



**WORKFORCE
SERVICES
HOUSING & COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT**

PRIVATE ACTIVITY BOND PROGRAM

PRIVATE ACTIVITY BOND PROGRAM NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING

April 9, 2025, at 9:00 a.m.

Olene S. Walker Building
140 East 300 South, Room 211
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111

This meeting was streamed at: <https://utah-gov.zoom.us/j/89424478439>

Materials regarding this meeting and an audio recording of the meeting can be found at
<https://www.utah.gov/pmn/sitemap/notice/984291.html>

John T. Crandall, Chairman of the Board

Board Members Present:

John Crandall, Chairman
Dean Lundell, Lehi City
Amelia Powers Gardner, Utah County
Curtis Koch, Davis County
Nicole Rosenberg, Iron County
Chip Dawson, South Jordan City
Heidi Voordeckers, North Salt Lake City
David Damschen, UHC
Kamron Dalton, GOEO
Nate Talley, USH

Board Member Absent:

Kirt Slauch, Utah Treasurer's Office

Staff Present:

Jennifer Domenici, HCD AD (Acting Director)
Jennifer Edwards, HCD AD
Jenn Schumann, HCD PM
Amanda McPeck, DWS Counsel
Elliot Lawrence, DWS Counsel
Dan Murphy, HCD PM
Ambra Peterson, HCD Staff
Janell Quiroz, HCD Staff
Kaylee Beck, DWS Financial
Stephanie Johnson, DWS Financial
Sarah Nielson, DWS PIO
Kathryn Halterman, HCD ERR

Guests Present:

Adam Hughes
Andrea Palmer
Andrew Nestlehut
Anna Sullivan

Ashley Grant
Betsy Olsen
Brandon Hodge
Bryan Caples
Carden Likes

Christian Traeden
Chris Zarek
Claudia O'Grady
Connor Mattoon
Corey Johnson



**WORKFORCE
SERVICES**
HOUSING & COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT

PRIVATE ACTIVITY BOND PROGRAM

Dan Adams
David Vaughan
David Wilson
Eddie Starz
Fredrick H Olsen
Gary Vizioli
George Hauser
Haley Holloway
Hasan Rahman
Jacob Williams
Jake Wood
Jason Martin

Jeff Murdock
Jereme Thaxton
Jesse Curtis
Jodi Bangerter
Jordan Atkin
Jonathan Hardy
Jonathan Woodland
Karl Niederer
Karly Brinla
Kyle Zack
Luann Spangenberg
Matthew Klein

Matt Krambule
McKenna Marchant
Nick Asta
Paul Bringhurst
Randy Clack
Steve Laski
Tim Cohn
Todd Reeder
Tommy Marcheschi
Troy Hart
Tyler Kirn

Meeting Minutes

I. Welcome and Introductions

- A.** Chairman John T Crandall opened the meeting at 9:00 am and welcomed those in the room and online and recognized the board members by name. He then asked Housing and Community Development interim Director Jennifer Domenici to provide an HCD staffing update and introduce any staff joining the meeting remotely. Director Domenici introduced the new Staff members who will be supporting the PAB program; Jennifer Schumann – Program Manager and Ambra Peterson – Program Specialist.

II. Public Comment

- A.** No public comments were submitted prior to the meeting or shared during the allotted public comment time during the meeting in person or online.

III. Approval of the minutes

A. January 8, 2025, Meeting Minutes

1. The Draft Minutes for January 8, 2025, were sent to the board members prior to the meeting for review. The Chairman asked for any discussion on the minutes and hearing none asked for a motion.

A Motion to approve the minutes of January 8, 2025, was made by Board member David Damschen and seconded by Board member Curtis Koch. The motion passed by a roll call vote with affirmative votes from Board member David Damschen, Board member Dean Lundell, Board member Curtis Koch, Board member Amelia Powers Gardner, Board member Heidi Voordeckers, Board member Nate Talley, Board member Chip



**WORKFORCE
SERVICES
HOUSING & COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT**

PRIVATE ACTIVITY BOND PROGRAM

Dawson and Board member Nicole Rosenberg. There were no negative votes. Absent from the vote were Board members Kirt Slaugh, and Kamron Dalton.

IV. Status Updates [8:23]

A. Status of Accounts

1. Chairman Crandall asked Finance Manager Kaylee Beck to update the Board on the status of accounts. Ms. Beck reviewed the Board's financials in preparation for the decisions to be made in this meeting. She covered the totals available, explaining that the Board 65.2M being applied for and 34.7M available. She pointed out that the program manager had listed the projects in order of scoring and the board will need to decide as they cannot award the ask for all projects.

