City of Columbia, Missouri

Meeting Minutes

Columbia Community Development Commission

Wednesday, May 16, 2018 7:00 PM	Public Hearing for Public Projects	Room 1A, City Hall, 701 E. Broadway, Columbia

I. CALL TO ORDER

MR. FLETCHER: Good evening, everyone. It is 7:00, so let's get started; we have a full agenda this evening. I'd like to call the May 16 meeting of the Columbia Community Development Commission to order.

II. INTRODUCTIONS

MR. FLETCHER: I'd like to start out by doing introductions, so, Paul, if you would begin.
MR. WHATLEY: Sure. My name is Paul Whatley; and I'm a Member at Large.
MS. DIBBEN: Carly Dibben, District Five.
MS. FORBES: Pam Forbes, Ward One.
MR. COLE: Randy Cole, City Staff.
MR. FLETCHER: Mike Fletcher, Member at Large.
MR. REGAN: Blaine Regan, Sixth Ward.
MR. SALANSKI: Michael Salanski, Fifth Ward.
MS. SUHLER: Diane Suhler, Human Services Commission Representative.
MR. AMELUNKE: Jacob Amelunke, City Staff.
MS. CLARK: Darcie Clark, City Staff.
MR. ANSPACH: Gary Anspach, City Staff.
MR. FLETCHER: Can we just go ahead and introduce the public members while we are doing the introductions? If you will just state your name and address, please.
MS. ANDERSON: I'm Allison Anderson with Public Works.
MR. MERRY: Scout Merry, Services for Independent Living.
MR. SMITH: Steve Smith, Job Point.
MS. KOTTWITZ: Leigh Kottwitz, Neighborhood Services.
MS. KLAASSEN: Sarah Klaassen; I'm a pastor.
MR. MANGOLD: Barry Mangold, ABC 17 News.
MR. FLETCHER: Thank you.

Present: 7 - Michael Fletcher, Pamela Forbes, Blaine Regan, Paul Whatley, Michael Salanski, Diane Suhler and Carly Dibben

Absent: 2 - Mitchell Ritter and Michelle Lambert

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MR. FLETCHER: Next is approval of the agenda. And I'd like to make a recommendation that we move the reports, as it will be a long discussion on some changes to the allocations, and let's move that back behind the public hearings so we don't keep all the folks waiting this evening who are here. Does anybody have any other changes they would like to recommend to the agenda? Hearing none, I need a motion to approve the agenda with those changes.

MR. WHATLEY: I so move.
MS. DIBBEN: Second.
MR. FLETCHER: All in favor of the changes to the agenda, say aye.
(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)
MR. FLETCHER: The agenda is approved with the changes.

Staff memo

Attachments: CDC Memo 5-11-18

Discussed throughout the course of the meeting.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

April 11, 2018 Draft Minutes

Attachments: CDC Bus Tour Minutes 4.11.18

MR. FLETCHER: Next is approval of the meeting minutes from the April 11 meeting. Does anyone have any comments or changes they want to make to the minutes? Hearing none, I need a motion to approve the minutes.

MS. DIBBEN: I'll make a motion to approve the minutes
MS. SUHLER: Second.
MS. FORBES: I'll second.
MR. FLETCHER: Thank you, Diane. All in favor of approval of the minutes, say aye.
(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)
MR. FLETCHER: The minutes are approved.

V. SPECIAL ITEMS

MR. FLETCHER: We don't have any special items.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

MR. FLETCHER: We don't have any old business.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

MR. FLETCHER: So on to new business - and we'll skip around the reports and go straight to the public hearings.

IX. PUBLIC HEARINGS

MR. FLETCHER: So for public hearings, we -- on the agenda the McKee Street Sidewalk goes first -- Pershing Street Sidewalk. So it's Public Works sidewalks; then it is Code Enforcement; Acquisition and Demolition; Rehabilitation and Repair; and the Ownership Assistance Programs. So we do have a member who hasn't heard presentations from your organization, so let's go with -- Paul, if you would keep track of time for us, and will allot seven minutes for each presentation, and then we'll take questions after that. So if you would state your name again for the record. And I think they -- do they have to give their address?
MR. COLE: She is City staff.
MR. FLETCHER: City staff. All right. Everybody is City staff.

Public Works Sidewalks

Attachments: McKee Street Sidewalk

Pershing Street Sidewalk

MS. ANDERSON: Hi. I'm Allison Anderson and I'm with the Public Works Department. And we have submitted two different sidewalk projects -- the McKee Street sidewalk project and the Pershing Street sidewalk project. All right. So, like I said, we submitted the McKee Street sidewalk and the Pershing Street sidewalk. I was going to start out with the McKee Street sidewalk. This project is located in the east strategic plan neighborhood. We're proposing to construct a five-foot wide sidewalk with green space. The sidewalk length is approximately 960 linear feet, and it will be on the east side of McKee Street, and it will fill in sidewalk gaps between Nick Court and Orchard Lane. There is kind of a segmented sidewalk through there, it will fill in the places where there isn't sidewalk. On the north end is McKee Street Park, and on the south end, the sidewalk would be down to Clark Lane. We've already completed the topographic survey for the area, and there was an Interested Parties Meeting held back on May 18th of 2016 with both Parks and Rec and Public Works. Parks and Rec was proposing some improvements along the park, and we were trying to --kind of trying to tie it all in together. And the estimated project cost is $182,910, and that includes easements and construction. We were planning to do the design of this project in-house. This kind of shows a drawing of it. Just looking south, you can see there's some sidewalk there that would tie into it and the green space, so it would kind of go behind the utilities here. And looking at this on the north, there's McKee Street Park, and then we have -- they have already constructed the sidewalk here. There is existing sidewalk there, so then we fill it in as the sidewalk gaps. There is a little more existing sidewalk here, and then fill in a couple more sidewalk gaps. And then --

MR. FLETCHER: So this isn't rehab? It's brand-new sidewalk?

MS. ANDERSON: Right.

MR. FLETCHER: And where is Clark Lane in this picture?

MS. ANDERSON: Clark Lane -- you can't see it. You keep going south, and it's down here.

MR. FLETCHER: Okay.

MS. ANDERSON: And there is sidewalk all the rest of the way down to Clark Lane. The second sidewalk that we submitted is Pershing Street sidewalk. This is in the central strategic neighborhood in town. This project is a little bit different in that the lots are a lot smaller and the homes are a lot closer to the street. And so for this project, we were proposing a six-foot sidewalk that would be at the back of the curb instead of having the green space. The sidewalk links about 800 linear feet, and it will contact sidewalk at Gary Street and at Pearl Avenue. So it was basically a two-block stretch where there isn't any sidewalk -- where it will connect to sidewalks on each end. At the north end is Again Street Park, and then if you go south, it connects to a sidewalk that will go to Broadway. This sidewalk gap is included in the City's 2012 Sidewalk Master Plan. And the estimated project cost is $246,110. This project we were thinking we would have a consultant design, so we included the design cost as well as easements and construction in this cost estimate. A drawing here, I think that is looking north. And up there is the park. Here is a drawing along this two-block stretch. Going this way is sidewalk going for a block, and then you have Broadway here. This sidewalk stretch, the road is a little bit wider, so we were going to bump out the sidewalk and put in new curb as well and reconstruct the driveways as part of the sidewalk construction. And then across here and then another length of sidewalk to here, and then is the park, and there is existing sidewalk at the park. So is there any questions on either one? Yes?

MR. SALANSKI: Michael Salanski, Fifth Ward. And your name again? I'm sorry.
MS. ANDERSON: Allison Anderson.
MR. SALANSKI: Allison, do you mind describing to me based on the cost of concrete and materials in projects like these, what's the -- what's the reasoning for doing a five-foot-wide sidewalk as opposed to a six-foot-wide sidewalk?
MS. ANDERSON: So on sidewalks we try to meet ADA -- American with Disabilities requirements, and so for that you are really required a five-foot sidewalk. So if you have green space -- you know, grass between the road and the sidewalk, you do a five-foot sidewalk, but if you have to push it at the curb, just for extra kind of room, we do another foot so that the walker has a -- can stay a little bit farther from the road. So that's kind -- it's kind of --
MR. SALANSKI: So a somewhat safety concern?
MS. ANDERSON: What?
MR. SALANSKI: A safety --
MS. ANDERSON: Yeah.
MR. SALANSKI: -- concern?
MS. ANDERSON: It's kind of the City standard.
MR. SALANSKI: And the former one, the reason why the five-foot was done was just based upon the spacing with regards to the utilities in play and obviously the easements that we can get so much in --
MS. ANDERSON: Right. We don't want to -- I mean, if we pushed it so it was back behind the utilities, we would be way up in there in their yard. So we like -- we like doing, you know, the five-foot. If you get out like three- or four-foot of green space, that is preferred, but with smaller lots, it's pretty hard to do.
MS. SUHLER: This is -- and I apologize for my kind of naivety -- and since I'm still kind of learning the process, but you said this is part of the City's master plan for sidewalks, and so I assume when the City has a master plan, they have a funding source tied to that master plan. So is it normal that you come to the Community Development Commission for funding for these types of projects or is that kind of unusual?
MR. COLE: That's pretty typical. It allows them to do more sidewalks. I don't think the funds set aside -- you probably know better than I do for sidewalks -- it's not that robust City funding-wise.
MS. ANDERSON: No. We have like an annual sidewalk money that we do have, but this helps that we can get more projects done basically.
MR. COLE: So our funds don't go to any Public Works staffing, it goes towards just doing more sidewalks.
MS. SUHLER: I see. Okay.
MR. FLETCHER: Well, obviously the cost per foot of this is -- of the second one was substantially higher than the first, and so is it all due to having to replace that curbing? Can't you leave the curbing and just do the sidewalk?
MS. ANDERSON: We're not --
MR. FLETCHER: And you have to replace everyone's driveways as well?
MS. ANDERSON: Yes. The driveways you do to meet ADA. Usually have -- because they have to have a two percent or less cross slope, and a lot of those driveways are kind of falling apart or they're not concrete, they're gravel. So we want it to be continuous to meet ADA. And, you know, it just would -- I guess if you were -- if you didn't -- the northern half, we weren't replacing the curb -- like this half up here we were keeping the curb, but here we were bumping it out to meet -- get farther behind these -- in front of these poles and stuff.
MR. FLETCHER: So are we upgrading the driveways then from the street back beyond the sidewalk to all concrete --
MS. ANDERSON: Yes. It would go in concrete --
MR. FLETCHER: -- where they have gravel now?

MS. ANDERSON: It wouldn't be -- like if you -- the concrete -- if the driveway were -- if the sidewalk ran here, we would run it through where the sidewalk is, and then just what it takes to tie into the existing. So we wouldn't redo the whole driveway, just kind of -- so until we could tie into the existing.
MR. FLETCHER: So it would be from the sidewalk to the street?
MS. ANDERSON: For the most part. These are pretty flat. Sometimes when you have a steep driveway going one way or another it takes a little bit more to tie it in, but these are pretty flat through here.
MR. SALANSKI: And then if I may ask just a follow-up question. Do you happen to know the percent -- based on the overall budget for the second sidewalk -- I believe it to be the Pershing Street sidewalk project, what was the percent to the overall cost of the project for the design firm or the consulting firm to --
MS. ANDERSON: I usually do 15 percent, is what I estimate.
MR. SALANSKI: So it was estimated 15 percent?
MS. ANDERSON: Uh-huh.
MR. SALANSKI: Do you happen to know where that came in at?
MS. ANDERSON: We haven't -- we haven't asked -- we haven't asked for that or anything yet.
MR. SALANSKI: Okay.
MS. ANDERSON: We haven't got that far on it.
MR. SALANSKI: If they happened to come in high based upon the services that they think that they are willing to provide and the value that they see that they are bringing, would the City be asking more in regards to funding or to -- or would you seek another funding source to make up the difference?
MS. ANDERSON: I think we would use our sales tax to -- we operate off quarter-cent sales tax for CIP projects and we have annual sidewalk there, so my guess is we would end up taking some money out -- using some of that to pay the difference if it came to that.
MR. FLETCHER: Does anyone else have questions?
MR. REGAN: Between the two projects, which one do you think takes precedent over the other one if we were only able to support one of them?
MS. ANDERSON: We prefer the McKee Street.
MS. SUHLER: Why -- why would you prefer the McKee Street?
MS. ANDERSON: The project is a little bit farther along on -- it's what we came up with first and then we decided to add Pershing second. But we're farther along on it. We've had the IP meeting and we've done the survey, and we're getting ready to do the design.
MS. SUHLER: Okay.
MR. FLETCHER: Are there any other questions? All right. Thank you.
MS. ANDERSON: Okay. Thanks.
MR. FLETCHER: Next we have Code Enforcement.

