

**MINUTES**

**HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION MEETING**

**COLUMBIA CITY HALL**

**701 EAST BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MO**

**JANUARY 24, 2024**

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT**

**Mr. Tom Rose  
Ms. Rebecca Shaw  
Ms. Erica Pefferman  
Ms. Rikki Ascani  
Mr. Michael Fletcher  
Mr. Ross Kasmann**

**COMMISSIONERS ABSENT**

**Mr. Mitchell Ritter**

**STAFF**

**Ms. Jennifer Deaver  
Mr. Jacob Amelunke  
Ms. Molly Fair  
Ms. Erin Welch**

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

MR. ROSE: Okay. We'll go ahead and get started. Call our meeting to order. Thank you all for joining us this evening.

**II. INTRODUCTIONS**

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

MS. SHAW: Rebecca Shaw, member at large.

MS. PEFFERMAN: Erica Pefferman, Ward 4.

MR. KASMANN: Ross Kasmann, Ward 3.

MR. ROSE: Tom Rose, Ward 5.

MS. ASCANI: Rikki Ascani, member at large.

MR. FLETCHER: Mike Fletcher, member at large.

MR. AMALUNKE: Jake Amelunke, City staff.

MS. DEEVER: Jennifer Deaver, City staff.

MS. FAIR: Molly Fair, City staff.

MS. WELCH: Erin Welch, City staff.

MS. DEEVER: And we'd like to introduce Erin as our new Admin Tech. So this is her first meeting in that she will get to meet all of you.

MR. ROSE: Very good.

MS. DEEVER: She has joined our team in November.

MR. ROSE: Nice to see you. Welcome aboard. Okay.

**III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA.**

MR. ROSE: At first, I will entertain then a motion for approval of the agenda.

MS. PEPPERMAN: So moved.

MR. KASMANN: Second. Kasmann.

MR. ROSE: It help -- and it is helpful to indicate first names.

MS. PEPPERMAN: Say our names.

MR. ROSE: Yes.

MS. PEPPERMAN: Yes. I did read that attachment. So sorry.

MR. ROSE: One of the first items that we --

MS. PEPPERMAN: So sorry.

MR. ROSE: That's good. One of the first --

MS. PEPPERMAN: I made the motion. Erica Pefferman.

MR. ROSE: Yes.

MS. PEPPERMAN: Yes.

MR. ROSE: All in favor, signify by saying aye. Any opposed, same sign.

(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

MR. ROSE: Okay. Thank you. Yes. One of our first items that we have is our tips for -- that helps out with our recording of our meeting, so just a reminder on some of those procedures that we'll follow again. I would add on there to speak loudly into your microphones because that's helpful, as well. So, yes.

MS. DEEVER: And one additional thing. Please remember that the microphones are extremely sensitive, and they pick up side conversations, they pick up whispering. So just be aware when -- I would always assume you have a live mic.

MR. ROSE: Okay. Thank you very much for that.

**IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.**

MR. ROSE: We have no minutes to approve still; is that correct?

Ms. Deaver: Correct.

MR. ROSE: Okay.

**V. PUBLIC HEARING**

MR. ROSE: Our next item is updates on the public hearings that we -- oh, no. We are having a public hearing right now. Do you want to talk to us about that, Ms. Deaver?

MS. DEEVER: Sure. So basically, the City of Columbia will -- is holding a public hearing this evening in Council Chambers. The City estimates that it will receive approximately \$1 million in Community Development Block Grant or CDBG, and \$600,000 in HOME funds. This is for the FY 2025

funds. The purpose of this hearing is to receive citizen input in identifying housing and community development needs within the community. Any comments received at the hearing or during the comment period will be considered by the Housing and Community Development Commission. Members of the community are encouraged to come and provide public comment regarding our community's priority housing and community development needs.

MR. ROSE: So I would entertain anybody who -- from the community that would like to comment?

MR. COLE: Randy Cole, CEO of the Columbia Housing Authority. Could I have permission to pass out our -- two-pager of our organization?

MR. ROSE: Yes.

