

City of Columbia, Missouri

*701 E. Broadway
Columbia, Missouri*



Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, November 3, 2021

7:00 PM

Regular

Council Chambers, City Hall

701 E. Broadway

Columbia

Housing and Community Development Commission

I. CALL TO ORDER

MR. WHATLEY: Good evening, everyone. It is seven o'clock. I would like to welcome everybody to the November 3rd Housing and Community Development Commission. Before we get started into our agenda, let's start with introductions, and if we can start on my far right.

Present: 8 - Michael Fletcher, Mitchell Ritter, Paul Whatley, Diane Suhler, Ross Kasmann, Thomas Rose, Barbara Jefferson and Rebecca Shaw

Excused: 1 - Blake Willoughby

II. INTRODUCTIONS

MS. SHAW: Rebecca Shaw, Member at Large.

MR. KASMANN: Ross Kasmann, Ward 3.

MR. WHATLEY: Paul Whatley, Member at Large.

MS. JEFFERSON: Barbara Jefferson, Ward 1.

MR. FLETCHER: Mike Fletcher, Member at Large.

MS. CLARK: Darcie Clark, City Staff.

MR. ANSPACH: Gary Anspach, City Staff.

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MR. WHATLEY: Okay. Thank you everyone. Hopefully everybody has had a chance to look at tonight's agenda.

If there's any -- if there are any not any questions or comments, can I get a motion to approve tonight's agenda?

MS. JEFFERSON: I do have a question.

MR. WHATLEY: Yes, ma'am.

MS. JEFFERSON: I just want everyone -- this public hearing is also going to be presentations. No?

MR. WHATLEY: No, ma'am.

MS. JEFFERSON: Because it was my understanding -- I don't understand why public hearing is on here if we were talking about public informational meeting.

MR. WHATLEY: Okay. So tonight -- tonight's meeting is -- is pretty much informational and educational, discussing the HOME-ARP process. So this was promoted as a public hearing event just in case the citizens of our community had any questions about, you know, money allocation or, you know, potential proposals, I guess, and so forth.

MS. JEFFERSON: So under the -- if it was just like as stated on our timeline piece of paper, informational meeting, would they not have time to ask questions and --

MR. WHATLEY: So if anybody who are members of the public or even if any of the agencies are here tonight, or the Commissioners, if there are any questions, that is a good time to ask them.

MS. JEFFERSON: And will these organizations be back also and have another opportunity?

MR. WHATLEY: Yes. So the next opportunity, which we'll talk about here in a minute, will be December 15th. And that's when we're going to hear any proposals. That would be --

MS. JEFFERSON: Some of the -- so some of the people speaking tonight will have like two times to tell us about who they are and what their purpose is?

MR. WHATLEY: Yeah, if -- so -- so I guess yes and no.

Tonight we don't want to hear any proposals. But if any of these organizations have any comments about maybe how to address, you know, the needs, I think we will be glad to hear that, but we're not going to hear any proposals specifically.

MS. JEFFERSON: So have we decided on what's going to be in those proposals?

MR. WHATLEY: No. Not yet. So I hope that helps a little bit, Ms. Jefferson.

MR. KASMANN: I move that we approve the agenda for tonight.

MR. WHATLEY: Okay. A motion has been made. Is there a second?

MS. SUHLER: I second.

MR. WHATLEY: A motion has been made and seconded. All those in favor of tonight's agenda, please raise your right hand.

(Hands raised.)

MR. WHATLEY: All those against?

(No visible response.)

MR. WHATLEY: The motion carries.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MR. WHATLEY: Next on the agenda is the approval of minutes from the past two meetings. Let's start with July 21st. Any -- any comments or any suggestions or changes that need to be made from the July 21st meeting minutes? Yes, Ms. Jefferson?

MS. JEFFERSON: I did not have a chance to read what was sent Monday. Those nine attachments. So I will not be -- I'm not going to vote on the July or the August minutes because I really don't know what's in them. I didn't get an opportunity to read through them.

MR. WHATLEY: Okay. Any other comments, changes or edits for the July 21st meeting? Okay. Can I get a recommendation?

MR. RITTER: Make a motion to approve July 21st, 2021 minutes.

MR. WHATLEY: Is there a second?

MS. SUHLER: I'll second.

MR. WHATLEY: A motion has been made and seconded. All those in favor, raise your right hand. (Hands raised.)

MR. WHATLEY: All those who oppose? (No visible response.)
MR. WHATLEY: The motion carries. Next is the approval of the August 4th, 2021 Housing and Community Development Commission minutes. Any questions, comments, changes or edits that need to be made? Hearing none, is there a motion to approve those minutes?
MR. RITTER: Make a motion to approve the minutes from August 4th.
MR. KASMANN: Second.
MR. WHATLEY: A motion has been made and seconded. All those in favor, please raise your right hand. (Hands raised.)
MR. WHATLEY: All those opposed, do the same. (No visible response.)
MR. WHATLEY: The motion carries.
MR. RITTER: And for the record, Mitch Ritter, Ward 2, has officially checked in.
MR. ROSE: And Tom Rose, Ward 5.
MS. SUHLER: And Diane Suhler, Human Services representative.

Attachments: [July 21st Minutes](#)

Attachments: [August 4, 2021 HCDC Minutes](#)

V. NEW BUSINESS

Review of HOME-ARP Eligible Projects and Qualifying Populations

MR. WHATLEY: Okay. I believe we have everybody now. Next on the agenda, we're moving over into new business.
Review of the HOME-ARP Eligible Projects and Qualifying Populations. Gary, would you like to -- MR. ANSPACH: Yeah. Absolutely.
MR. WHATLEY: Thanks.
MR. ANSPACH: Welcome, everyone. Tonight is the public hearing for HOME-ARP funding. Before we jump into the public hearing, I want to give some background on the HOME-ARP program, as well as the qualifying populations, and also talk a little bit about types of eligible projects and then we will discuss some of the timeline that we propose moving forward. So a little bit on the HOME-ARP background, March 11th, 2021, President Biden signed the American Rescue Plan, also known as ARP, into law. That was 1.9 trillion dollars in relief to address the continued impact of COVID-19. Out of that 1.9 trillion, Congress appropriated 5 billion in ARP funds to be administered through the HOME program. The City of Columbia, of that 5 billion, was awarded 2.1 million dollars of HOME-ARP funding. And the HOME-ARP funding is

to go towards eligible projects that will serve primarily homeless, at risk for homeless, and other populations. So in terms of the qualifying populations, the HOME -- like I said, HOME-ARP requires that the funds be used to primarily benefit individuals and families in the following specified qualifying populations. These individuals and families meet these criterias, are eligible to receive assistance or services funded through HOME-ARP without meeting additional criteria as, for example, other income criteria that they might have to meet under the regular HOME program. The specified populations for eligibility include homeless, at risk for homelessness, fleeing or attempting to flee domestic violence, sexual assault, stalking, human trafficking and other populations. So in order to qualify for -- if an agency or organization is carrying out a HOME-ARP funded project, again, they must benefit primarily these types of individuals and families. The different types of projects that are eligible for HOME-ARP include non-congregate shelters. Non-congregate shelters are private units or rooms to serve as a temporary shelter for individuals and families. They do not require occupants to sign a lease or any other occupancy agreement. The HOME-ARP funds may be used to acquire and develop non-congregate shelters for families and individuals that meet one of the qualifying population definitions. This project can include the construction of new structures or the acquisition or rehab of existing structures such as motels, nursing homes or others. So that is the non-congregate shelter. In the information that you all were provided earlier on the -- attached to the agenda, it goes into more depth as to some of the eligible costs and activities of these projects. What we're doing tonight is just giving you a brief summary of those projects and kind of touching on the high points so everybody here tonight has hopefully a better understanding of the types of projects that are eligible with this funding. Another possible project is Tenant-Based Rental Assistance or TBRA. HOME-ARP funds may be used to provide Tenant-Based Rental Assistance for the individuals and families that meet one of the qualifying populations. Because HOME-ARP TBRA is attached to the qualifying household and not a particular unit, the household may choose to move to another unit with continued assistance so long as the new unit meets applicable property standards. So this is very similar to the regular HOME-funded TBRA, but again, this all ties back to primarily serving to the benefit of homeless, at risk for homeless, and the other qualifying population definitions. For TBRA, eligible costs can include rental

assistance, security deposits, utility deposits, utility payments. One difference here is that the HOME-ARP TBRA may be used for up to 100 percent of the costs for a qualifying household. In addition to non-congregate shelters, TBRA supportive services may also be provided.

There are three specific categories included as support of services under HOME-ARP. And these include supportive services that are defined under the McKinney-Vento supportive services and homelessness prevention services. A list of these types of services are listed here on the slide. And they include things like child care, meals and groceries, legal services, assistance in providing or locating/obtaining rental housing, the teaching of life management skills, and other financial assistance costs including rental application fees, security deposits, utility deposits and back rent. Documentation is also required to support the use of supportive services. And really the supportive services are only eligible to the extent that the assistance is necessary to help the participants regain stability in their current housing or move to other permanent housing to achieve stability. The last eligible project type is rental housing. HOME-ARP may be used to acquire, construct or rehab rental housing for occupancy by individuals and families that meet a qualifying population. May be a single or multi-family housing, transitional or permanent housing, group homes, single homes, single occup-- single occupancy units, I'm sorry, manufactured housing. HOME-ARP may pay the entire amount of the eligible costs associated with the HOME-ARP rental units and there is no maximum per unit subsidy. So those are some differences between the HOME-ARP and the regular HOME funding. Those four that I mentioned, the non-congregate shelter, supportive services, tenant-based rental assistance, and rental housing are the four eligible categories for projects under HOME-ARP. There's one more piece. If an agency or organization is carrying out an eligible HOME-ARP project, they may also apply for non-profit operating assistance or/and capacity building assistance. So up to 5 percent of our HOME-ARP allocation may be set aside for the operating expenses of CHDOs and other non-profit organizations who are carrying out HOME-ARP activities. An additional 5 percent may be used to pay eligible costs and relating to the developing of the capacity of an eligible non-profit organization if they are success-- organizations that are successfully carrying out HOME-ARP eligible activities. This is not a stand-alone project. This would go along with an organization or an agency that is carrying out a successful HOME-ARP funded project. And it can be

expected to be eligible if there is an expectation within 24 months that that project will be started, as you can see on that last bullet point. So while there's four main eligible projects, there is a set-aside allowable for this non-operating assistance -- or I'm sorry, non-profit operating expense and capacity building assistance. So in addition to -- excuse me. In addition to the projects and the qualifying populations, a couple of requirements from HUD for the HOME-ARP is the requirement to do a consultation. So the Housing Programs Division work through a consultation process, which started on October 11th. And the Housing Programs Division sent a questionnaire out to 39 different public agencies seeking feedback and input regarding homelessness services and unmet needs. Responses were due this past Monday and we received responses from 11 different agencies. And you all received those responses to those questions. Those questions came from HUD, the consultation questions.

