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Disclaimer

ECONorthwest completed this report on behalf of Business Oregon. The Infrastructure Finance Authority (IFA) is a division of Business Oregon that provides funding to local governments, special districts and recognized tribes for critical infrastructure needed to support business and community development. The IFA has several different programs that provide grant and loan funds to eligible municipal entities. These programs often have complex application and reporting requirements that present administrative challenges, particularly to small communities with limited capacity. This report presents an analysis of key issues related to local government administration of IFA program funds and proposes approaches to better meet local government needs.

Throughout the report we identify the sources of information and assumptions used in the analysis. Within the limitations imposed by uncertainty and the project budget, ECONorthwest has made every effort to check the reasonableness of the data and assumptions, and to test the sensitivity of the results of our analysis to changes in key assumptions. ECO acknowledges that any forecast of the future is uncertain. The fact that we evaluate assumptions as reasonable does not guarantee that those assumptions will prevail.
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Executive Summary

The Business Oregon Infrastructure Finance Authority contracted with ECONorthwest and BergerABAM to conduct an evaluation of the capacity of small and rural jurisdictions to meet the administrative requirements of state- and federally-funded capital construction projects. This report presents the evaluation and recommends actions for improvement.

BACKGROUND

Development and operation of infrastructure is one of the most pressing issues facing Oregon. Many communities have aging water and wastewater systems that do not have enough capacity to accommodate anticipated growth or meet environmental compliance problems. In Oregon, the Business Oregon Infrastructure Finance Authority (IFA) administers several programs that support community development activities, through grant and loan programs. The IFA’s purpose is to ensure that the state’s infrastructure needs are identified and prioritized to make the best use of limited state resources. While the IFA provides a range of programs, it focuses on safe drinking water and wastewater systems.

While the state is making considerable investment related to infrastructure, most state agencies have experienced some problems with small communities’ ability to address the administrative requirements related to federal or state funded capital construction projects. Meeting requirements such as administering Davis-Bacon wage rates or Buy American provisions can be challenging for small communities, especially communities that rely on a single city administrator or city recorder to oversee all municipal operations.

IFA staff provide some post-award consultation. The grant or loan may include funds for hiring administrative know-how, so communities often hire external expertise to assist. IFA has concluded, however, that the current system lacks a consistent, trustworthy, and cost-effective range of options to help small communities manage administrative compliance.

Given these issues, the IFA and Oregon Business Development Department want to better understand approaches that would provide better support to small and rural communities that receive IFA funds or similar funding from public agencies. The objective of this study is to identify feasible options to ensure professional capital construction administrative resources are available to funded recipients that need them.
The IFA hired ECONorthwest and BergerABAM to conduct a process evaluation about how the current system meets, or fails to meet, post-award administrative needs. This evaluation focuses on specific issues related to program operation and specifically addresses challenges in operating the program related to fund administration by entities with limited expertise—often small, rural communities.

To prepare the evaluation, ECO and BergerABAM conducted the following research:

- **Key person interviews.** We conducted more than 20 interviews with stakeholders across Oregon.

- **Studies of programs in other states.** We developed four case studies that describe the systems used by other states to assist small jurisdictions in the administration of federal and state capital infrastructure grant and loans.

- **Focus group meetings.** We held two focus group meetings to discuss preliminary recommendations with stakeholders.

- **Training survey.** We conducted a survey of local jurisdiction staff and other stakeholders involved with project management to assess preferences for training about project administration.

## Findings and Conclusions

Through this project ECONorthwest and BergerABAM talked with more than 30 stakeholders from organizations in Oregon and staff at State agencies in four other states. The research confirms that small communities need assistance with grant and loan project administration. The types of difficulties that communities have with IFA project administration are common. Communities administering federally- or state-funded projects with the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ), Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), or in other states have similar difficulties. The high-level findings and conclusions from this project are:

- **Stakeholders are generally pleased with their interactions with IFA and think that the IFA is doing a good job.** While stakeholders had suggestions for a range of improvements that IFA could make, they were generally satisfied with their interactions with IFA staff. The most common issues discussed by stakeholders are with program requirements, the application process, and opportunities for improvements in communication with IFA staff.
• Small and rural communities often do not have capacity to meet the application and administrative requirements for state and federal grant capital construction programs. This issue is a combination of lack of staffing capacity and complex program requirements. The federal program requirements for grant/loan application and post-contract administration are complex.

• Small and rural communities often do not have the resources for staff to educate themselves about the program requirements. The smallest communities may have minimal or no staff, making it impossible for the community to administer a federally- or state funded-capital project without external assistance. The staffing issues include: shortage (or lack) of staff, lack of staff with experience with the federal and state programs, and shortage of time for training or to become conversant with the program requirements.

• The capacity for meeting administrative requirements varies among communities (even those of a similar size) and among regions of the state. Communities that are more likely to be able to meet program requirements have staff experienced in management and administration of projects in these programs. In addition, communities located in regions with active economic development districts, councils of government, or similar organizations also have more potential resources and support for meeting program requirements. However, the communities most likely to have problems are those with few staff or staff with little experience in these programs and with minimal support from outside quasi-governmental organizations.

• The state and federal program requirements are complex. Projects with funding from multiple sources probably have to meet requirements for multiple programs. The administrative requirements that are most challenging to understand and comply with are labor standards and environmental assessments.

• Many communities hire a third-party project manager. An important part of successfully managing the project to meet program requirements for communities with insufficient capacity is hiring an experienced third party to do project management. This third party may be from a quasi-governmental organization, an engineering firm, or a project management consulting firm.

• Some communities underestimate the complexity of project management. These communities may not allocate enough funds from the grant or loan or may not hire an outside project manager. These decisions are made at the beginning of a project, meaning that
it is important for staff and elected officials to understand the complexity of project management very early in the project. Once a community makes project management mistakes, it can take months or longer to fix the mistakes.

- **The most common administrative problem is meeting prevailing wage requirements.** In Oregon, communities that receive federal funds are required to meet complex wage requirements for both the State (BOLI) and the federal government (Davis-Bacon). Workers are required to be paid the highest of the prevailing wages for either BOLI or Davis-Bacon. For state funds in excess of $750,000 BOLI wage standards are required.

- **Some of these problems can be addressed through more communication with stakeholders.** Communities have expressed interest in having more communication from IFA staff, especially during the application phase of the project. One way that additional communication may solve some problems is through increased interagency communication, such as between IFA and other agencies involved in similar or related projects.

- **Community stakeholders have mixed opinions about what communities need.** Some suggest that IFA needs to do more training and make it relevant to the individual communities. IFA has had difficulty getting communities to participate in trainings, suggesting that the communities need something different than “more” training. Some stakeholders suggest that IFA should further refine the program manuals and develop manuals for programs that do not have a manual. Other stakeholders said that the manuals are useful and easily readable, but staff at some communities do not have the time to spend reading and understanding the manuals. Last, some communities suggest augmenting state agency staff support through developing administrative expertise (which would be made available to communities) at a third-party entity, such as a nonprofit.
RECOMMENDATIONS

The following key recommendations are based on the research for this project (i.e., interviews and case studies), discussions with community and State agency staff, and discussions with IFA staff. Chapter 5 presents the full list of recommendations.

- **Emphasize the importance of administration at the beginning of the project.** Changing the way that IFA projects begin is an opportunity to alter the way that projects are implemented. Our interviews and case studies suggest that working with communities on well-conceived applications may help avoid post-award problems. The following are recommendations on how to communicate the importance of effective administration early in the project:
  
  o **Identify and offer additional assistance to the communities most likely to need assistance in managing and implementing the project.** For example, Washington State makes this identification through use of criteria about: (1) the size and complexity of the project relative to the community and (2) the community’s experience managing projects of a similar scale and complexity. The IFA could use similar criteria or could ask communities to identify themselves.
  
  o **Strongly advise that communities hire a project manager for administration.** Programs often allow use of funds for administration. The IFA should strongly advise that communities, especially communities with less administrative capacity, hire a project manager for administration.

- **Increase informal monitoring early in the project.** The IFA has a ‘formal’ monitoring process that occurs when the project is 60% complete (i.e., 60% of funds are spent) or 24 months into the project. We recommend the IFA maintain and enhance its practice of regular ‘informal’ monitoring earlier in the project, especially for the communities with the least capacity. The monitoring process for ARRA Safe Drinking Water Projects was at: (1) first construction draw, (2) 60% completion, and (3) at project close.

  Monitoring at the front end of projects is very important, because issues, in particular Davis Bacon issues, become increasingly hard to rectify after time passes. Regional Coordinators currently monitor projects routinely in a number of ways, other than a site visit. A good relationship with the recipient and frequent communication
via phone, email all help the RC stay in touch and address problems early on.

- **Increase interagency coordination.** Some states, like Washington, have a formalized, well-defined process for interagency coordination and interaction. Other states, like Idaho, do not place much emphasis on interagency coordination. Interagency coordination is most important in cases when communities have complex problems that will require assistance from multiple agencies to solve. Interagency coordination allows state and federal agencies to coordinate attempts to solve similar or related problems in a community. The following are recommendations to increase interagency coordination:

  - **Establish institutionalized, regular interagency coordination.** Currently, interagency coordination on projects that IFA participates in is accomplished through monthly one-stop meetings with communities and inter-entity meetings, both of which include staff from other state and federal agencies. For the past three years, the IFA has had meetings with other agencies approximately every six months. In addition, the IFA participates in subcommittee group meetings to coordinate specific joint ventures, on as-needed basis.

    The IFA can increase the frequency of coordination with other agencies. Possible approaches to interagency coordination include holding quarterly meetings with key agencies or forming a working group that meets periodically. Additional contact between other agency and IFA field staff will additionally enhance interagency coordination.

  - **Direct assistance to communities working with multiple agencies on different projects, especially communities with less capacity.** IFA should establish processes to work more closely with the agencies that also have projects in the community. The inter-agency coordination process noted above should help identify such opportunities for more holistic assistance. The existing Regional Solutions Team structure may offer an opportunity for coordinating interactions among agencies.

  - **Evaluate interagency support for hiring a state specialist on prevailing wage issues.** This person would provide assistance with prevailing wage issues for state agencies that make grants or loans that are subject to BOLI or Davis-Bacon requirements. This person would not necessarily be a part of the IFA but would be available to IFA staff and communities with IFA-
sponsored projects. This specialist would conduct informal audits of paperwork, with a specific focus on low-capacity communities. Ideally, these informal audits would occur early on in a project (within the first few payroll cycles). If the audit identifies problems, the specialist would then schedule a follow-up visit to discuss problems and provide assistance and training to fix the problems and avoid future problems.

- Evaluate interagency support for partnering with a nonprofit agency to provide grant administration support. Finding experienced, qualified grant administrators is difficult for many local jurisdictions, especially those located in Eastern Oregon. One solution to this idea is that IFA could work with other State agencies to partner with a nonprofit agency to train and support one or more grant administrators. This administrator would be hired by local jurisdictions to do general project management and administration, complying with prevailing wage standards, or other administrative tasks.

- Continue to coordinate on development of the Investment Platform for Economic Development (IPED) database system. This system is a web-based database system being developed in coordination with the Meyer Memorial Trust, State and federal agencies, Community Development Financial Intuitions, IFA, and other stakeholders. The purpose of IPED is to provide a standardized way for communities to access information about funding opportunities that match the community’s needs. In addition, the system can improve interagency coordination by providing information to State and federal agencies about ongoing projects across Oregon.

- **Increase and diversify opportunities for training.** Training is important to IFA staff, as well as staff at communities and other organizations (e.g., economic development districts). IFA has gotten mixed signals from stakeholders about existing training opportunities. Though some stakeholders express strong desire for training, attendance is often low when IFA offers training, even if the training is outside of Salem (e.g., at the Oregon Coast or in Eastern Oregon).

  - Develop localized, customized training to meet an individual community’s needs. These trainings should address the specific issues of the community. IFA should offer the training locally, at a time that makes sense for the potential participants (e.g., avoiding holidays or local events), preferably early in the
developmental stage of the project. IFA staff should consider evaluating the capacity of the community when developing the training and should consult with the community about training topics. The training should include the project manager, key staff, elected officials (if needed), consultants, and any third-party entities that are assisting the community. If the community has projects from multiple agencies, IFA should evaluate the possibility of combining training on similar or related topics.

1. **Create training webinars to cover relevant topics.** Communities should have some level of understanding about topics such as prevailing wage, proper procurement processes, and other common topics. IFA staff could develop webinars to cover training on these topics.

2. **Attend the Washington Infrastructure Assistance Coordinating Council’s (IACC) annual conference.** IFA staff should attend the conference to evaluate whether a similar conference could (or should) be implemented in full or in part in Oregon.

3. **Evaluate the feasibility of holding additional training sessions at existing conferences in Oregon.** The IFA may be able to use existing conferences as a platform for offering more training to communities, without holding a special conference like the IACC’s annual conference.

**Other recommendations.** Our other recommendations for the IFA are:

1. **Develop a consistent interpretation of program rules.** Regional coordinators interpret program rules differently. Some have more flexible interpretations of rules and others have more strict interpretations. The IFA should develop a consistent interpretation of program rules, allowing as much flexibility as possible, and then train regional coordinators to consistently apply the rules.

2. **Develop and maintain a list of qualified grant administrators.** This list could include grant administrators that have successfully completed IFA projects in the past (or projects for other state agencies with comparable requirements). It could also include grant administrators who have successfully completed training and grant administration test (such as the test for CDBG administration). We recommend not requiring communities to
hire an administrator on this list but strongly encouraging communities to do so.

- **Identify opportunities to help develop qualified grant administrators.** Some parts of the State, especially in Eastern Oregon, have a dearth of qualified and interested grant administrators. IFA should provide self-guided training to help potential grant administrators learn the requirements for CDBG. IFA should also hold trainings on topics of interest to potential grant administrators (e.g., prevailing wage or environmental issues).
Chapter 1  Introduction

The Infrastructure Finance Authority (IFA) is a division of Business Oregon that provides funding to local governments, special districts and recognized tribes for critical infrastructure need to support business and community development. The IFA has several different programs that provide grant and loan funds to eligible entities. These programs often have complex application and reporting requirements that present administrative challenges, particularly to small communities with limited capacity. This report presents an analysis of key issues related to local government administration of IFA program funds and proposes approaches to better meet local government needs. It concludes with a set of recommendations for how IFA staff, possibly in conjunction with other state and federal agencies, might address the key issues.

1.1  BACKGROUND

Development and operation of infrastructure is one of the most pressing issues facing Oregon. Many communities have aging water and wastewater systems that do not have enough capacity to accommodate anticipated growth or meet environmental compliance problems. Infrastructure deficiencies limit communities’ ability to attract, retain and expand businesses. More than 44% of respondents to a 2010 survey of Oregon Economic Development Association members conducted by the U.S. Economic Development Administration University Center for Economic Development at the University of Oregon indicated that lack of access to infrastructure financing was a barrier to economic development in their community.

In Oregon, the Business Oregon Infrastructure Finance Authority (IFA) administers several programs that support community development activities. The IFA’s purpose is to ensure that the state’s infrastructure needs are identified and prioritized to make the best use of limited state resources. While the IFA provides a range of programs, it focuses on safe drinking water and wastewater systems.

In FY 2012, the IFA made 71 awards totaling nearly $63 million. About $12+ million was awarded through the Special Public Works Program, $22+ million was awarded through the Water/Wastewater Program, $13 million was awarded through the Safe Drinking Water Revolving Loan Fund, and $14+ million was awarded through Community Development Block Grants.
While the state, through several state agencies, is making considerable investment related to infrastructure, most state agencies have experienced some problems with small and rural communities’ ability to address the administrative requirements related to federal or state funded capital construction projects. Meeting requirements such as administering Davis-Bacon wage rates or Buy American provisions can be challenging for small and rural communities, such as communities that rely on a single city administrator or city recorder to oversee all municipal operations.

In short, many small and rural communities lack the in-house expertise to meet the administrative requirements of the state and federal programs. Once they receive capital grants or loans, administrative requirements for managing these funds often test the experience and capacity of staff to follow proper implementation procedures and protocols. While many cities rely on outside consultants to address these requirements, some administrative tasks must be completed by municipal staff and regardless of who performs the tasks, the cities are liable for any administrative errors.

The capacity constraints can lead to inefficient use of funds. When compliance issues emerge, they are time consuming and expensive to resolve. At worst, this lack of knowledge and capacity can lead to serious errors and related fiscal and legal liability. In the most extreme cases, grant or loan funds may be revoked from non-compliant communities, leaving the city with a partially completed project and a debt for the money already spent on the project.

IFA staff can provide some post-award consultation and the grant or loan may include funds for hiring administrative know-how, so communities often hire external expertise to assist. IFA has concluded, however, that the current system lacks a consistent, trustworthy, and cost-effective range of options to help small and rural communities manage administrative compliance.

Given these issues, the IFA and Oregon Business Development Department want to better understand approaches that would provide better support to small and rural communities that receive IFA funds or similar funding from public agencies. The objective of this study is to identify feasible options to assure professional capital construction administrative resources are available to funded recipients that need them.
1.2 FRAMEWORK AND METHODS

To better understand issues and opportunities related to local government administration of IFA funds, the IFA hired ECONorthwest and BergerABAM to conduct a process evaluation about how the current system meets, and fails to meet, post-award administrative needs. A process evaluation (sometimes called “implementation evaluation”) documents and analyzes the early development and actual implementation of the strategy or program, assessing whether strategies were implemented as planned and whether expected output was actually produced.

Process evaluations focus on how a specific program operates and is designed to answer the questions of what is done, when, by whom, and to whom. Process evaluations strive to:

- Provide information that can be used to enhance program quality;
- Ensure that the total quality of a program is captured; and
- Help the program be accountable to various stakeholders, including sponsors, client groups, administrators, staff and other community members.

This process evaluation focuses on addressing specific issues related to program operation, specifically addressing challenges in operating the program related to fund administration by entities with limited expertise, often small, rural communities.

To prepare the evaluation, ECO and BergerABAM conducted the following research:

- **Key person interviews.** We conducted more than 20 interviews, including with staff from nine rural cities or counties, nine agencies that work with rural jurisdictions on projects with IFA grant or loans (e.g., councils of government or economic development districts), and staff from state and federal agencies.

- **Studies of programs in other states.** We developed four case studies that describe the systems used by other states to assist small and rural jurisdictions in the administration of federal and state capital infrastructure grant and loans.

- **Focus group meetings.** We held two focus group meetings to discuss preliminary recommendations with stakeholders. One focus group was composed of State and federal agency staff and predominantly discussed issues related to interagency coordination. The other focus group was composed of community staff, organizations that assist communities (e.g., economic development districts), and consultants.
The discussion in this group was predominantly around issues related to providing more assistance to communities.

- **Training survey.** One of the key issues identified through this project is staff at jurisdictions awarded a grant or loan through an IFA program need more training about administration requirements of the programs. The survey focused on types of training that locals staff think they need and their preferences for getting that training.

### 1.3 Organization of the Report

The remainder of this document is organized as follows:

- **Chapter 2. Overview of IFA Programs** describes the objectives of the IFA and its programs, as well as a description of what the IFA does to assist communities.

- **Chapter 3. Interview and Training Survey Findings** presents key findings from the stakeholder interviews and summarized results of the training survey.

- **Chapter 4. Review of Programs in Other States** describes the programs used to help communities meet program administrative requirements and approaches to interagency coordination.

- **Chapter 5. Conclusions and Recommendations** presents the ECONorthwest conclusions and recommendations to the IFA

- **Appendix A. Stakeholder Participation** acknowledges stakeholders that engaged in this project.

- **Appendix B. Training Survey** summarizes the results of the survey training preferences of staff at jurisdictions and other agencies.

- **Appendix C. Washington Materials** provides examples of materials used in Washington to help communities and promote interagency coordination.
Chapter 2 Overview of IFA Programs

The Infrastructure Finance Authority is not a single program, but a collection of programs that draw from federal and state resources to support a broad range of community projects. The IFA has eight separate programs, each with a specific set of criteria and application guidelines. This chapter provides an overview of the IFA programs.

2.1 OBJECTIVES OF THE IFA

The Oregon Legislature created the Infrastructure Finance Authority in 2009 as part of the restructuring of the Oregon Business Development Department. The IFA strives to ensure that the state’s infrastructure needs — with a specific focus on safe drinking water and wastewater systems — are better identified and prioritized to ensure the best use of the state’s limited resources. The IFA is overseen by members of an independent Infrastructure Finance Authority Board appointed by the Governor, State Treasurer, Senate President, and House Speaker.

The IFA helps communities build infrastructure capacity to address public health safety and compliance issues as well as support their ability to attract, retain and expand businesses. The IFA also works with municipalities and state agencies to prepare municipally owned industrial land for certification.

The IFA focuses on four strategies to achieve its goals:

1. Create and develop an Infrastructure Finance Authority with specialized debt and asset management expertise, and programs that provide affordable financing for infrastructure projects to communities.

2. Coordinate with federal and state agency funding partners to streamline project approval processes to get funding to communities in the quickest and most comprehensive ways possible.

3. Assist municipalities to plan, develop, expand and sustain infrastructure and community development projects.

4. Work with communities to develop responses to state and local economic or infrastructure priorities and work collaboratively on

1 http://www.orinfrastructure.org/Learn-About-Infrastructure-Programs/
projects that leverage limited resources and position local communities to be competitive.

The IFA represents a significant portion of Business Oregon’s budget. The IFA program and administrative budget is about $215 million for the 2011-13 biennium. The program and administrative budget for the Business Development Department as a whole, including the IFA, for the same period is about $330 million.

### 2.2 IFA Programs

The IFA implements its mission of providing for local infrastructure needs and supporting businesses through eight programs. The programs support four types of projects: (1) community and economic development; (2) water or wastewater; (3) ports; and (4) special projects. This section provides an overview of the IFA programs.

Several of the IFA programs provide funding for a range of projects. Table 2-1 summarizes funding program by project type.

