

**COMMISSION ON HOUSING AFFORDABILITY**

**Minutes for December 13, 2021**

Hybrid Meeting: In-Person & Via Zoom

**Members Present**

Senator Jacob Anderegg  
Representative Joel Briscoe  
Representative Steve Waldrip  
Andrew Johnston  
Christina Oliver  
Christopher Gamvroulas  
Dave Damschen  
Jeffrey B. Jones  
Michael Ackerlow  
Michael Gallegos  
Michael Ostermiller  
Michele Weaver  
Tammy Hunsaker  
Tom Macdonald

**Representing**

Senator  
Representative  
Representative  
Salt Lake City Council  
Housing and Community Division  
Utah Homebuilders Association  
Utah Housing Corporation President  
Summit County Economic Development  
Community Development Corporation of Utah  
Salt Lake County  
Utah Association of Realtors  
Rural Communities  
Utah Redevelopment Association  
Utah League of Cities and Towns

**Absent Members**

**Staff Present**

Jennifer Edwards  
Jess Peterson  
McKenna Marchant  
Stacey Herpel

**Guests**

Sophia Dicaro  
Steve Erickson  
Wayne Neiderhauser  
Beth Holbrook  
Ben

**I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

The Commission on Housing Affordability meeting was held electronically via Zoom and in person at the Capitol in Room 445 on: December, 13, 2021. Representative Waldrip called the meeting to order at 1:00 PM.

**Representative Steve Waldrip:**

December 13th, 2021. Commission on housing affordability. We're grateful for all those who are online and here in person. We'll start out with just a recognition of the Co-chairs here. This is Representative Waldrip. I'll be chairing today's meeting. We have Representative Joel Briscoe Co. Chair to the Commission and let's start out with a quick public comment.

**II. PUBLIC COMMENT**

**Representative Steve Waldrip:**

Anything that's been filed? Nothing filed OK and we'll save other public comments until they're germane to the topic. Does that make sense? 'cause I think we've got some public comments that will go to sections four and five of the agenda. OK, let's have Sophia do her presentation. Sophia Dicaro, we've got her for a limited amount of time and she has a very full brain of knowledge and sweat and tears. And we're going to have her go over the budget as it has been proposed by the executive branch. While we've got her so Sophia take it away.

**III. PRESENTATION OF THE GOVERNOR'S HOUSING BUDGET**

**Sophia Dicaro:**

Can you hear me OK, OK, great. Wonderful, well thank you Mr. Chair and I appreciate the invitation to be with you here today and to talk a little bit about what was proposed and I know that you are all working hard to do great things for the Community, and I thank you for that as well. So we are proposing to invest a lot into housing. We've worked very closely with Wayne Niederhauser and Christina Oliver to understand that need, Pamela Atkinson as well and just appreciate what they're doing to further the needs as it relates to housing and homelessness affordability. We in our budget have proposed \$100 million one-time money of general fund to take that one time money and turn it into ongoing money. To put that in the Olene Walker Housing loan fund to be used in two ways, half of that would go toward the private activity bond program, where it can leverage more than \$300 million of federal money to go into loan and financing for affordable housing. That's under Christina Oliver's shop. We have also half half the other half of that hundred would go toward rural workforce housing needs. In some rural areas, home prices continue to increase and they're following out of alignment with median household incomes, and we believe every town deserves a qualified and competitive labor pool that can reside in the same municipality where they work. This would provide funding to help meet those needs in the rural areas. Again, recap 100 million. Half of that would go to PAB (Private Activity Bond) or private activity bond program, and then the other half to go into rural workforce housing. We are additionally proposing another 128 million and so 228 total for affordable housing. We're proposing 128 from ARPA money or can rescue funds to be used toward the things that Wayne Niederhauser is working on and that is for the deeply affordable population and to get housing needs for those who are struggling with homelessness and need to find housing in that way. He's doing some unique things to

build case management to keep people housed longer and I know you are all familiar with some of that. He's on the call as well. If there's additional questions related to that, we're proposing that 128 million be used for that purpose, that would include the first phase of tiny homes as well. We know that they have been approaching the legislature as well, and it's very important that the things that Wayne is working on and coordinating as it relates to the homeless population is coordinated and we know that putting that money in his portfolio will enable a stronger collaboration as it relates to the whole picture. So that does include that first phase of tiny homes in addition to the things that he's working on, which is acquisitions and case management sent to further those needs there, we do believe that that will be able to be executed and deployed within the time frame of the ARPA window, and so again that's a whole 228 picture for affordable, and deeply affordable housing and in addition to that. We know there's a need for the homeless Council and have presented a need for additional funding for the homeless mitigation fund. We had proposed 5,000,000 ongoing general fund to go there to help with those needs, and again, Wayne I know is working really hard in that area as I know many of you have as well, but we have proposed to fund what was asked. That 5,000,000 ongoing. So again, to recap, 5,000,000 ongoing for the mitigation fund. 128 million of ARPA funds to go to the homeless office and 100,000,000 to go to housing community development for both PAB and workforce housing and with that I'm happy to answer any other questions that you might have. We're excited, we know this is a big investment in housing. We have a unique opportunity in front of us to be able to utilize resources in front of us and we know this is a big need and we're excited to throw that support there but we know we have now passed the baton to the legislature, and that you all will take it from there. But we believe that. This would be a good investment for helping us to further the goals that you all are establishing.

**Representative Steve Waldrip:**

Thank you, thank you very much for that report. I see we have a number of questions. Let me just start out with a couple of my own. The 128 you specified is coming from ARPA. What about the other 100,000,000 to 50 million for private activity bond and 50 million for the rural initiative? Is that also ARPA funding as proposed?

**Sophia Dicaro:**

Yeah, we are proposing that 100,000,000 come from one time general funds and again it's an opportunity we have. You know a good amount of one time money that we are proposing to turn into ongoing money, and we do that in the form of this revolving loan fund. Now we couldn't do that with ARPA money. For eligibility reasons, the money is not able to be utilized in the form of a loan. It won't be considered spent if you put it in the form of a loan, so we thought, well, let's create some of this. Let's use some of this one time funding. Turn it into ongoing funding and help that need continue to perpetuate.

**Representative Steve Waldrip:**

Did they actually change the language to reflect that 'cause initially? The ARPA bill said it could be revolving, but then they said no did that get formally changed, or was that verbally communicated?

**Sophia Dicaro:**

Yeah, we had an opportunity to actually go to Washington DC and talk directly with the Treasury on some of these things, but what we learned in that meeting was that ancillary costs associated with the revolving loan fund could be eligible because it would be spent. So anything to put that money in action, you would be able to count toward being spent, but if the money is coming back to the fund in the form of a revolving loan fund it wouldn't be considered spent so you know at the end of the day. That doesn't translate to a lot on what the actual cost of executing a revolving loan fund. So we thought this would be

a better way to approach this and use the ARPA money for the things that Wayne's doing, because we know we can get that out the door and executed and then use general fund and turn that into ongoing funding for these loans.

**Representative Waldrip:**

OK, thank you. We have a couple other questions we have and let me just suggest maybe we start with questions. Come here in the Chamber and then we'll bring on Czar Niederhauser after, so we get some structure to this as best we can. So representative Briscoe and then we'll recognize our other chair, Senator Andregg, who's entered the Chamber.

**Representative Briscoe:**

Sophie, welcome thank you. My understanding of the \$5 million was it would be ongoing. Correct? OK, question about the \$100 million you specifically noted that half of it would be leveraged 3 to 1, four to one with private activity bond funding. Is there any leveraging going to go on with the \$50 million dedicated to rural workforce housing issues?

**Sophia Dicaro:**

Yes, and actually, since Christina Oliver here would be the one executing on that, it might be more appropriate for her to respond to that, but yes.

