

Commission on Housing Affordability
Minutes for December 9, 2020
Electronic Webinar - Via Zoom

Members Present

Senator Jacob Anderegg
Representative Joel Briscoe
Representative Steve Waldrip
Andrew Johnston
Ben Hart
Beth Holbrook
Chris Gamvroulas
Grant Whitaker
Janice Kimball
Jeff Jones
Matt Dahl
Michele Weaver
Mike Akerlow
Mike Gallegos
Mike Ostermiller

Representing

Senator
Representative
Representative
Salt Lake City Council
Economic Development
UTA
Utah Homebuilders Association
Utah Housing Corporation
Housing Connect
Summit County Economic Development
Utah Redevelopment Association
Rural Community Assistance Corporation
Community Development Corporation of Utah
Salt Lake County
Summit County Economic Development

Absent Members

Chris Condie
Julie Humberstone
Kathy Bounous

Staff Present

Jonathan Hardy	Director, HCD
Jess Peterson	HCD
Holly Taing	HCD
Keith Heaton	HCD
Rebecca Banner	HCD
David Fields	HCD
Christina Davis	HCD

Visitors

Peter Asplund
Dave Spatafore
Ashley Spatafore
Tara Rollins
Francisca Blanc

Heather Lester
Kaitlyn Pieper
Karson Eilers
LaNiece Davenport
Megan Ryan
Melia Dayley
Susan Olsen
Paul Anderson
Rebecca Ward
Steve Erickson
Jim Wood
Brook McCarrick
Bert Granberg
Andrew Gruber
Bill Tibbitts
Andi Beadles
Angela Price
Becky Pickle
Carrie Butler
Jason Glidden
John Drew
Karen Madsen
Lani-Eggertsen-Goff
Meredith Roberts

Welcome and Introductions

The Commission on Housing Affordability Board meeting was held electronically via Zoom on: December 9, 2020. Senator Anderegg called to order at 10:04am.

Review of OPMA statement read by Senator Anderegg.

Approval of Minutes: November 12, 2020

Motion to approve the minutes by Michele Weaver. Motion carries. All unanimous.

Public comments:

Steve Erickson: I was reading the Salt Lake Tribune this morning and there were some rather encouraging bits of news around the budget, in particular they were discussing potential bonding as well as one time money for construction projects, I would like to throw it out to the group to entertain, that we revisit your bill SB39 from last year Senator and the funding for the match Gap financing for PAB to develop affordable housing, as you all remember there was some money that was put aside for that and then retracted during the early months of the COVID crisis and it should be back on the table for discussion, so I'd like to make the suggestion that the commission consider empowering it's co-chairs to

speak to leadership about that subject and see if we can't revive the discussion of getting some money into the game to develop some housing, we set that aside this interim session for the commission because of the understanding there wasn't going to be much of an opportunity to get that money, I think that may be changed now and we ought to pursue it, that's my suggestion and comment. Thank you.

Senator Anderegg: Steve, thank you very much, I will say that, that is worth having a discussion on probably between now and January, I will also say that we were cut all the way back but we did get some money in June of the 10million that was approved during the legislative session, we ultimately got 5million of that and was split 2.5million to the private activity bonds and 2.5million into the preservation fund that was created with the private philanthropic efforts as well, opposed to a big discussion right now, I think it's something we really marinate on and let me go in and find out from our fiscal analyst where we're at and maybe it's a worth a discussion for our next meeting because I anticipate we'll need at least one or two more meetings with some of the stuff I plan on bringing up today. Seeing no further comments or questions, we'll move on to a motion from Jonathan Hardy.

Jonathan Hardy: With the departure of Rep. Potter, we're responsible for electing a new co-chair for the commission and I would move to nominate Rep. Steve Waldrip as the new co-chair for the Commission on Housing Affordability. Motion carries. All unanimous.

Senator Anderegg: Thank you and congratulations, I will go ahead and hand it over to Rep. Waldrip.

Rep. Waldrip: Thank you Senator, I appreciate your faith and confidence and guidance on this, I'm looking forward to it. We'll move on to the legislation update with Andrew Gruber and Bert Granberg.

