

Commission on Housing Affordability
Minutes for January 12, 2021
Electronic Webinar - Via Zoom

Members Present

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

Representing

Senator
Representative
Representative
Salt Lake City Council
UTA
DWS Executive Director
Utah Homebuilders Association
Utah Housing Corporation
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

Ben Hart
Chris Condie
Jacey Skinner
Janice Kimball
Julie Humberstone

Staff Present

Jonathan Hardy	Director, HCD
Jess Peterson	HCD
Holly Taing	HCD
Keith Heaton	HCD
David Fields	HCD
Christina Davis	HCD
Ian Shumway	HCD
Sarah Smith	HCD

Visitors

Peter Asplund
Ray Ward
Angela Price

Welcome and Introductions

The Commission on Housing Affordability Board meeting was held electronically via Zoom on: January 12, 2021. Senator Jacob Anderegg called to order at 3:04pm.

Senator Anderegg: We're going to go a little out of order today due to time restraints with Rep. Ward, he is going to share with us his bill and the time is yours.

Rep. Ray Ward: Thank you, I wanted to visit with you all today to tell you briefly what's in my bill and to get feedback. When I look at our housing affordability crisis that we have and we have so many different programs that we try and put in place but to my way of thinking, the more powerful driving force that anything is supply and demand and all of our government programs can be helpful but will not help nearly so much if supply and demand continue to move a little farther and farther and farther out of balance, to increase the supply available to me is the top of the list of what we can do overall to not have home prices be so high. As a state, we have invested heavily in single family dwelling, that's what two thirds of our units are and we have many units that used to happily house 8 people in a large family that now only houses an older couple with an empty basement, this is one of those places that governments not making more regulations to make something happen, it just looks like what government relations are to what currently stops, accessory dwelling from happening and so the solution is figure out all those obstacles and try and get them out of the way, to that end my bill has 3 main things that it does, one of them is building code is not clear in the state and in many different localities, people say an accessory dwelling unit is a duplex or not a duplex but a duplex is where two families live who don't know each other, where one family might use more electricity than the other but in an accessory dwelling units, the owner is there and responsible for their own home so an ADU needs to not have to follow the extra building codes that we have for duplexes and is not changing the code but clarifying the code. The second thing in there are just many different local zoning ordinances that make accessory dwelling units very hard and if you look at other cities, some other cities prohibit them unless you have 80ft of street front or certain number of square ft. or whatever and to try and alleviate that, what the bill does is, and we'll call it an internal ADU, one that you cannot see from the street it's internal to the footprint of a pre-existing house and say, if that internal accessory dwelling unit and if the city already in that zone permits accessory dwelling units and those two things are true then the city may not for those internal units put other restrictions on whether or not the person can have one. The bill states it will create a fund or some backing for banks that are willing to make these loans if the person getting the loan is then willing to rent at less than 80% AMI and the bank would qualify for CRA credit and my hope is that we can work on this and there are a whole lot of single family dwelling units out there and the owners should be allowed to use them to who lives at their own home with them, I do believe that will make our affordable housing overall crisis better if we can make that happen for people I would be happy to answer any questions that anymore may have. Thank you.

Mike Akerlow: Would this just be for internal units and not for units built outside or maybe on top of a garage or a backyard, is that correct?

Rep. Ward: At this time, that is correct and I'm happy to entertain that idea later but it seems to get the most for least other reasons for pushback.

Mike Akerlow: I'd love to talk to you about the external units when the time is right but what are the barriers on this that the cities are charging, in particular impact fees, so is there any discussion with the league about ways to mitigate some of those fees?

Rep. Ward: This bill does not address that right now, that is certainly a big piece of thing that still need to be considered and I have an idea that I want to propose about that but it won't be in this particular bill.

Mike Akerlow: Great, thank you.

Rep. Waldrip: So on impact fees right now, do we not have a requirement for an annual accounting on impact fees, does that lap over into this area as well or is this separate?

Rep. Ward: I'm not able to answer that yet, I hope to make myself more knowledgeable about it, I know there are a lot of rules already in place governing impact fees but I feel like I needed to understand the two sides a lot better before I went into changing it.

Rep. Waldrip: Yeah, I just wanted to know if you knew if that would apply, thank you.