Basically they centered around what types of demographics do -- does the organization serve? What services do they provide? What do they see as the current services in the community and how are those utilized? Other questions include what do they see as the unmet needs and how do they determine what those needs are? And then also what are any gaps in the service delivery systems that exist currently? So with the feedback that we were able to receive, we pulled some themes out of those consultation questions, and several things came back. I know it was a lot of information and you just got it a few days ago, but I want -- hopefully you'll have an opportunity to continue looking through that information. But just to touch on some main themes that we were seeing from the agencies that responded, there's just a limited affordable housing stock in the city. Lack of shelter and transitional shelters, the cost of construction of housing, and lack of income to pay for rent, food, and child care and other basic necessities.

We saw those answers over and over and things that pointed to those. So I think it's important just to recognize some of the themes that come from those consultations. The other questions and answers I think will be helpful in developing your recommendations for future projects, which you'll hear in the upcoming months and weeks. Kind of the timeline for the proposals that we're looking at -- again, there was 2.16 million dollars in HOME-ARP that was provided. We're looking at opening a request for proposals process on Monday, the 8th, with a Letter of Intent due November 19th. Now, this is very similar to the process that you all worked through with the regular fiscal year for HOME and CDBG funds. The

RFP process will close December 6th. In addition to our HOME-ARP, I wanted to circle back a couple months when we worked through the fiscal year 2022 HOME and CDBG process. At the end of that process there was 205,000 dollars remaining unallocated in the HOME program and that was only due to a lack of applications at that time. And the Commission recommended -- you all recommended that we reopen those for applications in the future. And with the HOME-ARP, I think there's a good opportunity to also reopen the FY-2022 HOME funding, that remaining 205,000, and solicit applications at the same time. And then also, it may provide an opportunity for -- if an agency or organization has a project that may not meet specific HOME-ARP guidelines but would meet regular HOME funding, we may have an opportunity to slide that over into the regular home funding for FY-22. Yes, sir?

MR. FLETCHER: It's safe to say though that -- that fiscal year 2022 HOME funds are more restrictive in terms of what they can cover than the ARP that seem to be a broader category, some of the services and other things?

MR. ANSPACH: I would say in some instances that HOME may be more restrictive because they don't provide those typical supportive services, but the HOME-ARP is going to specifically target that homeless population; whereas, the regular HOME funding is bound by those income guidelines for individuals. Regular HOME funds can work towards single-family home development, home owners-- down payment assistance.

So there's some -- there's some differences between the two. And I think it would be advantageous while we have the RFP process open, to also just receive applications from organizations that are applying for HOME-ARP if a project may -- if it's ineligible for some reason and if it's eligible for HOME, we could discuss the fact of sliding it over into the regular HOME funding. The funding for FY-22 would typically be available fall of 2022, which lines up fairly close to when the HOME-ARP funding may be available for those projects as well. So that's what we'd like to do and what we're -- put that in front of you all to consider as well. In addition to the FY-2022 HOME, we do have -- if you recall back last December during the Covid round three funds that came through CDBG, there was also some Council reserve funding that was provided to help fund different projects. One of the allocations was 75,000 for a comprehensive Homeless Service Center planning RFP. Currently we're working -- Tim Teddy right now is working to finalize some language in that RFP. We won't necessarily be releasing that on the 8th like these other two, but I just mention it to give you a heads-up that it is forthcoming and we'll have

more information for you in the future about when that is possibly ready to be released. And so that 75,000, that - that service center planning RFP is not tied to HOME-ARP or FY-22 HOME, but it's a different pot of money than the RFP being developed currently. Circling back to the request for proposals, what we anticipate is opening that portal on the Neighborly Software system on Monday, the 8th. Project proposals will be accepted through the portal. For agencies who have applied through that portal, they'll understand that it provides step-by-step direction on submitting the application with required documentation. For those who have not applied, our Housing Program staff will be available to assist with anyone who's seeking to input an application. One aspect that we do require is a Letter of Intent. This is very similar to the fiscal year CDBG and HOME process. We ask that Letter of Intent be provided by Friday, November 19th. This is 11 days after the portal opens, so hopefully this gives some opportunity to provide that Letter of Intent, think about projects that someone may want to apply for. But we do ask that that Letter of Intent is provided. And then fully complete project proposals must be submitted by December 6th. This is kind of an overview of the funding process timeline that we've -- we've put together. Again, it started October 11th when we sent out the consultation questions. Last week on the 26th, we held a preapplication workshop. And at that workshop we went into -- it was hosted for agencies and organizations to come in and learn about the different types of projects that were eligible and the qualifying populations definition. Much of the same information that you just heard. November 1st was when our consultation responses were due. Tonight, November 3rd, is this public information and public hearing. And then we have our RFP process starting on the 8th, with Letters of Intent on the 19th. Requests due on the 6th and then we will meet back here again on the 15th to hear project proposals. And then on December 22nd you meet again to determine your funding recommendations for those project proposals. From there, your recommendations will move on City Council for them to consider. And then depending upon those recommendations, if there's any changes, once everything's finalized and approved, the Housing Program staff will work to complete environmental reviews and put together agreements for funding that we would anticipate spring to summer of 2022. Of course, all dates are subject to change based on different things that come up or if HUD changes anything on us, but this is the schedule that we got put together and feel like it's going to accomplish the consultation and public hearing

requirements that HUD has set forth, while at the same time moving through the process and getting these funds out the door into the hands of the agencies and organizations that can put the projects together and make a difference in the community. So that's the end of those. I would just be open to questions from the Commission about any of those items.

MR. WHATLEY: I had one question. So you submitted or you sent out 39 -- or you sent out 39 questionnaires; received 11. Any reason why the other 28 didn't provide any feedback? MR. ANSPACH: I'm not exactly sure. We did send a couple of reminders out just asking. And one of the reasons we had the November 1st date of responding back to those was so that we could get those responses in front of you all this evening so you'd have that. I will say -- and it goes for any agency that received the consultation questions and haven't had a chance to respond. We will certainly continue to take those. And any responses that we get, we can -- we will certainly pass along to the Commission. That deadline was to try to wrap things up and get a good response so that you all could see those by this evening.

MR. WHATLEY: And I imagine the other agencies are relevant to this particular project and they do have an interest if they do submit an RFP, so.

MR. ANSPACH: Yeah. So one of the HUD requirements of the consultation process was for us to reach out to any and all agencies that work with, provide services for any of the qualifying populations. So the Housing Programs worked with the Public Health and Human Service Department to develop that list. There's a listserv of different agencies that we -- we've got the names of those and the contacts. So those 39, that's just where the total number landed. It wasn't that we were only able to send it out to those certain 39. It's just that -- that's how many was on the list. So we worked to include as many organizations -- whether or not they had a very -- you know, even in kind of a roundabout way they helped with homeless or homelessness, we sent it out to everybody that we could think of.

MR. WHATLEY: That's perfect. And the reason why I ask is I know that at previous meetings that we've had, you know, communication seems to be where we lack a little bit in getting the word out with the RFP. So I just wanted to make sure, you know, we're doing our best and it sounds like we are so that's perfect. Ms. Jefferson?

MS. JEFFERSON: Yes. Is there any way that the Commissioners can get the list that you sent out --

MR. ANSPACH: Yeah, absolutely.

MS. JEFFERSON: -- to the different organizations?

MR. ANSPACH: We'll make a note and send that out with our next communication.

MS. JEFFERSON: Thank you.

MR. WHATLEY: Any other questions? Ms. Shaw?

MS. SHAW: Is there any requirement that those organizations that responded -- is there any requirement from HUD that the organizations that are responding and putting in RFPs have to be at that informational session you had or respond to those questions in any way?

MR. ANSPACH: No. No requirement.

MS. SHAW: Okay. I have a few other questions, but Diane, if you --

MS. SUHLER: I have a quick question. During our deliberations in the summer, a lot of the applications we looked at kind of were very weak on details, especially about how funds are going to be used and their budgets.

And I know we thought about kind of ramping those applications up so they have to provide more detail. Has anything been done so that, you know, we're -- we're assured that we get a little more detail in the proposals?

MR. ANSPACH: Yeah. So we worked recently with Neighborly Software, our online software partner. And we've tailored the application to be specifically for HOME-ARP. There is also the regular HOME application that if -- during that RFP process that's running concurrently, if someone wants to apply for regular HOME, they will have that opportunity and that application will be different. This application asks the same question, but where this HOME-ARP application has been changed is specifically in the budget area. All of the eligible costs for the four different types of projects have been outlined. So each agency or organization as they apply for a HOME-ARP project, will have to be specific as to what they plan to spend in each of the eligible cost areas. So essentially they won't just put one dollar amount and say I'm using it for, you know, construction. It will have -- they'll break it down per only the eligible cost areas. In addition to that, they - Neighborly has also worked with us to include a menu to where they can only select the actual eligible types of project. So you will only be able to select from those eligible projects that I mentioned before. So hopefully with the budget revamp and the actual selection of the type of project, that will lead into additional more details on the proposal summary as to what's actually going to occur. And it will allow us, as staff, to marry up that Letter of Intent to what the actual proposal's asking for. So my intention is to try to get as much information out of the proposals for you as a Commission to consider during that -- not only

that project presentation that you'll hear, but also when you go to start looking at recommending funding, you'll have as much information as possible. So hopefully we've worked with Neighborly well enough to get as much of that info as possible from the jump.

