



City of Columbia, Missouri

Meeting Minutes

Columbia Community Development Commission

Wednesday, June 15, 2016
7:00 PM

Regular

City Hall, 701 E.
Broadway, Rm 1A,
Columbia

I. CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Forbes called the meeting to order.

II. INTRODUCTIONS

MS. FORBES: I'm going to start out with -- let's go around and introduce ourselves.

And I'm going to start with you.

MR. JONES: Mark Jones, Human Services Commission Representative.

MS. FORBES: I'm Pam Forbes. I represent the 1st Ward.

MR. COLE: Randy Cole, City Staff.

MR. SCHEPERS: Jim Schepers, Commissioner-At-Large.

MR. RITTER: Mitch Ritter, Ward 2.

MR. REGAN: Blaine Regan, Ward 6.

MR. AMELUNKE: Jacob Amelunke, City Staff.

MR. ANSPACH: Gary Anspach, City Staff.

Present: 5 - Pamela Forbes, Mark Jones, Mitchell Ritter, James Schepers and Blaine Regan

Absent: 2 - Michael Fletcher and Paul Girouard

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Schepers made a motion to approve the agenda; second by Mr. Jones; the motion passed by a unanimous voice vote.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Jones made a motion to approve the minutes of the June 1, 2016 meeting; second by Mr. Ritter; the motion passed by a unanimous voice vote.

June 1, 2016 CDC minutes

V. NEW BUSINESS

Election of Officers

MR. COLE: So we had O.U. resign, so we now have an empty chairperson slot. So you need to fill your chairperson.

MS. FORBES: Any ideas? Any nominations?

MR. SCHEPERS: I'll nominate Mark Jones for Chair.

MR. JONES: Thanks, Jim. I'd be happy to.

MS. FORBES: Good. I'll second that. So we -- anybody else?

MR. RITTER: And Michael --

MS. FORBES: All right.

MR. RITTER: Michael is still Vice Chair?

MR. JONES: Has Michael expressed any interest? Do you remember last time?

MR. RITTER: I -- I don't remember. I think he said he would, but I just -- I don't know about your affiliation from Human Services --

MR. COLE: Yeah. He's the liaison.

MR. RITTER: Yeah.

MR. COLE: I don't know if there is anything in the ordinance that says you can't be that way, but --

MR. JONES: You know what --

MR. RITTER: There's anything that says you can't, but --

MR. JONES: Jim, if you would withdraw your motion, I have an idea.

MR. SCHEPERS: I'll withdraw my motion.

MR. JONES: Can I -- can I suggest that we table this until the next meeting when we have the full representative of the body?

MS. FORBES: Yeah. I think that is a good idea. I'll second that.

MR. JONES: Motion we table until the next meeting.

MS. FORBES: All in favor?

(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

MS. FORBES: Opposed?

MR. JONES: Successfully punted.

MS. FORBES: So we're going to table election of officers. Okay. I'm trying to wear two hats here. Okay.

Mr. Jones made a motion to table the election of officers to the next meeting; second by Ms. Forbes; the motion passed by a unanimous voice vote.

VI. REPORTS

City Manager

MR. COLES: Yeah. So we had the City Manager scheduled to be here tonight, but he is a pretty busy individual and got pulled into another meeting, so he is unable to make it tonight. I did get to meet with him briefly, and he wanted me to relay his thoughts for the funding. And I think everyone was aware of the Central City Neighborhood request that included the redevelopment over at Garth, Lynn, Oak and Sexton, as well as the skate park. He felt with all of the requests, and the nature of all of the requests when we are trying to help homeless persons, you know, people in need of housing, to prioritize -- he wanted us to prioritize the Central City Neighborhood portion of it and remove the skate park portion was his thoughts and recommendations to bring to the Commission. But certainly he was of the mindset of whatever you guys come up with, he is sure he'll support just because he tends to agree with what the Commission comes up with every year. So that is what the City Manager had to say.

