

COMMISSION ON HOUSING AFFORDABILITY

Minutes for May 24, 2022

Hybrid Meeting: In Person & Via Zoom

Members Present

Senator Lincoln Fillmore
Representative Steve Waldrip
Nate McDonald
Andrew Johnston
Christina Oliver
Christopher Gamvroulas
Wayne Neiderhauser
Dave Damschen
Jeffrey B. Jones
Michael Ackerlow
Michael Gallegos
Michael Ostermiller
Michele Weaver
Tammy Hunsaker
Tom Macdonald
Ginger Chinn
Janice Kimball
Ben Hart
Kyle Palmer
Beth Holbrook
Matthew Loo

Representing

Senator
Representative
Executive Director DWS Designee
Salt Lake City Council
Housing and Community Division
Utah Homebuilders Association
State Homelessness Coordinator
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
Salt Lake Chamber
Public Housing Authority
Executive Director GOEO
Representative GOEO
President of UTA
Ascend Utah – Rural Housing

Absent Members

Representative Joel Briscoe

Staff Present

Jennifer Edwards
Jess Peterson
Stacey Herpel
Amanda McPeck
Carrie Henck

Guests

Tara Rollins	Susan Olson	Hailee Hernandez
Francisca Blanc	Jason Glidden	Karen McCandless
Cameron Diehl	Shule Bishop	Michelle Larsen

Hannah Rogers
Kara Trevino
Cindy Maughan
Paul Davis
Karson Eilers
Karina Brown
Meg Ryan
Alison Kuhlow
Danny Harris
Emily Means

Margaret Hostetter
Erik Fronberg
Kevin Burt
Rachel Boe
Andi Beadles
Rhonda Perkes
Natalie Bowen
Sarah Nielson
Miranda Cox
Michael Parker

Shawn Milne
Allie Brotherton
LaNiece Davenport
Ari Bruening
Bill Tibbitts
Ryan Hunter
John Drew
Jean Hill

I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Representative Waldrip:

Welcome to the Commission on Housing Affordability Tuesday, May 24th, and apologize for being a few minutes late. Just getting out of a water fight and not the good kind, the painful kind of water fight. What we have first, let's just do an introduction. We have a change in our senate chair, and we'd like to welcome Senator Lincoln Fillmore, who is taking the place of Senator Jacob Andregg and Senator Fillmore, would you like to introduce yourselves? Anything you'd like.

Senator Fillmore:

Good afternoon, I'm going to listen and learn at this meeting, and I look forward to working with all of you.

Representative Waldrip:

Thank you, I have had the pleasure of working with Senator Fillmore on Public education appropriations for the last couple of years and find him to be thoughtful and purposeful and very intentional about making sure that we're doing work that needs to be done and heading in the right direction, so I appreciate him being my co-chair and then, we'd like to excuse Representative Briscoe our other co-chair. Who is right now I think on the rim of a Canyon and hopefully not falling, but he's off enjoying some time with his family. We'd also like to welcome Matt Loo. Oh, you're online? OK, I'm looking around the room. Matt, is he a panelist? Let's have Matt unmute and just introduce himself.

Matt Loo:

Good afternoon, Matt Loo here in sunny southern Utah it's about mid-80s right now. Winds blowing from the southwest at about 5 miles an hour and about 9% humidity. Can't quite smell the ocean breeze yet, but someone is telling me that it's coming.

II. PUBLIC COMMENT

Representative Waldrip:

We'll hold our breath for those ocean breezes. Pray for rain. Do we have any public comments today?

Christina Oliver:

We have

Representative Waldrip:

OK. Welcome to state your name and who you're representing?

Tara Rollins:

My name is Tara Rollins and I'm from the Utah Housing Coalition I'm just going to give you a quick overview. The last time Mike Gallegos brought up the Gap report that had been published that day, it was asked that we kind of put it in perspective of like wages and so I just put this together in the medium. Excuse me, the area median income is for Salt Lake County and so you can see just really quickly the yearly, then monthly, and then the hourly wage for our deeply affordable housing needs and then, as you can see on the chart, the pie chart you know who are extremely low income and as you can see, majority of them are working and disabled or seniors. So, I think this is a good illustration of you know who we need housing for, and then when you look at the inventory gap for every hundred that we need, we only have 33 at under 30% of AMI, and so the negative is 67 for every 100. Then I just put some occupations that I received that come from DWS and then the number of jobs and then really a one-bedroom housing wage and so these figures are from 2021. So very quickly then I just illustrated two different Professions and then the housing cost burden. You know that extremely low, very low, and middle income. Then I also gave you the housing profile and then there's another report and this is the out-of-reach report that is done every year will be coming out in probably the next couple of months and they'll update all this information, but I think this is a really good tool to keep with you at times, so if you need to make any reference, but you can always look at these reports online. So, thank you.

Representative Waldrip:

There before you get up, thank you for being here today. Is this something you could email or submit to staff and they can send it out to the whole committee?

Tara Rollins:

Oh yes.

Representative Waldrip:

Because I think this is a critical piece of information, the government released this year's median wage information and it went up, you know what percent it went up this last year?

Tara Rollins:

Francisca looked at those, they came out in April and so what I would I kept to last year is because these two reports would match.

Representative Waldrip:

Yeah, it came out in April. Yeah, I think it went up. I want to say like 8 or 9%. Does that sound about right, Francisca? And housing has increased by what percent over last year?

Tara Rollins:

15 to 25%? Yeah, that's what I heard.

Representative Waldrip:

So, the gap is increasing. I think that's the message that we need to keep in mind, and we'll talk some more about how we're going to hopefully modify the structure of this a little bit. Add some subcommittees so we can deal with some of these issues in a more direct way than simply sort of

circling them. We can get in and actually attack them, so thank you very much for this or any other questions for Miss Rollins. OK.

Tara Rollins:

Very quick and if anybody wants to talk more in-depth, I'm happy to do that.

III. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES:

April 26, 2022

A motion was made by Mike Ostermiller to approve the meeting minutes as written for the dates above without any changes. Beth Holbrook seconds the motion. Motion passes unanimously.

IV. DISCUSSION – SUBGROUPS & TIMELINE

Representative Waldrip:

Minutes are approved. OK, let's move into our discussion portion and what we have in our handouts here. One of the things that we've talked about last year and let me back up just a little bit and say thank you to everybody for being willing to help on last year's efforts and then also to share your thoughts as we go forward on how to make this Commission more effective, more intentional, and more focused on solutions. I think you know what I've seen in my time on this Commission is we sometimes spend a lot of time talking about issues and we highlight like we just did this housing gap. So I think we can do a better job as a Commission of getting to the issue more quickly than you know than we've done in the past by subdividing ourselves in creating a working taskforce, or working subcommittees that can really dig into what the policy directives need to be to address those different areas of concern and so with that, we'd like to just talk about how we divide up those subgroups, and I would welcome input by anybody online or in the room here as to how we divide those up. Particularly, I think you know from the board members. Here's the overarching thought. So, as we have folded ourselves underneath the unified Economic Opportunity Commission, which is the governor, the speaker, and the Senate President, we have an opportunity now to have their weight behind our policy initiatives and we started to see a little bit of that last year. This year we started to see a little bit of bringing to them solutions and having them endorse them, and it resulted in, frankly, you know. I want to focus on the fact that what we got for our homeless population is an unprecedented appropriation. It wasn't as much as anybody wanted. Well, it was probably more than some wanted and less than others wanted, but we recommended more. But we got again an unprecedented sum for our homeless. Right? Requirements in the state of Utah and Wayne Niederhauser has done a fantastic job of painting the picture for that need, and I think that's a model for what we can do going forward on this Commission is create a very clear picture so that as we go to the UOC with our policy recommendations and our budget recommendations. We'll be able to bring them along early enough that this isn't hitting, you know, in late January or early February when budgets are well cooked, and the governor and leadership have already made their positions clear and we're fighting over scraps. I think, given the nature of and, I've heard this from the President Senate, the Governor, the speaker, pretty much everybody. We have two big issues in Utah over the next 10 to 20 years and there are only two, one is water, and two is housing. There were some reports, you know we recognize that there may be a recession going on and even in spite of that, universally there is a consensus that Utah is not going to have some massive falling off in pricing we're not going to have all of a sudden housing become affordable by virtue of the market because we still have this incredible pent up demand in the state of Utah. We still have 40,000 plus units that were short and the consensus among the experts is that while there will be a bit of a cooling-off as interest rates rise and things kind of

