

Commission on Housing Affordability
Minutes for May 26, 2021
Electronic Webinar - Via Zoom

Members Present

Senator Jacob Anderegg
Representative Joel Briscoe
Representative Steve Waldrip
Ben Hart
Beth Holbrook
Chris Gamvroulas
Dave Damschen
Janice Kimball
Jeff Jones
Michele Weaver
Mike Akerlow
Mike Gallegos
Mike Ostermiller
Tammy Hunsaker

Representing

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

Absent Members

Andrew Johnston
Chris Condie
Jacey Skinner

Staff Present

Nathan McDonald	Deputy Director, DWS
Jess Peterson	HCD
Keith Heaton	HCD
David Fields	HCD
Jennifer Edwards	HCD
Trudy Ellis	DWS
Lainee Meyers	HCD

Welcome and Introductions

The Commission on Housing Affordability Board meeting was held electronically via Zoom on: May 26, 2021. Senator Jacob Anderegg called to order at 3:07pm.

OPMA statement read by Senator Anderegg

Public Comments: No Public Comments

Senator Anderegg: (see attached Commission Survey results)

Let's move on to the Study items survey results and one of the things we wanted to do is have a frank discussion of where we ought to head for the upcoming bill for this next general legislative session for housing affordability, based upon the survey sent out to the commission members, this is the feedback we got from everyone. I'm looking at these and not sure what some of these mean, like 0% for housing.

Jess Peterson: (see attached Housing Authority priorities)

I have the explanations of what Robert Vernon presented last meeting, so at the top of this document, it states 20% for housing—a statewide coalition of non-profit housing develop/providers and service agencies are requesting that 20% of the discretion RPA funds be invested in housing and land with local entities. Unfortunately, when we sent out the list for the survey, they did not stay in order.

Senator Anderegg: Yeah, that got shot down pretty quick and as you guys know, we sent our letter over to house and senate leadership and we couldn't get any traction from them. Let's go by order of magnitude so I would say making LIHTC development tax exempt actually has a lot of merit and wouldn't be too difficult to do.

Mike Gallegos: Mr. Chair, what this one is, is the non-profit developers seem to get tax exempt where the for profit developers with tax credits do not, so this is an issue that's come up in the past.

Senator Anderegg: Is there any issue to the reason why, I mean shouldn't the tax exemption follow the induced product versus whether they're profit or non-profit?

Mike Gallegos: I would agree with that, it's going to depend on how each county approaches that.

Senator Anderegg: Unless we set it in statute, right?

Mike Gallegos: Correct.

Senator Anderegg: I like that one, it's a doable one. Looks like the next one is Fund Utah Homeless solutions, Utah regional housing corporation has master leased two motels in downtown Provo that provides 57 permanent supportive housing units for chronically homeless and working with the Continuum of Care to purchase an adjoining motel to provide 35 units for a nightly homeless shelter run by members of the Continuum. We have all three motels under contract to purchase for \$12.9 million and need funding, that one's probably going to have to be a separate RFP as opposed to be run in this bill, any thoughts on that one?

Andrew Johnston: Is there any time limitations on that one particularly if they're trying to purchase something, it may not line up with the next general session, right?

Senator Anderegg: It may not, I don't know what the time restrictions are. Jess, do we have any further feedback on that?

Jess Peterson: I don't.

Andrew Johnston: This may be something that should get forwarded to Wayne Neiderhauser and the new Utah Homeless Council as part of that process, they're a local homeless council and we could forward it up to that level to look at state funding that they have to recommend.

Senator Anderegg: Sounds like a motion Andrew.

Andrew Johnston: I move the motion.

Senator Anderegg: So Andrew made the motion as a commission that we have staff from DWS forward this to former Senate president Wayne Neiderhauser, now the executive director of the Homeless governance council, seeing no discussion to that motion. Motion passes.

