

**MINUTES**  
**COLUMBIA COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION MEETING**  
**COLUMBIA CITY HALL**  
**701 EAST BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MO**

**JUNE 19, 2019**

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT**

**Mr. Blaine Regan**  
**Mr. Michael Fletcher**  
**Mr. Paul Whatley**  
**Ms. Diane Suhler**  
**Mr. Mitchell Ritter**  
**Mr. Ross Kasmann**

**COMMISSIONERS ABSENT**

**Ms. Hannah Fisher**  
**Mr. Michael Salanski**  
**Mr. Nicholas Knoth**

**CITY STAFF**

**Mr. Randy Cole**  
**Mr. Gary Anspach**  
**Mr. Jacob Amelunke**  
**Ms. Darcie Clark**

**I.) CALL TO ORDER**

MR. REGAN: All right. And it is now 7:00 p.m. I would like to call to order the June 19, 2019 Columbia Community Development Commission Meeting. We'll start with introductions. We'll start down to my left with Ross.

**II.) INTRODUCTIONS**

MR. KASMANN: Ross Kasmann, Ward 3.

MR. RITTER: Mitch Ritter, Ward 2.

MR. WHATLEY: Paul Whatley, member at large.

MR. FLETCHER: Mike Fletcher, member at large.

MR. COLE: Randy Cole, City staff.

MR. REGAN: Blaine Regan, Sixth Ward.

MS. SUHLER: Diane Suhler; Human Services Commission Representative.

MR. AMELUNKE: Jacob Amelunke, City staff

MS. CLARK: Darcie Clark, City staff.

MR. ANSPACH: Gary Anspach, City staff.

MR. REGAN: All right. Thank you. Next we'll move to the approval of the agenda for this meeting.

**II.) APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

MR. REGAN: Any comments on the agenda? All right. Hearing none. If we can get a motion to approve the agenda?

**MR. WHATLEY: So moved.**

MR. REGAN: And a second?

**MS. SUHLER: Second.**

**MR. FLETCHER: Second that.**

MR. REGAN: All right. All in favor of approving the agenda as is say aye. Opposed?

**(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)**

MR. REGAN: All right. Ayes have it. The motion passes.

#### **IV.) APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

MR. REGAN: And we'll move on to the approval of the minutes from two weeks ago for the June 5, 2019 Commission meeting. Any comments on the minutes? All right. Hearing none. If I can get a motion to approve the minutes.

**MR. RITTER: Motion to approve the minutes.**

**MR. WHATLEY: Second.**

MR. REGAN: All right. All in favor of approving the minutes from June 5 say aye. Opposed?

**(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)**

MR. REGAN: All right. We will approve those minutes. All right. And we'll go ahead and move on to new business.

#### **V.) NEW BUSINESS**

MR. COLE: Yeah. We'll start with the first item, our CDBG and HOME funding policy resolution. So this is the Council resolution that guides your all's funding decision that you really take a more in-depth look at every five years. So at the last meeting, you all approved your funding categories -- your goals, if you remember this sheet. So you approved what your goals -- how the City -- how you recommend Council allocate your funds per funding category over the next five years. So that's really kind of the foundation of what's within the policy. It is -- I did update it quite a bit to reflect this as well as some additional changes that I recommend just having gone through this process before. So the first change I had in there is narrowing the ranges. So if you look at the ranges of funding, all of our percentages tie back to our goals and what we think the cost will be for a unit of affordable housing or sidewalks or whatever it is we're funding. And so I -- I based all of the ranges off of the mid-point of those, which is the specific point at which -- you know, how much funding needs to be allocated per category to make sure we do 35 downpayment assistances, or three sidewalks, you know, all those different things just to make sure your percentages match the goals that you have that tie to how much those goals cost. Does that all make sense? So on the last five years, we looked at the survey and broadened some of those categories to create greater flexibility. One would be the economic development ones -- we had between 10 and 50 percent, and there was another one that was pretty broad. But in my opinion it seemed like what happened was at the end because we had that broad of flexibility and the midpoint wasn't actually tied directly to the goal that you had established from the get go, that we kind of got out of line with what we funded per our goal. So we overperformed in like downpayment assistance and underperformed in microloans and a couple of other categories like that. And I think that's naturally going to happen because we're dependent upon the applications we get every year, both that we have interested organizations that want to apply for that funding and that also have viable projects that align with, you know, whatever comes up that year with the survey as being the most

important. So there's a lot of factors out of our control that guide us making exact incremental decisions that tie exactly about -- to the goals. Nonetheless, I thought narrowing those funding ranges would help us stay a little more closely aligned with that to make sure we're being strategic in matching all of our data analysis and public input. So that's the first change. The next one is renaming the categories to match what's on our new sheet of goals that you all approved at the last meeting, and then incorporate some of the policies identified in the Fair Housing resolution. So in our Affordable Housing sections, it mentions the types of housing, and some of those sustainability goals while also maintaining affordability. It includes the definition of Affordable Housing that was in the Fair Housing Task Force, and then the issue of chronically homelessness being raised up in our Community Facilities, since that was a big item. So we're trying to incorporate all the work that we've done and plug it into the policy resolution, and also further categorizes HOME expenditures. If you look at the HOME categories -- starts on the second page, in the past we used to only spell out that Council would set aside the 15 percent CHDO funding requirement, the 10 percent Admin, and the remainder would go into anything that is eligible, such as downpayment assistance, rental production with our Housing Authority LIHTC projects or that type of thing. This more clearly separates that out to also match with what your goals are for all of those categories. So now you have a guide to tie back to the goals that you determined, but still add some flexibility year to year. So you might have -- you might want to fund one higher or lower given -- given the year and the applications and what is going on, but you still have a stronger guide to work within and more clearly defined funding categories under the HOME. So we've got Home Ownership Assistance, the Production and Preservation of Owner-Occupied Housing, which includes our CHDO funding, so we have funded that category beyond the CHDO requirement in the past. So we're kind of keeping in standard with that but formalizing it with a percentage. Then having a Rental Production provision. Another significant change that you all should be aware of and that I'll make the Council aware of also is for our Rental Production. So that is what -- when we invest HOME funds towards like the Housing Authority's project over on Providence Walkway or Bryant Walkway II, any of the projects they fund, they anticipate probably applying for close to \$1 million over the next five years, and there is some additional organizations that might apply as well. Boone County Family Resources applied in the past, Jeff Smith's, some of his stuff, they might apply again. I don't know. But making it to where if someone went through our process and has funding recommended to go towards their project, utilizing that as a guide to prioritize who the Council recommends for City Support for applying for low income housing tax credit funding. Because we have had a year where we funded one low income housing tax project through HOME funding, but then another entity that didn't apply came in and got Council support while the other one didn't, and then it created this awkward situation where there wasn't a 7-0 vote on supporting affordable housing in our community. So this seems like a way that could help everyone get behind what we are going to fund for affordable housing rental-wise and leverage that to get additional funds in our community. Because usually those projects bring in about \$8 million per project or more.

MR. FLETCHER: Doesn't this just really slant this process towards one organization though

honestly? Isn't there really always one group that always comes here for funding, that's looking for tax-increment funding?

MR. COLE: So in the past three years we have had three different groups. We have had -- Jeff Smith's organization applied.

MR. FLETCHER: And he backed out.

MR. COLE: Actually --

MR. FLETCHER: Because he wasn't going to get any support.

MR. COLE: From the Council, yeah.

MR. FLETCHER: Yeah. Because the other --

MR. COLE: He had gotten funding.

MR. FLETCHER: -- organization went to the Council and got support. Right?

MR. COLE: Correct.

MR. FLETCHER: Okay.

MR. COLE: And then the Housing Authority has applied, and then Boone County Family Resources. So there's three.