settle out, it's not going to lessen the need and as we just saw from Tara Rollins report, the gap is even wider now than it was before. So, the issues that we're facing in housing are not going to be lessened by even a significant economic downturn. They're going to be exacerbated by this, so as we look at segregating ourselves into different groups and in creating task forces to focus on these specific areas of policy interest, I think this is a real opportunity for us to become much more direct and intentional in addressing those concerns by segment of the population. You know we have, or rather than saying, well, let's just put us all in the same group and we fight over whether we deal with middle income, lower-income or market rate or homelessness. We give ourselves the opportunity to really drill down on those specific areas. Bring all of that information back to this body, this body creates a very clear policy direction, which we then take to the UOC, and we have them buy-in on the front end of those policy issues which then will support the funding requests that follow. Did I just talk to myself for 10 minutes and/or did that make sense? Christina has a comment. I'm going to let her make a comment. She has no comment.

Christina Oliver:

No comment.

Representative Waldrip:

Will you note that in the Minutes in bold and large type. I love Christina. OK, let's move forward.

David Damschen:

I just had a quick what did you just say? Just kidding. I was taking careful notes.

Representative Waldrip:

I mean I was in my soliloquy mode. You know, I've been reading Shakespeare. I would actually while the MIC is hot over there, what art thou does that seem like a good approach? From the, you know from your Utah Housing Corp. Does that seem like a good approach to have any thoughts on that process?

David Damschen:

It's an interesting question. When I first got to Utah Housing Corporation, having served on the board of a homeless shelter, I had this attitude about how we establish priorities and those most in need and so forth, but we have single-family operations at Utah Housing. We help first-time homebuyers, low- and moderate-income families buy their first home. We provide down payment assistance and every time I think this had to be explained to me a couple of times, but every time we bring a family into a home they can own, of course, that's accomplishing a great ideal, but that's vacating unit and multi-family, and the fact is we have to attack this across the full spectrum, and I don't think it's very hard to prioritize. They all are interconnected and so I agree with you that you know we need to have a full-frontal assault and we have to cover the full spectrum. Although sitting next to Mr. Neiderhauser and having served in a homeless shelter, I will say I still tilt a little bit in the direction of those most vulnerable, as I think we probably all do.

Representative Waldrip:

Thank you. I'm looking around the room. I'd like to hear from Ben, representing the governor and Go Utah.

Ben Hart:

So I heard every word that you said Mr. Chair and like Mr. Damschen, I was taking copious notes, and here's the reality. I think we've got to always show results and then my Mike there goes. OK, I think the

more we can do, some of the legwork in some of the subcommittees, and actually bring back policy recommendations to this board. I think it is a really good thing. My challenge is always to every type of this committee is you know if you can bring 5 to 7 really good policy items for legislation next year, where I think they're well thought out you have a lot of buy-ins, and they're also substantive in terms of helping in all areas of housing in this regard, and I think that would be really good to me. That's what success looks like, you know, is that we're moving the needle and making a difference, so I think it is. We're considering that long-term approach keeping our eyes on how we vet these things by getting everything ready by the time we get to the legislative session and dialed in and ready. We go.

Representative Waldrip:

Thank you, Ben, and is that Mike?

Mike Gallegos:

OK, thank you Mr. Chair, I agree with what you had to say during those 10 minutes and the two other commentaries. As we look at the three subgroups and as Dave mentioned, it's hard to split some of this discussion out. Particularly, we're looking at the Subgroups for low-income housing and moderate-income housing, where are we going to split that? Because if you look at the gap report that was just handed out, it says area median income, 80% and below is considered low income 50% and below is called very low income. So, are we going to use that as a measurement to look at separating what is low-income housing and moderate-income housing? Is it 80% up to 120%, then becomes moderate? So just something to think about as we define the task of these subgroups and there'll be other topics that'll arise that will probably cover all three of these subgroups as well and as we look at the rural housing subgroup, I'm not sure how many individuals here on the Commission represent Housing, but we want to make sure there's some crossover knowledge and expertise as well on those.

Representative Waldrip:

Thank you very well stated. Beth Holbrook, see if I got your mic on.

Beth Holbrook:

Thank you, Mr. Chair, oh yes, I do thank you and I appreciate my colleagues' perspectives and yes, your soliloquy was spot on. That said I also wanted to add an element that I think is really critical to this is that the ongoing discussion is fantastic. We also need to make sure that this is becoming constructive dialogue in the communities as a whole. I think that there is always perception and a challenge to bring people with you in terms of the understanding as to why we're making these policy discussions and why we're doing this so that there is not this level of maybe like I'm going to dig my heels in the sand type of an approach, but more of an I understand why we're doing this, and I think that the critical element is and I know this word is not good, but there's this Nimbyism perspective and I think that the more that people understand all the elements that go into this policies that we're going to present, the better that our communities will all be. So, I just wanted to add that to the layered discussions my colleagues already made. Thank you.

Representative Waldrip:

Thank you, Beth, and it looks like we have Andrew with a comment online.

Andrew Gruber:

Thank you, Mr. Chair. I would endorse the Subcommittee work number 1. #2 I think a good place to start might be to review the deeply affordable subcommittee work from last year. I came forward with a number of recommendations and ideas and it might be helpful to give feedback on that sooner than

later to not go down the same path. If that was not feasible for some reason last year I'd hate to sort of do another few months of work without knowing if it's on the right track or not on that particular one.

Representative Waldrip:

Thank you for this great suggestion. So with that, let's talk about what Mr. Gallegos brought up, which is how are we going to distinguish these subgroup areas? and then we'll open it up for people and I don't think we need to firm this up today, but let's let's figure out what our definitions are for these spaces and then we will talk about the process of setting up these subcommittees and look for volunteers to lead these subcommittees in each of these particular areas. So I think it's been noted that typically moderate income housing is 80% to 120%. Anybody have any comments about whether or not we should follow that standard and this is AMI and obviously that changes depending on the area of the state, so I think the proposal would probably be to use Salt Lake AMI, I mean, does that seem like the right approach? I mean we have to pick something as our ah, my target, that may be on the higher end. You know when we go statewide, but we have to have some sort of a metric that we're using and obviously, we're not going to say "Oh well, that's 79% you know. So we're not going to talk about that", but the other thing maybe we do is we just say, you know 80-81 to 120 in each area, because those proposals will affect different areas differently, so any comments on that?

Mike Gallegos:

With the moderate-income housing area between 81 and 120%, that's what we'll probably have. We'll be addressing some home ownership, and so I think that's an area to that. I believe that's an area that we really haven't spent a lot of time focusing on in the past and I think that has to be part of the dialogue as was brought up in comments made by legislators this past year with regard to and, there's opportunities for homeownership even between 60 and 80% with the down payment assistance and other opportunities that are out there. So that's my comment on the split.

Representative Waldrip:

OK, thank you. Now we've got two comments online, so let's go to Jeff Jones, and then we'll go to Mike Ostermiller.

Jeff Jones:

Thank you Mr. Chairman and I think with regards to definitions we need to make sure we're consistent with what's already in the statute. I do believe that each area is uniquely different. Some accounting implies roughly a family of four is 135 \$1000 dollars. So for us to focus on the 80 AMI, I really do feel like we need to adjust that on an accounting basis and all of that information is available.