MR. COLE: That's just for informational purposes that you can read in your own leisure. That's our impact report for some accomplishments we had last year, and I think it's a -- showed some really good work going on with the Columbia Housing Authority. But back to stick to the -- to the public hearing. First, I want to say thanks to the Commission for all the support the Commission has provided the Columbia Housing Authority for a variety of projects. They really make a big impact on our residents. They really help us to expand our services and what we can do for our residents, so appreciate all the support that we have received. Two needs that I wanted to express this evening in the public hearing. One, a top one that I think is on a lot of people's minds is, of course, the need for more affordable housing, and I think that's inclusive of all different types of housing from rental to home ownership to multi-family to single-family to ADUs. We need all of it, wherever it can work and however it can work. I know the Commission has supported a lot of the different projects in the past, and I think continued support would be great. One additional item related to that is in your policy resolution on page 3. I think a good consideration to continue to have top of mind is looking at under Item C when you -- when there's a rental production project or funded rental housing, looking at aligning with projects that are leveraging additional dollars from outside the community -- entire community. The ordinance, or excuse me, resolution specifically states long-term housing tax credits and federal home loan bank refunds, those are two of the largest pots of money for affordable housing in the U.S. So leveraging our local dollars to bring those in whether it's through the Housing Authority or any other applicant, I think that's a good policy priority to -- to continue. I also wanted to highlight some of our current projects from an accountability standpoint from the Housing Authority to this Commission on progress that we've made on other projects. Just a few of them: Our Kinney Point Project, this Commission allocated about \$2 million in HOME ARP funds to that project. We did get our City agreement at the end -- towards the end of 2023 through a lot of hard work from City staff. That's allowed us to proceed into firm submission and now closing for all of our tax credits, and that project is fully funded. We have our investors, we have all of our good prices, and that project is proceeding to start here in first or second quarter of 2024. But the Commission's \$2 million support helped us leverage \$10 million of additional funds for the project to help us do 34 units of

housing, so appreciate your support. Our Tenant Based Rental Assistance Program, we just, as of last month, near fully expended our current active grant that we have with this Commission for that program, and I understand our next years or the new year is going before Council in February. So that continues to be a really good program that helps supplement and acts in a very similar fashion as our Section 8 or Housing Choice Voucher Program. It allows us to pick up the slack and provide vouchers to households that might not qualify for Section 8 due to criminal history or some other HUD regulations that might disqualify them. It gives us an additional pocket of vouchers that -- that makes sure we -- we not only served a lot of people, but specific people that might not otherwise qualify. Our Blind Boone facility renovations, we have two years' worth of funding there. We've gotten our 2022 agreement fully spent as of the end of December, so we've met those commitments. We've done the improvements to Blind Boone, and because of this Commission's support, we're now serving 100 kids out of that facility rather than 60. We have updated fire alarms, cameras, flooring. We've addressed some asbestos. The facility is better, and we're serving more kids, so we really appreciate the Commission's support, and we're looking forward to implementing the next round of funding, and we'll probably come back and ask for more. CHA has a long history of successfully implementing viable projects supported by this Commission, and we really do that by approaching with your all's policy priorities in mind. So we try to bring forward projects that maximize the number of populations served, including matched dollars from CHA and other funders, either local or at the state, making sure we have the required site control so we have legal control of the property to make sure the project is beyond the concept phase and one they can implement. We conduct neighborhood engagement and resident engagement and do a significant amount of engineering and planning and environmental concerns to make sure we're bringing forth viable projects. So I just want to say and reassure the Commission that you can rest assured that any proposal we bring before you going forward, we're going to make sure we've still checked all those boxes and make sure we bringing forth viable projects to you. So with that, thank you for all your support and thanks for all the hard work you do.

MR. ROSE: Thank you. I don't think I see any other public comment coming forward, so --

## **VI. OLD BUSINESS**

MR. ROSE: Our next item is an update on the Consolidated Plan Needs Survey and the plan itself.

MS. DEEVER: So we are still in the process of working on the FY 25 to 2029 Consolidated Plan. Where we are with the different phases of it, during the -- for the survey which was -- has been open since October 9th and we run through February 9th, we are -- currently have 184 returned responses. The survey is available in Spanish. We have distributed on several sites that BeHeard is the City's website where you can go to fill it out. CHA had distributed the flyers to all their residents. We have two listservs that it's been sent to more than once. It's on 500 on the housing programs listserv, we have 500-plus recipients, and in the neighborhood services Nextdoor listserv is also -- has 38,000 recipients.

All City employees have received it -- HCDC and CCLT. We have distributed -- it's going out two more times. It's been out several times already through Peachstar, which is the Columbia Public School District's website where it goes to every student with an e-mail. The City officials have had it. We've also posted flyers at the library, the health department, City Hall, bulletin boards at local laundromats, coffee shops, grocery stores, et cetera. And also flyers were distributed at the Everybody Eats event with Thanksgiving meals, and that was -- Rebecca had that idea, and that was a wonderful idea. And we did get that taken care of, so lots of -- lots of places where it's being distributed.

MS. PEFFERMAN: Question. Did you say you had 184?

MS. DEEVER: We have received 184 responses at this point.

