

# City of Columbia, Missouri

*701 E. Broadway  
Columbia, Missouri*



## Meeting Minutes

**Wednesday, August 4, 2021**

**7:00 PM**

**Regular**

**Council Chambers, City Hall  
701 E Broadway,  
Columbia**

**Housing and Community Development Commission**

## I. CALL TO ORDER

MR. WHATLEY: Good evening, everyone. It is 7 o'clock, and I would like to call tonight's meeting to order. Welcome to the August 4th Housing and Community Development Commission meeting.

## II. INTRODUCTIONS

MR. WHATLEY: Let's get started with introductions. Mr. Ritter, can you start us off?

MR. RITTER: Mitch Ritter, Ward 2.

MS. JEFFERSON: Barbara Jefferson, Ward 1. MS. SUHLER: Diane Suhler, Human Services Commission Representative.

MR. CROUCH: Terry Crouch, member at large. MR. WHATLEY: Paul Whatley, Ward 4.

MR. FLETCHER: Mike Fletcher, member at large.

MR. KASMANN: Ross Kasmann, Ward 3.

MR. WILLOUGHBY: Blake Willoughby, Ward 6. MS. CLARK: Darcie Clark, City Staff.

MR. ANSPACH: Gary Anspach, City Staff.

**Present:** 9 - Michael Fletcher, Mitchell Ritter, Paul Whatley, Diane Suhler, Ross Kasmann, Terence Crouch, Thomas Rose, Barbara Jefferson and Blake Willoughby

## III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MR. WHATLEY: Okay. Thank you, everyone. Next on the agenda is the approval of tonight's agenda. If there are no changes or corrections, can I get a motion to approve tonight's agenda?

MS. JEFFERSON: I would like to make a change, if possible. Should I do that now?

MR. WHATLEY: Yes, please.

MS. JEFFERSON: Okay. This is the one where we were going to talk about under old businesses the Housing and Community Development needs survey?

MR. WHATLEY: Yes, we are going to review the survey before we actually get into the new business tonight, which is the ratings.

MS. JEFFERSON: Okay. I understand. Go ahead.

MR. WHATLEY: Okay. Perfect. So, no changes or suggestions?

MS. JEFFERSON: Well, I did suggest something, but I can wait until the end on the comment part.

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

MR. RITTER: Second.

MR. WHATLEY: All those in favor, raise your right hand. (Unanimous vote for approval.) Those opposed, do the same. (No hands raised.) The motion carries. We have an agenda for tonight.

## IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

**Attachments:** [Draft July 7, 2021 HCDC Minutes.pdf](#)  
[Transcript of Proceedings 7.7.21.pdf](#)

MR. WHATLEY: Next on the agenda is the approval of the draft of the July 7th HCDC minutes. Hopefully everybody had a chance to review those. Any discussion?

MS. JEFFERSON: I did not have a chance to read it, so I will not be voting. Is that okay?

MR. WHATLEY: You can abstain. Okay. No discussion, can I get a motion to accept the minutes from the July 7th meeting?

MR. CROUCH: So moved. MR. WILLOUGHBY: Second.

MR. WHATLEY: A motion has been made and seconded, all those in favor, raise your right hand. (Commissioners Whatley, Ritter, Suhler, Crouch, Fletcher, Kasmann, and

Willoughby.) Those who oppose, the same. (No hands raised.) Okay, the motion carries for the approval of the agenda -- or, the approval of the July 7 minutes does pass.

## V. OLD BUSINESS

**Attachments:** [City of Columbia - Housing and Community Development Needs Survey for FY 2022.pdf](#)

MR. WHATLEY: Okay. Next on the agenda is the -- we are going to discuss the Housing and Community Development needs survey results for the fiscal year of 2022. So, Gary do you want to? (Thereupon, Commissioner Rose is seated in Council Chambers.)

MR. ANSPACH: So we included the results from the Housing and Community Development needs survey where some of the information that went out is also included on the agenda for you all to review. It looks like we had 240 responses overall to the survey, and as you read through the information and look at the different graphs, just the idea is to get an understanding of what the community feels is important in terms of high, medium, and low priorities of the different types of projects, different services, and things like that, that CDBG and HOME tend to find in those different types of projects. So, really does wanted to give some feedback as to what the community is identifying and is a priority needed in the high, medium, low category, and so it just helps to kind of guide your decisions tonight with the recommendation for funding for the FY 2022 HOME and CDBG projects.

MS. JEFFERSON: I have a question. MR. WHATLEY: Thank you, Gary. Ms. Jefferson?

MS. JEFFERSON: Yes, so this is the summary that we could do online, or we had handouts?

MS. CLARK: Yes, ma'am.

MS. JEFFERSON: Okay. Thank you, so, yes, this survey, I would like for us to really have time -- can we have another meeting where we just discuss the survey, or, we could talk about it tonight, but I would like to have additional time to talk about it.

MR. WHATLEY: So is the discussion geared towards the future surveys, or?

MS. JEFFERSON: I would say future, yes.

MR. WHATLEY: Okay. Yes, I think, you know, when we get into the next rounding cycle, you know, we probably should make some discuss the questions, and I have a few suggestions myself, but tonight won't be the appropriate time to do that, so, but, yes, we can definitely do that.

MS. JEFFERSON: I appreciate that.

MR. WHATLEY: Yes, I believe we did that the last time. I think we have kind of tweaked the survey a little bit based on the part of the process that we had from this year's funding, you know, request process.

So, if you've had a chance to review the survey, does anything jump out at you, or any discussion from the survey?

MS. JEFFERSON: What jumped out at me, to start off with, we only got 240 responses for the whole City of Columbia. Am I reading it correctly?

MR. WHATLEY: You're reading that correctly, and to me that was very disappointing, but once again, you know, we can do our best to promote it, talk to people in our circles, and friends and e-mail list, and at the end of the day, at least in my circumstances have been to make the decision to do the survey, so.

MS. JEFFERSON: So, yes, because in the future when we do have another talk, I do hope we look at other ways that we can get input because, you know, if someone can calculate this for me, and this was, what was it, like less than the sample population, and then there is a part on the survey where when we get into the different wards that participated, I just have questions about, you know, the color for Ward 1, too bad they don't have this up for everyone to see. Ward 1, we don't even get a percentage at all.

That is very concerning to me. We don't even get a percentage, and then there is some this that asked about housing, where you have got a high percentage of Ward 5 and 6 participation regarding housing, but yet, a lot of this money is targeted for low-to-medium income households. Is that correct?

MR. WHATLEY: That's correct. So everybody who --

MS. JEFFERSON: -- so I am trying to see if they are trying to say that Ward 5 and Ward 6 are trying to decide that low and medium income people should be really interested in having their own house, and stuff like that, versus letting what the Ward 1 people are saying that we really would be interested in, because there are so many of these questions on this survey, there is more questions on this survey that talks about housing than anything else, and we are housing and community development. Am I correct?

MR. WHATLEY: I think yes and no. So when I look at the survey, just myself speaking, so I do live in Ward 4, but when I asked the questions I think of it as it relates to the whole population. So it not necessarily, you know, I want this to benefit Ward 4, but as a person who lives in Ward 4, you know, what is my vision for Columbia in regards to the funding that we are going to receive, and how do I, as a citizen, want to see it distributed or appropriated.

MS. JEFFERSON: Okay. So, I guess I'm just trying to understand that in Ward 1, 2, and 3, low income and medium income people, there is such a small amount of input, but yet the input that you are getting from out of Ward 5 and 6, you're saying that is what they are focusing on they want to have more houses built.

MR. WHATLEY: It is their opinion or their views on how that money should be spent, you know, regardless of the Ward -- MS. JEFFERSON: -- but this money really is for low and medium income people.

MR. WHATLEY: Based on the views of the proposals that we have received.

MR. RITTER: And the CDBG guidelines require funds be expended towards those populations that are at or below those wage levels, depending on family size, but I would agree with Paul, I think the community would approach the survey from if they choose to answer the question of what ward they are in, I think it is a community survey, and I think that is how we approached it through the social media outlets and the City website is that it's a community-wide survey, it is just we do ask for your ward, if you do know it.

MS. JEFFERSON: And income, that is another question on here. So hopefully in the future, we will have a chance to discuss the different types of survey.

MR. WHATLEY: Right, and in a perfect world, you know, it would be nice to see at least 10 percent of the population, you know, participate in the survey, and I think that would be a well-rounded number for us to really make a very good decision in help putting things together, but once again, I think this is the first time with our survey. You know, I've done a strong push in

Ward 4, 5, and 6, just through my connections, and, you know, Ward 4 actually dropped this year, so, anyway.

MS. JEFFERSON: And I would be interested to know, like, maybe in the last five years how the survey turned out. Has it always been the same type of where, you know, just kind of compare.

MR. WHATLEY: I mean, it differs every year, but it also differs based on the questions that we are asking and the needs of the consolidated plan that we have a place for the cycle, so.

MS. JEFFERSON: So in the future, we will have an opportunity to be more involved with the type of questions that we ask on the survey.

MR. WHATLEY: Definitely. Part of this Commission's role is to make sure we are asking the right questions, and in our input is a must.

MS. JEFFERSON: Okay. So this survey that was passed out, it was decided when, in 2020, the questions to ask?

MR. WHATLEY: It would have been -- MR. RITTER: We had a meeting on it -- MR. WHATLEY: -- August of last year.  
Sometime we had a discussion. I don't remember the month, but we did have a discussion. I guess we would have to go back through the minutes and see.  
MS. CLARK: It was early this year that you all reviewed and approved, and we started sending out the survey.  
MR. WHATLEY: Between the two Covid or the CARES Act Funding, I don't remember so.  
MS. JEFFERSON: Okay. In the future, we will be going over the questions.  
MR. WHATLEY: Yes, and maybe when we start our next cycle for the Fiscal Year 2023, you know, maybe we can look at, you know, the past five years, and look at the questions asked, and maybe based on proposals that we receive this year, it may help define the questions for next year for the next cycle.  
MS. JEFFERSON: Thank you.  
MR. RITTER: There has been years that have been less than 50 respondents, and they were years where there were under a hundred, and one year we had volunteers from the University that went out and sought survey responses, and we were over 300 at that time. So I don't think 224 is that bad, actually, compared to what we've had in some prior years. Statistically it is approaching validity across the population of 100,000, so.  
MS. JEFFERSON: Well, and I just want to throw this in here, when you look at some wards, everyone -- the availability to get online is not available to every ward as easily. So when I think about Ward 1, 2, and 3, even if the word gets out there, I might have brought this up in a meeting, a lady told me about how she would have to go to the library on her time off from work to get on the computer to do the survey.  
MR. WHATLEY: Good stuff. I appreciate it, Ms. Jefferson. Any other questions or comments about the survey? (No audible response given.) Okay.  
MS. SUHLER: Maybe just a cautionary comment given the smallness of the responses, and maybe not being totally represented, we might take a little bit of care in terms of how much we use the survey to guide our decisions.  
MR. WHATLEY: I guess when I personally look at the survey and compared it with the proposal, I wanted to see if all the proposals actually married up with the categories that we received requests for. So, there is a couple of things that jumped out at me that we will discuss here in a few moments and maybe the other commissioners have seen the same things that I did, so, but no, that is a good point, so.

## VI. NEW BUSINESS

MR. WHATLEY: Okay, if there is no further discussion, let's go ahead and move on to new business. Next on the agenda is the draft of the Fiscal Year 2022 HOME Funding recommendations, so.

MR. ANSPACH: So, we put the funding recommendations from Staff, and there is a couple of avenues here that I just wanted to talk about real briefly before we jumped and before you all jumped in and started to look at what those recommendations are and formulate your own recommendations. So, essentially, we are going to start with the HOME side and then move over to CDBG. Looking at the spreadsheet, you will see the different categories of types of projects for the HOME program, Home Ownership Assistance, Production and Preservation of Owner-Occupied Housing, and then we didn't have any projects for Rental Production or Tenant-Based Rental Assistance this year, so you won't see any projects listed there. The score of 54, the percent of total, the HOME request and recommended, I will go through those real briefly. On your alls rating sheets, just as a side note, the rating that you all submitted, the rating itself is used as a guide for the recommendations. So it is

So,

used in order to help formulate, not necessarily which project is better than the other, but more of an avenue for you to understand what the Commission is seeing as they look at the project and looked at the application. So one of the things that we are trying to do, it looks like, back earlier this year, you approved a new draft rating criteria, and part of that included City Staff scoring. There was 45 points of Commissioner scoring, nine points of City scoring. So what we've tried to do under the score of 54 is to represent the total score provided from the ratings, and then on percent of total, that is out at a 54 point score.

The reason we put that in there is hopefully that give a little bit more of a representation of how many points was awarded to that project out of a total of 54. It just kind of gives another number of reference, so it kind of hopefully gives you some additional guidance or just another avenue to kind of see how does that project stack up on the total amount of points available. In terms of the actual Commissioners' score, what we looked at was a couple of different avenues. One of the ways that you traditionally do this is just average all the scores of all the Commissioners. Another way that we looked at this was to do what we called trim average where we disregarded a high score and a low score and look for more central tendency, and what that does is tend to help with any major outliers of scores. If one was particularly high or particularly low, it averaged in and can potentially skew the average of that potential project. So what you're seeing out of a score of 54 is that trend average plus the City score for a total score out of 54. I mention all that just to help give some additional background. I don't know that those particular trim scores were put out on the items that you all received, but they were included on a tab on a spreadsheet on the agenda, so I apologize we didn't get that sent out on the individual information, but it was included on the agenda. So, again, I just wanted to make sure that we kind of set a table for what the scores really are intended to represent. It does not necessarily mean this project is better than another project. It is only to be used as a guide for you all to kind of look inside that category and say, "Okay, based on the scoring criteria, here is where the Commission somewhat landed against those scoring criteria." The HOME request column is what the original project was requesting, and the Recommended column is for what Staff has currently recommended based on funding available. Just in terms of HOME, all the HOME-funded project requests can be fully funded, along with what they were asking for, and there are still additional HOME funding left over if you were to fully fund all those projects. So I will turn it over to you, Paul, for discussion to the Commission, but I, again, I just mention that all the HOME projects that were applied for could be fully funded based on what we anticipate the full HOME funding would be available from HUD will be in 2022.

MR. WHATLEY: Thank you, Gary. I would like to ask one question before we get started. So, on the spreadsheet that kind of breaks down the different point values that you provided, which I didn't snag, but I'm looking at one right here. How did the Staff come up with their rating?

