

MINUTES

COLUMBIA COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION MEETING

COLUMBIA CITY HALL, ROOM 1A

701 EAST BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MO

JUNE 21, 2017

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

**Mr. Blaine Regan
Ms. Pamela Forbes
Ms. Michelle Lambert
Mr. Michael Salanski
Mr. Paul Whatley
Ms. Diane Suhler
Mr. Michael Fletcher
Mr. Mitch Ritter**

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT

Ms. Cookie McCray

CITY STAFF

**Mr. Randy Cole
Mr. Gary Anspach
Mr. Jacob Amelunke
Ms. Leigh Kottwitz**

I.) CALL TO ORDER

MR. FLETCHER: It is 7:00 o'clock, so I would like to call the meeting to order. This is the June 21st meeting of the Columbia Community Development Commission. First off, I'd like to ask everybody please silence your cell phones, pagers, other things so we're not interrupted during the -- during the meeting.

II.) INTRODUCTIONS

MR. FLETCHER: The first order of business is introductions, so, Mitch, if you would start. I like your name tag by the way.

MR. RITTER: I'm glad we could be official tonight. Mitch Ritter, Ward 2.

MR. WHATLEY: Paul Whatley, Member-at-Large.

MS. FORBES: Pam Forbes, 1st Ward.

MS. SUHLER: Diane Suhler, Human Services Representative.

MR. COLE: Randy Cole, City Staff.

MR. FLETCHER: Mike Fletcher, Member-at-Large.

MR. REGAN: Blaine Regan, 6th Ward.

MR. SALANSKI: Michael Salanski, 5th Ward.

MS. LAMBERT: Michelle Lambert, Ward 3.

MR. AMELUNKE: Jacob Amelunke, City Staff

MR. ANSPACH: Gary Anspach, City Staff.

III.) APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MR. FLETCHER: The next item on the agenda is approval of the agenda. Does anyone have any changes they would like to see to tonight's agenda? Hearing none, we need a motion to approve the agenda.

MR. REGAN: I'll motion to approve the agenda.

MR. RITTER: Second.

MR. FLETCHER: All in favor, say aye.

(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

MR. FLETCHER: Motion carries. So we have an approved agenda.

IV.) APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- **June 7, 2017**

MR. FLETCHER: Next, we need to approve the meeting minutes from the June 7th meeting.

Does anyone have any comments or changes from the meeting minutes? Hearing none, do we have a motion to approve the minutes?

MR. WHATLEY: I motion that we approve the minutes from the June 7th meeting.

MR. REGAN: I'll second that.

MR. FLETCHER: All in favor, say aye.

(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

MR. FLETCHER: Motion carries. So tonight's meeting is going to address the 2018 HOME and Community Development Block Grant funding. It's the recommendations that we make to the City Council. The City staff has put together a report to summarize our ratings. So, Randy, I'll turn it over to you, and you can step through your report.

V.) REPORTS

MR. COLE: All right. Thanks. So we've got several new Commissioners that haven't been through this process, so I was going to talk through this and kind of what you -- go into this process and answer any questions that you have. And we can take as long as we need. So this was included in my report, so what formed the funding decisions for tonight. And these are the decisions that are basically the recommendations that go to Council that then go into the City budget for FY2018. So there's four things that I have listed. So funding percentages that are established through Council policy resolution. So I passed out -- that's the top pages I passed out of this packet, and these are the percentages of our budget that our annual funding recommendation should fall within. And these are tied to the costs of goals -- per unit costs per goals.

MR. FLETCHER: Can I interrupt you for a second?

MR. COLE: Yeah.

MR. FLETCHER: Does everybody have a copy of this? Do you provide it to -- to the folks -- the other folks in the room or only to the Commission?

MR. COLE: This is actually copies of the presentation --

MR. FLETCHER: Okay.

MR. COLE: -- that we make available online.

MR. FLETCHER: All right.

MR. COLE: So these are the specific slides that are right off of here. So, no, I didn't print copies of my slides for everyone.

MR. FLETCHER: But they're -- but --

MR. COLE: But --

MR. FLETCHER: -- we're going to step through all those.

MR. COLE: Yeah. They're on here.

MR. FLETCHER: Okay.

MR. COLE: And this presentation will be available online. So the Council policy resolution is what establishes how -- how we use -- or how much we fund per category that are then tied to actual costs of goals that are part of our five-year plan. So we have goals -- how many homes we're going to rehab; how many houses we're going to build; how many sidewalks; bus shelters. And then there is an estimated cost. So that's -- that's how we can make sure we're not putting in too many goals that we can't fund, but then we can also see the full picture and prioritize how much we want to do per funding percentage. And these are in our five-year plan. Also, we do a Community Needs Survey every year. We did one with our five-year Consolidated Plan, along with focus groups, and a very robust public input process, where I think if I remember correctly, we had 230 unique individuals attend either our neighborhood congress or focus group, and we also did a survey then. But for this year we -- we updated that survey and we got the most responses we've ever received since I've been here or that I could find on record. We got 362. We were shooting for 200, so it's good. The survey should be a really good tool to kind of add into the mix. And then also, fourth, we use Commissioner ratings of proposals. So, yeah, we have five-year goals, annual objectives, we have surveys of what the needs are from the community or the responses from the community, but then we also have strengths of each individual proposal that -- that go into the decision as well. So each of these things should inform how you come to your conclusions of what we're going to fund. I'd like to stress that for me, personally, I don't think there's really a right or wrong decision to make tonight. I think the goal is to make a thoughtful and informed decision. All the -- all the agencies that submitted proposals have very important causes and certain needs in our community, so it's just a matter of finding how we prioritize our scarce resources. You know, we had close to \$1.7 million in requests and only \$835,000 available in CDBG, so, I mean, several proposals aren't going to get funded, and just about everybody is going to feel some kind of cut just to make the math work. So the draft recommendations that I put together that are in the report are not necessarily how I would -- if I just did this on my own and put together what I think should be recommended. These are an interpretation of what your ratings were, and then the funding percentages kind of fitting within all those boxes. There's many different ways you could do it, so this is the CDC's recommendations -- the document that I put together should be changed and it should be amended. You guys should discuss it and see if you want to move, you know, money which way, whatever, to whatever priority. You should make it your own. That's just to get the -- the discussion started. We typically have it up and just go line by line, but however our Chairperson wants to do it. So again, these are the funding percentages, which is the top page. These are our one-year goals. I didn't print that out and include

it, but I know everybody has seen these. Also, this is what we've expended per funding category -- or not expended, but budgeted through 2017. So we haven't expended any of our 2017 funds because we haven't received any of our 2017 funds. So I felt it's better to look at what have we allocated, just because there is so far a lag of time between when Congress actually approves the budget and we get funding. So you can say we're a little ahead on Affordable Housing, what we've budgeted, a little lower on Economic Development, but honestly in each of these categories, we're not funding all the needs that are there anyways. So not to minimize our prioritization of all these goals, but I would take it all -- the whole thing with a grain of salt and think about the big picture of all the different inputs and what we're doing. So these are the survey results. There were some -- a few changes this year. Vocational Training typically goes -- or gets rated high, as well as Community Facilities. The Preservation of Existing Housing was up a little higher this year. Our Sidewalks typically score well. The Micro-lending has been trending downward. And our Demolition Program was lower than normal as well. But that's -- that's the survey data. Hopefully, everybody has had a chance to look at that. I've printed it out so you have it in front of you as you guys are discussing. This is the average Commissioner rating per proposal ranked top to bottom. So Bryant Walkway is at the very top and Family Health Center was at the very bottom. And you, I'm sure, have looked at this and can see who -- who all is in-between. So I -- I heavily weighted the spreadsheet that I put together on your all's scoring. So this is the actual spreadsheet, and again, make this your own. I am not emotionally tied to the document that I -- that I have in the report. That is to get the discussion started. The idea is for you all to make it your own. So that's my report, and I can answer any questions. Could I touch on one more thing?

MR. FLETCHER: Sure.

MR. COLE: There's a couple other compliance issues that we have to keep in mind as well. One is a thing called public services. HUD classifies -- and a good way to think about public services of how HUD defines it is like non-hard costs, like building a building or rehabbing a house. It -- it's our Homebuyer Training, our Fair Housing counseling, and as well as our Vocational Training is considered a public service according to HUD regulations. So we can't go over 15 percent per year, so I have those three items figured into this. So we have to be mindful of that, like if you wanted to bump up Vocational training, we would have to maybe reduce one of our other public -- public services items. And I can help you figure that out.

MR. FLETCHER: Any-- any other questions, anybody? Thank you, Randy. So I guess we'll jump right into the funding recommendations. I would like to first say that for the purposes -- so we have to approve the funding recommendations by vote. So when we come to a consensus on -- you know, we'll need a motion to approve and go through the votes. The other thing I would like, Pam, if you would, would you please -- I'm going to do it by show of hands and ask that we document every Commissioners vote by name, if we can do that, please. Okay.

MS. FORBES: Yes.

VI.) SPECIAL ITEMS

MR. FLETCHER: So I would like to start out with the HOME funding. I think that's going to be an easier decision for us because the requests were reasonably close to the funding that's available. So Randy has made some recommendations as a starting point for discussions, so I'd just open it up to the Commission for recommendations and comments. I guess I have one question. You mean, for -- for Administration, you've given yourself the maximum of 10 percent while other folks have received cuts.

MR. COLE: Uh-huh.

MR. FLETCHER: We can cut your budget as well. Correct?

MR. COLE: We would likely go to Council with a recommendation different than yours, if that were the case. Not likely, we would. So these -- these projects that are proposed for us typically aren't admin from other agencies, they are project-based. So like Habitat's building out a subdivision, it's -- CMCA is redoing a parking lot. So they're not putting in funds for their HR or their director, things like that or administering these programs. These are project-based. So we have costs associated with managing projects, grant management and all those sorts of things, and that's where that -- that funding goes towards. So if it were reduced, we would have to cut one of us in the room.

MR. FLETCHER: So you're saying that 10 percent is a -- that's a bottom line for you?

MR. COLE: Yeah. We would need it to -- to operate.

MR. FLETCHER: Okay.

MR. REGAN: I guess I'll jump right in --

MR. FLETCHER: Okay.

MR. REGAN: -- and make a comment. The Bryant Walkway was the highest rated Commissioner rating, so obviously I do believe that should be fully funded, and with only a mere difference in close to \$8,000 in request, I mean, we could kind of look at the difference. I mean, it's pretty well balanced as is. Everyone is pretty much near max request, so unless we want to shift money up to Show-Me Central Habitat for Humanity and shift between that and Homeowner Assistance Programs, I mean, that's really the biggest debate we have right now is how we want to cut that \$8,000, roughly. So that's just my comments to start us off.