MR. FLETCHER: And the Council put this language in?

MR. COLE: No. That's my recommended language.

MR. FLETCHER: It was yours?

MR. COLE: Because it seems like rather than just leaving it up to chance and figuring it out when we get there, it's a good way to align this body that makes recommendations to Council on affordable housing and how we support that in our community to kind of tie those together, in my opinion. Now, people can take it a different direction -- you all can and the Council can. That's just fine, but just having observed all that play out, this seemed like it makes more sense.

MR. FLETCHER: So you're introducing this tonight, but we don't have to vote on this. Correct?

MR. COLE: If you don't feel comfortable voting on it tonight, you don't have to. We're going to meet again in July. But if you do feel comfortable voting, you can.

MR. FLETCHER: So the wording under D, The Tenant Based Rental Assistance, was it also modified or has it always been like that?

MR. COLE: So we didn't fund Tenant Based Rental Assistance in our 2015 to 2019 plan, so we did the plan before. So it -- that was not in the Council policy resolution in the last five years. So that's new, but not new, I guess. It's added back in. The part in there that I think I mentioned up top was mentioning chronically homeless being prioritized and collaboration with the Functional Zero Task Force, just to make sure we are collaborating around those efforts. And then it outlines funding categories for if there is the event that we have non-CDBG or HOME funding. Whether or not it is just allocated straight to a priority or if there's funding just allocated. There is a process by which it can play into this funding process as well. And then also further defined some of your all's criteria for rating projects on the last page. I just spelled that out more -- how well it aligns with the City goals, policies, identifying the five-year

plan, alignment with your annual survey you do, and then alignment with the rating of proposals. So just calling that out that you guys do a lot of analysis on these decisions. So with that, I'll take comments or happy to make changes if there's recommendations.

MS. SUHLER: I appreciate all the work you have done on this in kind of spelling it out a lot more explicitly. I personally would like to reread it now in light of what you had said and maybe think on it a bit.

MR. COLE: That sounds great.

MR. WHATLEY: Yes. I agree. I would like to edit in more detail too.

MR. COLE: Did everybody get a chance to read it before tonight.

MR. WHATLEY: No. I didn't get past the first page; I hate to say. And it wasn't because it was --

MR. COLE: Yeah. It's a lot to synthesize --

MR. WHATLEY: Yeah, it is.

MR. COLE: -- even if you just read it beforehand, and some of the why behind it.

MS. SUHLER: Yeah. It makes a lot more sense.

MR. COLE: It makes good sense to take your time and make sure you're comfortable with it because it will be here for the next five years.

MS. SUHLER: Okay. Whether or not we will or not.

MR. COLE: I would say on the recommendations, the draft ones, that I put forward based on off your ratings, I did the funding percentages based off this policy resolution, so just so you're aware of that. So that's it for that.

MR. REGAN: All right. Do we want to table that till next month's meeting and we'll discuss that further -- pick up that discussion next month? And it looks like we'll move on to the funding discussions.

MR. COLE: Very good.

MR. REGAN: And we'll start with the CDBG funds first.

MR. COLE: Yeah. I think it's important for everyone to know these are draft recommendations that are not necessarily my personal recommendations. They are an interpretation of your ratings and then the funding percentages per category to kind of balance things out and make sure, you know, we don't spend more than what we have allocated. So this is just to get the conversation started. I would encourage you to move things around and change things you see fit, and I'll just help make sure we stay within some of those HUD percentages. We can't spend more than 15 percent on public services, which would be job training, CMCA, their technical assistance, and then our Fair Housing counseling. Those things combined can't be more than \$138,000, which is 15 percent of \$924,000. But other than that everything else we can move around as -- as you would see fit.

MR. FLETCHER: Forgive me, but I missed the last meeting, and I'm looking through your notes, your summary memo. I didn't see in there Columbia Housing Authority Stormwater Sewer Construction as a project.

MR. COLE: Right.

MR. FLETCHER: So what am I missing?

MR. COLE: So I put those together because it's all in the same project. So they have a project where they're going to be renovating more housing units, and one is for the units themselves, and then the other one is for some of the public main infrastructure that goes in there. So I viewed them as the same project.

MR. REGAN: And that was the Providence --

MR. COLE: Yeah.

MR. REGAN: -- Walkway?

MR. COLE: Different pieces of the same project. Yeah.

MR. FLETCHER: That's Providence Walkway. Yeah.

MR. COLE: The infrastructure improvements, I did look into that because we have more flexibility in HOME -- or more room. This is where if we had a different funding source that could help us maneuver funds and be a bit more strategic, but for public infrastructure, that can only be funded with CDBG funds. HOME can only fund like the service line from the main to the development, not the public infrastructure out in the street, but CDBG can.

MS. SUHLER: And could you reiterate what you said at the very beginning that constraints as far as percentages for those categories you mentioned?

MR. COLE: Yeah. Yeah. So -- so over the past two meetings you all formulated goals on how many people we would provide downpayment assistance to, how many -- how much we would allocate for Code Enforcement, how much we would allocate for sidewalks or stormwater or facilities -- so actual specific units, not percentages. And then with those I tied a cost looking back at what our cost per unit is and then estimated how much funding we would get over the next five years and based it off of this year's funding, and then -- and had a total. So I used that total to figure out a range -- a percent range and the midpoint tying directly back to that specific goal total by activity. And, yeah, I would say also I updated these from what I sent out to everybody. Ross sent me an update on the next slide, not on this one, on your HOME score for one of the projects and Michael Salanski submitted his today about 4:00.

MR. FLETCHER: Do you have them all --

MR. COLE: Uh-huh.

MR. FLETCHER: -- where you can show the entire rating, please?

MR. COLE: Sure. Yeah. It's kind of a hairy page, but is that what you're wanting to see -- what everybody ranked?

MR. FLETCHER: Not so much that, just simply, yeah, what the total score was.

MR. COLE: So it's out of 48.

MR. RITTER: It's in the column.

MR. COLE: Here's the rating in each column. So I have them at the top of every category the highest voted one. So this is CDBG that we're looking at, so the top-rated one was the Home Rehab Program and our Affordable Housing. The lowest Woodhaven's Home Rehab, but it was still a high if you look at it across --

MR. FLETCHER: You don't have a list where you can just show everything that's CDBG together so we can see everybody who applied for CDBG and how they ranked? That's what I was looking for.

MR. COLE: Instead of by funding category?

MR. FLETCHER: Right.

MR. COLE: I did it like this since you have categories that tie back to goals. I mean, I could do that, it would just be -- it would take me five minutes or so.

MR. RITTER: And as far as the classification goes, why was Woodhaven classified under housing? I know they are individual homes --

MR. COLE: Uh-huh.

MR. RITTER: But Great Circle was also, you know, at their facility, but it was apartments, basically for the residents to get in and out.

MR. COLE: Yeah. I took it that they did more than just live there for the Great Circle. Is it more than just a housing facility?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Great Circle?

MR. COLE: Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm with Woodhaven.

MR. COLE: Excuse me. Great Circle is not here.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: She -- I don't think she --

MR. COLE: You're Woodhaven.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah.

MR. COLE: I'm sorry. She is not here --

MR. WHATLEY: Great Circle wanted --

MR. COLE: -- but I took it that they had --

MR. WHATLEY: --the door lock --

MR. COLE: The door locks.

MR. WHATLEY: More -- they wanted more --

MR. REGAN: Yeah.

MR. WHATLEY: -- infrastructure.

MR. REGAN: They wanted badge entry.

MR. WHATLEY: Yeah.

MR. REGAN: Yeah. It was a lot more.

MR. RITTER: Oh, that was the security.

MR. WHATLEY: Yeah.

MR. REGAN: Yeah. So there was more about security and kind of making a safer place.

MR. WHATLEY: Right.

