**A243C002\_230614Q5\_CANON.mp3**

[00:00:06] **Speaker 1** Well.

[00:00:09] **Speaker 2** Good for history.

[00:00:12] **Speaker 3** All right.

[00:00:14] **Speaker 4** Hey, Jenny. I wish.

[00:00:16] **Speaker 5** We could just.

[00:00:18] **Speaker 3** Learn.

[00:00:18] **Speaker 2** About.

[00:00:18] **Speaker 3** Certain things, but, I don't know. I guess I could.

[00:00:25] **Speaker 4** Look at that. Oh, it's nice. All right. Good afternoon. Thank you very much for being here. It's going to be a busy couple of weeks at the Capitol today. We are talking about a topic that all of us heard over the course of the past year on the campaign trail. And we have heard about it ever since. We are lucky that we live in a state where people want to move. If you look at what's happened in the neighbors around us, we are an importer of people. I just saw something on the Internet yesterday, I think it was last year, 16,000 people moved here from Illinois. So there are people who are coming to Wisconsin because of their quality of life, our low tax burden and the great jobs that we offer people. One of the biggest challenges that we have, however, is that with all the folks who want to live, work, retire and play here we are in a shortage of housing. And that's one of the things that we have really focused on. Earlier this session, I asked Representative Brooks, the chair of the Housing committee, to work really hard to try to see if there were areas that he could find some free market based solutions to. And he did a great job with that. And the authors behind me have worked on the package with him. So I'll turn it over First to Representative Brooks. I'll talk about the topic in general, and then we'll ask each of the members to talk about their bill and some of the specifics and how it's going to help to alleviate the crisis that we have in affordable housing for Wisconsin. So thank you.

[00:01:45] **Speaker 6** So as Speaker Vos mentioned, a little over a year ago, we came together with a consortium, the realtors, all the League of Municipalities, the Towns Association, the Counties Association, different trades associations, the builders to see what we could do to increase the supply and reduce cost of housing. Here in the state of Wisconsin, we really focused on three major areas. That was regulation. Currently, about $85,000 in regulatory costs or attributed to a home. That is something we wanted to try and reduce over the upcoming years. Another area was litigation. We have a bill dealing with litigation and expediting and development by right. The other area is financing and we work closely with we to come up with a financing package to finance the things that are typically included in a TIFF or TID district but remain off the property tax rules. So it was really a probably a year long collaborative effort to focus on those different issues. And it wasn't for the Speaker's leadership. We wouldn't be here today. So I have to thank all of my authors behind me, our office coordinating the bills and these fine folks behind me really fine tuned it and brought the package home. And we're looking forward to a great bipartisan vote today.

[00:03:04] **Speaker 4** The first person the.

[00:03:05] **Speaker 6** First person up is Representative Armstrong.

[00:03:09] **Speaker 2** Hi. I've got two bills today. My first is kind of a hangover from last session, which is the like tech bill, low housing income tax credits. We introduced it last year. A little late in the session, didn't quite get it done. The governor put it into his bill. We've tweaked it a little bit more with like tech. A lot of people don't understand what like tech is. Low housing income tax credits are tax credits that are given to projects that typically house people that are 30, 60, 80% accounting, median income, some market rate in some cases. Who are those people? In my district? The seniors, Those people that are disabled? That's my working single family moms. That's people that are new to the workforce, people that can afford market rate for the most part. Without these tax credits, these projects wouldn't get done because the tax credits are given to the projects. The project sells those tax credits to an investor then that's used as part of the capital stack to build the project. Okay. So with these projects, with this bill right now, what it does is it takes the current 42 million up to 100 million. We figure that's going to build about an extra 1400 units a year. That's huge, right? I'm a rural area. I've had three of these projects in my area in the last three years. All of them work spectacularly. They're badly needed. The key that you're going to see here, and I've heard it from others is, you know, let the market well, we wouldn't be here if the market was doing what we needed to do. Okay. There's costs have gone up tremendously, etc.. So we've got bills today that are going to be put in place because the market isn't working right now in all circumstances. So with the light tax bill, I think will do fine in the assembly. We've got a little bit of hang up in the Senate and I'm hoping they'll come along. But I'm positive on this for what we've got right now. Now, the second one, 82, 64, is Representative Brooks brought up in areas and again, mine's a rural area. You've got small cities that are up to their limit in TID, which is 12% of the value of the city. So they don't have the tools available for water development. Well, this gives us some of the tools. The biggest issue we've got is developers trying to find money for infrastructure. Okay. Because again, the cities can't afford to write a two and a half million dollar check every time we want a new subdivision. So in lieu of TED, we've got a bill here that we will be providing 0% loans to developers for that infrastructure costs. So again, for my areas especially, we're a huge, huge because we need that extra help for the infrastructure. So with that, I'll turn it over to represent a.