MR. FLETCHER: Yeah. I mean, right now with this recommendation, you know, they are listed in the order that the Commission rated the proposals. The CHDO set aside is fixed at a minimum, so it has to be 15 percent, and Randy has indicated the Admin at 10 percent is pretty much the fixed dollar amount. So there's not a lot of discussion, other than the three funding choices. And it looks like all of those -- you know, since the Bryant Walkway was listed as the highest rated, to cut its funds I think would be inappropriate because the Commission saw that as the most viable of the proposals. So I feel pretty comfortable with their recommendation and what's been proposed. Anybody else?

MR. SALANSKI: Michael Salanski, 5th Ward. I don't disagree. I would agree with the City staff and Randy Cole that the two bottom lines, CHDO and the Administration are fixed.

Although we could tinker with the Administration, I don't disagree that those should be considered fixed. In addition to that, I would like to -- not to sound redundant, but the top three are in order as the Commissioners saw fit, and based on the percentage of funding as opposed to that left over to not be funded, I think it still speaks accordingly. I would -- I don't want to be premature, but I would go ahead and -- because I think there is going to be some discussion on the other side of this. I would move to a motion to go ahead and approve the HOME funding as determined by Randy Cole and City staff, again, with the basis of the Commissioners and how things were rated. I think there will be more discussion on the CDBG funding.

MS. FORBES: So you have made the motion?

MR. SALANSKI: Yes. Michael Salanski, 5th Ward. I make a motion to approve Randy Cole and City staff's allocation of HOME funding.

MS. FORBES: I'll second it.

MR. FLETCHER: Okay. So we'll take a vote, and I would like to see a show of hands, please. And hold them up long enough so Pam can keep track. So all in favor of the proposal to accept the HOME funds recommendation as documented in the --

MR. SALANSKI: Not to interrupt, but from a recording standpoint, should we also say -- state your name, along with raising our hand and calling the aye roll?

MS. FORBES: This -- this form has a --

MR. FLETCHER: It's got their names --

MS. FORBES: -- box under everybody's --

MR. SALANSKI: That would be fantastic. Perfect.

MS. FORBES: -- name, so I can --

MR. SALANSKI: Thanks.

MR. FLETCHER: All right. All in favor?

MS. FORBES: Even has one for abstain.

MR. FLETCHER: All in favor?

MS. FORBES: So is this unanimous?

MR. FLETCHER: Yes.

MS. FORBES: Yes.

(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

MS. FORBES: Okay. Thank you.

MR. FLETCHER: The motion is approved. So next is the discussion for the Community Development Block Grant. And again, we have recommendations that are based on our ratings. I think for me the -- I was surprised that overall the Commission rated Family Health Center renovations the lowest because I felt like personally that that was a good -- a good proposal. That was a strong -- strong proposal. I'm not sure why -- why other Commission members were adverse

to that, but we funded them before, and that's an important City -- City function that they provide. So for what that is worth as a comment from me.

MR. SALANSKI: I don't disagree the importance; however, what went into my determining based upon the proposal that all of the Commissioners heard, some of the speed bumps that were hard for me to overcome were the costs as it pertains to the repainting of interior walls -- two basic coats, eggshell finish. I appreciated Randy at the last -- two weeks ago's meeting sharing with us back in 2011, if I can recall correctly, that the pricing was around \$35,000; whereas, come present, it's \$42,800. So, of course, labor and materials, so on and so forth, naturally, we would expect them to up it; however, I think we overpaid then in 2011, and I think we would be overpaying now in 2017. The other thing that concerned me was that was 63 percent of what they in total asked for from the Commission being the grand total of \$67,944. Their survey that they proposed to their own clientele base had the interior lobby, the finishing of the door in which they still choose to not make compliant from a wheelchair accessibility standpoint is on the higher end and this being on -- the aesthetics piece being on the lower end, which also concerned me. So I was not in favor particularly for those reasons in supporting allocating funds to them.

MR. FLETCHER: Any other -- any other comments?

MR. REGAN: I do have a couple comments. I actually agree with you. I was kind of surprised it was the lowest ranked one. I understand the painting. I don't think we should allocate that much money for a repaint. I do agree with you on that. However, in healthcare, patient satisfaction scores are a big part of -- or about to become a big part of the way you get paid. And their biggest flaws in their patient satisfaction are handicap accessibility and their front lobby. So long term it is going to affect probably more if they don't fix any of this because lower patient satisfaction, you get paid less through Medicare. So while I completely agree that the painting probably doesn't need to be done, and given the other projects we have we should not allocate that much money, but I really think we should look at supporting either one or maybe two handicap accessible doors. They had that third door that was very narrow, which to me is very pointless to have a handicap accessible door that a wheelchair can't get through per se. I know they made the pitch of being able to walk through with ease with a stroller, but I really think we need to consider at least putting enough money for one, if not two, handicap accessible doors. And if you look at the Community Development Needs Survey results, construction, expansion, renovation of Community's facilities --

MR. FLETCHER: Is very high.

MR. REGAN: -- is the highest one. And we're kind of ignoring that the way we have it as now.

MR. COLE: One thing with that survey data to consider -- just to take into consideration is we get a lot of responses from local organizations, so certainly that would rate high. Just something to -- something to consider.

MR. SALANSKI: The only thing I would note, I suppose, and then I will kind of yield -- yield my time a little bit, but is getting back to the aesthetics piece being on the higher end of the patient

satisfaction survey. I don't disagree with the lobby being a factor. However, if I recall correctly, during the gentleman's presentation, it was the lobby floor that needed the most renovation --

MR. REGAN: Uh-huh.

MR. SALANSKI: -- as opposed to the aesthetics of the paint and that interior. The other thing that I would note for the Commissioners to consider between the two viewpoints is the total square footage space, if I recall correctly, was right around 22,000-square feet, if not a little bit more, where if we recall seeing the plan, that lobby was a rather smaller portion of that overall 22,000-square feet. So again, for something that took two-thirds of their asking, the lobby being the predominant focus on what they would prefer their clients to -- to dress up a little bit, that is a small portion of what ultimately we would be choosing to fund based upon they can't just paint the lobby -- or we would choose that they would wait and just paint the lobby.

MR. FLETCHER: One of the tools that we do have for funding is that we can, you know, give them partial funding and also target it, I believe, to, you know -- so we're not going to give them full funding, but we can give them less and target to specific pieces of their proposal too. So we could have given them --

MR. SALANSKI: If that's the case, I would be open to consider as you mentioned, Blaine, the third smaller door, if anything at all. But even at that point, I -- I do have a little bit -- I feel like perhaps they should have reallocated their -- ask better to support that door being more so compliant. Again, I would make the argument based upon the clientele base that services that facility. It would behoove those clients more so to be able to access a door appropriately as opposed to aesthetically appreciate the walls around them, is my opinion.

MR. REGAN: At the meeting a couple of weeks ago, I think they ranked their priorities on what they would want funded. One was their chair coverings, which is questionable. Two was the automatic door, so they did prioritize that. Repainting was number four, and that was the biggest hunk.

MR. SALANSKI: Okay.

MR. REGAN: And I completely agree the painting should not be considered at this point.

MR. SALANSKI: Well, and that was -- and not to interrupt --

MR. REGAN: Uh-huh.

MR. SALANSKI: -- but that was a flaw, I think in their prioritization. I think money talks, and I think if they were to prioritize, as you just outlined, appropriately, then all of the -- the 63 percent of what they're asking for shouldn't have been based upon their lower tiered prioritization.

MR. REGAN: I think that's just -- it's doing cost though.

MR. SALANSKI: Sure. I understand.

MR. REGAN: And I think they were -- I mean, I'm pretty sure in their proposal they wanted to paint the entire facility and not just the lobby. They were kind of gunning for it all rather than focus on the front lobby painting per se, and they were going for the whole -- figured do it all once and probably

cuts down on costs. I'm completely okay with not funding repainting. I don't think it's a priority for all the other things. I do think handicap doors are a big part of patient satisfaction, and I think it would do them really well if we allocated money just for one or two handicap door entrances. Is that specific cost in their proposal?

MR. RITTER: It's 4,200 for all of them.

MR. REGAN: For all of them?

MR. RITTER: Yeah.

MR. FLETCHER: What's the input from other Commissioners? I mean, did -- did -- was your perception that the costs were too high, so overall you gave it a lower rating or do you just believe the need, you know, overall is just something that we shouldn't fund because we have higher needs on some of the other proposals?

MS. LAMBERT: I will say that I thought the cost was appropriate. I mean, my brother-in-law is a painter, so I didn't think the cost was, like, outrageous considering the square footage of the building. It's just that considering how low a priority they ranked it on their own proposal and then based on the rest of the funds that we had available for other projects that would actually put people in homes, I mean, that's -- it was hard to justify. And especially since painting -- you know, you can buy 40 bucks of paint and do that piecemeal over, you know, several months. So just touch up rooms as needed versus, you know -- putting in two handicap doors, I felt like was way more important, especially for a health facility. So it's not that I don't agree they could probably use some paint, and I thought it was a perfectly fine quote, but there are just other things that needed to be funded more.

MS. SUHLER: I would agree with that. I think probably the lower rating reflected the painting and the perception of it as a cost and that if we do pull the proposal apart, the doors are definitely something that are very needed. And even, I would think, the flooring, you know, just in terms of going into that building, there are some real problems with the flooring. And I think flooring and doors might be a possibility as far as funding at least part of that proposal.

MR. SALANSKI: The question I have, and maybe this is still out for some better understanding on my part, if I -- the proposal that he made was to -- to make the -- was it all doors automatic or just the --

MR. RITTER: Yeah.

MR. SALANSKI: Okay. So if I'm understanding the rest of the Commissioners correctly, we would be essentially the one that could change their proposal in that we would make the third door -- ask that they make the third door wheelchair compliant, which is, in theory, what they didn't propose to begin with.

MS. LAMBERT: Not necessarily.

MR. FLETCHER: Yeah. We can't -- we cannot --

MR. SALANSKI: Yeah. That's my -- that's my point.

MR. FLETCHER: -- dictate that.

MR. SALANSKI: That's my point is that they asked to make the doors just automatic --

MR. RITTER: Uh-huh.

MR. SALANSKI: -- which I think our biggest focal point that we would agree with is the irrelevancy of the automatic when you have individuals that won't be able to access and go through the door.

