



# City of Columbia, Missouri

## Meeting Minutes - Draft

### Housing and Community Development Commission

---

Wednesday, June 12, 2024  
7:00 PM

Regular Meeting

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

---

#### I. CALL TO ORDER

MR. ROSE: We'll go ahead and call the meeting to order.

*Rose called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.*

#### II. INTRODUCTIONS

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

**Present:** 8 - Mitchell Ritter, Ross Kasmann, Thomas Rose, Rebecca Shaw, Rikki Ascani, Erica Pefferman, Jay McIntosh and Michael Nguyen

**Excused:** 1 - Michael Fletcher

#### INTRODUCTIONS

MR. ROSE: We'll start off again with our introductions. And, Erica, you get to start things off without even sitting down.

MS. PEFFERMAN: Hi. Hello everyone. Erica Pefferman, Ward 4.

MR. KASMANN: Ross Kasmann, Ward 3.

MS. SHAW: Rebecca Shaw, Member at Large.

MR. RITTER: Mitch Ritter, Ward 2.

MR. ROSE: Tom Rose, Ward 5.

MS. ASCANI: Rikki Ascani, Ward 1.

MR. MCINTOSH: Jay McIntosh, Ward 6.

MR. AMELUNKE: Jake Amelunke, City Staff.

MS. THOMPSON: Becky Thompson, City Staff.

MS. GRAHAM: Tracy Graham, City Staff.

MS. DEAVER: Jennifer Deaver, City Staff.

#### III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MR. ROSE: All right. And we'll start off with approval of the agenda, so I would entertain a motion to approve the agenda.

MS. PEFFERMAN: So moved.

MR. ROSE: Okay. I would like to make one just switch a little bit. I would like to cover

the HOME before we do the CDBG when we cover those, just to -- yeah. It would be easier to get one out, so -- so if that's right. Do I hear a second for the agenda?

MS. ASCANI: Second.

MR. ROSE: Second.

MS. ASCANI: Rikki.

MR. ROSE: Okay. Any other discussion? Okay. All in favor, specify by saying aye.

Any opposed, same sign.

(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

MR. ROSE: Okay.

**Motion to approve the agenda as amended: Pefferman**

**Motion to 2nd: Ascani**

**Motion passes unanimously: 8:0**

#### IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Approval of May 15, 2024 Meeting Minutes

**Attachments:** [05.15.24 HCDC Minutes - DRAFT](#)

[05.15.24 HCDC Meeting Audio](#)

[05.15.24 HCDC Transcript](#)

MR. ROSE: Next, we'll have approval of our minutes from two meetings. First, I'll entertain a motion for approval of the minutes from the May 15th meeting.

MR. MCINTOSH: So moved. Jay McIntosh.

MS. SHAW: Seconded. Rebecca.

MR. ROSE: Any discussion? All in favor, say aye. Any opposed, same sign?

(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

**Motion to approve May 15, 2024 minutes: McIntosh**

**Motion to 2nd: Shaw**

**Motion passes unanimously: 8:0**

Approval of May 22, 2024 Meeting Minutes

**Attachments:** [05.22.24 HCDC Minutes - DRAFT](#)

[05.22.24 HCDC Meeting Audio](#)

[05.22.24 HCDC Transcript](#)

MR. ROSE: Okay. Thank you. And then for our May 22nd meeting, entertain a motion for approval of that -- those minutes.

MS. PEFFERMAN: So moved. Pefferman.

MS. SHAW: Seconded. Rebecca.

MR. ROSE: Any discussion? All in favor, signify by saying aye. Any opposed?

(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

MR. ROSE: And our -- (inaudible) -- for introductions.

MR. NGUYEN: Michael for Human Services.

**Motion to approve May 22, 2024 minutes: Pefferman**

**Motion to 2nd: Shaw**

**Motion passes unanimously: 8:0**

## V. NEW BUSINESS

Discussion FY 2025 HOME Requests and Rankings

**Attachments:** [FY25 HOME Requests and Rankings](#)

MR. ROSE: Okay. Very good. We have approved the agenda and the minutes. And we will go ahead toward our new business, which is the discussion on the funding for the CDBG and HOME. I'd like to go ahead -- I think the HOME is going to be easier, and you might have an explanation to give with the HOME funds.

MS. DEEVER: Yes. And I do want to say before we start, just a couple of reminders. We appreciate so much every one of the different not-for-profits and groups that submitted applications this year. It is very competitive. We -- you know, when we look at a -- when we look at a project, we're looking at the whole project overall, so there's a lot of factors that go into it, not one factor overtakes another, it's simply looking at the whole package. So thank you again and we appreciate all the work you do in our community. It's priceless to what our citizens have here, so we're lucky to be in an area that has such great not-for-profits and groups that help us. Remember that the minimum that a group can get is \$25,000. That's the minimum that we can put towards a project. And we have started with our initial staff recommendations, and again, these are just a kicking off point for us, so -- where we are looking, going to the HOME funds, and where our recommendations were. Again, if you recall, down here at the bottom, we had -- we are estimating for -- for FY 2025 that the HOME funds will be \$470,000. We take out our 10 percent for admin costs and then the HOME projects, we have a HOME projects report of \$23,000. We had -- and we had that number in requests. So looking at kind of what we are recommending. First of all, we are required to do a 15 percent set aside for CHDO funds, so that 15 percent would be \$70,500. That doesn't mean that we couldn't apply more towards CHDO funds if we wanted to, and that was kind of where, when we had extra funding where staff put that in, we've had -- we've been kind of having success right now clicking off some of these CHDO houses and working with local groups to build those, and then we're putting in new -- you know, those become low-income housing, so that's been something that we've done. We did recommend for both Habitat for Humanity projects to do -- to fully fund them for \$37,500 each. They build a home on that amount and put a family into that home, so that's why we did that. And then there seems -- we'll

hold on here for that rental production. And then we also for the Columbia Housing Authority, for tenant-based rental assistance, they asked for \$75,000, and we did go ahead and do that. Those are funds that are directly provided to those who would be homeless potentially without those funds to keep them in those funds, so that's where we did that. What we're looking at with the CMCA building ADU Fourth Street, and with Woodhaven's new construction home. First off, the max that we can do for those units is \$50,000 per rental unit. So we would be looking at the max we can do is the \$50,000. What we really wanted to do with these two projects after further reviewing them, further reviewing their packages, we want to go ahead and hold -- allot the funding, the \$100,000 to rental production in the Annual Action Plan, but hold onto those projects until they're a little bit further into that process, and we can see their package better and see what that have -- the plans have the different things that we need to make sure it's going to work. We would then bring that back to HCDC for final approval before we funded them. But both of those projects -- there was a precedence done for this previously two years or three years ago, they did this when working with a CMCA project for the Providence Landing land, they did do the same thing, which was just to hold back for a time to the -- and then bring it back.

MS. PEFFERMAN: Jennifer, if I may? Erica Pefferman, question.

MS. DEEVER: Uh-huh?

MS. PEFFERMAN: So what exactly are you looking for for them to accomplish/approve - like, what are you looking for to be able to move that money forward, is my first question. Follow up would be is that part of the much larger CHDO fund that you have recommended?

MS. DEEVER: To answer your second question, no. This is the \$100,000 down here that is -- that if we put into 50 and 50, that would take that \$100,000.

MS. PEFFERMAN: Okay.

MS. DEEVER: We just did not have as many -- even though we had our HOME funds cut by 25 percent this year by HUD -- by -- for FY25 for HUD, we just didn't have as many applications for that -- those funds as we've had in previous years.

MS. PEFFERMAN: So then my first question is --

MS. DEEVER: Yes?

MS. PEFFERMAN: -- what do you need to see from CMCA and Woodhaven to recommend funding them at that level?

