



City of Columbia, Missouri

Meeting Minutes

Columbia Community Development Commission

Wednesday, November 8, 2017

7:00 PM

Regular Meeting

Room 1A, City Hall, 701

E. Broadway, Columbia

I. CALL TO ORDER

MR. REGAN: All right. Well, then it's 7:01, and I would like to call to order this November 8th meeting of the Community Development Commission.

Present: 6 - Pamela Forbes, Mitchell Ritter, Blaine Regan, Paul Whatley, Michael Salanski and Diane Suhler

Absent: 3 - Michael Fletcher, Michelle Lambert and Cookie McCray

II. INTRODUCTIONS

MR. REGAN: We'll start with introductions. Diane, we'll start down with you.

MS. SUHLER: All right. Diane Suhler, and I'm the Human Res-- Human Services Commission Representative.

MR. RITTER: Mitch Ritter, Ward 2.

MR. WHATLEY: Paul Whatley, Member-at-Large.

MS. FORBES: Pam Forbes, Ward 1.

MR. COLE: Randy Cole, City Staff. MR. REGAN: Blaine Regan, 6th Ward.

MR. SALANSKI: Michael Salanski, 5th Ward.

MR. AMELUNKE: Jacob Amelunke, City Staff.

MR. ANSPACH: Gary Anspach, City Staff.

MR. REGAN: All right.

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MR. REGAN: And then we'll go ahead and move down to the approval of the agenda. Do we have any comments or changes we want to make? Okay. If not, if we can get a motion to approve it?

MR. REGAN: All right.

MR. WHATLEY: I motion that we approve tonight's agenda.

MR. RITTER: I'll second that.

MR. REGAN: All right. All in favor? All opposed?
(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MR. REGAN: Now we move on to the approval of minutes from last month's meeting. Any comments on those minutes? All right. And then if someone would like to motion to approve those minutes?

MR. RITTER: So moved.

MR. WHATLEY: Second.

MR. REGAN: All right. All in favor? All opposed? (Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

V. NEW BUSINESS

Staff Memo

Attachments: [CDC Memo 11-8-17](#)

Discussed throughout the course of the meeting.

FY 2019 Community Development Needs Survey

Attachments: [Community Development Needs Survey 2018 - Google Forms](#)

MR. REGAN: Now we'll move on to new business. I guess we're going to turn this over to Randy with the staff memo.

MR. COLE: All right. I'll just run through the two items we have. Not a lot tonight, but one of them is pretty important and was a bit of a surprise to me. So I'll handle the easy one first.

So every year, we do a Community Development Needs Survey. I think most of you were here last year when we did it. I don't know if you were here, Diane.

MS. SUHLER: No, I wasn't.

MR. COLE: It's -- it was included with the materials. It's a short survey that goes -- basically tests the temperature of the public on all the 16 goals in our Consolidated Plan to see if people -- you know, how they

are feeling about different things we are doing. It helps inform our decision process every year. So whether they think we need to be investing more in sidewalks or affordable housing or job training, it kind of helps everybody with that regard figure out -- utilize the public opinion to form their decision.

That's just one of the pieces; we use several, including the strength of the proposals. So last year, we had 362 responses received, which was the highest we've had on record, so that was good. I would like to thank Paul for helping out a lot with that. I know you hit a couple of big email lists, so we had a lot of responses from the Fourth Ward. So -- but that really pushed our numbers up, so thank you.

So this year it would be great as well if once we push the survey out, if we could have Commissioners help send that out to your circles because really every year I've been here, we've increased our survey responses. We've never had a year where we went backwards, so we've got to shoot for 400 this year would be the goal.

So we basically have survey questions on the five different areas we fund. If it's Economic Development, Affordable Housing, what we call Neighborhood Needs -- or that's our -- where our infrastructure projects are, and then Fair Housing and Community Facilities. So we'll be utilizing service learning students and then utilizing all of our partners, using our neighborhood Listserv -- our CDBG Listserv, kind of all the different outlets we've used.