MR. ANSPACH: So part of the overall - if I'm recalling correctly from earlier this year, prior to me coming into this position, you all approved a new rating criteria score sheet, and it looked like there was some extensive discussion that you had. The Staff scoring section included points on whether the project was eligible. If I could refer to my notes real quick, or just refer back. It was project eligibility, organizational capacity, financial management, negative past

performance, board diversity, diversity inclusion for population served, inclusion for senior leadership, MBE/WBE contractors in Section Three. So staff looked at the project applications for each of those and awarded points based on whether the project did, in fact, meet that criteria, or no, it did not meet that criteria, and so that is how those staff scores were calculated and add into the trimmed average score.

MR. WHATLEY: Perfect. That helps me out. Okay. Any questions for Gary before we get started?

MS. SUHLER: Just one. I apologize. I don't have that spreadsheet with all the data on it, but was it broken out what the Staff rating was and then all the Commissioner ratings?

MR. FLETCHER: I am going to have him bring that up on the screen when we get to CDBG. Maybe it's not as germane that we get into a discussion because we have far fewer requests than we have funds available. But when we get to CDBG, I was going to make that request that we dig into that a little deeper.

MS. JEFFERSON: And you said there's extra money leftover?

MR. ANSPACH: So based on the HOME requests that we have versus what we anticipate getting is we have \$335,000 in HOME requests, and we anticipate \$540,000 being available for different projects. So it leaves a balance of \$205,000, and that is an area that we could potentially explore another funding proposal being opened up, moving it to a CHDO project, designate it for a CHDO project. Those are kind of big avenues that we've identified thus far, but it will be a conversation that we will have in the near future as to how we want to obligate that \$205,000.

MR. WHATLEY: Okay. So let's dive into the HOME requests and recommendations that City has provided. So the first category is Homeownership Assistance, City of Columbia through the Home Ownership Assistance Program is requesting and has recommended that we recommend \$100,000. Any discussion?

MR. WILLOUGHBY: I guess my question is since we do have excess in HOME, I mean, is this a space to where we could decide as a Commission give more than what was requested, or is this, since it is the City, there is a limit?

MR. ANSPACH: The only reason I hesitated because there is other agencies and project proposals that did not request more. If you provide that additional, I don't know that it is not -- it might be wise to also allow for additional for those projects. I think I would rather see us look at a potential new funding round or a CHDO option, or something to that effect.

MR. RITTER: If you put the excess in CHDO, so it has to be a CHDO organization that gets the extra funds?

MR. ANSPACH: We could. If there happens to be, you know, if we leave that where it is now, it provides us a little bit more flexibility, although it could be moved, you know, at a later time, but it could

go towards that, and it could potentially increase the amount of CHDO production we have for an RFP, you know. If we were looking at maybe one development, it could provide enough funding, so two or three, or something to that effect.

MR. RITTER: That is what I was thinking.

MS. JEFFERSON: Does it have to be for housing, the excess funds?

MR. ANSPACH: On the HOME side, it's going to be very closely related to housing. It would be for CHDO, that is the goal of the CHDO's, the Community Housing Development Organization, it is for the development of those homes, that would be very specific to home development.

MR. WHATLEY: I would recommend let's discuss the excess funds at the end of this portion of the recommendation, but going back to the home ownership assistance, any other discussion?

MS. SUHLER: When would these funds actually be funds available to distribute to the homeowners.

MR. ANSPACH: So we would anticipate these funds being available from HUD in the fall of next year, so the fall of 2022. So currently that program is working through funds that were previously awarded, but this would allow the continuation of the program on that timeframe.

MS. SUHLER: And can you tell us how much money there is currently in the fund?

MR. ANSPACH: I would have to guess at this point. I would have to get back with you on a firm number. We do utilize at times when we do have available program income from previous homeowners who have sold their property and repaid a prorated forgiveness back. We can utilize that for additional homeownership assistance, but this somewhat supplements the program overall, but I don't know for sure, and I would have to get back to you on a firm number.

MS. SUHLER: One last question, and this is probably applies more to current plans that are being allocated, given the housing market and the fact that \$10,000 per recipient for a down payment is not going to get you very far, as far as purchasing a house today, so what are you kind of seeing as the prices people are paying for houses that are perhaps using these funds right now?

MR. ANSPACH: Well, so we work close with some lending partners to develop the administration guidelines for our home ownership assistance program, and feedback that we've received from them, to this point, \$10,000 seems to be a sufficient maximum program limit for a lot of the first-time buyers that we are seeing. So essentially some of the guidelines that we are looking at now that HUD is requiring us to take a look at is determining what is called the appropriateness of down-payment assistance for first time homebuyers, and what that will allow us to do is to take a deeper dive into some of the financial circumstances of our applicants and really what we call the right size, the amount of down-payment assistance where, you know, currently it is based on the price of the house, you know, have the \$10,000,



whereas moving forward, we will be able to tailor that amount directly to what HUD and the lender may say is more appropriate. So what HUD wants to make sure we are doing is giving the correct amount. We're not over-subsidizing, and we are not under-subsidizing the house with down-payment assistance, but we are still looking at that \$10,000 as a program limit on how much someone would receive, and that seems to be a threshold that our lending community is seeing as being sufficient for individuals and households who are looking for first-time homebuyer assistance.

MS. SUHLER: What percentage of the down payment does that actually cover?

MR. ANSPACH: Well, a lot of time it depends on what the loan amount is.

MS. SUHLER: That's what I was kind of wondering. How big are these loans that people are receiving?

MR. ANSPACH: We see anywhere between right at \$100,000 upwards of \$180,000, and in some of that depends on the household size. Our income guidelines allow for higher income, so whatever the households is, and so in most cases, at times, families are more -- can afford more of a house payment, so their home prices may be more than a single person or somebody like that.

MS. SUHLER: You can actually buy a house for a hundred thousand dollars?

MR. ANSPACH: There are some, yes. We do see those come through our program somewhat frequently.

MR. WHATLEY: Good questions. Any other questions? (No audible response given.) Any other discussion? (No audible response given.)Hearing none, I -

MR. ROSE: Are looking for motions on each one, or what is your plan?

MR. WHATLEY: So, I apologize. I should have stated that first. So what I would like to do is discuss each category. So we are talking about homeownership assistance program right now. We will discuss everything within that block, if you will, and then if any of the Commissioners have any questions for the organization that gave a proposal, then I will call that organization up. You can ask your question, and then while the person is up here, we will make sure that all question that are related to the funding are asked, and then we will dismiss that person. So that is kind of the process.

MR. ROSE: Are you looking for a motion at the end of all of the Home, or is our recommendation, or how did you want to do that?

MS. CLARK: After you discuss all of the proposals, just please make a motion as this is our recommendation for FY 2022 HOME requests, or one motion for each funding source, funding source meaning HOME or CDBG.

MR. WHATLEY: Gotcha, so you are looking for two votes.

MS. CLARK: Two votes for these would be extremely helpful.

MR. WHATLEY: So my goal is just to make sure that we're in agreement, or if we need to make any changes, or hash out, if you will, any of these line items, so I am asking right now for under homeownership assistance, are the Commissioners okay with the recommendation for the request?

MS. JEFFERSON: I would like to know just organization that falls under this homeownership that asked for funding.

MR. ANSPACH: It is the City of Columbia Housing Programs Division.

MS. JEFFERSON: Thank you.

MR. WHATLEY: Okay, so all those in favor giving the City of Columbia \$100,000 for the Homeownership Assistance Program (cross talk). Are the Commissioners in agreement with \$100,000 for the City of Columbia? Are there any other discussions? See, now I know how to do it. (Cross talk).

MS. JEFFERSON: Consensus has been made.

MR. WHATLEY: Okay. Thank you. I apologize. The next and last category is production and preservation of homeowner occupied housing. So we have got three proposals, CHDO, which has a mandatory set aside of \$90,000, recommended \$90,000; City of Columbia for the Home Rehab Program, \$25,000 request, recommended the same; and then CMCA, or Central Missouri Community Action is requesting \$120,000 for the construction of a new single-family home, and we are recommending the same amount. So any discussion about the CHDO mandatory set aside?

MS. JEFFERSON: It's mandatory. Do we really need discussion?

MR. WHATLEY: We can discuss it, and I believe that really only the other option we would have in this case, since there is an excess of funds, we could allocate more, but I would like to save that to the end, if possible. Okay, next, City of Columbia Home Rehab Program requesting \$25,000. Any discussion?

MS. JEFFERSON: In the past, hasn't this been a program where all the money did not get used?

MR. WHATLEY: I can't answer that. Honestly, I don't remember, MS. Jefferson.

MR. ANSPACH: Anything allocated to the Home Rehab Program gets used. We have ongoing projects that are currently using some previous year's funds, but those projects are currently being done were allocated to be used by previous year's funds. So this year funding, the FY 2022, the HOME funds would be to fund a project during the, it would be after the fall of next year, so that is why it shows that Home Rehab Program continues to operate in the future.

MR. WHATLEY: Okay. Last is Central Missouri Community Action requesting \$120,000 for the construction of a new single-family home. Any discussion? Okay, hearing none. So, let's make this -- can you scroll down, please?

MR. ANSPACH: Yes.

MR. WHATLEY: Okay. For the Fiscal Year 2022, the allocation of \$600,000, the administration allowance is 10 percent, \$60,000. We have \$540,000 in projects, total requests \$335,000, and so we have some extra money, \$205,000. I would like to recommend that money -- that we have another round of funding. I would like to see if we could get some other organization maybe tied to rental production or even the tenant-based rental assistance. I believe there is a need. Maybe the word just didn't get out. I don't know.

MR. ROSE: Also, for instance, I don't think the \$120,000 covered all the projects for, like, the home from Central Missouri Community Action, so maybe they would request more for that project in an additional round. I don't know. I have tried to look it up, and I don't think it covers all (cross talk) --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, sir.

MR. ANSPACH: -- essentially, and so what I would recommend in that case is if CMCA felt like they could use additional funds, what I would recommend is during a new funding round that they, and anyone else, could propose a project, that way there is kind of an equal process for that. So if they need additional funds, they could request that, or if there is another project proposal they could come announce that, so.

MR. WHATLEY: That is a good idea.

MS. JEFFERSON: I agree with what you said as far as the extra money. I understand that this is going to come out in the fall of 2022; am I understanding this correctly?

MR. WHATLEY: Yes, ma'am.

MS. JEFFERSON: So, because there is now a need for rental assistance, and I don't see things getting any better, if we are looking at what is going on with this now called Delta, even though there is a new one out already, and so we have heard within the last several weeks, hopefully everyone has heard, about how rental assistance is much-needed nationally. So, I think if we can -- and I think in 2022 there is still good to be a big need for rental assistance.

MR. RITTER: I believe we still have Covid relief funds coming to this Commission to be allocated.

MR. ROSE: I think that's why we didn't get any proposals in those sections because they -- am I right on that?

MR. ANSPACH: It's possible, and one thing that you may want to consider is rolling these additional funds into the HOME ARP funds that will become available later, the \$2.1 Million has been designated through the HOME program for the City of Columbia, this additional could be rolled into that, or it could be a standalone RFP process just like we have now. So, you know, the timing for the HOME ARP is still a little blurry, but we continue, hopefully, to get additional guidance on when that planning process should start. Once we get information on when that process should start, if we combine them with additional HOME funding process, we may combine the two and go with that something may be aware to keep them separate and do two different processes.

MR. WHATLEY: I'm sorry, Gary, are you saying HOME ARP?

MR. ANSPACH: ARP, America Rescue Plan.

MS. JEFFERSON: And that HOME ARP that you're talking about, for the HOME, are you talking about, like, homeowners, or are you talking about helping people with utility bills, people with rent problems? What is that to be applied to?

MR. ANSPACH: Going through the HOME program is not necessarily for homeownership or that I know of for a utility allowance. There is some very specific types of projects that we've heard so far that will be allowed, but, again, guidance is somewhat limited from HUD at this point, so rental assistance is one of the big things that those funds would be eligible for. There is a couple of other types of projects that we may see proposals for come through for that funding, so as we continue to get guidance, we will keep you all up-to-date on what types of projects will be eligible, and then hopefully our partner agencies will formulate those projects to utilize those funds to fit their needs.

MR. RITTER: The homeless shelter continues to get high scores on the

surveys and public feedback hearings. Is there any opportunity for a homeless shelter in that program, or do you have to call that rental production and charge a dollar per month rent?

MR. ANSPACH: Potential, the wording so far from HUD is a non-congregant shelter. So, again, guidance is something we are seeking for HUD exactly as to what is allowable and what is not, but we have heard the term non-congregant shelter. So that is always a determining factor. What does the project look like, and what is it providing, instead of does it meet the definition of a non-congregant shelter.

MR. RITTER: That will be a key distinction as that amount of money becomes available to the community since that is something we're trying to fund for many years.

MR. ANSPACH: Absolutely.

MR. WHATLEY: And the other thoughts by the Commissioners as to the excess funds?

MR. WILLOUGHBY: Did you say that would be easier to keep them separate, or easier to put them together?

MR. ANSPACH: I am not sure it is easier to do one or the other at this point.

I hesitate to go one way or the other on that only because just a lack of guidance that HUD provides and how to plan for those funds.

It is a large allocation. You know, when we look at this allocation, this is our annual estimated amount, \$600,000, and then HUD here is \$2.1 Million, so we are looking at nearly four times our annual allocation. So it is a large, you know, chunk. So the planning process, you know, how do we balance \$2.1 Million cycle versus \$200,000 cycle. So whether it is easier, or not, to keep it together or separate, we will figure that out.

MS. SUHLER: I just have a question on the administrative allowance. I notice it's 10 percent for HOME, 18 percent for CDBG. Is that mandated by HUD, or is that an administrative decision?

MR. ANSPACH: It is an administrative decisions. It is an allowable amount that we can have for staff to operate the different projects that are funded, 10 percent is the max for HOME, 20 percent is the max for CDBG, but we are 18 on the CDBG side.

MR. KASMANN: Gary, is there a distinction in the HOME fund request for the Home Rehab Program and the CDBG request for the Rehab Program?

MR. ANSPACH: Yes, so that's a good point. We did request funding from both pods for the homeowner-occupied rehab program, one of the keys being is most of the projects are funded through CDBG. We do anticipate doing a HOME-funded project, which allows us to touch a little bit more on the house and do kind of a more comprehensive rehab. We can do that with CDBG, as well, but the CDBG side allows us to do some minor repairs or some things that we don't necessarily have to touch all parts of the house. You know, if somebody needs a new roof or HVAC system, we can do that easily with the CDBG regulations than we can on the HOME side, so it allows us a little bit more flexibility to have funding available from each pod. As those applications come in, we can determine if it is a good fit for HOME or a good fit for CDBG-funded projects.