MS. DEEVER: Jake, do you want to speak a little bit more to those --

MR. AMELUNKE: So a couple of the things would be, there needs to be a neighborhood

survey that's completed. That's part of the paperwork you -- that we request, that HUD requires that we get before we can proceed with the project. Another thing is that having finished plans available to see where the house or the ADU would fit on the property and make sure that Planning and Zoning has no issues and it can go straight through and we don't have to go through checking those boxes off, because what we want is to be able to start the environmental review process and not have to figure out -- to finish the environmental review process, we need the plans completed. So that's contingent on that -- on having the environmental review, which then can release the funds. So --

MS. PEFFERMAN: So then this would go back into what we were talking about, about having full control of the site knowing that the project is going to go forward?

MR. AMELUNKE: Correct.

MS. DEEVER: Uh-huh.

MS. PEFFERMAN: And we just don't have enough information that there aren't any obstacles in that?

MR. AMELUNKE: Right.

MS. PEFFERMAN: Okay.

MR. AMELUNKE: Because there's always a chance that something won't get approved, or it doesn't fit or there's not enough parking or something like that. So we want everything set in stone and then we can move forward with -- with the project.

MR. MCINTOSH: So -- Jay McIntosh. So what you're saying, it's basically a hold back, that you're holding back \$100,000 for this?

MR. AMELUNKE: Correct.

MR. MCINTOSH: But that's where it's going to go assuming --

MR. AMELUNKE: Assuming --

MR. MCINTOSH: So it's kind of a contingent funding, in effect?

MR. AMELUNKE: Yes.

MS. DEEVER: Correct.

MR. MCINTOSH: Okay.

MS. SHAW: Would you explain this \$50,000 max --

MR. ROSE: Rebecca Shaw.

MS. SHAW: -- when you say -- sorry -- Rebecca Shaw -- per rental unit? So Woodhaven was talking about splitting that house into individual rooms for rent but does that --

MR. RITTER: It doesn't --

MS. SHAW: -- it's considered one rental unit as a whole home?

MR. AMELUNKE: So they -- it's lived in like bedrooms is kind of how they do it, and then they have one person that -- I don't how to word it, but there's one -- there's one adult person that's kind of in charge of the house. And then everybody can take care of certain things by themselves, they just might need a little help. So it's kind of a bedroom setup, but I don't exactly know how their structure is on how they charge rent, but that's -- that's the place that we put it as rental production, because otherwise, it would be a home that was sold, which that's not the case either, so it would fit in one or the other.

MS. SHAW: Okay. Have -- sorry. Has it been discussed with the two -- the two companies that the \$50,000 is the limit, and can they still finish the projects with that limitation?

MR. AMELUNKE: That -- so that's going to be discussed -- part of it's been discussed, but we need to have further discussions once the plans are in place and moving forward. We need to know, like, we don't even know how much they cost officially. Like, there's been -- it's been approximated. So once there's firmer numbers and we know exactly how everything is going to move forward, then we can, you know, know whether or not there's going to be enough funding or whether that's going to be enough for them to complete the project. And there's also several things involved after, like, we have to monitor them yearly to make sure they're renting to the proper people. So all those kind of things are -- are in the rental production box that have to be checked.

MR. ROSE: Mitch?

MR. RITTER: Mitch Ritter. I wasn't here for the presentation, but I thought I read that the ADU was multiple units.

MS. SHAW: No.

MS. PEFFERMAN: Huh-uh. Single

MR. KASMANN: It's just -- yeah.

MR. RITTER: What would be the risk of recommending and getting Council, you know, approval of the budget of the \$50,000 each. But if we know they can't split it up, then the \$50,000 would just be the limit, take it or leave it.

MS. DEEVER: In my opinion, it would look better for the groups if we waited until they were fully ready to go than to have them return funds back to us if they can't do the project at the end.

MR. RITTER: Well, you wouldn't release on it.

MS. DEEVER: I'm sorry?

MR. RITTER: You wouldn't release the funds to them.

MS. DEEVER: No. No. But --

MR. RITTER: But I'm saying from a budget perspective, it would show support from the Commission that, yes, we think these are viable projects.

MS. DEEVER: Uh-huh.

MR. RITTER: We're just under a federal funding limitation of only \$50,000 per project.

MS. DEEVER: Uh-huh.

MR. RITTER: They need to come back to us and say is this still -- can we still get this to shovel ready with a \$50,000 budget item, and that's it?

MS. DEEVER: Uh-huh.

MS. PEFFERMAN: Pefferman. Comment. Mitch, I think what we're trying to do is avoid what we just went through, which was taking funds back and then reallocating them.

MR. RITTER: To someone else totally.

MS. PEFFERMAN: And putting the staff through the whole process of it again. So I think if we're going to, like, make a motion to approve this, I think we can say in that motion that we want these additional funds to be reserved based on these two organizations meeting the criteria, and that should accomplish what you're hoping to accomplish, if I'm not mistaken.

MS. DEEVER: And again, we would bring this back -- when -- when they come to fruition, we would bring this back to this group to approve before we would move on with that.

MR. AMELUNKE: We wouldn't need to, I don't think.

MR. RITTER: It would just pull --

MS. PEFFERMAN: If we put it in as a contingency like it should be able to move forward without another vote.

MS. DEEVER: Okay. That works, too.

MR. MCINTOSH: McIntosh. There is no real alternative, though, is there? We didn't have funding requests that were not --

MS. DEEVER: Correct.

MR. MCINTOSH: Correct. So we don't really have a choice.

MS. DEEVER: The other option would be to move -- if we decided not to fund anything in that particular category, would be to move it back up to the CHDO and let that sit for CHDO funding to be able to be as those come in.

MR. MCINTOSH: Okay.

MR. RITTER: Is CMC -- is CMCA still a registered CHDO?

MS. DEEVER: At this time, yes.

MR. RITTER: Okay.

MS. PEFFERMAN: Which was a comment I was going to make -- Pefferman -- which is that those same organizations can come and apply to CHDO for those same funds.

MS. DEAVER: Uh-huh.

MS. PEFFERMAN: But you're correct, yeah.

MR. RITTER: It just has to be for home development, not rental production?

MS. DEAVER: Correct.

MR. AMELUNKE: Correct.

MR. RITTER: That would be the switch.

MS. DEAVER: Correct.

MS. PEFFERMAN: But they both have plans for those kinds of projects, so --

MR. RITTER: Well, not Woodhaven.

MS. DEAVER: They do in a different project.

MR. RITTER: But that's all -- okay. That's on the other funding.

MR. ROSE: Okay. So the proposal before us is to -- at this funding, first off, if we're okay with the two \$37,500 for each of the Habitat for Humanity, and then the funding of \$75,000 for the tenant based rental assistance, and then not necessarily what this indicates, but actually holding \$100,000 in the rental production section. So that is the -- I would entertain a motion for that approval for -- entertain a motion for that recommendation.

MS. PEFFERMAN: Pefferman. I move that we make a motion that we fund with the HOME funds as the staff has presented.

MR. KASMANN: Kasmann. Second.

MR. ROSE: Any other comments? We'll do a roll call vote. To my right beginning --

MR. MCINTOSH: McIntosh. Yes.

MS. ASCANI: Ascani. Yes.

MR. ROSE: Rose. Yes.

MR. RITTER: Ritter. Yes.

MS. SHAW: Shaw. Yes.

MR. NGUYEN: Nguyen. Yes.

MR. KASMANN: Kasmann. Yes.

MS. PEFFERMAN: Pefferman. Yes.

**Motion that we fund with the HOME funds as the staff has presented: Pefferman  
Motion to 2nd: Kasmann  
Motion passes unanimously: 8:0**

**Yes:** 8 - Ritter, Kasmann, Rose, Shaw, Ascani, Pefferman, McIntosh and Nguyen

**Excused:** 1 - Fletcher



## Discussion FY 2025 CDBG Requests and Rankings

**Attachments:** [FY25 CDBG Requests and Rankings](#)

MR. ROSE: Okay. Next, we will take a look at the CDBG funding recommendations.