MR. COLE: And it felt like they did more than housing in their facility as well.

MR. REGAN: Yeah. Woodhaven was --

MR. RITTER: Uh-huh.

MR. WHATLEY: Whereas Woodhaven was wanting to support their overall program throughout the whole structure.

MR. REGAN: Uh-huh. The homes that they already --

MR. COLE: By rehabbing --

MR. FLETCHER: So how is Woodhaven different from Columbia Housing Authority? Are they in different groups? Because Columbia Housing Authority kind of builds all new buildings. So how does that come into revitalization and stabilization?

MR. COLE: So the Columbia Housing Authority's CDBG funding they applied for would go to the storm -- storm water and then the sewer mains out in the street and electrical infrastructure --

MR. FLETCHER: Not to the structures themselves because that's being covered under the other one?

MR. COLE: Right. They did apply for that under the HOME program, but that's how I separate that out. And we -- I intentionally separate the storm water out because we've experienced that in our own projects of how expensive it is to do storm water projects.

MR. FLETCHER: So if we give them funding, we need to make it contingent specifically on this or is that what they've requested for only?

MR. COLE: Contingent upon what? Getting the Low-Income Housing Tax Credits?

MR. RITTER: That they use it just for the --

MR. FLETCHER: That -- well, certainly that would be true, but it can only be used for storm water.

MR. COLE: So in their application -- yeah, it would have it go towards their storm water and sanitary sewer. Yeah.

MS. SUHLER: As we look at that, right now the allocation shows 45 percent for Affordable Housing --

MR. COLE: Uh-huh.

MS. SUHLER: -- which is about six percent about the mid-point you just discussed. So in terms of allocating funds, we could -- or could conceivably take money from that category and put it into other categories?

MR. COLE: Certainly.

MS. SUHLER: And be within our --

MR. COLE: Yeah. Yeah.

MS. SUHLER: Okay.

MR. COLE: And you all, by the resolution that is consistent with the last policy solution, if one year you have a really unique project that is going to go over in that category and pull under in another, you can do that if it's like we've got to have x amount of dollars to get this done, like Welcome Home's project would be an example where everybody wanted to get behind that project.



MS. SUHLER: Can we toss out some ideas?

MR. COLE: Yeah.

MS. SUHLER: Okay.

MR. COLE: It's your meeting. Yeah.

MS. SUHLER: Okay. I guess one of the projects that I thought was very worthwhile for the City was the Urban Ag project and -- or the Columbia Center for Urban Ag. And I noticed under the current allocation, it has no funding whatsoever, and I -- you know, I think, you know for several reasons, it's a very important project for -- the City, as I understand it, hasn't really funded the project. Funding has come from private donors from United Way, from the County, and yet it's kind of a gift to the City in terms of a lot of the stuff that it's doing -- will be doing for the City in terms of education for food that it provides to the Food Pantry. And, you know, I see it as a project that kind of keeps on giving, you know. If you fund that it is something that is going to be in existence for the next 20 years or whatever and will continue to contribute back to the City. And I guess I would just like to suggest that we do fund that project. I know \$250,000 is a lot, and, you know, I'm not sure we could allocate that much, but at least show that we do support their activities and their efforts.

MR. COLE: So I need to speak to that real quick. So I don't know if you recall at the last meeting, I talked about the issue of a conflict of interest. There was a perceived conflict. I have to report an apparent, an actual or perceived, and with that -- that organization does a lot of great work and everything is on the up and up with their application, but they have a City employee on their board. So I did follow up with the HUD Field Office, and we have had some back and forth. And they said, yeah, that would be a conflict. So they informed me not -- not to allocate funds.

MS. SUHLER: Is it a conflict something that could just be addressed with that board member resigning?

MR. COLE: I would want to get legal's opinion. And potentially they could resign and that could cure it. HUD may say they need to resign and then resubmit next year. I don't know.

MS. SUHLER: Uh-huh.

MR. COLE: I just know how they operate, and I could see that being a potential. But I -- if you want me to check again on that, I can get legal's opinion and recirculate it back to HUD.

MR. REGAN: So I was actually okay with the zero allocation on that level. A lot of it is the fact that they do have such good private funding, whereas these other organizations are really needing a lot more support from the CDBG funds. Also, the funds were going towards the main building that they were implementing, and I didn't see a whole lot of affect for the population that we are really trying to create a better environment for using CDBG funds, whereas the other organizations are really kind of helping a specific target audience and population of the City. So I have to -- that's the main reason why I didn't think that it was worth funding. It's a great thing that they are doing, and I can't wait for it to be done. I used to work over at the ARC, and I used to love -- and am glad that something is being done over in that area of the City, but I think the funds that we -- the minimum funds that we have would be better utilized

with other organizations on an outreach level.

MS. SUHLER: Just in terms of their funding, if you look at the financial statements of some of the organizations, Great Circle has a \$110 million in total assets; Woodhaven has \$10.4 million; Services for Independent \$1.9 million; and Center for Urban Ag is basically all private funding. So some of the other organizations have a lot of funding already. So, you know, I think the fact that it has been privately raised shows a lot of spirit and passion on their part.

MR. FLETCHER: Under Acquisition and Demolition, that minor amount of funding is going to be sufficient to maintain that program? Because that is a viable City program.

MR. COLE: You know, it might mean we just do one home.

MR. REGAN: All right. Do any other Commissioners have any comments on the current proposal?

MR. FLETCHER: And Woodhaven is acceptable with getting less than full funding or was it contingent on all or none?

MR. COLE: My understanding it would be -- they are here tonight if you want to ask them. That was my understanding. Because they are doing seven separate units, it might mean they do five.

MR. FLETCHER: All right.

MR. COLE: Or six, whatever.

MS. SUHLER: I guess if I could just raise a couple of other concerns and just toss these out. One would be with Parks and Rec. Again, there's a City Parks and -- Parks tax, and, you know, I think sometimes the CDBG pot is so small and limited that maybe, you know, since they have another pot that they can -- a much bigger pot, that they could get a lot of their funding from, maybe that \$20,000 could be better spent on some other project. And then second with Great Circle, again, it's a state-wide agency and has lots of resources when you look at its budget, \$9,000 is what they are putting into the project, I believe, if I have this correctly, out of the total amount that they want to spend. So I think it is, you know, a very minimal amount that they are putting in compared to what they are asking us for in CDBG funds. So I kind of wonder about that as well.

MR. WHATLEY: With Great Circle though -- I'm trying to remember. Aren't they county-based or tri-county based --

MR. COLE: Sure. More than regional, yeah.

MR. WHATLEY: -- by -- they're regional. So is this the organization -- this the first time they've applied for funds from the Commission?

MR. COLE: Since I have been here, this is the first time I've seen them.

MR. WHATLEY: And then they haven't applied for funds from -- from nobody else, if I remember correctly?

MR. COLE: I saw the City of Springfield funded their place in Springfield.

MR. WHATLEY: And I think the only thing that -- I mean, I -- I'm good with the allocation, but I guess, you know, the one concern I did have was the estimates on -- on the door repairs or the lock. I

didn't -- it seemed a little high to me, but I don't know if they actually had -- I didn't see a quote or a bid in the -- in the portal. But I -- but I'm good with the amount because of what they are trying to do and who they are trying to protect, and then the issues they've had in the past, you know, because of that.

MR. RITTER: But they're not a -- my thing was similar to Diane's is this -- it operates as a, you know, larger multi-region entity. And for a facility repair like that, it seems like it would be in their normal capital budget to do that type of thing.

MR. WHATLEY: Under the umbrella --

MR. RITTER: It doesn't seem -- yeah. I mean, it just should be --

MR. WHATLEY: Yeah.

