



Texas General Land Office

2024 Disasters: Local Communities Program (LCP)

Published July 1, 2026

Call for Projects Submission: General

Question: What does it mean that an entity has to expend leveraged funds before CDBG funds?

Answer: The GLO will not release CDBG funds for payment until the committed funds for the specific budget line (i.e. construction, engineering, etc) are fully expensed.

Example: The project construction budget is **\$5,000,000** and the entity has committed **\$250,000** from their local budget towards construction. The city must exhaust their **\$250,000** before the GLO releases the **\$4,750,000** of CDBG funds for the construction budget line.

Question: Upon receipt of the proposals on March 23rd, approximately how long will it take the GLO to announce the awarded projects?

Answer: The Program Overview posted on the 2024 Disasters LCP webpage outlines key dates for this program.

<https://www.glo.texas.gov/disaster-recovery/24DLCP>.

Question: When questions are submitted, will we receive a response to our email or will the question be logged and published as an FAQ? If so, how often will the FAQ page be updated?

Answer: All questions received will be acknowledged via email and added to the published FAQ weekly.

Question: In the survey it states that only one project can be submitted. Our project includes 14 sites across the county that are damages and need Mitigation work to resolve the ongoing flooding issues we face each year - am I allowed to enter this type of project in this grant offering?

Answer: Each eligible entity is permitted to submit a maximum of **two (2) eligible projects**. All submitted projects must address unmet needs or tie-back to the 2024 Disasters. The project must include one activity, one service area, and address one national objective. The Documenting Beneficiaries Information page is located on the 2024 Disasters LCP webpage to further define service area of a project. <https://www.glo.texas.gov/disaster-recovery/24DLCP>.

Question: If Survey is selected instead of Census, will any other information be requested in this survey?

Answer: No further information will be requested in the LCP Survey. If the entity is invited to apply, support documentation for the survey method used to determine beneficiaries will be required.

Question: Will we be able to print the survey?

Answer: Yes, from the submitted survey page select view details from the dropdown on the survey you want to print, then print page from your browser.

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?

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: Would any kitchen-related components be allowable if included as part of a broader construction or rehabilitation scope? Can GLO confirm whether such equipment is considered ineligible under this specific program? Does this restriction apply uniformly to all facility types (e.g., shelters vs. fire stations)?

Answer: Fixed kitchen equipment that is necessary to the project is an eligible expense. All costs associated with the project must be reasonable and necessary for the intended purpose. Equipment standards apply to public facilities, including but not limited to shelters of last resort and fire stations.

Question: Could you clarify how GLO is distinguishing between: Fixed or essential kitchen equipment necessary for facility operations, and Non-allowable items such as portable appliances or general supplies?

Answer: Fixed essential kitchen equipment must meet an unmet need from the 2024 Disasters and be justified for cost reasonableness. All costs associated with the project must be reasonable and necessary for the intended purpose.

Question: If kitchen equipment is not allowable as a direct cost, are there any circumstances under which it could be included (e.g., as part of construction, built-in systems, or another eligible category)?

Answer: Equipment purchased as a direct cost must follow standards outlined in the GLO Implementation Manual 5.14, also found in 2 CFR §200.313(c). If equipment purchase is part of a construction bid, all procurement standards must be followed as outlined in 2 CFR §200.318 through §200.327.

Question: Could you advise if the remodel-adaption of a recently purchased building for use as a County Courthouse Annex building even qualifies as a potential project under this program? This building will house a multitude of county offices.

Answer: Buildings for the general conduct of government, as referenced in 24 CFR 570.207, are specifically deemed ineligible for CDBG-DR funding assistance.

Question: Could you help to confirm if a RescAlert system would be an eligible project? This is a fixed system that monitors weather and environmental factors to notify first responders of wildland fires, flooding, and road temperatures in real-time.

Answer: All eligible projects have to demonstrate tie-back and an unmet need related to the 2024 Disasters. Emergency alert systems are generally eligible.

Question: Regarding public facilities, what types of buildings will be considered eligible provided a tie back to the storm can be provided?

Answer: Eligible Public Facility activities for CDBG funding can be located on HUD exchange, Basically CDBG Manual.

Question: A community has 9 months by law to complete an audit. If my most recent FYE is 12/31/25 the answer will be No. Do we say YES or enter the previous year end date of 12/31/24?