[00:06:05] **Speaker 7** All right, Thanks very much. Good afternoon, everybody. He be 96 disability authored. It provides an additional tool to municipalities for development. So when you dig into the weeds on every 96, there are two main ingredients. One is it allows the municipality or the tip to exceed the 12% cap if the project is developer financed. The other the other main portion that was really important to this bill was it takes away the requirement that the TID be contiguous so they can work on two different areas of of the municipality and still be under the same TIFF district. So a lot of good feedback from developers and mayors. This is something that could be used both in in urban areas and in rural districts like mine. So really excited to get this tool in the toolbox. So if I had my glasses out, I could tell you that. Representative fears of next.

[00:07:06] **Speaker 8** The main Street rehabilitation bill is a B to 65. This bill is so important to our communities. When our communities were formed, we had businesses that would be on the main floor and then often time, almost all the time the owners would live on the second or third story. Well, after World War Two people moved to the suburbs and these spaces have fallen into disuse, their storage bases, or they're just not utilized at all with the main Street housing rehabilitation bill. This will provide zero interest loans to those people who own those buildings to make those second and third floor spaces available for workforce housing. It will be great for our communities, our small communities, our larger communities. So this will be great for Wisconsin. Thank you. And now, Representative Crew.

[00:08:01] **Speaker 2** Thank heavens. I've heard this bill is, you know, when the speaker mentions all the people moving up from Illinois, it's no secret that Adams County shaped like Illinois. So that's where they all come up to. And we've got a severe shortage in housing as a real estate professional. I can tell you that these bills that we're talking about today are monumental because they've got buyers and sellers in a very crazy market where buyers are paying 25 to 30% more for house than they should. Sellers would love to take advantage of that, but they can't leave because there's nowhere to go. One of the bills that we're doing in this package is the bill I worked on 8266 that will help clean up some of this process that's involved. So there's no funding in this bill, but it helps us understand the interaction between municipal government developers, interaction between the courts and the developers, and more importantly, the interaction between people in neighborhoods and the courts for redress. So the four parts of the bill, the first part is the development by right. This is one of the things that I think was most important, where if a developer comes to a town, city village knows the rules, comes with the project and the town, city village says, well, we'll think about it. It's not exactly how the process is supposed to work. This this bill says, okay, if you have rules in place, developer wants to get to work, brings a project that fits the rules at the time the project has to be granted. I think that's one of the more important things about this bill is just making sure there's certainty for developers to be able to actually want to come to our communities and know what the rules are moving forward. Secondary parts of this is for a developer to be able to go to the courts and have some redress of. The town, decides to change rules midstream. As Bill talks about how that process would work and how it would change. Below that, it also talks about in the bill later where individuals in the community have to be able to prove the harm they're going to sustain if they're going to challenge this in court as well. So that standing component is something that we deal with in this bill as well. So I think as a as a package, we have a great thing going here. We got funding and the other bill's got procedural things to fix in this bill. And I and I think we're off to a great start here that we can help people actually be able to sell their homes, find places to go, and actually bring a lot more people into the state of Wisconsin. So with that, I'll turn it over to represent a veteran.