Senator Anderegg: I'll just take the prerogative of the chair and just say if it's an internal ADU through the initial impact fees covered any and all contemplated sewer, water, bath, kitchens, etc. because those were required in the initial building permit requirements, therefor it was built with capacity to the maximum of the entire structure, so impact fees that don't require any new line set is nothing but revenue to the cities.

Chris Gamvroulas: I was going to bring up the impact fee, and there's a lot of conversations now with communities we are intending to charge full impact fees, with the idea that it's this other house hold whether its finishing your basement, there's a lot of ways to gain the system and I can tell you that is happening right now in a lot of communities and what we'd like to see in Rep. Wards bill is prohibition on impact fees being assessed and we'd like to see it more permissive. I think that we as a commission should take a position of support on this ADU bill.

Rep. Briscoe: I've shared your PowerPoint with the housing advocates that are not opposed to ADU's but a concern was brought up, what would happen in some cities would be that ADU's would be built but would turn into housing for Air B and B's with people coming and going?

Rep. Ward: I have tried to be clear with the league all the way along and it is not my intention that these units just become duplexes and to me when we're going to give this extra permissivity and the thing that we're relying on for the owner to rent to someone, where they are still there and is there for most

strongly incentivized of anyone to not rent it to someone who's damaging to their most important piece of property and I'm open to suggestions on language if it does need other language to tighten that up.

Rep. Waldrip: I'd like to comment that Weber county recommended an ADU ordinance for an ADU internal, there has to be an owner occupied requirement and prohibited from nightly rentals and so that's in county ordinance in Weber, so if it's not in there now it will be, so that may be a model to look at.

Rep. Ward: Nothing in that would conflict with this bill.

Michele Weaver: I had a question regarding the 80% AMI and that impacting banks CRA and I'm curious how they would determine compliance with that?

Rep. Ward: We would be relying on the commission here to help set up a program to do that ascertainment.

Angela Price: I'm the project and policy maker for Salt Lake City community neighborhoods dept. On behalf of SLC I'd like to thank the commission for the important role that you play in solving the very complex housing challenges that we face here in Utah and I'd like to thank you for the opportunity to provide public comment on ADU's today. SLC is supportive of housing choice for all residence and understands the importance ADU's play by ensuring a diverse housing stock, additionally we recognize there are barriers that have limited the development of ADU's and with that in mind, we'd like to offer comments on potential ADU policy. The definition of single family unit is complex and often hard for cities to enforce, we recommend leaving the definition is outlined in section 10-9A 505.50 state code, if there's a desire to modify the definition to allow for additional individuals to live in a home, SLC recommends amending the number of individuals permitted to occupy a residential unit. SLC supports ADU's being a permitted use as it eases the processing time and reduces the costs for the developer, the city supports a loan guarantee program to ease the financial burden on home owners while encouraging the development of affordable housing units, we hear from our residence and community partners that financial barriers are one of the main issues of developments of ADU's so a funding solution that address this issue will be important and impactful, on behalf of the city I would like to thank you again for your time and welcome the opportunity to future dialog on increasing housing opportunities for SLC residence through the development of ADU's.

Senator Anderegg: Thank you for your time and we look forward to hearing from you often as this commission moves forward.

Jonathan Hardy: I wanted to say, I'm glad the financing mechanisms have been brought up, I've discussed this with Rep. Ward a little bit yesterday and have had some further conversations with Mike Akerlow and John Montgomery who I know both work with Rep. Ward, what has been mentioned is it's semi-cost prohibited especially to get something down to an affordable rental level in the development of ADU, I think Rep. Ward's bill is trying to do two things, one, remove regulatory barriers so supply can

increase but the other mechanism is behind this loan guarantee and is to create affordable units. In talking to Rep. Ward, we had a discussion on what's it going to take to get something moving on this from that side to get more private capital out there for more home owners to access and build ADU's and we're getting asked what's it going to take to get this program up and running. What we're hearing is that, in order to get this to affordable rental level, you really can't have more than about \$120,000 financing attached to it, so we should figure out how to create units that don't cost that much which would be an ideal thing to look forward to but looking at the models right now, it's about \$150,000 to create an ADU and these may be more external numbers, we talked through maybe creating a soft lean grant program that could be repayable through a sale or something like that to make up this \$30,000 gap, and we haven't had a ton of conversations with any other financial institutions on what a "guarantee program" could do but in any event, it doesn't look like you can move past the \$120,000 of financing to rent it, even 65% AMI and that's what we're looking for.

