



**Olene Walker Housing Loan Fund
Quarterly Board Meeting
April 11, 2024 – 9:00 am
Olene Walker Administration Building
140 East 300 South – Room 211A & B
Salt Lake City, Utah
Zoom Link**

**<https://utah-gov.zoom.us/j/86255132023>
Link to Audio Recording of this meeting:
<https://www.utah.gov/pmn/files/1109749.m4a>**

Meeting Minutes

- | | | | |
|----|--|----|---|
| 1 | Members Present and Representation: | 29 | Sophie Norvell – DWS Contract/Grant Analyst |
| 2 | Beth Holbrook - Transit-Oriented Development | 30 | McKenna Marchant- HCD PAB |
| 3 | Mayor Logan Monson - Local Government | 31 | Becky Yorgason DWS IA |
| 4 | Marty Henrie - Mortgage Lender | 32 | |
| 5 | Mike Glenn - Rural | 33 | Interested Parties and Guests: |
| 6 | David Snow - Mortgage Lender | 34 | Aaron Haroldson |
| 7 | John Lindsay - Rental Housing | 35 | Robert Tippits |
| 8 | Mayor Dawn Ramsey - Local Government | 36 | Hooper Knowlton |
| 9 | Jason Wheeler - Housing Advocacy | 37 | Chanel Flores |
| 10 | Kip Paul - Real Estate | 38 | Kent Andersen |
| 11 | Tyler Jensen – Manufactured Housing | 39 | Dakota Wurth |
| 12 | Steven Bond – Home Builders (Multifamily) | 40 | Natasha Pfeiffer |
| 13 | Kaitlin Myers – Housing Advocacy | 41 | Nick Berger |
| 14 | Excused/Absent: | 42 | Bob Stevensen |
| 15 | Jed Nilson - Home builders | 43 | Ryan Steinbeigle |
| 16 | | 44 | Chris Harrild |
| 17 | Staff Present: | 45 | Nyki Tallant |
| 18 | Christina Oliver - HCD Director | 46 | Amanda Rainey |
| 19 | Jennifer Domenici - HCD-Assistant Director | 47 | Anna Sullivan |
| 20 | Jennifer Edwards - HCD Assistant Director | 48 | T Rollins |
| 21 | Dan Murphy - HCD-OWHLF | 49 | Chris Parker |
| 22 | Janell Quiroz - HCD Administration | 50 | Josh Runhaar |
| 23 | Daniel Herbert-Voss - HCD-OWHLF | 51 | Erin Montgomery |
| 24 | Elliott Lawrence - DWS - Counsel | 52 | Cade Holzer |
| 25 | Katye Halterman - HCD - OWHLF | 53 | D Larsen |
| 26 | Kaylee Beck - DWS - Finance | 54 | Austin Taylor |
| 27 | Carver Black - DWS – Finance | 55 | Liz (ebkiger@gmail.com) |
| 28 | Sarah Nielson – DWS PIO | 56 | |

57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102

Chairwoman Beth Holbrook called meeting to order and welcomed participants at 9:09:21 am

