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Disaster Damage:

Missouri was heavily impacted by severe storms, tornadoes and flooding that began on April 19, 2011. Southern and northwestern portions of the state were inundated with flood waters, while the cities of Joplin and Sedalia, and Jasper, Newton and St. Louis Counties sustained heavy tornado damage. These disasters resulted in 161 fatalities, 535 reported injuries, 10,443 destroyed or damaged homes, and impacted more than 500 businesses. Many of the counties included in the FEMA disaster declaration for Individual and/or Public Assistance are some of Missouri’s most poverty-stricken.

Disasters:

Declaration Number
FEMA-1980-MO
FEMA-4012-MO

Narratives

Disaster Damage:

Missouri was heavily impacted by severe storms, tornadoes and flooding that began on April 19, 2011. Southern and northwestern portions of the state were inundated with flood waters, while the cities of Joplin and Sedalia, and Jasper, Newton and St. Louis Counties sustained heavy tornado damage. These disasters resulted in 161 fatalities, 535 reported injuries, 10,443 destroyed or damaged homes, and impacted more than 500 businesses. Many of the counties included in the FEMA disaster declaration for Individual and/or Public Assistance are some of Missouri’s most poverty-stricken.

Disaster Damage:

Missouri was heavily impacted by severe storms, tornadoes and flooding that began on April 19, 2011. Southern and northwestern portions of the state were inundated with flood waters, while the cities of Joplin and Sedalia, and Jasper, Newton and St. Louis Counties sustained heavy tornado damage. These disasters resulted in 161 fatalities, 535 reported injuries, 10,443 destroyed or damaged homes, and impacted more than 500 businesses. Many of the counties included in the FEMA disaster declaration for Individual and/or Public Assistance are some of Missouri’s most poverty-stricken.
1. According to FEMA’s Public Assistance assessments, the estimated total need for public assistance is $177,781,945. This is broken down by category:

- Category A (Debris Removal): $67,837,716
- Category B (Emergency Protective Measures): $18,793,962
- Category C (Roads and Bridges): $32,336,757
- Category D (Water Control Facilities): $694,150
- It should be noted that the repair of levees, dams and flood control channels fall under Category D, but the eligibility of these facilities is restricted by FEMA. In Missouri, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers will look to CDBG as a partner in levee restoration.
- Category E (Buildings and Equipment): $50,638,428
- Category F (Utilities): $6,047,959
- Category G (Parks, Recreational and Other Facilities): $1,432,977

2. All applications for 2011 CDBG Disaster funding will be evaluated for:

- Economic Revitalization/development: $4,141,553
- Administration (state/local) - $4,141,553

The Department of Economic Development used an economic model to assess the economic impact to the region based on these unmet needs. The unmet needs of businesses were entered into the model as an increased cost in capital investment of $32,974,170. Likewise, the unmet needs of housing affected the equity and rental incomes of property owners; the region’s personal income was lowered in the model by $74,283,794. Although agriculture is important to the economy in the northwestern part of the state, southeast Missouri relies heavily on agriculture as its economic base. In 2011, when the Bird’s Point Levee was intentionally breached, thousands of acres of farmland were taken out of production for 2011. The State of Missouri intends to apply this post disaster analysis of the economic conditions of southeast Missouri and make available funding under the economic development category to address specific agriculture related job creation activities in a manner that leaves the communities in the area better positioned to meet the needs of their post disaster populations and prospects for growth. This category may solicit requests for proposal for economic development activities that allow for a broader approach to the agricultural industry supply chain which includes manufacturing of products grown in the flooded areas.

Method of Distribution:

Recovery Needs:

In 2011, damages to businesses and homes reduced profits and family incomes resulting in a decline in total economic activity in the state by $81.8 million. In addition, Gross State Product (GSP) declined by $52 million and Personal Income in the state declined by $102 million. The loss to business profits and family income also resulted in over 800 job losses throughout the state.

Other effects include crop losses from the Birds Point Levee Breach in 2011 that flooded over 130,000 acres of farmland and homes. Initially, FAPRI estimated a net loss of $42.6 million in lost crop revenues to the Southeast Missouri region. The study had originally assumed that all 130,000 acres were unusable. Later reports reassessed the damage to acreage and determined that at least 50% of the acreage was used and did in fact produce crops. Given that 10% of the acreage turned out to be unusable, FAPRI’s model would now reflect $4.26 million in net losses to crop revenues.

