

**FY 2014 Budget Amendments
As of August 28, 2013**

Council Reserve and Other Council Decisions:

Council Reserve Available	\$98,000
	\$98,000

Fund FY 2014 CAT TV agreement from FY 2012 General Fund savings previously appropriated in FY 2013 to Annual Sidewalks in the CIP

Transfer from C40162 Annual Sidewalks (FY 2013) in the Capital Projects Fund	(\$200,000)
Increase General Fund Revenues (Transfer from Capital Projects Fund)	\$200,000
Increase General Fund Expenses - City Council - Miscellaneous Contractur	\$200,000

Staff Requests:

Capital Projects Fund:

Revenues: Records Management System - Add Cap Fund Balance to Revenues	\$750,000
Add CDBG funding in FY 2015 to Annual Sidewalks and Major Maintenance C40162	\$50,000
Specific project will be identified later. Funding was approved in the FY 2014 program	

Recreation Services Fund:

Expenses: Waters- Moss Memorial Wildlife Area - Add Interest payment for FY 2014	\$5,809
--	---------

Airport Fund

C44112 Terminal Master Plan - New Project for FY 2014	
Transfer PYA TST from C44008 (Annual Airport General Improvements)	(\$65,000)
Transfer PYA TST to Terminal Master Plan C44112	\$65,000
Grant	\$585,000
C44092 Upgrade Crosswind Runway - move project up from FY 2015 to FY 2014	
Transfer PYA TST from C44111 New Airport Terminal (FY 2013)	(\$150,000)
Transfer to C44092 Upgrade Crosswind Runway (FY 2014)	\$150,000
Grant	\$2,250,000

Fleet Fund

Increase C72002 Parks and Recreation Vehicle Maintenance Facility - to purchase translucent doors	
Decrease FY 2013 Estimated capital outlay expenses (metal lathe and sheet metal brake)	(\$24,000)
Increase C72002 P&R Vehicle Maintenance Facility (Ent Revenues for FY 2014)	\$37,000

Introduced by _____

First Reading _____

Second Reading _____

Ordinance No. _____

Council Bill No. B 222-13

AN ORDINANCE

adopting a budget for the City of Columbia, Missouri for the fiscal year October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014 (FY 2014); and fixing the time when this ordinance shall become effective.

WHEREAS, the City Manager of the City of Columbia, Missouri has submitted a budget for FY 2014; and

WHEREAS, a public hearing has been held on the budget as required by the Home Rule Charter for the City of Columbia, Missouri.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF COLUMBIA, MISSOURI, AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. The budget for FY 2014 for the City of Columbia, Missouri, as set forth in the document attached hereto, marked "Exhibit A," and incorporated by reference as if fully set forth herein, is hereby adopted.

SECTION 2. The City Manager is hereby directed to cause the proper accounting entries to be made in the books and records of the City to reflect the appropriations set forth in the budget.

SECTION 3. The City Manager, upon the recommendation of the department or agency head, may transfer any unencumbered appropriation balance or portion thereof from one classification of expenditure to another within an office, department or agency, and such transfers shall be reported to the City Council at the next meeting of the Council following such transfer.

SECTION 4. At the request of the City Manager, the City Council may, by resolution, transfer any unencumbered appropriation balance or portion thereof from one office, department or agency to another. No transfer shall be made of specified fixed appropriations.

SECTION 5. This ordinance shall be in full force and effect from and after September 30, 2013.

PASSED this _____ day of _____, 2013.

ATTEST:

City Clerk


Mayor and Presiding Officer

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

City Counselor

You can view the
**FY 2014 Annual Budget for
the City of Columbia, Missouri**
at the following website:

http://www.gocolumbiamo.com/Finance/Services/Financial_Reports/documents/FY2014CityManagerBudgetDocument.pdf



Source: Finance *JB*

Agenda Item No:

To: City Council

From: City Manager and Staff *MM*

Council Meeting Date: Aug 5, 2013

Re: Annual Budget - 2014

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

A resolution setting public hearings on the budget and the introduction of the budget adoption ordinance.

DISCUSSION:

The FY2014 annual budget being proposed by the City Manager has been submitted to the City Council as required by City Charter. Staff has prepared a resolution setting public hearings and an ordinance adopting the FY2014 annual budget. This process will allow for public hearings to be held on August 19, September 3 and September 16, with the passage of the ordinance at the September 16 Council meeting. This procedure will allow several opportunities for public input on the many items covered by the budget process.

In addition to the planned public hearings, the City Council will be holding a budget work session to further discuss, in more detail, departmental revenues and expenses proposed for the coming fiscal year. The proposed Council budget work session date is Saturday, August 24.

Following the work session and the public hearings, any final adjustments will be made by Council prior to passage of the budget on September 16. An amendment sheet will be introduced at the September 3 Council meeting.

FISCAL IMPACT:

Approval of the budget provides the authorization of the FY2014 expenditures for the City of Columbia.

VISION IMPACT:

<http://www.gocolumbiamo.com/Council/Meetings/visionimpact.php>

The public hearing allows public comment and makes this process more transparent.

SUGGESTED COUNCIL ACTIONS:

Passage of the resolution setting the public hearings and the introduction of the ordinance on August 5. The ordinance adopting the final budget should be held over for additional public comment until final passage on September 16.

FISCAL and VISION NOTES:					
City Fiscal Impact Enter all that apply		Program Impact		Mandates	
City's current net FY cost	\$0.00	New Program/ Agency?	No	Federal or State mandated?	No
Amount of funds already appropriated	\$0.00	Duplicates/Epands an existing program?	No	Vision Implementation impact	
Amount of budget amendment needed	\$0.00	Fiscal Impact on any local political subdivision?	No	Enter all that apply: Refer to Web site	
Estimated 2 year net costs:		Resources Required		Vision Impact?	Yes
One Time	\$0.00	Requires add'l FTE Personnel?	No	Primary Vision, Strategy and/or Goal Item #	10
Operating/ Ongoing	\$0.00	Requires add'l facilities?	No	Secondary Vision, Strategy and/or Goal Item #	10.1
		Requires add'l capital equipment?	No	Fiscal year implementation Task #	2014



Boone County Community Services Advisory Commission & Division of Human Services

City of Columbia Budget Summary: FY2014 Social Services Funding

QUICK FACTS

Poverty: Nearly 25,000 Columbia residents (23%) live in poverty. 38% of Columbia Public Schools students qualify for free and reduced lunch and over 4,000 (16.3%) of children in Columbia live below the poverty level.

Unemployment: The unemployment rate continues to improve in Boone County after a high of over 7% in 2010. But the current rate of 5% is still more than double the 2000 rate of 2%.

Disparities: Social, economic, health, and educational disparities among races continue to be a significant issue in our community. Africans Americans in Columbia experience disproportionately high rates poverty and unemployment and disproportionately low rates of home ownership and educational attainment.

Prevention: Providing funding for social services, especially prevention-oriented services, is cost effective and can reduce the cost to local government in other areas such as public safety. For example, the cost to mentor a young person for one year is \$644 as opposed to the conservative estimate of \$19,000 a year to incarcerate that same youth.

Return on Investment: For every \$1 the City of Columbia invests in local social services, our contracted providers generate \$58 additional dollars... a \$58/\$1 return on investment. In addition, a significant portion of these revenues is obtained from sources outside our community. Our relatively small investment makes Columbia very competitive in obtaining shrinking resources from external funders which are increasingly requiring local matching funds.

Funding Levels: City of Columbia social services funding was reduced from \$903,743 in FY2009 to \$893,556 in FY2010, a decrease of 1.1% (\$10,187), and held flat at \$893,556 for FY2011, FY2012 and FY2013.

BACKGROUND

For nearly 50 years the City of Columbia has recognized that in addition to physical infrastructure and public safety, it must also make an investment in our community's social infrastructure. To this end, the City has provided funding for social services to insure that adequate levels of social services are made available to residents of the City, particularly those most vulnerable. This longstanding commitment has been affirmed by the City's Vision Plan which calls for high quality social services with the goals of:

- Supporting quality points of entry to access information for high quality and affordable social services to support children, youth, adults, seniors, persons with disabilities, and people with cultural barriers.
- All social services will be sufficiently funded to work toward the elimination of poverty.

Social services funding is utilized in addressing some of our community's most challenging social issues such as:

- | | |
|---|-----------------------|
| • homelessness | • mental illness |
| • unemployment and economic insecurity | • disabilities |
| • food insecurity | • an aging population |
| • at-risk children & youth and their families | • domestic violence |

In order to address issues such as these, the City enters into annual purchase of service agreements with local organizations which can deliver and underwrite the cost of these services. While the funding provided by the City is not adequate to fully address any one of these difficult social issues, the funding allows organizations to leverage additional, external resources thereby increasing the providers' capacity to deliver services.

Examples of some the organizations with which the City currently contracts include:

- | | |
|---|-------------------------------|
| • Big Brothers Big Sisters | • Phoenix Programs |
| • Boone County Council on Aging | • Rainbow House |
| • The Food Bank | • Salvation Army Harbor House |
| • Job Point | • True North |
| • Lutheran Family and Children's Services | • Voluntary Action Center |

SOCIAL SERVICES FUNDING ALLOCATION PROCESS

The Boone County Community Services Advisory Commission (BCCSAC) and the Division of Human Services are charged by the Columbia City Council and the Boone County Commission to make contract recommendations for the purchase of social services each fiscal year using City of Columbia and County of Boone general revenue funding. This task has become increasingly challenging due to the growing need for social services and diminishing resources to meet and address these needs. In order to better target limited resources, social services funding is allocated to address five issue areas reflecting the funding priorities identified by the BCCSAC and approved by the City Council. "Requests for Proposals" (RFPs) and the resulting purchase of service contracts are issued by these issue areas in a staggered, three year cycle.

Issue Area	Target Funding Parameter	% Allocated in FY2013	Funding Cycle Year
Basic Needs and Emergency Services	15-35%	28%	1
Children, Youth and Families	15-35%	30%	2
Economic Opportunity	15-35%	15%	3
Independent Living	5-25%	13%	3
Mental Health	0-20%	14%	3

These targeted RFPs and contract recommendations are informed by both an independent analysis of the priority issues as well as an independent evaluation of applicant organizations. This information is then used to develop progressively more informed and targeted RFPs and contract recommendations in order to strategically apply City resources and to evaluate progress and impact.

Proposals are submitted via a web-based grants management system which allows for the automation of data collection, reporting, and analysis, resulting in easily accessible, real-time information utilized throughout the strategic funding framework. Proposals are due at the end of July and reviewed by the BCCSAC and staff in August and September. The BCCSAC then holds a work session in late September in order to review proposals prior to the applicant organization hearings which are held in October and followed by a second commission work session. Public input is encouraged throughout the process which culminates in a public hearing in November regarding the BCCSAC's annual funding recommendations to the City Council. Final funding recommendations are then made to the City Council in December.

For detailed information regarding the City/County social services funding, please visit our web site:
http://www.gocolumbiamo.com/Health/HumanServices/Programs/Social_Service/bccsacfundinfo.php

CURRENT RFP

For the FY2014-2016 funding cycle, the BCCSAC and staff issued an RFP June, 2013 for social services to address the issues of:


- Basic Needs and Emergency Services

Nine organizations have submitted responsive proposals to provide 14 program services. As outlined above, the commission and staff will review the proposals and develop a set of contract recommendations for the City Council. In part, these allocations will be based on the *Boone County Analysis of Basic Needs and Emergency Services*, which can be accessed on the City/County issue analysis web page:

http://www.gocolumbiamo.com/Health/HumanServices/Programs/Social_Service/SocialIssuesAnalysis.php

CONCLUSION

The members of the BCCSAC and staff would like to thank the City Council for its longstanding support of social services in our community. The BCCSAC looks forward to the opportunity to present its FY2014 social services funding recommendations to the City Council in December.



CITY OF COLUMBIA, MISSOURI

OFFICE OF CULTURAL AFFAIRS

DATE: August 19, 2013

TO: The Honorable Mayor Bob McDavid
Members of the City Council

FROM: Lynn Barnett, Chair, Commission on Cultural Affairs *L. Barnett*

RE: Arts Contract Recommendations for FY2014

The City of Columbia's funding for arts agencies has helped develop and create a strong cultural environment in our city. It is a unique aspect of Columbia that we can all be proud of. The city's Annual Funding process started in the spring and the Commission on Cultural Affairs spent many hours completing a detailed review of the art agencies' applications. Reading through the applications makes one appreciate how much these organizations add to our community and economic development. This partnership between the city and the arts industry is an important investment in the culture of our community for both our residents and visitors.

As you may know there are many studies that prove that the arts are a sound investment. Art organizations not only contribute to the quality of life for our residents but also increase tourism, enhance education and support economic development. City arts funding helps satisfy several main goals of the Visioning effort – by partnering with local arts agencies the city is addressing the need for expansion of art program options available to the public. We estimate that more than 150,000 citizens and visitors will participate in city funded arts activities and events this year. City dollars also leverage other funding sources that bring additional dollars into the community. A study has shown that every dollar given to the arts produces a \$10 return on investment. Another recent study shows that those that attend cultural events spend \$24.60 per person in addition to the cost of the ticket.

During these times of economic challenges there will be those that question the allocation of city dollars to art related activities. It is important to note that the amount of city funding has not changed since 2008. There is no doubt that the arts programming being proposed is a vital part of why Columbia is a leader in the arts statewide and Missouri's first-ever designated "Creative Community." We are especially proud that local arts organizations continue to grow their programs and services and are serving more citizens and visitors, as well as providing cultural opportunities for underserved populations.