I. Public Comment:

- a. Nicolas Berger, Chief lending officer for Rocky Mountain CRC. Thank you for the time. In advance of my comments I submitted a graphic that's being displayed right now that I'd like to discuss briefly with the staff and the board of the Olene Walker committee. First off my intent here today is to express our appreciation both as a lender in the affordable housing community and advocates for those that are in the affordable housing community. We appreciate all that the Olene Walker fund does, and continues to do to support this great cause of affordable housing. I would like to bring or call attention to one of the reasons why the Olene Walker fund is so important, and has become increasingly important over the past several years, and that is due to an issue of rising costs. We are all aware that we're paying more for a gallon of milk at the grocery store. We are definitely paying more per door for affordable housing. This is not a call to action. My purpose is simply to provide information to the committee and to the staff that's here today. So the Rocky Mount CRC is a nonprofit financial institution. We provide permanent financing strictly, on affordable housing multifamily projects. We do so in the State of Utah and in 7 adjoining States, which we include Montana. We do a good portion of business in the State of Utah, and we have done a little over 50 loans that incorporate and use Olene Walker money. So we're very familiar with the Olene Walker program. We're very grateful for the staff and for the board, and all they do. What I wanna call your attention to is the rising costs that we have noticed as a company. So as a company, we get the complete and entire picture of a project. What I display here above is the average cost per door to build affordable housing in the State of Utah as well, is in the 8 Western States in which we operate. As you can tell from the Graphics, since 2020 the average cost per unit has risen from just under \$215,000 per unit to about \$375,000 per unit in 2023. And we're continuing to see that trend grow in 2024. Utah is not special or different in this regard. And that's why I've included these other Western States. We have an increased cost per door in 2020 from an average of \$230,000 per unit to \$363,000 per unit. I present this so you know that every dollar of Olene Walker funding is helping to continue to move forward this great work of affordable housing. I'd be happy to take any questions if people have them, but I appreciate the time that you've given me.
- Q Snow – I'm sure this is based upon the projects that you've financed, how many projects per year does that average?
- A Berger – That is noted at the footnote on the bottom of the graph, it's 28 projects in Utah and 86 in the 8 western states. The information represents a good number of projects.
- Q Snow - is that average per year or is it based on 2023 numbers?
- A Berger – the 86 projects are pretty evenly distributed throughout 2020-2023. The one anomalous year was 2022 when Utah had maybe only 4-5 projects.
- Q Paul – these are for affordable projects, is that correct?
- A Berger - These are for affordable d restricted projects. The vast majority. I think all but 2 are competitive tax credit projects. That is, 9% tax credit projects.
- C Paul – Yeah what we're seeing in the marketplace with developers right now is if you're building more of a market rate project where you've got to have significant amenities, and a higher level of interior finishes, I would say average cost is about 450,000 per unit. So the costs are really a staggering issue right now, that's the reason why 98% of all the projects that were in planning are now paused.

103 C Berger - If I could build on that. We're seeing that same trend in 2,024 costs are creeping
104 closer to 400, even for the competitive 9 projects that don't include all the same amenities that
105 maybe a 4% or market rate would.

106 Q Holbrook – I have a questions in terms of projection. Are you seeing supply chain issues work
107 themselves through, and not being as much of a factor? Or is this looking like a the permanent
108 new, normal?

109 A Berger - If I understand, your question is, looking at this growing trend, is that what we could
110 look forward to in the future? Is there any end in sight. I wish I could tell you. I could tell you
111 that I've seen some easing on the supply chain issues. I would hope that we would see this start
112 to level out a little bit. But I think that would be a question best answered by our developers,
113 some of which are in this room, but I think the trend will continue.

114 C Snow – Based on the CPI index that was just released I think it'll continue or get worse.

115 Q Lindsay – how much of the increase is attributable to land costs vs. materials and labor?

116 A Berger – that might also be a god question to the developers but my experience is that land
117 cost changes is a smaller portion of impact than supply and labor.

118 A Paul - Land cost is a relatively small percentage of the totality of a given project. It's usually
119 around 15%. We are seeing land prices soften a bit, with the exception of if you have a top tier
120 location land prices are holding from where they were at the peak.

121 C Bond – I've had one supplier give a cost decrease in the last 5 years where they said their costs
122 had actually gone down. That was in the windows space with Pella. I have not seen any other
123 supplies come down. It's still incredibly hard to get your electrical components. You have to
124 order those close to 12 to 18 months in advance for a project at scale. Appliances and all the
125 other hard products that go into building these structures have not eased off. They're just a new
126 norm at this stage. And there's always the threat of well, “this bid’s only good for . . .”, that
127 conversation still always taking place, because those bids are changing and prices are continuing
128 to have pressure upwards. That's my experience.

129 C Holbrook - Did anyone else have anything? I know it is kind of unusual to have this kind of
130 dialogue in a public comment piece, but I do think perspective is incredibly valuable. Does
131 anyone have any other questions or comments?

132
133 Chairwoman Holbrook called for any additional public comment (none), she thanked Berger for
134 his analysis and discussion and commented “ I know it's not a typical format in public comment,
135 but I think given that we already have funding challenges just in today's environment for Olean
136 Walker, I think it's really pertinent to understand that this is a larger problem, and that we're
137 going to continue to have, at least in the near future, some more of these challenges. So thank
138 you again for the comment”.