Combining the economic impact of business and home losses with crop revenue losses equates to a reduction in overall state economic activity of $86.06 million.

Recovery Needs:

Housing Need: Even one year later, the rate of unmet needs remains high. As of December 2011, severe housing unmet needs were calculated by HUD at $74,283,794. Of the 16,489 FEMA registrants for DR 1980, 43% of these registrants were ineligible for the Individuals and Households Programs. Specifically, 41% were ineligible for the Housing Assistance Program. As of June 6, 2012, the U.S. Small Business Administration had received 1,848 applications for home loans and had only approved 605 of them, an approval rate of about 32.7%, leaving 1,243 (67.3%) requests unmet.

Infrastructure Need: Flooding, tornadoes, and severe storms caused numerous amounts of damage to infrastructure systems in Missouri during 2011. According to FEMA’s Public Assistance assessments, the estimated total need for public assistance is $177,781,945. Economic Need: The Department of Economic Development used an economic model to assess the impact to the region based on these unmet needs. The unmet needs of businesses were entered into the model as an increased cost in capital investment of $32,974,170. Likewise, the unmet needs of housing affected the equity and rental incomes of property owners; the region’s personal income was lowered in the model by $74,283,794. Although agriculture is important to the economy in the northwestern part of the state, southeast Missouri relies heavily on agriculture as its economic base. In 2011, when the Bird’s Point Levee was intentionally breached, thousands of acres of farmland were taken out of production for 2011. The State of Missouri intends to apply this post disaster analysis of the economic conditions of southeast Missouri and make available funding under the economic development category to address specific agriculture related job creation activities in a manner that leaves the communities in the area better positioned to meet the needs of their post disaster populations and prospects for growth. This category may solicit requests for proposal for economic development activities that allow for a broader approach to the agricultural industry supply chain which includes manufacturing of products grown in the flooded areas.

Method of Distribution:

1. According to FEMA’s Public Assistance assessments, the estimated total need for public assistance is $177,781,945.

2. All applications for 2011 CDBG Disaster funding will be evaluated for:

- Economic Revitalization/development: $4,141,553
- Administration (state/local) - $4,141,553
- Economic Need: The Department of Economic Development used an economic model to assess the impact to the region based on these unmet needs. The unmet needs of businesses were entered into the model as an increased cost in capital investment of $32,974,170. Likewise, the unmet needs of housing affected the equity and rental incomes of property owners; the region’s personal income was lowered in the model by $74,283,794. Although agriculture is important to the economy in the northwestern part of the state, southeast Missouri relies heavily on agriculture as its economic base. In 2011, when the Bird’s Point Levee was intentionally breached, thousands of acres of farmland were taken out of production for 2011. The State of Missouri intends to apply this post disaster analysis of the economic conditions of southeast Missouri and make available funding under the economic development category to address specific agriculture related job creation activities in a manner that leaves the communities in the area better positioned to meet the needs of their post disaster populations and prospects for growth. This category may solicit requests for proposal for economic development activities that allow for a broader approach to the agricultural industry supply chain which includes manufacturing of products grown in the flooded areas.

Method of Distribution:

Recovery Needs:

and $32,974,170 was related to businesses. In addition, the total Public Assistance need for DR-1980 and DR-4012 is $177,781,945. Due to the magnitude of the disaster events, and the massive amount of unmet need remaining, it is impossible to address all of these needs with available funding. DED will accept applications based on local needs and priorities for long-term recovery in disaster affected areas. DED has budgeted the following application categories:

- Housing/Infrastructure: $ 4,141,554
- Economic Revitalization/development: $4,141,553
- Administration (state/local) - $435,952

2. All applications for 2011 CDBG Disaster funding will be evaluated for:

- need (the breadth and depth of the disaster in terms of population affected and sectors (housing, infrastructure, business, environment) affected within the community;
- capacity (the degree of expertise and experience that the local government or contracted agency has to manage the project, administer the funds, and succeed with the outcomes and objectives defined in the application);
- the project’s impact on short and long term community recovery (the amount of spin off, community awareness and support and degree to which the activities will lead to further recovery);
- local effort (other state/federal resources, local cash, human resources, in-kind efforts) and do the CDBG funds assist with non-federal share for FEMA and/or USACE funding;
- consistency with a local short and long term recovery plans;
- consistency with local and state floodplain management practices;
- project sustainability and future disaster mitigation (the degree to which activities are defined with sound construction practices, quality and durability, energy efficiency and flood control or flood resistance);
- Available CDBG Disaster funds.