MR. FLETCHER: Well, I didn't -- I didn't mean to derail the whole Commission on that. I just -- it was just a general comment on my part that they rated very low and I -- I was surprised. So I think, you know, we've had a good -- good discussion, but maybe we can move on at this point.

MR. REGAN: I would like to visit the handicap door thing --

MR. FLETCHER: Okay. We can --

MR. REGAN: -- to consider putting money towards it because that was actually one of my big things looking all this over before --

MR. FLETCHER: Okay.

MR. REGAN: -- I wanted to address that. And I think that's the biggest -- I think that's -- I think we all agree that that's the most important part from the Family Health Center is the handicap doors. We don't have to fund all three to be automatic. We could put money towards the two doors that could be wheelchair accessible. I think the third door that's narrow, it would be kind of pointless to be automatic. But at a healthcare facility, I think that would improve their accessibility to everyone and I think it's very important. So I think we should really consider allocating money just towards two automatic door setups for them. And I think Mitch recalled it was \$4,200 for all three, which isn't a whole lot of money. I mean, yes, we're pinching pennies, but I would fully support -- I mean, if we had to do all three, I'd rather do all three than none, but I would really like to focus on funding them for two of the automatic doors.

MR. SALANSKI: But suppose -- I would then propose to the other Commissioners --

MR. FLETCHER: Forty-two hundred dollars was for the automatic door openers.

MR. COLE: I don't think it specified how many.

MR. FLETCHER: I don't see a number there --

MR. COLE: That's another issue.

MR. FLETCHER: -- that specifically -- it does -- there is a discussion here. Let me go back up. It just says there's two sets of these doors. There are three sets of doors in which a patient must navigate. At present, only two of these doors -- so it looks like that's for one door.

MR. COLE: I don't think it's clear.

MR. SALANSKI: Do we then have a consideration -- again, just trying to be cognizant of the math. We would be adding -- we would be altering the proposed outline from -- and more or less funding it and say \$8,400 to \$12,600 more so, and kind of make that one line item known, where would we -- what we deem less important, I suppose?

MR. REGAN: I think we would move on to others because we can go ahead and put it on there, and I do believe it shows that when Randy changes on the Excel, it shows that we're over.

MR. FLETCHER: Right. So you can pull up the Excel spreadsheet, and we can --

MR. REGAN: Uh-huh.

MR. FLETCHER: So we have that flexibility as he puts it up there as we add and subtract to see where we're at.

MR. RITTER: Well, read how that's worded.

MR. WHATLEY: So this -- this \$4,200 is just for one door.

MR. FLETCHER: It's hard --

MR. RITTER: It's for the third door.

MR. WHATLEY: It's for the third door, not for all three. Two of the three doors are already --

MR. RITTER: Automatic.

MR. WHATLEY: -- automatic. So we're funding the third door here.

MR. FLETCHER: Can we ask the individual? Is he here?

MR. COLE: He's not here. He called in. I encouraged him to come, but I think they had an event going on. You know, you might --

MR. FLETCHER: Well --

MR. COLE: -- want to look at all these.

MR. WHATLEY: -- I think \$4,200 is --

MR. SALANSKI: That's -- that's what I was under the impression of --

MR. FLETCHER: Right. But there's --

MR. COLE: Because there's all these --

MR. FLETCHER: So --

MR. SALANSKI: -- was it was just the one door that was not automatic, they wanted that to be uniform throughout the facility and have all automatic doors. And at the proposal two weeks ago, the reason why there was some push back from some of the Commissioners, including myself, was we wanted to allocate money to a door that wasn't --

MR. FLETCHER: Okay. Well --

MR. SALANSKI: -- compliant.

MR. FLETCHER: -- have -- we have a Commissioner that has made a recommendation to put \$4,200 in for this project, so we can go ahead and -- let's put that in the spreadsheet. This is just a draft -- a working draft.

MR. COLE: Okay.

MR. FLETCHER: And so let's -- let's add that and continue discussion then.

MR. COLE: Yeah. And then pull it down from here?

MR. FLETCHER: So your question is what do we have to remove it from?

MR. COLE: It would be from this one.

MR. RITTER: It doesn't have to be. It can be from anything.

MR. COLE: Oh, yeah. I guess it could be from any of them.

MR. FLETCHER: Right.

MR. REGAN: I would leave it as it is right now, and let's make it a note as -- that as of right now, we are at \$4,200 over.

MR. RITTER: Well, he's got a cell that kind of keeps track of it.

MR. COLE: Yeah. Down here it's -- yeah. So we've got to pull it from somewhere else.

MR. REGAN: Then I'd say let's start from the top and just kind of work our way down.

MR. COLE: So do you want to take the \$4,200 off and do that or leave it there and then do that because you might want to look at --

MR. FLETCHER: Well, just --

MR. COLE: -- all of these.

MR. REGAN: Yeah.

MR. FLETCHER: Right. We are -- so let's go -- let's just start at the top for Services for Independent Living. So let's go back. Last year, they were funded for how much? So this is an increase over last year's request. They -- they were rated the highest out of the CDBG fund.

MR. COLE: I didn't really include last year's presentation, but I can look it up if it's important.

MR. FLETCHER: Well, in a -- in a year when we're so competitive, where they are asking for an increase --

MR. COLE: Yeah. I can -- I can look it up.

MR. FLETCHER: So that's why I'm asking for that information.

MR. COLE: They had \$105,200, and they requested \$108,000 last year.

MR. FLETCHER: So basically they're getting level funding at this rate -- at the proposed rate.

MR. COLE: Correct. Yeah.

MR. FLETCHER: The second highest rated proposal was from Job Point for the Vocational Training.

MR. COLE: Yeah. It was a tie between Job Point and City Rehab and City Homeownership Assistance, if I remember correctly. Yeah.

MR. RITTER: Is there any particular difference between the HOME -- the HOME funded Homeownership Assistance and the CDBG funded --

MR. COLE: There is.

MR. RITTER: -- Homeownership Assistance?

MR. COLE: There is. So the CDBG portion goes towards purchasing all of our books, education materials, and then --

MR. RITTER: That's right. That's the training materials.

MR. COLE: The training --

MR. RITTER: And then the HOME side is the actual Downpayment Assistance.

MR. COLE: And then for the actual trainer that's doing the training.

MR. FLETCHER: So it falls into the services chunk?

MR. COLE: Yeah.

MR. REGAN: One comment I would make about the -- the top part in the Housing, we had the NRT Enforcement ranked pretty low. It was our third lowest.

MR. FLETCHER: And yet it's --

MR. COLE: We could pull the \$4,200 out of there.

MR. FLETCHER: It's close --

MR. SALANSKI: I'd actually second Blaine's opinion. Again, based on the previous proposal, one of the issues that I had mentioned was the NRT Code Enforcement, of course, was in part salary in addition to kind of hidden benefit costs, meaning this is a person on payroll, health benefits, retirement benefits, if I understood correctly. I mean, it had to do with paying them to do their job as they saw fit. I had noted that the City of Columbia specifically within the Boone County region, that the average individual made \$42,000 -- around \$40,000 a year. Although the \$70,000 in which they were saying made up this particular position didn't mean that was totally their -- their take home payroll, it did concern me that -- with how much we were choosing to allocate. So I thought, if anything, we could play around with that number among the other things to consider.

MR. COLE: Would it be all right if I reduced it by the \$4,200? So that gets that back even for now.

MR. FLETCHER: Input from other Commissioners? Paul, what's your opinion?

MR. WHATLEY: So the \$30,000 that -- that's recommended here, that's just offsetting what the City is going to pay this individual. Correct?

MR. COLE: Uh-huh.

MR. WHATLEY: And any income that's -- that's generated based on citations or fees or anything, how -- how does that work?

MR. COLE: Leigh could probably tell you that.

MR. WHATLEY: Yes. I guess maybe if I could get some --

MR. COLE: Yeah.

MS. KOTTWITZ: Sure. I'll -- if I can speak to that. Leigh Kottwitz, Neighborhood Services Manager. And there is not any offset through any kind of fines that would go through Municipal Court. That is actually collected by Municipal Court, and it's separate from any income that we would receive. So the -- the funding for this position actually offsets any general fund expense the City would have. So if this would be cut, any salary -- right now, you're essentially funding half of a full-time position. So we'd have to go back and adjust the City budget in some way. Of course, the City's general fund is pretty tight, so I don't know if there is another source for those funds. This particular inspector also would work Rental Code Enforcement. We do have an income stream for that. And so that offsets the -- the rest of that person's position.

MR. SALANSKI: And to that was this -- did you just say -- was this a part-time position or a full-time position?

MS. KOTTWITZ: It's a full-time. The staff are all full-time, and this is part of their function.

MR. SALANSKI: The -- the only thing that I would -- I would perhaps consider, and I know Randy had mentioned this was lower -- this was rated lower this time around than last time, but perhaps there is maybe some consensus around that. I think that the Commissioners also rated the Demolition and Acquisition Programs to be a little bit less favorable. So perhaps if we want to be more cognizant of an individual's salary and pull that from something else, I think we should probably consider that something else to be the Demolition and Acquisition Program or maybe split the difference, perhaps, if we again -- again view to be -- the door per that particular proposal to be that much more deserving than splitting hairs in the Housing Section.

MS. SUHLER: I had a couple of thoughts on this whole area of Housing. First of all it's funded at 40 percent, and when you look at where funds are already allocated, it's actually above that 40 percent level in terms of overall spending. So I think it's had a lot of allocation in the past. Secondly, if we were to cut anything within the Housing, my thought would be to cut Services for Independent Living because if you look at 2016, they had a -- they spent \$90,000, and they improved 33 homes. And their allocation was based on 40 homes that they were going to renovate in some way. But -- but they had no definite proposals whatsoever. So it isn't like they say we already have these 40 homes, this is what we have to do, this is how much we're going to spend. So it was much more of a ballpark figure. This is our number that was pulled out of the air. So I think that's a much more flexible fluid place to take the funds from as opposed to some of these other programs, and I would not be for one to cut somebody's salary or to look at maybe losing a staff position at all.

MS. LAMBERT: I agree with Diane on that point. I don't really feel comfortable cutting somebody's salary that's a City member, and, you know, \$42,000 [sic] in the Services for Independent Living is probably just one project. I mean, while I do think that's an important cause keeping people in their homes, but, I mean, if they don't even have any proposal, then maybe, you know, I don't know, keeping somebody in their job might -- you know, tangibly right now keeping in their job versus maybe keeping somebody in their home.