During the budget process, the Office of Cultural Affairs' (OCA) staff estimated funding from the city's general fund to be \$85,777. Additional funds of \$9,900 were moved from other OCA accounts to augment FY14 arts funding. With this addition, a total of \$95,677 is available for the annual arts agency funding. This budget scenario assumes \$92,677 to be used for Annual Funding and \$3,000 to be set aside for our Small Request funding to support quarterly applications from arts organizations for smaller projects.

If funding is approved in the Office of Cultural Affairs' (OCA) budget, contracts will be authorized in October to support arts "presentation" and "education" projects. This year, the OCA received 19 applications with requests totaling \$159,537. Attached to this document are the notes on the funding recommendations and stipulations (attachment A).

The guidelines and evaluation criteria can be found at: gocolumbiamo.com/Arts/Arts_Funding/index.php
A basic summation of the process is as follows:

- The arts funding application form is revised annually to guide planning, implementation and evaluation of programs.
- An announcement of the funding process was sent to all previous applicants. The *Arts Express* and City Source newsletters publicized the opportunity. The OCA's web page listed a timeline of the process and included an interactive application form.
- There was an opportunity for agencies to turn in drafts to the OCA staff for feedback and/or meet with the OCA for assistance.
- Requests are capped at \$10,000, allowing the most equitable distribution of the limited funds.
- Agencies may submit only one application.

Applications are reviewed by Commissioners in a process patterned after the Missouri Arts Council's. It results in significantly more feedback to agencies in the form of written comments and a shorter and therefore less hurried meeting at which the applications are formally considered. In short, each Commissioner reads all applications on their own, makes at least one written comment in each of four criteria categories and scores applications in advance of the June meeting. The written comments and scores are submitted to the OCA and a compilation is provided to all Commissioners prior to the June meeting. At the June meeting, preliminary scores are figured and finalized.

OCA staff employs a mathematical formula approved by the Commission to determine a preliminary funding level for each applicant. It directly relates the application scores and rankings, therefore rewarding proposals that most clearly and directly meet guidelines and address program criteria.

The Commission held a posted, public hearing at its July meeting to gather feedback from organizations and individuals wishing to comment on the funding process. Ultimately, the Commission approved the work done at its June work session, clearing the way for contracts to be authorized once the OCA's budget is in place.

Above all, please know that we deeply appreciate Council's recognition of the importance of actively supporting the arts locally. We hope that you share our enthusiasm for the range of cultural and arts-related opportunities the recommended projects will present to citizens and visitors.

Maplewood Barn Community Theatre

Project Name: **2014 Season**

Project Description: four spring/summer productions in Nifong Park, including a Shakespeare play, a drama, a musical, and a comedy. In addition, Maplewood Barn Radio Theater is presented weekly along with other outreach activities.

Request: \$10,000

Conflict of Interest: none.

Stipulation: Provide documentation of the partnership with the Boone County Historical Society for the Christmas at Maplewood program.

Columbia Handbell Ensemble, Inc.

Project Name: **Columbia Handbell Ensemble 25th Anniversary Concert Series (2014)**

Project Description: concert season with seven educational and hands-on opportunities

Request: \$1,750

Conflict of Interest: none.

University Concert Series/MU

Project Name: **FY14 OCA Quality Arts and Education Series**

Project Description: series of eight live performances, four each in the presentation and education categories

Request: \$10,000

Conflict of Interest: none.

Stipulation: One letter confirming school participation in *Christmas Caroling*, three letters confirming school participation in *Celtic Nights*, one letter confirming school participation in *Bach and Beyond*, three letters confirming school participation in *Missoula Children's Theatre* are on file with the OCA; agency will need to state total number of schools to be served, when known.

Columbia Art League

Project Name: **Art in the Park, Identity through Art for Teens, and Nature through Young Artists' Eyes**

Project Description: fine arts & fine crafts festival and education projects working with at-risk teens at

Douglass High School on identity and an exploration of art in nature with Lee Expressive Arts School

Request: \$10,000

Conflict of Interest: Yolanda Ciolli

Talking Horse Productions

Project Name: **2013-2014 Season**

Project Description: six main theatrical productions, plus two touring children's productions

Request: \$5,000

Conflict of Interest: Aaron Krawitz

Stipulations: Projects for FY14 cannot begin before October 1; therefore city funds cannot be used for the Fall Children's Production. Provide number of schools participating in the project when known.

Theater Reaching Young People and Schools (TRYPS)

Project Name: **2014 Season, Education and Outreach**

Project Description: four productions, acting classes, musical reviews, six theater day camps, vocal study and show choir sessions, inclusive theater for ages 6-15 diagnosed on the spectrum of Autism or Down Syndrome, audition workshops, annual fire safety tour, free outreach programs

Request: \$10,000

Conflict of Interest: none.

Stipulations: Seven letters confirming participation are on file with the OCA; agency needs to state total number of schools to be served. If more than 7, additional letters need to be submitted.

Mid-Missouri Traditional Dancers

Project Name: **Spring Breakdown Dance Weekend/ Family Dance Series 2014**

Project Description: weekend festival of traditional dancing to live music by nationally known musicians and caller; workshop for callers; dance and music workshops; free concert at the public library; series of family dances at various Adventure Club after-school care sites during the school year

Request: \$6,000

Conflict of Interest: none.

Missouri Contemporary Ballet

Project Name: **Dancing Outside the Box Performance and Education Project**

Project Description: two live performances, plus interactive lecture demonstrations to under-served groups such as at-risk students and senior citizens

Request: \$10,000

Conflict of Interest: none.

Columbia Civic Orchestra, Inc.

Project Name: **2013-2014 Columbia Civic Orchestra Concert Series**

Project Description: series of five orchestra concerts

Request: \$10,000

Conflict of Interest: none.

Columbia Chorale, Inc.

Project Name: **2013-2014 Columbia Chorale Concert Series**

Project Description: four choral performances

Request: \$10,000

Conflict of Interest: none.

Columbia Entertainment Company Theatre

Project Name: **2013-2014 (35th Season)**

Project Description: six live theatrical productions featuring cast and crew members

Request: \$10,000

Conflict of Interest: none

Performing Arts in Children's Education (PACE)

Project Name: **2013-2014 PACE Programming**

Project Description: six theater productions; camps, workshops and film making in all areas of musical theater (voice, acting, dance, tech.); Arts in Health will educate area students on bullying. YEAH! will bring free dance classes to underserved youth.

Request: \$10,000

Conflict of Interest: none

Stipulations: Confirmations from three schools are on file with the OCA; agency will need to state number of schools to be served and secure that number of confirmations.

Columbia Community Band

Project Name: **Performance Series 2014**

Project Description: at least six free concerts, open to the public of various ages, ethnicities and backgrounds

Request: \$5,000

Conflict of Interest: none.

Odyssey Chamber Music Series, Inc.

Project Name: **Odyssey Chamber Music Series 2013-2014: Season 10**

Project Description: nine concerts, including five free outreach concerts...four at Lenoir Woods Retirement Community and one at First Baptist Church's Child Development Center

Request: \$10,000

Conflict of Interest: none

Mid-Missouri Woodcarvers, Inc.

Project Name: **Technique Sharing Woodcarving Series**

Project Description: two hands-on seminars taught by nationally recognized woodcarvers to enable interested citizens, young and old, to experience one-on-one instruction

Request: \$1,787

Conflict of Interest: none.

Missouri Symphony Society

Project Name: **Hot Summer Nights 2014 and 2013-2014 Missouri Symphony Society Music Conservatory**

Project Description: summer musical festival (24 concerts, include 6 at no charge) and summer music camp for young musicians

Request: \$10,000

Conflict of Interest: Nick Kenny

Ragtag Programming for Film & Media Arts

Project Name: **True/False Film Fest 2014**

Project Description: four-day festival celebrating new and nontraditional, nonfiction filmmaking, plus offering panel discussions, director Q&As and special events

Request: \$10,000

Conflict of interest: Judy Harper

Stipulation: Provide audit information.

School of Service

Project Name: **Community Outreach, Special Needs Classes, Kids Klay Club, and Legacy Projects**

Project Description: art classes, workshops and outreach programs for people of all abilities, ages, backgrounds and financial positions with a focus on accessibility for special needs population

Request: \$10,000

Conflict of Interest: none.

"We Always Swing," Jazz Series

Project Name: **"We Always Swing" Jazz Series: Season 19**

Project Description: season of performances, community forums, master classes and artist residencies for student musicians, a children's concert, "Jazz in the Schools" and special events

Request: \$10,000

Conflict of interest: Nick Kenny

Stipulation: Six letters confirming participation are on file with the OCA; agency needs to state total number of schools to be served. If more than six, additional letters will need to be submitted.



City of Columbia

Community Development Department

701 EAST BROADWAY • PO Box 6015 • COLUMBIA, MO 65205-6015

August 1, 2013

Columbia City Council

Dear City Council:

On behalf of the City of Columbia Community Development Commission (CDC), I request your support of the CDC's FY2014 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and HOME Program funding recommendations. FY2014 CDBG and HOME Funding recommendations were approved by the CDC on June 19, 2013, and meeting minutes are attached for your review.

The CDC began the process of determining CDBG and HOME funding priorities in January of 2013 through our annual Community Needs Public Survey, and the annual Community Needs public hearing. The Commission received more public input this past year than in the previous 2 years combined with 128 surveys received and close to 30 people in attendance at the public hearing. Formulation of the CDC's funding recommendations are based upon careful analysis and rating of each individual application, a review of survey data and public input, as well as a review of community needs identified in the City's 5-year Consolidated Plan.

Please consider supporting the CDC's FY2014 CDBG and HOME funding recommendations as submitted. I will be unable to attend the City Council meeting to formally present our recommendations, but can answer any questions that you may have up until that meeting.

Thank you for your consideration,

Sincerely,

Mitch Ritter
Community Development Commission, Chairperson

2014 Community Development Commission Funding Recommendations						
Organization	Activity	Eligible Request	Rating Out of 48	CDBG Reprogrammed Funding	CDBG FY 2014 Funding Recommendation	Percent of Total Funding
				\$62,007	\$842,390	
Housing 30-40%						
Community Development	Housing Rehabilitation	\$116,400	44	\$ 22,007.00	\$78,407	
Boone County Council on Aging	Home Repairs	\$36,000	43	\$ 20,000.00	\$16,000	
Community Development	NRT Demolition	\$31,565	42		\$31,565	
Services for Independent Living	RAMP Program	\$50,000	41	\$ 20,000.00	\$20,000	
Community Development	NRT Code Enforcement	\$30,000	40		\$30,000	
Subtotal Housing		\$263,965			\$175,972	26%
Public Improvements 30-50%						
CHA	Housing Infrastructure	\$200,000	44		\$190,000	
City - Public Works Department	Sidewalk Project Design	\$70,000	40		\$50,000	
Parks and Recreation Department	Playground Improvements	\$125,000	33		\$0	
Subtotal Public Improvements		\$395,000			\$240,000	27%
Community Fac./Ser./Econ.Dev. 0-30%						
Rainbow House	Facility Purchase	\$200,000	44		\$170,000	
Reality House	Homeless Facility Renovations	\$90,000	40		\$40,000	
Mid-Missouri Youth Basketball Association	Facility Renovations	\$248,583	28		\$0	
Public Services Projects, 15% Cap or \$126,358 Available FY2014 Funds Only						
HUD Mandated Fair Housing Set-Aside	Fair Housing Activities	\$ 10,000.00	NA		\$10,000	
Job Point	HVAC and Pharmacy Training	\$105,000	41		\$71,636	
In2Action	Employment Services	\$24,820	30		\$0	
Public Service Total Request		\$129,820			\$81,636	9%
Subtotal Community Fac./Ser./Econ. Dev.		\$668,403			\$291,636	32%
Administration and Planning 0-16%						
City - Administration	Administration	\$101,086	NA		\$101,086	
City - Planning	Planning	\$33,696	NA		\$33,696	
Subtotal Admin and Plan		\$134,782			\$134,782	15%
Total		\$1,462,150		\$ 62,007.00	\$842,390	
Balance					\$0	

mandatory set-aside

2014 HOME CDC Recommendations						CDC Notes
Organization	Activity	Eligible Request	Rating	Recommendation		
		\$400,000		FY2013 Funds	FY2014 Funds	
Community Development Department	Homeownership Assistance	\$67,597	45	\$175,250	\$25,000	
Community Development Department	Owner Occupied Rehab Program	\$56,159	44		\$50,000	
Columbia Housing Authority	Lincoln Unity	\$350,000	44		\$150,000	FY2013 contingent on 1st round application approval
Columbia Housing Authority	TBRA	\$106,000	42		\$75,000	
Voluntary Action Center	TBRA	\$20,000	40		\$0	
Job Point	Homeownership Assistance	\$50,000	37		\$0	
Show-Me Central Habitat for Humanity	Homeownership Assistance	\$150,000	35		\$0	
Community Development Department	CHDO	\$60,000	NA		\$60,000	Mandatory set-aside
Community Development	Administration	\$40,000	NA		\$40,000	Mandatory set-aside
Grand Total Funds Requested		\$899,756		\$175,250	\$400,000	

MINUTES
COLUMBIA COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION MEETING
June 19, 2013

I.) INTRODUCTIONS

MR. UKOHA: Good evening, everybody. Welcome to Community Development Commission meeting for City of Columbia. Today is June 19, 2013. I call the meeting to order. I'm the Vice Chair for this Commission. My name is O.U. Ukoha. Let's start the introductions.

MR. FLETCHER: Mike Fletcher; I'm the representative from the Community Services Advisory Commission.

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

MR. CROUCH: Terry Crouch, representing Ward 6.

MR. SCHEPERS: Jim Schepers, Commissioner at large.

MR. RADMER: Jeff Radmer, Ward 4.

MR. HARRIS: Maurice Harris, Commissioner at large.