No maximum grant amount has been established for CDBG Disaster applications. Applicants must demonstrate financial need and leverage all (local, state and federal) available funds to minimize CDBG funding participation.

3. It is possible that the State (DED) will carry out an activity directly. This will depend entirely on need and applications received. Eligible activities will include housing, infrastructure and economic revitalization/development. The geographic area is limited to those areas included in Presidential Disaster declarations DR-1980 and DR-4012.

4. It is possible that the State (DED) will carry out an activity directly. This will depend entirely on need and applications received. Eligible
activities will include housing, infrastructure and economic revitalization/development. The geographic area is limited to those areas included in Presidential Disaster declarations DR-1980 and DR-4012. Any of the three CDBG national objectives may be used for activities carried out directly; however, at least 50% of the total allocation must meet the LMI national objective. Because of this requirement, recipients of CDBG Disaster funding should use the LMI national objective for all activities that qualify under the LMI criteria.

Recovery Needs:

-6. The following are criteria used to distribute funds to local governments including the relative importance of each criterion.

-7. The following are criteria used to document how the proposed activity will assist in the long-term recovery from the disaster event.
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-8. The following are criteria used to distribute funds to local governments including the relative importance of each criterion.
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-28. The following are criteria used to distribute funds to local governments including the relative importance of each criterion.
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-33. The following are criteria used to distribute funds to local governments including the relative importance of each criterion.
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-34. The following are criteria used to distribute funds to local governments including the relative importance of each criterion.
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-35. The following are criteria used to distribute funds to local governments including the relative importance of each criterion.
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-36. The following are criteria used to distribute funds to local governments including the relative importance of each criterion.
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-37. The following are criteria used to distribute funds to local governments including the relative importance of each criterion.
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-38. The following are criteria used to distribute funds to local governments including the relative importance of each criterion.

Recovery Needs:

-39. The following are criteria used to distribute funds to local governments including the relative importance of each criterion.

Recovery Needs:

-40. The following are criteria used to distribute funds to local governments including the relative importance of each criterion.
Recovery Needs:

from a disaster not occurring in 2011. However, if a need that arose from a previous disaster was exacerbated by a 2011 disaster, disaster recovery funds may be used.

>CDBG eligible activities
>1. Property Acquisition
>2. Property Disposition
>3. Property Clearance/Demolition
>4. Architectural Barrier Removal
>5. Senior Center
>6. Community Facilities
>7. Centers for the Handicapped
>8. Historic Properties
>9. Water Treatment/Storage
>10. Sanitary Sewer Collection
>11. Storm Sewers
>12. Flood and Drainage Facilities
>13. Streets (or Roads)
>14. Street Accessories
>15. Parking Facilities
>16. Bridges
>17. Sidewalks
>18. Pedestrian Malls
>19. Recycling or Conversion Facilities
>20. Parks and Recreation Facilities
>21. Fire Protection/Facility Equipment
>22. Solid Waste Disposal Facilities
>23. Other Utilites
>24. Public Service/Supportive Services
>25. Rehabilitation of Private Residential Properties
>26. Rehabilitation of Public Residential Properties
>27. Payments for Loss of Rental Income
>28. Relocation
>29. Code Enforcement
>30. Energy Use Strategy
>31. Non-Federal Share Payment
>32. Interim Assistance
>33. Planning
>34. Commercial or Industrial Facilities
>35. Administration
>36. Engineering/Design
>37. Housing Rehab/Demo Inspection
>38. Engineering/Construction Inspection
>40. Audit
>41. Port Facility
>42. Airports
>43. Natural Gas Lines
>44. Electrical Distribution Lines
>45. Rail Spurs
>46. Lighting
>47. Other Professional Services
>48. Security Fencing
>49. Site Preparation
>50. Purchase Land/Building
>51. Facility Construction Renovation
>52. Machinery/Equipment
>53. Working Capital
>54. Sewage Treatment
>55. LDC Homeownership Assistance &ndash up to $15,000 to purchase a new home
>56. Legal
>57. 911 Emergency Systems
>58. Homeowners Assistance- up to $5,000 to purchase an existing DSS home
>59. Lead-Based Paint Risk Assessment
>60. Asbestos Removal
>61. Job Training*
>62. Home-Ownership Counseling
>63. Substantial Reconstruction of the reconstruction of private residential properties on same lot- up to $15,000
>64. Water Distribution
>65. Lead Reduction NOT incidental to Rehab
>66. Asbestos Inspection

National Objective

>All three national objectives may be used with these disaster recovery funds: low and moderate income (LMI) benefit, slum and blight
removal, and urgent threat to health and safety. No less than 50% of the State’s allocation of disaster recovery funding must be used for activities that meet the LMI national objective. Because of this requirement, grantees should use the LMI national objective for all activities that qualify under the LMI criteria.