NRT Code Enforcement

Attachments: Neighborhood Response Team

MS. KOTTWITZ: Hi. I'm Leigh Kottwitz; I'm the Neighborhood Services Manager for the City of Columbia. And I'm here to talk a little bit about the funding that is used to pay for half of one of our Code Enforcement Specialists to work in the NRT area. This is a project that you all have funded for several years. I've been with Neighborhood Services for eight years and it was in existence before I started there, so it's been a long-time project for your Commission and for our office, so thank you for that. So tonight we're asking for $30,000, and that would fund half of one of our full-time Code Enforcement Specialists, and their focus would be on property maintenance within the neighborhood response team area. And here in a moment I'll show you a map of where that is in the City. That's been identified through the Consolidated Plan, and certainly that area might change in the future, but I'll share with you where that area is right now. Last year, our staff brought 174 properties into compliance, and looking back from 2010 to 2017, we brought 818 in compliance in that area. So I wanted to share a little bit about why this funding is important to us and why it is needed. And there are a number of reasons why. One is that that within the area that we're working it tends to be older housing stock and also lower income residents. That's why that area was selected. Your funding also helps us because we don't have other money for this work and it would compete against general fund dollars. So please know that's important because your funding helps us not ask City Council for dollars that might compete with public safety or other needs. And then the other thing we notice is that residents in these areas are less likely to call the City and complain about issues. We look at what we might think of as wealthier neighborhoods, those residents feel empowered. They're going to call us and let us know when there is issues. In the neighborhoods where we are working in the NRT area, we don't hear that. So it's important that we have some proactive enforcement so that we can protect those neighborhoods. So this is a map of the NRT area. It's the central city for the most part, all the way out to West Boulevard to the west and then across the central city and it includes Benton Stephens. East Campus is included. And this middle area is what we would call the White Gate neighborhood, and then to the west is the Indian Hills neighborhood near Indian Hills Park. So I wanted to do a little show and tell tonight so you will have an idea of the work that we are doing. I've got a few maps that will show our active cases, and these are available on the City's Website at como.gov on the Community Dashboard. I pulled these off last week, but you could go and every day it's updated with our current active cases. This includes all of the Code Enforcement activity from Neighborhood Services, so it includes more than just what this person is doing. But I wanted to share this just so you had a flavor of the level of cases that we're working on. The property maintenance cases are the little blue wrench on this map, but this isn't a picture of central, this is the White Gate neighborhood. And again, lots of activity in this neighborhood, White Gate, Quail, Sylvan -- this neighborhood, and then East Campus. And certainly a lot that goes on there as well. So I also wanted to share a few examples of some properties, and these are probably the worst-case scenario. When we talk about Code Enforcement, that could be something fairly small when we think about property maintenance. It could be a gutter falling off or a broken window or peeling paint, that kind of thing, but I brought some really extreme examples so you could get an idea of some of the things that we are working on. This is a recent case. This is just across from West Boulevard Elementary. We have already taken this all the way through our nuisance structure process. And right now we are hoping that the Public Administrator can help us with that, but we have deemed this property a nuisance. This is a recent photo of a property in the Benton Stephens neighborhood. You may have heard about this in the news. There was a fire there. They believe it was arson. Prior to this fire, we are -- we were involved here for a couple of reasons. One, because of some nuisances in the yard, but also because of some property maintenance issues. There was a broken window in the front, so we were already working with that property owner. So when the fire occurred, we weren't terribly surprised, but we've engaged him, and he knows our expectation is to get this cleaned up and moved on. This is a -- you wouldn't know it from the photo -- a success story. This is a property up in Indian Hills. This property set vacant for many years, boarded, certainly not something you would want to see in your neighborhood, but we just continued to put pressure on that owner. He sold it, and now it has been rehabbed and is occupied. So I didn't have a more current photo. It looks much better, but you can agree why we don't want to see those things in our residential neighborhoods. 204

Third Avenue, right in our central city, I wanted to share this because this was a voluntary demolition. The City did not do this, but again, just by contacting the owner and making sure they understood what our expectations were to be code compliant, the owner of this property took this down. And we hoped that this would influence and help us take some action on other properties on this street. So this was -- was really the first effort in that neighborhood. This is the back side of a property on Sexton, also a voluntary demolition. And again, just continuing to send notices to that owner to ask him, encourage him to comply with our City Code, and we -- as the application says, we use notices and also will send folks to court to talk to the judge if needed, and then also have the option of an administrative process if we have to take the house down. We're really glad that he could see that we were not going to let down from this effort, and he got this house down and hired the contractor to come in and haul it away. Another example of a property, this is on McBain. There was a neighbor next door who was having trouble selling her house and she said she was living next to this and would really love for the City to come in and give this some attention. And so we took this property through the nuisance structure process -- that's an administrative process the City has to determine if a property needs to be demolished, and we tore that down and tax billed the lot back for that cost. This is the most reason case that we're working. This is at 1004 North Eighth Street. We just did a search warrant a couple weeks ago to determine if it's a nuisance, and we'll take it through the similar process. This owner is somebody that is not living in Columbia. I don't know if he'll come to town because he wants to avoid court and the police and all that good stuff, but again, you can look from this photo and see with the roof damage and the other issues going on here, this is harming our neighborhood. And I'm done.

MR. WHATLEY: Time.

MS. KOTTWITZ: Okay. Well, I will stop with that and see if you have any questions.

MR. SALANSKI: Leigh, one question I have -- Michael Salanski, Fifth Ward. Was there any change in -- you mentioned that the funding that you all are seeking is essentially half of the salary for this particular individual. Did the individual from this time last year change?

MS. KOTTWITZ: Yes. And -- so just a little history about how we have used these dollars. For many years, we had a dedicated person who spent half of their time on this work. That was Bruce Martin. He was the last person designated in this role. He retired about a year and a half ago. When he retired, we used that as an opportunity to do some cross-training and have his work spread among four staff members, and I think they were doing a good job addressing the NRT area. But just recently, we decided to go back and we have identified another inspector, Ken Reeves, and Ken has agreed to dedicate half of his time to this work. And so I think that is going to help us. I think that means that assuming the funding continues, that it's going to be easier for us to tell our story when we come back next year. So that-- that's kind of how we've laid it out. We've split it up among four, but now we're going to go back and dedicate this work to one individual. And I think that's going to be a good thing, and Ken is looking forward to it, and I think it is going to increase our accountability and what we can demonstrate with these dollars too.

MR. FLETCHER: Do you see any kind of reduction in some of the more severe cases as you are focused specifically in this area? I mean, are we making improvement to where there is not a lot of examples anymore of these worst types of houses?

MS. KOTTWITZ: Well, I hope so. I mean, I -- steadily year after year we will -- either we will take down, as the City, a couple of houses or work with property owners to do that voluntarily. I think -- you know, you all are putting a lot more money into new housing in the central city, and that's the other part of this is that we want to protect that investment so that the neighborhoods can be strong and that those -- that investment can be protected. So, you know, that's on our mind too is just making sure

that the new housing stock that is going up is surrounded by well maintained residences as well.
MR. FLETCHER: Randy, where the houses are being taken out, are you guys working to then get ahold of those lots?
MR. COLE: Yeah. We did like all of those lots on Lynn, 6 Fourth is one where we coordinated with the -- with the Code Enforcement person. So, yeah, we do that quite often. I'd say almost every property we've purchased has been some kind of coordination --
MS. KOTTWITZ: Uh-huh.
MR. COLE: -- with her staff.
MR. WHATLEY: Is this completely complaint driven? Is it a process or does the enforcement officer actually drive the neighborhoods and if he or she sees something not right, do they --
MS. KOTTWITZ: Yes. It is primarily identified by staff. Throughout the City about 60 percent of all of our cases are identified by our staff and 40 percent are citizen complaints. And I would say if we were to analyze this area, the citizen complaints are actually lower. And so it's really important to us that we have our staff out on the street looking for these things because it is pretty amazing with some of the photos I have shared with you that people live next to those situations and just don't call us, don't talk to their Councilperson about it, so we want to be proactive because we want to think about the folks that might be living nearby.
MR. FLETCHER: Have you guys considered use of a drone to -
MS. KOTTWITZ: If it were legal.
MR. FLETCHER: Oh, it's illegal?
MR. COLE: I don't know about that. Is it?
MS. KOTTWITZ: Yeah, I don't know if can enter private property.
MR. FLETCHER: To be able to -- because one of the things is access. Right? You don't have legal access to go on individual's property without -- you said you use a warrant sometimes.
MS. KOTTWITZ: Right. Uh-huh.
MR. FLETCHER: But just to do a drive by, I didn't know if you could use something like a drone just to fly over a neighborhood and -- and give you what the backyards look like and other structures that are in the back.
MR. SALANSKI: Perhaps to piggyback off this great suggestion, the $5,000 that you're asking less of this year as opposed to last year, perhaps we can allocate those 5,000 extra dollars to a few drones. I think -- I sincerely think --
MS. KOTTWITZ: We'll talk to our law department.
MR. SALANSKI: I sincerely think it's a good idea because I know a lot of real estate agents --
MR. FLETCHER: Yeah. The real estate --
MR. SALANSKI: I'm not being, like, sarcastic. I think a lot of real estate agents, frankly whether it be farmers or what have you, have done that and have saved a lot of time, energy and effort. And it could be a cost-saving measure, time-saving measure for an individual having to be pounding pavement as it was done last year.
MR. COLE: It's also -- you've got to think of the politics behind our work. You know, people already feel kind of threatened with the City out there and are kind of put off. I think that could give a more heavy-handed approach that might turn a few people off as well bringing in drones. So it might feel a bit scary to some people.
MR. FLETCHER: I can understand that perspective as well.
MR. COLE: Yeah. Yeah.
MR. FLETCHER: Yeah.
MR. COLE: It's -- I like the creativity though.
MS. KOTTWITZ: Yeah. It would be worth considering.

MR. COLE: Yeah.
MS. SUHLER: You mentioned that there are 3,500 housing structures in that area. Like approximately how many cases do you have per year that this person actually would identify and follow up on?
MS. KOTTWITZ: Well, last year we closed out 174 cases within that area. So I don't have a total number of how many they would have opened. Sometimes it takes us more than a calendar year to get them closed, but that might give you some idea. I think citywide for property maintenance, and that's just exterior issues not related to rental or anything like that, we usually run between 400 to 600 cases citywide in a year, so I don't know exactly what that would be for the NRT area, but --
MS. SUHLER: Okay.
MS. KOTTWITZ: -- I'm going to say 200 to 300.
MS. SUHLER: And a half-time person is adequate to follow up on all of those and identify them?
MS. KOTTWITZ: Could we use more time? I'm not exactly sure. The rest of their time is working with rental inspections, and so that's a big chunk of our work. And then also there is property maintenance in other parts of the city. So they always have a lot to keep them busy, even outside of the half-time that you all are able to fund.
MR. FLETCHER: Any other questions? Thank you, Leigh. Next is Acquisition and Demolition, so that feeds right in.

Acquisition and Demolition Program

Attachments: Acquisition and Demolition Program

MR. COLE: Yeah. So we'll just kind of go through all of ours. Jacob is going to do the acquisition, demolition and then the rehab, and then Gary is going to help out with rehab as well and finish up with the Homeownership Assistance. And I'll chime in as needed or not needed. So I'll turn it over to Jacob since he has been the main person working with the Acquisition and Rehab Program. All right. He's been doing a great job. He has learned kind of A to Z how to do it from everything from the environmental review and the lead abatement and asbestos abatement that is required, to procurement and getting the houses down, purchased and all that good stuff. So I'll turn it over to Jacob and Gary.
MR. AMELUNKE: All right. Acquisition and Demolition. We're requesting $100,000. These funds are used for acquisition of real property, demolition of vacant and dilapidated structures, environmental review costs, lead and asbestos abatement and inspections, and legal costs associated with clearing titles. All right.
MR. COLE: Sorry.
MR. AMELUNKE: I'm getting dizzy up here. All right. 6 Fourth property, this is the one that was mentioned that the NRT handed over to us last year that we referred to with Leigh. This is 6 Fourth Avenue. The left most picture is the demolition process, and then the middle picture we're taking down some trees that were dangerous to the houses next door, and then this is what -- the right-most picture is what the lot looks like today. And this is 804 King. This is a CMCA house that we worked with, so the right-most picture is what the house looked like, and -- the right and the top left. And during asbestos abatement when they pulled the siding off, that's actually what it looked like underneath that siding. It was, you know, getting ready to fall in, so it needed to come down. This is 7 and 9 Third Avenue. These are the -- a couple of the lots that we purchased. This large tree that's straight through this picture catty-corner actually had a large branch that was hanging over the house in the back. So once we purchased the property, we cleared up the alleyway and had that tree removed, and there's the stump out there as it sits right now. So this average demolition cost for houses in general, that all depends on how much, if any, asbestos or lead is involved in

taking that stuff out. So the costs vary, but the average total is $31,000. Okay. So the units that we completed in 2017 were 6 Fourth Avenue, 804 King, the acquisition of Third Avenue properties, and the North Eighth Street properties. And the 2016 funds that were expended are $75,756.69, and we have $9,253.31 remaining.

