

Commission on Housing Affordability
Draft Minutes for August 12, 2020
350 N. State Street. SLC, UT 84103

Members Present

Senator Jacob Anderegg
Representative Joel Briscoe
Representative Val Potter
Jonathan Hardy
Andrew Johnston
Beth Holbrook
Casey Cameron
Chris Condie
Chris Gamvroulas
Grant Whitaker
Jaycee Skinner
Janice Kimball
Jeff Jones
Julie Humberstone
Matt Dahl
Michele Weaver
Mike Akerlow
Mike Gallegos

Representing

Senator
Representative
Representative
Director, HCD
Salt Lake City Council
UTA
Deputy Director, DWS
Lehi City Council
Utah Homebuilders Association
Utah Housing Corporation
Salt Lake Chamber
Housing Connect
Summit County Economic Development
Policy Analyst with LRGC
Utah Redevelopment Association
Rural Community Assistance Corporation
Community Development Corporation of Utah
Salt Lake County

Staff Present

Holly Taing	HCD
Jess Peterson	HCD
Christina Davis	HCD
Keith Heaton	HCD
David Fields	HCD
Elias Wise	HCD

Visitors

Steve Eliason
Austin Kimmel
Dave Spatafore
Ashley Spatafore
Angela Price
John Drew
Melia Dayley
Michelle Flynn

Peter Asplund
Michelle Larsen
Susan Olson
LaNiece Davenport

Welcome and Introductions

The Commission on Housing Affordability meeting was held electronically Via Zoom on August 12, 2020. Representative Val Potter called to order at 10:03am.

Rep. Val Potter: I'd like to propose a change to the agenda and move item #4 to the item #3 position and move the CARES Act down and the Legislative Leadership update forward due to Senator Anderegg needing to leave early from the meeting, with that I would entertain a motion regarding that change to the agenda.

Senator Anderegg: Motion to accept the changes you've recommended. All in favor.

Rep. Val Potter: We will have Steve Eliason joining us today for the item on the agenda "other options for consideration", with not having minutes to approve this meeting, we will move that to the next meeting, let's move now to the Legislative Leadership update and Senator Anderegg, would you give us an update on what you know regarding Housing Affordability.

Senator Anderegg: In the Senate, you know we've got a caucus meeting tomorrow morning to widdle down the number of bills and I think its 64 bills right now for a special session, there's no way the Senates going to hear more than about 20. As far as this special session, I don't know of anything that is percolating for this special session specific to our previous efforts on affordable housing or funding so that should all stay the same with what we got with the 5 million last time, it should be staying the same. There is a lot of discussion currently about the emergency management act passed in 1953 and whether or not there needs to be changes to that act for states of emergency, executive orders under those states of emergencies dealing with local health departments, state health departments, the governor's office, the closure of schools when it comes to who has the final authority on closing a school, is it the state board of education, is it the local school district, is it the local health department or whatever it may be, there are some discussions right now. There's possibly going to be a second special session legislative called on Friday because there are a couple items like the emergency management act modifications that governors not on board with so I don't know ultimately what's going to happen with that but keep your eye on the emergency management bill because it is still very much in flux but can have effects on what happens under that declared state of emergency for things that are relevant to this commission, like rental assistance on the state level, qualifications for those rental assistance under that declared state of emergency and the executive orders. It's still a moving target but I think it is something that is critical to be addressed, we've got certain cities and counties that want to take more action than where the governors at and we've got certain counties, cities and school districts that want to take less action than where the governors at with face masks and all that, so that's where we're at

and just stay tuned but no additional information that I'm aware of for this, that's what I have for legislative updates unless anyone has any questions.