**Christina Oliver:**

Yeah, so the rules and parameters of the specific loans that are provided. Have to be, they'll go through the administrative rules process. We haven't set up any sort of framework for the particular funds at this moment, but it will be a revolving loan fund in some form or fashion. There's been a need expressed by various municipalities as well as school districts out in rural Utah. Where they need to attract workers and in, but in order to do that, an alternative funding source to allow for building or rehabilitation of rural workforce housing is needed and there hasn't been a financing stream for that, so this is the first of its kind for, and it's for 80% and below AMI so it really is hitting that target.

**Representative Briscoe:**

My understanding is that, well, the data shows that Utah has been located on a lot of people's maps and I would assume that with a funding stream that there would be investors who would be willing to invest in rural communities as well as Wasatch front communities and it would be nice to have some of these places. In my opinion, teachers or first responders, they just respond to 180 days of the year. But first responders and others are tough when you have a salary. But it's not big enough to let anyone get housing in your community. Like that recommendation, I just want to see how far we can stretch that \$50 million knowing the other \$50 million is going to be added onto. Thank you Sophie and Christina. Thank you.

**Senator Andregg:**

Senator, yeah, thank you very much Sophia, good to see you. So now that this is officially in the governor's budget. I would like to solicit your help in working with the House and Senate leadership. OK, I know you said earlier, now we're passing the baton and we're going to see what happens. You're not wrong, however because it's in the budget I think having someone like Senator, former Senator Wayne Niederhauser up here ringing the bell, especially on the Senate side where he has so many connections is not going to hurt our cause. I'm just wondering two things. Number one, what initial conversation, not what initial conversations were had, but have initial conversations with House and Senate leadership already been had around these budget items that say yes or no response is all I'm looking for now

because I don't want any, I mean, privileged information out there and #2 if it could be had. Would you guys be willing to help us rally the troops? 'cause there's three of us up here and there's 104 total.

**Sophia Dicaro:**

Don't underestimate yourself.

**Senator Anderegg:**

Oh, I know, and we're and we're going to bang the drum to be sure and we have our work to do but we want to know can we look to the governor's office for a full court press on this something and if you're not comfortable saying it in a public forum, that's totally fine, because you don't want to speak on behalf of the governor without having had a conversation with him. I totally understand that, so I'm giving you all the cover if you need to demur, that's totally fine. However, I would request that if it's possible and if we need to have this conversation offline, that's fine, but if it's possible, I would request that we, together with you guys, give the full court press to actually get the money. It's you know you're a former legislator. The governor's budget is great. It's a great placeholder. As far as legislators are concerned, but what goes into the governor's budget may or may not actually make it into reality except for the governor's ability to veto line, item, veto and whatnot. So if it is known that these are really high priorities for the governor as well as a core group of the house and senate of the body. It has a much higher likelihood, you know what I'm saying.

**Sophia Dicaro:**

Absolutely, and you know just to answer your question, what I can convey is that it is , it's been funded, it is a priority. There's been good coverage on it already when we put it in here. You know, we really try to take a long term view of the needs and a long term view of you know how we can use these one time investments wisely and prudently and this has clearly been a need where we can potentially move the needle in some of these areas and housing affordability. We hope you know. We hope that to be one of those areas, so it is a priority. Leadership is aware we've presented our, you know priorities to legislative leadership in both majority and minority settings, and so they are familiar and again, you know I just want to reiterate that this is a long term view. It's a prudent way to turn one time money into an ongoing resource right to address these needs and and. You know we are taking feedback from groups like this one to really address these issues and if we're going to really look to partner with everyone involved here to make this happen. But first and foremost is, you know. It's in the budget and we do intend to support this going forward and we hope to have this come to fruition and work with you to make that happen. But again, we do think it's a prudent use of ARRP money, and we do think it's a prudent use for one-time general fund money to be used in a way that will leverage for years to come.

**Senator Anderegg:**

Absolutely, and I appreciate that Mr. Chair if I may just follow up on that. Would you then recommend, because if this is already on the windscreen of House and Senate leadership and executive appropriations. Should we run this as a stand alone appropriation or should we actually incorporate this funding request as a fiscal note in a bill?

**Sophia Dicaro:**

Well, I know that Wayne Neiderhauser is on this call as well. I'm guessing that some of the things he's doing may potentially need some legislation. If that's the case, it might make sense to look at that. I think all options are on the table as we explore what the willingness is of the legislature to invest in this area, but we will work with you as you figure out what legislation is needed in the best way to move forward the resources.

**Senator Anderegg:**

Awesome thank you Sophia. Appreciate it.

**Sophia Dicaro:**

Thank you.

**Representative Waldrip:**

Thank you, do we have any? I don't see the hands line up there. Now we'll get well, I just want to see if we have any more questions for Sophia before we turn to Wayne. OK, nothing alright. Let's turn the time over to Czar Niederhauser. To get your official title, I can't remember what it is but everything about you I come up with a new one so it's kind of a fun game for me. Former Senator Niederhauser can you just talk to us a little bit about the design and structure of both the 128 million and the 5,000,000 ongoing?

**Wayne Niederhauser:**

All right, can everybody hear me? I'll start with the \$5 million in ongoing mitigation funds. Excuse me when Speaker Hughes and I were involved in Operation Rio Grande the legislature was siding resource centers, Permanent Resource Center, Midvale, and one in South Salt Lake. There's probably no entity up there that will actually take a Resource Center or slash shelter without action of the legislature, there's a few exceptions to that, so we were forcing these communities to take these high impact shelters, resource centers, and we passed a bill that gave South Salt Lake and Midvale and other communities what we call mitigation funds for public safety. So South Salt Lake uses their funds to create a special section as a special group of officers who are trained to deal with homelessness and it's a 24/7 activity in South Salt Lake. The impacts of the men's shelter there and they couldn't do what they're doing there to mitigate those impacts. Without those funds, I become a huge believer of mitigation funds, but a couple of cities were left out of them. They can get some grant money that we have for mitigation, but there are a couple of cities that were kind of left out like Ogden and Saint George and Salt Lake City. They do get some of the discretionary funds that we have, but we need to also give them a fair amount of money to deal with the same issues that South Salt Lake and Midvale do and of course, Midvale and South Salt Lake would like to see a little bit more and they could use a little bit more, so our desire was to see if we could do a state appropriation and if you're not familiar, the current mitigation funds we've just approved 5.7 million that would go out to these cities beginning July 1st next year, which is the 2023 budget and if there's 5,000,000 passes, which I'm confident we can make happen then there would be an additional 5,000,000 that we could re-distribute at some point after the legislative session and we've got this money to give Salt Lake City, Saint George and Ogden and those other two cities, South Salt Lake and Midvale little bit more money to help mitigate those impacts. As I was going to say, the current revenue of 5.7 million is a redistribution of sales tax that goes to the cities, and yeah, we could do that again. We could ask the other cities to buck up or pony up \$5 million and you know, I think many of us would support that build, but right now the cities that are paying into that hate it and that I could see that was going to be a political problem, and so my the proposal we brought forth is the 5,000,000 in state ongoing funds. So if there's any questions on mitigation, maybe we ought to take those now Mr. Chair, and then I'll go into just a quick discussion about the deeply affordable housing money.

**Representative Waldrip:**

Looking around the room, I don't see any hands. Let me ask a follow up. So you referenced the housing mitigation fund that's contributed to by other cities, so is the proposal to do away with that? I mean, I just missed that little piece there.

**Wayne Niederhauser:**

No, and that's a great question. The five million will be on top of the redistribution that happens under current legislation under current statute.

**Representative Waldrip:**

OK, thank you. We have any other questions about the homeless mitigation fund appropriation request. OK, let's move on to the big nut \$128 million.

