

Table 1. November 3 Proposed Amendments to the Countywide Planning Policies

The following table contains underlying proposed amendments to Countywide Planning Policies that AHC staff developed in response to decisions made by the AHC in response to GMPC Motion 21-1 and which AHC Committee members reviewed at the November 3 AHC meeting.

Amend. #	Proposed Amendments	Rationale
1	<p>DP-12 GMPC shall allocate housing residential and employment growth to each city and urban unincorporated area in the county. This allocation is predicated on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Accommodating the most recent 20-year population projection from the state Office of Financial Management and the most recent 20-year regional employment forecast from the Puget Sound Regional Council, informed by the 20-year projection of housing units from the state Department of Commerce; b) Planning for a pattern of growth that is consistent with the Regional Growth Strategy including focused growth within cities and Potential Annexation Areas with designated centers and within high-capacity transit station areas, limited development in the Rural Area, and protection of designated Natural Resource Lands; c) Efficiently using existing zoned and future planned development capacity as well as the capacity of existing and planned infrastructure, including sewer, water, and stormwater systems; d) Promoting a land use pattern that can be served by a connected network of public transportation services and facilities and pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure and amenities; e) Improving jobs/housing balance consistent with the Regional Growth Strategy, both between counties in the region and within subareas in the county; f) Promoting opportunities for housing and employment throughout the Urban Growth Area and within all jurisdictions in a manner that ensures racial and social equity; g) Allocating growth to Potential Annexation Areas within the urban unincorporated area proportionate to their share of unincorporated capacity for housing and employment growth; <u>and</u> h) <u>Allocating growth based on the amount of net new housing needed to plan for and accommodate an equitable distribution of housing choices across all jurisdictions that is affordable to all economic segments of the population of the county, as provided by the Department of Commerce.</u> 	<p>Provides consistency with other policies about housing growth targets and housing needs</p>

Amend. #	Proposed Amendments	Rationale
2	<p>DP-13 The Growth Management Planning Council shall:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Update housing and employment growth targets <u>and housing needs</u> periodically to provide jurisdictions with up-to-date growth allocations to be used as the land use assumption in state-mandated comprehensive plan updates; Adopt housing and employment growth targets <u>and housing needs</u> in the Countywide Planning Policies pursuant to the procedure described in policy FW-1; Create a coordinated countywide process to reconcile and set growth targets that implements the Regional Growth Strategy through countywide shares of regional housing and job <u>growth, countywide shares of statewide housing needs</u>, allocations to Regional Geographies, and individual jurisdictional growth targets; Ensure that each jurisdiction's growth targets <u>and housing need</u> are commensurate with their role in the Regional Growth Strategy by establishing a set of objective criteria and principles to guide how jurisdictional targets <u>and housing needs</u> are determined; Ensure that each jurisdiction's growth targets allow it to meet the need for <u>housing affordable housing for to households with moderate-, low-, very low-, and extremely low-incomes; low-, very low-, and extremely low-incomes</u> Adjust targets and housing needs administratively upon annexation of unincorporated Potential Annexation Areas by cities. Growth targets for the planning period are shown in Table DP-1. <u>Net new housing needs for the planning period are shown in Tables H-1 and total projected housing needs are shown in Table H-2.</u> 	Provides consistency with the Growth Management Act (GMA)
3	<p>DP- 14 All jurisdictions shall accommodate housing and employment by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Using the adopted growth targets as the land use assumption for their comprehensive plan; Establishing local growth targets for regional growth centers and regional manufacturing/industrial centers, where applicable; Ensuring adopted comprehensive plans and zoning regulations provide <u>sufficient</u> capacity <u>at appropriate densities</u> for residential, commercial, and industrial uses that is sufficient to meet 20-year growth targets, <u>allocated housing needs</u>, and is consistent with the desired growth pattern described in VISION 2050; Ensuring adopted local water, sewer, transportation, utility, and other infrastructure plans and investments, including special purpose district plans, are consistent in location and timing with adopted targets as well as regional and countywide plans; and Transferring and accommodating unincorporated area housing and employment targets <u>and housing need</u> as annexations occur. 	Provides consistency with GMA
4	<p>Housing Chapter</p> <p>The Countywide Planning Policies in the Housing Chapter support a range of affordable, accessible, and healthy housing choices for current and future residents. Further, they respond to the legacy of discriminatory housing and land use policies and practices (e.g., redlining, racially restrictive covenants, exclusionary zoning, etc.) that have led to significant racial and economic disparities in access to housing and neighborhoods of choice. These disparities affect equitable access to well-funded schools, healthy environments, open space, and employment.</p> <p>The policies reflect the region's commitment to addressing the 2018 findings of the Regional Affordable Housing Task Force (Task Force). Key findings include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dramatic housing price increases between 2012 and 2017 resulted in an estimated 156,000 extremely low-, very low-, and low-income households spending more than 30 percent of their income on housing (housing cost burdened); and Black, Hispanic, Indigenous, and extremely low-income households are among those most disproportionately impacted by housing cost 	Reflects some proposed 2021 GMPC member amendment language and further clarifies that implementation requires support from many

Table 1. November 3 Proposed Amendments to the Countywide Planning Policies, 12/6/2022

Amend. #	Proposed Amendments	Rationale
	<p>burden.</p> <p>While significant housing market activity is needed to reach overall King County housing growth targets, the ability of the region’s housing market to address the housing needs of low income households is limited. A large majority of the need will need to be addressed with units restricted to income-eligible households—both rent restricted units and resale restricted homes (“income restricted units”).</p> <p>Building on the Task Force’s work and in alignment with the Growth Management Act, this chapter establishes goals and policies to ensure all jurisdictions in King County plan for and accommodate their allocated share of a countywide need for affordable housing defined as the additional housing units needed in King County by 2044 so that no household at or below 80 percent of Area Median Income (AMI) is housing cost burdened. While the need is expressed in countywide terms, housing affordability varies significantly across jurisdictions. In addressing housing needs, less affordable jurisdictions will need to take significant action to increase affordability across all income levels while more affordable jurisdictions will need to take significant action to preserve affordability. To succeed, all communities must address housing need where it is greatest—housing affordable to extremely low income households.</p> <p>When taken together, all the comprehensive plans of King County jurisdictions must “plan for and accommodate” the existing and projected housing needs of the county and comply with the Growth Management Act requirements for housing elements as articulated in Revised Code of Washington (RCW 36.70A.020 and 36.70A.070).</p> <p>While significant new housing growth is necessary to reach overall King County housing growth targets, new housing growth will not sufficiently address the housing needs for lower-income households without additional government support for the creation of units restricted to income-eligible households—both rent-restricted units and resale restricted homes (“income-restricted units”); and the preservation of homes currently affordable at or below 80 percent of area median income. Local jurisdictions can create enabling environments and generate local revenue to support new housing development and housing preservation, but successful implementation requires resources and involvement from other levels of government, nonprofits, and the private sector.</p> <p>These Countywide Planning Policies also recognize that housing affordability varies significantly across jurisdictions. In addressing housing needs, less affordable jurisdictions will need to focus actions on increasing affordability for low-income households while more affordable jurisdictions will need to focus actions on preserving affordable homes at risk of price increases. To succeed, all communities must address housing need where it is greatest—housing affordable to extremely low-income households.</p> <p>The policies below set a framework for individual and collective action and accountability to meet the countywide needs and eliminate disparities in access to housing and neighborhoods of choice. They first establish the amount of countywide housing needs a jurisdiction must plan for and accommodate in a manner that seeks to increase housing choice and begin to address disparities in housing choice throughout King County. The policies then These policies guide jurisdictions through a five four-step process:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. cConduct a housing inventory and analysis; 2. iImplement policies and strategies to meet housing needs equitably; and 	

Table 1. November 3 Proposed Amendments to the Countywide Planning Policies, 12/6/2022

Amend. #	Proposed Amendments	Rationale																																																							
	3. review comprehensive plans; 4. monitor and report Measure results and provide accountability; and 5. a Adjust strategies to meet housing needs.																																																								
5	<p>H-1 Plan for and accommodate the jurisdiction's allocated share of countywide future housing needs for moderate-, low-, very low- and extremely low-income households as well as emergency housing, emergency shelters, and permanent supportive housing. Projected countywide and jurisdictional net new housing needed to reach projected future need for the planning period is shown in Table H-1. All comprehensive plans in King County combine to address the countywide need for housing affordable to households with low-, very low-, and extremely low incomes, including those with special needs, at a level that calibrates with the jurisdiction's identified affordability gap for those households and results in the combined comprehensive plans in King County meeting countywide need. The countywide need for housing in 2044 by percentage of AMI is: 30 percent and below AMI (extremely low) 15 percent of total housing supply 31-50 percent of AMI (very low) 15 percent of total housing supply 51-80 percent of AMI (low) 19 percent of total housing supply</p> <p>Table H-1 provides additional context on the countywide need for housing.²</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="344 727 2166 1308"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="344 727 1131 764">Table H-1: King County Affordable Housing Need</th> <th data-bbox="1131 727 1392 764">30% AMI</th> <th data-bbox="1392 727 1653 764">31% - 50% AMI</th> <th data-bbox="1653 727 1913 764">51% - 80% AMI</th> <th data-bbox="1913 727 2166 764">80% AMI</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="344 764 1131 802">Housing Units by Affordability (2019)</td> <td data-bbox="1131 764 1392 802"></td> <td data-bbox="1392 764 1653 802"></td> <td data-bbox="1653 764 1913 802"></td> <td data-bbox="1913 764 2166 802"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="344 802 1131 839">Number of Units</td> <td data-bbox="1131 802 1392 839">44,000</td> <td data-bbox="1392 802 1653 839">122,000</td> <td data-bbox="1653 802 1913 839">180,000</td> <td data-bbox="1913 802 2166 839">346,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="344 839 1131 876">As Share of Total Units</td> <td data-bbox="1131 839 1392 876">5%</td> <td data-bbox="1392 839 1653 876">13%</td> <td data-bbox="1653 839 1913 876">19%</td> <td data-bbox="1913 839 2166 876">36%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="344 876 1131 914">Additional Affordable Housing Units Needed (2019-2044)</td> <td data-bbox="1131 876 1392 914"></td> <td data-bbox="1392 876 1653 914"></td> <td data-bbox="1653 876 1913 914"></td> <td data-bbox="1913 876 2166 914"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="344 914 1131 951">Additional Housing Units Needed to Address Existing Conditions²</td> <td data-bbox="1131 914 1392 951">105,000</td> <td data-bbox="1392 914 1653 951">31,000</td> <td data-bbox="1653 914 1913 951">23,000</td> <td data-bbox="1913 914 2166 951">159,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="344 951 1131 989">Housing Units Needed to Address Growth Through 2044³</td> <td data-bbox="1131 951 1392 989">39,000</td> <td data-bbox="1392 951 1653 989">32,000</td> <td data-bbox="1653 951 1913 989">33,000</td> <td data-bbox="1913 951 2166 989">104,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="344 989 1131 1026">Total Additional Affordable Housing Units Needed</td> <td data-bbox="1131 989 1392 1026">144,000</td> <td data-bbox="1392 989 1653 1026">63,000</td> <td data-bbox="1653 989 1913 1026">56,000</td> <td data-bbox="1913 989 2166 1026">263,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="344 1026 1131 1063">Total Affordable Housing Units Needed by 2044 (Includes Current Housing Units)</td> <td data-bbox="1131 1026 1392 1063"></td> <td data-bbox="1392 1026 1653 1063"></td> <td data-bbox="1653 1026 1913 1063"></td> <td data-bbox="1913 1026 2166 1063"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="344 1063 1131 1101">Number of Units</td> <td data-bbox="1131 1063 1392 1101">188,000</td> <td data-bbox="1392 1063 1653 1101">185,000</td> <td data-bbox="1653 1063 1913 1101">236,000</td> <td data-bbox="1913 1063 2166 1101">609,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="344 1101 1131 1138">As Share of Total Units</td> <td data-bbox="1131 1101 1392 1138">15%</td> <td data-bbox="1392 1101 1653 1138">15%</td> <td data-bbox="1653 1101 1913 1138">19%</td> <td data-bbox="1913 1101 2166 1138">49%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Refer to Table H-2 in Appendix 4 for countywide and jurisdictional future housing needed in 2044 and baseline housing supply in 2019. Table H-1 includes both homeownership and rental units. ³Estimates of additional affordable units needed to address existing cost burden and provide housing for persons experiencing homelessness. The estimates are based on a</p>	Table H-1: King County Affordable Housing Need	30% AMI	31% - 50% AMI	51% - 80% AMI	80% AMI	Housing Units by Affordability (2019)					Number of Units	44,000	122,000	180,000	346,000	As Share of Total Units	5%	13%	19%	36%	Additional Affordable Housing Units Needed (2019-2044)					Additional Housing Units Needed to Address Existing Conditions²	105,000	31,000	23,000	159,000	Housing Units Needed to Address Growth Through 2044³	39,000	32,000	33,000	104,000	Total Additional Affordable Housing Units Needed	144,000	63,000	56,000	263,000	Total Affordable Housing Units Needed by 2044 (Includes Current Housing Units)					Number of Units	188,000	185,000	236,000	609,000	As Share of Total Units	15%	15%	19%	49%	Reflects new countywide and jurisdictional housing needs established by Department of Commerce and the Affordable Housing Committee. Replaces old tables with new data.
Table H-1: King County Affordable Housing Need	30% AMI	31% - 50% AMI	51% - 80% AMI	80% AMI																																																					
Housing Units by Affordability (2019)																																																									
Number of Units	44,000	122,000	180,000	346,000																																																					
As Share of Total Units	5%	13%	19%	36%																																																					
Additional Affordable Housing Units Needed (2019-2044)																																																									
Additional Housing Units Needed to Address Existing Conditions²	105,000	31,000	23,000	159,000																																																					
Housing Units Needed to Address Growth Through 2044³	39,000	32,000	33,000	104,000																																																					
Total Additional Affordable Housing Units Needed	144,000	63,000	56,000	263,000																																																					
Total Affordable Housing Units Needed by 2044 (Includes Current Housing Units)																																																									
Number of Units	188,000	185,000	236,000	609,000																																																					
As Share of Total Units	15%	15%	19%	49%																																																					