MR. RITTER: -- in the facility's budget to do those types of upgrades, not come to a -- you know, come to a government organization for a grant for something like that. It just seemed like normal building maintenance that you would go through that process and budget for, and especially with their financials to shift \$100,000 out of their assets. I mean, it's a facility upgrade, so it goes into the appraisal of the asset anyways. So that's why I was a little -- it's just that bucket, that bucket down there is, you know, our narrowest -- that and the Workforce Development. It's tough to --

MR. WHATLEY: Uh-huh.

MR. RITTER: -- allocate the money on those just because of the small range.

MS. SUHLER: Yeah. I agree with you, Mitch, that --

MR. RITTER: But it, you know, once again, you know, we're going on, you know, kind of a group scoring, you know. I think everybody needs to weigh in on that since the score was the highest in that category.

MR. WHATLEY: I believe I scored, you know, lower on the Parks and Rec part. I -- I would think that they would have their own, you know, resources to fund their own project, you know, there on Worley. So I'm okay with moving that money around. But I also scored the Urban Agriculture a little lower too, so I kind of agree with you, Blaine, you know. They had the resources to raise the money to fund their project, I think. But with what we have to allocate the money too, it's kind of -- it's kind of tough.

MS. SUHLER: If there were a way to at least put some money into Urban Ag -- and I realize the conflict, and that needs to be -- but, you know, at least to show that the City is behind them and supports -- supports them. And knowing full well this is -- it's kind of like in the economic sense of capital -- something that reproduces, and this will reproduce for many, many years. So at least kind of giving some stamp or saying, yes, we do support what you're doing. But I know it's all contingent on --

MR. KASSMAN: Yeah. I mean, could we do some sort of resolution or something of support for them, but acknowledging that based on the conflict, we can't financially support it? I mean, does that help? I mean, I don't -- Blaine likes writing letters, I think.

MR. REGAN: So I guess my biggest thing with that is for the minimal amount that we put in there, would it worth the headache for them to go through eliminating a board member, approaching him saying we can only get a couple -- let's say we put \$50,000 in there. Is that going to be worth the -- losing

a person on their board for them? It's going to become a big cycle. It's going to become a bigger headache. Now, if we were funding for the full \$250,000, I would say probably a little -- it would be worth the headache. But if we're just talking about showing support by putting -- moving the \$20,000 or maybe taking a little bit from Great Circle, is then losing a board member that has helped raise \$4.1 million worth \$50,000 in the grand scheme of things? They've raised \$4.1 million with their current board. I would assume there probably has been some movement and is losing a board member worth just the minimal thing that's really not going to move anything in the grand scheme of things. To me, it does not seem like -- and we always have an issue where we get money pulled back towards us and we're scrambling in the fall -- well, where are we going to put this extra money that this organization couldn't use because of this issue? And we're kind of setting ourselves up for scrambling in the fall if we put any money towards the Urban Agriculture based on the conflict of interest. So, to me, it's best to kind of steer clear, especially with the potential of conflict of interest.

MR. COLE: From a staff point, it's nice to go right with what our field office says. They come and look at our books multiple times per year. It just shows that you're not going to keep pestering them and making them think what is going on when we give them a clear directive.

MR. FLETCHER: So looking at the Community Facility section, we're -- if we stay within our percentages -- our funding percentages that we've recommended, we can drop down to 8 percent. And if you look at the Great Circle in terms of the rest of the organizations just generally -- that's why I like to look at how they all stacked up against each other -- they were the eighth rated project. There are other projects above it that are in different categories that rated much higher. And one of the examples I already mentioned once is the Acquisition and Demolition program. So if there is some reservations about that organization Great Circle, I'm not saying don't fund them, but maybe we move some of that funding and reduce the -- reduce the amount under Community Facilities down to eight percent -- and we still meet our target and they are still the highest rated in that group and are funded appropriately. Maybe we move some of those funds up and get the Acquisition and Demolition program, which rated much higher, closer to its target and not have it cut so severely.

MR. COLE: So are you wanting to -- wanting to move a certain dollar amount?

MR. FLETCHER: I was just -- I was just putting that out there for the group discussion as a possible way to address the concerns about the funding level for Great Circle and we can still stay within our guidelines or percentages.

MR. REGAN: So it seems like the common thread I'm hearing is the \$20,000 for Parks and Rec should be moved, and we should move that to zero. I'll start with that low-hanging fruit. That right now is the lowest rated current funded project. Do we agree with that, to move that \$20,000? Let's go ahead and move that \$20,000 up to, I do believe, into Acquisition and Demolition just for now, so we can put that money somewhere. That puts us down to 10 percent on Community Facilities. The lowest being 8 percent, I think we should try to stay a little bit closer to the mid-point, so I think that \$90,000 would be acceptable to keep there to keep that at 10 percent for Community Facilities. Any thoughts or comments

on that?

MS. SUHLER: Is there any way that Woodhaven could be part of Community Facilities, only because I still have a concern about, you know, the funding for Great Circle, given their financial resources and --

MR. COLE: That's -- those are housing units that we're going to rehab and that's how I'll report it in our system. It's -- that's pretty clear cut, so, yeah, I don't think I can change that.

MR. FLETCHER: Well, I mean, we can still reduce Great Circle by whatever 2 percent would be.

MR. COLE: Sure. Do you want to raise it by --

MR. KASSMAN: Yeah. It would be 73,920.

MR. COLE: -- \$10,000 or 75?

MR. KASSMAN: Seventy-three, nine-twenty.

MR. FLETCHER: That would --

MR. COLE: Here, I'll do 75.

MR. FLETCHER: That would address or at least recognize the concerns some of the Commission members have raised.

MR. COLE: So where would you want to put that additional money? Maybe \$15,000?

MR. WHATLEY: You could move it up to the Vocational Training.

MR. REGAN: Yeah. I'd like to split that between Vocational Training and then Services for Independent Living. We can take both of those up to 100.

MR. COLE: So --

MR. REGAN: That leaves us another 1,000, I do believe.

MR. COLE: Yeah.

MR. FLETCHER: One of the things that occurred to me as I -- as I looked at these is, you know, thinking about building capacity or increase in capacity. And -- and to a great extent, all of these programs kind of maintain what we have.

MR. COLE: Uh-huh.

MR. FLETCHER: And so I think -- I don't know if there is a way to factor back into our rating sheets that -- that aspect. Because many times like new organizations come and we score them, but it's a new organization we're not familiar in, but they're -- in many of those cases, they're looking to add to the capacity that we currently have. We're not just rehabbing an existing building or upgrading an existing facility, but they're wanting to have new services or new facilities, something to that. Somehow, I think that that should get recognized and processed because we should always keep an eye towards increasing capacity for where we have opportunities to do so, you know, in a prudent manner -- is it an organization that's worth, you know, supporting. So if we could make a note of that for when we go look at our rating sheets next time to include that in the schedule because I'm sure I'll forget about it.

MR. COLE: So we could include that in the rating criteria if you want. Does it add more capacity to the community --

MR. FLETCHER: Yeah. Have that be an avenue.

MR. COLE: -- to serve a need?

MR. FLETCHER: Yeah. Have that be --

MR. COLE: Yeah. And that could be -- that could be -- that could apply towards an existing organization or a new one.

MR. FLETCHER: Absolutely.

MR. COLE: Like if they're starting something new.

MR. FLETCHER: Yes. Absolutely. Yeah. It doesn't have to be a new organization.

MR. COLE: Yeah. We should look at that on the rating sheet.

MR. FLETCHER: Somehow, to me, rehabbing a home or building a new one, if it's, you know, an existing, like low-income property -- housing property or increasing the value of that and the use of it, but if we're building new homes, that's adding to the capacity for the City. And somehow, I think that should have some weight in the evaluation process.