Andrew Gruber: Thank you all for inviting us to be with you today, I'm Andrew Gruber, executive director of the Wasatch Front Regional Council and there's so much work to do on this issue and it's a pleasure to be able to work with you and all the members of the commission and I want to be clear, even though this item we're talking about now is on the agenda under a legislative item, we are actually not proposing any new legislation at this time, rather what we're doing is providing an update on discussions that underway about coordinating and sharing data to facilitate good policies and decisions being made about housing and community development. This commission has longed discussed and recognized that the way we design our communities and our infrastructure, directly effects household affordability, so if we coordinate housing development with transportation infrastructure and economic opportunities, we reduce housing and commuting expenses, we increase access to jobs and education opportunities, reduce traffic congestion, air pollution etc. At a recent commission on housing affordability meeting, WFRC described and displayed to you some of the data and mapping that's available and utilized now in planning and decision making for infrastructure investment, during that meeting you may recall there was discussion it may be beneficial to enhance the consideration of other factors and data in our policies and decisions, so by organizing and displaying all of this information in a GIS map environment, we could facilitate better decision making by both public and private sector actors, following those discussion, we've initiated another set of other discussions with a broad set of

stakeholders including, cities, counties, accessors, DWS, automated geographic reference center etc. and our shared objective is to determine what data should be assembled by home, how, in what format that would provide the greatest value for decision making around housing and other infrastructure decisions to reach shared benefits, with that overall context, I'm now going to turn over the time to Bert Granberg, WFRC's director of analytics to briefly describe two concepts that we are discussing and working on.

Bert Granberg: Thank you Andrew, so the two concepts are fairly simple and the first is to put in place a process that creates an annual or potentially every two year housing unit inventory, this would be a report and map layer using GIS that shows housing types and their unit counts, distribution of different types of housing and how many units they're providing at those locations and this would build on existing available data that supports the 911 system currently and also the county tax assessment process, the hope with this housing data inventory would allow for a better understanding of the housing landscape and related trans especially in high growth areas that are near existing or planned major transportation investments, so concept one is the annual or every two year housing unit inventory and concept number two is the creating of a one stop online repository for completed state level and regionally significant plans and an archive of their supporting resources.

Rep. Waldrip: Thank you, I'd like to ask a question, so if I heard you correctly, you haven't determined who would be the repository of that information at this point, is that right?

Andrew Gruber: That's right, the goal is that there is a central repository that holds and makes all this information available to all stakeholders, now where the repository lives, there's a variety of options for that and we're evaluating and talking about that, that's one of the things we're sorting out and haven't quite answered yet.

Rep. Briscoe: I think one of the best things that's happening with the commission on housing affordability is that we've have lots of people talking, we're all in a similar boat and didn't always know who was on each one of the oars and in your discussions and your analysis, how much of this can be done with current resources, is that a fair question?

Andrew Gruber: It absolutely is and I think the answer to that is, most if not all but we haven't quite figured that out yet, I don't actually see either of these concepts that's been mentioned, the data repository or the housing unit annual or bi-annual report is actually being a real question of needing a significant additional resources, its rather a matter of coordinating the work that's happening already, I think there might be some modest effort or cost involved standing it up for the first time but Rep. Potter, we're not looking at this as a resource ask or questions, it's really more about making sure that everybody's working together as effectively as possible.

Rep. Potter: As one of those guys who got a BA and not a BS because I took all the English classes and political science classes, GIS people are somewhat like Jedi knights to me, they're like magicians because what they can pull off those sheets and put in, it's pretty amazing stuff but I guess the only reason why I

ask the question is, if there is a legitimate cost there that's quantifiable that we get it into the picture for this year, given the legislatures starting a week earlier and things are moving quickly and I'm not asking for us to create costs where there are no costs but I don't want us to ignore them if they are there and I appreciate all your efforts on this and I think if we can get this put together then it can be a great asset to many, thank you.