MR. MATTHES: I'm Mike Matthes; I'm the City Manager.

MR. COLE: I'm Randy Cole, City Staff.

MR. UKOHA: Thank you, everybody. I just want to make a note that the Chairperson, Mike Ritter -- Mitch Ritter, excuse me -- as soon as he steps in -- he will be probably 30 to 45 minutes late -- I will turn over the meeting to him.

II.) REVIEW AND APPROVE AGENDA

MR. UKOHA: Let's review the agenda for tonight. Any additions or subtractions?

MR. SCHEPERS: I make a motion to accept.

MR. FLETCHER: I second that.

MR. UKOHA: All right. All those in favor? Any opposition?

(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

III.) REVIEW MINUTES OF JUNE 5TH MEETING

MR. UKOHA: Let's go to the third item. We're going to be very fast tonight, so approval of the meeting for June 5th. Anybody see any changes, additions, or omissions that are made on it?

MR. CROUCH: Move to approve.

MR. FLETCHER: Second that.

MR. UKOHA: Okay. All in favor? Any opposition?

(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

IV.) STAFF REPORT

MR. COLE: All right. So I've just got a quick summary of pretty much what we need to do tonight, and then Staff recommendations with funding, based on the ratings, and then also a little summary of your ratings. So tonight the two main things we need to do is approve -- amend the

funding recommendations for 2013 funding. 2013 funding has nothing to do with the meetings we just had, the two prior meetings. It has to do with last year's funding because we base -- we do each year based on projected funding, and we got notice of how much funding we got for CDBG and HOME just this last week, which is pretty late in the process. So typically this is already taken care of before this point, but it impacts how much carryover we'll have for 2014 funding because we actually got more 2013 funding as a whole than we projected, so I'll explain that a little more in the next few slides.

MR. UKOHA: Mitch is here, so --

MR. RITTER: You just get started?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah.

MR. UKOHA: Yeah. We're on No. 4.

MR. RITTER: What was that?

MR. UKOHA: We're on Item No. 4, so he's still making a presentation.

MR. RITTER: Okay.

MR. COLE: I was just covering that we have to approve 2013 funds before we do the 2014 because we got --

MR. RITTER: Yeah.

MR. COLE: All right. So just to review the funding allocations -- this is Council policy; this isn't a HUD guideline, but for housing we do 30 to 40 percent of our funding, public improvements, 30 to 50, and so on and so forth; we've got the admin CPG for 16, HOME at 10 percent. One important item, the public services funding can't exceed 15 percent of our total CDBG allocation. And I have this all on the spreadsheet that you-all saw in the memo. But those are kind of the funding percent categories -- that were helped for each category. We have gone outside that in the past, if we just have more applications in one category that, you know, the Commission thinks should be funded, because that's a Council policy and Council could approve it outside of that. It's not a HUD guideline, but it's a good guideline for us to start out.

MR. SCHEPERS: Randy, let me ask a quick question here. Are you saying that we should -- of this \$62,700 [sic] that's a carryover for fiscal year 2013, that should apply these percentages to the 62,007?

MR. COLE: I have that in the --

MR. SCHEPERS: Oh, sorry.

MR. COLE: I'll get up to it. But, yeah. We need to take that into account in this year's funding. So this is what it looked like last year. We budgeted 802, roughly, thousand for CDBG and we got about \$80,000 more. HOME we got quite a bit less. So overall we got about 37, 000 more. So I had a concern of potentially getting bogged down too much and rehashing 2013 funds, so I have a recommendation for taking the most simple approach so we can get to discussing the 2014 funds. And that's basically to use the CDBG funds -- since we have more CDBG than HOME, use the CDBG

funds to fill the gap of where we need to cut from HOME. So my recommendations would be to adjust the admin threshold up for CDBG so we can get all the admin funds that are eligible for us and then also adjust down our HOME admin funds to make sure we're under our 10 percent threshold. And then, the Homeownership Assistance program, that's a program that is both CDBG eligible and HOME eligible. There's no other program that we funded with HOME last year that overlaps like that with CDBG. So this could be an opportunity just to fund everything the way you recommended last year. The only difference would be part of that Homeownership Assistance would be funded with CDBG rather than all with HOME, and then we'd adjust our admin figures. So that would still leave us with some carryover funds to put forward into 2014. There's also some additional carry forward -- or reprogrammed funds for projects that aren't moving forward. I'll get to those next. I apologize for such a busy slide here, but that's the budget as a whole for 2013. Basically, the ones highlighted in yellow are the ones that I'm suggesting adjusting, given what we now know about 2013 funding. You see we didn't have any CDBG Homeownership Assistance funded last year; it was all out of HOME. So I have us filling that gap with CDBG, adjusting our two admin categories, and then carrying forward the leftover 29,000 in CDBG into your 2014 projects. And then, on top of that 29,000 that you see at the bottom of the 2013 funds, those are the lists of projects that you-all approved to reprogram back in March. They're projects that are no longer moving forward, so we have about 62,000 that we can put into 2014 funding if you-all approve of this approach. So you can either adopt the 2013 proposed amendment along with your 2014 recommendations, or you can do it now and do another motion later. It's kind of up to you-all.

MR. RITTER: I think I prefer to just to take care of the 2013 now, and then the 62,000 that's reprogrammed, handle that piece with the 2014.

MR. COLE: Okay.

MR. RITTER: Because that can actually be dedicated to programs that can put the money to use more immediately, even though it's leftover from 2013.

MR. UKOHA: Can you go back to the one before?

MR. COLE: This one?

MR. UKOHA: No. No. No. Where you had the --

MR. COLE: Yeah.

MR. UKOHA: In 2010, Moneysmart didn't use the funding? Because that class is ongoing. Every --

MR. COLE: Yeah. That's -- I think that's around the time period where it started -- they were exploring getting funding through the C Call's (ph.) group. So they're being funded through there now, so it's -- that's why --

MR. UKOHA: Okay. Do you want a motion on that?

MR. RITTER: Does it need any -- does anybody have any more comments on Staff's recommendations --

MR. CROUCH: On this, basically, what you've done in this chart is you've given -- you've allocated those funds to make -- to fill out the budget so that each one of those projects that we heard last week, we use some of the funds go toward those and there's an immediate start on those projects.

MR. COLE: Uh-huh. So a motion for this would only deal with 2013 funds, but would effect how much money that project would get carrying forth.

MR. FLETCHER: Did the total amount of Homeownership Assistance change as a result of this? I know --

MR. COLE: No.

MR. FLETCHER: -- you shuffled it around from --

MR. COLE: The total would be pretty much -- pretty much the same as what --

MR. FLETCHER: Are we on track to utilize that this --

MR. COLE: Yes.

MR. FLETCHER: I mean, we're well into the year, so --

MR. COLE: Yeah. I got three HOA applications I'm doing this week, so, yeah, we're on good track with Homeownership Assistance program.

MR. FLETCHER: I mean, could we use more? Or there's no limit, is there, other than the administrative --

MR. COLE: Yeah. You potentially could, but there may be some programs or projects you want to put it towards for 2014 also. So do y'all want to --

MR. SCHEPERS: Yeah. I'll make a motion that we go with Staff's recommendation on the allocations of funds here of the CDBG funds of 2013.

MR. UKOHA: I second it.

MR. RITTER: All those in favor, say aye. Opposed?

(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

MR. RITTER: Okay. Took care of that.

MR. COLE: Okay. So this last slide -- and then I'll turn it over to --

MR. FLETCHER: So the carry forward now for 2014 was the 62 --

MR. COLE: Yeah. Yeah.

MR. FLETCHER: -- seven dollars.

MR. COLE: That's what you'll have --

MR. FLETCHER: In addition to --

MR. RITTER: It's kind of added on top --

MR. COLE: Yeah.

MR. RITTER: -- basically.

MR. COLE: So I passed out -- I think I covered with everybody just when you walked in, I passed out a packet of information. The memo I put out was pretty lengthy. My purpose with the

memo was to give you-all as much information as possible and, you know, if you found some less interesting, you wouldn't have to pay attention to it. In an effort to be more concise tonight, I gave you a packet with info that has what I thought was probably the four most important slides for -- or the most important charts for data for thinking about decision-making for the funding recommendations. So the first one is all the CDBG and HOME applications for this year's process, 2014, so that's CDBG and HOME. The second one splits out just CDBG, so when we're talking about just CDBG, you can refer to that slide. And the third one is just HOME, so when we're talking about just HOME, you can look at that slide. And then, the fourth piece of information is our Community Development aid survey results. That's the survey that we did from January through April of the community about how we spend our CDBG and HOME funds. So that gives you some good pieces of information. So with that, I can turn it over to you, Mitch, and I can switch seats and you can come over here and drive the spreadsheet or I can do it. However you want to go.

MR. RITTER: That's fine. We already approved the agenda, obviously.

MR. UKOHA: Yes.

MR. RITTER: The reason we had moved the City Manager's comments later in the agenda is because I thought I was going to be later than what I was. So is there any feeling that we need his input before this process?

MR. COLE: I know he had --

MR. UKOHA: Well, he's next now.

MR. RITTER: Oh, is it?

MR. UKOHA: Yeah. We've done --

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. RITTER: I knew I had Randy move it done because --

MR. UKOHA: Oh, yeah.

MR. RITTER: -- I didn't know what time I was going to be here.

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. UKOHA: Yeah. It's right now, number five.

MR. RITTER: Okay.

MR. MATTHES: Well, then, I'll jump in and say once again -- I think this is my third time to thank you. And I do appreciate the work that you volunteer to do. The decision-making that happens in this room affects a lot of people throughout the city. And I truly value that opinion and I think that's demonstrated by the fact that I don't think we've ever disagreed. So that's -- I'm proud of that and I think that's because you know what you're doing and you do a great job. And I've never seen anything that I, as a city manager, felt like I needed to correct or oppose or in any other way change. So I think that's remarkable. I've been through this process in other places, and that's not the norm. So I really respect the thought process that goes into it. I think you've created a pretty airtight process and I think that helps create high quality requests and makes, actually, the decision-making a

little bit easier when you get to the end. And I look at the projects that get done and they're wonderful. You know, as a city government, of course, our wheelhouse is physical stuff. It's sidewalks and roads and potholes and things like that. And while those are critically important, there's a lot more to life than those things and I think of housing as a big one. You know, this funding is one of our primary efforts to do something about that sphere of life. So this survey is, I think, very interesting, remarkable thing. Community facilities come in pretty much at the top. While I don't think this should guide all of your thinking -- because it is only 133 people?

MR. COLE: Uh-huh.

MR. MATTHES: So while it's not technically statistically valid, it is what we have, and it's a lot more than we had last time. Right? So I think we're heading in the right direction on the survey and I think it is an interesting conversation starter. So, you know, the fascinating thing is there, I can think of projects almost every one of these categories. So with that I just -- I don't have any particular advice or desires beyond what your mission already covers. Rather than restate all the mission stuff, I would say thank you and I can't imagine a scenario where we will disagree this year either. So looking at the applications and the process you use, it's pretty bulletproof. It's hard to criticize what you-all do, and that's hard to say in city government because it's very easy for anyone to criticize anyone. It's kind of a pastime. So thank you and excellent work.

MR. RITTER: Thanks.

MR. FLETCHER: While you're here, if I can, I've seen in the news recently the City has some excess funds, and I believe there's been a motion by one of the Council members to apply that to the Interfaith Council's day resource area. Again, I can't --

MR. RITTER: Homeless day center.

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. FLETCHER: Day Center. Thank you. You know, what's your thought on that? Now, that has come before us. My only thought on that, as it's something that the community needs and we all are -- as this Commission's been behind it -- unfortunately, they've never brought to us a viable proposal that we can fund. And my only -- so my only feedback would be, we're going to now spend City funds that could be reprogrammed and used in other ways for something that we could get federal funding for if they would kind of just, you know, get their act together and bring us something we could do. So is that a lost opportunity for the City to -- I mean, is there -- or do you see it as such a big need that it's worth going ahead and not waiting for federal funding to cover that?

MR. MATTHES: I do think the need is big enough to go ahead and move now. Partly, so many federal funds are contingent on having a site that you control, and we just don't have that. So most of the federal programs wanted -- they can't even apply. Don't even come talk to me until you own a piece of land. So I think this is a great partnership in a way. We'll use local dollars that are a surplus. And this doesn't happen very often, I have to say. And I'm not looking for any next year, I'll tell you that. I hope so. We've created a structure that I hope will produce more surplus as we move forward.

You think about the government, how it spends money. Everyone probably remembers the \$500 toilet seat -- that carton with the toilet seat around Caspar Weinberger's neck, you know, and he's just throwing money around. That's kind of the image people have of government. You know, there's this race to spend it all by the end of the fiscal year, because if you don't, you lose that and you might lose it permanently. Right? And so there's this real negative incentive, and so many bureaucracies do have this race to spend it all in the last month or two of the year. That's not quite so true in local government, but it still does happen, especially when there's a recession and the budget's are being cut. Anything that doesn't get spent, well, obviously, we don't need that, so let's cut there, you know, and so there's these knee jerk reactions to, you know, buy everything we said we were going to buy, even if we don't really need it or can't get to it yet. So we introduced the concept to try to change that incentive. We're calling it incentive-based budgeting because we can't think of a better word. Other folks have used that term, but had a different meaning for it. So very briefly, what we do is say, okay, if you end the fiscal year having not spent your budget, not only will you not lose it, we'll split it. So by we'll split it, means I get half, put it in the savings account -- you know, general funds savings account, and we'll put half of it back into the next fiscal year's budget for the department, on top of their normal budget. So we don't cut their budget. We leave it where it is, and we add half of what they didn't spend into the next year's budget -- or that current year. And so it becomes a one-time -- you know, let's say you didn't spend \$100,000, so, okay, we'll put 50,000 in this account. It doesn't happen again next year unless you come in under budget again. So -- so that's 50,000 that will stay there. It doesn't disappear each year. You know, the budget does disappear each year, so this we hold over like a capital program. And what departments then can do is spend that on accomplishing their mission. So, for example, the Health Department -- I'm pretty proud of them. They actually saved the most money in the general fund, believe or not. I think it was \$160,000 they got back. So they set about installing the push button doors. I think that's fantastic. That helps -- that's a benefit to the community and the customers and it's money we couldn't have spent in the budget. And that's above and beyond -- would never make it through the budget process. I mean, is there one on the building? Good enough. And now they have it on all their doors.