MR. COLE: But we've got probably enough work to not have the rest of our budget on North Eighth.

MR. AMELUNKE: Yes.

MR. COLE: That's it.

MR. SALANSKI: I just have -- it sounds like your partnership with NRT is -- is absolutely extremely important because -- and I don't know that I have ever had dealings with the picture that you shared regarding the asbestos case on the house that had almost yellow siding.

MR. AMELUNKE: Uh-huh.

MR. SALANSKI: But if I were just a passer by that has no knowledge of anything else, I don't know that I would have concluded that that was the problem that was frankly being behind that.

MR. AMELUNKE: Yeah. And that actually was aluminum siding on top of asbestos siding, so the asbestos siding was hidden. And when we -- we do those inspections for every demolition, they pull part of that siding off to see what was under there. And so that stuff had to be taken off. There was actually stuff underneath that had to be taken off.

MR. SALANSKI: But it was the -- it was kind of the NRT folks last year which is kind of splitting time to identify that particular property and then further get into it to do the testing, so they can conclude that it was the issue that it was?

MR. AMELUNKE: The reason that house -- I think that one was actually owned. 804 King was owned by CMCA, but the 6 Fourth Avenue was the one that we worked with NRT on because Ken Reeves contacted me and said that, you know, this property is in a dilapidated state and it's got lots of structure problems. And then, you know, he just kind of says here's the information we have. He may be interested in selling. If you want to contact him -- so then I give him a call and we figure out, you know, prices. We get appraisals to see that we're offering, you know, the correct price. And then once we get all the sale stuff gone through, then we start with the -- the other processes.

MS. SUHLER: When you -- this is kind of fast forwarding to the other side of the process, but when you look at the cost of demolition and acquisition of the property and all of the money that the City gives into it, does that then affect the selling price or what the return the City actually gets on the property when they say build a new home or something?

MR. COLE: No. We usually lose part of that. That's why the private market is not swooping them up, demo'ing them, and selling them. That's why those homes are sitting there. So that's why it takes our funds to fill that gap necessary to get those properties moving forward to help improve the neighborhood.

MR. FLETCHER: So for 2016, it looks like you spent somewhere around, you know, 80 to 85 thousand dollars. And then for 2017 funds, you asked for $90-, but got $50-.

MR. COLE: Uh-huh.

MR. FLETCHER: And then for 2018 funds, I think you -- I don't remember what you asked for, but you only got $30-.

MR. COLE: Uh-huh.

MR. FLETCHER: So it seems -- it seems like your funds available are going downhill. So this reflects past performance. I mean, do you have enough money to continue in 2017 and 2018 funds to keep this project going at the level it needs to?

MR. COLE: We need our 2018 funds released to keep it going, so -- so, yeah. We haven't been identifying any new properties for months.

MR. SALANSKI: And it's not because they don't exist, it's just because --
MR. COLE: Correct.
MR. SALANSKI: -- we don't want to get ourselves into something we can't firmly execute.
MR. COLE: Yeah. Yeah. So we did purchase the North Eighth properties, but we didn't purchase that with CDBG funds. That was local general revenue savings from 2017 that got allocated as part of the 2018 budget.
MR. SALANSKI: And I think to -- I mean that was great recall to Mike's point, but if I recall last year, you all again had asked for $90,000, which was frankly only 5 percent of the other things in which we were considering, and we allocated a third. So perhaps. frankly, we can maybe consider doing a better job knowing that the trajectory that we're on and need, that's evident this go around.
MS. SUHLER: Is this the only funding source for this type of ---
MR. COLE: Uh-huh.
MS. SUHLER: So there's nothing in general revenue or anything?
MR. COLE: So we've gotten the general revenue funds here and there that we've used for some purchases, but no other funding sources for demolition. But we use our demolition sources for demolition and purchase.
MR. FLETCHER: Are these -- these properties, once the demo is done, they're turned over to the Land Bank -- is that the right --
MR. COLE: Land Trust.
MR. FLETCHER: Land Trust.
MR. COLE: So usually they'll go to a CHDO, then to the Land Trust when done or like the ones on Lynn, a couple of those did go straight to the Land Trust. But going forward the thought is, you know all of these where we have put public money in necessary to move them forward, we want those to be protected -- that investment be protected. The plan is moving forward that they will end up in the Community Land Trust.
MR. FLETCHER: Any other questions? All right. Sounds like we're on to Owner Occupied Rehab.

Rehabilitation and Repair Program

Attachments: CDBG Owner Occupied Rehabilitation

MR. COLE: Yeah. I'll turn this over to you guys again.
MR. ANSPACH: Good evening. Gary Anspach with City staff. I want to talk real briefly about our Owner Occupied Rehabilitation Program. And this -- I'm going to just talk about the request for funds at first and let Jake talk a little bit afterwards about what the program does and some of the benefits and show you some pictures of some projects past -- some before and after. The Owner Occupied Rehabilitation Program is one of the staples of functions that we serve here, and this year we're requesting $250,000 to continue that program. The City has been operating a rehab or repair program for many years. We've got project files that date back into the late 70s and early 80s, so this is something that the City has been involved with for -- for a long time and you all have funded this program for a long time, so we appreciate that. For this year, the $250,000 would go towards 20 CDBG funded what we call minor home repair projects. Those projects are a part of our rehab program to where folks with somewhat smaller level types of repairs that are needed, we can go in and usually take care of fairly quickly. The minor home repair program has a program budget of $10,000 or less, and so we're able to do several more projects throughout the year. These things include things like a roof replacement or an HVAC replacement, although they do sometimes get into some other issues which could turn them into a rehab. And so in addition to those 20 minor home repairs, we also feel like we can do six comprehensive

rehabilitation projects, and that includes the CDBG money of the $250,000 in addition to some of our HOME program income that we expect to receive throughout the year as well. So we'll couple that with the CDBG money to perform those comprehensive rehab projects. Many costs are included with a particular project. Some of the list up there that you see, not all of them are included in each project, but many rehab projects along with minor home repair do include some of these costs, and that -- those involve things like third-party inspections, appraisals. We do a lot of work for engineering -- if we have a rehab that deals with foundation issues, we will bring in a professional engineer to give some guidance on the way that project should move forward. We do lead testing on all homes that are older than 1978 to determine the presence of deteriorated lead-based paint. The Rehab and Minor Home Repair has caveats in those programs to allow for abatement or stabilization of lead-based paint. We also provide or obtain clearance that the -- all the lead-based paint during a project has been fully abated or stabilized. We also provide radon testing as part of our rehab programs and put in radon mitigation systems where needed. The $250,000 would also include funds for marketing our program to get the word out to the citizens that we have this program available and how to apply. In certain cases if a rehab project is extensive enough, we do have funds available for relocating a homeowner on a temporary basis. That's had to have -- that's happened in the past at times. And, in addition, we do recording fees. The funds that are used for these programs are loan and grants, so when we do loans, we'll record deeds and promissory notes for those loans against those properties, and then at times, we can amortize part of that loan and receive payments back on rehab and minor home repair projects from the homeowners. And then, of course, it goes towards funding of staff as well. This graph you can see kind of a breakdown of what those items that I mentioned, how those are funded for the $250,000. Under the FY 2019 funding source, you can see in yellow that that adds up to $250,000. We anticipate typically those 20 minor home repair projects being around $7,000 average; the six rehab projects around $25,000 average, and so we have worked that out. In addition to the program income, we would expect to receive not only under CDBG, but HOME as well to kick in a little bit extra, and so we anticipate a total of $375,000 total. $250,000 of which would be what we are requesting for CDBG funds. And so Randy may have some extra insight as to any of those breakdowns or questions if you have them.

MR. COLE: Do you want to move to the next one?

MR. ANSPACH. Yeah. Let's go onto the next one. I'll have Jake talk about some of the repairs and some of the examples that we do.

MR. AMELUNKE: Okay. So this one we thought was a leaking water heater, and it turned out that the air conditioner had been leaking for some time which rotted the bottom of the water heater out and rotted the bottom of the floor out as well and the duct work. So we ended up putting a mini-split heat pump system in this house, and the water heater was sitting where the hole in the floor is. So what we did was temporarily move the water heater over to the right and repaired the floor and removed the old furnace after the new furnace was put in -- new furnace and air conditioning. And then at the end, you can see we moved the hot water heater into the corner to give it more space, and the mini-split system was set up outside and ducted in through the middle of the house to get -- make it more energy efficient for them and not have a hole through his floor.

MR. COLE: And the next one.

MR. AMELUNKE: This one was a rehab that we did, but the -- this is -- her floor was really cold in the wintertime. It was over a crawl space, and this was her bedroom floor. So what we did was have spray foam installed here, and she said it made a huge difference. When it gets down to zero out at night then her room is noticeably warmer. This rehab project -- there's a lot of pictures here. But this was the hot water heater line that came into the bathroom that broke underneath the crawl space, so the sweat on the window and the mold growing was actually not from the shower -- even though this window is in the shower -- or was, but it was actually sweating throughout the whole house because there was so much heat from that pipe busting. So we had that fixed, and then we went into a minor home repair project to take this window out. So her -- you can see her -- this is the side of the tub -- this bottom-left picture. The tub was actually sinking -- you can see it pulling the tile down, and the window was rotting out. And the window, if you look at the right-most picture, would have been right in the center of that -- that shower. So we had that shower put in, and then we redid the rest of it with a new vanity and sink. This is another one that we had done where the bathroom was just wearing out and rotting. It was kind of a weird design where the toilet was actually underneath the counter and you had to remove part of that to get to the float. So we had all of that pulled out and we actually made more room. As you enter, we took the water heater down and put it downstairs and made it a tankless system. And then we were able to move that wall out to get a little more room in that bathroom and make it more accessible. This was for an elderly person, so we had to put in a walk-in shower and a smaller vanity so he could get in and out more easily. So to review, minor home repair, we did five in 2017, and rehabs we did seven and we have zero CDBG funds and $55,375 remaining for 2016.

MR. SALANSKI: A few quick questions. Noticeably more projects I think -- I mean, 20 as opposed to -- was it five -- regarding CDBG related funds?

MR. AMELUNKE: Uh-huh.

MR. SALANSKI: HOME funding is practically on point, but you're not asking for funds to be allocated from that side of the equation. When it comes to being like the largest ask among all the other things that we have to consider, do you mind me asking from a marketing standpoint how important you think marketing is when it comes to the efforts that you all are putting forward?

MR. AMELUNKE: Like spending money on marketing?

MR. SALANSKI: Yeah. I mean, I know the concept of marketing and the importance of it, but the money that you are choosing to allocate based upon the percent to the overall project is about -- call it about a percent a quarter -- $3,000. I'm just curious as to the -- how important you view the marketing regarding these funds to be in relationship to the overall cost of the -- of all the projects. Am I making sense with the question?

MR. COLE: Yeah. We think it's pretty important. The challenge is you have, what, eight people you are working with right now and we're waiting for our funds to come in to get them, you know, all done. So we have this challenge where we want to market and get people in, but then also we get to a point where we don't have money, like last year, we were out of funds for a good three or four months. So then, yeah, we didn't want to market. So it's kind of tricky.

MR. SALANSKI: Well -- and the reason -- the reason I ask that, I mean, often you are trying to push a particular agenda or that you have something in mind and you really want it to hit home, usually 10 percent of whatever the overall cost is, is dealing with marketing. And so that would come to give or take $25,000 based upon your ask. And so I'm curious -- and I don't know if you all could recalibrate this, but if -- but if -- but being it be the largest ask, and there's a lot of projects that this would benefit specifically related to CDBG funded projects, could you ask for more to make it adequate for the marketing, and in my opinion, to really drive home the message that you're trying to portray?