Jim Wood: I'm with the Gardner Policy Institute and this would be a real leap forward if we can get a centralized database and GIS capability access data, we do a lot of work on housing and struggle when we need to get that data from a County and to have it centralized would really be valuable with the sort of data that would be provided at almost our fingertips, I know demographics from our office has talked to Bert about coordination with GPI and I'm excited about it as well, I work on the housing area and we would love to coordinate and support in every way, I think it's a terrific idea Andrew and Bert.

Mike Akerlow: These are great tools and I was looking at the GIS mapping that you presented a couple meetings ago and it's incredible, what a great tool but I did have a couple more in the weeds questions, my first one is about that tool you showed us during that meeting, is it possible to add a layers on there that would include the information that Utah housing corporation for tax credits, for example qualified census tracts, areas of opportunity according to their requirements and those kinds of things, I think it might be helpful for people who are looking for when you're doing tax credits, it really takes some efforts to find the right property that can give you the right points and so forth, I'm wondering if that's something that can be added on to that system? My second in the weeds question is on the housing inventory, is that going to get down the a number of units, whether they are tax credit projects or affordability or what kind of data would we get out of that inventory?

Bert Granberg: I think that would be possible but I'd have to have someone point me at where the authoritative information exists and we have some of that in terms of where the qualified opportunity zones are but we probable don't have all of what your describing so maybe a follow up and you could suggest some resources for our staff to look at.

Senator Anderegg: If you don't mind, I'm going to jump in here and just say absolutely Mike, we can put whatever we want into this so long as the data said is available and it is consistent with what we're trying to show, there could be multiple layers we look at such as this and that and then combining them and how they overlap or where those sweet spots are, the capabilities there and as long as we have a data set that is workable and the data is good and accurate then it certainly helps our cause.

Michele Weaver: I know we've had this conversation a little bit in the past and I'm glad to hear that there would be a centralized repository, do we need to set up something ARGIS to ensure that this is statewide, what are the steps to get the rest of the state involved?

Andrew Gruber: I think at this point it's undetermined as it is the case with a variety of elements with this as to what the right geography is for this, it may be that it's feasible to do it statewide, that the data exists statewide and it may also be that the data does not exist in the way that we want it and that we

would conceivably start out with doing it only in 1st and 2nd class counties where the accessors have more robust information, this is one of the things I think we need to sort out as to what's feasible and just a basic answer Michele, this is something we're still thinking about and sorting out.

Rep. Waldrip: Let me just confirm something that I think I understand Andrew that will help is, what you are doing today is simply giving a heads up that this planning process is in process and I'm assuming, if anyone has any specific requests or comments, they can get with you offline to make sure that certain data sets are in your process and if they have anything to add to that.

Andrew Gruber: That's correct and our objective here is to give an update and give as Senator Anderegg said, the expectation that this body will hold one or perhaps two additional meetings prior to the legislative session, what we'd offer is to continue the conversations with all the parties that we talked about and then report back maybe the first meeting after the new year and at that point, we may be able to say that we all collectively think that legislative action would be helpful or would not be needed and at that point it might make sense to have some sort of endorsement or action.

Senator Anderegg: I just want to say I do think that this is a component that will require some legislative action as Rep. Briscoe is right, there's probably going to be some financial component to this and we're going to need to take into consideration, we do need to identify where the home ought to be and I think it might be the state AGRC and so what I'd like to see more than anything Andrew is, talking from the legislation and some of the suggestions that could be put in are fantastic but to kind of get us an assessment of what do we have, what do we want in it, where are we deficient because that will help us create the scope of the language to help us but I do think it ought to be statewide and the value of it could be immense as we try to implement further actions for this commission as well as other policies and to that end, as you work through this one of the major components in the legislation, we need to be as accurate and detailed as possible to ensure it has the proper home, proper resources and we know what we're getting out of it in the first phases, thank you.