**Wayne Niederhauser:**

Earn \$20 million of ARPA funding, which fits uniquely into this deeply affordable area of affordable housing. This is critically needed across the state. We have a number of options, we've got one that I can think of in Cedar City. There's several here in Salt Lake. I know that Provo has got some things that they would like to do, Ogden where there's some high impacts and think about our resource centers in the Salt Lake area and think about Lantern house and a switchpoint down in Saint George. Our shelters are running at high capacity at this point. Our resource centers because there's really no deeply affordable housing available for people do move on, out of the shelters into a more stable housing situation where they can start to get treatment and other help to deal with the trauma or behavioral mental health issue that they deal with and so you know there's a lot and this will make this won't solve all the problems, but it'll make, I believe, a huge dent in providing some of this deeply affordable housing which will help relieve the pressures that are on our resource centers and our shelters across the state. Getting people into a more permanent supportive housing situation and like has been said and articulated already today, and as I mentioned with Dave Spatafore, when we presented his committee in September. When we're dealing with this type of housing, you not only need to manage the property, you need to manage the people in the property because they are dealing with trauma in their life. They might have a mental health bill situation and there are incidents that come up and so housing doesn't work unless it's case managed. So there's a couple of things we can do with this money: we can reduce the cost of the housing there. Through a subsidy that will just lower the cost that somebody had or what they have to pay on a monthly basis or we can come in and do a lie down of a debt stack or an equity stack and use the money that uses the cash flow that comes from that to pay for case management because case managed housing is stable housing people will stay in housing longer if it's case managed, it's it is absolute fact and where we don't or we have struggle keeping people in housing, it's because they're not case managed like they need to be and this includes mental health case management and behavioral health case management. So that's the idea, that's what we're putting forth to go to the legislature now. I'm so excited we got it in the governor's budget. I appreciate Sophia and her team and all the work that they have done and I'm very optimistic that we'll be able to get hopefully all of this approved by the legislature and to answer a Senator Andreregg question about will you help us get this through. So we've already started. I've already been talking and meeting with legislative leadership and will continue to do so for the next several weeks before the legislative session starts and we're getting some positive feedback with that, but we are going to need to have probably a bill file opened, and so I'm hoping that maybe one of you would be willing to open up that bill file because I think we're going to need to have some statutory language around the 128 million. As far as the 5,000,000 is concerned, we already have a bill file open with Stevie Eliason. Representative Eliason, excuse me, who ran the bill back in 2018. He's well actually, we're working with Dan Johnson on that part from up in Logan and will be working with him on a bill to come forward. But we will need some statutory language to deal with how we distribute these funds that are deeply affordable.

**Representative Waldrip:**

Thank you chair Niederhauser before we take questions we have a few questions for you. I'm going to return to Ms. Dicario and see if she has anything she'd like to add. We're going to dismiss her, but anything you'd like to add, Sophia?

**Sophia Dicaro:**

You know, I just again want to express our deep gratitude for the work that you're doing. We passed out a hard copy of the budget book for your reference so you can see what's in it in the economic development section. You'll see more on housing there. Please know that I am available if you have any questions that come up and I look forward to working with you as you formulate legislation and look to advance these resources forward and just know that you know I'm committed to here to to help and be a resource to you all. As you navigate through the waters ahead and again, just appreciate the time to introduce what we're doing and what we have proposed here before you today. Thank you.

**Representative Waldrip:**

Thank you, we appreciate it for those online. She's referencing a 173 page document that they just passed out. But fortunately page 173 is blank. So we only need you to explain pages 1 to 172 real quickly.

**Sophia Dicaro:**

No problem, how much time do we have?

**Representative Waldrip:**

17 days. No, we really appreciate all of your work. We know you've been up to your eyeballs and in alligators with this for a long time and you're breathing a sigh of relief, but just don't make that too long of a sigh of relief. We're going to need you. Thank you very much. OK, now questions for Chair Niederhauser will go to Representative Briscoe.

**Representative Briscoe:**

Wayne is good to see you online. I guess this may be more of a comment, I'm pleased to hear you talking about case management when I was still teaching not that long ago I remember showing a clip to my students from some cities. They might have been West Coast cities. They might have been East Coast cities, but they created a spreadsheet and they tracked the amount of money that the city expended for some of their unsheltered residents over one year and they were expending over \$100,000 a year for some individuals when you totaled up time in hospitals time and detox police time and they used those numbers to make the argument for permanent supportive housing and there are a significant number of people who use our homeless resource centers too. Make sure they have a place to stay while they restructure lives while they get some finances in place, they're there for several months. They're out and they don't come back. But a few years ago, the Utah Housing Coalition brought one from the national Low Income Housing Group, I can't remember her name and she spoke about housing guilt. There are people who have been living on the street and they would get an apartment and they feel guilty because they have a shower and they have a bathroom and they have a bed and they have all these friends on the street who don't. So they invite them in for shower, so they invite them in to eat and then they get in trouble with the landlord and they do and they make it more difficult for themselves to stay because just giving them a key and a place to sleep is not enough for some of them. They need more help and I'm really, really happy to hear you talking about that. I appreciate the energy you brought to your position. Thank you. Thank you Wayne I appreciate you.



**Wayne Niederhauser:**

Thank you very much.

**Representative Waldrip:**

Thank you, do we have any questions online? Not raised anymore. OK there question was answered. I have just a clarifying question for you. So if I understood your presentation, one of the questions I've had around as well. Actually two questions. So number one is I like the focus on creating transitional and supportive housing. 'cause I recognize that's a huge, huge empty area where we don't have places for people to go. They either go from homeless shelter to back to the streets or you know they are magically healed and they go from homeless shelter to you know full housing and employment. That's a really tough leap for most people. So if I understood correctly, one of the thoughts you had with this 128 million would be to buy down transitional housing so that we can use and I would assume this would be largely federal monies. Section 8 housing, can we use that money to provide supportive services for those individuals by sort of making the housing cheaper? How do we? How do we use that one time influx of money to provide ongoing supportive services that are, you know, obviously critical to that population?

**Wayne Niederhauser:**

A great question. So I presented in September a little graph about a visual that showed revenue or rents coming in. Now these are reduced rents when we're talking about deeply affordable housing and so we're already challenged to begin with. But like for a private developer who's doing a hotel motel, reconvert conversion to permanent supportive housing they'll have some debt. If we can give them a couple \$1,000,000 to buy down their debt, the revenue that they would have been using to pay that debt now can be used with a deed restriction. We'll work out those years in, probably in a bill file that we'll need to open and we've already got some private sector people that are thinking about these things and some non-profit individuals. But that then reduces or takes that cash flow and makes an ongoing cash flow to be used now for case management. So we're replacing a debt stack that would require revenue from the rents and converting that revenue now to pay for case management. Does that answer your question?

**Representative Waldrip:**

That does. Yeah, I just wasn't clear on what mechanism you were going to use 'cause the federal monies are also challenged to be turned loose in a different direction than their appropriated for so that does make sense to me and I think that's a brilliant way to try to address that issue. One other issue that I just want to just have you briefly address and I realize that this is all still a work in process, but one of the concerns that's been expressed previously in this Commission. Is concentration issues now obviously with the tiny homes you're going to have concentration and that's sort of part and parcel with what you get there when you have a development specifically for homelessness, or transitional what? How do you do that with what you're proposing for the rest of the 128 million to avoid undue concentrations in, you know, in communities? Because, as we've seen just very recently, you know all of a sudden you're trying to put something by the baseball diamond, you know, by the baseball park and the neighborhood goes crazy and the mayor pulls the support and all of a sudden we no longer have a resource there. Can you address that briefly if that's something that you've contemplated? If you say, hey, we're still working on that, I'm OK with that too.

**Wayne Niederhauser:**

It's the biggest unknown well, it's not unknown, but it's the biggest challenge we have with any kind of deeply affordable housing. Nobody wants it in their community and so land use becomes a big deal.