MS. SUHLER: Good. Thank you.

MR. WHATLEY: Ms. Shaw?

MS. SHAW: Is there an official legal definition of temporary shelter that I'm unaware of? I just -- it's a very general term. Is there a time frame that they enforce?

MR. ANSPACH: I'm not 100 percent sure about that. The only thing I would be able to do is go back into the HUD regs, into the HOME-ARP HUD rule and see if they've actually defined what temporary shelter is. But I don't know right -- right off the top. That's something that we'll make a note and do some research and find out and get back to you.

MS. SHAW: One other question. You mentioned that these funds could cover utility assistance. Does that include shut-off -- like past and present any shut-off fees or reattachment fees for continuation of services?

MR. ANSPACH: I do know it specifies utility payments and utility deposits, but I don't know for sure if that also includes -- it may have to -- it may depend on how those fees are classified. But again, we'll check the definitions in the HUD regs and see if there's anything specifically that mentions shut-off fees or reconnect fees.

MS. SHAW: I'm just -- I only ask that because I know there's been problems with people getting funds from like CMCA that won't cover certain portions of their utility.

MR. ANSPACH: Sure. We'll double check.

MR. RITTER: We funded a proposal for utility systems during one of the first couple phases of Covid relief, I believe.

MR. ANSPACH: I'm not 100 percent.

MR. RITTER: We had an organization that was doing utility assistance.

MR. WHATLEY: I believe you're correct.

MR. ANSPACH: It's very possible.

MR. RITTER: So can we get a report on the data that they're submitting to us on what's being reimbursed?

MR. ANSPACH: Certainly we can work on getting a report. I'm trying to think if Public Health and Human Services also weren't administering some of those projects that you had also provided funding for. So if that's -- if that's the case, I'll touch base with their manager, Steve Hollis, and see if we can get some data back on the project that you're

talking about. I don't know right off the top of my head.

MR. RITTER: It was through this - I know we voted for some funds. I just don't remember the exact dollar amount.

MR. ANSPACH: I think --

MR. RITTER: But you were --

MR. ANSPACH: -- after the fact those projects were divvied up between Housing Programs and Public Health and Human Ser--

MR. RITTER: Of who was going to monitor?

MR. ANSPACH: Yeah. And so if that's the case, if it did land back on their side, I'll work with Steve to get data for you and get back with you.

MR. RITTER: It might just help the applicants for this much larger amount of money solidify the data in their applications to help us allocate those funds accordingly.

MR. ANSPACH: Okay.

MR. WHATLEY: Ms. Shaw, did you have any more questions?

MS. SHAW: That's all. Thanks.

MR. WHATLEY: Ms. Jefferson?

MS. JEFFERSON: Yes. Will we also be able to get the follow-up as far as the agencies that we've already given the money to that have the utility aids, as far as how many were they actually able to help and how many did not get assistance?

MR. ANSPACH: You're asking for CDBG or HOME-funded agencies that received funding for utility assistance?

MS. JEFFERSON: Whoever we gave money to before with utilities. Because it seems like that really turned out to be a problem for a lot of people, not having utilities -- being able to pay their utilities.

MR. ANSPACH: I'm not aware of anyone receiving it for CDBG or HOME, but we can double check and I'll let you know.

MR. RITTER: That was separate. That was what I was -- my question.

MR. ANSPACH: Got it. All right.

MR. WHATLEY: So Ms. Jefferson, are you asking for a breakdown of those who applied that received assistance versus --

MS. JEFFERSON: I don't need the individual people. I'd just like to know from the agencies, how many did they really help and who did they -- you know, how many did they turn away.

MR. WHATLEY: Okay.

MS. JEFFERSON: And the -- the part about any money leftover or not.

MR. WHATLEY: I see.

MR. FLETCHER: You should be able to give us just some basic graph or numbers of, you know, utility shut-offs in

the past months.

MR. RITTER: Well, during that process I asked -- it was back when Randy was the Chair. He had provided some data from the Utilities Department. The numbers had gone down significantly through the end of 2020 and into 2021. So it might be beneficial to get those numbers updated just to see where we are in the general population as far as delinquencies and risk of shut-off going into this funding cycle. Because this money is not going to be disbursed until the middle of 2022.

MR. ANSPACH: Potentially, yeah.

MR. RITTER: So agencies need to realize what the volume of need is going to be nine months from now.

MR. ANSPACH: Right. Just circling back on the Covid funds, it does appear that Public Health and Human Services was allocated 100,000 in Council reserves for utility assistance. And they're the ones administering it. So any of the data, I can get with the counterpart over there in their department and get that back to you.

MR. RITTER: Okay.

MR. KASMANN: So is it 24 months to begin expending funds or to have the funds expended?

MR. ANSPACH: To begin. In that case, if they are receiving those capacity building or ongoing assistance for non-profit, it would need to be that they anticipate starting that project and being funded within 24 months.

So in these cases you -- you know, depending on the level of applications and all the project proposals that you get, they would need to be started in that time frame.

MR. WHATLEY: Any other questions?

MR. FLETCHER: So what's the expenditure time frame for the HOME-ARP? You probably said that. Their funds would be allocated in spring of 2022?

MR. ANSPACH: So that would -- that would be our goal is to get them allocated as quickly as possible for eligible projects. HUD has an expenditure deadline that all HOME-ARP funds must be fully expended after ten years.

So we do have ten years to spend it. But the goal of the funds is to get them out into the community as Covid response. But, you know, an ongoing project that's constructing rental housing may take -- you know, it may take a few years to get going, especially with the environmental reviews and things like that. So HUD did put that timeline of ten years to have everything fully expended, but our process is we want to get those funds out a little bit more quickly.

MR. WHATLEY: Are there any questions related to the fiscal year 2022 HOME unallocated funds that we talked about? Any questions about the comprehensive Homeless

Services Center? Only question I have -- or maybe a comment, you know, with the homelessness - the Homeless Services Center. Are we going to seek any public engagement opportunities or is there going to be a survey sent out, you know, with this? It's a big thing that we're embarking on and -- I guess.

MR. ANSPACH: I would anticipate on the RFP for that planning assistance, that 75,000, we'll receive applications for it and you'll have an opportunity to review those. And then I don't know if, Tim, you've got any additional input?

MR. FLETCHER: Frankly, that would be part of a project plan to develop that center would include stakeholder input.

MR. WHATLEY: So this is more of an assessment process.

MR. RITTER: Yeah. We're approving the funds for the project. The project should have already done that.

MR. FLETCHER: Well, this was for different planning.

MR. WHATLEY: Mr. Teddy, I don't mean to put you on the spot, but I --

MR. TEDDY: No. Mr. Fletcher took the words right out of my mouth. I was going to comment in response to your question that one conceivable purpose of the use of those funds is to do that part of the planning that involves engaging the public in the concept of the Homeless Service Center.

MR. WHATLEY: All right. Thank you, sir.

MS. SUHLER: One other question relative to the opportunity center. I know Human Services, we've allocated some funds to this and the City has and our Commission. Is anybody coordinating those efforts or -- because it seems like we're dumping a lot of money into it, but I'm not sure if the right hand is talking to the left hand about how those funds will be used.

MR. WHATLEY: That's probably part of the planning process.

MR. ANSPACH: I would anticipate that's part of what that planning RFP is for.

MR. ROSE: Mark Harmon would probably know that.

MR. WHATLEY: Okay. So just to kind of, you know, go over the new business, you know, we were given a lot of information a couple of days ago and it was a lot to digest before tonight's meeting. So I encourage all the Commissioners to go through those documents. And if you have any questions, I - I recommend just e-mailing them directly to Gary and -- and let him answer. And if he does see a common theme, then I would encourage you to share it with the group.

MR. ANSPACH: Certainly.

MR. WHATLEY: Just in case we're all asking the same

question and not asking, so --

MR. ROSE: Are you needing tonight like for the Commission to approve for you to do the RFP for the HOME -- the extra 200,000? Were you asking for that to have that as part of it?

MR. ANSPACH: Would certainly take your approval if that's what you -- if you'd like to approve it, that's what we'd like to do is get those -- get that RFP process started.

MR. ROSE: So I would move that we approve that -- doing the RFP for those extra 200,000.

MR. WHATLEY: For the what?

MR. ROSE: For the HOME funds.

MR. FLETCHER: For the HOME unallocated funds?

MR. ROSE: Yeah.

MR. WHATLEY: So a motion has been made to include the HOME unallocated funds in with the RFP process. Is there a second?

MS. SHAW: Seconded.

MR. WHATLEY: Any discussion?

MS. SUHLER: I just have one question. The -- will the criteria for using those HOME funds be different or will they be the normal criteria that we used in the past?

MR. ANSPACH: It will be the normal criteria. It will be just like the ones from the summer.

MS. SUHLER: Okay.

MR. WHATLEY: Okay. So just to reaffirm the next couple of meetings, at the December 15th meeting, we're going to hear proposals for the HOME-ARP funds and also for the HOME unallocated funds. And then at the December 22nd meeting, then we're going to provide recommendations to the City for both of those as well that night, so. And that was my comment. So -- so a motion has been made and seconded. Any further discussion? All those in favor, raise your right hand.

(Hands raised.)

MR. WHATLEY: All those opposed, do the same. (No visible response.)

MR. WHATLEY: The motion carries. And then more than likely some time at the beginning of the year, we're going to talk more about the Homelessness Services Center is kind of what I'm feeling. Okay. Thank you everyone.

MS. JEFFERSON: I do have a question. I'm sorry.

MR. WHATLEY: Yes, ma'am.

MS. JEFFERSON: Different requirements, right, for the HOME funding and the HOME-ARP?