MS. SUHLER: One project that we didn't fund at all is the CMCA Technical Assistance to Business, and I realize it has a lower rating. But if we do have some money that, kind of, we're trying to shift around, again, I think that's a valuable service. And if there were some way we could kind of ensure that the monies that we allocate are earmarked for low-income business, specifically -- because my concern when I was rating it was that there was no way to know exactly how many low-income people were going to be served. But if we could allocate some funds with them earmarked to be -- make sure they go towards low-income people who are trying to start microbusinesses.

MR. COLE: So our funds would have to go towards that. So if you all did decide to move money there, our agreement would say that it has to go towards a business that's either owned by a low- to moderate-income person or 50 percent of its employees were low income before they got the new job because of starting this business. So it would have to be meet a criteria.

MS. SUHLER: Okay.

MR. COLE: And that is something that came out of our Consolidated Plan process. That's something to consider as that is something that we added on here due to all the public engagement we did.

MS. SUHLER: Okay.

**MR. FLETCHER: Well, I'd like to make a motion that we accept the funding as it is proposed on the sheet on the overhead with the changes that we made.**

MR. REGAN: All right. Well, we do have a motion. And do we have a second for that or we can table that motion and continue to discuss the funding.

MR. RITTER: Well, just back to the last point, 30-- roughly \$36,000 will bring the Economic and Workforce Development up to the 15 percent. Because that -- I mean, we talked about this going into the Consolidated Plan, and having sat through the -- you know, the focus groups, you know, those sessions, I mean, that is a huge opportunity. I mean, Columbia is at roughly 3 percent unemployment right now, but

you see signs everywhere for help wanted. I mean, there's just industries that need the help and that's a huge, huge area of opportunity. I have always felt that was something that this Commission has always tried to fully fund up to the highest level.

MS. SUHLER: And I think maybe with that revitalization of the Business Loop, you know, there's a lot that could be done with new businesses. And if I remember correctly, the last couple of years we have not funded microbusiness at all.

MR. COLE: Huh-uh. No.

MS. SUHLER: So I think it could be a ripe area for some funding.

MR. RITTER: Well, I like the confirmation. That was a little bit of my hesitation on the rating was just remembering that these funds had to be allocated to the low-income population and just, you know, the ability to administer that and make sure that that was tracked.

MS. SUHLER: So you are --

MR. RITTER: But it means pulling some back out of demolition. That's just kind of where we're at, you know. Do you tear down a house or --

MS. SUHLER: Or SIL.

MR. FLETCHER: So what you're talking about is the tenth lowest rated, you know, score in terms of all the rest of these. So when you force rank them against each other, to take money from a higher rated one and move it down to that, to me is -- kind of goes against collectively what we evaluated and scored them as.

MS. SUHLER: Well --

MR. REGAN: You are also skipping over two other projects that are higher rated that are currently at zero-level funding. So when you look at the overall ranking, you're bypassing Columbia Parks and Rec, the \$20,000 that we already removed from the proposal, and then also the Urban Agriculture Center. So when you look at the collective group rating, you're bypassing two when you sort them by ranking and we are reprioritizing what we already collectively as a group rated these presentations.

MR. RITTER: And also taking out of Park's -- taking out of the Park's recommendation doesn't eliminate the upgrade to the Park.

MR. COLE: Uh-huh.

MR. RITTER: That was a -- I think a \$75,000 project.

MR. COLE: Uh-huh.

MR. RITTER: This was just to enhance -- you know, maybe upgrade the lighting or upgrade a few of the access points, those types of things.

MR. WHATLEY: Yeah.

MR. RITTER: It wasn't -- the Park is getting upgraded, so that -- I mean, the point about the money already being set aside through the Park tax to do that, and yet we have funded some, but we always fund a very low amount.

MR. COLE: And your ratings are one tool to this decision.

MR. RITTER: Well, and a big portion of the rating -- well, think back to the ratings. It is prior experience, it's financial stability, it's -- you know, some of those big top areas, I always rank those high for the City because we know they are going to use the money. We know that it's going to be tracked. The new agencies kind of get the short end of the deal there because of that.

MR. POLANSKI: Can I say something?

MR. COLE: If the chairperson --

MR. POLANSKI: I know it's not a public hearing.

MR. REGAN: Yeah. You can -- if you can come over here and state your name and who you are with.

MR. COLE: You might want to make sure that other folks have an opportunity --

MR. REGAN: Uh-huh.

MR. COLE: -- if there is someone else that wants to --

MR. REGAN: Yeah.

MR. POLANSKI: Hi. I'm Billy Polanski. I'm the Director of the Columbia Center for Urban Agriculture. I'd like to state that we would appreciate the opportunity to reconcile that potential conflict of interest. I found out just now that the -- that Randy had spoken with HUD and we -- we really haven't had any opportunity to speak to that board member or -- or investigate it further of what -- what the options are. And I feel like that shouldn't really have a bearing on the value of the project we've proposed. That's -- that's an administrative thing that really has -- has no bearing on -- on the impact the project would make. So I just -- I just wanted to say that because it's -- it kind of sounded like, well, maybe there's this -- this conflict, and that -- so that means that let's -- it would just be easier if we -- if we kind of just skipped over this.

MR. COLE: I'm okay with doing something that is not easy. It's just it was a perceived conflict, and they said, yes, this is a perceived conflict and it is a problem. So -- but I'm happy to follow up more if you would like.

MR. POLANSKI: Right. We -- I mean, we'd like an opportunity to remedy that. That board member joined our board two weeks before we submitted this application. So, yeah, we -- we were sort of unaware that this was an issue until the day of our last presentation, and we got this new information tonight. So that's all I wanted to say is we -- we'd like the opportunity to -- for that not to be a factor in determining the value of the project.

MS. SUHLER: Maybe to share an anecdotal experience, I was on the -- I'm on the Human Services Commission and was also on the board for CATCH (ph.) Room at the Inn folks, and when we got ready to have to allocate funds for them, I was -- I resigned from the CATCH board and, you know, we were able to make that allocation then. So I think maybe there's some precedent, perhaps not with HUD, but with other entities.

MR. COLE: I can -- I'd be happy to investigate further, and it actually helps that the entity



requests it as well.

MS. SUHLER: Could we tentatively make an allocation for Urban Ag with the caveat that if there is a problem, then we would -- we would change some things?

MR. COLE: Certainly. We're going to have another meeting in July, which is not typical, but that presents another opportunity. So you could have a meeting in July, and then we could make sure things are solved before the August budget hearing at Council.

MR. FLETCHER: I mean, but the bottom line is, they were the twelfth-lowest scored project of fourteen. And so, how can we provide any funding to that. And, I mean, I don't know that that was -- we just found out that information too. It had no bearing on my rating of that program. I mean, I just don't see how we can give money to something that's -- that's rated that low while following our process and be true to that process.

MR. REGAN: I am in agreement with Mr. Fletcher here with our -- we do -- we all have our personal beliefs. Me, personally, I should -- I thought Great Circle was one that was underfunded, even on the proposal. We have already taken 16 -- or 1,400 since then, and I kind of accepted that and moved on to other funding out of respect of the rest of the Commission. And we keep circling back to things we have already moved past, so I'll leave you with that thought. Again, even disregarding the conflict of interest issue, I just did not see the impact as the organizations would have with the CDBG funding in general. So that was my initial belief, and I'm sure that my lower rating of that proposal probably was below what the average was. Obviously, some of us are going to feel stronger about some of these organizations than others. The rating is -- to me, meaning half of us were above that and half of us were below that. So we're all going to have our own personal feelings towards these. I just want to remind the Commission that we are trying to work collectively, and these ratings are reflective of all of our ratings. And hearing that we did have one member speak from the public, if any other organization would like to have a minute or two to say something to the Commission, well, you can step on up to the mic. We'll give you a minute or two to kind of -- for you to give us a thought.

