



# City of Columbia, Missouri

## Meeting Minutes - Final

### Housing and Community Development Commission

---

Wednesday, April 10, 2024  
7:00 PM

Regular Meeting

Room 1A/B, City Hall,  
701 E Broadway

---

#### I. CALL TO ORDER

Rose called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m.

#### II. INTRODUCTIONS

Present at the start of the meeting were Board members Rose, Ascani, Ritter, McIntosh, Fletcher, Nguyen, Shaw, Pefferman, and Kasmann. City staff Deaver, Thompson, Amelunke, and Graham were also in attendance.

**Present:** 9 - Michael Fletcher, Mitchell Ritter, Ross Kasmann, Thomas Rose, Rebecca Shaw, Rikki Ascani, Erica Pefferman, Jay McIntosh and Michael Nguyen

MR. ROSE: And we'll start off with introductions to my right.

MS. DEEVER: Do you want to start --

MS. GRAHAM: Oh, I'm sorry. I'm Tracy Graham. I just started this week. I'm the admin tech. And that's kind of where --

MR. ROSE: Okay.

MS. THOMPSON: I'm Rebecca Thompson, and I'm the director of the Housing Neighborhood Services Department.

MS. DEEVER: Jennifer Deaver, City Staff.

MR. AMELUNKE: Jake Amelunke, City Staff.

MS. ASCANI: Rikki Ascani.

MR. ROSE: What ward do you represent? Are you at large?

MS. ASCANI: Yeah. I don't know if I'm ward or at large, but if was, Ward 1.

MR. ROSE: I think you -- okay.

MR. RITTER: Mitch Ritter, Ward 2.

MR. ROSE: Tom Rose, Ward 5.

MR. MCINTOSH: Jay McIntosh, Ward 6.

MR. FLETCHER: Mike Fletcher, Member at Large.

MR. NGUYEN: Michael Nguyen, from Human Service Commission

MS. SHAW: Rebecca Shaw, Member at Large.

MS. PEFFERMAN: Erica Pefferman, Ward 4.

MR. KASMANN: Ross Kasmann, Ward 3.

MR. ROSE: I think you're Ward 1.

MS. ASCANI: Okay.

### III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

**Motion to approve the agenda: Ritter**

**Motion to 2nd: Kasmann**

**Motion passes unanimously: 9:0**

### IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Approval of March 13, 2024 Meeting Minutes

**Attachments:** [3.13.2024 HCDC Minutes](#)

[HCDC Meeting Recording 3.13.24](#)

**Motion to approve the March 13, 2024 meeting minutes: Pefferman**

**Motion to 2nd: Shaw**

**Motion passes unanimously: 9:0**

### V. OLD BUSINESS

Discussion of Reallocated Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)  
Recommendations: Recommendations on Approving Amendments to  
Annual Action Plans (AAPs) for FY 2020, FY 2021, FY 2022 and FY 2023

**Attachments:** [Reallocation Plan 4.9.2024](#)

MR. ROSE: Next we will have some updates on old business.

MS. DEEVER: So we -- as you know, we put out the RFP for reallocated funds and for our FY 25 funds. Please excuse me tonight, have a little sympathy. I am -- my allergies are going crazy. So basically, what we have done is we received -- we will review FY 25 at the end of the month when we have the regular time for that. What we did do on this -- if you recall in this meeting was, we did the RFP that we would have a preferred deadline to try to move the reallocated funds along a little bit quicker. And so we -- we did that, and we received four proposals. We received a proposal from the Columbia Housing Authority for, basically, demolition on a big portion of their East Park -- East Park Avenue units, they will be doing -- demolishing 70 units, and they have requested \$820,000 -- or 40,000 for that -- \$840,000, wasn't it?

MR. AMELUNKE: Yeah.

MS. DEEVER: \$840,000. And we received the proposal from Woodhaven Learning Center, and they were requesting that we -- the six properties that they are currently working on, that we go ahead and we help them complete some more projects in those. They requested \$200,000 for that. And then we had two additional proposals. One was from Job Point. They were requesting that we help them pay off some loans that they

