

**Commission on Housing Affordability**  
**Minutes for October 28, 2020**  
Electronic Webinar - Via Zoom

**Members Present**

Senator Jacob Anderegg  
Representative Joel Briscoe  
Representative Val Potter  
Andrew Johnston  
Ben Hart  
Chris Gamvroulas  
Grant Whitaker  
Jaycee Skinner  
Janice Kimball  
Jeff Jones  
Julie Humberstone  
Matt Dahl  
Michele Weaver  
Mike Akerlow  
Mike Gallegos  
Mike Ostermiller

**Representing**

Senator  
Representative  
Representative  
Salt Lake City Council  
Economic Development  
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  
Summit County Economic Development

**Staff Present**

Jonathan Hardy	Director, HCD
Jess Peterson	HCD
Holly Taing	HCD
Rebecca Banner	HCD
Keith Heaton	HCD
David Fields	HCD
Aubrey Larsen	HCD
McKenna Marchant	HCD

**Visitors**

Dave Spatafore  
Ashley Spatafore  
Andrew Gruber  
Bert Granberg  
Angie Cook  
Austin Kimmel  
Francisca Blanc

Karson Eilers  
Louise Knauer  
Melia Dayley  
Michelle Larsen  
Paul Drake  
Peter Asplund  
Rob Jolley  
LaNiece Davenport  
Pauline Zvonkovic  
Kelly Jorgensen  
Benj Becker  
Becky Pickle  
Tara Rollins

### **Welcome and Introductions**

The Commission on Housing Affordability meeting was held electronically via Zoom on October 28, 2020. Senator Anderegg called to order at 10:02am.

**Review of the OPMA guidelines** (see attached)

### **No Public comments**

**Senator Anderegg:** We'll start off with a deep dive into the concept of HRZ's and we have LaNiece Davenport here from the Wasatch Front Regional Council who's ready to address us specific to the review of transit corridors and GIS data.

**LaNiece Davenport:** (links attached - [SB34 General Planning Resources webmap](#) )  
( [new map shown during today's Commission on Housing Affordability meeting](#) )

Thank you Senator, I'm LaNiece Davenport, government relations manager with the WFRC and as most of you know WFRC is the regions Metropolitan planning organization so thank you so much for the opportunity here today, we love the work that comes out of the Commission, great conversations, great policy and we especially liked SB34 sponsored by Senator Anderegg during the 2019 Legislative session and we liked it because it places new planning requirements on local governments in there general planning, mainly on the housing, the land use and transportation elements of a general plan. What it asks local governments to do, is to consider what each of these could have been separate planning initiatives together, so now the housing, land use and transportation now must be considered in concert and it really make the most sense to do that when planning and the idea that matters is where and how we grow, as well where housing goes matters, so when we build housing near transit or near transit investment corridors, it's an effective strategy. When we build housing near transit, we're really able to fully capitalize on the infrastructure investment and it gets people out of their cars so they're walking more, it improves air quality, allows easier access to jobs and other opportunities, it improves health as we're walking and biking more and reduces overall household expenditures which impact housing

affordability and so much more. You may recall in SB34, communities with major transit investment corridors must plan for residential and commercial development around these corridors to improve connection between housing, employment, education, recreation and commerce, as well communities with a fixed guideway transit station have to do one of two things, they shall either encourage higher density or moderate income residential development near major TIC or eliminate or reduce parking requirements for residential development where a resident is less likely to rely on their own vehicle and I'd like to define these terms of major TIC and parking structures in just a minute but first I understand that the HRZ concept being discussed, would tie new housing and workforce housing to transit, so an HRZ would be a value capture tool like an RDA or a CRA that would use the revenue or increment as a way to develop or redevelop workforce housing if and when the project is within a quarter mile of, let's just say of transit, so local governments now under SB34 have a responsibility to plan all kinds of development around transit and HRZ's if in place could be the financing mechanism used for the housing piece of development, so going back to further define these major transit investment corridors and fixed guideway public transit stations because these are the places we could put the housing. SB34 clearly defines these, the major TIC include tracks, front runner and bus rapid transit lines and any potential fixed route bus that's been approved through an inner local agreement, i.e.: the trolley that runs along Park City's main street and fixed guideway public transit stations include the station for the major TIC. There are currently 20 cities that have stations within UTA service district and plans for 10 more cities to have stations, all of this information is listed on our website at: [wfrc.maps.arcgis.com](http://wfrc.maps.arcgis.com) that we've created as a resource for SB34 and has the transit corridors and stations highlighted. WFRC created this with the help of UTA of course and they've been an excellent resource, and I'd like to turn the time over to Bert Granberg, he is WFRC's analytic director.