MS. DEEVER: So for CDBG, and again, this money was very competitive. There were lots of factors that -- that went into it. We are recommending as a staff that the City project for City rehabilitation, and we have put a little bit of additional funds in here for the \$112,300, Services for Independent Living, we put at \$75,000. We are HUD mandated to do \$3,000 for HUD fair housing counseling. For Job Point and CMCA, Women's Business Center for the vocational services, we did put \$75,000 for each. Remember that the max that we can do is 15 percent, which is \$150,000. We are -- and I should have prefaced this. We are estimating that we will receive \$1 million in CDBG funds for FY '25. Then City of Columbia, the acquisition and demo we put at \$50,000. City of Columbia Code Enforcement, we put at \$45,000, and then the sidewalk project for \$174,700 on Pershing. We did put -- go ahead and put in for that. CHA Blind Boone, we did put in \$60,000 for them that they had recommended, and then the Woodhaven project for the renovations to their Thornberry building, we put it at \$150,000, and that took us to the zero. That used all of the funds that we had for that. Again, we have a -- we're estimating \$1 million For CDBG funds, you're -- we take 18 percent for admin. And then we have the -- the allotments that we -- we put in.

MR. ROSE: So to begin off and -- to begin with this discussion, because there -- we each have a lot of thoughts, I think, on the various areas here. And last year what we did, I gave a suggestive other scenario and then we went back and forth on that. And we knew when we took something out, we had to add something in, back and forth with that. And so I can explain a little bit some of the thinking I think from staff as to their recommendations here. One is that working with entities that they know, they've worked with before and know can get the projects done. It is glaringly obvious to me that we don't have any new entities involved in this, and I get quasi-concerned sometimes that we might not have new entities approach us if we can't do that, but their understanding is that there's always a risk with those new entities. So -- so that is one issue. I did find it interesting that you had a concern of the 15 percent under the economic and workforce development, but you go way over the 15 percent on the bottom category.

MS. DEEVER: So --

MR. ROSE: So -- so --

MS. DEEVER: For economic development, the 15 percent is a HUD rule.

MR. ROSE: Yeah.

MS. DEEVER: The others are guidelines. So --

MR. ROSE: Yeah. But it still went way over -- yeah.

MS. DEEVER: And those are deadlines set on the Consolidated Plan.

MR. ROSE: Yeah. Yeah.

MS. DEEVER: Correct.

MR. ROSE: So I -- you know, I don't know if anybody else was thinking about potentially funding some of the newer. Was anybody thinking on that -- potentially funding some of the newer recommendations?

MS. PEFFERMAN: Well, I have a comment about that. Pefferman.

MR. ROSE: Okay.

MS. PEFFERMAN: My comment about -- and I think I scored both of these in this manner, was my concern was they didn't have the local connections that I was hoping to see, you know.

MR. ROSE: Uh-huh.

MS. PEFFERMAN: You know, I mean, I think that there were -- I'd have to remember exactly, but one of those for sure -- I'm specifically talking about WeeCare and Connections To Success.

MR. ROSE: Right.

MS. PEFFERMAN: I feel like those organizations were outside entities coming into Columbia, and looking for funds for this to grow. I mean, childcare is a crisis in our city, and I totally believe 100 percent in the need to fund it. I just don't know that it was a better application and/or a better risk than some of these others that directly relate to housing and community development. So I -- I had selected them as the bottom of my list, as well, for funding. I would agree with -- I would agree with -- with the City's recommendations with the exception of I do have a question of why you would choose -- why was your recommendation to do the parking lot for Woodhaven versus doing the facility where services are provided.

MS. DEEVER: Partly was the score that they got was higher for that, that was the score between staff and between the Commission, they scored that project higher. It's also a less expensive project, so that was another reason that went in and felt that the \$150,000 would obviously help to help them with their entire project instead of part of their project.

MR. ROSE: I kind of -- Tom Rose here. I kind of was thinking like Erica. I felt like the other project had more to do with just kind of the work personnel rather than providing --

MS. PEFFERMAN: Providing services.

MR. ROSE: -- services that they were going to be providing through that versus just

being a parking lot. And I realize the safety of the parking lot --

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

MR. ROSE: -- is an issue for the people that come there, but I would agree with you on that one, Erica. Other thoughts?

MS. SHAW: I would -- Rebecca Shaw. I agree with Erica on WeeCare. I also scored them low. On Connections to Success, it kind of fell in the middle for me, because we have talked in the city about violence intervention quite a bit.

MS. PEFFERMAN: Uh-huh.

MS. SHAW: And I think that a program like that would offer help to people who hopefully wouldn't be reoffending. They're talking about preparing a different segment of the workforce. So I -- I would like to see, and, again, yeah, we talk about funding new agencies a lot, and here we have an agency that does -- they were collaborating with other local groups, so I feel like maybe they have a little bit of a foundation. And if we could open that door to them with the City and say, yes, we want to try to help you out, at least get started and get going, because I know that they said they worked with In2Action and another local group, which I'm not recalling.

MR. ROSE: Tom Rose here. They also work with the Columbia Public Schools a little bit, too.

MS. SHAW: Yeah.

MR. ROSE: So I have a similar feeling as you had, Rebecca, with them.

MS. PEFFERMAN: So -- Erica Pefferman. I also -- I remember that about them, too. I definitely scored them higher than WeeCare. But I also gave consideration to duplication of services to other funded agencies or proven agencies, and Job Point works with formerly incarcerated people in a very large capacity. And as far as creating life skills, keeping the recidivism rate is very much lower with people that work with Job Point. And I felt like that was covered by a different -- a different agency. But I love it too.

MR. ROSE: Yeah.

MS. PEFFERMAN: If we had more money, they would be my next one for sure.

MR. ROSE: Sure. Yeah. Tom Rose here. I think they do it a little bit in a different personal way, one on one, different -- a little bit, I would think. But can I -- if you're not opposed, I would like to offer another suggested funding and --

MR. MCINTOSH: I would like to make a comment first.

MR. ROSE: Okay. Yes. Yes.

MR. MCINTOSH: I would take the -- McIntosh. I would take the sidewalk out. That's \$174,500. They haven't even talked to the neighbors, the people that live there, about it.

And we could fund a lot more if we took that out.

MR. ROSE: Jay, I would have to -- Tom Rose here. We have classically not funded the sidewalk issues before, so that was kind of an issue. But then as we looked at the percentage of where things fit on our guidelines, that was a difficult drop. Yeah.

MR. MCINTOSH: Except that one of the guidelines is talking to the people it impacts.

MR. ROSE: Uh-huh.

MR. MCINTOSH: And they did not do that. I would check the -- I checked the presentation, and they specifically said they didn't talk to the neighbor.

MR. ROSE: They didn't have -- yeah.

MS. PEFFERMAN: Pefferman. Can anyone from the City verify that, because I feel like when they presented their presentation --MR. MCINTOSH: It's in the minutes.

MS. PEFFERMAN: -- they said they had talked to the neighbors. No?

MR. MCINTOSH: I checked the minutes.

MS. PEFFERMAN: Huh. Okay. Well, and the ability to get by on it, especially in that neighborhood with direct property that we're talking about, I mean, accessibility is critically important to that neighborhood.

MR. ROSE: Uh-huh. Yeah.

MR. MCINTOSH: But to me it's more imposing our will on them. I mean, why can't they ask them and then they can tell us they support it?

MS. ASCANI: Rikki Ascani. I've -- I have not talked to -- or I don't know if they have talked to neighbors, but working at Local Motion personally, we've consistently heard that Pershing is in desperate need of a sidewalk. Again, I don't want to impose our will onto anyone, but we have heard a lot of people, especially living on, like, Gary Street and Clinkscales area and Pershing are really concerned about that area with accessibility.

MR. RITTER: This is Ritter. I think it's the second year they've applied, too.

MR. ROSE: Uh-huh.

MR. RITTER: I'm pretty sure they had feedback last year.

MR. ROSE: Uh-huh.

MR. RITTER: We wiped them out and then they're back a second year.

MS. DEEVER: And another thing.

MR. RITTER: So they might not have mentioned that. I wasn't here --

MR. ROSE: Yeah.