have on Job Point buildings in -- for construction loan prior to reimbursement. We -- they are requesting us to go back on those and pay loans that they've already processed on. We are not able to do that, so we were not able to have that proposal come. And then, also, we had one from the Food Bank where they were requesting the purchase of a forklift for their warehouse. We are not able to purchase equipment. So when we got done with the proposals that had been submitted before the priority date, two -- we ended up with the two, the one for CHA, and the one for Woodhaven. So basically, what we've done is, you know, we are trying to obligate out the \$840,000 that we had talked about previously. We are going back four program years for FY 20, 21, 22, and 23 to do that. We have, if you see here for 2020, we are -- Woodhaven had some funds that they did not use in 2020. They were -- well, actually, I'm sorry, let me respeak that. Woodhaven funds were -- one of the things that we also discussed previously was program income, and then when we get program income in, we are required to use it first before we can use our entitlement funds. What that does is, if we obligated \$100,000 to somebody and we use \$50,000 of it, it has to be paid by program income, then we have \$50,000 still sitting out here because it's -- that money is still there. That's one of the things that's caused a backlog, as well. So in 2020, Woodhaven had \$13,082.47 that was covered by PI, so we would put that towards this. Job Point -- and you can see through these. Job Point had \$12,000 with some additional funds. Woodhaven, again, had entitlement covered with PI. CMC Women's Business center had entitlement covered with PI. Services for Independent Living had entitlement covered by PI, and then the Shalom Academy had some also, as well. So for 2021, we have about \$70,000 that we're looking to reallocate that was for PI -- it was -- the entitlement had been covered by PI. For '22, we have Services for Independent Living in Central Missouri. Community Action did not spend all of their funding that they had been allocated, so we have drawn that back in. Job Point, Services for Independent Living, CMCA, and Columbia Housing Authority all had funds that were covered by PI, so have reallocated out of that year about \$359,000. And then for FY 23, Love Columbia, Voluntary Action Center, and Fun City did not spend their funds, and we have brought back \$400,000. What this is bringing us to is a total of about \$843,000, and we had \$780,040 was what we would go as our max. That is what we are still recommending is that we go to that \$840,000 as we had put out. So what we're recommending with the staff recommendation is that we allocate the \$840,000 that Columbia Housing Authority has requested in those funds to be covered with this \$840,000 that we have. Are there any questions on any of that? I know it gets confusing with program income.

MR. ROSE: Tom Rose here. Can you tell me again what the Housing Authority -- that project was going to be demolition for where again?

MS. DEEVER: Their proposal is --

MR. ROSE: East Park Avenue.

MS. DEEVER: -- East Park Avenue, units consisting of demolishing 70 legacy units of public housing that have exceeded their life cycle and redevelopment, 79 new high quality and affordable units. Those 79 units include nine market rate units. CDBG funds requested for the remediation, demolition and relocation and site improvement costs.

Residents include single adults, elderly, and families with children. Sixty-seven percent of the residents on Park Avenue are minority populations, and 81 percent make less than 30 percent of the area median income.

MR. FLETCHER: Are they able to --

MR. ROSE: Go ahead and state your name, too.

MR. FLETCHER: Mike Fletcher. Do they have all the permits and everything to do the demo?

MS. DEEVER: As far as I know, yes. All -- they are in line to start being able to do the work. Part of the -- part of the reallocated funds was that the -- any group that applied for it, we were very clear that the work had to be able to be started and move quickly.

MR. MCINTOSH: Jay McIntosh. What happens to the displaced families during construction?

MS. DEEVER: They are all moved at the expense of the Housing Authority. That is part of what is required under HUD is that every bit of their -- they're allowed to move, and please correct me if I'm wrong, Randy -- Randy Cole is here. They're allowed -- they're picked to move, and when they move, if they want to stay where they were placed, I think -- I believe that they have the option to stay where they were placed. It's very much towards the benefit of the homeowner or the renter in that case. Any other questions?

MS. PEFFERMAN: Erica Pefferman. I have questions about FY 2023. I remember why BAC is unspent, but I can't remember why Love Columbia and Fun City were unspent. Do you have a real quick snapshot of that?

MS. DEEVER: Love -- Love Columbia did not have site control over their property --

MS. PEFFERMAN: Okay. Yeah.

MS. DEEVER: -- and so they have -- they asked that we just take the funds back. Fun City also did not have site control, and the building that they thought they were going to be able to purchase never came to fruition.

MS. PEFFERMAN: They never -- okay.

MS. DEEVER: Any other questions here? Yes.

MS. PEPPERMAN: Can you make this document available?

MS. DEEVER: Yes. It will be out -- it will be on -- in the notes.

MS. PEPPERMAN: Okay. Thank you.

MS. DEEVER: Yes.

MR. ROSE: Tom Rose here. Are we needing to then make a proposal -- or a proposal then that we vote on to approve those?