Representative Waldrip:

OK, that cut out just a little bit. Let me just make sure I understand you want to look at that on a county-by-county basis as it was. Kind of the final.

Jeff Jones:

The discussion there that is correct, OK?

Representative Waldrip:

Thank you, Mike Ostermiller.

Mike Ostermiller:

I just want to echo what was said a minute ago. I don't really have a strong opinion about the percentages, but if we do look at percentages around 80 to 120% I would just like to see one of the subgroups or subcommittees focus on housing affordability on homeownership specifically, which is going to be housing creation and land-use policies. I think something like that we can. I'm not saying we shouldn't be talking about deeply affordable, but I think that should be one of the components of our conversations and since he's on mute, I'd like to nominate Chris Gamvroulas to chair that effort.

Representative Waldrip:

I have a second but quick before Chris Unmutes himself. It's been seconded. I think that's a great point and I think that's part of you know, part of the strength of trying to create this. This structure is that we do have work that was done last year on deeply affordable housing. We didn't really attack a whole lot of housing ownership, you know, we spent a lot of time on homelessness and so I think this will help us to refine our focus and refine our policy proposals as we take them to the UOC. Any thoughts on the low income we have? Oh wait, hang on, there's a comment here. Thank you.

Janice Kimball:

Thank you, Janice Kimball, with the housing connect. I really support the idea of looking at Homeownership, particularly for lower. My role in this committee has been representing folks who are extremely low income where, Housing Authority, our average tenant earns about \$15,000 a year and so the tools when you have the low-income group together the tools to provide housing for somebody who earns 45 to 60 or 70% AMI are very different than what we need for folks who are at 30% AMI and below, and so I just want to make sure we don't lose that focus on that population because they will not be served on the market unless we have some sort of ongoing support or investment in the capitol, thanks.

Representative Waldrip:

I think that's a great point. I think as we're hearing this, I think it's this structure that is sort of calling itself out that we've got within that moderate-income housing area. We've got an ownership component within the, you know, low-income housing. We have a deeply affordable component. We have a sort of a next-tier component that those committees can kinda break out and focus on solutions in those various areas which I think we did some of that last year, but it, but it never really got to the finish line and I think that's part of what's kind of caused us to think about a new structure so that we make sure we get fully vetted ideas in each of these tiers of need if that makes sense, OK, any other thoughts on. Those distinctions so right now we're looking at, you know, kind of a 31 to 80 and then an 81 to 120 on the low income and moderate-income county by county, and then with a note that on the moderate-income we have a component of that committee work beyond ownership opportunities and on the low-income housing we make sure we tear those out with deeply affordable and I'm not sure what the name of the next is it moderately affordable? Maybe or just simply low income. So we make sure we have work going in both of those directions. Any other thoughts on that initial structure as we as we set up these subcommittees. Jeff Jones.

Jeff Jones:

Thank you, Mr. Chair, I think we need to use the term moderate-income housing as defined in the bills that we passed which is 80% of the median gross income for households with the same size in the county in which the city is located. I think we need to stick with that if we want to have 80 to 120. Then maybe we use the term attainable. So that is because a lot of us have already put a lot of ordinances in place, defining that in to be consistent with state codes.

Representative Waldrip:

That's a great suggestion, and I'm hopeful that those on those committees can help remind us of those definitional distinctions so that we do. I don't know about anybody else here, but the acronyms get deep and thick very quickly. When we were looking at setting this up, I think I used eight or ten different acronyms in the committee discussion on the bill to create the SHA under the UOC with the focus on MI&L. MI and I just strung off this whole list of acronyms so that no one on the committee had any idea what I was talking about and they all voted. Yes, so it worked. Awesome, but that is something we've run into that challenge before, and I'm looking out at Cameron as well and the league is you know those definitional foundational things we need to make sure that we're unified on our use of those because very quickly, I've seen discussions go off the rails because people are using the same term with two different definitions and if you've done any spending time in critical race theory, you've seen that happen as well. You know where people are defining the same term in very different ways, and it causes people to talk past each other instead of dealing with the issues. So, I think that's a great comment. Matt Loo, let's go to you.

Matt Loo:

I think again you know, listening to the discussion going on, I do like the concept of not recreating wheels again. There's a lot of work that's been done by a lot of good people to keep it simple and keep it moving forward. I do agree with the comments that have been shared thus far and I'm excited to again move forward with whatever committee that I might be a part of. I'm thinking rural might be a fun one for me.

Representative Waldrip:

I think that would be great. Do we have any? Let's just talk really quickly about the definition of rural. We have, I think in state code again we have rural definition. Do you know what that definition is in the state code? Christine, do you want to share that real quick?

Christina Oliver:

So how we defined it in the Olene Walker was counties of the 3rd, 4th, 5th, and 6th class and cities 10,000 and under and counties of the second class.

Representative Waldrip:

Yeah, and it brings up an interesting one, which is our second-class counties. If I can list those off just really quickly because that is kind of a critical distinction because we do have on Wasatch Front and off Wasatch Front counties, that will have definite rural components to them. Cache County, do they know what Cache County classification is? Three OK, Cameron back there. What about Washington County too? So Washington County will definitely have a rural component to it. Are there any other rural counties that would have? I mean, I'm sorry, a Class 2 county that would have a definite rural component to it. Utah County would yeah. Weber does as well. So, I think let's make sure we keep that definition in place because we do have sort of these forgotten children. I was up in Cache County a couple of weeks ago and you know, sometimes they feel like they've gotten left behind in some of the discussions because they are viewed as a more developed county, but they definitely have a different flavor than you know, than a Wasatch Front County does, and they have different problems that are more in line with probably rural county issues. So, I would be in favor of using the States rural county rural distinction for counties and cities but let's give latitude to our committee. Our subcommittee includes, as common-sense dictates, other areas of the state that may not fall strictly within that classification but would definitely be a part of that. I mean I'm thinking about Cache County and I'm

looking over at Beth with UTA. I mean we're going to have growth issues with transit in that county very quickly in Washington County as well. Where they're going to have some of the, you know, different growth issues than we've got in Weber in Utah, and you know the Wasatch Front counties. Yeah, Cedar City, that's another great example. So, with that discussion is there anybody on the board that's uncomfortable with using these three categorizations for our subcommittee work, recognizing also that we have Czar Niederhauser here. That will bring into the mix, particularly in that low-income housing category. How that interfaces with our homeless population, because there's going to be significant transitions between our low income and our homeless population and that you know there's a lot of instances where those distinctions get pretty blurry. So we'd want you to know, I think for sure to recognize your input in that area as well. Is that an official title? I'm going to make it a one and we have a motion to recognize Wayne Niederhauser as our Czar.

Wayne Neiderhauser:

Yeah, I would love to be involved in that and hope we'll have some more success this coming year with deep, deeply affordable housing.

Representative Waldrip:

Yeah, and I think you know as we keep in mind that goal of having people transition from homelessness to low income from low income to moderate-income that we also keep that in mind, especially on the housing ownership front where we're encouraging people to create generational wealth. You know, that's sort of a foundational thing for our society. You know, in each of our and I think that'll just be natural, but in each of our subcommittees you know we'll want to keep that as a focus of graduating people, I guess, so to speak.

Wayne Neiderhauser:

So, I think that's going to, what is called is like a move on and move up or whatever you want to. But the official effort is moving on and that's crossing those AMIs, there's going to be a certain population of those who are experiencing homelessness that will be able to do that, but there's also a significant amount that are not going to and that's you know we're dealing with the most difficult population to house. Most of the people I know that live on the streets unsheltered or sometimes frequent to the shelter they've been in housing multiple times. They've been in treatment multiple times. They've been in the criminal justice system multiple times and so it isn't like they haven't had those opportunities in the past. So, if somebody was easy to be housed, they're probably in housing. We're talking about the most difficult population to get into housing and sustain that housing which, as we talked a lot about last year, that's called support. That's called management case management. If you've got robust services there, then it'll be sustained. If you, don't it's not going to be successful, it'll just be the more of the spin cycle.