We get this survey out into like the Housing Authority and Centro Latino and other places that -- that serve a large lower income population, but then we push it out to other community partners like the Board of Realtors, Apartment Association, Chamber, whomever -- everybody. So we'll do that again this year. So basically, we just need your all's approval to move forward with the survey this year. And if you had any recommended changes --

MR. SALANSKI: Randy?

MR. COLE: Yeah?

MR. SALANSKI: Quick question. Is there -- when we're ready to forward out the surveys to our circles, as you refer to it --

MR. COLE: Uh-huh.

MR. SALANSKI: Is there anything in which we need to say a particular way upon sending out the survey?

MR. COLE: No. I'll -- I'll put something in the body of the email that kind of explains everything and then you can just forward that.

MR. SALANSKI: Okay.

MR. COLE: I can include the -- kind of the summary of what it is, why we do it and the impact of it, if that would help you.

MR. SALANSKI: Okay.

MR. COLE: Yeah.

MR. WHATLEY: I kind of just took the information off the City website about the survey and kind of just made it my own.

MR. COLE: And that's --

MR. WHATLEY: My own voice and then --

MR. COLE: It's actually embedded in the survey too.

MR. WHATLEY: Yeah.

MR. SALANSKI: Okay.

MR. WHATLEY: And then I kind of use that as the header and --

MR. SALANSKI: Okay. So there's no -- it sounds like then there's no problem with tailoring the message --

MR. COLE: No. No.

MR. SALANSKI: -- just -- okay.

MR. WHATLEY: Yeah. I just kind of said, you know, my name is Paul Whatley, and I'm your Ward 4 representative for this Commission and I'd love your input, and here's why.

MR. SALANSKI: Okay.

MR. COLE: Yeah. Take it and run with it. So we'll get the survey out. We usually get it out mid-December to early January. We want to have it out before the January public hearing because that's when we have public comment or we hold the hearing when people can come in and give comments about what they feel they should have funded in the next year. What the priority needs are that we should be focused on. Any kind of comments of what we have done in the past, but then it's nice to also highlight the survey at that meeting as well. So if you all are right with doing -- moving forward with the survey, I just need to change the dates. The ones that I included in the memo were the -- it was 2018 survey that we did in 2017, if that makes sense. It's a survey planning for the year that we're going to do our funding cycle on.

MR. WHATLEY: Yeah. It does talk about the two different amounts and --

MR. COLE: So our next year or when I update it, it will say 2019 because we'll be planning for the 2019 annual action plan because we're always planning about a year and a half out. So we're collecting information for how we want to spend our 2019 funds.

MR. RITTER: Is there a way to put a link to maybe organizations that got funded so --

MR. COLE: Sure. We could do that.

MR. RITTER: We may just -- I mean, because it does go out electronically to a lot of neighborhood associations and a lot of not for profits to fill out, so it might be good for them to see who is actually getting the money this year.

MR. COLE: Yeah. We can have a link directly to the previous awards.

MR. RITTER: Uh-huh.

MR. COLE: And I think we keep two years back on there, so --

MR. RITTER: Yeah.

MR. COLE: Sure. That would be nice to --

MS. SUHLER: Is the only way to access the survey through the internet?

MR. COLE: So we -- we get the most responses that way, but we have printed some out and had students go stand at Paquin or Oak Tower --

MS. SUHLER: Okay.

MR. COLE: -- or out in front of the post office.

MS. SUHLER: Uh-huh.

MR. COLE: We have also had a student have it on their iPad and to survey people. So we try to do it a couple different ways. So, yeah, we could --

MR. RITTER: Does the library let you put a stack over there anywhere?

MR. COLE: They do. You know, we haven't really got much success putting a stack there.

MR. RITTER: Uh-huh.

MR. COLE: When we had a student go over there and sit and just collect people --

MR. RITTER: That probably helps.