Rep. Val Potter: Thank you very much for that. The house has a caucus on Friday, mid-day to discuss the same kinds of things and there has been a lot of noise about so many bills coming forward as you mentioned and if there's a special session I'm going to make sure I get a bill in there then but leadership is not in favor of that, these are emergency things that need to be taken care of in the special session and I think that's where the senate's going and I think that's where the house is going as well, so we'll see where it shakes out in the next few days and I'm guessing we should have the agenda by Monday or Tuesday next week and special session will be on Thursday, is that what you heard as well Senator?

Senator Anderegg: Yes, that's what I've heard.

Mike Akerlow: This might be a little of topic but I'm curious, given the state of the economy right now and Utah seems to be doing pretty well but what data are you using as legislators on where things are headed for us here locally, is there any data or any indications locally or for our state that we should consider and talk about with the affordable needs coming up, does that make sense?

Senator Anderegg: Do you mean like, what are we seeing as far as the status of the economy or what we're doing as a state dealing with the pandemic?

Mike Akerlow: Yeah pandemic, are we looking towards a recession or any kind of down turn, we seem to be fairing pretty well and then how would that impact our funding moving forward?

Senator Anderegg: Well those are two very different questions tied together but difficult to answer to second portion of that and maybe I'm not the best person to answer this so I might turn the time over to Jonathan here in a minute but what we saw kind of in general with the whole COVID pandemic is, we saw a pretty significant spike in unemployment and in fact many people jumped up for a period of time there to about 9.7% unemployment, a lot of the economist I work with think that, that was artificially held low maybe by 10 points because of the CARES Act intervention and the money that came to people directly, the money that came through unemployment insurance, the money that came to the PPP program, I mean the state funded close to 4.8 billion dollars of CARES Act PPP money, Zions bank I think did 2.5 billion of that in about 45 days, so that money came in and kind of tamped it down a little bit and we've seen our unemployment numbers recover some and last I heard we were down about 5.4%. I think that there are cautious optimism, however; we've had just over 500,000 tests given, we've had just over 40,000 people infected and we've had just under 400 people that have died but those who have been infected and have confirmed infections is under 2% of the entire population, so we are concerned that there could be a second wave, we're concerned that we've down well and tamping down the curve for the most part but we're not out of the woods yet by any means and if we have another major significant spike in infections, that will have a deleterious effect on the entire economy but we've seen out infectious rates drop, not the infectious rate of the virus itself but the number of people becoming infected, I think we're averaging now in the last 2 week window right around 400 a

day, which we were as high as almost 800 or so a day, so it seems to be trending and for all my tin foil hats constituents out there that are turning in and saying that masks don't help, the evidence shows otherwise, so wear your mask when you're out in public or when you're going to be around people, it is helping and Jonathan, I don't know if you have any additional information just as far as the overall perception of where we're headed?

Jonathan Hardy: It's not really my exact area of expertise but we've definitely seen a bit of a decline from the high of people filing for unemployment, although I think as of last week there was still 80,000+ folks that were claiming unemployment for that week and we have seen a rebound from the unemployment rate but I think our next update is next week, Casey do you have any information on that?

Casey Cameron: Yes, we'll have our next update on the unemployment rate on August 21st and the last one was at 5.1, so we should have some information on that here in about 9 more days.

Senator Anderegg: Great so I think I would say there is some cautious optimism Mike but to answer the second phase of your question, how is this going to impact our budgets going forward? Absolutely this is going to have an impact, one of the biggest aspects of our budget that was creating all the surplus was our income tax and our income tax was a direct result of decades worth of economic development focus, drawing companies here and keeping Utah being the #1 place to do business and raise a family, now we've got a scenario where we've had a huge spike in the last 6 months of people being unemployed, so I think you're seeing the economy rebound a little bit but it's not going to be significant enough that we're going to enjoy a lot of these surpluses that we've had in the education fund from the income tax. There's also a deleterious effect across fuel motor taxes and collections have gone down significantly because a lot of people aren't driving into work as much and the point is, we were already with a structural balance coming into this year, between our income tax fund and our general tax fund and that I think is going to be exacerbated in my opinion, it's going to increase and I think next year is going to be a significantly tough year, I think much worse than what we saw the year before but once again, this is just one legislator's opinion on the whole thing and we'll see if it actually transpires that but I would not be surprised to see a significant decrease in our income tax education fund and a subsequent decrease, which we were already basically in the negative on the general fund, that we're going to have to make some pretty significant cuts going forward.