MR. WHATLEY: Yes. And those are both outlined on the RFPs that the City will send out.

MS. JEFFERSON: Thank you.

MR. WHATLEY: You're welcome.

Attachments: [HUD Qualifying Population](#)
[HOME-ARP Pre-Application Workshop](#)

HOME-ARP Agency Consultation Responses

Attachments: [HOME ARP Consultation Questions](#)
[Summary of Responses to HOME ARP Consultation](#)

HOME-ARP Request for Proposals

FY2022 HOME Unallocated Funds RFP

Comprehensive Homeless Services Center Planning RFP

VI. PUBLIC HEARING

MR. WHATLEY: Moving on to the public hearing, what I'd like to do tonight if there are any agencies that are here tonight that sent in the questionnaire to the City, if you want to talk about that a little bit or just provide us with any general information, we would love to hear that. So I'm going to go down the list of the 11 -- of the 11 agencies that submitted the questionnaires. Is there a representative from the Salvation Army here tonight that would like to speak? I'm mostly just listening, but I'm here if there are any questions for us. Okay.

MR. WHATLEY: Thank you, sir. Voluntary Action Center?

THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry. Can I get your name?

MR. SPENCE: Sean, S-e-a-n, Spence, S-p-e-n-c-e.

MR. WHATLEY: Salvation Army. Is there a representative from Voluntary Action Center here tonight that would like to speak?

MR. KIPLING: I can't speak on behalf of the questionnaire, but I will speak on behalf of the Opportunity Campus later in the meeting.

MR. WHATLEY: Okay. Turning point? Services for Independent Living? Great Circle? Love Columbia?

MS. WILLIAMS: I'm Jane -- I'm Jane Williams and this is Kelli Van Doren from Love Columbia. And we did -- I probably sent in way too many words to read, so I apologize for that. But just trying to help you see the characteristics of the population we serve and the volume also. So just a little bit in a nutshell, in -- five years ago we were receiving 40 to 50 new requests per week; last year it was 80; this year it's 110. And over half the requests for assistance we receive every week are related to housing instability. So it feels dire to us. We've seen great changes in terms of rents being raised so that people can't renew their lease, they can't afford to renew them. People not getting back to work, just all the factors that you're well aware of that have

put pressure on families. So we've tried to respond in a variety of ways. We are an agency that connects people with the SAFHR funds and have done I think --

MS. VAN DOREN: 248.

MS. WILLIAMS: -- 248 people since June with an average of \$3,200 per application and about 99 percent of those are getting approved, they're on track. So we're pretty excited about how much rent we're bringing back in past due rent to, you know, landlords, but that is still not helping with people who are topping the homelessness. We have seven transitional houses. CDBG, our City reserves, helped us fund one of them, a seventh one last year. So those are full, waiting lists. We're stretched thin just the number of calls. I feel like -- I've said in my notes, what we need is an emergency room really to just triage the number of dire situations. So we've gotten a homeless fund for hotels, we're applying for some ESG funds. It's just every day just a lot of pretty desperate people. We, in the last month, have worked with four families with five children each. That's twenty kids right there. The last -- two weeks ago we were with Ranita Norwood at CPS and she said there were 61 kids being picked up from hotels, 157 homeless students identified. We know that's underreported.

So we primarily focus on families with children, people with medical and health issues. And, you know, it's just a lot. So we're all about trying to create more housing, find ways. We took a busload of people to visit a new complex in Kansas City and are trying to create an informal affordable housing coalition just to get partners together to cheerlead one another's projects, see how we can collaborate, not duplicate. And so really good partnerships I think we're forming with some people in business, people in other non-profits. We sincerely want to all work together I believe in this community because we know that's what it's going to take to make a dent in this need. It's so overwhelming you can tend to not want to step in to actually create any more housing, but I think that's what we need to do. So I think I've talked too much.

MR. WHATLEY: Well, thank you very much.

MS. JEFFERSON: I have questions.

MS. WILLIAMS: Oh, yes. Sorry.

MR. FLETCHER: I'm sorry. We have several general questions. So you're Love Columbia?

MS. WILLIAMS: Yes.

MR. FLETCHER: So are you tied to Love, Inc. and Loveseat?

MS. WILLIAMS: Yes. We were - we changed our name in January.

MS. JEFFERSON: And you have other organizations. You have

-- you get donations, correct, from other --

MS. WILLIAMS: We receive private donations.

MS. JEFFERSON: Private, uh-huh.

MS. WILLIAMS: Private donations and also some funding through government sources, yeah.

MS. JEFFERSON: And you -- did you mention that you refer some of your clients to other organizations?

MS. WILLIAMS: We do. We try to be aware --

MS. JEFFERSON: Do you send money to cover -- how does that work? When you refer somebody to another organization, then are they -- they left with coming up using their own financial means to take care of your referral that you send to them?

MS. WILLIAMS: Well, we don't refer to an agency that doesn't have funding. We like to check that out before we would actually send somebody there. If we have ever done that, I would apologize because we don't want to give people the run-around.

MS. JEFFERSON: And then -- so I guess what -- tell me a little bit about how you decide where to send somebody else to.

MS. WILLIAMS: Well, if we hear that Voluntary Action Center has funding for a certain category of rental assistance, we will send someone there. We partner with St. Vincent de Paul Society, they do rent assistance. Sometimes they split it with us. We will sometimes be able to work with Phoenix programs. Or just any of the other agencies that have rental assistance, we try to be aware of that, be in contact with them, collaborate with them so that we know if they have it. And we work through the Functional Zero Task Force with a lot of the agencies so I think there's pretty good communication. Steve Paulus helps to facilitate that. So we're aware -- hey, if somebody got money, everybody knows about it and we try to send people there or we receive it. We have been receiving -- we've been trying to use the SAFHR funds. That's a portal. We don't receive any money. Actually we just connect people to the government portal, but it's been different for people to do. You can't do it on a cell phone, you have to scan documents, you have to have a lease so it requires some assistance. And so if we can work -- work through SAFHR, that's what we've been trying to do rather than use other rent assistance money. That's always our first course of action. Sometimes the landlords won't wait because it is a process. Sometimes it's not quite applicable. But we're trying to juggle all the different pots of rental assistance that are out there so that we can make the most of it.

MS. JEFFERSON: So when you send somebody with a referral, you refer them to another organization, do you

still count them as someone that you've helped?

MS. WILLIAMS: No.

MS. JEFFERSON: And then --

MS. WILLIAMS: I mean not with rental assistance. We would maybe count it as a referral, but we wouldn't count it as someone that we've helped with rental assistance or utility assistance or anything else.

MS. JEFFERSON: Like food assistance or anything like that?

MS. WILLIAMS: No.

MS. JEFFERSON: Thank you.

MR. WHATLEY: Thank you. Oh, wait. Sorry. Ms. Shaw?

MS. SHAW: Thank you for talking about the families that you're helping. Am I correct in thinking that there's -- the only options really, we have Harbor House in town. Correct? And then our motels and hotels, is that the only other option for people with children?

MS. WILLIAMS: Well, there's the St. Raymond's Maternity Home here in town. I think they can accept four families with a pregnant woman or woman with children under five.

Then, of course, there are some beds at True North. Do they have 12? I don't know exactly. So they would sometimes, of course, have families. But other than that, it would be the Harbor House -- and correct me -- I believe has six family rooms with four beds each.

That's, you know, hard for larger families. So yes. So in 2015, we started our transitional housing program with one house. We now have seven just because that was a big gap in the community was transitional housing for families. So often, you know, we get the family when they are just -- they would be on the street in their car. We either help them get into a hotel, try to get them into Harbor House if possible or into one of our houses. And we often have them there until we can -- if they can't pay market rate rent, which is often the case with a large family and a single mother, we work with Columbia Housing Authority to get them into an apartment.

So a perfect scenario is we can keep them in one of our houses for six months or maybe a little longer and then they can move into their own income-based apartment. So that's Kelli's favorite scenario. Unless we can help someone get a job that they can make enough money to pay market rate rent, but market rate rent has gone up about 10 percent in the past year and so it's getting harder and harder for that to happen.

MS. SHAW: Sure. And those individual homes that you have and Harbor House, that's only ten, maybe, families and --

MS. WILLIAMS: Right.

MS. SHAW: 60-some-odd, right, that are housed in hotels currently?

MS. WILLIAMS: Right. It's not enough. So we're thinking of just creating more three bedrooms and we want to work with others, of course, to do that. So anyway that's --

MS. SHAW: Thank you.

MS. WILLIAMS: Anything else?

MR. WHATLEY: Thank you. Central Missouri Community Action?

Columbia Housing Authority?