MR. FLETCHER: Well, in an interesting way, it kind of serves the similar function in that one of their major roles is for handicap access in the home, and in a sense, we're providing that same handicap access, but in the Community Health Center. So it's kind of still serving that same population in a different way, maybe in the -- in this community facility it would benefit more people in that regard. Mitch, what's your opinion.

MR. RITTER: I agree with NRT Code Enforcement staying at 30-. It's always a \$5,000 cut from the request. That position has been around for years, and we get documented results of enforcements and citations year over year. So I would be hesitant to cut that any more. And the Demolition, even though it scored lowest in that category, it's still kind of a good average score over

40, and once again, that -- that's really the only program with City funding to get rid of dilapidated houses in these neighborhoods. We're trying to either move lots into land trusts or move lots into re-improvement and redevelopment, so I hate to even see that cut. You know, at \$30,000 versus the request of \$90,000, but these are the times we're in with the allocated funds to us. So everybody has got to take a cut somewhere, so I think I agree with SIL coming down by the \$4,200 to fund that door at the Health Center.

MR. FLETCHER: All right.

MR. RITTER: So that's where we're at as of now.

MR. FLETCHER: Thank you. I think that's good input. Let's make that change, Randy.

MR. COLE: You've got it.

MR. FLETCHER: Good.

MR. COLE: It balances.

MR. RITTER: Well, and that's why I also asked for clarification on the Homeownership Assistance. I need -- I think we all needed the clarification that that is for the training materials, which that is a requirement to even get the Homeownership Assistance from the HOME program. So the City's willingness to take the \$2,000 hit there and hit in the other areas for Demolition and Code Enforcement, I think -- and I think also taking the \$5,000 from SIL is responsible as well.

MS. SUHLER: This may not be a relevant question, but, like, some of the large cuts to the Demolition and Acquisition program, is that going to have implications for people's jobs -- City jobs or are these contract workers?

MR. COLE: No. So we use that to purchase and demolish vacant and dilapidated homes. So we do have approved contractors on our list that --

MS. SUHLER: Okay.

MR. COLE: -- you know, they get a financial benefit of doing those, but in terms of City staff, no. It will just limit how many homes we can -- we can go do that with.

MS. SUHLER: Thank you.

MR. COLE: Yeah.

MR. FLETCHER: Is the -- what is it -- the Land Bank effort, is that going to be --

MR. COLE: Community Land Trust.

MR. FLETCHER: Yeah, the Land Trust. Is that going to be impacted by cuts in this area? I mean --

MR. COLE: Certainly if --

MR. FLETCHER: -- have we postulated a certain number of vacant lots to be available based on projected funding that's going to impact that?

MR. COLE: So, yeah, usually that cut there would take away two homes that we could certainly get and put in the Land Trust. We've requested the 90- and tied that to three -- doing three

homes, which would include the purchase, demolition, all the environmental review costs, everything with it, so yeah.

MR. FLETCHER: So we're just reducing it by one then, essentially?

MR. COLE: Actually, by two.

MR. FLETCHER: Two.

MR. COLE: We would be reducing by two.

MR. RITTER: And that's for a full acquisition and demolition?

MR. COLE: Yeah.

MR. RITTER: I think the demolitions were anywhere from \$10,000 to \$14,000.

MR. COLE: Yeah. That's for the -- everything.

MR. RITTER: And that's if you acquire the lot, plus the demo, would be \$30,000 --

MR. COLE: Doing the demo, getting an environmental -- Phase I --

MR. RITTER: -- or so.

MR. COLE: -- Environmental Site Assessment, getting an asbestos contractor, and everything. There's several costs involved.

MS. SUHLER: And kind of being new to this, can you explain the Land Trust?

MR. COLE: The Community Land Trust. It's -- it's a local -- an initiative of our Council -- City Council that I've been working on for the last three years. So we have a -- a new separate 501(c)(3) -- and I could probably talk about it for an hour or so. It -- I'm pretty excited about it. So it's going to be an organization that will protect the affordability and quality of our investments in an affordable initially owner-occupied housing, so like the houses on Lynn, it will own the land beneath the homes and we'll sell just the homes, which will allow us to sell it at a reduced cost. And then make sure that when they resell it, that it sells to an affordable -- at an affordable rate to a -- to an income-eligible buyer. So basically it means that we'll have an affordable housing unit beyond our lifetime. So the Land Trust's main goal is to be the stewards of those properties. We have an event coming up August 10th and 11th too about all of our efforts.

MR. FLETCHER: So are there any other comments under Housing? Does everybody feel reasonably comfortable with the Housing?

MR. SALANSKI: I would actually say I agree with Diane. I think I alter my position after hearing the other Commissioners speak, specifically with it being a City staff position on the NRT Code Enforcement. Again, I think I had overlooked the fact that they had already lessened their funding recommendation by \$5,000 from what was originally requested. I think Diane made a great point and I wouldn't disagree. I think if we were to consider the door and see that as valid and get some consensus around that, I think taking the \$4,200 from -- from that SIL project would be -- would be ideal.

MR. FLETCHER: All right. Let's move to Neighborhood Needs.

MS. LAMBERT: I thought this one was pretty well funded as far as how you have it and what we've got. I think the sidewalks are really important. I used to bike through that area all the time to go to work when I used to live over there and there were always people in the road because there's no sidewalks. So I think that's a really important need there.

MR. RITTER: And we don't know what portion of the sidewalk project that that \$80,000 will be allocated towards or is -- does it just go into the pot and --

MR. COLE: They're going to start on Lynn and work their way around. So, yeah, they may be able to make up the difference if -- if, you know, we get a good bid or if they have some other sidewalks projects that they can move money from.

MR. RITTER: They'll just make it as far as they can with the CDBG money.

MR. COLE: Yeah.

MR. RITTER: And what portion -- yeah, the Habitat for Humanity proposal was split between HOME and CDBG. Was it the HOME funds that were going to land bank the two lots?

MR. COLE: Yeah. Yeah.

MR. RITTER: And then the CDBG is for the development?

MR. COLE: Yeah. So those HOME funds should be able to fund two of their properties that they're doing, and we would get those into the Community Land Trust. So that's something nice where those are properties we didn't have to go remove a vacant dilapidated home, so if that -- it helps meet that need also.

MR. RITTER: And as with prior Habitat for Humanity projects, I assume if any is appropriate? It wasn't an all or nothing proposal.

MR. COLE: Knowing Habitat, I didn't take it that way, but Bill -- I see Bill here tonight if you wanted to ask him.

MR. VIEW: I didn't hear the question, I'm sorry.

MR. RITTER: Is this an all or nothing proposal or is a partial funding adequate?

MR. FLETCHER: I think we asked the --

MS. LAMBERT: Yeah. I think he said anything that we could give him, I thought.

MR. VIEW: Well, I mean, we've got a chance to build -- sorry. Bill View, Habitat for Humanity. You know, this is -- we feel like this is a great opportunity for us to put up 125 homes, build them all at once for low income in Columbia, and so, you know, there's not very many opportunities to get that done. Usually, we buy one lot at a time or two and they have so many restrictions. Can we do it all at once without all the funds? No. Obviously, we will have to do phases; otherwise -- so, you know, we might -- if all of our funding doesn't come through, then we will have to do -- we will take whatever money we have and build whatever we can build. So if we can build, you know, the street entrances and things and meet those initial hard costs and build ten home lots, then that's what we will do. If we can build 40, we'll build 40. And we would like to build them all, but you guys have lots of problems

with spreading money around that you don't have, so I understand all those things. But I want it just as badly as everybody does -- Habitat does.

MR. RITTER: Yeah. Thank you --

MR. VIEW: Did that answer --

MR. RITTER: -- for the clarification.

MR. VIEW: Yeah.

MR. RITTER: I figured that was the answer.

MR. VIEW: Yeah.

MR. RITTER: I just wanted to make sure.

MR. SALANSKI: I would just note, I don't disagree. I think having the ability to have 125 homes or thereabouts is -- is ultimately a large piece as to what we're trying to do in general. The fact that -- if I recall Bill's presentation, it was \$115,000 per house which one would come to, and I liked the idea of the fact based upon the other homes within the area that property value would be going up, not down, which I would say is a positive direction. I guess the only thing that I would have liked more -- more of an understanding or better clarification, and I apologize if I didn't ask this, but perhaps one of the other Commissioners heard more correctly. If I recall correctly, I think Bill and Habitat had quite the angel investor. I don't recall if that was contingent upon how well CDBG allocated its funds as to how well he or she or the business, if I recall correctly, would then pony up or if they would more or less pick up the slack from if the CDBG would -- would be kind of slacking in what they allocated. So does any other Commissioner recall if that angel investor, as I call it was going to go to bat regardless and pick up the slack if, you know -- again, not trying to shift costs to an individual that perhaps might be well endowed or a business that might be well endowed and willing, but again, we are dealing with rather limited resources. I would have liked to see -- not to add controversy to all of this, but I would have liked to see even more funds allocated to the CMCA project, and I actually had a notation that based on how much we allocated from HOME funds to the Habitat for Humanity project, which again, is a drop in the bucket based on what their total ask was, I was actually seeking to consider pulling a little bit on the CDBG side from Habitat and reallocate that even more so to the CMCA project.

MS. LAMBERT: I think based on what I remember from the meeting that although the funding was not public yet, they were like 99.9 percent sure they were going to get it. And I'm pretty sure that it was not contingent on us funding the other --

MR. FLETCHER: It was based on tax.

MS. LAMBERT: Yeah.

MR. FLETCHER: Tax advantage. It was some kind of tax funding.

MS. LAMBERT: It didn't really have anything to do with, you know, our funding it or not. I did really struggle with this one myself because, I mean, it's going to be putting so many more homes in Columbia that people can afford, but on the other hand, Habitat for Humanity is a big -- well, a big

organization, and it's got a lot of name recognition, where some of these other ones don't really have that. I think -- you know, I thought that they should get a lot more funding, but considering we don't have the funding, you know -- but like I said, I really struggled with it, and it was hard for me to not give them all the funding that they needed, even though that they could probably get it other places. You know, I don't know, but --

MS. FORBES: I have a question for Bill.

MR. VIEW: Sure.

MS. FORBES: Do you have a waiting list of applications? I know that Habitat, as a rule, wants to have an owner in mind when they start to build. Correct? Do you have --

MR. VIEW: Well, we don't have 125 homeowners ready, I mean, if that's what you're asking.

MS. FORBES: Yeah.