Rep. Val Potter: I back that up too, I think that's the word that most of us are hearing, nobody in the state wants to come out and say it, that we're facing a serious recession right now but all the facts are not in and we still don't know where we're going to be in the next several months, everyone's hopeful that school starts and the businesses all get back to doing what they do and by the end of the year we can say that there won't be a spike and we can get back to semi-normal in 2021 but we still don't know. I think the jury's still out in my opinion but I back what the Senator said, Rep. Briscoe, do you have anything you want to add?

Rep. Joel Briscoe: we should all pray for a positive future because it's all unknown and every two weeks there's something new to learn about this and we just don't know but it's pretty scary.

Rep. Val Potter: To tie that back in with what we're talking about housing, I hear some horror stories and I get emails about people that are really in distress over rent and the fact that some people can't get assistance and the price of housing continues to climb in spite of the economy and the shakiness out there, so we've got a reason to be here and we've got a lot of work to do and as the Senator says, we have some issues regarding the budget and I don't think we can lean back on the legislator for funding going into the next session.

Moving onto the next item which is the CARES Act, Housing Assistance program update.

Jess Peterson: So I thought I'd give a little description of the program first. The program started back on July 1st and we've got 9 agencies helping administer this program as well we've started out with 3 criteria's with the \$600 a week supplemental income and decided to focus on those who have actually lost income. The criteria that we set were: you needed to have a loss of income due to COVID 19, you needed to be at 60% or below AMI and the big one was, you needed to be denied unemployment because those who are obviously getting unemployment were getting that \$600 per week supplemental income, so we started off with that and then mid-July we modified the scope of work a little bit to up the AMI to 100% and we kept everything else the same and we did up the amount per person to \$2,000 to help and by July 31st we made another change to the scope of work and we removed the criteria for being denied unemployment, so now the 2 main criteria's are: you need to be financially effected by COVID 19 and you need to be under 100% AMI. Each agency has a progress sheet that they're supposed to fill out on a weekly basis and as of today, we've approved 281 applicants and funded \$393,000, so now that we've removed the criteria of being denied unemployment, we're expecting a big influx of applications and we've talked to the agencies and talked to 211 and that's our big push is we refer everyone to 211 because most of the time, if they're struggling with rent then they're struggling with something else, so we advise everyone to call 211.

Does anyone have any questions?

Janice Kimball: My question is the limit of \$2,000, is that total or by month?

Jess Peterson: That is by month, so what we can help with is you have \$2,000 for rent and utilities, we can also help with late fees and arears, so if they didn't receive unemployment for the month of arears.

Janice Kimball: Just to give you some scope, we've had some county funding and we're just under about half a million dollars and that's how much we've pushed out to the community in that period of time, our qualifications are similar to what you are doing now, thanks.

Matt Dahl: I was just wondering when someone applies, how quickly is the turnaround for getting them the money and what's that process look like for an individual who starts to go through the process of getting those funds?

Jess Peterson: The turnaround really varies per agency, so it can vary between up to a week because some of the agencies only cut checks once a month and so they're scrambling to really make sure that they get these applicants checks as soon as possible but they're all trying to get them out as quickly as possible due to the situation they know these renters are in.

Mike Gallegos: I do have a question kind of related to Matt's question but a starting with the contact at 211, have they built capacity for the increase calls or are you providing any support to them so they're able to do that? I think part of the issue I've seen thus far on, as early on as people trying to find their way through the process and the time it takes from the initial contact to actually being qualified for rental assistance, so I'm wondering if there are some areas on that path way for assistance that could be shortened.