MR. COLE: Thank you. Randy Cole, CEO of Columbia Housing Authority. I do have some comments summarizing what was submitted so I'll just talk through -- Columbia Housing Authority, kind of where we're headed, as well as the needs that we see as an organization. So the Columbia Housing Authority is our community's largest and longest tenured affordable housing provider. And we were created by the City of

Columbia back in 1956 to assume this role for our community. One thing I've learned as I've stepped into my new role is that public housing authorities have tools, resources and capacities that other low-- local organizations don't have access to, but are also good partners. But I think it speaks to the power of the public housing authorities. One of those powers has to do with how we're defined under state law. We're municipal entities so, therefore, we have the ability to issue tax exempt bonds for financing, which -- which means when you invest dollars in us, we have the ability to match it with a lot of financial capacity. We also have the power of our vouchers. So we have Section 8 vouchers that in times where we can't match vouchers to available units on the private market, which is right now -- right now we have about 150 vouchers and a lengthy wait list of close to 900 households. Our people can't connect those vouchers to available units on the market because the availability is just not there. The power we have is to convert those vouchers to project-based so no longer tenant-based, which means that's another financing mechanism, which means housing authorities nationwide are really valuable tools and resources for communities to undertake scalable efforts to really make a significant impact on the housing needs in the communities. So right now we serve close to 800 households totaling roughly 3,900 persons. So that's quite a few people we serve. I was in the meeting with Jane and CPS talking about, you know, some of the homeless children, the 160 that Jane mentioned. You know, we work with our partners as well as the Functional Zero Task Force, but again, we can't -- our participants are really struggling to match vouchers to available units because available units aren't there. We have a big stack of vouchers to assist people, but no

places to match those to. So this really speaks to the need to increase our community's stock of affordable housing and preserve what we have. Right now in terms of the populations we serve, 61 percent roughly of our participants right now are minority populations, 81 percent of our participants make less than 30 percent of the area median income. If you think of a two-member household, that's 13,000 dollars gross annual income. So we really serve a big portion of our community that's at need and needs our support. Right now in our community there's about 5,800 households in Columbia that are 30 percent or below the area median income that are paying more than 50 percent of their gross monthly income on gross housing costs. That really speaks to the need. So given the shortage of housing and our level of unutilized vouchers, the data shows it's important to invest in our supply of affordable housing site. So I'd really recommend not going the route of putting money into additional tenant-based rental assistance. I just don't think that would be a wise use of funds. The HOME-ARPA notice, you know, I think it's also really important to look closely at that notice, if you haven't looked into, it and how they identify homeless populations. They go -- they utilize -- the feds utilize the McKinney-Vento Act, which is the broader definition that includes those that are at risk of homelessness. So it includes populations beyond people that might be visible and on the street corner that definitely need our help. There's a really big portion of the population beyond that. We've seen a much bigger demand from that group. The families that are doubled up with other family members or friends living out of a hotel. And I think the intent of the feds was -- was spot on by including that broader definition because thinking about the pandemic and the impact on families, those are people that really have had to make those tough choices about not going to work and staying home with your child because they're learning virtual or losing your job because you're a service worker and -- you know, all those economic hardships we've faced in the pandemic. So I think it's important to think about those families that are impacted the most by the pandemic. And these are the households that we serve at CHA and served before the pandemic and are continuing to serve. Right now I mentioned we have about 900 people on our -- or 900 households on our wait list. The ARPA notice also, if you look closely, encourages cities to consider funding of affordable housing projects in partnership with public housing authority entities because of that power of converting Section 8 vouchers to project-based vouchers.

Because that really puts additional stability

financially and for long-term upkeep of the property. Because we have that power, that means we can really scale our efforts. So for every dollar you invest, you know, you're going to at least get one, probably more dollars than that from us for our ability to finance that project and get other funding sources. Lastly, a couple of additional points. I've been looking at kind of the history of the Columbia Housing Authority and the level of housing stock that we've had. I think a really interesting fact that I've come upon is if you think back over our history, in 1974, we had about 719 units of affordable housing in our portfolio and our population was about 226,000. Today our population is about 126,000 as a community and our -- our affordable housing portfolio has only grown to 753. So really we've seen the population growth go exponentially higher than the level of housing we have in our inventory, which speaks to the need to invest in more affordable housing. So lastly, I think it's an exciting time for CHA. I'm really excited in my position there. And a couple of things that I'm excited about is we're empowering our residents. We have a Resident Advisory Board made of 25 different residents. We haven't had a formal leadership structure in place. We're getting to the point where we do now. So those residents will take ownership of how those meetings are run, how they inform us of how we can best serve them. That's something that's really important to me. We're also reducing barriers on our wait list. I know we get referrals from Love Columbia and Voluntary Action Center and others that work through the Functional Zero Task Force and we try to be good partners. When I first started, we did learn -- or I learned of some barriers including if -- if people were unemployed, they were penalized on our wait list. So basically people that were employed would move up our list more quickly. So we took away that provision. So now if you're homeless and unemployed, you're going to move up the list much more quickly than you would have in the past. So that barrier is gone. And we're listening and seeking more input from others where we can reduce barriers. Another exciting thing we have going on is we've reformulated our mission and vision and we've worked to incorporate the values of diversity and equity and inclusion, into our values and we're really committed to being our community's leading affordable housing provider. One last point I would make -- I know there was some discussion about utility assistance and other things beyond investing in affordable housing. I would encourage the Commission to think globally on what other resources are already out there doing those things. Because our HOME

funding in our community is the only dedicated source of funds that can go into investing in affordable housing.

And those funds that are flowing into our community that are already going towards, you know, some of the supportive services like utility assistance, those cannot go into affordable housing stock and that's our biggest need and biggest problem. So I would recommend maximizing that resource. So thank you.

MR. WHATLEY: Thank you, Randy. Any questions?

MS. JEFFERSON: Yes. Now, before you came aboard, Steinhaus -- Phil Steinhaus on that Garth and Sexton area, there was going to be more housing available. What was that; 14, 17, 20 something?

MR. COLE: The plat had 24 units.

MS. JEFFERSON: So is that still going to happen or not?

MR. COLE: so I appreciate you asking that question. So I don't want to show all my cards, but we definitely want to develop housing there. I'm fully committed to re-looking at how that project's formulated. I've been -- I've met personally with Pat Kelley, Ridgeway North Neighborhood Association. Also went out to a meeting they had a couple Saturdays ago -- or about a month ago connecting with those neighborhood members. I think they were excited of rethinking that property, trying to make it blend a little bit better with the neighborhood, be something that the neighborhood would accept more and a little more residential feel. So I'm fully committed to working with the neighborhood to look at that.

MS. JEFFERSON: And so I'm still -- so does -- do you think that's going to be a decrease in housing in that area or an increase for people to develop housing in that area?

MR. COLE: We would increase the housing available. I think what I would look at is how it's configured. You know, could we give it a little more residential feel? I think there was concerns with how much, you know, concrete was there, you know, how it looked as opposed to the existing housing stock. It might mean we might need to reduce a few units as well or look at, you know, adding some units on some other land that we own. I think we're going to have all options on the table. But I want to work with the neighborhood to help -- have them help us paint that picture of what that's going to look like.

MS. JEFFERSON: And you mentioned that you included diversity and inclusion. Did you say something like that?

MR. COLE: Yeah. We redid our organization's mission, vision and values, which included surveying all of our residents, our internal staff, doing a commu-- or employee engagement survey and working with our board. Also, we held a funders roundtable from other non-profit

fundors and non-profit partners, kind of talked about what our strengths, weaknesses and organizational threats were. So something that came out of that planning process was the need to incorporate diversity and equity and inclusion in our values so that we can build policies off of that as an organization in everything we do.

MS. JEFFERSON: So you talked about it, but are you putting something in action?

MR. COLE: We have incorporated our -- our Board approved that about a month ago. So yeah, I think we are putting that into action. We've communicated to our Resident Advisory Board, I think we're seeing some elements of change in how we approach safety with our residents, how we engage our residents. You know, I think us having a formal power structure in place where we put our residents in leadership roles on our advisory board is a demonstration of operationalization of that value. But we've got more to do and we're going to work with our community partners, this Commission, whomever how we can incorporate those values even further.

MS. JEFFERSON: Last question. I know you have one. Last question for you, Randy. Several times you've come up here and you've talked about how you wanted to remodel those old projects over there on -- is it Fisher Walkway?

Fisher --

MR. COLE: Park Avenue, Fisher Walkway, Providence.

MS. JEFFERSON: Have you done that yet?

MR. COLE: We haven't. We will be seeking funds through the City's funding process similar to this and what might come out of the ARPA funds. We need the City's investment to be able to do efforts like that. Those are very costly undertakings. But that's why we're, you know, at this meeting tonight, to seek ways to fund those. But yeah, that's a big priority of mine. Those units are in, you know, really rough shape. We need to modernize them, make them nice. I think that would -- that's a huge opportunity to make a statement and real impact on social equity in our community. You know, saying these people deserve to live in high-quality housing with dishwashers, washer and dryer hook-ups, energy efficiency, you know, all the things that we want our people to be living in.

MS. JEFFERSON: And have they - those are your oldest buildings, but yet you have not given them any attention?

MR. COLE: So of the 753 that I've mentioned, we've done 597 so we've got about 120 to go. My predecessor applied for funds multiple times. I think with all the support here locally we're getting with our efforts, I think we're heading in a good direction to be able to address those 120 units. And that's definitely a priority. We want to preserve what we have so we don't lose it and

make it better for our people and build more.

MS. JEFFERSON: Thank you.

MR. WHATLEY: Mr. Fletcher?

MR. FLETCHER: I think you answered the question that I had. Thank you.

MR. WHATLEY: Mr. Ritter?

MR. RITTER: I think you mentioned - I think you said 800, but in your written it says 1,800 households served.

MR. COLE: Yeah. We serve about 1,800.

MR. ROSE: I think the 900 came in my head as to who's on the waiting list.

MR. COLE: We have 900 households on the waiting list.

MR. RITTER: Oh, on the waiting list. Okay. Of the 1,800 served, do you have an idea of the percentage that are totally unemployed right now?

MR. COLE: I don't have that number, but I could get that and share that with the Commission.

MR. RITTER: Can you share that with your grant proposal?

MR. COLE: Yeah. I'd be happy to.

MR. RITTER: And then under-employment? And maybe that's a question for an organization that does more vocational counseling. But I think that's an important statistic in this community to know what percentage of these households are truly unemployed right now versus under-employed versus fully employed and just not making enough to make a rent payment.

MR. COLE: We can -- we can look into that data.

MR. WHATLEY: Any other questions? Ms. Suhler.

MS. SUHLER: I have one, but it's kind of a fuzzy one to be -- last spring, Phil Steinhaus brought a proposal to our Commission that was kind of trying to fund a position for a person who would be a clearinghouse and would kind of alleviate some of the issues Jane was talking about where people come to her and she says well, I don't have money, I have to send you here. And I -- I wondered, has anything - has there been any follow-up on that or is that a proposal you might throw -- loft our way again?

