

JOINT ~ COM DEV & FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
from MONDAY, AUGUST 29TH, 2022 [Joint meeting began at 6:10 P.M.]

CD PRESENT: Chair Callahan, Mitchell, Oswald, Schneider, Lipian
FINANCE PRESENT: Chair Stewart, Tollett, Cerra, Davis, Schneider
OTHERS PRESENT: Law Dir Deery, Mayor Whitfield, Safety Svc Dir Brubaker, Asst Dir Williams, Asst Dir Calvert, Finance Dir Pileski, Asst Fin Dir Farrell, Engineer McKillips, Parks Dir Reardon, WWPC Supt Korzan, CD Dir Scott, CD Mngr Almobayyed, Asst Law Dir Breunig, Councilperson Simmons

*This is a JOINT Meeting of the Community Development Committee and the Finance Committee of Elyria City Council.
Community Development has already been called to order and Chair Stewart called Finance to order at 6:10 P.M.*

1. Approval of the Joint Meeting Minutes ~ June 27th, 2022.

(There was no Joint Meeting on July 25th)

Moved by Mr. Oswald, seconded by Mr. Schneider to approve the above listed Joint Meeting Minutes.

2. The matter of the PY 2023 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Action Plan Update.

FIRST PUBLIC HEARING *(1st of 3 Public Hearings) [NO ACTION THIS EVENING]*

Referred By: Community Development Director Scott

Chair Callahan read the 'Call To Public Hearing'.

The first proponent to speak was Community Development Dir Scott. Dir Scott said tonight is the first of three public hearings for the start of the annual CDBG 2023 planning process. As is was stated they will anticipate \$762,114 for the 2023 CDBG program This amount can and will vary. They will receive the final allocation in early 2023.

The City did receive it's 2022 allocation. The expenditure of those funds are; 22 percent encumbered and expended in administration, 42% in housing rehab, 25% in code enforcement and 95% in public service activities.

The public facility projects are currently underway. There have not been any agreements signed, to date. The City submitted the caper in May which is the annual report to HUD. HUD sent a letter back in June stating the City was in compliance with all of the CAPS. The 70% low to moderate income benefit required by HUD for these funds.

The funding requests have been put on line today for the non-profit organizations. They will be accepted until noon on September 30th. At that time Community Development will review them and provide Council with narratives and funding amounts.

They will hold an informational meeting on September 7th for anyone that's interested. And questions and concerns will be answered.

The second public hearing will be held on October 11th at the Joint Meeting.

At that time they will review all of the requests. The third and final meeting will be held on Monday, October and at that time they will ask the joint committees to develop the draft budget and then they will put the draft plan out for public comment beginning October 28th for 30 days. After that 30 days they will come back to the Joint committees to ask for approval. Depending on any public comments that are received and they will ask for final approval from Council on December 5th, 2022.

Chair Callahan asked if there were any more proponents two more times, and there were none.

Chair Callahan asked if there were any opponents three times, and there were none.

Chair Callahan declared this Public Hearing has been held.

3. The matter of the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Consolidated Annual Action Plan - Substantial Amendment.

PUBLIC HEARING [COMMITTEES WILL VOTE THIS EVENING]

Referred By: Community Development Manager Almobayyed

Chair Callahan read the 'Call To Public Hearing'.

First proponent to speak was Community Development Manger Almobayyed. Manager Almobayyed said they have one item to be considered. There was one non-profit that did not expend all of their funds. All of the other non-profits did a great job with their programming and their participants getting their funds spent within the grant deadline. Now there is this small piece to take care of which will require councilmatic action to transfer the unexpended funds from Adopt A School into the housing rehab activity.

Chair Callahan asked if there were any more proponents two more times, and there were none.

Chair Callahan asked if there were any opponents three times, and there were none.