MR. COLE: It could, but I feel like we have plenty of people line up and we haven't had the need to allocate money away from the program. We have been able to get people -- typically, we do a little bit more marketing, like when we get a good chunk of money -- like if we get this $250,000 plus the previous amendments, we will be wanting to get

the word out. And one really good way that we have seen to get the word out -- and this is kind of city-wide -- is putting information in the City Source. It's a very low cost marketing effort that gets a lot of return, like when we sold the homes over on Lynn Street, as soon as we put it in the City Source, that next month we had like 20 calls.
MR. FLETCHER: Is that what comes out with the bill?
MR. COLE: Yeah. What comes out with the Water and Light bill.
MR. FLETCHER: Okay.
MR. COLE: So we have spent a bit more, and I like that thought. We did like a commercial two or three years ago. We could look at doing something like that again. But we want to make sure we hit those low-hanging fruit marketing items too that are low cost.
MR. ANSPACH: Certainly appreciate the -- that prospective, and like Randy said, it is a balancing act at times between lining up too many folks for projects that we can realistically work on at one time and then, you know, promoting and having that material available. We certainly, you know, revise a lot of our promotional material, whether it Is brochures or flyers. But there are people who just naturally come to the program and need help. We do get referrals from, you know -- the code enforcement specialists will refer folks to us, and a lot of times maybe they haven't heard of the program before, but they are coming to us -- and having seen that marketing material. And so we can line projects up through that as well, so I thought it was important to mention that there are folks that --
MR. COLE: We do need to make a new brochure with Jacob on it rather than Eric.
MR. FLETCHER: Are you having any issues with folks not, you know, making the payments, paying the funds back?
MR. COLE: No.
MR. ANSPACH: That's a good question. It's a -- it's -- an important function that we serve in the office is really a loan servicing arm of part of the City. And we have several -- several loans in our portfolio. I think, total -- and not just rehab, but there was, you know, a couple million dollars' worth of older rehab loans that we service. A lot of those loans are deferred to where there -- no payments are necessary. But we routinely have, you know, between 50 and 75 payments every month or so that we enter on a monthly basis for folks who have got minor home repairs and rehab projects in the past, and those payments typically range anywhere between $25 to $100 a month. And so because the loans are zero percent interest, you know, we encourage folks that have those amortized loans to stay current on their payments, but we do serve that function as well as part of this program.
MS. DIBBEN: Is there a long waiting list for this program right now? Are there a lot of people waiting?
MR. ANSPACH: Yeah. Jake might be able to speak a little bit. I know he's got several as we --
MR. AMELUNKE: Yeah. There is not actually a waiting list, it's more of waiting to have -- waiting through the processes of starting the program. We have to do, you know, a historical review, and then, you know, checking for lead. So once the -- once everybody gets their application filled in and it is actually totally done and accepted, with the process we have to go through it could be three to six months. There is not anything that's very quick about going through these --
MS. DIBBEN: So is the process -- that slows things down? It's not the funding?
MR. AMELUNKE: At this point. But sometimes the funding, it's kind of like a, I don't know, slow down on I-70. It's like all of it comes together, and then it kind of slowly spreads apart. And then about the time it spreads apart, you'll realize that you are out of money, and then it will all slam together again.
MR. SALANSKI: Do you have people that bail based upon the process and how intensive it is? They get going through it and then they just essentially say it's not

frankly worth the effort?
MR. COLE: Yeah. We have some return customers that do that too.
MR. AMELUNKE: Yeah. Yeah.
MR. SALANSKI: Is there any -- I'm just trying to think of the efficiency. And again, I'm almost like wanting to throw more money based on how many projects you all -- and just like the job that you all do. Is there -- maybe not marketing, per se, but is there any sort of classes or other things that we -- that you all can like partner with to have an individual perhaps allocate to like preparing people for the process and like helping them? Almost kind of make it seamless to where you're kind of -- maybe you do the hold -- the hand holding already.
MR. AMELUNKE: Do you mean to make it faster?
MR. SALANSKI: Not necessarily to make it faster, but to make it more palatable. Like --
MS. DIBBEN: Less intimidating.
MR. SALANSKI: Yeah. Like if I know that I have to clean my whole house in a day, that might seem daunting, and I just might choose to not do it. But if I know that I'm having, say, someone that's going to coach me through it and tell me, hey, this is the best way you can choose to do this, I might, be like -- my attitude might be different so therefore following through.
MR. AMELUNKE: Yeah. And I did -- I printed off a -- or I made kind of a list of just how the process goes, and I did start walking people through that, you know, just within the last month or so, so they could kind of figure out where the process was. So like a -- you know, the first step after turning in an application when I go to take pictures is the -- is the historical review or the SHPO, as we call it. They have a month after we take the pictures to send that back to us to say that it is okay, and it usually takes close to that amount of time. So I have on there, you know, that's the first thing on the list is we send this in and in a month, I will be getting ahold of you when I get your paperwork back. And then we'll go to the next step of having someone come in and schedule for a lead test. And then, you know, that takes a couple weeks to get that scheduled to have the lead test done. They send the lead test in. So we're figuring two to three weeks for that to come back. And once all those things come back for a minor home repair, then I can start to write up the bid and figure out what needs to happen, not only with -- with what they want fixed, but what we have to fix when we're using these funds. And then in the rehab program, it's even more intensive because we have to do -- you know, we have to have bids done before we have appraisals done, and there are other things thrown in there with classes and such. So the minor repair is faster because we don't have to do as much to get a loan, but there is still several months of just paperwork that is -- it is monotonous to even talk about.
MS. DIBBEN: So is this process coordinated by you guys or is it coordinated -- like, is it the responsibility of the people who are asking for the home --
MR. AMELUNKE: No, it's our process.
MS. DIBBEN: Okay.
MR. AMELUNKE: Or it is us that --
MS. DIBBEN: So you are contacting them and telling them what the next step is?
MR. AMELUNKE: Yeah.
MS. DIBBEN: Okay.
MR. AMELUNKE: So what -- yeah, like after we get the review done -- the first review done, we'll call them and say that I've now -- I'm going to schedule a lead person to come to your house -- or actually, we give them their phone number because it is easier to have them communicate with them to figure out when they are going to be home. And then someone will come and check for lead. And then I'll get the review back, and then we'll have to go and explain to them if they do have lead in the house that we have to fix it. We have them sign documents. I explain where the lead is at

and what different ways it can be fixed. And then I tell them the next process is coming up and I'm going to give their phone number out and it will take, you know, a couple of weeks. That is kind of how we --
MR. COLE: And really Jacob and Gary bear the burden of all that complexity of driving the whole project through. You know, they just have to get information from the homeowners. They do a great job of wading through all --
MR. FLETCHER: Have you looked at doing some of that in parallel versus -- I mean, like --
MR. AMELUNKE: Some of it, you can't.
MR. FLETCHER: -- doing lead testing up front and --
MR. AMELUNKE: Well, the --
MR. COLE: Some of it depends on what the results --
MR. AMELUNKE: Yeah. We can't -- we can't start on a project per the HUD guidelines.
MR. FLETCHER: Okay.
MR. AMELUNKE: When we start, we can't -- we're not even supposed to write up a bid until we get the historical review back.
MR. FLETCHER: Okay.
MR. AMELUNKE: Now some of it you can do and some of it we do in parallel, but like once we get that review back, we have to have the lead part done before I know whether or not I need to include that in a bid to be written up and figure out -- like sometimes that will throw them over their amount, so they may have to back off on what we can spend because we have to fix, say, their windows or their front door have lead. So it's a figuring out process as you go. Some of it can be done together, but not all of it.
MR. FLETCHER: Any other questions?
MS. SUHLER: Just maybe one. The 20 projects that you are -- that you have slotted -- or 26 I guess it is, would you say it is aggressive or is it conservative in terms of the needs of the community?
MR. COLE: It's aggressive with our capacity.
MR. AMELUNKE: Yeah.
MR. COLE: I'll tell you that.
MR. AMELUNKE: That's --
MR. COLE: But there is definitely a higher need.
MR. AMELUNKE: Yeah.
MS. SUHLER: Okay. So actually if you had more money, you could actually do more, but it taxes kind of the resources that you have?
MR. COLE: We could. This would probably be one of our biggest years if we actually get the full 26, which I think we can do, but it would be a big year.
MS. SUHLER: Uh-huh.
MR. SALANSKI: I mean, just a hypothetical follow-up question. I mean, since some of our funding can apparently be allocated for income, is the NRT -- and this I know unrelated to some degree -- is the NRT person, is that City staff or is that independent of City staff?
MR. COLE: It's a City staff person.
MR. SALANSKI: Okay. Is there -- I mean, it sounds like essentially two men do jobs of what should be done by 10 people.
MS. DIBBEN: Yeah.
MR. SALANSKI: Is there any ability, hypothetically speaking, if we were to reallocate funds differently to get you more funds to be able to not have those go towards projects, but to have go towards hiring additional staff to provide for the process and for the efficiency of everything else to kind of comingle together better?
MR. COLE: We could, but if we hired another staff, I would want to be able to double the projects because there is just a certain level of project output that HUD would need

to see if they come in and monitor us. That would be the risk of being too staff heavy.
MR. SALANSKI: Well, then that kind of defeats the whole --
MR. COLE: Yeah.
MR. SALANSKI: -- purpose. Right?
MR. COLE: It's a balancing act.
MR. SALANSKI: Yeah.
MS. SUHLER: Yeah.
MR. FLETCHER: Does the City pay some for the project personnel?
MR. COLE: No.
MR. FLETCHER: Is it totally funded by this?
MR. COLE: This is totally by HUD funds.
MR FLETCHER: Any other questions? Gary and Jacob, thank you.
MR. AMELUNKE: All right. Thanks.
MR. COLE: We've got one more. Oh yeah, Gary has got that.
MR. FLETCHER: Okay.

Homeownership Assistance Program

Attachments: Homeownership Assistance Program

MR. ANSPACH: All right. I think this might -- is this the last one on the list?
MR. COLE: Yeah.
MR. ANSPACH: All right.
MR. FLETCHER: Last, but not least.
MR. ANSPACH: Last one of these. Okay. So the final proposal that we have is for the Homeowner Assistance Program. Again, this is another long-standing City program that the HUD staff has provided for many years. This request is for $250,000 in HOME funding, which would continue the Homeownership Assistance Program. The HOA program as it stands today provides up to $7,500 in closing costs and/or downpayment assistance for eligible buyers who are first time homebuyers purchasing a home inside the city limits of Columbia. The $7,500 is the maximum. We also -- we would go up to 7 ½ percent of the purchase price or $7,500, whichever is less. So a house that is being purchased for less than $100,000, we provide 7 ½ percent of that for downpayment and/or closing costs. In 2017, we did serve 35 households. So 35 families were able to purchase a home inside the city limits of Columbia here using our downpayment assistance. And so as part of the process for obtaining that money, they have to attend our first-time homebuyer class. That first-time homebuyer class is held right here in this room once a month. We have local lenders and real estate agents come in to discuss what the homebuying process is all about. And so last year we had 181 folks attend that class over 12 months right here. And so some of those folks go on to purchase homes and utilize the City assistance; some of them purchase homes without utilizing the City's assistance; and some of them are here just for the information and purchase homes later in the future. So since 2000, we've provided downpayment assistance to 493 folks or households and we've had 100 -- or, I'm sorry, 1,750 households for the homebuyer class come through since 2005. So we're getting our message and we're getting the information out to a lot of folks in the community. Some of the guidelines for our downpayment assistance, folks must be at or below the 80 percent area median income. For a household size of one, that's roughly $41,600. For a household size of four, we are at $52,000, I want to say. Randy, does that sound right?
MR. COLE: Sounds right.
MR. ANSPACH: About $52,000. Some of our other guidelines, front and back end ratios are capped, so the mortgage loan that these folks are getting, they're front end ratio, which their mortgage payment versus their gross monthly income must be under

35 percent. The back end ratio has to be under 45 percent, and that includes minimum debt obligations plus their housing costs divided by their gross monthly income. So we do cap those as part of some standard guidelines. We want to ensure that the folks that we are assisting with this homeownership assistance is getting a good mortgage loan product and will be able to afford that mortgage loan payment based on their -- on their income. We also require credit scores of at least 600 -- I'm sorry, I didn't flip the slide -- No more than $15,000 in non-retirement assets. Folks with what we call non-retirement assets, that would include things like saving account, checking account. Folks with more than $15,000 we feel are able to provide downpayment assistance on their own, so they would be ineligible. We also perform a property maintenance inspection on each house that is being purchased with our assistance, so myself or Jacob or, at times, Randy will do an inspection on a home before it closes. And so we are looking for things that are health and safety related, and you can see from this list that we'll look for peeling paint, we ensure that smoke alarms and carbon monoxide alarms are functional. We want to ensure that the structure is sound. No -- no vegetation problems, no tall weeds or anything like that in the yards. Ensure that windows are operating. We insure that there are handrails on staircases, no leaks in the plumbing, and basic just health and safety items that you would expect for a house that someone is purchasing. So that does exclude certain things like a fixer-upper, so -- or somebody who is wanting to buy a house and flip it and move on. So we do require that these things are corrected prior to closing for the buyers that are using the assistance. The way our $7,500 is formed is through a 10-year forgivable loan. It is forgiven 10 percent a year for the 10 years -- the first 10 years that that participant lives in the home. So we'll forgive up to 750 a year for 10 years as long as they remain the owner/occupant. If the person decides to sell or move from the home, they would owe a pro-rated portion of that 7,500 back to the City. And so we secure all of that with a deed of trust and a promissory note prior to closing. The City records the deed of trust after the mortgage loan has been closed and recorded, so there is a second lien on the property that the City owns. But that loan is forgivable over those 10 years, and staff tracks that forgiveness each year through the course of their 10 years. Once that 10 years is up, the City provides a deed of release and sends that to the homeowner so that they can clear that lien on their title. The importance of this program, it really provides folks in the lower income bracket this opportunity to purchase a home that they may not otherwise be able to afford. The $7,500 in assistance can really kind of close the gap as to what someone may be eligible for, and the price of a house that they are attempting to purchase. This assistance is not out there buying, you know, $300- and $400,000 homes. It's used to help folks get into those starter homes. Typically, our price range is for houses that we're seeing are anywhere between $100,000 and $150,000. It is typically a three-bedroom style house with two baths and a garage. And that's on average of what we see. Our family sizes are somewhere in the neighborhood of three to four people per household, and we serve folks in many different demographics. We find that this stabilizes neighborhoods, if we're able to provide homeownership to folks that are moving out of either subsidized housing or moving out of rental housing. We see folks come from the Columbia Housing Authority. We find folks who have been renting a long time in town and have either improved their credit score or have saved up money, you know, from their job or whatever the case may be and make that transition to homeownership. And finally, this is one of the only programs that really does assist folks into getting into home ownership. I know the Housing Authority provides some assistance and -- in some ownership building, but this really is the step that gets those folks into -- into buying their house. To just summarize it really quick, we would use the $250,000 in HOME money to serve 35 folks for downpayment assistance, and then we would also expect at least 150 folks through the homebuyer class for this year. I think that's the last

slide. I'll take any questions that you might have about the homeownership assistance request.