I don't know that we remove this from our list but there may be a time sensitive nature to this that would need to move forward quickly. There is also the topic that the preservation fund could come into play on this and I don't know for sure what their criteria is but that might also be something. The next one is Homeless Mitigation fee, every city in Utah County is sending a check every year to Salt Lake City to help them with their homeless problem, and Utah County has a growing homeless problem but it is not as large or as visible as Salt Lake yet, this law needs to be changed to be flexible and workable for Utah County and each city should be able to hold their yearly payment for up to three years to accumulate enough money to invest in homeless solutions in Utah County or their respected county and we also need to combine efforts so that if Provo has a shelter that serves Orem and other surrounding communities, those communities can pay to support local homeless efforts instead of funding SLC. One dollar spent today for prevention will save hundreds of dollars needed to address the problem 10 years from now. Thoughts, comments or questions on that?

Andrew Johnston: I think we said this last time but that state funding does not go to SLC, the state homeless coordinating council, they would make the recommendations to where that funding would be allocated to which cities who apply for it, I think right now the statute has a language where any city that has emergency shelters over a certain size can apply for it, so I think that process needs to be looked at and that's how it should probably be handled, I think.

Senator Anderegg: Ashley Spatafore texted and said that, they're saying this Homeless Mitigation fee is also under the purview of former President Neiderhauser and the new homeless council, sounds like Andrew Johnston is making another motion that we forward this also to Mr. Neiderhauser, is that correct Andrew?

Andrew Johnston: Yes sir, I am.

Senator Anderegg: that motion is in order, I'm not going to restate it since everyone knows what we are talking about, any discussion to that motion? Seeing none, motion passes.

Once again, let's not remove this from our list so we can continue to follow up on it because we definitely went through the trouble of creating the homeless governance council and we need to utilize them as much as possible.

The next item is Utah Community Land Trust, is asking the legislature set aside \$50 million in matching funds for Utah County similar to what happened last year for the SLC preservation fund. I'm going to interject here and say that would be awesome, however; you need to understand the Utah Housing preservation fund was actually the brain child of the philanthropic groups specifically Clark Ivory, Gayle Miller and Scott Anderson and they approached us saying that they had matching funds, so I spoke to Robert Vernon and said to him, as much as that concept is a great concept and yes, we did fund them \$50 million, it was only after they had committed to do a 12-1 match, so I suggested he reach out to the many unicorns in Utah County like Ryan Smith and a few others and to get them to commit to do something similar, then we'll have a discussion about setting up a potential second fund or maybe expanding the existing preservation fund.

Mike Akerlow: I wondered if we could get some information on the preservation fund and is there data available that we could see before we provide more funding?

Jess Peterson: We could provide more information next commission meeting. Doug Harris is the manager of the fund and I could speak to him and have him present at our next commission meeting. There is one quick comment with the preservation fund and it is statewide, so 30% of the funds are required to be spent in Rural Utah.

Senator Anderegg: I think it might make sense to have Wayne serve on this commission, what do we think about that?

Christina Oliver: I think it would be good to include Wayne, he and I are going to working a lot together on some of our projects so if he could, that would be a great benefit.

Mike Akerlow: Looking at the priorities here, it looks like much of it is on deeply affordable housing, homeless mitigation and homeless funding and it would make a lot of sense to make those connections, especially with his team there at the state offices.

Senator Anderegg: I think it make a heck of a lot of sense because so much of what we're doing and what we're focusing on with that lower AMI, we're either talking about homelessness, homeless services, transitional housing, permanent assistance housing and low income housing and in that range and they kind of have the dual, swap back and forth nexus that I think is very appropriate for us.

Nate McDonald: I think it's something we can definitely look into and what the process would be, right now would be a reminder for everyone, the office of homelessness that Wayne is the director of and also resides in the dept. of Workforce services as well. I think there may be a few ways to look at this, the commission already does have the Director of HCD on it and an Executive representative from the

dept. but we could also look at how that could be amended to include Wayne from the office of homeless services or the Utah homeless councils, so there's a few options there we could look at.