Answer: If the entity has a fiscal year that ended within 9 months from the submission, the prior year ACFR will suffice.

Question: If a community submits two applications, but only one will most likely be funded, can they prioritize which project they want funded first?/ Since a city will score exactly the same on both application submittals will they be able to select which project gets priority?

Answer: Yes, if the score is the exact same.

Question: Page 4 of the Submission Guide states that applicants must “follow [a] public participation process with a public comment period.” Just to confirm, are applicants required to conduct a public participation/comment process prior to submitting a project proposal?

Answer: Per Section 7.8.8 of the 2024 Disasters Action Plan, public participation is an eligibility criteria for the application. Project proposal submissions do not require public participation.

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.

Technical

Question: Noticing that buyouts/acquisitions is an eligible activity, majority of the time a single buyout project would include multiple addresses. How an applicant identify multiple addresses within the call for project submission if it is written that only a single area can be identified?

Answer: If the proposed project is a buyout/acquisition activity, please include centroid coordinates for the desired area of buyout/acquisition that falls within the eligible county location.

Question: Where can I find the spreadsheet with the LMI upper quartile waiver city data to use for the 2024 Storms (LCP) applications?

Answer: The Upper Quartile data can be found on the 2024 Disasters LCP webpage, <https://www.glo.texas.gov/disaster-recovery/24DLCP>.

Question: Where can I get a copy of the current LMISD numbers with the state waiver?

Answer: The LMISD can be found on the 2024 Disasters LCP webpage, <https://www.glo.texas.gov/disaster-recovery/24DLCP>.

Question: Can you please explain how the 'SoVI Score' and the 'Damage Per Capita Score' weighs into the selection process?

Answer: The Selection Criteria is based off the eligible entity and can be located on the 2024 Disasters LCP webpage, <https://www.glo.texas.gov/disaster-recovery/24DLCP>.

Question: Are there any other subjective criteria that may be considering when evaluating/scoring the project, such as proximity to schools, shopping, or parks?

Answer: The Call for Projects Submission Guide contains detailed information on selection criteria, maximum and minimum award information, eligible entities, and project application questions.

Question: Will the SoVI and Per Capita damage tables be available on the application resource page, or will the community have to wait until completing the application when it is auto populated?

Answer: Yes, it is currently on the LCP webpage on the GLO website.

Question: If a community already has TIGR access, do they have to submit a TIGR Access Form specifically for 2024 LCP?

Answer: Yes, as this is a new program, the submitter will need to submit a TIGR Access Form specifically for the 2024 LCP.

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: Is it permissible to utilize existing procurement contracts that are already in place for multiple agencies or programs (for example, contracts that state the vendor is available for 'any grants or services for GLO or FEMA-funded programs')?

Answer: The entity must ensure procurement transactions are conducted in a manner of full and open competition and eliminate unfair competitive disadvantages. Eligible entities must adhere to the procurement process in compliance with federal requirements defined in 2 CFR 200.318 through 200.327 and Appendix II to Part 200. Confer with your entity's local purchasing agent or legal counsel.

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: If an applicant qualifies as greater than 51% LMI under the Standard LMISD, but in the initial LCP survey request, the applicant indicated that they would use the SMI Waiver. Does GLO prefer we use the Waiver LMISD numbers or stay with the standard LMISD numbers?

Answer: LMISD with SMI waiver should be utilized. If the SMI waiver results in a “negative impact”, subrecipients can utilize the Standard LMISD for determining percentage of LMI 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)].

Environmental Review

Question: When is an approximate date that the AUGF’s will be issued?

Answer: The Authority to Use Grant Funds (AUGF) allows subrecipients to use funds once an environmental review is completed. The timeline for completing the review is determined by the environmental milestone set by the subrecipients in the project schedule. After the environmental review is completed, the responsible entity (the unit of general local government) for the HUD Part 58 review submits the Request for Release of Funds (RROF) to the GLO. When GLO issues the AUGF, the responsible entity receives an email notification. The AUGF then becomes available in the Environmental Review Record.

If the GLO assumes the responsible entity role for a subrecipient that is not a unit of general local government, the subrecipient will conduct the environmental review on behalf of the GLO, and the RROF will be submitted to HUD by the GLO.

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 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.