Where it looks like Salt Lake City is quite a bit down the road, quite a ways down the road on the tiny home community. There's also models where instead of having a whole building of deeply affordable housing, we have 10% of the units and this is something that we'll work with developers. I know Christina Oliver works closely with a number of other individuals where we could actually just have a portion of that of a complex building, apartment building that would be deeply affordable, which you could mix with market rate or 80% or 60% and that mixed community actually is very healthy. For individuals who haven't been living in such a healthy community to have others or a community around them that are living more healthy lives. Should we say, and so we'll be looking into that also and looking into those options, we already know that that's going to be an element of this and cities are going to be a lot more amenable to that kind of housing. Deeply affordable houses where the impacts are lower and again case management is the key to that because cities will have less impact when somebody is more stably housed with case management.

**Representative Waldrip:**

I appreciate that answer, and I think that's exactly right that that's one of the things I think that's been a theme as we've talked about over the past year. You know, we've talked about that with UTA as well with dedicating a portion of those developments to, you know, a portion to low income, or transitional housing, especially if it's supportive I think that's something you know, something that we could do and that's something we also need to encourage and see if we can incentivize our cities to take on as well as they do market rate developments to include, you know, and that's part of hopefully the inclusionary language we can come out of with this bill is to have those opportunities present themselves throughout our communities so that we don't have the concentration issues so that we don't have the pitchforks and torches marches on City Hall, which proved to be a significant impediment. So thank you for all your good thoughts and all of your good work, and that's a significant job you took on there and it does not go without notice that you've created something so significant in such a short amount of time. So thank you.

**Wayne Niederhauser:**

Thank you representative and there's one other element in this too that I think we also need to recognize is we could also have a preservation fund that we funded last year. Some of this money could also go to help preservation of deeply affordable housing that we already have but maybe being sold or now in jeopardy of its status for deeply affordable, so whatever way we can get the deeply affordable and to maintain that deeply affordable is what we need to do to relieve some of this pressure that we see in our shelters.

**Representative Waldrip:**

Yeah, absolutely the bottom of that deeply affordable piece falls out and people go right into homelessness. So that is definitely critical and on your front we do have one question online we have Michael. I don't know which Michael that is, but introduce yourself, please.

**Michael Gallegos:**

Gallegos, thank you Mr. Chair. I just want to congratulate Wayne and others and Christina. Working with the governor's office to get this into the governor's budget. Two questions really right off the bat since tiny homes as part of the 128 deeply affordable. So that's sort of been predetermined is that an earmark to consider an earmark was a certain amount and if so should that be it at a different budget and then Sophia brought up, there's some housing and economic development. I see that bends on, so I wonder if you could maybe address that.

**Wayne Niederhauser:**

It's a great question, Michael. Good to hear from you. It is not an earmark they will have to offer up a proposal like any other project to receive some of this grant money?

**Michael Gallegos:**

Thank you.

**Representative Waldrip:**

Yeah, and I would focus on the link between economic development and housing. I think that's going to be more in the policy realm as far as when we do incentives, you know, are we thinking about and creating solutions for housing? And you know, when we're bringing in 500 jobs, say are we looking at that community provides that housing opportunity for those so that that won't be funding as much as that will be policy directives from GoUtah. I think through that program. Does that answer that second question, Mike.

**Michael Gallegos:**

It does, thank you.

**Representative Waldrip:**

OK, thank you and let me just ask a question and I'll just bring this up now 'cause I think it's germane to what we've been talking about, and I wish Sofia were still here because I meant to ask this while she was here. One of the restrictions on the \$100 million for private activity bonds in rural we're talking about 80% AMI or lower. That may or may not be adequate anymore, and in March I think when the Fed releases their new am I numbers, we'll see what impact they give to inflationary pressures into housing prices. We just don't know what that looks like, so I think we may need to create some flexibility in that statutory construct to say we may need to adjust. To you know, let's say to 2000 AMI levels and you know go from there some benchmark where we're going from some point where we know 80% AMI worked but you know it, it may no longer frankly be the case. We just don't know yet. I mean right now it's not and we don't know what the Fed is going to put out in their area, median income increases next year and with that I'm going to go back to one other issue before we go on the agenda. Last year's bill, when we talked about the ability of local governments and we're going to adjust that to add state government entities this year to provide some land as an incentive for low income development. One of the requirements was not more than 31% of the income go to housing payments under that scenario, and that may be another thing we need to look at because again, it depends on what we come out with and that's probably independent. I guess that is independent of AMI calculations. That's just a rough, you know, that's just a number, and I think that number probably, and we've talked about it in this Commission. That number probably is no longer adequate, but I mean we're looking at, I think 35% to 38% on a more normal basis now and so I don't think we want to limit the ability of municipalities to address workforce housing by something that's going to artificially hamstring them. So those two comments and I hope Gus is back there, taking a couple of notes. Those have just come up and I think if there are other places in our legislation that we need to look at those issues, we probably ought to review those now and be ready for him going forward 'cause we're in a different world now and that Senator Anderegg has a comment.

**Senator Anderegg:**

Yeah, and I appreciate it just for everybody who's online. We do have our drafting Attorney Gus Harb in the room. So what I'm about to say is directed at him, but I, you know, I just wanted everyone to hear.

Senator or former Senator Niederhauser with you still on the line I'm actually going to recommend that we instruct Russ as just a private legislator, it is not Russ, it's Gus, Russ is my fiscal analyst on social Services, so it's a Freudian slip. I'm sorry Gus. Anyhow, I'm going to ask Gus to open a bill file for Senator Niederhauser's needs for the direction of those ARPA funds. I would request that you talk directly to President former President Niederhauser to get from him his specific details. I would request if you're amenable to start on the Senate side for this portion and you will be the House if you're willing to be Representative Waldrip?

**Representative Waldrip:**

You bet ya.

**Senator Anderegg:**

Not at this point. Run it as a priority bill. I don't know that we need it, but I think that there's just a few tweaks that would be needed in the existing statute in order to pull off what we're trying to do with those ARPA funds, so we don't need a discussion, I just wanted that to. OK, I got the thumbs up. Thank you.

**IV. COMMISSION ON HOUSING AFFORDABILITY LEGISLATIVE BILL**

**Representative Waldrip:**

Alright, I don't see any hands online and yeah. Let's go back on the agenda to do a number 3 Commission on housing, affordability, legislative bill and we're going to turn it over to our very own Christina Oliver. Who's going to walk us through?

**Christina Oliver:** *(see attached presentation)*

Well, thank you. As Gus and I have been working with the various stakeholders, we've narrowed it down. So thank you as we've worked throughout the year and then individually with certain stakeholders. Certain topics have come to light that need to be more that need to be modified in current legislation. So we have narrowed that down to a few topics that were open for discussion. Today I'm just going to be reviewing the topics and then I expect there would be discussion at the end, if that's all right?

So the first one would be the division that I currently run, which is the Housing and Community Development Division we're looking to add two more individuals to the Olene Walker Housing Loan Fund Board. These Members will be from the rural interest. The second thing that we will be looking at is adding a specific piece of legislation, specific code section to address the Rural Housing Fund which Sophia Dicaro just went over the \$50 million, and the third would be including a one time appropriation for a statewide moderate income housing tracking system as well as new reporting tools and a database of all of the affordable housing units in the state of Utah. Currently, HUD produces a database that shows litech funded projects, but there are also additional affordable housing units in this state that we want to gain visibility. This can be multi-tiered. My ideas are big. It's probably going to be narrowed down, but really we would like to see where all of the affordable housing units where their deed restrictions are ending so that we can proactively keep the pipeline of affordable housing robust.

Oh, we started on the wrong slide, so we're going to start with accessory dwelling units. Accessory dwelling units were making changes to one of them prohibiting the impact fees for construction of an

internal ADU, this has been spurred by individuals going in to build a mother in law apartment and being charged the full impact fee the second would be prohibiting municipalities and counties from requiring business licenses from an owner of an ADU. So the proposal is to prohibit municipalities and counties from requiring business licenses from the owner of an internal or external or detached ADU, unless the owner operates 4 or more ADU's within the owner's property.