**Bert Granberg:** (link attached - [interactive map](#))

As LaNiece was mentioning, you can find the information on the website and that map provides an overview of some of the resources that are available to cities as they reconsider their general plan, including population projection and of course the major TIC. I've taken the major TIC information and thrown that into an interactive map that has a little more capability and functionality and to highlight some of that functionality, is to differentiate between the planned infrastructure that qualifies as major TIC and then the existing. As we begin, one of the layers I've got added to this map are the stations that have either a transit oriented development in progress or some kind of a plan that been considered or put forward to do transit development of some kind. Stations right of the start are not always created equal because some of them are actively perusing transit oriented development or at least have a plan in place, the next layer that's added to the map are the centers that have been identified as part of the Wasatch choice visioning process, those cities that are working with WFRC have identified for more intensity in terms of both housing and jobs. To give you an example of other resource data that's available, let's take a look at the employment intensity because we know that it's advantageous to locate housing near jobs and most the data sets I'm showing here where it extends across the WFRC's mag Wasatch front urban area and a few are statewide and kind of setting the stage for maybe a future exploration of these data sets to hone in on candidate areas for the housing zones that are under consideration, so if we turn on a access of opportunities layer, it'll show the access to jobs via transit with the areas that have more jobs within a typical commute by transit and it tends to parallel the

existing transit lines and we've got this data not only for current conditions but for tested out for when the future of the planned transit facilities open. To peaks peoples interest, there are qualified opportunity zones that have been identified and based on senses tracks and places where there are incentives in place for development activity, also with publically owned land, parcels that are owned by either the city, state or some other public entity and they include things such as the airport, fair park, and other state or locally held properties and could be factored in some way in new future or enhanced future uses, basically we have data that shows schools, child care, community centers and services etc. and we can use this type of information to determine if it's appropriate for consideration for housing, hopefully this has been a quick rundown on some of the possibilities of layering data together to look at areas that are more attractive than others, in terms of siting housing in proximity to employment, inclusion within a center that's been identified as added intensity and proximity to some key services. My intent was to expose some possibilities and provoke some discussion, so I'll take any questions.

**Senator Anderegg:** Thank you Bert, looks like we have a couple questions.

**Mike Gallegos:** Thank you Bert for your presentation, the question I have for you, as part of our sustainable communities regional planning grant a few years ago, we had identified low and high opportunity areas and looking at low opportunity areas, is it possible to overlay that here, mostly areas with low mod population and maybe where we have a lack of public transit to get people to jobs or services because the low opportunity areas have not changed much in the recent years.

**LaNiece Davenport:** I'd like to ask you a question before Bert jumps in and if you can remind me, was this HUD data, were these opportunity zones defined or could we pull this up from a HUD chase data?

**Mike Gallegos:** You probably could, I know that Jim Wood has updated it recently so you may pull it from his data.

**Bert Granberg:** If that information is valuable and in a format that we can translate into maps format, we'd be happy to add that and one of the layers that I haven't added to the map and we have readily available are what WFRC has termed as equity focused areas, these are areas at the senses block group level, there's a higher concentration of low income households, zero car households, seniors and ethnic minorities.

