environmental findings is required; If re-evaluation is not required, the supplemental assistance can be treated as a CESNT.

Example: If a HUD-assisted project had been cleared (AUGF issued) but subsequently was reduced in scope because of cost, and the completed portion was 100% constructed a few years back, the RE can add additional HUD funds (amendment or new contract) to finish the project as initially intended and cleared in the Environmental Review Record (ERR). In this example, a CENST for supplemental assistance could suffice, assuming all the conditions of §58.35(b)(7) can be met.

2. If RE adds funds and additional scope to a previously environmentally cleared HUD project, a re-evaluation (58.47) may be possible. Original determinations/findings must remain valid; Any additional HUD assistance (amendment or new contract) can be added to the re-evaluation. No new RROF (or ERR) would be necessary. However, if there are any potential changes in environmental findings, then additional consultation or publication may be required.

For example, the original review is not in a floodplain, but the new project activity is in a floodplain; therefore, an 8-Step is required. Or consultation with the Texas Historical Commission may need to be reinitiated because the project footprint has changed.

The RE should document the re-evaluation by drafting a memo to the ERR that explains the reason(s) for the re-evaluation and identifies any changes to the project or environmental conditions. The memo should also summarize the results of the re-evaluation and state that the environmental finding (CEST, EA) has not changed as a result. The memo should be dated and signed by the Responsible Entity. The memo needs to include supporting documentation. A new CEST or EA (with RROF) will be required if the original determination or findings are no longer valid.

3. What factors should a Responsible Entity consider when determining whether to re-evaluate a project or when to initiate a new environmental review and publish its findings? When deciding between re-evaluation/updating an existing review or undertaking a new environmental review, HUD



Texas General Land Office

Published February 17, 2026

advises to consider the purposes of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) with respect to informing the public of the impact of the project on the environment and the impact of the environment on the project.

Scope—Has the project changed so much that the public should be informed through a new environmental review?

Length of time - How has the public been informed of the project? Has the project been 100% constructed, and how much time has passed since the publication of NOI/RROF to the initiation of the project (e.g., more than five years)?

Environmental impacts—Has the analysis of the environmental impact revealed new and substantial impacts that the public should be informed about?

A new environmental review would also be required when the scope has changed so much that the project is basically new. For example, the RE cleared an exact location for one-for-one street improvements, but they are now doing a new project, such as drainage lines or detention basin.

What the RE is building isn't what the public thinks the community is building, and the public might get upset about not being notified, then maybe that's also a sign that the RE should do a new environmental review. The change in the project is now triggering a higher level of environmental review, so if it goes from a CEST to an EA, the RE would have to do a new review.

The RE is doing the same project but at an entirely different location because the first location turned out not to be the best place, then the RE would probably have to do a new review because the RE has not reviewed the location in which you now want to build the project.