

Commission on Housing Affordability
Minutes for May 11, 2021
Electronic Webinar - Via Zoom

Members Present

Senator Jacob Anderegg
Representative Joel Briscoe
Representative Steve Waldrip
Andrew Johnston
Beth Holbrook
Chris Condie
Chris Gamvroulas
Dave Damschen
Jacey Skinner
Janice Kimball
Jeff Jones
Michele Weaver
Mike Akerlow
Mike Gallegos
Mike Ostermiller
Tammy Hunsaker

Representing

Senator
Representative
Representative
Salt Lake City Council
UTA
Lehi City Council
Utah Homebuilders Association
Utah Housing Corporation
Salt Lake Chamber
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

Ben Hart

Staff Present

Nathan McDonald	Deputy Director, DWS
Casey Cameron	Executive Director, DWS
Jess Peterson	HCD
Keith Heaton	HCD
David Fields	HCD
Jennifer Edwards	HCD
Deann Zebelean	HCD
Christina Oliver	Director, HCD
Daniel Herbert-Voss	HCD

Welcome and Introductions

The Commission on Housing Affordability Board meeting was held electronically via Zoom on: May 11, 2021. Senator Jacob Anderegg called to order at 10:03am.

Approval of Minutes: April 20, 2021

Motion to approve minutes by Mike Gallegos. Motion passes. Minutes approved.

Public Comments Submitted:

Susan Olson: With all the new state, federal, and philanthropic funds coming in for affordable housing, wouldn't it make sense for the Commission on Housing Affordability to press for the production of a comprehensive plan for how best to spend this money in ways that would be most likely to house the greatest number of Utah residents making 50% or less of AMI? The private market is unlikely to be able to fill this need, even if/when the cost of lumber and availability of construction workers improves. Such a study should take a long view, perhaps to 2040. The study should tap the expertise of DWS, the Gardner Institute, the U's Department of City and Metropolitan Planning, the Utah Housing Coalition, and members of the Commission itself. It is wonderful to have these new funds devoted to housing, and it's essential that they be well spent. Thank you.

Jean Hill: As co-chairs of the Salt Lake Valley Coalition to End Homelessness, we know the solution to homelessness is housing that meets the needs of those who live in it. To house those who are experiencing homelessness today (both sheltered and unsheltered), we need 2,950 new/additional affordable units. An additional 1,400 households per year, at current trend, will require housing subsidy and/or access to additional affordable housing, your recommended funding for affordable housing during the legislation session was a much needed influx, but will not address the needs of our homeless neighbors who are living at or below 30% AMI. With the anticipated funding through recent federal legislation, we have a unique opportunity to address our homeless crisis in a significant way. While cost estimates may be in the hundreds of millions, providing housing to those who are homeless returns Utah back to Housing first... where we provided the stability and permanent housing coupled with services to reduce the demand on our resource centers and impact on our communities—not to mention the change in people's lives. This investment in housing would also preserve on-going state funds for critical elements our statewide homeless services system - resource centers/short term interventions, as well as the wrap-around supportive services housing case management. Current data shows a 96% retention rate for those who find housing in Utah. Imagine our city if that percentage of those who are in need today found housing. Imagine the impact on these people who can then live safe and healthy lives. The Commission on Housing Affordability should go beyond debating local policy and housing for higher AMI households and instead address the biggest housing affordability issue our state faces: deeply affordable housing for those experiencing or on the brink of homelessness. We have an opportunity that can change the narrative and trajectory of our housing crisis—let's be thoughtful, efficient and impactful in using these funds for our most vulnerable.

Robert Vernon: (see attached "Affordable Housing Commission")

Thank you, I've got a lot of things I want to talk about but most importantly to start off is, DWS HCD, State of Utah affordable housing report of 2020 states, providing governmental support to create an atmosphere where socially equitable forms of shelter are accessible as a challenge but not an insurmountable one, ignoring housing affordability especially from an institutional point of view will contribute to this slippery slope vulnerable Utahans continually risk towards housing instability, homelessness and social detachment and the State recognizes that housing is a major, major issue. We've been given a once in a lifetime opportunity to invest a significant amount of money in housing that will be life changing from many Utahans that are struggling with the challenges of COVID 19 has forced on us and the opportunity is now to invest in housing. The 20% for housing is a statewide

coalition of housing authorities', non-profit housing developers and providers and service agencies that are requesting for 20% of the discretionary portion of the American rescue plan funds, which is \$320 million and 20% of all other discretionary federal funds in 2021 to be invested in housing and land. These funds should be managed by local entities as the cities would like for local control. We are in the process of putting all this together and we're looking for \$120 million dollars for housing assistance to be administered through public housing authorities throughout Utah. We would welcome some input through a trusted third party, like Jim Wood on how to distribute fund throughout the state and according to needs like poverty levels, number of evictions and that type of thing and these funds will help people struggling to stay in their current homes and to help get more people housed more quickly.