MR. FLETCHER: Does your -- does your program income, does it fluctuate a lot? Like all the sudden, you get a -- somebody ends up having to move because of their job after five years and you get a big chunk of money you weren't expecting? Does that happen a lot?

MR. ANSPACH: We -- on homeownership assistance, we do at times get folks who move or sell, and that does trigger a repayment or that repayment of that forgivable loan. But because the loans are all $7,500 or less, typically there is not a large chunk coming back. You know, on average, folks are staying in their homes three to five years, so when we see a repay or payoff, it's typically $3,000 to $4,000, sometimes even less. Our big payoffs occur on rehab projects and things like that when the initial investment was in the $20,000 to $30,000 range.

MR. COLE: We did a guideline change too. About three years ago we went from $5,000 forgivable over five years to $7,500 forgiven over 10, so we probably haven't seen the impact of that policy decision yet. So our recapture probably will go up slightly in the next three to five years.

MR. SALANSKI: You mentioned earlier that one of the prerequisites is that potential person or persons that is needing assistance can't have any liquid savable means exceeding $15,000. Is there any sort of follow up -- for example, sometimes in my profession I will deal with an individual that leads me to believe that have x, and then lo and behold, there is a pending lawsuit that has them to receive $50,000 that entirely change -- I mean, had I known what I don't know, changes the -- so is there a follow-up annually since we -- since there is that ten-year partnership, perhaps?

MR. ANSPACH: Certainly, I understand what you're saying. We look at the situation at the time of application. We look at all the folks in the household, so we look back at bank statements and income for the last several months for each person in the household. Unfortunately, there is no follow up beyond once that loan is closed. That assistance has been provided. So if the situations change and in cases that happens where someone's income may just substantially change after closing or they may have a windfall, but in terms of doing those extensive checks as to maybe a pending lawsuit or something like that, we don't take those steps. But what we would look at is if there's large unexplained deposits, much like an underwriter might look at into a bank account or we feel like there may be someone providing additional funds beyond just the employment of the participants, we would ask for explanations of that and proof as to where those deposits are coming from.

MR. SALANSKI: And that's prior to or that's after the fact?

MR. ANSPACH: That's -- that's all prior to.

MR. SALANSKI: Okay. I guess my -- and you ask for three months' worth of bank statements?

MR. ANSPACH: Yeah. We go back I think -- I believe it's three months on bank statements and at least the last two months on employment check stubs. And then we look at W-2s and tax returns from the past three years, not only just to prove no homeownership credits have been used on or -- you know, tax credits have been used, but also to prove prior addresses that they are indeed a first-time homebuyer. So we do look at those past documents, but once the loan is closed and once the assistance has been provided, at this point there is no follow up or there is no penalty if someone was to have a change in income or have like a windfall of money come their way. But we do our -- we do our diligence to try to determine what is that situation leading up to the purchase of the home at that time.

MS. SUHLER: Is there any stipulation that the home can't be rented out or subleased?

MR. COLE: Uh-huh.

MR. ANSPACH: Yes, ma'am. Yes, ma'am. As part of the agreements that the participants sign with us, renting out the home or not remaining the owner/occupant would trigger the repayment or the full payment of that $7,500. So whatever hasn't been forgiven, if we -- if we determine that they are no longer living in that home or they are renting it out, they are subject to the recapture portion of that -- that $7,500, whatever is left would not be forgiven at that point.

MS. SUHLER: And do you actually go and kind of poll people each year to make sure that is the case?

MR. ANSPACH: There are times where, you know, with our code enforcement folks -- with neighborhood services, if -- they may refer a case to us and if we've got record that it's a homeowner, but they are getting record that there is rental going on -- rental activity at that address, then we would definitely follow up and make that determination at that point.

MS. SUHLER: Okay.

MR. WHATLEY: Do you have any kind of a wait list? So let's say you -- nine months into the year you spend all or loan out all $250,000, do you encourage potential homebuyers to work with the small banks or --

MR ANSPACH: We don't -- yeah, we don't have a current wait list, and we've been -- we've been lucky that we haven't ever had to use a wait list. I think in the past maybe there was where we had to shut it down at one point.

MR. COLE: You all have kept allocating more money to it because the need has been there. We 've had a couple of big projects that didn't go through like that Jeff Smith project two years ago. So it seems like we've gotten good allocations to that program because we have been requesting high ones and we want to keep it moving.

MR. ANSPACH: It's a good pipeline. There are lots of folks moving through. In fact, we've got four that's probably going to close in the next two weeks. And so we feel -- we feel like we have a good -- a good program. We have a lot of partners with our local lenders that are providing participants to us and we just feel like it's in good shape and will continue.

MR. COLE: Gary does a good job with reflecting well on the program and to the community. My first year here, we did 12 homes, so he has pretty much tripled our production. I think that's a lot through his efforts.

MR. FLETCHER: All right. Gary, thank you so much. That finishes up all the public hearings. So we can work backwards in the agenda and go to reports.

VIII. REPORTS

Community Development Needs Survey Update

MR. COLE: All right. So the first one was just an update on our Community Development Needs Survey. We've got 321 survey responses.

MR. SALANSKI: Should we say thank you to Paul right now?

MR. COLE: Yeah.

MR. WHATLEY: Well, not yet, because let's see what happens.

MR. COLE: I think 42 percent of them were from Ward Four.

MR. WHATLEY: I sent out my final plea email today asking to get us over the 400 mark, so -- you know, through the Nextdoor community.

FY 2018 Funding Allocation Amendment

Attachments: CDBG Allocation Amendment

HOME Allocation Amendment

MR. COLE: That's cool. Well, we're going to keep it open through May 31, and whatever we get by that date, I'm going to email a spreadsheet over to Mitch because he said he his company has some software that they thought they could do some extra tabulations, which would be really good. So we'll see what he can come up with before the June 20th meeting. So I've got some big items on the agenda in a very non-typical year. So you guys have a lot on your plate. So my main goal for tonight was to get everybody a firm understanding of what we need to do and by when. And then also get feedback from you all of what further information I can provide to help you make good decisions. So we're in the middle of the 2019 funding allocation process for collecting proposals that will be funded next year, but Congress was very late this year in deciding a budget. This is one of the latest notifications I've received for 2018 funds, and it was a wild year. There was a proposal to eliminate the programs altogether, but we ended up getting an increase, so go figure. So we got a 10 percent increase in CDBG dollars, which is about $90,000 and a 43 percent increase in home, which is about $250,000. And that all being said, HUD doesn't remove all of our expenditure requirements. They are all in place and we've got to get everything done on time just as normal. So that presents a real challenge. The challenge is getting those funds allocated to viable projects that will move forward, but also making sure we're being strategic in our decisions and not just throwing money haphazardly. So that's a lot to do and a very important task, but a good opportunity too. So the estimated CDBG for 2018 funds, so these are the funding allocations you all recommended last year -- so last July 2018. We estimated $835,000 and that's about what we've been funded at for close to every year I've been here. But the actual amount would be $924,326. The estimated HOME was $415,000, but the actual is $651,000. So we haven't seen funding allocations this high since before the budget crisis started in 2008, so well before I was here. So the increase in HOME funds is beyond the level of funds even requested, so I've got some thoughts there I want to share, and then we still have 60 days to amend the 2018 recommendations that you guys provided last July and get an annual plan together, approved by Council, and to HUD on their -- in their office within 60 days of them notifying us. They notified us on April 27th, so that means I have to have it to them by June 26. And within that 60-day time period, it will take two Council meetings and a 30-day notice period, and I want to work in at least two meetings for you guys to absorb this information, synthesize it, think about how to make a good decision, and then make a recommendation. So that's a heck of a lot altogether. And there's a lot of moving parts.

MR. FLETCHER: Do we have enough time?

MR. COLE: We do. So my thought is tonight I present like I always do -- I give you a starting point for recommendations, and like always, these are just my recommendations to get started. I'm not married to them, and I would really prefer if you guys had thoughts about moving funds around or changing things because it really needs to be owned by the public body that you are that makes recommendations for how we submit funds. So we really need you all to kind of review what my recommendations are, have a discussion, give feedback, figure out things that I can do to bring to the next meeting to help you with that decision, and then make the decision at the next meeting. So I had Darcie bump our meeting time. Hopefully this is okay with you all. I want to see if that is all right with you for our next meeting to be at 6:30. I don't know if that's all right with everyone to give us a little more time. And I was thinking we would do the -- the hearing in there for our 2019 requests in the Council chambers and then take like a five- or ten-minute break and come in here and hash out 2018 because I just feel like this is a better space where I can have the chart up and it's a little more intimate. It's easy to interact. I was thinking we would bring some food or something, and then figure out the 2018 funds. So hopefully that sounds like an okay plan for you all.

MR. FLETCHER: It doesn't sound like the time is going to be a problem.

MR. REGAN: Can I ask a question, Randy?

MR. COLE: Yeah. Yeah.

MR. REGAN: So is this going to be kind of a common thing now because I noticed we are at 2019 you also have the $835,000 as the expected --

MR. COLE: I viewed the --

MR. REGAN: So is the one off thing or --

MR. COLE: I viewed this allocation process, and I could be completely wrong. I viewed it as an anomaly due to just the crazy environment in Washington. We had a year where it was like everybody get everything that they wanted. Now, we'll cut taxes, boost spending, we've got the midterms coming up, so it was kind of everybody take all. That's what it seemed like. I could be wrong.

MR. FLETCHER: Well, like you said, we --

MR. COLE: Yeah.

MR. FLETCHER: I was concerned at one point that the funding was going to be cut completely.

MR. COLE: Yeah. Now, the house proposed budget for 2019 kept CDBG at 10 percent increase and HOME was decreased a little bit, but it was still higher than what it was in the past. I just don't know how long that will stick. So I felt it was responsible to go back to what our baseline was last year. I could be wrong, but it seems like it would be better to having this discussion versus next year figuring out who you are going to take money from in this type of meeting.

MR. FLETCHER: After they've made plans. Yeah.

MR. COLE: So tonight I was hoping you would review what my recommendations were to do and start thinking of how you would do it differently. Also, on top of this we've got our 2017 CHDO proposal out and it's looking like right now Job Point is potentially going to be the only group proposing, so I would just throw in their proposal at the next meeting. Kind of with that, that's the Third Avenue properties that we're putting that money around, and there is a decision there, so the alleyway there the neighborhood really wants redone to have rear garages. I think we discussed this --

MR. FLETCHER: Yep.

MR. COLE: -- a couple of meetings ago. I had Job Point submitting two proposals as well as if any of the other CHDOs decide to present. One with two houses with rear-loading garages and one with one house with a front-loading garage. That way it gives you flexibility of, yeah, we want to spend the extra $95- in CDBG to redo the alleyway or, no, let's just put one house there and put that $95- somewhere else. So it gives everybody flexibility. So my approach to providing your recommendations I'll go over was to fund up all of the projects that you all voted for funding to what they requested. I didn't propose putting it to new projects that didn't get funded last year for a couple of reasons, but if you adamantly want to fund another project, you guys should make that recommendation and we'll get it done. But the reason I didn't is because Jacob talked about a lot of that environmental review process. We're already down the road on that for most of these other projects, so we haven't started that process on any one that you didn't recommend for funding. And those processes can take anywhere between 60 to 90, and sometimes 120 days, and it would just put that out further. So this November we're going to hit all of our expenditure requirements easy for CDBG. It's the next November that's going to be the tricky one because we've got this big influx of funds and then we also have the funds that we reallocated through those amendments.

MR. FLETCHER: Yeah.

MR. COLE: The bus shelter one and then the Wilkes Boulevard one. Those two plus additional funds are going to put pressure on us next November, so it is really important that we allocate the shovel-ready projects. So I was thinking to go over my recommendations tonight and hear all the proposals for 2019, so in the event you see something there that could be funded right away and you want to do it, you could do that. You could make that recommendation at the next meeting. But that's kind of where my head is at. This is --

MR. FLETCHER: So let me -- from what I just heard you say, so at the next meeting if we hear something that -- that we don't believe we would have the money for in the 2019 funds, but we could give them -- we could give them 2018 funds to go forward immediately with it if they were in a position to be able to do that?