Senator Anderegg: Nate, I know you'd have to get back to us but would that require a statutory change?

Nate McDonald: That's what we would need to check to confirm and we could look at it from a delegatory standpoint and we could consider that option but I would need to consult with Executive Director, Casey Cameron whether that's something we would want to look at or whether or not we want to go the other path.

Mike Gallegos: I agree with all the comments that are being said here but I also want to recognize and not forget that we have a larger role on housing affordability as well and making sure we're not stepping on each other's toes in regards to the commission and the homeless committee as well.

Senator Anderegg: I think that's why it would make sense to have better coordination.

Andrew Johnston: Assuming its statutory or something a little more in depth, is there something or any reason he couldn't be invited as a consulting member rather than a voting member initially?

Senator Anderegg: I think that's a good question and you know we can invite whoever we want to invite and provide feedback, such as we do with the Spatafore's but I think we can invite Wayne to be sure but I do think it might make sense to if it requires statutory change, and I also think Mike is right and that we're swimming in our own lanes and coordinating well with each other.

The next item is Permit Fees, make sure that impact fees are directly applicable to affordable housing developments, I met with Provo City today and brought up this issue to them and we need to navigate this and I think that's where our broader discussion between land use authority and some of those things will probably get pulled into this, one of the things we have to, if we're really are going after some of these issues but I do think there needs to be an appropriate factor when looking at these permits.

Mike Akerlow: As someone who over saw SLC impact fees for a few years, I know the city waives those when there is a deed restriction placed on the property that shows the affordability, it's a good model to look at, it's a good incentive for development for developers to come in, so impact fees can be waived, so I think that we could look at that issue as an incentive and also worth looking at impact fees how there being spent and how it relates to development itself.

Tammy Hunsaker: If I may go back to a previous item, the tax exemption for LIHTC developments, I think if we look at that, it should be not just LIHTC but any development with a certain threshold of a deed restriction because there could be affordable housing developments that are funded with HUD 221-D4 or other sources that aren't LIHTC.

Senator Anderegg: Would you recommend putting a floor in place, you know I just would hate for a developer to figure out that if they had a 1 unit set aside, they'd be become tax exempt.

Tammy Hunsaker: Actually, other states do this, like New York State in particular, they have an as of right threshold with the percentage and the AMI and if the development meets that then they receive a tax abatement as of right.

Senator Anderegg: Ok, so what is the percentage set at usually?

Tammy Hunsaker: I think it's 20% of the units and it might be a sliding scale on the level of abatement.

Senator Anderegg: That would make sense to me, I would like to look at that more and could you find out that information and forward it to our staff, so we can have a greater discussion in our future?

Tammy Hunsaker: Yes, I actually have a facts sheet on New York's model I can send.

Senator Anderegg: If you could send that over, that would be great.

Michele Weaver: Tammy, I just had a question about that facts sheet and New York's model and how does that relate to the rural areas?

Tammy Hunsaker: It would apply to the rural areas, I'm not sure if they had any special provisions for the rural areas but I think that's something we could look at because obviously the projects are going to be smaller and structured a bit differently in rural areas.

Michele Weaver: I'd like to do that because 20% of 4 unit is different than 20% of an 80 unit.

Mike Gallegos: Continuing off this item, is there any way we could look at potential impact of this untaxable property statewide, including not only the LIHTC but the other HUD mortgages that Tammy mentioned, I think if we know that the impact is, that helps on selling the concept.