B. Project Closing/Groundbreaking/Ribbon Cutting Updates, if applicable [9:30]

1. The Chairman asked Jennifer Schumann to share the information of this agenda item as this is a new agenda item for the board. Ms. Schumann said she would like to have a place on the agenda to share good news and provide feedback on how projects are moving forward in terms of milestones. To that end she told the Board that Latitude Apartments (previously known as 2nd South) had a groundbreaking the previous week. SPARK! is having a grand opening on May 7, 2025, at 11 am. Additionally there are several projects planning to close in May and June so they will be included in July's update.

C. Relinquished Cap Updates, if applicable

1. Chairman Crandall asked Ms. Schumann to provide an update on relinquished or returned cap. Jenn Schumann said that the Lotus River Park project recently closed and did so without utilizing their full allocation; as a result, 1.3M in bond cap has been returned and will be added to July's available balance. She had a second update for this topic which unfortunately was a relinquishing of cap by Alta North because they did not meet the closing deadline on their 5th extension. That cap will also be available in July and the project may return and reapply.

V. Action Item: Future Rebalance of Bond Allocation Accounts [12:11]

A. Manufacturing Balance to Pool Account

B. Exempt Facilities Balance to Pool Account

C. 50% of Pool Account transferred to Manufacturing

D. Multi-family Account

- E.** The Chairman invited the program manager to provide the information needed for this Board discussion. Ms. Schumann explained that there are several allocation accounts that make up PAB as a whole. Code outlines an annual waterfall effect of moving funds to the pool account. The Code identifies a window of July 1st-September 30th to execute the rebalancing. The action item for the Board to consider is if they would like to execute the fund movement at the beginning of the code specified timeframe (July 1st) so that the funds are rebalanced and ready for use for the July 9,



**WORKFORCE
SERVICES
HOUSING & COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT**

PRIVATE ACTIVITY BOND PROGRAM

2025, meeting. If the Board decided against staff's recommendation the rebalance would happen September 30, 2025, and be available in October 2025. The Board asked a clarifying question to understand the timing of the rebalance.

A Motion to carry out the rebalance of funds in accordance with state law and as recommended by staff at the beginning of the window of time allowed for the rebalance, was made by Board member David Damschen and seconded by Board member Kamron Dalton. The motion passed by a roll call vote with affirmative votes from Board member David Damschen, Board member Dean Lundell, Board member Curtis Koch, Board member Amelia Powers Gardner, Board member Heidi Voordeckers, Board member Nate Talley, Board member Chip Dawson, Board member Nicole Rosenberg and Board member Kamron Dalton. There were no negative votes. Absent from the vote was Board member Kirt Slaugh.

VI. Action Item: Volume Cap Extension Requests

Extension Request

A. Single Family Housing

1. [16:21] Utah Housing Corporation

First

Single Family Allotment for 2025 - \$186,608,276

- a. Chairman John Crandall asked Board member David Damschen (President of the Utah Housing Corporation) and his team to address this first extension request for the Utah Housing Corporation. Mr. Damschen gave an overview of the work the Utah Housing Corporation does as well as shared concerns and wins for housing in the current political climate. He shared some general numbers in terms of overall needs and fund availability as well as how the UHC works to utilize and stretch the resources available to help as many homeowners and projects as possible.
- b. The Chairman asked Jenn Schumann for the Staff's recommendation. She stated that staff recommended approval of the extension.

A Motion to approve the first extension for Utah Housing Corporation's volume cap for single family housing as recommended by staff, was made by Board member Heidi Voordeckers and seconded by Board member Dean Lundell. The motion passed by a roll call vote with affirmative votes from Board member David Damschen, Board member Dean Lundell, Board member Curtis Koch, Board member Amelia Powers Gardner, Board member Heidi Voordeckers, Board member Nate Talley, Board member Chip Dawson, Board member Nicole Rosenberg and Board member Kamron Dalton. There were no negative votes. Absent from the vote was Board member Kirt Slaugh.