MS. DEEVER: What we're going to need tonight is -- and I have one more thing we want to talk about out of the CDBG funds.

MR. ROSE: Okay.

MS. DEEVER: But we're -- what we will need tonight from you all is that you approve us to amend the annual action plans for the four years that will be covered. So '20, '21, '22, and '23, we're going to have to amend all of those action plans to make this happen.

MR. ROSE: And essentially, in doing so, we're approving those projects?

MS. DEEVER: After this, once you've approved them, we take the -- it will be noticed in for 30 days in the paper and it will be out in the public. It will also have to go back to City Council for two City Council meetings, one to post the public notice, and then not to have the public hearing. So there will be another month that it sits with the -- with the -- and, ultimately, yes, the City Council approves it.

MR. ROSE: Right.

MS. DEEVER: Approves those two, and then the -- the annual action plans.

MR. MCINTOSH: Jay McIntosh. Can they approve it the date of the public hearing or do they have to wait till the next meeting after that?

MS. DEEVER: They approve it the date of the public hearing.

MR. MCINTOSH: All right.

MS. DEEVER: If they approve it, they will approve it that day.

MR. MCINTOSH: All right. Okay. So two more. All right.

MS. DEEVER: We have one meeting to say that we're going to have a public hearing --

MR. MCINTOSH: Right.

MS. DEEVER: -- and then the next meeting you have a public hearing.

MR. MCINTOSH: Got it. Thank you.

MS. DEEVER: So our other proposal is we've been doing a lot of looking at our numbers. And one of the things that we feel we could do is we said that there were two proposals. We're recommending as staff to do \$840,000 toward the -- towards the funds to go to the Columbia Housing Authority. They will be able to take them and use them quickly. The

other proposal we had was for Woodhaven to, as I said, they have been -- they have funds right now that they got from the last reallocation of funds. They've used them. They did ask for an extension on those funds because they were having trouble getting materials and things like that for one of their projects, but we do fully anticipate that they will spend their funds by the end of July which they've been extended to. What we are commending is, in looking at our numbers, another place where we had kind of a bit of money sitting, is in previous years housing rehab funds, which are our housing rehab funds. We're recommending that we transfer \$200,000 of that money, do the same thing as a reallocation of funds to them to Woodhaven for the \$200,000 that they have requested, that they feel they will be able to spend before the end of the year. So it's the same thing, we're just -- we're using our funds for this instead of using funds that have been returned or were covered with PI, these are funds that were -- that were City of Columbia rehab funds, that we -- once we do this, we will still have over \$250,000 to put towards rehab. It's not stopping our rehab program; it's just covering that -- that's where we would have some extra funds.

MR. MCINTOSH: So Jay McIntosh again. Do both the \$840,000 and the \$200,000 have to be spent by the end of this calendar year?

MS. DEEVER: Yeah. That is -- that is the hope.

MR. ROSE: Tom Rose. So the \$90,000 or so is from the 2020 funds that we're giving that we would switch over and then the -- \$109,000 of those funds we switch over from the next year?

MS. DEEVER: Correct. Yes?

MR. FLETCHER: Mike Fletcher. So what caused you to get behind for the rehab funds? Was that program income that you ended up having to spend in that same scenario?

MS. DEEVER: There's a -- there could be -- that could also have impacted it. A lot of what happened is is this 2020 and 2021, we're coming out Covid.

MR. FLETCHER: Covid. Right.

MS. DEEVER: When we weren't able to get into houses the same way to do rehab projects. There was material shortages. There were lots of things like that that happened around that time. We feel like we're just at this point, and we discussed this in previous meetings, where we're really gearing up again, and now the agencies are starting to catch back up.

MR. RITTER: Mitch Ritter. We -- I did notice moving, looking forward in the survey results --

MS. DEEVER: Uh-huh.

MR. RITTER: -- existing home rehab is a very high focus area.

MS. DEEVER: Uh-huh.

MR. RITTER: Are you sure this isn't going to constrain funds now that contractors and materials and things are starting to catch up, that we're not going to -- we're going to put resources --

MS. DEEVER: Right.

MR. RITTER: -- to a couple of rehab projects to Woodhaven --

MS. DEEVER: Right.

MR. RITTER: -- but it -- I don't want it taking away from community members' projects that might be applied for.

MS. DEEVER: Jake, do you want to speak a little bit to that?

MR. RITTER: Just make sure we don't have a backlog on that.