MR. RITTER: -- but they might not have mentioned that specifically in the minutes.

MR. MCINTOSH: Okay. But I specifically asked the question --

MR. RITTER: But it is the second year --

MR. MCINTOSH: -- and they specifically said no feedback.

MR. RITTER: Okay. And it, of course -- it's a lot of money for a short piece of sidewalk -  
- one block.

MR. MCINTOSH: It is. And look at what we could do with that money.

MR. RITTER: Connecting a commercial property and a park.

MR. MCINTOSH: Right.

MR. RITTER: So it seems like the City could come up with those funds from other tax --

MR. MCINTOSH: Totally agree. Totally agree.

MR. RITTER: And Tom is right. We've been very hesitant to fund sidewalks. They did  
rise. You know, scoring-wise, you know, you have to fairly score these, so I had to give  
them points because it was ranked high in the survey.

MR. ROSE: Yeah.

MR. RITTER: But other areas were lower, which is why I think the average stayed down.

MS. DEEVER: Remember also that in our needs survey that we did for the FY '25-'29  
Consolidated Plan that sidewalks ranked high. That was one of our top five rankings.

MS. SHAW: Rebecca Shaw. To that point though, in that same category, we've got  
funding for code enforcement which was ranked very low because people don't want it --  
don't want it in their spot. So I -- I agree with Jay that I -- I'm not a fan of funding  
sidewalks with this money in particular because we have a sidewalk master plan and that  
is something the City should be paying for in the general budget. But I -- if the City could  
do the project in a private/public enterprise between that private business and the park  
that's coming, maybe we can partially fund this. Is that an option?

MS. DEEVER: I would think so.

MS. ASCANI: That's a compromise.

MR. MCINTOSH: Yeah. Good idea.

MS. ASCANI: It's a compromise.

MR. MCINTOSH: Uh-huh.

MR. ROSE: Well -- Tom Rose. What was that again?

MR. RITTER: Just cut the fund.

MR. ROSE: Oh, okay. Because we have no control over what the City is going to try to  
make it --

MR. RITTER: Yeah. Throw \$75- there and see where it shakes out.

MS. SHAW: On the -- the option --

MR. RITTER: We almost need to go down project by project to see if we have  
consensus.

MR. ROSE: Yeah. Yeah. Yeah. Yeah. Enough for what we're doing, yeah.

MR. RITTER: Because I think we're going to get onesie, twosies --

MR. ROSE: Yeah. Yeah.

MR. RITTER: -- agreeing or disagreeing on the finish line.

MR. ROSE: Right. Right. Right. So on the -- so do you want to go each level now?

We have -- so let me get a -- let me get a --

MR. RITTER: At least in that section.

MR. ROSE: Let me get a --

MR. RITTER: At least by section by section.

MR. ROSE: I would -- I would like to get a consensus feel for the group about funding, because that's a large sum of money that we need to put somewhere else if we're funding that sidewalk.

MR. RITTER: I'm in the reduced camp.

MS. ASCANI: Yeah. I don't --

MR. RITTER: I think we do --

MR. ROSE: Okay. Take away -- some funding, but reduced funding.

MR. MCINTOSH: Uh-huh.

MR. ROSE: Would you say, like, \$100,000?

MR. RITTER: \$75,000.

MR. ROSE: Do it for \$75,000 and take \$100,000 out?

MR. RITTER: I'm comfortable -- I think I'm comfortable with \$75,000.

MR. ROSE: Okay. Can you make your new column that we're going to start with the recommendations?

MR. RITTER: Give them some engineering funds.

MR. MCINTOSH: Yeah. Good idea.

MR. RITTER: Kick-start it, but not fully funded.

MR. MCINTOSH: That gives us a lot of money to spend on other specific projects.

MR. ROSE: We're going -- go ahead and do that with that column, and I'm going to give you some numbers for the other columns just as a start. Okay? But we'll have an extra \$100,000 to put in because I didn't --

MR. RITTER: \$75,000.

MS. DEEVER: \$75,000?

MR. ROSE: Yeah. We took it off there.

MR. RITTER: That's --

MR. ROSE: That would be good. That's a good start.

MR. RITTER: That's where my head is at.

MR. ROSE: That's a good start. Okay. Let's go -- let's go up to the top, and I'm just going to put out some numbers. It seemed to work a little bit last year. I don't want to force my thinking on anybody, but it helped us get to a point of what we knew we had to add and subtract. Okay? Put that one -- the first one at \$100,000. Put Services for Independent Living at \$90,000. Put Love Columbia at \$50,000. And then you've got your \$3,000. And then go down to Job Point, \$80,000. The Women's Center, \$50,000.

MS. DEEVER: One -- one second.

MR. ROSE: Or the --

MS. DEEVER: I'm trying to make sure my math is mapping.

MR. ROSE: Okay.

MS. DEEVER: Okay.

MR. ROSE: Again, this is just a point to start. The -- where are we at here now?

MS. DEEVER: Women's Business Center.

MR. RITTER: Women's Business Center.

MR. KASMANN: Women's Business Center at \$50,000.

MR. ROSE: Yeah. \$50,000. Connection to Success, \$28,000. Then go down to the next --

MS. DEEVER: That category, we would need -- we couldn't do the \$28,000.

MR. ROSE: Okay. We would have to go -- it's too -- you know, you can change around to get to that level, because it has to be \$50,000.

MR. RITTER: We'll do \$25,000, and then --

MR. ROSE: Yeah. \$150,000. Yeah.

MR. KASMANN: And then you want Job Point, \$75,000.

MR. ROSE: Yeah. \$75,000 or \$50,000 -- \$75,000 for Job Point or whatever.

MR. RITTER: No.

MR. ROSE: No. That's \$25,000.

MS. DEEVER: Where are we going here?

MR. ROSE: Put that at \$25,000.

MR. RITTER: \$25,000.

MR. ROSE: And then maybe Job Point, \$85,000.

MS. PEFFERMAN: No, it would be \$75,000.

MR. ROSE: Or \$75,000. Excuse me. Yeah.

MS. DEEVER: Okay. I just don't want that to be incorrect.

MR. ROSE: Yeah. Exactly. Then \$50,000. I had -- I had a higher number than probably

Rebecca would like for this next category. I don't know how other people feel about funding that position again. I had it at \$45,000, but if somebody feels that that --

MR. RITTER: That's the highest scoring thing in there.

MR. ROSE: Yeah. You know, I left it at \$45,000.

MS. PEFFERMAN: It was -- Erica Pefferman. It was an excellent application. I know it is safer for our families to have to have safer homes. I think the burden can fall on the homeowners if we're talking about rental units. I know it could be different for different people, but I think all families deserve a safe place to live, and there has to be someone to help make sure that those standards are held. I'm a big fan of making sure. But I think, if I understand our conversations before, Rebecca kind of asked you, like, would you expect that money to be paid for from a different source, or that it shouldn't happen at all?

MS. SHAW: Not that it shouldn't happen at all.

MS. PEFFERMAN: Okay.

MS. SHAW: I think that the City -- I understand that last year, we did not fund this. They had two part-time positions that they ended up kind of rolling into this that weren't filled that paid for this. The City has a lot of unpaid positions right now --

MS. PEFFERMAN: They do.

MS. SHAW: -- given their general budget presentation. I feel like the City can find funds for this job.

MS. PEFFERMAN: Okay.

MS. SHAW: And that that seems to have been what has happened in the past.

MR. ROSE: Let's -- let's just for a number back up there, let's put it at \$30,000. For Blind Boone, \$60,000. I was thinking more about the -- not the side -- not the sidewalk, but -- and I'm lost here now. Okay.

MS. PEFFERMAN: Woodhaven?

MR. ROSE: Okay. The parking lot is the --

MR. RITTER: The Blind Boone at \$60,000.

MR. ROSE: -- the parking lot is --

MR. RITTER: The first one is facility renovations. That's renovations to the facility.

MR. ROSE: Yeah. I'm open here to what you people would think.

MR. RITTER: Yeah. I think this needs -- we need to go around the table on this.