Table 1. November 3 Proposed Amendments to the Countywide Planning Policies, 12/6/2022

Amend. #	Proposed Amendments	Rationale																																																												
	<p>model in which adding units for households within a given low income category (e.g., < 30% AMI) allows those households to vacate units affordable within the next income category (e.g., greater than 30% AMI and less than or equal to 50% of AMI), in turn addressing needs of cost-burdened households in that income level. (Estimates shown assume that housing units equal to 1/25th of cost-burdened households in each category are added annually in each income category until cost burden is eliminated; a range of estimates is possible depending on inputs to this model.)</p> <p>³ Estimates of housing units needed to address growth assume income distribution of households added through growth is the same as existing income distribution.</p> <p>Refer to Appendix 4 for the methodology used to calculate countywide need and 2019 jurisdictional affordability levels as compared to countywide need.</p> <p>Table H-1: King County Countywide⁵ and Jurisdictional Housing Needs 2019-2044</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th colspan="8">Countywide Permanent Housing Needs by Income Level (% of Area Median Income)</th> <th>Countywide</th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th colspan="8">0-30%</th> <th>Emergency</th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th>Total</th> <th>Non-PSH</th> <th>PSH</th> <th>>30-50%</th> <th>>50-80%</th> <th>>80-100%</th> <th>>100-120%</th> <th>>120%</th> <th>Housing Needs⁶</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Countywide Baseline Housing Supply: 2019⁷</td> <td>960,951</td> <td>32,115</td> <td>6,266</td> <td>91,505</td> <td>155,214</td> <td>181,009</td> <td>119,133</td> <td>375,709</td> <td>8,330</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Countywide Net New Housing Needed: 2019-2044</td> <td>308,677</td> <td>80,813</td> <td>48,728</td> <td>48,220</td> <td>21,692</td> <td>14,349</td> <td>16,274</td> <td>78,601</td> <td>57,327</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Countywide Total Future Housing Needed: 2044</td> <td>1,269,628</td> <td>112,927</td> <td>54,994</td> <td>139,725</td> <td>176,906</td> <td>195,358</td> <td>135,408</td> <td>454,310</td> <td>63,318</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Countywide Permanent Housing Needs by Income Level (% of Area Median Income)								Countywide		0-30%								Emergency		Total	Non-PSH	PSH	>30-50%	>50-80%	>80-100%	>100-120%	>120%	Housing Needs ⁶	Countywide Baseline Housing Supply: 2019 ⁷	960,951	32,115	6,266	91,505	155,214	181,009	119,133	375,709	8,330	Countywide Net New Housing Needed: 2019-2044	308,677	80,813	48,728	48,220	21,692	14,349	16,274	78,601	57,327	Countywide Total Future Housing Needed: 2044	1,269,628	112,927	54,994	139,725	176,906	195,358	135,408	454,310	63,318	
	Countywide Permanent Housing Needs by Income Level (% of Area Median Income)								Countywide																																																					
	0-30%								Emergency																																																					
	Total	Non-PSH	PSH	>30-50%	>50-80%	>80-100%	>100-120%	>120%	Housing Needs ⁶																																																					
Countywide Baseline Housing Supply: 2019 ⁷	960,951	32,115	6,266	91,505	155,214	181,009	119,133	375,709	8,330																																																					
Countywide Net New Housing Needed: 2019-2044	308,677	80,813	48,728	48,220	21,692	14,349	16,274	78,601	57,327																																																					
Countywide Total Future Housing Needed: 2044	1,269,628	112,927	54,994	139,725	176,906	195,358	135,408	454,310	63,318																																																					

Table 1. November 3 Proposed Amendments to the Countywide Planning Policies, 12/6/2022

Amend. #		Proposed Amendments									Rationale
		Jurisdictional Net New Permanent Housing Units Needed 2019-2044 by Income Level (% of Area Median Income) ⁸								Jurisdictional Net New Emergency Housing Needs	
		Total	0-30%		>30-50%	>50-80%	>80-100%	>100-120%	>120%		
			Non-PSH	PSH							
Metro	Bellevue	35,000	11,827	7,131	8,810	2,549	615	698	3,370	6,500	
	Seattle	112,000	28,333	17,084	19,181	7,731	5,212	5,911	28,548	20,800	
Core Cities	Auburn	12,000	1,526	920	299	610	1,136	1,288	6,221	2,229	
	Bothell	5,799	2,078	1,253	813	640	133	151	731	1,077	
	Burien	7,499	1,428	861	519	397	564	640	3,090	1,393	
	Federal Way	11,260	1,779	1,073	840	190	969	1,099	5,310	2,091	
	Issaquah	3,499	1,086	655	870	452	57	65	314	650	
	Kent	10,201	1,850	1,116	785	302	808	916	4,424	1,894	
	Kirkland	13,200	4,797	2,893	3,057	975	194	220	1,064	2,451	
	Redmond	20,000	6,965	4,200	3,862	2,720	296	336	1,621	3,714	
	Renton	17,001	4,065	2,451	1,613	988	1,036	1,175	5,673	3,157	
	SeaTac	5,900	639	385	180	138	599	679	3,280	1,096	
Tukwila	6,500	885	534	270	208	605	686	3,312	1,207		
High Capacity Transit Communities	Des Moines	3,801	781	471	227	222	276	313	1,511	706	
	Kenmore	3,070	1,053	635	480	386	68	77	371	570	
	Lake Forest Park	870	310	187	142	138	12	14	67	162	
	Mercer Island	1,239	338	204	200	489	1	1	6	230	
	Newcastle	1,481	620	374	435	14	5	6	27	275	
	Shoreline	13,330	3,587	2,163	2,721	702	546	619	2,992	2,476	
	Woodinville	2,032	844	509	352	148	23	27	129	378	
Cities and Towns	Algona	170	31	19	8	7	14	16	75	32	
	Beaux Arts	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Black Diamond	2,900	737	445	199	408	146	166	799	539	
	Carnation	799	236	142	22	84	41	47	227	148	
	Clyde Hill	10	3	2	2	3	0	0	0	2	

Table 1. November 3 Proposed Amendments to the Countywide Planning Policies, 12/6/2022


Amend. #	Proposed Amendments										Rationale
	Covington	4,310	998	602	602	0	277	314	1,517	800	
	Duvall	890	264	159	0	267	26	30	144	165	
	Enumclaw	1,058	161	97	38	60	92	105	505	196	
	Hunts Point	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Maple Valley	1,719	536	323	320	19	68	78	375	319	
	Medina	19	5	3	3	8	0	0	0	4	
	Milton	50	13	8	0	8	3	3	15	9	
	Normandy Park	153	40	24	32	17	5	6	29	28	
	North Bend	1,749	429	258	119	220	95	108	520	325	
	Pacific	136	23	14	4	6	12	13	64	25	
	Sammamish	2,117	926	558	411	222	0	0	0	390	
	Skykomish	9	1	1	0	1	1	1	4	2	
	Snoqualmie	1,500	467	282	232	77	58	66	318	279	
	Yarrow Point	9	3	2	3	1	0	0	0	2	
	 Urban Unincorporated ⁹	5,411	1,145	690	569	283	358	406	1,960	1,005	
	<p>⁵The countywide need projections were derived from the Washington State Department of Commerce and adjusted to align with the adopted housing growth targets for the planning period to ensure jurisdictions are planning for growth that is consistent with the goals of the Development Patterns Chapter.</p> <p>⁶ "Emergency Housing" includes emergency housing and emergency shelter and is in addition to permanent housing needs.</p> <p>⁷Data on baseline housing supply is estimated using 2020 Office of Financial Management data on total housing units, and 2014-2018 Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy and 2020 Public Use Microdata Sample data on the distribution of units at different income levels. These data sources are used to align with Department of Commerce countywide need baseline data, even though the King County growth target setting process began in 2019.</p> <p>⁸Beaux Arts Village and Hunts Point both have growth targets of one unit, meaning their total need allocated is also one unit. The allocation process divides that unit up into multiple area median income bands, but to get need allocations that are whole numbers, we round all allocations in each area median income band and the emergency housing/shelter category.</p> <p>⁹This includes all Potential Annexation Areas within the High Capacity Transit Communities and Urban Unincorporated King County regional geographies.</p>										
6	H-3 Update existing and projected countywide and jurisdictional housing needs using data and methodology provided by the Washington State Department of Commerce, in compliance with state law.										This policy is no longer needed and subsequent policies are renumbered

Table 1. November 3 Proposed Amendments to the Countywide Planning Policies, 12/6/2022

Amend. #	Proposed Amendments	Rationale
7	<p>H-34 Conduct an inventory and analysis in each jurisdiction of existing and projected housing needs of all segments of the population and summarize the findings in the housing element. The inventory and analysis shall include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Affordability gap of the jurisdiction's housing supply as compared to countywide need percentages from Policy H-1 (see table H-3 in Appendix 4) and needs for housing affordable to moderate income households. The number of existing and projected housing units necessary to plan for and accommodate projected growth and meet the projected housing needs articulated in Tables H-1 and H-2, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Permanent housing needs, which includes units for moderate-, low-, very low-, and extremely low-income households and permanent supportive housing 2. Emergency housing needs, which includes emergency housing and emergency shelters; a) Number of existing housing units by housing type, age, number of bedrooms, condition, tenure, and <u>area median income AMI</u> limit (for income-restricted units); b) Number of existing emergency housing, emergency shelters, and permanent supportive housing facilities and units or beds, as applicable; c) Percentage <u>and geographic distribution</u> of residential land zoned for and geographic distribution of moderate- and high-density housing <u>and accessory dwelling units</u> in the jurisdiction; d) Number of income-restricted units and, where feasible, total number of units, within a half-mile walkshed of high-capacity or frequent transit service where applicable and regional and countywide centers; e) Household characteristics, by race/ethnicity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Income (median and by <u>area median income AMI</u> bracket) b. Tenure (renter or homeowner) c. Size d. Housing cost burden and severe housing cost burden; f) Current population characteristics: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Age by race/ethnicity; b. Disability; g) Projected population growth; h) Housing development capacity within a half-mile walkshed of high-capacity or frequent transit service, if applicable; i) Ratio of housing to jobs in the jurisdiction; j) Summary of existing and proposed partnerships and strategies, including dedicated resources, for meeting countywide housing needs, particularly for populations disparately impacted; k) The housing needs of people who need supportive services or accessible units, including but not limited to people experiencing homelessness, persons with disabilities, people with medical conditions, and older adults; l) The housing needs of communities experiencing disproportionate harm of housing inequities including Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC); and to advance m) Areas in the jurisdiction that may be at higher risk of displacement from market forces that occur with changes to zoning development regulations and public capital investments. 	Replaced with new text for consistency with revised policy H-1 and the RCW

Table 1. November 3 Proposed Amendments to the Countywide Planning Policies, 12/6/2022

Amend. #	Proposed Amendments	Rationale
8	<p>H-54 Evaluate the effectiveness of existing housing policies and strategies to meet the jurisdiction's housing needs, a significant share of countywide need. Identify gaps in existing partnerships, policies, and dedicated resources for meeting <u>housing the countywide needs</u> and eliminating racial and other disparities in access to housing and neighborhoods of choice.</p>	<p>Replace countywide need with newly defined term "housing needs" consistent with policy H-1 amendments</p>
9	<p>H-67 Collaborate with diverse partners (e.g., employers, financial institutions, philanthropic, faith, and community-based organizations) on provision of resources (e.g., funding, surplus property) and programs to meet countywide housing needs.</p>	<p>Replace countywide need with newly defined term <i>housing needs</i> consistent with policy H-1 amendments</p>
10	<p>Increased Housing Supply, Particularly for Households with the Greatest Needs</p> <p>VISION 2050 encourages local cities to adopt best practices and innovative techniques to meet housing needs. Meeting the countywide affordable housing needs will require actions, including commitment of substantial financial resources, by a wide range of private for profit, non-profit, and government entities. Multiple tools will be needed to meet the full range of needs in any given jurisdiction.</p>	<p>Replace countywide need with newly defined term "housing needs" consistent with policy H-1 amendments</p>
11	<p>H-12 <u>Adopt and implement policies that improve the effectiveness of existing housing policies and strategies and address gaps in partnerships, policies, and dedicated resources to meet the jurisdiction's housing needs.</u></p>	<p>Added in response to proposed 2021 GMPC member amendment 17 to ensure that cities plan to fill gaps identified through policy H-4. Location of policy amendment changed to a location in the chapter about implementation. Exact language modified to mirror the housing needs requirements of policy H-4. See policy H-20 for new requirement related addressing gaps in disparities to housing access and choice</p>

Table 1. November 3 Proposed Amendments to the Countywide Planning Policies, 12/6/2022