MR. VIEW: But we're going to have as many homeowners as we can build. As fast as we can build them, we're going to have a homeowner. So we have -- typically in the past, we haven't had a problem getting homeowners. We do have a -- we have had, just to be fair, we've had a bad string of luck the last few months in the ones that have applied because they just didn't qualify because of credit, but, you know, that's not -- we'll just find other homeowners that are. But we haven't really statistically ever in the last 11 years that I have been here had trouble finding homeowners.

MS. LAMBERT: And you don't need to find all of them right away though. Right?

MR. VIEW: Pardon me?

MS. LAMBERT: I mean, because -- you don't need to find --

MR. VIEW: Oh, no. No.

MS. LAMBERT -- because you get like --

MR. RITTER: It's going to take a while.

MR. VIEW: We'll find them as we build.

MS. FORBES: Well, I just wondered if he had a -- like a --

MR. VIEW: A Backlog?

MR. RITTER: Backlog.

MS. FORBES: Backlog of applications.

MR. VIEW: Well, we could, but we control our system so that we don't have a backlog because we don't like people waiting a year and a half to get their homes, so it doesn't make sense to have too big of a waiting list per say.

MS. FORBES: Right.

MR. VIEW: Since I'm up here I'd just like to say that we worked hard at getting those donors, and everybody in the community has the same opportunity to find donors too, so I'd hate for that to be held against us. Thanks.

MR. FLETCHER: Well, my -- my reservation about that project is it's the largest project undertaking they've -- they've ever done, and it's significantly more houses than they've ever built in

the timeframe they're proposing. It's very aggressive. And, you know, we have to be shepherds of the money and make sure that it's spent wisely. And if we sink the money into this project up front -- because what this funding was for was all the base development, and then it sits. So our money will be tied up, but then they have trouble going ahead and building the houses, so it turns from a five-year project to a ten-year project because they just can't get the resources it takes to finish out 100-and-some houses. Then we -- you know, we've put this money out there and tied it up for such a long period of time. So that -- that was my reservation, and I -- I -- so applaud them for thinking big, but on the other hand, they don't have, you know, a demonstrated track record of being able to build this many houses underneath -- in that schedule.

MR. REGAN: My thing with the Habitat presentation, at the time they showed how they were going to get the money, they had, I think, \$1.2 million raised by Habitat, and I think \$1 million of that was by tax credits. They have a private donor for \$800,000, so they've hit the ground running already. It's not like we're throwing money at a project that's -- we don't know it's going to happen. It's going to happen regardless if we fund it or not, and I do recall them also saying that if they did it all at once, they would save \$250,000 long term. So this is really an investment that turns into a double investment where it's helping them save \$250,000 long term. Now, I'm not saying we should fund them at the full \$200,000, but when you compare maybe a quarter to a third of a sidewalk versus saving Habitat \$250,000 by helping them a little bit more, we have to weigh our pros and cons. I agree the sidewalk would be important, but I don't know how much \$80,000 would get for a sidewalk when they're looking at a whole neighborhood. It might be best to try to do that all at once. And -- and I agree with what Michael said earlier about the CMCA Head Start parking lot. I think that should be funded a little bit more. I would -- to me, I see the sidewalks as not a very important investment for the community. It does affect a small part of the community, but it doesn't help many people. I see the parking lot affecting many families, and I think that's a dire need for the community. I think that also goes to just renovating community facilities, which was a higher need on the Need Survey. I'm opening discussion of course. I'm just throwing thoughts out there, but I would personally like to see the \$80,000 spent on the sidewalks than elsewhere, whether that's funding CMCA at the full \$85,000 -- putting \$15,000 towards that and then throw-- putting the rest towards Habitat. They would still be short of the \$200,000, but I think that would close the gap to what maybe they'd ask their donor for a little bit more possibly or maybe raise more privately. Those are my initial thoughts.

MR. FLETCHER: So in -- in constructing the homes -- so when you talked about funding, it's essentially for the materials. Keep in mind that the houses are built with volunteer labor. So when you start -- so it's one thing to get everybody to show up for the weekend to build a couple of houses, and it's another thing to get them all to show up to build 100-and-some houses -- a substantial difference, you know -- so on your volunteer resource base. So -- So, you know, they're not a full time homebuilding organization, and they're not paying outside contractors to construct these, so that's my concern is you can kind of wear out the resource to be able to do that.

MR. REGAN: From my understanding -- Bill, could I ask you one other question?

MR. VIEW: Sure.

MR. REGAN: Was this proposed \$200,000 request to develop the land before you start construction up front?

MR. VIEW: It was for the engineering costs. The engineering costs have to be there regardless, and we wanted to do the engineering of the whole thing, and then do the whole project at once as it did have those initial savings in doing it that way. We're not going to build all 125 homes in two or three years, but we're going to have all the infrastructure there, and that's important because we have such a hard time finding properties that don't have restrictions on them. So in other words this property is all owned by us, so the only restrictions put on it will be the ones we place on it. So we're not going to put a restriction of a three-car garage on the property. And that's what's valuable about this project. Otherwise, we would just go buy two lots here and two lots there, although they are getting hard to find.

MR. REGAN: Thank you.

MR. VIEW: Yeah.

MS. LAMBERT: I will say that I wouldn't feel comfortable cutting the entire \$80,000 out of the sidewalk budget, only because that is in an area where it's -- I mean, it's low income, so people are more often than not walking to work, walking to school -- you know, kids walking to school as I've seen, and I just feel like that -- that the roads are so narrow as they are that, you know, somebody walking not on a sidewalk, it -- it could be unsafe and, you know, there's already enough daily struggles that people of low income -- you know, lives that, you know, being hit by a car on the street trying to get home from work shouldn't be one of them. But I -- I guess I'd -- it is a hard bet because, yeah, the Habitat for Humanity is going to put a lot of homes in our community. I'm not as concerned with the Worley Head Start parking lot. I think that's enough money for their project to do most all of it, but, you know, I don't know. The \$80,000 I don't think should be cut all the way, I guess, is my concern.

MR. COLE: We've also done a lot of work with the neighborhood, and they've had a lot of input into those --

MR. RITTER: Yeah. That's what I was going to -- I was going to reiterate that. This Commission has put quite a bit of funding into Lynn Street already either through directly or indirectly. And there's a lot --

MR. FLETCHER: Yeah. And the City has --

MR. RITTER: -- of new development coming so it --

MR. FLETCHER: The City has made a huge investment in that same area separate from our funding for improvements and application.

MR. RITTER: And that's why I was curious on where they would start the sidewalks. You know, make sure that that --

MR. FLETCHER: So it really supports that --

MR. RITTER: -- development would continue.

MR. FLETCHER: -- overall development that we put together there.

MR. RITTER: Uh-huh.

MR. WHATLEY: Randy, can I ask a question?

MR. COLE: Uh-huh.

MR. WHATLEY: Just so I understand the -- the percentage of the total funding by category.

MR. COLE: Yeah. Uh-huh.

MR. WHATLEY: So right now we've been talking about Neighborhood Needs, you know, pretty in depth here. And right now we're -- we're at the minimum of 20 percent.

MR. COLE: Uh-huh.

MR. WHATLEY: So if we -- if we take money away, for example, from the sidewalks and move it to the Worley Head Start project, that's going to -- that's going to drop that percentage. Do we have to stay at 20? I mean, can it get -- can it be less?

MR. COLE: It's supposed to be a guide to help us stay --

MR. WHATLEY: Okay.

MR. COLE: -- on course with our goals. And in the Council policy resolution it does state that you can go outside those percentages for a few reasons. One of them was if you have a unique project that you want to fund.

MR. WHATLEY: Okay.

MR. COLE: The other was if you don't receive enough proposals within a category to equal that funding.

MR. WHATLEY: Okay.

MR. COLE: Or if you don't receive a viable proposal with this. So you don't get painted in the corner of funding a project that's, you know, not viable to meet a percentage.

MR. WHATLEY: I just wanted to make sure these weren't mandated percentages that we had to stay within, so --

MR. COLE: No.

MR. WHATLEY: Okay.

MS. SUHLER: And these are the overall percentages that you're --

MR. COLE: Uh-huh.

MS. SUHLER: -- talking about?

MR. COLE: Yeah. Of what we budgeted thus far through 2017.

MR. SALANSKI: Paul, but I do think you raise a good point. I mean, we are obviously at the very bottom of what is suggested.

MR. WHATLEY: Right.

MR. SALANSKI: And not previously looking at that myself or taking that into consideration makes me reconsider, although I am passionate about the CMCA project, and kind of decreasing of that Neighborhood Needs area to be reallocated. So I would -- I think that was a good point.

MR. FLETCHER: How -- how did you categorize the Habitat proposal under Neighborhood Needs versus Housing? Because I'm sure I just heard all the discussion on Affordable Housing, so how did that slide in underneath that, Randy? That doesn't seem to make sense to me.

MR. COLE: Well, I connected it to their infrastructure and all the engineering that needed to be done at once because he kept saying we want to it all at once. And that's not all the houses; that's all the infrastructure.

MR. FLETCHER: Yeah. I don't --

MR. COLE: So it's all the design and site work for the streets, sidewalks, sewers, roads --

MR. FLETCHER: Only on their property though.

MR. COLE: -- and the platting. Yeah, on their property.

MR. FLETCHER: Not -- not for --

MR. COLE: I would think that those streets and part of the sidewalks, there would be easements donated to the City when -- when those all go through the platting process. I'm saying you could throw it up into Affordable Housing if you wanted, but that was my reasoning.

MR. FLETCHER: Okay.

MS. SUHLER: I think maybe to throw another monkey wrench into the discussion, you know, I kind of keep looking at the Services for Independent Living, and where it is allocated now is taking about 12 percent -- 11 to 12 percent of the total amount of funds that we have that we can play with. And if you look at it kind of on a bang for the buck sort of analysis, we're funding basically maybe 35 ramps or helping 35 individuals. And, you know, do we get the same bang for each dollar that we're spending there that we would get by putting the money towards Habitat for Humanity and using it for the -- some of those development costs or for the sidewalks. You know, is that going to impact more than just the 35 individuals. So my sense is that maybe -- in my perspective, I think the funding for them is a little high, and maybe we could take some of the money and reallocate it to some of these other projects.

MR. FLETCHER: When you said -- you're talking about the Services for Independent Living is still high, you believe, for their percentage?

MS. SUHLER: I think so, and I think of the -- when you look at this, they took the smallest hit of any group.

MR. FLETCHER: Right.