MR. AMELUNKE: Yeah. I mean, so we're -- we're moving along with the energy efficiency sent, and we've got one rehab going and we've done four energy efficiencies. Since this is older money, it would be good to get caught up a little bit and just kind of clean house with stuff. I don't think it's -- we're going to be applying for future money here --

MR. RITTER: True.

MR. AMELUNKE: -- in the next couple of weeks or whatever or a month. I think we'll be fine with that. I haven't -- we just need to figure out if they can actually spend all this money. There may be -- we'll just have to look at what their projects are. I don't think it'll hurt us at this point because we're going to be in still kind of a building phase teaching people how to do income qualification and get rolling with all of our new staff. So hopefully within the next six months to a year, we can be fully staffed up and be running like we used with the rehabs. I don't think it will negatively affect toward the other ones, so --

MR. RITTER: I just wanted to make sure we're -- Woodhaven isn't going to run into the same issues --

MS. DEEVER: Correct. And we will --

MR. RITTER: -- that the community members are running into in finding quality contractors and materials to complete those jobs. And we'll trade one issue for another.

MS. DEEVER: We will confirm that again with them.

MR. RITTER: Okay.

MS. DEEVER: So any other questions? So what we're asking for tonight, as I said, is the first is to have a -- a motion made to approve the FY --

MS. THOMPSON: I'm sorry.

MS. DEEVER: She's going to word it better.

MS. THOMPSON: I'm just going to jump in and I'm just going to ask for -- that a separate motion be made for each annual action plan.

MS. THOMPSON: Okay.

MR. ROSE: Each annual. Okay.

MS. THOMPSON: Yeah. That you go through starting with 2020 and make a motion to approve the amendment to the annual action plan consistent with the reallocations that have been discussed this evening and do that for each annual action plan.

MS. DEEVER: Okay.

MR. ROSE: Pretty much as they're listed up there?

MS. DEEVER: Correct. So for 2020, we would like to -- someone to make a motion to amend the annual action plan for FY 2020 in what we have discussed here this evening.

MR. ROSE: Do I have a motion?

MS. PEFFERMAN: I'll make that motion with the words she just used.

MR. ROSE: Do I hear a second.

MR. MCINTOSH: Jay McIntosh. Second.

MR. ROSE: Okay.

MS. DEEVER: Okay. We ask for a motion on -- to also do the same with FY 2021 funds to amend the annual action plan in conjunction with what we have discussed here this evening.

MR. ROSE: Do we want to vote on each one?

MS. DEEVER: I'm sorry. Do you want to have a vote --

MR. ROSE: We're going to vote for each one.

MS. DEEVER: Okay. Let's go ahead and vote.

MR. ROSE: And we'll do roll call votes.

MS. DEEVER: Okay.

MR. ROSE: Yeah.

MS. DEEVER: Will you please say your name and --

MS. ASCANI: Rikki Ascani, yes.

MITCH RITTER: Mitch Ritter, yes.

MR. ROSE: Tom Rose, yes.

MR. MCINTOSH: Jay McIntosh, yes.

MR. FLETCHER: Michael Fletcher, yes.

MR. NGUYEN: Michael Nguyen, yes.

MS. SHAW: Rebecca Shaw, yes.

MS. PEFFERMAN: Erica Pefferman, Yes.

MR. KASMANN: Ross Kasmann, yes.

**Motion to approve the amendment to the Fiscal Year 2020 annual action plan consistent with the reallocations that have been discussed this evening:**

**Pefferman**

**Motion to 2nd: McIntosh**

**Motion passes unanimously: 9:0**

**Yes:** 9 - Fletcher, Ritter, Kasmann, Rose, Shaw, Ascani, Pefferman, McIntosh and Nguyen

-----

MR. ROSE: Next, we would entertain a motion to amend the 2021 action plan as proposed and discussed.

MR. NGUYEN: Michael Nguyen. I'll second.

MR. ROSE: Did we get a -- we didn't have a first? We didn't get a first.

MR. NGUYEN: I thought you motioned.

MR. ROSE: I'm just calling for a motion.

MR. NGUYEN: I motion to -- I motion for the FY 2021 as previously discussed in this meeting.

MR. ROSE: Can I get a second?

MS. ASCANI: Rikki Ascani. Second.

MR. ROSE: Okay. Any discussion? Roll call vote again.

MS. ASCANI: Rikki Ascani, yes.

MR. RITTER: Mitch Ritter, yes.

MR. ROSE: Tom Rose, yes.