139
140 **II. ACTION ITEMS:**

141
142 Item 1: Approval of Minutes

Beth Holbrook

143
144 Quarterly Meeting – January 11, 2024

145 Electronic Meeting – February 16, 2024

146 *Motion to approve the minutes from October, January and February’s board meetings was made by*
147 *Logan Monson and 2nd by Mike Glenn. Vote by acclamation all members present responded in*
148 *affirmative none opposed.*
149

150 Item 2: Financial Report & FY24 Budget Update Kaylee Beck
151 Kaylee Beck reviewed the financial report. Carver Black prepared the report.
152 Q Glenn – At the bottom we have the FY24 Olene Walker fixed appropriations, what kind of
153 responsibility do we have to track those expenses/ appropriations? Do we have to track the expenses, or
154 do we need to receive some reports? I guess I'm looking into direction from Staff on that.
155 A Beck - It depends on what the fix appropriation is. For instance, the first time home buyer assistance
156 program is administered through UHC. They send us bank statements so we can see how much they've
157 been spending. Section 8. Landward incentives that's run in house we actually spend all of that money
158 ourselves so we track that personally. Some of the other ones we do have contracts like for single family
159 rehab. We do have contracts with some of the rural AOGs. And so we kind of have a hand in that. So if
160 there is a report that we receive, they are contained on the packets. If you have any specific questions
161 about any specific appropriations and you don't see them in the packets reach out to Dan or I.
162 Q Glenn - Should we at least know what the balances are, or the expenses are out of each of those
163 appropriations.
164 A Beck - That's not something we put on this board report or the previous report. We could look into
165 some of that and see where some of the balances are based off of contract. So we used to say what was
166 obligated and what was UN obligated. For instance, as soon as the contract with UC was executed for
167 first type of buyer systems program, we said that none of that was available for you, and we didn't say
168 what was spent or not spent, just what was committed.
169 C Oliver – On those funds that are listed at the bottom, some have legislative reporting requirements
170 which is once a year. The section 8 is easy, because we do run it in house to provide you a balance
171 quarterly, if you'd like, but some of the other contracts, such as Utah housing preservation and a variety
172 of other programs we are simply pastors, and they have reporting requirements which we will provide
173 to the board, but they prepare them on an annual basis, which is, when we do our auditing as well.
174 Q Snow – I would like to see a year over year comparison column there since they are only reported
175 annually we could see what kind of growth or movement there is.
176 A Oliver – we prepare briefings every year for the legislative session on our programs.
177 Q Snow - but in the column right next to it so we could easily compar.
178 Q Oliver – are you asking for more frequency than annual?
179 Q Snow – don't we see this on every report?
180 A Oliver – we don't have to, it could just be reported on the July report when the numbers have been
181 updated.
182 Q Holbrook asked for clarification, is it extraneous and unneeded or do we want to see more detail?
183 A Snow – I would like to be able to see this year vs last year to compare. Are we going up? Is it markedly
184 increasing? There's no real basis to be able to look at it.
185 Q Oliver would it be satisfactory to have an update on July one on all these. They are pass through
186 contracts that we monitor.
187 A Snow – I would just like to see historical data for comparison.
188 A Oliver – Yes we can add the history that we have.
189 A Holbrook – how about we incorporate that into the annual reports that we do for July one, and we'll
190 do that moving forward. And then, if there's anything else on this topic, maybe we can have an
191 additional meeting just specific to what we would like to see in the financials, because I want to keep
192 moving along. Given that, I unfortunately already started as late, and then it kind of is escalating from
193 there. So I want to get to the projects. But we can maybe swing around. Talk about this after that, or
194 have a separate meeting on the financials.
195 Q Glenn – My question is, does the board have a responsibility to monitor any of those funds or is it just
196 provided as information?
197 A Oliver – it is just provided as information.

198 Holbrook - Great. I would like to say that we do that on the financials moving forward. I think that we're
199 all very sensitive to the fact that we just don't have enough money, and we want to understand more
200 about why we don't have enough money, and or how our money is being allocated so that we can have
201 better financial understanding.

202 Q Snow – I understand as Kaylee just reviewed that there is not enough to fund all the projects being
203 presented today. Are the projects on a first come first serve basis, is that how they are placed on the
204 agenda?

205 A Murphy – the projects are in order on the agenda by priority and scoring. We will be presenting all the
206 projects, the board will be able to discuss and ask questions and we will not make any motions until all
207 the projects have been heard. That way you have all the information needed to make a decision the
208 projects. After they have all been presented you will be able to make a motion on each individual
209 project.

210 Q Snow – so the agenda order is listed by scoring?

211 A Murphy - yes

212 A Holbrook – So what we're going to try to do basically is once we get to the items themselves, we're
213 going to go through them. We'll talk about that particular project, talk about the funding, and then
214 we're not going to make a vote until we have heard about all those other projects. And at the end of all
215 the presentations, then we will go back and individually vote on each project. We'll obviously have to
216 have discussion on those projects, so we'll have the discussion at the time the project is presented.