Amend. #	Proposed Amendments	Rationale
12	<p><u>H-20</u> Adopt and implement policies that address gaps in partnerships, policies, and dedicated resources to eliminate racial and other disparities in access to housing and neighborhoods of choice.</p>	<p>Added in response to proposed 2021 GMPC member amendment 17 to ensure that cities plan to fill gaps identified through policy H-4. Location of policy amendment changed to a location in the chapter about implementation. Exact language modified to mirror the requirements of policy H-4. See policy H-12 for new requirement related to addressing gaps in meeting housing needs</p>
13	<p><u>H-231</u> Adopt and implement policies that protect housing stability for renter households; expand protections and supports for <u>moderate-, low-, very low- and extremely</u> low-income renters and renters with disabilities.</p>	<p>Technical fix to ensure this isn't interpreted as renters earning 51 -80 percent area median income</p>
14	<p><u>Review, Monitor, Report, and Adjust Measure Results and Provide Accountability</u></p> <p><u>The following policies guide a housing comprehensive planning review, monitoring, reporting and adjustment process conducted by the Affordable Housing Committee, Growth Management Planning Council, and King County. This process ensures plans are coordinated and consistent with countywide housing goals and policies, increases the likelihood of housing-related plan implementation to ensure needs are met, and provides jurisdictions with a periodic opportunity for adjustments and continual improvement in between comprehensive plan periodic updates.</u></p>	<p>New text introducing the intent of the accountability framework</p>
15	<p><u>Review Comprehensive Plans</u></p> <p><u>H-26</u> The Growth Management Planning Council or its designee will conduct a housing-focused review of all King County jurisdiction's draft periodic comprehensive plan updates for alignment with the Housing Chapter goals and policies prior to plan adoption and provide comments. The purpose of plan review is to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Offer early guidance and assistance to jurisdictions on comprehensive plan alignment with the CPP Housing Chapter;</u> • <u>Ensure plans address all Housing Chapter goals and policies and include required analyses;</u> • <u>Evaluate the meaningfulness of plan responses to policies in this chapter, where meaningful responses can be reasonably expected to achieve a material, positive change in the jurisdiction's ability to meet housing needs; and</u> 	<p>New section subheading and policy to establish housing-focused comprehensive plan review authority</p>

Table 1. November 3 Proposed Amendments to the Countywide Planning Policies, 12/6/2022

Amend. #	Proposed Amendments	Rationale
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collect data on jurisdictional implementation details to inform future monitoring and evaluation during the remainder of the planning period. 	
16	<p>Monitor and Report</p> <p>Each jurisdiction has a responsibility to <u>plan for and accommodate</u> address its share of the countywide housing need. The <u>Ce</u>ounty and cities will collect and report housing data <u>at least annually</u> to help evaluate progress in <u>achieving the goals and advancing the policies of this chapter</u> planning for meeting this shared responsibility. The <u>Ce</u>ounty will help coordinate a <u>necessary transparent</u> data collection and <u>reporting sharing</u> process with cities. Further detail on monitoring <u>and reporting</u> procedures is contained in Appendix 4.</p>	<p>New section subheading and edits to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> clarify when King County as an agency is responsible for an activity, use language more consistent with policy H-1 amendments state reporting frequency
17	<p>H-275 Monitor progress toward meeting countywide <u>and jurisdictional</u> housing growth targets, countywide <u>needs</u> and eliminating disparities in access to housing and neighborhood choices. Where feasible, use existing regional and jurisdictional reports and monitoring tools and collaborate to reduce duplicative reporting.</p> <p>a) Jurisdictions, including the <u>Ce</u>ounty for unincorporated areas, will report annually to the <u>Ce</u>ounty using guidance developed by the County on housing AMI levels:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> In the first reporting year, total income-restricted units, <u>total units</u>, by tenure, <u>area median income AMI</u> limit, address, and term of rent and income restrictions, for which the <u>jurisdiction city</u> is a party to affordable housing covenants on the property title created during the reporting period. In future years, report new units created and units with affordability terms that expired during the reporting period ; Description and magnitude of land use or regulatory changes to increase zoned residential capacity including, but not limited to, single-family, moderate-density, and high-density ; New strategies (e.g., land use code changes, dedicated fund sources, conveyance of surplus property) implemented during the reporting period <u>to advance the policies of this chapter. This includes strategies</u> to increase housing diversity, or strategies to increase the supply of income-restricted units in the jurisdiction <u>and implementation details identified in the jurisdiction's comprehensive plan</u>; and <u>The value of jurisdictional contributions to subregional collaborations to support preservation or creation of income-restricted housing within the subregion made during the reporting period. Contributions may include, but are not limited to, cash loans and grants, land, and fee waivers.</u> <p>b) The <u>Ce</u>ounty will, where feasible, consolidate housing data across jurisdictions to provide clarity and assist jurisdictions with housing data</p>	<p>Provides consistency with policy H-1 amendments, adds new jurisdictional reporting requirement to ensure the value of jurisdictional contributions to subregional entities are tracked, adds new goal for King County to collect data on special housing needs, if feasible</p>

Table 1. November 3 Proposed Amendments to the Countywide Planning Policies, 12/6/2022

Amend. #	Proposed Amendments	Rationale
	<p>inventory and to will report annually <u>on</u>:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Countywide housing inventory of: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Total housing units, by affordability to <u>area median income AMI</u> bands; ii. Total income-restricted units, by <u>area median income AMI</u> limit; iii. Number of units lost to demolition, redevelopment, or conversion to non-residential use during the reporting period; iv. Of total housing units, net new housing units created during the reporting period and what type of housing was constructed, broken down by at least single-family, moderate-density housing types, and high-density housing types; and v. Total income-restricted units by tenure, <u>area median income AMI</u> limit, location, created during the reporting period, starting in 2021-; vi. Total net new income-restricted units and the term of rent and income restrictions created during the reporting period, starting in December 2022; vii. Share of households by housing tenure by jurisdiction; and viii. Zoned residential capacity percentages broken down by housing type/number of units allowed per lot; 2) The Ceounty's new strategies (e.g., dedicated fund sources, conveyance of surplus property) implemented during the reporting period to increase the supply of restricted units in the county, including geographic allocation of resources; 3) The Ceounty's new strategies implemented during the reporting period to reduce disparate housing outcomes and expand housing and neighborhood choice for Black, Indigenous, and other People of Color households and other population groups identified through policy <u>H-56</u>; 4) Number of income-restricted units within a half mile walkshed of a high-capacity or frequent transit stations in the county; 5) Share of households with housing cost burden, by income band, race, and ethnicity; 6) Tenant protection policies adopted by jurisdictions <u>in King County</u>; and 7) Number of individuals and households experiencing homelessness, by race and ethnicity. <p>c) Where feasible, jurisdictions will also collaborate to report:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) <u>Jurisdictions will collaborate to report net new units accessible to persons with disabilities; and-</u> 2) <u>King County will collaborate with the King County Regional Homelessness Authority and public funders to report total net new permanent supportive housing, emergency housing, and emergency shelters units/beds.</u> 	
18	<p>H-286 The Ceounty will provide guidance to jurisdictions on goals for housing AMI levels annually provide <u>necessary, transparent,</u> ongoing information <u>on measuring</u> jurisdictions' progress toward <u>planning for and accommodating their housing needs meeting countywide affordable housing need, according to H-25,</u> using public-facing tools such as the King County's Affordable Housing Dashboard. <u>The Affordable Housing Committee will establish standardized benchmarks, housing data trends, and comparative standards to aid in assessing local progress relative to countywide trends and other jurisdictions. Measurement will include at a minimum, the meaningful actions taken by a jurisdiction to implement their comprehensive plan housing element, housing unit production within jurisdictions, as well as credit jurisdictions for direct funding and other contributions to support the preservation or creation of income-restricted units through subregional collaborations.</u></p>	<p>Establishes accountability framework components approved by the Affordable Housing Committee, clarifies intent of monitoring, and provides assurance that monitoring will include jurisdictional contributions to</p>

Table 1. November 3 Proposed Amendments to the Countywide Planning Policies, 12/6/2022

Amend. #	Proposed Amendments	Rationale
19	<p>Adjust Strategies to Meet Housing Needs</p> <p>H-297 The Growth Management Planning Council or its designee will review monitoring and reporting data collected through annual reporting and other local data and analysis five years after adoption of a periodic update to a comprehensive plan, identify jurisdictions with significant shortfalls in planning for and accommodating housing needs and require those jurisdictions to take reasonable measures to adjust plans, strategies, actions, or land use maps to address identified shortfalls. The Growth Management Planning Council or its designee will develop new Housing Chapter Countywide Planning Policies amendments establishing adequacy standards for jurisdictional efforts to plan for and accommodate housing needs and the implications for jurisdictions required to take reasonable measures no earlier than 2024. Review and amend countywide and local housing strategies and actions when monitoring in Policy H-25 and H-26 indicates that adopted strategies are not resulting in adequate affordable housing to meet the countywide need. Consider amendments to land use policies and the land use map where they present a significant barrier to the equitable distribution of affordable housing.</p>	<p>subregional collaborations</p> <p>Establishes a process for developing new accountability framework components to measure and adjust plans, strategies, actions, or land use maps to address shortfalls</p>
20	<p>Appendix 4: Housing Technical Appendix</p> <p>Policy H-1: Housing Countywide Needs</p> <p>Each jurisdiction, as part of its Comprehensive Plan housing analysis, will need to address affordability and the condition of existing housing supply as well as its responsibility to plan for and accommodate its share of countywide housing needs for affordable housing as defined in policy H-1 and articulated in Tables H-1 and H-2. In order for each jurisdiction to address its share of the countywide housing needs for moderate-, low-, very-low-, and extremely-low-extremely low-, very-low-, and low-income housing, as well as permanent supportive housing and emergency housing, a five-step four-step approach should be followed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Conduct a housing inventory and analysis; 2. Implement policies and strategies to equitably meet housing needs; 3. Review comprehensive plans; 4. Monitor and report-Measure results and provide accountability; and 5. Adjust strategies to meet housing needs. <p><i>Calculating Total Countywide Permanent and Emergency Housing Needs</i></p> <p>Consistent with the Revised Code of Washington 36.70A.100 and 36.70A.115, King County identifies a 20-year population growth target that is within the range of projections prepared by the Washington State Office of Financial Management. In the past, the County has taken this projection and used its own framework to calculate growth targets for housing units and jobs over the planning period. A decision-making process between King County and King County cities then distributed housing units and jobs between different jurisdictions, to be used in developing local comprehensive plans.</p> <p>Updates to the Growth Management Act in 2021 changed this process, such that the Washington State Department of Commerce (“Commerce”) now supplies counties with the number of permanent housing units and emergency housing beds necessary to manage the projected growth and</p>	<p>Appendix changed to reflect new countywide and jurisdictional housing needs established by Department of Commerce and the Affordable Housing Committee. Provides description of countywide need allocation method and points to information provided by Department of Commerce on their methodology. New Table H-2 reflect new countywide and jurisdictional housing needs.</p> <p><i>Note: New Table H-2 shown is not embedded with the matrix do to size limitations.</i></p>

Table 1. November 3 Proposed Amendments to the Countywide Planning Policies, 12/6/2022

Amend. #	Proposed Amendments	Rationale
	<p><u>meet both current unmet and future housing needs over the planning period. Permanent housing projections are expressed as a total countywide housing need figure that is then divided into units for moderate-, low-, very low-, and extremely low-income households. Permanent supportive housing is included as a subset of the 0-30% percent area median income projection. Countywide needs for emergency housing beds, which include both emergency shelters and emergency housing, are supplied separately by the state. Refer to the Growth Management Act and Department of Commerce guidance for permanent supportive housing and emergency housing definitions.</u></p> <p><u>After receiving housing need numbers from the State, counties are responsible for selecting a growth projection within the Commerce-provided range to determine their net new countywide housing needs. Counties then select a method for allocating permanent net new countywide housing needs between jurisdictions.</u></p> <p><u>To arrive at countywide net new permanent housing needs for by income level and permanent supportive housing, King County selected the net new units needed from Commerce’s medium projections and scaled the net new units needed proportionately to equal King County’s housing growth target to build on and maintain consistency with the population projection and assumptions about regional growth.</u></p> <p><u>To arrive at a countywide net new emergency housing need, King County selected the net new emergency housing needs from the same medium population projection series provided by Commerce and scaled it at the same proportional rate as permanent housing needs.</u></p> <p><u>For more information about how Commerce calculated total countywide housing needs, including baseline housing supply, net new units needed, and future housing need expressed by income level, permanent supportive housing, and emergency housing needs, please refer to methodological documentation on the Department’s website.</u></p> <p><u><i>County Method for Allocating Permanent Housing and Emergency Housing Needs</i></u></p> <p><u>This section describes how countywide housing need was allocated to jurisdictions.</u></p> <p><u>Permanent net new countywide housing needs were allocated to jurisdictions using a multistep method, which allocated larger percentages of housing need to the 0-80 percent area median income levels based on local factors.</u></p> <p><u>Each jurisdiction was initially allocated the same proportion of their housing growth to the 0-80 percent area median income bands. Then, local factor weights were applied, which accounted for current affordability of the jurisdiction’s housing stock, the amount of the jurisdiction’s housing stock at or below 80 percent area median income that is income-restricted, and the ratio of low-wage workers that work in the subregion compared to low wage workers that live there. These factors either increased or decreased the proportion of a jurisdiction’s housing need that was allocated at 0-80 percent area median income, with jurisdictions that scored poorly on these factors having more housing need allocated at 0-80 percent area median income. Units were then allocated within each area median income band based on current units already in each area median income band as compared to countywide averages. Net new permanent supportive housing need is part of the 0-30 percent area median income level and was allocated consistent with the income level method described.</u></p>	

Table 1. November 3 Proposed Amendments to the Countywide Planning Policies, 12/6/2022