B. Multifamily Housing Projects

1. [24:01] Alta Fairpark

Fifth

147 Units - 100% Affordable
New Construction

140 North 1000 West



**WORKFORCE
SERVICES**
**HOUSING & COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT**

PRIVATE ACTIVITY BOND PROGRAM

Developer-Alta Bay Capital

SLC, UT 84116

Original Allocation - \$21,500,000 [January 2024]

Additional Allocation - \$2,000,000 [April 2025]

- a. Chairman John Crandall reminded the Board that as the number of extensions increases the staff scrutiny also increases. He stated that a 5th extension, which is the last allowable extension under the Board's policy, involves quite a bit of review by staff. The Chairman asked Ms. Schumann to give a summary of the project and state the staff recommendation. Ms. Schumann went through the specifics of the project as well as changes that have been made since the original allocation, the reason for the additional allocation request and calling out that with the changes and without the requested additional allocation the project no longer meets the 50% test. She stated that staff's recommendation would be to approve the 5th extension and approve the additional \$2M in allocation.
- b. The Chairman asked the Board's legal counsel Amanda McPeck to confirm whether the board could stipulate that additional allocation would be able to be limited to the existing allocation's deadlines assuring that the new allocation would be subject to relinquishment if the project failed to complete it's closing by the deadline of the 5th extension. Ms. McPeck confirmed that the Board could stipulate in the motion that all allocations are tied together to the project's currently requested extension timeline.
- c. The next question was whether this decision was an all or none scenario? Could the Board approve the extension but not the additional allocation? The answer was that it is an all or nothing scenario since approving the extension but not the allocation would not address the project's current failing of the 50% test. The Board was told they must approve or deny both requests together.
- d. The Board asked for clarification on the finances and the impact to projects later in the meeting if this allocation would be approved. The clarification was that this was the only extension requesting additional allocation so it would not be impactful for the remainder of the extension applicants.

A Motion to approve the fifth extension for Alta Fairpark with an additional allocation of \$2M to align with the current allocation and 5th extensions defined parameters and timeline, was made by Board member Curtis Koch and seconded by Board member Kamron Dalton. The motion passed by a roll call vote with affirmative votes from Board member David Damschen, Board member Dean Lundell, Board member Curtis Koch, Board member Amelia Powers Gardner, Board member Heidi Voordeckers, Board member Nate Talley, Board member Chip Dawson, Board member Nicole Rosenberg and Board member Kamron Dalton. There were no negative votes. Absent from the vote was Board member Kirt Slauch.

- 2. [32:02] 9th Note [Moda Griffin]**
110 Units – 100% Affordable

Fifth



**WORKFORCE
SERVICES
HOUSING & COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT**

PRIVATE ACTIVITY BOND PROGRAM

New Construction *915 W North Temple*
Developer – JF Properties *SLC, UT 84116*
Original Allocation - \$21,500,000 [January 2024]

- a. Chairman John Crandall called on Ms. Schumann to share a summary of the project and state the staff recommendation. The program manager went through some of the specifics of the project as well as the remaining timeline as submitted by the developers. The staff's recommendation was to approve the fifth extension for 9th Note.
- b. The Chairman invited questions and comments from the board regarding the project. There were no questions or comments.

A Motion to approve the fifth extension for 9th Note was made by Board member Heidi Voordeckers and seconded by Board member Nate Talley. The motion passed by a roll call vote with affirmative votes from Board member David Damschen, Board member Dean Lundell, Board member Curtis Koch, Board member Amelia Powers Gardner, Board member Heidi Voordeckers, Board member Nate Talley, Board member Chip Dawson, Board member Nicole Rosenberg and Board member Kamron Dalton. There were no negative votes. Absent from the vote was Board member Kirt Slaugh.

3. [33:59] Liberty Corner

Fourth

200 Units – 100% Affordable
New Construction *1265 S 300 W*
Developer – Cowboy Partners *SLC, UT 84101*
Original Allocation - \$60,700,000 [April 2024]
Additional Allocation - \$5,000,000 [July 2024]

- a. Chairman John Crandall asked Ms. Schumann to give a summary of the project and state the staff recommendation. The program manager went through some of the specifics of the project as well as the remaining timeline as submitted by the developers. The staff's recommendation was to approve the fourth extension for Liberty Corner.
- b. The Chairman invited questions and comments from the board regarding the project. There were no questions or comments.

A Motion to approve the fourth extension for Liberty Corner adding that the additional allocation awarded in July 2024 would be subject to the project's current extension timeline and relinquishment protocols was made by Board member Kamron Dalton and seconded by Board member Heidi Voordeckers. The motion passed by a roll call vote with affirmative votes from Board member David Damschen, Board member Dean Lundell, Board member Curtis Koch, Board member Amelia Powers Gardner, Board member Heidi Voordeckers, Board member Nate Talley, Board member Chip Dawson, Board member Nicole Rosenberg and Board member Kamron Dalton. There were no negative votes. Absent from the vote was Board member Kirt Slaugh.