Chair Callahan declared this Public Hearing has been held.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE:

Mr. Oswald moved, second by Mr. Schneider to recommend an ordinance authorizing the 'said' Substantial Amendment to shift unexpended funds from Adopt-A-School to Housing Rehab Activity. Emergency clause is requested.

MOTION CARRIED COMMITTEE REPORT WRITTEN

FINANCE COMMITTEE:

Mr. Cerra moved, second by Mr. Schneider to recommend an ordinance authorizing the 'said' Substantial Amendment to shift unexpended funds from Adopt-A-School to Housing Rehab Activity. Emergency clause is requested.

MOTION CARRIED COMMITTEE REPORT WRITTEN

4. The matter of Oakwood School Emergency Repairs; (Roof Replacement, Window & Door Replacement, Upgrading Restroom to ADA, Fire Suppression System). (Discussion only)

Referred by: Assistant Dir Williams

This discussion began with Mayor Whitfield thanking the committee for hearing this again. They've been working on this for a long time now. This evening will be a presentation with the staff which will include multiple options for us to get goal that they have. The focus is on the outcome and that's providing opportunities for young people to have a safe and nurturing place for them to go after school to help them academically and to prepare for the future. And to also foster relationships within the community. What the committees will hear is the same proposal as before, but with a lot more detail. But they've also provided two other options. They've provided enough options that they hope the committee will be able to accept and decide on one of the options so they can move forward. The school year started this week, everyday that goes by there's a young person who's looking for something to do after school and potentially without something to eat after school. There is youth that need to be served. Mayor hopes they can come to some sort of consensus on a direction moving forward.

Direction Williams thanked the Mayor and said they have directors from the staff who will be able to speak specifically to areas in which they have expertise. Engineer McKillips will present the issues of the engineering study and the costs associated with the numbers that they have arrived at. Parks Dir Reardon will speak on Plan A. There is concern about sustained costs of programming and maintenance. We also have Save-Our-Children here this evening. They are the primary partner in this endeavor. They expect there may be other community partners that they've had conversations with and stakeholders who will be participating and providing resources and services to our residents. They are committed to this endeavor. Our program and their program currently offers services to students after school. The City also offers senior services which allows us to expand and they believe that as stated in this brief, that the Oakwood School Intergenerational Community Center would become the City's highest volume service facility. Save Our Children will be able to serve 150 to 250 kids a day with the senior side being designed specifically for those services. Presently when the fitness opportunities is set up in one of the Park's facility the equipment has to be set up for the activity and then take down when that activity is finished. To have a fitness area set-up in a specific room and it would stay set-up which will allow for utilization of time and space. Another thing the Eng McKillips will speak to is how will the resources to this building differ from the same resources in another building.

Dir Williams said that this investment of the current Oakwood School would give us far more efficiency and far more utilization than we could by taking the same amount of money and investing into one of the City's existing facilities.

The first proposed plan is Plan A which is traditional. Elyria will appropriate 1.6 million dollars of ARPA Funds for the stabilization of the school building and the conversion into an intergenerational community center. The City would bid out respective projects to complete stabilization. If the project is in excess of the allocation it would trigger other options, which could be B, C or the unfortunate thing would be if they would have to demolish the building and there's a cost to that would have to be calculated also. The big piece is the 1.6 million dollars of ARPA investment. They used an architect firm to give them a comprehensive assessment of the building and Engineer McKillips will go into details about that.

Engineer McKillips began her presentation. She said they use a firm called Anissa Neider Architects and Stroller Architects provide a report on a complete overhaul of the Oakwood School Building. The complete overhaul would include items like a commercial kitchen and removal of walls for large gathering spaces & activities.