Senator Anderegg: Is this something that we can have each of the Commission members look over and digest and just so the Commission is aware, this is a list coming from Utah County Housing Authority and other housing authorities that Robert has worked with, I sat down with Robert and looked at a lot of these that we could look at incorporating into next year's efforts for the housing in commission and we're already having discussions right now for about \$100 million to be set aside from the monies that might be released for this year, meaning that the \$1.5 billion dollars is probably not all going to be spent in year one and we have with the feds authorization all through 2024 to spend that money and if you could briefly summarize the rest of your list and we may invite you back to address these in greater detail in the future Commission meetings.

Robert Vernon: The 2nd item on the list is, we would like some changes in the homeless mitigation fee, no one in Utah county or many surrounding counties qualify with a homeless shelter that allows us to keep our money local, all of the cities in the county end up writing a check for \$120-\$140K to Salt Lake City every year for homeless and I would like to have that number changed a little and have some flexibility to help communities partner together and have cities be able to hold that money for 2 or 3 years, to try and build up enough money that we can actually get something done and would like to explore some changes on. Thank you

Senator Anderegg: I felt like after meeting with Robert, it was important that he be given an opportunity to share his list of suggestions for this upcoming session and looks like we have a question from Andrew Johnston.

Andrew Johnston: I agree with most of what Robert's saying but I wanted to make a couple of clarifications here, the state mitigation fee does not go to the Salt Lake City, in fact we don't get that money period, it goes to the State and then re-allocated out to other cities which we need to talk about but that fee does not go to Salt Lake City. I love the idea on your list about the land trust, I do believe there are a couple of land trusts already set up that should be evaluated the same way and the reservation fund, I believe that is State wide, am I incorrect on that?

Senator Anderegg: I believe it was intended to be State wide but is being run by a non-profit and so we would need to clarify what their mission and service area is, I don't think there's anything statutorily that would compel them to do anything off the Wasatch Front or out of Salt Lake County but I do believe it was intended to be a State wide but I think we need to follow back up and see if we're doing a separate fund or how is this working.

Jess Peterson: 30% of the funds need to be used in Rural Utah so it is State wide.

Senator Anderegg: Outside of that thought, is there any other statutorily component to be out of Salt Lake County?

Jess Peterson: No.

Andrew Johnston: I don't think it's a bad idea to evaluate those funds, I know there's pros and cons to having one fund for the whole state versus multiple local jurisdictions but I think it's a good discussion point for us.

Robert Vernon: One of the issues we have in Utah County is, that we struggle to get money south of the point of the mountain, a lot of the funds that are allocated go to the Salt Lake area or Ogden, in the past and with our population growing rapidly and in Utah County, we're feeling the stress of more homeless and definitely affordable housing issues and just would like to see more of that money pushed south of the point of the mountain.

Senator Anderegg: It's a good point and I know in 10 years, we're likely to be as a as Salt Lake County, so there is a compelling reason to have more of a discussion.

Janice Kimball: I just want to say I am in support of this proposal and that we really are at a unique opportunity, we have a resources coming to a state that was already doing really well and I believe that this is really a once in a lifetime opportunity to move the needle on affordable housing, I recently attended the point of the mountain planning discussion and was a disappointed to see the lack of focus on affordable housing and believe we have a tremendous opportunity here to use some of these funds, they are carefully planning a community and if we can tie into that a model of affordability, we will have an opportunity to do something that may never have been done before. I'd like to ask that we make a bold request for these funds.