MR. PREIS: I appreciate that very much. My name is Darin Preis; I'm the executive director of Central Missouri Community Action. I really have a deep respect for the work that you are doing here. The -- I know most of the people in the room, and everybody is doing great work, so you're making decisions between good and good. But I did want to comment just very briefly as to our proposal with the Women's Business Center and the work that we are hoping to do with helping low-income entrepreneurs start businesses. I do want to point out that we -- we really do track every single participant in our program, so we know exactly what their income is. And this funding would specifically focus on the low-income population. Obviously, we're not going to get the \$75,000 we requested, but any funding that we would get, you could consider that sort of like a scholarship. We would apply that to supporting specific low-income populations. And, you know, as is related to the weighting of the scores for new capacity in our community, I think it is important to note that what we are talking about is new businesses. This isn't just supporting existing businesses; this is helping new businesses start up on the Loop and working with

the great work that Carrie Gardner has done out at the Parkade Center. So I think there is a lot of opportunity here to get, you know, pretty tremendous impact out of whatever dollars you would choose to put into that category. Thank you.

MR. REGAN: Thank you. Anyone else from the public like to speak?

MR. PALMER: I would like to echo Darin's comments about your hard work and effort. Oh, sorry. Mark Palmer, CEO of Woodhaven. I would like to echo Darin's comments about your hard work and effort to work on this project. There were just a couple of questions during the discussion about would Woodhaven be able to adjust into the different homes and the different projects because of the difference in the requested versus the amount of recommended, and that will not be an issue for this organization because we have so many properties that we're able to do that. So, in general, yes, that is not going to be an issue, but I'd be happy to -- if you had any additional questions, I would be happy to address those at this time.

MR. REGAN: Thank you.

MS. SUHLER: I don't mean to beat a dead horse, but I would like to go back to the Urban Ag and that Community Facilities. If I remember correctly, the last couple of years that has always been a very low category in terms of our funding. I don't think we ever even met the -- the -- even the minimum amount.

MR. COLE: I think last year we did.

MS. SUHLER: Did we?

MR. COLE: Yeah.

MS. SUHLER: And if -- you know, I think at least some funding would be good. And also with the CMCA, the Business -- I think we need to kind of break out of our old. It seems like we fund the same projects every year, which I think that they are very worthwhile projects, but we have the opportunity to fund some different projects and maybe move our funding impact in a different direction, certainly with the assistance to business -- technical assistance to businesses and the Urban Ag. And even if they were scored lower, I think if they still fit the framework for what our mission is trying to achieve, I -- because I think a lot of time we -- if you're -- when I go through and I rate things, it's -- you know, I flip a coin, you know. Is it -- you know, is it a 45 or is it a 42 or is it -- you know, it's not totally objective, and it's certainly not a scientific process at all.

MR. REGAN: So I guess let's focus on the Urban Agriculture. Does anyone else on the Commission feel that we should be putting any funding towards that? Right now, we have heard from one Commissioner that is in support of putting -- moving funding from a current funded organization back to the Urban Agriculture. If there is any other Commissioners that feel that we should, we can take up that discussion. If not, at this point I think we need to move on from that and leave that as is. All right. So at this moment I do believe we should leave it as is with no funding. We can start -- I do believe the next one we kind of were talking about is CMCA. So let's focus on that one right now. So we're going organization by organization. So going back up to there, are there any other thoughts?

MR. RITTER: What do we have? We took the 20 from the Parks?

MR. REGAN: Yeah. So what we've done so far, we took the 20 from the Parks and we took 14 from Great Circle. We put, I do believe, 20,000 towards Acquisition and Demolition, and then we took Vocational Training up to 100- and then we took SIL -- Services for Independent Living up to 100-. So we do have some wiggle room. I kind of pulled back mentally in my head -- we can easily find 10,000 to 20,000. We took 5,000 back from Services for Independent Living, and Vocational Training, and that gives us 10,000 wiggle room. We've also put 20,000 more towards Acquisition. If we pulled another 10 grand from that, we would have about 20 grand -- we could kind of have some wiggle room with that if you were -- if the Commission was feeling very strongly towards CMCA, we could move those funds around that way. I still have not heard a whole lot of support from multiple Commissioners on that, so I am comfortable at this moment leaving our recommendations as is. But again, we are working together to make sure this is a plan that works for all of us.

MR. FLETCHER: Again, maybe I'm too much of a numbers guy, but -- but that rated lower than Urban Agriculture that we just said didn't merit funding -- CMCA, how can we justify that given our previous discussion?

MR. RITTER: But if the City came into this meeting willing -- that 25,000 on demo, I would rather see three businesses start up than one house get torn down. I mean, the cost of demolishing these houses is getting ridiculous for the price of the lots that you end up with.

MR. FLETCHER: Well --

MR. RITTER: I mean, I've said that for the last like three or four meetings, and --

MR. FLETCHER: Well, I mean --

MR. RITTER: -- the City keeps saying the demolition costs are what they are. And it's -- the ROI on that just seems pointless.

MR. FLETCHER: That is certainly a fair argument. And from my perspective, if we want to reallocate that to one of the other higher-rated projects that are also available, then we should do that. But to arbitrarily give it to one that scored much, much lower, I don't -- I don't understand that.

MR. RITTER: I guess I'm like Diane was with the -- with the Center for Urban Agriculture. I would like to see the Economic and Work Force be at the full 15 percent. That's just --

MR. FLETCHER: And I -- I --

MR. COLE: Well, for the demo program, we also utilize that to support Habitat, Job Point and CMCA.

MR. FLETCHER: Yeah.

MR. COLE: And the housing market is what it is. The cost of land just keeps going up.

MR. RITTER: Uh-huh.

MR. FLETCHER: And to Diane's point, I feel the same sense of frustration that we have a tendency to fund some of the same things over and over. And I would like to see us be an inclusive and open organization that gives everybody a fair opportunity to bring their projects here and feel like they

have an open opportunity to get funding, and we have to do that as an organization and as a Commission. So I agree with that, but how to change that, I don't know.

MR. RITTER: I mean, I'd even be in favor of taking the Great Circle money down even further. I mean, I know it rated high and we've tried to stick to that in years past, but knowing the financial position of the organization compared to the others and that it's --

MR. REGAN: Also, we're talking about funding --

MR. RITTER: -- you know, not just a --

MR. REGAN: -- new organizations that are presenting, and this is the first time --

MR. RITTER: Yeah.

MR. REGAN: -- that Great Circle has ever come to us.

MR. FLETCHER: Right. So that is --

MR. REGAN: And now to fund ones that -- other new ones, we're taking less [sic] from Great Circle, which we have already personally -- we're already down at the 8 percent on Community Facilities, which I think is a little low, but --

MR. FLETCHER: We are providing funding to two new organizations --

MR. REGAN: Uh-huh.

MR. FLETCHER: -- which are Woodhaven and Great Circle, so that's --

MR. REGAN: And if I'm not mistaken, we have supported CMCA in the past, just different --

MR. FLETCHER: Absolutely.

MR. REGAN: -- ventures, not this specific strategy.

MR. WHATLEY: Now if I remember correctly, with CMCA, was the majority of the money -- and you can answer this -- but was it more for project personnel more so than scholarships to help potential businesses or --

MR. KASSMON: Before -- I'm going to need you at the mic, sir.

MR. WHATLEY: You know, I guess that the money was going towards serving the need of the community more so then -- then the staff. I mean, I guess I would be more in favor of that versus majority of the money was going towards personnel, if I remember correctly. Am I mistaken?

MR. RITTER: Yeah. A chunk of it was.

MR. PREIS: That's correct.

MR. WHATLEY: So that was my thoughts with the CMCA.

MR. PREIS: Do you want me to respond to that?