Heart of Missouri United Way

Also with us tonight is Rachel from the Heart of Missouri United Way. Rachel is part of a group that I have been working with of local funders since she oversees the United Way's funding process, but there is four individuals -- actually five of us, but four organizations that have been working together -- so the Division of Human Services -- that is the Commission that Mark is on and Steve Hollis, as well as the County Community Services Representative, Kelly Wallis. We all represent local funders that provide funding to organizations that overlap, you know, assisting those in need in our community in a variety of different ways. So we meet weekly to discuss strategies to meet all the needs in the community -- identify the needs, as well as make sure we are using our funding together in ways that is effective in allowing organizations to double-dip, but then also making sure we are filling gaps that are -- that are unfilled. So for the United Way's funding process this year, Rachel had me come and talk about our funding process and what we fund, so their board can kind of know what projects we fund as well as some of our initiatives and priorities that we have for the year, such as the day center and other priorities. So Rachel came here tonight, so if it is all right with the Commission, I would let Rachel kind of explain what she does in her role and how we all fit together.

MS. FINCH: Do you want me to move up or am I cool here?

MR. COLE: Either -- I think she likes it at the --

MS. FINCH: Yes. Okay. Thank you guys for having me here. Like Randy said, I am Rachel Finch and I'm the Community Impact Director at Heart of Missouri United Way. And the collaboration of the funders has been kind of instrumental in helping us continue to improve our process. Just learning -- having our community volunteers who run our allocations learn more about how the different structures and strengths and challenges in each funder setting can really work together to make sure that we are meeting needs in a complimentary way. So I appreciate the opportunity to kind of share on our end how it went this year. We had two areas open this year: Safety Net and Income out of our four. The other two are Education and Health. So a lot of those targets kind of overlap with some of the things that CDBG dollars can do. We actually had ten Safety Net agencies that we ended up allocating to and seven Income agencies for a total of about \$725,000. But we had about \$1.8 million in express needs and requests, so I empathize with you as it is a struggle to try to figure out how to make that stretch in a way that is most effective. Our work together has really let us kind of -- I'll give you an example: We have kind of figured out that

our dollars tend to have a little bit more flexibility, not quite as many restrictions or boundaries, I guess you could say. For example, like the County statute, you know, can only serve up to age 19. Okay, that is important to know. What ages do we need to cover on a specific issue then? So that is an example. This year, we committed to investing funds in building capacity in Turning Point in a manner that agency needs that we realized couldn't be -- really be funded by other resources of the City, neither CDBG or Social Services. Our volunteers were really impressed with their ability to engage with such a population of so many challenging needs, but realized that they needed some capacity. So we really learned a lot more about -- we learned that Impact can look different for each organization for each issue. So we are really excited to work with the other funders to think that our dollars might be able to help leverage other resources, both locally and beyond. So that is kind of the point that I wanted to get across today. I think that committing CDBG funds to Turning Point's facility can help improve their -- it is kind of another key piece in improving their program operations and can complement the funds that we worked hard to understand were so needed that were invested by United Way. Do you guys have any questions?

MR. JONES: Just how would you describe your coordination with the new County Children's Trust Fund and how is that working out?

MS. FINCH: Well, we share -- we actually share the same data system, Apricot, for funders, so, you know, even if there wasn't sort of that personal level of corroboration, we can share the same data. We can see -- we can see the budgets, we can see whose dollars are going where and what impact they are having. So that alone has been huge. We are still learning more about that and how to do that more effectively, of course. But, yeah, we've -- we've just realized that you can't -- you know, the whole idea of Impact is you use information to guide your decisions. So as we get a better understanding of the information in front of us, we have to get better and more willing to adapt to strategically meet the needs that are so dynamic.

MR. COLE: I've had a lot of good feedback on organizations not having to reenter the basic information that they were for every funder also with the Apricot system.

MS. FINCH: Yeah. I had some good -- yeah, I just put our feedback together as well, and, yeah, there is always a learning curve with a new system. There is never a perfect system. But I was pleasantly surprised by that same sort of commentary from agencies.