Walter Plumb:

Hello, I wanted to touch on SB34 and what's been playing out in real time, we own a property out in West Bountiful and located a mile off the legacy parkway on ramp on 500 S., 126 acres and borders the Woods Cross property that's owned by the Smith family and they own 80 acres which that property is currently in for approval with the density of 11 units to the acre and has a significant component to affordable housing. In Feb 2019, SB34 was passed and we were excited to see this legislation get passed because we had been dealing with West Bountiful that wants to affordable 1 acre units on 126 acres, so when the bill was passed, we quickly submitted a plan for 500 units, many of which were for affordable housing and was quickly rejected by West Bountiful. In Dec 2019, West Bountiful passed a general plan amendment that declared they had sufficient affordable housing and that low density residential development will be protected from higher density and since that time, they have yielded one application for an ADU unit. We decided we wanted to test how bad they hated affordable housing and not interested in complying with SB34 so we made an offer we thought no city in the state could refuse, so we reduced our plan down to 232 lots which is only 1.63 lots per acre. As part of that proposal, we proposed to give to the city 40 fully improved lots that would be given to them free of cost to own free

and clear and with those lots, they could sell them and have a 10-12 million fund for affordable housing and yet the plan was quickly denied, nobody wanted it, neighbors voiced extreme opposition to anything less than 1 acre and several people said they only wanted people who could afford 1 acre lots in the area, no open space, parks or amenities for the public, just 1 acre lots. When we asked about people who need affordable housing like school teachers or fireman or anyone working for the community, they responded that “those people can live down on Redwood Road” that’s been our experience that’s been playing out over the last 12 years and in 2019, we were excited about SB34 and our hope is that the Commission can maybe somehow put some more teeth to SB34. This to me is the poster child of the problem that’s happening in the state right now and there’s a big concern that teachers and fireman and other need housing and as a developer, we’re willing to pitch in and help solve the problem but we do need additional help for the cities to approve some of these plans.

Chris Gamvroulas: We’ve done a lot of work with the plumb group over the years and have a great relationship with Walt, I think I wanted to point out a couple things and one, you’ve got someone who’s a significant land owner and a city willing to stand up in public and make a statement that could be really negative to his prospects in this community with the policy makers but Walt is willing to do that because he believes in this and what you’re seeing with this is a lot of developers is we’re going to do whatever we can to get a return on our capital, that’s what we do, that’s the nature of capitalism and that and doing the right thing are not mutually exclusive and what Walt is saying is, we can do either way, but can we do the right thing while we’re at it. I just want to let the commission know that this is not a small thing and I appreciate everything the commissions doing.

Walter Plumb: Really, we’ve gone even further and I’ve actually vowed that I would never bring a plan with 1 acre units to the city because I feel like it’s such a waste of resources and unfortunately we have partners who are holding the property now for 12 years and we have to do something, but this is totally the wrong use of this property, it will serve some really wealthy people and they’ll have some really nice homes and yards but we’re going to keep pushing and I’ll never forget one comment when they said “those people” because those people are who make up our community, those people are the ones that inspire me, not the guy who doesn’t have to work because he’s made it in life and has a 4 car garage, an Rv and a boat, I’m not inspired by that, I’m inspired by the ones who grind it out every day.

Andrew Johnston: From our commission perspective when talking about policy though, we’re not going to paint certain cities that are already doing a good job and harm them, because sometimes when we talk about policy and what it would benefit and how cities aren’t doing the right thing but also harm cities that are doing the right thing, trying to bring in the that balance and it’s a tricky thing but I’m not sure about all the policy discussion but as long as we’re keeping that in mind as we try and move forward with our policy recommendations with the legislature.

Duane Huffman: I am the city administrator in west Bountiful city, I was not planning on speaking to you today and just learned of this meeting yesterday and heard that Mr. Plumb was presenting and it is not my intent to refute everything he has said but I will note that it was a very 1 sided description of a very long and detailed history of this property and id include what I believe to be many factual

inconsistencies, I do want to address some of the statements shared about not wanting certain types of people in the community, do not reflect the leadership of West Bountiful City and I'm unsure if whom Mr. Plumb was quoting and it may have been residents but I can tell you that the West Bountiful City council and West Bountiful planning commission are actively trying to find ways to increase the housing supply in West Bountiful but they want to do so in a way that will be maintainable in the city. The property owned by Mr. Plumb has actually never had a full or complete application made for any of the different proposals Mr. Plum has referenced, he's floated many trial balloons and received feedback on many of them and in many cases, it was very positive, so I do want you to know that West Bountiful is actively trying to not only comply with the law but also trying to do better than that and trying to find ways to increase housing density in our community.

Senator Anderegg: Thank you very much, seeing no further comments, does this conclude your presentation Mr. Plumb?

Walter Plumb: Yes it does and I just want to say, I stand by everything I said and want to mention that Duane has been very helpful in helping us navigate things.