Representative Waldrip:

And let me ask a follow-up on that. You know that goes into the Health and Human services world very quickly and how integrated has that been? Do we need to do anything here, as we look at that transition from homelessness to low-income housing, how are we integrating those services into our discussions, and is that working and do we need to do more on that? Let me just turn some time over to Ben Hart real quick.

Ben Hart:

No, I was actually just communicating via sign language is what President Niederhauser was saying was very important and I don't want to disrupt that. I, if it's possible, I'd love to serve on the moderate-

income housing subgroup, and I was also going to say, but we are going to have a switcheroo. So, Kyle Palmer is actually going to be taking my spot on this committee moving forward, so this is my last meeting after I don't know how many years it's been. I feel like I should get a cake or something, but it's been a while, but it's been an honor to serve with this committee and our executive director in the next couple weeks is going to make a change, and Kyle Palmer is actually going to start representing our office on this condition moving forward.

Representative Waldrip:

Thank you, but you would like to stay on as a committee member, is my understanding?

Ben Hart:

Like to volunteer Kyle.

Representative Waldrip:

Oh OK, alright. I wasn't sure I understood that. You said I want to be on this and then you said I'm leaving so.

Ben Hart:

That's 'cause I didn't see it.

Representative Waldrip:

Oh, OK, we'll work on the cake thing. Alright, thank you Ben. Let's go over to Mike Gallegos.

Mike Gallegos:

Yes, thank you Mr. Chair want to follow up with what Wayne and yourself we're talking about right now is the opportunity for individuals or households to move up the housing spectrum, and Salt Lake County, we're seeing a significant increase on seniors being priced out of their rental units and Wayne, I guess you could also say that there's probably an increase on seniors moving into homelessness. So it's an area that's being somewhat overlooked and with that, there's other groups, subgroups, and I know that if we could probably get down a little bit further into the low income, they find some of these groups, but I guess we'll leave that work to the subcommittee itself, but I just want to throw it out because I think seniors are going to be one of the areas that's gonna pop up, popping up as a critical area to focus in on. Thank you.

David Damschen:

Thank you, Mr. Chair, Senator Fillmore, and I were talking about something yesterday. Basically, there's no singular profile, but when we're talking about those served by permanent supportive housing, these are chronically homeless and there's a, you know, there's a full spectrum if we're trying to paint a profile of like who are these folks, and do they work? How much? How many of them can work? How many of them cannot? Of course, there are different applications or uses. Different folks that are served populations that are served with permanent sort of housing. But I think that part of the, I guess analysis, and in discussing these solutions with policymakers, we need to have a pretty good handle on who these folks are and how and why they need this level of ongoing support, why it's permanent, and so I think some of that demographic data that I know we have in various places, but I think that's important to have at hand as we're talking about these issues.

Representative Waldrip:

Thank you, I think that's great. Very important points raised, so let's do this. For the next few minutes here, let's take 10 minutes or so and let's go to our calendars for the UOC and the corp or Sean I don't know. Oh, we do have a hand up. Andrew please unmute yourself before we move on.

Andrew Gruber:

Thanks Mr. Chair I just wanted to make sure we're not missing any drivers points. We've talked about this before, but I don't think we've really heard it a few times. There's a group of folks who are currently with our seniors or below the age of 65 or a large number who, for a variety of reasons, are not necessarily going to move up the economic spectrum in their time and it's just a visibility piece with state offices. It's mental health. Sometimes it's chronic and long-term. It's senior citizens. Grandparents were talking about great-grandparents and I fully endorse going through the numbers and making sure we're understanding this, but I want to make sure also that we're clear. Not everybody can move up, and I think sometimes we gloss over that and hope that people can move out of what we call permanent supportive housing to other housing, and for some folks that is supposed to be permanent with services that. That's the way it has to be. Unless we are willing to say some people just can't be housed and they are going to be in the shelter's perma. So, I don't want to gloss over that at all. I fully endorse the idea of helping people move up the economic ladder in various ways, but I think I would love to see Commissioner Fritz talk to Wayne more often. Perhaps we talked through the demographics he's seeing and he's looking at in his work to really understand to that point earlier about why some folks won't be able to move out of some housing, we need to make sure we're aware of that and how we're allocating resources.

Representative Waldrip:

I think that's wise advice. So with that in mind, let's do this for the next portion of the meeting. Let's talk about the schedule going forward. We've got a couple of handouts in the packet, and we'll turn that over to Melissa to review the schedule, oh my gosh, I don't know who Melissa is. I work with a number of Melissas' and, I don't know who I was referring to, but who would like to turn the time over to is actually Christina. Who also goes by the name of Melissa in some strange way and talk about the cadence of our meetings while we're doing that. I'd like to invite the members of the Commission to text and talk amongst yourselves as to who would like to lead these subcommittees. I know we've already got Ostermiller's already pegged Gamvroulas, so I'm totally comfortable with that. If everybody is OK with that, let's select our committee leadership at this meeting so that we can turn you loose today with some leadership and some marching orders so that we keep the ball rolling here. So, with that, we're going to go to Christina.

V. DISCUSSION & ADOPTION – NEW MEETING CALENDAR

Christina Oliver:

Or Melissa. I mean, that can be my new pseudo name that works. So, in your packets, you see this colorful Commission on housing affordability and our proposal is for the full Commission to meet on the 1st Tuesday of every other month. So, the EOC will meet one month and then this group will meet the next month in between those meetings the subgroups will meet. So, if you haven't had a chance to look at this please pull it out. So, in June the subgroups that are established today we'll get together at a time that works for all of you. They don't need to be held in this meeting, you can hold them however you choose and in July we will reconvene. It won't be the first Tuesday in July because a lot of people will be out of town. So, the proposal would be the 12th of July if that works for everyone, and then on July 27th

the EOC will meet again. The CHA representation will be there to discuss what's happening in the subgroups and we'll follow that type of a schedule until December when we recess. But you also have the lifecycle of the Unified Economic Opportunity Commission, and I would like to turn the time over to Kyle to just walk through this, if that's alright.

Kyle Palmer:

Thanks for seeing it. So yes, we'll refer to that handout. Really what this shows is just that we move on a pretty expedited cycle to get through all these different items through the year. One thing you'll notice on the handout that Christina's reference to you as well as this other. We'd like to have everything wrapped up and ready to go by November. The reason you know, and ideally in September, even if we can represent Waldrip referred to this earlier, but if we can get requests into the governor for inclusion in his budget, or if we can get things through to interim committees that are meeting things go so much smoother during the session and there's a higher likelihood of getting what we need and getting the right prioritization on that. So it is a pretty fast pace. We have been told before that we move pretty quickly. Sometimes in the form of a question, questioning that to which the governor and others have responded good, we want to move quickly. We want to get these things done because the need is now, especially for housing affordability, so you know there's anything else I'm happy to answer any questions on it too, but should be good to go, thanks.