MR. COLE: You could, yeah. But I would really, really want it to be a project that's like, wow, they could get started with that within 90 days, you know. And there's a couple in there that might fit that mold.

MR. FLETCHER: You haven't given us that forward look, have you, of what's going to be presented at the next meeting? Have we gotten that?

MR. COLE: I have it. The top page -- maybe I can back up. I was kind of stuck on 2018, but the second page in the packet that everybody has has everything that was submitted for 2019 projects. So you heard all of the City ones. The Housing Authority had two projects. They had an additional tax credit project with HOME funds down there at $100,000, plus their Park Avenue facility improvements, Kings Kids had the facility purchase, Central Pantry improvements, that was a lighting efficiency improvement that they're proposing. Then we've got Job Point, their proposal. So, yeah, we've got quite a bit in funding proposals -- $1.2 million CDBG and $458,000 HOME.

MS. DIBBEN: So how much again was it that was -- came back from those projects that we need to now fund?

MR. COLE: So you guys allocated all of the previous, so maybe I'll go back to this 2018 sheet.

MR. REGAN: Ninety-five, wasn't it in 2017?

MR. COLE: Yeah. So how about we start at the 2018 sheet?

MR. FLETCHER: Well, we've reallocated all of the 2017 stuff already. Right? 2017?

MR. COLE: There's $95- hanging out there that we didn't that we're going to roll into this process. So that's where I'm saying you could redo that alleyway as a part of that CHDO project and get that to work right away.

MR. FLETCHER: So we have $95,000 from 2017.

MR. COLE: Uh-huh.

MR. FLETCHER: Plus in 2018, we have $250,000 as CDBG, roughly, and $90,000 -- no, the other way around.

MR. COLE: Uh-huh.

MR. FLETCHER: Two hundred and fifty thousand dollars of HOME and $90,000 of CDBG.

MR. COLE: Yeah.

MR. FLETCHER: So $180,000 in CDBG, and $250,000 in HOME.

MR. COLE: Uh-huh.

MR. FLETCHER: That's a lot of money.

MR. COLE: Yeah.

MR. FLETCHER: That's a lot.

MR. COLE: Yeah. So maybe I can go through the 2018 sheet I passed out. So I had funding up SIL to their full proposal. You guys recommended them at $100-. Move them up to the full $119,350. Moving up our Rehab program to what we requested last year from $160,000 to $194,000. Boosting up the Home Ownership Assistance Classes by just $1,700. I didn't increase the Demo for the Code Enforcement because that is kind of fixed cost. They're not going to hire another inspector if we get another $10,000 or $15,000. The Demo I didn't just because I felt I needed to fund our partners up too. So this is where I need your all's help. So increase Job Point's up from $102,700 to $110,000. And then the CMCA from $74,000 to $85,000. So the thought being it would help them do all their projects to the extent that they wanted to from the

get go. I do have Admin going up in our budget. Our salaries will all stay the same, but we are redoing our Consolidated Plan and working with the Fair Housing Task Force over the next year and a half, so we plan to engage some kind of consulting assistance in those efforts, so it would be nice to have that flexibility if we needed like some kind of facilitator or some additional data analysis. So that's CDBG.
MR. FLETCHER: So the money coming from 2017 has to be spent in 2018?
MR. COLE: So for CDBG, we can't have more than 1.5 times our annual allocation on hand every November, so you could have a couple of years back, but that's going to bite you if you have too much back because it's going to push that ratio. So really, yeah, the $95- that we have back from 2017, we need to get allocated to something that is going to get started in 2018.
MR. WHATLEY: Within the 90 days?
MR. COLE: Not by a specific rule, but just by needing to get out front of meeting our ratio not this November, but next November.
MR. FLETCHER: So the increased allocations you have recommended here in yellow --
MR. COLE: Uh-huh.
MR. FLETCHER: -- does that -- that doesn't come close to addressing all of the funds that we have. Correct?
MR. COLE: Correct. So that addresses the addition in 2018 funds that we get, but I mentioned -- I recommended putting that $95- to the CHDO project to round out that alleyway so that they can two homes rather than one. That's just -- that's an option. But you guys could have a different -- different take on it. The HOME funding for 2018 --
MR. FLETCHER: Before -- before we go to HOME --
MR. COLE: Uh-huh.
MR. FLETCHER: -- let me -- I just -- so one of the things that is important to me is Community Facilities. And if you look at 2017 and 2018, we had a lot of requests.
MR. COLE: Uh-huh.
MR. FLETCHER: And we funded virtually none of them. One out of -- of -- or is it two? So it was a pretty low percentage.
MR. COLE: We funded Wilkes, but then they gave it back.
MR. FLETCHER: They gave it back. Right. So we really ended up in two years' time -- so in 2017 that Community Facility's funding was -- ended up being zero. We had good intentions, but it didn't work out.
MR. COLE: Uh-huh.
MR. FLETCHER: And now in 2018, we have one project we are funding. So it seems like we are lagging behind and I don't know if there is any way to get some of this funding for some of the facility stuff, but --
MR. SALANSKI: I will say -- and I think it's a fair point, Mike. But I also think it's important to reflect back as to why we did that based upon the presentations that were presented. If you recall, the Family Health Center, which suggested the renovations, we had a lot of issues with that based on the presentation. We thought that the costs for essentially labor and paint we thought was relatively high. One of the doors of the two doors that was proposed wasn't even ADA compliant. There was a lot of issues with that, so, frankly, I think we wanted to give money had there been a better presentation. YEZ, the Youth Empowerment Zone, again one of those programs that one, they obviously had a director change, to say it politely. Two, they -- if you recall, the proposal, there weren't a whole lot of answers to questions that frankly should have been -- should have been prepared -- I mean should have been questions that he -- that that director at that time should have been prepared to answer. So, to me, I don't disagree. I think -- I mean, Job Point has been -- has continued to be a good steward of funds that were allocated. I think if we are going to discuss anything --
MR. FLETCHER: Didn't the City -- didn't the City for Job Point help with their facility

purchase?
MR. COLE: So the --
MR. FLETCHER: They got funding.
MR. COLE: -- Council allocated $250,000 in funds.
MR. FLETCHER: Yeah. So that's off the table.
MR. SALANSKI: Yeah.
MR. FLETCHER: So I was still going back -- so keep in mind --
MR. COLE: There's a nuance --
MR. FLETCHER: So keep in mind when we -- when we were looking at this originally, we had a pretty sharp scalpel.
MR. SALANSKI: Right.
MR. FLETCHER: Because we were so short on funds. So we were pretty meticulous, particular. So some of those comments may not be as sharp now that we have extra funding. So, you know, we still have the opportunity -- probably out of all these, the Family Health Center is still -- would be an opportunity for us to make improvements to another facility that would be in the wheelhouse of what we could --
MR. COLE: Would you mind if I chimed in for a second on the Job Point funds?
MR. FLETCHER: Go ahead.   Yeah.
MR. COLE: So there is $250,000 allocated out of the City surplus funds.
MR. FLETCHER: Yep.
MR. COLE: But as the legal department dug into it and put additional requirements on how those funds are spent, they are to be spent on the programming itself rather than purchasing the facility. So those funds likely won't be spent on the facility itself, so there might be an opportunity if you did want to fund Job Point's facility purchase, there might be an opportunity to move some of their funds there.
MR. SALANSKI: Well -- and I know it wouldn't fund -- I mean, I don't recall specifically the amount for that facility.
MR. COLE: I think the request was $275,000.
MR. SALANSKI: Okay. So obviously it would bridge the gap, but it certainly wouldn't cover it.
MR. COLE: Uh-huh.
MR. SALANSKI: I guess my thing is is just to not -- I'm all -- I won't say giving money, but I'm all for providing funds for entities that have demonstrated time and time again to be a good steward of those funds and have proposed, whether it was a year ago or two years ago, their management of those funds and putting it to meaningful purposes. I -- I'm like -- I guess I'm like you, Mike, that I would like to fund Community Facilities as a part of the pie more, but frankly --
MR. FLETCHER: It would have to be viable requests. Absolutely.
MR. SALANSKI: Yeah. I just don't --
MR. FLETCHER: No, I agree with that.
MR. SALANSKI: I just don't know how impressed we were then and --
MR. FLETCHER: Yeah.
MR. SALANSKI: -- frankly, I would want to --
MR. FLETCHER: So keep in mind we can always put stipulations on any approved funds, so if we don't like it or whatever --
MR. SALANSKI: Oh, I see.
MR. FLETCHER: -- we can always put contingencies on things. Would it be possible just to talk back with the --
MR. COLE: Uh-huh.
MR. FLETCHER: -- Family Health Center and let them know that we've -- you know, our funding resources have changed and we might consider it if they still have a need. Maybe they found another funding resource and the project is already done. I have no idea.

MR. SALANSKI: And perhaps to your point, Mike -- and I don't know that I knew that, could we -- if we were to -- if the Commissioners were to consider that as an option, I suppose we could then make it contingent upon both doors --
MR. FLETCHER: They might modify --
MR. SALANSKI: And again, why the heck would the one --
MR. FLETCHER: Can they bring back a modified proposal?
MR. COLE: You guys could fund a specific part of the proposal if you wanted.
MR. FLETCHER: Yeah.
MS. SUHLER: I agree with --
MR. FLETCHER: So that's just a possibility?
MS. SUHLER: I think --
MR. FLETCHER: Just a possibility. Just a possibility. I just think that we've missed a gap and I agree some of it may be, you know, the requests are really big and we -- when one organization comes with such a large request, it's hard for us to make that decision.
MR. COLE: What's specific information would you like me to get from the Family Health Center?
MR. FLETCHER: Just ask them if they still have their need.
MR. COLE: If they are still interested --
MR. FLETCHER: Yeah. Just have an initial discussion.
MR. REGAN: A breakdown of each specific item that they need there. I think it was re-upholstery of the chairs, there was painting, redoing the floors --
MS. SUHLER: Carpet.
MR. SALANSKI: And then the doors.
MR. REGAN: The two automatic doors.
MR. COLE: Well, the chairs is ineligible, so --
MR. SALANSKI: The chairs are ineligible.
MR. COLE: Ineligible. Yeah. We can work on the building itself. Maybe I'll look through their proposal and just ask what their need is. So if we are asking one organization, it kind of begs the question should we be asking each of the organizations.
MR. FLETCHER: And if you think that that is their right process --
MR. SALANSKI: I guess my concern is --
MR. FLETCHER: -- for an update.
MR. SALANSKI: -- again, that we're dealing with --
MR. FLETCHER: That would be fair.
MR. SALANSKI: -- lack of time.
MR. FLETCHER: Yeah.
MR. SALANSKI: I don't disagree with the idea of fairness, but I guess is that really --
MR. REGAN: I do recall we debated a lot on the Family Health Center whether or not to fund them, so it was kind of one of those things that we actually debated at the time. So I think some of us wanted to fund them, but they also didn't come back, so we couldn't get the answers to the questions we had. So we decided based on that to kind of -- just kind of put the funds towards other areas. And I know there was people wanting to fund them. I know me, personally, I was wanting to fund them because I know it makes a big difference for them and Medicare payments and all that as well. So with that being said, I don't think we have enough to really make a difference with Youth Empowerment Zone or Job Point's request for $275,000, but the $67,000, and if we limit it to certain aspects is a realistic possibility of funding.
MR. SALANSKI: Yeah. I --
MS. SUHLER: And maybe looking at the projects that are for 2019 that you said could be, you know, moved back, something like the Central Missouri Food Pantry --
MR. COLE: Yeah.