MR. ROSE: Yeah. Yeah.

MS. PEFFERMAN: Start -- Pefferman. I hate parking lots for this. I would rather see us fully fund more of the services provided through, like, even the career -- like Connections



to Success, Job Point, and/or the Missouri Women's Business Center, all of which are helping people, like, gain skills, gain stable income than a surface people can drive on.

MR. KASMANN: We've already maxed out that category.

MS. DEEVER: Just a reminder that category is maxed.

MS. PEFFERMAN: Okay. Thank you. Well, if you can just skip that --

MR. ROSE: Yes. Next one --

MS. PEFFERMAN: -- Okay. I see.

MR. RITTER: Affordable housing is not, and neighborhood is not.

MS. PEFFERMAN: Yeah. I don't love parking lots.

MS. ASCANI: Rikki Ascani. I agree. I don't feel --

MS. PEFFERMAN: I don't love it.

MS. ASCANI: -- I don't see the similarity between a parking lot and a sidewalk then.

Like it feels a little --

MR. MCINTOSH: It's not giving the impact we want.

MR. ROSE: Tom Rose. In this category thought is the -- oh, the renovation of the Workforce Development Center. Yes, we would --

MS. PEFFERMAN: That feels much better to me than a parking lot.

MR. ROSE: Yeah. I'm fighting for that. Yeah.

MS. ASCANI: Or doing like we did with the sidewalk and just taking some money away from the parking lot.

MR. ROSE: Yeah. Well, right now -- can you tell me what we have left right now, and what would -- these numbers are up there.

MR. KASMANN: \$272,000.

MR. ROSE: \$272,000. So there's a potential to really bump the -- if we felt like the funding for the Workforce Development Center was where we would like the funds to go, and we could do --

MR. MCINTOSH: From the whole thing --

MR. ROSE: -- a significant amount there.

MS. PEFFERMAN: Fund it and kill the parking lot.

MR. ROSE: Rebecca Shaw?

MS. SHAW: Rebecca. So I'm looking back at my notes on these two things, and the -- the parking lot isn't -- wasn't just a parking lot. That was kind of a generalized -- so it was tree trimming around it. It was creating the drive-through space for the accessible vans to pull through because right now they can't do door drop-off, it sounded like. And then on the public improvements, this was one where they had bought an old office space. They

want to clear it out and create bigger rooms for more work to be done in them. So instead of individualized small rooms, it was bigger open spaces. And we also said, like, they have a \$20 million budget annually. This is not -- not a group that --

MS. PEFFERMAN: Is hurting financially.

MS. SHAW: Right.

MS. PEFFERMAN: Yeah.

MS. SHAW: So we may want to consider, if we do for one project, maybe not the other.

MR. ROSE: Right. I would agree there.

MR. MCINTOSH: McIntosh. But one of the toughest societal problems is those people that are -- you know, that can't quite live on their own, so, I mean, I -- their mission is really important.

MS. PEFFERMAN: Yeah.

MR. MCINTOSH: And it directly affects people, unlike some other -- I -- I would like to fund the whole \$200,000 for them --

MR. ROSE: Do you want to do it?

MR. MCINTOSH: -- and zero for the parking lot.

MS. PEFFERMAN: I would do that, as well.

MR. ROSE: Go ahead and put that there.

MR. RITTER: Oh, sorry. What did you say -- for the parking lot or for the --

MR. MCINTOSH: Zero for the parking lot.

MR. RITTER: Oh, okay. The \$200,000 for the --

MR. ROSE: Yeah. Where does that stand now?

MS. DEEVER: Wait. My math is on -- that leaves you with \$12,000. And again, a place is a place holder. I think you came out to about where we did when we added up here in the -- in the -- as a placeholder since no one can just get \$12,000.

MR. ROSE: Oh, yeah. Yeah. Yeah. Yeah. Yeah.

MR. AMELUNKE: Can I just say something real quick? On the -- on the Love Columbia rehab and repair, they came to us after the last meeting and said that they were trying to still get their numbers together, but they came up with approximately \$34,000 to \$48,000 in just lead abatement on those houses. That does not include any of the stuff that they were planning on doing to them. So I don't know -- I don't know what their budget was before, but that was one of the reasons that we didn't initially recommend that because of the fact that the -- that the cost of just the lead might blow the whole project out of the water. So I just want to make sure we're not getting funds back.

MR. ROSE: Okay. Well, we did not know that.

MR. AMELUNKE: Yeah.

MS. SHAW: Part of their -- Rebecca Shaw. Part of their -- their project was -- it was two separate homes. Right?

MR. AMELUNKE: Correct.

MS. SHAW: So would it be -- is it possible to fund one home to be repaired, because what they're talking about is transitional housing, maybe family housing, you know.

MR. AMELUNKE: So -- and another thing that came up with this is that we're trying to figure out what -- the way you would do a rehab project would be that the house would be rehabilitated and sold. And since they own the house now, there's lots of -- we're not really sure how this would work because what you do is when they would be doing the rehab, there would be a deed of trust and promissory note signed. So when the house sold, that would then say that the deed of trust and promissory note, we needed to get our money back, so then we would immediately get that CDBG money back because it would be going to someone else. We're not really sure how the logistics of all that is going to work. Does that make sense?

MS. PEFFERMAN: Uh-huh.

MR. AMELUNKE: Because they own the -- Love Columbia owns the house, they're not going to use it for transitional housing -- my understanding -- after that. It's going to be sold to individuals, in which case then that -- that would be due, and we would get that money back.

MS. DEEVER: Back. And we would have to then be re-allotting it as we have --

MR. AMELUNKE: Yeah. So I don't know that that project has just got a lot of works that --

MS. DEEVER: -- (inaudible).

MR. AMELUNKE: Yeah. So --

MS. SHAW: Was it possible for them -- I mean, were they looking at selling it to an individual or putting it in land trust?

MR. AMELUNKE: Selling it to an individual was our understanding at this time, but they were kind of trying to get things going throughout the process. So -- anyway, just wanted you to know about that stuff.

MR. MCINTOSH: McIntosh. Is it possible to do the same thing there that for the other projects that -- that money is just set aside for that?

MS. DEEVER: Yes. That would be a possibility.

MR. MCINTOSH: Okay.

MR. AMELUNKE: If we do that with everything thought, then --

MS. PEFFERMAN: Back on --

MR. AMELUNKE: Yeah. We're going to --

MS. DEEVER: Well, remember also that, as we go through this process, we will -- once the funds are -- we're in a little bit different year this year because we're working on the Consolidated Plan. The FY '25 Annual Action Plan becomes part of that document when we submit it in November. There is a -- we're very, very likely that we're going to -- once we get our final figures from HUD, we're going to have to go back in and amend the Annual Action Plan anyway. That's just part of the process because they don't -- we won't have the final figures for FY '25 until probably next spring. So if there was something that needed to be changed, we could change it at that time in the Annual Action Plan as well.

MS. PEFFERMAN: Is there anything below what we're looking at, because it's kind of off our grid? Okay.

MS. DEEVER: Yeah. It's hard to see the whole. Yeah. You're \$12,000 -- at this point, at the way you are now, you have \$12,000 left.

MR. MCINTOSH: What do we have in Love Columbia now?

MS. DEEVER: \$13,000.

MS. PEFFERMAN: Pefferman. I know that the project is wonky with Love Columbia. I get that. There -- there is a dire need for what it is that they're trying to do at least in the short term. And they've been very successful with any initiatives that they have -- outside of this funding source, they've been very successful in making their projects work for their mission. And if we've got 12 grand, we have not fully funded it. My vote would be to put the other 12 grand up with Love Columbia. And then if it -- everything else feels really good and really solid, I feel like there's a very minimal chance that we're going to be bringing any -- you know, at least a lot of funds back. This one has a bit of a risk factor to it, but it's -- they also have a very active donor base and they have the ability to raise funds really well. I think even if their project comes in 30 grand over, they'll find a way to get it done.