#### Table 2-1. IFA funding program availability by project type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment Fund / Program</th>
<th>Community and Economic Development</th>
<th>Water and Wastewater</th>
<th>Port</th>
<th>Special</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Development Block Grant</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Public Works Fund</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Drinking water Revolving Loan Fund</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waster/Wastewater Financing</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Navigation Improvement Fund</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Revolving Loan Fund</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Planning and Marketing Fund</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Public Works Emergency Project</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Community Development Block Grant

Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) are available to non-entitlement cities and counties.\(^2\) CDBG provides funding for a variety of community facilities, public works projects, housing rehabilitation, and services to microenterprise where the proposed project will primarily

\(^2\) Oregon tribes, urban cities (Ashland, Bend, Corvallis, Eugene, Gresham, Hillsboro, Medford, Portland, Salem and Springfield) and counties (Clackamas, Multnomah, Washington) receive funds directly from HUD. This organizations are called “entitlement” cities and counties.
benefit low- and moderate-income persons. CDBG requires an income determination for eligibility.

Grants and technical assistance are available to develop livable urban communities for persons of low and moderate incomes by:

- Expanding economic opportunities; and
- Providing suitable living environments.

All CDBG projects must meet one of three national objectives:

1. The majority of proposed activities must benefit low- and moderate-income individuals.

2. The activities must aid in the prevention or elimination of slums or blight.

3. There must be an urgent need that poses a serious and immediate threat to the health or welfare of the community.

As of 2012, CDBG provides the following maximum amounts for any individual project:

- Microenterprise: $100,000
- Public Works
  - Water and Wastewater Improvements: $2,000,000 except preliminary/engineering planning grants maximum $150,000
  - Downtown Revitalization: $400,000
  - Off-site Infrastructure: $225,000
- Community/Public Facilities: $1,500,000
- Community Capacity/Technical Assistance: no specific per-award-limit but limited overall funds
- Emergency Grants: $500,000
- Regional Housing Rehabilitation: $400,000

Because of its federal funding source and eligibility requirements, CDBG is among the most complicated programs administered by the IFA.
SPECIAL PUBLIC WORKS FUND

The Special Public Works Fund (SPWF) provides funds for publically owned facilities that support economic and community development in Oregon. Funds are available to public entities for:

- Planning;
- Designing;
- Purchasing;
- Improving and constructing publically owned facilities;
- Replacing publically owned essential community facilities; and
- Emergency projects as a result of a disaster.

SPWF provides both loans and grants (contingent upon funding availability). Loans for construction projects range from about $100,000 to $10 million. The IFA offers low interest rates that are equivalent to tax-exempt bond rates. Loan terms can be up to 30 years or the useful life of the project, whichever is less. Loans also are available to plan a construction project.

Grants are available for construction projects that create or retain traded-sector jobs. They are limited to $500,000 or 85 percent of the project cost, whichever is less, and are based on up to $5,000 per eligible job created or retained. Limited grants are available to plan industrial site development for publically owned sites and for feasibility studies.

The SPWF provides funding to a broad range of government organizations include cities, counties, county service districts (organized under ORS Chapter 451), tribes, ports, districts as defined in ORS 198.010, and airport districts (ORS 838).
SAFE DRINKING WATER REVOLVING LOAN FUND

The Safe Drinking Water Revolving Loan Fund provides low-cost financing for construction and/or improvements of public and private water systems. This fund has two loan programs for drinking water system improvements needed to maintain compliance with the Federal Safe Drinking Water Act:3

- The Safe Drinking Water Revolving Loan Fund (SDWRLF) is designed for collection, treatment, distribution and related infrastructure projects.
- The Drinking Water Protection Loan Fund (DWPLF) is designed for the protection of drinking water sources.

The Safe Drinking Water Fund is funded by annual grants from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and matched with the state Water/Wastewater Financing Program. The program is administratively managed by the Oregon Health Authority. Drinking Water Program loans to the communities are managed by the Infrastructure Finance Authority (IFA).

Funding is available for all sizes of water systems, although 15 percent of the funds are reserved for systems serving a population of fewer than 10,000. The program is available to water system owners that provide service to at least 25 year-round residents or systems that have 15 or more connections (or a nonprofit with 25 or more regular users).

WATER/WASTEWATER FINANCING PROGRAM

This loan program funds the design and construction of public infrastructure needed to ensure compliance with the Safe Drinking Water Act or the Clean Water Act. Loan and grant amounts are determined by a financial analysis of the applicant's ability to afford a loan (debt capacity, repayment sources and other factors). Allowable funded project activities may include:

- Reasonable costs for construction improvement or expansion of drinking water system, wastewater system or stormwater system;
- Water source, treatment, storage and distribution;
- Wastewater collection, treatment and disposal facilities;
- Stormwater system;

3 http://www.orinfrastructure.org/Learn-About-Infrastructure-Programs/Interested-in-a-Water-or-Wastewater-Improvement-Project/Safe-drinking-water-revolving-loan-fund/
- Purchase of rights of way and easements necessary for construction;
- Design and construction engineering; or
- Planning/technical assistance for small communities.

The maximum loan amount is $10 million per project; loans are typically repaid with utility revenues or voter approved bond issues. The program also provides grant awards of up to $750,000 for eligible applications. Applicants are eligible for grants if the annual median household income is less than 100 percent of the state average median household income for the same year and user rates are high.

This program also offers technical assistance financing (grants of up to $20,000 or loans of up to $50,000) for municipalities with populations of less than 15,000. The funds may be used to finance preliminary planning, engineering studies and economic investigations. Technical assistance projects must be in preparation for a construction project that is eligible and meets the established criteria.

**MARINE NAVIGATION IMPROVEMENT FUND**

The Marine Navigation Improvement Fund provides matching funds needed for projects that have received funding from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers or for projects that directly support or provide access to a federally authorized navigation improvement project. Legislative appropriation for project specific improvements generally occurs. The Marine Navigation and Improvement Fund provides grants and loans for either:

- A federally authorized project that needs matching funds; or
- A non-federally authorized project that directly supports or accesses an authorized navigation improvement project.

The program provides up to 25% match for congressionally authorized projects that have a positive national cost-benefit ratio, are sponsored by a port, and are in the port’s business or strategic plan.

Non-federally authorized projects must support a certain level of commercial or recreational activity to qualify for state funding. These projects must:

- Meet the criteria of a freight project or a commercial/recreation project;
• Be a new water project that directly supports, or provides access to, a federally authorized navigation improvement or navigation channel project;
• Be ready to begin in the biennium funding is requested; and be listed in a port's business or strategic plan.

**PORT REVOLVING LOAN FUND**

Port Revolving Loan Fund provides loans for the construction and/or improvement of facilities and infrastructure that promote maritime shipping, aviation and commercial activities of ports. The program is available to ports that are incorporated under ORS Chapter 777 or 778.

The program funds are available for port development projects (facilities or infrastructure) or to assist port-related private business development projects. Funds are available for a range of uses including engineering, acquisition, improvements, rehabilitation, construction, as well as operation and maintenance of facilities. The list of eligible projects is very broad and includes:

• Water-oriented facilities;
• Industrial parks; and
• Airports and commercial or industrial developments.

To be eligible, projects must be located within port district boundaries.

**PORT PLANNING & MARKETING FUND**

Port Planning & Marketing Fund helps finance planning and marketing activities to improve a port's trade and commerce capacity. Specifically, the program helps ports fund planning or marketing studies related to expanding trade and commerce activities. This includes developing and marketing facilities and services including:

• Agriculture
• Aviation
• Fishing
• Maritime
• Commerce
• Transportation
• Tourism/recreation
• Wood products
This program is primarily a grant program that is funded through a transfer of interest earned on the Oregon Port Revolving Fund. The IFA has established several high-priority projects for ports:

- Development of strategic business, marketing or financial plans for ports
- Updates to such plans that are required to keep the plans current for a period of five years
- Regional or cooperative projects that benefit more than one port
- Projects that leverage other marketing and development efforts by the state or other government units

Half of the funding is reserved for high-priority projects.

**SPECIAL PUBLIC WORKS EMERGENCY PROJECT**

The Special Public Works Emergency Project fund supports communities that require assistance following a disaster. The fund has very specific eligibility criteria:

- The project funding will be used only for eligible activities required to return an Essential Community Facility to its pre-disaster condition as a result of an "Emergency" as defined in ORS 401.025(4).
- A federal disaster declaration must have been issued.
- The benefited area must be included in the designated disaster area.
- Federal funds must be committed.
- Project activities are not a duplication of costs paid under the Public Assistance Program.
- The assistance must be for one of a set of listed Essential Community Facilities.
- The facility must be municipally owned.
- The funding requested is to cover the local matching share (25 percent) required by the federal government.
2.3 IFA IMPACT

The IFA has had broad impact on the state of Oregon. Map 2-1 shows the location of IFA investments statewide for 2009 through Spring 2012.

Map 2-1. Location of IFA projects, 2009 to Spring 2012

Table 2-2 shows that in 2011, the Infrastructure Financing Authority made 66 awards totaling nearly $30.4 million. About $10.7 million was awarded through the Special Public Works Program, $8.7 million was awarded through the Safe Drinking Water Revolving Loan Fund, and $5.9 million was awarded through Community Development Block Grants. In Fiscal Year 2012, the Infrastructure Financing Authority made 71 awards totaling nearly $62.3 million. About $12.2 million was awarded through the Special Public Works Program, $22.2 million was awarded through Water/Wastewater program, $12.9 million was awarded through the Safe Drinking Water Revolving Loan Fund, and $14.1 million was awarded through Community Development Block Grants.
### Table 2-2: IFA Investments, FY 2011 and FY 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment Fund / Program</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2011</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recipients</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Public Works loans / grants</td>
<td>15    $10,701,625</td>
<td>9    $12,177,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water/Wastewater loans / grants</td>
<td>8     $1,776,380</td>
<td>25   $22,219,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Drinking Water Revolving Loan loans / grants</td>
<td>7  $8,677,250</td>
<td>7    $12,909,795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development Block Grant grants</td>
<td>27    $5,890,549</td>
<td>20   $14,135,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ports loans / grants</td>
<td>9     $3,319,000</td>
<td>10   $834,752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>66</strong></td>
<td><strong>$30,364,804</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Business Oregon Infrastructure Finance Authority

In short, the IFA provides needed funding to local governments for a broad range of infrastructure investments that would not otherwise be possible. The emphasis is on projects that support economic development and job creation as well as community development.

### 2.4 IFA ASSISTANCE TO COMMUNITIES

#### BUSINESS OREGON IFA STAFF

The IFA has more than 30 employees. Eight employees are in the Financial Services Division, which provides services such as accounting, contracts, fiscal analysis, and other financial services. More than 20 employees are in the Program Services Division, which assists communities with applying for and managing state and federal grant and loans. The key positions in Program Services and Financial Services are:

- **Regional Coordinators.** These staff primarily work with communities to develop and implement infrastructure projects to improve livability and business opportunities, such as upgrades to wastewater systems or building a new library. Regional coordinators work with communities from the beginning of the project (before application for grants or loans) through the completion of the project. Key parts of regional coordinators’ role are: project development (including matching funding opportunities with community needs), assisting with grant or loan applications, assisting with implementing the project after the grant or loan is awarded, monitoring the project for compliance with state and federal regulations, and providing other assistance to communities. IFA has 10 regional coordinators.

- **Program and Policy Coordinators (PPC’s).** IFA has six staff that specialize in programs: Ports programs, Safe Drinking Water Revolving Loan Funds, Community Development Block Grants, Special Public Works - Water/Wastewater. PPC’s are experts in their area. They understand and manage state and/or federal rules,
develop application eligibility criteria, develop program handbooks and training for communities, and answer questions from the regional coordinators or others with program-specific questions.

- **Assistants and coordinators.** IFA has about four staff who are assistants or coordinators in the Program Services Division. These staff provide a wide-range of assistance, such as managing data, developing reports, answering phones, and other vital administrative tasks that support the regional coordinators.

- **Public Finance Officers.** The IFA has 3 Public Finance Officers who work with the Regional Coordinators in assessing the financial strength of funding requests proposed to the IFA. The Public Finance Officers have specific and special knowledge that can assist a community in preparing a sound financially compelling funding request.

In addition, IFA is managed by the Executive Director, the Financial Services Division Manager, and the Program Services Division Manager.

**APPLICATION ASSISTANCE**

IFA provides communities with assistance on project development and loan and grant application assistance. The following list provides examples of the assistance that IFA provides but is not intended to be an inclusive list of IFA assistance.

- **Interagency collaboration.** IFA coordinates with other State and federal agencies to help communities develop projects and identify funding opportunities.
  - **One-Stop workshops.** IFA works with a range of agencies to help communities develop projects through one-stop workshops. These workshops help communities identify the grant or loan program that will best fit their situation and needs. State and federal agencies who participate in one-stop workshops include: Business Oregon IFA, USDA Rural Development, Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, Oregon Department of Transportation, Oregon Association of Water Utilities, Association of Oregon Counties, League of Oregon Cities, U.S. Economic Development Agency (EDA), or the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE).

Prior to a one-stop workshop, the community provides an overview of the project to ensure that the right agencies
participate in the workshop. The agenda of a one-stop workshop typically includes: agencies describe funding opportunities, discussion of timelines for accessing funds, and action items for the communities.

The workshops are typically held in Salem but can be held in other regions of the State, as needed. The one-stop workshops are held monthly, with four time slots available per month. Time slots are generally available and, if a time slot is not available, the agencies can arrange to add another time slot for an interested community.

- **Inter-entity coordination meetings.** Like the one-stop meetings, these meetings include a range of State agencies, such as IFA, ODOT, DEQ, Department of State Lands (DSL), Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD), all of whom are part of the State’s Regional Solutions teams. The inter-entity meetings provide an opportunity to work on projects for communities over time, with a focus on identifying and resolving issues to move a project forward.

- **Pre-application technical assistance.** Regional Coordinators assist communities prior to funding application through providing technical assistance about different programs, eligible/ineligible activities, attend Board or Council meetings to talk about programs, or direct them to different state agencies. Regional coordinators help communities with project notification and intake form, which (once completed) indicates that a community is ready to apply for a grant or loan.

- **Application preparation.** Regional Coordinators assist communities with application preparation, including providing application feedback. The application process is designed to help the community prepare to implement the project, including getting needed permits, doing pre-application technical and engineering assessments, assessing whether the project will solve the identified problem, and assessing the financial feasibility of the project. When the project is ready to proceed and will meet the requirements of the grant or loan program, the IFA invites the community to submit an application.

- **Preliminary engineering grants.** IFA provides preliminary engineering grants from some programs for some projects by cities, counties, or special districts with fewer than 15,000 people.
POST-AWARD ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANCE

IFA provides a range of post-award administrative assistance, such as:

- **General assistance from regional coordinators.** The Regional Coordinators provide assistance on post-contract administration for a variety of issues, such as: meeting state requirements for public contracting and procurement, meeting State and federal prevailing wage rate laws, meeting federal Americans with Disabilities requirements, or other necessary reporting. Where necessary, regional coordinators get assistance from Program Specialists, who are experts in the individual programs.

- **Official monitoring.** IFA “officially” monitors administrative performance at 60% completion (e.g., 60% of the project funds have been spent) or 24 months after award if not at 60%. In addition, Regional Coordinators “informally” monitor projects on an on-going basis, to identify problems, potential problems, program status, and accomplishments.

  The purpose of the monitoring is to ensure that the community is following the administrative rules correctly, such as obeying state rules about public procurement or meeting State and federal requirements for prevailing wages. The official monitoring process should identify areas where the community is not or may not be following administrative rules correctly. If there is a clear problem, the IFA sends the community a letter with a Finding, which describes the issue and the corrective action to address the problem. IFA may send a letter to the community with concerns about possible problems, which is meant to identify issues before they become Findings with necessary corrective actions.

- **Training.** IFA offers training on specific programs (e.g., for CDGB or Safe Drinking Water program) and for broad issues, such as those related to applying for a grant or loan. The IFA operates a List Serve notification to over 300 subscribers for program changes and announcements.

- **Program-specific assistance.** The following describes assistance specifically available for CDBG.
  
  - **Grant administration.** Ten percent of the requested grant (up to $25,000). Over the past six years, IFA has awarded an average of approximately $393,000 per year for grant administration, totaling about $2.4 million.
o *Other financial assistance.* CDBG offers up to $15,000 per project for environmental review, up to $15,000 per project for labor standards monitoring and compliance, and legal services as needed. CDBG funds are also available to prepare public works applications for the next phase of work, regardless of eventual funding source.

o *Voluntary Certified Grant Administrator Program.* CDBG offers a program to teach CDBG grant administration, including an open book certification test. The purpose of the program is to help grant administrators better understand CDBG requirements and processes.

o *Preliminary engineering.* CDBG requires engineering studies before design and construction will be funded so that updated project costs are used and the projects are properly planned, and offers grants up to $150,000 for this work.

o *Handbooks.* The CDBG program has two handbooks: the Method of Distribution (applicants pre-award handbook and the grant management handbook (post award handbook).

o *Workshops for community staff and grant administrators.* CDBG offers workshops for grant management workshops. At infrastructure workshops, such as those sponsored by OAWU or RCAC, CDBG offers specialized workshops on topics such as labor standards, engineering requirements, or fair housing. The grant and specialized topic workshops are also available on request.

o *New Elected Official Workshops.* IFA offers CDBG workshops to newly elected officials. Most recently, this workshop offered on the northern Oregon Coast had two attendees.
Chapter 3 Interview and Training Survey Findings

This chapter discusses the findings from the more than 20 interviews ECO and BergerABAM conducted for this project. The purpose of the interviews was to gain a broad perspective on key issues and opportunities related to administration of IFA funding programs. We interviewed staff from a range of organizations: rural cities and counties, the Affiliated Tribes of Northwest Indians, councils of government, economic development corporations, and other state agencies. The findings are organized around key themes from the interviews: (1) availability and capacity of staff; (2) application process; (3) understanding administrative requirements; (4) communication with communities; and (5) feedback on interactions with the IFA and IFA staff.

This chapter also summarizes key findings from a survey of staff at local jurisdictions may be awarded IFA grants or loans and staff with other agencies that assist local jurisdictions with meeting administrative requirements of the IFA grant or loans.

AVAILABILITY AND CAPACITY OF STAFF

The two factors that affect communities’ capacity to meet the administrative requirements of the programs are (1) the availability of municipal staff with the necessary skills, and (2) access to expert assistance from outside of the Municipality.

- **Many small communities have insufficient staff to meet administrative requirements.** Some communities have a single staff person, such as the city administrator or a city recorder, that oversees a broad range of municipal functions. Some communities have additional staff but they do not have enough time to address their existing job duties and do the necessary administration required by the IFA programs.

- **Municipal staff may not have the necessary skills and experience to meet administrative requirements.** Even in communities with staff who have some time for administration of an IFA grant or loan, the staff may not have the necessary skills and experience to meet...
administrative requirements. The interviews suggest that staff who have never done program administration for IFA projects (or projects with other State agencies) have considerably more problems than staff with prior experience meeting the IFA administrative requirements of those or other state or federal programs.

- **Isolated communities may not have access to expert assistance that is available to communities in urban areas.** Communities outside of urban areas, such as those in Eastern Oregon, have less access to expert outside assistance (i.e., council of governments or consultants) or must pay considerably more for the expertise. Communities in urban areas, such as the Willamette Valley, have access to a broader array of options for qualified outside assistance. Communities in the most isolated areas, mostly in Eastern Oregon but also Southwest and coastal areas, may not be able to access or know where to look for expert outside assistance.

- **Municipal staff will be responsible for some administration, even if they hire outside expertise.** Staff are sometimes not aware that they are responsible administrative tasks such as submitting payment requests or filling out and submitting forms, even if they hire outside expertise. For communities with minimal staff, even this level of administration can be challenging.

- **Municipalities may lose experienced staff between projects.** Some communities go years between capital construction projects that are funded by state and federal programs. In the intervening years, the community may lose staff with experience completing the projects, leaving the jurisdiction with inexperienced staff for the new project.

- **Indian Tribes have similar issues with limited capacity as communities.** Most of Oregon’s Indian Tribes are small, similar in size to Oregon’s rural cities. The Tribes generally lack enough staff capacity to meet administrative requirements.
APPLICATION PROCESS

The application process is the formal beginning of the project. During this time, communities are generally in contact with their IFA Regional Coordinator. Communities may write their own application or may seek assistance from an outside expert, such as a business development corporation.

- **The application process is time consuming.** Interviewees report that the project application process can be more time consuming than they expect. Some communities do not have sufficient resources to devote to developing a project application and either do not apply for the grant or loan or receive assistance from an organization like a local development corporation or council of government.

- **Processing the application takes a long time.** It can take 18 months from the time of expressing an official program interest to approval of a loan/grant for the Safe Drinking Water Revolving Loan Fund program. The long processing time leaves the community uncertain about whether they will be able to proceed with the project.

- **There is not enough financial support for the application process.** The resources spent on loan and grant application are not eligible for reimbursement. Communities may spend a considerable amount of staff time or money working with outside experts when developing their application.

- **There is more support from third parties for project development than for project administration.** Organizations like economic development districts or regional government entities commonly help communities with project development and applying for grants and loans. Many of these organizations do not provide support for project administration.
UNDERSTANDING ADMINISTRATIVE REQUIREMENTS

The types of difficulties that communities have are generally related to lack of understanding of the post-award administrative and other requirements of the IFA programs. Interviews with staff with other state agencies (i.e., Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) or Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT)) showed that communities have similar problems meeting administrative requirements for federal or state grant and loan programs.

- **Local staff may not understand the requirements of the grants and loans.** Communities with few staff or without experience administering prior state or federal projects may have more difficulty in understanding the post-award administrative requirements of the programs. This lack of understanding ranges from knowing how and when to fill in particular forms to how and why certain program requirements such as Davis-Bacon wage rates need to be addressed. Municipal staff with prior experience administering similar projects have a better understanding of how to meet the administrative requirements and when to seek help on the more complex requirements. Interviewees said that understanding and meeting CDBG requirements is considerably more difficult than the requirements of other IFA programs.