The third change prohibits municipalities and counties from establishing restrictions or requirements for internal ADU's constructed before May 5th of 2020. One, the date when HB 82 took effect. In other words, exempting internal ADU's created before HB 82 from regulation under sections 1095, thirty or 1727 A 526. This is reviewing the first slide, but was missed, so changes to the Housing and Community Development Division. The first one would be modifying the membership of the Olene Walker Board to include two additional individuals from the rural community in Utah.

The second would be to establish the Rural Housing Fund which Sophia Dicaro went over. It's in the governor's budget to the tune of \$50 million, and the third would be a one-time appropriation for \$100,000 for moderate income tracking system. Moderate income Housing plan tracking system rather. In a database of affordable housing units within the state, there are other nuances that we will include in this particular tracking system, and it'll be a geospatial type of model.

The next is transit oriented development and the proposal is to prohibit the public transit district from participating or assisting in a transit oriented development unless a minimum of 20% of the proposed housing units within the transit oriented development are dedicated to affordable housing of which at least 10% of the total units dedicated to households at 50% AMI and at least 10% of the total units dedicated to households at least 80% AMI.

The next point would be the point of the Mountain State development. It's a similar proposal to the transit oriented developments. Again, it would be 20% of the proposed housing units would be affordable, housing 10% would be at the 50% AMI and 10% would be at the 80% AMI. Now we'll jump into the moderate income housing plan. The requirements of the plan starting December 31st, 2022. It would be to require municipalities and counties to include a comprehensive map of all land use categories and zones within the boundaries that will be updated every five years. A second change would be to modify the list of strategies for municipalities and counties to implement with respect to the moderate income housing plan to give more force to implementation, also that the cities and municipalities will be reporting the implementation of their strategies.

This is a continuation of the plan requirements. We will require an adoption of the implementation element for the moderate income housing plan with specific implementation measures reflective of local needs and clear implementation schedules for each strategy implemented. Further changes to the moderate income housing report would include clarifying the purpose of the report, modifying requirements for format content to make the report focused on implementation activities in progress, require municipalities and counties to send a report only to the Department of Workforce Services. The department will then relay that report to the Governor's Office of Planning and Budget, the Governor's Office of Economic Opportunity, The Department of Transportation and the Local Association of Governments no later than December 31st of each year. Again, the report requirements continued. It would require the division of Housing and Community development to review the report to check for compliance at a penalty stating that municipality county is ineligible for funding from certain funds or programs if the municipality or county fails to adopt a moderate income housing plan or implement the strategies and requirements of that plan. It would also add an incentive stating that the municipality and

county and or county has priority for funding from transportation for transportation, investment funds, transit transportation, investment funds, ARPA and Governor's Office of Economic Opportunity Programs if the municipality and county or county implements an additional 2 strategies. In addition to the already metered required activities that they're supposed to be doing and with that, that's it.

**Representative Waldrip:**

Alright, if you can close that, let's look at. Who's hands are up, well, no hands, excellent, let's move on. Got it and we may need. I'm not sure how we can do this. We're probably going to need to pull those slides up again as we get questions from the online viewers here, I don't see anyone in. Chamber that has questions. So let's go to Tom, will be the first one.

**Tom Macdonald:**

I just wanted to know if we could have those shot slides shared with us.

**Representative Waldrip:**

Yeah, can we just send those out to the members of the Commission? OK, anything else Tom?

**Tom Macdonald:**

No, that was it. Thank you, OK.

**Michele Weaver:**

I just wanted to say how excited I am for rural and for two additional seats on the Olene Walker Board, so I'm very excited. That's all I wanted to say. I'm going to hold my questions until things start to develop. Thank you.

**Representative Waldrip:**

Alright, thank you Michelle. Beth.

**Beth Holbrook:**

Thanks Mr. Chair. I appreciate that opportunity and I, UTA, is supportive of doing anything that we can to help with the affordable housing challenges that we have today. If you could go to that slide just so I wanted to just point out just one thing that I think I, I know that this will kind of shift around and there might be some other discussions and I'm happy to do that, but one of the things, Oh yeah, one more transit down transit oriented. There we go. As you know, and as you articulated in this UTA doesn't control the land use or zoning in the area in the land that we own and some of the challenges would be that if a developer works just outside of that area, it would actually confine and constrain a TOD being developed that could be of the highest value, because if they don't include our land, we can't. We don't have any say obviously, and so I'd like to maybe be able to take a look at refining some of that so that it can't just be an automatic carve out of our land. Does that make sense? Kind of skirt that a little bit. It's just something I just thought if we could take a look at this and maybe have to include a station area plan or some other thing that addresses the utilization around that quarter mile component regardless of whether UTA owns the land or not. Maybe that could help to refine this. Otherwise, I think it is that we are again very supportive of having something that can move the needle on affordable housing.

**Representative Waldrip:**

Yeah, let's turn over to Senator Anderegg.

**Senator Anderegg:**

Yeah, Beth, thank you so much for bringing up this topic. This issue. I do know that Senator Harper, who is running an adjustment to his HTRZ bill from last year, is contemplating in essence, doing exactly what you just suggested as far as providing guidance for the requirements for TOD along a fixed guide rail. I still think there are opportunities for discussion with him on that. I don't know that he is 100% going to run forward with that. But that would be where I would recommend that we look at making a tweak to his bill from last year to address your concerns. That being said, I personally will be pushing for at least up to 20% of any and all TOD to include affordable housing up to 20% of the units, so that's my own personal wish, but let's I would recommend that you and I have conversations with a Senator Harper to look at making some tweaks to the HTRZ and if it looks like Senator Harper isn't going to look at that. We can always look at doing something here in this bill, but it's not my bill, it's Representative Waldrip's bill, but that's all I had.

**Representative Waldrip:**

Way to pass the buck there.

**Beth Holbrook:**

I just wanted to say I appreciate what Senator Anderegg said, and I have been working with Senator Harper on that language. However, that language is designed, if you will, to be impactful when you're looking at that component of funding and that's where that language would come into play. So if, for instance, there is a transit site that is not looking to do HTRZ. See then that would not be applicable, so I will definitely make sure that I work with Senator Harper on that one as well. But I just wanted to incorporate that and I'm happy to have further dialogue with the Committee on this.

**Representative Waldrip:**

OK, yeah, it would seem to me that you know as I think about the process. You know, with UTA not having zoning authority and not having that authority, but with the prohibition on a sale without those restrictions in place. It would seem to me that UTA could work with whatever governing authority is coming up with that plan. Whatever development agreement that they have to ensure that those requirements are met so that UTA can sell that ground, because otherwise they can do all they want, but if these restrictions are in place and they don't meet that restriction, then you'd be prohibited by law from selling them that ground. I would assume something along those lines, so again I think we can look. Let's look at the practical realities of how this operates in the real world and see what makes the most sense to to implementing these kind of structures so that you know we achieved that important goal of creating again avoiding concentrations, I mean, I think that's the thing that you know we're seeing is a theme here throughout all of our discussions is to try and avoid concentrations, and the best way to do that is to make sure that where we have significant opportunities that we include a portion of that as affordable housing so that you know we're not doing onesies or twosies deals, we're doing. You know we're doing 10, 20 to 100 on some of these larger developments. So thank you Beth. We certainly will be open to talking with you and and maybe you know, as you talked to Senator Harper and then bring us into the loop on that discussion as well.

**Beth Holbrook:**

I'm happy to do that. Thank you representative, I appreciate it.

**Representative Waldrip:**

OK, Mike Akerlow.

**Mike Akerlow:**

Hi there. Just first of all Christina, great work on this. These are huge steps and I'm really excited to see all of the work you've done and what you're proposing to do, just a couple quick questions. Some of the changes that you're proposing for the reporting does that have to go through, or do we need to change any wording in the, I think it was SB30 for the moderate income housing reports to do what you're doing, I don't know. Maybe you mentioned that already, or is that something that can just be done on an administrative level. Then my second. Question is, I love this idea of a tracking system, just wondering really, if you have capacity in your office to do not only that, but all the other things, if there's any need for additional people to make this work, or if do you feel like you've got enough people there now to do all this. So there's my 2 questions.