Senator Anderegg: If what is being portrayed is accurate, even if its 10% of the cities along the Wasatch Front, that's alarming and disturbing and it is this balance of how to maintain local control and yet at the same time, push the cities to overcome their nimbyism and I would be very interested to see how many cities have said to let people live in West Valley or down Redwood Road or in these high density areas, when in reality the high density areas are now here in Lehi and West Bountiful and the Wasatch Front is filling in. GOED last November estimated there were over 200,000 Californians that moved to the State of Utah in 2020 and I know at least in Lehi, they're buying our homes with cash and driving up the prices to unsustainable levels and this is part of the problem, I think we need the league of cities and towns and the home developers and all sit down and have a really, really frank conversation, which leads us into the rest of our agenda. I will publically state here for now that both the speaker of the house and the president of the senate have given us very clear direction that land use, up zoning, permitting, impact fees and inclusionary zoning, everything that has been the hard things for us to discuss, need to be addressed by this commission this year, and one of the members said that if we don't address this, then maybe it's time to ban this commission and we recognize that it's going to be a balancing act on what the cities needs are and the local control aspects and see if we can't find some middle ground, so it's time for us to actually dive into the weeds and figure out what that is, and from my stand point and Rep. Waldrip's, that is what we intend to do this coming year, so if we are going to have any ongoing support from the legislature, then these are the items that they want addressed.

Andrew Johnston: The whole discussion is important and it's easy to spend so much of our energy and time on land use because it will build access right, but we may not get to a piece of it where it's going to take some money and we've got some money in the legislation but I want to make sure we're carving out some space for that as well some of these really painful long discussion with the senate.

Mike Akerlow: I wanted to make a comment about the policy items, and I think in the last session, we started having those discussions around inclusionary zoning and impact fees but I do feel like we didn't have enough information behind it to make good decisions or recommendations and I'm not sure how you were thinking of setting this up but I know we've had in the past different sub-groups doing the work and perhaps given the nature of these topics, maybe we need to set up some sub-groups on these topics as well and get the right information to the commission.

Senator Anderegg: Thank you both Andrew and Mike. Moving on to the Interim study items, the finalized 2021 goals, I think we have a list that came to us from the property rights coalition, and the list from the land use authority group.

Rep. Joel Briscoe: I remember one of those items being inclusionary zoning and I think that's on the property rights list, my only concern is not the right word, I would like to see what's on their list but if we're going to talk about inclusionary zoning and if what we heard today was 50% true, then we have a classic study case presented to us of exclusionary zoning which is why we talk about inclusionary zoning so if we're going to talk about inclusionary zoning, then the people discussing it should be broader than just home builders and realtors as important as they are.

Senator Anderegg: Right! Are there other people or groups that you would recommend?

Rep. Joel Briscoe: I'm still trying to learn what everyone does on this commission after 3 years and to be honest and to be blunt, there are so many pieces to this issue, it's complex and I mean this is what we're all for, you give it to a sub-group like Chris Gamvroulas or Michael Parker who are very knowledgeable about these issues, and they bring it back to the commission and then anyone who wasn't on the sub-group asks about this or that, I would ask other people on the commission or outside of the commission who may want a way in to signal people who they think ought to be a part of it.

Jeff Jones: I think it would be helpful and I'm sure there's only a handful of jurisdictions in the state that actually utilize inclusionary zoning so we should at least invite those governmental entities in and briefly explain how the program works, and what the results of that program are and give the commission an opportunity to listen to that because I'm sure there will be recommendations, even from those jurisdictions.

Chris Gamvroulas: (see attached land use priorities)

Just to be very clear, this is a working document that a group of people from the development community, home builders and realtors have gotten together to think about strategies that the commission ought to be thinking about, we know that this market is not a normal market and some of the concepts is increasing home build momentum and one way to do that, is not just to track building permits but to track entitlement approvals and to track the time line for these entitlement approvals, fast tracking those projects and expanding where homes can be built, we've talked about big box redevelopment, giving some incentive for good zoning and it is also possible for us to build a home and make a profit but still want to do it more affordably. I would challenge those are public office and the

league and I don't mean the management of the league, but the body of the league, what are your ideas, because we have lists and have come up with all these ideas, so what are your ideas and do you have any ideas that will substantively change this, not just fill out a report, we have a housing issue and what if we treated it like a crisis, what if we treated it like COVID like a crisis and come with some ideas and let's work those out the Utah way, the way we know how but if everyone's going to be protecting their turf, then it will be an issue.