**WORKFORCE
SERVICES
HOUSING & COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT**

PRIVATE ACTIVITY BOND PROGRAM

4. [37:21] Provo Commons Apartments

Third

129 Units – 100% Affordable

New Construction

156 W 500 S

Developer – M13 Construction, Incorporated

Provo, UT 84601

Original Allocation - \$25,600,000 [July 2024]

- a. Chairman John Crandall asked Ms. Schumann to give a summary of the project and state the staff recommendation. The program manager introduced the project and went through the remaining timeline as submitted by the developers. She said the developer had expressed concerns over the volatility of the market and had indicated the tax credit investors have been hesitant to invest. Ms. Schumann stated that the staff's recommendation was to approve the third extension for Provo Commons.
- b. The Chairman invited questions and comments from the board regarding the project.
- c. The project's representative for the meeting was Randy Clack. The Board asked Mr. Clack to shed additional light on the notice in the extension request about the difficulty with tax investors, the significant increase to the 50% test, as well as their indication in the request that frozen federal funds were causing an issue with the project. Mr. Clack explained that the original tax credit investor had pulled out with a letter stating volatility in the market as the reason for discontinuing their offer of investment. He said that they were raising their cost estimates in case tariffs affect costs. Mr. Clack explained that the Provo Housing Authority told them that the freezing of federal funds would affect some project-based vouchers. During the conversation Claudia O'Grady of the Utah Housing Corp was consulted to speak about the timeframe for tax credits in relation to the timing of this project.
- d. The Board also discussed as a general topic: the process and timing of tax credits, more in-depth readiness evaluations for extension requests and a better rating system for determining the experience and expertise of developers.

A Motion to deny the third extension for Provo Commons was made by Board member David Damschen. There was no second on that motion.

A new Motion to approve the third extension for Provo Commons was made by Board member Amelia Powers Gardner and seconded by Board member Dean Lundell. The motion passed by roll call vote with affirmative votes from Board member Dean Lundell, Board member Amelia Powers Gardner, Board member Heidi Voordeckers, Board member Nate Talley, Board member Chip Dawson, Board member Nicole Rosenberg and Board member Kamron Dalton. Negative votes were cast by Board member Curtis Koch and Board member David Damschen. Absent from the vote was Board member Kirt Slauch.

5. [1:03:41] Ventana Apartments

Second

120 Units – 100% Affordable



**WORKFORCE
SERVICES
HOUSING & COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT**

PRIVATE ACTIVITY BOND PROGRAM

New Construction 570 E Kaneplex Drive
Developer – Acumen Development Kanab, UT 84741
Original Allocation - \$11,800,000 [October 2024]

- a. The Chairman invited Jennifer Schumann to give a summary of the project and state the staff recommendation. Ms. Schumann went over the working timeline and funding progress as submitted by the developers. The staff's recommendation was to approve the second extension for Ventana Apartments.
- b. The Chairman invited questions and comments from the board regarding the project. There were no questions or comments.

A Motion to approve the second extension for Ventana Apartments was made by Board member Curtis Koch and seconded by Board member Kamron Dalton. The motion passed by roll call vote with affirmative votes from Board members David Damschen, Board member Dean Lundell, Board member Curtis Koch, Board member Amelia Powers Gardner, Board member Heidi Voordeckers, Board member Nate Talley, Board member Chip Dawson, Board member Nicole Rosenberg and Board member Kamron Dalton. There were no negative votes. Absent from the vote was Board member Kirt Slauch.

6. [1:05:24] Lotus Fluence

Second

225 Units – 100% Affordable
New Construction 120 N Washington Blvd.
Developer – Lotus Advantage Ogden, UT 84404
Original Allocation - \$32,500,000 [October 2024]

- a. Chairman Crandall invited the program manager to give a summary of the project and state the staff recommendation. Jennifer Schumann outlined the work and any changes that have occurred since the project was last before the Board as submitted by the developers. The staff's recommendation was to approve the second extension for Lotus Fluence.
- b. The Chairman asked why the 50% test increased and Board member Dalton followed that up with a question about what the cap was for the 50% test in the Board's policies (58% cap). The developer's representative was invited to join the conversation to address the increase to the 50% test. Adam Hughes with Lotus Company joined the board at the table and informed the board that the calculations they had submitted in the request were incorrect. Mr. Hughes stated that the project's actual number for the 50% test is 53.8%. With that question resolved there were no additional questions around this project. The board discussed some extension request processes and UHC processes related to TEFRA calculations. The conversation was general and unrelated to the project.