**Janice Kimball:** I'm wondering if you have an overlay of zoning and could you identify which sites have multifamily zoning in place?

**Bert Granberg:** That's a great question and a timely one, we are just finishing up a round of connecting with cities and getting their update general plan of map layers, we call this generalized future land use and it does include specifically areas that cities have identified for multifamily housing allowances but it's not zoning specific data, WFRC doesn't work with zoning data a lot because that's sort of what's allowed right now, we tend to have an outlook on longer term as well, tend to gravitate towards the general plan designation, we will be publishing publically within the next week or two that data layer.

**Janice Kimball:** Very excited, thank you.

**Michele Weaver:** You are the Wasatch front regional council and I don't know how big your map is but I was just wondering if you cover the whole State?

**Bert Granberg:** Some of these layers currently cover the whole state but others, we're working with partners like UDOT to expand to cover the whole state but primarily the data that's available is for Brigham City down to the southern Salt Lake County border, then we have partner data that we get from Mountain Land Association of Governments that continue south to Santaquin, so some of the layers are state wide.

**Michele Weaver:** Just a follow up question then, on your zoning that you're you looking, are you doing that state wide or is it just for the Wasatch front?

**Bert Granberg:** Currently that is for the WFRC and Mountain Land Association of Governments area, I'm not sure if there's a state agency level interest yet, I don't think we've identified one but we'd be happy to partner if that's something of interest.

**Michele Weaver:** Thank you

**Dave Spatafore:** I just have a brief comment based on the work that you're leading and where we're working on the HRZ concept, the next data point that would be very good for this map is the listing of vacant or underutilized government owned parcels that could be added to this heat map because then it could show us the areas that we could focus on to try to look at the creation or development of affordable housing.

**Bert Granberg:** Yeah, we took a quick stab at that in trying to use the county level property parcel data to look for tax exempt status which would indicate government ownership and filtering out the tax exempt property that's owned by religious institutions and other non-profits and we can certainly work on but one caution is, we can get vacant properties but we'd be missing sort of that underutilized properties.

**Dave Spatafore:** You haven't been part of the discussion but what we are talking about is having the various levels of government to produce that inventory so you won't have to do it but the governments would have to, then we could take that information from the various governments providing the list of vacant or underutilized government properties and that's what you could utilize to put on your heat map.

**Bert Granberg:** We'd be happy to do it.

**Rep. Joel Briscoe:** To that point, I've spent some time on the phone with Kevin Jacobs from Salt Lake County Assessor and he ran a map of Salt Lake County for all vacant properties under 0.25 acre and properties are classified apparently, so the first file contains all vacant parcels less than 0.25 acres, we could have him change that designation and there's a column at the end of the spreadsheet that shows which city and the second file contains data on all buildings, both residential and commercial that have been classified as fair or poor condition and that are older than 40 years old, we can suggest other things for him to sort, I'll get this forwarded on to WFRC and see if Bert can make an overlay out of it.

**Bert Granberg:** That sounds great, that information exists in the assessor's data base for all of our urban counties and it's just a matter of them assisting to figure out how to kind of tease it out of the parcel information that they have and if you have specific criteria then we can work with the assessors to collect that data and would make a fantastic addition to the map.

**Senator Anderegg:** In essence, that's what we are proposing to put together in this bill, is what that criteria would be and Rep. Briscoe, my understanding is that Salt Lake County is further ahead than most other counties in identifying their surplus properties and I like Bert's suggestion of also identifying all underutilized properties. I think taking 5 or 6 of your maps together and really help us narrow in on that nexus, I would imagine we're talking within a certain area out from a TIC, a fixed guideline, BRT, or a dedicated bus line and then going back to Michele Weaver's question regarding rural, their TIC are not transit lines and many instances aren't even bus lines and what would be really great is if we could put this all together, you certainly have the resources at your fingertips because you can bring the data in and put it together but is WFRC the right vehicle for us to do this state wide, yes you are able to do it but is AGRC a better fit for what we're talking about, so a better question is are you the ones that would be the best for a state wide analysis of what we're looking at?