MR. ROSE: Do you remember to the state for the recording whose requesting, so --

MS. PEFFERMAN: Okay. I will try.

MR. ROSE: Okay.

MS. PEFFERMAN: Pefferman, ask a question.

MS. DEEVER: Any other questions? So this is the flyer that's being distributed, and as you can see down here, there's a QR code that people just click on the QR code and it takes them directly to the BeHeard website so that they can complete that also. Paper copies are available at our office. If people request paper copies, we would get them paper copies so that they can complete it, as well. So we've had several events that we are required to do as part of the Consolidated Plan. The first that we did was the Neighborhood Congress. We had about 25 participants, and this was held at The ARC. And we did have numerous topics that we covered. We covered affordable housing, economic development, fair housing, neighborhood needs, and community facilities. This event was held in October and was our first event that we did for the Consolidated Plan. Our next event was our discussion on fair housing. This was -- we had about 55 attendees at this event. We did this in conjunction with the Columbia Housing Authority at the Kinney Point Housing Resource Center, and this was a fair housing event and was well attended and we received quite a bit of comments from that. And at this, we actually also did have a presentation by Professor Oliver Reed with the University of Missouri. Our next event was a conversation about economic development. We did this in conjunction with REDI in December, and we had 18 participants at this event. And again, we talked about how economic development is impacting the -- the grants and what we -- and how citizens felt we should spend the funds for those. And then our last event was just this past week. We were at the Columbia Public Library. We had about 17 participants for the Community Facilities and Community Needs Round Table. It ended up being a great conversation between the different not-for-profits and what types of opportunities were out there and different things that they've done with their funds through the time. So that is the status of the Consolidated Plan. We are still working on it, and we will be submitting that in November of this year. Questions? Anything on the Consolidated Plan? Our next item that I wanted to discuss is the Status of CDBG Funds. So one of the things that I did want to go over with everybody is making sure that you're

understanding where the projects over the past -- from '21 forward are. On FY 2021, we had seven projects that were approved, five were completed, and one was withdrawn, and one did not spend all of their funds. On the FY 2022 year, we had nine projects. Three were completed, one is still in development, and four were withdrawn. One did not spend all of its funds. On the FY 2023, we had seven projects. Four agreements are in process. We still have one that is potentially in development, and two withdrew. For the FY '24 projects, which is our next year projects, we have six projects that were approved. Five are set for agreements and are still looking strong that they will continue on. One has withdrawn. So this is a total of ten projects, potentially 12 projects out of the 23 that have not come to fruition. So our current funds that we will -- that we will need to reallocate again here when we go into our next funding cycle is going to be about \$783,000. This is collecting all of these funds that have not been spent. So we did have some unforeseen factors. We had high interest rates that have been much higher than we had where we have waited -- we have a waiting list for rehabs due to the lack of contractors and length of projects that we have, but this result of all of this is that we have been given -- timeliness has been discussed with us by HUD. So we are working with them on a timeliness plan since we did not meet timeliness for the last year. So when you look at where the different funds are, you can see here the -- as we've gone through and when we've allocated everything, and this includes at the end when we've allocated out the \$411,000 that we were able to reallocate last spring, that we're still at that \$783,000 when half of our projects aren't being -- coming to fruition. We've had to strategize and -- and kind of go forward. So I've been problem-solving on this and working with staff. Starting in FY '24, projects were strictly reviewed for the number -- for a number of factors, and the first one is site control. Projects will not -- we cannot have projects move forward that don't own -- that don't either own property or are not ready to proceed when they are given the -- the money, so we're going to be very strict on site control. Timeliness is a priority. We have to be looking at whether projects will be able to be finished during the time span that they say they are, and entities must have the ability to complete the projects. One of the -- one of the other challenges that we've had is -- is projects that have been put in place, have been approved, and now they want to change -- we get towards the end of the time, and then they want to change their projects. So when they do that, there is a chance -- I mean we would try to work with them to the extent that we can, and kind of go through that with them, if it's not drastically different than their original idea. But the problem that we run into is that that starts us back at zero clock, so we're back to a three to four month process before we'll be able to get them going between getting the environmental reviews, historical reviews, which have been very slowish at this time, and also going through all of the different processes that we have to do -- going through City Council, going through approvals, getting with HUD. We have to change the Consolidated Plan. All of it has been very taxing and time-consuming for our staff. So we're -- we're very -- we're very strict on doing the -- the big one is going to be site control. Additional solutions that I've been really thinking and pondering on, again, site control. I -- I can't emphasize that enough, and accounting for potential program income. One of the