**Representative Waldrip:**

Can you repeat the first question, Mike?

**Mike Akerlow:**

Oh yeah, the first question was do we have to go back to SB34 at all to change any wording in that to do what you're doing? What do you want to do on the income or moderate income housing report?

**Representative Waldrip:**

It would, yeah, yeah, I think. I think we would have to go back in and tweak it to make sure that those are incorporated and that the reporting requirements are also designated by statute, and then you know probably create a little bit of latitude within the department to make sure that they can adjust as necessary, but to have the fundamentals of that in in statute.

**Mike Akerlow:**

Is that something we wanna, I mean, do we do that now? Are we doing it for this session?

**Representative Waldrip:**

Yeah, that'll be this session. It's today.

**Mike Akerlow:**

OK.

**Representative Waldrip:**

Yeah, that will be in the bill that everybody will have. A chance to. Casual grues And then your second question, Mike.

**Mike Akerlow:**

It's really just about the capacity within Christine's office. I think these are some really great things, but I'm wondering if she's gonna need more people or does that mean more budget?

**Representative Waldrip:**

Have you seen that show multiplicity? She's got a machine.

**Mike Akerlow:**

Good for her. I need to borrow that.



**Christina Oliver:**

Well, Mike, I was just gonna lean on you to help me here. It's updated every year. No, the first the initial proposal is just to develop the tool and then we will need to address ongoing how the material is added to keep that tool current. But right now staffing is not the issue, it's simply getting an RFP out nationally and producing some sort of a better metric for the cities and counties who have to create these moderate income housing plans to utilize as well as capturing current data. Again, we will address staffing in the future, but it's not quite primed yet.

**Mike Akerlow:**

All right, well good work this is really exciting. Thank you.

**Representative Waldrip:**

And Jeff.

**Jeff Jones:**

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Christina, nice work. Appreciate all the effort. One comment with regards to some of the proposed changes for ADU's, we have some developments where we have negotiated development agreements that have specific provisions for ADU's that is deed restricted for affordable housing targets and an overall project density so it would be helpful if there were an exclusion included in the statute that if a development agreement is in place that would be recognized.

**Representative Waldrip:**

That sounds like a good idea. Do you have a specific language for that, Jeff, that you could forward on to Gus?

**Jeff Jones:**

I could. Probably put something together and email it to you.

**Representative Waldrip:**

If you wouldn't mind, that would be helpful. That'll save a little chase tail chasing there.

**Jeff Jones:**

OK.

**Representative Waldrip:**

OK, great, thank you. Almost smiling. Oh, he cracked a smile. Little one though. All right, we're back to Mike Gallegos.

**Mike Gallegos:**

Yeah, thanks, thank you. I've had the opportunity to be involved in developing moderate income housing plans, and I think the what's been proposed here is that not only do we out of the strategy that's selected by the city or county, but identifying your strategies and metrics and how you're going to get to that, I think it's very important a good way to catch on the progress of what's being accomplished out there by those jurisdictions, and I'm glad you're going to have a tool to measure it. That's my comment.

**Representative Waldrip:**

Thank you and I think as we as we talked over the last few months, we've seen that as a key, that that we don't know well enough what's happening, and so, to a certain extent, we're flying blind, and I think that's part of, you know, the effort Christina is making also to inventory and maintain a standing and ongoing inventory of our low income housing throughout the state, so we know what we have where we have it and when it's going to be gone so we don't continually fall behind and be surprised by that. So thank you, Michael. OK, that's all of the comments I see on that section. Oh sorry, except for my esteemed Co chair who's sitting behind me? I already turned on his microphone so I don't know why has he been asking permission? You just start talking.

**Representative Briscoe:**

Yeah, we know where I rate.

**Representative Waldrip:**

It's Representative Briscoe.

**Representative Briscoe:**

Yeah, we know where I write. Thank you, thank you Mr. Chair so my question for Christina is and kudos on, you know, this is what should have been in SB54 but we didn't understand it at the time and we're figuring it out and this is going to go a long way toward us, you know. Helping cities plan and providing appropriate. Yeah, SB34 sorry. All those numbers will do legislative, legislative, dyslexia, OK. You know my question is, do you currently collect information as a database or in any other form on affordable housing units subsidized by RDA, CRA tax increments, financing you currently click that, and if not, you're going to add that to the database.

**Christina Oliver:**

Well, I know I believe Ben is still on the line, so that's kind of a tag team question. First of all I want to make it clear I'm only the convener of information with Gus. Everyone here and the Utah League of Cities and Towns in the land use Task Force has had their hands in this and I just want to ensure that the credit goes to all of the very smart, wonderful, capable people who have participated. So with that being said The Governor's Office of Economic Opportunity is required to develop an RDA database and I didn't know Ben are you still on the line? Do you want to chime in a little bit as to where that is.

**Ben:**

Yes, in fact we actually held a meeting on that earlier today, just within our internal office. So our deadline for creating this database is at the end of this fiscal year, which is June 30th. We would like to have it up and operating potentially before then, so we're developing out the interface now we're trying to determine if there's going to be a cost, or if we're going to try and keep the costs limited. Regardless, we would like to be able to have a really good tool so that those who are practitioners of Community reinvestment, tax increment, redevelopment of overseeing those funds where they can input the data, but also something that's robust in terms of transparency for the public as well so we are working on that. We're hoping to have something sooner rather than later, and that's probably the report.

**Christina Oliver:**

Thank you, I will say two pieces that could be added which we hadn't added as of now, but are well. We're happy too for the RDA report. Two other items, one is that housing specifically if they provided funding for housing units, the second one would be for any other incentive that a municipality provides

those are not currently captured in those particular reports, so if it's in a project area and there's sales tax, that's simply the city working with the developer who met whomever it may be, so that could also be added if there was temperature to do that.

**Representative Briscoe:**

Yeah, I think more. The more information you have the better decisions you make. There is a place for overkill, but I don't think we've quite reached that yet.

**Representative Waldrip:**

We can get to that discussion when we do.

**Christina Oliver:**

Think it's educating ourselves by capturing the data points that we currently don't have visibility to.

**Representative Briscoe**

And I also think that in the affordable housing crisis we're currently in, we didn't have the figures on home prices today when we started this. You know, some people might say well, what do you people think you're doing? I mean, I think the more information we have that helps us make decisions about how we move forward the better, off, better decisions we're going to make.

**Representative Waldrip:**

And I think another important thing to note is that I don't think that there's anybody in this meeting that believes that we're on the tail end of a housing crisis. That all of a sudden things are going to get better anytime soon we've got multi-year issues that are going to take multiple years to address and remediate, and so this data, you know. Again, let's just make sure we're all considering this a first step to making sure we have all the adequate data, but not the last step, because we're going to have to. We're going to have to. Once we get what we get, then we'll have to see what we don't know based on that as well, so really appreciate the efforts in this space, though by everybody that's done it. Let's move on to the next item on the Agenda Commission structure. Why don't you come up and give your comment 'cause I think some of your comments may go to Commission structure, so why don't you introduce the topic with a couple of your comments and that'll get us kind of thinking forward I think. I know your name but it's, I'm just not that smart.

**Steve Erickson:**

Yeah thank you Mr. Chairman Steve Erickson with yeah you've done. Yeah, I'm not that memorable. They represent Utah Narrow and also crossroads urban center and I wasn't going to repeat what I said in committee the last month regarding your legislation to fold The Housing Commission on Commission on housing affordability into the Economic Opportunity Commission. But since you've asked, I'll give a thumbnail. I think the concern is, and I understand your perspectives on what we represented Wallbrook and Waldrip and I had a really good conversation about this in the hall. I talked with Ben hard about it as well. Well, I think we just kind of have a slight disagreement on what we foresee in the future, which is easy to do and that is I, I think that if over time that the Housing Commission would be subsumed by the economic development interests that will be primary and The Economic Opportunity Commission and that's my concern is that you hear from voices in this group that you won't hear in that EOC. Just by the shared nature of its mission and its membership, I would hope that we might be able to come up with a workable hybrid that would allow for a representation from the Co-chairs, or perhaps the three legislators that are on this particular Commission into that one without disbanding or otherwise. Diminishing the work of this Commission, where, in finishing up year three here, if my

calculations correct, and having been around a long time, I've seen these efforts, sort of weighing over time and we hope that won't be the case here, and I hope that that would not be the case should your legislation go forward be enacted and implemented. So that was my piece on that I had some other suggestions and comments, but I can hold those until later.