MS. DEEVER: And do remember that they have -- they did have funding returned from them last year, so that -- they had a project that they were not able to bring to completion.

MS. PEFFERMAN: Okay. Is that because they didn't have the site -- ownership of the site?

MS. DEEVER: Uh-huh.

MS. SHAW: Rebecca Shaw. So my understanding -- again, back to my notes -- was

that -- and they -- they had said that this would be a rental property then following their immediate, like, four to six months of transitional housing in their presentation. But I don't know if that has changed since.

MR. AMELUNKE: Well, I -- that was what I understood when I was verbally talking to them, but Becky was just showing me that that wasn't in their --

MS. SHAW: In their proposal.

MS. PEFFERMAN: The presentation is multiple families per year were going to be served through this house.

MS. SHAW: Yeah. I didn't feel like it was a --

MS. PEFFERMAN: It is very transitional living.

MS. SHAW: -- a turnover kind of thing, yeah. Because they -- they bought two adjacent properties.

MR. RITTER: Uh-huh.

MS. SHAW: And I think they were looking at or had already purchased the one across the street. So I think they were trying to make a community. And I remember Jay talking about, like, a community garden, and, I mean, they -- this was -- you know, it felt like a neighborhood kind of thing.

So --

MR. ROSE: And it says here -- Tom Rose. The home at 208 St. Joseph will be used to provide transitional housing for families who are experiencing homelessness. The home at 1211 Ash Street will be used to provide transitional housing or will be sold to a first-time owner at below market rates.

MR. RITTER: Well, I think if this funding -- they can pick the one house.

MR. ROSE: Right.

MR. RITTER: Or we could stipulate that.

MR. ROSE: Yeah.

MR. RITTER: I don't know. I knew you threw out -- this is Ritter. I knew you threw out the \$90,000 for SIL, but it's the highest scoring project up there, so --

MR. ROSE: Uh-huh.

MS. DEEVER: Services for Independent Living also returned money last time. They were not able to spend their money.

MR. RITTER: Not have enough projects.

MS. DEEVER: And we're -- we're looking -- there also is -- we're looking at how much money they're spending this year as how quickly they're going to be able to spend it. Part of their big problem has been, and it's a problem in Columbia, is that they work on

many houses that have lead and need lead abatement, and there's not a lot of people that can do that work. That's one challenge that they've had. And so their -- their projects are moving slower than they have in the past. Also, materials are more than they've been in the past, and so when they're hitting their limits quicker than they were in previous years, it's --

MR. MCINTOSH: Do you think if you put the home, print preview, it would fit on one screen, we could see everything?

MR. ROSE: Okay. So -- oh, sorry.

MS. DEEVER: I don't know. Do we know how to do that?

MR. MCINTOSH: Up in the top left where it has -- there should be a print preview up there somewhere. No. Go to file. Go to file. There should be a print preview.

MR. RITTER: Just -- just -- just adjust your view percentage.

MS. DEEVER: Like that? Okay. There you go. Does that work?

MR. MCINTOSH: Yeah.

MR. ROSE: I can't see it. There you go. That's okay.

MS. PEPPERMAN: But we still can't see it all.

MR. RITTER: Take your word for it.

MS. DEEVER: Yeah. Either way --

MR. MCINTOSH: Well, there you go.

MS. PEPPERMAN: Let's just -- I feel like this is --

MS. DEEVER: And this isn't showing your recommendations. They're going to be on another page.

MR. MCINTOSH: Oh, okay. All right. Well, that's --

MS. PEPPERMAN: Erica Pefferman. I feel like, Tom, your recommendations are really good. Once again.

MS. DEEVER: One second. Sorry. Panic -- panic on the staff side.

MS. PEPPERMAN: Panic on the clicker. Tom, I appreciate your suggestions. I think we're down to a really good figure. I think \$12,000 is left, and wherever anyone wants to put it, I could be totally fine with. I like -- I like this plan, and wherever you put the \$12,000. I'd like -- personally like to see it go to Love Columbia, but I also would be fine with anything, so --

MS. SHAW: Jennifer, can you -- when you have a -- when you're ready --

MS. DEEVER: Yeah.

MS. SHAW: -- can you scroll up and let us see, like, if you go through it. Yeah.

MR. ROSE: Go through it once.

MR. MCINTOSH: Yeah. I'd like to see which -- which ones we're funding and not funding compared to staff, just look at that --

MR. ROSE: For -- for -- Tom Rose here. For just additional purposes, go ahead and put the -- what we have left into the first line there. Question: Can that -- will you be able to use that for home rehab. I know there was a period of time when we took some money out and put it somewhere else. Can you speak to that?

MR. AMELUNKE: Yeah. So the -- the plan moving forward is hiring more people and getting this program working again. We're planning on making it easier from our side to get the smaller rehab projects done and move through more of them. So --

MR. ROSE: Okay.

MR. AMELUNKE: And this is looking -- looking forward at this program that we can just focus really on energy efficiency repairs that are easy to get people in and out of the house. The logistics are easier. There's not a lot of stuff to look at on painting and such that people are upset with. It's good for the environment, it's good for the City, as far as the utilities department goes, and it's -- it's good for the homeowner. So that's the plan for that. And then we'll try and get maybe one large rehab in a year, but we're going to kind of revamp that process too, and not include some of the harder things to do, like foundations.

MR. ROSE: Right.

MR. AMELUNKE: That's the plan, so --

MR. ROSE: Have you balanced it out, Jennifer?

MS. DEEVER: Yes.

MR. ROSE: Okay.

MS. DEEVER: It -- the map is all mapping.

MR. RITTER: Ritter, comment.

MS. DEEVER: Right now, you're at zero the way that it is.

MR. ROSE: Okay.

MR. RITTER: We're at 32 percent on community facilities. That's more than double the max for that category. This really changes the -- I mean, I know we're Housing and Community Development Commission, but that's the highest percentage I've seen in that category in over 15 years on this Commission. That was particularly held at the 15 percent level historically because of housing and -- and neighborhood projects. So I don't know what type of Consolidated Plan adjustment that would take, but that's significantly blowing through the goal for that category.

MS. DEEVER: And this would be something that was going into the new Consolidated

Plan, so that would be added into that plan.

MR. RITTER: For '25 to '29.

MR. ROSE: I do recognize that that was a lot.

MR. RITTER: I was nowhere near \$200,000.

MR. ROSE: Yeah.

MR. RITTER: I mean, I knew the parking lot -- my opinion, the parking lots were out, and then the facility renovation was significantly reduced to bring it in category. And then the funds left over from there were to fully fund the housing area. But I understand the concerns with --

MS. PEFFERMAN: What concerns?

MR. ROSE: The housing area.

MR. RITTER: I mean the housing -- I mean, because even fully funded, we were at, you know, 35 percent, which is less than the 48.

MR. ROSE: Yeah.

MS. PEFFERMAN: Uh-huh.

MR. RITTER: But I understand the concerns with Love on the two different houses. One might be sold, and that's going to be a call back of funds. But certainly their mission is well established at this point in the community, and if they put those funds towards the one house that is going to be dedicated to that community for transitional housing, I don't care if it's used for lead or painting or whatever. It's being used for transitional housing, and that's important in this community right now. Not that Woodhaven isn't. You know, certainly two viable projects in that organization, but it just -- it puts that category in an uncomfortable spot for me.

MS. DEEVER: So if you're looking at the numbers that way, one of the areas that you were low is neighborhood revitalization and stabilization. If you went to 30 percent on that, would be at 246, so that would be a place, again, to go put money back into --

MR. RITTER: The -- but the sidewalk's there.

MR. ROSE: The sidewalk is there.

MS. DEEVER: And that's -- that's -- that's the -- the decision on that. And once we take these to City Council, I'm not sure how they will look at those, but that's the ultimate decision for them. But when you were -- I was just trying to look at percentages per category.

MR. ROSE: Yeah. I mean, so potentially -- potentially --

MR. RITTER: Yeah, they're kind of like -- figuratively, land-locked into our categories, but without enough projects in job growth --MR. ROSE: Yeah.