Those items are not necessarily essential for the stabilization of the building which is what they are looking at at this point in time. She and Dir Reardon had a meeting with the architects to go over the numbers of the report that was produced. They were able to continue to analyze the numbers of the facility and the need to improve the building. That includes items like the roof, windows, tuck pointing, items that are required in order to make the building sustained weather. It needs to be accessible and parts of the facility are accessible but there are other parts that are not, for example, the restrooms need to be upgraded, doors need to be upgraded, those items are included in the cost of the \$1.6 million. The fire alarm system needs to be upgraded to code. There is asbestos in the building that needs to be abated. Interior finishes that were damaged due to the water coming thru the roof or thru when windows were broken. Those repairs are also included in these items. When you look at the detailed breakdown, you can see where some items remain the same and other items, you can see there is a difference in the numbers that came from the architects. For site modifications, they had \$300,000 for landscaping, paving, sidewalks and the City decreased that down to \$150,000. Landscaping is not necessary. The parking lot does need to be improved, there are storm water aspects that need attention, the corner of the property has drainage issues and part of the solution is to make modifications to the parking lot and thru that process, some of the parking lot will get re-paved, that's not included in the cost. The roof has deteriorated to the point where there are holes, the cost of the roof project is not quite half of the total. We do have an actual quote from a firm that is participating in a cooperative purchasing program. that number is \$400,000 and is good number to go with. That does not include asbestos removal or testing. The quote for windows was increased for prevailing wages and administration costs, which is \$250,000 which is \$200,000 less than the estimate from the architects. Other estimates from the architects was re-tuck pointing of the masonry, that remains the same. The building will need new entry doors which is needed for safety reasons and building envelope issues. The interior improvements are needed. The restrooms to bring ADA compliance that cost actually doubled. They want to make sure they have enough funding in that line to accomplish what they need to do. The plumbing costs came out of the lines below the plumbing upgrades. The cost for interior finishes has decreased significantly. The architect recommended that all the flooring in the building needed to be replaced. But not all of the flooring needs to be replaced. Same thing with the ceiling and painting. That's why the number is still \$50,000, which is less than the \$200,000 originally quoted. The doors were priced to be completely replaced. They can be retro fitted and still be in compliance with ADA. There are plumbing upgrades that are required for drainage lines coming off the roof. There's also other interior plumbing that will need to be taken care of in certain areas. There will need to be electrical upgrades, the fire alarm system, which would include new emergency lighting and replacement of lighting fixtures that were damaged due to water. That's included in the \$200,000. There is an abatement allowance of \$100,000 which they left in there. The piping insulation is asbestos and the flooring is assumed to be other materials and are assumed to be and have to be tested. This number should cover what needs to be done for the area that's being disturbed and any other improvements as part of the overall building improvements.

There is also a small number for selective demolition allowance. The original number of \$100,000 included the demolition for the exterior buildings, which possibly can be used for something for the City or any tenants.

The total to stabilize the building, we're looking at \$1.6 million dollars which does not include any contingency or soft costs. There is a lot of work needed. This is the minimum bare bones work that need to be done in order to occupy the building.

In lieu of renovating this facility, we could look at doing another facility or a brand new facility. If we do something similar to the construction of this facility we are now talking about multi millions of dollars. The plus with Oakwood School is the square footage that it provides to the community, it's a pretty good deal.

Eng McKillips finished her presentation, and asked for questions.

Mrs. Mitchell thanked Eng McKillips and asked if there would be separate restrooms for the Save-Our-Children side and Senior Center side?

Engineer McKillips said there are 5 sets of restrooms. There would be enough restrooms to be able to provide for ADA accessibility in both areas.

Mrs. Mitchell asked for clarification on the doors, Eng McKillips had said there are 48 doors.

Eng McKillips said there are 48 interior doors.

Mr. Tollett asked why this wasn't brought before the Parks Board 1st?

Dir Williams said he's not sure that there's a reason why except that when it was originally proposed it was to use ARPA funds, which were to be allocated in the budget and to his mistake maybe it should have gone to the Parks Board first. They are aware of this project, but it was brought to Council first for the appropriation of the ARPA funds and it's where he thought this project existed. There was no intention to bypass the Parks Board.