[00:10:09] **Speaker 1** Thank you. Good afternoon, everyone. I'm here to talk about Assembly Bill 267. It expands on last year's legislation that created Wisconsin's housing rehabilitation loan program. This merely expands on that. As I drive through my district, especially in Columbia, Dodge and Jefferson County. So there's a lot of existing housing stock that already exists, but a lot of it started to fall into disrepair. And with this, we're talking about critical infrastructure siting, roofing, h back systems, even houses that still contain lead paint. So this bill really provides low interest loans for individuals making up to 120% of the median household income in any particular county to provide loans for them to rehabilitate their houses, to remove that lead paint, remove asbestos, update the HVAC system. We're talking about critical infrastructure so that their houses can remain in a safe and sanitary condition. So very, very happy to improve upon the the growth and success we had off last year's legislative session. And I'm looking for good bipartisan support on Assembly Bill 267. With that, I'm going to turn it over to Representative Summerfield. Well, thank you. I just want to echo what Chair Brooks mentioned. That's how much work has been put in this as last session as the chairman of the housing and Real estate with the Speaker's leadership. And we did put a good chunk of bills through the Assembly. And fortunately, the Senate just ran out of time into it. But that really helped start the conversation to where we are today with these housing packages. Like my colleagues behind me, every integrated about how important this is, how we're driving through our districts and we see see potential. And that's what my bill does with the commercial bank banking, commercial real estate that's available now to communities. We see, especially on the retail sides, they are having challenges and the challenges on the retail side is in turn for our local governments. We have a lot of these vacant buildings there. They're just sitting empty. My bill will work with, we need to have a revolving loan program to redevelop these areas for senior development and, you know, next generation housing. So I've been very happy to be part of this project and look forward to getting these things to the finish line in this business. Speaker Okay, thank you.

[00:12:43] **Speaker 3** Questions for the Office.

[00:12:46] **Speaker 4** A question for the Speaker.

[00:12:49] **Speaker 5** If something gets to revenue education through it, are you going to take that up this afternoon? Do you have the votes to pass?

[00:12:56] **Speaker 4** Yeah, our plan actually, we're going to do another media avail once we. Go through and see if the Senate offers an amendment, what the amendment contains, whether it will concur in it. So we're going to do that as soon as we know. It sounds like the Senate is going to go in today. So that's positive. Sounds like hopefully they're going to pass the bill and we'll just have to wait with our caucus because we have not seen the draft of the changes yet and what they would be required. So we'll come back and talk about that then. But I assume that assuming that they are acceptable to our caucus, will bring that to the floor and pass it today.

[00:13:28] **Speaker 8** Mr. Speaker, you talked about cutting the UW system budget by about 32 million. Yesterday was politics reporting showed that part of that is for lecturers and professors salaries. So what is the goal here? Is this something about banning teachings related to diversity?

[00:13:44] **Speaker 4** Sure. Well, the goal is really fairly simple. It's to say that if you're at the UW system on any one of the campuses, you should be able to be taught and you should be able to learn. It should not be indoctrination where you're only allowed to have one point of view. And we use taxpayer dollars, which, as they tell me, we don't have enough people to be in engineering. We don't have enough folks who are teaching an awful lot of careers. But boy, are they able to find millions of dollars to put money into a curriculum and to an ideology, because that's really what is for people on the left. It's become their new religion. They no longer go to church on Sunday, but boy, are they trying to make sure that everybody is evangelized to on campus that there's only one acceptable viewpoint. That's not what I think taxpayer should be funding. So we gave them more than enough time to say, let's redouble our efforts to take the money, which is going into promoting your new religion and saying let's promote economic development and careers that we know we need and filling jobs that should be taught to kids in Wisconsin. They've kind of ignored that. So if they had extra money, I think it should be taken back and the taxpayers of Wisconsin will get a chance to use it for something better than indoctrinating kids with left wing ideology.