MR. COLE: We actually hired that position, a housing ambassador. And that's been a great effort. He's been going to all the Columbia Apartment Association meetings, connecting with landlords, trying to eke as much out of the market as we can. He's also -- we also hired an IT person. We hadn't had a dedicated IT person. I did that about a month in. And so now those two are working together and doing some really innovative things. We have on our website the list of properties and then also text messaging software. A lot of people we serve -- you know, you may think our low-income don't have access to cell phones. That's not necessarily a true statement. Many and most do. Some of the service might be spotty at times,

but it's a really great way to connect with folks. So every time we have any properties, we blast out texts to all the participants that have signed up. And I think there's close to 80 on that text messaging service now. So yeah, the housing ambassador is always trying to collect properties, work with our people that come in the door needing housing and try to connect them. So that's been a good thing and I'd want to continue that.

MS. SUHLER: And do you also include other organizations so they have --

MR. COLE: Yeah.

MS. SUHLER: -- privy to your information?

MR. COLE: We do. We're on the Functional Zero Task Force so we go to those meetings every two weeks. We get a lot of help from Love Columbia. They're a great resource to connect with people that we help serve. I think that's something - the collaborative Jane mentioned starting up is great and I appreciate all of Jane's work. I think the more we can make that connection between people that need shelter right off the street, the transitional housing, and then to our housing, the more we can all work as partners to lift up each other's projects, I think is good.

MR. WHATLEY: Ms. Shaw?

MS. SHAW: One last question, Randy.

MR. COLE: Yeah.

MS. SHAW: So what is the average wait time on your wait list right now?

MR. COLE: I'm sorry. What was that?

MS. SHAW: The average wait time on your wait list?

MR. COLE: I'm going to look at Charlene. Three months now?

CHARLENE: So it's all dependent on the household size. There's really no way to tell.

MR. COLE: Yeah. Like our one-bedroom -- yeah, appreciate that. Our one-bedroom wait list is about 600 people. So if you're looking for a one-bedroom unit, you're going to be on there, you know, nine months to a year. If it's a two- or three-bedroom, you know, it might be a couple months. And, you know, it's all depending on if people can find a unit as well. So it kind of depends on the size. I might also say I have a couple of other people with me tonight that will probably want to speak as well, some residents and leaders that are residents.

MR. ROSE: One more. I think I understood that you probably were going to have a proposal for the extra HOME funds, I think. Did you say that?

MR. COLE: Absolutely.

MR. ROSE: Yeah. Okay.

MR. COLE: Yeah.

MR. WHATLEY: Okay. So any other representatives from the Columbia Housing Authority who would like to speak?

Hello again.

MR. DUNBAR: Hello. My name is John Dunbar. I'm the acting president of the Resident Advisory Board. I think Randy had said basically most of the things that I was going to cover. However, what I do need to say is that we are in desperate need of more housing. The number of people that have come up on these waiting lists and the people that are applying is just a very small fraction. And I speak from a very unique point of view. I was homeless for a number of years. It was like -- someone said earlier someone said that there's those homeless that you see, but then there's those homeless that you don't. So therefore, what I'm saying is that the population has grown more than 126,000 because the number of homeless isn't even being counted. So now once we try to come together and work together, city, state, whatever it takes, there is a great need for funding, for new housing, affordable housing. We have families that have been impacted and displaced due to this pandemic. We're going into the second year. Thank God they have vaccines for the children now and have -- if this is successful, then hopefully we can start getting, you know, our families back together. Once again, I want to go back to trying to find a way that we, as a city, can work together and create the housing that's necessary for our homeless. That is the message that I want to impart on you all. And it takes money. I understand that through the relief plan, there is money available. I'm assuming that the proposal and the Letter of Intent is -- should be forthcoming And I just implore you to take consideration into those proposals and help us with the problem that we all face as a city, and that's to get affordable housing to our homeless. Thank you.

MR. WHATLEY: Ms. Jefferson?

MS. JEFFERSON: Mr. Dunbar. Right?

MR. DUNBAR: Yes.

MS. JEFFERSON: So you said at one time you were homeless.

Am I correct?

MR. DUNBAR: Yes.

MS. JEFFERSON: Okay. And I believe when Randy was up there before you, he had mentioned how there -- there's a list. And it seems -- did I hear correctly that the homeless was moved to the -- they're more put now at the top of the list -

MR. DUNBAR: They have been --

MS. JEFFERSON: -- and other people that were in line for homes are kind of moved aside or put to the bottom? And do you agree with that type of --

MR. DUNBAR: I think that -- I think that part of that is correct. The other part is essential. During the period of being homeless, I was also disabled. So my career took me to a point till I lost my wife tragically. I had a mental problem, I stepped away from my profession. I found myself homeless and in need of mental assistance, which is once again, something else that the homeless face and have very little help for. But due to my disability now, I'm still -- well, I was homeless until the point of coming to Columbia and then getting involved in the Columbia Housing Authority process. And because of my being homeless and disabled, I was able to move up the list, and I think that was the question that you were asking. I was able to move up a little more expediently than some others.

MS. JEFFERSON: And that is another one of my thoughts. I feel like -- so what's your take on people coming to Columbia and they're homeless and, therefore, now there are more homeless people?

MR. DUNBAR: I think that we look at socio economical issue. When a lot of people come to different cities, they're coming there for a reason. They're either displaced from where they are, they've got better jobs, whatever the case may be. But in regards to the homeless, the people that are coming to Columbia I think are still somewhat off the radar. Because, first of all, most of them don't have ID. They don't have all of the necessary credentials in order to start this process. So therefore, opposed to having the resources or finding the resources in order to get these things, they find themselves -- once again, it's a mental thing as well. If you've never been on the streets, it takes a toll on you mentally state of mind. So I'm thinking that a lot of these people that come to Columbia are just beat down. They need assistance, which means that someone I think needs to probably form some type organization to go out, to seek out the homeless, to take information, get information, give them some type of a carriage to bring them from where they are to at least have an ID, get your birth certificate, all of the essential things necessary to get housing. You can't have housing -- you can't get housing without these things, so.

MS. JEFFERSON: Last question. So you're emphasizing, you know, how badly we need to shelter the homeless. But -- but you're also -- so it's coming across to me you're kind of saying like this Board/Commission needs to really work on that. What other -- what other resources, availability - what other types of financial assistance - where else could you get financial assistance other than coming to this Board?

MR. DUNBAR: Well, I would have to, once again --

MR. COLE: And John's on our Resident Advisory Board. Some
places that we're going to go seek funding, aside from
the City, would be the Missouri Housing Development
Commission, the Federal Home Loan Bank. We'd p

PUBLIC HEARING

MR. COLE: So the HOME-ARPA funds, as Gary mentioned, is
they can go into tenant-based rental assistance, but as I
mentioned, there's no avail-- there's very little
availability on the private market, so what we will
probably apply for --not probably, definitely -- will be
funds to expand our affordable housing stock.

MR. ROSE: To create housing --

MR. COLE: So we have more units to pull those 900
households off the wait list.

MR. ROSE: Yeah. Is it they're not available because
landlords don't want to make it available? The housing is
actually there?

MR. COLE: So we can talk about this for a while.

MS. VAN DOREN: Jane has a comment.

MS. WILLAAMS: I can actually say something about that.

MR. WHATLEY: Supply and demand.

MR. COLE: Before the pandemic, you know, our housing
construction hasn't kept up since the 2000s with the
growth in population and the demand that's out there. The
construction costs have risen and financing costs to
consider, you know, national disasters, things like that.
But, you know, regulatory costs have went up as well, you
know, the last 50 years. So it's not one thing. It's
about twelve things that have impacted -- and this is
nationwide. Communities haven't been able to keep up with
providing enough housing supply in their communities so
we have a housing affordability crisis. And really, you
know, rent assistance, utility assistance, all those
things are short-term solutions that just push the bubble
even bigger. I think it's going to come to a head soon
for everyone to realize we need to invest in hard
infrastructure. And yeah, it's going to take a couple
years to buy land, construct it, but really that's the
solution. And that's how this funding is even directed.

MR. ROSE: I should have read that article they did on
it. I guess I would have gotten that information.

MS. VAN DOREN: Jane wanted to make a comment.

MR. ROSE: Sure.

MS. WILLIAMS: Can you hear me?

MR. ROSE: Yes.

MS. WILLIAMS: So we provide a low-cost housing openings
list every week.

MS. VAN DOREN: Come up to the microphone so they can
hear.

MS. WILLIAMS: And we've been doing this for a few years.

And recently we've just -- well, really just since May we've even noticed how much -- how many fewer listings we can find. And so it's for any housing under a thousand dollars or less. And so it -- typically we would always have 60, even a year ago. Now we're usually at about 30. And there's some weeks there are no -- well, absolutely no four-bedroom and very few three-bedroom and sometimes there's no three- or four-bedroom, even two-bedroom on the list that will accept a housing choice voucher. The market is so tight, that landlords don't need to accommodate. They don't need to accept someone with a felony on their background, someone with an eviction on their background. They don't need to wait for the process to accept a housing choice voucher. And sometimes the housing choice voucher is not even offering the rent that they can now receive on the private market. It's a whole new -- it's a whole new situation out there. So anyway.

MS. VAN DOREN: Thanks for letting her talk.

MR. WHATLEY: I would like to --

MS. JEFFERSON: I just want --

MR. WHATLEY: -- stop for a moment. I want to make one comment. I would really like to stick to --

MS. JEFFERSON: Well, you know, we're having this public hearing --

MR. WHATLEY: -- the ARP process more than anything else.

MS. JEFFERSON: -- and I would like to make a comment.

MR. WHATLEY: So if it's related to the HOME-ARP --

MS. JEFFERSON: It's related to what they're up here talking about.

MR. WHATLEY: Okay.

MS. JEFFERSON: So I hear about the homeless since the Covid, but don't you agree that we had a homelessness problem way before the Covid?

MR. DUNBAR: Yes.

MR. COLE: Yes.

MS. JEFFERSON: Okay. And the thing about everyone needs to like actually be in a home that they're buying affordable, is that what you feel like you're saying?