Mr. Tollett wasn't implying that there was a fault, he was just looking at proper channels that this runs through.

Dir Deery said this property has not been declared a Park Property by this body.

Mr. Tollett said in looking at the cost estimate, our estimate that was used in the right column is 31% of the engineer's estimate, which is what it comes out to be. He said he doesn't understand with items like roofing which, coming from an industrial roofing family, that price for that square footage seems very low. The drainage for that roofing showed a cup on that of 75% of the cost of roof drainage. He's not understanding these numbers. As it was presented, this was to stabilize the building only, not to operate in the building.

Dir Williams said the stabilization and operation are congruent with each other. They had another architectural firm provide estimates early on. Those estimates didn't include the roof. They had a local roofing service provide services and they went up on the roof and measured and were able to give actual estimates. That estimate was discussed at the time they also discussed the window estimates, doors and the roof. At that stage, a more comprehensive piece was requested. They removed that to add this context once that number was part of the recommendations from that estimate. The number from the director's recommendations is from that estimate and it can't be accepted as an estimate because it wasn't an official bid. Some estimates were not very specific.

Mr. Tollett asked if we spend 1.6 million on this, which other non-profits would be considered to have a similar agreement? There will be numerous, how do we justify this large of an investment that so much of it is earmarked for one program?

Mayor Whitfield said this is a building that the City owns. It's not us asking groups if they want to partner with us on a program, this is a building the City has acquired and our goal is to find the best use for this building.

The moment the decision was made to acquire this building was the moment money was decided to be spent on it. It either had to be demolished, re-habbed or what we're proposing here. That decision to acquire the school was made before his time and now that he's inherited this, his proposal is to take what he's heard from this body which was around the desire to have senior services. And if we went after that plan alone, it would not only be 1.6 million to stabilize, it would be 100% of the cost of programming the building that the City would be responsible for. We're fortunate to have an organization that is interested in occupying 50% of it and paying 50% of the cost to run the building and alleviate to try to fill up the building. When it comes to other organizations applying for money, it's apples and oranges because this is the City's building. The number one reason for us to do this is to provide a safe place for young people to go after school and to develop and as we look at the challenges that our residents face, they're concerned about child care and where they will go after school. And this is an opportunity to wrap our young people with services and to be cared for. And the seniors can provide mentorship for them and there's room for other non profits to be able to provide programs. If another organization wanted to utilize some of the space, we have the ability to do that.

Chair Stewart asked if the plumbing upgrades would that include the fire suppressant system?

Eng McKillips said the report from the architects, the only part of the building that needed to be upgraded is the fire alarm system and the emergency lighting system.

Mr. Schneider said the kitchen estimate is removed on the minimum to stabilize but in discussion a kitchen is a main need of the Save-Our-Children program so is the kitchen classified as an operational minimum for opening up Save-Our-Children?

Dir Williams said from the initial inception of the this, Save-Our-Children had agreed to and offered that they will pay for the entire cost of the kitchen, that with part of their investment. One of the things, this won't be a commercial kitchen for cooking food at a restaurant, it's for warming food and preparing snacks. There won't be hoods and convection ovens using up electricity. We do hope that the kitchen they construct will have enough capacity that we'll be able to utilize it for seniors and using it for cooking demonstrations and things of that nature. Recently they had a meeting with Neighborhood Alliance, who provides hot meals for seniors. There are opportunities the kitchen can offer.

Mrs. Davis said in the event that the seniors are allowed the use of the kitchen, how will that work, since Parks & Rec hasn't been asked to come on board. She thought the kitchen was going to be able to be used to cook in. She thinks Save-Our-Children is doing more than just snacks.