Jess Peterson: I know we've reached out to 211 and I don't know what 211 has done, I don't know if they've hired more people but I know the agencies have hired more people to help with the applicants, with our criteria we've made it so the agencies don't have to require much documentation, the people just have to sign a document that really states, this is what I'm making, this is how I've been effected and they sign an agreement that we're going to pay their rent and that's pretty much about it. We've really tried to keep the documentation simple so we're not getting 2 weeks' paychecks or a month of paychecks and so we've really tried to simplify it for the applicants to speed this process up and again, I'm not sure what 211 has done, I can reach out and follow up with them if needed.

Jonathan Hardy: I know we've talked to 211 and I know they have the capacity to handle the phone calls but it was more of, do the agencies have enough people to process the applications was more the bottle neck and how much time does it take to produce the documentation, so lowering the documentation standard I think is going to help and our agencies have indicated that they can handle increased capacity and we'll see when the floods come in but right now we have not heard anyone saying they don't have the capacity to handle what's being offered to the program right now.

Michele Weaver: I just wanted to know the geography of the requests?

Jess Peterson: So the two largest are one, here in the Slat Lake County and the other is up in Northern Utah at Bear River as well Weber and Davis county, so those are the biggest ones.

Jonathan Hardy: I'd like to just add that this is the 20million legislature set aside, so we're less than half a million dollars in, we know that the demand will be more but I think there is still a lot of, to be determined with unemployment insurance and what's going to happen there and if there's going to be some future modifications, if there's some extended enhancements then we may significantly under spend the 20million and that's going to lead into this next item, are there other recommendations we would put forward on spending the CARES Act money, both maybe what is not allocated yet or some of this 20millions been allocated for this purpose or other housing things that we could do with it, I just wanted to put that out there.

Rep. Val Potter: Thank you for that. We've asked Rep. Steve Eliason to join us today regarding the CARES Act and he has a proposal out that he's working on right now and we'd like to turn some time over to him.

Rep. Steve Eliason: Thank you, I just wanted to give a brief history and I'm sure this a little familiar to everybody but I think it helps give it the context of what I'm going to talk about, several years ago when the legislature addressed the issue around Pioneer Park, the decision was made to close the road home shelter and break that up into a series of smaller resource centers, at the time the main shelter could shelter over 1,000 people and the decision was made to reduce capacity by hundreds of beds and at the time the belief was the new model of resource centers would reduce demand for homelessness, regardless of the details behind that, suffice to say the demand hasn't been reduced, now how much of that is a function of COVID 19 and having to limit some capacity in the shelters versus people losing employment and being evicted, suffice to say there are talks for a winter shelter are ramping up as we know that we're going to need additional beds beyond what the current resource centers can accommodate. We've been having some conference calls with Jonathan Ball and Jonathan Hardy and those involved in the homeless resource communities and Jonathan Ball told us that CARES Act funding can be used to purchase old hotel facilities or new hotel facilities to use as quarantine resources for those individuals that have tested positive for COVID, there's a number of these that are already being utilized but with the daily counts, luckily it's falling but there's still plenty of demand as I understand it for quarantine facilities. Jonathan Ball raised the question with and I'm not sure if it was with FEMA or the department of treasury but he got word that if a state expends CARES Act funding for this type of facility using it for quarantine facility then what happens to that facility after the pandemic is behind us and the answer was, those facilities become the property of the state. We've been acquiring a motel or multiple hotel properties to use as overflow shelters because currently workforce services spends hundreds of thousands of dollars on motel vouchers when a family of individual shows up to one of our current resource centers and there is the proverbial no room at the end, there's no capacity for them so particularly families have been spread around to numerous hotel properties where they don't have case management facilities and it's difficult for the buses to pick the children up for school, so if we use some CARES Act funding to purchase a hotel or hotel properties, which are probably at the lowest price they've been in some time due to how the lodging industry's been impacted by COVID. They could then be used as quarantine facilities for individuals testing positive for the virus and at that point they could be used for temporary overflow for shelters and thus avoid the ongoing cost of motel vouchers which we have to utilize for years since the capacity has been constraint. Once COVID is behind us, those hotels could be used to resource centers, shelters for the homeless or to house individuals that are temporarily homeless and again thus saving the cost of motel vouchers and I'm going to ask Jonathan Hardy to fill in any of the gaps or correct an errors I may have made.