Victoria Ashby: I just want to say, Chris we accept your challenge, we've had a lot of discussions with you and other members and commission chairs and we've invited the chairs to our board meeting that's happening next week, we may come back with third or fourth rails of our own but we understand there needs to be some conversations and difficult subjects on this and we want to be willing partners but doesn't necessarily mean we agree to taking out all local authorities to decide and elected officials to listen to the communities and decide the future of their communities but we know there are opportunities for discussion, so we'll come back with some of our ideas and hopefully get some motion before the commission.

Beth Holbrook: One of the things that caught my eye the most and what I think is really critical, is the connectivity piece to the MPO's in the infrastructure discussion, those are two things I think have a lot of analysis and as UTA, we would love to be a part of that because infrastructure investment and corridor preservation, all of those elements that we have to talk about, we think they are correlated to some extent and I would love to be committed to this sub-committee and help in any way and I appreciate the dialog, I do think that this is a crisis and am happy to do what I can.

Rep. Joel Briscoe: I think Chris has put together an excellent list, they are important issues and we call them third rail issues because they are electrified and have high capacity to either send us on our way or to do damage and he raises an excellent point in treating it like a crisis, one of the items on the list towards the bottom and let's be honest, Ivory Homes is a great home builder and we shouldn't ask Ivory not to do something they do very well but it's their core mission and that item on the list was preservation fund and looking at a spreadsheet I was sent by someone who works in our community and there are 28 properties across the Wasatch front and some in rural areas, that his estimate for a new unit might cost \$50k per average and these could be rehabilitated and let go in another 15 years and keep people in affordable housing for \$50k a unit rough estimate, so it's 5 times the bang for the buck and these are for existing units that don't need permitting or all the processes that need to have for building housing. These are units that house thousands of Utahans, so here's something we can do with a quicker turnaround time and some of the money we'll be looking at, the RPA money I've been told will be spent in 2 years, so when you're 50 thousand units short of affordable housing, you need new construction and also need to preserve, I would like that on the plate with more detailed information.

Tammy Hunsaker: We appreciate the discussion and recognize that RDA funds set aside could be a significant contribution to help address the affordable housing crisis and we would appreciate a seat at the table as well, sometimes there's a misconception that there's a lot of RDA funds just sitting around based on our project area budget but those funds really trickle in on an annual basis over time and I

know there's always room for improvement, there's a lot RDA's across the state have been doing what they can do, in Salt Lake City, we actually leverage city local funds with our RDA funds and have deployed about 52 million for affordable housing over the course of 5 years, I would just like to advocate for RDA's maintaining local control over those funds but recognize there's room for improvement and better coordination.

Senator Anderegg: Tammy, I'd be interested to see if you'd be willing to put together kind of what an accumulative amount of money and I know if you look at it in an individual city level, it's probably not significant but if every city has maybe a couple hundred thousand dollars or something like that, I would imagine over 80 cities along the Wasatch front, we'd potentially be talking about tens of millions of dollars I would imagine, but I would be interested in seeing what that real time money looks like.

Tammy Hunsaker: That's true and for state statute for RDA's as you probably already know provide the opportunity for those communities that do have a just a little bit of housing funds and don't really equate to a larger project, that community can drop those funds into the local housing authority or Olene Walker but you're right, it would be interesting to see what it all totals up too.

Senator Anderegg: Thank you, we're going to move onto further discussion on this list as well as transition into the APRA funds but before we do, I'd like to introduce Christina Oliver and if you could give us a quick introduction of who you are and what you'll be doing at DWS for the commission.

Christina Oliver: I am very excited that Casey has given me the opportunity to work on affordable housing and community development throughout the state and a little about me, I've worked on bringing the jobs in, worked as the corporate recruitment directors for the Governor's office of Economic Development under Governor Huntsman as well worked under Governor Herbert for a while and worked with UTA for a little and also worked with Ben McAdams for about four years and have most recently been the community development director here in Draper City and have been working on the point as one of the selecting committee members for the planning group, so I'm very familiar with the discussions and the options that are being promoted as we speak. There is so many great opportunities to increase the affordable housing stock in the state of Utah and I am honored and humbled to be part of this robust group. Thank you.

Senator Anderegg: Thank you, and for those who are unaware, Christina has been hired to take over Jonathan Hardy's position over at DWS and will now be the guru over there, and has an extensive amount of experience and I think she has her work cut out for her and I think my co-chair and I, and Rep. Briscoe will want to meet with you once you're fully in the position and we'll set up a time to sit down and brainstorm what this year kind of looks like for us. Moving on with the agenda and now will give some time to Dave Spatafore and his working group.