217
218 Discussion with Legal (Lawrence), Lindsay and Holbrook regarding conflicts of interest protocols of
219 recusal.

220 Board member Lindsay has recused himself from all 6 projects today based on various conflicts of
221 interest of a couple projects which then may affect all projects as this a competitive funding cycle.
222 Board member Pual is recused from Bumperhouse and Board member Henrie is recused from
223 Bumperhouse and 2nd South.

224

225

226

227 Item 3: New Board Members – Introduction

Beth Holbrook

228 Kaitlin Myers -Housing Advocacy, Moab city council member director of Moab Area Community Land
229 Trust and serve on the Utah Housing Coalition.

230 Steven Bond – Home builders MF Provo and President Elect of the Utah association of Realtors, privately
231 for business I do small multi family development or redevelopment and mixed use redevelopment
232 mostly in Utah and Salt Lake counties.

233 Tyler Jensen – Manufactured Housing. Practicing attorney representing primarily the owners of Mobile
234 home parks. I represent, probably 150 mobile home parks in the State of Utah, and then parks and other
235 States as well.

236

237 *Myers, Bond and Jensen repeated their Oath of Office.*

238 Holbrook - Congratulations. Thank you very much. We're very excited to welcome you onto this board.
239 As you know, housing is one of our key challenges as a state, and so thank you for representing your
240 voices on here.

241

242 Item 4: Chair, Vice-Chair Election

Beth Holbrook

243 Holbrook - This is just to give some context. The chair and the vice chair both run for one year. On each
244 of these respective roles and that election and change over occurs on July first of each year. So with
245 that, I'm actually going to turn it over to Elliot. Lawrence.

246 Lawrence – Majority rules, we'll open it up for discussion and nominations.
247 Q Glenn – Beth and Jason is there any reason why we shouldn't nominate both of you to serve another
248 term?
249 C Wheeler - I fully agree, nominating Beth to serve another term. She's fantastic, I think, over this last
250 year of keeping us on track and organized.
251 C Ramsey – I agree with what was just said and I would be very supportive of another term with the
252 current chair and vice chair.
253 Q Wheeler – Beth are you comfortable with that? Does your life situation allow for another year?
254 A Holbrook – yes I am comfortable with that.
255 Q Holbrook to Wheeler – Are you also good with serving, the hope is that the vice chair would then roll
256 up to the Chair.
257 A Wheeler – Well I don't know if I want to see that but I am comfortable serving in the Vice chair for
258 another year.
259 Q Henrie – do the terms extend throughout the full coming year?
260 A Holbrook – yes they would start July 1 2024 and end June 30th 2025
261 Q Henrie – does the appointment to the board extend that long?
262 A Holbrook – there's not a lot of TOD people in this space so I would be fine
263 Q Holbrook to Wheeler same question yes
264

265 *Nomination made by Mike Glenn for Chairwoman Holbrook and Vicechair Wheeler to serve another*
266 *term. Motion made by Beth Holbrook and 2nd by Mike Glenn.*
267 *The motion passed by roll call vote with affirmative votes by Holbrook, Monson, Snow, Henrie, Paul,*
268 *Lindsay, Glenn, Ramsey, Wheeler, Jensen, Bond, and Myers*
269

270 Item 5: Davis County HOME Consortium – one-time request Dan Murphy
271 Murphy reviewed request.
272 Request representative Kent Anderson, Bob Stevenson, Chanel Flores, Dakota Wurth, Ryan Steinbeigle
273 Anderson - Davis County, has been working on over the last about 6 months to the year to set up a
274 home consortium that would essentially set Davis County up to be an entitlement community for the
275 HUD administered home funds we've presented to our cities. There's a lot of support for this initiative.
276 We're asking for a one-time allocation to reach a minimum threshold that's required to stand up a home
277 consortium. Davis County does have limited resources and a need for more affordable housing. You can
278 see there at the bottom of the slide how short we are. Based on AMI in the community we do have. We
279 are an entitlement community for the Community Development Block Grant program. We see, receive
280 about \$900,000 a year, good portion that will go to affordable housing activities the Commission also
281 last year appropriated 1.6 million of our Covid dollars towards a homeownership assistance program.
282 But, as you can tell, with those types of gaps in housing units, a lot more resources are going to be
283 necessary. My next bullet we talk about the smallest county, third, largest in population. Why is this
284 important being the third largest in population we have are rapidly approaching. Build out in Davis
285 County. We're at 83% developed with about 11,000 acres left to be developed. And so when it comes to
286 Greenfield development, time is running out and so we wanted to have resources appropriated that we
287 can go ahead and take advantage of at least lower expense. When it relates to Greenfield as opposed to
288 redevelopment. We want to have a little bit more control on how we partner with our local
289 communities, a lot of local communities receive tax increment dollars that the county allocates we give
290 the county provides an additional allocation. If they do affordable housing. If they have an affordable
291 housing component, we want to leverage those resources with additional funds to make an impact.
292 We go to the next slide, please. HUD estimates that an annual allocation to Davis County would be
293 \$544,000. There is a minimum requirement of \$750,000 and it's a common practice, particularly as HUD