Rep. Ward: Jonathan, I just want to push back on that because I really do not think that's right at all, I think that number is right if you're considering building an external ADU but an internal ADU can be anywhere from 0 if the city would just permit it, or to say everything here is how it needs to be but I need to put in a kitchen downstairs here and a separate washer and dryer upstairs and then goes on up from there right but if you're only making a little interior remodel then it just depends on what is already in the home. We know that the number of axial ADU's is probably 50 times the number of permitted ADU's and to those people renting part of their home out, did not pay \$100,000 to make that happen so I think we just need to talk that through again.

Jonathan Hardy: I agree but I want to throw that in there, that there hasn't been a great conversation with the banks and their CRA money on how to participate in this loan guarantee program and so we probably need to discuss a little bit around what kind of financing structure can help support that private capital.

Rep. Ward: I would like to participate in those conversations if you had a short list of people that you thought would be useful for me to get together with you, I would certainly try to make that happen.

Senator Anderegg: We'll follow up on this offline but we'll take a few more questions before moving on.

Mike Akerlow: I think both Jonathan and Rep. Ward are correct. Jonathan, I think in the cost is really referring to, would be a significant internal improvement or a construction of an external ADU, I think more people would be adding in a kitchen or moving around some walls internally but my guess is, those costs are minimal enough that they would probably just pull equity out of their home and maybe some would take out a loan but it would be small enough that a guarantee would be that significant.

Mike Gallegos: I wanted to agree with Mike and we have to remember that the home owner making the improvements on the existing footprint is making an investment, if we look at the affordability, they understand that upfront and as part of the administrator rules on this, is the affordability factor and would have to be built in if there was going to be any type of guarantee support of public financing.

Rep. Ward: The guarantee would be built in, the thing we've got going for us is that most of these units already rent for less than 80% AMI, people aren't renting a basement if they're paying in the upper tier of what the rents are, they are already down there lower because that's who the natural constituents are, so it's my belief there's a sweet spot that you can be below 80% AMI, many home owners are in fact incentivized to rent for less than market rates in exchange for getting a tenant that they trust they will get along with since it's in their own home.

Senator Anderegg: Moving on. Earlier in the discussion there was a soft motion that we as a commission take a position of support on this ADU bill with a strong encouragement on some of the items that were brought up and from a pragmatic standpoint as the chair, I'm just going to say, don't be surprised if this takes you years to actually get through but I think you'll have a lot of support from the members of this committee, and the vote to take before us is to: take a position of support, discussion to that motion?

Jeff Jones: Within the bill, do we have the required provisions with regards to the mandate for restricted rent below 80% AMI, is that within the bill?

Rep. Ward: It does say that but the exact mechanism to govern it, it delegates to the housing commission to put those rules in place.

Senator Anderegg: So the question I have to that is a follow up question and I'm going to ask Jonathan, is our commission a dually-designated entity that can write rules?

Jonathan Hardy: The bill itself directs it to workforce services in the Olene Walker Housing Loan Fund and I will say that it's really designed that if there's money attached to this loan guarantee portion, that can be utilized to create affordable units and I think the regulatory part, people can create ADU's, as long as you're not using the OWHLF then you don't have those restrictions upon you but if you want to set up a loan guarantee program where you set up and write rules for, then that would be a requirement that, while you have money attached to that unit, you'll be renting it at an affordable level.

Jeff Jones: Just a follow up, are these the same provisions in regards to the restriction on the nightly or short term rentals, is that also going to be part of the bill?

Rep. Ward: At this point, I'm going to say I'm pretty open to that but if the league opposes no matter what I do, then I need suggestions and someone who is willing to support the bill.

Jeff Jones: I would not support the bill unless there was provision restrictions regarding the short term rentals.

Andrew Johnston: I'm sure you all heard some concerns about cities uniform overriding some local ordinance and safety issues, so I may have to at least abstain if not oppose it initially but I'm willing to

work ongoing with Rep. Ward and others about this, I think ADU's are needed badly and I just want to make sure we're all on the same page.