MR. COLE: -- it worked better. But it's-- it seems like when we just go leave a stack, you don't get it filled out. You've got to have somebody there kind of chasing people down. All right. Well, we'll move forward with that if it's okay with you guys.

MR. REGAN: Any other comments among the --

MR. RITTER: Do you -- do you need a motion?

MR. COLE: I don't think so. I don't think we need to -- yeah. Are you ready for me to move to the next one?

MR. REGAN: Let's move on.

FY 2017 CDBG Funding

Attachments: [CDC-Ratings-FY2017-CDBG-1](#)

MR. COLE: All right. So 2017 funds. So we've got new

Commissioners here that probably weren't here for the 2017 discussions, so this isn't the funding that we just talked about this last spring. It would be the one the spring before. But it is the funding that we just released like a couple of weeks ago because HUD just released it -- as of September 22 was when their release was dated. We received it like right at the first of October, I believe -- the 1st or 2nd.

MR. RITTER: Could you pull up the 2018?

MR. COLE: Yeah.

MR. RITTER: Because I had some ideas.

MR. COLE: Yeah.

MR. RITTER: But it might hinge on --

MR. REGAN: Was this the church that was going to build a fence --

MR. COLE: Yeah.

MR. REGAN: -- in the back of the parking lot --

MR. COLE: So would you mind --

MR. RITTER: And had like a wheelchair --

MR. REGAN: Uh-huh.

MR. RITTER: -- for one of their staircases -- a wheelchair lift, I think.

MR. COLE: Yeah. Would you mind if I gave -- just gave you a little summary of what -- what we've funded so far --

MR. RITTER: Yeah.

MS. FORBES: Yeah.

MR. COLE: -- because we did get -- they did get City funds. So we gave them \$43,000 in general revenue that Council approved and now they've already spent -- they spent most of that last year. But then on top of that, they had \$50,000 in CDBG funds. So over this last couple of weeks, I've had a lot of back and forth with them and they didn't like the agreement the way it was written with all the federal requirements. And we had a provision in there saying that, you know, as a part of receiving the services you couldn't require, like, you know, prayer or

religious stuff. And they -- they wouldn't do that. They don't strike me as that type, and they don't -- I know they don't. So I don't think it was that provision. I think it was more -- I think they might have been overwhelmed with everything. Just -- maybe they haven't worked with federal funds in the past.

MS. FORBES: So what's that --

MR. COLE: So the second one --

MS. FORBES: -- lien?

MR. COLE: Yeah. All CDBG facility projects, we secure the funding to the property with a deed of trust, and that's the way we've -- we've always done that, and HUD recommends to do that. So that's how we keep leverage over a property to make sure it stays in compliance. So, like, Centro Latino, we just funded, so we have a lien on that property. You know, we have ones on Reality House, the Housing -- some of the Housing Authority properties.

MS. FORBES: So if they somehow violate --

MR. COLE: Yeah. So --

MS. FORBES: -- the rules, you can take --

MR. COLE: So say we give money to, you know, an organization, you know, that's providing some kind of service and they decide, well, we're going to turn this into a for profit thing. We're going to stop doing this or we're going to fold up shop and we're going to sell the facility. That's typically what happens. So we've -- I've seen like two or three payoffs from nonprofits funded like back in the 80s that had kind of mothballed what they were doing. They sell it, and then we get the money back and it goes into more projects. So that's how we funded them in the past and, yeah, there's nonprofit facilities all over town that have --

MR. RITTER: So they did quite a few of those things out of the general revenue that didn't have the same federal --

MR. COLE: Right.

MR. RITTER: restrictions?

MR. COLE: Right. And -- yeah, correct. And the feds would let us grant the money. So we don't have to do that, but as a policy, that's how we have done it since long before I was here. So I was uneasy saying, hey, we don't have to do it or we don't do it.