MS. SUHLER: -- the improvements, that might be something $19,000 -- that would also help bridge the --
MR. COLE: That seems like a really tight project that could be done pretty quickly in my opinion when I reviewed it.
MS. SUHLER: Right. And that would put the Facilities --
MR. COLE: Uh-huh.
MS. SUHLER: -- so everybody else would be small enough --
MR. FLETCHER: I'm sorry. Where --
MR. COLE: It's a -- it's a new proposal for 2019 for the Food Bank.
MR. FLETCHER: Food Bank.
MR. COLE: It was a pretty tight proposal that was well done.
MR. SALANSKI: So -- sorry. Say that again. So we could hypothetically hold funding -- or, excuse me --
MR. COLE: You could allocate that project to --
MR. FLETCHER: We could -- yeah. Because this is just a --
MR. SALANSKI: Oh, we could fund it sooner?
MR. COLE: Yeah.
MR. FLETCHER: That's right. It's a request --
MR. SALANSKI: Okay.
MR. FLETCHER: it's a request for funds, and if we have funds available right now, we can go ahead and give it to them. They don't have to wait for 2019 funding. If it is shovel-ready, we could move --
MR. COLE: I think that is where being able to hear all those proposal that night before you have the decision, you can get a fuller picture, and then I can do a little legwork on your request.
MR. SALANSKI: Yeah. And perhaps they maybe did get a little bit of funding and the gap isn't as -- with regard to the Family Health Center isn't as extensive as we had thought then. And so perhaps if we did the $19,000 and then -- yeah, I think that's a good --
MS. DIBBEN: I have a question.
MR. SALANSKI: -- suggestion.
MS. DIBBEN: Is there a reason why you -- all the recommendations you made are just for projects that were already approved for funding? You didn't go back to ones that weren't approved?
MR. COLE: Yes. I did because that's the safest way to know those are all viable projects that are going to happen, and the money will get spent.
MS. DIBBEN: Okay.
MR. COLE: So that's -- I erred on the side of what is going to get this money out the door and then spent and -- but still serve more people. So like Services for Independent Living, they're going to serve more people with more money. Our Rehab Program will serve more money with more people [sic]. But also it is less risk. The less organizations we allocate funds to the less risk and less administrative burden on the front end in terms of doing our environmental reviews and getting agreements before Council and doing all that.
MS. DIBBEN: Okay.
MR. COLE: So that's why I erred on the side of just funding what you all thought rose to the top of being the best.
MS. DIBBEN: So it's more likely we are going to reach our goal if we focus on things that have already been funded than things that --
MR. COLE: What I proposed --
MS. DIBBEN: -- we have that are completely questionable at this point.
MR. COLE: What I proposed would do that.
MS. DIBBEN: Okay.

MR. COLE: But certainly if you guys feel the need to hit a different facility that was done in the past that we could get done or something that was proposed in ’19, it’s -- it’s your decision.
MR. FLETCHER: There’s a lot of options.

FY 2019 Public CDBG & HOME Project Proposals

MR. COLE: But I was erring on the side of being safe and getting work done quickly. Did we -- did we give the CDBG enough of a look to move onto the HOME?
MR. FLETCHER: Yes.
MR. COLE: Okay. All right.
MR. FLETCHER: Let’s do it.
MR. COLE: All right. Very good.
MR. FLETCHER: Because that’s where even more money is available.
MR. COLE: Yeah. It seems like that big kicker hanging out there for CDBG is that $95,000. So the HOME funding, funded up the Home Ownership Assistance Program and basically do one more home. Bryant Walkway you already fully funded, so I just left that as it is. Our CHDO set aside will go up. That’s a federal requirement of 15 percent of our HOME funds go to CHDO, and that goes to CMCA, Job Point, Habitat. So that’s got to be that number. So Job Point’s Boone Prairie project funded up to $50,000. Bill has been making really good headway on that project; however, he is not as far down the road for predevelopment as he would want to be, so actually myself and Jacob have been talking with him. He still has two empty lots in his development we funded out south of town. It was Old Plank Estates. So we have been seeing if he would be open to instead of doing two lots out of his Boone Prairie because he still has additional engineering and work to do out there, could we allocate that out to finish out his lots on Old Plank, and he was very excited about that. And I said that would need to go back before the Commission to be approved, but it seems like a really good way to get two homes done in a more timely fashion because we have already done the full environmental review on that whole site back in 2014. That’s something to just keep in mind for the next meeting when you are making recommendations. So you’ve got about four or five things. So the North Eighth property, we just purchased -- well, we haven’t purchased it yet. Council approved at their last meeting for us to purchase by consent which was pretty cool. They’re really supportive of us on our next project there. So you’ll see CHDO funding -- the next CHDO funding round -- this $97- will go over towards those lots. So that’s three big lots on North Eight Street between Club Vogue and then southward. There are three vacant lots. They are about a little over an acre. I think we can eventually fit close to 12 homes there. We’ve done a lot of work with the neighborhood. I was in a neighborhood meeting last night. They are all excited about it. They want to see owner occupied homes going in there that fit their neighborhood. They are all -- they are fired up. So I was thinking it would be good to budget for funds to do more houses there, but knowing we’re going to do a process to identify who is going to build those down the road. So we’ll do an additional funding process.
MR. FLETCHER: We -- okay. So haven’t allocated any funds for that project right now?
MR. COLE: Right. We --
MR. FLETCHER: We really haven’t --
MR. COLE: All of those properties --
MR. FLETCHER: -- had a presentation on anything. Right?
MR. COLE: Right. So this would be holding back funds saying, hey, we’ve got funds for this property and then receive applications just like your CHDO funding process.
MR. FLETCHER: Aren’t we running out of people who can build all these houses?
MR. COLE: We’re not.

MR. FLETCHER: Because you just told me -- well, you just told me Habitat for Humanities is maxed out.
MR. COLE: Yeah.
MR. FLETCHER: And then -- and we're down to just two CHDO.
MR. COLE: So the one --
MR. FLETCHER: I mean, folks are building houses.
MR. COLE: So for the --
MR. FLETCHER: Right?
MR. COLE: I would engage a private developer to do those homes just like we did over on Lynn Street. So on Lynn Street, we had the same issue. Our CHDOs have a certain level of capacity, so they did three homes, but we're doing seven total there. So we had a private developer do four. So I would think we would do a similar arrangement. We've got a good structure that shows it works. We would do a similar arrangement over there on --
MR. FLETCHER: Are they cost competitive with the CHDOs --
MR. COLE: Yes.
MR. FLETCHER: -- given all the --
MR. COLE: Very much.
MR. FLETCHER: -- extra materials they get and the services they get from Job Point?
MR. COLE: They are very cost competitive. So this action will just budget the funds for that, but some -- any kind of RFP would come back to the Commission to review it, so it's not like these funds are allocated to a specific person to take it and run.
MR. FLETCHER: So they would be unallocated actually is what we would do.
MR. COLE: We need to show in our annual action plan that we have identified a project. So we've got the property and we're going through the predevelopment process now.
MR. FLETCHER: Okay.
MR. COLE: And then we would allocate the --
MR. WHATLEY: Allocate for future use?
MR. COLE: Uh-huh. And that future use would likely be January or February of this coming year.
MR. FLETCHER: I mean, what -- for HOME funds, we are pretty limited in how we can spend it. Right?
MR. COLE: Uh-huh.
MR. FLETCHER: I mean, it's not a lot of choices.
MR. COLE: So that's -- that's kind of the full picture. So that's a lot.
MR. FLETCHER: The HOME -- the HOME funds can't be used to pay for that alleyway --
MR. COLE: Right.
MR. FLETCHER: -- for the other project?
MR. COLE: Right. The money doesn't play nice together.
MR. FLETCHER: Does anybody have any questions -- more questions? Now, what's our -- what's our limitations for communicating if we have -- if any of us have questions as we think about this over the course of the next month in terms of email and communicating?
MR. COLE: Yeah.
MR. FLETCHER: I know there's some --
MR. COLE: So you don't want to break the Sunshine Law, so you don't --
MR. FLETCHER: Right.
MR. COLE: -- email --
MR. FLETCHER: So refresh our memory on what --
MR. COLE: So the best thing to do is if you have a question or something you want to communicate to the group between here and the next meeting, send it to me and then I

send it out via email. I'll blind carbon copy everybody. So I'm just communicating information.
MR. FLETCHER: Okay.
MR. COLE: You don't -- what you don't want to is back and forth.
MR. FLETCHER: Okay. So if somebody asks a question, you'll --
MR. COLE: Yeah.
MR. FLETCHER: -- shotgun that to everyone?
MR. COLE: I'll say, Hey everybody, Mike asked this question. It was an okay question and here's the answer.
MR. FLETCHER: Okay. And then you're going to follow up with the facility about if they are still interested in some funding?
MR. COLE: Yes. Would it be all right if I followed up with everybody? Maybe not YEZ given everything that has come to past there.
MR. FLETCHER: Yes. I would -- I think -- and, yes, I think that would be appropriate.
MR. COLE: I would be nice to be able to follow up with -- I guess the other one would be Job Point.
MR. FLETCHER: Okay.
MR. SALANSKI: I misunderstood you. I'm sorry. I thought you were following up with -- but since everyone else is practically fully funded --
MR. COLE: Uh-huh.
MR. SALANSKI: -- and already decided upon, it's just within that -- that block? That Facilities block?
MR. COLE: Yeah.
MR. SALANSKI: Okay. I was going to say I think that would be --
MR. COLE: And you've got Job Point here tonight, so you might hear from them later -- Steve Smith.
MR. FLETCHER: Right. So Worley Head Start under their proposal would already be fully funded.
MR. COLE: Uh-huh.
MR. FLETCHER: And then Youth Empowerment Zone, we believe that their organizational structure probably wouldn't support --
MR. COLE: Yeah.
MR. FLETCHER: That funding at this point, and so really it comes down to talking to Job Point and the Family Health Center.
MR. COLE: Yeah.
MR. FLETCHER: All right. If there are no other questions --
MR. REGAN: One more from Randy.
MR. FLETCHER: Go ahead.
MR. REGAN: Because I was just looking at 2019 again, and I actually don't see the NRT listed on the funding request on here.
MR. COLE: It looks like I've got a typo. I am missing it.
MR. FLETCHER: Well, that was going --
MR. REGAN: I just wanted to point that out.
MR. COLE: Thank you.
MR. FLETCHER: Good catch. Thank you.
MR. COLE: all right. I'll make that correction for the next meeting. That was my miss.
MR. FLETCHER: So it looks like we are done with reports. And that takes us next to general comments by public members or staff.

X. GENERAL COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, MEMBERS AND STAFF

MR. COLE: Does anybody have any food allergies or anything, just send me an email.
MR. FLETCHER: Oh, okay.

MR. COLE: Yeah.
MR. SALANSKI: And then could you please share that assuming there's some pretty cool allergies to the rest of the --
MR. COLE: I don't know if they will allow it with HIPAA involved.
MR. SALANSKI: Okay.
MR. FLETCHER: Any other comments from staff or Commissioners? All right. So we'll open it up to comments from the public. If you would sit over there and please introduce yourself and give your address, please.
MR. SMITH: Steve Smith with Job Point, 400 Wilkes Boulevard, 1603 Canton Drive. I guess I just have a question for the group. I have a fairly complicated approach that could address the 2018 CDBG funds that I think would please Council and potentially serve everything. Do you want me to talk about that tonight or would you prefer I wait until the next meeting?
MR. FLETCHER: Probably better, I believe, to talk about it right now so that we can have that as part of our consideration.
MR. SMITH: Okay. Well, I'll try to be brief. The Council did approve after much discussion both over a fair amount of time $250,000. The ultimate goal is for Job Point to purchase our current location at 400 Wilkes, and I think you remember that. Very late in the discussion and very late at night in that Council meeting, legal counsel for the City noted that Council reverse funds cannot be used directly for capital projects, but CDBG funds can. A couple of Council people, whatever was done, wanted it to come back to this Commission no matter the source of the funds for approval, so there's a tie. I guess my one suggestion -- and actually one other Council person was reluctant to set a precedent of using Council reserve funds for the purposes that we ended up with, which is for a non-budgeted outside agency for services, even though it had been done the year before. So one suggestion, and I'm not trying to take money away from others, so I'll be clear about that, and if you decide to do what has been recommended, we are cool with that. But given that some Council members were concerned about the precedent set with their reserve funds and wanting it to come back to this Commission, one approach would be to -- for us to remove our training fund request of $102.500 and combine that with the excess funds, if you will, which would roughly be $200,000, reduce that amount of money - you know, we would agree to reduce a like amount on the Council reserve funds, and we could use that $200,000 directly for the purchase of the property. And I think it would fit the time frame that you are looking at. So I will be -- I could go longer. I'll stop there.
MR. FLETCHER: Yeah. Well, if we just reallocated -- so if you have program funding that the City has provided now up to $250,000, I understand it can't be used for facilities, only for program funds. So you don't -- if you -- theoretically, you don't need the $110,000 we're proposing for program funds now? That can be moved over to -- under our process to a facility --
MR. SMITH: Well, what I am saying is we would be -- we could combine this, and we would reduce the $250,000 where it is by like amount or significantly at least and address our immediate need because those -- basically --
MR. FLETCHER: You still have $140,000 shortfall. Right? If we reallocated $110,000 to facilities versus --
MR. SMITH: Well, what I'm saying is if we did the excess funds in CDBG and the $110,000, that would be roughly $200-- approximately $200,000.
MR. FLETCHER: I mean, do you have to -- I mean, do we have to fund everything? You can't come up with any funds on your own?
MR. SMITH: Sir, we're going to fund --
MR. FLETCHER: Or you already were?
MR. SMITH: We're going to fund over a million dollars of this.
MR. FLETCHER: Okay. All right.

MR. SMITH: The building -- we don't have an exact cost. We're going to get appraisals done --

MR. FLETCHER: All right. So this was just partial funding?

MR. SMITH: -- this month. Yeah. It's going to cost about a million and a quarter.

MR. FLETCHER: Okay.