- **Labor standards and environmental assessments cause the most confusion.** Interviewees report that communities struggled most frequently to meet labor standards (i.e., prevailing wage requirements) and environmental assessments. Contractors, especially those without prior experience on federal or state projects, may not understand the labor standard requirements, which require complying with Federal standards (e.g., Davis-Bacon) and Oregon’s Bureau of Labor and Industries (BOLI) standards. Complying with these labor standards requires understanding the complexities of both federal and state labor standards. Some contractors make payroll requests that do not comply with the prevailing wage standards and, when required to make corrections to the payroll, some contractors are resistant to re-filing corrected payroll reports.

- **Staff may not know that they can spend grant funds on administration or how much funding is allowable for**

---

5 For example, BOLI requires overtime pay for work beyond an 8-hour work day. The Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act (a Davis-Bacon related act) requires overtime pay for hours worked in excess of a 40-hour work week. Communities and contractors must understand these differences and correctly comply with the most appropriate labor standards.
administration. Staff may not budget for the full amount allowed for administration because they may under estimate the complexity and costs of administration. Staff may not know which administrative expenses are allowable reimbursements under the grant.

- **Money spent on administration is money not spent on the project.** Staff may be disinclined to spend money on administration because that money is not directly spent on the project. For projects funded through loans, where the grantee will have to pay back the loan, the grantee has a large incentive to try to minimize administrative costs.

- **Staff may not understand the full requirements of the project and amount of time that administering the project will take.** At the beginning of the project, staff may not understand the amount of time they will need to dedicate to the project for administration and all other aspects of the project. In addition, staff may not understand all the work tasks entailed in the project, such as a boundary survey, documenting existing infrastructure systems, or environmental assessment. Interviewees said they would find it helpful if IFA staff told them before applying for the grant what ancillary studies and other work would be involved with the project, including an estimate of staff time to complete this additional work.

- **Some administrative requirements make little sense to interviewees and seem burdensome.** For example, jurisdictions using a CDBG grant are required to adopt an *Excessive Force Policy*\(^6\) at the beginning of the project. In other cases, some projects may be required undergo environmental reviews that seem excessive in relation to the scale of the projects. Some municipal staff resist complying with requirements that do not make sense to them, in part as a way to minimize costs.

  For example, a Safe Drinking Water Revolving Loan Fund project required that the municipality provide documentation about the municipal water system, even though the project was not related to the municipal water system. The municipality did not understand this requirement at the outset of the project, including the amount of work it would take to meet this requirement. As a result, city staff were resistant to meeting this requirement because it did not make sense to them and because doing so was costly.

---

\(^6\) Recipients of a Community Development Block Grand (CDBG) are required to have a policy that it is the grantee’s policy not to use excessive force against any individual engaged in nonviolent demonstrations or not to physically bar entrance or exists of a facility that is subject to a nonviolent demonstration.
• **Elected officials may not understand the complexity of project administration.** Municipal staff, even experienced staff, may have difficulty educating elected officials about the complexity and importance of meeting administrative requirements. Having support from elected officials can be critical to successful completion of the project, especially when allocating staff resources or funds to the project. Turnover in elected officials contributes to the lack of understanding.

• **Program requirements change and may become more complex over time.** Even experienced staff may encounter difficulties with administration as the program requirements change. Unless a community has a recent grant or loan funded project, staff are less likely to understand changes in the program since they last administered a project from the same funding source. In addition, administration may become more complex, as new requirements are added to existing requirements.

• **Administration is more complex on projects with funds from multiple sources or in multiple areas.** Projects with funds from multiple sources may need to meet different program requirements (i.e., CDBG grants have to comply with federal labor standards but DEQ projects need only comply with BOLI’s state labor standards). These projects may need to track funds from each source separately. In addition, accounting can become complex for projects in multiple jurisdictions, where one jurisdiction may be eligible for grant funding that another jurisdiction is not eligible for. In both of these instances, having clear, robust financial controls is essential, so that the community can report spending and meet other administrative requirements.

• **Unaddressed problems build on each other.** One way that communities get into trouble is by failing to recognize or address errors or problems, which creates more problems as the project continues. Going back and addressing problems from earlier in the project becomes increasingly difficult (but likely essential) as the project continues.

• **Problems may occur with the transition of local staff.** Problems in on-going projects may begin with transition in staff, such as project managers or staff with a key responsibility. Miscommunication or lack of communication is often made worse through staff transition, especially if information or expectations are not communicated to new staff.
• **Tribal staff are generally more familiar with federal requirements than other communities.** Because working with federal programs is more common for many Tribes, Tribal staff generally have more experience with federal grant and loan programs than other small communities. Although staff is more familiar with the requirements, Tribes often lack enough staff to do the work of meeting the requirements.

• **Some interviewees are concerned that they are not meeting the grant requirements.** Even when interviewees had experience administering prior projects, they were worried that they were not meeting grant requirements. The basis for the concern comes from a combination of: (1) lacking a full understanding of program requirements; (2) a lack of clarity in program requirements; (3) complexity of program requirements; and (4) the threat the funding may be revoked for accidental non-compliance.

• **Some communities are unwilling to pursue grants or loans because of the complexity of the regulations or requirements.** A few interviewees said they chose not to pursue CDBG projects because of the complex regulations, restrictions, and reporting requirements. The communities make this choice because they do not have enough staff to meet reporting requirements or because the cost of a market-rate loan may be lower than the cost of staff time to meet program requirements.
COMMUNICATION WITH COMMUNITIES

Some interviewees identified issues related to the communication between the community and the IFA. The issues ranged from written communication to follow-up communication for unsuccessful proposals.

- **Communities may benefit from more communication during the application phase of the project.** Increasing pre-application training and ongoing communication during the application process can improve community’s preparation for project management and understanding of the project requirements.

- **Communities would like training on writing proposals and project management.** When asked, ODOT staff made the suggestion that IFA may benefit from offering training on: (1) writing a clear, concise, compelling proposal, (2) the basic steps of project delivery for federally funded projects, and (3) training on project planning and scoping.

- **Program manuals are not always clear.** The program manuals do not always present information in a way that helps staff completely understand the requirements. For example, one of the manuals leaves room for interpretation about how to determine if the Americans with Disability Act applies because the manual does not give clear direction on how to count employees (i.e., how to count part-time employees).

  Confusion with the manuals is more likely to be a common issue for inexperienced staff. Interviewees with administrative experience on multiple projects reported that they found the manuals relatively clear about administrative requirements and easy to understand.

- **IFA Manuals and trainings may include jargon which creates a barrier to understanding requirements.** This is an issue most frequently among staff with little experience administering capital construction projects. One interviewee characterized the problem as follows: “The requirements are not written to be understandable by a person of average intelligence with a reasonable level of education but no experience with this type of project.”

- **Communities are not always given feedback about why they were not awarded a grant or loan.** This feedback can help the community select what grants or loans to pursue in the future and to prepare a better application in the future.
FEEDBACK ON INTERACTIONS WITH IFA STAFF

Interviewees generally provided positive feedback about the IFA and IFA staff. Common themes were:

- **IFA staff, especially regional coordinators, are knowledgeable and try to be helpful.** Multiple interviewees observed that their regional coordinator and other IFA staff are helpful, very willing to share information, and try to provide good service. Some interviewees feel that they have a partnership with their regional coordinator and have no suggestion for improvements in the assistance they receive from the IFA.

- **The IFA provides good, timely information about project administration.** The IFA’s manuals and checklists are comprehensive and provide good guidance on project administration, especially for staff with prior administrative experience. As program requirements change, the IFA does a good job of updating manuals and other written materials in a timely manner.

- **The IFA tries to be flexible, when possible.** Given that the state and federal requirements are inflexible, IFA staff tries to work with the communities to meet requirements. For example, when time to process a contractor’s payment was unusually long, the IFA was able to provide funds to pay the contractor in advance of the processed payment.

People interviewed offered ideas for ways that the IFA could work better with communities. Some of these ideas are contradictory, reflecting different opinions about how IFA should operate and what relationship IFA should have with communities.

- **Regional coordinators have inconsistent interpretations of the rules.** Some regional coordinators interpret the rules very strictly, with little flexibility. Other regional coordinators interpret the rules more broadly, allowing for more flexibility. Interviewees who work in multiple regions of the state (e.g., consultants) commented on this issue most frequently. Several interviewees said that rules should be interpreted consistently, even if that removes flexibility.

- **IFA staff have the challenging dual role of providing technical assistance and enforcement which requires balancing rule enforcement with community partnerships.** Though IFA staff must ensure that communities meet state and federal requirements, communities to work with IFA as a partner, with an emphasis on discussing and understanding local needs.
Regional coordinators are required to have a wide range of knowledge. Regional coordinators are expected to know details of IFA’s programs, about upcoming opportunities, about their community’s needs, and details of other issues. Some regional coordinators are good at helping communities with the application phase of a project, some are good at explaining program rules, and some are good at helping communities with the construction phase of the project. Few regional coordinators can play all of these roles. There may be opportunities to shift some responsibilities from regional coordinator to other IFA staff to ensure that communities have access to staff with a variety of skillsets.

Provide more opportunity for casual communication between municipal staff and agency staff that assist communities. IFA staff communicate regularly with communities when they are applying for funding or engaged in a project. People interviewed would like more opportunities for casual communication with IFA staff, such as through hallway conversations at meetings. This sort of casual communication generally happens in-person and provide times for discussing grant and loan opportunities and for communicating the community’s issues and ideas.

IFA staff and outside experts may have very conflicting opinions, putting municipal staff in a difficult position. At times, IFA and outside experts (e.g., consultants) are unable to agree. Municipal staff may not know who to take advice from and, occasionally, having to manage conflict between IFA and outside experts. Although outright conflict appears to be relatively rare, this type of conflict is difficult for communities to manage.
KEY FINDINGS FROM TRAINING SURVEY

Interviewees indicated that staff at local jurisdictions that are awarded a grant or loan through an IFA program need more training about administrative requirements of the programs. The IFA currently offers training on specific programs (e.g., for CDGB or Safe Drinking Water program) and for broad issues, such as those related to applying for a grant or loan. Some of the training sessions have low attendance and some stakeholders indicated that they would like different training.

After completing the interviews and discussing preliminary results of the evaluation with IFA staff, it became clear that the IFA needed more information about training preferences of local staff. ECONorthwest developed a survey to assess the training needs of staff at local jurisdictions and agencies that assist them. The intent of the survey was to get feedback from people who had either previously participated in an IFA training or have an interest in training on IFA programs about: (1) past experiences with IFA training, (2) current and future interests in training for IFA programs, and (3) preferences for types and location of training.

The survey had a total of 100 respondents, with 88 respondents completing the full survey. This section presents the key findings from the survey. Appendix B presents the full results of the survey, including the methods used to contact potential respondents.

- **Most respondents worked for a local government.** About 60% of respondents worked for a city or county. Respondents included staff with: economic development districts, councils of government, nonprofits, private consulting firms, and other agencies.

- **Most respondents have experience with federal or state grant or loan programs.** Eighty-five percent of respondents worked with a community that had been awarded a grant or loan funded by the federal or state government. Three-quarters of respondents had experience with CDBG. About one-third of respondents had experience with one of the following: Safe Drinking Water Revolving Loan Fund, Special Public Works Fund, or Water/Wastewater Financing Program.

- **Nearly 60% of respondents had previously participated in training about state- or federally-funded programs from one or more agencies.** Two-thirds of those participants (or 35% of all respondents) had experience with IFA’s training. About 70% of respondents who participated in training on state- or federally-funded programs were satisfied or very satisfied with past trainings. The most common reasons for dissatisfaction with past training was that the training was not detailed enough.
• More than 90% of all respondents are interested in more training or might be interested in training (depending on the training's relevance and cost to participate). Respondents are most interested in training on (in descending order of interest): grant or loan applications, CDBG administration, Water/Wastewater administration, Safe Drinking Water administration, environmental review, and prevailing wage compliance.

• Most respondents prefer local training where they can save on time and travel costs. Availability of funding and time are the most common barriers to participating in training.
  
  o Respondents indicated that the following are barriers to participating in training: travel distance (52% of respondents), concerns about relevance of training (44%), travel costs for multi-day training (35%), staff release (24%), and concerns about understanding complex or jargon-filled training (24%).
  
  o Nearly half prefer trainings in their region and nearly one-quarter would be most likely to participate in a webinar. Only 17% would be most likely to participate in training in Salem.
  
  o Most respondents are willing to travel up to 100 miles and able to spend up to $100 per day on expenses. About half of respondents are willing to travel up to 100 miles for training, including 16% of respondents who are willing to travel no more than 25 miles. In addition, half of respondents are able to spend $100 or less per day on expenses, including 18% of respondents who are able to spend $25 less on daily expenses.

• Most respondents prefer single-day training, early in the project.
  
  o Three-quarters of respondents prefer training that lasts a full day or less. Nearly 45% of respondents prefer training that lasts no more than one-half day. Some respondents indicated that they are willing to do multi-day training to cover complex topics.
  
  o More than two-thirds of respondents think that training would be most helpful at pre-application or immediately after the award is received.

In summary, there appears to be substantial interest in training about administration of IFA grant and loan programs. Most respondents are interested in participating in training on administrative issues, provided
that it is relevant training, does not require traveling long distance, and requires one-day or less of time out of the office.

Respondents are most interested in training on topics related to application and general administration, with three-quarters or more respondents indicating that they are interested or very interested in training on these topics. Fewer respondents (74% to 68%) indicated that they are interested in training on the topics that communities struggle with most: environmental review and prevailing wage compliance.

The comparatively lower interest in training on the more complex topics of environmental review and prevailing wage illustrates the finding that many of the staff at local jurisdictions need help with understanding and implementing the basics of the administrative requirements. Local staff need to become proficient with general administrative tasks before are ready to become trained on the more complex topics. Rather than attempting to become proficient in administration of these more complex topics, local staff may need assistance with meeting the requirement of environmental review and prevailing wage standards.
Chapter 4  
Review of Programs in other States

As part of the overall program evaluation, IFA requested that the project team conduct case studies of four other states that administer similar infrastructure grant and loan programs. The intent of the case studies was to identify how other states were dealing with grant and loan management challenges in small and rural communities, and to highlight successful programmatic elements that might be adaptable to Oregon’s IFA operations. The IFA recommended initial interviews with the states of Washington and Idaho. Subsequent contacts with those states identified Montana and Oklahoma as viable case study sources.

The project team conducted at least two telephone interviews with representatives of each state. The first interview used a standard list of questions developed in coordination with IFA that identified administrative challenges, application management processes, and systems developed to address pre and post-award issues. The second interview round drilled down on specific information regarding post-award contract management support, grant/loan volume, and staffing levels.

Each state contact was slightly different. The Washington interviews involved conversations with representatives from the Department of Health and the Department of Commerce. The initial interview with the Department of Health indicated this was the best state program to benchmark compared to other states interviewed. The subsequent dual discussion with Health and Commerce offered the opportunity to probe the state grant and loan processes in more depth.

In Montana we spoke with the lead grant and loan manager for water and waste water projects within the Department of Natural Resources. Montana also offers some excellent insights on inter-agency collaboration which we expand upon below. Representatives of the Oklahoma Water Resources Board provided additional perspectives on that state’s management of water and wastewater State Revolving Loan Funds. Our conversation with the Idaho Department of Environmental Quality representative was the most narrow, focusing entirely on Clean Water State Revolving Loan Funds (SFR) grant and loan processes.

Collectively, these representatives shared grant/loan operational methods for Safe Drinking Water Revolving Fund, Clean Water Revolving Fund, Special Public Works, and a variety of state-specific grant or loan programs. Although some states also administered Community Development Block Grants for infrastructure, housing and facilities, the interviews focused on their common responsibilities for sewer and water projects.
4.1 KEY FINDINGS

The intent of the case studies was to identify successful programmatic elements that can be adapted to enhance the Oregon IFA program. All of the states acknowledged common problems, such as lack of rural staff capacity and experience, when dealing with small jurisdictions. Idaho provided an excellent example of a capacity/experience issue. The small community of Bliss, Idaho has 0.5 FTE to manage all city business with a $100,000 annual budget. Yet, they were required to manage a $2.5 million Clean Water SRF project. The community required assistance from the state in developing the SRF application and was directed to hire a contract administrator as a condition of awarding the funds.

The series of state interviews also yielded three common approaches that three of the states felt were the ultimate keys to programmatic success:

- **Strong coordination/collaboration among state and federal grant/loan agencies.** All four states contacted noted that this cross-program and cross-agency information sharing helped the state and federal agencies develop funding priorities and also assisted applicant communities to develop practical loan/grant packages that serve their needs. This coordination is especially useful when jurisdictions are bundling grants/loans for a single project such as CDBG, Clean Water SRF, and USDA Rural Development loans and grants. Applicants may be focused on a single funding source and not be aware of other options to finance their infrastructure improvements. Early engagement with all potential funding agencies helps identify more productive approaches. Washington and Montana have sophisticated, long-term consortiums described in the state overviews below that may be models for Oregon.

- **Effective training programs to improve jurisdiction performance.** Many of the interviewees emphasized that up front training and clear guidance documents smoothed the application process. The training also made applicants aware of likely challenges they would face during project implementation, and steps they can take to administer projects effectively. Most states emphasized the importance of providing training regionally as well as online (webinar) options. Again, Washington and Montana appeared to have the most robust programs.

- **A commitment to pre-award “hand-holding” and responsive post-award management help spot and/or prevent common problems with payroll management and payment distribution.** Washington
and Montana particularly emphasized that being a patient guide and trusted resource ultimately saved time. This real time training during the application process was a good investment. Close tracking of post-award performance and interventions to prevent derailments are also important. The states also acknowledged that communities must feel empowered to call and ask questions to address problems before they become major issues. All states relied on third party project administrators to provide effective support for small and rural jurisdictions. Oregon has a limited number of third party administrators to assist communities.

The following section summarizes what each state considers their most effective operational methods, lessons learned from their experiences, and potential programmatic elements that may be adapted to enhance Oregon’s infrastructure financing programs. The information here is detailed to the level of FTEs in key programs and relevant loan volumes for comparison. In most cases, interviewees were not able to provide specific staffing budgets or agency shared costs during the interview process. These findings are also presented in order of potential relevance to Oregon’s future program enhancements.
4.2 Washington

Description of Washington’s Program

Washington is a state much like Oregon, with a few large urban centers located west of the Cascade Mountains and many small and rural jurisdictions. Washington had 6.7 million people in 2010, with about half of the State’s population located in the Seattle-Tacoma-Bellevue Metropolitan Statistical Area. Like Oregon, Washington’s infrastructure management system must support both large, urban communities and small, rural communities.

State and federal infrastructure grant and loan programs are managed through the Department of Commerce, Department of Ecology, and Department of Health. Commerce manages grants and loans for programs like the Safe Drinking Water State Revolving Fund and Special Public Works. Ecology provides financing through the Clean Water Revolving Fund and also regulates operations of waste water treatment systems throughout the state. The majority of CDBG funds are administered through Health.

The Public Works Board construction program, within the Department of Commerce, made awards for about $250 million for 114 projects under the following programs in 2011:

- **Public Works Board**: 44 projects with awards of $155 million
- **Drinking Water State Revolving Loan Fund** (co-administered with the Department of Health): 36 projects with awards of $75 million
- **Community Development Block Grant**: 25 projects with awards of $11 million
- **Community economic Revitalization Board**: 9 projects with awards of $9 million

Washington has three significant programmatic elements that work in concert to assist small communities during the application process and with tracking of project performance during construction: Commerce Department administration, the Small Communities Initiative, and the Infrastructure Assistance Coordinating Council. These three elements work together (often across agencies) to help small communities meet program requirements.
Commerce Department administration

The Commerce Department administers infrastructure grant and loan programs, such as Special Public Works, the Safe Drinking Water Revolving Loan Fund, and some CDBG funds. Commerce has staff who work with communities to develop projects and assist with program application, as well as staff who administer the contracts. The Contract Administration Unit (CAU) is a centralized function within the Department of Commerce that serves Commerce, Health and Ecology departments. The unit has 10 FTEs devoted mainly to managing water and clean water infrastructure SRF contracts from the point of contract execution through project closeout and loan repayment. The budget for administration to support infrastructure grant and loan programs is $2.2 million annually, as of 2011. One of the major functions of this unit is working with communities that are managing multiple, bundled grants for a single project such as SRF, CDBG and USDA Rural Development funds used for a water or wastewater system improvements.

The CAU is also described as a “one stop shop” for small jurisdictions that have administrative questions during post award. CAU staff can also spot and flag potential problems such as late or incorrect payroll accounting reports, and alert managing agencies such as Health and Ecology to potential project upsets. This unit does not track the technical or engineering side of project implementation. Combined, the infrastructure grant/loan programs managed through the CAU average about $750 million accounts payable and $1.5 billion accounts receivable.

Like Oregon, Washington’s small communities often lack the internal capacity to meet the administrative requirements of state and federal grant and loan programs. Commerce assesses a community’s potential need for assistance and capacity to meet the program requirements based on: (1) the size of the project relative to the jurisdiction size; (2) experience of staff at the community with managing similar projects; and (3) community’s finance plans for the loan, including plans for paying the loan back. Based on this assessment, Commerce determines whether the community is likely to need extra attention and assistance.

For example, Commerce is likely to rate a loan of $1.5 million for wastewater upgrades in Seattle as being unlikely to require extra attention, given the relatively small amount of the loan and the track record of Seattle’s staff for implementing other projects. Commerce may target a similar loan of $1.5 million for wastewater system upgrades for a small community (e.g., 900 residents) with few staff that has no prior experience with a similar loan program as being likely to need extra assistance.
One type of additional assistance available to small, rural communities is participating in the Small Communities Initiative (described in the next section). Commerce also offers new client communities training courses for and assistance with understanding the contract and reporting requirements (including legal assistance). In addition, Commerce recommends that communities (especially low capacity communities) hire contract management assistance, typically from an engineering firm. Finally, Commerce’s CAU works closely with these communities, especially at the beginning of the project, to identify problems early. For example, Commerce reviews the first pay request for compliance with Davis-Bacon payroll requirements.