Andrew Gruber: Just a brief comment concluding what Senator Anderegg stated before, there's so much information that can be put in here and at times a little overwhelming with all the data out there but really it's a matter of driving wisdom and meaning from all of that data to be able to make good decisions and that's what we're trying to sort out so that this information is available for this group and for others and I think with a tool like this benefits from being flexible and dynamic so we we'll take this feedback and continue working these issues through and plan to report back at the next meeting.

Rep. Waldrip: Thank you for the update, now we'll be moving on to Senator Anderegg with other concepts and follow up.

Senator Anderegg: I wanted to bring to the commissions attention some practical feedback that we're getting on some of the items that are being proposed and discussed, as part of what we're drafting in the bill, we still do not have a working copy because of a little bit of some moving targets, I spoke with Cameron from the league last week and he gave some feedback from their internal meetings from the

league on the aspects of the HRZ's and what it ultimately makes them that much more different from an RDA and what value, looking at transit worldwide and trying to implement and best practices have said you need to have value added capture, TRZ so many others and I worked out what that looked like, put it together and got that passed and Senator Harper worked diligently to get the TRZ's put in place and nothing's happened, it has been utilized and the concern with the TRZ is it doesn't generate enough revenue on an individual localized basis to justify a repayment structure or a significant amount of the repayment structure to justify the capital improvement so if you put transportation aside and go back to housing, we have the concept of an HRZ but the practical application of it is dubious and the feedback that the league gave to me was, it's not bad, we don't hate it but what's the difference from an RDA and how's this really going to help us attack the housing gap shortage, I thought it was constructive feedback but it has me wondering whether or not we have enough of an incentive or concept that would really create the traction that we need and the last thing I want to do is spend all our time working through it and have nothing happen. I think we may need to go back to the drawing board on HRZ's but I wonder if we leave it as a localized option or set up a state HRZ which has problems of its own and I just don't know but I'm throwing it out there and what recommendations do you have.

Rep. Briscoe: Was there any thinking about why the creation of TRZ's have yet to produce positive action?

Senator Anderegg: Yes, the biggest issue was this natural nexus and when you're talking about a tax increment that's coming from property tax, there's this natural balance but if you don't generate enough then the project isn't viable and if you generate too much to make the project viable then you're in essence taking essential funds from education, so there's that sweet spot but I think we can balance it but the issue with TRZ's is its originally contemplated, it was more left up to what we're proposing with the HRZ's to the local discretion and groups. When you pencil out the numbers what a TRZ can and will do it doesn't generate enough revenue at what was and has been that sweet spot.

Rep. Briscoe: To make sure I understand, it generates revenue but it doesn't look like it's going to generate the revenue to produce the results that we'd like and to produce and generate that amount of revenue will probably lack the political support of the giving entities.

Senator Anderegg: It could but it depends how much of an increment you're asking, and just to be clear I'm talking about a TRZ so let's say under a TRZ something is worth \$10 a square ft. after you put the infrastructure in, it jumps up to \$18 a square ft. so that \$8 dollar increment under a TRZ and let's just say 15% gets pulled off of that and that's 15% school districts aren't currently seeing so the other 85% is going into the pot that wasn't there before and might not be there for years to come and the problem is only collecting that 15% on a small group of properties around a transit oriented development and is in 1 or 2 stations, it doesn't generate enough revenue so in order to justify how do it with that small group then you'll need to exceed above the 15% of that increased tax increment and becomes problematic. I wanted to also say that there is a significant talk in the legislature about tying economic development incentives to effective planning for housing and I'll be clear, I think there are tiers when talking about the incentives for businesses in GOED and we're not talking about the lower tier mom and pop shops,

we're talking about the higher tiers of business opportunities like Facebook, Microns, eBay and anything else so if we're talking the cities, taxing entities, and school districts give away the bank on a project for the 30 years, in order to bring Facebook to their district that ties to being eligible for tax incentive then we want you to have effective plans but if we have a city that is willing to give away the bank to get a Facebook here but isn't willing to look at affordable housing then I personally think we need to say the bank is closed as far as GOED is concerned.

Ben Hart: I know that affordable housing has been tied into the tax increment law for many years now but if I understand this, so instead of the just back end it's tying in affordable housing with an affordable housing requirement on the front end as to whether a community can actually afford to pay the property taxes.