things that I don't think had been all -- had been in the last few annual action plans really considered and in trainings I've been to, HUD is encouraging you to put in potential contingency items that -- in case you get program income returned to you. We did get a big program income last year. We had got about \$250,000 with Phoenix programs, so they'll -- when they changed their building, so that was lot of money to get back on top of what we had already had. Just to remind the Commission, when you have program income returned, the first money that has to be spent is program income, so we can't -- you're not using any of your HUD funds. You have to spend that program income first, so that's going to be one of the things that we're going to be doing. One of my other things that I've kind of been pondering around is funding fewer larger projects. These seem to be more manageable. Staff time is the same regardless of how many projects -- for each project we have, staff time is the same. We have to do monitoring, we have to do reporting, we have to do, you know, keeping up with them, we have to do paperwork, we have to do draws. All of that is the same, so that is one thing that I've kind of considered as a potential strategy. One of the other things that I have been looking at is a longer RFP time, so when we put out the request for proposals this year one of -- and I -- and I have this as will bring this next time back to the meeting to -- to potentially change the calendar. But I'm looking to try to keep that RFP time open longer so that groups that are looking at doing projects, one can meet with us, which we've done in the past, but also make sure that their projects are structured, ready to go, then -- and have meetings with them with R -- before the end of that RFP process. And then one of the other things I think we may have to really start prioritizing each year is doing a City project, and whether that's sidewalks or street lights or whatever that's going to be that fits into the guidelines, those are viable things that we can be doing with these funds. There is a potential one that we're looking at right now that would potentially spend \$250,000. This is an allowable cost through CDBG. Some cities take money out for city projects prior to even bringing the funds to their groups to approve, so I think that one of the things that we have to do is be looking at that and -- and be looking at what City projects we can put through. And then, finally, having additional contingent projects included in the annual action plan, so that it helps to eliminate some of the - of the paperwork and the time-consuming factors that we run into when we have to readjust the annual action plan. Questions? Yes?

MR. FLETCHER: So did you do --

MR. ROSE: Yes, Mr. Fletcher?

MR. FLETCHER: Mike Fletcher. Yeah. Did you do, like, a root cause analysis, or do you have some evaluation where you looked at all of these projects that -- that basically failed and -- and try and, you know, group them, and --

MS. DEEVER: We did discuss that. I can bring that back to the next meeting. We did discuss that at the last -- in a -- in one of the meetings in the fall of the different reasons some agencies have pulled out because they did not have the capacity to do the projects the way that HUD requires them to do the projects. Several did not have site control, so they did not own the property that they had, or

they've switched the -- they were trying to switch properties that they had, or they were waiting on getting a property that they had. Those were the biggest factors that went into it. But the -- one of the -- as we know, one of the big ones that we had come back that had -- that had some pretty major funding ended up being a project that had a conflict of interest, and they withdrew their application because of that. So it just adds up. It just is over time the -- the having the small projects or having each project come out, it just adds up over time. And it's been -- it's actually really been occurring back since FY '21, so several years ago prior to, you know, many of you probably weren't even on -- may not have even been on this Commission then.

MR. FLETCHER: Mike Fletcher. So is it in any way tied, do you think, to, you know, the Covid and the excess funds, because there were other funds coming into the organizations from other funding sources, not just ours and was there just -- you know, we are a limited size city. So is it -- does that contribute to it, that, basically, we ended up with more money than we could deal with in the time frame that we had to spend it?

MS. DEEVER: In my opinion, yes. I do think that Covid has been a factor in all of this. I think that it took a longer time for the agencies to get kind of back up on their feet after Covid happened. And yes, I do believe that there is a lot of different funding that has been put into the community, and it can only absorb so much. So I do think that had a factor on it, you know. And again, we can't -- you can't predict when something like Covid might have happened or, you know, with the long term, but the agencies have said that, yes, it has been challenging for them to use the funds and to be able to get rid of all of the funds that they had.

MR. FLETCHER: Yeah. We're not -- we're not in a position where we're going to lose any funding that's unspent at this point. We've reprogrammed everything we need to reprogram; is that correct?