Amend. #	Proposed Amendments	Rationale						
	<p><u>Net new countywide emergency housing need was allocated to jurisdictions based on their percent share of planned countywide housing growth.</u></p> <p><u>For additional information about the allocation methods, refer to the King County Affordable Housing Committee website. Both final countywide housing need and allocated jurisdictional housing needs can be found in Tables H-1 and H-2. Table H-1 focuses on net new permanent and emergency housing units/beds needed. Table H-2 provide a complete picture of housing needs by jurisdictions, with information on current baseline housing supply and future housing need at the end of this planning period.</u></p> <p>Countywide need, also called the countywide affordable housing need, is the number of additional, affordable homes needed by 2044 so that no household at or below 80 percent AMI spends more than 30 percent of their income on housing. The countywide need for housing is estimated at 263,000 affordable homes affordable at or below 80 percent AMI that need to be built or preserved by 2044 as shown in Table H 1. The countywide need estimate includes both homeownership and rental units and accounts for people experiencing homelessness. The estimates are based on a model in which adding units for households within a given low income category (e.g., < 30 percent AMI) allows those households to vacate units affordable within the next highest income category (e.g., greater than 30 percent AMI and less than or equal to 50 percent of AMI) each year, in turn addressing needs of cost burdened households in that income level. The estimates in Table H 1 assume that housing units equal to 1/25th of the cost burdened households in each category in 2019 are added annually in each income category until cost burden is eliminated, which occurs in different years for different income categories due to the vacating unit process described earlier. The estimates of housing units needed to address growth also assume income distribution of households added through growth is the same as existing income distribution.</p> <p><i>Estimating Local Housing Need</i></p> <p>While the CPPs do not prescribe a jurisdictional share of countywide affordable housing need, per RCW 36.70A.070 jurisdictions must include in the housing element of their comprehensive plan:</p> <p>an inventory and analysis of existing and projected housing needs that identifies the number of housing units necessary to manage projected growth, as provided by the department of commerce, including:</p> <p>(i) Units for moderate, low, very low, and extremely low income households;</p> <p>Countywide housing need, housing affordability, and income restricted housing unit data provided in Tables H 1 and H 2 and through the King County Regional Affordable Housing Dashboard can assist jurisdictions in estimating their local affordable housing needs. Sample calculations using a simplified methodology and potential policy responses for three jurisdictions of varying size and affordability are provided below. As a reminder, Policy H 1 and Table H 1 provides that the countywide need for housing in 2044 by percentage of AMI is:</p> <table data-bbox="336 1193 1545 1291"> <tr> <td>30 percent and below AMI (extremely low)</td> <td>15 percent of total housing supply</td> </tr> <tr> <td>31-50 percent of AMI (very low)</td> <td>15 percent of total housing supply</td> </tr> <tr> <td>51-80 percent of AMI (low)</td> <td>19 percent of total housing supply</td> </tr> </table> <p>The sample jurisdictional calculations use fictional data from Table H-3.</p> <p>Table H-2: Fictional Jurisdictional Data</p>	30 percent and below AMI (extremely low)	15 percent of total housing supply	31-50 percent of AMI (very low)	15 percent of total housing supply	51-80 percent of AMI (low)	19 percent of total housing supply	
30 percent and below AMI (extremely low)	15 percent of total housing supply							
31-50 percent of AMI (very low)	15 percent of total housing supply							
51-80 percent of AMI (low)	19 percent of total housing supply							

Table 1. November 3 Proposed Amendments to the Countywide Planning Policies, 12/6/2022

Amend. #	Proposed Amendments									Rationale
	Jurisdiction									
	Current Housing Units (HU) (2013-2017)									
	0-30% AMI		31-50% AMI		51-80% AMI		Over 80% AMI		All Incomes	
	# of HU	% of Total HU	# of HU	% of Total HU	# of HU	% of Total HU	# of HU	% of Total HU	Total HU	
	Jurisdiction A	2,000	3%	3,000	4%	7,000	10%	58,000	83%	70,000
	Jurisdiction B	2,500	4%	20,000	33%	18,000	30%	20,000	33%	60,500
	Jurisdiction C	300	3%	600	6%	1,600	17%	7,000	74%	9,500
	Source: 2013–2017 CHAS									
	Jurisdiction									
	Income-Restricted Housing Units (HU) (2019)									
0-30% AMI		31-50% AMI		51-80% AMI						
# of HU	% of Total HU	# of HU	% of Total HU	# of HU	% of Total HU	# of HU	% of Total HU			
Jurisdiction A	300	0.4%	500	0.7%	2,100	3.0%				
Jurisdiction B	300	0.5%	1,200	2.0%	1,800	3.0%				
Jurisdiction C	0	0.0%	70	0.7%	80	0.8%				
Source: King County Income-restricted Housing Database										
Jurisdiction										
Future Affordable Housing Need (2044 total units * Countywide Housing Need)										
0-30% AMI		31-50% AMI		51-80% AMI		Current Housing Units	2044 Housing Growth Target	Total Housing Units in 2044		
# of HU	% of Total HU	# of HU	% of Total HU	# of HU	% of Total HU					
Jurisdiction A	15,750	15%	15,750	15%	19,950	19%	70,000	35,000	105,000	
Jurisdiction B	10,875	15%	10,875	15%	13,775	19%	60,500	12,000	72,500	
Jurisdiction C	1,710	15%	1,710	15%	2,166	19%	9,500	1,900	11,400	
Note: This applies the countywide need for affordable housing to each jurisdiction's projected total housing units in 2044										
Jurisdiction										
Difference from Current Housing Units to 2044 Need										
0-30% AMI		31-50% AMI		51-80% AMI						
# of HU		# of HU		# of HU						
Jurisdiction A	13,750		12,750		12,950					

Table 1. November 3 Proposed Amendments to the Countywide Planning Policies, 12/6/2022

Amend. #	Proposed Amendments			Rationale
	Jurisdiction B	8,375	-9,125	-4,225
	Jurisdiction C	1,410	1,110	566
	Note: This table shows the gap or overage between the 2044 Housing Unit Need and Current Housing Units			
	Jurisdiction			
	Difference from Current Income-Restricted Housing Units to 2044 Need			
		0-30% AMI	31-50% AMI	51-80% AMI
		# of HU	# of HU	# of HU
	Jurisdiction A	15,450	15,250	17,850
	Jurisdiction B	10,575	9,675	11,975
	Jurisdiction C	1,710	1,640	2,086
	Note: This shows the gap or overage between the 2044 Housing Unit Need and Current Income-Restricted Housing Units			
	<i>Jurisdiction A: Large, generally unaffordable</i>			
	<p><i>Analysis:</i> Jurisdiction A is a larger jurisdiction with a relatively limited supply of housing affordable to households at or below 80 percent AMI (3 percent, 4 percent, and 10 percent of housing units for 0-30 percent, 31-50 percent, and 51-80 percent AMI respectively). Based on its housing growth target, to meet a proportional share of countywide housing need by 2044, the jurisdiction will need 15,750 units affordable to 0-30 percent AMI, 15,750 units affordable to 31-50 percent AMI and 19,950 units affordable to 51-80 percent AMI. This is a sizeable need compared to current levels of affordability.</p> <p><i>Potential Policy Response:</i> Given the low levels of currently affordable and income-restricted housing in the community, the jurisdiction will need to employ a diversity of tools—from public subsidy to policy tools like increasing the amount of land zoned for multifamily housing to meet affordability needs. For example, currently, only 3 percent, or 2,000 units, in the jurisdiction are affordable to households at or below 30 percent AMI. Of these units, only 300 are income-restricted. This means the jurisdiction will need to focus significant attention on creating new deeply affordable units as well as preserving any currently affordable units that are not income-restricted. Given the scale of the affordability gap, however, the jurisdiction's primary focus should be on income-restricted housing production strategies. This could also include purchasing currently unaffordable housing units and holding rents relatively steady until they are affordable, a strategy recently employed by the King County Housing Authority. As the impact of overall housing supply increases on prices are uncertain, the jurisdiction should monitor affordability levels as overall supply of unrestricted housing units increases.</p>			
	<i>Jurisdiction B: Medium, currently affordable to all but the lowest incomes</i>			
	<p><i>Analysis:</i> Jurisdiction B is a medium-sized jurisdiction with a large supply of housing affordable to households at 31-80 percent of AMI. If that</p>			

Table 1. November 3 Proposed Amendments to the Countywide Planning Policies, 12/6/2022

Amend. #	Proposed Amendments	Rationale
----------	---------------------	-----------

housing was preserved at current affordability levels, it would more than provide a proportional share of housing to meet countywide affordable housing need. However, the jurisdiction lacks housing affordable to households at the lowest income level (0-30 percent AMI) and only a small portion of its housing is income-restricted, leaving prices vulnerable to market forces and residents vulnerable to displacement.

Potential Policy Response: Given the current levels of affordability in the community, Jurisdiction B should focus on rehabilitation and preservation of both income-restricted housing at or below 80 percent AMI and unrestricted housing affordable at all income levels, and production of housing affordable to households at or below 30 percent AMI. Preservation may entail supporting affordable housing providers in the purchase of housing units that are currently affordable to households at or below 80 percent AMI, as well as investing in programs that improve the quality and safety of existing housing stock.

Jurisdiction C: Small, moderately affordable, low growth target, limited transit, large lot sizes

Analysis: Jurisdiction C is a smaller jurisdiction with some existing housing affordable to households at or below 80 percent AMI, but very little income-restricted housing. Compared to jurisdictions A and B, it has a low-growth target, meaning that its future need for affordable housing is much larger than its projected growth. In addition, the jurisdiction lacks significant plans for transit investment and most of the current housing is on very large-sized lots, as prescribed by current zoning.

Potential Policy Response: Jurisdiction C will need to explore preservation and production tools appropriate to its context to increase its supply of affordable housing, particularly income-restricted housing. Likely, it will need to use land-use policies to increase the diversity of housing types in the jurisdiction, as well as use public resources to support affordable housing production. The jurisdiction may also wish to engage with neighboring jurisdictions with better transit and employment access to determine if it makes sense to contribute to affordable housing production elsewhere in its sub-region in order to support job and service access for residents of affordable housing. However, this approach should be balanced with attention to providing equitable access to high-opportunity areas, such as areas with quality schools and open space, to low-income residents and residents of color.

Table H-2: King County Countywide and Jurisdictional Housing Needs 2019-2044	Countywide Permanent Housing Needs¹⁰ by Income Level (% of Area Median Income)								Countywide Emergency Housing Need
	Total	0-30%		>30-50%	>50-80%	>80-100%	>100-120%	>120%	
		Non-PSH	PSH						
<i>Countywide Total Future Housing Needed: 2044</i>	1,269,628	112,927	54,994	139,725	176,906	195,358	135,408	454,310	63,318
<i>Countywide Baseline Housing Supply: 2019¹¹</i>	960,951	32,115	6,266	91,505	155,214	181,009	119,133	375,709	8,330
<i>Countywide Net New Housing Needed: 2019-2044</i>	308,677	80,813	48,728	48,220	21,692	14,349	16,274	78,601	57,327

Table 1. November 3 Proposed Amendments to the Countywide Planning Policies, 12/6/2022

Amend. #	Proposed Amendments	Rationale
	<p><u>¹⁰ The countywide need projections are derived from the Washington State Department of Commerce and were adjusted to align with the adopted housing growth targets for the planning period to ensure jurisdictions are planning for growth that is consistent with the goals of the Development Patterns Chapter.</u></p> <p><u>¹¹ Data on baseline housing supply is estimated using 2020 Office of Financial Management data on total housing units, and 2014-2018 Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy and 2020 Public Use Microdata Sample data on the distribution of units at different income levels. These data sources are used to align with Department of Commerce countywide need baseline data, even though the King County growth target setting process began in 2019.</u></p>	

Table 1. November 3 Proposed Amendments to the Countywide Planning Policies, 12/6/2022