Senator Anderegg: That would be the idea, to make an eligible requirement versus an ineligible requirement based upon what are you doing for your effective planning in your area to compensate.

Dave Spatafore: The group that Ashley and I are facilitating dealing with HRZ's and new construction of affordable housing and still working on this concept and the key is providing adequate incentives for everyone, for local government and local developers and referring back to Rep. Briscoe's question, TRZ's have stumbled out of the block because they use the same funding mechanisms that RDA's use so in that particular situation there's more incentives to use RDA's than to do a TRZ and if we're looking at an HRZ and geographically looking at groups that are on or close to major transportation corridors and one of the concepts that we're researching now is to take a look at some form of tax abatement for the developers who build a certain amount of affordable housing that is deed restricted in the HRZ's along those major transportation corridors and a property tax abatement could provide annual revenue for developers to provide that incentive to build affordable housing.

Matt Dahl: Dave covered what I wanted to say but I do want to reiterate the importance of state participation in this and as we look at using property tax whether it's its own HRZ or tied in with CRA's, that's still always using local sources of funding and I suppose I get nervous as we start talking about things like cities needing to participate or they won't get their economic development funds or transportation funds, those are issues that we've already determined have statewide value and to suddenly say you're not going to get that if you don't provide the housing, then I don't know that that's really fair and maybe we need to say that housing is just as important as economic development and transportation and provide more resources to encourage communities to build that housing.

Andrew Gruber: I wanted to offer a brief perspective about TRZ's because we talked about it so much and there was a lamenting of how they have not been utilized today but wanted to make sure before people say that it's a tool we should set aside, we remain hopeful that, that tool will be utilized.

Mike Akerlow: I don't think the HRZ is a dead conversation but personally I'd like to see us spend more time on it because I think there's some real value there but there's also a lot of unknowns and I don't know how the rest of the commission feels or whether it's something we should focus on for this

legislative session or continue to work on and present next year but I do think there are enough questions about it whether it's really going to be a tool that is used.

Beth Holbrook: One of the things I wanted to point out is when you look at TRZ's and the multiple amounts of money coming in from various areas, one of the federal requirements for a transit project of any kind is that local communities support and when you're looking at a TRZ or a funding mechanism, that usually screams to the federal government that you have community support and a willingness to put some funding towards this type of a project and I'm excited to see a TRZ and hopeful that we can do that soon, I think the point of the mountain is a great example of what could come down the pipeline and it will be expensive to do and however that transit in that area turns out to look like but the commitment from the community really puts federal applications up a notch or two or three when the federal government is looking for funding and thank you for the discussion, it's been really effective.

Rep. Waldrip: I appreciate all the comments and I think this is something we need to look at carefully with the limited time we have and to see if there is anything we can do this session and we'll move onto rental assistance updates with Jonathan Hardy.

Jonathan Hardy: This is a follow up from our last meeting and there was a motion made to work with the legislators on this commission and to submit a request for funding from Dec 1 to Feb 1 and let me give an update on rental assistance, we did secure more CARES Act money, we've got 6.5million dollars since our last commission meeting and that has been approved by Unified Command in conjunction with the legislature and the legislative committee that's reviewing the requests, so according to all our projections and our work with our agencies, will get us through Dec 30th for those eligible expenditures will have to be for December rent, we can't pay anything forward on that but we've secured some resources to get through the end of December and I think people in general are very supportive of our rental assistance program to help keep housing crisis from happening.

Janice Kimball: What about the eviction moratorium, is there movement on that?

Jonathan Hardy: I'm not sure, we probably would need Senator Anderegg to confirm that but I think in general, there's not a lot of support for eviction moratorium unless there was maybe some rental assistance also available, I think that's the general feeling but I haven't had those direct conversations.

Jeff Jones: What's our burn rate in the past couple of months on our rental assistance program and to get us through the vaccines next year, is the plan to find dollars and if they don't come in from the federal government then do we find state resources?