Representative Waldrip:

Yeah OK. Are there any questions about that meeting structure? We have any questions about how that's supposed to be laid out. OK. I think you know that this is the critical piece, right is to remember that our goal is not simply to come up with good ideas. Our goal is to come up with good ideas in a timely enough fashion that we can get funding for the best of those ideas and we can do our own prioritization and present that prioritization to the UOC, so that they have a very clear view of what is coming up from the working group that is going to recommend the solutions in this space. Last year we were working on the affordable housing bill on 462 up until you know, virtually, the last minute of the last night of the 2nd to last. OK, yeah, and we almost killed Gruber. He very nearly, you know, took an early leave of absence from this life, because he was working so hard. But I feel like what we've done there as we talk about carrying forward some of those things that are maybe a little bit outside of the structure we've talked about today when we set up an HP 462 some other issues that we will resolve as a committee and those issues will largely fall on the chairs to manage the and bring to this committee the work on what we're going to use as the determining of Fair share for cities that we will bring to this group as sort of our body of work that falls sort of outside of these Commission Structure Subcommittee structures, we have an obligation to deliver to the UOC that formula of Fair share we have an obligation to work on overnight housing, overnight rentals in the state and trying to come up with a consistent policy toward those right now it's extremely inconsistent and as the league has shown, we have some north of 20,000 of these units in the state, many of which are not operating within the bounds of any law or reason and that is a critical distinction to say not only are they against the law? But they're also out of reason where they're impacting residential neighborhoods inappropriately and we've had a commitment from our land-use task force and Representative Musselmann to sort of, take that on and that will either be a part of this bill or it could be its own bill, but you know we want to get housing appropriately on the market and have appropriate overnight rentals in places where you know where they're governed appropriately by law. Right now, it's been kind of a Wild West and I fear that we've set up investors to fail in some circumstances. There were expectations are not going to be met based on people not caring what the rules are, and so we're going to have a little bit of pain in this Commission dealing with that issue and in the legislature dealing with that issue, I think. What's our other? We have one other thing that we have to do from 462, just the data collection. Yeah, the data collection structure

that we've set up, we need to be supportive of and it will be very interesting for this Commission to hear back on what the data shows. We've been operating a lot in a data vacuum in our state. As far as what we have in affordable housing, attainable housing, multifamily housing, what cities are doing and that will go into that fair share determination as well so we can understand how we're going to direct municipalities to participate. There will be some instances where it's very appropriate for them to, you know, to permit and construct it. There will be others where it's not appropriate, and so how do they participate in the shared burden of trying to make sure we have sufficient housing for all income types throughout the state. So that will fall on them. We've sort of reserved that as the chairs lift outside of the Committee subcommittee structure. Am I committing us to something we're not doing Lincoln? OK, and then one other thing that will happen here over the next probably two months, hopefully as we will be bringing on a second House majority member that will begin to learn the ropes of this space and take us to new and greater heights. You know I'd like to continue staying involved with this Commission into the future, as I'll be involved in housing in my next life as well. OK, so having done that, let's come back to the Commission. Chris Gamvroulas is raising his hand to accept his nomination. Thank you Chris for that generous acceptance, please go ahead and speak.

Chris Gamvroulas:

I'm just honored. Thank you. I wasn't prepared with an acceptance speech. I'm happy to do that and suggest that Tom Macdonald, who's representing the as an appointee of the League of Cities and Towns, is a member of the Quorum City Council, work together to maybe Co. Chair that group and move that forward.

Representative Waldrip:

I'm receptive to that suggestion. Do we have any comments to those two Co-chairing the moderate-income housing group? Tom, you're raising your hand also to graciously accept your railroading.

Tom Macdonald:

That's exactly what it is, a gracious acceptance. Thank you, Chris.

Representative Waldrip:

I'm waiting for somebody to say I'd like to thank the Academy. Alright, so with that, I guess we'll put that to a vote. Do we have a motion on the moderate-income, housing, subgroup, and leadership to accept it.

Mike Gallegos:

I'll make the motion.

Representative Waldrip:

Alright, thank you, Mike, 2nd Mr. Damschen all in favor say aye. Any opposed? OK, let's move to the low-income housing subcommittee. Do we have any railroad nominations that will take place here shortly?

Christina Oliver:

Point of clarification.

Representative Waldrip:

A point of clarification.

Christina Oliver:

Are Chris and Tom chairing the 81 to 120?

Representative Waldrip:

Yes, the moderate-income housing.

Christina Oliver:

We're going to call that attainable.

Representative Waldrip:

Attainable, whatever we're calling them.

Christina Oliver:

Is that correct?

Representative Waldrip:

Works for me.

Christina Oliver:

No, we're making it up but, then we don't get it. The next group is the 31% to 80%.

Representative Waldrip:

To 80% OK.

Wayne Neiderhauser:

Again, I think that's the discussion we had on alignment with what the statute is so we don't get caught up in different definitions, please.

Mike Gallegos:

Would it be better to be 80% and below.

Janice Kimball:

Yeah, 'cause you're forgetting below 30% AMI

Representative Waldrip:

Yeah, that's fine with me. It goes into homelessness. I mean, that's the question is where we crossover into homelessness but I'll defer to the Czar.

Wayne Neiderhauser:

You crossover at 30%, with veterans you might be at a little higher, am I? So there's a little bit of a fuzzy area there but there's no way to really define or draw that hard line.

Janice Kimball:

Yeah, there are many people who earn below 30% AMI who aren't homeless. They're served in public housing and litech units, so I like the idea of just saying 80% and below.

Christina Oliver:

One of the ideas that this was sort of the output is not focusing as much on services and facilities that Wayne's other group works on. So, we wanted to really focus more energy on that 80, 60, 40 and not get 2 taken away with the 30% below.

Janice Kimball:

I don't agree with that.

Representative Waldrip:

Let me make sure I understand so we want to deal with housing for a, you know, for a contingent of individuals, and then within that low-income Housing Committee subcommittee, they'll be bringing forward recommendations based on tiers, I'm assuming I mean it'll be on, you know, make sure we're dealing with the individual tiers separately because you know, like with moderate income and rural there are separate issues that are going to affect different groups differently. So, we probably just need to come up with a definition for the group, like we've set attainable housing for this group in AMI so that we kind of leave it more broad so that we're not getting cross purposes with the statute. Do we have a suggestion for that group and then we leave it to that Subcommittee to sort of focus their efforts on those different tranches within that group? Does that make sense? That makes sense, Christina. OK, do we have a suggestion for a name? I don't know if Mike or.

Mike Gallegos:

I don't have a suggestion, but you know Wayne was put on this Commission because of what, he represents as far as the program. So, if we're going to exclude that portion from here, I'm not quite understanding that. But I think if there's a focus on 30% to 80% you haven't clarified or justified that to my satisfaction yet. So, then I guess the question has to be the work for 30% and below are the homeless, is that housing going to pretty much fall into Wayne's Homeless committee?

Representative Waldrip:

I think that's a great question. Maybe that's for Wayne. Can you talk about the scope of where you feel like your services extend to, because you know, again, you're here to make sure we coordinate that? You know that piece of your work with everything else we're doing here. We don't take over your work. We don't jump into your space, but we make sure we understand where your space ends and where our space begins and that there's some gray area there. So, we make sure we handle that transition.

Wayne Neiderhauser:

If we're trying to separate out homelessness, you would probably do it with an AMI. It would probably be 50% AMI and below would capture 99.99% of the situations, but most of them are under 30% AMI and some are way down at zero, so it's a spectrum. Probably the biggest bulk is probably 20% and under.

Senator Fillmore:

So, if we set it at 50%, we would capture 99% of the homeless problem, but what else would we capture there? I wonder if we captured, if that cohort is almost all the homeless but is still only 5% of that cohort, where maybe?

Wayne Neiderhauser:

You capture upstream people that are on the edge of their income. A health incident, a car repair, they end up getting evicted, so it's not really homelessness, but you're talking about people who are susceptible to, very susceptible to losing their housing.

Senator Fillmore:

Is that different than the subcommittee that we're setting up on, you know, the 30% and below subcommittee that we've already set up? is that a different target, a different working group in your mind.

Wayne Neiderhauser:

Well, you know it gets into more semantics and and so you know I think that 30% below can deal with homelessness and deal with some of the exceptions that might go above like so, so veterans you know might have an income but may have some mental health or addiction issues that are based on things they've lost or harm they've experienced or trauma, but this was a discussion I had with the Veterans Administration representative Josh the other day that you know if we just set 30%, you might be able to exclude some of those that are really kind of in that homeless situation, but have an income and so that puts them above that. But it's kind of an exception, and I think you could just kind of include all of homelessness in 30% and below. So we're not getting you know, caught up in bright lines there is no bright line.