Mr. Williams said the specifications for the kitchen for Save-Our-Children are based on the requirements that they have to provide the services that they do. There are specific specs that will have to be done for this kitchen. The kitchen is essential for their program, it's not an option. That's why the kitchen is not on anything that the City provides the funds for. He believes that there will be mutual use of the kitchen. He can't define that use or what the apparatus inside the kitchen will be. He's simply stating that is the responsibility of Save-Our-Children and is a prerequisite for them to provide their services under whatever State guidelines that exist. The City has expressed to Save-Our-Children that we would like to be able to share the use of the kitchen. Right now we offer senior programs in other facilities and we don't have the capacity to do cooking and nutritional programs. They believe this will increase that.

Law Dir Deery said this building will still be a City of Elyria Building and she would anticipate that any use agreement that the City would have with Save-Our-Children would lay out the specifics as far as what the kitchen would and would not be and any use of part of the facility would be as far as what the seniors' use would be.

Mr. Oswald said that he's done a lot of estimating and it's hard to go through numbers and then to try to start shaving the cost down. He said it would be nice if we could get all of this done within these numbers, the \$1.6 million. There will still need more money to continue all the things that will need to be done and where will that money come from?

Mayor Whitfield said that a part of the bidding process from his understanding that if these estimates are more than 10% more than what the estimate is, that bid can be rejected. Mayor asked Eng McKillips to confirm that process.

Eng McKillips said once an estimate is out there, say for instance, the cost for the Oakwood project is \$1.6 million and the bids come in more than 10 percent over the \$1.6 million, we have no choice, we have to reject all the bids, we cannot award a bid that exceeds 10% over the Engineer's estimate.

Mr. Oswald said, we know have the money to stabilize the building, but we have to do a lot of other work that will need to get done soon. For instance, the parking lot will need to be resurfaced. So, will they keep coming back to Council each time more money is needed? What will be the City's options for finish those projects?

Mr. Williams said the stabilization is what is the City's responsibility. The options were to demolish the building, to do something or to stabilize it so that it has a use. There is also a number that reflects what would be a complete renovation. Which would include all new floors, all new ceiling, tearing out walls, etc. Save-Our-Children could go into the building right now and deliver services. This building was a functional and fully occupied school building three years ago, prior to it being given to the City. Through the architecture's work, this building is a sound, stable building. Yes, it needs stabilization and renovation work. After we do the roof, windows and other essentials, there is nothing that the City has to do cosmetically. If Save-Our-Children wants to paint that's on them.

If you look at other City facilities, we are spending around \$350,000 at one of our Rec Centers, those are repairs and things that need to be done on a regular basis, which is part of owning these facilities.

Mr. Williams said what is being asked for the stabilization of Oakwood School is what is needed and they've been transparent and they've showed the committee how they got to these actual numbers. They are not just giving the minimum today with expectations of coming back, that is not what they're intending to do. He said they are confident that these numbers are accurate and are not misleading and they are not trying to go to a place where they just ask for more.

Mr. Oswald asked about Air Conditioning. He asked if they are going to come back and say they need money for A/C?

Mr. Williams said they have an allocation of \$350,000 from the State of Ohio and they looked at HVAC. They don't think it's affordable. They would not have Senior Programming in there without A/C. There is the \$350,000 that they will put into this project. That \$350,000 is specific to the senior and intergenerational component. They have already determined that of that \$350,000, the single A/C units will be done, more along the line of space units that you would see in a hotel, which are what are installed in some of the City's facilities.

They've always expected that after stabilization, there's another phase, it's not a phase that Council will fund, it will be a phase that they look to philanthropic organizations, grants and to other means of resources. They've demonstrated that they've been proficient in getting those resources, whether that's a Capital Project Grant, which is what we've received of other grants that are currently supporting the City. There is no means where they would not try to further develop this facility. They believe this is a very fundable initiative.

Law Dir Deery asked Finance Dir if we've received the Capital money, the \$350,000 from the State yet?

Finance Dir Pileski said no, not to his knowledge.