**Representative Waldrip:**

If that's alright, yeah, let's talk about this right now and Senator Anderegg had a comment on.

**Senator Anderegg:**

So we actually had that exact discussion several times prior to kind of giving our nod to move forward on this. What we didn't want is we didn't want the efforts of this Commission to stop or to be watered down. So what the effort, what the goal really was is to take what we're doing here. Which in my opinion I don't want to speak for any of my colleagues here. We've done a lot of, I think, good work. There's more we could have done. There's you know what we got is what we got right? but by and large, my perception is that what we do here is largely in a bubble and what I found frustrating is once we would kind of give our stamp of approval for what we were going to run after, then all of a sudden we were starting from scratch in House and Senate caucuses and it was what was really hard it was like we gleaned all of this knowledge from from you folks from people that are in the trenches dealing with us every day, and so we could stand up and speak articulately and an advocate and, you know, we haven't been great, but we've been decent in my opinion. What my hope was to that, your point, I don't want this Commission to stop. I don't want it to go away. I don't want us to let our foot off the pedal, you know? But we need more and even more influence to get behind this effort. So one of the things that we discussed is do we just become part of or do we still function autonomously and that was what we had several conversations on. How do we function so that we can still, you know we don't need a mother-may-I from The Governor to hold a meeting with everybody here and that as far as how we've been functioning here, this is going to continue. So what we're looking at is, is what we're saying is. In the form of the Economic Opportunity Commission, we become this Commission's Advocates in those chairs and the bills that will come from our Commission. We just hope to coordinate better with that Commission that this Commission still functions "as is" but is technically in statute a subcommittee to that commission, in essence, we will invite certain people from that Commission to come and talk to and, and so that we can integrate and dovetail because one of my concerns personally has been the left hand is totally autonomous from what the right hand is doing, and quite frankly we are spending 10s of millions of dollars every single year on economic development and it's having all this effect on our water and on our housing and on our schools and the other side of that coin 10s of millions of dollars of increased cost to the infrastructure into other things, and there doesn't seem to be just this disconnect between all housing efforts and economic development efforts. So your concern is very well noted and I want you to know from my standpoint at least. I agree 100%. My goal and I don't want to speak for my colleagues here, but I'm just going to say what I think we all think is we wanted to take this to a new level so that we could get much more input and participation. We're only as good as those of us who are still in the driver seat up here are pushing for it and we have the support of you guys behind us. So our intent was we're not changing the way we function, but that we are going to be participating in a greater scale that was my goal and I don't know if you had thoughts on that but.

**Representative Waldrip:**

I agree. Representative Briscoe.

**Representative Briscoe:**

We've just got. We've discussed this Steve. Welcome, happy to always have you here. I think we're going to be on a little higher plane when the advocates participate, and there are a lot of advocates around the table and there are advocates for different parts of the program and I could be wrong and I'm sure people will tell me if I am. But I think the whole affordable housing community is a little bit less siloed today because of the Commission for housing affordability. Not that we don't. Not that individuals don't advocate for their organizations and advocates strongly, but I think there's been more opportunities. There's always been an advocate for the homeless. There has always been advocates for the builders. There's always been advocates for the cities, but I think this has offered us an opportunity to speak face to face and to work on some things together that haven't existed in as robust form. In the past we did have a one year and then we decided. I mean, my Co chair says we could run this thing out into. We're just at the start of these problems, Utah has been discovered. There are some unique things going on in the world because of COVID and supply chains and logistics. You know, as a lot of people say, there are no one is inventing anymore land. Many of our communities on the Wasatch Front are reaching build-out Salt Lake City's going up. Some other cities are starting to go up into the air. We have a lot more work ahead of us and if I ever thought that our connection with the OC was leading to stymie or curtail. Our discussion of rural issues, Homeless issues, and other issues that we've tackled here I would quit, if I thought that someone above us was telling us what we could or could not talk about. Just me personally but I appreciate you keeping this before us. Thank you.

**Steve Erickson:**

Well, thank you, that's very helpful. You know I think it's important that we do recognize that affordable housing development is economic development and it is economic opportunity and so just being a technicality in the statute isn't necessarily that painful. Just as an aside, a little historical background on this that the Commission came about through discussions originally with the sponsor of the bill Representative Becky Edwards regarding the possibility of creating a housing committee within the legislature. So at a stand-alone committee, in order to raise the profile of the need for some serious action on Housing affordability. There's also been ongoing discussions over the years about relocating the appropriations for the housing division to the economic development side of the aisle where it once was. Given that it's unique in that builders don't necessarily think of calling the division of Workforce Service or Department of Workforce Services, which has a distinct mission separate from the housing component, that's within it, so ways to raise the profile that I think that this Commission has helped do that for sure.

**Representative Waldrip:**

No, Steven and thank you and forgive me again for not remembering your first name which is unforgivable.

**Steve Erickson:**

No, it's not.

**Representative Waldrip:**

But no, I knew what you were about to know what you wanted. One of the things you wanted to talk about. So I did want you to be able to introduce that because one of the things that we've talked about internally a little bit and I want to throw this out to the Commission is you know a lot of the time in our limited meeting time together. We tend to get competitive in our various spheres of influence, for instance those who are focused on low income housing don't always feel like they get enough airtime and those who are focused on moderate income housing don't feel like they always get enough airtime

and those who are focused on market rate housing. I mean, we've got these competing interests, not to mention homelessness, which is, you know, really, you know, sort of a stand-alone, but it does attach to everything that we do here. So one thought that we've had, and again, I'm throwing this out for discussion, brief discussion today this is a rabbit hole we could spend a lot of time on but this is homework for everybody on this Commission to look at setting up 3 subcommittees, and the subcommittees would be low income housing, moderate income housing, and market rate housing so that as we come together, we have 3 distinct bodies that have spent time working on issues germane to those specific areas of housing and we can come together and have some structure to those discussions because again, the concern is and and I appreciate this Steve, that this some of these nuances get lost in economic development. What do they think about? They think about housing, that it and affordable housing and once it's affordable to them, I don't know 80% below whatever you know. I mean. It's sort of an afterthought and so again, I don't want to open it up for comment on this, but I do want everyone to think about it. Come prepared maybe to the next meeting or when we're, you know, when we kind of have a little breather when we're not deep on legislation side about the structure of this Commission and we'll talk about it as well as the chairs and let's see if we can find a better way to address the specific needs in each of these areas so that we're not feeling like we have to shout over top of each other to be heard and I think these can be self-selecting committees. I think you know people will have a natural gravitation toward one or the other and I don't know that we limit it to, you know, membership in only one, but maybe you're a member of two or, you know, I don't know those. Those are the kind of things that I'd like the participants in this community to think about. Think about what's worked in other spaces that you've been involved in because we have a lot of experience in this Commission, and we ought to take advantage of that and then you know one final piece of that is obviously Chair Niederhauser's homelessness, which again attaches to everything that we do here. And as we look forward, and this is one of the key reasons I think that it's important to do what we did with the Governor's Office of Economic Development or what no opportunity GOUtah is if you look long term at what we need to address in order to push development off of the Wasatch Front, it's not housing. It's infrastructure, its transportation, its mass transit. It's all of these other pieces to the equation that we need to have access to those discussions, because those will have a much more dramatic impact on our ability to create and provide housing than us simply talking about what we want to build. Houses that are 80% AMI if the infrastructure is not there. If the transportation corridors aren't there, if we haven't had those big picture discussions then we will be hampered in our ability to create solutions in the housing world. And so this gives us reach, I think into a much bigger pond through that. Through that extension into that group and gives us an opportunity to have input and influence in those discussions as well. So we're not simply the end of the tip of the tail getting wagged over and over again and wondering, you know where we sit and how we fit in. So I think that's another reason too. To think that this move is actually a wise one for this body to have additional influence in those larger discussions that deal with. You know we're talking about. You know, a couple \$100 million today. Those are billion dollar discussions that we need to be a part of because those have a major impact on our ability to provide housing and affordable housing in our state. We have a couple of hands. Michele and then Beth.