MR. REGAN: Yeah. And if you would like to answer that question for us.

MR. PREIS: So I have to speak on behalf of my nonprofit friends and point out that it takes money to run these programs --

MR. WHATLEY: Right.

MR. PREIS: -- and it takes staff to run the programs. That said, clearly if, you know, we're talking 20,000 for this project, that's not going to fund a position. So what we would do with that is really,

you know, take our existing staff and focus on the Parkade area and the Loop area. And so I said we could equate it to scholarships because that's essentially how we would end up using it. It wouldn't be paying for more overhead.

MR. WHATLEY: Okay. Thank you. That helps me out.

MS. JEFFERSON: Can I speak? Have you closed everything out to the public?

MR. REGAN: Yeah. You can -- yeah. If you would like to come on up and introduce yourself.

MS. JEFFERSON: My name is Barbara Jefferson. I'm -- I'm looking at this and under the Neighborhood and Stabilization part -- that 10 to 30 percent, I just don't -- is this the organization that helps to rehab homes, like --

MR. KASMANN: Uh-huh.

MS. JEFFERSON: -- the owner's homes, I mean?

MR. KASMANN: Yeah.

MS. JEFFERSON: So where -- where does that fall at --

MR. COLE: That would be at the very top here, the Home Rehab.

MR. RITTER: Our biggest bucket of money.

MS. JEFFERSON: Okay. So that's not just for the new affordable homes and --

MR. COLE: No.

MR. REGAN: No.

MS. JEFFERSON: It's for rehab --

MR. REGAN: Uh-huh.

MS. JEFFERSON: -- of homeowners to get loans from? Is that going to be like a loan program?

MR. COLE: Correct.

MR. RITTER: It can be a loan or it can be forgiven, zero percent loan.

MS. JEFFERSON: Okay. So my -- my concern on that is I don't know who adjusts the sliding scales for those in a -- you know, you've got to make a certain amount a year to qualify to get something done to your house, but with the cost of living going up and the cost of having projects done, a lot of times the cutoff amount for, let's say, two people -- a two-person home or even a one-person home, you can't fit in that. So I don't know where -- I don't know where that can be adjusted at in the Home Rehab Program. And just as a resident here -- a citizen, you know, here, it -- isn't there a Park and Recreation funds already or does it already always come out of this type of program?

MR. RITTER: There's a tax --

MR. KASMANN: Yeah. There's a --

MS. JEFFERSON: So I'm just a little -- yeah, I don't understand why that is even in here. I mean, I understand you all was saying that, you know, you're doing some of the things like you've been doing in the past, but I also hear some people say that you might want to change some things around and start doing some things differently. Columbia is changing, so maybe you do need to look at doing things differently. Thank you.

MR. REGAN: Thank you.

**MR. FLETCHER: I make a motion that we accept the funding as noted on the sheet above.**

MR. REGAN: All right. We have a motion. Is there a second?

MR. FLETCHER: All right. So let's go to rock, paper, scissors.

MR. REGAN: All right. Let's start at the very top. We'll work our way down. It seems like we're pretty happy with the Affordable Housing section; is that correct? Are there any comments on the Affordable Housing Section as is?

MR. RITTER: The -- SIL started --

MR. REGAN: If we need to remove funding later, we can. We're just -- are we content with the way it looks at the moment up on the screen? If everyone -- if no one has any comments on that, we'll move down to the next one. We'll go to the Economic and Workforce Development. There's two programs, Vocational Training and CMCA, which I do believe seems to be a little bit of the hang up at the moment.

MS. SUHLER: I suggest we put \$20,000 into CMCA.

MR. REGAN: All right. And where would you propose we remove that \$20,000?

MS. SUHLER: Maybe from the top category, Services for Independent Living, we bumped that up when we were moving some other funds around, and so maybe some from SIL.

MR. REGAN: Okay. Does anyone else feel that we should be moving toward CMCA? Let's start there.

MR. WHATLEY: I do. So based on, you know, the previous answer to my question --

MR. REGAN: Uh-huh.

MR. WHATLEY: -- I am now good with moving some money into CMCA. And I recommend we take, let's see, SIL from \$100,000 down to \$95,000; we take Vocational Training from \$100,000 to \$95,000; and then we take \$10,000 out of the Acquisition and Demolition and move all that into CMCA.

MR. REGAN: All right. Any other comments on the Vocational Training, CMCA or anything on that move? Mr. Fletcher, do you have any comments on that?

MR. FLETCHER: No comments.

MR. REGAN: Okay. So I know we have Paul and Diane that were wanting CMCA funding, Mitch and Ross, where do you guys stand on that?

MR. RITTER: I'm happy the number is going up. There is so many competitive programs this year.

MR. WHATLEY: Yeah.

MR. RITTER: And they are all so highly scored. It's the situation we are in every year, so I'm glad to see some money in their loan.

MR. KASMANN: Yeah. I support it too.

MR. REGAN: Okay. All right. We'll leave that section alone. We'll go back down to the Neighborhood Revitalization and Stabilization section. I do believe there were some concerns on the

Acquisition and Demolition program. We have since removed \$10,000 from that. Are there any other thoughts on if we need to remove any more money from that or are we content with that being at the \$35,000?

MR. WHATLEY: I'm good now.

MR. REGAN: Okay. And then we will go down to Community Facilities. At this moment it is at the minimum 8 percent. That's going towards Great Circle. Are there any thoughts on that or anything on that section? All right. We have went from top to bottom. Any other discussions on the CDBG recommendations that are present? All right. Well, if we have no further discussions, if we can get a motion to pass this recommendation?

**MR. KASMANN: So moved.**

MR. REGAN: And if we can get a second?

**MR. WHATLEY: I'll second.**

MR. REGAN: All right. All in favor of passing the present recommendations for fiscal year 2020 CDBG funding, say aye. All opposed. All right.

**(Voting yes: Mr. Regan, Mr. Fletcher, Mr. Whatley, Mr. Ritter, Mr. Kasmann. Voting no: Ms. Suhler.) Motion passes 5-1.**

MR. REGAN: All right. Ayes have it. We will pass the recommendations as present [sic]. All right. Thank you for that. And now on to our next spreadsheet. We'll move on to the 2020 HOME recommendations. Let's dive in.

MR. COLE: All right. So we all did talk internally today. We had a change -- we relooked at when Ross submitted his scores of Ash Street Development -- the Creative Commons and felt -- we looked at it more closely and we would recommend not funding that project. It requests two units. That would be \$32,000 unit in subsidy. We felt like the price was really high. I mean, we've been seeing what -- what subsidies needed for like the last five years, and it is much more than that per home. Sixty-four is almost what it would be per one home, honestly. And then just seeing what it rated, you all rated it really low, so Gary, in particular, we had a discussion about it and recommended moving that back up to the Home Ownership Assistance Program. I initially had it down there because you all had just added more to it at your last meeting with that extra bit of funds we had from the Housing Authority's Providence Walkway project, so that was my initial thought. But then just looking at the ratings more closely, it just -- 31-, that seemed pretty low, that we shouldn't -- that we should just fund up to the Homeowner Assistance program. Right now, Gary has 15 names on the board of ones he is going to close on soon and we just -- we did 40, which is the highest year we ever had last year, and we are on track to at least hit and maybe surpass it. So it seems like we can just keep getting buyers at this point. So that's that, but if you guys want to change that up, we'll definitely support whatever you do.

MR. KASMANN: I just want to -- I adjusted my score because the presentation was -- seemed less cohesive than the materials that were submitted before that presentation. So that was my reason for changing my score. And the timeline just didn't seem to make sense.

MR. COLE: We had similar comments.

MR. KASMANN: Yeah.