MS. JEFFERSON: If we are using the CDBG or the HOME, so they still would have to go through all the other requirements to be eligible, like, if you were saying a roof, they would still have to make sure that everything else is up

according to code?

MR. ANSPACH: You know, property maintenance standards must be met, but we may have a house that, you know, just we have a homeowner that would need a roof and a new furnace, or something to that effect, and so that might be a good CDBG fit, whereas if there were multiple items, the HOME side might be a better fit because it meets some of those extended requirements, as well.

There's some additional HOME standards which are set by HUD, and so there are some areas that we have to touch even if the homeowner is not interested in those areas, so that is why if we are doing a more comprehensive rehab, it may be more appropriate to fund it from HOME, whereas if we are only looking for a couple items, it's more appropriate to the CDBG side. So that the rationale behind requesting funds from both sides.

MR. WHATLEY: Any other questions or comments that talks about the excess funding?

MS. JEFFERSON: The extra funding, even if we did put it into rental or utilities, and for some reason this ARP, or some other funding comes along, could we move it somewhere else, or what?

MR. ANSPACH: I guess I'm not sure of the question because there's no project for the utility or the rentals --

MS. JEFFERSON: But if we can make up an extra category?

MR. WHATLEY: So I guess there's actually three choices that we can make now. So we have got the HOME ARP option. We can do another round, request for proposals, or we can move this money with the CHDO, and set it aside for that use. Is that correct?

MR. ANSPACH: That is essentially it.

MR. WHATLEY: I don't know of any other option that we could do. You know, my preference, once again, is another round of proposals. Hopefully some other organizations can come in and utilize these funds. Otherwise, if we don't get that, you know, which I would be surprised if we wouldn't get proposals, then we can make a decision for the HOME ARP fund or the CHDO after that.

MS. JEFFERSON: I agree. I like what you said about other organizations coming in.

MR. ROSE: Is there any reason for why we didn't get more, or what is going to be different in the new funding proposal round? I'm just curious. I think that's the best way to go, but.

MR. ANSPACH: I am not 100 percent sure why. Most of the time, we always have excess requests, and I didn't anticipate that happening, and this was just kind of an outlier.

MR. WHATLEY: Okay. Hearing no more discussion --

MR. ROSE: I guess you need a proposal to accept the current recommended --

MR. WHATLEY: Somebody needs to make a --

MR. ROSE: I would propose that we accept the recommended as presented, funding for the HOME funds.

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

MR. CROUCH: Second.

MS. JEFFERSON: Did we decide what we are going to do with the extra money?

MR. WHATLEY: We are going to have another RFP. Okay. A motion has

been made and seconded. All those in favor, raise your right hand. (Unanimous vote for approval.) Those opposed, do the same. (No visible hands raised.) Okay, the motion carries. We are going to accept the recommendations from the City Staff utilizing the excess funds going to another round of RFP. Thank you, everyone. Okay, next on the list is the draft of the fiscal year 2022 CDBG funding recommendations.

MR. ANSPACH: So on the CDBG side, this is a little bit different tune. So we had a million dollars in allocation estimate, our 18 percent administration allowance taken out. That leaves us \$820,000 for funding requests. We had a total of \$1.645 Million in requests, so that represents \$825,000 in cuts that are needed. So again, what we try to do here is represent the scoring, and I know we will pop up this additional spreadsheet for some of the scoring. You can see the CDBG requests and the recommend requests over on the right.

MR. WHATLEY: Thank you, Gary. So, just like before, I would like to start with affordable housing.

Let's talk about the three requests that we received, and we see what their request is, you know, what is recommended, and let's just go through those one by one. So first is Services For Independent Living requesting \$95,000. It is recommended that we give them \$95,000 for the modifications and accessibility of the homes that they work on. Any discussion?

MR. FLETCHER: Can I back this up a little bit, and, I'm sorry. So all of these recommendations are based on a rating?

## NEW BUSINESS

MR. ANSPACH: That's not necessarily accurate. The rating itself is a combination of, like I said, that the Ratings Commission provided using the trend average idea. The recommended is, it is somewhat based on a rating. It's also based on what Staff looks at the proposals, Staff looks at the ratings, Staffs at the presentation developing those recommendations. One of the rationales behind the recommended funding on all the projects under CDBG was to look and see how can we fund the most amount of projects utilizing what we've got available, knowing that over half of the amounts that are requested, you know, \$825,000, has to be cut, and so what we have attempted to do here is show, I believe, all projects are funded outside of three that weren't recommended for any funding, and one project was funded partially. So that is kind of where we landed.

MR. FLETCHER: Right. So, I mean, if you hold up that sheet, it will show that in the short order based on the ratings, there were 15 proposals rated, and funding was full funding down to the 11th one, the 12th one got partial, 13, 14, and 15 get zero.

MR. ANSPACH: Yes, but --

MR. FLETCHER: -- based on that rating, and it is based on the scoring. So let's pull up that sheet. Okay. So in just going through this, it looks like, which is confusing to me, so under the ratings 1, 2, 3, 4, those were the individuals; is that correct?

MR. ANSPACH: Yes, so the columns rating 1 through 9, indicates that the Commissioner rating that we received in that order. So Column A or Column B, where it says rating 1, doesn't necessarily represent one particular Commissioner's rating of each of those projects. So it is important to know that

doesn't quite reflect. It just reflects the order that we received the rating in, in the Neighborly system.

MR. FLETCHER: One of the things that occurred to me first as I looked, it looks like some of the fields were blank. So, some of the Commissioners just failed to rate that proposal?

MR. ANSPACH: That is correct. So we had a couple of instances where we had one, you know, we had four ratings back by last Wednesday. We had one that we did not receive any ratings for by that time. We had one instance where we had potential conflicts of interest so that Commissioner abstained from rating, and we had one just for whatever reason, I don't know if it was missed, or whatever the case was, that there was no information entered into that particular project under the Commissioners rating. So that is where you see under 8 and 9, again, it doesn't reflect what Commissioner Number 8's ratings were. It just represents what order we received it in.

MR. RITTER: Two were missing from the Diggs project across all raters.

MR. ANSPACH: Well, one was abstain, one did not submit a review.

MR. RITTER: So what is a zero?

MR. FLETCHER: So, I saw some of these. So if the Commissioner would follow the guidance of the rating process, you have -- for each category you have to give it a number. There was only several choices. So you can't give a zero. You can't get a five. I don't think that's possible on the rating.

MR. ANSPACH: It was.

MR. FLETCHER: -- had to omitted answers under the --

MR. RITTER: You could type in any number you want. You were given the choice of 2, 4, 6, 3, 6, 9, 1, 2, 3, but you could type in 7, 4, 3, or zero. I don't know who did that, but it is possible.

MR. FLETCHER: I thought you had to follow the recommendations of --

MR. RITTER: Or you should have.

MR. FLETCHER: All right. So you have got the total average and truncated means you take out the highest and lowest.

MR. ANSPACH: Yes.

MR. FLETCHER: Okay.

MR. ANSPACH: So then you have the Staff rating, and then your total rating would be that trimmed average or the truncated average as a Staff rating, and then that's where we come up with a rating that you're seeing on the other spreadsheet.

MR. FLETCHER: And so, curiosity to me was to take a look at how the results after the Staff rating looked versus what the Commission rating. For most of the proposals, they moved only one place up or down, so it wasn't really remarkable, but there were several that moved substantially. I would just like to point out. So for Kidz Ink, the Commissioners rated it ninth in the rating level, it would have rated number nine, but after the City's input, it rated 14th. Grade A+, the Commissioners rated it the eighth best, but after the City's input, it was 13th, and so both of those fell out of the funding after the City's input. Fair assessment, and then the other one that moved substantially

MR. RITTER: Oh, because you're adding in -- hold on a second -- you've got a math program here because you're adding the City's rating in as a total number, the rest of them are all averaged.

MR. ANSPACH: Right. So the --

MR. RITTER: Was the City score intended to be an additional score on top

of our average score?

MR. ANSPACH: That's how I interpreted the draft or the rating criteria sheet that was developed was that --

MR. RITTER: I just want to make that clear that is how that is being factored in is an additional score. It is not being put into our average, and then re-averaged.

MR. FLETCHER: And as you indicated, this is the first year that we have done that, and the purpose of that was to try and look at equality, I want to get the wording right, the EEO-type focus from the City.

MR. ROSE: I think just from the previous funding cycle we had, that's where we have been able to discuss it here and make those adjustments in the sections.

MR. RITTER: This is the first guide, and if somebody feels strongly that something is not in the right order or the right place, then you can make that -- that is what this public hearing is about.

MR. ANSPACH: That's a good point. Again, so the Staff recommendation is just the starting point. So it is only intended to give that Point A and allow you all the discussion and the input to end up on what you ultimately recommend.

MS. JEFFERSON: So, let me be sure. What I see that a lot of -- the requests according to what all of the City added together and what we the Commissioners put in, a lot of these organizations are getting what they asked for, except for maybe two or three, but then there are three organizations that zero money is given out to.

MR. ANSPACH: That's only the starting point that Staff has put together.

MS. JEFFERSON: And we have got to make up -- not that we have to make up, but there is -

MR. ANSPACH: There is \$825,000 that would need to be cut from all projects combined.

MR. ROSE: So we can start with the recommended and then make adjustments in that category because we know those are the total dollars available. One thing we looked at previously was making sure the percentages for each section, we have recommended percentages; is that right?

MR. WHATLEY: (cross talk) in the past.

MR. ANSPACH: I do recall that was on there. Some of the percentages that -- a lot of that is what is available, or what has been proposed, and so I think in terms of putting the sheet together, you know, or whatever, I don't know for sure where that used to be up here in the column. We can do -- I will have to do some research to find out what those consolidated percentages are.

MR. FLETCHER: I just wanted to have that discussion, and thank you for providing us that, along with that sheet. Just set the table as we go into these discussions in each one of these categories to understand how the Commission voted because in this recommendation sheet, all you see is that final number, and there was some manipulations that got there that included City Staff rating, our rating, and some averages due to some issues with some of the ratings by the Commissioners, so, anyway, we all understand equally now, so.

MS. SUHLER: That is something going forward, if I remember correctly the discussion we had about the Staff doing the rating for, kind of, the



organizational strengths, they were conditions that we weren't familiar with as Commissioner,s, or they weren't part of the proposal, but I think some of that is not visible when it is just one number because I know you were looking at financial strength, organizational strength. Part of the criteria, I believe, was, you know, how they performed in the past, and I think for us to understand the Staff number, we would need to see a break out of how you got to the number. So in the future, I think it would be good if, you know, they get two points because they have done well in past, but if it is a new organization that has never been here, they should not be penalized because they have never applied before, so I think more transparency would be very helpful.

MR. ANSPACH: We can provide that for sure.

MR. WHATLEY: That something else we can discussion for the next cycle, so, definitely. Okay. So back to affordable housing, I guess what I would like to do is just mention one organization and the activity they are providing and just see if there's any discussion or questions that we need to ask, and then we were kind of just do a quick -- well, not quick, we will review each one, and then we will continue on after that. So, Services For Independent Living, \$95,000 for the modification accessibility. So basically it is the ramps that will be built in the homes and some other odds and ends. Any discussion or any questions about their proposal?

MS. JEFFERSON: They were just wanting ramps, and they were also wanting to also work on houses; correct?

MR. WHATLEY: They have other projects, I believe is what they do, but ramps is --

MR. ROSE:-- they did fencing for somebody that had a child that needed protection. They do those types of things.

MR. WHATLEY: Hearing none, City of Columbia, Home Rehabilitation Program. The City is requesting \$50,000. Any discussion or comments?

MS. JEFFERSON: I don't have any problem with this one.

MR. WHATLEY: The last proposal for affordable housing is also by the City of Columbia, HUD-Mandated Fair Housing Counseling. The City is requesting \$3,000. Any discussion?

MR. ANSPACH: I would just mention, this is not a project that was presented or proposed or that you rated on. It is just a set-aside, much like the CHDO side, where our housing programs division, we may be required to provide or refer an individual or household to fair housing counseling, or if there is any type of legal issues that may come up regarding housing that we refer someone to, to have legal services, we are required to provide those services or reimbursement for those. So we set that finding aside specifically for those individuals and for those cases as they come up.

MR. WHATLEY: Thank you for the clarification.

MS. JEFFERSON: What is the cost?

MR. ANSPACH: It really just depends on what the scenario is. We don't see too much of it, and that is why the request is nominal, but it is something that was set aside to ensure that we have on hand to refer, like I said, a household or family to if they are experiencing issues and they come to us for assistance, it is an area that if we can't provide the assistance, we refer to them, and that is an area where they can get assistance for that. In terms of cost, it just really depends on how much time is needed to work through that process.

MR. ROSE: But you said that is going to be a requirement, though?

MR. ANSPACH: We set it aside. We call it mandated set aside for those situations as they come up so that we have the funding available for that specific purpose. Otherwise, all the funding that would be available would be allocated to projects -

MR. ROSE: But I'm saying you might be seeing more cases where you have to do that where they have to have, a conflict.

MR. ANSPACH: Potentially, depending on what happens. At least, from what I understand, what I've interpreted, it meets the regulations that we are required to have.

MR. WHATLEY: Any thoughts or comments for the Affordable Housing category overall?

MS. SUHLER: I think just to add, kind of, some detail. I believe the Fair Housing Affordable Housing Task Force has, kind of, the five year plan. They were supposed to be 30 to 48 percent, and this is 18 percent according to what we have here.

MR. ANSPACH: And a lot of those, you know, we are kind of bound by the amount requested, the different projects, that fall under that category, so that is the target we try to hit, but again, it is very dependent upon what we have available to fund.

MS. SUHLER: I was just providing. Thank you.

MR. WHATLEY: Okay. Let's move on to Economic and Workforce Development. So the first proposal that we heard was from Job Point direct training of their participants, requesting \$150,000. We are seeing a recommendation of the same. Any discussion?

MS. JEFFERSON: I don't think they should have the full amount.

MR. WHATLEY: Okay. Let's stop for a second. What would you like to see happen?

MS. JEFFERSON: Job Point, this is the one, so they are going to start an evening program, their organization is, and again, they are wanting more staff; right?

MR. RITTER: Scholarships.

MR. ROSE: Part of it was for prep for high set.

MS. JEFFERSON: Which is the evening program?

MR. ROSE: Yes.

MS. JEFFERSON: They are starting a new program, and they were wanting some tutoring staff; is that correct?