A Motion to approve the second extension for Lotus Fluence was made by Board member Kamron Dalton and seconded by Board member Curtis Koch. The motion passed by roll call vote with affirmative votes from Board members David



**WORKFORCE
SERVICES
HOUSING & COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT**

PRIVATE ACTIVITY BOND PROGRAM

Damschen, Board member Dean Lundell, Board member Curtis Koch, Board member Amelia Powers Gardner, Board member Heidi Voordeckers, Board member Nate Talley, Board member Chip Dawson, Board member Nicole Rosenberg and Board member Kamron Dalton. There were no negative votes. Absent from the vote was Board member Kirt Slauch.

7. [1:10:34] Folsom Apartments

Second

108 Units – 100% Affordable

New Construction

947 W. South Temple

Developer – Roers Companies

SLC, UT 84114

Original Allocation - \$24,137,592 [October 2024]

- a. Chairman Crandall invited the program manager Jenn Schumann to give a summary of the project and state the staff recommendation. Jennifer Schumann stated that the developers had filed for a second extension and shared the original allocation information. She stated that staff did recommend approving this 2nd extension for Folsom Apartments.
- b. The Chair asked for the expected closing date. Board member David Damschen added that the project had completed their TEFRA hearing and their tax credit resolution was also complete so he thought they should be able to close on time.

A Motion to approve the second extension for Folsom Apartments was made by Board member Dean Lundell and seconded by Board member Chip Dawson. The motion passed by roll call vote with affirmative votes from Board members David Damschen, Board member Dean Lundell, Board member Curtis Koch, Board member Amelia Powers Gardner, Board member Heidi Voordeckers, Board member Nate Talley, Board member Chip Dawson, Board member Nicole Rosenberg and Board member Kamron Dalton. There were no negative votes. Absent from the vote was Board member Kirt Slauch.

[01:13:14] Chairman John Crandall told the Board that there are 5, first extensions applications. He reminded the Board the first extensions are considered perfunctory, and staff does not typically do extensive research into first requests. The Chairman asked Jenn Schumann to give summary of the first extensions. She stated that “They each submitted an Extension request. There have been no significant changes on any of the of the projects from the January meeting, so, as they stand, staff recommended that we move these extensions forward.” The Chairman asked the Board if they would like to talk further and individually or consider them in one motion. The Board determined to include all the first extension applicants in one motion to approve. The projects included in this motion are listed below:

8. The Cooperative 1581 Apartments

First

144 Units – 100% Affordable

New Construction

1581 Millcreek Drive

Developer – 22 Communities

Moab, UT 84532

Original Allocation - \$21,620,000 [January 2025]

- c. Chairman John Crandall asked Ms. Schumann to give a summary of the project and state the staff recommendation.



**WORKFORCE
SERVICES
HOUSING & COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT**

PRIVATE ACTIVITY BOND PROGRAM

9. The Cooperative 1881 Apartments

First

198 Units – 100% Affordable

New Construction

Developer – 22 Communities

Original Allocation - \$21,620,000 [January 2025]

1581 W North Temple

SLC, UT 84116

10. Daybreak Phase I

First

203 Units – 100% Affordable

New Construction

Developer – Wasatch Residential Group

Original Allocation - \$35,500,000 [January 2025]

10821 S Grandville Ave

South Jordan, UT 84009

11. Daybreak Phase II

First

184 Units – 100% Affordable

New Construction

Developer – Wasatch Residential Group

Original Allocation - \$33,000,000 [January 2025]

10851 S Grandville Ave

South Jordan, UT 84009

12. SSL Apartments

First

255 Units – 100% Affordable

New Construction

Developer – BCF ARC Fund

Original Allocation - \$50,000,000 [January 2025]

55 East Haven Ave

South Salt Lake, UT 84115

A Motion to approve the first extension for The Cooperative 1581 Apartments, The Cooperative 1881 Apartments, Daybreak Phase I, Daybreak Phase II, and SSL Apartments were made by Board member Kamron Dalton and seconded by Board member Heidi Voordeckers. The motion passed by roll call vote with affirmative votes from Board members David Damschen, Board member Dean Lundell, Board member Curtis Koch, Board member Amelia Powers Gardner, Board member Heidi Voordeckers, Board member Nate Talley, Board member Chip Dawson, Board member Nicole Rosenberg and Board member Kamron Dalton. There were no negative votes. Absent from the vote was Board member Kirt Slauch.