MR. COLE: No. Some people need rental housing. But people that have gotten gainful employment and want to, you know, build their -- their income and wealth might -- yeah, home ownership is good. Everybody needs that opportunity. Some people might need -- might be in a place where they need transitional housing. I think we need all --

MS. JEFFERSON: Affordable housing is just --

MR. COLE: I think broadly. Broadly, yeah.

MS. JEFFERSON: -- affordable. Thank you both very much.

MR. WHATLEY: Thank you. Representative from The Food Bank?

UNIDENTIFIED: One more --

MR. WHATLEY: One more CHA. I apologize.

MS. RAHN: Sorry about that. I just moved and I have a voucher -- oh, I'm Jama Rahn, J-a-m-a, last name is R-a-h-n. There's no affordable housing in Columbia. If you find something that works, you don't even want to look at it; you want to get it. Because if you go online today and look at the apartments and the houses that are available, there's generally none or two or three that are 600 dollars or less. They -- a few, you know, 500 - or 700 to 800. And then you look and they're all 1,500 or 1,000 dollars or upwards. WorldPopulation.com, I think they work with the census somewhat. They were looking at the median income -- rental properties being 804 dollars, 884 -- I left my notes back there -- in Columbia. That can't be right. They must be taking the students that rent the rooms in the big places. Those have to be on there. Because any given week you look and there's probably two or three available. And they're not the best places in town. There's just nothing out there. So say that you make minimum wage. Let's just say 9 dollars an hour, 40 -- 40 hours a week. That's 360 before taxes, so roughly 1,240, 1,300. If you have to rent a place for 800 dollars, that's well over 30 percent. That doesn't include utilities, medical, transportation, food, clothing, anything, you know, electric. So there's just nothing out there. It -- it's crazy trying to look. And it's probably this way everywhere, but there's a whole lot of homeless people we don't even know about. And I think a part of the crime comes from that insecurity with housing. I know a lot of our mental health does, you know. It's just so important that there are places that will take us. And -- and the -- I don't know. I don't know the solution, but I know we have to have more affordable housing. It's -- it's insane how 49 percent of the people in Columbia are renters, you know, yet we can't find any place to rent. So I think that's where CHA comes in and it really helps. I'm a veteran. Domestic violence really brought me here. I had no idea where I was going. I saw VA a bus that could reach it, there had to be jobs, you know. There were no shelters, not for women. I've -- I wasn't from Boone County so the domestic violence, North Star, I couldn't go there and the Salvation Army was full. I found a place, but it was the grace of God. And the landlord there let me in and he lost a lot of money on me, you know. And then I finally got into the veterans and the CHA and it's still very tough to find any place. So, you

know, it can be anybody. You know, so many people are that far away from losing their job, losing their house. And I don't know. it's -- there's got to be a solution. So that's all I had.

MR. WHATLEY: Thank you.

MS. SHAW: Thank you for sharing.

MR. WHATLEY: Gary, just a quick question. A reference has been made to the city population of 126,000. Is that with or without students, do you know?

MR. TEDDY: Generally with.

MR. WHATLEY: It's generally with students?

MR. TEDDY: Generally resident students.

MR. ANSPACH: Yeah. And I don't know for sure. Tim says it is with students.

MS. SUHLER: It is with students.

MR. WHATLEY: It is with students? Okay. Just curious. A representative from The Food Bank? Habitat for Humanity? City of Columbia Public Health? Did I miss any of the organizations?

HOME-ARP

VII. GENERAL COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, MEMBERS AND STAFF

MR. WHATLEY: Okay. We will go ahead and open it up to public comment. If there's anybody from the -- who's a resident of the city who would like to make a comment, please do so. You're welcome to do so, I should say. And if you can give your name - do we need any other information besides their name or is just the name okay?

MR. ANSPACH: The name's fine.

MS. PLACIER: Hi. I'm Peggy Placier. I'm from 209 South Greenwood in Columbia.

MR. WHATLEY: Hi.

MS. PLACIER: Just before coming here, I got a -- I work with the RMF Community Bail Fund. Just before coming here, I got a text message from one of our volunteers who had just bailed out someone who had nowhere to go. People call us because they would prefer not to be in jail to being in jail, but then when they are released, they -- they often say, you know, I've got family here, but they can't provide for me or none of my friends can take me in. So I want to speak on behalf of the Homeless Service Center. It's a desperate need. If we had a place to drop people where they could get a start on getting services, on getting referrals to the help they need, it would make a huge difference. Just in 2021 alone, we have bailed out about 52 people now and a substantial percentage of those have been homeless. So this

transition from being, you know, at the -- I don't want to say bottom. That's not how I evaluate people, because I highly value the people that we bail out of jail. But being the most vulnerable, those with the least resources, all the needs that I've heard about this evening are so moving, but I want to put in a word for those folks. Thanks.

MR. WHATLEY: Ma'am, can you tell me what's the name of your organization again?

MS. PLACIER: It's the RMF Community Bail Fund. We raise money -- we're all volunteers. We raise money from donations. We don't have any office. We don't -- we're not -- we're a mutual aid kind of group. And so we're not asking for money for us. We're asking for it for services for the people that we serve.

MR. WHATLEY: Thank you. I just never heard of your group before, so thank you.

MS. PLACIER: Well, now you know.

MR. WHATLEY: Thank you. Would anybody else like to make a comment tonight?

MR. PALMER: Still not used to the mask after all this time, so.

Good evening. My name is Mark Palmer, 106 Kipling Way in Columbia, Missouri. This evening I'm speaking on -- I'm speaking before the Commission on behalf of the Voluntary Action Center where I serve as the project coordinator for the Opportunity Campus. This summary -- I'm here tonight really just to give the Commission a summary on where we're at. The Commission was gracious and approved a 70-- about 75,000 dollars in Community Development Block Grant funding in the last cycle in the summer that will be expended later on in 2022. And we thank you for that support and vote of confidence. At this time we've made great progress in the planning and concept development of the Opportunity Campus and we still have a long way to go, but we are making progress on a daily basis. We've had tremendous support from both the community and both the public and private sectors. Our main objective has always been to have this be a community public partnership. It was never designed to have one group take care of everything. And so based on that, I'm here to give you an update on that public/private partnership. We've been working with the City of Columbia, the City Council, the mayor to work to move this forward and have been active in advocating -- excuse me -- for the use of ARPA funds for this project. Everybody has been supportive of this and staff have met the needs that we have requested for information. We will continue to work with the different city departments, which will oversee this process moving forward. We've

also had initial conversations with the county and they're showing some interest as well. I do think it's very important to keep in mind that while we've been working with the city and working with the county, no funds have been appropriated. So there's kind of that misconception that it's already funded. It is not. We are still very early on in the process. We are beginning the process of formulating and structuring the private sector part where we'll be looking at private funding through the capital -- through capital campaign, working with donors to make that be part of the reality. The Opportunity Campus will be made up of several organizations providing multiple types of services and VAC, Voluntary Action Center, will be the lead agency.

We'll be working with Turning Point, Loaves and Fishes, Room at the Inn -- excuse me - and others. We anticipate numerous ancillary services to include transitional housing, permanent housing, vocational services, recovery services, mental health, as well as potential medical and dental service. The Opportunity Campus goal is to have a comprehensive service delivery system that will provide a high level of support for folks moving out of homeless or being unsheltered. These are very complex issues and situations, but we feel that a comprehensive service delivery model will be the only solution. We anticipate the emergency shelter piece being a congregate setting. The things you've heard tonight, that is a non-congregate setting. So there is a difference there. So we will not be going after those funds. We will continue to look at the service delivery model as we move forward, potential locations, types of buildings, zoning issues, future operating costs and potential revenue streams. We will be applying for the planning grant that was discussed here this evening. At this time, I just want to close by letting you know that this is totally being funded by private donations at this time and we continue to work with the city and county to move this forward. So I'd be happy to answer any general questions if you have any this evening.

MR. WHATLEY: Any questions by the Commissioners? Ms. Shaw?

MS. SHAW: In your discussions with the county, it's my understanding that the county is having an outside group consult with them for how to spend the ARP funds that they have been given; is that correct?

MR. KIPLING: We have not gotten into that. I mean I've heard that as well. We had also heard that they're not looking at getting - moving the process further along until the actual clarity is provided with what the regulations are as to how the funds can be spent. So

they're waiting for the actual -- I'm forgetting the proper terminology,
but -- clarity on how the funds can actually be spent.
MS. SHAW: Okay. And so right now your plans are only to apply for that 75,000 dollars that was set aside and will have an RFP?
MR. KIPLING: Uh-huh. Yeah. And that's just for the planning part. I mean obviously we continue to work with the city and we continue to work with the county to keep them informed of where we're at. You know, we've obviously met with the Finance Department, Public Health, City Manager's Office to educate, to work together, to talk about it. But it will -- my guess is it will probably go through the normal RFP process of both the city and the county. So while the Opportunity Campus is out there, we potentially could be just one of other organizations that applied for these sorts of funds as it comes a little further down the path. Got a long way to go.
MR. WHATLEY: Mr. Ritter?
MR. RITTER: Has the county not viewed the city presentation on the guidelines for these funds?
MR. KIPLING: I'm sorry?
MR. RITTER: Has the county not viewed the presentation that the city prepared on these guidelines?
MR. KIPLING: I'm sorry. I can't --
MR. RITTER: That was a public comment, not directed at you. So maybe we can share that with your counterparts at the county.
MR. KIPLING: I do think -- I do think that there's some different regulations as well. And maybe Gary or Mr. Teddy can do this, but I think there's also some differences coming up with -- HUD is coming up with some of their funds, as well as what are coming out of some of the other ARPA funds through the different --
MR. ANSPACH: I can really only speak to the HOME-ARP funds at this point.
MR. KIPLING: Right.
MR. ANSPACH: Those are the regulations that we are navigating through the housing program. I can't speak between the city ARP funds and county ARP funds.
MR. RITTER: Versus county?
MR. ANSPACH: Right. I don't know about that.
MR. KIPLING: I think they're going to have different guidelines on how the money is to be spent.
MR. RITTER: So the 75,000, you said that was already approved through CDBG?
MR. KIPLING: No, no, no, no. I'm sorry. So yeah, we received that last year through the last cycle.
MR. RITTER: I just want to clarify her question.