294 is recommended, is to use additional State home funds to meet that gap. And so, right now it. It is
295 estimated at 205,820, we will know the final amount coming in September when they'll give that final
296 allocation amount. What is needed in addition to those dollars is essentially authorization. A letter from
297 the governors or the designee authorizing these funds to be transferred to Davis County. Finally, how
298 would the county use home funding? So a lot of opportunities, pretty much anything in the affordable
299 housing space is eligible, something that we look at as something particularly important is the
300 preservation of expiring deed restricted properties. We've got 279 units that are expiring within 5 years.
301 I think those are one of those low hanging fruits to continue housing affordability by continuing those
302 deed restrictions. Now, of course, with the home buyer assistance, we continue to do that, and I think
303 we would look for opportunities for new construction as well. I really want to thank the staff, Dan,
304 Christina, you guys been very helpful in getting us to this point before I close, Commissioner, do you
305 have any comments?

306 Stevenson - The only thing that I'd like to say is that one of the things in Davis County we've been trying
307 to be as proactive as possible to do our part as for affordable housing, and for us to come up with these
308 ideas and these concepts to be able to do it. You know I give credit back to the staff but also to the
309 entire community, Davis County, for what we're trying to do to not only do our part, but also to be able
310 to maybe lead the way out on a lot of these things.

311 Holbrook - I want to thank you so much for your presentation this morning. I am a Davis County
312 resident, and I recognize all of the inherent challenges it is in in working to provide these types of
313 affordable housing, especially in areas where there's not a lot of land and geographical constraints really
314 do have an impact. Thank you for that, and I wanted to thank you again for bringing up all of the
315 elements of the work that you guys are doing in order to make sure that we have multiple income
316 strategies for all of our counties. I think that that's really going to become critical, especially as we look
317 at connectivity and total build out. Does anyone have any other comments or questions.

318 Q Wheeler – this is a one-time allocation, correct? There won't be annual reallocations.

319 A Anderson – correct.

320 Q Wheeler - who is currently administering funds for Davis County?

321 A Anderson - So any home appropriations to Davis County would come through the Olene Walker fund
322 the State. So we have no home funds other than what which would be appropriated.

323 Q Glenn – As you can see we're coming up short on our home dollars, we've got projects that are not
324 going to be funded today because we are short on funds. Please explain why you are coming to Olene
325 Walker to ask for funds when we are experiencing a shortfall. And what is going on in Davis County to
326 raise monies.

327 A Anderson – It is HUD's direction for us to come to the State. They like seeing the home funds being
328 combined with other home funds. It maintains consistency in the application of those resources. The
329 county has put in significant resources of their own, both through their community development block
330 grant appropriation and through covid dollars. And in fact, we were just tasked to be looking for
331 appropriations from the State for homeless a community resource center in Davis County. We've got
332 multiple strategies. But the ultimate request that came to the State for the home funds was at the
333 recommendation of the department of housing and urban development.

334 Q Snow – will this allocation go to any specific project?

335 A Anderson - Similar to how the State would go about it. We would develop an annual action plan where
336 we would dictate or indicate to the community and to the Department of Housing and Urban
337 development how we intended to use those resources, we'd hold public hearings the community could
338 come and make comment, and then the Commission would take final action on how to allocate those
339 resources. Likely is, this would be an annual allocation. So we'd be receiving these funds additionally,
340 that approximately half 1 million every year that would have that process would have to be done each
341 year. And so over time, I could see those projects being any number of those that are listed on there.