MR. MCINTOSH: Jay McIntosh, yes.

MR. FLETCHER: Mike Fletcher, yes.

MR. NGUYEN: Michael Nguyen, yes.

MS. SHAW: Rebecca Shaw, yes.

MS. PEFFERMAN: Erica Pefferman, yes.

MR. KASMANN: Ross Kasmann, yes.

**Motion to approve the amendment to the Fiscal Year 2021 annual action plan consistent with the reallocations that have been discussed this evening: Nguyen**

**Motion to 2nd: Ascani**

**Motion passes unanimously: 9:0**

**Yes:** 9 - Fletcher, Ritter, Kasmann, Rose, Shaw, Ascani, Pefferman, McIntosh and Nguyen

-----

MR. ROSE: Okay. Then I would entertain a motion for amending the fiscal year 2023 --

actually 2022. I'm getting ahead of myself. Actually, they get more expensive as you go along -- action plan as discussed.

MR. RITTER: So moved. Mitch Ritter.

MR. ROSE: Mitch.

MS. SHAW: Seconded. Rebecca Shaw.

MR. ROSE: Any discussion?

MS. PEFFERMAN: I do have one question on this.

MR. ROSE: Yes.

MS. PEFFERMAN: Could you clarify why CMCA was not able to spend that \$75,000?

MS. DEAVER: That was for their project, and Jake, you know more about this project than I do. It was for the -- over by -- they have changed the type of project they were looking to do twice, and then again, a third time, and they ran out of time to be able to do it. They were past timeliness. We actually withdrew their funds.

MS. PEFFERMAN: Got it.

MR. AMELUNKE: Do you need more info on that?

MS. PEFFERMAN: No. Thank you.

MR. ROSE: Okay. Roll call.

MS. ASCANI, Rikki Ascani, yes.

MR. RITTER: Mitch Ritter, yes.

MR. ROSE: Tom Rose, yes.

MR. MCINTOSH: Jay McIntosh, yes.

MR. FLETCHER: Mike Fletcher, yes.

MR. NGUYEN: Michael Nguyen, yes.

MS. SHAW: Rebecca Shaw, yes.

MS. PEFFERMAN: Erica Pefferman, yes.

MR. KASMANN: Ross Kasmann, yes.

**Motion to approve the amendment to the Fiscal Year 2022 annual action plan consistent with the reallocations that have been discussed this evening: Ritter**

**Motion to 2nd: Shaw**

**Motion passes unanimously: 9:0**

**Yes:** 9 - Fletcher, Ritter, Kasmann, Rose, Shaw, Ascani, Pefferman, McIntosh and Nguyen

-----

MR. ROSE: And then I would entertain a motion for amending the fiscal year 2023 action plan.

MR. MCINTOSH: So moved. Jay McIntosh.

MR. KASMANN: Kasmann, second.

MR. ROSE: Any discussion, questions? Okay. Roll call vote.

MS. ASCANI: Yes, Rikki Ascani.

MR. RITTER: Mitch Ritter, yes.

MR. ROSE: Tom Rose, yes.

MR. MCINTOSH: Jay McIntosh, yes.

MR. FLETCHER: Mike Fletcher, yes.

MR. NGUYEN: Michael Nguyen, yes.

MS. SHW: Rebecca Shaw, yes.

MS. PEFFERMAN: Erica Pefferman, yes.

MR. KASMANN: Ross Kasmann, yes.

MS. DEEVER: And the 2021, 20, and 21, do you want to do those?

MR. ROSE: But we've already --

MS. THOMPSON: I think those were included.

MR. ROSE: Those were included.

MS. DEEVER: Okay.

MS. THOMPSON: My perspective was those would be included in the amendment that he already made to those action plans.

MR. ROSE: Correct. That's correct, yes. Because of the action plan changes.

**Motion to approve the amendment to the Fiscal Year 2023 annual action plan consistent with the reallocations that have been discussed this evening: McIntosh**

**Motion to 2nd: Kasmann**

**Motion passes unanimously: 9:0**

**Yes:** 9 - Fletcher, Ritter, Kasmann, Rose, Shaw, Ascani, Pefferman, McIntosh and Nguyen

Discussion of Reallocated HOME Recommendations: Recommendations on Approving Amendments to Annual Action Plans (AAPs) for FY 2021

-----

MS. DEEVER: Okay. Moving on to our HOME funds, for the HOME funds, we had one application for the \$45,000 worth of HOME funds which was also from the Columbia Housing Authority, and the property, Jake?