Jonathan Hardy: You did great job and you were very well informed on the issue and that's why we wanted to have you here today, I think one thing that we've been talking a lot about in the Salt Lake area and anyone who's ever been involved in this conversation has always been, how do we get more housing options on the table, so a single room occupancy has been a big topic of discussion and what we've done recently is, there's been some motel purchases and conversions for single room occupancy

and it's been a really good option for some of these targeted populations as a housing solution going forward, not just the utilization of motels as a temporary solution which is part of the model right now and as Rep. Eliason outlined, an ongoing expense but after needing them for quarantine or other types of options, like overflow and right now they could be permanent housing options as single room occupancy units in the future as well. Those are some things that are part of the discussion and I think it's important when we talk about what this commission wants to do going forward or what we'd recommend in relation to the CARES Act funding, we have 20million on the table that is for rental assistance and we can kind of turn the switch up and down on that on how fast that gets spent and we can kind of decide on where we provide assistance and where we don't especially where we have other options that we want to bring to the table as, we think this would be a good use of the funds because not only it helps us out right now to address the pandemic situation but could be helpful for housing options in the future, that is something to definitely to consider and I'm glad that Rep. Eliason has been talking about this with folks and that's something we could consider as a commission as well.

Rep. Steve Eliason: If I could just add a couple things, one thing that is hard and fast as I understand it and had multiple conversations with Jonathan Ball and Duncan Evans, the CARES Act funding must be expended by December 30th, not December 31st but December 30th and if it's not then the money would lapse back to the federal government so it seems like a lot of money and a lot of time, if that's not fully utilized for rental assistance which I think may be very difficult to spend in that amount of time, this could be a good option and Jonathan Hardy makes a very good point about the potential to transition these facilities into long term and in this case maybe in support of housing. I think if we purchase something that maybe even has a kitchen space then we could transition that into long term housing and I think this option does give us a lot of flexibility both for overflow as well to address the housing crisis that we all know is not easily solved.

Rep. Val Potter: Rep, so considering you've got about 4 and half months before we lose the funding, is there something in process, are you discussing and negotiating a hotel?

Rep. Steve Eliason: There has been a number of properties identified and again this is kinds of serendipitous because the lodging industry has been hammered, however without any clear guidance whether funding is available beyond simply identifying potential properties, nobody's entered into negotiations as far as I know of because there's no guaranteed funding mechanism to purchase such properties so we would need specific guidance, potentially intent language and maybe Jonathan Hardy can answer this question that maybe in the special session that we give additional flexibility by giving them intent language that this pool of 20million could also be used for this additional purpose.

Janice Kimball: I think this is a wonderful idea, it would be nice to have particularly SRO housing but there's going to have to be operating costs going forward for rent assistance to make that work long term so I just wanted to put a place holder with the committee for that, thank you.

Rep. Steve Eliason: I really appreciate that point and the thing we've learned with the resource centers in talking to folks from VOA, I think they had 13 opened case worker spots, the resource model was

never fully funded and we've already seen catholic community services pull out because there wasn't sufficient funding so I guess there shouldn't be any surprise that the demand has not been reduced as anticipated since the full resource model was not fully funded, so we've learned that lesson and we don't want to have to learn it again, now maybe 2 related points I would make would be that the funding stream for motel vouchers could be reutilized for this purpose and allow us to serve a lot more people, if the properties are own free and clear and they are the SRO model, that does bring an ongoing source of revenue in and between the motel voucher funding and we'll just say minimal amount of rental income coming from the SRO's that maybe sufficient without having to seek any additional new funding.