MR. JONES: All right. Thank you.

MS. FINCH: You're welcome.

MS. FORBES: Okay. Any other questions?

MR. COLE: All right. I can move into our --

MS. FORBES: City Staff.

MR. COLE: All right. Thanks Rachel.

MS. FINCH: You're welcome.

MS. FORBES: Thank you.

MS. FINCH: You're welcome.

City Staff

MR. COLE: So I'll move into the presentation of information that I typically do every year at this meeting just to explain our funding process, especially since we've got a couple of new Commissioners. I see there is one new Commissioner here tonight. So this is the big meeting of the year where we -- the Commission works to recommend to Council what gets funded for FY 2017 CDBG and HOME. So I always find it useful to think about what information should form this process, and I have these four items that are category funding percentages, which is guided by the City Council Policy Resolution which breaks down what we spend per Affordable Housing, Neighborhood Needs, Economic Development, Community Facilities and Fair Housing; what are five-year plan goals are; how many homes we want to rehab; how many homes we want to demo; how many facilities we want to renovate; how many people we are going to provide job training -- all of those goals. We also -- it is also good to look at what the most Community Needs Survey data is. This year I'm happy to report that we exceeded our number of surveys again. We are up close to 200. I think it was 191, if I remember correctly. So we are still increasing that every year, so that is always good. And then, fourth, the Commissioner ratings of proposals. So I put a graphics in the Commission memo that shows what the average Commissioner score was per proposal. So these are our funding percentages again for CDBG and HOME on what we fund. You see there is a window for each of those -- 25 to 40 percent goes to Affordable Housing; 20 to 50 percent goes to Neighborhood Needs. So when we developed our five-year goals, we tied a dollar value to the mid-point of all of those percentages so that way we could have goals that actually match to the available funding. So in thinking about that -- those big categories -- those six big categories of what we fund with CDBG, this is what we budgeted through 2016. So you can say we have fallen within the category on all of them. Economic Development, we are a little bit on the low side. Community Facilities, we are a little ahead of the game. That has to do with a lot of the funds we've set aside for Welcome Home in 2015. But that gives you a good snapshot of where we are at. Again, these are our one-year goals that show each of the different activities and how much we'll do. Another good graph that -- this wasn't in the memo, but it shows what percent of our five-year budget goal has been achieved through 2016, so we've only had two years where we have budgeted funds for. So basically you can look at it as a percent of what we set out to expend money on these different categories, where we are ahead and where are we behind. You

can see the bus shelters. We decided to do those all in one swoop -- doing five bus shelters in one year because it made sense for getting appropriate bids. So that one is pretty much taken care of. Also noteworthy, you will see removing our dilapidated houses, we're pretty ahead of the game. We've demo'd quite a few houses, so you'll see that that connects to my recommendations, which is reflective of your ratings of it getting funds, but also at a fairly reduced rate since we are, you know, pretty far ahead of the game. Another noteworthy thing that I see is on constructing new energy efficient homes, we haven't budgeted quite as much of that as we set out to do through year two, and we do have an application for one of those, so that is something to consider. But that gives you a good picture of -- of where we are at and if we are on track to exceed or come under some of those goals. Our Community Development Needs Survey results -- this was included in your memo. This is us checking in on all of those 16 different goals that we have those numbers tied to on how many, you know, houses we're going to rehab or how many home owner occupied downpayment assistance participants we're going to help. You can see our affordable housing with energy efficiency and universal designs scored really high this year. That has been a trend, but that is as high as it has scored over the last three years. Our nonprofit community facility scored high. That is typically the case. We get a lot of participation from our local organizations. That might drive that up a little bit. Yeah, it seems like everything from the construction of sidewalks and up are seen as high priorities. Other items are important, but, you know, those ones above the sidewalks have really scored up. So the last item that is probably really important to you is the average Commissioner rating. So this shows the rating per project based upon how viable a proposal you think it is on all the different criteria within the rating. So you can see our demo program scored really high this year followed by homeownership assistance, which has been a trend. We had a lot of really high scores. You know, anything 43 and up is pretty close to being, you know, almost the same score. And you can see toward the bottom we have Welcome Home, CIRC or CATCH, and the Urban Empowerment Development Corporation. So in putting my recommendations together, I looked at the four categories that I'm describing, and it is important to note -- I'll just get my spreadsheet up. So these are the funding recommendations I recommend to start the discussion. These are not my own personal recommendations. These are all based on your all's rating, what we spent so far, and kind of where we are at with our goals. But really I think it is probably pretty close, and very reasonable, and probably similar to the way I would