MR. FLETCHER: It gives everybody discretionary spending within their budget that they wouldn't otherwise have.

MR. MATTHES: Now, it still has to get approved, of course. So you can't just, you know, buy a trip to Bermuda and all that. We have control. So that's kind of a long-winded story to say that's how the surplus was created and so this is a one-time expense. I don't know that it'll ever happen again. And I know our involvement as a city government is the physical side of it, not the programming. We are not expert at running homeless shelters. We want collaboration to do that. So the goal is to find a site. Maybe this money can buy it. It might not be enough, but it's something that we can use to leverage other funds and provide a site, and then they can be successful in the grant making process.

MR. FLETCHER: Okay. So that was my next thought is, you know, we kind of -- we're a snail pointed in the right direction because we go year to year and those funds are spoken for. Can you set up something that's like a lease with an option to buy and so they have their facility, they have everything, and then they can come to us, and then we can grant them those funds? And then we can -- so we can leverage the City funds, keep your expenditures less, and then use these federal funds to go ahead and make that purchase. Because it seems like the issues have always been kind of timing, where we're always kind of crossing with them and their ability to be able to get something together and us to have funds at the same time. So that might solve that if we kind of know something's coming in the future because the City has helped them. Usually it's the other way around. Usually we give somebody some seed money and then they go out and they get other funds. This will be kind of a reversal --

MR. RITTER: They need the entire funding and that's -- you know, last year they had a house -- some sort of facility identified, but this funding cycle runs, like, almost a whole year in advance. So even if they come to us -- or any organization comes to us and says we have somewhere we want to buy next month, this funding can't --

MR. FLETCHER: Yeah. We just can't --
(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. FLETCHER: But -- and so that's where the City funds -- you might be able to reduce the involvement and we still leverage the federal funds. Is that possible if they get into a scenario like that, like a lease with an option to buy or something like that?

MR. COLE: I know I've been working with Steve Hollis for this specific type project and the idea was to obtain site control and then if they get a good project together, use CDBG to do some kind of construction or rehab on a place, ideally totally new construction.

MR. RITTER: Because that's what, you know, Rainbow House's application this year --

MR. COLE: Yeah.

MR. RITTER: You know, they've got a capital investor that could front the money, but under the condition that it'll eventually be paid off. So this is another project -- you know, anything with homeless or homeless -- this one particular, the homeless teens, we were -- you know, at least some of us were disappointed that made it -- that went through the funding cycle for the facility over by Hickman High School when that one totally got wiped off the map, figuratively. So we were actually glad to see Rainbow House kind of pick that up, and now they've got the programming and the facility identified, so that was one we were pretty excited to see come in. What are your thoughts on the Parks and Rec with the playground improvements? That was one that -- I think it's one of our lowest -- lower rated projects by the Commission. There was much discussion about it, I think, at the time of the application. There was some follow-up e-mails and correspondence from City Staff on that. But speaking for myself -- and I think the conversation the Commission had was there was a

thought that this was -- this could be funded through other tax revenue basis, you know, obviously, the parks tax, things like that. And, you know, we have better, you know, uses of money for that here.

MR. MATTHES: And I think that's one of the things we'll always agree on. You know, I really do look to this group to make those judgment calls. And you look at what it's competing with, and I think you made the right choice. There's a lot of playground equipment in the community, you know. Now, this would be great. There's no question. It's --

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. MATTHES: But the other seems like more pressing need to me, so I think you made the right choice.

MR. RITTER: Do any other Commissioners have questions or comments?

MS. FORBES: I do.

MR. RITTER: Okay.

MS. FORBES: When Watkins was here the last time and spoke to us, Central Latino, the building -- financing the building was on the agenda, and he -- Watkins supported and urged us to do it because it fit in with the City's long-term plans for that area. And I recently, because of the housing project, I've wondered, has that been on the table the whole time. What are the City's long-term plans for that area?

MR. MATTHES: Well, we're just about finished with the comprehensive plan, so if that gets approved -- I think it will -- I'll have a much more coherent answer for you. But, you know, we want to -- we want, really, what the mission of CDBG wants. We want strong neighborhoods. We want affordable housing. We want sidewalks, complete streets. You know, that quality of life that we all want. So that's the vision there. Of course, we want a walkable neighborhood that you can talk to a job if you want to, walk to the grocery store. Wouldn't that be great? But, you know, not everyone lives that close to that sort of stuff, so we have the opportunity for that in that neighborhood that we don't in some. Go out west, no one's going to build a grocery store on Scott Boulevard right now. There's enough people, but, you know, the cost of -- the Cherry Hill track record of businesses is not very good. Right? You've sent that rotation. So, you know, they're going to want to come to more centrally-located places. So there's some neat possibilities down there, and I'm really actually looking forward to the project Phil's trying to put together now on Garth and Sexton --

MR. RITTER: Well, yeah. That and then also just as a community member, I was glad to see somebody take over the Osco building.

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. RITTER: A grocery chain from Colorado, I think, but at least it's -- you know, somebody's going to revitalize that space --

MR. CROUCH: China comes --

MR. RITTER: -- after many, many years.

MR. CROUCH: -- to Columbia.

MR. RITTER: What's that?

MR. CROUCH: China comes to Columbia.

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. FLETCHER: It's the federal visa program. Write a big enough check that you get a visa.

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. RITTER: Yeah. You need to talk about walking distance, you know, and proximity and things, and that's where, you know, it's unfortunate to see some things rotated. And out at Cherry Hill, which, you know, that's just not as centrally located as it needs to be. Any other questions or comments? All right. Well, thank you for your time. I think we'll --

MR. MATTHES: Thank you.

MR. RITTER: -- be able to get started with the --

MR. MATTHES: I'll leave you to it. Thank you again.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you.

MR. RITTER: All right. Looks like Randy's got these organized into the various categories and funding and they're sorted in order of our rating and City's recommendation. Staff recommendations are in column E and F. And we can go through the process of modifying those, discussing as we go down the list. Each category, I think, stands alone, to some extent, unless we get into a situation where funding needs to be moved amongst categories based on our discussion and recommendation.

MR. COLE: Staff recommendation might not be quite accurate. It's more Staff getting the discussion started. Definitely expect a lot of --

MR. RITTER: No. We appreciate the first look just based on -- you kind of take the ratings and --

MR. COLE: Yeah.

MR. RITTER: -- just kind of take a first cut at it. But we can -- we can delete those out and start from scratch or --

MR. SCHEPERS: No. I think it's a great starting place.

MR. RITTER: At least gets the process started. Is everybody okay with starting with housing and just kind of working our way down that?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That sounds good.

MR. RITTER: Okay. Community Development, the housing rehab program, probably the highest rated project over all. I know there's history there. We know their success and the funds are always utilized. We do have some reprogrammed funds suggested in that to get it -- you know, we've got projects, obviously, constantly coming and going in that process. And then some carryover, the 2014 would be -- would fill the gap on that request from additional 88,400. The home repairs program

from Boone County Council on Aging, second highest in the category. We can -- looks like -- you know, once again, that's a program that constantly has a list of people needing assistance and resources, so they can use, you know, the funding quickly. So we've got a 20,000 sitting in there with the 16,000 fill for full funding. NRT, full funding, all that 2014; the ramp program, full funding with 20,000 immediate and then 30,000 from fiscal year '14; and then full funding, code enforcement. And it appears that -- you know, because you're getting housing rehab funds -- no. There's a \$6,000 shortfall there. Is that --

MR. COLE: Yeah.

MR. RITTER: Is that from the previous --

MR. COLE: Yeah.

MR. RITTER: Okay. Does anybody have any objections to --

MR. CROUCH: Shortfall was where?

MR. SCHEPERS: Well, see. This doesn't add up to 116-.

MR. RITTER: It's 110,400.

MR. SCHEPERS: Yeah. It only comes up to --

MR. RITTER: And they had requested 116-, so --

MR. CROUCH: Got you.

MR. RITTER: -- it saves, you know --

MR. CROUCH: Yeah.

MR. RITTER: -- a few grand to carry down somewhere else.

MR. CROUCH: I think under the umbrella of housing, the survey results said community facilities one of the highest, so that whole block, I would move that we accept that recommendation, if we could do that, Mitch, by block.

MR. RITTER: Yeah. We can -- I mean, we can just kind of make a mental note and take one motion for the entire thing or we can take a motion for each segment. It just -- you know, in case we want to move things amongst segments, that is only reason why --

MR. SCHEPERS: Just for the sake of argument, I think I wouldn't make a motion on each one then because we'd almost be locking ourselves in about moving the money between area to area. But it's just a point of discussion.

MR. RITTER: Yeah. I think we can take a mental note and then we'll --

MR. CROUCH: Okay.

MR. RITTER: -- take a motion for the whole thing.

MR. UKOHA: Yeah. I was just going to say, you know, we can do it section by section. Like housing, that segment, we can make a motion to -- and when we go into a different section, we can do the same thing, just one motion there.

MR. RITTER: And I guess my only question there on the reprogrammed money for the ramp program, would they be able to expend another 20-, because I thought they had --

MR. COLE: They've got a pretty good waiting list and they're about --

MR. RITTER: They're about to --

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. COLE: Now, they did get 2013 funds --

MR. RITTER: How recently?

MR. COLE: No. They haven't got it yet. Everybody will get their 2013 funds probably by September 1st, after we go through all the environmental review and request for release of funds. So, yeah. They'll have quite a bit of money right off, but those were the three projects that I thought had the most immediate participants that could be served right away.

MR. FLETCHER: So for the requests that don't get full funding, have we verified that giving them less than full funds -- you know, sometimes some of the requesters say, you know, I need the full funds or it's -- you know, I can't use it. You know, it's an all or none request. And looking at these, I thought I heard Phil say -- but he's in the room, but -- he needed full funding. And also, like -- and you might know, Public Works, on the sidewalk design, is that going to be sufficient for them to move forward and --

MR. COLE: They'll just do less sidewalk projects. I mean, instead of --

MR. FLETCHER: Expend whatever they have in terms of design --

MR. COLE: They've got four projects; they'll do the top two, rather than all four.

MR. FLETCHER: Okay.

MR. COLE: Then they'll come back the next year.

MR. FLETCHER: And then, the other one I think -- I know we did specifically ask the executive director for the Rainbow House --

MR. COLE: She said a little bit was okay, and I --

MR. FLETCHER: Yeah.

MR. COLE: -- interpreted a little bit, I guess, to be 10,000. But I guess that's all up to interpretation. So, yeah. You guys may want to move some money around.

MR. RITTER: Yeah. I don't know if an immediate, you know, chunk of money for that facility purchase -- I don't know. Was it anybody's impression that the investor would not wait a year? I mean, I think I got -- I think I got the impression that he's okay for a year.

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. COLE: I had met with her about the process and she was very attuned with that and waiting.

MR. RITTER: Okay.

MR. COLE: She's got a lease-purchase option, so --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah.

MR. FLETCHER: I'm good with all of those requests that are not funded at all. I think that's -- those were the right targets. The only one that, you know, is heartburn for me specifically is Reality House.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah.

MR. FLETCHER: I would've liked to have seen us be able to get some funding to them. I think one of the things that drove their score down was because of the questions that came up about the value of their structure, but that got answered, you know, kind of after the fact, after we'd already set the scores. And I don't know how that would've affected everyone's perception of that, that we know that the structure is worth, you know, that investment. But it would be nice to have been able to fund, you know, at least, you know, remodeling one of the floors --

MR. CROUCH: Right.

MR. FLETCHER: -- to keep --

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. FLETCHER: We've invested some funds in that structure. I mean, we paid for the first floor and the -- and, you know, if we could get those other two floors done, you know, that's not somebody who's not going to be coming to us for funds and they should be good for awhile --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah.

MR. FLETCHER: -- and their facility's going to be in a good place.

MR. COLE: Yeah. And their whole first floor is done and it looks nice. The parking lot just got done.

MR. CROUCH: Michael, you echoed my own sentiments on that. I feel that that was a -- the fact that she went out and did the work and came back with the evaluation showed some seriousness of intent there. I think it was a good proposal other than that.

MR. FLETCHER: And would that fall into the category of what we call shovel-ready project or not? I mean, what would --

MR. COLE: For Reality House?

MR. FLETCHER: Yeah. I mean, that's --

MR. COLE: They've got contractors lined up and

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MS. FORBES: I want to put in a word for the Basketball Association -- Youth Basketball Association. I think that would bring money to town.

MR. FLETCHER: There was an article in the paper recently about the City or an economic development effort to look into that very scenario, that we don't get enough of -- you know, we don't have enough of those types of facilities, like ball diamonds, you know the big -- the big park area that has 20, you know, softball fields or baseball fields or basketball. And there's an economic development group looking at, you know, pursuing that for Columbia.

MS. FORBES: The other thing about that particular project is that it falls into line with the community impact model that United Way is now funding. So I believe that it's a worthy project. It's something we ought to support.