			<u>Jurisdictional Permanent Housing Needs by Income Level (% of Area Median Income)¹³</u>								<u>Jurisdictional Emergency Housing Needs¹⁴</u>
			<u>Total</u>	<u>0-30%</u>		<u>>30-50%</u>	<u>>50-80%</u>	<u>>80-100%</u>	<u>>100-120%</u>	<u>>120%</u>	
				<u>Non-PSH</u>	<u>PSH</u>						
Metropolitan Cities	<u>Bellevue</u>	<u>Total Future Need: 2044</u>	<u>99,687</u>	<u>13,582</u>	<u>7,253</u>	<u>11,151</u>	<u>8,091</u>	<u>13,534</u>	<u>9,086</u>	<u>36,990</u>	<u>6,735</u>
		<u>Baseline Supply: 2019</u>	<u>64,687</u>	<u>1,755</u>	<u>122</u>	<u>2,341</u>	<u>5,542</u>	<u>12,919</u>	<u>8,388</u>	<u>33,620</u>	<u>235</u>
		<u>Net New Need: 2019-2044</u>	<u>35,000</u>	<u>11,827</u>	<u>7,131</u>	<u>8,810</u>	<u>2,549</u>	<u>615</u>	<u>698</u>	<u>3,370</u>	<u>6,500</u>
	<u>Seattle</u>	<u>Total Future Need: 2044</u>	<u>480,307</u>	<u>41,752</u>	<u>22,365</u>	<u>45,728</u>	<u>61,795</u>	<u>76,542</u>	<u>50,088</u>	<u>182,037</u>	<u>25,233</u>
		<u>Baseline Supply: 2019</u>	<u>368,307</u>	<u>13,419</u>	<u>5,281</u>	<u>26,547</u>	<u>54,064</u>	<u>71,330</u>	<u>44,177</u>	<u>153,489</u>	<u>4,433</u>
		<u>Net New Need: 2019-2044</u>	<u>112,000</u>	<u>28,333</u>	<u>17,084</u>	<u>19,181</u>	<u>7,731</u>	<u>5,212</u>	<u>5,911</u>	<u>28,548</u>	<u>20,800</u>
Core Cities	<u>Auburn</u>	<u>Total Future Need: 2044</u>	<u>40,049</u>	<u>2,589</u>	<u>1,170</u>	<u>8,328</u>	<u>8,685</u>	<u>5,563</u>	<u>4,590</u>	<u>9,124</u>	<u>2,294</u>
		<u>Baseline Supply: 2019</u>	<u>28,049</u>	<u>1,063</u>	<u>250</u>	<u>8,029</u>	<u>8,075</u>	<u>4,427</u>	<u>3,302</u>	<u>2,903</u>	<u>65</u>
		<u>Net New Need: 2019-2044</u>	<u>12,000</u>	<u>1,526</u>	<u>920</u>	<u>299</u>	<u>610</u>	<u>1,136</u>	<u>1,288</u>	<u>6,221</u>	<u>2,229</u>
	<u>Bothell</u>	<u>Total Future Need: 2044</u>	<u>18,481</u>	<u>2,465</u>	<u>1,253</u>	<u>2,071</u>	<u>2,387</u>	<u>2,665</u>	<u>2,010</u>	<u>5,630</u>	<u>1,088</u>
		<u>Baseline Supply: 2019</u>	<u>12,682</u>	<u>387</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1,258</u>	<u>1,747</u>	<u>2,532</u>	<u>1,859</u>	<u>4,899</u>	<u>11</u>
		<u>Net New Need:2019-2044</u>	<u>5,799</u>	<u>2,078</u>	<u>1,253</u>	<u>813</u>	<u>640</u>	<u>133</u>	<u>151</u>	<u>731</u>	<u>1,077</u>
	<u>Burien</u>	<u>Total Future Need: 2044</u>	<u>28,284</u>	<u>2,418</u>	<u>861</u>	<u>4,452</u>	<u>5,839</u>	<u>4,336</u>	<u>3,344</u>	<u>7,034</u>	<u>1,643</u>
		<u>Baseline Supply: 2019</u>	<u>20,785</u>	<u>990</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3,933</u>	<u>5,442</u>	<u>3,772</u>	<u>2,704</u>	<u>3,944</u>	<u>250</u>
		<u>Net New Need: 2019-2044</u>	<u>7,499</u>	<u>1,428</u>	<u>861</u>	<u>519</u>	<u>397</u>	<u>564</u>	<u>640</u>	<u>3,090</u>	<u>1,393</u>
	<u>Federal Way</u>	<u>Total Future Need: 2044</u>	<u>48,937</u>	<u>3,404</u>	<u>1,151</u>	<u>7,752</u>	<u>13,265</u>	<u>8,178</u>	<u>4,515</u>	<u>10,672</u>	<u>2,198</u>
		<u>Baseline Supply: 2019</u>	<u>37,677</u>	<u>1,625</u>	<u>78</u>	<u>6,912</u>	<u>13,075</u>	<u>7,209</u>	<u>3,416</u>	<u>5,362</u>	<u>107</u>
		<u>Net New Need: 2019-2044</u>	<u>11,260</u>	<u>1,779</u>	<u>1,073</u>	<u>840</u>	<u>190</u>	<u>969</u>	<u>1,099</u>	<u>5,310</u>	<u>2,091</u>
	<u>Issaquah</u>	<u>Total Future Need: 2044</u>	<u>20,802</u>	<u>1,822</u>	<u>655</u>	<u>1,606</u>	<u>1,947</u>	<u>3,525</u>	<u>2,110</u>	<u>9,137</u>	<u>654</u>
		<u>Baseline Supply: 2019</u>	<u>17,303</u>	<u>736</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>736</u>	<u>1,495</u>	<u>3,468</u>	<u>2,045</u>	<u>8,823</u>	<u>4</u>
		<u>Net New Need: 2019-2044</u>	<u>3,499</u>	<u>1,086</u>	<u>655</u>	<u>870</u>	<u>452</u>	<u>57</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>314</u>	<u>650</u>
	<u>Kent</u>	<u>Total Future Need: 2044</u>	<u>59,358</u>	<u>3,931</u>	<u>1,116</u>	<u>9,767</u>	<u>15,351</u>	<u>11,263</u>	<u>8,129</u>	<u>9,801</u>	<u>2,063</u>
		<u>Baseline Supply: 2019</u>	<u>49,157</u>	<u>2,081</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>8,982</u>	<u>15,049</u>	<u>10,455</u>	<u>7,213</u>	<u>5,377</u>	<u>169</u>
		<u>Net New Need: 2019-2044</u>	<u>10,201</u>	<u>1,850</u>	<u>1,116</u>	<u>785</u>	<u>302</u>	<u>808</u>	<u>916</u>	<u>4,424</u>	<u>1,894</u>
	<u>Kirkland</u>	<u>Total Future Need: 2044</u>	<u>53,218</u>	<u>5,837</u>	<u>2,905</u>	<u>4,841</u>	<u>4,709</u>	<u>8,335</u>	<u>5,433</u>	<u>21,158</u>	<u>2,600</u>
		<u>Baseline Supply: 2019</u>	<u>40,018</u>	<u>1,040</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>1,784</u>	<u>3,734</u>	<u>8,141</u>	<u>5,213</u>	<u>20,094</u>	<u>149</u>
		<u>Net New Need: 2019-2044</u>	<u>13,200</u>	<u>4,797</u>	<u>2,893</u>	<u>3,057</u>	<u>975</u>	<u>194</u>	<u>220</u>	<u>1,064</u>	<u>2,451</u>
	<u>Redmond</u>	<u>Total Future Need: 2044</u>	<u>51,739</u>	<u>7,718</u>	<u>4,258</u>	<u>5,266</u>	<u>4,904</u>	<u>9,566</u>	<u>5,175</u>	<u>14,852</u>	<u>3,915</u>
		<u>Baseline Supply: 2019</u>	<u>31,739</u>	<u>753</u>	<u>58</u>	<u>1,404</u>	<u>2,184</u>	<u>9,270</u>	<u>4,839</u>	<u>13,231</u>	<u>201</u>
		<u>Net New Need: 2019-2044</u>	<u>20,000</u>	<u>6,965</u>	<u>4,200</u>	<u>3,862</u>	<u>2,720</u>	<u>296</u>	<u>336</u>	<u>1,621</u>	<u>3,714</u>
<u>Renton</u>	<u>Total Future Need: 2044</u>	<u>60,363</u>	<u>5,475</u>	<u>2,683</u>	<u>7,819</u>	<u>10,247</u>	<u>11,899</u>	<u>8,163</u>	<u>14,077</u>	<u>3,271</u>	
	<u>Baseline Supply: 2019</u>	<u>43,362</u>	<u>1,410</u>	<u>232</u>	<u>6,206</u>	<u>9,259</u>	<u>10,863</u>	<u>6,988</u>	<u>8,404</u>	<u>114</u>	
	<u>Net New Need: 2019-2044</u>	<u>17,001</u>	<u>4,065</u>	<u>2,451</u>	<u>1,613</u>	<u>988</u>	<u>1,036</u>	<u>1,175</u>	<u>5,673</u>	<u>3,157</u>	

¹³Beaux Arts Village and Hunts Point both have growth targets of one unit, meaning their total need allocated is also one unit. The allocation process divides that unit up into multiple area median income bands, but to get need allocations that are whole numbers, we round all allocations in each area median income band and the Emergency Housing/Shelter category.

¹⁴“Emergency Housing” includes emergency housing and emergency shelter and is in addition to permanent housing needs.

Table 1. November 3 Proposed Amendments to the Countywide Planning Policies, 12/6/2022

High Capacity Transit Communities	SeaTac	Total Future Need: 2044	17,674	953	397	3,214	4,179	2,882	1,554	4,495	1,096	
		Baseline Supply: 2019	11,774	314	12	3,034	4,041	2,283	875	1,215	0	
		Net New Need: 2019-2044	5,900	639	385	180	138	599	679	3,280	1,096	
	Tukwila	Total Future Need: 2044	15,243	1,137	622	2,544	3,269	2,205	1,311	4,155	1,207	
		Baseline Supply: 2019	8,743	252	88	2,274	3,061	1,600	625	843	0	
		Net New Need: 2019-2044	6,500	885	534	270	208	605	686	3,312	1,207	
	High Capacity Transit Communities	Des Moines	Total Future Need: 2044	17,023	1,237	471	2,853	3,532	2,928	1,943	4,059	706
			Baseline Supply: 2019	13,222	456	0	2,626	3,310	2,652	1,630	2,548	0
			Net New Need: 2019-2044	3,801	781	471	227	222	276	313	1,511	706
Kenmore		Total Future Need: 2044	12,659	1,412	635	1,315	1,569	1,345	1,594	4,789	603	
		Baseline Supply: 2019	9,589	359	0	835	1,183	1,277	1,517	4,418	33	
		Net New Need: 2019-2044	3,070	1,053	635	480	386	68	77	371	570	
Lake Forest Park		Total Future Need: 2044	6,434	438	196	427	513	710	1,054	3,096	162	
		Baseline Supply: 2019	5,564	128	9	285	375	698	1,040	3,029	0	
		Net New Need: 2019-2044	870	310	187	142	138	12	14	67	162	
Mercer Island		Total Future Need: 2044	11,808	612	204	485	675	1,507	1,235	7,090	230	
		Baseline Supply: 2019	10,569	274	0	285	186	1,506	1,234	7,084	0	
		Net New Need: 2019-2044	1,239	338	204	200	489	1	1	6	230	
Newcastle		Total Future Need: 2044	6,953	696	374	568	391	610	510	3,804	275	
		Baseline Supply: 2019	5,472	76	0	133	377	605	504	3,777	0	
		Net New Need: 2019-2044	1,481	620	374	435	14	5	6	27	275	
Shoreline		Total Future Need: 2044	37,372	4,746	2,252	4,245	4,461	5,032	4,078	12,558	2,549	
		Baseline Supply: 2019	24,042	1,159	89	1,524	3,759	4,486	3,459	9,566	73	
		Net New Need: 2019-2044	13,330	3,587	2,163	2,721	702	546	619	2,992	2,476	
Woodinville	Total Future Need: 2044	7,927	911	509	638	617	1,354	896	3,002	378		
	Baseline Supply: 2019	5,895	67	0	286	469	1,331	869	2,873	0		
	Net New Need: 2019-2044	2,032	844	509	352	148	23	27	129	378		
Cities & Towns	Algona	Total Future Need: 2044	1,219	54	19	318	407	196	88	137	32	
		Baseline Supply: 2019	1,049	23	0	310	400	182	72	62	0	
		Net New Need: 2019-2044	170	31	19	8	7	14	16	75	32	
	Beaux Arts	Total Future Need: 2044	120	1	0	4	9	2	10	94	0	
		Baseline Supply: 2019	119	0	0	4	9	2	10	94	0	
		Net New Need: 2019-2044	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Black Diamond	Total Future Need: 2044	4,742	818	445	441	639	507	493	1,399	539	
		Baseline Supply: 2019	1,842	81	0	242	231	361	327	600	0	
		Net New Need: 2019-2044	2,900	737	445	199	408	146	166	799	539	
	Carnation	Total Future Need: 2044	1,614	241	142	163	214	128	110	616	148	
		Baseline Supply: 2019	815	5	0	141	130	87	63	389	0	
		Net New Need: 2019-2044	799	236	142	22	84	41	47	227	148	
Clyde Hill	Total Future Need: 2044	1,106	27	2	30	26	52	104	865	2		

Table 1. November 3 Proposed Amendments to the Countywide Planning Policies, 12/6/2022