MS. SUHLER: So, you know, even in terms of fairness, if we're going to reduce everybody's funding, you know, they -- they are actually -- came out -- came out a little bit higher than everyone else.

MS. LAMBERT: They're also the highest rated though. I mean, I feel like keeping somebody in their home, you know, is -- would be easier than building a whole new home, especially since it would be, you know, five to ten grand per project. I don't know. I don't -- it would be hard for me to move money out of there any more than we already have only because if it is the highest rated of any of the -- one of the ones on here by at least two points it looks like.

MR. REGAN: I think their past experience with us using CBDG funds and their success using it really kind of makes a stronger proposal than something like Habitat for Humanity, which I do agree is a great proposal, but they have a running success of using our funds -- actually allocating them and using them. I know in the past we have had funds that weren't allocated -- weren't used that were allocated, I believe; is that correct, Randy?

MR. COLE: Two of them.

MR. REGAN: I don't remember the --

MR. COLE: SIL and Habitat have both been in compliance with all of their agreements and their money spent on time.

MR. REGAN: Uh-huh. So I agree with Michelle. I would have a really hard time pulling from them, especially putting them below what we funded them last year because I don't think they should be regressed by what we funded them last year. I think the minimum point should be what we did last year, and I do believe we are pretty much there. I think Randy pulled that up and I think it was right at \$100,000 or \$105,000. I don't quite remember.

MR. COLE: It was \$105,000.

MR. REGAN: Okay. So we're not --

MR. FLETCHER: Yeah. We -- we reduced it by that amount that we are going to use for the accessible doors.

MR. REGAN: So I think we've taken enough from SIL, personally. I would have a hard time taking more. I think they do a great job in the community and they have a pretty good track record and lots of success. I see the SIL vehicles around town from time to time. If you're looking at percentagewise, what's taking up the biggest part is the Home Rehab and Repair programs, and they've -- we've already cut \$30,000 from that. I'm really comfortable with how we have our Housing set up as of now, and --

MR. FLETCHER: And that did rate high. It was tied for second in terms of the Commissions' rating. So do we have any recommendations for changes under Neighborhood Needs? So hearing none, I assume that we're going to leave it as proposed. So move on to Economic Development. So we have one entry in that category. It rated -- it was a tie for second, so it rates very -- very high under the Community Development Needs Survey, that rates very high.

MR. COLE: Do you want to know what they got last year?

MR. FLETCHER: Sure.

MR. COLE: They got \$90,000 last year.

MR. FLETCHER: So it's an increase from last year.

MR. COLE: Uh-huh.

MR. RITTER: Once again, I think it's, you know, already been fractionally cut with the recommendation. It's hard to -- it's hard to not support that program, just community-wise, especially now that they're venturing into the HVAC training, and you know, continuing with the construction, which is obviously a growing industry, high wage, so I can't support cutting that any more for any other reason.

MR. REGAN: Randy, sorry to bother you.

MR. COLE: Uh-huh.

MR. REGAN: Can you go back to last year's real fast, just so we can look at Job Point. And we said \$90,000. What was the request?

MR. COLE: \$110,000.

MR. REGAN: Okay.

MR. WHATLEY: That's a plus in my book.

MR. REGAN: So that is one I feel comfortable cutting a little bit, solely for helping out the Worley Head Start. We allocated \$90,000 last year. I would be more than willing to go higher than we did last year. They had the same request, and we were comfortable last year filling it with \$90,000. I would be okay with dropping it down a little bit. I would suggest --

MR. FLETCHER: Is the Worley Head Start folks here?

MR. COLE: Uh-huh.

MR. REGAN: -- \$95,000 or \$100,000, and then putting that difference towards the Worley Head Start parking lot. We're essentially giving them \$12,700 more than last year, so we're expanding by quite a bit cutting a lot to everyone else. We looked at the prior year. I'm comfortable with giving them more than last year. I think it's a great organization. Knowing that we gave them \$90,000 last year with the request of \$110,000, again, I'm all for giving them more. I would say between the \$95,000 or \$100,000 even, and then putting that difference towards the Worley Head Start parking lot.

MR. SALANSKI: The -- the other thing I would note, Blaine -- and I actually do not disagree either. If I recall correctly from two weeks ago, Mr. Smith did a great job in presenting Job Point's proposal; however, I think I would ask that the Commissioners remember him being a previous banker, and his conservative nature and how he was -- I'm going to reference Providence Bank. Potentially they were going to provide them with a \$975,000 loan. He was guesstimating, of course, at 5 1/2 percent, 20-year note. Of course rates, as we know it, are slowly but surely on the rise; however, with the project start date at 10/01 of '18, I would argue there would be enough banks -- assuming he would kind of widen his net to be even further competitive on providing that particular project at a more favorable rate to Job Point. So I think his rate, his loan, his term was factoring in

Mr. Smith's request, and, so again, I would just echo Blaine's opinion. I think we could take a little bit of money from there. Again, I'm partial to more so allocating that to the CMCA project.

MR. RITTER: Are you talking about the training?

MR. COLE: I think to clarify, Michael --

MR. REGAN: Yeah. You're talking about the other presentation.

(Multiple people talking simultaneously.)

MR. FLETCHER: That was for the facility purchase, and this is for the vocational training. So there was -- it was confusing, but there is two pieces to that --

MR. SALANSKI: Right.

MR. FLETCHER: -- and we're on the vocational training.

MR. SALANSKI: And the vocational training piece, to kind of echo that point, was the -- was the scholarship piece. Correct?

MR. FLETCHER: Yes.

MR. SALANSKI: Which I felt there wasn't full understanding on this scholarship piece that -- again, I think Mr. Smith did a great job specifically bringing in Mr. Jacob Kyles on behalf of Job Point, and him being an individual that we all appreciated his time. I don't know that I considered the difference -- go ahead, Mike. Could you re-explain then to me the separation of his proposal?

MR. FLETCHER: Well, the --

MR. SALANSKI: Because under the impression that --

MR. FLETCHER: This in particular is for basically units of training where they have training programs set up as heavy construction, nursing -- what are some of the others?

MR. WHATLEY: Culinary and --

MR. FLETCHER: Culinary.

MR. WHATLEY: -- HVAC.

MR. FLETCHER: Yeah. And the HVAC class.

MR. WHATLEY: And it's actually job placement as well.

MR. FLETCHER: Yeah. Yeah. And they have a pretty good track record of, you know, being supported by the community, the folks in community -- business community hire the individuals and have faith in them. And it's something that we've funded a number of years.

MR. RITTER: Yeah. If this results in two or three more people finding jobs versus two or three more people finding a parking spot, I'm going to support the jobs any day.

MS. FORBES: Speaking from -- speaking from the standpoint of somebody who works in a factory, we're hiring --

MR. RITTER: Yeah.

MS. FORBES: -- for the first time in probably five or six years, and some of our -- some of our candidates for being hired went through Job Point. They're preparing people to go out into the workplace. And so that's like two sides of the coin. They're making people who can just go out and

get a job now without doing anything in preparation. But the people that they're prepping for work are doing -- are doing excellent work, and then they're done.

MR. SALANSKI: Yeah. I am going to apologize to the Commission. I misunderstood that particular line item. I thought it was more so pertaining to --

MR. FLETCHER: The facility.

MR. SALANSKI: -- the facility, itself. So for that I take those comments back.

MR. FLETCHER: So under Economic --

MR. RITTER: Can you redact your comments from the minutes, maybe?

MR. SALANSKI: Yeah.

MR. FLETCHER: Under Economic Development, do we have any changes for the recommendations?

MR. REGAN: I go back to just looking at last year. We can decrease with \$102,700, and it would still be higher than what we allocated last year. We allocated \$90,000. I would be comfortable with increasing that by \$5,000 to \$95,000, and just putting that \$7,700 -- did I do my math right?

MR. FLETCHER: That would be \$7--

MR. REGAN: \$7,700 --

MR. FLETCHER: -- bumping that up to --

MR. REGAN: -- put that down to Worley Head Start parking lot, and I think we're still increasing funding versus last year's application --

MR. FLETCHER: So we have one -- we have one for and one against. So we need the other Commissioners to voice because Mitch said jobs over parking places, and that's a legitimate comment as well.

MR. RITTER: Well --

MR. FLETCHER: Paul, I'm sure you can --

MR. RITTER: I apologize for not being at the CMCA presentation last week. But I know if the exact question had been asked on how many bids they tried to secure before they came up with an \$85,000 estimate. It goes back to, you know, just is there an opportunity --

MR. FLETCHER: Well, they --

MR. RITTER: -- to take any amount of funding and put it --

MR. FLETCHER: For -- for clarification --

MR. RITTER: -- towards the project or is it --

MR. FLETCHER: -- they did say they could use less than the full amount.

MR. RITTER: Okay. That's what I figured.

MR. FLETCHER: So I did ask that question specifically, and they said that that would be acceptable.

MS. LAMBERT: Did Job Point -- I thought they said what -- how much each of their scholarships costed [sic], and it was like --

MR. COLE: They applied for \$110,000, and they said they would train 12.

MS. LAMBERT: So each -- okay.

MR. COLE: So the amount you reduce probably would be close to one.

MS. SUHLER: I would weigh in in favor of jobs over asphalt. I think the Job Point funding -- and if we had any wiggle room, I would actually like to see it bumped up farther than that, but --

MS. LAMBERT: It might be different -- I mean, back to the -- the thing -- the proposal that they were just looking at, I mean, 100 percent -- according to their statistics 100 percent of the people that they serve are unemployed and disenfranchised in some way, and I just feel like, you know, one person unemployed is more of a drain on resources. And I know that the parking lot is important, but, you know, like Mitch says, maybe five less spots or, you know, something like that or maybe if they get a lower bid or, you know, maybe they can contract with maybe somebody at Job Point to -- I mean, that's -- that's in their purview of what they do.

MR. RITTER: They've got street and road construction.

MS. LAMBERT: Yeah. I mean --

MR. SALANSKI: Can we get that contingent applied?

(Multiple people talking simultaneously.)

MR. RITTER: Maybe we can make a partnership here.

MS. LAMBERT: Yeah. But I'm just saying like somebody that they're training, they can go, hey, you know, we're in training, and maybe we can do this at a lower rate. You know, something like that. You know, I just feel like Job Point does such an important thing for the community that I have a hard time taking money away from that.

MR. FLETCHER: Yeah. I think at the level of funding that we've provided to the Worley Head Start, I think they'll be able to complete their -- their project. So we haven't cut it --

MS. LAMBERT: At least make it more safe. I mean --

MR. FLETCHER: We haven't cut it to the extent where their funding isn't sufficient for them to complete it.