Dir Williams said they've received notification from the State. And we've received a 13 page application / receiving portion which will need to be completed and turned back into which is due. It talks about the requirements for expenditure whereas this is a reimbursement. They will advance funds up-front and it would be similar to other grants, where the work is done and then we receive the invoices and then it goes out. So, there are strict and specific restrictions and guidelines around this State money. Whatever it's used for, it has to fit within those guidelines.

Dir Deery asked if the City has to front the money and then be reimbursed?

Dir Williams said yes, or we could ask for a cash advance on it and then we start building against the advance which can be navigated?

Dir Deery asked for her to get a copy of the State application and the receiving portion of the application.

Mayor Whitfield said there were comments made around the Parks involvement of this project and it's important to hear some perspective from the Parks Director.

Parks Dir Reardon started with stating that all these meeting have been around, what is out end goal? She believes everyone is on the same page. The Parks goal is to expand the capacity, what can be offered, the immediate portion is for seniors. They've only gotten to proposed Plan 'A'. As far as the programming goes, the Parks plan really doesn't change. The Parks will offer programming no matter which of these 3 plans is chosen. The space they will use will not change, as long as everything is agreed on. With Plan 'A', the operational costs will be higher and it will remain a City owned building. The Parks proposed budget, is set up as if they are at 30% capacity, 60% capacity and 100%. Ideally that would be the first second and third year.

Year one, at 30% capacity they would project \$54,000 for personnel, operating, maintenance. Year two, at 60% capacity goes up to approximately \$91,000 and year three and continuing after that at 100% capacity would be approximately \$210,000. These are only projections.

Dir Williams said if we are in Plan 'A' all of the maintenance and repairs will be the City's responsibility. All of those costs don't transfer into Plan 'B' and Plan 'C'.

Dir Williams moved onto Plan 'B', long term use to Save-Our-Children, similar to what we currently provide to Little League Baseball or Cascade Park/Metro Parks. We've tried to capture some of the provisions that we believe would be included in that lease agreement which offers certain protection of things they are concerned about. It would be a long term lease, 25 years. The intention is that we're not having a partner to invest significant capital and we've invest significant capital for a short term relationship. Bases on the investment of this partner, we believe that the investments and grant monies we show to those foundations that where we're investing our money, they won't be out of there in a year. That kind of stability that is important to investors.

Also, we would not only be putting that \$1.6 million out there, but we would propose a \$500,000 to \$800,000 one-time grant, conditional to only stabilization of the building. Then they would include the \$350,000 capital grant. All of these things are specific to conditional acceptance or awards and they have to fit into exactly what we spell out.

Also, the City could rent space from Save-Our-Children for programs for the seniors through a shared use agreement in which the City would be paying 45% of the utilities. Save-Our-Children would occupy 55% and The City would occupy 45%. The City's utilities share is estimated between \$1,000 and \$1,200 per month. It was proposed in Plan 'A' that Save-Our-Children pay a \$500 per month maintenance fee. And in lieu of the City paying a \$500 maintenance fee we could swap with public utilities. In Plan 'B' Save-Our-Children would be responsible for the maintenance and upkeep of the building and would be responsible for insurance on the physical building. The City would have insurance coverage on it's materials within the building. The City would be responsible for the outdoor grounds keeping. Presently we cut the lawn and would continue to do that. They've also proposed that either in Plan 'B' or Plan 'C' there would be one parcel that would be a carve out of that building. The City would maintain control and responsibility for the parking lot. We need the parking for other access to other parts of the parks. We also don't want to lose easement to out property. We believe since we have resources, it's better for the City to maintain the parking lot.

Here's another piece which is about the exterior. The City has aspirations of the construction of the perimeter of the walking trail.