Jonathan Hardy: I'll just say there's a lot of ongoing discussion about the budgets at the homeless resource centers, one thing is we had a lot of money returned in our contract this last year and we talked a lot about not being fully funded and I think a lot of positions were not filled as well, there's a general challenge of getting social work type positions in some of these spots but there is an ongoing discussion on how to balance all those needs and to make sure we're supporting the housing just as much as we are the resource centers and I think they go hand in hand and we don't want to rob peter to pay paul, we want the right services to be at the right place at the right time.

Rep. Val Potter: I just wanted to ask another question to Steve, if a motel was purchased, wouldn't there be the need for fulltime assistance there, would that be additional help or would that be transitioning people from other locations and I know it's kind of an off based question but any idea on that?

Rep. Steve Eliason: It's a good question and there would be some incremental costs but again unlike a traditional resource center where the client is not charged anything, under an SOR model you kind of triage those that are the closest that are stepping out of homelessness and frankly it could be used as a bit of a carrot because you could say, hey you can get your own room and not have to live in a congregate setting if you have some sort of employment and paid something towards your rent. There are some hotel facilities that are near or adjacent to some of the resource centers and one of the great big points I didn't make is, when you purchase a hotel as it's already a transient type, you don't need to seek a zoning change and that makes the solution even more desirable.

Beth Holbrook: Thank you, I wanted to endorse what Janice and Rep. Eliason has said, we have a tracks stop at the ballpark area and due to the lack of immediacy for restroom facilities, they have established and set up a porta-potty in that area and they have attendance watching it and because there are a lot of challenges in that particular area and just outside of our free fair zone but a lot of the times the officers on board on tracks would say, I'm sorry if you don't have fair then you need to get off and that's where they end up getting off and their struggling right now. I just wanted to update you on that and also think this would be a really good move for us to amend some language to incorporate this.

Rep. Joel Briscoe: I'm glad that Beth brought up the issue with the ballpark because of significant part of that community counsel is in my district and I've received regular communication from constituents

about the impact of the homeless resource center there and I'm really supportive of the concept, it was a great frustration to me a couple of years ago that I couldn't get my mayors to talk publically about, the fact that these 3 wonderful new homeless resource centers would not meet the entire needs and I have a couple issues here and one issue is, is COVID 19 depressing the number of people that would normally go and the second issue are people who are simply resistant to being helped and prefer living on the streets because they know how it works and it's something that is familiar to them.

Rep. Steve Eliason: The first question I have no doubt that a large contingent of people resistant to seek help from the resource center because of COVID 19 and we know that they've had outbreaks and despite their best efforts it's going to be an issue no matter what with that many people being in that close proximity of each other, so these types of facilities where their individual units will be a huge pressure relief for being able to relocate individuals from the resource center to their own room, and second question is much more difficult to answer because the reality is, until somebody wants help, it doesn't matter how many resource centers we make available, they have to want to ultimately make that decision.

Andrew Johnston: I support the concept of purchasing the motels and I think it's got a lot of promise and I know the county is using a motel current but not for quarantine facility but a preventative facility to relieve pressure for folks over the age 60 or have higher underline conditions that may make them more susceptible, using that has also helped the rates in the resource centers and all 3 resource centers are consistently full even with people saying they don't want to come in, so the need is above and beyond the current capacity, I fully support this concept and I think the details about where, what kind of facilities will need to be worked out because there will be a lot of discussion around grouping them around resource centers.