Representative Waldrip:

Please Tara can you come to the mic so I can hear and then we've got a comment here and then we'll go to Mr. Damschen.

Tara Rollins:

I'm just going to point out this chart once again to say who is the 30% of AMI and 45% of them are working and also disabled and seniors and so we need to be looking at making sure that they're stabilized in housing because they're also paying more than 50% of their income to housing, and so they're just a step away from being evicted or one life event away. So, I'm just pointing out that this is really important. It's always been important to the Utah Housing Coalition because this is, these are the people that are in some ways, being ignored because it's extremely hard to pencil these projects, and so if we're going to have low-wage jobs in this state, we're going to need to be looking at how we can successfully house people to have those jobs because it's important to our economy.

Representative Waldrip:

Thank you, let's go to Nate.

Nate McDonald:

Nate McDonald with workforce services. I think this is an interesting discussion and you know where that line is drawn because there is a crossover. For example, the 55 million for deeply affordable, you know, weighing in the office of homeless services with the Utah Homeless Council is determining those funds so that crossover. It's definitely a healthy discussion of how those two were, or how this organization, this group with that group, and where the line is drawn there.

David Damschen:

I'm just going to say whether it's new construction or acquisition rehab. Obviously, we have a little bit of a product focus and working with developers and 9% is a certain type of a product, generally speaking,

and it's inclusive of permanent supportive housing, but also workforce housing the dividing lines usually kind of in the range of like 60% and down. 50% is not a bad place to be and then the 4% tax credits generate a fair bit less equity. The 9% tax credits are about 70% equity, 4% about 30% equity and so the economics are quite different. You're serving a different population, so 60% of AMI and up really solidly into the workforce housing realm and there's an economies of scale thing going on there. As Christina knows, I mean the private activity bond deals that are coupled with the 4% tax credits are much larger, more units. Kind of that workforce housing space, but in our realm the dividing lines like 60% of AMI.

Representative Waldrip:

Thank you, let's go to Neiderhauser.

Wayne Neiderhauser:

Just one other comment Mr Chair is, The State Homelessness Council is redoing our strategic plan and we want to go upstream to those who are vulnerable to housing instability because we gotta shut the tap off or we'll never get ahead of it. So just, I mean, just keeping that in mind as we go forward with this and it's OK to identify 30% and below, but we want, homelessness is going to be looking up to try to as a prevention to becoming homeless.

Representative Waldrip:

And I think that's exactly why you're on this Commission is because we want to make sure we integrate that discussion that you're having on shutting off the tap with the discussion we're having here about housing affordability and how we're going to deal with housing affordability and then it crosses over into a lot of services discussions as well. Thanks, Andrew.

Andrew Johnston:

We are still discussing partially if below 30% should be included in this or not? Is that part of our current line of discussion?

Representative Waldrip:

Well, I don't think we're discussing whether or not we include homelessness in this. I think that's pretty clear that you know that there is some crossover, and we want to have representation on homelessness. It's just trying to define the scope of and the name of so that we're appropriately tasking this subcommittee with the work that we want them to tackle and hearing what Czar Neiderhauser just said, I'm just going to use that to death, gives us a little bit clearer vision of what they are going to do so that we don't double that work. Does that make sense?

Andrew Johnston:

Yeah, I think it's right to not double it. I think going back to it, Mr. Damschen said if we're looking at housing retention or creation, the mechanisms are going to be pretty similar below that threshold whether you're homeless or not, and so I would personally believe that we need to include that full spectrum below 80% AMI all the way down to zero in those discussions for policy discussion reasons. Because it's not a different policy discussion for someone homeless versus working in that type of housing. The difference is going to be the services you attached to it, which is funded differently anyway. So, from a tax credit or other mechanism and policy discussion, we're going to have, I think it's the same that we need to include everything down to zero AMI.

Representative Waldrip:

So with that discussion it seems like we can call it low income, but just not limit the AMI distinction to 30% because there will be some overlap and crossover, but make sure our focus is on housing affordability at this Commission with an eye to making sure we coordinate with the services that are being provided and the intent that's coming from Wayne's group so that we don't double-dip, but we also make sure that we're single dipping everywhere we ought to be single dipping. Does that make sense? OK, so I'll entertain a motion to that effect and then I don't know that we've had any nominations for it, so let's get a nomination or two here. Who's ready? Nominate someone that you love.

Andrew Johnston:

Mr. Chair this is Andrew Johnston. I would propose a motion to not limit the low-income group's AMI to anything below 80% AMI. Let's first motion and I have a second one in a second.

Representative Waldrip:

OK, we have a second on that first motion.

David Damschen:

Second

Representative Waldrip:

OK. Mr. Damschen And a vote all in favor of that first motion. Say aye, any opposed? I should have called for discussion. Seems like we've discussed it alright, next motion, Andrew do you have a second motion?

Andrew Johnston:

Yeah, Mr. Chair, I would nominate Beth Holbrook to lead that subcommittee.

Representative Waldrip:

We'll open up Beth's microphone to see if she has capacity and an interest in that.

Beth Holbrook:

We had been having a private, just a little bit of a discussion and I would be happy to try that, thank you.

Representative Waldrip:

OK.

Mike Gallegos:

Committee chair, subcommittee chairs. Are they supposed to staff their own subgroups? OK. It's a good choice then.

Representative Waldrip:

Bring what you can bring to the party. BYOS bring your own staff. OK, so we have a nomination for Beth Holbrook to chair that committee and you know, I think we don't need to get too formal. You know we can allow her to, you know, pick others to assist her as Co-chairs or vice chairs or whatever she wants. OK, any discussion to that motion? The low-income group 80% below. All in favor. All right? We had a

suggestion as well, just to open up back onto the moderate-income housing group we'd like to just ask and we haven't had this discussion, so we're going to look over at Mr. Damschen and see if he would also participate in leadership with moderate-income group because purchase of housing is going to be a focus of that. We'd like to make sure that you have, you know, sort of a bully pulpit in that group to make sure we're tackling that issue from your perspective. Attainable, sorry. There you go now you got a microphone.

David Damschen:

I just want to stay on Melissa's good side.

Representative Waldrip:

OK, perfect thank you. We'll add you to that. Now let's talk about rural housing, and I think we've talked about that enough. Do we have somebody who is willing to lead the rural housing effort? Or somebody who knows someone who would be awesome at leading the rural housing effort?

Christina Oliver:

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to nominate Mr. Loo.

Representative Waldrip:

OK. Mr. Loo can you unmute yourself and then we'll answer the question online.

Matt Loo:

Mr. Loo would love to take on that responsibility.

Representative Waldrip:

OK, we'd love to have you take that on. Do we have a second to that motion?

Wayne Neiderhauser:

I second.

Representative Waldrip:

OK, and all in favor. Any opposed, you can't vote no for yourself man, sorry. OK, so we have our three subcommittees now established with some leadership and one of the questions is can citizens volunteer for committees? I think in an unofficial capacity you know we have the opportunity for people to show up to this meeting and make comments. I think the subcommittees will be able to manage their own agenda and their own membership as they see fit. Bring in the best minds and come up with the best solution, so I think that's totally appropriate that I'm OK with, if my colleagues here are OK, I assume that was the case. Let's go to Janice.

Janice Kimball:

Thank you, I had a suggestion for the rural committee, is that they look to having some Housing Authority representation on that committee and I could send out some contacts if that would be helpful.

Representative Waldrip:

That would be terrific.

Christina Oliver:

Want to serve on it?