MR. RITTER: I don't the rate -- I mean, my particular rating on that project didn't as much concern the need or the benefit to the community. I think it was more the amount of money they were going to put into a facility that we were being told was already previously used --

MR. CROUCH: Virtually new.

MR. RITTER: -- as a basketball facility. So it seemed like, from the application, a lot of that request had more kind of sticker shock to me.

MR. FLETCHER: And it's --

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. FLETCHER: -- a big investment into an organization that doesn't have a track record.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah.

MS. FORBES: Yes.

MR. FLETCHER: So, you know, we're really putting ourselves out there and --

MS. FORBES: They don't.

MR. FLETCHER: -- as a group to put that much funding into an organization that has no track record when we've just been in the media for some other --

MR. UKOHA: Yeah, guys. I think we're going all over the place.

MS. FORBES: Well, I just wanted to make sure that --

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MS. FORBES: -- I said that about that particular project.

MR. UKOHA: -- that point, the idea --

MS. FORBES: I'm not trying to start a --

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MS. FORBES: I'm just stating my opinion.

MR. FLETCHER: O.U. always keeps us on track.

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. RITTER: Yeah. I mean, housing, I think it's more of a reprogram -- like if -- you know, I originally threw out the question about Rainbow House, but then the Reality House question comes up. If --

MR. FLETCHER: Yeah. I was just --

MR. RITTER: -- they've got contractors lined up, bids ready, you know, it's just basically paint, carpet, you know, that type of stuff, you know, they could use that as well. You know, and is that -- I guess when I look at the ramp application, I'm thinking they have the funding already in place per year, I guess. So unless there's an extra need that we can fill, will the 2014 funding of only 30,000 --

you know, if they expend the 20,000 quickly, does the funding -- does that almost create a shortage for next year for what they're able to do.

MR. FLETCHER: We gave them 40,000 for last year.

MR. RITTER: Last year, yeah.

MR. FLETCHER: So this 50,000 would be an increase above that.

MR. RITTER: Yeah. But the 40- plus the 20- would be 60--

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. RITTER: -- and then the next year they would only get 30-.

MR. FLETCHER: Yeah. But I'm -- yeah. I'm speaking to 2013. 2013 funding is 40,000, and they're asking for 50,000 in 2014.

MR. COLE: Their production has --

MR. RITTER: It's been --

MR. COLE: -- progressed. I feel comfortable with their production.

MR. FLETCHER: Right. So there's no question that either one of these projects could expend the funds. So it's really up to us as to do we want to build ramps or do we want to remodel Reality House, one floor. You know, what's important, where we want to spend that. And I would just like to see us get some money to them as well, especially where we have some reprogrammed, shovel-ready money that could go to that.

MR. UKOHA: You're suggesting instead of giving that \$20,000 to --

MR. RITTER: Well, between the --

MR. FLETCHER: The 20,000 --

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. RITTER: Between the 20- on Boone County Council on Aging and the 20- on ramps, that would be a way to get --

MR. FLETCHER: Yeah. But then that --

MR. RITTER: -- the money out --

MR. FLETCHER: -- leaves to home repairs really underfunded and that's very -- that, A, rates high, and it's really important.

MR. RITTER: I don't think --

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. RITTER: -- underfunded. It would just be funded earlier versus during the year that they applied for it. I mean, they applied the 36,000 for fiscal year '14. We're saying do we need to give it to them earlier and then it's going to take it away from the year that they applied for it.

MR. FLETCHER: Yeah. But in 2014 they're going to be short of funds because they'll still want to be getting 16--

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Right.

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. RITTER: They're getting 16- in 2014.

MR. COLE: So they would get less, but overall --

MR. RITTER: It's not like we're giving them additional --

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. COLE: I was just taking a conservative approach of knowing what projects I --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Were going to spend the money.

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. UKOHA: Well, we don't have to give them 20-, we can give them 10-. Anything wrong with that? Then they would have 26,000 instead of 16- for 2014, so it will take that to 10,000.

MR. COLE: They are continually one of the highest performers though, also.

MR. FLETCHER: Yeah. I mean, that's what makes this whole thing run. So we're already --

MR. UKOHA: But we've got 20- that we can put down at -- you know, for the Rainbow, so if -- to get money for somewhere else.

MR. FLETCHER: Now, are funds, like, for Job Point's training?

MR. COLE: They basically said it's a per student cost, so less funding will have less students.

MR. CROUCH: Right.

MR. FLETCHER: Because that rates -- in terms of rating, that just about equal, and we're giving them three-quarters of the funds they asked for and, you know, Reality House rated essentially equal to them and gets zip.

MR. COLE: But 70- would be pretty close to what they've been receiving in the past for their training programs also.

MR. RITTER: Yeah. I'm --

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. UKOHA: So where are we at --

MR. RITTER: I'm just highlighting the ones that have been up for discussion.

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. RITTER: I mean, I guess this is still kind of up in the air.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah.

MR. RITTER: Are we -- I mean, I guess, is Youth Basketball up in the air in anybody's mind right for any funding?

MR. FLETCHER: Not in my --

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. RITTER: I just don't think it's ready.

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. FLETCHER: I love the idea, but not the -- the organization just doesn't have a track record that warrants that level of -- and it's an all or none thing, because he said he would have to have all the money to get this going because this is what we want to do is buy the facility. So that's one of those that is almost like an all or none. It's not like we could give them, you know, \$50,000 to get them going because they still -- they don't have the facility still, so it's -- he made it very clear it was all or none.

MR. CROUCH: And I think -- you know, to that point, I mean, it was a very enthusiastic presentation, but there were few facts to support it that everybody from Missouri is going to be coming to Columbia to play in these leagues, but no facts were -- I think that somewhere we should encourage that proposal to come again, but to get some help in preparing that presentation to make it more meaningful and factual rather than emotional. Because there's a need, no question, but, you know, it would be very difficult to allocate funds on that particular presentation.

MR. FLETCHER: Well, it would be nice to see them get into a rental situation, into a faculty, and get the program going and then there's a viable program and say, Hey, we have this great program that's working and we want to move into this newer facility, can you support that. Then we could certainly get behind it.

MR. UKOHA: That has always been my opinion. When he made the presentation, I didn't think -- you know, at the beginning you want to spend \$200,000 buying a facility when you haven't even established a program up to a point when you make that request. And like I asked him that day, as opposed to buying it, what about leasing? I mean, if he had asked for leasing, then I think it's something we can help on, but when you're asking for \$200,000 and we haven't seen anything, you know, that was done, that's, you know, one of those impossible things to do. So, yeah. Hopefully we can make a contact with him to let him know that he's free to apply, you know, next year, but that he has to show that he has done some fund raising and some other things that if we do help that it will be matching funds instead of just paying for the whole thing without seeing any result.

MR. CROUCH: Is there something that the City could do to work with somebody like that to help them put a proposal together that either would be more --

MR. COLE: I can definitely communicate where the weaknesses were, but as far as really guiding someone how to put a proposal together, I would feel a little conflict of interest.

MR. CROUCH: Yeah. Yeah.

MR. SCHEPERS: Need to keep that at arm's distance.

MR. UKOHA: But I think there are a lot of facilities around that they can lease, you know. The place is way, way out. I think the target he is trying to reach -- that is way, way off on Boone Industrial. How many people live over there? You know --
(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. UKOHA: -- basketball arena right down at the Armory. Is it being fully utilized? You work with the City. Is it being fully utilized, the Armory?

MR. COLE: Yeah. They had youth basketball there the other evening when --

MR. UKOHA: Yeah. So why can't they start with something like that?

MR. FLETCHER: Well, is there any -- the other thing -- and I hate though to try and count on that, but just like this year, there always seems to be somehow reprogrammed funds. And I don't ever like to count on that, but if for some reason we decided to reprogram some of the ramp funds, we could always keep that in our back pocket, that if we have some reprogrammed funds, we could target that back to them.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah.

MR. FLETCHER: You know, because that is a project that can take the money and put it to use in --

MR. RITTER: We're not saying we're not fully funding it though. It's still fully funded.

MS. FORBES: Are you talking about the --

MR. FLETCHER: Well, not if we shave --

MS. FORBES: -- ramp program --

MR. FLETCHER: -- some money off of it to put to the Reality House.

MR. RITTER: I just did that.

MR. UKOHA: Yeah. We're doing that. We're taking --

MR. RADMER: Well, that got shaved off of Rainbow House though. That money --

MR. RITTER: No. I did that separately.

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. RADMER: You took the funds from up there and left them fully funded and you reduced --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The 2014.

MR. RADMER: -- funding to Rainbow House for 2014, yeah. I was thinking when the request was made that we were going to take 20,000 from the housing --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah. Yeah. Yeah.

MR. RADMER: -- section and put down here for Reality House and reduce those two requests. But we --

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. UKOHA: Is that not what you did?

MR. RITTER: Yeah. But for some reason I'm still getting a \$20,000 --

MR. UKOHA: Because if you put --

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. RADMER: Is that what we were talking about, taking and reducing those two by 10,000 each to put the money down on Reality House?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Uh-huh.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah.

MR. RADMER: So instead of fully funding 36-, we were only going to fund 36-. And instead of fully funding 50-, we were only going to fund 40-. Is that -- that was how I understood what we were kind of thinking about.

MR. FLETCHER: What's the impact of -- you know, like, for code enforcement, taking some money away from that? Does that affect people's jobs --

MR. COLE: Yeah, Bruce's. That pays for half of one of the inspectors.

MR. FLETCHER: All right. Because, I mean, if you just look at the ratings, it rates the same as Reality House. The sheet I have shows Reality House at 40 and this one shows --

MR. COLE: You know, one thing Eric and I talked about is that if it came down to it and we needed to sacrifice 25,000 out of the rehab, that would just mean one less house rehab.

MR. FLETCHER: Right.

MR. COLE: We'd be willing to do that, but the Commission would just have to note we would do one less house, so that's an option.

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. COLE: If that helps.

MR. HARRIS: And that's for 2014 or for 2013?

MR. COLE: You could take from the 2013 or the 2014.

MR. RITTER: Like, this year would just disappear and go down the rail.

MR. COLE: Yeah. You could do that.

MR. RITTER: Take this out and put it there.

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. FLETCHER: -- some money from the ramp project? Is that still --

MR. RITTER: Well, he's got -- that's what I was misinterpreting on the spread sheet. He's got FY '14s already totaled out.

MR. FLETCHER: Right.

MR. COLE: Uh-huh.

MR. RITTER: So if you take --

MR. FLETCHER: 10- out of that --

MR. RITTER: -- this away -- well, it goes away.

MR. UKOHA: If you put 10-, 10- there, bring down the 20- that you are taking, it will still be the same amount.

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. RITTER: I misstated earlier that they're still going to be fully funded. If you take 10,000 out of this column --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: They're not.

MR. RITTER: -- and only leave 16-, it's not going to be fully funded.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Right.

MR. SCHEPERS: Yeah. I think everybody understands that.

MR. FLETCHER: Yeah. But the point was, like, last year, 2013, they only got 40-. So they've asked for, like --

MR. RITTER: I see what you're saying.

MR. FLETCHER: -- a \$10,000 --

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. FLETCHER: -- increase, so we're giving them even more money this year. So my point is --

MR. RITTER: So you back this to 10- --

MR. FLETCHER: And we're leaving them flat funding for --

MR. RITTER: That puts down --

MR. FLETCHER: -- what they got in 2013 and that starts getting Reality House up to where maybe they can remodel one of their floors. And then there's no change in the ramp program and Reality House can still remodel one of their floors maybe. And that funding may be contingent on if you call them and they say that's just not enough for us to do --

MR. RITTER: Well, 90- was after we saw the appraisal letter. That's, you know, 40 percent of the value of the building, and plus we've already put in a parking lot and

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. RITTER: So we would be at -- I mean, that wasn't an option in my --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah. That --

MR. RITTER: I mean, we're not -- we can't put 190,000 in renovation into something that's only worth 230-.

MR. UKOHA: Right.

MR. RITTER: So another 30-, even if -- I don't even know if I'm comfortable at 30- because that would be putting us at more than half. We've put in the renovations on a building that doesn't even appraise --

MR. FLETCHER: Well, that's going to improve its appraisal value.

MS. FORBES: Yeah, it is.

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. FLETCHER: It's also -- you know, I mean, some of it you can't -- it's location, location, location and you can't just say -- somebody suggested, well, find another spot. Well, good luck with that.

MR. RITTER: No. Yeah. No.

MR. FLETCHER: And, you know, in that location and what it serves and the place that it serves -- and in that lot there's a lot of facilities like that --

MR. SCHEPERS: And the other thing about that appraisal was it was based on an income stream of that being a rental property, so that's how they kind of got to that amount. So as you fix a

place up, you might be able to demand larger rent, but who knows. As you said, location, location, location.

MR. CROUCH: Well, when they made the presentation, they were recognizing that this was going to be a 2014 due rather than wanting to do it right now, so --

MR. FLETCHER: And so I guess that's -- that would be a part of it. But the 2013 funds that they're going to get won't be until September, so they'll have some knowledge that it's coming. And they'll have how long to spend it?

MR. COLE: They would have -- we've been doing 18 months.

MR. FLETCHER: Yeah. So that'll be all through next year, so they would have 12 to 18 months to spend it after they get notified they get this funding --

MR. SCHEPERS: And you got construction going on at the time. I mean, you'd hate to see something stop and then try to get momentum going again.

MR. FLETCHER: Yeah. Well, the level of things they want to do is something you should be able to get some bids on and make happen.

MR. RITTER: It's just a -- I mean, just decide what adds up to 30 grand or 20 grand.

MR. CROUCH: I mean, we're talking about allocating funds to this year, but I didn't hear that they were asking for the funds for this year to --

MR. FLETCHER: That's correct.