MS. DEEVER: We are working our best to do that. So when I -- as I said we were, one of the things that we did get this year, we did not meet timeliness last year for CDBG funds because these funds from the previous were not spent. So we are working on it. We have a plan that we've approved -- have approved with HUD right now, but there is a chance that they -- we may -- if we can't spend the funds again, if we can't allocate out this -- get rid of the \$700,000, that, yes, that could happen, and, yes, one of the potential things is that HUD could take back money or not allot us out as much money in the future. So it's -- it's -- we have to be strict as we go on from here. We -- as a staff, this has been extremely challenging for us. It's trying to figure out how to, you know, use the funds, try to -- you know, it's -- and then every time that we do any changes to it, we have to go back and redo the Consolidated Plan -- or, I'm sorry -- do the annual action plans with HUD, which is a lengthy two to three month process, to get through at least with them. So we are taking this extremely seriously and we are looking at these funds and trying to figure out how to get rid of them. I think, also, like I said, if we try to use a City project that we can allot funds to and get a big chunk of money to -- to do good in the community,



they have to be -- meet the CDBG requirements. It has to be in a CDBG area. It can't -- you know, there are certain guidelines that they have to follow, too, but that will also help us use a bigger chunk of the funds. You know, getting rid of a -- of a fourth of it with \$411,000 that we were able to get rid of that year and obligate out was huge. But as we -- as we got into FY '23, we had additional projects that didn't make it, as well.

MR. FLETCHER: Have you put this information out where we have access to it? Just this part -- yeah.

MS. DEEVER: This particular chart? I can get it out to you.

MR. FLETCHER: Okay. Yeah. Because I didn't think I had seen that.

MR. ROSE: Tom Rose, just with a comment. I think -- I feel like, you know, I can't remember how long I've been on, but I know we were -- I would say maybe we are trying to experiment with approving funding for different projects because we tried to spread it across the community in -- in different organizations. And I call it experimentation in -- in some -- it might be that reality has hit as to how these funds have to be spent and how we can do that.

MR. KASMANN: This is Ross Kasmann. I'm not sure that it's as much a failure on the spenders as it is on getting the money to them and helping them understand how to, you know, meet the requirements.

MR. ROSE: Ms. Shaw?

MS. SHAW: Rebecca Shaw. So your idea of kind of a wait list, I guess if you would call it that, for, you know, projects --

MS. DEEVER: Projects.

MS. SHAW: Right. Yeah. How does that work for -- have you talked with the -- the non-profits and a couple of different people to kind of figure out, because they're going to be fundraising for something in the meantime. Right? So what happens if we do put them on a wait list, someone drops, and all of a sudden, they have the opportunity for this funding, but perhaps they don't need as much as they had asked for or --

MS. DEEVER: And that is another solution that we're working with. One of the other things that we're doing is we are -- we have gotten the FY '23 agreements. They go through the City Council next week -- next week. They're in -- it's the first meeting in February. I think it's the 5th. They go through that, and then those will be in process. At that point, we do have some of the agencies that we did fund that have said that they could take more funds, and we will adjust that to give them more funds, but I was letting that get through so that those can go through on it, but then I'm going to have to change the annual action plan. So those are things we're working on. The -- the contingency plan is that a list of things that you have is -- it's not that you put an agency on there, per se, but you have a -- you have several other things that you may -- one of them may be a City project, one of them -- and maybe they're unspecified, but you're putting in there what the needs are that we are going to still try to go towards when

we're doing that, whether that's serving people with disabilities or whether that's -- you know, whatever we decide that we want that to be. But it's have a way that you have things listed out that you are going to move towards next if -- if somebody drops out, where is the next place I'm going, and it's just listed out in your plan so that you -- it helps alleviate a little bit of the changes that you have make when you're doing the annual action plan amendments.

MS. SHAW: And I would caution maybe, like, we don't want to mandate that a City plan or a City project be done each year. I just -- we want to make sure that -- and I understand what you're saying is the City has more capacity to do these things and understand the rules behind HUD. I would just -- if we're talking about our action plan, we don't, I think, want to state that, but maybe just have it be an understanding with the Commission that the City may be able to better use those funds quickly.

MS. DEEVER: Yes?

MR. FLETCHER: Mike Fletcher. So for -- for the Opportunity Center and the conflict of interest, so I've missed a handful of meetings, I believe.

MS. DEEVER: Uh-huh.

MR. FLETCHER: Can you refresh me? Explain this to me as to how -- what the basis for this is, because that was a huge chunk of funding. It's something that we had been trying to support for years, and now, all of a sudden --

MS. DEEVER: So basically, and a lot of this was before me, as well. But basically, there was a conflict of interest with the owner of the property and the City of Columbia. It was taken in front of the City's legal team. They wrote to HUD. We had -- we tried to have -- we had conversations with HUD. HUD really never came back and -- and stated either way whether they set -- thought it was going to be a conflict of interest or not. In the time that that was going through, VAC decided to withdraw their application for concerns of what might happen if -- if whatever decision was made. They withdrew their application. So when they withdrew that application, all that funding from the several years that they had it -- and we kind of -- if -- if you recall, I did discuss this at the last year's meeting that we were -- staff had concerns. I particularly had concerns with the conflict of interest because it had not been resolved by HUD, and we went ahead and put some money towards them again in FY '24. But when that -- when they withdrew their application, that whole process was ended, and they -- they returned, actually, quite a bit of money.