**Small Communities Initiative**

The Small Communities Initiative (SCI) is housed within Department of Commerce and serves the full range of grant and loan types from application through project close out. Small Communities Initiative was authorized by the 1999 Washington State Legislature to establish excellent working relationships between communities and regulators, promote compliance with environmental and public health requirements, and support the economic vitality of small communities. This program provides technical assistance to small, rural communities that are required to meet the same public health and environmental mandates as larger cities but often lack the administrative, technical, or financial capacity to do so effectively.

This program has two full-time staff and is funded through an intergovernmental agreement (IGA) among the departments of Commerce, Health, and Ecology. Funding for the SCI in fiscal year 2010 to 2011 was $240,000. SCI staff are located in Olympia and in Spokane. Since 2003, SCI has assisted with completion of nearly 50 projects, through the planning, design, and construction phases. SCI staff have assisted communities in securing $142 million in state and federal funding.

The SCI focuses on water and clean water SRF funding. Typically, regional staff for either Health or Ecology identify small jurisdictions that need assistance meeting water or waste water compliance requirements. The SCI staff will then form a team of local elected officials and staff, and a technical team composed of funding and regulatory staff. These teams assist jurisdictions in project development, exploration of funding options, and preparing applications. Much of the work within this group is during the application process, but field staff from both Health and Ecology often tracks post-award project implementation.
Communities who participate in SCI are identified in coordination with the Health and Ecology departments. Participants are selected based on: community size and capacity, regulatory priority, need for planning, and community commitment. SCI staff meet with communities on an as-needed basis (generally between once a month and once a quarter) and serve as facilitators, technical advisors, and resource brokers. SCI staff typically form a local team, which is composed of local elected officials and staff, as well as funding and regulatory staff. SCI assistance includes training elected officials about their responsibility for water and wastewater systems, helping communities develop a funding package, and identifying consultants.

**Infrastructure Assistance Coordinating Council**

The Infrastructure Assistance Coordinating Council (IACC) is a consortium that includes the Department of Commerce, Department of Ecology, Department of Health, US Department of Agriculture, non-profits, and Indian Health Services dedicated to identifying and assisting small communities with infrastructure improvement projects. The (IACC) is a unique, non-profit organization formed more than 20 years ago. Non-government members include associations of Washington cities and counties, non-profit technical assistance and grant administration providers. The IACC is not directly associated with any state or federal agency. It is managed through in-kind support of its members.

The IACC is run by staff from state and federal agencies, which allow their staff to participate in the IACC based on memoranda of understanding. The IACC has no paid staff. The IACC’s only source of funding is attendance fees from the annual conference, which is about $40,000.

The Council has a governing board led primarily by Department of Commerce and US Department of Agriculture managers. The IACC’s focus is keeping members up to date on changes in infrastructure programs and services, and providing guidance and technical assistance to small jurisdictions to identify and obtain resources they need to develop, improve, and maintain infrastructure.

The IACC’s main activities are:

- **Tech Team Meetings.** The IACC convenes staff from a range of state and federal agencies to meet with individual communities to discuss community infrastructure funding needs and potential funding opportunities. The result of the meeting is an action plan, with the following outline: list of participants and contact information, project description (from the community), proposed timeline, regulatory...
requirements, potential funding sources, and next steps for the community. The IACC does Tech Team Meetings throughout the year and at the Annual Conference.

- **Annual Conference.** The annual, two-day conference offers a range of technical and policy sessions covering topics including regulatory requirements for water and wastewater systems, grant application processes, systems management and construction management. At the conference, 20 to 30 individual communities typically attend to receive technical team support. Conference training topics range from permitting issues, updates on funding programs, suggestions for writing grants, and program-specific training. Attendance at the conference is $175 per person. In 2011, the conference attracted about 300 participants (e.g., community representatives, agency staff, and exhibitors) from 100 distinct communities across Washington. The conference is entirely planned by volunteers from IACC participating agencies, with no assistance from outside event planners.

- **Meetings.** The IACC meets every other month to discuss budget, planning for the annual conference, program changes, and other IACC initiatives.

Other initiatives include:

- **Website and Online database.** The IACC developed and maintains a website that serves as an information hub and includes a searchable, online database that helps potential applicants identify funding and/or technical assistance resources. The database is designed to walk potential applicants through a check list that leads to agencies and organizations they need to contact to help with their project.

- **Unified forms.** The IACC is currently working to simplify application processes using unified forms to replace multiple application documents.
4.3 Montana

Description of Montana’s Program

Montana is a rural state. Total population in 2010 was under one million people, with Billings the only city with a population over 100,000. As a result, Montana’s infrastructure management system is largely geared to supporting rural community needs.

Public Works and water and clean water state revolving loan funds (SRF) grants and loans are managed through the Montana Department of Natural Resources and Conservation (DNR) and the Montana Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ). Montana has five financial management staff that support SRF grants and loans plus other state-specific grants. This staff oversees the application processes and tracks post-award payroll and draws.

Montana funds about $60 million annually in infrastructure projects, with $40 granted through SRF. CDBG grants, administered through the state Department of Commerce, fund about four projects per year totaling less than $4 million annually.

Interagency Coordination

As with Washington, Montana has a long-standing, multi-agency consortium focused on collaborative funding options, combined training, and technical assistance to jurisdictions that need support. The Water, Waste Water and Solid Waste Action Coordination Team (W2ASACT) is a comprehensive, interagency coordination group that includes state staff from DNR, DEQ, and Commerce. Federal participants include EPA, Economic Development Administration, USDA Rural Development, Housing and Urban Development, and occasionally the Corps of Engineers. This consortium was first established in 1982.

DNR serves as a central coordinator for W2ASACT. The agencies have monthly progress meetings via phone with jurisdictions who are in the grant/loan application process, or actively managing a funded project. W2ASACT also holds a half-day, bi-monthly meeting to review active and pending grants/loans, share inter-agency information such as potential projects in the application pipeline, and hear presentations about program activities.

State and federal agency staff participate in W2ASACT as representatives of their agencies, which do not generally have line-item budgets for participating in W2ASACT. The agencies have an informal system to
determine sharing of staff time and expenses related to meetings and training system. The costs of participating in W2ASACT are considered a regular part of program administration.

The intent of W2ASACT is to identify problems, answer questions, and make resource allocation suggestions. The goals of W2ASACT are:

- Further simplify and coordinate our actions, procedures and forms
- Provide technical assistance to communities
- Obtain adequate state and federal funding for PE and construction
- Promote capital improvements and financial planning
- Promote water metering throughout Montana
- Promote regional water systems
- Become a recognized advisory body for legislative changes
- Improve timely access to grant programs

The W2ASACT assures that all grant and loan agencies are aware of what other agencies are doing, and that communities handling bundled grants can interact with all agencies at the same time rather than separately. The W2ASACT has developed a standardized spreadsheet for project accounting. This form allows the jurisdiction to create one reporting document and shows all the funding agencies how funds are being disbursed across funding sources.

The inter-agency W2ASACT conducts four, joint, on-site trainings annually in various areas of the state, produces two webinars each year as well as training videos on water and waste water system management. In addition, the W2ASACT website acts as a clearing house for other guidance documents. Costs for providing these services are split among the participating agencies.

One of the accomplishments of W2ASACT that may be of interest is the creation of a universal application. The application form provides most of the basic application information for the following programs: State Revolving Fund, Special Public Works, CDBG (with a supplement form), USDA Rural Development (with a supplemental form) and Corps WRDA funding requests. The form can be found at:

IMPLEMENTATION

Third party non-profits, for-profit project managers, or project engineers typically handle overall post-award grant/loan administration for communities lacking the capacity to handle this themselves. The state provides a list of potential providers to jurisdictions during a grant/loan application process.

The state has seven engineers available around the state to provide technical services and track project implementation. Five positions are funded through the Department of Environmental Quality and two through the Department of Natural Resources. These engineers review environmental assessments during the application process. Engineering field support for project implementation may include periodic site inspections and attendance at progress meetings, depending on the duration and complexity of the project. The engineers also track contractor payroll performance for Davis-Bacon and other wage standards compliance.

Preparing well-designed projects is part of the application process. To support this, Montana, provides preliminary engineering (PE) grants to fund PE needs for grant applications. This helps jurisdictions develop a project plan that has accurate cost estimates, identification of potential design challenges, and allows consideration of implementing the project in phases so that grant/loan funding can be allocated over time.
4.4 Oklahoma

Description of Oklahoma Program

Oklahoma has many small communities, with more than half of the state’s population concentrated in a few large cities. Oklahoma had about 3.8 million residents in 2010. Oklahoma has 598 incorporated communities, with three cities over 100,000 and forty cities with population over 10,000. In addition, Oklahoma has 77 counties.

The Oklahoma Water Resources Board (OWRB) is responsible for defining state policy and conducting the State’s water business. The Board has nine members, appointed by the Governor. OWRB has four divisions:

- **Executive Administration:** provides support to the agency through the Information Services and Legislative/Media Relations Sections.

- **Financial Assistance Division:** provides loans and emergency grants for water and wastewater infrastructure throughout the state.

- **Planning and Management Division:** administers permitting programs for use of the state’s surface waters and groundwaters and cooperates with various agencies and organizations in technical studies to determine the amount of water available in Oklahoma’s stream and groundwater basins.

- **Water Quality Division:** develops and maintains Oklahoma’s Water Quality Standards and routinely collects physical, chemical and biological data to support the document.

The Financial Assistance Division administers state and federal loan and grant programs. The Division has a staff of four financial advisors, four engineers, three environmental specialists, an assistant chief, one attorney and one certified public accountant. The division has no regional staff, but does rely on other agency staff as needed for local knowledge.

The Division administers loans with a value of about $75 million annually, and grants of about $2 million. Their loan programs include the Clean Water SRF Program and the Drinking Water SRF Loan Program and grants include emergency grants (up to $100,000) and Rural Economic Action Plan grants (up to $150,000). They process about 30 drinking water or clean water infrastructure loan/grant applications annually, although the number was more than double that during the federal stimulus grant process.

Staying in touch with past, current and prospective clients is a high priority. Finance Authority loan officers are required to make a minimum
of 24 phone or direct contacts per year with current and past borrowers to identify any problems and get a sense of what other applications may be submitted in the future. In addition, the agency provides guidance on finance management and organization of filing and payment systems to maintain a clean process.

**INTERAGENCY COORDINATION**

Funding Agency Coordinating Team (FACT) is an informal interagency coordination arrangement among the State departments of Water Resources and Commerce, DEQ and USDA Rural Development. FACT was formed during the 1980’s. Agency staff participate in FACT as part of their regular job duties, with no formal budget allocated to support FACT. Each agency shares the costs associated with meeting logistics (e.g., venue or food costs). The Oklahoma Rural Water Association (a nonprofit) is responsible for the setting up and running the meetings.

The goal of FACT is to provide opportunities for interagency coordination to better assist communities and to provide training to community staff and officials. The interagency meetings occur one day per quarter. In the morning meeting, agency staff discussion includes updates about grants/loans in progress, anticipated applications for projects, and discussion of interagency coordination opportunities. In the afternoon, agency staff meet with individual communities that may be having problems meeting grant requirements, such as rate increases to meet financing structures, and seek workable solutions across involved agencies. The quarterly meetings may include other agencies, such as the Councils of Government and tribal representatives.

FACT provides training focused on water and wastewater systems to: (1) infrastructure engineers who assist communities with grant and loan applications (and pre-application) processes; and (2) system operators, governing board members, and elected officials. One training session is offered annually, alternating between training for engineers and operators/officials. Additional training is available from the Finance Authority, through Rural Water Association and Municipal League conferences.

The Authority is currently working with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to design and implement an online program called OASIS that will offer online worksheets and guidance documents to analyze loan and grant options and demonstrate community benefits that projects and related rate increases will provide.
4.5 Idaho

Description of Idaho’s Program

Idaho had a population of about 1.6 million people in 2010. Idaho has one city with more than 100,000 residents, about 20 cities with more than 10,000 people, and about 50 small cities and towns. Idaho has 44 counties. The majority of the State’s population is concentrated in the Boise metropolitan area in Ada County.

The Idaho Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) administers the Clean Water State Revolving Loan Program. The State Department of Commerce administers CDBG Grants. DEQ averages $33 million annually in grants and loans for the SRF program, with $50 million in 2011.

DEQ Grants and Loans has a staff of six state office staff dedicated to grant and loan management process and engineers in each of six administrative regions. DEQ has a separate enforcement division. Grants and loan staff do not have a regulatory function beyond assuring that applicants meet conditions of loan approval. State staff focus primarily on grant and loan applications and awarding funds. State staff in Boise have minimal interaction with post-award project implementation in the regions, unless there is a problem or need to change the scope of work.

The regional engineers maintain post-award project relationships including file and reimbursement reviews to assure compliance with project plans, specifications, and estimates. Post award tracking, monitoring, and assistance are done by staff at the regional level. Depending on the complexity of the project, the regional engineers will also conduct site inspections ranging from quarterly to project opening and close. They will attend weekly progress meetings by phone if necessary, and be available by phone for questions such as eligibility of certain project activities for grant/loan reimbursement.

Assistance to Communities

The DEQ relies on the Rural Communities Assistance Corporation (RCAC) for assisting communities with grant/loan applications and post-award administration. RCAC is a nonprofit with offices in 13 states that provides a range of program assistance for small jurisdictions. DEQ pays RCAC for administration from the general fund budget. Additional assistance is provided by councils of government, consulting engineering firms, and grant management contractors.
In addition, Idaho requires that communities use certified grant administrators to assist with meeting state and federal requirements. The Idaho certification process requires:

- Attending the Department of Commerce certification training
- Successfully completing an open book exam
- Submitting a current resume

Based on the combination of exam score and past experience, the State determines if a person can be certified. This certification program has been in place for about 15 years and now provides a network of administrators statewide. Idaho currently has about 60 grant administrators certified for administration of CDBG funded-projects. Many of these administrators work through local councils of government, but may also be based within some engineering firms and consulting businesses. In addition, Idaho provides a grant administration manual for continuing reference as well as periodic refresher training.

In addition to administering the certification program, the Department of Commerce also allows jurisdictions to use up to 10 percent of the grant to fund administration services. The Department also provides the jurisdictions with an administrator contract template that describes specific administrative duties and a budget for administrative tasks, such as:

- Project setup
- Environmental Review
- Acquisition & Relocation
- Labor Monitoring
- Project Monitoring
- Civil Rights
- Fair Housing Plan
- 504 Analysis and Transition Plan
- Project Close-out
Chapter 5 Conclusions and Recommendations

ECONorthwest and BergerABAM were hired to conduct a process evaluation about the how the IFA’s existing grant and loan management system helps communities meet post-award administrative needs. The research suggests that project development assistance is also a key need, and an area that given additional attention, may partially address some post-award issues. Through this project, we talked with more than 30 stakeholders from organizations in Oregon and staff at State agencies in four other states.

This chapter presents our conclusions about the issues related to project development and post-award administration for capacity lacking, often rural, communities. The chapter presents recommendations for addressing these issues. ECONorthwest discussed drafts of the recommendations with a range of stakeholders and refined the recommendations based on their feedback.

5.1 CONCLUSIONS

Stakeholders are generally pleased with their interactions with IFA and think that the IFA is doing a good job.

While stakeholders had suggestions for a range of improvements that IFA could make, they were generally satisfied with their interactions with IFA staff. The most common issues discussed by stakeholders are with program requirements, the application process, and opportunities for improvements in communication with IFA staff.

Small and rural communities often do not have capacity to meet the application and administrative requirements of state and federal grant capital construction programs.

This issue is a combination of lack of staffing capacity and complex program requirements. The federal program requirements for grant/loan application and post-contract administration are complex. For example, IFA’s handbook describing how to comply with CDBG requirements is hundreds of pages and the application manual is about a hundred pages. Part of the reason the manuals are so large is that IFA staff have taken pains to make the requirements clearer and easier to understand. Several stakeholders praised the IFA’s attempts to make the regulations clearer. They said that the handbooks are helpful but
community staff must make the time to read and understand the handbooks.

A related issue is that many communities do not have resources (mostly time) for staff to educate themselves (through reading or training) about the program requirements. The smallest communities may have minimal or no staff, making it impossible for the community to administer a federally- or state funded-capital project without external assistance. The staffing issues include: shortage (or lack) of staff, lack of staff with experience with the federal and state programs, and lack to time for training or to become conversant with the program requirements.

The capacity for meeting administrative requirements varies among communities (even those of a similar size) and among regions of the State. Communities with staff experienced in management and administration of projects in these programs are more likely to be able to meet program requirements. Communities located in regions with active economic development districts, councils of government or similar organizations also have more potential resources and support for meeting program requirements. The communities most likely to have problems are those with little staff or staff with little experience in these programs and with little support from outside quasi-governmental organizations.

The state and federal program requirements are complex. Projects with funding from multiple sources probably have to meet requirements for multiple programs. The administrative requirements that are most challenging to understand and comply with are labor standards and environmental assessments.

Business Oregon cannot change the federal requirements and changing State requirements is difficult. IFA staff try to make the requirements as clear and understandable as they can (as described above). The lack of community capacity to meet administrative requirements can be compounded by lack of understanding about the responsibilities and complexities of the grant or loan award. Community staff and elected officials may not have enough experience to understand how complex administrative requirements are, which may lead some communities to underestimate the amount of time and resources that project management and administration will take.

An important part of successfully managing the project to meet program requirements for communities with insufficient capacity is hiring an experienced third party to do project management. This third party may be from a quasi-governmental organization, an engineering
firm, or a project management consultant. When staff or elected officials underestimate the importance and complexity of project management, the community may not allocate enough funds from the grant or loan or may not hire an outside project manager.

These decisions are made at the beginning of a project, meaning that it is important for staff and elected officials to understand the complexity of project management very early in the project. Once project management mistakes are made (e.g., mistakes in prevailing wage calculations for payroll), it can take months or longer to unravel and fix the mistakes.

The most common administrative problem is meeting prevailing wage requirements. In Oregon, communities that receive federal funds are required to meet wage requirements for both the State (BOLI) and the federal government (Davis-Bacon). Workers are required to be paid the highest of the prevailing wages for either BOLI or Davis-Bacon. For state funds in excess of $750,000 BOLI wage standards are required. These requirements are complex and difficult to understand.

To meet requirements, the project manager must have a thorough understanding of the rules for complying with prevailing wages for both systems. In addition, construction contractors need to understand the rules too. In practice, many contractors, communities, and some management contractors make errors in the prevailing wage verifications. The errors may not be discovered for several months, requiring fixing past errors. This problem is exacerbated by the fact that some projects have many contractors working on the project, with contractors starting and ending the work throughout the project. So, even if a problem is found and addressed with one contractor, other problems may emerge, especially if the project manager does not closely examine every payroll request (which requires a complete understanding of requirements and sufficient time to do the examination).

Some of these problems can be addressed through more communication with: communities, the Tribes, organizations that assist communities (e.g., economic development districts or councils of government), engineering firms and other consultants, and other State agencies.

The IFA can address these issues in part by communicating more with the full range of stakeholders. Communities have expressed interest in having more communication from IFA staff, especially during the application phase of the project. Communities would also like IFA’s assistance in implementing the project and meeting administrative requirements.
The community stakeholders we talked with, however, were of mixed opinions about what communities needed. Some suggested that IFA needs to do more training and make it relevant to the individual communities. IFA has had difficulty getting communities to participate in trainings, suggesting that the communities need something different than “more” training. Some stakeholders suggested that IFA should further refine the program manuals and develop manuals for programs that do not have a manual. Other stakeholders said that the manuals are useful and easily readable but staff at some communities do not have the time to spend reading and understanding the manuals. Last, some communities suggest augmenting state agency staff support through developing administrative expertise (which would be made available to communities) at a third-party entity, such as a nonprofit.

One of the ways that additional communication may solve some problems is through increased interagency communication, such as between IFA and other agencies involved in similar or related projects with communities. For example, a community may have grants and loans from IFA, DEQ, and ODOT at the same time. The projects may be related or not. Currently, the IFA communicates with other State agencies in relatively informal ways. There are opportunities for improving or increasing communication among State agencies, including opportunities to simplify the application process or make it easier for communities to comply with administrative requirements.

One of the ways to address some of the basic problems with administration is through additional training of staff at local jurisdictions. Additional training, however, will not solve the difficulties with administration because local jurisdiction staff have limited time to devote to training and some of the administrative issues are very complex.

Staff with local jurisdictions and other agencies are interested in getting more training about administration of IFA grant and loan programs. Local staff want training that is relevant to their tasks, begins early in the project, does not require long travel is requires one-day or less of time out of the office.

Local staff have limited amounts of time and funding (for travel) that they can devote to training. These limits will constrain the types of training available to local staff. Training on complex issues, such as environmental compliance or prevailing wage issues, would take more time than local staff are likely to have.
5.2 RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are based on the research for this project (i.e., interviews and case studies), discussions with community and State agency staff, and discussions with IFA staff.

STARTING THE PROJECT

Our interviews and state case studies suggest that working with communities on well-conceived applications may help avoid post-award problems. The following recommendations focus on helping IFA staff set clear expectations with communities at the beginning of projects and catch administrative problems early, before they become big, complex problems.

- **Require a meeting during project development and a meeting at the signing of the contract.** The project development meeting could be a one-stop workshop with IFA and other state agency staff, as well as staff from the community. The meeting at the signing of the contract should include IFA staff, the community’s staff in charge of finance and the staff-member in charge of the project, and the elected official who will be signing the contract, and the contract administrator.

  The IFA generally meets with staff and other stakeholders at these two points in the project. The IFA reports that these meetings especially the one at the beginning of the project, sometimes get cancelled or do not have the necessary people from the community in attendance.

  The purpose of the project development meeting is to help the community understand the funding options, application procedure and requirements, coordinate ideas among State agencies, and plan the community’s actions to ready the project application. This meeting should include representatives from all organizations that will be involved in the project.