MR. CROUCH: -- do it quickly.

MR. FLETCHER: Right.

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. UKOHA: Well, 32,000 is better than nothing, so I mean --

MR. FLETCHER: Yeah. Whenever we have reprogrammed funds though --

MR. CROUCH: Well, yeah. I understand that. Yeah.

MR. FLETCHER: I mean, if we give extra money to Boone County Council on Aging, they didn't ask for that money this year either, but they'd certainly spend it.

MR. UKOHA: So where are we, Mitch?

MR. RITTER: We're sitting on that 32- for Reality House. I mean, we have to -- I mean, we're back to looking at things collectively, which I think we have to do in this instance. But we just have to be comfortable that -- be comfortable with another \$30,000 going into that building. I don't -- I'm not worrying about them using it in 18 months, just because they've done it -- you know, they used the other one in --

MR. COLE: The total overall percentages are further away from the goal too.

MR. RITTER: Uh-huh. Because we're pulling it out of housing.

MR. FLETCHER: What are the goals?

MR. RITTER: 30 to 40 on housing. We're at 25.

MR. FLETCHER: Oh, okay. Got you.

MR. UKOHA: I mean, we can simply put it back and have it as recommended by the Staff.

MR. CROUCH: Well, if we put it back to the -- the funds that were available for 2013, to leave them as suggested -- if we leave those allocations as Staff recommended, and if we want to reallocate funds, look at reallocating the 2014 funds to help fund Reality House, at least on one of the floors.

MR. FLETCHER: It is worth noting that Reality House falls under this community facilities, and if I'm not mistaken, community facilities rated the highest on the survey.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Right.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Uh-huh.

MR. SCHEPERS: And also, didn't I make a motion earlier that we leave the -- that we go with Staff's recommendation on the 2013 and we all voted on that? So why are we --

MR. RITTER: No. That was --

MR. COLE: That was the 2013 budget.

MR. SCHEPERS: Oh, the budget.

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. FLETCHER: Well, that's why I was still willing to be a little bit -- what we were doing with the 2013 stuff, to see if we could get some more reprogrammed funds to help with this type of an issue.

MR. UKOHA: Yeah. They had recommended it being on three places, so --

MR. RITTER: If we're saying take -- I was thinking if we gave it to Public Works for the engineering, which they could probably use within 18 months, that would free up money in 2014 to give to Reality House. But then, that still -- that's going to further throw off our percentages when you put it back -- you know, split it between --

MR. COLE: Actually, that would make our percentages --

MR. FLETCHER: What's the -- under community facility services, what the percentage, because it's not showing that?

MR. COLE: It's --

MR. RITTER: Zero to 30. It's right there.

MR. FLETCHER: What is the actual percentage though?

MR. COLE: That's it. So you are over a little bit so you could move that --

MR. FLETCHER: Right. And that's just because of that one big project for Rainbow House.

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. RITTER: Yeah. I don't think 190- is necessary to make a commitment to that project.

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. RITTER: I think her point was 75-

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. CROUCH: Her words were don't take 100,000.

MR. FLETCHER: Do we have the meeting minutes because we asked her that question?

MR. CROUCH: Her response -- I remember it because I asked the question.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It was minimal --

MR. CROUCH: Yeah. She said, Well, you know, don't take 100,000, but --

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. RITTER: Yeah. And 150- is --

MR. CROUCH: I mean, it's a pretty well-organized organization --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Oh, yeah.

MR. CROUCH: -- and their ability to raise funds, when we're talking about 2014, I think if there was a substantial allocation from the Commission, I think they would have a pretty good opportunity to close any gap that we might create.

MR. COLE: I think this project's really important too. We had the HUD field director --

MR. CROUCH: Right.

MR. COLE: -- come and say this is one of Shaun Donovan's goals for the year is this type of projects.

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. RITTER: And if they came back for 2015 for another 50- to continue to pay back their investor, it would still qualify and still -- you know, it doesn't all have to be done in the first year. It just -- it has to be a level of commitment --

MR. CROUCH: Absolutely.

MR. RITTER: -- by the City to say it's a viable deal and get it done and get it started.

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. UKOHA: I don't think we need to give them 190-.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: What happens if you change that to --

MR. FLETCHER: 175-.

MR. RITTER: I heard four different numbers. I put 160- in there for now, but that's totally just to start seeing where the -- we're right at 30 with the 160-, but that's not moving -- if you move this over here at 30-, it's 34 --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Gets back to 34-.

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. FLETCHER: Now, those percentages, those, again, were Council mandates? We have to follow those or --

MR. COLE: They're Council resolution --

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. COLE: Council can approve something outside of that amount, but it's supposed to be our guide on --

MR. FLETCHER: Okay.

MR. SCHEPERS: We've got to ask them to do a new resolution.

MR. RITTER: We're back to where we were at the top. We're at 160- on Rainbow, the difference in Reality. And that puts us at 30 percent --

MR. UKOHA: Okay. That's better.

MR. RITTER: -- for community facilities, which is right at the cap. That puts us at 27, which is -- we haven't even talked about public improvements yet, but that's where we're at. And we're at 29 on housing, which is --

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. FLETCHER: That just makes me nervous that we get enough money to Rainbow House because that's a good project and we all liked it, rated it really high. Is that why you chose the 190-value is it was 30 percent?

MR. COLE: No. I chose high because it rated high and they had a lot of money they brought to the project.

MR. FLETCHER: Right. A ton of other funds.

MR. UKOHA: Okay. Mitch, do you want to start from the top down and that way --

MR. RITTER: Back to the top.

MR. FLETCHER: Okay. So housing rehab is where it started still and the home repair is --

MR. RITTER: Where it started: Fully funding, but 20,000 of it now, 16- later. Fully funding on NRT, which, you know -- and 10,000 reduction on the ramps and then 30,000 full --

MR. FLETCHER: But that puts them back to the same -- that's level funding from this year, keep in mind, for the ramp project. So they asked for an increase, and we're just going to give them what they got for this year.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Correct.

MR. FLETCHER: So they're not getting cut. They're just not getting an increase.

MR. CROUCH: That wasn't the original number though, the 185-. It was 195-, wasn't it?
(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. FLETCHER: And CHA, that stayed the same. The sidewalk project is unchanged.
(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. FLETCHER: Yeah. That's leveraging those tax break funds. I'd like to get involved in that. I looked that up online to read all about that. If I was a big investor, I'd be lining up for that.

MR. UKOHA: So I think Phil will be okay with 190-. Right, Phil? Is that where we're at, Mitch, public improvement?

MR. RITTER: Yeah. That's out next thing that we -- I mean, other than the sidewalks, saying out of four projects, you're going to pick two or three to fit into that. They can get it done with 50 grand or 40. I mean, we have to try to stick close to the 30 threshold.

MR. UKOHA: Where are you at?

MR. RITTER: 27. That's really about it. I mean, there's \$30,000 reduction on --

MR. FLETCHER: Well, are they going to balk then -- the City Council going to have a problem that both of those are 27 percent, they're underfunded?

MR. UKOHA: I mean, that's the amount of money we have, on 842,000.

MR. FLETCHER: That looks -- that 27 percent is total that -- is that looking only at 2014 or is that --

MR. RITTER: No. It's looking at the total of both.

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. RITTER: Like I said, that' --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Close as you're going to get it.

MR. RITTER: That's not a HUD requirement. That's just a --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: A Council resolution.

MR. RITTER: -- Council -- it's a guide. And if you do -- you know, since community facilities was the highest rated in our --

MR. CROUCH: Yes.

MR. RITTER: -- survey, I think, you know, by being a little higher on that -- because that one's a zero to 30 traditionally because some years we have no applications in that category, so we --

MR. FLETCHER: Yeah. And this year we have --

MR. RITTER: -- had to put it at a zero. So this year we had a couple big ones, so by partially funding both of those, it gets us almost, you know, to the 30 percent.

MR. FLETCHER: Now, what changed on that value for Reality House because my spreadsheet says 40 and this says 39? Did something get rounded off or --

MR. COLE: I think I had an error there. I did have some information come in after I sent that off to --

MR. RITTER: You don't have to point out that my ratings sheets were late.

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. UKOHA: So where are we at now? Are we at public improvements?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah.

MR. RITTER: Housing infrastructure, I mean, we know the money's used. It's a good -- you know, good project rehab, but I think it's kind of like the Rainbow House. You know, you get too far away from the goal of funding and then it becomes not a priority.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Right.

MR. RITTER: So I think keeping it as close to the 200- as possible is important there. Sidewalks, we've seen ups and downs on those projects in the past years with expending of funds. You know, they came in under plan on some and had delays on others, so it's kind of a toss-up there.

MR. FLETCHER: Yeah.

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. FLETCHER: But that always shows up high in that --

MR. RITTER: Yeah. No.

MR. FLETCHER: When I first got on this commission, I always hated the sidewalk projects because I thought they were expensive and I didn't understand that need, but then as soon as we started doing this survey, it's always come up very high.

MR. CROUCH: Yeah.

MR. FLETCHER: So obviously, you know, that's what our target audience wants --

MR. UKOHA: Is there any reason why we're --

MR. FLETCHER: -- in on sidewalks.

MR. UKOHA: -- giving zero to Parks and Recreation Department?

MR. RITTER: Yeah, because that was the playgrounds.

MR. UKOHA: Oh.

MR. SCHEPERS: The only problem I have with that is they have a tax revenue.

MR. UKOHA: Oh, okay.

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. SCHEPERS: I mean, there's a city parks tax and so rather than --

MR. UKOHA: That makes sense. And so they can --

MR. RITTER: They weren't proposing a new playground. They were proposing --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Upgrading --

MR. RITTER: -- upgrading existing mulch and replacing it with --

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. FLETCHER: The city manager was okay with it.

MS. FORBES: I was in contact with somebody after the hearing and they mentioned the toxicity -- the possible toxicity of the materials itself for little kids.

MR. FLETCHER: Oh. Of the surface stuff?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah.

MR. RITTER: I'd have to really see -

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MS. FORBES: And how would you really know?

MR. FLETCHER: I looked at all those websites for all the materials and stuff though and kind of went and looked at all that. And it looked like it's, you know, used nationwide. It's, you know --

MS. FORBES: And nobody's ever linked --

MR. FLETCHER: -- meets all the --

MS. FORBES: -- it to any studies or any --

MR. FLETCHER: No. It meets all of these -- there's all kinds of codes and standards and other things that it all meets, so it's -- I wouldn't think --

MS. FORBES: And the thing that solidified my decision was seeing the kids are the Art in the Park playing in the mulch playground. I thought that's organic, they're having a good time, nobody's

bouncing on something that makes them fall down. You know, I just -- I have decided I like the mulch better.

MR. RITTER: Yeah. You can't convince me that if my three-year-old falls off the monkey bars on his backside on plastic tile, it's not going to hurt more than it will on mulch.

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. FLETCHER: The mulch is what they use for Columbia Public Schools.

MR. SCHEPERS: I think we're okay there.

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. RITTER: I think we're getting pretty close here.

MR. UKOHA: So are we very comfortable in the 30,000 for Reality House or do we make it 40- and making the loan 160-, the Rainbow House.

MR. FLETCHER: I don't -- I'd like Rainbow House to stay where -- I don't want to get it so low that it -- that they lose that opportunity because it does leverage a ton of funds and so I don't -- since we didn't ask the executive director for a specific -- you know, what is it you absolutely -- you know, what's your drop-dead low value or something, I hate to go much lower than that.

MR. UKOHA: Well, they still have a source of funding. They still have matching funds and somebody's asking for 200,000 and you're giving them 160-, that's not a bad deal. It's not at all. Because 30,000, if we make that one -- if we make it 40-, I think it will help out Reality House to do the improvement they're already doing.

MR. FLETCHER: Maybe we compromise, 5,000. You broker deals all the time.

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. COLE: That's the -- rather than move Rainbow House, if you do need to move 10-, move from rehab for the City funds, because I'd prefer Rainbow House as --

MR. FLETCHER: Yeah.

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. RITTER: I mean, I want --

MR. FLETCHER: And I still think --

MR. RITTER: -- to see that work. I mean --

MR. FLETCHER: And I just always think that there's always some reprogrammed fund opportunities that we can give back to the ramps or to any other -- there will be some funds that bubble up somewhere, just like there were this year. It seems like that's always the case, for whatever reason, in those smaller amounts.

MR. CROUCH: So are you suggesting taking 10- out of the housing for the city funds and adding that to --

MR. COLE: You could take it out of the ADA, yeah.

MR. CROUCH: -- and adding that to --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Oh, out of the ADA.

MR. COLE: -- to Reality House. That's just a suggestion, if the committee --

MR. FLETCHER: Make that 78-.

MR. CROUCH: Yeah. And make that 78-.

MR. COLE: If you want to make Reality House up to 40-.

MR. CROUCH: Well, if it gets to 40-, that give them a real chance of doing one whole floor.

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. UKOHA: You're giving them more. I was thinking 170- is too much already. Make it 170- them and 40-. They are going to do -- be very happy with 170-.

MR. SCHEPERS: You know, Mitch, if you did that enough times, you probably wouldn't get re-elected.

MR. RITTER: We're at 32 percent now on community --

MR. FLETCHER: Yeah. I mean, we're a little out of whack, but I think the argument that you can make to the Staff is --

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. FLETCHER: Well, it's the one big project with Rainbow House that gives them the opportunity to double their capacity. It's a huge community need for housing for homeless kids. And, you know, they're going to leverage -- you know, it's like Phil's project. They're going to leverage millions of dollars in other funds for the project, so this is seed money for a bigger issue, so hopefully they would understand that.

MR. UKOHA: Where are we at, Mitch?