MR. WILLOUGHBY: They wanted to be able to hire people to help those that don't meet the standard to get into the program, who are very close to help them get to a level where there may meet the standard to get into the program, and it can be a part of the program.

MS. JEFFERSON: Yes, this is the one I'm thinking about. So, I'm still saying that I think that they need to look inside their own organizations about how they can better adjust things because they're always coming for more staff, and I know they can say, "Well, we do a lot," but I just don't -- they should not be fully funded. Surely there is some way they can do some adjustments with the staff that they have now, as well as they are taking on a new program, this evening program. They need to look at it some other way.

MR. WHATLEY: So let me ask this first. Do you have any specific questions for Job Point that might help clarify?

MS. JEFFERSON: I guess I would like to know why do they always come here -- why do they always - I need a better understanding, I guess, about why staffing is always --

MR. ROSE: Let me clarify also that divisions of the funding they are looking at \$40,000 was for the tutoring of the high-set class, and the other \$110,000 is for scholarships for students, just to let you know how that --

MR. WHATLEY: That is not all for the (cross talk) --

MS. JEFFERSON: \$110,000 for scholarships. I hear that.

MR. WHATLEY: And also, too, if I remember correctly, vocational training is kind of a high score on our survey, as well, so.

MS. JEFFERSON: Well, I don't know about that, I mean, I do know that that was, like, the number one question on the survey.

MR. ANSPACH: It was. It was question number one, and it scored a 55 percent on high, 33 1/2 percent on medium, and 11 1/2 percent for low.

MS. JEFFERSON: And are they the only one asking for assistance regarding vocational training?

MR. ROSE: I think they were the only one providing vocational training like that, other than --

MS. JEFFERSON: Although, I still say there is \$110,000 you are saying for scholarships.

MR. ROSE: Would you like clarification from Job Point a little bit more?

MS. JEFFERSON: Where are they at?

MR. WHATLEY: Before we bring anybody up, I want to make sure we are asking specific questions related to the proposal. We are not allowed to get off topic in any way, so.

MS. JEFFERSON: The scholarship would be one of the questions.

MR. WHATLEY: Is there a representative from Job Point here tonight? Can you come on up, sir? And, if you don't mind, please introduce yourself, as always, and then when you're done, please wipe down the podium.

MR. SMITH: Thank you. Steven A. Smith, President and CEO of Job Point. Our request for the high-set class is to contract with Moberly Area Community College, and they will provide the class. We are not adding staff. They are adding one instructor, but the cost for the high-set class is basically to rather than us re-create the wheel, Moberly Area Community College has the contract, but they do not have the funding to do a night class. So we are using Council reserves from this year that was just approved to start this nighttime class because many people cannot attend during the day because of work or other obligations, and they can earn much more money over their career if they have their high school equivalency. So we are not adding staff for that. That we are looking to add a few part-time people, very minimal portion for tutoring, but it is not full-time staff.

MS. JEFFERSON: But you are going to put some tutors in there, you said?

MR. SMITH: Yes, ma'am, in addition to the volunteers we already have.

MS. JEFFERSON: But go ahead. Tell me about the scholarships?

MR. SMITH: The scholarships pay for people to take our classes. No one pays to go to Job Point. We provide them scholarships.

MS. JEFFERSON: There is 40, then there is 4110?

MR. SMITH: One hundred and ten. If for some reason we don't use all the 40, if, for instance, if we don't need to hire for more tutors, we would use more for scholarships, is what we requested.

MR. RITTER: That is the fallback. The fallback is to put it into the scholarships.

MR. SMITH: We want to be sure that we are able to have the tutors. We are having to pay more for tutors now because of the shortage of workers. It is not as easy for us to find people, and we are having to pay more per hour to do that, to tutor the folks to help more people to be able to take our classes, and the scholarships allow people to take our classes, and we have 24 full-time staff people, and in a normal year, they serve over 400 people. So we don't have extra people sitting around not doing anything, but we do some of the high-set instruction ourselves, but in order to do this nighttime class and to have it be an ongoing functioning class at a location that people are comfortable attending, we are contracting with, we have contracted with Moberly Area Community College to provide the class.

MS. JEFFERSON: But the class is going to be at the Parkade Plaza?

MR. SMITH: No. The class will be at our location.

MS. JEFFERSON: Which is at (unintelligible)?

MR. SMITH: Yes, ma'am.

MR. RITTER: Do you require the high-school equivalency to get in to your scholarship program?

MR. SMITH: No, absolutely not, except for highway heavy construction class, those contractors require -- they will take a very extensive legal history, but they do require a high school diploma equivalency, and those are the jobs that start at \$40 an hour base pay, plus per diem. So we have a lot of people that come to us, either directly from jail or prison, they want to take the highway heavy construction class, and they do not have their high school diploma or equivalency, and so we first help them find a part-time job, and then take our class, but first, if they don't have their high school diploma or equivalency, they need to get their high-set, so there is a progression there.

MS. JEFFERSON: Your clients come from prison?

MR. SMITH: We have a lot of people that come from prison or the jail or juvenile justice center. We are preparing do high-set instruction in the juvenile justice center, as well.

MR. WILLOUGHBY: MR. Smith, the part-time people that you are talking about, part of that comes, if I remember correctly, you can tell me if my memory is wrong, is the fact that you do you have volunteers to help with this, but a part of it is they are very - its is transient in their volunteer ability.

MR. SMITH: Well, availability, right, particularly we have a lot of students, college students, and we have a lot of retirees, and that seems to be both ends of that spectrum, starting careers or ending careers. We are just starting this tutoring, the extra tutoring for the people that are just below the line to be able to attend our classes because we would like to see an eighth-grade reading and math level. Sixth or seventh grade, we would probably take some people. We can't have a full class of people at that level, but we have people coming to us with second and third grade reading levels. Some people can make lots of progress in a short time, but we need to have tutors right there and then when they can be there, and those are the people we would need to hire.

MS. JEFFERSON: Have you not chose to take prisoners before, is this something new?

MR. SMITH: We've done this for way before I was there.

MS. JEFFERSON: And now you are needing to tutor the prisoners?

MR. SMITH: Some of them, and in the high-set class is for a lot of them. It is not solely for them, but they would make up a big part of it. We work with The Rock. You know, those are all folks that have recently gotten out of prison. They take some of our programming, and many of them will go through our classes. Some of them will use the scholarships, some of them will use the tutoring.

MS. JEFFERSON: And you work with - over there in Ward 3 area -- I don't know, so I thank you for that information.

MR. SMITH: Thank you.

MR. WHATLEY: Any other questions for MR. Smith before he sits down? (No audible response given.) Thank you, sir. Any other discussion about Job Point before we move on? (No audible response given.) Okay. Next is Central Missouri Community Action technical assistance to businesses, and they are requesting \$75,000, and it is recommended that they receive the same. Any discussion?

MS. JEFFERSON: This is about staffing, also?

MR. WHATLEY: If I remember correctly, the majority of this funding was for staffing, but it is staffing that provides the services that their clients need. So, it's more of a, and I don't want to speak on their behalf, but is more of a mentoring and coaching, you know, type of service, you know, that the women need in the City of Columbia, so it's kind of a summary.

MR. WILLOUGHBY: I do have a follow up question for them. The demographics, who are the clientele, the socioeconomics, it was kind of a - just because of Daren being here.

MR. WHATLEY: Is there a representative from CMCA? Would you mind coming up, please? Thank you. Would you introduce yourself?

MS. YANKEE: My name is Jessica Yankee. I am the director of the Women's Business Center.

MR. WILLOUGHBY: I have something to ask, and Diane, I think you are the one who asked this, but you can tell me if I am wrong, but we were just curious to know when it comes to clientele, the people that are the mentees, where do they align when it comes to socioeconomics within our community?

MS. YANKEE: As in income, race, everything?

MS. SUHLER: Especially if it's a two-income household, you know, where do you draw the line?

MS. YANKEE: So we are not income-based. We do track that, so with our CDBG funding we have gotten in the past, it would be allocated towards family set to meet the requirements. In terms of demographics, we are about 61 percent Caucasian and 39 percent minority clientele. In terms of income, no, I don't have exact numbers on that, but we do -- we track every single client and make sure that funds are allocated towards those who are qualified for this funding. Does that answer your question?

MS. SUHLER: I think so. Blake?

MR. WHATLEY: Blake, does that help you?

MR. WILLOUGHBY: I was curious just because it was a little vague.

MS. YANKEE: No, that is fine. I was on vacation. I'm sorry.

MS. JEFFERSON: You try to set people up with their own business?

MS. YANKEE: So when people want to start a business, they come to us to go through all of that. A lot of what we do is help them with capital, so that is the main thing I work on. So people that need access to capital, whether it is loan, grants, other type of funding, we help them through that, and a big part of what we do is create new avenues to that capital, so micro-loan funds. Things that don't require a credit score is a big thing that we work on, so alternative access to capital for businesses, and so to your question about staffing, without the staff, we don't have services.

MS. JEFFERSON: You do have some services already.

MS. YANKEE: Right, but if you remember from the presentation, we are seeing a pipeline that we have never, especially because of Covid, and without this type of funding, we go back down to pre-pandemic numbers, and I think this was part of our presentation, as well, about the massive influx of minority and low-income clients that we have served, and we just cannot continue to operate at the capacity we are doing without community support.

MS. JEFFERSON: You cannot, really?

MS. YANKEE: No, we cannot.

MS. JEFFERSON: All right.

MS. YANKEE: I don't know if it was in the presentation, I think it was, but CDBG funds are the only federal funding that we are allowed to match our grant with.

MS. JEFFERSON: So do you do any type of fund drives?

MS. YANKEE: Oh, absolutely. Yes. So this current year, we are operating on over a \$400,000 budget. So \$75,000 is really what we need to operate at the federal standards to match our grant, but even then, that's just a percentage. We do fund raise the rest.

MR. ROSE: You are talking just the Women's Business Center?

MS. YANKEE: Correct.

MR. ROSE: She is not talking --

MS. YANKEE: Yes, just the Women's Business Center.

MR. RITTER: So Daren had confirmed, I think a question came up that you've got over a 95% success rate with your businesses?

MS. YANKEE: Yes. It is very, very high. I don't have exact numbers on that, but it is very high, and we have also, I just spoke about this today, I don't think any of our clients have ever defaulted on a loan. We really, really work hand-in-hand, a perfect example is of a project we are doing right now is somebody that had a bankruptcy last year, and I won't mention her here, but you guys all know her, and she is full capacity moving forward with an SBA loan.

It absolutely would not happen without the Women's Business Center. I can fully say that, because we work with every bank in town to create access to capital for people that need a second chance financially.

MS. SUHLER: Some of the data I didn't see in your proposal would have to do with what is the average income or sales revenue of the firms that you're helping, what is their net income, what is their return on investment, and I didn't see any of that.

MS. YANKEE: I do wish I had that. I absolutely agree with you. It is just at a capacity level to track something like that when we have 600 clients a year, it is just not possible to have staff to do that type of follow-up.

MR. RITTER: And the private businesses?

MS. YANKEE: Right.

MS. SUHLER: I guess my concern is that if we were going to help micro-businesses, they have to be sustainable, and they have to be able to produce enough income for people to be able to live. You can't have, kind of, breakeven, sort of, scenario where you are paying your loan, but you have no money left over. So I guess those, even though they are tedious to construct, I think they are very important to be able to assess in a program like this.

MS. YANKEE: Any other questions?

MR. WILLOUGHBY: Would you just mind refreshing my mind because I am forgetting. When it comes to the funds that you do have from past funding periods due to the delay, how are those funds going to be used?

MS. YANKEE: So they will be specifically for a center we are opening for economic inclusion, so they will work specifically with low income, minority individuals in the new center, and then we are doing that as of now, hopefully, now that Covid is kind of coming back, but.

MR. WHATLEY: Any other questions? (No audible response.) Thank you.

MS. YANKEE: I appreciate it. Thank you.

MR. WHATLEY: Next on our list is Grade A+ Youth Services. They are requesting \$109,000, and right now, the recommendation is zero. Any discussion?

MR. WILLOUGHBY: Just a quick question. Just going back on the process we are doing. If we want to make a recommendation that is different than what is on here, do we need to do that as we are talking about the entity, or are we just talking through all of them before we make final recommendation?

## NEW BUSINESS

MR. WHATLEY: I think what I would like to do is to stay within the category that were in. Let's talk through each one first. You know, so for example, MS. Jefferson had some -- she had the recommendation not to fully fund Job Point, for example, and I don't know if that is still the case or not, MS. Jefferson, but then what I would like to do just kind of talk through each one, ask all the questions we need, and then let's talk about the funding for each category, if that works for everybody.

MR. WILLOUGHBY: Thank you.

MR. WHATLEY: So Grade A+ Youth Services. Any discussion?

MS. JEFFERSON: I am much bothered by this recommendation of zero. When I was on multiple Zoom meetings regarding what the people on the Zoom meeting, which was my ward, which is Ward 1 and 2 and 3, when childcare was their number one, not the number one, was one of the main concerns was having childcare, and for this to turn out to be a recommended of zero, I hope that gets fixed differently before this ends tonight.

MR. WHATLEY: I was thinking along the same path, but I think, you know, I don't want to confuse myself, but a lot of the youth services need that we've had in the past so far was Covid-19 related, so a lot of the requests that we received before were partly with the CARES Act Funding, and that is where that need arose, I guess. But one of the things I kind of looked at on the survey, the survey really doesn't talk about youth services in general, and so, you know, kind of like when we were you dealing with the Covid CARES Act

Funding, you know, we never knew that food shortages was a need until we added it to the survey, and then we received a high response. So one of my takeaways based on what you asked for earlier was when we create a survey, you do need to tie youth in, possibly, as a question. You know, what the question is, I don't know what it is tonight, but just for the future.

MR. RITTER: I was going to say, I don't know if those are actually in the right category. I believe Grade A+ and they were looking at a facility purchase and needing some commitment from the City to get their financing and fundraising capabilities over the next year some credibility with City backing. I believe Kidz Ink was also looking for a bigger facility so they didn't have to use the church.

MR. ANSPACH: So at the time of the applications when the closed, and we reviewed the initial application, the Grade A+ project did not talk specifically about the building. They talked about a spot. There was some talk of renting, so there's some further discussion with trying to nail down exactly what that request was, and that is where we landed was more on the youth services side, so that is a category that it started with and where we left it throughout this funding process, even though by the time the presentation was made, the request had kind of morphed into the purchase of a potential building. On the Kidz Ink side, and we can talk about this as we move on, just based on the information that is in the application, this seemed to be the most appropriate category just based on what I was able to read and interpret.