MR. WHATLEY: You know, as a -- you know, as somebody who is in manufacturing, we don't use Job Point, but I know a number of businesses up and down Paris Road and the Industrial Park do rely on Job Point as -- as a pool of labor. And so, I am -- I am for, you know, leaving --

MR. FLETCHER: Okay.

MR. WHATLEY: -- leaving the Economic Development as it is.

MR. FLETCHER: So -- so I think -- I hear consensus that we'll -- we'll leave it funded as recommended. So let's --

MR. REGAN: Can I make one more comment?

MR. FLETCHER: Sure.

MR. REGAN: We're expanding by \$12,700 compared to last year. What happens next year? Do we increase it another \$12,700? I think my biggest point is we're still increasing funding

compared to last year. This is an exponential -- we're funding them at 93 percent of their request, and we're doing Worley Head Start at 82 percent of their request. So, if anything, I would like to see that split evenly so we're funding them both at the same percent of their request. And I think -- the CMCA goes more than the asphalt. It goes towards the building of the preschool. They had issues with flooding, and they've already expanded their classroom, so it's a huge need I think in the community. We're not -- if we cut -- I think Randy said it would be about one scholarship. I understand jobs are very important. I do completely agree with that. I mean, it's a struggle. I mean, we're already cutting probably -- but if it's going to be one scholarship, it's not great, of course, but I think the Head Start -- they said they were going to do the parking lot no matter what. They would find funds somewhere. Their -- they would be grasping at straws. I would feel more comfortable helping them -- and that's a long-term investment. It is helping with their building, their parking lot, making families and children safer, and I think it makes the community -- that part of the community safer because people can actually park in the parking lot and not on the streets and deal with children that are running across the street to find their parents. So I view it as that. I don't view it just as asphalt -- somewhere that someone can park. I view it as how does that parking lot affect the community itself. It's providing a safer environment for children that are walking across the street. People aren't parking in the streets; they are actually going to a parking lot. So those are my thoughts. And that's my only opinion on that. And I'll leave that as is.

MR. WHATLEY: You know, I do drive by that, you know, Head Start every day going home from work, and the parking lot is in disarray, don't get me wrong. I -- I have seen it. And I don't know if a representative from the Head Start is here, but is -- will -- will this actually -- by renovating the parking lot by, you know, fixing the parking lot, does that solve all of your flooding issues moving forward? Is -- I mean --

MR. PREIS: Yeah. I'm Darin Preis; I'm the executive director at Central Missouri Community Action, and, yes, that's -- part of the engineering was to really address that flooding and the water issue and really move it all towards a water retention area that we've had built into the lot. So it would take care of those needs.

MS. SUHLER: And if I remember correctly from the discussion, there was one part that was going to be turned into a parking lot, but it wasn't really needed right away or it was kind of a -- a little extra part.

MR. PREIS: We are expanding the parking lot to meet the needs of the new facility.

MS. SUHLER: Uh-huh.

MR. PREIS: So we -- we've been operating Head Start. We've added an Early Head Start, so these are families with infants and toddlers, and we don't have currently the parking space for that addition.

MS. SUHLER: Uh-huh.

MR. PREIS: So that's what this covers.

MR. RITTER: So you plan the addition without planning space for people to park for that addition?

MR. PREIS: No. We -- I mean, it's all in the engineering. It's all part of the drawings. And -- and so we've been paying for this as we go. We've put in about \$200,000 into the project so far. This is the last piece of funding in -- in the investment.

MR. FLETCHER: Thank you. So the last section to discuss, Community Facilities, I think we've already had a lot of discussion on the CMCA request. Any discussions regarding the Job Point facility purchase?

MS. LAMBERT: I don't think we have enough wiggle room in our budget to really make a meaningful allocation to Job Point or the Youth Empowerment Zone. I mean, the request was so large that, I mean, we couldn't really cut much out from what we've already talked about to make any sort of -- I guess, a meaningful impact on what they've requested.

MR. FLETCHER: Any other discussion? Comments?

MS. SUHLER: Just one question on the Job Point facility. And I believe someone is here from Job Point? It was a question. Will your loan from the bank -- will it be impacted at all whether or not you get some funding from the City? Are they going to look at that as kind of some downpayment money or something that will make your loan easier to secure, or without City funding is there no impact on whether or not you get the loan?

MR. SMITH: Well, there's an impact if you don't get a couple hundred thousand dollars, but -- I'm sorry. Steve Smith with Job Point. You know, as I mentioned in our presentation, we are viewing this as kind of the first step in the process. So if -- if this isn't approved -- and I understand all the requests and the amount of money you have, so I understand that. But if this isn't approved, this will probably be -- because of some other things we have going on in the organization -- and I mentioned some of those too, we probably won't move on it as quickly as we would if we got the money. We -- we plan to buy the building, but how quickly we move on that is as much as any individual or company's budget would be. If you don't have the initial piece, it -- you move it further down the road. That's the best way I know how to explain that. And I'd like to make one additional comment, and then I'll leave it alone. I would point out that two years ago, we were receiving significantly more money than the \$90,000, and last year we were cut. So if we want to talk about how far -- and we -- and we can all play that game, but we received, I believe, \$110,000 two years ago, and were cut \$20,000 last year. So this -- whatever you fund us at this year will not get us back to where we were a couple years ago, but I appreciate your consideration, and I greatly empathize with the decisions you are having to make. So thank you very much.

MR. FLETCHER: Thank you.

MR. SMITH: And we're finishing building a house for CMCA right now. It will be done in two weeks.

MR. FLETCHER: Good. Thank you.

MR. SMITH: So we are already collaborating.

MR. PREIS: But we'll check any parking lot issue --

MR. SMITH: If it's concrete, we can do it.

MR. FLETCHER: Do we have any other comments under Community Facilities? So you can see the current funding recommendations. So do we have any further -- any further comments? Do we have a motion?

MR. RITTER: How would you like to make a motion? Will it be by category or will it be to accept the spreadsheet as completed at 8:30?

MR. FLETCHER: I believe that would be appropriate as indicated. Yes.

MS. FORBES: What was that?

MR. RITTER: How we want to make the motion.

MS. FORBES: No. I heard you. I didn't hear you.

MR. FLETCHER: As provided on the spreadsheet. We don't need to call out the specific changes we made, do we, Randy?

MR. COLE: Huh-uh. You can just adopt the recommendations --

MR. FLETCHER: Okay.

MR. COLE: -- as they are.

MR. RITTER: Okay. I will make a motion to approve the 2018 funding recommendations for CDBG as indicated on the spreadsheet after discussion as of 8:35 on June 21st.

MR. FLETCHER: Do we need to add a contingency in for the funds for Family Health Center?

MR. RITTER: Yeah. Including a -- yeah. We can put --

MR. COLE: No.

MR. RITTER: -- an amendment in there that --

MR. COLE: Huh-uh. I'll just --

MR. RITTER: Tell them?

MR. COLE: -- state that it's for the doors. Yeah. Or I could --

MR. FLETCHER: Very good. Thank you.

MR. RITTER: I think that was pretty clear in the discussion and it will be reflected in the minutes.

MR. COLE: Actually, could I -- could I clarify that? Did you guys want -- was that all -- I don't remember what -- was that one door or three doors?

MR. WHATLEY: That -- that amount is for the narrow door.

MR. FLETCHER: I would just put --

MR. WHATLEY: The third door.

MR. FLETCHER: I would just put for a door accessibility --

MR. REGAN: I wrote down from the slides it said automatic doors for three doors, and when they showed the slide --

MR. RITTER: When they actually presented?

MR. REGAN: Yes.

MR. RITTER: Okay.

MR. REGAN: Their priorities were chair covering 60 chairs, automatic doors -- 3 doors, flooring, repainting at \$2.25 a square foot.

MR. RITTER: Okay.

MR. REGAN: And that's what was on the slides.

MR. RITTER: There was a weird sentence in the application --

MR. REGAN: Yeah. Looking over here was very --

MR. COLE: It didn't match the proposal.

MR. RITTER: I would -- I would just put ADA accessibility on the recommendation.

MR. FLETCHER: Yeah. I wouldn't call out a number because we couldn't fund it based on a number.

MR. COLE: It kind of begs the question though when I do an agreement, do you guys want me to follow up with them and say how many doors are we getting for this amount?

MR. SALANSKI: Right. And I would also note, again, we're making this suggestion that it's ADA compliant. This third door is not. It's not.

MR. REGAN: Can I make a suggestion real fast? If this is for all three doors, that would be, what, \$1,400, I think, per door. I don't know what the cost is.

MR. FLETCHER: That would seem reasonable.

MR. REGAN: I think that if this is only for one door, and the small door, I --

MR. FLETCHER: We can't do it like that.

MR. COLE: That's --

MR. RITTER: Yeah. That's getting to granular.

MR. FLETCHER: We can't make it that.

MR. COLE: I think that -- I think that raises why this is kind of problematic.

MR. RITTER: Yeah.

MR. COLE: I mean, they can always come back and request funds next year with a more refined and better proposal that we can understand.

MR. REGAN: Given that, would we -- I actually would agree with that, and considering there is not a representative to clear that up here tonight, I think that might kind of be a holding point. As much as I want to see that -- from my understanding it's for the three doors, but if it's for one, I don't think that's a good investment. If it's a skinny door -- and I guess given the uncertainty, yeah. I mean, I'm okay moving that towards the parking lot, and --

MR. COLE: So did we have a motion and a second?

MR. RITTER: No. We did not get a second. So you need to clear the motion.

MR. COLE: You can redraw it.

MR. RITTER: The motion is withdrawn due to no second.

MR. FLETCHER: So after all that discussion, we disagree with ourselves?

MR. RITTER: No. It just -- I think we need to revisit the \$4,200 and --

MR. REGAN: We have different understandings of what the presentation was, and I think without the clarity --

MS. LAMBERT: I don't know. I feel like even if that is only for the one door and even if it is for the skinny door, I still feel like it is worth it because, I mean, we're looking at one type of thing here is just wheelchairs. I mean, yeah, strollers, but, you know, amputees who maybe can't open a door on their own or, you know, mothers with children, parents with children --

MR. FLETCHER: People with walkers. That was the examples they were providing.

MS. LAMBERT: people -- yeah. People with walkers. I mean, there's -- that's one class of people who maybe can't use this door, and there are the two other doors. So even if it was just for the one door, I still think for a medical facility it is important to have that sort of accessibility.