[00:14:51] **Speaker 9** Your words on this, quote, diversity and.

[00:14:54] **Speaker 5** Inclusion really upset Milwaukee Democrats. They accuse this overall shared revenue bill in racist.

[00:14:59] **Speaker 2** Do you take your words back on that?

[00:15:01] **Speaker 4** No. I mean, this is something that's very simple. The idea should be I mean, it's ironic that we have gone from a time in the 1960s where famously Martin Luther King said, we want a colorblind society. And now people are saying, no, we want race, color and gender to be a part of everything and almost mandated for what people should believe. That's not what taxpayer dollars would be for. If you want to raise money in the private sector, if you want to have a bake sale or put money into your own ideology, you have every right to do that because look at America. But it's not the right to use taxpayer dollars to try to push one ideology over another is wrong.

[00:15:36] **Speaker 5** How did it break down yesterday? The head of finance. What happened?

[00:15:40] **Speaker 4** I'll turn it over to Gerald, famously.

[00:15:44] **Speaker 7** Yeah, I mean, first of all, I don't accept that anything broke down. We're working through the budget process, and historically, as well as in this budget, sometimes things are delayed as discussions or work continues. And so I don't think there's any breakdown. We voted on a number of key departments yesterday, while a number of key agencies again tomorrow and continue our work on the budget process and we remain after now, that should revenue is back. Moving along nicely today, we're back on our regular schedule to to finish the budget on time.

[00:16:15] **Speaker 8** Will you take up UW tomorrow then?

[00:16:17] **Speaker 7** We'll take it up when we're ready to take it up, just as all the other agencies of somewhere through the process.

[00:16:22] **Speaker 1** Are you considering returning funding for the engineering building?

[00:16:26] **Speaker 7** I don't know that we're considering looking backwards. The action we've already taken. We're moving forward on the agencies that are left to be finished and the final decisions that are being made to craft the budget on time.

[00:16:37] **Speaker 1** Your viewers, you may try to.

[00:16:38] **Speaker 5** Wrap up the budget as far away as that need to that.

[00:16:42] **Speaker 7** I think we'll probably need a few more days than just tomorrow night. We have not noticed all the agencies yet that are remaining.

[00:16:49] **Speaker 5** Speaker on the tax on the public school funding plan. You had a milwaukee Democratic senator vote for that bill yesterday, but at the same time, call the process B.S.. What do you say to anybody who looks at this and thinks that it's B.S. that education funding was made conditional.

[00:17:06] **Speaker 2** With the shared revenue bill?

[00:17:08] **Speaker 4** Well, you know, part of the legislative process is give and take. There are parts in the bill that we are going to be voting on today that if it were just me, I would have done differently. But that's disagreements even amongst Republicans. And then you add in trying to find a truly bipartisan agreement, we have to give up on some things that are really important to Republicans. There are an awful lot I would say most members of our caucus still have major heartburn about giving up the referendum requirement, which has been a core tenet of being a conservative in Wisconsin for the past 35 years. There are, I think, probably some Democrats who have had a core tenet of hating school choice. And we found a way to say each side has to compromise. And I guess if I just wanted to spend all of my time complaining about the things I didn't like, there would be a different press conference than focusing on the things that anybody does in government. There's always. Ways you can find, you know, to be a critic and be a complainer. I would focus more on the fact that we have a historic investment in public education. Over $1,000,000,000 is historic investment in alternative education, a quarter billion dollars, and a whole lot of other good things that are in there in the education side and the shared revenue side. We have huge increases of sharing the dollars that come from income and sales taxes back to local governments that will allow them hopefully to not raise property taxes, that allows them to invest in the things that we required police, fire and EMS. So if there are some who say police and fire shouldn't be a priority, I think that said, they have the right to vote no. But I think for the vast majority of Wisconsinites, this is a commonsense middle ground package that everybody can find something to support. And if you can find something different, play it out.

[00:18:45] **Speaker 8** Okay. Thanks, everybody. Thank you.