MR. ROSE: That one was programming in what they were requesting.

MR. RITTER: Which one?

MR. ROSE Kidz Ink.

MR. RITTER: Kids Ink was programming. Yes, but they had alluded to the fact that their space was more limited.

MR. ANSPACH: Between the time application was submitted and the presentation was made, if there was any changes by the organization itself, in terms of what they were requesting, just on this form, it stayed with the original application as to where we landed.

MR. RITTER: Not that the money magically appears from somewhere, but.

MR. WHATLEY: Just on a side note, I don't want to get back to the HOME funding, per se, but if Grade A+ or Kidz Ink are both looking at a facility-type, you know, need, that could go back to the HOME funding RFP that we might -- yes or no?

MR. ANSPACH: No, that not an eligible use for those funds. HOME would be to for affordable housing for a family.

MR. WHATLEY: Okay. Thank you. So, let's get back to Grade A+. Any discussion about that organization and their needs?

MS. JEFFERSON: Well, they are needed in the community. I've already told you what I've heard, and that is the main concern in the area that I live in on the Zoom meeting that came from multiple wards, the type of services they offer is a much-needed service.

MR. CROUCH: I would certainly endorse that, and I think when we get to the end, if there was some agreement, I think we need to find some funding for this program because I think it is a worthwhile endeavor.

MR. ROSE: I would agree with that, too.

MS. SUHLER: It kind of creates that pipeline for people.



MR. WHATLEY: Okay. So before we move on to Kidz Ink, do we need to ask any questions with Grade A+, if they are in the audience? Do we have questions for them?

MR. WILLOUGHBY: I don't have a question for Dr. Threat, but I do have a question for the City. I know with Grade A+ being a newer requestor, how much assistance does the City give in aiding those that are new to the application process if they are afforded the funds to ensure that everything runs smoothly for the requestor?

MR. ANSPACH: Assuming the project is eligible and receives funding, we will ensure the walk-through to ensure that all the environmental reviews are completed as required, whatever they may be. We will ensure that all of the draw requests have complete documentation to back up any invoices that have been submitted and ensure that any reporting criteria documentation are provided with those draw requests so we can report back to HUD the accomplishments and any issues with those projects. So City Staff is very involved with helping and assisting in the administering of the project as they navigate the CDBG process.

MR. ROSE: That's kind of a question I have is some of the difficulties making sure that the organization will use the funds in the appropriate way or the allowable way. You know, a particular proposal we have was \$84,000 for office and utilities and \$20,000 for project personnel. I'm just going to throw out a number. Say you decide, "Well, we think the organization should get \$20,000 but they use that for programming rather than trying to use it toward a building that we would see that as inappropriate, and just from what the presenter stated, I think they would see that as a plus. Just to get anything, they would be willing to that, but how do we guarantee that? I don't know.

MR. WHATLEY: And that is true due to the contingency on the funding; correct?

MR. ANSPACH: It can be written into that agreement, but what we would want to ensure is that the application is eligible and the draws that are submitted are eligible and relate back to what the original application was so what we would not allow is the project to be funded and then draw requests come in for expenses that are not related to the original application. So we would ensure that is not taking place, and if that were to occur then, if the project doesn't move forward, those funds could be reallocated to another project that this Commission would then make a decision on, but hopefully if we have done everything correct up to this point, we've got a clear picture of what the project is and what the funding would be used for so that we don't run into a situation where we are reallocating from a project that has been awarded funds.

MR. ROSE: And I don't know if me reading this, and I don't know that it was clear to me as I looked for what it meant, project personnel, \$20,000, if that meant person personnel securing a place for them to move to or personnel?

MR. WHATLEY: Let's get some definition. Let's get an answer for that. Can a representative from Grade A+ please come up?

DR. THREAT: I am Dr. Janice Dawson-Threat, Executive Director of Grade A+, Inc. I think Gary made it real clear, yes, it was our first application. Yes, as we move through the process, we were learning at the same time we were doing it, and, yes, as we found out certain things and blockages started appearing, I stayed in communication with the staff in terms of could we do

this, could we do that and still qualify? And so at no time did they discourage us that we could not continue, and so I'm very appreciative that they made the decision to put us in the economic work force category because that would be more appropriate for where we are and what we do now. We fit, we would align perfectly in terms of the programming. We do not have funding to support the teens that come into our program, and so we would be able to align with the types of proposals that Job Point and CMCA have proposed, and so programming-wise, we would like to go after that high school population, which is dealing with violence, a lot of violence, and as part of their attending our tutoring services, which is covered by other grants, we would like to add in mental health counseling to deal with their stress, mentoring, job shadowing, and then we are trying to partner with the Chamber of Commerce to develop a workforce development program for the teens. So if we can get the funding and be able to put a part-time staff person on that and put that program out there, we could hit every point on that. You would not have to worry. We would be able to do all the paperwork, all the accounting, everything perfectly. Is that okay? Is that clear what you would be paying for? And it would make a difference to these young people, their parents and this community.

THE WITNESS: And Dr. Threat, when it comes to their personal individual Grade A+ isn't just starting from the ground, kind of the ground up, you have infrastructure already built in with the school district and everything to make this kind of streamline with the high schools real quick.

DR. THREAT: Right. Really it would be an expansion because the funding we have caters for elementary and middle school and because of our partnership with the graduate math department, we have been able to appeal to high school students, but we need more to bring those kids in, and so if we can put in that job development piece, that career development piece and give those kids that one-to-one attention, and then our other services could support because when those kids go to school at Battle, they can't get the tutoring. So we have transportation. So we go to Battle, pick them up and bring them to our program that was pre-Covid, and because we are still virtual because of Covid, we think we would increase our enrollment in that population, and so I didn't know what else to say.

MR. WHATLEY: Do we have any other questions?

MR. RITTER: In the application, you mentioned receiving funding from Human Services. So that to me seems like where your service and programming funding will come from.

DR. THREAT: Not for this age group. They are funding 10 children who are in the elementary and middle school level. We have no funding to support high schoolers. You know, we just ignore these kids, and when they are in these communities that are low income, and they don't have support besides a school bus, they can't get jobs, they can get out in the communities, they can't get tutoring, and so we would like to expand our services to that population, and this would be the best place to do because that is what you said, workforce development, economic development. We would fit.

MR. RITTER: Your application says, "We are seeking to obtain funds to secure a facility."

DR. THREAT: Yes --

MR. RITTER: That is what I'm worried about, the disconnect on what your application says versus what you have told us since then.

DR. THREAT: That is what I said. As we went through the process, we were first-timers. As we went through the process and City Staff began to explain things to us, and then we also did our homework, we went out and started talking to bankers and realtors, and all these people, and they made it very clear what you need to apply for that, and so I called the Staff and said, "Listen, can we," you know, and so they have made the decision to put us in this category. We can fit here if you leave us in another category, then I know you are going to turn us down.

MR. ROSE: But under this summary describing your proposed project, your second sentence is to be able to expand services to provide community-based mentorship and job and career development. That (cross talk) --

DR. THREAT: Thank you. So we are not changing it. There it is. I am going to stop talking. Is that enough?

MR. WHATLEY: Any other questions?

DR. THREAT: \$40,000 dollars.

MS. SUHLER: The Human Services Commission does not fund children services anymore. (Unintelligible) United Way.

MR. WHATLEY: Okay. Any other discussion about Grade A+? Okay. Moving on to Kidz Ink. They are requesting \$200,000 for their after-school program. Any discussion.

MS. JEFFERSON: It is a much-needed program in the community. Again, another much-needed program. I am looking here where they wrote about the safe space after school programs. I don't need to say anymore. It is a much-needed service for the kids. When they get out of school, they need to have a safe place to go, and I remember the lady that talked about this Kidz Investing In Knowledge, how they provide services on the weekend, as well as what I believe Grade A+ does, too, so this is giving them a place to go on the weekend. They are educating them on how to maintain a good credit. There's a lot of things they do with children that the clients that they serve they need. It is knowledge not just as far as math and English, it is knowledge on how to make it upward.

MR. WHATLEY: They definitely have a well-rounded program, if you remember the video that they showed at the last meeting. You know, so not only is it an after-school program, but it's also a summer school program, too, if I remember correctly. So we need to keep that in mind. I am also in favor of seeing what we can do to help them out, as well. Any other thoughts or comments by the Commissioners for Kidz Ink, or do we need to bring a representative up to ask any questions specifically to their proposal?

MR. RITTER: No questions, just agree we need to try and find some money. It is very similar to the Grade A+, but a small bucket of money available.

MR. WHATLEY: Okay. So that is the last RFP for the economic and workforce development. So, we have a total request of \$534,000. You know, we have \$225,000 right now in that pot, if you will.

MR. ROSE: Can you tell me, go back to these percentages for the different sections and where that is based upon --

MR. KASMANN: Those eight to 15 percent, and 15 percent is \$123,000. (cross talk).

MR. ROSE:-- whether we move something from another category --

MR. RITTER: That was my comment, is it in the right category because I mean our guiding from the consolidated plan is to not have that much on economic and workforce development and shift more towards housing and community facilities.

MR. ROSE: So we are looking at shifting something in that section?

MR. RITTER: Or, into that section.

MR. ROSE: Or right now, we would be looking at we can't shift more into that section; is that right? Because that has already got (cross talk).

MR. WHATLEY: -- we are just (cross talk) --

MR. CROUCH: Just ask the City on this. If we made this percentage high, Gary, in this category, what pitfalls are we digging for ourselves?

MR. ANSPACH: That is a good question. So these percentages were developed as part of the development of consolidated plan. Essentially that is what the City says we are going to spend, this range of funds in these categories, and so from my understanding and interpretation would be HUD can provide a finding this says you did not follow your plan as written. There are opportunities for amendments to that plan if there are significant changes, but the guiding principle that put those percentages and ranges in place were the result of a lot of public input and public meetings that were held during the development of that consolidated plan, and that is really where the public input landed was those percentages, those previously-mentioned percentages in these categories. So, you know, again, we are somewhat bound by the types of projects and the amounts that were requested, but as much as possible, we try to fit into those ranges as much as we can.

MR. CROUCH: So even if we transfer funds from another category, that is going to add to that percentage, and that also would be a difficult thing to do?

MR. ANSPACH: It could be.

MR. ROSE: Difficult thing to get past Council, too, because they are looking at those percentages.

MR. FLETCHER: I think given our overall scenario with Covid, I think having more focus in the short term for one funding cycle for economic and workforce development, I don't think anyone would argue with that.

MS. SUHLER: I think the goals are over a five-year period. So it doesn't mean that you have to stay within those, some just kind of broadly over that entire timeframe. I don't think we need to worry. You know, this is a special time, and they overspend now in that category, and later on, I think it would balance out.

MR. WHATLEY: So let me ask this. Is there a recommendation from a Commissioner to move monies from one area and then bring it into the Economic and Workforce Development category?

MR. ROSE: I make a recommendation. I always like to take a starting point. (cross talk).

MR. RITTER: You can make a conversation point without making a motion. (cross talk).

MR. ROSE: For instance, what if we said for the Columbia Center for Urban Agriculture, drop that down to \$100,000 and \$40,000 up into the Economic Development and divide \$20,000 between each of those two programs, as a for instance.

MR. CROUCH: As a for instance, that is exactly the numbers that I had, and

I think that we could move that \$40,000 up, we can make some adjustments to the allocations to Job Point and Central Missouri Community Action and add them to Grade A+ and Kidz Ink.

I have some numbers if you're interested.

MR. WHATLEY: Okay. So there's one recommendation, taking \$40,000 from CCUA and moving it up, dividing it evenly between Grade A+ and Kidz Ink. Is there another suggestion?

MS. JEFFERSON: Well, I --

MR. FLETCHER: Just an observation is that the two organizations, Grade A+ and Kidz Ink and just a row scoring from the Commissioners, they scored higher than the Urban Agriculture, so, and if we are taking the recommendations to fully fund Urban Agriculture, our opinion, based on our reviews, indicated that these other two organization had higher a rating, so I think the funding should reflect that.

MR. WHATLEY: MS. Suhler?

MS. SUHLER: I would also second Terry's recommendation in taking some from Central Missouri Community Action. I think if you look at the number of people served per dollar spent in that program versus the number of people served per dollar spent through Grade A+ and Kidz Ink, I think you get a lot more bang for the buck.

MR. WHATLEY: Any other thoughts from any of the other Commissioners?

MS. JEFFERSON: I know it's not much, but the part where they go around and destroy homes, and that code enforcement thing, and that's not much, but every little -- even taking five out of that 35, that Code thing, taking maybe 10 out of that, then I'm looking down here at this construction of early childhood building, a construction -- I remember the situation, but, you know, even taking five away from that.

MR. WHATLEY: Okay. So, Gary can we do this first, can we edit this spreadsheet as we go?

MR. ANSPACH: Yes.

MR. WHATLEY: First, let's deduct \$40,000 from CCUA and divide it evenly between Grade A+ and Kidz Ink. Let's just start there. So now that takes that category up to 26 1/2 percent.

MR. WILLOUGHBY: I would just propose decreasing CMCA, the federal assistance to businesses, from 75 to 50, and then taking that 25, and I'm open to suggestions on how you want to do that one.

MR. WHATLEY: Do you just want to split it in half?

MR. WILLOUGHBY: And then I agree with MS. Jefferson -- (cross talk) --

MR. WHATLEY: Five hundred for each of those, Gary?

MR. ANSPACH: Do you want me to put it -- the 25 from CMCA's technical assistance to businesses and split it between even Grade A+ and Kidz Ink?

MR. WHATLEY: That is correct.

MR. ANSPACH: Is that in addition to the \$20,000 from CCUA so that would be twelve five.

MR. WHATLEY: Thirty two five.

MR. WILLOUGHBY: Once we get into Neighborhood Revitalization and Stabilization, I do have a question when it comes to code enforcement, but I do

see -- I do personally have (unintelligible) pulling that up in to Economic Workforce Development, but I do want to answer questions first before we propose it fully.

MR. WHATLEY: Are there any other suggestions moving any money around and bringing it in to the Economic and Workforce Development category, specifically for Grade A+ and/or Kidz Ink?

MS. JEFFERSON: You don't want us to mess with the neighborhood park yet, is that what you are saying, you're holding on to --

MR. WHATLEY: I would like to finalize them as best we can, this category, before we move on.

MS. JEFFERSON: Well, I would like to see more money from (unintelligible) if we get into -- so it also as we get into the other areas that we can choose to take from these areas?