MR. COLE: So I had -- our CHDO is funded at 95-, the Housing Authority funded at 200,000. Tenant Based Rental Assistance funded at 60-. They did request 100- to do vouchers, 10- for Admin. Home is always 10 percent Admin as the requirement, but per our previous policy resolution and the draft one I put before you tonight, I have only Admin funds going to our City staff as every year, we're, you know, tight on our own Admin budget. So it just -- I don't feel comfortable taking money out of our Admin budget to give to the Housing Authority knowing that they still need the support to run that program, but, you know, we need support to run our programs as well. So that's -- that's something hanging out there that we would need to work out with the Housing Authority.

MR. RITTER: So on the CHDO set asides, 32- -- 32- per home on the Creative Commons was too much because of the ultimate value of those homes?

MR. COLE: Yeah.

MR. RITTER: Whereas the 95- I believe we can get about three --

MR. COLE: Probably two.

MR. RITTER: Oh, just two out of that?

MR. COLE: Yeah. Yeah.

MS. SUHLER: On the Tenant Based Rental Assistance, so any desire to move that funding back a little closer to the requested amount, especially in light of the Fair Housing Task Force, the Homeless Assistance, and the importance of it was really rated high.

MR. KASMANN: I would support that.

MR. REGAN: Uh-huh.

MS. SUHLER: And maybe moving that closer.

MR. COLE: What would you want to move it to?

MS. SUHLER: I don't know where we would take funds or -

MR. REGAN: So from the original recommendation, we went from 103- to 167- on the Home Ownership Assistance, which is a great organization or great program in and of itself. But we did add to it from the original. I think that was where you moved all that funds from.

MR. COLE: Uh-huh.

MR. REGAN: So if we wanted to split the original 64,000 from Creative Common between Home Ownership Assistance and Tenant Based, I think that would be a good happy meeting.

MR. WHATLEY: I think so too.

MS. SUHLER: it sounds good.

MR. COLE: There we go. Will that work?

MR. REGAN: Are there any other comments on the HOME funding recommendations?

MR. RITTER: Is it an issue that the top section is under the guideline? You need about another 3,000.



MR. COLE: Yeah.

MR. REGAN: Got you.

MR. COLE: Does that get what you want?

MR. WHATLEY: It keeps us in line.

MR. REGAN: Hit our ranges and everything?

MR. COLE: Uh-huh.

MR. REGAN: Any other comments from the Commission?

**MR. KASMANN: Move to approve the Fiscal Year 2020 HOME recommendations.**

MR. REGAN: All right. We have a motion. Do we have a second?

**MR. RITTER: Second.**

MR. REGAN: All right. All in favor of passing the current recommendation for Fiscal Year 2020 HOME funding, say aye. Opposed?

**(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)**

MR. REGAN: All right. We will pass those recommendations for the 2020 HOME fundings. All right. And that is -- it looks like we have one other thing under new business -- the Joint CDC and Columbia Community Land Trust Meeting.

MR. COLE: Yeah. So we have a Community Land Trust Meeting scheduled on July 9th. We're going to talk about the North 8th Street project. So we've been talking to our CHDOs. I think it would be really beneficial for both boards to meet at the same time because the way we have -- we have ten homes over there, six of them are going to be done by CHDOs and four of them are going to be done by the Community Land Trust contracting with a private contractor. So I think it would be good if both of these groups were talking together when they make decisions because otherwise you've got one entity making decisions on what proposals get funded and has their own set of views, and then the other entity is going to be the steward of the land and procuring a developer to develop homes and thinking through their own lenses. So I think it would just be really beneficial if both groups came together on that issue and looked at the plans that we have internally for how we want to roll that out and utilize our CHDOs and the Community Land Trust. I think it would help everybody be on the same page.

MR. WHATLEY: When?

MR. COLE: July 9th in 1B at 6:30.

MR. REGAN: And how long is that meeting -- those meetings supposed to go?

MR. COLE: So those meetings can go an hour and a half to two hours. But I would think we would put this item on the front end and have you all first -- or everybody talk together first for, you know, 30 minutes, an hour, whatever it takes. I would think no more than an hour. And then once that item is done, they can move on to their normal business approving their monthly financial report, you know, that type of thing. It would be really helpful for us. I know it's an extra meeting than we normally do. I just think -- I think you guys would want to be there.

MR. FLETCHER: We don't have a meeting in July?

MR. COLE: Not -- we normally don't have a meeting in July or August. But I think this will set you up for a more efficient meeting in September and October when we look at CHDO proposals.

MR. REGAN: Okay.

MR. COLE: I think you've got --

MR. REGAN: Yeah. Do you have a comment?

MR. TEDDY: Yeah. Randy, did you say Room B?

MR. COLE: 1B.

MR. TEDDY: Oh, 1B. Right next door?

MR. COLE: Yeah.

MR. TEDDY: Yeah. That's a pretty large group -- the two Boards. That's not a large space. Do you think A and B?

MS. CLARK: I spoke to Dalton and let him know the headcount.

MR. TEDDY: So that B will fit?

MS. CLARK: He said it will fit. Yes.

MR. TEDDY: Okay.

MR. REGAN: I will be tentative. I have a 7:30 hard meeting that I have to be at on July 9, but I should be able to be there if it is the first --

MR. COLE: All right.

MR. REGAN: -- topic. I just might have to sneak out a little bit towards the end -- tail end of the conversation.

MR. COLE: Sounds good.

MR. REGAN: And Darcie is going to send out a calendar invite for that?

MR. COLE: Yeah.

MR. REGAN: Perfect. Thank you.

MS. CLARK: Yeah. Just make sure if you know you're going to be there or not, to let me know just in case of a quorum. I've got you Ross.

MR. COLE: That's it for that.

MR. REGAN: All right. That is it for new business. I'll go on and move on to general comments by the public, members and staff.

## **VI.) GENERAL COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, MEMBERS AND STAFF**

MR. REGAN: I'll kind of start and say thank you to the Commission for being civil. We had some disagreements today. It's always the toughest meeting of the year. I thank you all for your input and the respect everyone showed each other. Obviously, it is not easy when we have such little funding and many great organizations that request money. So thank you all for your patience and your cooperation and discussion. Are there any other comments by -- from the Commission, public, staff?

MR. COLE: I thank you did a great job.

MR. REGAN: All right.

MR. WHATLEY: You know, I think next year we are going to see more -- more action or more proposals from our Fair Housing Task Force. You know, this year was kind of a brainstorming mission and there is a plan in place. And, you know, based on, you know, my interaction with some of the task force members, we're going to see some -- some new different proposals next year.

MR. FLETCHER: Under -- under -- they would be under HOME funding?

MR. WHATLEY: It will probably be under -- well, probably a combination both of HOME and CDBG. So, anyway, just my food for thought.

MR. REGAN: All right. Any other comments?

MS. ANDERSON: I just wanted to say thanks -- do I need to --okay. Madison from Services for Independent Living. I just want to say thanks for your continued support. I know you have supported us across many years, and you're helping us help a lot of low-income seniors and people with disabilities in the community. So I just wanted to say thanks.

MR. REGAN: All right. Any other comments? All right.

#### **VII.) NEXT MEETING DATE**

MR. REGAN: The next meeting we will have a tentative meeting with Community Land Trust meeting on July 9th at 6:30 next door in Room 1B. Next meeting will be posted later for us. I do believe this concludes our cycle.

#### **VIII.) ADJOURNMENT**

MR. REGAN: And then next up is adjournment. Can we get a motion to adjourn?

**MR. WHATLEY: So moved.**

MR. REGAN: All right. And a second?

**MR. FLETCHER: I'll second that.**

MR. REGAN: All right. All in favor of adjournment say aye. Opposed.

**(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)**

MR. REGAN: All right. This meeting is adjourned.

(The meeting adjourned at 8:25 p.m.)

(Off the record.)