		<u>Baseline Supply: 2019</u>	<u>1,096</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>52</u>	<u>104</u>	<u>865</u>	<u>0</u>
		<u>Net New Need: 2019-2044</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>
	<u>Covington</u>	<u>Total Future Need: 2044</u>	<u>11,460</u>	<u>1,069</u>	<u>602</u>	<u>1,164</u>	<u>1,821</u>	<u>1,869</u>	<u>1,450</u>	<u>3,485</u>	<u>800</u>
		<u>Baseline Supply: 2019</u>	<u>7,150</u>	<u>71</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>562</u>	<u>1,821</u>	<u>1,592</u>	<u>1,136</u>	<u>1,968</u>	<u>0</u>
		<u>Net New Need: 2019-2044</u>	<u>4,310</u>	<u>998</u>	<u>602</u>	<u>602</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>277</u>	<u>314</u>	<u>1,517</u>	<u>800</u>
	<u>Duvall</u>	<u>Total Future Need: 2044</u>	<u>3,668</u>	<u>312</u>	<u>159</u>	<u>221</u>	<u>342</u>	<u>321</u>	<u>319</u>	<u>1,994</u>	<u>190</u>
		<u>Baseline Supply: 2019</u>	<u>2,778</u>	<u>48</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>221</u>	<u>75</u>	<u>295</u>	<u>289</u>	<u>1,850</u>	<u>25</u>
		<u>Net New Need: 2019-2044</u>	<u>890</u>	<u>264</u>	<u>159</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>267</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>144</u>	<u>165</u>
	<u>Enumclaw</u>	<u>Total Future Need: 2044</u>	<u>6,423</u>	<u>435</u>	<u>97</u>	<u>1,519</u>	<u>1,664</u>	<u>1,140</u>	<u>460</u>	<u>1,108</u>	<u>196</u>
		<u>Baseline Supply: 2019</u>	<u>5,365</u>	<u>274</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1,481</u>	<u>1,604</u>	<u>1,048</u>	<u>355</u>	<u>603</u>	<u>0</u>
		<u>Net New Need: 2019-2044</u>	<u>1,058</u>	<u>161</u>	<u>97</u>	<u>38</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>92</u>	<u>105</u>	<u>505</u>	<u>196</u>
	<u>Hunts Point</u>	<u>Total Future Need: 2044</u>	<u>186</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>147</u>	<u>0</u>
		<u>Baseline Supply: 2019</u>	<u>185</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>147</u>	<u>0</u>
		<u>Net New Need: 2019-2044</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
	<u>Maple Valley</u>	<u>Total Future Need: 2044</u>	<u>11,154</u>	<u>700</u>	<u>323</u>	<u>752</u>	<u>1,063</u>	<u>2,368</u>	<u>2,062</u>	<u>3,886</u>	<u>319</u>
		<u>Baseline Supply: 2019</u>	<u>9,435</u>	<u>164</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>432</u>	<u>1,044</u>	<u>2,300</u>	<u>1,984</u>	<u>3,511</u>	<u>0</u>
		<u>Net New Need: 2019-2044</u>	<u>1,719</u>	<u>536</u>	<u>323</u>	<u>320</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>68</u>	<u>78</u>	<u>375</u>	<u>319</u>
	<u>Medina</u>	<u>Total Future Need: 2044</u>	<u>1,151</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>45</u>	<u>107</u>	<u>904</u>	<u>4</u>
		<u>Baseline Supply: 2019</u>	<u>1,132</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>45</u>	<u>107</u>	<u>904</u>	<u>0</u>
		<u>Net New Need: 2019-2044</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>4</u>
	<u>Milton</u>	<u>Total Future Need: 2044</u>	<u>737</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>211</u>	<u>119</u>	<u>224</u>	<u>74</u>	<u>81</u>	<u>9</u>
		<u>Baseline Supply: 2019</u>	<u>687</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>211</u>	<u>111</u>	<u>221</u>	<u>71</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>0</u>
		<u>Net New Need: 2019-2044</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>9</u>
	<u>Normandy Park</u>	<u>Total Future Need: 2044</u>	<u>2,960</u>	<u>169</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>166</u>	<u>285</u>	<u>229</u>	<u>826</u>	<u>1,261</u>	<u>28</u>
		<u>Baseline Supply: 2019</u>	<u>2,807</u>	<u>129</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>134</u>	<u>268</u>	<u>224</u>	<u>820</u>	<u>1,232</u>	<u>0</u>
		<u>Net New Need: 2019-2044</u>	<u>153</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>28</u>
	<u>North Bend</u>	<u>Total Future Need: 2044</u>	<u>4,700</u>	<u>558</u>	<u>258</u>	<u>524</u>	<u>625</u>	<u>459</u>	<u>380</u>	<u>1,896</u>	<u>325</u>
		<u>Baseline Supply: 2019</u>	<u>2,951</u>	<u>129</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>405</u>	<u>405</u>	<u>364</u>	<u>272</u>	<u>1,376</u>	<u>0</u>
		<u>Net New Need: 2019-2044</u>	<u>1,749</u>	<u>429</u>	<u>258</u>	<u>119</u>	<u>220</u>	<u>95</u>	<u>108</u>	<u>520</u>	<u>325</u>
	<u>Pacific</u>	<u>Total Future Need: 2044</u>	<u>2,602</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>814</u>	<u>889</u>	<u>474</u>	<u>157</u>	<u>194</u>	<u>25</u>
		<u>Baseline Supply: 2019</u>	<u>2,466</u>	<u>37</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>810</u>	<u>883</u>	<u>462</u>	<u>144</u>	<u>130</u>	<u>0</u>
		<u>Net New Need: 2019-2044</u>	<u>136</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>64</u>	<u>25</u>
	<u>Sammamish</u>	<u>Total Future Need: 2044</u>	<u>24,660</u>	<u>1,036</u>	<u>558</u>	<u>752</u>	<u>763</u>	<u>1,899</u>	<u>2,024</u>	<u>17,628</u>	<u>390</u>
		<u>Baseline Supply: 2019</u>	<u>22,543</u>	<u>110</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>341</u>	<u>541</u>	<u>1,899</u>	<u>2,024</u>	<u>17,628</u>	<u>0</u>
		<u>Net New Need: 2019-2044</u>	<u>2,117</u>	<u>926</u>	<u>558</u>	<u>411</u>	<u>222</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>390</u>
	<u>Skykomish</u>	<u>Total Future Need: 2044</u>	<u>162</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>67</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>2</u>
		<u>Baseline Supply: 2019</u>	<u>153</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>67</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>0</u>
		<u>Net New Need: 2019-2044</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>2</u>
	<u>Snoqualmie</u>	<u>Total Future Need: 2044</u>	<u>6,174</u>	<u>516</u>	<u>282</u>	<u>378</u>	<u>344</u>	<u>410</u>	<u>627</u>	<u>3,617</u>	<u>310</u>
		<u>Baseline Supply: 2019</u>	<u>4,674</u>	<u>49</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>146</u>	<u>267</u>	<u>352</u>	<u>561</u>	<u>3,299</u>	<u>31</u>

Table 1. November 3 Proposed Amendments to the Countywide Planning Policies, 12/6/2022

		<u>Net New Need: 2019-2044</u>	<u>1,500</u>	<u>467</u>	<u>282</u>	<u>232</u>	<u>77</u>	<u>58</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>318</u>	<u>279</u>
	<u>Yarrow Point</u>	<u>Total Future Need: 2044</u>	<u>422</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>338</u>	<u>2</u>
		<u>Baseline Supply: 2019</u>	<u>413</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>338</u>	<u>0</u>
		<u>Net New Need: 2019-2044</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>
3)	<u>Urban</u>	<u>Total Future Need: 2044</u>	<u>90,031</u>	<u>3,724</u>	<u>690</u>	<u>7,078</u>	<u>11,206</u>	<u>11,010</u>	<u>9,241</u>	<u>47,082</u>	<u>1,080</u>
	<u>Unincorporated</u>	<u>Baseline Supply: 2019</u>	<u>84,620</u>	<u>2,579</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>6,509</u>	<u>10,923</u>	<u>10,652</u>	<u>8,835</u>	<u>45,122</u>	<u>75</u>
	¹⁵	<u>Net New Need: 2019-2044</u>	<u>5,411</u>	<u>1,145</u>	<u>690</u>	<u>569</u>	<u>283</u>	<u>358</u>	<u>406</u>	<u>1,960</u>	<u>1,005</u>

21 Policy H-3: Housing Supply and Needs Analysis

As set forth in policy H-4, each jurisdiction must include in its comprehensive plan an inventory of the existing housing stock and an analysis of both existing housing needs and housing needed to accommodate projected population growth over the planning period. This policy reinforces requirements of the Growth Management Act for local ~~h~~Housing ~~e~~Elements. The housing supply and needs analysis is referred to in this appendix as the housing analysis. ~~As is noted in policy H 1, H 2, and H 34, T~~the housing analysis must include the jurisdiction's established housing needs expressed in Table H-1 and Table H-2 consider local as well as countywide housing needs because each jurisdiction has a responsibility to address-plan for and accommodate its allocated share of the countywide affordable housing needs~~s~~.

The purpose of this section is to provide further guidance to local jurisdictions on the subjects to be addressed in their housing analysis. Additional guidance on carrying out the housing analysis is found in the Puget Sound Regional Council's report, "Housing Element Guide: A PSRC Guidance Paper (July 2014)," Washington State Department of Commerce's report, "Guidance for Developing a Housing Needs Assessment" (March 2020); and the Washington Administrative Code, particularly 365-196-410 (2)(b) and (c). ~~The Washington State Department of~~ Commerce also provides useful information about housing requirements under the Growth Management Act in the "Growth Management Planning for Housing - Washington State Department of Commerce" portion of their website.

Housing Supply

~~Understanding the mix and affordability of existing housing is the first step toward identifying gaps in meeting future housing needs.~~

~~Table H 3 shows the current housing supply by jurisdiction and affordability levels, using data from 2013-2017 CHAS broken out by different income segments and 2019 housing unit data estimated by the Washington State Office Financial Management (OFM) which OFM does not break out by income segments. The 2019 OFM data serves as the base year for each jurisdiction's 2044 housing growth targets and appears in Table H 1. The OFM housing units were allocated to different AMI bands by applying the percent share of total~~

Updated appendix to align with GMA language and new requirements for housing elements. Elimination of guidance on calculating local housing needs to Commerce calculations. Clarifications added around types of housing needs.

¹⁵ This includes all Potential Annexation Areas within the High Capacity Transit Communities and Urban Unincorporated King County regional geographies.

housing supply in each income segment as reported in the 2013-2017 CHAS data to the total housing units reported by OFM for 2019. These 2019 current housing units in each income segment are added to the countywide need (the total additional affordable housing units needed between 2019-2044) by AMI reported in Table H-1 to determine the Total Affordable Housing Units Needed by 2044.

Figures in Table H-3 include both rental and ownership units. Note that while some jurisdictions have an adequate supply of housing affordable to low income households (51 to 80 percent of AMI) and very low income households (31-50 percent of AMI), no jurisdiction in the county has sufficient housing affordable to extremely low income households (0 to 30 percent of AMI) to meet a proportional share of existing needs as shown in Table H-1. This is where the greatest need exists and should be a focus for all jurisdictions.

Table H-3 will be updated annually and will be made publicly available on the Regional Affordable Housing Dashboard. While Table H-3 provides a starting point for understanding current housing supply by jurisdiction, other metrics are required to fully measure housing need. Jurisdictions may choose to supplement the data in Table H-3 with other data sources, such as PUMS, ACS, or their own housing inventories that may be more current or use different underlying assumptions. Because data sources vary in the time period they measure, the assumptions required to analyze the data, and the sampling techniques they use, they may produce results that do not perfectly align with Table H-3. Jurisdictions should use the methodology documented here to explain the causes and implications of differences between alternative methodologies and the information presented in Table H-3.

The methodology used to calculate current housing units in Table H-3 is summarized as follows:

1. CHAS data is downloaded from the HUD website. Select the most recent vintage of data (in this instance it was 2013-2017 ACS 5-year average data”) for the data year, select the “Counties split by Place” Geographic Summary Level, which provides data at a jurisdictional level, select “csv” for the file type, and then download the data. This will download all the CHAS tables, as well as a data dictionary.
2. Tables 17A, 17B, 18A, 18B, and 18C have data on housing units and what AMI brackets they are affordable at. Tables 17A and 17B include data on vacant units for ownership and rental units respectively. These vacant units are included in the totals, because while vacant units are not currently being rented, they are still a part of a jurisdiction’s housing supply, and many vacant units are available to rent or buy. Tables 18A, 18B, and 18C include data on occupied ownership units with a mortgage, occupied ownership units without a mortgage, and occupied rental units respectively. All these units are also included in the totals in Table H-3.
3. To calculate how many units are in each jurisdiction at each AMI band, calculate those totals for tables 17A, 17B, 18A, 18B, and 18C and then sum them all together. To calculate total numbers of units by AMI, use the subtotal columns of the CHAS data. The data dictionary that comes with the CHAS tables shows which columns are subtotal columns. Multiple subtotal columns must be added together to get the total number of units affordable at a certain AMI. For example, in Table 18A, to get the total number of units affordable at 0-50 percent AMI, the columns T18B_est3, T18B_est28, T18B_est53, T18B_est78 must be summed, as each column represents a different number of units in the structure. The columns that must be summed together differ slightly based on the table. Refer to the data dictionary to ensure that the correct columns are chosen, as these may change slightly year to year.
4. CHAS uses RHUD for rental units and VHUD for ownership units as measures of affordability that correspond to AMI. For example,

units that have a value of “less than or equal to RHUD30” are marked as being affordable at 0-30 percent AMI. Unlike with rental units, for the home ownership units found in tables 17A, 18A, and 18B, CHAS does not differentiate between VHUD0 to VHUD30 units and VHUD 30 to VHUD50 units. It instead combines them all into a “Value less than or equal to VHUD50” category. Since affordability is measured at 0-30 percent AMI and 30-50 percent AMI separately in Table H 3, assume that all units in the “Value less than or equal to VHUD50” are actually only affordable at 30-50 percent AMI, and are included in that column. Thus, all 0-30 percent AMI units in Table H 3 are rental units. This assumption is made because of the distribution of home prices in King County, where almost no homes are affordable to households making 0-30 percent AMI.

5. Once each of Tables 17A, 17B, 18A, 18B, and 18C have been totaled to get the number of units available at each AMI band, and the home ownership units in the “Value less than or equal to VHUD50” category have been recoded to be equal to 30-50 percent AMI, combine the totals of each table to get countywide totals. RHUD and VHUD categories should now line up for all categories up to 80 percent AMI and can thus be combined and re-labeled with the AMI categories seen in Table H 3. While categories above 80 percent don’t align between renter and ownership tables, they can all be combined into one over 80 percent AMI category.
6. Then take the sum of each AMI band to get the value in the “All Incomes” column. These values may differ slightly from the total units calculated using the CHAS “Total” columns, as individual “Subtotal” columns round units in the “Subtotal” columns (see here for more information on CHAS’s rounding methodology). This has only a minimal impact on overall totals. Then, calculate what percentage of each jurisdiction’s housing supply is in each AMI band by dividing the number of units in each AMI band by the total number of units. Note that the totals included in the “% of Total HU” columns in table H 3 are rounded. The actual, unrounded percentages are used in the following steps. To calculate the unrounded percentages, in the “Housing Units (HU) 2017” section of the table divide the “# of HU” column amounts by the “Total HU” column amount for each jurisdiction.
7. To find the “All Housing” units data in the “2019 HU” column refer to the King County rows in the “2019 Postcensal Estimate of Total Housing Units” column in the Washington State Office of Financial Management’s (OFM) April 1 postcensal estimates of housing: 1980, 1990-present. Sum these values to get the total estimated housing units for 2019 countywide.
8. To break out OFM’s reported total countywide housing unit number, apply the percent share of housing units by AMI found in the “% of Total HU” columns to the total housing units reported by OFM for each jurisdiction in the “Total HU” column in the “HU 2019” section of the table for each jurisdiction and each AMI band. Then sum all jurisdictions totals together for each AMI band, then round the total to the nearest thousandth. This will give you the total units reported in “Countywide Total HU, 2019” row.
9. Add the current “Countywide Total HU, 2019” totals by AMI with the “Total Additional Affordable Housing Units Needed” (2019-2044) by AMI reported in Table H 1 to determine the Total Affordable Housing Units Needed by 2044 in Table H 1, which includes current housing units.