MR. RITTER: -- or housing to make up for it, it kind of puts us in a different spot this year. Typically, we've had, you know, the -- the overage has been housing --

MS. PEFFERMAN: Uh-huh.

MR. RITTER: -- so we haven't had this issue. But I understand if it's -- if we're adjusting the Consolidated Plan for 2025, then we'll just fix it there, so --

MS. PEFFERMAN: Correct.

MS. DEEVER: And -- and another place that you could always put money if you wanted to, for instance, change where you are, if you feel that too much is being put in under a certain category, is you could always put it up under rehab because that's always going to go towards fixing low-income housing.

MS. PEFFERMAN: That's a very good point.

MS. SHAW: Rebecca Shaw. I -- I think -- so I had personally kind of allocated more funds toward Job Point and the Women's Business Center because vocational training was one of the things that also popped up really high on the surveys.

MS. DEEVER: Uh-huh.

MS. SHAW: And I -- I had originally had Love Columbia at about \$40,000 is where I was looking because I -- they ran off really quickly through their budget on both homes, and I wanted to say that, like, \$30,000 to \$40,000 was about what they had said for one house.

MS. DEEVER: Uh-huh.

MS. SHAW: So --

MS. DEEVER: And that may have been prior to the \$38,000 --

MR. RITTER: But the -- (inaudible).

MS. SHAW: Yeah. With the addition of the lead, yeah. That changes things, but --

MR. RITTER: Why is -- this is Ritter --

MS. PEFFERMAN: So, Rebecca, where does that put you on Connections to Success, because, if I'm understanding this correctly, are we completely maxed out at 15 percent in that category.

MS. DEEVER: It is --

MS. PEFFERMAN: -- that is the most we could fund it?

MS. DEEVER: At this point, the most that could be funded underneath that category is \$150,000.

MS. PEFFERMAN: So would you choose to give that money to the Women's Business Center, do you think?

MS. SHAW: I think I -- I would. We've got them at \$50,000 right now. I know that they have consistently asked for around \$75,000 to keep the three employees, I think, that

they have currently working.

MS. PEFFERMAN: Uh-huh.

MS. SHAW: So, yeah. And -- and as far as what to take away from, the Connections for Success is the newest entity; right? And I don't -- I feel like \$25,000 could make a big difference to a small group like that.

MS. PEFFERMAN: Well, one of the things that I'll point, and I think the data was shared with us today, that when women entrepreneurs create their own businesses and are able to provide stable income, and they're able to keep stable housing, it does provide a dramatic impact on our community. So I, personally, also, now that we're revisiting that, I kind of let that dog -- that bone go because I thought I was going to lose on it. But I -- I personally would choose to put \$75,000 Job Point, \$75,000 Missouri Business Women's Center. And Connections to Success, there again, I know that there is some differences, but I feel like there's a big overlap in what Job Point does and what they do. And Job Point has a proven track record of success with doing their work.

MR. KASMANN: I think that's right, but their scores are -- would not indicate that, between the Women's Business Center and Connections to Success. So I think trying to get a new funded organization off the ground may be pretty substantial for them.

MS. ASCANI: And I worry. I'm kind of, like, torn, too, but I worry that if we consistently turn down new small non-profits --

MR. KASMANN: Uh-huh.

MS. ASCANI: -- then they'll stop applying for money either for HOME or CDBG funds.

MS. PEFFERMAN: Is this -- if somebody can help me remember exactly. Is this a local entity, or is this the one that was out at, like, out of state and is trying to make a presence.

MR. KASMANN: No.

MR. ROSE: It's out of St. Louis.

MS. DEEVER: It was, I think, they're out of St. Charles.

MS. PEFFERMAN: Right. It's not local. I mean, this is their -- they're a local presence, but it's not a local company.

MS. DEEVER: They do have local offices.

MS. PEFFERMAN: Huh?

MS. DEEVER: They do have local offices.

MS. PEFFERMAN: Yeah. A lot of people have a local office in Columbia.

MR. ROSE: Tom Rose. My understanding is that they've been here for about four years.

MS. PEFFERMAN: Yeah. But their primary focus is Kansas City and St. Louis, like

other bigger cities. I'm not sure that they -- I just -- I personally have a hard time investing community funds in someone that hasn't been long-term commitment to the community, as well.

MR. MCINTOSH: McIntosh. I would support the allocation the way we have it. I like that.

MR. ROSE: Tom Rose. I'll call a question or -- well, okay. Go through the columns again so we can see those, and then I'm going to entertain a motion.

MR. RITTER: How did \$12,000 get put back into the --

MR. ROSE: I think she put it at the top, but did you put it in?

MS. DEEVER: I put it back into rehab.

MR. ROSE: Yeah. Yeah.

MR. RITTER: Oh.

MR. MCINTOSH: So it was either that or Love Columbia that they were talking about.

MS. DEEVER: I'm sorry?

MR. RITTER: Just to make it balance.

MS. DEEVER: That was to make the balance; correct.

MR. ROSE: So we -- I'm going to go through the lines. Currently, home rehab is \$112,000, Services for Independent Living \$90,000; Love Columbia, \$50,000, and then \$3,000 for the housing counseling.

MR. RITTER: Ritter --

MR. ROSE: (Inaudible) -- were there entities that were able to do housing counseling, we have more certified housing counselors now?

MS. DEEVER: The local housing HUD certified is the Love Columbia.

MR. ROSE: Okay. They had that -- okay. They trained; I know what they -- okay. Then we have in the next category, \$75,000 for Job Point training, \$50,000 for the Women's Business Center, and \$25,000 for Connections to Success. And the next category, Acquisition and Demolition, \$50,000; Code Enforcement Position, \$30,000; Sidewalk, \$75,000. And then in the final category, the Blind Boone, that is the -

MS. DEEVER: Funding renovations.

MR. ROSE: Okay. What was I --

MS. DEEVER: Continuing them.

MR. MCINTOSH: Yeah. \$60,000.

MR. ROSE: Oh, for the Blind Boone Center. Okay. Sorry.

MS. DEEVER: Correct.

MR. ROSE: I was thinking tenant based rental assistance, but that was number. And

then \$200,000 for renovations to facility understanding that this doesn't fit necessarily within our current plan, but our new one coming up.

MS. DEEVER: And again, we can only plug in projects we have.

MR. ROSE: Yeah. Oh, yeah.

MS. DEEVER: So they're going to -- they may not -- they may skew the percentages over time.

MR. ROSE: So I would entertain a motion for approval of this recommended funding for the CDBG funds for 2025.

MR. MCINTOSH: So moved. McIntosh.

MR. ROSE: Do I hear a second?

MS. ASCANI: Second. Ascani.

MR. ROSE: Okay. Open for discussion. If there is no further discussion -- okay. Go ahead.

MR. MCINTOSH: Well, the only question I have is the \$12,000, whether it goes to Love Columbia or City, but you seem to be more comfortable that you'll be able to spend that \$12,000 then, but -- so it's not a big deal -- so not that big a deal.

MR. ROSE: Yeah. Okay. So all in favor -- oh, go ahead.

MS. SHAW: Sorry. I'm just -- last one. Could we take \$5,000 from the Home Rehab Program and put it toward Services for Independent Living so that they get fully funded? Did they -- they said they have used --

MR. ROSE: Yeah. Tom Rose. I would be in favor of that, but I -- there was a concern about them being able to use the funds.

MS. DEEVER: They had -- they returned quite a bit of money last year.

MS. SHAW: From that program?

MS. DEEVER: From that -- from Services for Independent Living.

MR. ROSE: Yeah.

MS. SHAW: Okay.

MS. DEEVER: This year, they did have the same amount, and they're about \$20,000 into it now, so we're -- I'm starting to work -- look -- be concerned if they're going to spend all their funding for this year.

MS. SHAW: Okay.

MS. DEEVER: That's one of the reasons why we chose to cut them a little bit was so that they would be able to spend the funds that they're allocated.