I don't feel that's appropriate for me to make that call without -- you know, I wouldn't even want to put that before Council without you all talking about it. So that could be an option. So they have spent \$43,000 on several important items that they have done, so one thing to think about, whatever decision you all make for recommending to Council, it's good that we get this money allocated quickly because every year we're held to this test to this standard that we can't have more than 1.5 times our annual allocation on hand.

And they do that test every November -- by the first of November. So basically if we're not moving projects forward and we're --

MR. RITTER: Then they'll pull the funds.

MR. COLE: Then they'll want to take the money back. So we've never been at risk at that with CDBG since I have been here, and this last year -- or this last November -- or right now, I guess that would be November 1st, we were at 1.14, which is the lowest one we have had on record. So we're in really good shape, but I would caution us to not take the attitude of, well, we're in real good shape so we could let this ride for a while because we're in good shape because we don't have that approach.

That being said, I don't think you need to make a decision tonight. If you want me to collect more information for the December meeting or, you know, if you want to think about other options. But I would really prefer to not wait until the next funding cycle. I feel like that would be a little too long.

So in the past -- this has happened before a couple of times -- we

typically reallocate the funding to existing projects or proposals that are being executed that are moving forward, like, you know, SIL could maybe do a few more ramps, Job Point could do a -- have a few more students, or we could rehab a few more homes. It's kind of that approach.

MR. SALANSKI: A question already. If we were to take that approach, do we hurt ourselves -- is there any sort of noncompliance seeing that this was the only project that we had wanted to fund within this particular category? If we were to not reallocate those funds within that same category, would that matter at all?

MR. COLE: So there's no compliance issue, but our next funding cycle when we look at, you know, where have we allocated our funds in the past and where are we meeting our goals or where are we exceeding and where are we behind, it would probably impact our community facility ones. In our next cycle -- it would probably show, hey, you guys should maybe focus on funding that category a little more that year. So it would impact that, but as far as compliance with HUD, we wouldn't have any problems there. We would just be more -- what we're doing in accordance with our community goals might be a little out of whack.

MR. RITTER: And it's a zero percent category because that issue has come up in the past --

MR. COLE: Yeah.

MR. RITTER: -- so we set that at zero as the floor because some years --

MR. COLE: Yeah.

MR. RITTER: -- there's either been only really big projects that we couldn't fund or kind of all or nothing projects. So as far as what City Council sees is recommended zero to 30 percent, so it wouldn't cause any issues there.

MR. SALANSKI: Does anyone know on -- with regards to the other four

projects that within that category, were those either fully fund or not fund at all?

MR. REGAN: I feel like CATCH was, if I remember.

MR. COLE: CATCH was, but they don't have a place where we could spend that money because they don't have a site identified. Welcome Home is completed; they got their project done. And the Housing Authority, that was for Oak Tower, and they have --

MR. RITTER: It was all or nothing.

MR. COLE: -- enough funding to get it done, but I don't believe they're putting solar panels on it. And then Urban Empowerment, I'm not sure where they're at on that project.

MR. RITTER: Yeah. That was another facility.

MR. COLE: Yeah.

MR. RITTER: And that's why I asked about the -- I mean, I was going towards the top.

MR. COLE: Yeah.

MR. RITTER: I'm kind of looking for areas that we know have had prior success. I just -- I don't know what the current backlog is on a few of these things. We obviously don't know --

MR. COLE: So I have a pretty good understanding of where we are at on all these.

MR. RITTER: Okay. Because I was thinking, you know, Job Point, we were 20,000 -- we've held money from them two years in a row.

MR. COLE: Uh-huh.

MR. RITTER: So if we kind of went back to the notion of making them whole on the 2017 year, they could maybe enroll students immediately in their newest voc training program --

MR. COLE: One thing --

MR. RITTER: -- coming up.

MR. COLE: One thing to consider with Job Point is the Council

allocated that \$250,000 extra.