Table H 3: Housing Affordability for King County Jurisdictions by Regional Geographies

Regional Geography and	Housing Units (HU) 2017 ¹⁶	HU 2019 ¹⁷
------------------------	---------------------------------------	-----------------------

¹⁶ Source: CHAS 2013-2017 (released August 25, 2020)

¹⁷ Source: 2019 data from Office of Financial Management’s April 1 postcensal estimates of housing: 1980, 1990-present. Percentages are rounded.

Jurisdiction	0-30% AMI		31-50% AMI		51-80% AMI		Over 80% AMI		0-30% AMI	31-50% AMI
	# of HU	% of Total HU	# of HU	% of Total HU	# of HU	% of Total HU	# of HU	% of Total HU	Total HU	Total HU
Metropolitan Cities										
Bellevue	1,750	3%	2,814	5%	6,363	11%	46,400	81%	57,327	62,372
Seattle	19,330	6%	32,655	10%	55,910	17%	212,875	66%	320,770	367,806
Core Cities										
Auburn	1,335	5%	9,400	38%	6,590	26%	7,660	31%	24,985	27,391
Bothell	390	4%	1,200	11%	2,075	19%	7,215	66%	10,880	12,208
Burien	985	5%	4,879	26%	5,155	27%	8,003	42%	19,022	20,793
Federal Way	1,430	4%	9,170	26%	12,450	35%	12,695	36%	35,745	37,257
Issaquah	715	5%	845	6%	1,770	12%	11,750	78%	15,080	16,801
Kent	1,970	4%	11,195	25%	14,769	33%	16,720	37%	44,654	48,228
Kirkland	1,125	3%	2,325	6%	4,775	13%	28,405	78%	36,630	39,312
Redmond	640	3%	1,325	5%	2,705	11%	20,365	81%	25,035	28,619
Renton	1,720	4%	7,285	19%	10,160	26%	20,133	51%	39,298	42,855
SeaTac	350	3%	3,400	34%	3,460	35%	2,799	28%	10,009	10,855
Tukwila	385	5%	2,150	30%	2,680	38%	1,909	27%	7,124	8,445
High Capacity Transit Communities										
Des Moines	585	5%	3,015	25%	2,999	25%	5,244	44%	11,843	12,898
Kenmore	255	3%	1,070	12%	1,190	14%	6,135	71%	8,650	9,485
Lake Forest Park	105	2%	344	7%	419	8%	4,325	83%	5,193	5,494
Mercer Island	270	3%	380	4%	400	4%	9,015	90%	10,065	10,506
Newcastle	60	1%	115	3%	480	11%	3,699	85%	4,354	5,214
Shoreline	1,180	5%	2,090	9%	4,440	20%	14,425	65%	22,135	24,127
Woodinville	150	3%	280	6%	495	10%	3,825	81%	4,750	5,450
Cities & Towns										
Algona	8	1%	404	43%	350	38%	169	18%	931	1,053
Beaux Arts	-	0%	8	6%	4	3%	114	90%	126	119
Black Diamond	40	2%	350	21%	230	14%	1,070	63%	1,690	1,808
Carnation	34	5%	119	19%	134	21%	354	55%	641	817
Glyde Hill	10	1%	39	3%	15	1%	1,055	94%	1,119	1,100
Covington	160	2%	790	11%	2,280	33%	3,770	54%	7,000	7,102
Duvall	50	2%	200	8%	250	10%	2,085	81%	2,585	2,684
Enumelaw	265	6%	1,469	31%	1,495	32%	1,515	32%	4,744	5,228
Hunts Point	4	3%	12	8%	4	3%	139	87%	159	186
Maple Valley	220	2%	530	6%	1,450	16%	6,650	75%	8,850	9,280
Medina	15	1%	19	2%	10	1%	1,125	96%	1,169	1,233
Milton	20	6%	99	28%	59	17%	175	50%	353	608
Normandy Park	150	5%	235	8%	220	8%	2,200	78%	2,805	2,876
North Bend	95	4%	340	14%	390	16%	1,565	65%	2,390	2,783
Pacific	40	2%	934	39%	840	35%	600	25%	2,414	2,460

Table 1. November 3 Proposed Amendments to the Countywide Planning Policies, 12/6/2022

Sammamish	180	1%	365	2%	853	4%	19,615	93%	21,013	22,159
Skykomish	4	6%	23	34%	8	12%	33	49%	68	173
Snoqualmie	45	1%	169	4%	293	7%	3,664	88%	4,171	4,748
Yarrow Point	4	1%	4	1%	8	2%	419	96%	435	416
Urban-Unincorporated & Rural										
Unincorporated King County	2,465	3%	7,287	10%	12,223	17%	48,920	69%	70,895	93,179
Countywide Total HU, 2017⁵	38,539	5%	109,333	13%	160,401	19%	538,834	64%	847,107	956,128
Countywide Total HU, 2019¹⁸	44,000	5%	122,000	13%	180,000	19%	610,000	64%	956,000	
Countywide Total HU Needed by 2044	188,000	15%	185,000	15%	236,000	19%	644,000	51%	1,253,000	

Housing Needs

The housing needs part of the housing analysis should include demographic data related to existing population, household and community trends that could impact future housing demand (e.g., aging of population). This data will be derived from a mixture of jurisdictional records, County datasets, State datasets, and Federal datasets. The identified need for future housing should be consistent with the jurisdiction's population-housing growth and housing targets the jurisdiction's share of countywide housing needs, found in Tables H-1 and H-2. Combined with the results of the needs analysis, these data can provide direction on appropriate goals and policies for both the housing and land use elements of a jurisdiction's comprehensive plan.

The following guidance is offered to ensure the housing inventory and analysis data is consistently utilized and reported by all jurisdictions in King County:

- Affordability gap means the comparison of a jurisdiction's housing supply as compared to the countywide need percentages expressed in policy H 1. 2013-2017 housing supply is included in table H 3 in this appendix. The County will update this table annually and make it available online. Housing Needs means the needs articulated in Tables H-1 and H-2.
- Moderate-, low-, very low- and extremely low-income households means >80-120 percent, >50-80 percent, >30-50 percent, and 0-30 percent of area median income respectively.
- Permanent supportive housing, emergency housing, and emergency shelters are defined in the Growth Management Act and relevant Commerce guidance.
- Age means built in 2014 or later, built 2010 to 2013, built 2000 to 2009, built 1990-1999, built 1980 to 1989, built 1970 to

¹⁸ Extrapolated using the percent share of total housing units from CHAS 2013-2017 and 2019 total housing unit data from Washington State Office of Financial Management's April 1 postcensal estimates of housing: 1980, 1990-present. Figures are rounded, see methodology above for how to recreate unrounded totals.

	<p>1979, built 1960 to 1969, built 1950 to 1959, built 1940 to 1949, built 1939 or earlier.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Number of bedrooms</i> means no bedroom, 1 bedroom, 2 or 3 bedrooms, and 4 or more bedrooms. • <i>Condition</i> means lacking complete plumbing facilities, lacking complete kitchen facilities, and/or no telephone service available. • <i>Tenure</i> means renter-occupied and owner-occupied. • <i>Income-restricted units</i> should be reported by <u>AMI-area median income</u> limit (i.e., ≤ 30 percent <u>area median income-AMI</u>, ≤ 50 percent <u>area median income-AMI</u>, and ≤ 80 percent <u>area median income-AMI</u>). • <i>Moderate-density housing</i> means the following housing types: 1-unit attached; 2 units; 3 or 4 units; 5 to 9 units; 10 to 19 units. High-density housing means the following housing types: 20 or more units. • <u>Accessory dwelling unit means a small, self-contained residential unit built on the same lot as an existing single-family home. Accessory dwelling units may be built within a primary residence or detached from the primary residence.</u> • <i>Household income by area median income AMI</i> means equal to or less than 30 percent <u>area median income-AMI</u>, above 30 percent to 50 percent <u>area median income-AMI</u>; above 50 percent to 80 percent <u>area median income-AMI</u>, above 80 percent to 100 percent <u>area median income-AMI</u>, above 100 percent to 120 percent <u>area median income-AMI</u>, and above 120 percent <u>area median income-AMI</u>. • <i>Housing cost burden</i> means a household spends more than 30 percent of its household income on housing costs. • <i>Severe housing cost burden</i> means a household spends more than 50 percent of its household income on housing costs. • <i>Displacement risk</i> means where residents and businesses are at greater risk of displacement based on <u>Puget Sound Regional Council-PSRC</u>'s index or equivalent composite set of risk indicators such as: socio-demographics, transportation qualities, neighborhood characteristics, housing, and civic engagement. 	
22	<p>Policy H-45: Evaluate Effectiveness</p> <p>Prior to updating their comprehensive plan, a jurisdiction must evaluate the effectiveness of existing housing policies and strategies to <u>meet-plan for and accommodate a significant-their allocated</u> share of countywide need. This will help a jurisdiction identify the need to adjust current policies and strategies or implement new ones. Where possible, jurisdictions are encouraged to identify actual housing units created, by affordability level, since their last comprehensive plan update.</p> <p>This evaluation must also identify gaps in existing partnerships, policies, and dedicated resources for meeting the countywide need and eliminating racial and other disparities in access to housing and neighborhoods of choice. This exercise helps a jurisdiction understand what other strategies it should pursue beyond updating the comprehensive plan to meet the goals of this chapter. Some strategies, like inclusionary housing or new dedicated resources, will be easier to evaluate a quantitative impact and for others, it may be more qualitative. Jurisdictions without the ability to identify the impact of each policy may wish to describe the policies and programs that contributed to creating or preserving a given number of income-restricted units, special needs housing units, etc.</p>	Revised appendix to align with GMA language

Table 1. November 3 Proposed Amendments to the Countywide Planning Policies, 12/6/2022

<p>23</p>	<p>Policy H-56: Racial Exclusion and Discrimination</p> <p>To inform a comprehensive plan strategy, a jurisdiction must also document the local history of racially exclusive and discriminatory land use and housing practices, consistent with local and regional fair housing reports and other resources. A jurisdiction must also explain the extent to which that history is still reflected in current development patterns, housing conditions, tenure, and access to opportunity. Examples of suitable data include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • homeownership rates by race/ethnicity and age; • concentration or dispersion of affordable housing or housing choice voucher usage within the jurisdiction; • affordability of housing in the jurisdiction to the median income household of different races and ethnicities; • racial demographics by neighborhood, e.g. degrees of integration and segregation; • access to areas of opportunity by race and ethnicity; • demographics of residents in areas of high displacement risk; and • results of fair housing testing performed or fair housing complaint data within a jurisdiction. <p>Jurisdictions must also identify local policies and regulations that result in racially disparate impacts, displacement, and exclusion in housing, including but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • zoning that may have a discriminatory effect; • disinvestment; and • infrastructure availability. <p>Racially restrictive housing covenants, unrecognized treaties with tribes, current exclusionary zoning, and lack of investment in affordable housing are examples of discriminatory practices or policies a jurisdiction could include in an assessment. Jurisdictions should not limit their review to local policies and regulations. The region should share resources and work together to develop a shared understanding of how racist or discriminatory housing practices and disparities were perpetuated by all levels of government as well as the private sector. While each jurisdiction’s assessment will be unique, King County jurisdictions are encouraged to identify federal, state, and regional practices as well as local.</p> <p>Finally, a jurisdiction must demonstrate how current strategies are addressing impacts of those racially exclusive and discriminatory policies and practices. Using this information jurisdictions should identify and implement policies and regulations to address and begin to undo racially disparate impacts, displacement, and exclusion in housing caused by local policies, plans, and actions consistent with the policies in the “Implement Policies and Strategies to Equitably Meet Housing Needs” section.</p> <p>Jurisdictions are encouraged to refer to the 2019 King County Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice (Analysis of Impediments) to understand current barriers to fair housing choice. In addition to the guidance offered in this technical appendix, the County will support jurisdictions in identifying and compiling resources, such as University of Washington reports and databases, to support this analysis.</p> <p>For further guidance on this analysis, refer to guidance on conducting a racially disparate impact analysis from the Department of</p>	<p>Edited policy numbers to align with new Housing Chapter CPPs. Added reference to forthcoming Department of Commerce guidance on racially disparate impacts analysis.</p>
-----------	--	---

Table 1. November 3 Proposed Amendments to the Countywide Planning Policies, 12/6/2022

	<u>Commerce.</u>	
24	<p>Policy H-67: Collaborate Regionally</p> <p>The lack of homes affordable to low-income households is a regional problem that requires regional solutions. Jurisdictional collaboration with diverse partners is key to an effective regional response. Jurisdictions in their collaboration are encouraged to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • address the countywide housing needs; • engage and collaborate with other entities in efforts to fund, site, and build affordable housing; • join resources; • raise public and private resources together to provide the additional subsidies required to develop housing at deeper levels of affordability; • support affordable housing development or preservation in each other’s jurisdictions; and • take other collaborative action to address the countywide housing needs. <p><u>Refer to the Washington State Department of Commerce’s guidance for additional recommendations for the potential and appropriate roles for interjurisdictional partnerships in meeting housing needs as well as how these roles should be reflected in countywide planning policies and comprehensive plans.</u></p> <p>Partners collaborating with jurisdictions are encouraged to support the following needs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • technical assistance; • organizational capacity building; • land donations; • financial contributions for operating and capital needs to support affordable housing development, maintenance and operations needs; • funding for other needs such as data and monitoring infrastructure; and • advocate for efforts to fund, site, and build affordable housing. 	<p>Edited policy numbers to align with new Housing Chapter CPPs. Added in a reference to Department of Commerce guidance on the potential and appropriate roles of partnerships in meeting housing needs and how these should be reflected in comprehensive plans.</p>
25	<p>Policies H-9 through H-24: Implement Policies and Strategies to Meet Housing Needs Equitably</p> <p>Jurisdictions need to employ a range of policies, incentives, strategies, actions, and regulations tailored to equitably meet their housing need. The Puget Sound Regional Council’s Housing Innovations Program¹⁵ presents a range of strategies. The strategies can be filtered by objective, project type, and affordability level. Strategies marked with an asterisk include more detail and are proven to be particularly effective at meeting regional housing goals. The Municipal Research and Services Center (MSRC) and Washington State Department of Commerce also offers affordable housing-related resources on their websites, including information about techniques and incentives for encouraging and planning for housing affordability. <u>The Washington State Department of Commerce also provides access to ample resources, including guidance on how to complete the land capacity analysis required in H-12 and on other adequate provisions jurisdictions can take to plan for and accommodate housing needs.</u></p>	<p>Edited policy numbers and text in policies to align with new Housing Chapter CPPs. Provided guidance for new policies H-12 and H-20. Aligned text in policies H-10 with edits to the GMA. Eliminated guidance on land capacity analysis and added reference</p>

Table 1. November 3 Proposed Amendments to the Countywide Planning Policies, 12/6/2022

Local jurisdictions may also refer to this table for suitable strategies, largely derived from recommendations from the December 2018 Regional Affordable Housing Task Force Final Report and Recommendations. King County’s Department of Community and Human Services will work to periodically update these suggestions on the King County website if new strategies and best practices emerge.