VII. [1:15:49] Action Item: New Volume Cap Requests

Amount Requested

A. Multifamily Housing Projects

1. Brooklyn Yard

\$29,210,000

171 Units – 100% Affordable

New Construction

Developer – Brinshore Development

269 Brooklyn Avenue

SLC, UT 84101



**WORKFORCE
SERVICES**
HOUSING & COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT

PRIVATE ACTIVITY BOND PROGRAM

Score: 567

- a. The Chairman, John T. Crandall, told the Board that is project, Brooklyn Yard is the project formerly known as “Bumperhouse”. He then called on Jenn Schumann to introduce the project and state the staff recommendation. Ms. Schumann read the executive summary of the project as follows, “Brooklyn yards is an 100% affordable new construction development, consisting of 171 units. The unit mix is 1-, 2-, and 3-bedroom units making this a project that addresses the need for larger family sized housing opportunities. The development will occur in a single 8-story podium-style building to be located on a .69-acre parcel. The site previously contained vacant commercial buildings that have been demolished and have been remediated under the Utah Voluntary Cleanup program. “She shared additional information about proximity to transit and some background information about the developer. Ms. Schumann continued to walk the board through the summary by calling out the environmental status and funding sources. She stated that the project meets the 1.15 debt coverage ratio. She also shared that nothing stands out in construction costs or funding sources but there is some ambiguity around the 1.8M in funding from the Salt Lake City Community Reinvestment Agency.
- b. Aside from the project related update there was a question from the board about a line item in the financials – the executive summary template is used for both the PAB and OWHLF boards and the line where debt service is identified is titled “Funding terms approved by the OWHLF **and/or** PAB Boards” this line does not indicate that OWHLF or PAB are carrying debt services for the project; only that the project’s debt services have been identified, reviewed and approved by which ever board is relevant to the project. The Board asked that staff look at re-wording the title of that line item to be less confusing. The Board also asked for the executive summary to be finessed a bit so that the titles didn’t run on into other fields and that they are simplified if possible.
- c. The project representative, Karly Brinla and her PAB consultant McKenna Marchant joined the Board at their table to answer questions about the project. The Board asked if the project would be applying for OWHLFs, Ms. Brinla said that they did not intend to apply and explained the reason for not requesting funds from the OWHLF board. The Chairman asked about the purchased agreement and what changes have occurred in the project’s ownership/investor/developer mix since it was Bumperhouse. Specifically, the board wanted to know where Brinshore Development falls in relation to the project. Karly Brinla said, “The previous owner was a partnership between 2 gentlemen who were part of the application team before. One of them was part of 22 Cooperative, which was going to be the



**WORKFORCE
SERVICES
HOUSING & COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT**

PRIVATE ACTIVITY BOND PROGRAM

developer, and the other one was our architect. They reached out to us and said that they thought that it was the opinion of the Board that you guys wanted a more experienced developer doing this project. So, they are going to sell us the land at closing. They'll get reimbursed for the land and for the work that they've done for the environmental cleanup which was extensive. The architect will stay on as the architect. The work that 22 Cooperative has done will be compensated with, like, a finder's fee that is coming out of our portion of the developer fee. Brinshore will be the sole owner and developer of the project." The Board and developer had a lengthy discussion about the logistics and conditions of the land purchase agreement, when the project would officially be Brinshore's, and whether Brinshore could act on behalf of the project prior to closing. Ms. O'Grady of the Utah Housing Corp was asked by the Chairman to weigh-in on the commonality of the developer not owning the land and she confirmed that often the land purchase can be part of a "giant closing" involving all partners (Tax credit partners, Bond partners, Landowners etc.). The project's consultant McKenna Marchant stated that it is a threshold requirement would be for the developer to have an agreement/contract for site control. Both scenarios of owning the land upfront or establishing a contract for the purchase of the land at closing are acceptable and common practice. The Board shared thoughts on the repackaging of the project, some were concerned and others felt it was a step in the right direction. The Board asked about the RDA funding which was worded ambiguously in the application. Ms. Brinla explained that the project had won an amount under the previous owners and the current developers have received a letter inviting the project to apply in the fall. The discussion about this RDA funding established that the project has not yet received the funding or a confirmation of intent or commitment to fund but has a letter inviting them to apply for funding. Ms. Brinla did say that the developers had contingency plans to cover the money if it is not awarded in the fall. The increase in HUD allowable rent rates will more than cover the gap if needed.