**Bert Granberg:** That's a great question and the ARGC is the state GIS coordination office and some of the data layers including the parcels data that is shared to them by the assessors, we pulled from them and we work closely with them and I think you're right, from a state wide perspective they are probably the right lead for this, they're very capable and we have a great working relationship and we'd be happy to hand this off and play a supporting role going forward.

**Senator Anderegg:** That's one of things we do here, is a deep dive into this and to really assess what that next nexus needs to look like, what data sets, what data points so we can find those sweet spots and identify what the policy statute needs to look like, for instance the creation of the data set like UDOT already has their list of 10,000+ parcels but we also need to provide some criteria but we want to figure out how you collect the data and what we can do to take that data to help us identify along these transit investment corridors as we've defined in statute and make sure the cities have a clear understanding of the tool we have in an HRZ, and to utilize it in the best way.

**Jonathan Hardy:** I wanted to just mention, I know we're talking a lot about public parcels but I also think we're are talking in the context of the areas around these transit corridors and we want increased production, that wouldn't be exclusive to public parcels and we'd want to see HRZ with public and

private parcels combined to make this happen and with Sb3 I'm thinking of the context of SB34 with both our office WRFC's office to get information of what the cities are planning on doing, if one of the strategies we identify is some of the redevelopment commercial centers and if we could get more targeted information as part of that submission, I think that would help us out and also overlaying what zoning they have in place to help accommodate that, I think those are kind of the things we want to see as additional items with the concepts of SB34 that would help us pin point, what we think should happen in these areas and what is being planned for form the cities.

**Bert Granberg:** Yeah, the formula for figuring out where these things are, are pretty easy and there's data that cities and the tax commission have access to, so there's lots of possibilities but I think maybe the best would be just reaching out and asking citifies to self-identify their targets.

**LaNiece Davenport:** Can I jump in here, we've been given these moderate income plans that highlight where communities are going to develop around transit corridors and stations, they're required to do that already, so we can use that as our first step in gathering that information, we already have that and we'll have the report here in about a month and half and for us it would be helpful is we had actual locations of redevelopment or planned development.

**Senator Anderegg:** Thank you. Bert, does this conclude your aspect of this presentation?

**Bert Granberg:** It does and just a final word, if there's interest in coordinating more broadly with the assessors or with the state GIS coordination office, AGRC, I'd be happy to be part of that discussion, I think it would be pretty straight forward and we could probably make some progress on really valuable data.

**Senator Anderegg:** I think as we move forward with some drafting instructions with my attorney, Peter Asplund, it might be good to have you in the room to help provide some guidance as to how and what we would need to put in the statute to get that information on a regular basis, looks like we have another question from Mike.

**Mike Gallegos:** Yes, thank you and I've had some conversation on a couple cities in the county on underutilized properties and they do have that, I'd be surprised if they don't have that list already, in speaking with them, part of the issue there is the property owners are asking for a lot for that land and as the discussion becomes more public, that'll possibly drive up the cost just like anything else does where we start looking at development opportunities, just wanted to give everyone a heads up here.

**Senator Anderegg:** That makes sense as it stands to reason with the market, and I would say that we maybe have to have another offline deep dive discussion is to what specifically do we need to ask for and from whom and how's that supposed to come in to a centralized place and they can then take the information and make it what we need it to be.

**Jonathan Hardy:** I do have another question, we talk a lot about this proximity to these transit corridors and I know I've heard quarter mile throughout this presentation, I think in other venues and Grant, you can correct me if I'm wrong, in some of our housing investments we've started at half or even 3 quarters of a mile from these corridors being targeted areas, so this may be helpful in the offline conversation when we create this heat map is hone in on that it's within a proximity that we all agree on that's reasonable for housing development and close to these corridors as well.