Matt Dahl: I misunderstood and thought we were more just discussing it than taking a position to vote because I intend to not support it, I'm torn because I do support the idea of ADU's and as mentioned earlier, many communities said that is the tool they want to use but as what Andrew said and others, there are reasons that local control is important because we understand that the neighborhoods in which we are working, we set up rules to make sure that the land use that goes into those areas fits with what's there, and generally I'm not supportive with sort of removing those rules within communities, I will not be supporting this but I do appreciate the effort to try and make these more useable and agree that I'm willing to participate in discussions to make this more workable.

Senator Anderegg: Seeing no further questions, I'm going to go ahead and say it is really difficult as a legislator to see good policy come up and pragmatically the cities get in the way because of local control, and very few of them actually have real experience with zoning until they get to the city and each time we say, cities, you should be doing many things of your own freewill and choice, they say "oh, well people freak out" but every once in a while the legislature needs to stand up and kick them in the rear to get something done. So let's take this to a vote.

- **Motion: to favorably support this bill with strong recommendations that those other items brought up would be pursued as to best of your ability.**

Motion passes.

Senator Anderegg: Thank you Rep. Ward for your time.

Review of OPMA statement read by Senator Anderegg

Public Comments: No public comments submitted.

Approval of Minutes: December 9, 2020

Motion to approve the minutes by Rep. Steve Waldrip. Motion carries. All unanimous.

Senator Anderegg: (see attached)

Ok, let's move on to legislative update and before we move on to the bill, I wanted to bring and update to everyone that the executive appropriations committee reached out to me to the first part of December and requested of me based upon our budget projections for the upcoming fiscal year, that we resubmit for the additional 5million dollars from last year's bill, and they didn't do this on all bills that passed last year and had their funding stripped but we are ones that they said, they would like to restore these funds and so between then and now, I was made the chair of the social services appropriations subcommittee and as such, this is prioritized as one of the highest priority bills, so during the first week of the session, all the monies that were pulled out of a certain number of bills will be restored or will be discussed in the committee, we did receive 5million dollars from last year's bill and

are very likely going to receive another 5million dollars which would get us back up to the 10million which was agreed to by the legislature and passed last session. I just offer that to everyone and to let you know that in addition to the budget requests in the bill for this year, it looks like we will get the remaining portion that was passed last year. The bill you see before you and let me be very frank that this is a very, very, very rough draft which this bill will undoubtedly go through certain revisions, mainly because COVID is devastated our legislative offices and our drafting attorneys are all working remotely and with the holidays, we had difficulty syncing together but Peter has done the best he could to get us this working draft today, so don't panic if it doesn't say what you want it to but just make notes of what it needs to say and get in contact with myself or Jonathan and we will instruct Peter on how to make corrections, so with that being said, we have the bill before us today and we'll talk about concepts and the portions of the bill that are finished, once we get your feedback and rerun everything then we'll email it out to everyone, so by the next meeting hopefully you'll have had time to go through it and Peter, if you can give us a review of the bill.

Peter Asplund: Surely and my attempt when I talk about a bill is not to speak in favor or against it, I'm just trying to neutrally explain what it does so far and Senator Anderegg has done a good job of lowering expectations because this was really a quick, try to throw down some of the concepts that I think we've agreed to as a commission, so we've done modest changes to what community reinvestment agencies are allowed to spend their housing allocation money for, as you can see the big changes there are on lines 366, page 12 and that discusses all the various affordable housing things you can spend that housing allocation money, such as you can pay for a local government building or publicly owned infrastructure, if they support the rehabilitation or construction of income targeted housing within the boundary of the agency, on line 369 for the cost of land or installation etc. of improving buildings that will support income targeted housing or related services including, in drafting language means including but not limited too under Utah code, so these are just some examples but not a complete list of examples including, workforce development, education healthcare services or other community services The next thing we've outlined for now on line 443, page 15 and the idea of this is predevelopment grants in advance of the construction of low-income housing units in a county of the fourth, fifth or sixth class, or in other words rural areas, so there's a lot more detail than that, that we can put in this and we could even make it a separate grant program, we can allude to it here for the purposes and write a lot of details about a grant program and one of the issues that the commission might want to discuss is and I've been hearing a lot of back and forth whether they should go with Olene Walker or with the governor's office of economic development, so that may be a slight issue where to put this but we're prepared to get the conversation started. Next we have on line 446, the creation or financial supporting the mediation program for landlords and tenants designed to minimize the loss of housing for low-income persons and with this mediation program, we might need more or less and it might be something that we provide in the money for Olene Walker to find the right people to organize such a program or we can put more detail on code. Senator, if you want to mention some of the other things that we've talked about putting in here that we haven't done so far.