MR. SALANSKI: I would disagree. But, then again, I'm just using the gentleman's words as I heard them, and I recall him stating that it was his staff, and those that worked within the facility that predominantly used the third door, which further made it to where I contested the overall plan in that more of a reason as to why do I need to make it for a physically capable individual to have an automatic door? And then that's when you kind of started going into the, well, a lot of people will have the accessibility with strollers and so on and so forth. I -- I don't disagree. I mean, obviously, we're in a predicament that we have little funds, a lot to fund; however, it's not particularly helpful with not having clarity on a particular matter, and the individual not being present.

MR. RITTER: Is it worth another discussion for the lowest ranked project with maybe some inconsistency about what we even think it's for when we've got one ramp that we know will get done or a partial scholarship that we know will get allocated versus an unknown on a facility?

MR. SALANSKI: And that's why I would agree with you, Mitch, is that the \$4,200 should be scrapped --

MR. RITTER: Okay.

MR. SALANSKI: -- from the project and put elsewhere to where we could get more confident with how it will be used.

MR. FLETCHER: All right. Is that the consensus of the Commission?

MR. REGAN: I have another comment.

MR. RITTER: I'm not saying it's consensus. --

MR. REGAN: So I pulled out my phone --

MR. RITTER: -- I'm just saying that's --

MR. REGAN: -- and Googled ADA door openers. They average between \$1,200 and \$2,000. So I would assume this would be for all three. I'm sure they're getting some sort of -- I'm sure they

got a contracted rate from the supplier. So with installation, I would assume that's all three for \$4,200. I doubt one door that you could buy off Amazon for \$2,000 installed is going to cost \$4,200.

MR. RITTER: Well, I doubt overhead [sic] doors ordering from Amazon, but --

MR. REGAN: So -- yeah. I'm sure they're higher quality, but at the same time, they are probably from a medical supplier that specializes, so I'm assuming it is all three doors, and that's what I wrote down from the slides.

MR. SALANSKI: I guess my -- I guess my concern, again, to piggy-back off of Mitch's opinion is I don't want to make -- I don't want to make my decision based on assumptions, and I think it would have been more -- more -- it would have been more up for consideration had the gentleman been here to address the questions that the Commission has. Again, I -- I will agree -- I think there's not consensus, but I will agree with Mitch in that we could use that \$4,200 elsewhere for things that we've been -- feel more certain will happen as proposed.

MR. RITTER: And just final clarification --

MR. FLETCHER: So what would be the proposed --

MR. RITTER: I'm going to read the sentence from the application.

MR. FLETCHER: Yeah.

MR. RITTER: It says, There are three sets of doors which a patient must navigate before reaching the exam room. At present, only two sets of these doors have automated door openers. That tells me two out of three have the door opener. You would be approving \$4,200 for one additional door of which you said -- two weeks ago, they said that was the thinnest of the three doors.

MR. SALANSKI: Correct. And that's how I recall our meeting two weeks ago, that it was adding one door to be automatic. And part of the reason why I had issues with that was it was not an ADA compliant door to begin with.

MR. RITTER: Okay.

MR. SALANSKI: So why provide the --

MR. FLETCHER: So -- so the recommendation then is to take that funding and put it back into what project?

MR. COLE: I moved it to CMCA because of what Blaine said, but we can move it wherever.

MR. WHATLEY: I would recommend we take the \$4,200 and move it to the Worley Head Start project.

MS. SUHLER: I would suggest it be moved to Job Point and to vocational training.

MR. RITTER: To where?

MS. SUHLER: Job Point Vocational Training.

MR. SALANSKI: Is there a third consideration or do we propose a vote to --

MR. COLE: So we've got a disagreement here.

MR. FLETCHER: It's not -- yeah.

MR. SALANSKI: Because I suppose if there's just two, then I suppose we can kind of go around the room and --

MR. FLETCHER: So what is your opinion then? So those are kind of the choices that have been proposed. So it's --

MS. LAMBERT: I would put it towards the CMCA.

MR. SALANSKI: I would agree, the CMCA project.

MR. REGAN: We debated so long on that at the very beginning to put that there, and I think it should stay there.

MR. FLETCHER: And you want Job Point?

MS. FORBES: Well, if you get a job and you've got a kid, you've got to take them somewhere. So I think the parking lot is a good idea.

MR. WHATLEY: Why are you looking at me? I'm for the CMCA, the --

MR. FLETCHER: CMCA.

MR. WHATLEY: Worley parking lot. I'm sorry?

MR. FLETCHER: So it looks CMCA is --

MR. RITTER: I can get behind that because it is a viable --

MR. FLETCHER: -- the majority. So let's move it to that. And now do we have a motion?

MR. REGAN: I will motion to approve the 2018 CDBG funding recommendation spreadsheet that is present.

MR. SALANSKI: I'll second the motion.

MR. FLETCHER: Okay. The motion has been seconded. So we'll take a vote, and again, by show of hands, please. All in favor, show of hands.

MS. FORBES: And we're all -- it's unanimous. All right.

(Unanimous vote for approval.)

MR. FLETCHER: Thank you. All right. So we have a funding recommendation for the City Commission. If I can find my agenda here.

VII.) GENERAL COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, MEMBERS AND STAFF

MR. FLETCHER: So if anyone would like to make comments, there's -- please use the end of the table, introduce yourselves, and, Mitch, would you make the microphone available so if there's any comments by the public.

MR. CHAPMAN: Hi. Tec Chapman, executive director at Services for Independent Living. This is my fourth year coming here, and I want to appreciate the Commission's work. Some of you obviously are some new faces, but I appreciate the difficult decisions you have to make, and appreciate your support. We partner quite often with Job Point, so the issue of jobs and keeping people in their homes, specifically people in the First Ward, most importantly, and people that are highly impoverished and homeowners. I think it is a worthy effort, and I appreciate the work that Steve does in our partnership, and I just want to thank you guys tonight for -- for taking the time. For

some of your new faces I want to let you know, I will be reaching out to you because I would love to have you actually come take a look and meet some of these people so you have a strong sense of the accessibility or of their prior lack of accessibility that they had in their home. And typically it's because they may have had a stroke or they, just like most of us, age and the body doesn't quite work the way it used to work or they may have lost eyesight or like I said, may have had a stroke or something. So we would love that -- I'll be reaching out to you to have you come -- come take a tour and come meet some of these folks. But thank you very much for your support. I appreciate it.

MR. FLETCHER: Thank you. Are there any other comments? Any --

MR. COLE: I have one, if I could.

MR. FLETCHER: Go ahead.

MR. COLE: So we're doing a joint meeting or planning a joint meeting between the Columbia Community Land Trust, our Loan and Grant Committee that Mitch serves on, which we have a meeting on Thursday in August -- August 15th, and we'd like a handful of people from each of the Commissions -- ideally, we would get at least four from this Commission. So if people could just email me if you'd be available --

MR. FLETCHER: The time of that? Is it during the day?

MR. COLE: It's 5:30 to 7:30.

MR. FLETCHER: Okay.

MR. COLE: We're doing the evening.

MS. LAMBERT: Is it here in this room?

MR. COLE: We have 1A and 1B reserved.

MS. LAMBERT: Okay.

MR. COLE: So ideally, Mitch would be there, since you're on Loan and Grant. And ideally, the Chair. And then --

MR. SALANSKI: You said that was August 15?

MR. COLE: Yeah. Yeah.

MR. SALANSKI: Is it limited to four or --

MR. FLETCHER: I should be available --

MR. COLE: I would like to limit it to four so we don't establish quorum, but it's going to be an open meeting anyway. So if more -- I wouldn't exclude anyone that doesn't -- that want to come. But I just want to get at least four from this Commission so we have good representation.

MR. FLETCHER: You'll send out an invite or a reminder?

MR. COLE: I'll send out an invite and see who all can --

MR. RITTER: The 15th is a Tuesday.

MR. SALANSKI: A Tuesday? Okay.

MR. COLE: Excuse me. Actually, that's the wrong date, my bad.

MR. REGAN: Is it a Thursday?

MR. COLE: Let me look at my calendar.

MR. RITTER: Thursday is the 17th.

MR. COLE: Sorry about that. It would actually be the 9th -- August 9th.

MR. RITTER: That's a Wednesday.

MR. COLE: August 15th is our Homebuyer orientation. So August 9th.

MR. SALANSKI: So we've come to a consensus August 9th?

MR. COLE: August 9th.

MR. REGAN: A Wednesday?

MR. COLE: Wednesday.

MR. REGAN: Okay.

MR. COLE: So I'll just send it out to you and whoever we can get will be great. So we'll basically learn about what each Board does and if there's a way that we can better work together and that sort of thing.

VIII). NEXT MEETING DATE: TO BE DETERMINED

MR. FLETCHER: We don't have a date for our next meeting?

MR. COLE: We don't. We haven't made our next year's schedule yet.

MR. FLETCHER: Okay.

MR. COLE: But we do have a meeting that comes up here in August. That will be the Council meeting in August where you do the --

MR. FLETCHER: Yeah.

MR. COLE: -- presentations.

MR. FLETCHER: When is that?

MR. COLE: Let me look at the calendar.

MS. LAMBERT: What's this meeting for?

MR. FLETCHER: It's the presentation of our recommendations to the City Council.

MS. LAMBERT: Oh, okay.

MR. COLE: It will either be the 7th or the 21st. I think it's the 21st.

MR. SALANSKI: And that's in August, Randy?

MR. COLE: Yeah. It's at the City Council meeting. So Michael will come and give a summary of what the recommendations are. It will be shorter than this evening. But, yeah, kind of throw it out there. And we've had other Commissioners come and support the Chairperson in the past. And so if you want to do that, that's great. If you're not available, that's fine too.

MR. SALANSKI: August 21st, and that's a 7:00 p.m. meeting. Correct?

MR. COLE: Uh-huh. Yeah. So it's the budget hearing, and so our Commission, the Cultural Affairs, and then Human Services typically present their recommendations. And Michael did a great job last year.

MR. FLETCHER: Okay.

MR. COLE: But for the next year, we'll make the calendar and we'll start -- September, we'll start our meetings again.

MR. FLETCHER: Okay.

IX). ADJOURNMENT

MR. FLETCHER: Do we have a motion to adjourn?

MS. FORBES: I move we adjourn.

MR. RITTER: Second.

MR. FLETCHER: All in favor, say aye.

(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

MR. FLETCHER: The meeting is adjourned. Thank you.

(The meeting adjourned at 8:49 p.m.)

(Off the record)

DRAFT