MS. SHAW: And is that because of contractors are difficult to find.

MS. DEEVER: Again, their -- one of their big problems has been the -- finding people

that can do the lead abatement. One of the problems that they've had is finding contractors that are at the levels that they're needing to spend, what their maxes are, that hurts them because the product -- everything has gone up. Materials have gone up, labor has gone up, everything has gone up, so they've been having challenges trying to find people to do what they do.

MS. SHAW: Okay. Thank you.

MS. DEEVER: They still do a good job. It's just that it's not necessarily a reflection on them, it's just the reflection on what -- how much funds they can get through.

MS. PEFFERMAN: Pefferman. Additional question then. If that is the case, \$90,000 is not much different than \$95,000, so -- and if you're concerned about them spending the money that they have this year, should that be dropped even further?

MR. ROSE: And moved up to -- maybe to the rehab program?

MS. PEFFERMAN: Either rehab or Love Columbia, yeah.

MR. RITTER: This is Ritter. Once again, setting a precedent of over-funding projects. If it applies for the City, it should apply to others. I don't like doing it, for whatever it's worth. I think the same contractor issues would apply to the City that they would to SIL. So --

MS. PEFFERMAN: So what does that mean?

MR. ROSE: Leaving --

MR. RITTER: Why we're over --

MS. PEFFERMAN: Leave it alone? Leave it alone? Okay.

MR. RITTER: Why are we even putting the \$12,000 to the City --

MR. ROSE: Yeah. They're --

MR. RITTER: -- if that's going into the public budget record and someone will have to present that. And why is -- why is finding contractors and material costs and rehab a problem for SIL and it's not for the City? Different contractors, maybe?

MS. DEEVER: Different types of projects --

MR. RITTER: Just the visibility probably isn't the best.

MS. DEEVER: And potentially, the different kinds of projects that we would work on.

MS. PEFFERMAN: So then, Mitchell, are you maybe suggesting that we remove that \$12,000 and reallocate it to the next two lines?

MR. RITTER: Or else. I mean, we've got clearance in that area.

MR. ROSE: Or you could --

MR. RITTER: I mean, that could get you \$10,000 more for Women's Business Center. (Multiple people speaking simultaneously.)

MR. RITTER: Oh, yeah. That's the one that's maxed out.

MS. PEFFERMAN: But everything else is --

MR. RITTER: I mean, you could put it to another City project. I mean, you could put it to the Code Enforcement. That's another City budget item, and that's about it. Yeah, we're just kind of stuck.

MR. ROSE: We -- Tom Rose here. We are kind of tied with the minimum.

MS. SHAW: If you would -- Rebecca Shaw.

MR. RITTER: Or just put it to low. I mean -- yeah.

MS. SHAW: If you moved Love Columbia to \$60,000, and SIL to \$92,000, you've got it done.

MR. RITTER: Yeah. You take care of the money.

MR. RITTER: Or just \$95,000 -- just put the \$95,000 and the \$57,000 and split the \$12,000 and make the categories look even. It doesn't have the public perception of over-funding a City project.

MS. PEFFERMAN: That makes a lot of sense.

MR. RITTER: If you wanted \$115,000, ask for \$115,000 next year.

MS. PEFFERMAN: That looks good.

MR. ROSE: Any further comments? Okay. We'll start with our roll call vote to my right.

MR. MCINTOSH: Jay McIntosh. Yes.

MS. ASCANI: Ascani. Yes.

MR. ROSE: Tom Rose. Yes.

MR. RITTER: Mitch Ritter. Yes.

MS. SHAW: Shaw. Yes.

MR. NGUYEN: Nguyen. Yes.

MR. KASMANN: Kasmann. Yes.

MS. PEFFERMAN: Pefferman. Yes.

MS. DEEVER: This has passed as is.

MR. ROSE: Yes.

MR. RITTER: We did balance at the bottom.

MS. DEEVER: We did balance.

MS. PEFFERMAN: Commission -- (inaudible).

MR. ROSE: All right

**Motion for approval of recommended funding for the CDBG funds for 2025:**

**McIntosh**

**Motion to 2nd: Ascani**

**Motion passes unanimously: 8:0**

**Yes:** 8 - Ritter, Kasmann, Rose, Shaw, Ascani, Pefferman, McIntosh and Nguyen

Excused: 1 - Fletcher

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

MR. ROSE: Next, we'll move on to if we have any general comments from the public first? No comments from the public?

MS. SWITZLER: I would like to say thank you so much.

MR. ROSE: Wait. Wait. It doesn't work like that.

MS. PEFFERMAN: You're not saying your name.

MS. SWITZER: Ashley Switzer.

MS. DEEVER: You need to come up to the microphone, please.

MR. ROSE: You've got to come up to the microphone.

MS. SWITZER: Ashley Switzer with Habitat for Humanity. I just want to say thank you all for doing all of this work. I know that it is a pain to look over all of these proposals and trying to figure all of this out, but it really means a lot to all of the non-profits and the City employees and everybody that's trying to do their job. It really, really makes a big difference to have people who care about what we do, helping us by allocating funds. So thank you, thank you, thank you.

MR. ROSE: Thank you. Do we have any comments from the members of our council committee here? Yes?

MR. MCINTOSH: McIntosh. This is my first time through this. I just want to say I'm impressed how important every one of us got prepared. Really, I thought it was a very good discussion.

MR. ROSE: It can be confusing.

MR. MCINTOSH: It's hard work. I mean, it is hard work.

MR. ROSE: And, you know -- Tom Rose here. We get torn between wanting to do what we think is the right thing but dealing with reality. Any news from staff? You can say where we go from here, and then fill us in with all the details.

MS. DEEVER: So the -- kind of where we are, with this particular -- with the FY '25, as I said, we will take this. Tom will present at the City Council the recommendations of HCDC. I believe we'll do that in August is when the budget meeting usually is, and that's -- Tom will go to present then. We are currently waiting on the -- we have noticed the FY '24 Annual Action Plan. It has to be noticed for 30 days. That date is up at the end of the month. We will be submitting that in right at the first week of July and to IDIS, which is the HUD system. And then -- can you think of anything else that we're -- we're working on the reallocated funds. We're working on those agreements and getting those all through, as well. They are all in process, so -- yes. Do you understand that we probably

are going to schedule another meeting in August? It will be a special meeting, and it will be -- once we have completed the Consolidated Plan, to have you all approve the -- and review the Consolidated Plan, have a public hearing to have more public input, and then from there, we'll take that to City Council for their two readings of that. They'll have a -- putting it on the public hearing schedule and then the next week having a public hearing then.

MR. MCINTOSH: McIntosh. Do we have any scheduled meetings? I didn't see any on the --

MS. DEEVER: As of now, this is the last -- generally, this is the last meeting for the -- until fall --

MR. MCINTOSH: Okay.

MS. DEEVER: -- when we'll send out a new schedule. But because of the Consolidated Plan, this being a special year that this is the twenty -- the year we're actually submitting that, there will be an extra meeting for you all to approve that, and we'll look at dates coming up and try to get that on the schedule so that we can have that.

MR. ROSE: Tom Rose. A comment here. I know Commissioner members always have -- think about why don't we discuss other things about community development, you know, It seems to be difficult to have an opportunity or a meeting to do that, so we -- if anybody has ideas or plans or, you know, for certain, let our staff know of how we might be able to -- a lot of their time now has been on the Consolidate Plan, and everybody else will, but we certainly could look at those things -- those opportunities, so -- all right.

MS. DEEVER: Good work.

## VII. NEXT MEETING DATE

*(To be determined.)*

## VIII. ADJOURNMENT

MR. ROSE: I would entertain a motion to adjourn.

MR. MCINTOSH: so moved. McIntosh.

MS. PEFFERMAN: Second. Erlca.

MR. ROSE: All in favor?

(Unanimous voice vote for approval).

(The meeting adjourned at 8:06 p.m.)

**Motion to adjourn: McIntosh**

**Motion to 2nd: Pefferman**

**Motion passes unanimously: 8:0**