MR. AMELUNKE: Yeah. 207 Lynn Street, and we already have some funds tied up in that, but with the increased construction costs and higher interest on housing, this was going to increase the downpayment assistance for that home.

MS. DEEVER: Any questions?

MS. SHAW: Could you clarify that because this will increase the housing assistance -- as in this is going for the program for -- (inaudible).

MR. AMELUNKE: Yeah. So we -- there's -- there's subsidies in the houses, so --

because the cost of building now is so expensive. To get down to the 80 percent AMI, the houses need to be subsidized. There was some subsidy already in it, but it's not going to be enough to get people down to that 80 percent AMI, so this request is to --

MS. SHAW: Cover your extra expenses?

MR. AMELUNKE: Yes.

MS. SHAW: Okay.

MS. DEEVER : Any other questions? We would need the same motion.

MR. ROSE: So I be entertaining a motion to amend the 2020 -- it's 2021 --

MS. DEEVER: 2021.

MR. ROSE: -- action plan for HOME funds as presented.

MS. PEFFERMAN: So moved, Erica Pefferman.

MS. SHAW: Seconded, Rebecca Shaw.

MR. ROSE: Any questions? Do the roll call vote.

MS. ASCANI: Rikki Ascani, yes.

MR. RITTER: Mitch Ritter, yes.

MR. ROSE: Tom Rose, yes.

MR. MCINTOSH: Jay McIntosh, yes.

MR. FLETCHER: Mike Fletcher, yes.

MR. NGUYEN: Michael Nguyen, yes.

MS. SHAW: Rebecca Shaw, yes.

MS. PEFFERMAN: Erica Pefferman, yes.

MR. KASMANN: Ross Kasmann, yes.

MS. DEEVER: Okay.

MR. ROSE: It was carried. I wanted just to add -- Tom Rose -- to add that we appreciate that we were able to do this early and give them time to get their projects going. This was a concern.

MS. DEEVER: Yes. We are moving as fast -- if lightning had speed, if that makes sense.

**Motion to amend the Fiscal Year 2021 action plan for HOME funds as presented:**

**Pefferman**

**Motion to 2nd: Shaw**

**Motion passes unanimously: 9:0**

**Yes:** 9 - Fletcher, Ritter, Kasmann, Rose, Shaw, Ascani, Pefferman, McIntosh and Nguyen

## VI. NEW BUSINESS

Review of Consolidated Plan - Survey Results

Attachments: [Consolidated Plan Survey - Overview](#)  
[Survey Results Breakdown](#)  
[Survey Responses Summary Report](#)

MR. ROSE: Okay. Next -- next would be a discussion about or new business would reviewing the results from the consolidated plan survey.

MS. DEEVER: So as everyone knows, we -- the -- for the consolidated plan, one of the things that we're required to do is to do a survey, which we put out -- it ran from October through February -- or, I'm sorry -- November through February. The final results that we had, there were -- it was the -- the survey was through the City's website, and 476 people visited the survey. Of those people, 322 -- it says contributors, 328 responded, and then these are some different -- some were anonymous, some were -- registered their names to do that.

MS. PEFFERMAN: How can you have more people contribute than -- or respond than actually contributed?

MS. DEEVER: I am not sure.

MS. PEFFERMAN: Okay.

MS. DEEVER: These were the results that we received.

MS. ASCANI: I wonder if it's people who, like, started filling it out, but didn't actually submit it.

MS. DEEVER: And they just stopped.

MS. PEFFERMAN: It's a really good point.

MS. DEEVER: So of the survey responses, and we sent this for you all -- you all have one. I'm not going to go through every single question here. I have it broken down a little bit differently. But I did want to look at the demographics with you of where we ended up. We ended up with a really nice range across the different wards, you can see we had response from all different wards. We had -- this is looking at are you Hispanic, yes, no. This is looking at what is your race, and you can see -- and I can see if I can get this a little bit -- I don't know if I can make it all fit, but you can -- and this is all, again, you've been sent this information to review, as well. And then there were several questions of people that they could ask what they could fill in what their race was, which is what they've done here. What language do you speak at home, the majority was English, and then we had a small percentage of other. Does anyone in your household have a disability? Of the people who did that, you can see the green section shows 90 --

MR. MCINTOSH: I was surprised by that high percent.

MS. DEEVER: Surprised how?

MR. MCINTOSH: Jay McIntosh. There was a high percentage. It's like almost a third of

-- over a fourth of the people.