MR. SMITH: So we're putting up the bulk of this money.

MR. FLETCHER: So this was just partial funding?

MR. SMITH: This is a downpayment basically.

MR. FLETCHER: Okay.

MR. SMITH: Well, I just wanted to throw it out. We don't have to solve -- resolve it tonight.

MR. FLETCHER: Sure.

MR. SMITH: But it is --

MR. FLETCHER: Does anyone else --

MR. SMITH: -- a unique circumstance and the Council was wanting it to come before this group no matter what we did. So I'm doing that today.

MR. SALANSKI: Do you mind, Mr. Smith --

MR. SMITH: Sure.

MR. SALANSKI: There's bullet points again of where we are taking money from, where potentially we would reallocate that towards. Do you mind just hitting those bullets again?

MR. SMITH: Well, on the -- well, the current proposal I'll say, 2019, we have requested $102,500 for training, and I'm saying we would be willing to instead of training, utilize that for our building purchase. And then what I'm suggesting is the other, what, additional funds, is that the way to say it? And I haven't done the math, but it's, what, $90,000?

MR. WHATLEY: Ninety-five thousand --

MR. SMITH: Ninety-five thousand.

MR. WHATLEY: -- of the 2017 CDBG funds.

MR. SMITH: right. So combining those two, which would be just under $200,000 of what we requested for last year.

MR. COLE: Do you mind if I chime in here?

MR. SMITH: No. Go ahead.

MR. COLE: Rather than thinking the 2019 funds, I'd look at the 2018 ones.

MR. SMITH: Yeah.

MR. COLE: Since we could spend those more --

MR. SMITH: From whatever source.

MR. FLETCHER: If you don't get $250,000, are you still going to be able to go forward? I mean, is that an all or none? That -- that figure is a --

MR. SMITH: Well, what I understand, and another irony is last year it was said if the money was there, you would be willing to talk to us, so what I -- it doesn't have to be -- I'd like to have $250,000. We don't have to have $275,000. If we can get $200,000 though -- the issue is with the Council money, we have to draw up an agreement, we have to come with all the services to provide. Ultimately, after it runs through our income statement, then we could use it. But you are talking a year or two to work all that money through. So basically what I'm saying is instead of $275,000 we requested last year, if we can get $200,000 or more now or sooner, we would prefer to do that because we want to buy that building. If you remember, even with rates picking up a bit -- with current rates, allowing for higher insurance rates and a maintenance fund more than what's been spent on the building up until now, we would save more than the $102,000 a year that we normally request from CDBG money, and that would go to scholarships and so forth. So it -- by getting the building bought, it actually allows us to serve more clients, and that's the reason to do that.

MR. FLETCHER: It puts a lot of eggs in one basket for us in case it doesn't work out. Do you understand the money that needs to get spent by a certain time, if we go ahead and allocate that large chunk of funds and then something doesn't happen and you're --
MR. SMITH: What's the time frame, Randy --
MR. FLETCHER: -- not able to close the deal --
MR. SMITH: -- that would need to be spent?
MR. FLETCHER: -- because we're just a piece of the funds.
MR. SMITH: I understand.
MR. FLETCHER: And the rest of your funds don't come together or the loan doesn't happen or interest rates go up. If something happens, then we're --
MR. SMITH: What time frame are we talking about?
MR. FLETCHER: -- at big risk.
MR. COLE: So I'm going to talk through what you guys did recommend and if it went before Council and got approved, but let's say that that all happened. If they worked out that way, that would mean it would get approved on June 18th, and then we would probably start our environmental review of the building and the site. And I would give that 90 days. So then that's July, August, September -- and then we would do our release of funds from HUD and then an agreement before Council. Then you are talking October or November. So we would have an agreement that says go forth and spend these monies, and our agreement is typically a year long, but I would want to make it to where you had to have that building purchased and drawn down funds from us before November 1st of next year. So by September 1st of 2019.
MR. FLETCHER: 2019. Yeah.
MR. SMITH: Well, I can't -- I can't commit to it today, but our goal is to close on this building this calendar year.
MR. COLE: That would be --
MR. FLETCHER: So the other funding is committed right now? It's fully committed?
MR. SMITH: No. I said I can't commit to it today. We -- we have a loan committed. We have one material ask that has said they are going to give -- they are to give their amount in the next couple of months. So I'm saying I can't commit today that I can close this year, but that is our goal. And our primary donor has committed that they are giving money. They haven't said the amount yet. And we have others -- we have other requests out. So I can't sit here today -- I'm not going to play games with anybody. I can't commit today that we would do that, but our goal is to purchase the building before the end of the year -- end of the calendar year 2018. But I understand the issues you have to deal with and I appreciate that. So not easy.
MR. SALANSKI: Mr. Smith, the last question. You can answer this perhaps another time too if you don't know the answer. Based on your debt obligation currently --
MR. SMITH: None. We have none.
MR. SALANSKI: -- which Mr. Fletcher's --
MR. SMITH: We have no debt.
MR. SALANSKI: Well, I mean, be hypothetical here. So the overall cost of the building was $1.2 million?
MR. SMITH: A million, two fifty approximately. We are ordering appraisals to determine the exact purchase price.
MR. SALANSKI: Okay. Let's assume we believed in those efforts and we reallocated things appropriately to come up with the $200,000 to put against a future debt allocation.
MR. SMITH: Uh-huh.
MR. SALANSKI: And let's hypothetically assume that none of the things in which you are saying materialized. So you had that outstanding debt obligation. I guess I am curious as to -- based on the rate in which you foresee to get recognizing the -- I mean the feds are going to meet on June 12th.

MR. SMITH: Uh-huh.
MR. SALANSKI: Another rate increase. Hypothetically, rates rise. I'm curious as to what the savings would be if we gave you $200,000 now knowing nothing else materialized because I love the argument of the cost savings of $102,000, which essentially replaces -- I mean that -- that makes perfect sense. But I guess what would the $200,000 buy us with regards to cost savings?
MR. SMITH: Well, we have more cash than that on hand now. We wouldn't use all of that, but if no other money came in, subject to Board approval and proper work on our end, the $200,000 wouldn't be all we would use for downpayment. But -- and so given that, if we used a portion of that, our payment on a loan today that has been committed would be less than our current rent and allowing for insurance -- owner's insurance versus renter's insurance and allowing for maintenance fund, so there would be virtual immediate savings.
MR. COLE: And that's if you didn't raise any funds beyond what you're using for CDBG?
MR. SMITH: Right. And we have some committed -- folks who are committed that have not said the amount yet, which right now it counts as this. It's a zero, and I understand that. I was in banking 37 years, so I understand that.
MR. COLE: But if you just had the CDBG funds, you could qualify for the loan, purchase the property and still realize this savings?
MR. SMITH: Right. Which we would do less of our own cash.
MR. FLETCHER: Other questions?
MR. SMITH: So I appreciate your consideration.
MR. FLETCHER: Thank you.
MR. SMITH: I know you have a lot of hard decisions to deal with, but I did want to touch base on that tonight given the timeliness. And I'll be here next round. Thank you.
MR. SALANSKI: Thank you.
MR. FLETCHER: Other public comments?
MR. MERRY: Scout Merry, Services for Independent Living, 1401 Hathman Place. I have nothing nearly so dramatic. All I wanted to do is, is kind of give a small update and -- and basically request that you go with Randy's suggestion for funding. Currently, we have -- I think we're a pretty steady performer with our CDBG funding. Of our $108,500 that we got that we're working on right now, we only have $65,630 remaining. And of that, we have almost half of that allocated in projects, which leaves us right around $35,000 left. And the only thing is we spent nearly, or have allocated nearly 75 percent of our funds for this year, which means that we're going to run out pretty early. The people that we serve with out home modification program are people with disabilities, low income seniors -- I guess everybody is fairly low income -- and veterans. You know, just like Jake talked about with the City's minor home repair, there's a lot of legwork on our part. We are happy to do it because, you know, our goal is to just keep people independently in their homes fixing large or small -- well to them -- I mean, all of our repairs are what we consider minor. Some get a little bigger than others, you know, but it really is something that a lot of these homeowners just couldn't do without us. Just an -- my couple of minutes, recently we did a kitchen remodel for a man that ended up having these extra benefits we didn't even think of. We opened up a wall so that he could get his wheelchair from the living room to the kitchen really easily. He is a very large man. And the day that I went to look at the project, he -- he was saying the greatest thing is that we had increased the airflow through his house from his front to the back of his house and through his kitchen. And it was a warm day and he was just like that is almost as great as being able to reach things. We -- he has -- he has made all of this own furniture because he is a very large man, and so we helped him move things up and pull out cabinets. It was a great

project. But this added benefit was just really nice. Another woman we helped get out of a nursing home, and we actually reutilized a ramp that we had purchased with CDBG funds in the past. We reutilized it for her. We put in a new water heater. We did some insect abatement so that she could come out of the nursing home and have her husband take care of her in her own home. I won't take any more time. I just wanted to let you know we use our funds. We're really -- we're really glad to be able to provide these services. Job Point is a great partner, you know. He has a good proposal. If you could just carve out a couple of dollars for us. Anyway, thank you very much.
MR. FLETCHER: Any questions?
MR. MERRY: Oh, so any questions?
MR. SALANSKI: Sorry, Scout. Real quick question. So you mentioned that you are running out of funds. Based upon the -- and I know -- I think there is always a waiting list -- right -- for your services because you guys do such a fantastic job?
MR. MERRY: Yeah. We have kind of a working list. I mean, again, not unlike the City, people put in their requests and we start working on them. When we do run out of funds, it will have to be -- you know, we'll probably still start working on them and just put them on a longer --
MR. SALANSKI: So, I see. Okay. With every proposed opportunity, you kind of -- you kind of get it started, and if need be, hit the pause button. But obviously the goal is to complete?
MR. MERRY: Yeah. Right. Right.
MR. SALANSKI: Okay. So there's --
MR. MERRY: If they -- if they get through the beginning, you know. Like we have to make sure that their project is a good project -- you know, it qualifies with what our -- what our, you know, kind of scope of what we can do with our funds. If the City has come in and said, you know, that we can't rehab this house because it is too far gone, it's, you know, you're putting it closer to the demolition side of things, then we're not going to go in. And we've had things like that happen. We're not going to go in and spend $4,000 on a house that, you know, isn't eligible basically. But anything that is eligible, yeah, we start working on it because the process can be lengthy.
MR. SALANSKI: Is there a number then to kind of make up the deficiency that you've been able to kind of forecast? I mean, naturally, you know, when we're looking at numbers -- not to -- not make it impersonal --
MR. MERRY: Right.
MR. SALANSKI: -- I mean, we obviously as we said in previous meeting after previous meeting, we wish we had all the money in the world to be able to fund all of the projects.
MR. MERRY: Sure. Sure.
MR. SALANSKI: But is there -- based on where you are at and you have seen that the liquidity is drying up, what would -- what would be needed to kind of --
MR. MERRY: You know, I do my part, and I have a partner at work who does the other -- mostly the number crunching. I meet with contractors and the home owners. So when I got these numbers today, I actually hadn't looked at the spreadsheet, and I -- it was a little intimidating that we have so few -- you know, few dollars left. And --
MR. SALANSKI: Perhaps could you share that with -- I mean, maybe kind of circle back with Randy then if you kind of want to rely on your other partner for that number?
MR. MERRY: Oh, I mean, the numbers are here. We've -- with what we had allocated --
MR. COLE: They should track that internally. Yeah.
MR. MERRY: With what we have allocated, you know, we are down to like $35,000 for the year. And this $30,000 that we have allocated, those are all -- we have five waiting historical review. But I've actually started -- not cementing things, but I've started contacting my contractors already on these. You know, I laughed with the historical

review people. They -- I mean, I know them -- you know, we talk, and they're like, You've never had a project turned down from -- you know, so I've already started working on some of these. We did have one turned down for historical review once. We actually still made the project go forward, but once in 10 years. But as far as a number, I don't -- I mean, we -- I could probably spend another $30,000. I could probably spend more, but, you know, it feels greedy. There's -- the need is out there. All I'm -- for the record, all I'm requesting is -- is the funding that was recommended, but if you need to allocate more, we would take it.

MR. FLETCHER: Any other questions?

MR. COLE: Thank you.

MR. MERRY: Yeah. Thank you.

MR. FLETCHER: No comments. All right. It sounds like that's the end of public comments.

XI. NEXT MEETING DATE

MR. FLETCHER: Reminder, our next meeting is June 6. Also, obviously we have a lot of decisions to make in the next month, so let's have a lot of communication. And again, due to the Sunshine Laws, make it all go through Randy and he'll make sure that -- that we do it appropriately.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

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

(The meeting adjourned at 9:17 p.m.)

(Off the record)

MR. FLETCHER: And with that I need a motion to adjourn.

MR. REGAN: Move to adjourn.

MR. FLETCHER: And a second?

MS. DIBBEN: Second.

MR. FLETCHER: All in favor?

(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)