  The purpose of the meeting at contract signing is the ensure that the community understands its responsibilities for managing the project, discuss administrative issues, answer questions, and make sure there are common expectations for implementation of the project. The IFA could consider making at least the signing meeting mandatory for communities to receive the award. In some instances, it may be appropriate to involve local elected officials in this meeting.
• Identify and offer more assistance to the communities most likely to need assistance in managing and implementing the project. The IFA should identify those communities who have the least capacity to manage and implement their project. Washington State makes this identification through use of criteria about: (1) the size and complexity of the project relative to the community and (2) the community’s experience managing projects of a similar scale and complexity. The IFA could use similar criteria or could ask communities to identify themselves.

Regardless of how the identification is made, IFA staff should closely monitor the progress of the communities with the least capacity and offer assistance when needed. The recommendations below are most applicable to communities with lower administrative capacity.

• Strongly advise that communities hire a project manager for administration. Programs often allow use of funds for administration. The IFA should strongly advise that communities, especially communities with less administrative capacity, hire a project manager for administration. IFA staff should point out when administrative funds or project management assistance are a part of the project award.

• Examine project budgets in more detail. Regional coordinators should be more critical in their review the community’s budget for implementing the project. If budget line items for administration and legal advice are missing or seem insufficient (given the regional coordinator’s experience), the coordinator should discuss the issue with community staff and strongly advise that the budget be revised.

• Increase informal monitoring early in the project. The IFA has a ‘formal’ monitoring process that occurs when the project is 60% complete (i.e., 60% of funds are spent) or 24 months into the project. We recommend the IFA maintain and enhance its practice of regular ‘informal’ monitoring earlier in the project, especially for the communities with the least capacity. The monitoring process for ARRA Safe Drinking Water Projects was at: (1) first construction draw, (2) 60% completion, and (3) at project close.

Monitoring at the front end of projects is very important, because issues, in particular Davis Bacon issues, become increasingly hard to rectify after time passes. Regional Coordinators currently monitor projects routinely in a number of ways, other than a site visit. A good relationship with the recipient and frequent communication
via phone, email all help the RC stay in touch and address problems early on.

We recommend more monitoring earlier in the project, especially for the communities with the least capacity. The area most likely to benefit from early monitoring is payroll and meeting prevailing wage requirements. Review of prevailing wage could (and perhaps should) begin with the first payroll. For complex projects with multiple contractors, it would be wise to review the first payroll for each contractor.

**INTERAGENCY COORDINATION**

Some states, like Washington, have a formalized, well-defined process for interagency coordination and interaction. Other states, like Idaho, emphasize interagency coordination substantially less. Oregon’s system of interagency coordination is not as formal as Washington’s, but is more defined than Idaho’s.

Interagency coordination is most important in cases where communities have complex problems that will require assistance from multiple agencies to solve. Interagency coordination is important to allow State and federal agencies to coordinate attempts to solve similar or related problems in a community. Interagency coordination is important to communities because: (1) different funding is available from different agencies and (2) programs across agencies have different requirements, which can cause confusion and difficulties.

- **Establish institutionalized, regular interagency coordination.**
  
  Currently, interagency coordination on projects that IFA participates in is accomplished through monthly one-stop meetings with communities and inter-entity meetings, both of which include staff from other state and federal agencies. For the past three years, the IFA has had meetings with other agencies approximately every six months. In addition, the IFA participates in subcommittee group meetings to coordinate specific joint ventures, on as-needed basis.

  IFA could use a similar approach as Idaho and have quarterly meetings with key agencies. An alternative would be to form a working group that meets periodically. If IFA choses to implement a working group or meeting strategy, it should first ensure that it has commitment from other agencies (ODOT, DEQ, Oregon Health Authority, as well as USDA rural development). It will also need to identify a mechanism that ensures that information not only gets
exchanged with the meeting participants, but that information also gets to key field staff.

- **Direct assistance to communities working with multiple agencies on different projects, especially communities with less capacity.** Small communities with few staff resources that have projects from multiple agencies are likely to be the communities most in need of assistance. IFA should establish processes to work more closely with the agencies that also have projects in the community. The inter-agency coordination process noted above should help identify such opportunities for more holistic assistance.

The existing Regional Solutions Team structure also may offer an opportunity for coordinating interactions among agencies. Such a process could be similar to the Small Cities Initiative (SCI) in Washington where RST staff provide on-site meetings and community consultations.

The Regional Solutions Teams, however, operate differently in different regions of the State. The IFA may want to try a trial project in a region where the Regional Solutions Team members would be open to this type of interagency interaction.

- **Evaluate interagency support for creating a State specialist on prevailing wage issues.** This person would provide assistance with prevailing wage issues for State agencies that make grants or loans that are subject to BOLI or Davis-Bacon requirements. This person would not necessarily be a part of the IFA but would be available to IFA staff and communities with IFA-sponsored projects. This specialist would conduct informal audits of paperwork, with a specific focus on low-capacity communities. Ideally, these informal audits would occur early on in a project (within the first few payroll cycles). If the audit identifies problems, the specialist would then schedule a follow-up visit to discuss problems and provide assistance and training to fix the problems and avoid future problems.

- **Evaluate interagency support for partnering with a nonprofit agency to provide grant administration support.** Finding experienced, qualified grant administrators is difficult for many local jurisdictions, especially those located in Eastern Oregon. One solution to this idea is that IFA could work with other State agencies to partner with a nonprofit agency to train and support one or more grant administrators. This administrator would be hired by local
jurisdictions to do general project management and administration, complying with prevailing wage standards, or other administrative tasks.

Jurisdictions have similar difficulties with meeting the administrative requirements of DEQ-funded projects as with IFA projects. Initial discussions with agency staff indicate that DEQ might be interested in participating in such a partnership. Initial discussions with staff with ODOT suggest that ODOT’s participation in such a partnership would be limited to projects that are not federally-funded transportation projects.

Ideas for the organization to host the grant administrator(s) include an established nonprofit entity with existing relationships with small communities, such as the Association of Oregon Counties or League of Oregon Cities. Initial discussions with the Association of Oregon Counties suggest that the Association may be interested in such a partnership. Another option for hosting the grant administrator is through the State of Oregon’s Regional Solutions Teams, which has collaborative partnerships in five regions in Oregon.

- **Document action plans at one-stop workshops.** One of the key methods that IFA uses for project development with communities is the one-stop workshop. These workshops are especially important for communities that need to engage multiple State agencies in developing a project. Oregon’s one-stop workshops are relatively similar to Washington’s Action Team meetings. The key lesson learned from Washington’s meetings is to develop a written action plan as part of the meeting. The action plan should contain: (1) the names and contact information of all relevant agency and community staff, (2) the community’s description of the issue and project (including documentation like engineering drawings), (3) information about funding opportunities from State and federal agencies including bundling grants, (4) documentation of financial analysis discussed at the meeting, and (5) a list of action items to help the community proceed with next steps.

- **Coordinate on development of the Investment Platform for Economic Development (IPED) database system.** This system is a web-based database system being developed in coordination with the Meyer Memorial Trust, State and federal agencies, IFA, Community Development Financial Intuitions, and other stakeholders. The purpose of IPED is to provide a standardized way for communities to access information about funding opportunities
that match the community’s needs. The system will also allow community members to post their projects, with indications of priority, for funder consideration. In addition, the system can improve interagency coordination by providing information to State and federal agencies about on-going priority projects across Oregon.

IFA staff should continue to participate in development of IPED. IFA staff can provide insight into the type of information that would promote interagency coordination and that communities would like to access.

- **Map the resources available to communities across the State.** The purpose of the resource map would be to make communities aware of the resources available to them for capital projects. Some resources would be common across the State, such as programs offered by State or federal agencies. Other resources would be specific to the region. The map would include resources such as: economic development districts, councils of governments, private firms that provide services (e.g., engineering firms or other consultants), and other resources. The map should contain information about each resource, such as: description of the resource, region(s) served, services provided, and contact information.
TRAINING

Training is an issue that is important to IFA staff, as well as staff at communities and other organizations (e.g., economic development districts). IFA has gotten some mixed signals from stakeholders about training. Some stakeholders express strong desire for training but attendance is often low when IFA offers training, even if the training is outside of Salem (e.g., at the Oregon Coast or in Eastern Oregon).

Based on feedback from interviews and the survey assessing training needs, we make several recommendations about training.

- **Develop localized, customized training to meet an individual community’s needs.** This training should be community-specific and should address the specific issues of the community. The training should be offered locally, at a time that makes sense for potential participants (e.g., avoiding holidays or local events). IFA staff should consider evaluating the capacity of the community when developing the training and should ask the community what it is they want training on. The training should include the project manager, key staff, elected officials (if needed), consultants, and any third-party entities that are assisting the community. If the community has projects from multiple agencies, evaluate the possibility of combining training on similar or related topics.

- **Create training webinars to cover relevant topics.** Communities should have some level of understanding about topics such as prevailing wage, proper procurement processes, and other common topics. IFA staff could develop webinars to cover training on these topics. IFA may want to develop a short series of webinars on key topics (e.g., prevailing wage), with each webinar building on the previous webinar to communicate relatively complex ideas when put together. In addition, IFA staff may want to develop webinars that cover or supplement information in the handbooks to assist communities in understanding the handbooks.

- **Offer more training in regions outside of Salem.** Staff at local jurisdictions want more training in their local area, with trainings lasting one day or less.

- **Offer shorter training sessions.** IFA may want to consider offering part-day trainings in the field, where training lasts for two or three half days, rather than one full day. Shorter trainings may allow local staff to attend the training, while allowing part of the day to address their everyday responsibilities. In addition, part-day trainings may
be more effective, as it becomes difficult to absorb eight-hours worth of information in one day.

- **Offer training early in the project.** One of the challenges in training local staff on administrative issues is delivering the training when it is needed, which is as the administrative requirement becomes relevant. Timing training for staff at multiple jurisdictions to be delivered as they need it is difficult, if not impossible. IFA should consider dividing training topics into groupings based on when the knowledge is needed. Then offer several trainings at the appropriate time, with more trainings early in the project, during the developmental stage of the project. These trainings may take the form of in-person trainings in a classroom setting, webinars, or one-on-one training sessions with RCs.

- **Attend the Infrastructure Assistance Coordinating Council’s annual conference.** The IACC’s 2012 annual conference will be held October 2nd to 4th in Wenatchee, WA. IFA staff should attend the conference to evaluate whether a similar conference could (or should) be implemented in full or in part in Oregon. In addition, IFA staff will have an opportunity to talk with Washington State staff in detail about how the IACC and SCI work, both for promoting interagency coordination and assisting communities.

- **Evaluate the feasibility of holding more training sessions at existing conferences in Oregon.** Organizations hold conferences related to issues that concern small communities, such as RCAC conferences. The IFA may be able to use existing conferences such as the Oregon Association of Water Users as a platform for offering more training to communities, without holding a special conference like the IACC’s annual conference. The AOC and LOC conferences also offer an excellent opportunity for training sessions.
OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS

This section presents recommendations for IFA’s consideration.

- **Develop a consistent interpretation of program rules.** Program rules are interpreted differently by the various regional coordinators. Some have more flexible interpretations of rules and others have more strict interpretations. The IFA should develop a consistent interpretation of program rules, allowing as much flexibility as possible, and then train regional coordinators to consistently apply the rules.

- **Increase the amount of direct communication with communities.** Community staff generally want more face-to-face and direct communication with their regional coordinator, including informal opportunities for communication, such as “hallway meetings.” Increasing in-person communication will, in many cases, require staff to travel to the communities from Salem. The IFA may want to investigate increasing opportunities for regional coordinators to live in the region they serve (if they prefer), rather than in Salem. In cases where a regional coordinator prefers to live in the region they serve, the IFA should facilitate telecommuting as a way to coordinate with Salem-based staff.

- **Consider video-conferencing for communication with remote communities.** As high-speed Internet becomes more common in rural areas, electronic methods of communication (e.g., Skype or screen-sharing technologies) will become more commonplace and easier to use. Using video-conferencing technologies can provide a less expensive form of face-to-face communication. Video conferencing is not as personal as face-to-face communication, but it may provide a viable alternative for some communities.

- **Develop and maintain a list of qualified grant administrators.** This list could include grant administrators that have successfully completed IFA projects in the past (or projects for other state agencies with comparable requirements). It could also include grant administrators who have successfully completed training and grant administration test (such as the test for CDBG administration). We recommend not requiring that grant administrators become certified because the potential expense and political complications of such a program may outweigh the benefits of certification.

We recommend encouraging communities to hire an administrator from this list. This recommendation falls short of the certification
program used by Idaho but provides more guidance to communities for hiring a qualified grant administrator.

- **Identify opportunities to help develop qualified grant administrators.** Some parts of the State, especially in Eastern Oregon, have a dearth of qualified and interested grant administrators. IFA provides self-guided training to help potential grant administrators learn the requirements for CDBG. IFA also holds trainings on topics of interest to potential grant administrators (e.g., prevailing wage or environmental issues).

Even with this help available, there are not enough grant administrators available in the State. IFA may want to reach out to qualified grant administrators to try to understand why there are not enough grant administrators and whether there is something that IFA can do to help address the problem. One approach could be developing incentives that encourage consultants and engineering firms to seek grant development and administration training/certification as a business enhancement opportunity.

Economic development districts and councils of government have existing relationships with local governments that IFA may be able to tap into for grant administration. The IFA should reach out to these organizations if they are not already currently engaged in grant administration and explore whether they would be willing to become grant administrators. If they are willing to become grant administrators, IFA should work with staff at the organizations to provide training for grant administration.
5.3 Financial Analysis of Key Options

A key issue for IFA is funding programmatic changes. To better understand the financial implications of our recommendations, IFA asked ECO to prepare a preliminary financial analysis of key program options. Many of the recommendations do not necessarily have substantial financial implications for IFA. In several cases, IFA should continue doing what it is currently doing but with some changes, such as increasing communication with communities. Some recommendations have smaller financial implications, such as maintaining a list of qualified grant administrators. The IFA could incorporate the maintenance of this list into existing IFA staff responsibilities.

An important finding of the evaluation is that IFA could increase coordination and communication, with other state agencies, local jurisdictions, and other interested stakeholders. We recommend that the IFA work with state agency partners to establish more regular interagency coordination, especially in communities with projects funded by multiple state agencies. We also recommend that IFA increase communication with local jurisdictions, through mandatory meetings with staff and local decisionmakers at the beginning of a project or through increasing opportunities for face-to-face meetings between IFA and local community staff.

These types of communication are happening at some level, although not consistently and not in all instances. While increasing time spent on coordination and communication should not require IFA to hire more staff, it will take staff time and may increase the amount of time spent in meetings. If the IFA implements the recommendations in this report and finds that communities have fewer problems, especially complex problems, then existing IFA staff would have more time to devote to coordination and communication. Although increasing coordination and communication can increase the efficiency of project administration, there will eventually be diminishing returns to more communication. The recommendations about increasing communication and coordination should result in more effective communication, not simply more communication.

The key options with substantial financial implications are:

- **Increasing opportunities for training.** We recommend that IFA increases training opportunities through offering more, shorter training sessions early in each project. Some of these training opportunities would be with IFA staff in-person in the local region and some could be via webinar.
The cost of additional training will be affected by the number of new community projects. Some programs will require more training, such as CDBG or the Safe Drinking Water Revolving Loan Fund, because the administrative requirements are more complex. In the last two years, IFA had between 20 and 27 new CDBG projects and seven new Safe Drinking Water projects begin. If half of these projects have staff who need training, then IFA will need to get training for about 12 communities for CDBG and three communities for Safe Drinking Water.

If CDBG projects require about 32 hours of administrative training and Safe Drinking Water projects require about 16 hours of administrative training, with eight hours of preparation for each community’s training, then the cost of training staff at these 15 communities would be about $30,000, assuming that each community is trained separately. This estimate can be reduced if training for jurisdictions in the same region can be combined.

One key way that IFA can increase opportunities for training is through webinars. While there is a cost in staff time for developing a webinar, it can be used many times by multiple jurisdictions. Webinars offer the opportunity to increase the flexibility for training by local staff (who can view the webinar at their convenience) and to decrease the cost of training for IFA. However, webinars are best suited for general training on topics that can be clearly described in an electronic form, not for custom training on topics that vary depending on local conditions.

- **Creation of a state specialist on prevailing wage issues.** This person would provide assistance with prevailing wage issues for State agencies that make grants or loans that are subject to BOLI or Davis-Bacon requirements. This person would not necessarily be a part of the IFA but would be available to IFA staff and communities with IFA-sponsored projects. An expert on prevailing wage issues is likely to have similar levels of expertise and responsibility as IFA’s regional coordinator. The biennial average cost of a regional coordinator’s salary benefits is $190,000.

- **Partnering with a nonprofit agency to provide grant administration support.** We recommend that IFA continue

---

7 The estimate of $30,000 assumes that the trainer will have a similar cost as a regional coordinator for salary and benefits, $190,000 per biennium or $45 per hour. It also includes travel cost of $5,000.
conversations with DEQ and ODOT about the possibilities of working together with a nonprofit entity to develop a partnership to provide grant administration support. In this partnership, the nongovernmental entity would employ one (or more) project managers that communities could choose to hire to meet administrative requirements of the grant and loan programs, such as project administration, procurement, prevailing wage administration, or environmental obligations. The IFA, through the nonprofit entity would ensure that the project manager was well-trained and understood the requirements of the state and federal programs.

A grant administrator employed by a nonprofit organization could reasonably be expected to have a similar cost as an IFA regional coordinator, between $90,000 to $100,000 per year or $180,000 to $200,000 per biennium. The largest variable in annual costs is the benefits package. Nonprofit agencies have flexibility to negotiate the amount that the project manager would work (assuming he is not full-time), as well as to negotiate about salary and benefits.

The cost of this administrator would be supported by the grant or loan program, through the funds allowed for administration. CDBG and Safe Drinking Water have about 40 projects per year, with a cumulative biennial budget of nearly $700,000 for administration, including funds for labor standard review. If we assume that 40% of jurisdictions hire the grant administrator from the nonprofit, then this administrator would handle about 16 projects with administrative budgets of about $275,000 per biennium.

It seems reasonable that there could be enough demand from jurisdictions to support a grant administrator at a nonprofit agency. However, support for the cost of a grant administrator would not happen all at once. It would take the administrator some time to build relationships and trust with local jurisdictions, possible one or two biennia. It would be prudent to consider starting this person part-time at the nonprofit with a few projects, building up to full-time as demand increases. In time, there may be demand for more

---

8 The estimate that 40% of jurisdictions would hire the grant administrator at the nonprofit is based on response to Question 18 of the survey (Appendix B). This question asked how likely respondents would be to hire a project manager from a nonprofit agency that was partnered with the IFA to provide high-quality project management and administration. Twenty-two percent of respondents were very likely and 20% were likely to hire such a project manager. Forty-percent of respondents were unlikely or very unlikely to hire such a project manager.
than one grant administrator from the nonprofit.

The estimate does not include potential funding and demand for such a grant administrator through DEQ or ODOT projects. If IFA partners with these agencies, it may be easier to support a full-time grant administrator sooner because there would be a larger pool of communities who might choose to hire the administrator. In addition, a jurisdiction with multiple projects from State agencies could benefit from having one grant administrator manage all of the projects. This would create new opportunities for coordination among State agencies.
Numerous people participated and contributed to this project. This appendix acknowledges participants in the interviews, focus groups, and interviewees from case studies.

Table A-1 presents a list of the Oregon stakeholders were interviewed as part of this project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Jurisdiction or Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>George McAdams</td>
<td>Community Project Coordinator</td>
<td>Benton County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Hyde</td>
<td>County Commission</td>
<td>Columbia County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrie Richards</td>
<td>City Administrator</td>
<td>Elgin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Muir</td>
<td>City Administrator</td>
<td>Mt. Angel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Marshall</td>
<td>Finance Director</td>
<td>Newport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Quinn</td>
<td>Public Works Director</td>
<td>Riddle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Reagles, John Krawczyk</td>
<td>City Administrator, Public Works Director</td>
<td>Rogue River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Amberg</td>
<td>City Manager</td>
<td>Toledo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ric Ingham</td>
<td>City Administrator</td>
<td>Veneta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City or County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Burton</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Affiliated Tribes of Northwest Indians Economic Development Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Hanus</td>
<td>Policy Manager</td>
<td>Association of Oregon Counties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Wilson</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Cascades West Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eileen Ophus</td>
<td>Community Development Director</td>
<td>CCD Business Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary McArthur</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Columbia-Pacific Economic Development District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Newstetter</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastern Oregon Professional Services, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Greater Eastern Oregon Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council of Government, Development Corporations, Consultants, or Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melisa Druege</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Henry</td>
<td>Principal Engineer</td>
<td>HBH Consulting Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda Hoey</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Mid-Columbia Economic Development District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Marko</td>
<td>Rural Development Specialist</td>
<td>Rural Community Assistance Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Baker</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Special Districts Association of Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governmental Agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Ault</td>
<td>Safe Drinking Water Program Manager</td>
<td>Business Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Baker</td>
<td>Policy and Program Coordinator for the Community Development Block Group</td>
<td>Business Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanna Bailey</td>
<td>Regional Clean Water SRF Coordinator</td>
<td>Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Olsen, Pat Fisher, Sheila Lyons</td>
<td>Program Managers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Goldstein</td>
<td>Community Program Director</td>
<td>USDA Rural Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ECONorthwest held two focus groups on May 9, 2012 to get feedback from Oregon stakeholders about potential recommendations to address the issues identified in the project. Table A-2 presents a list of people who participated in focus group discussions.