recommend. But, yeah, that was -- the goal was to reflect your ratings. Certainly, we had \$1.8 million in requests and we only have \$830,000 in funds available, so, you know, I had pretty much everybody feeling, you know, some of that burden of cutting and also to make sure the proposals we fund get enough funding to be a viable -- to be viable means a few of them aren't going to be able to get funding at all. So this is the recommendation for CDBG, and HOME is a lot more close. I took a little different approach on HOME. You know, one thing to think about with the applicants for the HOME funds is CMCA is going to -- cutting CMCA is going to have a lot more impact on their ability to execute the project versus cutting our downpayment assistance program or the Southampton Senior Housing. So I tried to cut it proportionally to share the pain, but in a way that, you know, has the least bad, you know, on how we do the cuts. So I would recommend the Commission -- you could start with deciding on City general revenue funds set aside for the Homeless Day Center. And certainly whoever you choose with that will impact, you know, who you go forward with on CDBG or you could kind of do that all at once. But I will turn it over to you all and you can have the conversation. I would encourage you to change my numbers and reexam different ways of doing this. I would prefer if you would make it your own.

VII. SPECIAL ITEMS

CDC Recommendations

MR. SCHEPERS: I'll start the discussion and ask if we might not take the low-hanging fruit first and start with HOME.

MS. FORBES: Yeah.

MR. SCHEPERS: And the only thing I want to make sure that all is aware of was the comments from Mike Fletcher that we would just kind of -- that's what Mike's desires were. And I understand what Randy said a minute ago, but Mike had suggested that we -- we fund all -- everything at 100 percent and just take the 15,000 deficit from JES Development and knock that down to \$85-. And I really kind of agree with that because on the night that JES Development presented, I asked them specifically what would happen -- I pointed this program out, and they said that it -- that they just would be short, but they would still go ahead with the development. So that would -- I think that echoes Mike's recommendation, so that is what I would tend to like. So I'll let you guys fool with that.

MR. JONES: I would just echo that. I mean, the JES Development is a 5.39 million dollar project, if I recall correctly, so I don't think \$15,000 will make a difference; whereas, for 804 King, where we are actually talking about trying to fund some Affordable Housing, and as we noted, we are behind on our Affordable Housing, so that is a good place to go. So I would just echo what Jim said and Michael's comments as well.

MR. SCHEPERS: So I would make a motion that we go with that recommendation for our HOME funds and then we can work through this -- the Community Block Grants next.

MS. FORBES: Okay. So you move that --

MR. SCHEPERS: I would make a motion that we fund the HOME allocations just as it is showing on the screen here. \$175,000 for the Community Development Department; \$85,000 for JES Development Company; \$40,000 for CMCA; \$60,000 for the Community Development Department; and -- I'm sorry - - for CHDO; and then \$40,000 for the Administration.

MS. FORBES: And that is the staff recommendation?

MR. SCHEPERS: It is not.

MS. FORBES: It is not.

MR. SCHEPERS: Staff recommendation --

MR. COLE: And that -- our staff recommendation was just to get the conversation started. We're going to be with you guys whatever your recommendation is.

MS. FORBES: Okay. So I can put down here, Move that we fund the HOME allocations as they appear on the screen or should I detail out each one?

MR. SCHEPERS: Well --

MR. RITTER: Where is the other \$15,000?

MR. SCHEPERS: It is removed.

MS. FORBES: Remove the \$15,000 from --

MR. JONES: JES Development.