MR. FLETCHER: Okay. Can you explain the conflict of interest? I don't understand. That's what I'm -- what -- what is the conflict of interest?

MS. DEEVER: The conflict of interest that they had is basically that a -- a City Council person owned the property that the -- that the campus was going to be built on.

MR. FLETCHER: But it was going to be donated to this non-profit organization?

MS. DEEVER: So HUD has very strict guidelines and thoughts on conflict of interest, or the assumption of a conflict of interest. And what kind of what in our conversation at one point that we had

with them, and I think in one of the letters that came back from the -- when -- because the City's legal team dealt quite a bit with them on this. One of the things that they said is if you own a property, and you donate the property or sell -- it was one of these, I think, sold for cost to them, whatever, you're -- that's alleviating a debt from you. So whether or not you are making a profit on it, if you own it and now I don't have that debt anymore, it's -- that's -- that's a -- that is a benefit to that person.

MR. FLETCHER: So it was solely because they were on the City Commission?

MS. DEEVER: The person that owned the property at the time, yes. She was and is on the City's Commission -- the City Council.

MR. FLETCHER: City Council.

MS. DEEVER: And that was VAC's choice to pull their funding. They chose to pull that back.

MR. FLETCHER: Is the project still going forward, or is the whole -- in other words, okay, is it going forward without our funding or is it dead?

MS. DEEVER: I believe it is still going forward. I don't know the status of that project.

MR. ROSE: Tom Rose here. They've certainly secured a number of the ARPA funds for that project.

MR. FLETCHER: I'm sorry?

MR. ROSE: They've secured or have County and City ARPA funds for that project, that they're able to move forward with, like in the millions. So any other questions on the -- that update?

## **VII. NEW BUSINESS**

MR. ROSE: Okay. Our next item of business is to review -- new business, to review the -- the policy resolution that essentially set the perimeters for this Commission. And then if we have any recommendations for changes to that; is that correct?

MS. DEEVER: This -- well, I think what this is is looking at the policy. It's just reviewing for your -- since we do have new members, the policy resolution each year, we review it.

MR. ROSE: Okay.

MS. DEEVER: If there were changes, we would have to take them back to the City Council.

MR. ROSE: Correct. That's if we recommended any changes or anything.

MS. DEEVER: Right.

MR. ROSE: Does anyone -- any members have any questions about the policy resolution? And within this resolution, when we -- when we look at different projects and there are suggested percentages of funding for different categories that are within that, so --

MS. DEEVER: And just to remind you, those are just recommendations. The only one that is strictly enforced is the economic and workforce development can spend no more than 15 percent of a budget can go towards that. The other ones are just recommendations as to where -- where they should go or where they could go.

MR. ROSE: Yes, Mr. Fletcher?

MR. FLETCHER: Yeah. Mike Fletcher. So probably in all likelihood, we will want to revisit this with closer scrutiny next year once the new Consolidated Plan is developed, because that -- you know, given all the input that it's going to get, may change some of these targets. So I would say this year, we probably want to hold off making any substantial changes and wait for that new plan.

MR. ROSE: Okay. If no other questions related to that, I didn't realize we had election of officers already again.

MS. DEEVER: Yeah. It's that time.

MR. ROSE: I think we just did that and here --

MS. DEEVER: I started about a year ago.

MR. FLETCHER: Do we need to make a motion to not make any changes or is it okay as is? I mean, what's the resolution --

MS. DEEVER: I believe it's okay as is. It was to review it.

MR. ROSE: Well, what's that? On the policy review? Yeah, I think that you --

MR. FLETCHER: It's already an approved policy, so there's nothing for us to do.

MR. ROSE: Right. Yeah. Sorry about that.

### **VIII. SPECIAL ITEMS**

MR. ROSE: Okay. For election of officers, I guess we have -- do we have any nominations for chair? I can be chair again. I would offer to be chair. I was impressed it was coming up again, so I would accept that.

MR. KASMANN: Yeah. I nominate Tom Rose for the chair.

MS. SHAW: Second. Rebecca Shaw.

MR. ROSE: Okay. All in favor, signify by saying aye. Opposed, same sign.

(Unanimous voice vote for approval).

MR. ROSE: Okay. Thank you. And then for --

MS. DEEVER: I believe that we have to do a roll call on that.

MR. ROSE: Oh, we do a roll call. I'm sorry. We have to do a roll call vote. I forgot about that.

MR. ROSE: Ms. Shaw?

MS. SHAW: Aye.