Jonathan Hardy: The last couple of months, we've been burning about 7millions dollars a month, but a lot of it depends on what the federal government ends up supplying and what we've been using right now is the COVID release funds that have been allocated to the state from the federal government and then the state has discretion on how that gets spent, so there may be a new round of that or something

specific for rental assistance but I think we need to be prepared for what will happen with the pandemic but hopeful it's winding down so the expenditures get less and needs get less.

Grant Whitaker: I just want to make a remark on the rental assistance and I'm reading an article about a group that's trying to put this federal bill together and released more details that include 25 billion dollars of rental assistance to state local governments and Native American tribes and also extends the federal moratorium but only through the end of January and I was speaking with a group yesterday that the state housing agencies belong to and there's a lot of encouragement that whatever bill comes out, that there will be something in there for rental assistance and there's a lot of favorable attitude towards that with the understanding of the significance and importance of it, so hopefully we'll see something come through very soon.

Mike Akerlow: Jonathan, when you were talking about the bag payments and mentioned we were going through about 7 million dollars a month, are we looking at some of those who received payments for November and December, having to come back in January so do we have past users and then additional ones so do we have any kind of estimate on the demand?

Jonathan Hardy: We kind of know what's happened in the past but I don't think we're very good at predicting the future on COVID and who all of a sudden gets their income back but on the tenants side, I'd say in 4 months there's been a good ramp up activity in rental assistance and about 25% of the clients received more than one time of assistance, we make everyone apply every month to see if their situation changes so that's what's been happening up until now and a lot of those that got their first payment made, it was to bring them current and could have been for multiple months but of those amounts about 25% received an additional payment at some point. There's been a little over 9,000 households assisted with that and that includes the landlord side but again that 25% was the tenant side and maybe about a 1,000 households received that second payment.

Rep. Waldrip: There's some national reports that show a large number of Americans that are significantly behind on their rent and we are going to have to deal with that reality. Thank you Jonathan for that update and relatively good news, we'll now turn the time over to Jim Wood with the Kem Gardner Institute and here that report on best practices.

Jim Wood: (see attached)

We partnered with the Salt Lake Chamber about a year ago on this study regarding best practices and was initiated by Clark Ivory through the chamber with the Gardner Policy Institute, we've done a lot of work on housing over the years and this was an opportunity to look at some of the practices that had been adopted by local communities in Utah and we surveyed some 35 different individuals that were from the city, county, state and non-profit as well developers that have been involved over the years in housing affordability and in some cases developing affordable housing. Through a literature search, I have identified about 17 practices that seemed to be common throughout states and cities that have written reports on best practices, from the survey we identified 5 major practices that consensus of those thought were very effective in addressing the issue of housing affordability. There were 5 things

we identified, zoning changes, preservation of existing affordable housing, redevelopment agencies, accessory dwelling units and transit oriented development and for each ones of these, we discussed why the practice is a best practice also some of the implementation frame work and given some examples locally of the use of the practice and where it's been effective, and I had a really good discussion on zoning changes and high density and zoning really is the mother lode of all best practices, the effectiveness of any of these best practices are going to depend on if not mostly on zoning changes. In the last 5 years we've seen more high density built than in anytime in Utah's history, we're getting about half of all new housing units that a high density that are twin homes, condos or apartments but it is encouraging because they are affordable units and again this is a complicated field where you have lots of nuances and how RDA's are used and with TOD's, they have provided a lot of housing and again we see development which is important because by large, lower priced housing and it's high density has some efficiencies but I wish we'd get more affordable housing with the TOD's and by that, I mean housing that is tax credit and targets households that are 40-45% AMI, land is expensive around TOD's and in Salt lake County it totaled up about 1 in 4, 30,000 rental units are within half mile of a tracks station and in Salt Lake City it's almost half and a lot of development has taken place in the last 10 years with this apartment boom. Why are best practices important? Because Utah is in perilous price territory and we've had 4 episodes of rapid increase in prices in the state of Utah in the last 50 years, one was in the late 70's and went from 77 to 79 and burned itself out with the recession, then we had the mid 90's which was a great period for Utah, economic growth and very comparable to what we've experienced in the past 7-8 years, so we are in a period of 2014 to present where housing prices increases had been as much as 60% along the Wasatch front in 5 years, and housing prices have gone up 20% in the last 2 years and right now, days on market in the 3rd quarter for Wasatch front counties for a home that's up for sale is less than 10days, the Salt Lake metro area housing prices are higher than 88% of all metro areas in the country at \$381,000 dollars and mortgage payment has increased in the last 5 years 43% despite the drop in interest rates, our high growth leads to higher housing prices and is inevitable as long as we're a high growth state, we're going to struggle with this problem. There's really no single practice answers the growing threat, it's a multitude of practices and cities have to be willing to be innovative and adopt several practices, success is measured in small increments, land use regulations is most important and determines the effectiveness of all practices and I really can't emphasize this enough, that leadership and political will and state involvement in this issue and is the only way we will bend the cost curve and if we don't get some relief, then we'll see people start to leave the state because they won't be able to afford housing costs, it's a very serious issue and I thank you for the time.