Table A-2. Participants in the focus group discussions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Jurisdiction or Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sherry Wickert</td>
<td>Finance and Operations Manager</td>
<td>Mid Columbia Economic Development District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda Hooey</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Mid Columbia Economic Development District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Hanus</td>
<td>Policy Manager</td>
<td>Association of Oregon Counties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Ault</td>
<td>Safe Drinking Water Program Manager</td>
<td>Business Oregon Infrastructure Finance Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise Birk</td>
<td>Regional Coordinator</td>
<td>Business Oregon Infrastructure Finance Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tawni Bean</td>
<td>Regional Coordinator</td>
<td>Business Oregon Infrastructure Finance Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Rueff</td>
<td>Program Services Division Manager</td>
<td>Business Oregon Infrastructure Finance Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn Schoessler</td>
<td>Deputy Director</td>
<td>Business Oregon Infrastructure Finance Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eileen Ophus</td>
<td>Community Development Director</td>
<td>CCD Business Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Newsstetter</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastern Oregon Professional Services, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betty Riley</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Klamath Economic Development District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Muir</td>
<td>City Administrator</td>
<td>Mt. Angel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanna Bailey</td>
<td>Regional Clean Water SRF Coordinator</td>
<td>Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Watters</td>
<td>Loan Information</td>
<td>Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Olsen</td>
<td>Program Manager</td>
<td>Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerri Bohard</td>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam De Semple</td>
<td>Revolving Loan Program Coordinator</td>
<td>Oregon Health Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Reister</td>
<td>Community Programs Specialist</td>
<td>USDA Rural Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ric Ingham</td>
<td>City Administrator</td>
<td>Veneta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A-3 presents a list of people interviewed as part of the case studies.

Table A-3. Stakeholders in for the case studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Jurisdiction or Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Wenlend</td>
<td>Revolving Loan Program Manager</td>
<td>Idaho Department of Environmental Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Freeman</td>
<td>Chief of the Financial Assistance Div</td>
<td>Oklahoma Water Resources Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Wasinger</td>
<td>Assistant Chief</td>
<td>Oklahoma Water Resources Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Miller</td>
<td>Renewable Resources Grant and Loi</td>
<td>Montana Department of Natural Resources and Conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristin Bettridge</td>
<td>Water System Capacity Manager</td>
<td>Department of Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John LaRocque</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Department of Commerce Technical and Financial Services Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathi Read</td>
<td>Program Manager</td>
<td>Department of Commerce Small Cities Initiative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Training Survey

One of the key issues identified in the this project is that staff at local jurisdictions that are awarded a grant or loan through an IFA program need more training about administrative requirements of the programs. The IFA currently offers training on specific programs (e.g., for CDGB or Safe Drinking Water program) and for broader topics, such as those related to applying for a grant or loan. Some of the training sessions have low attendance. In interviews, some stakeholders indicated that they need training on additional or different topics than the trainings offered by the IFA. ECONorthwest conducted a survey to gather information about training wants and needs of staff with local jurisdictions.

ECONorthwest administered the survey on-line via the website “surveymonkey.com” and gathered responses from August 2, 2012 through August 17, 2012. The intent of the survey was to get feedback from people who had an interest in training on IFA programs. The IFA sent an invitation to participate in the survey and a reminder email to several email lists (i.e., the cdbgnews list and the general IFA list). The subscribers to these lists are current participants in IFA programs or people interested in IFA programs, such as staff with cities, counties, councils of government, economic development district, Native American Tribe. These lists have more than 700 members. The email invited recipients to forward the invitation to anyone they thought would be interested in taking the survey.

The survey had a total of 100 respondents, with 88 respondents completing the full survey. The survey was not intended to be statistically representative of the views of all people interested in training for IFA programs. The remainder of the appendix presents the questions and results from the survey, organized by question number from the survey.
Question 1. What type of organization do you currently work for?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic development district</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council of governments</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-profit</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private consulting or engineering firm</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American Tribe</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other:
- City/County Economic Development
- Unemployed
- Community Action Agency ORS Chapter 190
- Special District
- 501 (c) 3 Business Incubator under contract to city for ED
- State government
- Retired vocational counselor
- Municipality / water district

Question 2. Have you either worked for a community or were an elected official at a community that was awarded a grant and/or loan from a state- or federally-financed program, where you administered or assisted in administering the award?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 3. If you have worked with a community that was awarded a state- or federally-funded program in the past, what program(s) was the award from? Please select all that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Development Block Grant</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Drinking Water Revolving Loan Fund</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Public Works Fund</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water/Wastewater Financing Program</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect Oregon</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean Water Revolving Loan Fund</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Revolving Loan Fund</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Public Works Emergency Project</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Planning and Marketing Fund</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Navigation Improvement Fund</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 4. Have you participated in training about state- or federally-funded programs from IFA, ODOT, DEQ, USDA Rural Development, or Housing and Urban Development in the past?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 5. Have you participated in training on state- or federally-funded programs in the past? Please check all that apply.

Other:

- ARRA Funds
- CDBG in other state
- Oregon Economic Development Association conference trainings
- OEDD was the entity administering these grants/loans, several years ago
- Oregon Parks and Recreation Department
- SDAO as a Board Member of Seal Rock Water District
- State of Washington programs through Association of WA Cities (AWC)
- USDA Value Added Producer Grant
- USDA RD
- USDA RUS programs

Question 6. How satisfied have you been, in general, with past training from the IFA on state- and federally-funded grant and loan programs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 7. In past training from the IFA, what left you satisfied or dissatisfied about the training?

Satisfied

Trainers

- The trainers were very experienced and could answer any questions. The materials were efficient and could easily be used for reference.
- The information was presented in a generally detailed and proficient manner.
- Easy to work with and knowledgeable about process.
- Good subject knowledge.
- Having the in depth knowledge of those who had navigated and surmounted the many stumbling blocks in securing grants and then being accountable for how it is spent.
- All questions were answered and assistance available with a phone call when necessary.
- The rules/procedures were explained in a straightforward manner.

Scope of Training

- The training and discussions have been useful.
- I left satisfied on the training for the subject.
- Very good training. Time to ask questions. Was comprehensive.
- Coverage of updates and changes to grant management and MOD from prior year and funding availability for the year.
- No IFA training but with Oregon USDA the contacts made and understanding the background and intent of the program was critical to the success of our future submissions. Learned how to not only prepare a competitive package but how to win. What worked and what wouldn't work, how and why.
- We have not had any training on any of the loan programs from the state. We have had training on the CDBG and the Enterprise Zone and it has been great. If there is ever any training on Davis-Bacon that would be great. We do get the BOLI training.
- Seminars and training events cover broad rules and topics and a more focused, in-depth look at requirements and pros/cons of policies would be appreciated.
- Understood grant process

**Timing & Organization**

- I went to a training in Salem about CDBG and gave me a good understanding but it needs to happen again.

**Other**

- It has been several years. The training was good, and I don't remember anything that I was dissatisfied with.

- The funding was in place when I started this job. I haven't had any issues with the payments/funding, but we have not had anything "new" so to speak since 2004.

**Dissatisfied**

**Scope of Training**

- Generic, not specific enough for each situation.

- It was overwhelming.

- Lack of specific training for Housing Rehabilitation.

- Too vague, not specifically geared to the full range of procedure and qualifying that would take place, not sufficient help in the application questions.

- Beyond general discussions of rules for applications, there was a lack of the detail of meeting federal and state rules. Trainings have been restricted to: how to submit applications.

- It didn't seem adequate for the complexity of the CDBG rules.

**Timing & Organization**

- Was unable to attend both trainings on CDBG held closely together.

- With all of the requirements, it is difficult to do an adequate job providing training in a few hours. The classes probably will have to be longer with more examples given, more specific training on the rules (of which there are many), and some time spent on the processes involved in administering these grants.

- I learned from the subject matters presented. I do feel that there was not enough time to cover each subject thoroughly.

- Beyond written comments on draft rule changes, IFA should encourage and invite a gathering of interested parties for an open and frank discussion on program rules. Shouldn't those that use the programs and are required to comply be on the front and
early end of draft program rule changes rather than responding to policies developed internally by staff?

- The grant administration handbook is huge and potentially changes each year. It is frustrating to reprint it each year yet I still cannot identify what exactly is different and when the rules changed. Building Codes are amended regularly and Oregon has its own special amendments. Rather than putting out the entire code, only the changes are sent out as annotated colored pages. This would make training about the code much simpler.

Question 8. Are you interested in participating in additional training about program administration from IFA on state- and federally-funded resources?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It depends (please explain why)</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants responding with “It depends” gave the following explanations:

Relevance

- If I think the training will prove useful, I will attend.
- If we were to be involved in another participating program.
- Training may be most appropriate for a staff member.
- I am a one person office so if it is something we are interested in participating yes, but right now we have other/local funding in place that I would not have time for loan funding training and programs. I'm always on the look out for grants though and would make time.
- If offering new resources in the training, I would certainly be interested in participating.
- Subject and value relevance.
- My volunteer work now is with very small communities, any training I would take needs to focus on how to group communities or help these small places.
- Not at this time but if we find an opportunity to use funding in the future, I would.
- If the City is in need of using public assistance.
• On future funding.
• Are their funds worth pursuing?
• Toledo has some infrastructure improvement needs coming up and we need to get in the queue to apply.
• If we were ever to borrow again.

**Location and limited resources**

• Location.
• We are a small community and councilors have full time jobs and city staff is busy, it may be hard to make meetings for training opportunities.
• I have very little time available to participate in trainings.
• Yes in regards to the Community Development Block Grant in Lincoln County and how it could provide more services to customers and less $$$ to administration of those services. Also better coordination with the CDBG and CCWD through OCCC.
• I would be interested, providing that it had minimal financial impact on our budget. We are a city of 690 residents, and simply don't have the funding needed for costly trainings or trainings held at distant locations.
• Cost, location, time of year offered.
• Yes, I would but our City is located a large distance from almost all areas of training opportunities. This City has not money budget for funding of training.
• I'm always interested in learning more and doing a better job. Time and cost of attending (traveling to) training impact how much training we get. So, a webinar format is better than a physical training in Salem for us.

**Other**

• I have no idea who you are.
• I'm retiring in April 2013.
Question 9. What topics would you be interested in attending training on?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Very interested</th>
<th>Interested</th>
<th>Neither interested nor disinterested</th>
<th>Disinterested</th>
<th>Very disinterested</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grant or loan application</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration for CDGB</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration for IFA program</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration for Water/Wastewater</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration for Safe Drinking Water</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental review</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevailing wage compliance (e.g., Davis-Bacon)</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify e.g., DEQ or ODOT)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other:
- DEQ
- DEQ and ODOT
- Law enforcement or community corrections specific
- ODOT
- ODOT STIP 2015-18
- SBIR and STTR as well as BOA's and FOI's
- Specifically Housing Rehab and how broad CDGB policies are applicable

Question 10. What approach for delivering training would you be most likely to participate in?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-person training in your region</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-person training in Salem</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual or written materials</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other:
- Both in the region and in Salem - in person.
- Combination of in person in my area, along with written and webinar.
- In person in Yamhill County - Salem is not in Yamhill County.
- Whatever is offered.
Question 11. What method of training do you think would be most effective for each topic?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>In-person training in your region</th>
<th>In-person training in Salem</th>
<th>Webinar</th>
<th>Manual or written materials</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration for CDGB</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant or loan application</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration for Water/Wastewater</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration for Safe Drinking Water</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental review</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration for other IFA program</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevailing wage compliance (e.g., Davis-Bacon)</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Other:*
- Along with written materials and webinar.
- Would recommend webinar or in-person training in region.
Question 12. What are the barriers that would be likely to prevent you from participating in training? Please choose the TWO most likely barriers.

**Answer Options** | **Response Percent** | **Response Count**
--- | --- | ---
Travel distance | 52% | 43
Concerns about how relevant the training is | 44% | 36
Travel costs for multi-day training | 35% | 29
Staff release | 24% | 20
Difficult to understand the training because of program-specific jargon in the presentation | 24% | 20
Length of training (too long) | 21% | 17
Travel costs for one-day training | 18% | 15
Other (please specify) | 5% | 4

**Other:**

- Finding the time to train and still accomplish mission critical work that piles up at the desk while I train. Can't afford and justify the time away for possible future benefit.
- Rush the training and not take time to fully explain forms or process.
- Time of day.
- Time is wasted by participants asking specific questions about their project or situation that isn't applicable or they spend time discussing concepts that are already clear to me.

Question 13. What distance is convenient for you to travel for training?

**Answer Options** | **Response Percent** | **Response Count**
--- | --- | ---
25 miles or less | 16% | 13
25 to 50 miles | 32% | 26
50 to 100 miles | 31% | 25
100 to 150 miles | 13% | 11
More than 150 miles | 7% | 6
I am not willing to travel for training | 1% | 1
Question 14. What is the typical expense limit for training, on a per-day basis?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$25 or less</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25 to $50</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50 to $100</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100 to $200</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than $200</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 15. What length of time do you prefer for a training?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 hours</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half day</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full day</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple days</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It depends (please explain how)</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other:

*Training time should match complexity of subject*

- Depends on the topic. Short if just one of the topics; half- or full-day if multi-topics.
- It depends on what the topics being covered are.
- Suggest combining training for topics if possible; complexity will dictate length of time needed.
- Subject matter, depth of knowledge conveyed and where it is held as well as time of year, etc. Usually half-day works if local or Salem. Full-day on site or Portland.
- I like full days but if we need to go in-depth on something I would like multiple days so that we walk away knowing the information not walking away in a daze from all that was given.
- Depends how long it takes to understand.
- Depends on the type of training. If it requires multiple days than we are willing do to it.
- Whatever amount of time it takes to get the most out of training - not having to rush through training.
Travel time

- If we are going to travel 12 hours to Salem (6hrs each way) we want to make the most of our time. If we only have to travel 50 miles, a half-day session would be just fine.
- Full day if I have to travel very far.
- If travelling, would like to have multiple items condensed into a full day training. In general, though, these trainings are often too lengthy for the material covered. Using time efficiently is of the most concern.
- For webinars, 2 hours, for in-person training where 6-8 hours of travel is involved, full-day to multiple days - I want the training time to be at least as long as the travel time to/from a training.
- A full day is fine if the training doesn't begin at 9 in Salem.

Limited resources

- Staff availability.
- Work schedules certain times of the year...
- Distance from City and expense of overnight/travel distance/meals/cost of training.

Question 16. How helpful would it be to have training on project administration at each of the following points in the process?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Very helpful</th>
<th>Somewhat helpful</th>
<th>Not helpful</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-application</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the very beginning of the project, immediately after the award is received</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the beginning of the project, after the construction contract is signed</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early in the project, after the project has started</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the mid-point of the project</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At multiple points during the project</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 17. What can the IFA do to make training more relevant for you?

Scope of the training

Training on the basics

- New to the process, with this in mind I would appreciate the ABC's in getting started.
- Help understand what process we need to go through and what we need to do
- As a relatively new face in municipal government, I find that some trainings are tailored specifically to people who have prior experience or education in that particular area. I would benefit greatly from a training session tailored to someone who is relatively new to the field, and who needs to get a basic sense of what the IFA/CDBG/DEQ grant and applications processes really entail. We all want to do the best job we can for our governments and for the community as a whole. By falling short on trainings, we do our communities a great disservice.
- Having examples of the types of information requested for CDBG. Example: Wages Due Schedule, Proper formatting of Section 3 and 504, listing the correct federal clauses for the Environmental Review. On the checklist form at the beginning of each chapter, indicate the page to locate the information.

More in-depth training

- Design some classes for those of us who have been around the block before, but are not experts. Some "mid-level" training would be good. Many trainings are just the very basics which we have already had, or are familiar with. More advanced, but not too far advanced would be helpful.
- I have been to CDBG training annually, and will continue to do so - it is very informative and I learn something new every year. Plus going over changes helps immensely. Training on the loan programs would be what I would like the most, at this point in my career. Learning the rules, the differences explained, etc.
- Every project is different. It would be helpful to have review of specific project(s) to identify what (and how) potential issues such as (but not limited to) can be resolved: 1. unusual environmental circumstances, 2. efficient program for property acquisition, 3. funding short fall, 4. issues that arise during project construction that were not in the scope of work.
Other comments on scope of the training

- Specific training for CDBG Housing Rehab. Training for the first and last draw requirements and for program administration.
- Complete understanding from application to project completion.
- Explain current scoring for funding possibilities and what is looked for in narratives. Explain reporting requirements and partnerships that will make projects stronger.
- Training geared to Small Cities. Help finding funding and applying for those funds.
- Has to be relevant to the topic and since we travel great distances worthwhile to make the trip.
- Actual hands-on experience.
- Having training on the closing process would be helpful
- Be project specific.

Timing and Organization

- Consider limited staff of smaller communities.
- Provide opportunities for small communities that lack funding to be able to attend more training courses.
- The training would be more relevant if the managers and RC's were to come to the region the RC represents to provide training. That way the RC can explain what documentation he or she expects for each requirement, the program manager can provide other detailed information. RCs don't necessarily require the same details and documentation so it can be confusing for the to the consultants and staff working for communities. If the training is done in the region than all of the staff and consultants have the opportunity to hear the same information, thus making it easier for the RC to get the documentation in the end.
- I think set up yearly training so that we can plan on it each year and it covers all topics. There may need to be two sessions one of in-depth learning and the other could be refresher/updates.
- I really like the webinar idea because I can get the information I need without having to sit through concepts that are already clear to me. I intend no disrespect to others, but most people want to talk in painstaking detail about their project or situation and most of that kind of discussion is irrelevant or they ask questions that will be answered during the presentation.
• Convey information regarding potential program adjustments electronically. Keep everyone in the loop. Avoid surprises.

• Provide samples of required language for RFP's ahead of time.

• I think if we are involved in a project, training is relevant. If we don't have to deal with an issue/rule/procedure, then training on that issue is less relevant.

• Make sure the Regional Coordinators get the training too. Hopefully, we will all hear the same thing and be on the same page.

Trainers and Administration

• Fumi is IFA's saving grace. I can always contact her about any aspect and receive real help. The grant admin handbook is so huge and so daunting that without a translator, it can seem impossible to administer a grant successfully. Having Fumi write a guidebook to the handbook would put the rules in the language of us users.

• Ensure the presenters are experts in their fields with real answers to questions and if do NOT know the answer admit it and find the answer quickly and get back to the person asking. No hype and "I think.....type answers".

• Provide funding.

• Help your staff be more friendly and oriented to the reality of local government work, and understand and help build bridges, not every rule works, not every interpretation works, try and listen and understand and either explain why the state interprets something someway or listen to the challenges they deal with. The IFA staff appears to present everything very black, or very white, where local government may see some gray. Help bridge that gap instead of ruling with an iron fist.

Other

• Still have no idea who you are or what you are attempting to accomplish.

• I'm not sure, I just know that trying to help with the administration without training is like working blind and it is terrible.

• Training Grants?
Question 18. How likely would you be to hire a project manager from a nongovernmental agency that was partnered with the IFA to provide high-quality project management and administration?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very likely</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither likely nor unlikely</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlikely</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unlikely</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 19. Please explain your answer to the previous question. What would lead you to consider or not consider hiring this project manager?

Cost

- Cost would be the major issue. We have had very good luck by either managing a project with existing staff or by hiring our own project manager. These options seem to be the most cost effective.
- "We are a small city with limited funds for an outside manager. Our population is only 950 and at this time the economy has shut down all of our capital funds."
- Who pays for the PM?
- Depending on the cost and the need at the time.
- Cost.
- Obstacles in funding.
- Unless the grant provided funding to hire a project manager, we couldn't afford it.
- No money.
- Cost.
- Funding.
- What the cost would be and how accessible is the project manager.
- Cost, ability of project management to be paid under grant funds, project manager understanding of government operations and needs.
- No money devoted to additional staff or help. Everything has to be done with volunteers and budgets have no stretch in them.
• Funding.

**Existing staffing is sufficient**

• We work as a project manager for local municipalities who receive CDBG grants.

• We have an excellent crew available for project management and administration. Our greatest need is to be kept current on all requirements and updates.

• Much easier to manage projects with existing staff.

• City staff have experience in grant administration, outside assistance not needed.

• CDBG pretty much requires a project manager and we are already hiring a grant administrator.

• Grant budget supports hiring project manager who has current training in program's administrative requirements.

• I am employed by the Rogue Valley Council of Governments (RVCOG). RVCOG would not directly hire a project manager to facilitate a project. Presently I do grant administration for local jurisdictions that cover the above mentioned project management duties. Additional training of other RVCOG employees to do grant administration (project management) would be very helpful because of the time sensitivity of related grant/loan activities.

• We would hope that our organization would be able to do this. We are already doing this in the region and don't need the IFA to have their own entity on board unless it was the EDD's...that would be smart and probably would not cost as much. This survey about training for us would enhance the knowledge we already have. We are able to train either in Salem or in the region and we are willing to go through the trainings annually.

• As an EDD, we currently do these tasks. We would not need additional people to do this, nor would we look to hire anyone. We would consider being hired to provide this assistance, partnering with IFA, if they chose to implement this type of program.

• Our community employs a professional grant program manager, eliminating the need for an outside manager. Additionally, having a consistent point of contact from project inception through to project completion has proved valuable because it allows for institutional knowledge and better tailoring projects based on community needs.
• Our office tends to be hired as project administrator, so I’m not sure how this project manager fits in. I do think however that it would be something to consider IF we did not have someone in the office that was qualified to handle this.

• We would then be relying on someone else at times where I think each agency sometimes needs to do these things in house so they really know what is going on and if personnel change then it might be hard for someone else to pick up where they left off or the agency would then be thrown back into it when they have been out of it for so long.

• Secured the grant without any assistance. It was rather easy to do.

• We are already paying experts with tax dollars that have the knowledge necessary in project management. Auditing accounts could require another agency, but contracting out government services is bad practice and duplicates services.

**Limited staffing**

• We have limited staff that deal with multiple disciplines, not specialists.

• Lack of staff.

• We are a small community without a lot of time or experience in large projects. Having a skilled professional available would be very helpful.

• Even if an outside project manager is hired, there still a certain amount of City staff time that is required to assist that project manager. There is a certain amount of work that an outside person will not be able to accomplish due to them not being familiar with the City’s working. Any project that a City undertakes requires additional work for staff and in our City, our employees are already over booked with just day-to-day activities and no ability to hire additional employees.

• We are a small city with very little staff capacity to administer and manage grant requirements... especially CDBG. Having someone outside the agency who was full trained and competent would be a tremendous help.

• Availability of local staff.

• It would depend on whether we had access to our own project manager or not.
- Budgets are stretched very tight and there are just no additional funds to hire bodies. We are severely understaffed and to bring on an individual that is not actually doing work directly within the office is out of the question. If a grant paid for this person, it may be possible, however, it would be a tough sell to the Board of Commissioners or the local Sheriff.