MR. ROSE: Yes. Ms. Pefferman?

MS. PEFFERMAN: Yes.

MR. ROSE: Okay. Mr. Kasmann? Sorry.

MR. KASMANN: Aye.

MR. ROSE: Mr. Rose, yes. And I'm forgetting names.

MS. ASCANI: Ascani.

MR. ROSE: Yeah. Ascani?

MS. ASCANI: Ascani, yes.

MR. ROSE: And Mr. Fletcher?

MR. FLETCHER: Yes.

MR. ROSE: And do I have nominations for -- I forget the position was called --

MS. DEEVER: Vice chair.

MR. ROSE: -- vice chair. All right. There we go.

MS. PEFFERMAN: I nominate Ross Kasmann to stay as vice chair. Erica Pefferman.

MR. ROSE: Tom Rose, second. Okay. We will do a roll call vote again. Ms. Shaw?

MS. SHAW: Aye.

MR. ROSE: Ms. Pefferman?

MS. PEFFERMAN: Aye.

MR. ROSE: Mr. Kasmann?

MR. KASMANN: Aye.

MR. ROSE: Mr. Rose, aye. I forgot how to say your name -- Ascani?

MS. ASCANI: Aye.

MR. ROSE: And Mr. Fletcher?

MR. FLETCHER: Aye.

MR. ROSE: Okay. And then for secretary. Entertain a motion for secretary? I would nominate Ms. Shaw again for secretary.

MS. SHAW: Accepted. Yeah.

MR. KASMANN: Second.

MR. ROSE: All right.

MR. KASMANN: Kasmann.

MR. ROSE: Okay. And roll call. Ms. Shaw?

MS. SHAW: Yes.

MR. ROSE: Ms. Pefferman?

MS. PEFFERMAN: Yes.

MR. ROSE: Mr. Kasmann?

MR. KASMANN: Yes.

MR. ROSE: Mr. Rose, yes. Ms. Ascani?

MS. ASCANI: Yes.

MR. ROSE: Mr. Fletcher?

MR. FLETCHER: Yes.

MR. ROSE: All right. Thank you all.

MR. KASMANN: Nailed it.

## **IX. GENERAL COMMENTS**

MR. ROSE: Next, we have General Comments. Yes?

MS. DEEVER: This is Jennifer Deaver. I do have one general comment. The -- we did -- for those of you that may have seen it, it was announced today that the new director of the Housing and Program Services was announced today. Her name is Rebecca Thompson. Becky Thompson. She is currently an attorney with the City of Columbia, and she's been, I believe, seven years with the City of Columbia as a City's attorney. So she -- her first day that she will be starting as our new director is March 6th, so if you want to read more information about her, it's all on the City's website and out in the news and things like that, so -- but I did want to make that announcement. So we look forward to welcoming her to coming on and helping our division. And then also, I will have that calendar updated. I'm not changing any dates of any meetings. It's strictly changing the -- it's lengthening the RFP time so that there is more time for projects to come through.

MR. ROSE: Tom Rose. Question. Do you have more meetings for the Consolidated Plan -- public meetings?

MS. DEEVER: I am currently working on one more plan that will be in -- I believe at the end of February. I'm -- I have not -- have a lot of details on that.

MR. ROSE: Okay.

MS. DEEVER: So -- but there will be one more meeting. What I'm really looking at is kind of a consolidation meeting of all of the meetings. Again, we started with the Neighborhood Congress to talk about all the topics and come back at the end and be able to review some of that and go -- try to get more public input on that.

MS. PEFFERMAN: Erica Pefferman. I have a question about the minutes process, just because I just need some clarification, and out of a desire to be transparent. I know that we are a couple of meetings -- two or three meetings behind on having the minutes done. Can you explain -- and I know that you had a great, you know, reason. You guys are short-staffed or whatnot. However, in light of our current education about how things work with the transcription process, can you help me understand. Is that not an automated process or does that require -- what kind of work process, workflow goes into that for the staff, so that we can understand better, like, maybe why they're not available to the public.

MS. FAIR: Molly Fair. I can speak to that. So basically, Janna, the court reporter, does the transcribed minutes, and then we also do the regular minutes, which is just, like, motions and that sort of thing, with briefer descriptions. Janna has had hers done. That's totally on me that the last couple of minutes aren't done. Basically, I just thought it made more sense to do them all at one time, approve the transcription, and the audio, and the minutes. So we will have those for the next meeting. Since we do have Erin on board now, we shouldn't have a problem going forward because we'll have adequate staffing. So does that answer your question?

MS. PEFFERMAN: I think so, yeah. I was just curious of the process of it, about how it worked, and I understand, you know, being shorthanded. I just want to make sure that we're being responsible to the public in making sure that they're available.