342 But they're going to be looking for opportunities. They're going to have the greatest impact in the
343 immediate term.
344 Q Snow – question for staff, have we had requests like this from other counties throughout the state
345 and do we anticipate that?
346 Murphy – we have had other counties and consortiums that have had this request in the past. Davis
347 County is the only one we are aware of currently making this request.
348 Q Snow - And then so if I understand correctly, it's an annual request that would be
349 ongoing or is it one time?
350 A Anderson – It's one time request for a state allocation. Then going forward Davis County could receive
351 an annual allocation from the Feds (not state). This is a one-time request for 205,000 to get us to this
352 minimum requirement of 750,000 to start for a new consortium. So this is just a one-time request.
353 Q Snow – so this kind of like priming the pump?
354 A Anderson – that's a great way to put it.
355 Oliver - I am having technical difficulties as well. Today. I just want to say, on behalf of staff and others
356 and leadership, this is something that we support because it is increasing the pot of funding available
357 within the State. A small investment from the only Walker board will make a monumental impact in
358 Davis County. So just wanted to throw that out there. It is one-time request, and it does increase the
359 available funds for the State.
360 Steinbeigle - I just would echo what Christina was saying about increasing the pot of funds, I mean,
361 currently with Davis county, not being a home consortium and not receiving home funds. People in
362 Davis County wanting to do projects, they would typically come to the State and request funds from the
363 Olene Walker fund to do those projects. Now they can come directly to Davis County with us, being our
364 own home consortium, and, as Chris, as Christina said, it does add to the pot of money available to the
365 entire state. So I think that's a positive.
366 *Motion to provide the funding to Davis County, to support the request for the State Home Funds for*
367 *\$205,820 made by Board member Marty Henrie and 2nd by Board member John Lindsay.*
368 *The motion passed by roll call vote with affirmative votes by Holbrook, Monson, Snow, Henrie, Paul,*
369 *Lindsay, Glenn, Ramsey, Wheeler, Jensen, Bond, and Myers*

370
371 Item 6: OWHLF Project Scoring Criteria

Dan Murphy

372 Dan Murphy presented a plan to set up small groups where the Board Members will be able to offer
373 feedback and go through the scoring criteria and specific definitions. He asked the board to watch for
374 discussion times and signup to participate so the board members can have a input and better
375 understanding and then staff can have a processed fleshed out with the board's criteria and asks
376 incorporated by July.

377
378 Item 7: OWHLF/PAB Combined Executive Summary

Dan Murphy

379 Dan Murphy presented the new executive summary with a quick overview for the Board's approval.
380 *Motion to accept new summary made by Board member Logan Monson and 2nd by Board member Dawn*
381 *Ramsey.*
382 *The motion passed by roll call vote with affirmative votes by Holbrook, Monson, Snow, Henrie, Paul,*
383 *Lindsay, Glenn, Ramsey, Wheeler, Jensen, Bond, and Myers*

384
385
386 **III. NEW BUSINESS:**

387
388 Dan Murphy explained the process for this meeting's New Business section. Traditionally each project is
389 presented and a motion/vote is made immediately following each project. Because the funding available

390 would not cover all the projects applying, the process for this meeting would be to hear all the projects first
391 and then motion and vote once they have all presented their case and the board has had the opportunity to
392 ask question and consider all the applicants.
393

394 Item 1: New Multifamily Projects (listed by statute priority and then score [highest to lowest])

395 Homeless Projects (Statute Priority - Homelessness): None (no applications)
396

397 Rehabilitation Projects (Statute Priority – Rehabilitation):

398 1. Ashley Valley Apartments (Vernal) – Neighborhood NPH Daniel Herbert-Voss
399 Score: 327 out of 500

- 400 • Dan Murphy presented an overview of the project, scoring and the applicant’s ask. He read the staff
401 recommendation to Fund \$252,000 as requested from HOME CHDO funds as a fully-amortizing loan
402 for 30 years at 1.5%. Funds to be used to retrofit two ground-floor units to Type A fully-
403 accessible handicap standards. Lien positions: 1) Bonneville Mortgage RD 538 mortgage; 2) USDA-RD
404 515 loan; 3) OWHLF loan. Funding contingent on all other funding sources as listed in Application,
405 and rehabilitation to Energy Star/minimum HERS standards. Source of funding determined at
406 discretion of HCD/OWHLF staff as needed, and subject to funding availability. OWHLF deed
407 restriction to show a total of 2 HOME-assisted units restricted for 30 years minimum.

- 408 • Representing the project was Chris with Neighborhood Nonprofit who was available to address
409 questions from the Board.

- 410 • Board members and project representative discussed timeline for lining up financing, and
411 affordability restrictions.