**Grant Whitaker:** Yes Jonathan, our QAP has those 4 tracks and front runner within a 3<sup>rd</sup> of a mile of a stop and for some of the bus lines, the ones that are more permanent like 700 East and State Street and so forth, those I believe are the ones that are within a half mile, there are additional points for those given.

**Senator Anderegg:** Grant, can I ask you a question, if we're talking about setting up an HRZ, are we talking about having a value added capture on the property taxes of the commercial establishments or are we also including residential in there? What do you guys think?

**Jonathan Hardy:** Personally I think you should have all options on the table to capture tax increment so whatever's available to help out with that, I think if we're talking about creating these areas, any option to utilize the tax increment is palatable and should be on the table.

**Senator Anderegg:** I agree, we do have another question from Michele.

**Michele Weaver:** Thank you, I just wanted to hit on the quarter mile from the main transit corridor and I'm wondering if that is far enough with some of the zoning we have in rural areas and wondering if we need to expand that out a little bit, maybe I need to bring this to the rural committee and ask them.

**Senator Anderegg:** I personally think a quarter mile is too short, I think a mile is too long and I would favor something in-between probably 3 quarters to a half and I just think if you have a walkable distance, it's usually less than half a mile.

**Michele Weaver:** I agree but I'd like to hear from rural folks and see what they say.

**Andrew Gruber:** Senator, can I make a comment on this point, you raised two questions, first is the area that you would consider TOD that perhaps a HRZ concept might apply a quarter mile, half mile whatever the distance is and typically the development impacts from having high capacity transit service, and this doesn't get it in Michele's point in rural directly but for high capacity transit service, the real impacts on density of development, walkability and property values. Property values is typically within the quarter mile area and that's just sort of intuitively if you think about it, how far are people willing to walk or change their community design if they're in proximity to a front runner station or a tracks station, so it's not a magic distance but there's a pretty steep drop off in terms of development intensity or impact on property values as you get beyond that quarter mile, and if what we're talking about here relating to the next question Senator that you asked of, what are the incremental values that we're attempting to



capture here, as we talk about value capture associated with transportation infrastructure, that also ties to the distance and the more you can spread the capture of value to do reinvestment through a TRZ in transportation and an HRZ in housing the more you spread the capture among all the taxing amenities, the less of an impact you'll have and the more revenue you'll have to be able to contribute to making the kind of development that we actually need, that provides housing affordability in choice and limits traffic congestion and better air quality and better quality of life etc.

**Senator Anderegg:** That makes sense and Andrew, I may need to pick your brain offline a little more and probably someone from the league just to figure out exactly word and craft this so it accomplishes what we need. We have a couple more questions.

**Andrew Johnston:** Thank you, I agree with Andrew Gruber and the walkability piece is clearly a quarter mile and if we're going to tie that into a larger discussion about taxing and rates, I think that's worthy especially in the rural areas where the impact is very different but if we're creating the walkability, the quarter mile isn't really going to work well.

**Matt Dahl:** Thank you, I also agree with the Andrew's and as we look at how ever the HRZ is structured, one thing that needs to be considered is, currently the way residential is taxed and the amount of resources you have, whether it's a primarily residential development versus if you have commercial and those are very different things and need to be factored in.

**Senator Anderegg:** Thank you for your comments and I know we've already touched on the GIS overlays and other key elements that are necessary from the agenda, Jonathan is there anyone else that was designed to discuss or add to this?

**Jonathan Hardy:** I don't want to put Chris on the spot but we talk a lot about this in the policy realm and we want to make sure that developers will pick up act upon where we're trying to create and I just want to make sure we're not missing anything from that side, I know Mike brought this up about parcels, the asking price is too high to get it redeveloped and that could be a function of what's allowed to be used on the land or that there's incentives in place, and would be nice to get a private sector side discussion on anything we're missing out on these concepts, so we're not just creating something that will sit on the shelf, I don't know if Chris has anything to add or if we should just talk more offline about it.