Mike Gallegos: Like Andrew said, the concept is great and as part of these types of efforts, one thing we want to make sure moving forward is we talk about various spots of funds out there that could support this and it would be great to see a business plan that actually identifies and before a commitment of funds could be used to purchase an asset like this and rather than having to come back later and having an asset but not the funds to support it, as we're looking at locations let's make sure we're doing the right thing in those particular areas and with the state purchasing the facility, that really takes the local government out of the picture out of any type of input so I'd like to know if there's any type of way to involve the local jurisdiction where these locations going to be because it's the local city that's going to be impacted by any types of concerns.

Rep. Steve Eliason: There's lots of great insights and I appreciate the comments that have been made and this is what I would say, I would look to your committee for support and these have been superficial discussion because there's not guarantee on the funding so for those of us working on this issue, on many different fronts, we need that clarity and guidance to continue on and time is of the essence. If you make a motion to give DWS this authority and then we can work with legislative leadership to get that intent language in the special session because if that can happen in that special session, then we can easily have sufficient time to work with local officials, sellers and operators to make this a reality but

if we don't receive that clarification in that special session, I don't know if or when there will be another special session before the CARES Act funding lapses so time is really of the essence on that guidance.

Rep. Val Potter: I'm glad you clarified that I appreciate what you've done here and everything you've done is exceptional, so thank you.

Rep. Joel Briscoe: I would like to make a motion that the housing affordability commission ask the legislative leadership to include intent language in this special session to authorize DWS to use any available CARES funding current or future to purchase properties that would be appropriate for COVID/quarantine and a potential future SRO permanent supportive housing.

Janice Kimball: I'm sure this goes without saying but I just want to make sure that people that are in units and need the assistance, that we're not doing this at their expense, so that we're making sure we're balancing both.

Matt Dahl: I just wanted to say that I agree with a lot of what the other commission members are saying and I think that providing for flexibility is good, however I think that putting resources first towards doing whatever we can to keep people out of experiencing homelessness and putting money towards rental assistance is key and so if there is additional funds that wouldn't get spent through the program that could be put towards acquiring the hotels, then I could be ok with that.

Rep. Val Potter: Let me just say to Rep. Elaison, as we prepare through this and that the language is good, it's a good thing, it doesn't guarantee that we're going to move ahead with a purchase of a hotel but considering the temperature of the legislator right now, we need some data to show that there is a serious issue and problem here or we'll be wasting our time to even take the language to the legislature, I think there will be enough questions but we need to come up with some kind of information data of what's going on out there to justify why we'd even ask this, does that make sense to you Steve?

Rep. Steve Eliason: Yes and not just wanting to pass that hot potato on to Jonathan Hardy, I'm going to anyway but this is the backbone though of what I would say the data would like, look at our daily case count, if you were to quarantine everyone even on our lower case counts that we're experiencing, you could fill up multiple properties a day so the data for a quarantine facility I think is pretty easy to obtain.

Rep. Val Potter: Seeing no other questions from the commission, we have a motion before us. All those in favor of the motion. Motion passes unanimously. Moving on to Land Use.

Chris Gamvroulas: The Land Use sub-committees have had a couple meetings and what the chairs asked for us to do was to take the 6 items that was listed for the housing affordability statute ideas and let's talk about them. They mentioned #3 is a no brainer and that cities shouldn't be charging more and increasing the costs of housing more than the cost of providing the service, the building services, the development services and planning services and there would be some kind of nexus test in building and planning departments. I can tell you that the sub-committee hasn't come to consensus on that, we lost a