412 *Motion to approve staff’s recommendation made by Board member Jason Wheeler and 2nd by Board*
413 *member David Snow.*

414 *The motion passed by roll call vote with affirmative votes by Holbrook, Monson, Snow, Henrie,*
415 *Paul, Ramsey, Wheeler, Jensen, Bond, and Myers. Board member John Lindsay was recused. Board*
416 *members Nilson and Glenn were absent for the vote.*

417
418 2. 515 Tower Apartments (SLC) – GIV Group Daniel Herbert-Voss
419 Score: 302 out of 500

- 420 • Dan Murphy presented an overview of the project, scoring and the applicant’s ask. He read the staff
421 recommendation to Fund \$1,000,000 from state match and match PI funds as requested. Loan will
422 be issued as a fully-amortizing for 40 years at 1.5%. Lien positions: 1) Key Bank first mortgage; 2) SLC
423 RDA loan; 3) OWHLF HOME match loan. Funding contingent on all other funding sources as listed in
424 the Application, and rehabilitation to Energy Star/minimum HERS standards. Source of funding
425 determined at discretion of HCD/OWHLF staff as needed, and subject to funding availability. OWHLF
426 deed restrictions to show a total of 5 HOME-assisted units for 40 years minimum.

- 427 • Representing the project was Chris Parker. He spoke more about the project and fielded questions
428 about building specifics, parking, how the perpetual housing fund will be managed, and costs.

429 *Motion to approve staff’s recommendation made by Board member Kip Paul and 2nd by Board*
430 *member Martie Henrie.*

431 *The motion passed by roll call vote with affirmative votes by Holbrook, Monson, Snow, Henrie,*
432 *Paul, Ramsey, Wheeler, Jensen, Bond, and Myers. Board member John Lindsay was recused. Board*
433 *members Nilson and Glenn were absent for the vote.*

434
435 New Construction Projects – Other Multifamily Projects [Ranked by Score]:

436 1. Birkhill Loft Apartments (Murray) – Knowlton Development Daniel Herbert-Voss

437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482

Score: 267 out of 500

- Dan Murphy presented an overview of the project, scoring and the applicant's ask. He read the staff recommendation Fund \$1,000,000 from Federal HOME funds, and fund \$625,699 from Federal HTF funds as two separate loans instead of \$1,798,676 of HOME funds as requested. Loans to be issued as fully-amortizing for 40 years at 1.5%. Lien positions: 1) Rocky Mt CRC first mortgage; 2) OWHLF HOME loan; 3) OWHLF HTF loan. Funding contingent on all other funding sources as listed in the Application, and construction to Energy Star/minimum HERS standards. Source of funding determined at discretion of HCD/OWHLF staff as needed. OWHLF deed restrictions to show a total of 3 HTF-assisted and 2 LIH-assisted units for 40 years minimum.
- Representing the project was Hooper Knowlton and Bob Tibbits who were available to address questions from the Board. They discussed the funding struggles the project had experienced.
- Board discussed particulars of the project and funding and timeliness funding with regards to the current building permit and costs to start over. Additionally it was discussed that the project's current ERR was more than 5 years old and they will need to do a new ERR before funds could be released.
- Natasha Pfeiffer a loan officer for Rocky Mountain Community Reinvestment Corporation joined the conversation to answer questions about DCR for this project and clarify some of the information captured in underwriting. There were some changes to operational costs and an adjustment to % of units with 30% AMI which altered the summary numbers.
Motion to approve staff's recommendation made by Board member David Snow and 2nd by Board member Logan Monson.
The motion passed by roll call vote with affirmative votes by Holbrook, Monson, Snow, Henrie, Paul, Ramsey, Wheeler, Jensen, Bond, and Myers. Board member John Lindsay was recused. Board members Nilson and Glenn were absent for the vote.

2. Bumper House Apartments (SLC) – SMH Construction Daniel Herbert-Voss
Score: 232 out of 500

- Dan Murphy presented an overview of the project, scoring and the applicant's ask. He read the staff recommendation not to fund due to insufficient funding available at the present time, additionally due to not having units that meet the AMI requirements and because no representatives were available to answer questions about the project.
- No representatives for this project chose to attend this board meeting to discuss the project.
Motion to not fund the applicant's request made by Board member Jason Wheeler and 2nd by Board member Logan Monson.
The motion passed by roll call vote with affirmative votes by Holbrook, Monson, Snow, Paul, Ramsey, Wheeler, Jensen, Bond, and Myers. Board members John Lindsay and Marty Henrie were recused. Board members Nilson and Glenn were absent for the vote.