**Senator Anderegg:** I think it would be good to talk more about it offline, if that's ok Jonathan?

**Jonathan Hardy:** Yes, it is.

**Senator Anderegg:** We do have Karson Eilers from the League of Cities and Towns, the time is yours

**Karson Eilers:** Thank you Senator, I think mostly everything I would of said has been covered but I wanted to add one more comment about the GIS discussion and that was, whether qualified opportunities zones could play into this consideration and whether we could take advantage and

leverage federal funding opportunities to enhance these tools, it's just been something that's been crossing my mind in these discussions.

**Senator Anderegg:** Karson, that's a good suggestion and Chris, if you're feeling up to the task and possibly trying to do an overlay with the federal opportunity zones, to see if maybe there's a nexus there and we could do this offline. Seeing no further comments, we'll move on to the updates with the sub-committees and we'll start off with Dave and Ashley Spatafore.

**Ashley Spatafore:** Thank you Senator, the good news if we don't really have a long update so we'll be brief. We have the 3 different sub-groups that we've been working on, production and preservation lead to as part of the HRZ discussion, so that now will just be whatever legislative drafting meetings we have and we can bring it back to that group, so no update on that. Our other topics are expanded mediation and we're not ready for a full presentation yet but the group met internally Monday and I'm in the process of summarizing what we discussed, but the next steps will be to meet with the apartment association to make sure it's a mutually beneficial program so by next commission meeting, we should have an update for you.

**Dave Spatafore:** If I can interject, mediation proves to be very successful in Salt Lake and Tooele County and various spots throughout the state and if we are successful in putting together a program in conjunction with the apartment association and landlords, we may want to ask for a state appropriation, potentially up to 500,000 to provide for mediation services between landlords and tenants to try and keep the relationship good, education high and keep folks in their apartments with rents being paid.

**Senator Anderegg:** Thanks Dave, I'm wondering if this is something being contemplated that we would include in this bill or is this something that is being discussed with the landlords, renter's apartment association on a separate piece of legislation, I just want to make sure we're not duplicating efforts and I'm trying to identify outside of policy, what things we might need, one aspect is tenant/landlord and the other aspect is, are we going to need to provide some resources to either Wasatch front regional council or AGRC for this concept that we're doing with the overlay, so back to my question are we looking to include an aspect in this bill, what are you wanting to do?

**Ashley Spatafore:** The governments COVID task force, the apartments association, Utah housing coalition and a hand full of other people were on their discussing mediation program for COVID, using COVID dollars, so part of what our request is looking at taking some of those useful components that were deemed beneficial to both landlords and tenants and trying to compose a state program, outside of the COVID dollars.

**Dave Spatafore:** To be more specific, after we put those concepts together and meet with the apartment association and landlords, I think we'll have a better understanding if anyone else if making a request for that, so at our next meeting we'll have a more specific answer but at this point in time, if the request comes from the commission and the commission approves, I think we're looking at \$500,000.

**Senator Anderegg:** When are you meeting with them again, the reason I'm asking is because I know the Governors working on his budget requests and they won't make that public until January but I know they're compiling what they'd like to put in to this and they've reached out to us, so I've got to get back to him in somewhat short order.

**Ashley Spatafore:** We haven't set up a meeting, we had just met with our group internally but we can reach out to Mike after this meeting to move forward as soon as possible, our goal is to have something to you by the next meeting on Nov 12<sup>th</sup>.

**Senator Anderegg:** I might be able to report back to the governor that there will be a request but we're fine tuning what the exact request amount is and find out how much time they can give us, I would like to just have something included in the governor's budget request before it comes over to the legislature, it just helps our cause.

**Dave Spatafore:** What we'll do Senator, is send you the one page that we have that Mark Bushard and his group advocated to the governor using COVID funds for mediation during COVID, so we'll send this to you and you might want to share it with the governor's office and take a look at maybe extending this with general fund revenues throughout the state for the fiscal year 2020.