MR. RITTER: We're at --

MR. CROUCH: What's the --

MR. RITTER: -- housing infra-- I mean, are we kind of -- I mean, everybody's --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: What's the bottom line with --

MR. RITTER: -- okay with -- we're even.

MR. CROUCH: Was the resolution on the Council for those percentages done before or after we knew there were cutbacks in --

MR. COLE: It was -- last time it was updated was three years ago, so it was well before two years of --

MR. CROUCH: So it was well before the cutbacks we've had, so I think you can make that as a reasonable argument that the percentage -- when the allocations are really done within the amount we've got to allocate.

MR. FLETCHER: And the other thing is is when we get the 2014 funds, we may get surprised and get more.

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. FLETCHER: The economy's picking up. Things are getting better, so at that point in time we may have some extra funds to kind of fill back in on some of the community development funds

that, you know, we're a little short on that top box. Because those we know we can always spend the money immediately.

MR. RITTER: Is everybody comfortable with 190- for the CHA?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. FLETCHER: We get 660 housing units for 200,000? That's a bargain.

MS. FORBES: My only problem is that the city needs -- really, really, really needs to address the --

MR. FLETCHER: Stormwater.

MS. FORBES: -- stormwater and the sewer issues in that area before they start building anything, because you'll just add to the problem.

MR. FLETCHER: In your proposal the City isn't on the hook for the stormwater stuff, is it? Are they doing a redesign of all the stormwater?

MR. STEINHAUS: We've been talking with the city civil engineers and the City's a partner on this project. They're going to -- and the proposal's in front of City Council to donate those three properties from the NSP program to the project, so -- but we can't solve the whole --

MR. FLETCHER: Like you said --

MR. STEINHAUS: We will have to solve what happens on our property, but, you know, even if --

MR. FLETCHER: Next down there's a smaller hole --

MR. STEINHAUS: -- tunnels on our property twice as big, unless the artery downstream gets bigger, it won't do any good, so --

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. STEINHAUS: We're going to have to put water detention and stuff like that on the site, ways to shore water on the site and let it then slowly -- so it doesn't rush across the property or rush downstream, so there's some systems we can look at. But we have had a camera -- and actually, that's the oldest part of it that was built before urban renewal and it's cameraed. It's in good shape and it's not full of garbage and rocks and dirt and stuff like that. It's pretty clean, but it's just not big enough --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The water velocity through it --

MS. FORBES: Wasn't it in --

MR. STEINHAUS: The real issue is not the stormwater. The real issue is people dumping stormwater into the sanitary sewer and overflows the sanitary sewer. The sanitary sewer flooded Switzler Street a foot deep three or four weeks ago right in front of our offices on Pendleton, so -- I always thought those were stormwater and then I clarified with them, no, that's the sanitary sewer that's coming out there. There's just so much stormwater in it, it looks fairly clean, but --

MR. FLETCHER: And that's a big long-term issue that we --

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MS. FORBES: And that exists all the way up to --

MR. STEINHAUS: Yeah. We got a map of all the complaints the city civil engineer provided to us and we've been talking with the city manager on how that moves up on their city master plan. What we're basically saying is we'll work with you in any way you're addressing all the rest of the arteries down there, what needs to be done, and let's do it now before we build housing there and then come back and tear stuff up. And I think they -- I'm not sure if maybe Randy knows, but there was something in the paper. They've got something in the budget about stormwater.

MR. COLE: I'm not aware of that.

MR. FLETCHER: So this is a leap of faith for us to fund this, you know, given some of those issues, but it's an opportunity to leverage, you know, millions and -- what's the total of dollars --

MR. STEINHAUS: About six million.

MR. FLETCHER: \$6 million for 190,000. That's a pretty good leverage.

MR. HARRIS: I think if the City sees that commitment, that they'll be willing to do something about it, personally. I mean, you're not going to let it --

MR. FLETCHER: Right. And when we -- we heard the city manager. I mean, he can't -- he can make those recommendations too, obviously. If he's behind them, that helps. He doesn't make all the decisions, but --

MR. STEINHAUS: It's not like we haven't been addressing this from the very beginning. We see this as an opportunity so we -- (inaudible). If we can't solve it by working hand-in-hand with them, it's not solvable.

MR. SCHEPERS: So are we ready to address the next section?

MR. RITTER: Well, we'll --

MR. FLETCHER: Do we vote on this one or --

MR. RITTER: Yeah. Let's take a motion on the CDBG by itself.

MR. FLETCHER: Okay. I make a motion that we accept the CDBG funding as noted on the sheet that's on the overhead. I don't know how else to do that.

MR. RITTER: Can we make a motion like that?

MR. COLE: Sounds good.

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. HARRIS: Take a picture.

MR. COLE: Let's make sure it adds up.

MS. FORBES: Move we accept -- somebody word it for me. Move we accept --

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MS. FORBES: Anybody want to second that motion?

MR. SCHEPERS: Sure.

MR. RITTER: We'll let the secretary catch up on --

MS. FORBES: I've got my second written down. Somebody call for the vote.

MR. RITTER: Okay. All those in favor, say aye. All opposed?

(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

MR. RITTER: Okay. There we go. CDBG is done.

MS. FORBES: Yay.

MR. RITTER: HOME funding. You've got survey results in your packet. These are all in one category, sorted by rating. Homeownership assistance finished high again here. Owner-occupied rehab, the Lincoln-Unity project, and then two tenant-based rental assistance projects, two homeownership assistance projects -- really home build project, Job Point and Habitat for Humanity. So looks like we've got fiscal year 2013, 175- coming there.

MR. COLE: That was funding that was set aside, 2013 funds, for rental production. So it was originally set aside as an adjustment project that never went forward, so it was still available for anyone who would apply for a rental production project such as this one.

MR. RITTER: So we're estimating 400-'s available, and then there's 175- available now.

MR. COLE: Right now. Yeah.

MR. RITTER: So their request was 175-, so why are we essentially giving them 3--

MR. COLE: That's a mistake. They requested 300-. They requested 175- in 2013 and 175- in 2014.

MR. RITTER: So it should be 350- here.

MR. COLE: Yeah.

MR. FLETCHER: Say that one more time.

MR. COLE: They requested half of it from 2013, 175--

MR. RITTER: Didn't we fund it?

MR. COLE: What's that?

MR. RITTER: We didn't fund it in 2013?

MR. COLE: They're requesting it right now, but they knew that there was 2013 money available.

MR. RITTER: Oh, got you. Got you. Got you.

MR. COLE: Sorry. I just -- I should've wrote 350- in there.

MR. RITTER: So we've got 900,000 requested for an available 575-. Suggested cuts: To Homeownership Assistance Program as Randy pointed out earlier, \$6,000 cut in the owner-occupied rehab, so that's essentially, you know, average of, what, one project or so.
(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. COLE: Probably like a half a project.

MR. FLETCHER: Sorry. I'm going to interrupt. I apologize. Back to that 2013, 175,000, I'm still confused by that. Looking at your overview, it says here -- so explain this to me. The City set

aside 175,000 for a rental production program in fiscal year 2013. How does that factor in -- what were you trying to tell us that --

MR. COLE: Just that that money was available for rental production projects such as this. So as part of last year's funding process, you guys had one line that said rental production 175,000. There was no specific project identified, but it was approved for it to be set aside for a rental production type project. It originally was going to be Gentry Estates --

MR. FLETCHER: So we --

MR. COLE: -- ended up not applying for our funds.

MR. FLETCHER: -- have 175,000 right now to give them for --

MR. COLE: Yeah. And it's part of that 2013 money that will become available --

MR. FLETCHER: Have 18 months to spend it?

MR. COLE: Yeah.

MR. FLETCHER: And you can do that that fast?

MR. COLE: Well, actually, that type -- that funding, the HOME funds, they have to be committed within two years and then after --

MR. FLETCHER: Oh.

MR. COLE: -- they're committed, they have four years beyond that.

MR. FLETCHER: Oh, okay.

MR. COLE: So it kind of helps with the low-income housing tax credit projects, so they can know if they have time to make sure they get tax credits -- we can also make it contingent to where if they don't get the tax credit funding we can reprogram it to something else. Does that make sense?

MR. FLETCHER: Yeah. Because this was contingent on that tax funding process.

MR. COLE: Yeah.

MR. CROUCH: When is that tax funding process going to be available?

MR. COLE: Applications are due in September and then they make approvals by the end of December; is that correct, Phil?

MR. STEINHAUS: Right.

MR. COLE: So we would know by the end of the calendar year.

MR. FLETCHER: Yeah. Like I said, I went online to the HUD website and looked at all that and if I was a large investor, I'd be applying to try and get in on that, because it's, like, a 10 percent return on your money and it's guaranteed.

MR. UKOHA: Why don't we go ahead and make it contingent upon that tax --

MR. FLETCHER: Well, that's true anyway. I mean, basically, if you don't get that funding, it's -- you're not going to go forward with the project anyway.

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. STEINHAUS: What we're planning to do right now --

MR. UKOHA: This is Lincoln. Oh, okay.

MR. RITTER: This is different from --

MR. STEINHAUS: This is for renovation of --

MR. UKOHA: All right. Yeah.

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. STEINHAUS: There's two tax credits, a 9 percent and 4 percent. The 4 percent is much less competitive because it generates less money and it uses tax exempt bonds. The 9 percent generates more money for the project. So the 9 percent is highly competitive. The 4 percent, they don't usually allocate all the money they have set aside so if we can fund the gap between what we're going to get from HUD, what we collect in rents, other layers of subsidy, like these funds here, then we can leverage the tax credits and do the renovations that we need to do. So if for some reason they didn't fund them in September, there's another 4 percent application we know that opens up in March. So that would be the only contingent I would say on that is that if for some reason they didn't award it to us in December, we could reapply in March and possibly that would be awarded sometime in June. And we could report back to you certainly.

MR. FLETCHER: But we have a bunch of -- sounds like we have several years to reprogram

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. COLE: We really -- the funding expires after, like, six years, but we have commitment levels overall that we're bound by. So really we can't sit on our hands for spending money because we have overall percentages that we got to meet for committing and spending funds as a whole.

MR. FLETCHER: Okay. So what's your drop-dead date for them having commitment to spend money?

MR. COLE: For knowing if they're going to get tax credit funding?

MR. FLETCHER: Can you wait until March?

MR. COLE: I would think -- yeah. Certainly. I would definitely --

MR. FLETCHER: Because they didn't get it in the first-round funding and the second-round opportunity, can you wait that long?

MR. COLE: Yeah. I would think.

MR. STEINHAUS: Just to clarify: The applications open again in March. They wouldn't make decisions on that until June of 2014.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: This time next year.

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. FLETCHER: But, again, it leverages a ton of funds, but it --

MR. COLE: I would think what we could do is make it contingent upon the first round, but then revisit it and see where we're at for --

MR. FLETCHER: Let's so that.

MR. COLE: -- funding as a whole.

MR. FLETCHER: Let's require them to give us feedback after this first round of funding and then we can revisit that at that point in time.

MR. COLE: And you could extend it or not depending on what --

MR. FLETCHER: Yeah.

MR. COLE: -- what we've been --

MR. FLETCHER: So that would be -- when will you find out with the first round --

MR. STEINHAUS: In December. Usually, they make the awards in December. This year because of some politicking that was going on in Jeff City, they did it, like, the second week in January, but it's usually right before Christmas.

MR. CROUCH: So what does that mean when we have to commit that 175,000 to be spent? Not until that date or --

MR. COLE: We can -- if you-all vote to approve this project, we can commit it to the project -- (Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. FLETCHER: It's contingent on them getting --

MR. COLE: -- HOME commitment --

MR. FLETCHER: And then, for it to be reprogrammed to other HOME funds, it would have to be in the category of stuff we're seeing right here --

MR. COLE: You could reprogram into any HOME eligible activity.

MR. FLETCHER: Okay.

MR. STEINHAUS: One possible solution is that with the money that we requested for TBRA. You could reprogram that into -- instead of the 2014 and move that money around that way and reprogram it, but it's not that our TBRA is going to increase, but you could say, Well, go ahead and spend these funds down this year. It's kind of like what we're doing with that 90,000 from last year. So if you give us money, we can figure out how to spend it.

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. UKOHA: Just leave it as is and our next meeting --

MR. RITTER: The only think I was thinking of Voluntary Action Center program. That was more of a --

MR. FLETCHER: I liked their --

MR. RITTER: -- you know, emergencies versus tenant-based rental assistance and it was a lesser amount --

MR. FLETCHER: The community knows them as a place to go for assistance and they, you know, are a clearing house and direct people to a lot of other services and providers and other things. And they're recognized as --

MR. RITTER: I mean, I'm leaning towards funding that at some --

MR. FLETCHER: I would like to do that to.

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. RITTER: -- level. It's up for debate on what level should be. I just -- I think it's a different -- it's the first time we've seen a different TBRA proposal. Now, I think, like Michael says, it's going to serve a different purpose in that, you know, people look towards the VAC for emergency help when --

MR. FLETCHER: That's the thing is somebody who has a -- they've got a shortfall this month and it can keep them in their house --

MR. RITTER: Exactly.

MR. FLETCHER: -- keep them in their apartment, you know, and I think that can be a really good thing. Phil's process is more, you know, long-term getting people --
(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. FLETCHER: And this would be more -- this could keep somebody from becoming homeless, if they lose their job or they've been sick or they have, you know, a hiccup in their income stream, but they're going to be back and their feet, and that could be something that keeps them from losing their housing situation, I think --

MR. UKOHA: Are you suggesting taking 20,000 from 120- to give full funding for the Voluntary Action?