Janice Kimball:

I don't. I'm not from a rural area but I bet there are many really good Housing Authority directors in rural Utah who would be fabulous.

Representative Waldrip:

OK, and so with that, let's just ask that everybody who is a member of this Commission volunteer for at least one group. Participation, I'm a little worried we're going to get thin on our rural group, so let's make sure we have people who can add to the rural discussion. Christina is going to be on that. Go ahead Mr. Damschen.

David Damschen:

My organization will be represented in all three.

Representative Waldrip:

Excellent, OK.

David Damschen:

We just had a conversation this morning with Commissioner Warnick and a couple of other representatives down in Delta, Millard County about some special challenges down there similar to what you and I discussed up in Box Elder County. Yeah, big deficits and supply very immediate need. So yeah.

Representative Waldrip:

Yeah, so they'll be on all three.

David Damschen:

Might not be me on all three, but someone from Utah housing on all three. But for sure, yeah, no we need to be there.

Representative Waldrip

It looks like Hailey Hernandez is volunteering. I think to touch on that point. We have in rural Utah for those of us that don't live in rural Utah, go visit rural Utah and ask about their open job positions versus their housing options. The imbalance is so dramatic, there it's different than the problem on the Wah Satch front because you have such volume on the Wasatch Front you can figure out in rural Utah, there is no volume. There's no opportunity to sort of absorbing in the non-market solutions basements, you know, they're just much more limited in what they can provide opportunities for employment, and one of the state's goals is to try to help balance the growth of the state outside of the Wasatch Front, there's a, you know, there's a significant state interest in that effort and in order to make that even remotely possible, we're going to have to figure out more housing options for rural Utah and getting developers and builders go out to rural Utah right now is a virtual impossibility, so there's going to have to be other solutions that are brought to rural Utah to do anything of any scale or volume. OK. Let's move on to other items, other business. I'd like to invite Cameron Diehl up to the podium to just talk about the league. I know you've had several discussions with your board and membership and just want to get your input on what we've been talking about and what are the things we should be talking about. If that's OK.

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

Cameron Diehl

Thank you, Mr. Co-Chair and members of the committee. Cameron Diehl, the executive director of the Utah League of Cities and Towns, and I presented to you last month as we recapped what I believe was a very successful and collaborative legislative session and I also told you we had just finished our Spring conference in our outreach to our members. We had a record number of attendees at our Spring Conference, over 500, and clearly the number one topic everyone wanted to discuss was growth now within growth, that was everything from water to housing to residents' frustration about the negative impacts on their quality of life, from growth to homelessness. All of that kind of wrapped into the umbrella issue of growth. Since that time, the league has seen that league staff and our attorneys from key cities and planners from key cities have sat down with the Property Rights Coalition. Chris Gamvroulas and Mike Ostermiller represent 2 aspects of the Property Rights Coalition on this Commission. We sat down last week and started putting together the potential list for the Land Use Task Force which last year was where we highlighted several key issues that the CHA ultimately endorsed, including looking at the Nexus of housing and economic development improvements to moderate-income, housing plans, inclusionary housing, stationary plans, and the like. So really what you had in House Bill 462 and House Bill 303 came through the Land Use Task Force process with the input from the Property Rights Coalition as well as from local governments, so we will be meeting on June 6th. Both sides have put together their lists of potential topics, some of which have come up in today's conversation. Many of which will feed into the different subgroups that the CHA has now put together, most of which I would assume will be on that modern income side. But there could be some overlap on the roadside, and I said moderate, the attainable sorry, sorry Christina, attainable model. You've always been Christina to me, but the attainable housing group, long-term group and then in the build group. On June 6th we will take the list that the league has, 20 or so items. Property Rights Coalition has 20 or so items and we'll be finalizing our priorities of those items in order to make sure that what we're doing in the lending task force dovetails into conversations here and I think it's wise that you have the league and the PRC code sharing your modern income housing group so that we have that synergy between those two groups and can be working together as we approach this interim represent Waldrip, you had asked what top fix you thought we should focus on recognizing that we have a long list and the profit rights Coalition also has a long list and we have not yet gone to the prioritization phase. I hesitate to go into those specifics until we've had a chance to finish that vetting process. I want to be fair to all the stakeholders in that process, but know that at city halls, across the state everywhere I turn, cities are talking to us about growth challenges and they're trying to figure out what their roles are in planning for that growth. Beth and I mentioned this last meeting, but I think it's worth reiterating as we set this process forward in the summer and tis I received tremendous positive feedback from city leaders about the and the ultimate outcomes in House Bill 303 in House Bill 462 that, at least, on paper, people feel really good about. The final out of the finalcome. In those bills, there's a lot of work that has to be done between now and this fall just to implement those bills just on House Bill 462 alone, you'll have said that Bill hasn't even gone into effect yet. It has an effective date of June 1st, and between June 1st and October 1st, every city above 5000 has to update their modern income housing plans based on these new standards. There will be new reporting requirements and new data collection that will help inform policy discussion and that's how independent of the station area plan requirements that cities are going to be actively planning in pursuing over the next few months, so my hope is that come January, we will have a very good story to tell about the the ongoing imentation of House Bill 462, and I think House Bill 462 over the course of the next few years will pay significant dividends for the state. Obviously there's a lot of work to do this summer, but I just want to make sure we recognize how much, how much work

not only went into the passage of 462, but we'll go into the implementation of House Bill 462 so that Mr Co-Chair. I'm happy to take any questions. Or did I address what you wanted me to tackle?

Representative Waldrip:

I think that's totally fair and I would just reiterate for the Members of this body that The League of Cities and Towns, I mean in my very short tenure in the legislature, I've watched some really bloody fights over housing, over zoning, over some of these land use issues and those bloody fights generally end up with mixed results, because when you know when a sovereign entity is the cities you know are organized under state law, they have responsibilities to their citizens and counties as well and when they feel like something is forced down their throats in contravention to the duty that they feel to those they represent. They almost feel a duty to oppose it, you know, and that's human nature and so this past year as Cameron and league leadership and members of the league came to the table with the idea that they would find solutions and work with policymakers to find solutions that will move the needle. It was an amazing success and that is due to the personalities and the willingness of people to put their own sort of selfish self-interest aside and look at the greater picture. Look at regional solutions beyond sort of their own borders and I can do nothing but commend Cameron and his team for their leadership they provided in navigating those very, very tricky waters and Mayor Ramsey and the other members of the board, I won't name all I'll never stop now, but they were tremendously visionary. In looking ahead and saying OK, how do we impact these issues in a meaningful way while still maintaining our duty to our residents and I think they did a fantastic job of coming to the table with real solutions and then from the property rights side, the same exact process. It was painful for everybody, which is exactly how it should be. Growth equals pain I grew, I'll just tell you this, was when I graduated from 9th grade I was 5'11", when I started 10th grade I was 6'5". That's an insane amount of growth in a very short period of time. I know pain of growth. It was painful. I slept and ate and played basketball and not necessarily in that order. Well, maybe in that order. Growth is hard and we're dealing with very, very difficult issues, and we're dealing with things that affect real people's lives in a very, you know, impactful way, and I think this the care that this body and that the legislature and Mr. Diehl took in creating solutions to address those growing pains was absolutely visionary and amazing and I couldn't be more grateful for the cities and the counties in participating in that process and coming up with great solutions and I think we're on a very good path to creating real solutions going forward that are going to have an impact on people's lives, this is, this will be really extremely impactful into ordinary Utahns' lives for many, many years to come. So we got to get it right now. So I just say thanks.

