Week 3 overview

• 1300+ bills so far
• 224 tracked by ULCT
• 25 days to go!

Actively worked on:
• Rep. Eliason’s proposal
• Small cell infrastructure
• S.B. 52 Sale of State Land Act
• S.B. 55 Motor Vehicle Registration Amendments
• S.B. 154 Prohibition on Law Enforcement Quotas
• S.B. 158 Municipal Business Licensing
• S.B. 167 Food Truck Regulation Amendments

• H.B. 175 Oversight Committee Creation
• H.B. 250 Building permits and impact fees
• H.B. 256 Moderate income housing
• H.B. 225 Initiatives, Referenda, and Other Political Activities
• H.B. 203 Nighttime Construction
• H.B. 181 Homemade Food Consumption
• H.B. 271 Government Enterprise Amendments
• H.B. 248 Compensatory Service in Lieu of Fines
• H.B. 209 Mental Health Protections for First Responders
• H.B. 265 Body Cam Amendments
• H.B. 279 Design Professionals Liability Amendments
• H.B. 294 Municipal Forms of Government Amendments
• H.B. 298 Victim Advocate Confidentiality Amendments
• H.B. 303 Drinking Water Source Sizing Requirements
• H.B. 346 Local Government Building Plan Review
• H.B. 361 Billboard Amendments
1) What is the problem the bill is trying to solve?

2) Is the bill a “one size fits all” approach?

3) Does the empower or restrict the “local control” of local governments?
   • “Local control” means authority to make autonomous decisions without state mandates, accountability to residents about those decisions, and the ability to evolve naturally to achieve the community’s vision

4) Does the bill have a financial impact on local governments?
Undermining local authority: *Nix these Six!*

- HB 79
- HB 83
- HB 175
- HB 242
- HB 248
- HB 271

*You shall not pass!*
Key questions: what should our role as cities be?

- Should the state impose a fee/tax on local governments for homelessness?
  - Public hearing requirements?
- Should local gov’ts w/o a homeless resource center contribute to the O&M?
- Should local gov’ts w/o a homeless resource center help mitigate the impacts of the centers, either in the cities who house them or in their own cities?
- Which homeless resource centers would qualify (SLC/Midvale/SSL/Ogden/St G)?
- If there is a fee, is it outcome based or formula based?
  - Population based?
  - Based on housing stock within a community? (“affordable housing”)
  - Fundraising arm with fixed target or incentive to affect behavior?
- If there is a fee, who decides amount? Who collects, manages, and expends it? How long does the fee last? What is the accountability back to the cities?
Homelessness proposals, House and Senate

**Rep. Eliason: (Speaker Hughes supports)**
- $3.3 million total city assessment
  - $12 million estimated O&M need for 4 SL County shelters; cities = 25%
- Purpose: supplement Road Home O&M
- Formula: based on inventory of very low income or affordable housing in city
  - More low income housing = smaller fee
  - Less low income housing = greater fee
- Cities with qualifying shelters pay $0

**Sen. Davis: (extent of support TBD)**
- $3.6 million in ongoing approp. request
  - Law enforcement, fire, paramedics
- Purpose: Mitigation for state mandated shelters in Midvale and South Salt Lake
- Formula: open bill file to utilize the population portion of the local option 1% sales tax to fund the mitigation
  - Every city would contribute toward mitigation by a portion of sales tax
- Does not apply to SLC, Ogden, St. G
Here we are, as of Feb. 12

Option 1:
• Eliason concept
  • State & counties want city participation (perception that cities are not “partners” on state priority)
  • Speaker of the House: “Get out of jail free card;” pay fee in lieu of a shelter in your city
  • Precedent of state charging cities for O&M of a facility with a fixed fundraising target
    • Make legislators responsible for the “homeless fee”

Option 2:
• Sen. Davis concept
  • Focus on mitigation rather than Road Home O&M
  • Impact on local sales tax; precedent of state diverting our sales tax

Option 3:
• ULCT rejects both? Counter proposal? What do we want to accomplish?
  • Mitigation for cities with shelters, credit for cities w/realted facilities, affordable housing, or services (“participation match” concept), prevent bad policy precedent
HB 361: Billboard Amendments

- If billboard owner wants to rebuild, repair, relocate, or modify billboard, then make request of city
- To deny, a city has 90 days to use the eminent domain process
  - Compensation, due process
- Response to Salt Lake City litigation
- Outdoor advertising industry reached out to multiple members of Team ULCT on Friday about bill
Contact us anytime (literally) during the next 25 days

• Cameron Diehl, cdiehl@ulct.org
• Rachel Otto, rotto@ulct.org
• Roger Tew, rtew@ulct.org
• John Hiskey, jhiskey@ulct.org
• Brandon Smith, bsmith@ulct.org
• Karson Eilers, keilers@ulct.org

• Follow us on Facebook and twitter
• Bill tracking on website with assigned staffers
• Daily operational call and emails (committees, daily update, action alert)