The Board discussed whether to make a motion on Brooklyn Yard prior to hearing from The Flats at Folsom or to hear both projects and then deter motion. Additionally, they acknowledged that there was not enough volume cap available for both projects, and should they choose The Flats at Folsom they would not have the full ask they would only have enough volume cap to fund 32,680,000. The Chairman, foreseeing this shortage, had asked the program manager prior to the meeting to verify with the developer if that lesser amount would be acceptable and they confirmed that it would be. The Board acknowledged that the scores were so close as to be basically equal (separated by 5 points). The Board decided to move forward and hear The Flats at Folsom and then take action.

2. [1:42:44] The Flats at Folsom

\$34,000,000



**WORKFORCE
SERVICES**
HOUSING & COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT

PRIVATE ACTIVITY BOND PROGRAM

188 Units – 100% Affordable

New Construction

16 S 800 W

Developer – Lincoln Avenue Communities

SLC, UT 84104

Score: 562

- a. Chairman Crandall invited the program manager Jenn Schumann to give a summary of the project and state the staff recommendation. She read the following information, “Flats at Folsom is 100% affordable new construction development consisting of 188 units. The unit mix includes studios, 1-bedroom and 2-bedroom units. This development is located in Salt Lake City, a mere half mile from the gateway and Delta Center, and directly adjacent to the Folsom Trail. The Folsom Trail provides a connection between the Jordan River Trail and the North Temple Front Runner Station. This project will be built in that podium style construction, as we've seen in other projects as well on a .88-acre parcel that is currently vacant. Lincoln Avenue Communities indicates that they are one of the largest owners, operators, and developers of affordable housing in the country, and has national experience with 30 over 30,000 units in their portfolio. The developer is requesting 34 million in tax exempt bond cap.” Ms. Schumann directed the boards attention to the status of parcel, environmental status, energy efficiency standards and project funding. She finished her summary by stating that the project meets the debt coverage ratio, and that construction costs were not out of line. Ms. Schumann said the staff recommendation was to approve the request provided the bond cap was available. Ms. Schumann shared that at the Chairman’s request she had had a conversation with the developer on whether they could accept a slightly lower bond cap amount and they said that the project would absolutely be able to move forward at that available amount.
- b. The Chairman asked the Board for questions and discussion. There was a note that the estimated overall construction cost was slightly lower than average and the board wanted to know how firm the developer was feeling about the costs and whether there was any contingency built into the costs. The developer would be covering any gaps that could not be raised.
- c. The project was represented by Matthew Klein. He gave a quick company and project overview stating the project efficiencies they had made in preparation for this meeting. Mr. Klein then extensively addressed the questions from the Board. He reviewed the cost-saving methods the project employed. He also addressed the readiness of the project including obtaining permit approval. Throughout the conversation Mr. Klein addressed contingency options and the consideration of using other programs for funding sources. Mr. Klein expressed confidence in the project’s 50% test and said they were committed to keeping costs in line with what they had presented.