MR. RITTER: That was for the facility though. Right?

MR. COLE: Yeah. But if you saw the discussion -- I don't know if you folks saw the discussion, the legal department said that that couldn't go towards the facility itself, it needed to go towards their services. So then that -- I think they're going to -- they're going to have a significant amount of funds to put towards their students rather than the facility. So now they're -- that's kind of flip-flopped where they would want to be.

MR. REGAN: So are they using the CDBG funds that they are getting towards the facility now?

MR. COLE: No. Because their proposal to us --

MR. RITTER: They can't --

MR. COLE: -- was for students.

MR. RITTER: -- switch that.

MR. COLE: So that -- they've got to do what they proposed to us. But that does throw a kink -- if I could back up one second. The yellow bullets there, I think it's important just to consider those items when we're figuring out this decision for fairness and making sure people don't feel like somebody is getting an extra pot of money that they're not fairly getting access to.

Risk, making sure we're not allocating funds to something that is not going to move forward because we're already taking a second swipe at this. So I tend to be much more risk adverse, especially when we are reallocating funds to make sure we're putting it to a project that we know is going to get done on time and effectively.

And then, agility, making sure that, you know, they can spend the funds quickly and that's it's not a project that they're still, you know, doing a capital campaign on or something. And then, strategy, of course the first three -- particularly two and three, probably make you less strategic because you are wanting to put it to something you know is going to go

forward. So making sure you hit a priority need. You know, those all kind of intertwine and push and pull against each other.

But if we go down the list, I know -- so for 2017 funds, and I can pull up the 2018 too, if that would be helpful. But for 2017, we've already spent all of our Demo funds on the purchase of three vacant properties on Third -- well, actually, we haven't closed on them yet, but they -- we will soon.

MR. RITTER: So hold on a second. You can use the Demolition funds to purchase property, not demolish property?

MR. COLE: Uh-huh. Yeah. It's Acquisition and Demolition Program. And then we'll end up donating it to Job Point, Habitat or CMCA, one of those.

MR. RITTER: Uh-huh.

MR. COLE: But we will have some sewer tap repair and other site clearance to do before we donate it.

MS. FORBES: Wasn't there a parking lot?

MR. RITTER: That's this year.

MS. FORBES: Oh.

MR. COLE: Yeah. So the 2017 was --

MR. RITTER: Yes.

MS. FORBES: I'm sorry.

MR. COLE: Code enforcement, they don't need any additional funds. Rehab and Repair, we had been out of funds for six months for that program, and we're already eating way into it, so we probably could use more there, but we have enough to fund our operations. And then you've got SIL. It seems like they can always squeeze out a few extra ramps, but I would want to look at where they are at.

MR. RITTER: I wonder -- I mean, 50,000 in the grand scheme of all the CDBG funding isn't a high percentage.

MR. COLE: Uh-huh.

MR. RITTER: But it's not a small chunk of money either.

MR. COLE: Uh-huh.

MR. RITTER: So I wonder -- I mean, is it appropriate to ask -- ask them to come, you know, maybe back in for a quick RFP proposal?

MR. COLE: For -- I would do it --

MR. RITTER: I mean, because like CMCA, like when I think back to -- that's why I asked about the 2018 funding --

MR. COLE: Do you want me to pull up the 2018 --

MR. RITTER: -- because there are some quick projects that were smaller in scale that didn't get funded because we ran out of money, but they could be executed quickly. And that -- you know, but then again, it's back to your bullet point of, well, they didn't present in the cycle that the money is being returned in. So I struggle with that as well.

MR. COLE: Uh-huh. Yeah.

MR. RITTER: So my first inclination is to try to allocate it back to the organizations that presented in this cycle.

MR. COLE: Uh-huh.

MR. RITTER: But if like you said -- and in Job Point's situation, if they're going to have to allocate that general revenue money towards the training and services, that --

MR. COLE: Yeah.