Plan 'C' is probably the most non-traditional. It's the transfer of the building in a carved out parcel to an independent person of whom everyone would mutually be satisfied with and then would ultimately transfer the property to the CIC. We would protect the outcome and would have the first right of refusal on any sale. If we sold the building for one dollar, upon a first-rate refusal, we would buy it back for one dollar. The terms would be negotiated by the City Legal Staff. We could restrict tenants and the entities of the two tenants that we have determined; our Parks Dept. and Save-Our-Children. Conditional use would restrict use for only the intended use as defined in the contract., which is an intergenerational center with the City's Parks & Rec Dept., and Save-Our-Children. The conditional grant of \$500,000 to \$800,000 to be used only for the stabilization of the building.

He went on to say that Plan 'B' and Plan 'C' are very similar. One is a lease to Save-Our-Children, the other to allow the purchase of the building.

Mr. Williams finished his presentation.

Mr. Oswald thanked Mr. Williams and the staff who put in time and effort for this presentation and the three different plans.

Mrs. Mitchell thanked Mr. Williams, Dir Reardon, Engineer McKillips and Mayor Whitfield for all of their dedications and hard work. She's an advocate for this senior center and she's excited and hope they can figure it out.

Chair Callahan thanked Dir Williams and asked if anyone from the audience wanted to speak.

First speaker: Bob Yost, 260 South Logan St., Elyria. Mr. Yost thanked Mr. Williams. He said two of Save-Our Children Board members are here this evening; President, Tim Harris and Tom Dahl the export President and Director Chase Farris, which shows their support and commitment for this project is one hundred percent.

They believe in this project, they believe in the partnership, it makes sense. As far as the options that have been presented, from his perspective, Option 'B' would probably work best for the organization, but that's not for them to decide. The City is the landlord and Save-Our-Children are the tenant. They respect that. When we can take our attendance from 130 kids to 275 kids which are identified as high risk youth. If they can save 10 kids, 20 kids it's an accomplishment, and at the end of the day they're proud and the City should be proud as well.

Tim Harris came up to speak. He used to be the Chair and Tom Dahl took over last year. This is an incredible organization and he's been privileged to be a part of it. They've done an excellent job of recruiting people to the board, they have representatives from Bendix Corp. Mr. Harris is president and CEO of a company in Cleveland. They also have Sherwin Williams on board and a number of community leaders including Ambassador Brothers, Stephen Gettis. This is just an outstanding organization. Mr. Harris said kids having great teachers and great access to education can be a way out, which it was for him. The most rewarding thing is to be able to give back and see all the committed people and to bring Chase Farris on board who is a product of Elyria and has done great things. He thanks the City for their opportunity to have the potential to have their own space which is strictly dedicated to academics for kids who are at risk and who would maybe otherwise not have an opportunity to be connected to the school environment. The digital divide during covid was exasperated for the families who didn't have access to internet and services. Save-Our-Children provides chromebooks and internet for the kids which gives them the opportunity to continue with the continuity of education. Mr. Harris thanked the panel.

Chair Callahan said that they have options and we've taken a huge step forward. He thanked Mr. Williams, the Mayor and others this presentation. This evening's meeting was very productive.

Mr. Cerra asked when will the panel be making the decision?

President Stewart said there's been a lot of information this evening and we've all talked about the effort that's been put in by the administration and Save-Our-Children. He said that the committee members digest what was discussed this evening and we'll have the 1st Full Council Meeting on Sept. 6th and then probably a follow-up committee meeting after that to have a path moving forward and perhaps a decision. It's been a long time to put this together so we need a direction moving forward. He recommends to have the matter at the meeting on September 12th.

If anyone has any questions for the administration or Save-Our-Children, please reach out to them. The outcome of this will provide a public good for many.

**Mr. Oswald moved and second by Mrs. Mitchell to adjourn this evening's Community Development portion of the Meeting at 7:30 P.M.
MOTION CARRIED**

[The evening's meetings continued with the Finance Committee Meeting].

*Respectfully submitted by, Colleen M. Rosado
Council Clerk Secretary/Administrative Assistant*

CMR/