Public Comment:
The draft CDBG Disaster Action Plan was made available on the DED website on July 6 for a seven day public comment period ending on July 12. The availability of the plan was made public via the DED Weekly electronic newsletter, and was also disseminated to local communities and other partners via the Missouri Municipal League and the regional planning commissions/councils of local government. No comments were received.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>This Report Period</th>
<th>To Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Projected Budget from All Sources</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$8,401,476.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Budget</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$8,401,476.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Obligated</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$217,976.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Funds Drawdown</td>
<td>$2,157.20</td>
<td>$3,879.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Funds Drawdown</td>
<td>$2,157.20</td>
<td>$3,879.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Income Drawdown</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Income Received</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Funds Expended</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$1,722.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match Contributed</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Progress Toward Required Numeric Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>To Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Benefit Percentage (Projected)</td>
<td>65.16%</td>
<td>65.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Benefit Percentage (Actual)</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Non-Federal Match</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limit on Public Services</td>
<td>$1,307,858.85</td>
<td>$1,307,858.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limit on Admin/Planning</td>
<td>$1,743,811.80</td>
<td>$3,879.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limit on State Admin</td>
<td>$435,952.95</td>
<td>$3,879.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Progress Toward Activity Type Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Type</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public services</td>
<td>$1,307,858.85</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Progress Toward National Objective Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Objective</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low/Mod</td>
<td>$4,359,529.50</td>
<td>$5,237,125.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Progress Narrative:
The state has awarded two projects of $2.8M and $4M from the 2012 allocation, and are finalizing contracts with the grantees.
## Project Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project #, Project Title</th>
<th>This Report Period</th>
<th>To Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program Funds</td>
<td>Project Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drawdown</td>
<td>Budgeted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 DT Admin, 2012 DT Admin</td>
<td>$2,157.20</td>
<td>$435,952.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-DT-01, Joplin School District 2012-DT-01</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-DT-02, Joplin 2012-DT-02-DEMO</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$4,000,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-DT-03, Joplin Area Chamber of Commerce Foundation 2012-</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-DT-04, Wyatt 2012-DT-04</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Activities

Project # / Title: 2012 DT Admin / 2012 DT Admin

Grantee Activity Number: 2011-DT-STADM
Activity Title: 2011 DT State Administration

Activity Category: Administration  Activity Status: Under Way
Project Number: 2012 DT Admin  Project Title: 2012 DT Admin
Projected Start Date: 09/14/2012  Projected End Date: 09/14/2015
Benefit Type: N/A  Completed Activity Actual End Date:
National Objective: N/A  Responsible Organization: State of Missouri

Overall  Jan 1 thru Mar 31, 2013  To Date
Total Projected Budget from All Sources N/A  $217,976.00
Total Budget $0.00  $217,976.00
Total Obligated $0.00  $217,976.00
Total Funds Drawdown $2,157.20  $3,879.56
  Program Funds Drawdown $2,157.20  $3,879.56
  Program Income Drawdown $0.00  $0.00
Program Income Received $0.00  $0.00
Total Funds Expended $0.00  $1,722.36
Match Contributed $0.00  $0.00

Activity Description:
The state has budgeted an initial 2.5% of the 5% cap for state administration. The balance of administration funds will be awarded to local governments once the projects are identified and agreements signed.

Location Description:

Activity Progress Narrative:
Accomplishments Performance Measures
No Accomplishments Performance Measures found.

Beneficiaries Performance Measures
No Beneficiaries Performance Measures found.

Activity Locations
No Activity Locations found.

Other Funding Sources Budgeted - Detail
No Other Match Funding Sources Found

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Funding Sources</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Other Funding Sources Found</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Other Funding Sources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Monitoring, Audit, and Technical Assistance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Type</th>
<th>This Report Period</th>
<th>To Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring, Audits, and Technical Assistance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring Visits</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit Visits</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Assistance Visits</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring/Technical Assistance Visits</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report/Letter Issued</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>