MR. RITTER: We took it from CCUA (cross talk) we might as well take a recommendation to take it from somebody else.

MR. WILLOUGHBY: I would recommend pulling the \$35,000 that is in Code Enforcement, and putting splitting that between youth services --

MR. RITTER: -- person that is dedicated to doing that in the City. That's been a program --

MS. JEFFERSON: That is a .5 position, you know, I'm just saying, it's a half a person.

MS. SUHLER: But is that the only person that does that, or is it --

MR. WHATLEY: -- there is four or five employees that is in that division, so if they get a call to go to one of those homes in that area, that task force area, the NRT?

MR. ANSPACH: Yes.

MR. WHATLEY: And they log the time spent at that home, and it comes out of that half of that .5, if that makes sense. Did I explain that correctly?

MR. ANSPACH: Yes.

MS. SUHLER: But there actually are four positions that do that? (cross talk).

MR. ANSPACH: One-half full time equivalent staff person, but the tasks are spread out over the four individuals in that office that work that program. So it pays the portions of four people salaries, but it is representative of one half or .5 FTE.

MR. ROSE: And it is for a specific area of the city.

MR. ANSPACH: So when one of the Code Enforcement individuals on staff report and go to an area inside that NRT area, which is in the central area town, they can bill -- they bill that to this specific funding bucket.

MR. WHATLEY: And it is not just reactive, it is a proactive program, as well, but if they are driving

through that area and that individual sees something, then they are going to make a point to stop and hopefully provide some education to the homeowner.

That is the way I understood it.

MS. JEFFERSON: I understand that's the way they explained it, but I like the idea of taking that 35 because they do still have staff. I mean, I understand it might make them short staffed, but really, overall, that \$35,000 could come out of the City budget for half the staff.

MS. SUHLER: And that's my concern that a lot of times City departments come to us to ask for CDBG funding, and if they don't get it, it would just mean it would come out of general revenues, or some other pot, and so it is likely we

have this tiny piece of money to spend a few programs that have access to no other funding, and if we, you know, fund, like, this Code Enforcement, it is something the City is going to do anyway. All were doing is covering the City expense so the City can use it for whatever they want to do.

MR. WHATLEY: And that exactly was kind of my thought. So if there is a complaint in that area, I mean, somebody from the City is still going to go out there and respond.

MR. ROSE: You will probably have a decreased time for response. I am just going to speak on the side of the City. You know, you can have a decreased time of response. It is supplanting funds that, you know, I'm looking at now at City Council, you know, I'm looking at supplanting that.

MR. WILLOUGHBY: I think that it just - we are kind of getting it to the point of, like, into the neighborhood revitalization and stabilization, and so I kind of just wanted to ask City a question on that one, if that is okay to jump that way, or if we want to hold off. I'm fine with holding off, but as we are in this conversation on this one. When it comes to the Code Enforcement of target areas, in my perspective when as we were listening to it, part of why I think that I moved to changing these funds and not having it funded here, it just seemed that it wasn't -- I didn't fully understand what all it helped us with getting into the day when it came to community and housing development.

MR. ANSPACH: A couple of points. Code Enforcement, obviously, it has been a long-time funded project from this Commission over the course of many years. That notwithstanding, the goal of Code Enforcement is to help property owners maintain their property, and even if it is not something that I would say the City is picking on someone or identifying someone to cause an issue with, it is to help surrounding neighbors. It is to help neighborhoods to make sure that problem properties are identified and services, or at least help to bring that back up to property standards. You know, obviously, it is an eligible CDBG activity. It is something that been long-time funded, and it is one of those things that for this specific bucket of funds is targeted directly to that NRT area that is in the central City area that CDBG really has a national focus on in terms of focusing on the areas where there is a low-to-moderate income population, and so the goal is really to help those property owners get their properties back up to the standards and help the neighborhood and help themselves, and I don't know if Tim Teddy, the Director of Community Development.

MR. TEDDY: There was also a consolidated plan target for this. So we say over five years, 375 properties into compliance, so that is 75 a year. If you look at the total number of housing units, that's about 10 percent of the housing units on an annual basis that improvements are being made to. So it goes to the suitable living environment objective of CDBG, and fully funded, it is 20 hours a week, and it is various inspectors. We have restructured it somewhat over the years. We have had dedicated persons, but we are rotating them out, and a lot of the neighborhood services inspection function has a funding source, and that is the rental inspection fees that are paid by landlords, but this type of code enforcement doesn't have a cost recovery mechanism, so that's why we come to that request funding through CDBG.

MS. JEFFERSON: I do think \$35,000 can go back and let the City take care of it, and hopefully they will understand the priority of giving support to providing a safe space and also what is involved with youth services.

MR. CROUCH: Can I make an alternate suggestion, not touch that 35, but take -- and I am one of the biggest supporters of Job Point, that we are fully funding that. Why don't we take \$25,000 out of that and split that between Kidz Ink and Grade A+, giving them both \$47,000 and leaving the 35 where it is.

MR. FLETCHER: Let's do that with the Urban Agricultural. That was still a proposal that was rated lower than those other two organizations, and yet we are still funding it, you know, at a substantially high level.

MS. JEFFERSON: Because they are the ones requesting Grade A and Kidz Ink. I think both things could be done. They are still not getting to what they are asking for.

MR. ROSE: I don't think we are looking to request to fund what -- most of the funds that they were looking to request was the building, so.

MS. JEFFERSON: I understand that, but like I said, there are other organizations that we -- it seems like we just kind of -- their request was equal to what was recommended, and just adding to Grade A and Kidz Ink still won't be what they requested, and I understand --

MR. WHATLEY: Let's be a little specific here. So, I've heard a couple of things. So one was to take \$25,000 from Job Point, and split it in half, and give it to Grade A+ and Kidz Ink. So, is that something we want to entertain?

MS. JEFFERSON: Are we going to add it on?

## NEW BUSINESS

MR. WHATLEY: Or, the other suggestion is, is possibly take that same amount of money from CCUA and divided it in half with Grade A+ or Kidz Ink. So I guess that is the question. Do we want to take funding or recommendation funding from Job Point and give it to Grade A+ and Kidz Ink, or do we want to take some recommended funding from CCUA and give it to Grade A and Kidz Ink. That is the two things that I just heard from our discussion. There is one caveat to that. I think when we get down to the community facilities, we may not want to make some other adjustments there within that before we take money out of that.

MR. FLETCHER: And Job Point is a high-rated -- (cross talk) -- funds from them.

MR. WHATLEY: Okay. So I am going to recommend we move on to Neighborhood Revitalization and Stabilization. Let's go ahead and just move on to the next category, so --

MS. JEFFERSON: -- add to the -- (cross talk).

MR. WHATLEY: Well, we've tweaked recommendations to build up the Economic and Workforce Development category specifically, but we haven't discussed the other two categories yet. That's my goal right now is let's finish the list, and then let's continue to hash it out like we are, so. So first is the City of Columbia Acquisition and Demolition program. The City is requesting \$50,000, and it's also recommended that we give them the same. Any discussion?

MS. JEFFERSON: I don't think they should get what they're asking for. I don't I understand what they do.

MR. WHATLEY: All right. So we have got one comment. Any other comments? I believe this is typically for two homes or two properties.

MR. ANSPACH: Typically, yes.

MR. WHATLEY: Typically? Okay.



MS. SUHLER: On these properties, is it guaranteed they will be used to provide new affordable housing?

MR. ANSPACH: Yes, that is typically the goal with the Demolition Program is to -- the final use of those properties will then be redeveloped typically by one of our CHDO's on the HOME side to rebuild an affordable housing unit.

MR. WHATLEY: And the land, itself, stays within the Land Trust, if I remember correctly, or am I confusing that with another program?

MR. ANSPACH: It can.

MR. WHATLEY: Okay. Any other comments by the Commissioners for the Acquisition and Demolition Program?

MS. SUHLER: And how tight of a budget is that, like \$50,000, is that the exact amount you need for two properties, or is that --

MR. ANSPACH: That's typically the average for two. So sometimes it depends on what is found in terms of asbestos or lead paint, the acquisition of the property, you know, those costs can vary, but that is typically about the average when we put the proposal together the amount requested would represent two homes.

MS. JEFFERSON: So this is about knocking down two homes --

MR. ANSPACH: -- demolishing two homes --

MS. JEFFERSON: -- and then turning it in to affordable housing-type situation?

MR. WHATLEY: Correct.

MR. ANSPACH: It would be redeveloped with a new affordable house for low-to-moderate income.

MR. ROSE: You are knocking down two abandoned and maybe dangerous facilities.

MS. JEFFERSON: And then so, turning it into an affordable housing, but it would not be affordable -- we just don't know if it is going to be affordable for low-income people or the moderate income people.

MR. ANSPACH: They would be sold to a low-to-moderate income family. So it would not be an open-market-type house that just anyone could buy. It would be available if a household or family would meet low-to-moderate income guidelines, just like all the other projects that are recommended.

MS. JEFFERSON: I'm still going to say they shouldn't get the \$50,000. That is just my thinking.

MR. WHATLEY: So let's move on to Code Enforcement of targeted areas. Let's discuss this one just a little bit more. If we have got a consensus that we might want to move some of these monies around, so what are the actual thoughts to do with the \$35,000 request?

MS. JEFFERSON: I think we should split it. I did hear that they have been coming here for many years to get this. It is for, like I said, I understand that this helps to allow for four staff members, if I'm understanding correctly. I still think that it could be used to add on to Grade A and Kidz Ink. I'm sorry if it runs those two programs into the ground. I'm just saying those are very important programs.

MR. WHATLEY: Okay. So there's one thought. Any other thoughts from the Commissioners?

MS. SUHLER: I guess I just want to clarify. If we do not fund that half a position, that doesn't mean the City is going to do away with that half a position.

I assume is there money?

MR. WHATLEY: This is going to be --

MS. SUHLER: -- City has -- (cross talk) --

MR. TEDDY: So, of course, we would like to preserve the strength that we have now, due to the numbers of inspectors, so we will probably amend our budget request to rely more on general funds to support the other half of the position there, and kind of to your point, if there is a complaint in an area, we would most certainly respond. We wouldn't have as much justification to have that funding, though, to be proactive-type inspection in the target area, which is a central area of the City, the White Gate area, which is what we call the NRT.

MS. SUHLER: But you would be able to get it through the regular funding process?

MR. TEDDY: I'm not going to take anything for granted, but that would be my approach, would be to request some additional funding out of the City's general fund to meet this, I think it was observed earlier that we've had this \$35,000 rate for quite some years, so, you know, we have kind of relied on it for the existing staffing.

MR. CROUCH: Once again, supporting the idea of getting more funding to create Grade A+ and Kidz Ink, I think that is an important program for the City, and I think there are other areas that we can look at to further fund Grade A and Kidz Ink other than this \$35,000.

MR. KASMANN: I agree with that.

MR. ROSE: I would agree, too.

MR. WHATLEY: I still think we loose a sense of education and educating our homeowners and working with the homeowners in our communities with their properties, and if we do eliminate that funding, or we don't recommend anything, then I think we just get to a reactive state, you know, with this targeted area that we need to work with.

MR. RITTER: I mean, it has always fit, kind of, the mission of this Commission and the funding cycles to have something around code enforcement. That's why it's been a fairly small commitment of the Commission given the close to a million dollars of this year of funding, I mean, to have that half FTE dedicated to the NRT and having that speed of response, maybe. It's hard to measure exactly what half an FTE really adds, as far as response time, but they have always presented well and have documentation of hitting those areas of need, and same thing with the demolition program, we've taken tours, we've seen the properties, we've seen the properties get rebuilt -

MS. JEFFERSON: Well, I am just going to say that since -- (cross talk) --

MR. RITTER: -- neighborhood revitalization and --

MS. JEFFERSON: -- again, I say that these Code Enforcement people, they just don't -- there is areas that they seem to look at, and they seem to just drive right on by. I am still visualizing a machine, a vehicle that's been sitting with expired license plates of 2017, and it's been there for a good three to four years, and they just can't seem to see that like I see it.

MR. WILLOUGHBY: I also think it is important to point out that when it comes to the Commissions truncated average, that the Commission ranked this project 13th out of 15, and so I mean that is something that at least where we were at, we rated that quite low, to where comparably with Acquisition and

Demolition, we ranked that a little bit higher. So, I mean, I think when looking at these two City projects, the Commission, at least in our truncated average, so we got rid of our highest and our lowest, I mean, put one, kind of, over the other one, and substantially it's a three point difference.

MR. WHATLEY: Okay.

MS. SUHLER: One concern, too, I have from last week's discussion was the woman who presented, and she responded to a question that a lot of times condemned properties then can be purchased, or the land, by different entities and not necessarily kept as homes for low-income people or to preserve the spirit of the area in which they were in, and she cited just an example, Columbia College buying some of those properties, and then they are going to use it to expand. It is kind of like if we -- if this is in the spirit of identifying these violations, and then keeping these areas so that they preserve the character and the culture, then that is fine, but without a caveat or prescription that says, "Yes, we will do whatever has to happen," preserves the character and culture, and I'm concerned given just the nature of that.

MR. WHATLEY: Okay. So I am just going to throw something out here. You know, I'm kind of in favor of the program, myself, because I kind of see it as a useful need, but on the flip-side, as a Commission, if we have doubts that this program is not really working to fit the needs with the City, then maybe not funded it for a year and maybe when we receive another RFP from the City, you know, for this next year, maybe we can hear maybe a possible impact in not having the program for the year. I don't know if that is measurable in any way, to be honest. But, you know, we need to come to a consensus. I would rather do this now than go through the rest of the RFPs and then get into a big debate.

MR. WILLOUGHBY: Obviously, this has been consistent. The City has relied on this for some time. It has had a history of passing most of the time, I'm assuming, as it has come up. Instead of pulling all of it, that way, I mean, I understand that the City is looking at funding a bunch of things. What if we just pulled either or \$10,000 or \$15,000, means that they have a short gap stop kind of fill in and pull from a different area of the budget, but it is not fully (unintelligible) the entire thing and then this way they can tell us how -- I think we can still look at that, and that can be something for the City to kind of look at, "This might be a program we need to reimagine how it operates."

MR. RITTER: You take 15 from that, it evens out Grade A and Kidz Ink at \$40,000 each.

MR. ROSE: I support that idea. That's reasonable.

MR. WHATLEY: Any other thoughts?

MR. CROUCH: I think it's a good idea.

MR. RITTER: Drop Code 20, and then bump the other two up to 40, whoever is taking notes.