**WORKFORCE
SERVICES**
HOUSING & COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT

PRIVATE ACTIVITY BOND PROGRAM

- d. Board member Kameron Dalton shared with the developer a Utah specific program that the project should look at- HTRZ (Housing and Transit Reinvestment Zone)
- e. The Board members lamented the problem of having 2 really good projects and 2 really good developers with a near equal score and only being able to award cap to 1. They discussed whether developer fee deferment should be a part of scoring. Ms. Schumann circled back to a question Chairman Crandall had asked her to review and speak about regarding Brooklyn Yard's letter of intent for RDAs and confirmed that it was a more a letter of interest. She said the letter reads like an invitation to apply and not a guarantee of award. But it does technically fit within the application's ambiguous wording as a letter of intent. Ms. Schumann recommended that that board consider the value and definitions of scoring, she did confirm that the letter had been accepted in the past and could not affect the scoring for this round of applications. The Board continued to discuss the value of and scoring around letters of intent vs. letters of interest and how they would like the LOIs to be evaluated in the future. At this point in the discussion the electronic meeting glitched and the room lost it's audio and video feed. The board was asked to pause the conversation while the equipment and feed were reset. This reset took approximately one and a half minutes. The conversation resumed at **[2:03:45]** on the audio recording. In resuming the conversation (post technical difficulties) Board member Kameron Dalton restated the question he had asked just before the meeting cut out, asking if there was no submission at all for the 1.8M in RDA funds and that was removed from calculation would the score be impacted? Program manager Jenn Schumann said that it would not be impacted as there were multiple LOIs and not including that one would not discount the scoring due to the other LOIs from other lenders for the project. Having a greater understanding of the scoring around lender intent the board move back into the conversation of how to weigh and compare The Flats at Folsom and the Brooklyn Yard to determine which project they would award. The Board shared feelings of consternation about whether the Brooklyn Yard will run into delays again if the 1.8M doesn't get awarded. Board member Curtis Koch also shared that he was thinking about the types of units available on the market right now. He said that one project was heavy on studios and 1-bedroom units and the other had a mix of larger family sized units. He thought it was critical to know, if he was going to base his decision on unit mix, whether the developer would be able to complete the project if the 1.8M was not awarded. Chairman Crandall asked the developer's representative to return to the table for some questions from the Board. The Board asked what contingencies were in place if the 1.8M was not awarded and whether receiving the RDA funds was a condition of the new developer continuing to purchase and complete the project. Karly Brinla responded that the receipt of the RDA funds in question was not a condition of Brinshore's purchase of the project and that part of the contingency to cover the gap if the money was



**WORKFORCE
SERVICES
HOUSING & COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT**

PRIVATE ACTIVITY BOND PROGRAM

not secured would be covered by the increased rent rate that HUD had just updated for Salt Lake County. She said that since rent rates have increased by .2% it almost exactly covers the 1.8M should it not be awarded. Ms. Brinla also said there was room for more deferred developer fees if needed. The Board, acknowledging that there is demand for all types of housing, discussed whether they felt like there was greater demand for single person units vs multiple person units. Many of the Board members weighed in on the greater need for family size units citing the governor's housing objectives and current legislative emphasis. The Board expressed multiple times the desire to award both projects and the desire to see both developers succeed at their projects as both projects are critically needed. The Board would really like to see whichever project is not awarded at this meeting back in the July meeting.

A Motion to approve the request for \$29,210,000 in volume cap for the Brooklyn Yard project per staff's recommendation was made by Board member Kamron Dalton and seconded by Board member Curtis Koch. The motion passed by roll call vote with affirmative votes from Board members David Damschen, Board member Dean Lundell, Board member Curtis Koch, Board member Heidi Voordeckers, Board member Nate Talley, Board member Chip Dawson, Board member Nicole Rosenberg and Board member Kamron Dalton. There were no negative votes. Absent from the vote was Board member Kirt Slauch and Board member Amelia Powers Gardner (Ms. Powers Gardner had to leave the meeting at 2:03:43).

No Motion was taken regarding The Flats at Fulsom as there was not sufficient bond cap available. The Board expressed a hope to see this project continue and apply again.

[2:18:25] A quick conversation about what the anticipated balance would be in July occurred between Chairman Crandall and Kaylee Beck. Board member Curtis Koch explained why he voted no on the 3rd extension for Provo Commons. Chairman Crandall expressed gratitude for the Board's and Staff's work and time

VIII. Other Business and Adjournment

- IX.** [2:18:25] A quick conversation about what the anticipated balance would be in July occurred between Chairman Crandall and Kaylee Beck. Board member Curtis Koch explained why he voted no on the 3rd extension for Provo Commons. Chairman Crandall expressed gratitude for the Board's and Staff's work and time. Board member Kameron Dalton asked if they should discuss awarding the remaining 3M to Flats at Folsom. The Board discussed whether it would be enough to keep them going for a little while until they return in July. They talked about precedents and whether that conveys a message of forward-allocation. Projects in the past that would have been approved but there was insufficient allocation to give were asked to apply for the next competitive cycle and the Board discussed the implications of deviating from the previous pattern without a change to rule. The Board determined



**WORKFORCE
SERVICES**
HOUSING & COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT

PRIVATE ACTIVITY BOND PROGRAM

that they would not award the remaining 3M and asked the developer, Lincoln Avenue Communities, to please compete in the next round because they really want to see the Flats at Folsom built.

A. Next Meeting – Wednesday, July 9, 2025

B. Meeting was adjourned at 11:27

Minutes Submitted by Janell Quiroz

Minutes Approved 07/09/2025