- With limited staff we had to hire out on our project, so we are definitely interested in this type of service.

- Depending on abilities/workload of our own staff.

**Expertise of project manager**

- As long as they had experience.

- A project manager partnered with the IFA would understand how the process works and would probably help make things run smoothly.

- Highly likely to hire a project manager, that has more expertise and knowledge of the grant/loan funding programs

- The best person available would be hired.

- In theory, if the consultant was partnered with the IFA, the level of training and expertise would be higher and there would be greater assurance of compliance with regulations for communities.

- I would consider hiring this project manager because they would be newly well-trained with a good understanding of the requirements of the state and federal programs.

- From a small City perspective, continuity is vital for proper compliance and reporting. I think a project manager would help City staff complete the project even if there should be employee turn over or any other unforeseen concerns. Council would have at least that one person who they could rely on for vital information.

- We have had experience both ways. It works much easier to hire the experts.

- I have found that experts in the field lead to a better, less expensive project.

- Technical assistance should come from an employee of IFA. Otherwise, this step adds another layer to absorb scarce resources.

- I feel that if the manager is capable of doing the job or is qualified for the job.
• We trust that the IFA would provide only qualified and competent individuals that would lend their expertise to our organization.

• IFA could focus on training a few specialty contractors rather than every city/county official and consultant who might exhibit interest.

\textit{Scope and complexity of project}

• Size and complexity of project and project funding

• Depending on the size and scope of the project.

• Labor Standards monitoring, admin policies, etc., require diligence and understanding. The guidance manuals contain so much information, unless you were very familiar with them, it would be very easy to overlook things. To do the job correctly and do the community a service, not to mention the IFA coordinators, it would be well advised to consider project management. It keeps the project on track and moving forward. Having the grant fund that person puts it over the top...why wouldn't a community take advantage of that service? I certainly would.

• Flexibility and adaptability to a variety of topic areas and contract for specific scope of work and time period to address needs to the project.

• The complexity of the project and availability of qualified/competent staff.

\textit{Assistance from other organizations}

• Depending on the project whether we would hire our engineering firm to take on this task. If it is a large project, we would hire the engineers since we do not have the staff to take on the extra duties.

• Only if it was for something the EDD or local government didn't already provide. Prefer building local support and capacity.

• We have used individuals outside of the organization many times to assist with project management, we prefer they be local however.

• Governmental agencies provide project management and administration already. Why create more overlap?

• Having worked with both non-governmental agencies and well-qualified consultants, I prefer a consultant. She seemed to be able to quickly provide services at a very reasonable cost. Sometimes working with an agency meant working with a team whose members sometimes seemed concerned mostly with justifying their position in the company.
• NGOs have no lock on either competence or motivation. A private consultant would always be driven to positive performance by the bucks and would compete effectively by referrals. And, the cost would be monitored by funders to assure satisfactory value."

• Using a project manager/administrator is helpful but we are unclear on why a "nongovernmental entity" is being specifically brought up. There are plenty of Economic Development Districts and COG's that provide this service along with non-profits. Are you talking of creating yet another entity to provide these services?

• I might have a hard time feeling like the person who is partnered with the IFA was working for the best interest of my local government...what is the difference between them and IFA staff? Why wouldn't I just hire my own independent consultant? What would the advantages be?

• "This concept is a bit incestuous. The ""manager"" should be an independent and private consultant; well-schooled and trained in the details of managing both simple and complex projects. Similar to the Certified Water Rights Examiners program run by OWRD. But, differing from the CWRE program, the consultants should have a source of current information inside the Authority to whom questions and concerned could be directed.

• MWVCOG does a great job of taking care of the technical portion of grant administration. We would not like to do it without them.

**Other**

• As a government agency we would not be eligible, but it sure sounds good.

• If I don't know who you are I doubt I would hire you.

• Have recently worked with an agency on a CDBG project and they either keep files or misplaced pertinent files from the contractor.

• My organization would not apply or administer the grants. The decision would be up to the applicant. We are a resource partner.

• It's not relevant.

• We are located in a rural area. Can't be picky out here.
Appendix C: Washington Materials

This appendix provides materials used by State agency staff in the State of Washington. The materials included in the appendix are:

- Example notes from a Technical Team Meeting for the Town of Lind
- Example notes from a Technical Team Meeting for the City of Brewster
- Infrastructure Assistance Coordinating Council (IACC) 2001 Conference program
Tech Team Participants:

Patty Phillips Clerk-Treasurer townoflind@lindwa.com (509) 677-3241
Jamie Schmunk Mayor ladybuglady4u@hotmail.com (509) 347-6696
Marti Canatsey USDA RD marlene.canatsey@wa.usda.gov (509) 454-5740
Kaaren Roe CDBG Kaaren.roe@commerce.wa.gov (360) 725-3018
Michelle Bly Progressive Eng. msandmd@aol.com (208) 746-5406
Michele Vazquez ORA Michele.vazquez@ora.wa.gov (509) 329-3460
Chad Short ERWOW chort@erwow.org (509) 429-7167
Richard Koch DOE rkoch461@ecy.wa.gov (509) 329-3519
Jon Galow SCI jon.galow@commerce.wa.gov
Andy O’Neil RCAC aoneill@rcac.org (509) 860-7063
Jeff Logan USKH Eng. jlogan@uskh.com (509) 328-0423
Steve Dunk Public Works Board Stephen.dunk@commerce.wa.gov (360) 725-3157

Project Description:
The Town of Lind is in the process of obtaining funding for a new wastewater treatment facility. Lind’s existing NPDES permit will expire on May 2, 2011. After this period, surface water discharge will no longer be permitted due to the intermittent flows within the stream bed. The Town has requested, and was granted, a one year discharge permit by DOE. It is likely another extension may be necessary depending on when funding is acquired by the Town of Lind to make the necessary upgrades.

The town has decided on a Mechanical Extended Aeration Biological Treatment Plant Discharging to Effluent Land Application. The cost of this project is estimated to be approximately $3,000,000.

The Town has received a grant from USDA Rural Development and Adams County Capital Improvement Fund for the completion of the sewer facilities plan and the necessary environmental reports.

A Public Works Trust Fund application in the amount of $600,000.00 has been submitted for design/construction of the project. The town has been notified that they are on the list of recommended projects and are awaiting a final decision from the legislature. The rest of the funding is being applied for.

Meeting Notes:
The Lind technical team began with introductions and then proceeded with Michelle Bly (working in partnership with USKH) giving a brief overview of the Lind sewer project. Michelle
mentioned the PWTF loan (as stated above) and the applications deadlines for DOE (November 5, 2010) and CDBG (January 20, 2011).

After Michelle reviewed the Lind sewer project and application deadlines (USDA RD is a definite possibility as a gap financier however, applications for USDA can be submitted at any time) the individual funders spoke about their application criteria and things of which to be aware.

Kaaren Roe with CDBG, reiterated the January 20, 2011 deadline for the CDBG General Purpose grant (for up to $1,000,000). Kaaren went on to talk about the 1. Need 2. Capacity 3. Readiness and 4. Results of the CDBG application.

Once Kaaren gave an overview of CDBG, the discussion quickly turned to ----- “is the Town of Lind qualified for CDBG?” According to the 2000 Census and OFM the Town of Lind does not qualify for CDBG. However, in 2006 the Town of Lind completed an income survey (completed by RCAC, Joe Mitschelen) for a General Purpose CDBG that was being used for the Town of Lind’s water system. The service area that was used for the 2006 income survey included 220 town’s people of which 156 surveys were returned.

Currently, USKH engineering, RCAC (Andy O’Neil), and the Town are identifying the service area for the wastewater system to confirm that the same 2006 income survey can be used for the 2011 CDBG general purpose grant. In addition, this same survey will be helpful when applying for the USDA RD loan/grant funding and determining “hardship” for the Dept. of Ecology (DOE). During the discussion above, Kaaren (CDBG), Marti Canatsey (USDA) and Richard Koch (DOE) were all pretty comfortable that the 2006 survey would be sufficient.

Andy O’Neil (RCAC) will work with both the Town of Lind and USKH to confirm service areas. Once service areas have been confirmed Andy will forward the information on to Steve Dunk (Public Works Board) who will distribute the information to USDA RD, CDBG and DOE for their approval.

Kaaren acknowledged that the Town of Lind was right on track for completing their General Purpose grant application. She also suggested that it could be helpful to get a letter from DOE (Richard Koch) for the NPDES violation and demonstrate any past efforts to comply.

Another significant reason that there was such a thorough discussion about the 2006 income survey was to clarify that another, more current (2010 or 2011), income survey is not needed. The only reason that the Town was considering another survey was to try and qualify for the “poverty” status under USDA criteria. The poverty status would allow Lind to be eligible for up to 75% grant and 25% loan but all indicators coming from the USDA home office highly suggest that 75% grant would not be a reasonable expectation. With the current 2006 income survey, Lind would qualify for up to 45% grant. Steve Dunk (PWB) wanted to confirm this information with Marti Canatsey (USDA) in the technical team meeting so everyone involved with the Lind sewer project was in consensus. Marti agreed with the comments made by Steve. The Lind members (the Mayor & Town Clerk) and the other tech team participants were unanimous that the 2006 survey was more than adequate to be competitive for the best possible funding scenarios.
The tech team discussion then turned to the Dept. of Ecology. Richard Koch (DOE) commented that he had received USKH’s environmental information (just prior to the IACC conference) which was the last requirement needed in order for DOE to review and approve Lind’s sewer facility plan.

With the approval of the sewer facility plan, Lind is now able to apply for the DOE design & construction funding for the November 5, 2010 deadline.

There was a lengthy discussion about the “hardship” criteria that DOE uses to determine the amount of grant to loan and the interest rate for the loan. Although there is preliminary information that implies that Lind could qualify for “Elevated Hardship” (sewer rate is 3% to 5% of MHI) Jon Galow, with Small Communities Initiative (SCI), stressed that Lind would need to confirm existing debt, operations and maintenance costs, MHI according to 2006 survey, the effect of receiving $1,000,000 CDBG, etc. etc. etc.

Steve also made the comment that even if Lind does qualify for the “Elevated Hardship” it does not ensure that the Lind project will be wholly or even partially funded. It all depends on how Lind’s application scores (DOE has a 1000 point scoring system) and hardship only gives an extra fifty (50) points advantage.

**Action Items:**

1. Andy O’Neil is going to confirm the service area for the wastewater system and compare that to the 2006 income survey (two weeks). Once this has been completed he will send the information to Steve Dunk

2. Steve Dunk will forward the service area information on to DOE, CDBG and USDA for their approval (immediately). An e-mail back from the funders confirming the 2006 survey will suffice for the confirmation.

3. Steve will try to locate the actual survey forms that were completed by RCAC back in 2006. Steve will check with Sheila Lee Johnston (Contracts Admin. Unit) for the survey forms. (Survey’s were not found, Steve checked w/ Sheila)

4. Michelle Bly will complete the CDBG application for the January 20, 2011 deadline.

5. USKH will complete the DOE design/construction application for the November 5, 2010 deadline.

6. Richard Koch will write a letter for Lind that addresses them being out of compliance (end of November). This letter will help to strengthen Lind’s funding applications.

7. Steve, Patty & USKH need to tighten and confirm the debt, O & M costs, etc. in order to predict and anticipate funding scenarios. (By mid November)
City of Brewster  
IACC Tech Team  
DRAFT Meeting Notes  
October 19, 2011

Tech Team Participants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J D Smith</td>
<td>City of Brewster</td>
<td>(509) 689-3464</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jdsmithpwd@frontier.com">jdsmithpwd@frontier.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John LaBree</td>
<td>City of Brewster</td>
<td>(509) 689-3464</td>
<td><a href="mailto:johnpfd@yahoo.com">johnpfd@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Bubba Scott</td>
<td>Pend Oreille PUD</td>
<td>(509) 447-6375</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mscott@popud.org">mscott@popud.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Schroeder</td>
<td>Anderson Perry</td>
<td>(509) 529-9260</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aschroeder@andersonperry.com">aschroeder@andersonperry.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Smith</td>
<td>Erlandsen</td>
<td>(509) 884-2562</td>
<td><a href="mailto:erics@erlandsen.com">erics@erlandsen.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaaren Roe</td>
<td>Commerce/CDBG</td>
<td>(360) 725-3018</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kaaren.roe@commerce.wa.gov">kaaren.roe@commerce.wa.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Pendergraft</td>
<td>ERWOW</td>
<td>(509) 322-6474</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mpendergraft@erwow.org">mpendergraft@erwow.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose Running</td>
<td>USDA Rural Development</td>
<td>(509) 663-4019</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rose.running@wa.usda.gov">rose.running@wa.usda.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Justus</td>
<td>DOH</td>
<td>(509) 329-2119</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tom.justus@doh.wa.gov">tom.justus@doh.wa.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather Cannon</td>
<td>DOH</td>
<td>(509) 329-2121</td>
<td><a href="mailto:heather.cannon@doh.wa.gov">heather.cannon@doh.wa.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Bannier</td>
<td>RCAC</td>
<td>(509) 860-5846</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dbannier@rcac.org">dbannier@rcac.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Gagnon</td>
<td>Public Works Board</td>
<td>(360) 725-3158</td>
<td><a href="mailto:christina.gagnon@commerce.wa.gov">christina.gagnon@commerce.wa.gov</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Water System Upgrades Project Description:
The City of Brewster recently completed and submitted an update to their Comprehensive Water System Plan to the Department of Health. The following is a list of major water system deficiencies and recommended improvements which have been identified in the existing water system.

**SUPPLY**
Near Term 1 – Pump and Well Rehabilitation – Rehabilitate River and Canyon Wells to improve well capacities and reconstruct pumps. Existing wells have been in service for approximately 44 years with little maintenance. Work will entail cleaning well screens and rebuilding pumps.

**STORAGE**
500,000 Gallon Reservoir Repairs – During cleaning and inspection activities in 2008 numerous leaks were discovered on the interior of the concrete Reservoir 3. Video records show water exfiltrating through the cracks. Repairs proposed will seal the cracks and fill void spaces below the at-grade reservoir. Given the reservoirs is in the upper pressure zone, temporary piping and pumps will be needed to provide water to the pressure zone.
Reservoir Liners – Work will entail installation of new reservoir liners for Reservoirs 1 and 2. Tanks will be drained, cleaned and installation of liners will occur. General repairs to the interior of the reservoirs will also be completed.

**FIRE PROTECTION**
Hospital Way Improvements – Hospital Way, which provides access to the Okanogan Douglas Hospital, Assisted Living Facility and other medical practices has 6-inch asbestos concrete piping. This piping network does not have sufficient capacity to provide the required fire flows for this critical area of the City’s infrastructure. Project will provide new piping, meters, and fire hydrants for the project area.
DISTRIBUTION

Angle Trailer Park – The existing City owned park has one service meter for all 39 connections. This area has numerous leaks over the years and usage is impossible to track. In addition, the area has no fire protection for the high-density development that provides homes for low-income residents. Work will include installation of meters, new system piping, fire hydrants and additional system piping required to provide fire flows for the area.

Proposed Project Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Target Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approve Water System Plan</td>
<td>April 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtain Project Funding</td>
<td>September 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begin Project Engineering</td>
<td>March 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of Project Engineering</td>
<td>January 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOH Approval of Project Documents</td>
<td>March 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertise for Construction</td>
<td>Ongoing 2013 and 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start Construction of Projects</td>
<td>September 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Completion</td>
<td>November 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regulatory Requirements Relating to the Project:
Draft water system plan is currently being reviewed by DOH

STATUS OF WATER SYSTEM

- No water debt
- Water loss addressed to a point, but continues
- Angle trailer park water loss; lack of meters and hydrants
- Dilemma with taking one reservoir offline to repair another
- Sewer improvements recently; $4.2M from Ecology and PWTF
- Transmission lines undersized; well pumps; reservoirs cracked, leaking, need fireflow
- Hydraulic analysis is complete
## POTENTIAL DRINKING WATER FUNDING SOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1) PWTF</strong> – Applications due in Spring 2012</td>
<td>Program is currently being modernized, so rates/terms have not been determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2) CDBG</strong> – Applications due March 1, 2012</td>
<td>Funding awards in June 2012, Assess affordability online – <a href="http://www.commerce.wa.gov/cdbg">www.commerce.wa.gov/cdbg</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• &lt;2% = questionable need for CDBG grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• &gt;2% = concerns whether project is affordable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Staff reviews rates and ability to incur debt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Staff can review threshold requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3) DWSRF</strong> – applications due March 1, 2012</td>
<td>Board approves August 2012, Funding available December 2012, Need DOH-approved water system plan that includes project at time of application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Interest rates range from 1% - 1.5%, with potential subsidy, depending on affordability index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Projects primarily for fire flow or growth are ineligible, although those can be incorporated into a project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4) USDA RD</strong> –</td>
<td>3% interest rate up to 40 years, No grants based on current rates, Best to apply for larger construction project, Open cycle; last funder, Pre-development planning grant:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• $25,000 maximum grant with 25% match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Must show lack of resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Need environmental to be completed as part of application</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Technical Assistance:**

**RCAC:**
- 5% interest rates for bridge loans
- Income surveys
- Rate setting
- Outreach
- Board training

**ERWOW:**
- Provides hands-on training, source protection
- Provides assistance with Chapters 5 and 6 of the Small Water System Management Program, to reduce engineering costs
- Leak detection program
- Income surveys
- Water use efficiency
### NEXT STEPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DOH conducts Sanitary Survey – use results to lend support to project</td>
<td>This fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check into whether there are any mandates to fix reservoirs for stability</td>
<td>This fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with Rick Rose to develop a USDA RD application</td>
<td>This fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend DWSRF application workshop -</td>
<td>Nov 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.doh.wa.gov/ehp/dw/Publications/srf2011/6.htm">www.doh.wa.gov/ehp/dw/Publications/srf2011/6.htm</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spokane area</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty Lake Water and Sewer District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22510 E. Mission Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty Lake, WA 99019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moses Lake</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Bend Community College</td>
<td>Nov 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harden Community Room</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7662 Chanute Street NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses Lake, WA 98837</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend CDBG application workshop –</td>
<td>Nov 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.commerce.wa.gov/cdbg">www.commerce.wa.gov/cdbg</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Olympia</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 am to 3:00 pm</td>
<td>Nov 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSHS Bldg - Capitol View 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>712 Pear Street SE at Quince Street Entrance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympia WA 98501</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moses Lake</strong></td>
<td>Nov 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 am to 3:00 pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Bend Community College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATEC Bldg, Room 1870</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7662 Chanute Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses Lake, WA 98837</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get familiar with Investment Grade Efficiency Audit requirements</td>
<td>Dec - Jan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit funding application for USDA RD</td>
<td>Dec - Jan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit funding applications for CDBG &amp; DWSRF</td>
<td>March 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit funding application for PWTF</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CDBG – Community Development Block Grant program
DWSRF – Drinking Water State Revolving Fund loan program
IACC – Infrastructure Assistance Coordinating Council
PWTF – Public Works Trust Fund loan program
RCO – Recreation & Conservation Office
TIB – Transportation Improvement Board grant program
USDA RD – Rural Development loan/grant program
2011 Conference

October 19-21, 2011
Wednesday - Friday
Wenatchee Convention Center
General Information

What is IACC?

The Infrastructure Assistance Coordinating Council (IACC) is a nonprofit organization dedicated to helping Washington communities identify and obtain resources they need to develop, improve, and maintain infrastructure. It consists of staff from state and federal agencies, local government associations, and nonprofit technical assistance organizations.

IACC is a unique organization that has enhanced the relationships between government agencies and communities in Washington for over 20 years. Together with IACC, communities are better able to provide the infrastructure necessary to enhance, preserve, and protect Washington’s environment and quality of life. IACC is operated by four Board Officers and six Board Members.

What does IACC do?

IACC’s purpose is to improve the delivery of infrastructure assistance, both financial and technical, to local governments in Washington State. It does this by keeping its members informed of changes in infrastructure programs or services and in providing opportunities to network and gain information:

• IACC sponsors an annual statewide conference where state and federal programs assisting local governments with infrastructure needs convene to share information about their programs with local government representatives.
• IACC provides technical assistance to communities by bringing together the appropriate funding and technical assistance representatives with community members to collaborate on specific projects.
• IACC provides information regarding funding and technical assistance programs by maintaining an online database at www.infrafunding.wa.gov.