MR. COLE: I think one thing you should be concerned about is you could be potentially opening up the floodgates for more TBRA applications, which may or may not be a good thing. From a Staff standpoint, I think it increases the difficulty in monitoring because there's a few other agencies that do similar type rental assistance, like Lutheran Family Services, Salvation Army. So it could open the floodgates for more TBRA applications and have more organizations to monitor to make sure we're not duplicating --

MR. FLETCHER: Stuff like that --

MR. COLE: -- we're not duplicating serving TBRA with the same person --

MR. FLETCHER: Yeah. But I -- this really isn't a -- this doesn't really duplicate what Columbia Housing Authority does because it is different, but there are other organizations in town that do that.

MR. COLE: And another point I'll throw out there is in our annual performance report, rental assistance is one that we're -- we've been consistently overachieving in, and underachieving in other areas, so --

MR. FLETCHER: Rental assistance in terms of, again, the survey rated reasonably high at number three.

MR. UKOHA: Well, since you put it that way, you know, we have always gone with Staff recommendation. Probably we should leave it at -- the way it is, zero for now.

MR. RITTER: And then see what happens with --

MR. UKOHA: Yeah.

MR. RITTER: -- the application for --

MR. UKOHA: Yeah.

MR. RITTER: -- additional funds.

MR. CROUCH: Then again, we're talking about 2014 and as we say, by the time that comes around, we'll know where we are on the application.

MR. RITTER: Are there any additional notes we need out here so that the documentation's in the file? I mean, just other than saying contingent on the application approval, I guess.

MR. SCHEPERS: Does this spreadsheet become part of the official record? No. I wouldn't think it would then.

MR. COLE: Yeah. This would be a public record.

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. FLETCHER: You could put contingency in there if you want, but you would --

MR. RITTER: I'll say fiscal year 2013.

MR. UKOHA: Yeah. Let's do it for the fiscal year 2013.

MR. SCHEPERS: Well, I like it so much I'll make a motion we approve that.

MR. FLETCHER: So we're rolling up all of the homeowner assistance under the City.

MR. UKOHA: Yeah. There's no need for duplication there.

MR. RITTER: And there's no construction funds to Job Point on the --

MR. FLETCHER: The CHDO is -- that's admin funds?

MR. COLE: That's mandatory CHDO set aside. So that's the funding that we'll get back together this year, since now we know our 2013 funding, we'll do that this fall, probably September, October-ish. So that's that mandatory amount of HOME funds that we set aside through Job Point, Habitat, CMCA that CHDOs can apply to for specific housing development. So we're mandated by HUD to set aside 15 percent --

MR. FLETCHER: That's housing development. So, like, the tenant-based rental assistance can't be funded with that?

MR. COLE: No. It could be the production of new rental unit housing or just houses in --

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Big chunk of money.

MR. RITTER: There's a motion to pending to approve the funding --

MR. FLETCHER: Okay. Just by show of hands, is anybody else other than the two of us want to see Voluntary Action Center get some funds for --

MR. UKOHA: No. I withdrew my support of that.

MR. FLETCHER: I know you did.

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MS. FORBES: I'm with you.

MR. HARRIS: I have to say I think so too. I think it's a -- I understand the problem with trying to track all the funding to make sure it's all up-to-date, but I think it's a special need where people may be short a paycheck, may need access to emergency funds.

MR. RITTER: And I trust the organization itself.

MR. HARRIS: Yeah. They have a good track record too.

MR. RITTER: They can accurately accept those applications and put the funds in the community where they're needed.

MR. FLETCHER: Where would it come from?

MR. RITTER: That's a little bit different question.

MR. FLETCHER: Because, I mean, everybody is already underfunded, just because of the big request for the Lincoln-Unity.

MR. RITTER: It would probably be something, like, you know, maybe taking the rehab back 5- and --

MR. FLETCHER: Now, can the CHDO fund --

MR. COLE: No. Those have to be what they are. That's a federal mandate.

MR. FLETCHER: Right. So they can't go back into the Lincoln-Unity project?

MR. COLE: No. It has to be a CHDO funded organization. So the Housing Authority is not a CHDO.

MR. FLETCHER: Okay.

MR. RITTER: But Habitat and Job Point are.

MR. SCHEPERS: Right.

MR. RITTER: So that's money set aside for their applications in the spring usually.

MR. COLE: In the fall.

MR. RITTER: I mean, we've got three of us, maybe four. That's a split.

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. FLETCHER: Terry, what's your opinion? Weigh in.

MR. CROUCH: I think, you know, from what you're saying, the concern that you're opening up to other organizations to come in, I mean, that would ultimately be the decision of this commission. If this commission feels that Voluntary -- and I defer to the comments that it's a well-known and trusted organization. I don't see why we should move to be concerned about further applications for TBRAs if we feel this is valid at this point in time. And listening to the comments, you know, I would tend to be for it if we can find the funds from this amount of money.

MR. COLE: Yeah. I think it's a really good organization to work with. I know their staff. My concern was more of --

MR. FLETCHER: What the need is.

MR. COLE: -- the need and potential duplication of services, even though they are serving a slightly different style of program. I wouldn't -- you know, If the Commission wants to fund it, I would certainly support whatever ya'll decide.

MR. HARRIS: Is any other organization inquired in the past about -- or do they even know it's available? I mean, let's say we pass -- let's say we give them money and then word gets out --

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. COLE: I would say most of them don't. This came about through one of my conversations with a VAC member because he was asking, you know, is there anything that's HOME eligible. And I said, well, TBRA would be eligible.

MR. FLETCHER: I'm sure they have the need and they get the requests. It's just --

MR. COLE: They definitely have a lot of people in the door. Mine was more just the managerial aspects of it, but I can certainly deal with it if it's the Commission's wishes.

MR. SCHEPERS: For the record, I'll withdraw my motion.

MR. RITTER: Yeah. It never got seconded.

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. CROUCH: If we want to fund it, where do we take it from?

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. RITTER: I took 5- from rehab and 5- from Lincoln-Unity to give them 10-. But 10-, you know, on an average say it's a \$500, you know, assistance, that's 20 -- you know, 20 months. So, you know, I don't know if that's worth --

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. RITTER: I know. It's like at some point what do you -- where's the administrative pain point --

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. UKOHA: I think we don't do anything with it. If we have more funding later, we can do something for it, but --

MR. RITTER: You know, anything away from owner-occupied rehab is a risk too because we know we always use those funds. There's always applications there. I mean, granted 5,000 is a 60, 50, 75 percent of a project, but it could be the difference between getting somebody the --

MR. CROUCH: In going back to your, you know, is 10,000 worth the administrative nightmare, it's still 50 percent of their ask. And, you know, I had my arm twisted because we thought it was a good project. Now we don't want to do it because we don't think 10,000 is enough, but 10,000 is better than nothing.

MR. FLETCHER: Yeah. And we can always track their progress and you get feedback from them to see if something we want to fund more later.

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. UKOHA: I know they will use it. I have no doubt.

MR. COLE: We already took housing away on the CDBG.

MR. RITTER: On the homeownership assistance, go back to your Staff memo on why that's 40,000 -- 42,000 less.

MR. COLE: That was just to help spread the money. That was just the fact that we don't have much money.

MR. RITTER: Oh, okay.

MR. COLE: I think we could spend that no problem, the 25- and more.

MR. RITTER: It is the highest rated project and it's being funded at a third of what the application is.

MR. HARRIS: I would say we take 10- out of the FY 2013. I mean, to have it tied up for almost 18 months with -- for a tax credit application is kind of a -- I hate to see that much money get tied up and not get used.

MR. RITTER: Like that there?

MR. HARRIS: Yeah. And then again, down the road, if there's more money available, we can always switch it around to CHA.

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. FLETCHER: Can we do it that way, like what he's done?

MR. COLE: No. Those funds were authorized by Council for rental production.

MR. UKOHA: That's what I'm saying. You cannot do that. Just leave it the way it is and --

MR. FLETCHER: You have to take it out of the 2014 --

MR. UKOHA: And there's nothing on there to --

MR. RITTER: Yeah. It would be taken out of that bucket and those are already under -- this one's underfunded by 31,000. It's just a tough -- it's a small pot.

MR. FLETCHER: Yeah. And HOME funds got cut in -- you know, in 2013, so we got under in HOME funds. Jim, what was that motion you made?

MR. SCHEPERS: I liked it.

MR. UKOHA: Are you making a motion to leave it the way it is?

MR. SCHEPERS: I already withdrew my motion.

MR. UKOHA: Oh, you did?

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. UKOHA: I'm making a motion we leave it the way it is.

MR. SCHEPERS: I'll second it though.

MS. FORBES: All right.

MR. RITTER: So there's a motion to approve HOME funding as recorded in the spreadsheet. All those in favor, say aye. All opposed?

(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

MR. RITTER: Okay. Done.

MR. FLETCHER: That's it. Right?

MR. RITTER: Do we have any --

MR. FLETCHER: We just blew through, what, \$1.4 million that fast?

MR. RITTER: Do we have any further comments from the public? Yes. Please state your name and address for the record.

MR. FOSTER: Nick Foster, 4803 (inaudible) in Columbia, and director of Voluntary Action Center. I appreciate the kind words from the Commission about our agency in appreciation for our application. I just want to say a word or two just to -- that might clarify that. We have moving over the past year, year and a half into rental assistance. And part of that is that some of the money that's been available in the community for rental assistance has begun to be sort of funneled to our agency for that purpose. An example of that would be some grant funds -- federal grant funds that become available in the past few months. A number of agencies gather around the table and talk about how we would do this. It was agreed among those agencies that VAC would be the place that would be the depository for rental assistance, the acceptance being True North because they -- because their clientele -- we couldn't work with their clientele in the same way that they can because of privacy issues, of course. And the other thing I'd say is I think -- I'm not sure that Randy's right about the other agencies that might be applying. Salvation Army, I think, does not do rental assistance. They do shelter, of course. In that same process we were involved in, they were at the table and it was agreed that they, you know, would make application for that. The reason for that was we wanted to have a community-wide supported grant proposal that went to HUD and everyone that was involved from Columbia was fully funded in our request. So we feel like a part of that was because we working together. I think you can anticipate that happening also in the future. We really are as basic needs service agencies trying to do this more and more. I think you will likely see us back at the table asking you to consider this again, and again we appreciate your consideration. Little disappointed we didn't make it, but, you know, that's the way it is.

MR. UKOHA: Well, that would be my recommendation, that you reapply for next fiscal year. And as things normally happen, if we have reprogrammed funding, you never know. We might decide to still fund it.

MR. FOSTER: Sure. Well, we appreciate that and we're certainly open to any other questions or any clarification we can get about our process. Thanks.

MR. UKOHA: Thank you.

MR. RITTER: Any additional comments?

MR. STEINHAUS: I just want to thank everybody for the support of our affordable housing projects. I know we've been after some big chunks of money here, but that's the -- we have a big subsidy gap. Tax credits doesn't cover all of it, and what we're really trying to do is preserve our most affordable housing in Columbia, our 50-year-old public housing units. So it's a huge commitment on your behalf to support that project and I know you made some tough decisions. I appreciate that very much. And we also hope we'll get started in that community development business as well there at Garth and Sexton. We hope we can fund our McKinny Point project without funds from you, but we are asking for some of that support for the McQuitty Square project. And just as a note, as far as rental assistance, one thing we do with public housing is if somebody has that some kind of glitch, we'll work our repayment agreement with them, so if they have an emergency situation, we can

document where they had a health issue that's prevented them from working, there's some other way they can document that this was unpredictable and they can't come up with the rent, then we'll work our repayment agreement with them rather than just terminate the lease.

MR. FLETCHER: Yeah. But that's just within our organization.

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. FLETCHER: And that's the difference between the funds that they --

(Multiple people are speaking simultaneously.)

MR. STEINHAUS: It's just kind of the way we compliment each other. We're on the FEMA Board together and try to work together on that.

MR. CHAPMAN: My name is Tec Chapman. I'm the executive director of Services for Independent Living. I've been there about nine and a half weeks. I want to thank you for your continued support of our ramp project. We'll do a better job next year articulating the immediate need so you can understand clearly the number of ramps that are needed here and where people are looking for that, and we'll do a better job next year so you can fully fund us. But we do appreciate your support this year and thank you very much.

MR. FLETCHER: Now, are you new to Columbia?

MR. CHAPMAN: No, sir. I've lived here for seven years.

THE COURT REPORTER: Could you say your name again for me?

MR. CHAPMAN: Yes. I'm sorry. Tec, T-e-c, Chapman, C-h-a-p-m-a-n. Forgot the address. 1401 Hathman Place, Columbia, Missouri 65201.

MR. FLETCHER: And the ramp program has been a success story because when I first got on the Commission, it was -- you know, it was something we were funding on a routine basis, but it was being under-utilized and wasn't performing like it should, and now that's not the problem. Now you can spend all the money you get because it's working so well.

MR. CHAPMAN: Yeah. And the other -- we have an annual event -- and this year it'll be October 5th -- here in Columbia, it's called Ramp Up, where we actually leverage awareness about the ramp program and support that you-all provide so we are able to get various crews and companies that come together and build ramps in our outlying areas throughout the county. And last year, if my memory serves me correctly, we built, like, 16 ramps in outer Boone County all the way up into Randolph County and Montgomery and Howard. And part of that awareness just came from the work that we've done with funding you've given to help us build ramps for disabled veterans, seniors, and people with other disabilities. And so it's bore a lot of fruit and we can actually double the number. Granted, we don't need the funding for that, but it's the awareness issue that helps people to know what the need is.

MR. RITTER: Thank you for your comments. All right. I'll take a motion for adjournment.

MR. UKOHA: Motion for adjournment.

MR. SCHEPERS: Second.

MR. RITTER: All those in favor, say aye. Opposed?

(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

(The meeting adjourned at 8:58 p.m.)

(Off the record.)

DRAFT