MR. RITTER: -- doesn't really lead me to believe that they need the additional \$20,000 to \$50,000 for that.

MR. COLE: This can make it messy. So there's the 2018 recommendations that you all had. And another challenge with these is the remainder -- like, if you give somebody \$50,000 extra bucks, they can spend it, but the remainder of what they have, they can't spend --

MR. RITTER: Until --

MR. COLE: The next year.

MR. RITTER: -- the next year.

MR. COLE: Habitat, I know could spend it relatively quickly doing all their engineering and predevelopment out there. And they're one that got cut pretty deep.

MR. REGAN: I guess my main question, if we look at the current or the 2017 year --

MR. RITTER: Oh, you know what? CMCA did get funded.

MR. COLE: Uh-huh.

MR. RITTER: That came back in because they presented at Council. Right?

MR. COLE: No. You guys funded that.

MR. RITTER: Did we end up doing that?

MR. COLE: You guys funded -- you recommended them.

MR. RITTER: Okay.

MR. COLE: Yeah.

MR. RITTER: But it was just the full funding I was remembering that we could give them the full amount.

MR. REGAN: I think we originally started lower with CMCA, and then we decided maybe --

MR. RITTER: It started --

MR. REGAN: -- the health center didn't have enough detail in their proposals.

MR. RITTER: Oh, we took them off.

(Multiple people talking simultaneously.)

MR. REGAN: So we put that into CMCA.

MS. FORBES: Right.

MR. REGAN: So it's -- would you say it's safer, Randy, to put it towards the 2017 plan to ensure it's used?

MR. COLE: Unless there's a 2018 one that would use it right away, 2017 is probably better. I've been looking at these. Yeah. That would make a lot more sense. The only one on here that could spend it right

away without having access to the remainder of their funds would be Habitat.

MR. RITTER: And they didn't present at all on the CDBG side in 2017. They were all on the HOME side.

MR. COLE: Yeah.

MR. RITTER: So that would be bringing --

MR. REGAN: Have you heard any --

MR. RITTER: I still, you know, I kind of -- it's just like granting the exception --

MR. COLE: Uh-huh.

MR. RITTER: I don't like that, you know, granting the exception goes against standard procedures.

MR. COLE: As far as not requiring the lien?

MR. RITTER: Well, as far -- yeah, like if you were going to make an exception of the lien --

MR. SALANSKI: Would it make sense to first kind of maybe kind of have a show hands of whether or not we should just focus on 2017 and just reallocating it as opposed to then --

MR. COLE: Uh-huh.

MR. SALANSKI: Kind of just break it down that way? And then once we know, okay, we're going to stick with 2017, then perhaps -- I don't think there's a lot of options that are even left to fund. I think once we decide on what year, it would kind of just fall into place essentially.

MR. COLE: Uh-huh.

MR. SALANSKI: Would that be okay to kind of -- I mean, I'm for it staying -- even though I was not part of it at the time, it staying within that 2017 agenda as opposed to --

MR. WHATLEY: I'd agree too.

MR. SALANSKI: Everybody else in --

MR. REGAN: Yeah.

MR. SALANSKI: -- agreement on that one? That said, Randy, could you give me just a Reader's Digest of what is -- what actually entailed the central city neighborhood improvements?

MR. COLE: Yeah. That's our big bioretention project over there on the Sexton lots. Actually, I could pull up a map for you.

MR. SALANSKI: Because my -- my thought was for that first set of categories in housing were \$12,700 shy in that Rehab and Repair, which it sounds like you all could use that.

MR. COLE: Uh-huh.

MR. SALANSKI: And then \$2,800 shy in SIL, which would bring it to \$15,500, leaving us \$34,500 left. And nothing else other than taking it back to central city neighborhood improvements makes sense to me based on things either being already fully funded or just not being applicable.

MR. COLE: So were you suggesting to put it in the central city neighborhood project?

MR. SALANSKI: Yes.