MS. FORBES: From JES.

MR. JONES: And fully fund other projects.

MS. FORBES: Okay. Move that we remove the \$15,000 from JES.

MR. RITTER: And how much was available in HOME?

MR. COLE: \$400,000 was the total.

MR. SCHEPERS: \$400,000.

MR. RITTER: Okay. All right.

MR. COLE: Yeah. That is what we are estimating.

MS. FORBES: Okay. And the motion was made by Schepers?

MR. SCHEPERS: Yes.

MR. JONES: I'll second.

MS. FORBES: Seconded by Jones. All in favor?

(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

MS. FORBES: Opposed? All right. Well that one was easy. Okay. We'll go to the other page.

Mr. Schepers made a motion to fund the HOME allocations as follows: \$175,000 for the Community Development Dept; \$85,000 for JES Development Company; \$40,000 for CMCA; \$60,000 for CHDO; \$40,000 for Administration; second by Mr. Jones. The motion passed by a unanimous voice vote.

MR. SCHEPERS: Once again, looking at the chart and the graphs that were provided by staff, I'm picking once again -- I'm picking up little hanging fruit. Our funding over the five-year plan for Fair Housing is very, very low. And I would look for us to fully fund Fair Housing Set-aside there. It's just an idea. I don't -- I think that helps us as far as the five-year plan, and some of the other things I see up there that most of us at least rated high were the Wilkes Boulevard United Methodist Church. And I think we heard basically in their proposal that they need the full funding to get that -- Turning Point.

MR. RITTER: I also would support full funding of Turning Point due to the completeness and accuracy of their application and presentation.

MR. JONES: I would like to make a suggestion. While I understand why the Housing Authority wants solar panels on Oak -- over at Oak, two pieces of that are concerning -- not concerning, but we're basically talking about energy efficiency and savings which would be realized over 20 years. We have some other projects up here that are more immediate. I would actually suggest zeroing out the solar panels and splitting it between the SIL and the Rehab and Repair. I also think that follows along with what we see from the Community Needs Survey of where they would like to see our funding go.

MR. SCHEPERS: Another area that I think we should look at is the Economic Development Area. Once again, I look at the five-year plan and we're barely above 10 percent with the current funding at 80 percent for Job Point. That shows it is only at 10 percent, so we are still going to be in year four of the five-year plan and we're still going to be sitting at 10 percent. That is fine because it is within the guidelines there, but I would hate for us to take anything else away from that particular proposal under Economic Development because we'll kind of be in a bind. Going into our fifth year, we'll be looking for any sort of Economic Development at that time, so I would say that we go with the -- at least staff recommendation there of 80,000.

MR. COLE: Might I make a recommendation?

MR. SCHEPERS: Sure.

MR. COLE: That we pull maybe at least \$10,000 of it from what you moved up to the Rehab and Repair down to --

MR. SCHEPERS: Sure.

MR. JONES: Sure. Yeah. Actually I was about to make the -- say the same thing actually. That is what I was looking at.

MR. COLE: I feel like we can absorb that easier than anyone else.

MS. FORBES: Good.

MR. RITTER: So leave Rehab and Repair at \$135,000 and put \$10,000 --

MR. SCHEPERS: Yeah. If you didn't have a score card, you're in trouble.

MR. RITTER: So \$145,000 and \$95,2-- oh, \$105,2--.

MR. SCHEPERS: Yeah.

MR. RITTER: Well, with Demolition being the highest rated in the category and a priority in the survey, why -- why wouldn't we put -- if the City was recommending themselves at \$135,000 for Rehab and \$50,000 for Demolition, why not put -- split that \$10,000 into Demolition?

MR. SCHEPERS: Take it from there? Oh, put it there.

MR. RITTER: Leave at \$135,-- and put that up in Demolition where there's -- I mean, it's kind of -- it kind of goes hand-in-hand with -- I realize if you don't do the Rehab and Repair, you're going to end up in that situation.

MR. JONES: My only thoughts on that were we seem to be ahead on the Demolition side, you know.