Rep. Waldrip: Thank you Jim and also a great reminder that we need to make this a priority as a State and not look at it as localities having to deal with small issues because this impacts us all. We have a comment from Janice.

Janice Kimball: In the information that you presented, looks like there's a lot on zoning and then RDA, is there other best practices around funding or financing affordable housing that we should be looking at?

Jim Wood: We looked at some practices in other states and of course we have the Olene Walker Housing Loan Fund but housing trust funds and how you fund those, many states and communities and

Salt Lake City I believe has a housing trust fund, that's a great source and of course you've got typically the home funds and CDBG but last year with SB39, it got a little funding and we did get cut short but hopefully we can get ongoing funding and increased funding from Olene Walker.

Rep. Waldrip: Thank you again Jim, let's move on to sub-committee updates with Michele Weaver and then Chris Gamvroulas.

Michele Weaver: (see attached)

Our group has worked on the definition of Rural which has been a big piece of what we've worked on to really determine where some of the things like rural capacity development grant that we're requesting a onetime funding should be aimed at, we are leaning towards the cities of the 5th and 6th class and to give everyone an idea, there are 248 cities, 187 of those are 10,000 and below so that's your 5th class so it's a significant population, however; we'd like to keep it at cities, not counties and the reason being is there are some areas of Utah county that would be considered rural and when I say rural, I'm talking about the characteristics of rural like lack of infrastructure, water resources, lack of access to building materials and hospitals, it's those kinds of things that are characteristic to rural areas, whereas Wood Cross, Alpine, Bluffdale are cities that are classified as 5th class cities, not just population size, we're looking at wanting these cities to show how they're rural in character, not defining that just by population size. I sent out the rural housing development grant and we're still working on that as well, but this just gives you a good idea of what we're thinking as a group in our onetime non-lapsing grant funds, when I sent it out, I did make one change to add Tribal housing entities as an eligible applicant but as I mentioned, these are all being flushed out by the group and this is just a draft at this point. We are also working on researching needs assessment and both Jonathan Hardy and Jess Peterson have been really generous in offering their help with the work on the needs of rural areas, also in our last meeting, it was stated that we would like to see short term rentals so rentals for teachers, or potential permanent residence and short term rentals for recreational areas.

Rep. Waldrip: Great, thank you Michele and seeing no questions we'll move to Chris.

Chris Gamvroulas: We've had some meetings with the land use sub-committee and we're working on some language to take back to the sub-committee and bring to the commission for consideration around development and building permit fees and we're also going to explore some language around inclusionary zoning and take that back to the sub-committee meeting and I think we might have something by the next couple weeks then bring it to the full commission.

Brooke McCarrick: Read and provided the OPMA training for the Commission on Housing Affordability Board Members.

Rep. Waldrip: Thank you everyone who presented today. I'll now entertain a final motion.

Motion to adjourn by Rep. Joel Briscoe at 12:06pm

Next proposed meeting: January 13, 2021