MR. RITTER: Yeah. Like if they're -- are they running short?

MR. COLE: Yeah. They're not. I am very aware of their budget, so at this point --

MR. RITTER: Okay.

MR. COLE: -- I don't think they need more.

MR. SALANSKI: Oh, really?

MR. COLE: Yeah.

MR. REGAN: Have they not spent this --

MR. COLE: So they're getting -- they're going through the bid process right now for the bioretention. That's going before Council on December 4th.

MR. SALANSKI: So did they overshoot their -- their request then?

MR. COLE: No. Because there is some additional items they haven't

gotten funds back yet on so -- or bids back. So the bioretention came in at \$105,000, but they're going to need funds for sidewalks to go around it as well as some landscaping and other things.

And I don't know where they are at on that. But I feel like -- I feel like they are fairly under budget. I wouldn't want to dump more money at that.

MR. SALANSKI: Well, because then if -- if we didn't have that as an option, that \$34,500, if everyone were to kind of agree on that first category -- set of categories, I don't know where else we could put that money in 2017, because it is my understanding that the urban empowerment development -- that that facility renovation expansion deal, that that is still something that they are still doing capital campaign on.

MR. COLE: Uh-huh.

MR. SALANSKI: I mean --

MR. COLE: Uh-huh. Yeah. I wouldn't want to -- yeah.

MR. SALANSKI: And everything else looks -- appears to be funded.

MR. COLE: I mean, you could -- you could give like -- you could break it out, you know, equally a percentage-wise and give like -- let me just find -- Job Point, you know \$15,000 more; SIL \$15,000 more and then split the rest between our Rehab and Demo Program.

MR. SALANSKI: So there's not a hindrance to us funding a request more than what they had proposed?

MR. COLE: Oh, I see what you're saying.

MR. REGAN: For SIL, we would only be able to give \$2,800 more --

MR. COLE: Yeah.

MR. REGAN: -- which I think would be --

MR. COLE: I see what you're saying.

MR. REGAN: -- a good --

MR. COLE: Yeah. It's not really a good precedent to go beyond what

they requested I would think.

MR. SALANSKI: Yeah.

MR. REGAN: So going back to the top there, you said you -- you have used your Demolition funds --

MR. COLE: Uh-huh.

MR. REGAN: -- the Rehab and Repair?

MR. COLE: Yeah.

MR. REGAN: Which of those two programs do you think would be utilized the best if we put money towards either of those?

MR. COLE: You know, they're pretty equal. I would -- what do you guys think? It seems the Minor Home Rehab needs it the most.

MR. ANSPACH: That's what I would think would be Minor Home Repair.

MR. COLE: Uh-huh. We've seen a lot of demand. I mean, we shut the program down for like six months, and we've never done that since I was here.

MR. SALANSKI: Well, perhaps then we could consider taking \$12,700 to that, which would bring it to the request amount and then completing the request amount of the -- or excuse me -- to Rehab and Repair, and then completing the request amount at \$2,800 to the Home Repair and Accessibility Program. And then that remainder of \$34,500, perhaps we could consider that going to Demolition, if it would make sense to --

MR. COLE: That would work. One thing that is nice about going to the Demolition, you know, a lot of this is going to the City, but Job Point, Habitat, and CMCA all benefit from that Demolition Program because we'll end up donating the property to -- so you end up hitting multiple entities. But that would work, but it's your guy's decision, and if you need more info, we can gather more for the next meeting.

MR. WHATLEY: How much farther is \$2,800 going to go with the Minor Home Repair? I mean --

MR. COLE: For SIL?

MR. WHATLEY: Yeah. It doesn't seem like it's going to go far.

MR. REGAN: The cost of ramps --

(Multiple people talking simultaneously.)

MR. ANSPACH: I mean, they do things besides just ramps.

(Multiple people talking simultaneously.)

MR. WHATLEY: Yeah. But how far would that money go?