Senator Anderegg: I know that's information that staff could work with LFA and GOMB to get, I believe but would take a little work to do. The last item is a tear down fee and I think everyone understands what a tear down fee is, many high cost states and cities have implanted an affordable housing replacement requirement or significant fee to approve the demolition of existing housing, the fees go to local land trusts to assist in building more housing, so I think everyone understands this and seeing no further discussions, let's move on and opposed to going through each of these one by one, does anyone have anything in these that particularly needs attention because I would say that everyone needs to look through these very thoroughly and we'll develop a list and we just don't have enough time, I have several other items we need to get too. So I recommend we table this for now. Let's move onto the HTRZ and the affordable housing connection with Beth and Andrew, the time is yours

Beth Holbrook: I wanted to just give a quick over view and then turn the time over to Andrew for more detail, as you may recall during this last legislative session, HTRZ (the housing transit reinvestment zone) legislation was passed and it was really designed strategically to focus on the front runner system, and is

really designed to maximize the incentive to get density housing with an affordable housing component, this hasn't been used yet or the TRZ legislation that was passed and we're hopeful that this could really move the needle strategically to incorporate that affordable housing component.

Andrew Gruber: (see attached HTRZ slides)

The idea behind housing and transit reinvestment zones is to be strategic as we try to target the housing challenges, particularly affordable housing that our state is confronting, this is legislation passed in the last session after a lot of collaborate effort from a lot of parties, public sector and private sector working on this, and here's the objective laid out in the bill, its creates a new development tool to help address Utah's housing crisis by facilitating mixed use, multifamily and affordable housing development specifically within a 1/3 mile radius of UTA's soon to be 16 front runner stations between Ogden and Provo. This is about being strategic, it's about location, efficiency of where development is occurring. The objectives are laid out in the bill, which promotes higher public transit, increases availability and affordability of housing, conserve water resources through efficient land use, improves air quality by reducing consumption, mixed use development, strategic land use and increases access to employment so if you live by the front runner station, you can access the entire region by transit. The process is made up of three components which is essentially the city first makes the proposal then they present that to GOED or go Utah to do a Gap analysis and then there is a committee who is formed up of all the relevant tax entities that do the approval, so a quick overview of how it works, the city proposes a development and zoning around a front runner station of a 1/3 mile radius and the actual proposed HTRZ is a maximum of 125 acres within that 1/3 mile radius and has to be mixed use, cannot be all residential or all commercial and has to average at least 50 units to the acre and at least 10% of those unit need to be affordable housing, the basic notion here is "all hands on deck" the development tool enables up to 80% of the incremental local property tax revenue growth from cities, counties, school districts etc. and to be captured over a period of time as needed to support costs of affordable housing, structured parking and land purchase, also does not apply to parcels with existing CRA's. The way it gets evaluated is, the proposal gets submitted to GOED, gets evaluated and verified the amount of public financing and tax increment capture needed for the proposed development, then an HTRZ committee is established with member from the city, county, school etc. and if and once approved, the tax increments is captured pursuant to the proposal, 15% of incremental state sales tax revenue growth in the HTRZ is transferred to the UDOT TTIF is prioritized for projects in an HRTZ, and the final thing is the resources made available is SB217 bill summary, a white paper HTRZ and map, there's more information on our website as well and we're going to target it out to the cities that actually have front runner stations and the last thing I'll show you is the map as a reminder of where these areas are, and this map is also available on our website but shows the front runner station across the region and am open for any questions.

Rep. Joel Briscoe: I wanted to go back to the 80% AMI and to some is considered the ceiling and to some the floor, but there's nothing to prevent a city from developing at 50%, 40% or below, they just can't go higher than 80%, it sounds like to me that we're giving a lot of flexibility and power to a city to look at what they believe would benefit there city, that particular area and it would go to an independent group or independent entity that which will say, we've looked at it and it's good, or we think you need to make

the following adjustments which those adjustments might mean, number of units that are affordable or percent, am I reading this right?

Andrew Gruber: Yes and no and because this is the Commission on Housing Affordability, let me read you the sentence from the statute that defines for affordable housing: Affordable housing which is defined by section 11, 38, 102 of Utah state code, housing occupied or reserved for occupancy by households with a gross household income equal to or less than 80% of a median gross income of applicable municipal or counties statistical areas for household of the same size, that's the definition and as you noted, there is nothing that stops a city developer from working together to do below 80%, there's also nothing that stops the number of units from being more than a minimum of 10%.