MS. FAIR: Uh-huh.

MS. PEFFERMAN: Thank you.

MR. ROSE: Good question. Tom Rose. Good question, and they had been pretty regular and we have been behind a couple, so that will be brought up. Yes, Ms. Shaw?

MS. SHAW: I just -- I had been contacted by a couple of people in the community asking -- there's been a lot of issues, I guess, with landlord/tenants happening.

MR. ROSE: Yes.

MS. SHAW: And they were looking for information.

MR. ROSE: You know what, I was going to -- Tom Rose is here. I was going to make a comment on that, and I was actually going to ask Randy to come forward, and you may not have any answers for us, Randy, and this is kind of out -- you know, out of the blue. And it's maybe related, Ms. Shaw, to what you're talking about. And we see in the news about -- you know, and I'm seeing one landlord that isn't keeping up, and if you can maybe speak to some of those to what -- maybe not?

MR. COLE: Sure. Is there a specific question or information?

MS. SHAW: I think they were interested in resources available, especially to tenants who weren't getting either contact from the landlord at all, or getting things fixed in a timely manner, or a lot of -- you know, we are seeing a lot of either non-local or out -- you know, out-of-state management -- property management companies now that are running a lot of our rentals.

MR. COLE: Yeah.

MS. SHAW: And they're having difficulties. They have to leave a voicemail, or they have to text, and they get no return, so --

MR. COLE: Uh-huh. Yeah. So for our programs, I'll speak to the Columbia Housing Authority on the Section 8 program. If the tenant, you know, is on Section 8 has an issue that they're concerned about with their unit, they can contact us and we would send an inspector out, and we pay for that process. They go out and inspect. If they find a -- an identifiable violation, they've got to get it fixed, or we withhold the assistance payment that goes towards the rent, but they still can't evict based on that. They have to get back into compliance. So we -- we do do that, and there's instances that I have observed of that happening, so that's within our programs. I would say we -- we -- you know, there's multiple things true at once in the world all the time. The vast majority of our experiences over the last couple of years have been positive with landlords. We have 364 that we're working with each month, so I want to make sure I give those good landlords credit and their due because the process works pretty seamlessly. They provide a good service to tenants, and it works. The ones that don't fall in that category, you know, that is of that smaller percentage, they do stand out, and we know who they are, tenants know who they are. We typically try to work with them to get them to a different landlord, as well. And if there's significant issues, you know, given that we're over seeing a large pot of funds, we refer them to Mid-Mo Legal Services to provide that services because that seems like a more appropriate

process than for us to intervene to far into an advocacy role, since we're overseeing, you know, a significant amount of federal money. But that's how we handle those processes.

MS. SHAW: Thank you. For City staff, I know that there are some links on the Neighborhood Services page. Are those -- they're buried a little bit, and you do have to know where to look for them.

MS. DEEVER: Okay.

MS. SHAW: Maybe making that a more accessible button for someone to find, or, I'm not sure. I just -- I know that we've had -- we are a city of Renters. I mean, we have a lot of college students in and out. We have a lot of -- a lot of need in that area, so being able to make sure that people can find their answers easily would be -- would be good.

MS. DEEVER: I can definitely talk with the director of Neighborhood Services, with the -- with the manager of that, and make sure Lena is aware of that -- that comment.

MS. SHAW: Thank you.

MR. ROSE: Tom Rose here. I did get to visit a couple of properties with Randy. He was nice enough to take us on a little tour, and it was great to see the improvements that had been -- one thing I would recommend to everybody if they have an opportunity is go to the Blind Boone Center and see that Moving Ahead program. I was amazed at what -- how that's been organized and what -- what's been happening there, so it's really nice to see that. All right. Any other comments? Okay.

#### **X. NEXT MEETING DATE**

MR. ROSE: Our next meeting is February 21st, and at that meeting, we will be -- what will we be doing at that meeting; do you remember?

MS. DEEVER: I -- we'll be -- we'll be starting to look at the process through as we go through with the remainder. We'll have an update on everything that -- where we are, and then go from there.

MR. ROSE: Okay.

MS. DEEVER: I'll have more information as we get closer.

MR. ROSE: Okay. Very good.

#### **XI. ADJOURNMENT**

MR. ROSE: Entertain a motion to adjourn.

MS. SHAW: Motion made. Rebecca.

MS. PEFFERMAN: Pefferman, second.

MR. ROSE: All in favor? Any opposed?

(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

MR. ROSE: Okay. Thank you, all. Have a good evening.

(The meeting adjourned at 7:46 p.m.)

(Off the record.)