couple of our sub-committee members, Holly sent out this morning another doodle poll for some dates coming up and I'll ask the sub-committee members on the call and see if we can't come with a formal recommendation from the sub-committee one way or the other about the issue of essential nexus and segregated accounts for fees collected in a planning and building department. There's some consensus for the folks in the private sector who are in the sub-committee and I think we just need to have the conversation and maybe take a vote and bring it to the commission. The other sub-committee members like Matt Dahl and Andrew Johnston had some great thoughts about, maybe let's do something that's going to have a bigger impact and there are certainly some other ideas and some actually work together, we've talked about inclusionary zoning for the last 18 months and we had the debate if you remember whether to put the words inclusionary zoning in SB34 and unless we had a really good definition for what that was, it was some concern on our part so we took that out, we really think a nuance approach ought to be, how do we put some bumpers around what inclusionary zoning is, how can we use it and then tie it to things like the residential design standards, in that zoning they put in limiting the size of the home which couldn't be any smaller than 3,000 sq. feet and had to have a 3rd car garage, had to have 100% full brick on the home, this increased the cost of housing in a city about 70,000 per house and there not producing any affordable units. So if you want to have residential design standards as a city and as a policy maker that's something you want to have, so you can vote to have those but in order to enforce them, you would have to give a density bonus to a certain minimum units per acre and some of those units would have to be set aside for affordable units of 80% AMI. Cities are a subdivision of the state, the state is not the united cities of Utah, and the cities only have the powers that are given to them by the state and those powers include, police powers and also includes land use powers, planning and zoning and those powers are enumerated in the statute with guidelines. This is a commission on housing affordability and should the state amend the enabling statutes for cities and how they zone and we think that's a fair conversation. In summary, we're going to do some hard stuff and have a meeting and maybe have some consensus and come back with a recommendation.

Beth Holbrook: I think there is a lot of potential to navigate this and I would like to add an additional element to contemplate in terms of some of this overall perspective and I will say one of the elements of strategic land use and zoning that I think is really a critical element of future growth is that we do it strategically and in other words or less, it makes much more sense to put a density land use and zoning capacity on a transportation corridor via either road or transit of some other element that's going to maximize the value of doing that, I think structurally there's less value of putting that in the proverbially cul-del-sac then there is having it be accessible structurally that you're not having to commute just to get to the commute.

Chris Gamvroulas: In my experience in the last 18 months since SB34 passed was really the two no brainers was the ADU's and putting density buy those corridors you mentioned and the problem is, the 90% of the cities that picked ADU's as their number one strategy, 3 of them have passed ADU ordinances so out of 82 cities and 75 picked ADU's they're still debating what is the definition of and ADU, literally debating that 18 months later so it's been in effect for a long time and they've had an opportunity, the functional reality of what's happening versus the theory and the presentations, it's not happening and we're getting push back and I understand that municipal officials that want to preserve

commercial and those things but at the maceral level of putting housing, particularly workforce housing in an employment center makes all the sense in the world, oh by the way this employment centers on a state highway, so we've hit a brick wall. We should be proposing things that will gain a consensus otherwise they still won't happen.

Rep. Val Potter: Chris is right, the cities are the subdivision of the State of Utah and there's no toucher thing than being at the local level, the city council level planning and zoning and that's closest to the people and they hear from the people all the time on those developments, somehow we need to come up with the state coming up with the cities can accept and it's going to be some serious pushing to make it happen, Chris you're right and some work needs to be done and I'd like to see another report from you in the next meeting, this is a process and I think what we're trying to do is work towards recommendations and ideas that can be put into legislation for the next session in January, that's what we're working for from the way I see it, Rep. Briscoe, do you see it the differently?

Rep. Joel Briscoe: No I definitely like some of the those things on that list and I definitely want to be able to run it past Senator Anderegg and now we've heard report from the working group that the Spatafore's are facilitating and we've heard from the group that Chris is helping convene and I think there's a lot of good stuff in both of them, and I think we have made all the motions we need to make for this special session next Thursday. I like that we have some regular meetings coming up, we'll be meeting in September and this gives us time to go and talk to our constituents groups and pull in Senator Anderegg and decide where we go with these recommendations.

Rep. Val Potter: I would like to see Chris make a report on the next agenda and are there any other agenda items that anyone would like to talk about right now? I'm not seeing any more comments so I'd like to entertain a motion.

Motion to adjourn by Rep. Joel Briscoe at 12:08pm

Next meeting:
September 9, 2020 at 10:00 am