Rep. Joel Briscoe: I want to make sure I understand the last bullet under "if approved" one way of understanding this might mean that a small piece of the TTIF funding is going to go into the state TTIF and is going to build a fund that can be used for future HTRZ or its going to roll back into the current project of that approved, or it could be both.

Andrew Gruber: So this is a way for the state to say in this area, where additional economic activity, the state will benefit from that, as the largest sales tax entity and because of that, they're going to take a slice of that and put it into the transit fund, there is a requirement in the legislation now that the state transportation commission and when prioritizing, all TTIF dollars going forward, they have to look at prioritizing investment in any HTRZ. The housing affordability component of this is critical and the other broader perspective on this strategy gets at so many of the issues that we're confronting around housing affordability just around the supply of units around transit, traffic congestion and would put this tool at the center of coordinating the location of housing with our transportation system.

Senator Anderegg: Thank you very much for your presentation, and we're going to move on to the Center of Excellence Coordination with Melissa Freigang and I met with her and her group up in Weber County and it was incredible, it was some of the best coordination I have ever seen statewide between homelessness, affordable housing, permanent housing and transitional housing efforts and what they're doing up there, I truly believe is a model and template for what we should try to do with those nexus between housing affordability and homeless services and would like to turn the time over to Melissa.

Melissa Freigang: (see attached Center of Excellence Presentation)

I'd like to start with what is the center of excellence, it is a unique organization and were founded almost 2 years ago, and we are strategic partnership between the Weber County Commission and our behavioral health which is Weber Human Services and Weber Morgan Health Department. Our jobs is to increase the capacity of all our agencies that are doing work in Weber County and that can be across multi-sectors, such as economic development, community development, business and non-profits, and our focus right now is to make the systems really strong so our agencies can continue to do the work they do really well. Currently our focus is on the determinants of health, homelessness, housing, prevention and intergenerational poverty and today, I'll just do a quick overview of homelessness, specifically how the intersectionality works with housing, The way this works is, we take a model

including a child center approach as much as possible, interpersonal relationships around that child which typically is adults, coaches, or teachers and the institutions in which they all engage in terms of the child and the interpersonal of the family, we have a community level and the policy level so the greyed out areas is where we really have our intergenerational poverty and our focus on homelessness and housing is really around this community level and the policy level, and the way we're structured is our whole goal is to increase this vertical alignment and there's really great work happening. We want to look specifically around homelessness and housing and first we start with housing and the way we look at it is on a continuum so all the way from the unsheltered who currently not housed or have a roof over their heads and all the way up to affordable housing and everything in-between are our strategies, programs and funding that all need to come together. The way the homelessness system works in the state of Utah comes down federally, the states have a continuum care and the way they organize their continuum care is in three different categories, with local coordinating councils that operate at the local level, in terms of local level front line strategies. The local coordinating councils have been operating and our housing authority wrote a proposal to a non-profit organization, our homeless trust fund who commission a strategic plan, the center of excellence was tasked with implementing the strategic plan from 2019 so when we took on the plan, this is how it was organized with these five priorities, to provide leadership and unified advocacy, increase functioning of WMLHCC, create consistent collaboration, improve data quality and align with state level priorities. Commissioner Scott Jenkins is the chairman of the homeless coordinating council and we are within his portfolio and help run the WAGOG, we also have a welfare reform commission and a homeless task force, because we are part of the health department, the center of excellence facilitated everything really COVID related such as vaccine clinics. The bulk of the presentation today and the way the center of excellence has designed our inventory and address the housing gap analysis and with that, I will turn the time over to Danielle.