Senator Anderegg: I'm happy to do and first and for most, as was discussed when you come down the funding items on lines 489-491, I think we have our numbers switched, we intended on 500K would go

to the landlords and tenants mediation and 300K for the predevelopment grants for low-income housing in rural Utah, so just note that we caught that and it should be switched and secondarily we are still looking at doing two things now, on the inventory which you'll recall we had a conversation on surplus inventory and we had a really good conversation with the technical guys at ARGC and Wasatch Front regional county who are bringing everything together and being able to do an overlay and determining surplus properties and wanted to put in the bill to do a stock inventory analysis throughout the state which I think is fantastic to get that real world annual report, so those two items will be included under that one aspect.

Michele Weaver: The bill is actually correct with the 300K going to mediation and the 500K going to rural

Ashley Spatafore: Yes, how the bill is drafted is correct.

Senator Anderegg: Okay, we'll go ahead and leave it how it its drafted and I will say the governor has included this in his budget this year and its coming before my committee, so I'm just saying there's a good chance, and I'm going to turn the time over to Rep. Waldrip regarding the pilot program that he mentioned that he's running up in weber County, so if you can give us a quick update.

Rep. Waldrip: It was some time ago and I had appeared before this commission and presented the Rocky Mountain Homes Fund program and it is designed to provide for teachers initially and we believe we'll expand it very rapidly to cities and counties to deal with primarily first responders, law enforcement and firefighters, this allows the city to take a portion of their reserve revenue that is currently invested in the state treasurers fund and repurpose that for housing for their employees and it does it in a way that the entity that's investing that money receives a greater return, a 2% return on cash on a quarterly basis as well participate on the upside of the appreciation of the underlining housing with the employee ad If anyone has any specific questions, please contact me and I'll walk you through it.

Senator Anderegg: There are a couple more items that we are anticipating in the bill that Rep. Waldrip will discuss regarding HRZ's and zoning.

Rep. Waldrip: I think a lot of challenges that we notice with inclusionary zoning, which is providing an offset affordable units in a development as a required element of that development is, let's say you get an offer for 100 units and of those 100 units, 20 are required to be affordable so then you only get 80 market units and what happens by default is the costs that are essentially the same and all you're doing is producing profitability on 20% of those homes, so that 20% reduction in profitability goes over to the other 80% and ends up raising the price of that other 80%, while it provides for some low cost homes, it's actually increasing the cost of all non-affordable housing which ends up trickling down and being a wash in the overall cost of housing and overall availability of housing. This proposal would do, would be to require any inclusionary zoning whether you develop 20 units or contribute x amount of dollars per residents into a fund that provides affordable housing, that those requirements are offset so if you had an approval under the normal rules for 100 units and they wanted to put another 20 affordable units

then you'd have 120 total units instead of just 100, so the intent is to reduce the incentive to have the market rate homes pick up the slack for the affordable homes which should provide a net reduction in the overall home prices for the entire development.

Senator Anderegg: Again, we can go into all this once we get the bill drafted. Moving to the last item which is actually in two parts and I believe we had a discussion back in November but I've been working with the new executive director of the governor's office of economic development and a few other legislators about the concept of tying to GOED tax incentives with a thorough analysis and effort to evaluate the impact on housing stock, especially for housing in the area median income of 80% or less, for instance when you're talking about the microns, facebook, ebay where there's going to be tens of millions dollars in tax credit given and they're going to bring about 1,500 employees with an average salary and the city within that jurisdiction must according to that concept go in that with analysis and adding that workforce here and what it's going to do with the impact housing stock in that area, is going to drive up prices and everything else, so number one they must do an evaluation of what the housing stock impacts would be and number two they need to show how the city can incorporate, and this is a fungible number but 80% of that stock requirement within their city or their surrounding cities and if they don't comply, they would not be eligible for those GOED funds going forward, that's the rough concept so with this idea is if you're going to bring the those bigger projects, let's say 10million or whatever the dollar amount is, then you have to do the analysis and you have to figure out how to incorporate the 80% of those new housing stock into your city plan so we can have this trickledown effect but in addition to that, they would have to do a full fledged evaluation and I think it would be a good thing to put into law, I know the league of cities and towns is going to hate me for saying that but I do think it would be good but getting it past the legislature would be really hard so that's why I'm talking about doing a ratchet up with those existing levels, going from 3 and 4 and having cities get their act together and with that, I'm open for any discussion.