MR. ANSPACH: Just so I am clear, we are going to drop Code Enforcement from 35 to \$20,000?

MR. WHATLEY: Correct.

MR. ANSPACH: And take that \$15,000, split it in half, so it is \$7,500 more for Grade A+ and Kidz Ink?

MR. WHATLEY: That is correct.

MR. ANSPACH: That will put those both at 40.

MR. WHATLEY: Okay. Next in the Neighborhood category is Diggs

Meatpacking Company. If you remember, they were wanting to place the sidewalks along the businesses, basically, in that -- I can't remember how they define that area, south-central Columbia. Anyway, so, you know, they're requesting \$106,710, and the recommendation is none right now. I drive by this every day, and there is some revitalization going on in this portion of town, at least some fantastic looking curb appeal from Worley, you know, looking north, and I can't think of this side street that goes from Worley north, but that particular street is actually used partially as a parking lot or for parking during the day, so if sidewalks were placed on that portion on either side, where are those vehicles going to park? You know, Boone County Lumber utilizes one side of that, and I don't know whether I should say if on one side of Boone County Lumber is, you know, their property there, but that was part of the proposal for a sidewalk, so. Now, the other side that goes east to west. I just imagine there is no sidewalk there. There is probably utility poles --

MR. RITTER: On the south side there is no sidewalk. On the north side, there is.

MR. WHATLEY: There is. Correct. Correct, and so I am, you know -- and also this is all business where that the sidewalk is going to be placed. So even though, you know, sidewalks is rated high on our survey, I think that's more for residential, you know, perspective versus commercial. So I am not in favor of the sidewalk.

MS. JEFFERSON: I agree, and this is Ward 1, and when I think about the residents, the number of residents in that area, I'm just having a hard time coming up with a number of that the man spoke of, actually, in that area.

MR. ROSE: Or the income level. He had a high income level for that area, if I understand it. If it was just the businesses, so, yeah.

MR. WHATLEY: So, that's my thoughts. I mean, I think it is starting to look good in that neighborhood, but I think, you know, for the funding that we receive, and as we have been talking about, you know, where the need is greater, I don't think it should be for the sidewalk in the proposed area. My thoughts. Any other discussion or comments by the Commissioners? (No audible response given.) Okay. Let's move on to the last category, Community Facilities. We have a request for a total of \$771,700. Recommended right now is down to \$322,000. Columbia Housing Authority for the Blind Boone for renovations. The City is requesting \$56,700, and the same amount is recommended. Any discussions?

MR. WILLOUGHBY: It is one of our highest rated just our numbers, and with the City Staff numbers, as well, so I think fully funding it is appropriate.

MS. JEFFERSON: I agree.

MR. WHATLEY: Okay. Central Missouri Community Action, CMCA, construction of early childhood -- of a childhood building. They are requesting \$75,000, and we are recommending the same. Any discussion?

MR. FLETCHER: If I remember, that is the project that is leveraging a lot of already-committed funds that are already out there, so (unintelligible) we have already replaced all the parking and drive at this particular location, so I think it's good to bring it all up to a high standard. (cross talk).

MR. WHATLEY: -- see from the street there is some definite wear and tear, you know, with it, so.

MR. ROSE: And toddler is sorely needed.

MS. JEFFERSON: I think the only thing with this one, not the only thing, but,

is if I recall correctly, their lease is going to run out. Isn't there something involved with that?

MR. WHATLEY: The trailer, itself.(cross talk).

MS. JEFFERSON: So they waited a little -- you know, it seems like they only have a year left, or something, and it sounds like we have been giving -- they have been given a lot to get as far as where they are at now.

MR. ROSE: From the Commission?

MS. JEFFERSON: From the Commission -- no, I mean --

MR. WHATLEY: -- the parking lot, and that was in dire need, as well. You know, I can understand from a business standpoint why they have held off on the trailer for so long. It may be fiscally advantageous for them to hold onto it for this long, but now that they are going to lose the trailer, the decision has got to be made on their part. I'm kind of in favor of this particular proposal.

MR. WILLOUGHBY: I do have a question for the proposers. I was in Arizona when we had our last Commission meeting when they were presenting, so I made a choice that I was just not going to ask any questions. So you don't mind if I can ask you a question. From my understanding, what these funds are going to be doing is having that property be built facilitating the amount of kids that you already are able to at this point. Is there a reason why this area is not, you all are not choosing to expand to add more service to kids?

MS. VOSSLER: First of all, Beth Vossler, Missouri Community Action. So it is a product of our funding stream. So we are given so many slots by the government, by the office of Head Start. There are opportunities to request for expansion, but you cannot, as a rantee, just decide to add 20 more kids.

That's not how this funding source actually works, and so we're working within the constraints of our grant that is funded through the office of Head Start, and so that's why we aren't looking to expand. Now, that being said, I do actually have to submit a request to expand services here in Boone County. So every time there is an opportunity, I look at the data, and I do actually request for expansion, or what they call expansion, which just increased capacity.

MR. WILLOUGHBY: Hypothetically speaking, if you all built a building that had additional room to add that capacity, would Head Start or the other grantors that give you all funding be more inclined to give you all funds for more kids?

MS. VOSSLER: It is possible. I will tell you on that particular property, there is a water-retention issue, and so there is a water-retention pond behind it, and just how the property lays. There actually is not a possibility of expanding on that particular property, but to answer your question, yes, in theory.

MR. WILLOUGHBY: Thank you.

MR. FLETCHER: Is there any update on the funding process from the national organization since the last meeting?

MS. VOSSLER: Since the last meeting, no. So, like I was articulating, the funds are already sitting there. What the Feds are just doing is, is the final approval of the actual project.

MR. WHATLEY: Any other questions? (No audible response given.) Thank you. Okay, next on the list is Columbia Center for Urban Agriculture construction renovation and acquisition, if I remember correctly, their final building. They're requesting \$140,000, and right now, the recommendation is for the same amount, so. Okay. I'm sorry. We were recommending \$100,000. I'm sorry. I had my laptop up, so. Any discussion?

MS. SUHLER: I think this is a good use of money. It certainly diversifies our portfolio of projects because it does kind of look at the facility that can be used for lots of different activities, plus it kind of ties into food security, which is something that none of the other projects that we have looked at addressed, and I don't quite understand this, but I do know that the groups work with Parks and Rec, and so the funding actually comes back to the City of the money somehow, so it's kind of multiplied back into the City.

MR. WHATLEY: You know, I'll tell you, I've been out to the, it is called the Farmers Market, a few times, and every time I've been out there, whether it's been on a Saturday or Wednesday when all the food trucks are out there, you know, the CCUA are out there, and they are educating everybody who was going to stop and listen, and so with that in mind, you know, I think having an actual building there to actually do some of this educating and training, you know, for the kids, or whoever, I think it's just the last piece of the puzzle to make this complete, just in my mind. So I'm in favor of \$100,000, myself.

MR. ROSE: I have a question on the timing on when the funds have to be utilized for these projects?

MR. ANSPACH: They would be available next fall, and there is a timeframe, usually three years. So we provide that time frame for them to be fully expended, but we do set a threshold in the agreement in conversing with the administrator to make sure, you know, to set those thresholds that they are actively spending those funds throughout the agreement period to making sure they stay on track, and you know, we don't get to the end of the agreement period and there are still funds that have not been expended. So we take some steps to ensure that they stay timely.

MS. JEFFERSON: I do think that this falls on part of the Parks and Recreation, this Welcome Center, and that's all. I'm done.

MR. WHATLEY: Okay. The last proposal under Community Facilities is Voluntary Action Center acquisition and land for a homeless campus. They are requesting \$500,000, and right now, we are recommending \$90,300. I have rated this high,

personally, because the need is here. I was on the Affordable Housing Task Force, as well, and in just with all the partners in the community that deal with homelessness, they are starting to pool their resources together, and they are starting to make some footprints here in Columbia with a permanent facility, and even according to the survey, it is a high need, and we do need something. You know, but I do have some concerns, as well. So as I reflected on this after the last meeting, you know, we didn't really see a definitive plan as far as, you know, what possibly the building is going to look like, you know, and where it is going to be, and in regards to the location, you know, how are the residents in that area going to take to having this facility in their area. I mean, it does have to go somewhere, don't get me wrong, but I think I have a lot more questions as far as an actual plan.

MR. FLETCHER: If you look at the merits of the request specifically, there is no timeline, there is no specific location for construction, there is no details of construction, or cost. There really is no details at all other than give us some money because were going to go to good things with it, and I think overall, like you indicated as a Commission, we want to support the idea of this facility, but I think that we need more concrete information to provide funding to this.

MR. WHATLEY: So the proposal is for the acquisition of land specifically, is the correct, or is the building part of the wording of the proposal? I don't remember.

MR. ANSPACH: I don't recall right off hand.

MR. WHATLEY: Nonetheless, I guess, you know, if this funding become available in the fall of next year, 2022; right?

MR. ANSPACH: Yes.

MR. WHATLEY: And if I remember correctly, you know, there is going to be some additional funding from the City that is possibly going towards this program. I don't know if that was a definite yes or a no, so that is part of my hesitation, as well. It was part of the proposal. So maybe, if a representative from Voluntary Action Center could come up, I guess you could just give us a little quick review of -- or can you help me out?

MR. STANSBERRY: First, Ed Stansberry, Executive Director of Voluntary Action Center, and I want to express first our gratitude for your funding of the project to the extent you have. I don't think it worked in our favor to go last tonight. Anyway, just a little humor. Yeah, I think this project, as we have discussed before, was identified in the Consolidated Plan for 2020 to 2024. Specifically, \$250,000 to come out of CDBG, and so that was the impetus for us to put this in

this program. Most of you know that Voluntary Action Center volunteered to take on this project that has been a problem for the City for 25 years. So we are not sitting on a reserve of funds to be able to seed and plan and buy property, develop architectural renderings and programs that would make a more impressive presentation to this group. I understand that, but this is where we are right now, and so to your point about City funding, we were mentioned, or a homeless center was mentioned in one of the mayor's proposals at a level of a million dollars. As of pre-council last Monday night, the Council the still wrestling with public input, which some of the models that were brought to the Council Monday night were 12 to 18 months in length, some six months in length. Any of those time frames puts our folks that are most at risk at the same risk level for that extended period of time. Take RATI, for instance, who is a partner, Room At The Inn, they are going to try to respond to an RFP for \$75,000 to get them through the winter of 2020-2021. If this timeframe goes to that extent, RATI will be left in the same position for the 2022-2023. Your funding coming in the Fall of 2022 does not necessarily address that portion of the program. What I'm trying to present is a picture of where we are, the timeframe of where we are, and the financial resources that Voluntary Action and our partners have at our disposal at this time. Go ahead. Sorry.

MR. FLETCHER: Well, it sounds like what you need now is money to be able to get the project planning underway to start the process, to find a location, and getting public input, and doing all these things. This funding will come way too late for that; right? Because you need that funding now, you know, as quick as possible because you're ready to go but lack the resources.

MR. STANSBERRY: Right, but I hope there is an understanding that at the point when these funds do become available, they would certainly be of great use to this project at that point in time.

MR. FLETCHER: So, what do you need funds for, specifically, then because in reading the project proposal, again, it is just as big picture of developing this campus, and so as this Commission, if we approve some monies for you tonight, what will it be used for?

MR. STANSBERRY: Well, again, and I'm not disagreeing with any of your analysis of our proposal. Don't get me wrong, but I think that my hope is, in all truthfulness, that the \$90,300, it will be too late for land acquisition. We will have already done that. So, but having said that, I don't think it's reasonable to expect that land acquisition and construction would be completed by the Fall of next year. Now, we could get fortunate and find a building that we could retrofit that RATI, Turning Point, and Loaves and Fishes could move into fairly easily,



but I think to answer your question directly, what do we need money for now? You hit it on the head earlier. It is planning and development. We believe that our next step is to develop a program. The program will drive physical space. Physical space determines how much money is coming in. So the program has to come first. In other words, do we want a laundry? Do we want a clothing shop? Do we need showers? How many meals are we going to serve? How many people are we going to shelter? Do we want a medical clinic? All of those things have to be determined first, and what has changed all of this, we had, and I'm sorry, I could talk all night, but we had a beautiful linear plan when VAC hired Mark Palmer to be the project coordinator for this to take 12 months to plan all this out. All of a sudden, these ARPA funds become available, and we look at each other, and say, "We've got to go. The time is now. If we don't do this project now as a community, we will never do it." This is a generational opportunity to make a transformational difference in the community in a collaborative manner that is bringing together many, many agencies that we have talked to, and some are here tonight, Randy Cole being one, to make a difference. So we kind of changed our neat, little plan that we had in place because we felt like we had to react to the situation at hand. So we're going after everything we can is what it amounts to.

## NEW BUSINESS

MR. RITTER: So a lot of organizations that come to this Commission look for us to, and the City Council, to make a commitment with these funds that helps you then leverage other fund raising and other government programs if the City is committed to it. So even though these funds come available next fall, this maybe this lesser amount, certainly less than what you asked for, we know what the demand is, we know what the need is, but this still, I feel like, gives the commitment of the City with federal funds coming through this Commission and then through City Council that is very important for this community.

MR. STANSBERRY: I agree.

MR. RITTER: And you will use the money at some point. There is no doubt about that. It is just, I think the commitment, I mean, I don't know if anybody is disagreeing that we touch any of this anyways, but I am just saying I think this stays put so that we show the commitment in the community that this is important, and this is a funding source in the future.

MR. STANSBERRY: And I would add on to that, that when we can go to the community with that in our pocket, that the City is in, at least

to some degree, it does allow us to leverage that in the community, as well.

MR. WHATLEY: But I guess my question, and this may be your question, too, MR. Fletcher, but for the City, so -- and I am in favor of this, as well, I just need some things cleared up in my mind, but if we do recommend the \$90,300 for Voluntary Action Center, and when the money becomes available, you know, if they don't use it for the original intent or purpose as outlined in the proposal, are they going to lose it, and was it a waste of time?

MR. ANSPACH: It could be reallocated to another project if their intended use has changed because this is their proposal because the proposal does mention acquisition and development, future development would fit the potential, the project proposal. So as long as there is that time, then I feel confident that we are fine, but it is when we get into that area where something completely changes, that may be a situation where they come back to the Commission, explain it, and then they decide to go with that, but if, for some reason, the project did not move forward after a certain period of time, those funds could come back in front of the Commission, be reallocated to another project that is an FY '22 project, or, if it is at that point, FY '23, or so on.