MS. DEEVER: Uh-huh. Yeah.

MR. MCINTOSH: Doesn't that seem odd?

MR. ROSE: Tom Rose. I would say that there are all kinds of disabilities.

MS. DEEVER: Disabilities.

MR. FLETCHER: Mike Fletcher. I -- I think some of that is there was -- you got the populations in some of the Columbia Housing Authority were targeted, so they were well represented and that would include a number of individuals who would fall into that category.

MR. ROSE: Uh-huh.

MS. DEEVER: So how many people lived in households, the largest portion was, as you can see down here, two. Then it looks like the next number was one and then three, so those -- we had a lot of different sized households. Is the annual household at or below 80 percent of the median income, and you can see here that, yes, 127 said yes and 195 said no. So that was very interesting to me to look at the demographics, and I was the most pleased that we had a wide variety across the different wards. So what I've done with this data, and this is just our initial discussion of this, with -- with us looking at these results. I went and I took them into -- for each area, what was the -- was it -- what was their highest area. Was it medium high, medium, or low, which was the way that they were set up. So, for instance, the number one thought that people wanted -- felt should be looked at and then get assistance is mental health services. Then to housing and for homeless individuals and families needing support of services, services for abused and neglected youth, vocational training -- street improvements rated in the -- in the top ten, health services, services for battered and abused spouses, emergency homeless shelter, energy efficiency improvements, and sidewalk improvements, and then downpayment assistance for home ownership. So a lot of what we do already is -- was in the top -- in the very top answers that were given. Looking at what was in the top -- where the median -- the medium area was the top in that area was for services for persons with disabilities, employment services, commercial/industrial development or rehabilitation, business mentoring, lead based hazard, mold, and asbestos mitigation which is interesting because that is a requirement of HUD. We have to do that regardless, code enforcement for the exterior of buildings, demolition of dilapidated buildings, community garden's facade and infrastructure. And then the low areas that rated -- where the low area was the highest were housing for people HIV and Aids, railroad cross improvements, parks and trails improvements, residential historic preservation, services for individuals with HIV

and Aids, tree planting along streets, bus shelters, construction rental, housing, residential solar improvements, and then finally legal services. Any comments, questions?

MR. ROSE: Rebecca Shaw?

MS. SHAW: Rebecca Shaw. I am curious to know. I also agree that our demographics it was great to see Wards 2 and 3 well represented across this.

MS. DEEVER: Uh-huh.

MS. SHAW: How do our breakup of race, how does that compare to the City, like, the latest census from the City? Are we seeing a pretty good representation of our City as a whole kind of in that?

MS. DEEVER: I have not explored that. I can look into that.

MS. SHAW: I'm just curious.

MS. DEEVER: Yeah.

MS. SHAW: I want to say the last time it was -- I wanted to say 12 to 14 percent --

MS. DEEVER: Uh-huh. Uh-huh.

MS. SHAW: -- maybe black and then other -- I mean, it seems like it's close.

MS. DEEVER: Okay. I can definitely look into that.

MS. SHAW: I think that -- thank you for the breakdown of this. This is really helpful to kind of see, and I think you're right, we've funded a lot of projects that fall in these categories.

MS. DEEVER: Uh-huh. And remember part of what we will use the survey for is to go in when we're breaking down by the four categories that we break down into what percentages we recommend you use for those, or that you're recommending we use for those. So we're not stuck on them except for the 15 percent for the vocational training, but -- but -- and the mentoring falls under it, as well. But other than that, those can switch, but that helps us kind of look. In my very brief not really specific -- a lot of time put into it, but we're very close to where we were the last time that we did the consolidated plan and where those were going to be.

MR. FLETCHER: Mike Fletcher. There were some interesting findings because here we see sidewalk improvements was rated high, and yet the bus -- improving bus stops was low.

MS. DEEVER: Uh-huh.

MR. FLETCHER: And it would seem that -- that those would typically work together. Someone is walking, they may not have a vehicle, and would need bus transportation --

MS. DEEVER: Uh-huh.

MR. FLETCHER: you know, the both of those would -- would rate high versus one high and one not.

MR. MCINTOSH: Jay McIntosh. There wasn't any waiting in this. Right? Anybody could -- could just -- every -- they could have said everything was on it; am I right?

MS. DEEVER: Correct.

MR. MCINTOSH: Okay.

MR. ROSE: All right.

MS. DEEVER: Any other questions, comments? Okay.

MR. ROSE: I think that is all that we had for this evening then; is that right?