MR. KIPLING: Right.

MR. RITTER: Because that's already been funding from a previous cycle so they will get those funds already.

MS. SHAW: Okay.

MR. RITTER: What they would be applying for would be an additional planning budget.

MR. KIPLING: Right. That was on the agenda this evening.

So I'm sorry if I didn't make that clear.

MS. JEFFERSON: And I missed out on how -- how is that 75,000 dollars already been being used? How are you using that?

MR. KIPLING: We haven't received it yet, so yeah. That was just part of the award that was given earlier this year. And those funds aren't available until summer or fall.

MR. ANSPACH: Just to clarify. So you all, as a Commission, voted to recommend and council ultimately approved 75,300 --

MR. KIPLING: Sorry.

MR. ANSPACH: -- was the final number. 75,300 is what was approved for VAC in CDBG funds for fiscal year 2022.

MS. JEFFERSON: And you're planning on using that in what way again?

MR. KIPLING: That will be part of the Opportunity Campus if it does become a reality. So it will fall under the guidelines of what those funds can be used for. It will be a very, you know -- it's a wonderful support, but we're talking an extremely large project here.

MR. WHATLEY: Any other questions? I just have one. So as part of your planning process, are you looking at other cities or other campuses across the United States to look for those best practices or --

MR. KIPLING: Uh-huh. We are. We've taken a couple different site visits. Probably one of the ones that is closest, the model that we're currently looking at right now is the Tulsa Day Center.

MR. WHATLEY: Tulsa Day Center?

MR. KIPLING: Yeah. It seems to be a model that works real well. Very comprehensive services in regards to case management, have partnerships with a lot of the agencies that I talked about. Obviously we've been discussing our project with Randy and the Columbia Housing Authority about how we can work on that continuum that you've been hearing about all night.

MR. WHATLEY: Right.

MR. KIPLING: And so those discussions are already occurring. That's primarily the one we're looking at as far as the model it goes with. Now, they have been in existence for I think it was about 30 years.

MR. WHATLEY: Oh, okay.

MR. KIPLING: A lot of that also was funded with oil money so they had that resource down there, so -- in Tulsa, so.

MR. WHATLEY: The second and last question I have is with part of your planning process, are you -- is the Opportunity Campus group, are you taking any sort of a census of the current homeless population that we have?

MR. KIPLING: Yeah.

MR. WHATLEY: And, you know, I guess that's an interesting number that we would all just love to know, you know --

MR. KIPLING: Sure.

MR. WHATLEY: -- where we're at with -- or I mean --

MR. KIPLING: Yeah. I think there's a number -- there's data that has come out through a number of different areas versus the number of beds that are available. You know, a good -- a good number that we're seeing is in the -- the 2- to 300 range and then you also have the number of beds doing that. Probably the best example is when you look at the Room at the Inn, you know, what they're dealing with in the winter months. They can go anywhere from 50 to 100 folks that are looking for services of that. One of the things that you've also heard tonight, very difficult population to get a census on.

MR. WHATLEY: Right.

MR. KIPLING: And so that -- that's a struggle. But we feel like we have a -- you know, somewhat -- and we have a lot of those folks that need this type service, the low barrier. And those are -- those are folks that a number of folks have mentioned that there's not a lot of restrictions to get in. You know, that they can come in for a night, two nights three nights, whatever the case may be and then try to get them into the other systems and the other partners to move them through the process. So the numbers are very difficult, but that's clearly something that we hope to have a better opportunity to research and plan for that. But it is a constant change in numbers. I can let you know that.

MR. WHATLEY: I can imagine.

MR. KIPLING: Yeah.

MR. WHATLEY: Thank you. Any other questions? Comments?
Thank you, Mr. Palmer. Hello?

MR. BURHANS: Hi there.

MR. WHATLEY: Good evening.

MR. BURHANS: My name is Dirk Burhans and I live at 803 Clayton Street, Columbia. And I wasn't going to -- really prepared to say anything tonight, but I'm a member of the John Brown Gun Club. We're a mutual aid group that's existed in Columbia since 2017. And we work with unsheltered homeless people almost on a daily basis. Since the winter of 2018, we've -- we've run a -- what we call a mobile soup kitchen that serves between 40 and 50

homeless folks, mostly unsheltered at camps, three mornings a week. And this year starts our fourth year of running that. And we -- we've been hearing a lot of talk about shelters, interim shelters and housing. So I just wanted to make -- I'm sure people are aware about the unsheltered situation in Columbia, but we are just always going to have people who are not going to want to stay in a shelter, who are not going to want housing. We have people who have been abused in shelters, we have people with social disorders that make them very uneasy in shelters. We also have people who are stubborn about restrictions on prescription drugs, all kinds of things. So we work with these people all the time. They're always going to be here. They're going to be camping around the outskirts of Columbia. The landowners are going to complain about disturbances. The landowners are going to complain about trash. Our campers are forced to move all the time because of these kinds of complaints. So what we would like -- what I would like and what we would like Columbia to think about is something along the lines of a permanently available supervised campground. A place where campers can set up camp, where restroom facilities would be available, cooking facilities would be available. Camps like these were all over the country during The Great Depression. It could be done. We have places within the city limits where something like this could happen. So I just wanted to bring people's attention to that.

MR. WHATLEY: Thank you. Any other comments by the members of the public? Any comments by the Commissioners? Mr. Fletcher?

MR. FLETCHER: So I was very encouraged tonight to hear for the HOME-ARP fund scope that they've included supportive services. Because we heard a lot about housing, but housing is a symptom to a great extent. We're not going to miraculously, in the next year or two, develop all of the capacity we need to address the need. But the supportive services can help with those who are unemployed, under-employed, who are lacking transportation, who are lacking child care. All those other things to -- to kind of reduce the population that need that housing -- that affordable housing. And so I hope that -- that the agencies who apply for these funds, you know, are thinking in those terms as well to reduce the need instead of solely to focus on trying to build capacity.

MR. WHATLEY: Thank you, Mr. Fletcher. Any other comments?

MS. JEFFERSON: I -- I agree. And I just want to say that I know with -- we did have a lot of talk about the homelessness that's already out there. But this American

Rescue Fund Plan is also for - to keep people from becoming evicted. So I hope that we can keep some of our focus on how do we make sure they don't become homeless.

MR. WHATLEY: Comments?

MR. RITTER: I've been on the Commission for over a decade. Homelessness and affordable housing has been a topic every single year. This is an opportunity to have a chunk of money to do something about it. And I just continue to express my thoughts around the homeless shelter that's needed, rental assistance that's needed, and supportive services to get these people into gainful employment so they don't have a housing issue. So that's what we'll be looking forward to seeing in these proposals.

MR. WHATLEY: Ms. Shaw?

MS. SHAW: I'm the newbie here so - but you know, I've known -- I'm aware of all of the problems that have been stated tonight that's happening in the community. And I would like to thank Mr. Burhans for coming and bringing up the fact that we do have camps out that people aren't reaching whenever they're doing the census information. And I know that your mobile soup group has doubled in the portions they've been serving in the last year. So there is a need out there that will not be met maybe by either an immediate low barrier shelter or transitional or affordable housing. So that is something to keep in mind as well.

MR. WHATLEY: Ms. Suhler?

MS. SUHLER: I really appreciate all the comments and every -- all -- everything people have brought to the table. And I guess I share my concern as a Commissioner.

I feel overwhelmed often, you know, as we look at proposals. All of them are very good and identify a need. And anything that you can do to help to help -- help us figure out where we get the biggest bang for our -- for the buck. You know, where can we help the most people? Is it in services? Is it in new facilities? Whatever it is. Because I -- I think, you know, if we can use this money wisely and serve the most people and then maybe address, you know, the housing issue -- which I think Mitch made a good point. We're never going to solve that -- but maybe we can at least help a lot of people right now in this very dire situation.

So I ask you to help us make these decisions by showing us where we can serve the most people.

MR. WHATLEY: Any other comments?

MR. RITTER: How many times at any one of our lives have we seen housing costs go down? Maybe once after the recession? I mean it's not going to go down. Housing's going to get more expensive, building costs are going to

be get more expensive, labor is going to get more expensive. We need to solve for what's in front of us now to get us over the hump.

MR. WHATLEY: That was a lot of food for thought and we have a lot of serious opportunities to think about moving forward.

Thank you, Mr. Fletcher, for renewing your Commission with us for another term. Welcome, Mrs. Shaw, to our Commission. We look forward to seeing you at our future meetings for your term. I do appreciate everybody who spoke tonight. It's your voice that we need to hear. Thank you for those -- for the new groups that I learned about tonight that are out there doing some marvelous work. So we need more of you. So thank you to the organizations that responded to the questionnaire and spoke tonight. You've given us a lot of food for thought. So with that in mind, any comments by the City Staff? I don't want to forget you.

MR. ANSPACH: No. We're good.

VIII. NEXT MEETING DATE: December 15, 2021 - 7:00PM

MR. WHATLEY: Okay. So our next meeting is December 15th here in Council Chambers at seven o'clock. We're going to hear some proposals that night. Hopefully a few that will meet all the needs that we discussed tonight.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

MR. WHATLEY: So with that, can I get a motion to adjourn tonight's meeting?

MS. SUHLER: Motion to adjourn.

MR. WHATLEY: Is there a second?

MR. KASMANN: Second.

MR. WHATLEY: A motion has been made and seconded
All those in favor, raise your right hand. (Hands raised.)

MR. WHATLEY: Opposed?
(No visible response.)

MR. WHATLEY: We're adjourned.
(Meeting adjourned at 8:50 p.m.)

Members of the public may attend any open meeting. For requests for accommodations related to disability, please call 573-874-CITY (573-874-2489) or email CITY@CoMo.gov. In order to assist staff in making the appropriate arrangements for your accommodation, please make your request as far in advance of the posted meeting date as possible.