**Senator Anderegg:** Let's talk offline more, I've got another question or comment from Michele.

**Michele Weaver:** Thank you Senator, I was wondering with that meeting with the apartment association or even with this group in general, if we should be talking about the CDC's moratorium ending December 31<sup>st</sup> on the evictions, I don't know if that's something that this subgroup should take on, and I've been in a housing conference all week and the housing coalition brought that up yesterday as a potential problem that we should be forward thinking on, and the concern is that the feds won't get anything passed and we could be facing a lot of foreclosures come January, depending on what happens in the next couple months.

**Senator Anderegg:** The question is of that Michele, are you suggesting we look at how we handle the federal suasion of that moratorium or are you suggesting we look at the aspects of setting up a Utah moratorium?

**Michele Weaver:** Aspects of setting up a State mitigation if the feds don't come through, I know they said on the conference yesterday that a lot of states are setting stuff up and I don't know if it's something we can just have waiting in the wings, because if the feds don't come through with something then it just seems like it's something we should be thinking about in case something happens, so maybe we should be talking about an ask.

**Senator Anderegg:** Ok, looks like we have another comment specifically related to this topic from Tara Rollins

**Tara Rollins:** I appreciate Michele bringing this up because I really think there needs to be a spin off group to discuss this and the report back to the commission on really what we might be faced with after the moratorium ends, I think there's a lot of data out there that we can look at, as well as some of the best practices that are happening, it is extremely scary to think about people being faced with evictions during some of the coldest months in Utah, where are they going to go etc. and I appreciate Michele bringing this up and having the conversation about that and I think it needs to be at the State level.

**Senator Anderegg:** I appreciate that Tara and it looks like you just volunteered to help head up a group for that discussion, did I hear that correctly, can we specifically give you that assignment and have you come back to us and present to us in the next commission meeting and not just hammer on but actually come back with ideas and recommendations and let myself and Jonathan know when you're ready.

**Tara Rollins:** Yes, we will take that on.

**Michele Weaver:** I think its needs to encompass both the small landlords that need to pay their payments as well as their tenants, so not just the tenants but also needs to encompass what can we do for those landlords because they need to not be out as well.

**Tara Rollins:** Correct and I think that's one of the things we need to do is identify the smaller landlords because we keep hearing about them but right now from the information that I'm looking at, it's the corporate port folio's collecting the funding from the state right now, so we will dig into that a bit more and definitely be able to give you a presentation.

**Senator Anderegg:** Thank you Tara, lets come back to Dave and Ashley Spatafore to finish their presentation seeing no further questions or comments.

**Ashley Spatafore:** The only other update we have is the 3<sup>rd</sup> component that we were looking at originally was rental assistance, and based on our last commission meeting and proposing a rental assistance program for the state isn't really a feasible option right now but we did discuss looking at better data to maybe show a state incentive or how the state could benefit from a rental assistance program, and we had another meeting on Monday with our group and the next steps on that are twofold, Tara and Francisca of the housing coalition received a federal grant to collect some information related to something similar to what we were talking about and they're in the process of working that through that and they're also going to identify a prioritized list, a potential data points that could maybe get us moving in the right direction and then Tara and Francisca suggested that Dave and I work with Tricia Davis with DWS that oversees the HMIS Data to look at maybe what the opportunities are and the best points of data to collect, so that will be our next meeting and Dave and I will do and report back, so as of now there are no reports or requests from the commission.

**Senator Anderegg:** Ok, it looks like the governor's office is going to want to have concrete numbers next week after the election, so we have just a little bit of time but the sooner the better but if we are going to make an specific appropriations request as we look at these different aspect, I would ask that you

contact me or Rep. Potter or Rep. Briscoe and let's have those conversations. Ashley thank you, does that conclude any other aspects of your presentation?

**Ashley Spatafore:** That's it, thank you.

**Senator Anderegg:** Let's move on now, Michele Weaver the time is yours to talk about your rural subcommittee group and your updates.