**Michele Weaver:**

Thank you Mr. Chair I hear what you're saying. I think it's good to have those subcommittees to bring information to the group as a whole, I also think it's important that the Commission stay together for reasons that Steve has talked about as well as I don't think it's, I think it's good dialogue but of course my concern is hyper focused on rural and so the three committees that you have suggested as the rule represents. Representative on this Commission would it then be your suggestion that I attend all three of those subcommittees? How would rural get their information and their piece into each of those?

**Representative Waldrip:**

That's a great question, Michelle. I think Christina, won't you just talk about that real quick. Christina has got some thoughts on that I think are exactly right.

**Christina Oliver:**

I hope they're good thoughts, but the concept of having the three different income categories as discussion topics would be wrapped up in a statewide effort, so this Commission will still have the rural presence with yourself as well as the opportunity to collaborate with the other subcommittee that is focused on rural Utah under the Economic Opportunity Commission, so this will be a blanket discussion. It won't simply be focused on urban Utah, it will be on all of Utah. Not sure if that completely answers the question Michele?



**Michele Weaver:**

I think I have to give that some more thought. I'm concerned that those three groups would get into silos. I've just seen. I think it's really great that we've all come together the way that we have and we don't always agree, and I think that's part of what's great about it. So I think I have to give that some more thought.

**Representative Waldrip:**

Yeah no, we want you to give that more thought Michelle and I think we want to make sure that we're not, you know, that's why, frankly, we're throwing it out to the members of the Commission because we want you guys to think about it. We want all of you to consider the implications and Michelle, you know, again, rural. Do we need a rural section in each of those or do we do it separately? How do we integrate rural? Because obviously again as we look at infrastructure and some of those things that the growth needs to shift and we know that and rural is going to be the focus of much of that shifting. So we want to make sure your voice is heard. So please continue to consider that talk with your colleagues about how to best do that and we'll bring that back before this Commission. Again, thank you, Beth.

**Beth Holdbrook:**

Thank you so much. It's interesting Michelle did kind of take my same question from obviously with the TOD's market. You know moderate as well as affordable. There's always a dialogue at least along the Wasatch Front and UTA, and so that was my question is, how could that be framed so that information and that exchange of dialogue can be articulated and then obviously? That the context would be throughout this state. But for myself, it's like if I can explain all of the situations, or at least the large majority of how UTA can contribute to these and what they can contribute. Then it's helpful to have it in the structure that exists, so I'm trying to figure this out as I'm even talking to you, but I do understand the whole. The whole process and the goal, and I think that the economic opportunity could really have strong value to understand how the transit component can articulate within all of those the market, the middle, et cetera and just trying to really navigate it so if there's any perspectives that you guys have that you want to share after this or that you're thinking oh I didn't include this in my discussion. I would be happy to hear it because the way I'm seeing it is I would really want to make sure. I was involved in as many as I could be.

**Representative Waldrip:**

Yeah, absolutely, and I guess the way I think we're thinking about at this point is that these Commission meetings would not be changed to, you know, only this committee meets for only that those committee meetings will happen in between our Commission meetings and so as we meet as a Commission, those committees are bringing the ideas that they create within their subcommittee to the larger bodies so that everybody has a chance to interface with one another and and make sure that we're hearing and seeing what the other issues are so that you know again, it's just kind of a feeling like we've just heard, you know where's rural voice? How do we need to make sure that we're giving each of our interests within this space enough time and space to create their vision and then bring it to the table so that we can then have a consolidated vision that we take to the Economic Opportunity Commission and that we take as a unified body up to that level with a lot more in depth thought about each piece of what we deal with in housing affordability. Because our charge is not affordable housing only is low income, it's moderate income, it's market rate. We have a charge to look at the entirety of the housing market and sometimes those can be competing priorities but if we have the opportunity to develop those independently and then bring them together and have a really robust discussion with kind of leadership from three different groups, I think that'll give us a better structure to come up with. Specific policy and budget proposals for each of those areas.

**Beth Holdbrook:**

That's helpful, I really. Appreciate that and I'm going to continue to kind of, you know, mull this over and figure out what is a good strategy to engage in that. So thank you.

**Representative Waldrip:**

Yeah, please do Mike Gallegos. Going once. Going twice.

**Mike Gallegos:**

I'm sorry I was muted, I'm going to be on the opposite side of my two Co commissioners only because I think what we're trying to do here is look at housing overall and try to be focusing on a statewide housing strategy, not just those at 80% or below or 40% below, I think we need to look at the whole picture and particularly in working with the with GoUtah and their needs, I think it's something we ought to give it a try and as long as it's all coming back to the Commission as a whole. I think we could have some frank discussions in those subcommittees and anyway, I'm willing to give that support.

**Representative Waldrip:**

Thank you. All right, there are no more comments. Oh Steve, you have some more you want to share with us?

**Steve Erickson:**

As part of public comment.

**Representative Waldrip:**

You bet. We have to end early, 'cause that's what I always do. So you have you have a couple minutes, you're good, we've got time.

**Steve Erickson:**

Oh, I will be. I'll be very brief. First, I was delighted to see the inclusion of the point in the. Discussion that Christina Laden presented earlier. I was planning to point out that the governor's budget is recommending \$141 million for transportation related infrastructure and transit at the point, and



thought this would be a good opportunity to bring up the idea that we really ought to work towards inclusion and affordability at the point, I think there's still work to be done because we're going to run into the same. Some jurisdictional ownership issues that we often do with codes in municipalities, so there will need to be some effort to work with the city of Draper and others in that process as to how we pull that off. But that's, I think a really laudable goal and thank you for all who were participating and getting that into the draft bill. Two things, one in the context of land use planning. I just wanted to call your attention to the fact that this has become a big issue of discussion within the water community. I know we sometimes get siloed but there are now some efforts being done to raise the profile of putting water into your land use planning. It may be right at the very top 'cause if you don't have water you can't do much with any additional growth, and that's going to continue to be a problem. It's also an opportunity to do what I think we all want to do and that sort of integrate these planning processes into one. A whole sweater and not just desperate threads. And then lastly, it's just a suggestion for the Commission for future agenda purposes and that is before we go into the legislature would be really good to know where we stand with the 1st \$75 million funds ARPA funds that were allocated in the last special session. It would be nice to have a go and GOP report back to us on where that money is with the grantees were what the grants were. I mean, it's all public information, of course, but it would, I think, be better to hear it from the sources. Who are administering these dollars would be helpful to kind of have that context before we start asking for more money, but as we do, I think we also might want to consider. An additional investment in the Olene Walker Housing Loan Fund when we're spending a lot of one time money, that's a really good place to park it, and it does have plenty of value and we've always almost always underfunded it, so there's just my plug for that too, so thanks.

## V. ADJOURNMENT

### **Representative Waldrip:**

Thank you Steve and appreciate it. I'm entertaining the final motion.

### **Representative Briscoe:**

I think we should move to adjourn until our January 7th meeting.

### **Representative Waldrip:**

Fantastic, all in favor? anyone not in favor of that? Too bad it's 2:59. We have ended early. Thank you everybody for all your participation. We appreciate your diligence and efforts. This is great work. Thank you.