Dave Spatafore: (see attached CHA Policy recommendations)

We've heard a lot of discussion using the RPA funds for onetime expenses and what this document shows and would like to thank those all those folks who worked vigorously over the last few days to get

this out for everyone, the goal here is deeply affordable housing and we think a portion of the commission over at least the next 180 days ought to be focused on deeply affordable housing which we define later in the document as 50% AMI or below, even down in the 20-30% range and we also talk about the fact we roughly need 3 thousand units and probably about 14 units a year for the next four years and that's what our goal is with this document. As you can see under the goals and metrics, we want to develop a state housing fund that maximizes state, county, city and private partnerships to address the need for deeply affordable housing and we believe the revenue to prime the pump will be initially RPA funds, this is the first draft, it's not a final version by any means and just a framework that we think will be amended and changed as we move along over the next 90-180 days and so we want to look at permanent housing options for the homeless system for those who are deeply affordable. When you move down to the funding source, we want to start with state wide and yes, we'll need tens of millions of dollars, it isn't cheap but we believe there is a political will today to do this, we know there's a need and we want to ask this commission to lead out on it, we also want to provide a partnership with the state and the cities that comply with SB34. We also need to have ongoing funds and recording fee on real estate transactions as well a linkage fee, target population, the fund should focus on investment in deeply affordable units and provide housing options for sheltered and unsheltered individuals and if you notice on the third bullet point, the fund investment should target individuals at 50% AMI or below and ensure less than 30% of monthly income is spent on housing costs plus utilities and a lot of the folks have revenue, they just don't have enough to get into a home, and I've skipped a lot of things but what this is, is the official draft document to provide this framework and we're anxious to work with you Rep. Waldrip, Rep. Briscoe, Jess, Christina and the team at DWS under the capable leadership of Casey Cameron.

Senator Anderegg: Thank you, I appreciate that and I also think that's a very robust list, one of my concerns is what we're talking about the property rights coalition as well as this and what Robert Vernon came up and undoubtedly a few other items that will come up and that we spread ourselves very thin, what I would like to do is compile this list into 3 categories, maybe more, and we need to have a category looking at that lower median income, have an area that is looking at the land use authority aspects and the 3rd category is the housing authority that Robert presented and have everyone go through it and prioritize each of the groups so we can compile the top 3 or 5 and that will help better target what we're trying to focus on. One thing you all need to be aware of is there's a certain portions of the RPA money that the legislative executive appropriations committee is talking about setting aside for next year and I don't know how much that is so part of what we're going to do today is come up with recommended suggestions on how much money we would utilize and for what.

Rep. Steve Waldrip: I think we are watching a dancing and moving target, I think they are getting a \$30-50 million dollars request every single day and a lot of wonderful ways to spend all this money but I do think part of our job is to remind leadership appropriations side of things, we just need to continue to press and it is a priority issue and has a significant impact on the daily life a whole lot of Utahans.

Janice Kimball: I wanted to ask Dave who helped work on the document and the homeless number, if that's a statewide number or a Salt Lake County number?

Dave Spatafore: This was put together primarily by folks of Salt Lake City and we believe the number with the 2,950 is not just Salt Lake but statewide.

Janice Kimball: Thank you.

Mike Gallegos: As we go forward with this plan, let's also consider other sources to include such as the Utah Housing Corporation as they look at setting up the priorities in regards to tax credits, also the municipalities that are also receive ARP funds.

Senator Anderegg: It looks like we are running over and won't have time to get to Dave Fields presentation, so if we could get him on the agenda for the next meeting. I would like to have my co-chair make a motion that we will compile all these lists, send it out to everyone and have them rank them based on their priority level and interests. The motion is, the chairs will put together a letter that we will send to house and senate leadership as well as executive appropriations committee with the request that both political subdivisions as well as social services appropriations and the Utah affordable housing commission provide additional substance to this framework for what we're asking in the appropriations request as well as the items we would like to address for the upcoming session that will tie into those funds.

Rep. Steve Waldrip: I will move that motion.

Senator Anderegg: Discussion to that motion, seeing no further questions. Motion passes.

- Next Commission meeting: May 26, 2021 from 3:00pm-5:00pm

Rep. Waldrip: Motion to adjourn at 12:08pm