**Michele Weaver:** Thank you, we had a meeting last week and I do have some updates, it was pretty much an overview and introduction of everyone and what subcommittees are going on currently with the commission, what we would like to focus on. We did talk about the definition of rural and we've got a group working on that and I talked with Sharlene Wilde yesterday who is leading that group, she had some really good suggestions that she's going to be bringing to our meeting next week, we want to think about this in both the scope of what the rural subcommittee is going to work and focus on as well how that should look in policy and our concern is that defining rural with the state size, county, and cities of the certain class could bring in some communities that maybe have those resources available to them and leave out some remote communities, so we want to be sure that we're inclusive and looks like the suggestion that could come in is maybe some menu options, similar to what we did with the bill. We talked about additional invitees and we did have a really good turnout but we felt some additional leadership should be included, Commissioner Jerry Taylor was invited and accepted, someone from the Sorenson impact center, Commissioner Chris Parker and Tammy Pearson and looking at someone from the housing authority. We are also looking at prioritizing some of the bigger challenges to see what the lower hanging fruit is possibly and that's pretty much about it unless I'm forgetting something Rep. Briscoe, did I capture pretty much how the meeting went?

**Rep. Joel Briscoe:** Yes, I think you used the term remote but Mayor Niehaus suggested that sometimes it's more than an issue of ruralness, it's an issue of being remote or far away so that's something we're looking at in terms of us helping define rural, one of the commission members did a little search during the meeting and sent us an information piece indicating that the United States Federal Government has 15 definitions of rural depending upon which federal agency you're working from, and our goal is to have fewer definitions than the federal government, I told Michele when you drive through a rural area, you know it and recognize it and then you may have to put words to define it but we're going to wrestle with it and that's all I have to add to that.

**Senator Anderegg:** Might I suggest Rep. Briscoe as a member of the legislature as well, I am fairly certain that rural is probably already defined in our statute somewhere, it might be good to contact Peter and see what the existing definition is and then see what nuance tweaks under this proposed section of code you might want to make.

**Rep. Joel Briscoe:** I've been taking notes and I bet Peter's been taking notes as well but that's a good idea, thank you Mr. Chair.

**Senator Anderegg:** I just want to encourage you once again to look at how you would need us to implement the concepts we're discussing with these policies in this version of the bill and how we're going to tweak them specifically for rural. Seeing no further questions we will move onto Land Use subcommittee, I'm not sure that they are ready or have finalized some stuff but Chris, if you're ready and available, the time is yours

**Chris Gamvroulas:** Yeah, going back to the HRZ discussion really quickly, we'll be getting with our group to be coming up with some wish list items to throw in there on the land use side and as far as the land use concepts, we're proceeding forward with getting some draft language on collections on fees, something more in line of the impact the act, the rough proportionality test and those kind of things and then wanting to peruse some of the inclusionary zoning in the future legislative session but want to get some draft language and concepts around that and see what that looks like, I don't have anything else unless someone has a question for me.

**Senator Anderegg:** Thank you Chris, I appreciate that and seeing no further questions I would simply say, that if you guys come in with what the incentives might be, like what we were just talking about for the developers, that would be very helpful but you and I and some others could sit down with Peter Asplund and work through what these specific policy requests would be and Peter can go putting together that language as we're proposing that to the commission, and once again I want all commission members to remember what we're doing here is, we'll need to come back for a final vote for the commission and it helps me as we move through the legislative process to say, this is what we're asking this year, this is the policy changes, these are what we want to set up etc. I'm not seeing any questions from the committee and I look forward to seeing what the land use subcommittee comes back with and with that, I want to thank everyone for their efforts and we'll likely be meeting again before now and Thanksgiving and we're going to continue to push this rope up the hill and see if we can't get some language put together in short order that the commission can consider, seeing no other comments or question, I will come to Rep. Briscoe for a final motion.

**Motion to adjourn by Rep. Briscoe at 11:26am**

**Next Meetings:** November 12, 2020 at 10:00am