3. 2nd South Apartments (SLC) – Hermes Affordable Daniel Herbert-Voss
Score: 195 out of 500

- Dan Murphy presented an overview of the project, scoring and the applicant's ask. He read the staff recommendation not to fund due to insufficient funding available at the present time as well as because they were not present to discuss the project.
- No representatives for this project chose to attend this board meeting to discuss the project.
Motion to not fund the applicant's request made by Board member Logan Monson and 2nd by Board member Steven Bond.

483 *The motion passed by roll call vote with affirmative votes by Holbrook, Monson, Snow, Paul,*
484 *Ramsey, Wheeler, Jensen, Bond, and Myers. Board members John Lindsay and Marty Henrie were*
485 *recused. Board members Nilson and Glenn were absent for the vote.*
486

487 **Item 2: Existing/Returning Multifamily Projects**

- 488 1. Sandstone Hills (Richfield) – CJM Dev – Increased First Mortgage Daniel Herbert-Voss
489 • Dan Murphy presented an overview of the project, scoring and the applicant’s ask. He read the staff
490 recommendation to approve the OWHLF subordination of loan #WHE1938 to the larger Zions Bank
491 first mortgage of up to \$16,000,000.
492 *Motion to approve staff’s recommendation made by Board member David Snow and 2nd by Board*
493 *member Jason Wheeler.*
494 *The motion passed by roll call vote with affirmative votes by Holbrook, Monson, Snow, Henrie,*
495 *Paul, Ramsey, Wheeler, Jensen, Bond, and Myers. Board member John Lindsay was recused. Board*
496 *members Nilson and Glenn were absent for the vote.*
497

498 **Item 3: Reports (Please review prior to meeting – Staff will answer questions)**

- 499
500 1. Portfolio/Aging Report Kathryn Halterman
501 2. Multifamily Quarterly Progress Report Daniel Herbert-Voss
502 3. Single Family Report Kathryn Halterman
503 4. Energy Star Report Daniel Herbert-Voss
504 5. Monitoring Report Update Steve Fox
505 6. Home Choice Quarterly Report Josh Runhaar
506 7. Cash Flow Loan Status Report Daniel Herbert-Voss
507 8. TOD Report Dan Adams
508 9. Utah Housing Preservation Fund Lukas Ridd
509 10. Landlord Incentive Program Kathryn Halterman
510 • Board member Steven Bond asked for clarification on report #3 regarding the board’s policies for
511 late payments and foreclosure procedures. Staff member Katye Halterman addressed the questions
512 and additional conversation with the board members and staff around the procedures of how
513 efforts are made to keep people in their homes.
514

515 **IV. Next Quarterly Board Meeting: July 2, 2024**

516
517 *Motion to adjourn the public meeting made by Board member Marty Henrie and 2nd by board member Logan*
518 *Monson. Board voted unanimously to adjourn public meeting.*
519

520 **Public Meeting adjourned at 11:32**

521
522 A closed meeting for the purpose of discussing pending litigation and property sales began at 11:36 and the
523 discussion was conducted for 33 minutes.
524

525 The closed session included a quorum of the following Board members as well as listed staff.

526 **Members Present and Representation:**

527 Beth Holbrook - Transit-Oriented Development

528 Mayor Logan Monson - Local Government

529 Marty Henrie - Mortgage Lender

530 David Snow - Mortgage Lender

531 Mayor Dawn Ramsey - Local Government
532 Jason Wheeler - Housing Advocacy
533 Tyler Jensen – Manufactured Housing
534 Steven Bond – Home Builders (Multifamily)

535 **Excused/Absent:**

536 Jed Nilson - Home builders

537 Mike Glenn – Rural

538 Kip Paul - Real Estate

539 John Lindsay - Rental Housing

540 Kaitlin Myers – Housing Advocacy

541 **Staff Present:**

542 Elliott Lawrence - DWS - Counsel

543 Katy Halterman - HCD - OWHLF

544 Kaylee Beck - DWS – Finance

545 Jennifer Domenici - HCD-Assistant Director

546 Dan Murphy - HCD-OWHLF

547 Janell Quiroz - HCD Administration

548

549 No Motions or actions were taken except that following the discussion there was a motion to close the meeting
550 made by Board member Logan Monson and 2nd by Board member Tyler Jensen. The meeting was adjourned by a
551 unanimous vote at 12:09pm The Board did not return to a public meeting as the meeting had adjourned. It was
552 determined that the Board would need to reconvene at another time to take the actions discussed in the closed
553 meeting in a public meeting at a future date since the public meeting had been adjourned.

554

555