¹⁵ Puget Sound Regional Council’s SRC Housing Innovations Program <https://www.psrc.org/hip>

in policy H-11 to Department of Commerce guidance for the land capacity analysis jurisdictions must conduct, based on staff decisions to defer to state guidance.

Table H-4 Suggested Strategies for Achieving Policy Goals

Policy	Suggested Strategies
<p>H-101 Adopt policies, incentives, strategies, actions, and regulations that increase the supply of long-term income-restricted housing for extremely low-, very low-, and low-income households and households with special needs.</p>	<p>Suggested strategies to help <u>meet-plan for and accommodate</u> the need at these affordability levels include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase financial contributions to build, preserve, and operate long-term income-restricted housing • Increase the overall supply and diversity of housing throughout a jurisdiction, including both rental and ownership • Provide housing suitable for a range of household types and sizes, including housing suitable and affordable for households with special needs, low-, very low-, and extremely low-incomes Implement policies that incentivize the creation of affordable units, such as Multifamily Tax Exemption, inclusionary zoning, and incentive zoning, and density bonus • Coordinate with local housing authorities to use project-based rental subsidies with incentive/ inclusionary housing units to achieve deeper affordability • Implement policies that reduce the cost to develop affordable housing • Implement universal design principles to ensure that buildings and public spaces are accessible to people with or without disabilities • Support sustainable housing development • Promote units that accommodate large households and/or multiple bedrooms • Prioritize strategies for implementation that will result in the highest impact towards addressing the affordable housing gap at the lowest income levels
<p>H-112 Identify sufficient capacity of land for housing including, but not limited to: income-restricted housing; housing for moderate-, low-, very low-, and extremely low-income households; manufactured housing; multifamily housing; group homes; foster</p>	<p><u>Refer to the Washington State Department of Commerce’s guidance on land capacity analysis for guidance on identifying sufficient capacity of land. An approach to identifying sufficient capacity for housing types is:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider the local and regional housing needs and available land capacity identified in H 4. For example, a jurisdiction that doesn’t have

<p>care facilities; emergency housing; emergency shelters; permanent supportive housing; and within an urban growth area boundary, duplexes, triplexes, and townhomes.</p>	<p>any unhoused people may still need to provide sufficient capacity for this population if unmet need exists within the county or subregion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determine if current capacity is sufficient to meet future needs. For example, most permanent supportive housing will require multifamily zoning • Collaborate with other jurisdictions to identify the subregional or countywide capacity needed for these housing types if current need within a jurisdiction is substantially less than the countywide need for that housing type 	
<p><u>H-12 Adopt and implement policies that improve the effectiveness of existing housing policies and strategies and address gaps in partnerships, policies, and dedicated resources to meet the jurisdiction's housing needs</u></p>	<p><u>A jurisdiction's policies and strategies adopted and implemented in response to policy H-12 should be informed by the ineffective policies and gaps in partnerships, policies and dedicated resources identified through the analysis required by H-4. A jurisdiction may find that several comprehensive plan policies and implementation of these policies end up supporting the intent of policy H-12.</u></p> <p><u>Example approaches to improving policy effectiveness and addressing gaps in partnerships, policies, and dedicated resources to meet countywide housing needs include:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>• Reducing permitting timelines for affordable projects receiving public funding</u> <u>• Shifting incentive program requirements to accommodate development at different Area Median Income levels</u> <u>• Working with subregional collaborations to increase availability and flexibility of gap financing for local projects</u> <u>• Partner with local housing providers and developers to identify needed shifts in development regulations and public resources to support affordable housing development and preservation</u> <u>• Facilitate partnerships between community-based organizations and affordable housing developers to develop community-led affordable developments</u> <u>• Establishing or enhancing a Housing Levy</u> <u>• Retooling a Multifamily Tax Exemption program to improve its effectiveness and/or increase utilization</u> <u>• Increase regulatory flexibility and incentives for affordable housing (e.g., reduced parking requirements)</u> 	

Table 1. November 3 Proposed Amendments to the Countywide Planning Policies, 12/6/2022

<p><u>H-20</u> Adopt and implement policies that address gaps in partnerships, policies, and dedicated resources to eliminate racial and other disparities in access to housing and neighborhoods of choice.</p>	<p>What partnerships, policies, and dedicated resources are needed to eliminate racial and other disparities in access to housing and neighborhoods of choice will depend on the results of analysis conducted under H-4. A few examples of strategies that could fill or assist in filling identified gaps include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Establishing partnerships with local community-based organizations (CBOs) headed by and/or serving populations most affected by housing cost burden, with a focus on BIPOC-lead or -serving organizations</u> • <u>Convening community advisory committees to oversee housing policy implementation and to evaluate policies annually for discriminatory or disparate impacts</u> • <u>Promoting models to promote community ownership or land and housing, including Community Land Trusts, Coops, or Tenant Opportunity to Purchase Acts</u> • <u>Requiring community preference policies for recipients of jurisdictional housing funding or building incentives</u> • <u>Prioritizing surplus public property for community-serving uses and housing projects, in partnership with disparately impacted communities.</u> • <u>Encouraging the use of affirmative and race-forward marketing plans in affordable housing projects utilizing public funding</u> • <u>Establishing down-payment assistance programs for first-time homebuyers, with a focus on first-time homebuyers of color.</u> • <u>Expand the allowed housing types (e.g., missing middle, multifamily) in areas with limited affordability and remove barriers (e.g. conditional use permits) to constructing those types</u> • <u>Partner with housing authorities to expand the use of housing choice vouchers in areas that data demonstrate are racially or economically exclusive</u> • <u>Support fair housing education and enforcement programs</u> 	
<p><u>H-232</u> Adopt and implement policies that protect housing stability for renter households; expand protections and supports for <u>moderate-, low-, very low-, and extremely</u> low-income renters and renters with disabilities.</p>	<p>Tenant protection policies to consider include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Just cause eviction for tenants with termed leases • Increase time periods for notice of rent increases • Prohibit discrimination in housing against tenants and potential tenants with arrest records, conviction records, and criminal history • Tenant relocation assistance • Increase access to legal services 	

Table 1. November 3 Proposed Amendments to the Countywide Planning Policies, 12/6/2022

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rental inspection programs <p>Supports for landlords that promote tenant stability include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish a fund that landlords can access to make repairs so costs are not passed on to low-income renters Increase education for tenants and property owners regarding their respective rights and responsibilities <p>Supports for low-income renters and people with disabilities to consider include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shallow and deep rent subsidies Emergency rental assistance Services to address barriers to housing, including tenant screening reports and civic legal aid Increased funding for services that help people with disabilities stay in their homes and/or age in place 	
26	<p><u>Policies H-25 and H-26: Measure Results and Provide Accountability Review, Monitor, Report, and Adjust</u> <u>The Affordable Housing Committee, Growth Management Planning Council, and King County will conduct a comprehensive planning review, monitoring, reporting, and adjustment process to ensure that jurisdictions are successful in their efforts to plan for and accommodate their share of allocated countywide housing needs and meet the goals of this chapter. Information in this section provides guidance to jurisdictions on their participation in this process.</u></p>	Guidance added to the appendix on new amendments for CPP Housing Chapter accountability process.
27	<p><u>H-26: Comprehensive Plan Review</u> <u>The Countywide Planning Policies Housing Chapter represent an agreement between cities in King County on strategies to equitably meet countywide housing needs. The comprehensive plan review process conducted by the Growth Management Planning Council or its designee is a method of confirming that the comprehensive plans prepared by jurisdictions respond to these countywide goals. Designated reviewers will use a set of plan review standards to evaluate the completeness of plans in responding to the Housing Chapter, implementation details for policies requiring adoption or implementation, and the meaningfulness of policies that jurisdictions propose to plan for and accommodate their housing needs. A complete set of standards, along with technical assistance for the comprehensive plan review process, can be found on the King County Affordable Housing Committee website.</u></p>	Text added to provide a description and preliminary guidance on new comprehensive plan review policy. Reference added to forthcoming comprehensive plan review documentation on King County website.
28	<p><u>H-27: Jurisdictional and County Reporting Requirements</u> Success at meeting a community’s need for housing can only be determined by measuring results and evaluating changes to housing supply and need. Cities and the County will collaborate to monitor basic information annually, as they may already do for permits and development activity. Annual tracking of information such as new policies, new units, and zoning changes will make periodic assessments easier and more efficient. A limited amount of annual monitoring will also aid in providing timely information to decision makers.</p> <p>The purpose of <u>monitoring and reporting “measuring results and providing accountability”</u> is to motivate and enhance learning,</p>	Edited to align with new CPP Housing Policy H-27 and to provide further information on the annual reporting and monitoring process.

Table 1. November 3 Proposed Amendments to the Countywide Planning Policies, 12/6/2022

	<p>collaboration, and progress. While some Housing Chapter Countywide Planning Policies-CPPs clearly lend themselves to quantitative measures and straightforward evaluation, some do not. This is often true when factors like the result of engagement with disproportionately impacted community members significantly shape implementation or where quantitative data is lacking. In these cases, jurisdictions have the liberty to make any reasonable interpretation of the policy and report as completely and honestly as possible how well the policy has been met.</p> <p>Policy H-25 requires cities and the County to collaborate in this monitoring to ensure continual review of the effectiveness of local strategies at meeting the countywide need.</p> <p>Policy H-27 establishes a commitment to monitor countywide and jurisdictional progress toward meeting housing needs and eliminating disparities in access to housing and neighborhood choices. Both King County and the cities are required to annually report data that will assist with this monitoring process.</p>	
29	<p>H-28: Annual Monitoring</p> <p>Policy H-28 requires cities and the County to collaborate in monitoring to ensure continual review of the effectiveness of local strategies at meeting the countywide need. The Affordable Housing Committee will establish standardized benchmarks, housing data trends, and comparative standards using data collected under H-27 to aid in assessing progress over the planning period, relative to countywide trends and other jurisdictions. The information will be collected by King County and reported annually in a public-facing, interactive regional affordable housing dashboard. Updates on implementation strategies reported by jurisdictions as part of the comprehensive plan review process will also be available on the Regional Affordable Housing dashboard. Information on how to prepare implementation strategies is included in the comprehensive plan review standards guidance document on the Affordable Housing Committee website.</p>	<p>Added to align with changes to H-26 and H-27 and explain new accountability requirements related to monitoring. Added reference to the AHC dashboard where annual reporting by the AHC will be located, as well as to forthcoming guidance on implementation strategies required by comprehensive plan review.</p>
30	<p>H-297: Adjust Strategies to Meet Housing Needs</p> <p>The Ddata collected annually provides an opportunity for cities and the County to adapt to changing conditions and new information when monitoring finds that the adopted strategies are insufficient for meeting housing the countywide needs or result in the perpetuation of the inequitable distribution of affordable housing. Adaptation strategies can occur before the next comprehensive planning cycle during annual comprehensive plan updates, updates to the land use map, and/or a jurisdiction's urban growth strategy (buildable lands) reporting process. The King County Affordable Housing Committee can serve as a venue for discussing regional progress and challenges jurisdictions face. The results of these conversations and recommended actions to meet countywide need more effectively can be shared with the Growth Management Planning Council.</p> <p>To ensure the successful implementation of comprehensive plan goals related to housing needs, the Growth Management Planning Council, Affordable Housing Committee, and King County will organize an adjustment period for comprehensive plans at the midpoint of the ten-year planning cycle. The intent of the adjustment period is to provide a formal opportunity for the Growth Management Planning</p>	<p>Added to align with new policy H-29, which outlines a commitment to design and organize a midcycle review and adjustment period for comprehensive plan. Appendix text provides further detail on the plan to launch this program, no earlier than 2024, as well as AHC intentions to align efforts with Commerce work to design a similar</p>

Table 1. November 3 Proposed Amendments to the Countywide Planning Policies, 12/6/2022

<p><u>Council or its designee to assess jurisdictional efforts in planning for and accommodating needs, and to require jurisdictions to take reasonable measures, if necessary, to address any identified shortfalls. The Growth Management Planning Council or its designee will develop Housing Chapter amendments that articulate the procedure and adequacy standards used to assess jurisdictional efforts no earlier than 2024. This includes work to outline the reasonable measures that the Growth Management Planning Council will use to address shortfalls.</u></p> <p><u>In developing these amendments, the Growth Management Planning Council or its designee will develop Countywide Planning Policy amendments, informed by guidance, if available, from the Washington State Department of Commerce, who, under directive from 2021 House Bill 1241, will organize a state-run implementation progress report process for local comprehensive plans. Per state law, the progress report process is also meant to occur at the five-year midpoint of the planning cycle.</u></p>	<p>midcycle review process.</p>
---	---------------------------------