Cameron Diehl:

Well thank you Mr Co-Chair, and one last thing I'll add is that of the Wasatch Front Regional Council will be considering a stationary plan policy this week and the Mount Association of Governments will be considering their stationary plan policy next week. So even though that bill doesn't officially take effect until June 1st, but there's always already been a considerable amount of work by DWS, by the league, by The Association of Governments and impose the Property Rights Coalition and others working toward implementation of those bills so a lot of work to be done there, in addition to everything that you've talked about here, so thank you for the support and thank you for the partnership. The last thing I'll say is this from a local government perspective. One size fits all and that's something we have heard over and over and over again and part of the beauty of the consensus we were able to build with those bills, House Bill 303 and 462 is, we're able to respect those principles while still making progress on consensus based public policy and so let's see what this summer holds.

Representative Waldrip:

Thank you, any questions for Cameron while he's up here.

Beth Holbrook:

Thanks Mr. Chair. Not a question Cameron, but a comment. I just wanted to thank you again for all of your work. UTA really appreciated the camaraderie and the ability to navigate all of this. Your U & WRFC and MAG, all of you guys worked really hard to take some of the structure that was a requirement for UTA and articulate that into something that all of these localities, all of these local communities can take into consideration as they do their transit overlays and so we just wanted to thank you for that and thank everybody involved. This was a really hard lift and Representative Waldrip that I ran into you a couple times as well during that session and appreciated all the work that you did coalescing everyone and helping them to understand the value of all of this integrated work and what we can expect to do by focusing on our existing infrastructure, so just wanted to articulate that. Thank you again.

Cameron Diehl:

Well, thank you and the other thing is, thank you to the state for the state financial support on the technical assistance side. That will help make those stationary plans a reality. There's more money that the state allocated in part because the recommendation of this group for this type of technical assistance at any time before, both through UDOT and through the Governor's Office of Economic Opportunities. So again, great model of partnership and collaboration.

Representative Waldrip:

I'd say to the committee here as we look at the subcommittee efforts. That is a model that we really ought to keep in mind where we did impose some requirements on the cities, but we didn't do it without providing them assistance and funding, and we got tremendous support from that from the state from the governor's office and from House and Senate leadership to make sure that we had resources there so we weren't just turning them loose and saying good luck. Then having them complain back saying how, how do we pay for this? I mean it's expensive so that's something that you know it is. We talked through these processes that was a separate funding line item aside from all of the other funding's we broke down the line items in the funding on that on 462, which is as a policy that is, I think that helped a lot to make sure that we were funding the appropriate priorities. I've got a comment over here.

Mike Gallegos:

I'll comment, just request if it's possible if the Commission could receive an invite to listen in on the UOC meetings?

Kyle Palmer:

Yeah, absolutely, everyone is welcome to join that. It's an open public meeting. We do have a link and I can send it out to everyone as well to participate on zoom and view everything that's going on so absolutely.

Representative Waldrip:

Yeah, we just send out a link to the Commission members. That'd be great.

Kyle Palmer:

Do you want us to send it to you Christina or to Stacey?

Christina Oliver:

Because our email lists are starting to get so cumbersome, I would suggest that everybody sign up. If you just sign up under the public notice website, it shoots you and email every time that they're having a meeting and then you for sure will get it. I'm not saying that Kyle won't.

Representative Waldrip:

So, can we do that? We ask staff to send a link to the sign-up? Yes, that's easy. OK, then it's your fault if you're not there.

Kyle Palmer

But it is from 9:00 to 11:00 tomorrow morning and it's actually in this room too. So if anyone wants to camp out overnight and wake up here, we'll be ready, we'll see you soon.

Representative Waldrip:

Security doesn't mind. Tested yeah, please.

Christina Oliver:

Can I ask those who are here and I can't see everyone online I apologize, but Janice which group would you like to sit on? Low income? OK. I just wanted to make sure and not assign you just in case. Andrew Johnston.

Andrew Johnston:

The low-income and Mike Akerlow asked to be on that one as well.

Christina Oliver:

OK. Then I have Mr. Gallegos. Ok, we are skinny on rural Utah.

Jeff Jones:

I volunteer for that. Jeff Jones.

Christina Oliver:

Got you down. Ginger Chinn, I'm not sure I believe she was double booked today so Danny Walz are you on the phone?

Danny Walz:

Yes, I'm here. I would like to serve on whatever the final description was for the moderate-income housing group.

Christina Oliver:

So, the attainable.

Danny Walz:

Thank you, Christina.

Christina Oliver:

You're welcome. OK, then I think we're good.

Representative Waldrip:

One note for the subcommittees we are going to try to find a way so that these don't have to be publicly noticed meetings that will be very cumbersome for our subcommittees, so Gus is going to help guide us through that, and we'll give some direction and even if we have to come back and make them unofficial committees, and maybe we ought to do that as I'll entertain a motion that we find a way to make these as non publicly noticed subcommittee meetings so that they can be less formal and more working groups.

Kyle Palmer:

Mr. Co-Chair I managed to make that whether you want to be a motion or just my understanding. Is that they are subgroups, not committees, 'cause they're planned by this and placing were in statute beyond that they are not a decision making body, but they will discuss and then bring recommendations to this and then this group is publicly noticed and you know a more public recommending body. So that's my understanding of it.

Representative Waldrip:

Let's make that a motion as a group so that we don't have an official subcommittee distinction, because that may determine something in state law.

Kyle Palmer:

I'll actually just clarify, making that the motion, Mr. Co-Chair. I think it also helps with the UOC, 'cause the UOC has three subcommittees of which this is one of them, and then four different working groups. So similarly, to this, if we call you the sub-committee subcommittees, then that's going to be confusing. So, I think the term. Subgroup as funny as it is, and with attainable versus moderate on the nuances here, I think that's another good note is we called these subgroups so.

Representative Waldrip:

We have a motion. We have a second.

Christina Oliver:

I second.

Representative Waldrip:

OK, any discussion. Seeing none will place that for a vote, all in favor. Any opposed? Again, for the public listening, this is not an attempt to limit public access. It's simply an attempt to facilitate working group meetings through this public meeting, you have notice of who is on those subcommittees and who leadership is. They're reachable with public information and can be accessible to get information on when those committees are meeting and it is our intent to have those committees be accessible. You know, as reasonably determined by the sub subgroups, sorry subgroups accessible as reasonably determined by the leadership of those subgroups. Do we have any other? I do have one other item of business that I have to say. We need to officially appoint myself and Senator Fillmore as Co-chairs of this. So, can I get a motion to that effect?

Janice Kimball:

I'll make the motion this is Janice.

Representative Waldrip:

OK, a second. OK, second Nate. All in favor, say aye. Any opposed better not be just kidding, send it recorded. Thank you very much. That'll just clarify the structure going forward. We have any structural or business-type issues that we haven't tackled today.

Christina Oliver:

No, I will be sending out a summary of what was decided today and I would request that the chairs and the Co-chairs of each subgroup work out a structure between the members. Our next meeting will be held on July 12th at 1:00 O'clock we will meet. We'll have a hybrid again, which seems to work out for everyone. So, July 12th at 1:00 o'clock. The first action item will be to discuss each subgroup's ideas generated thus far based on the schedule in your packet, there is no meeting in August. Kyle does the EOC not meet in August?

Kyle Palmer:

Yeah, we're meeting every two months since it's towards the end of each of those months, so it would be the end of July that we're meeting there.

Christina Oliver:

So, then the proposal for the dates of this particular group would be July 12th, September 6th, October 4th, and November 8th. That being said, there would be no meeting in August if you'd like to have a fifth meeting, we could do August 9th. So one meeting per month, the first Tuesday from one to three.

Representative Waldrip:

I think that sounds great. Let's see what our July meeting brings and then we can determine and then let me ask 11 just quick favor from the subgroups. If you could respond to Melissa when your meeting is scheduled and let her know. Please title it. Melissa "MELISSA" kidding. Well, we have to adopt this OK can we adopt? We have a motion to adopt the calendar that was just discussed. OK, any discussion all in favor? Any opposed? OK.

VII. ADJOURN

Representative Waldrip:

Meeting adjourned @ 2:53 p.m.