MR. FLETCHER: So the City has no concerns with the proposal as it worded if we approve funds that it will be able to stay within the CDBG guidelines (cross talk) to make sure the same schedule we have with other organizations that the funding is being spent appropriately.

MR. ANSPACH: I don't have any concerns that would be the case based on what was submitted in the project proposal, that the eventual use of funds would be a CDBG-eligible activity.

MR. WHATLEY: That was my concern, so that is perfect. Any other questions?

MS. JEFFERSON: Yes, I have got a question. So, you said you felt like if we gave you this money, it would make you look good? Is that the reason why we --

MR. STANSBERRY: That is not at all what I said, no.

MS. JEFFERSON: Oh, okay. So, really -- (cross talk) -- okay, so has the City given any money?

MR. STANSBERRY: No. We are surviving on community donations at this point to keep the project alive.

MS. JEFFERSON: Well, what I think is that we should see how they do, and let them come back next year to see where they are at before we give them this amount.

MR. WILLOUGHBY: When it comes to the ARP funds, is this going to be very similar proposal that you will be submitting for those funds, or is it a different portion of this whole project that you will be submitting for those, and right now, it is preliminary, I know, because those are ARP funds haven't been fully guidelineed up.

MR. STANSBERRY: Yes, I think that is the difficulty in the ARP funds is because they haven't been fully outlined, but it would be the same basic proposal that we brought to the Commission.

MR. WHATLEY: Any other questions?

MS. SUHLER: I know the City Manager in his budget presentation the other day had an amount that he was proposing for a homeless project, and it seems like it is \$2 Million, but I could be totally wrong. I guess my concern, I assume those funds would be coming down the pike much quicker than these since they are not going to be available until next Fall, and if you have got \$2 or \$3 Million dollars from that, which you use for construction and development of it, and then these CDBG monies come along, what happens if -- can the money be used for operations at that point, or what happens if all these other plans come through and all of those expenses that were in the proposal have been covered?

MR. ANSPACH: If I heard you correctly, if the acquisition and construction was completed with other funds, and these funds were still set aside, could they be used for operational costs, and my preliminary answer would be no, we would want a different proposal for the operation because that wouldn't be consistent with the original application.

MR. CROUCH: And these funds, if we approve them tonight, those funds could then be reallocated to other projects?

MR. ANSPACH: Yes, that's correct.

MR. WILLOUGHBY: And, once again, just to make sure, these funds are three years, so, yes, they would begin to be available Fall 2022, but they have a three-year period to utilize.

MR. ANSPACH: I believe that is correct, and that is typically what we try to shoot for, but we will work within the guidelines of what HUD allows for the full spending of those funds. We will work to make sure that everything is being spent timely, but typically agreements are three years.

MS. JEFFERSON: Well, you said you are pulling from all areas. Did you say that, that you're trying to get money from different areas?

MR. STANSBERRY: Well, this will be a public-private partnership. I think the we are estimating the total cost at this point around \$5 Million. So if the City, and I'm glad to hear that. I hadn't seen that. Thank you. I will have to look closer MR. Glasscock's proposal, but we

will be approaching the County, as well. They have ARP funding, and then we will also be approaching private entities here in town to help meet that \$5 Million mark.

MS. JEFFERSON: And this 90 is not going to be, you said -- you originally said for land for the homeless camp, but you said it would be too late by next year.

MR. STANSBERRY: No. I think to MS. Suhler's point, it would be a miracle if we were done before your funds became available. I think there is a lot of work to be done between now and then, not to mention just the commercial project of this magnitude takes some period of time to complete. So, I'm sorry. I kind of lost what your question was there.

MS. JEFFERSON: Nevermind.

MR. STANSBERRY: Okay.

MR. WHATLEY: Okay. Thank you.

MR. STANSBERRY: You bet.

MR. WILLOUGHBY: Can I propose a recommendation? I see this very much like seed money in the sense of this is going to be a huge project. This is long term. This is really looking at trying to address a huge thing. I think with the allotment that's there, it is a little high in that sense, in my perspective, of kind of like how operating kind of seed money in it, our way of saying that there is a commitment here. So something that I would propose is pulling \$15,000 out of that, make it \$75,300, and then take that 15 and distribute it evenly between Central Missouri Community Action technical assistance to business, Grade A+, and Kidz Ink, so \$5,000 going to each of those three and having that for VAC being the \$75,300. We pulled funds from the Central Missouri Community Action technical assistance to put it into Grade A+ and Kidz Ink.

MR. WHATLEY: We took \$25,000. Okay, so you are -- okay --

MR. RITTER: Put money from row 13 from row 28. Isn't that what you said?

MR. ANSPACH: If I heard you --

MR. RITTER: Divide it evenly amongst three. (cross talk) --

MR. WHATLEY: Okay. So take \$15,000 from Voluntary Action Center and divide it evenly among CMCA technical assistance --

MR. WILLOUGHBY: And I offer that just in a sense of these are three programs that we know in Fall, like if these things -- these are funds that can be implemented very quickly, and not to say that the funds for VAC can't be implemented in the Fall, but this is kind of that sense of we are making a commitment here then they know there is larger, and we also know that we have a huge lump sum funds coming with ARP, and that is another opportunity of really looking at making

an even larger commitment to this project.

MR. WHATLEY: That is perfect. Thank you. So I am just going to go down the list here and ask Ross now, do you have any recommendations or anything that you like to see differently?

MR. KASMANN: No, I'm pretty good with where we are at.

MR. WHATLEY: MR. Fletcher?

MR. FLETCHER: I have no concerns.

MR. WHATLEY: I'm good with this myself. MR. Crouch?

MR. CROUCH: Agreed?

MR. WHATLEY: MS. Suhler?

MS. SUHLER: I agree.

MR. WHATLEY: MS. Jefferson?

MS. JEFFERSON: Well, I do, no doubt, coming down from zero to 45 is something. Can we just take five off of Job Point, and make it 50? So, what we would do is take 10 off of Job Point, and give them five each, and make it 50. I mean, one is 100, and I understand they don't give what they are requesting to everybody.

MR. RITTER: If there is any program that we are going to fully fund, it is the highest-rated one in the highest category of our survey in the community -- (cross talk) -- vocational training because there is a historical performance there, as well, that these other news organizations don't have with CDBG money. Not to say they don't have historical performance, but I think any commitment even at the \$45,000 level gives them the opportunity to get familiar with the City processes and federal reporting requirements -- (cross talk) --

MS. JEFFERSON: And what?

MR. FLETCHER: And potentially leverage that for outside funds, again, in the same way Voluntary Action Center mentioned. It shows a commitment by the City of their organization that gives them the opportunity to go out and sell their programming to other organizations who might get fund them (trailing off).

MR. WHATLEY: Any other thoughts, MS. Jefferson?

MS. JEFFERSON: I'm not happy with it, but I'm only one person.

MS. SUHLER: Maybe to MS. Jefferson's point, the other program, Services for Independent Living, I know it gets rated very highly, but, again, when you look at the number of people served per dollar that is spent, perhaps a little bit of funding could be pulled from it, and if I remember correctly in their proposal, they hadn't quite spent all the money from last year, and also, I think last year, we funded them at a lower level and then went back and actually coughed it up and gave them some extra because we had some. So, you know, they have been getting excess funds maybe for the last few years. So perhaps they would be one where we could take a little bit to give, and perhaps

a nice, even amount, \$50,000, for each of those groups might be a nice signal from our Commission that we do support those.

MR. WHATLEY: So are you recommending we take \$10,000 from Services for Independent Living and divide it among Grade A+ and Kidz Ink?

MS. SUHLER: It would be one possibility.

MR. WHATLEY: The services they provide for the elderly and those in need are just as great. They may not serve the numbers like Grade A+ or any other group, but I think they've always done real well with the funds we've given them, and the projects go a long way with them for the homeowners who are in the homes who are in need and couldn't manage otherwise, so. MR. Ritter, what are your thoughts, sir?

MR. RITTER: As is.

MR. WHATLEY: MR. Rose?

MR. ROSE: I am good as is, but we want to make sure that we specify on the proposals for Grade A+ and Kidz Ink what we are funding on their proposal.

MS. JEFFERSON: What are we funding?

MR. ROSE: Programming versus the property. They both have programming described in the proposals.

MS. JEFFERSON: Oh, okay, well, I'm good with that.

MR. FLETCHER: Do we actually really need to do that, or will that -

MR. ANSPACH: It will be in an agreement. Once the funds are available, it will be in an agreement that is signed that specify what those funds will be specifically used for.

MS. JEFFERSON: Could we have someone here, a representative, come back up?

MR. WHATLEY: For who?

MS. JEFFERSON: Grade A+.

MR. WHATLEY: Can Dr. Threat come back up to the podium, please?

MS. JEFFERSON: Is this workable?

DR. THREAT: Yes, we will work with every dollar, but the \$50,000 sounds better because it was just explained to me that this was across three years; right? You just get this lump sum --

MR. RITTER: You have three years to use it. You can use it day one if you have the need for it.

DR. THREAT: Right, but you just get that one lump sum?

MR. WHATLEY: You can come back next year and apply again.

MR. FLETCHER: You just three years to spend it.

DR. THREAT: We are going to use it up. We won't have a problem

with that. I'm just trying to understand.

MR. ROSE: You can come back the next cycle.

DR. THREAT: So we can join the crew that comes every year?

MR. RITTER: Yep.

DR. THREAT: All right. So we can work with it. We will be back next year.

MS. SUHLER: You can make your reservation.

DR. THREAT: Yes, thank you very much.

MR. WILLOUGHBY: MS. Suhler, just to comment to you on what you said with Services for Independent Living, and also just kind of agreeing with you, as well. It is just that I get the round that they might have had -- this Commission has given them more money before. I also think though that just hitting on the fact that this is a group within our community that isn't addressed in other programs that were funding, and so I think ensuring that we do keep this level of funding there especially because of the vulnerability that this group has, and it is not always highlighted. It is one of those underrepresented groups, even indirectly underrepresented groups, and so I think this is something that really important for us to constantly keep the light on.

MR. WHATLEY: Thank you. Okay. Overall picture, any further discussion with what we discussed tonight? (No audible response given.)

MR. ROSE: I would propose that we recommend funding for the CDBG funds as we have discussed here with our final numbers, which I can't see too well -- (cross talk) --

MR. ANSPACH: I missed on whether there was any changes to Grade A+ or Kidz Ink just now.

MR. WHATLEY: We are going to let them stand.

MR. ANSPACH: Okay. I just wanted to clarify.

MR. RITTER: That is why I think, does the motion need to indicate the recommended dollar amounts by program instead of just saying Column G on the spread sheet?

MR. ANSPACH: Yes. So what we can do is you can make a motion to approve the recommended funding levels as shown on the sheet for each of the projects. You don't have to specify each particular project. So, we want to make sure that we get this sheet correct.

MR. RITTER: Does it balance at the bottom? Scroll down and make sure that everything is where we need it to be before we make a motion.

MR. ANSPACH: You are correct.

MR. FLETCHER: Did we add any contingency for those two organizations that it would be programming?

MR. ANSPACH: It would be part of the agreement. So as long as this sheet on the recommended column is correct, you can make a motion to accept those recommendations, that would be your recommendation.

MS. JEFFERSON: This \$45,000 for after school program for Kidz Ink and \$45,000 for Youth Services, but none of it can be applied toward property; is that the understanding?

MR. ANSPACH: You are correct.

MR. WHATLEY: Programming only.

MS. JEFFERSON: Thank you.

MR. WHATLEY: A motion has been made --

MR. ROSE: Can you read through the list quickly, if you can do it real quickly because I can't see, and some of the people out here can't see.

MR. WHATLEY: Okay. I will run down the list real quick. So under Affordable Housing, Services For Independent Living, we are recommending \$95,000. City of Columbia for the HOME Rehab Program, \$50,000. City of Columbia, the HUD-mandated Fair Housing Counseling, \$3,000. Underneath Economic and Workforce Development, Job Point, we are recommending \$150,000. CMCA for technical assistance for businesses, \$35,000 - I apologize, \$55,000. Thank you. Grade A+ Youth Services, \$45,000. Kidz Ink after school program, \$45,000. Neighborhood Revitalization and Stabilization, can you scroll, thank you, City of Columbia Acquisition and Demolition Program, \$50,000. City of Columbia Code Enforcement of Target Areas, \$20,000. Diggs Meatpacking, no recommendation. Underneath Community Facilities, Columbia Housing Authority Blind Boone renovation, \$56,700. CMCA for the construction of the early childhood building, \$75,000. CCUA, \$100,000 recommended for the construction and renovation and acquisition. Voluntary Action Center for the acquisition of land, \$75,300. So that brings us to a total of \$820,000 that we are going to recommend to the City Council for these projects proposals.

MR. ROSE: That is what I propose.

MR. RITTER: Motion seconded.

MR. WHATLEY: A motion has been made. Any discussion? (No audible response.) All those in favor of accepting the Fiscal Year 2022 CDBG Funding recommendations, raise your right hand. (Unanimous vote for approval.) All those opposed, do the same sign. (No visible hands raised.) The motion carries to accept as I have just stated previously. Okay.

Attachments: [FY2022 HOME Funding Recommendations.pdf](#)



Attachments: [FY2022 CDBG Funding Recommendations.xlsx](#)

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

MR. FLETCHER: Okay. So I was mixing the process.

MR. WHATLEY: Any other comments? Any comments by the City Staff?

MR. ANSPACH: None.

MR. WHATLEY: Thank you for all that you do.

## VIII. NEXT MEETING DATE

MR. WHATLEY: The next meeting date is to be determined, so I'm sure we will receive an e-mail

invitation from Darcy, maybe, or from somebody else might.

MS. CLARK: It might be Nikki.

MR. WHATLEY: Keep in mind, I believe this coming Monday, the City of Columbia is going to require

masks in all City buildings, if I remember correctly. So next time we meet, we might be needing to wear

masks, so keep that in mind. I want to thank everybody, you know, for what you have done for this cycle. We have done a lot in a year's time, you know, more than I have ever imagined doing, and I think this year, I've learned a lot more in one year than I have in the four-and-a-half years. So I appreciate everybody, all the input, all the questions, comments, everything. It all helps us make the right decisions, I hope, we hope. So with that in mind, is there a motion to adjourn tonight's meeting?

## IX. ADJOURNMENT

MR. ROSE: Moved to adjourn.

MR. KASMANN: Second.

MR. WHATLEY: Okay. A motion has been made and seconded. All those in favor, raise your right

hand. (Unanimous vote for approval.) Those opposed, same. (No visual hands raised.) Good night, everyone. (Thereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 10:06 16 p.m.)

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