Danielle Stevens: (see attached Housing Inventory)

Two years ago, I started working with Dr. Jennifer Nagy, she's an economist with Weber State and a housing advocate with the Ogden City network and at the time, she was conducting a housing gap analysis for Ogden, she taught me her methodology and I replicated that with all the communities in Weber County, earlier this year, DWS required all homeless coordinating committee's in the state to submit a pretty substantial housing inventory for the communities, they did not set the parameters on what methodology to use so I determined for continuity sake to align with our past analysis to continue what you see and what we submitted to DWS is Weber and Morgan County which is just a simple inventory of what is available in these counties in terms of type of units, price of units in that range and number of units available, this data is pulled from the American community survey and for Weber County that's a 1 year estimate and Morgan County is a 5 year estimate and the earliest year for data is 2019 but it is reliable data and all this really tells us is what each kind of unit is theoretically available in the community. We also submitted a summary of special set aside units for the entire county for people experiencing homelessness, veterans, domestic violence, and people with aids etc. In Weber county total, there are 2,203 units for all of these special populations which are defined in the green box columns, we've also compiled all of the raw data of low-income housing developments in the community and this is all information from Olene Walker. So the individuals and families with a certain income who are occupying housing that would be affordable to a defined income bracket so as an

example, you have people who make 50-80% AMI occupying housing that's affordable to those who are making 30-50% AMI and when we calculate all these occupancies, what we see are the actual affordable and available deficit is substantially more and the link between the trends where people can live has a downstream effect for those who have the lowest wages in our communities, this methodology is replicable across the state, any community could do this and take what's actually affordable and available and I'm more than happy to share that methodology and educate and to entertain any questions you may have about this as well.

Christina Oliver: This is amazing and love to see this data in some form or fashion and we'll get in touch with you to go over this, I think it's wonderful.

Senator Anderegg: I want to jump in and the slide that was pulled up earlier on the housing continuum, when we're talking about this gray section, that's intervention like operation Rio Grande or I should say operation leaf blower, we're literally spending hundreds of millions of dollars a year and I'm wondering how much are we actually spending in each of these buckets and not only what are we spending in each of these buckets but what's the inventory of permanent supportive housing, or transitional housing and then as you move over to the orange side of that where we're looking at subsidized housing and market rate, let's not forget this spectrum continues on past the orange to what Chris and a lot of other are saying, we can't just focus on this 50% or lower AMI because if we ignore this section over here, which is where people are buying houses and if we're 49 thousand units short, the lions share is over here and if this is also in trouble then that creates this downward pressure on everyone in the orange section and then ultimately everyone in the gray section. I would love to do a deeper analysis of every single one of these buckets, I would love to have an analysis that's looks at the AMI, the number of individuals in that area, the number of units available in that area, what the deficiencies are and that gives us really a potentially a really detailed focus target that we go after county by county.

Janice Kimball: I really like how this presentation was laid out and I've done a lot of work with the homeless services and the homeless housing and I know throughout the state, this information can be readily made available and I do know that the Salt Lake County continuum has really looked at this way and has actually started to figure out what is the gap between what we have, the number of people in the homeless system and what we think we need to have, what types of housing we need to have to solve the problem and there's a lot of rich information here that we could build on and really paint a compelling picture here.

Senator Anderegg: I agree. I just know that when we talk a little bit about in abstracts up in the legislature, it gets lost on what we're giving 10, 20 or 30 million dollars for and this I think really helps us define what it is we're trying to do and in short of having a better methodology, I would really like to look at this and strongly recommend that Melissa and Danielle work with Christina and see if we can't get DWS to put something together area by area.

Christina Oliver: I actually took a picture of this slide and sent it to Wayne Neiderhauser and this is the concept that we were brainstorming yesterday and you have a unified body at DWS that wants to

produce hard data and I agree with you, it needs to be clear where the funding is going, what problems we're solving and where there may be some disconnect.