MR. AMELUNKE: Three hot water heaters probably.

MR. ANSPACH: We had several requests that fall under that -- that threshold for multiple properties.

MR. RITTER: Oh, because they combined with --

MR. COLE: BCCA.

MR. RITTER: The nursing -- yeah.

MR. COLE: Yeah.

MR. RITTER: So they do the Minor Home Repair. Yeah. It probably actually -- yeah. I was leaning towards making as many of those holes filled as possible until the money ran out.

MR. COLE: Yeah. That seems like a smart approach.

MR. RITTER: So I'm good with that or whoever wants to make the official motion.

MR. REGAN: So we were going to take SIL up to their request.

MR. RITTER: And so it is increased \$2,800 to SIL.

MR. SALANSKI: \$12,700 to Rehab.

MR. RITTER: \$12,700 to Rehab.

MR. WHATLEY: And the balance to Demolition.

MR. SALANSKI: Yeah. I think that's --

MR. REGAN: Yeah. I think that's fair and I think it would be utilized.

MS. FORBES: Okay. How am I going --

MR. COLE: Very cool.

MS. FORBES: Is somebody going to make a motion?

MR. COLE: So I'll take that to the Counsel as an action plan amendment. That will take two Council meetings. Actually, it will take three because there's an empty one in between, but --

MR. RITTER: Holidays?

MR. COLE: Yeah. And for getting the notice out on time, they require a meeting in between. But the Council is the final say, so typically they go with you guys. But, yeah, they will be the final decider.

MS. FORBES: I got the amounts down. What -- \$2,800 to --

MR. RITTER: It was SIL.

MS. FORBES: Okay. And \$12,700 to --

MR. WHATLEY: To Rehab and Repair.

MS. FORBES: Rehab and Repair.

MR. WHATLEY: And the balance --

MS. FORBES: To Demolition.

MR. WHATLEY: To Demolition.

MS. FORBES: Okay.

MR. REGAN: All right.

MR. COLE: I'm impressed you guys got that done.

MR. REGAN: And that was it for the funding discussion?

MR. COLE: Yeah. That's it.

MR. SALANSKI: Yeah. I'll make a motion to put \$2,800 to Minor Home Repair and Accessibility Program, making that fully funded; in addition to \$12,700 to Rehab and Repair, also making that fully funded; and then the remainder of \$34,500 to Demolition, bringing that close to funded.

MR. WHATLEY: I'll second that.

MR. REGAN: All right. All in favor? All opposed?
(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

VI. GENERAL COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, MEMBERS AND STAFF

MR. COLE: One announcement, if you don't mind. This Saturday we're doing a meeting with the North Central Neighborhood Association about the North 8th property. So that's the one that Council allocated money towards and where we're potentially going to put CHDO funds

to.

So we are having a neighborhood meeting to basically ask them what you guys want here and what are some key features? Which way do you want the houses to face? Yeah, just get feedback from them to figure out what they want and what they potentially wouldn't want there just to make sure we're doing right by the neighborhood.

That will be at 10:00 a.m. We're meeting at the project site. Any of you would be welcome to come out as well. We're meeting at 10:00 a.m. at the project site and then walking down to Columbia College to do a little bit of brainstorming and planning session.

MR. REGAN: Any other comments? All right.

VII. NEXT MEETING DATE

MR. REGAN: Our next meeting is December 13th, same time, same place. Randy will send us a reminder email.

MR. COLE: Yeah. I'll say to RSVP this time.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

MR. REGAN: Well, since there is nothing else on the agenda, we'll move to adjournment. Do we have a motion to adjourn?

MR. WHATLEY: I motion that we adjourn tonight's meeting.

MR. SALANSKI: Second.

MR. REGAN: All right. All in favor? All opposed?

(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

MR. REGAN: Okay. Meeting adjourned.

(The meeting adjourned at 7:34 p.m.)

(Off the record)