2010-2011 IACC Officers

Janice Roderick, Co-Chair, (360) 704-7739 or janice.roderick@wa.usda.gov
Cathi Read, Co-Chair, (360) 725-3016 or cathi.read@commerce.wa.gov
Lynn Kohn, Secretary, (360) 725-3042 or lynn.kohn@commerce.wa.gov
Debbie Harper, Treasurer, (360) 704-7764 or debbie.harper@wa.usda.gov
## Sessions At A Glance

### Wednesday - Afternoon

**October 19, 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session 1</th>
<th>Session 2</th>
<th>Session 3</th>
<th>Session 4</th>
<th>Session 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12:15</td>
<td>Announcements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30-1:15</td>
<td>Keynote Speakers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:15-2:15</td>
<td>General Session</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modernization of Infrastructure Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presenter: John LaRocque, PWB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session 6</th>
<th>Session 7</th>
<th>Session 8</th>
<th>Session 9</th>
<th>Session 10</th>
<th>Session 11</th>
<th>Session 12</th>
<th>Session 13</th>
<th>Session 14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2:30-3:30</td>
<td>IACC Conference Overview for new attendees</td>
<td>Ecology's Water Quality Grant &amp; Loan Funding Programs</td>
<td>Drinking Water State Revolving Fund for 2012</td>
<td>SERP &amp; Federal Cross Cutters for Revolving Fund Projects</td>
<td>Archaeological Predictive Modeling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:55-5:55</td>
<td>OPTIONAL General Session</td>
<td>Non-Municipal Urban Growth Areas (NMUGA) Infrastructure Funding Roundtable Discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Session</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:45-1:30</td>
<td>Awards Ceremony</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30-2:00</td>
<td>S26</td>
<td>How to Make Your Public Works Project Take-off and Land Smoothly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00-3:00</td>
<td>S27</td>
<td>Connecting to Capital Grants for Non-Profits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S28</td>
<td>Environmental Requirements - How They Relate to Funding a Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S29</td>
<td>RD Funding: Understand the RD Funding Process and Tips to get Your Project Funded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S30</td>
<td>Funding Technical Assistance for Brownfields Revitalization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S31</td>
<td>Benefiting from the Main Street Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S33</td>
<td>What Can ORA Do For You?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S34</td>
<td>Section 106 - Requirements of the National Historic Preservation Act</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S35</td>
<td>WA State Community Development Block Grant Program Overview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S36</td>
<td>RD Funding: Understand the RD Funding Process and Tips to get Your Project Funded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S37</td>
<td>Connecting to Capital Grants for Non-Profits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S38</td>
<td>Environmental Requirements - How They Relate to Funding a Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S39</td>
<td>RD Funding: Understand the RD Funding Process and Tips to get Your Project Funded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S40</td>
<td>Funding Technical Assistance for Brownfields Revitalization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S41</td>
<td>Benefiting from the Main Street Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00-9:00</td>
<td>S36</td>
<td>Washington State Government to Government Tribal State Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S37</td>
<td>Application Tune-up for Ecology Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S38</td>
<td>Decentralized Sewage Treatment Utilizing a Membrane Bioreactor (MBR)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S39</td>
<td>Income Surveys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S40</td>
<td>Short Course on Local Planning with a Focus on Capital Facilities and Infrastructure Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:20-10:20</td>
<td>S41</td>
<td>TIB Urban Transportation Funding Opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S42</td>
<td>Ensuring Your Grants Get Funded: 25 Tips for Success REPEATED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S43</td>
<td>CDBG - What Can It Do In My Community?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S40</td>
<td>Short Course on Local Planning with a Focus on Capital Facilities and Infrastructure Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:40-11:40</td>
<td>S44</td>
<td>Compliance with the Governor’s Executive Order 05-05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S45</td>
<td>TIB Small City Transportation Funding Opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S46</td>
<td>Public Works Trust Fund - Current and Future Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S47</td>
<td>CDBG General Purpose Application Nuts and Bolts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S40</td>
<td>Short Course on Local Planning with a Focus on Capital Facilities and Infrastructure Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thursday - Afternoon  
October 20, 2011

Friday - Morning  
October 21, 2011
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12:15</td>
<td>Announcements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30-12:15</td>
<td>Keynote Speakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mario Villanueva, State Director, USDA Rural Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wolfgang Opitz, Assistant Treasurer, WA State Treasurer’s Office (Invited)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:15-2:15</td>
<td>GENERAL SESSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modernization of Infrastructure Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presenter: John LaRocque, PWB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description: Section 7028 of the SFY 12 House Capital Budget instructed the Public Works Board, in cooperation with Commerce, Health, and Ecology, to ‘modernize state programs that provide financial and technical assistance related to local infrastructure...’ An implementation plan must be submitted to the Legislature by November 1, 2011. This session will provide details on the implementation plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2:30-3:30 | S1 IACC Conference Overview for new attendees |
|          | Presenter: Cathi Read, Commerce |
|          | Description: An interactive session to help new attendees get the most out of the conference. We will make suggestions about the best sessions to attend and arrange meetings with helpful contacts at the conference, based on individual needs and local project needs. |

|          | S2 Ecology’s Water Quality Grant & Loan Funding Programs |
|          | Presenter: Joseph Coppo, Ecology |
|          | Description: This session will provide an overview of Ecology’s water quality financial assistance programs that provide loans and grants for water quality improvement projects throughout the state. The session will focus on the types of funding available, eligible project types, anticipated funding levels, annual application process and schedule, and changes and new developments to the funding programs. |

|          | S3 Drinking Water State Revolving Fund for 2012 |
|          | Presenter: Karen Klocke, DOH |
|          | Description: Explanation of the new requirements for the 2012 DWSRF loans. |

|          | S4 SERP & Federal Cross Cutters for Revolving Fund Projects |
|          | Presenter: Alice Rubin, Ecology |
|          | Description: This presentation will help de-mystify and provide an overview of the State Environmental Review Process (SERP) and federal cross cutter requirements for local municipalities who are interested in applying for a Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund loan for wastewater, stormwater, combined sewer, and large on-site septic facilities. |

|          | S5 Archaeological Predictive Modeling |
|          | Presenter: Russell Holter, DAHP |
|          | Description: Modern technology and sophisticated mathematics are used to demonstrate the probability of finding archaeological sites in development areas. |

| What will you learn? | Attendees will receive guidance on the best sessions to attend and helpful contacts at the conference, based on individual needs and local project needs. |
| What will you learn? | Ecology’s Water Quality Program funding programs, eligible project types, anticipated funding levels, application process and schedule. |
| What will you learn? | The new requirements for the 2012 DWSRF loans. |
| What will you learn? | Attendees should walk away having a better understanding when SERP and federal cross cutters are required for revolving fund loan projects. They should also have a general understanding of Ecology’s expectations. |
| What will you learn? | There are tools available to assist you in project development to avoid archaeological resources. |
### What will you learn?

**Tools, techniques, and tips for preparing and successfully implementing capital facilities plans.**

**Financial resources that may be available for your priority projects.**

**The new requirements for the 2012 DWSRF loans.**

**There is a historic precedent for why we have laws to protect our history and you may be surprised at what we could have lost.**

**Attendees will learn about: 1. iPRMT Virtual Tech Team sites. 2. IACC projects already using or planning to use iPRMT. 3. Who to contact and how to get going with a Virtual Tech Team site.**

### 3:50-4:50

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S6</th>
<th>Basics of Infrastructure Planning</th>
<th>Presenter: Gregg Dohrn, G.R. Dohrn &amp; Assoc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S7</td>
<td>Survey of RD Funding Programs</td>
<td>Presenter: Debbie Harper, Bruce Whittle, Wes Cochran, USDA Rural Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8</td>
<td>Drinking Water State Revolving Fund for 2012</td>
<td>Presenter: Karen Klocke, DOH REPEATED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>SERP &amp; Federal Cross Cutters for Revolving Fund Projects CONTINUED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S9</td>
<td>History of the Preservation Movement in America</td>
<td>Presenter: Russell Holter, DAHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S49</td>
<td>iPRMT and Virtual Tech Teams</td>
<td>Presenter: Scott Boettcher, Special Projects Consultant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description:** The theory and practice of infrastructure planning including how to identify, prioritize, and document needs; how to update your capital facilities plan(s), and; how to secure the resources necessary to implement your plans.

**Description:** An “overview” of the 40 plus programs that USDA Rural Development offers; emphasis on Community Programs Guaranteed Loans and Business financing.

**Description:** Explanation of the new requirements for the 2012 DWSRF loans.

**Description:** Compliance with state and federal regulations is not new. Find out why protection of your local cultural resources is important in providing a community identity for future generations.

**Description:** An overview and showcase how iPRMT can be used as a virtual tool to support the work of Tech Teams. Provide contact information and instruction on accessing iPRMT and setting up Virtual Tech Team sites.

### 4:55-5:55

**OPTIONAL General Session**

**Non-Municipal Urban Growth Areas (NMUGA) Infrastructure Funding Roundtable Discussion**

**Moderator:** Katy Isaksen, Katy Isaksen & Associates

**Description:** Non-Municipal Urban Growth Areas (NMUGA) Infrastructure Funding Roundtable Discussion

**New UGAs - Infrastructure Funding Approaches**

Now that your new UGA is approved, how do you go about funding the urban infrastructure, such as sewers? The approaches from 3 counties will be presented: Port Hadlock in Jefferson Co., Freeland in Island Co. and Carlsborg in Clallam Co. Time will be reserved for roundtable discussion.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Presenter(s)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00-9:00</td>
<td>S10</td>
<td>Proving Your Utility's Financial Sustainability</td>
<td>Skip Rand</td>
<td><strong>Description:</strong> Is your utility financing heading in the right direction or are you going to crash and burn in the future? How do you determine this and how do you prove this to your customers or council/board?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S11</td>
<td>CDBG Planning-Only Grants</td>
<td>Phyllis Cole, Commerce</td>
<td><strong>Description:</strong> Cancellled. Sessions S35 &amp; S47 will include information on the Planning-Only Grant application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S12</td>
<td>Water Quality Permitting 101</td>
<td>David Dunn, Ecology</td>
<td><strong>Description:</strong> Ecology staff will explain the history and essential components of permits issued under the Clean Water Act, including the differences between a wastewater and a stormwater permit, or a general permit and an individual permit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S13</td>
<td>Funding Program Updates - What's New This Year?</td>
<td>Cathi Read, Commerce (PANEL)</td>
<td><strong>Description:</strong> This session will focus on new policies, requirements, and areas of focus for selected funding programs, not on overall program information. Panel members include staff from CDBG, PWB, CERB, DWSRF, Ecology, USDA Rural Development, TIB, WSDOT funding programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S14</td>
<td>Energy Efficiency, Water Conservation and Sustainability</td>
<td>Jim Wilson, RCAC</td>
<td><strong>Description:</strong> A review of the current tools and approaches in water and energy conservation for small water and wastewater projects. An introduction to water use efficiency program implementation and tools, energy conservation and implementing renewable resource use for water and wastewater projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:20-10:20</td>
<td>S15</td>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td>Dan Bannier, RCAC</td>
<td><strong>Description:</strong> A checklist approach to determine financial health and where to obtain spreadsheets to back up your opinion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S16</td>
<td>Downtown Revitalization - Improving Your Community’s Living Room</td>
<td>Jeff Louman, P.E., Huibregste, Louman Assoc, Inc.; Colie Hough-Beck, ASLA, Hough, Beck &amp; Baird, Inc.</td>
<td><strong>Description:</strong> How to revitalize downtown core areas using public infrastructure improvements. Step-by-step discussion of project development from initial visioning, to study and action plan, to funding strategies, to construction issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S17</td>
<td>SEPA Review for Public Projects - A Basic Overview</td>
<td>Annie Szvetecz, Ecology</td>
<td><strong>Description:</strong> The State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) requires agencies to ensure a broad range of environmental protections. SEPA provides procedural and substantive mandates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S18</td>
<td>Funding Program Updates - What's New This Year?</td>
<td>Cathi Read, Commerce (PANEL) REPEATED</td>
<td><strong>Description:</strong> This session will focus on new policies, requirements, and areas of focus for selected funding programs, not on overall program information. Panel members include staff from CDBG, PWB, CERB, DWSRF, Ecology, USDA Rural Development, TIB, WSDOT funding programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S19</td>
<td>Charging Ahead with Electric Vehicles (EVs)</td>
<td>Anne Fritzel, Commerce; Ron Johnston-Rodriguez, Port of Chelan County</td>
<td><strong>Description:</strong> Learn about plug-in electric vehicles (PEV) and types of chargers and their requirements, and their economics. Learn about the state law requiring cities to allow electric vehicles, and how to plan for them.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
steps needed to create a project scope of work, obtain engineering services, develop a funding strategy, apply for funds, etc.

What will you learn? The typical process for funding and managing a capital project when state or federal resources are needed, pitfalls and where to get additional resources.

What will you learn? How to initiate the process, organize and engage stakeholders, develop an action plan, consider funding opportunities and lessen construction impacts.

What will you learn? Changes to programs for upcoming funding cycles.

What will you learn? Relative costs, charging rates for EVs, economic opportunity.

What will you learn? What is SEPA and when does it apply? Who conducts SEPA review and when? What resources are available to assist lead agencies?

What will you learn? Overview of the variety of Essential Community Facilities that RD can fund.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10:40-11:40</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S20 Fluid Group Process</td>
<td>S21 Investment Grade Efficiency Audits</td>
<td>S48 Small Water System Management Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenter: Bill Hashim, Ecology</td>
<td>Presenter: Doug Kilpatrick, P.E., GA</td>
<td>Presenter: Linda Kildahl, DOH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description: ups solve problems by enabling the experience and wisdom of group participants. The process of problem orientation versus solution orientation, and the value of doing so. How creating an atmosphere of equality at the group table allows for creative problem solving. How the caste system and opinions are the greatest enemies of experience and what to pay attention to during group meetings to keep those at bay.</td>
<td>Description: Information about GA's Energy Savings Performance Contracting Program and the concept of the Investment Grade Audit.</td>
<td>Description: DOH ODW has written a new guidance document to guide you through the Small Water System Management Program. This is a NEW and different program than before, so come learn about the new Small Water System Management Program, and its key objective to help small water systems achieve and maintain technical, managerial, and financial capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenter: Rick Rose, USDA Rural Development</td>
<td>Presenter: Victoria Leuba, Ecology</td>
<td>Presenter: Marti Canatsey, Rose Running and Agnieszka Kisza, USDA Rural Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description: This session will cover who is eligible for the RD Water/Waste programs, how to apply and what to submit, funding requirements from application to construction and through loan servicing, funding deadlines and future projections.</td>
<td>Description: In late October 2010, the Supreme Court of Washington issued its decision on a facial challenge to the Municipal Water Law. Ecology has developed guidance for internal use to implement sections of the law. This session will explore the Court decision and Ecology’s guidance to assist purveyors in understanding the challenge to the law and maintaining compliance with its provisions.</td>
<td>Description: Valuable tips you shouldn’t miss for your next RD Community Facilities application.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What will you learn? Attendees will have a new appreciation of the group process. I want to provide a new way to look at groups for problem solving.

What will you learn? Description of GA's energy program, identification of the ESCO pre-qualified through GA's program, and a description of preliminary and investment grade audit scopes, costs, and outcomes.

What will you learn? Key objectives of the revision, the new framework, and DOH expectations for water systems who develop a Small Water System Management Program.

What will you learn? Learn what Rural Development water/waste programs are all about and how RD can assist with your project.

What will you learn? Ecology's interpretation of the law and the Supreme Court decision and the impact on purveyors.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>What will you learn?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12:45</td>
<td>S26</td>
<td>How to Make Your Public Works Project Take-off and Land Smoothly</td>
<td>How to close out a public works project in compliance with applicable statutes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S27</td>
<td>Connecting to Capital Grants for Non-Profits</td>
<td>Rules and regulations regarding applying for and receiving state funds for capital projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S28</td>
<td>Environmental Requirements - How They Relate to Funding a Project</td>
<td>What the requirements of an environmental review are - Endangered Species Act, Section 106 Consultation, Prime Farmland/Forestland determinations, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S29</td>
<td>RD Funding: Understand the RD Funding Process and Tips to Get Your Project Funded</td>
<td>Step by step explanation of the RD funding process, Roles and responsibilities of RD staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S30</td>
<td>Funding Technical Assistance for Brownfields Revitalization</td>
<td>The panel will explain who and where to find funding and technical assistance to redevelop blighted properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S31</td>
<td>Benefitting from the Main Street Program</td>
<td>There are programs to help revitalize downtown and how to take advantage of them.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description:**
- **Awards Ceremony**
- **Connecting to Capital Grants for Non-Profits**
  - Presenter: Michael Kendall, Commerce
- **Environmental Requirements - How They Relate to Funding a Project**
  - Moderator: Janice Roderick, USDA Rural Development (PANEL)
- **RD Funding: Understand the RD Funding Process and Tips to Get Your Project Funded**
  - Presenters: Gene Dobry, Dave Dunnell, USDA RD
- **Funding Technical Assistance for Brownfields Revitalization**
  - Presenter: Jessica Brandt, ECY; Ignacio Dayrit, Ctr for Creative Land Recycling (PANEL)

**Description:**
- Washington State offers competitive grants for nonprofit agencies to help fund construction of their facilities. Eligible projects include community service centers, indoor athletic facilities and arts-related buildings. The next round of grants will become available Spring of 2012.
- There are environmental requirements that need to be fulfilled in order to fund a project through state and federal agencies. This session will provide you information on how to determine which requirements apply for the various funding agencies and how to efficiently go through the process for a multi-funded project.
- The panel will present Federal and State resources to assist communities to revitalize their communities, including infill development and brownfields sites. Programs may include Federal and State resources for environmental assessment & cleanup, integrated planning, housing, recreational space, and community facilities.
- An introduction to the Washington State Main Street Program followed by a discussion on appropriate downtown design and economic restructuring using facade improvement grants and investment tax credits.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Presenter(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S32</td>
<td>Ensuring Your Grants Get Funded: 25 Tips for Success</td>
<td>Do you want to increase the odds that your grant applications will get funded? If so, attend this session and learn how to ensure your grant applications appeal to the funding source.</td>
<td>Michelle S. Mazzola, Resource Solutions, LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S33</td>
<td>What can ORA Do For You?</td>
<td>Does your infrastructure need a face-lift or overhaul? Do you know of a business that is interested in locating in your city or county? Overwhelmed just thinking about the multiple regulations and processes to maneuver through? The Governor’s Office of Regulatory Assistance is here with help. Come and learn what on-line tools and personal help are available to you.</td>
<td>Karin Baldwin, Governor’s Office of Regulatory Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S34</td>
<td>Section 106 - Requirements of the National Historic Preservation Act</td>
<td>Professionals with projects funded or permitted by a Federal agency which have the potential to affect cultural resources should take this class either as orientation or as a refresher.</td>
<td>Russell Holter, DAHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S35</td>
<td>WA State CDBG Program Overview</td>
<td>An overview of the WA St CDBG program, describing the wide range of eligible community development and infrastructure activities, the grant limits, the low income persons requirements, and the rural (non-entitlement) local governments eligible to apply. *The Planning-Only Grant application will also be covered.</td>
<td>Kaaren Roe, Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S30</td>
<td>Funding Technical Assistance for Brownfields Revitalization CONTINUED</td>
<td>Funding agency staff will provide an overview of the federal prevailing wage laws and what recipients of federal funding must do to comply. Information on the specific requirements for each funding program will also be provided.</td>
<td>David Dunn, Ecology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S22</td>
<td>Complying with Davis Bacon Requirements</td>
<td>An overview of the Davis-Bacon Act requirements of the law and how to comply.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What will you learn?**
- How to increase the odds of your grants getting funded.
- How to take an application that has been turned-down and rewrite it and resubmit it, with higher odds of it being funded.
- Attendees will learn about tools available at the Office of Regulatory Assistance Web site, such as iPRMT.
- The regulatory process for environmental compliance.
- Whether you and your proposed project are eligible for CDBG funds and how to apply.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Presenter(s)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S36</td>
<td>Washington State Government to Government Tribal State Relations</td>
<td>Doug North, DSHS, Office of Indian Policy</td>
<td>Reasons to seek training: You will run across tribal issues and cases, so you need to know: – Why there are differences – How to recognize tribal issues/cases – What actions to take – Who should handle the issue/case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S37</td>
<td>Application Tune-up for Ecology Programs</td>
<td>David Dunn, Ecology</td>
<td>Ecology’s funding applications are due the first week of November. Applicants are invited to attend an informal session with Ecology staff to review this year’s form, help you craft solid application, and answer any last minute questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S38</td>
<td>Decentralized Sewage Treatment Utilizing a Membrane Bioreactor (MBR)</td>
<td>Bruce Lounsbury, Calco Environmental Group</td>
<td>Review of several case studies of cost, feasibility, operations and maintenance of decentralized sewage treatment systems utilizing MBRs for small communities in North America.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S39</td>
<td>Income Surveys</td>
<td>Andy O’Neill, RCAC</td>
<td>Income surveys may be used in the application process when applying for funding. This training session will inform community leaders on the process of conducting a successful survey. By attending this session you will gain a better understanding of the benefits and potential risks of conducting a survey. This session will aid in the development of community leaders ability to make informed decisions related to conducting income surveys.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S40</td>
<td>Short Course on Local Planning with a Focus on Capital Facilities and Infrastructure Planning</td>
<td>Anne Fritzel, Commerce</td>
<td>The Short Course on Local Planning is a “Planning 101” program designed to introduce elected officials, planning commissioners, government staff, interested residents and stakeholders to land use and natural resource planning in Washington State. The course will provide an overview of the legal basis of planning, the requirements and processes of comprehensive planning and implementation at the local level, with a focus on capital facilities and infrastructure planning, and a discussion of the roles in the planning process. The Short Course on Local Planning is jointly sponsored throughout the state at no charge by the Washington State Department of Commerce and the Planning Association of Washington.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Presenter</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S36</td>
<td>TIB Urban Transportation Funding Opportunities</td>
<td>Greg Armstrong, TIB</td>
<td>TIB provides grant funding for street and sidewalk projects. This session will explain TIB funding opportunities for urban agencies. (for over 5,000 population)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S41</td>
<td>Ensuring Your Grants Get Funded: 25 Tips for Success</td>
<td>Michelle S. Mazzola, Resource Solutions, LLC. (REPEAT)</td>
<td>Do you want to increase the odds that your grant applications will get funded? If so, attend this session and learn how to ensure your grant applications appeal to the funding source.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S42</td>
<td>CDBG - What Can It Do In My Community?</td>
<td>Kaaren Roe, Commerce</td>
<td>The Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program is a federal fund for both local and state governments to assist a wide range of activities to benefit lower income persons. This session will provide an overview of HUD's CDBG program and then focus on how the state is using its CDBG allocation in the rural areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S43</td>
<td>Short Course on Local Planning with a Focus on Capital Facilities and Infrastructure Planning CONTINUED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S44</td>
<td>Compliance with the Governor's Executive Order 05-05</td>
<td>Russell Holter, DAHP</td>
<td>Learn how to implement a GEO 05-05 review, what is required to meet the standards, and how these requirements for environmental review work hand-in-hand with SEPA and Section 106.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S45</td>
<td>TIB Small City Transportation Funding Opportunities</td>
<td>Greg Armstrong, TIB</td>
<td>TIB provides grant funding for street and sidewalk projects. This session will explain TIB funding opportunities for urban agencies. (for under 5,000 population)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S47</td>
<td>CDBG Applications Nuts and Bolts</td>
<td>Lynn Kohn, Commerce</td>
<td>Basic requirements, tips and suggestions for filling out a Planning Only Grant and a General Purpose Grant application will be discussed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S40</td>
<td>Short Course on Local Planning with a Focus on Capital Facilities and Infrastructure Planning CONTINUED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>