Michele Weaver: I wanted to jump back to your inventory discussion but I wondered if you were also going to include some sort of maintenance of that inventory because I think it's great if we do all that upfront but I think it's important that we maintain it somehow, so I'm just curious if that's also going to be included or if you would consider it?

Senator Anderegg: Yes, that would be an ongoing thing and at this point we could use Wasatch Regional Council or we could use ARGC but we're still having discussion on where the home would be but yes we would have an ongoing annual requirement to give us updates. I was also thinking in this bill of modifying the housing affordability commission statutory authorization language and wanted to ask everyone if it made sense to open up some commission positions or position to someone from the fill and tropic community, what do you guys think?

Jeff Jones: I would support that.

Senator Anderegg: I just know they are a big component to what can happen in the state and where more than half the money comes from the fill and tropic people, it might be good to have them at the

table, and without objection, this is what I'm kind of looking at with this bill and our hope is that Peter and I can get the drafting of all this done and out to everyone as soon as possible, with giving you 2 or 3 days to thoroughly vet the bill and in the next meeting that we work out any of the kinks and get support for the worked out provisions. Alright, let's move on to Jonathan Hardy for a brief summary of the COVID 19 relief bill.

Jonathan Hardy: The state is getting a whopping 213 + million dollars to help with rental assistance for COVID impacted individuals at or below 80% AMI over the course of this next calendar year and we had a big discussion on rental assistance a few months ago and we were able to get CARES Act money through December 30th and for January we got another 7million dollars authorized and structured to help get it qualified into this new bill that's been authorized by congress but we have a great opportunity to help out with rental assistance and there's a lot of details to be worked out but we pretty much need all hands on deck to distribute this amount of money just for context, 7million a month was our trajectory the last couple months, so we really need to hit every nook and cranny to help out for those COVID impacted individuals that meet the income requirements but a lot of details to be flushed out from treasury, we don't have them all yet but working to set up a portal that can be supported for multiple funding partners because any city or county over the population of 200 thousand is also eligible within that 213 million to get a piece of that pie and the states going to get at least 140 million even if all those entities claim it, so we have a lot to discuss in future meetings but just know that we are trying to work with as much stake holders as possible to get this program up and running for both tenants and landlords to keep housing money flowing and to keep people housed.

Senator Anderegg: Great. We will move onto subcommittee meetings for rural with Michele, the time is yours.

Michele Weaver: (see attached)

I wanted to talk about the document that was sent out to everyone on the rural predevelopment grant that the committee's been working on and we did add earnest money as a potential eligible expense and the committee was thinking more of a percentage of the purchase price or maxing it out at a certain percentage, but has yet to be determined, we also added association application fees and other expenses as identified in the budget, as well the outcome section and Dave Fields from DWS is working on some research to determine what is needed in rural areas and the outcome we'd like to see is to reduce the housing gap as defined by the research that Dave determines makes the most sense and I spoke with Peter regarding potentially adding some compliance which I'll discuss with the committee during the next meeting, this may be a little more detailed than what we want in the bill but when advocating for it, we need these answers.

Senator Anderegg: Looks like Jonathan has a question.

Jonathan Hardy: So of the 5million dollars reinstating from last year that request going forward executive appropriations of that would that be a FY21 supplemental or an FY22 appropriations?

Senator Anderegg: My understandings are, all of it is going to be FY22 appropriation.

Seeing no other questions from the commission, with that I want to reiterate that we're going to do our best to get an updated bill within the next week hopefully, and I'd like you to have a least 2 solid days to review it and come prepared for the next meeting but anything you can give us before the meeting would be great because I would bet that 3 or 4 of us are going to have the same issues on our list, so we can make whatever adjustments we need, and so with no further questions, I will entertain a final motion. Thank you.

Motion to adjourn by Rep. Joel Briscoe at 5:01pm.