MR. SCHEPERS: Yeah.

MR. RITTER: On the --

MR. REGAN: And on the Community Development --

MR. SCHEPERS: Yeah. On our five-year plan.

MR. REGAN: -- Survey, it is only a 33 percent for --

MR. SCHEPERS: I'm sorry, Blaine?

MR. REGAN: On the Community Needs Survey, Demolition was only at 33 percent.

MR. SCHEPERS: Yeah.

MR. REGAN: So it's not a high need right now. So --

MR. SCHEPERS: You don't --

MR. REGAN: -- I don't think we need to add more to it.

MR. SCHEPERS: Right. And your point is well taken. We're past a year for funding on remove the five dilapidated houses, and so we're on goal there.

MR. RITTER: Okay. So back to --

MR. COLE: So we'll move that back?

MR. RITTER: -- \$145--. Yeah.

MR. COLE: All right.

MR. SCHEPERS: And there is still an area that is covered down there --
Administration?

MR. COLE: Uh-huh.

MR. JONES: Right. And those are -- that's fixed by law. Correct?

MR. SCHEPERS: Yeah.

MR. COLE: Yeah.

MR. SCHEPERS: I mean, we might as well not even show it because we can't do anything about it.

MR. COLE: So I'd assume if you're going with Turning Point, you would be comfortable with the City general revenue going there also?

MR. SCHEPERS: Yes.

MR. COLE: Okay.

MR. SCHEPERS: Did everybody follow what Randy was saying there? That was the funds -- the \$43,000 that the -- the extra funds that the City had that was also part of --

MR. COLE: That was set aside for the Homeless Day Center as the balance left for it.

MR. SCHEPERS: I believe the City wanted us to use those funds to fund one of the proposals for the homeless center -- the Homeless Day Center.

MS. FORBES: Okay.

MR. JONES: I'm not trying to cut off the discussion, but that looks pretty good to me. Does anybody else have any thoughts?

MR. SCHEPERS: Is that what we are shooting for -- \$835,000? Yeah. Okay. We can't -- all right. So we've got that.

MR. COLE: Yeah.

MS. FORBES: It's a hard year.

MR. SCHEPERS: All right.

MR. RITTER: We have the Lynn, Sexton --

MR. SCHEPERS: Yeah. And they --

MR. RITTER: -- stay the priority. And that was the most costly part of that City proposal there.

MR. SCHEPERS: Right. I forget how much that skate park was, but I know the City cut \$100,000 from it.

MR. RITTER: Yeah.

MR. COLE: It was \$75-.

MR. SCHEPERS: It was \$75-?

MR. COLE: Yeah. And we did have the remainder of it at \$225,000. So that means we --

MR. RITTER: So that is even taking a little bit out of the --

MR. COLE: Yeah.

MR. RITTER: -- Sexton/Lynn improvements.

MR. COLE: Yeah.

MR. SCHEPERS: But that -- that is still a high priority for me.

MR. RITTER: Yeah. It doesn't --

MR. SCHEPERS: That area needs so much work, and it is going to take a lot of money.

MR. COLE: Uh-huh.

MR. RITTER: Yeah. I would agree. I think that is still --

MR. REGAN: So are you wanting to put that back up to \$225,000 to fully fund everything but the skate park?

MR. SCHEPERS: Well, I --

MR. RITTER: I just wouldn't know where to take it from. That is the only --

MR. SCHEPERS: I wouldn't know where to take it from.

MS. FORBES: Yeah. That was --

MR. SCHEPERS: We would have to really --

MR. RITTER: We are already tight.

MR. SCHEPERS: -- look at our needs here and --

MR. RITTER: We're already tight in the housing, and that's got the most -- the highest commitment percentage.

MR. JONES: Randy, correct me, but this is -- for the central city, that wouldn't be the sole source of funding for those improvements. Correct?

MR. COLE: For the bioretention portion --

MR. JONES: Correct.

MR. COLE: -- and stormwater improvements on the lot itself -- or on

MR. JONES: Uh-huh.