Melissa Freigang: We were really fortunate to have Wayne come up on May 7th and we did provide this to him as well the in depth tour we gave to Senator Anderegg, we're super excited to work with you and whatever you need, we're more than happy to provide it and to the commission as well.

Senator Anderegg: Thank you Melissa and Danielle for coming on today and presenting to us. Seeing no further questions we do have a comment from Utah Housing Coalition.

Tara Rollins: I wanted to talk a little bit about investing and when people are housed and making sure that they don't fall into homelessness, I was shocked yesterday when I found out some information, So HMIS is now and we have asked them last fall to include three questions and the questions were if you were evicted last year, is your homelessness due to eviction, and then have you been denied housing due to eviction, I want to dig deeper into this and 85% of people have said their homelessness have been caused by eviction and if we start investing in people in their housing, I think it will save us a lot of funding on the other side and that's all I wanted to indicate, thank you.

Rep. Steve Waldrip: I would say what Melissa and Danielle shared today was amazing work and the vision she and Commissioner Jenkins have both had in creating this structure and format, I think will be the model for the future and there's a great effort to start to implement a lot of these coordinating efforts, and that we're dealing with issue by issue.

Rep. Joel Briscoe: Would we be able to hear from Michele on the next meeting regarding the appropriation that was achieved for rural?

Senator Anderegg: Yes, we do have a little time now to hear from her if she has anything to report.

Michele Weaver: We did have a meeting this week with a developer, Jess and Keith but would like to do a more formal update on the next meeting if possible.

Senator Anderegg: Thank you and moving back to the agenda looks like we're pretty much at the end of what we had planned for today, I do want to ask another question under other business and wanted to have the discussion as a commission on whether or not we wanted to continue doing virtual meetings or in person meeting now and if there are limitations in SLC that would prevent that?

Michele Weaver: I would like to be live.

Senator Anderegg: I would like to be live as well but I don't want to do anything that anyone's uncomfortable with but pretty sure we could still use the capital room 445 but we could do a hybrid option as well.

Cameron Diehl: The league has a couple of representatives as you know on the commission and we've been listening to each other and meeting with each other, we are trying to make sure we are all on the same page about the problems we're trying to solve, I know that may sound a little odd in year four with the commission and what we have found in our dialogue are the constituents that represent as well as council members that there is still a disconnect in what we're trying to accomplish, are we addressing housing affordability in the general sense or are we addressing affordable housing or working on plans with the housing growth or trying to close the housing gap, and the answer is yes to all of the above. As we framed these conversation with our members, we asked for their input on how local governments, private sector state and residents can work together, with that we have put together the planning for growth wish list, as we start our deep dives this summer there are things for people to keep in mind, for example: cities and planning for the future and housing is only piece of the plan, many cities are planning a variety of housing but we have to balance all of the needs, right and amenities in a community, such as; jobs, commercial center, industry, recreation etc. also city leaders are frustrated by nimbyism and bares a few key questions, who should bare the primary burden of funding infrastructure for population, should that be existing residents or future residents, infrastructure's not free, so how do we collectively pay for it, the potential solutions on the table really do address the problems we've identified and I'll stop there, those are just the framing questions.

Senator Anderegg Thank you for your work on this, my hope is between the property rights coalition list and the Utah league of cities and towns list, we can identify those areas and offset hat those costs are. I'd like to take in the regards and see if we can take to house and senate leadership in the June interim, is that something I could task the land use working group to do?

Cameron Diehl: My preference would be to let the dialogue start for a few weeks and then be able to come back in July or August.

Rep Steve Waldrip: To me, that seems like the best thing to do is to get with our leadership and see how they want to approach that part of their commission and coordinate the efforts.

Senator Andgeregg: Let's plan our next meeting in 2 weeks' time?

- Next Commission meeting: Tuesday, June 8, 2021 from 2:00pm-4:00pm

Rep. Waldrip: Motion to adjourn at 5:14pm.