MS. DEEVER: We just have general comments.

MR. ROSE: I mean for what you have here?

MS. DEEVER: I believe so, for new business; correct.

## VII. GENERAL COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, MEMBERS AND STAFF

MR. ROSE: So do we have any general comments from the public today? We do.

MR. COLE: Randy Cole, Columbia Housing Authority, 201 Switzler. I just wanted to thank the Commissioner for the recommendation for funding this evening. I do have one pager on both of our applications that was submitted. If you're interested, you can grab one. I didn't want to take time passing it around, but they're here for you tonight. Just a couple of brief highlights. The Park Avenue project, I guess, is one of the most important projects of the Columbia Housing Authority, at least in our generation. I'm really excited about the project. And your recommendations tonight were really important to the project. It was first conceptualized back in December of 2022, so we've had some increase in costs that happened since then, particularly in interest rates for our construction financing. Also as we've looked at demolishing the units, we've identified some additional costs associated with asbestos remediation, so on those two items alone, our asbestos and demolition remediation cost increases were around \$413,000 since initial conception. And then our development hard costs were about \$644,000, so this will be really good for the project. It means we'll have less debt service over the long term, which means we'll have more funds available for the programming for the residents for maintaining properties, making sure they're well cared for. We think this project will serve over 1,100 individuals over the next 25 years. You know, ten percent of CHA residents every year move on and up into market rate housing, so just that housing stability loan is really important for our community. We think this project will produce about 43 jobs while it's happening. It will increase our real estate tax revenue, because we'll turn that into an income-producing property of \$61,000 per year. It'll increase both

oversight of the Housing Authority because we are accountable to hire IRS, MHTC and HUD, as well as the City. And we're going to mix in ten percent of our units for market rehab, but the projects we'll let progress along. We received our environmental clearance from HUD and authority to proceed last week. We have a couple of deadlines with MHTC. Our firm's submission is due May 31st, along with HUD. So after we submit there, closing will happen within four months afterwards and we'll proceed into the project. Our residents are really excited. They continue being engaged with the community partners that are helping with this, so thank you the Commission for helping with this. It's real important. The other project, the 207 Lynn home, when we first conceptualized that project, interest rates were at five percent, and now they're at about seven and a half percent, so I'm thinking through an affordable mortgage. Back at that time, we thought affordable mortgage at the five percent was around \$137,000, and that would get us to a principal interest, taxes and insurance to about \$863. If we try to stay at that same range at a seven and a half percent, we need to get down to \$100,000 to make that work with the interest rates. We've also -- we'll also see a little bit of appreciation from our as-is appraisal at that time, so this \$45-- truly does fill that gap that's been created just over the passage of time with increasing interest rates and appreciation in the market. So another really important investment that will make sure we can get a household in that unit. We had the mayor out at our board meeting tonight to recognize the family self-sufficiency program and the graduate that we think is going to go into that house, that we're really excited about, so it's a really important project to get our Housing Authority residents into home ownership and out of renting, a big part of our strategy moving forward. So thank you again for that, as well.

MR. ROSE: Thank you, Randy. Any other comments. Any comments from the Commission?

MS. SHAW: I'll just let everybody know that the next project Homeless Connect is going to be on July 7th at First Baptist Church from 11:00 to 2:00. They're looking for volunteers, they're looking for help purchasing items to stuff backpacks, but really your -- your time on that day is the most valuable thing.

MS. PEFFERMAN: Thank you.

MS. SHAW: Uh-huh.

MR. ROSE: Anything from staff?

MS. DEEVER: We -- we did submit the CAPER, the last -- the CAPER did go in four days early, so we were -- we're pleased to have one project off of our -- one major report off of our desks, and we are now waiting on the -- HUD to release the final numbers for

the 2025 funds so that -- or, I'm sorry -- 2024 funds, and then we will, once they do release those funds, we have 60 days, 30 of those that needs to be noticed, so we have 30 days to write the annual action plan for 2024, which we are already working on. We're just waiting on our final numbers, so that will be our next big project coming. And then we'll all start talking about consolidated.

MR. ROSE: Very good. All right. Welcome to our -- your new staff member.

MS. DEEVER: Yes. We're excited.

MR. ROSE: Very good.

#### VIII. NEXT MEETING DATE

May 15, 2024

#### IX. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 7:38 p.m.

**Motion to adjourn: Pefferman**

**Motion to 2nd: Kasman**

**Motion passes unanimously: 9:0**