MR. COLE: -- the land itself, yes. But there is some additional funds that is going to go into the culvert that it will connect to.

MR. RITTER: The street and sewer.

MR. COLE: And then water and light, street, sewer -- there will be a significant amount of City funds that go into it. But certainly these are funds that are really important to improving the stormwater for that block as well as meeting the stormwater requirements on Lynn cottages.

MR. RITTER: Uh-huh. Yeah. I view this as necessary to get the cottages going --

MR. COLE: Uh-huh.

MR. SCHEPERS: Yeah.

MR. RITTER: -- as part of that whole project. I think you are going to have to keep it at \$200,000 --

MR. SCHEPERS: Yeah.

MR. RITTER: -- or we're going to start cutting from the top --

MR. SCHEPERS: I agree. We would just have to go through it all again.

MR. COLE: You know, last year what we got funded came in higher than what, you know, was recommended, so you all could think about if we did get more funding come next January about which projects you would want it to go to. Certainly we would revisit that conversation at that time too because things can change between here and there. But last year we did get a little extra.

MR. SCHEPERS: **You know, I'm going to make a motion that we go with the funding request that we've got -- as we have it up there based on the amount of money that we have to allocate. There are some great projects that are -- that we are not funding at all, and it is sad, but it is what it is. And I think it keeps us online with the five-year plan, and also along with our own desires and our own proposal rating sheets and where we are at in the Community Development Needs Survey. So I see a lot of reasons to do the funding that way.**

MR. RITTER: Uh-huh.

MR. JONES: I would --

MR. RITTER: I agree.

MR. JONES: Sorry.

MR. RITTER: No. I was just going to say it certainly lines up with our group ratings. I mean, I just don't -- at this point with the funding gap this year, it's --

MR. JONES: **I would second the motion. And given that we have \$1.8 million in requests and only about 40 percent of that money, I think we are making the best decision we can under the circumstances. I think there are a lot of projects up here if we all had our own personal bank accounts we would fund, but -- and are certainly worthy, but this is the best we can do under the circumstances.**

MS. FORBES: This was a tough year. I agree. So how can I word that motion? Do you want me to write down every single number or --

MR. COLE: No. That's okay.

MS. FORBES: Is there a simple way that I can write that down?

MR. COLE: Just say as they are recorded.

MS. FORBES: As Commission recommended?

MR. COLE: Yeah.

MS. FORBES: Okay. Everybody in favor of --

MR. RITTER: Well, we need a motion and a second. Did we get?

MS. FORBES: I got it.

MR. RITTER: Got it. Okay.

MS. FORBES: Everybody in favor of accepting it the way that it is right now and making that recommendation to Council?

(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

MS. FORBES: Opposed? Okay. We have it.

Mr. Schepers made a motion to approve the CDBG funding as recommended; second by Mr. Jones; the motion passed by a unanimous voice vote.

VIII. GENERAL COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, MEMBERS AND STAFF

MS. FORBES: Does anybody got anything they want to say?

MR. COLE: So these recommendations will go in the budget this year. That budget hearing is typically in the second meeting in August, I believe, which would fall on the 15th. So whoever the Chair is at the time will come and present these recommendations at that public hearing. So we don't have a Chair right now.

MR. SCHEPERS: Yes. I was going to ask that. So who is that going to be?

MR. COLE: So we'll just have -- it will fall to Mike Fletcher since he is the Vice President.

MR. RITTER: And it would fall to Mike anyway, so --

MR. COLE: Yeah.

IX. NEXT MEETING DATE: TO BE DETERMINED

MR. COLE: So then our next meeting as we pick up the next year will be in September.

MS. FORBES: All right.

X. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Schepers made a motion to adjourn; second by Mr. Ritter; the motion passed by a unanimous voice vote.

Members of the public may attend any open meeting. For requests for accommodations related to disability, please call 573-874-7214. In order to assist staff in making the appropriate arrangements for your accommodation, please make your request as far in advance of the posted meeting date as possible.