

King County Affordable Housing Committee Meeting Minutes

July 27, 2022 | 1:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.

Location: Zoom Meeting

Introductions

Members & Voting Alternates	Present	Alternate	Members & Voting Alternates	Present	Alternate
CC Claudia Balducci	X		CM Marli Larimer	X	
Don Billen	X	Thatcher Imboden	Ryan Makinster	X	
Susan Boyd			CM Ryan Mclrvin	X	
Alex Brennan	X	Brady Nordstrom	CM Teresa Mosqueda		
Jane Broom	X		Michael Ramos	X	
Kelly Coughlin	X	Rob Wotton	Kelly Rider		
Russell Joe			Mayor Lynne Robinson	X	
CM Jeanne Kohl-Welles	X		Tim Walter	X	
Mayor Nigel Herbig	X	DM Dana Parnello	Maiko Winkler-Chin	X	

Non-voting Alternates

CM Amy Falcone	
CM Chris Stearns	X
CM Dan Strauss	
CM Lindsey Walsh	

* CC = Council Chair, CM = Councilmember, CP = Council President, DM = Deputy Mayor

Introductions and Agenda Review

- The Chair welcomed Affordable Housing Committee (AHC or Committee) members and Community Partners Table members in attendance

Action Item: Adoption of May 18, 2022 Meeting Minutes

- Vote to approve by CM Jeanne Kohl-Welles, seconded by CM Ryan Mclrvin
- Approved

Briefing: Community Partners Table

- Sarah Ballew, Operations and Development Director with Headwater People, provided an update on Community Partners Table (Table) progress and Table reflections on jurisdictional housing need options
- Sarah invited present Table members to share comments:
 - Table member stated Option 3 is more equitable because it gets to geographic disparities and jurisdictions with fewer affordable housing options today will receive more need.
 - Another Table member expressed support for Option 3 because so many low-wage workers are leaving communities due to the housing cost, forcing them to commute long distances. A fully functioning community has diversity of incomes, job types, and

similar factors. Long commutes prevent low-wage workers from being involved in community. Low-wage workers want access to good schools, parks, and similar amenities where they live. Good quality of life is important to everyone. There is a huge need for affordable housing in East King County.

- Another Table member expressed support for Option 3. He is very stressed out because he cannot find an apartment. Even though he has income, he gets denied by landlords because he does not have a rental history. He stated the Committee should look into why people cannot find housing they can afford.
- Another Table member expressed support for Option 3. Communities served by this Table member's organization need more options for intergenerational housing. There needs to be requirements and incentives for family-sized housing. Most affordable housing units are studios, 1-, or 2-bedrooms. These smaller units do not meet the needs of many families, forcing them to break up their families and live in different places. The majority of residential areas throughout King County cities are zoned for single-family housing. There needs to be more areas that allow missing-middle housing types that will meet the needs of larger families.
- Another Table member agreed with the previous speaker. In addition to larger units, communities need access to other needs and services, such as jobs, health care, transit, and childcare. These services should be incorporated into and around housing. This Table member recommends the Committee look into the funding structure for creating mixed-use and mixed-income housing. It is very difficult to construct these property types with low-income housing due to the funding available.
- Sarah shared comments from another Table member who was unable to attend the meeting that low-income housing is often not up to living standards. There is not support to remodel housing in order to support people to age in place.
- Chair requested a summary of the Community Partners Table members' reflections.
- Committee member pointed out the discrepancy between what is happening between the improving economy and how many people struggle with accessing housing. It is very important to hear these stories and gives this Committee member more incentive to do as much as possible to address these problems.
- Committee member put in the chat that from an employer's perspective, he appreciated the Community Partners Table talking points.

Direction: Growth Management Planning Council (GMPC) Motion 21-1 Accountability Framework Update

- McCaela Daffern, lead staff to the Committee with King County's Department of Community and Human Services, briefed the AHC on progress to:
 - Develop the accountability framework, including comprehensive plan review standards
 - Develop a comprehensive plan certification pilot program
 - Respond to 2021 GMPC member amendments
- The Chair opened the floor for questions: 1) is there anything staff should consider while refining the accountability framework and 2) do you recommend any changes to the plan certification pilot recruitment process or handout?
 - A Committee member asked staff about what data they use to make recommendations, and if the data is more recent than 2019.

- Staff responded that most of the data currently used relies heavily on information from the US Census, which does have some lag. The housing inventory of income-restricted units will be updated annually.
- A Committee member asked if it is required that a diverse set of cities throughout King County are invited to participate in the pilot. Participation from a diverse set of cities would provide information about the distinct challenges and opportunities in cities throughout the county. The Committee could consult with the Community Partners Table, not just city leadership, for their recommendations of cities invited to participate in the pilot.
 - Chair seconded this point and stated when selecting cities, it is important to be mindful of geography and size of cities.
- A Committee member expressed concern about how stretched his small city is currently. He stated there needs to be an incentive to participate in this pilot. Without incentives, he believes it will be hard to get buy-in from cities, especially from smaller jurisdictions. Even receptive councils may not want to participate due to capacity.
 - Staff stated five jurisdictions have expressed interest. King County may be able to provide some technical assistance to other jurisdictions. At this time, no smaller jurisdictions have volunteered to participate in this pilot.
 - Chair stated that the Committee could think about ways to support smaller jurisdictions through comprehensive planning and the pilot in a way that would benefit them. She stated this is a discussion worth having as a Committee.
- A Committee member stated Maple Valley is interested in the pilot program. He stated that participating in the pilot is a staff-level administrative decision, not council decision, and is based on bandwidth of staff. He stated there is an advantage of participating in a new process because staff can partner with the people setting the policy and be set up for success from the beginning.
- Staff will follow up with the Community Partners Table and see if they want to have a role in encouraging cities to join the pilot. Staff will circulate the handout in August and will report back to Committee on interim updates in September.

Direction: GMPC Motion 21-1 Establishing Jurisdictional Affordable Housing Needs

- Sunaree Marshall, Housing Policy and Special Projects Manager with King County’s Department of Community and Human Services, briefed the Committee on the GMPC Motion 21-1 requirement to establish subregional or jurisdictional affordable housing needs, informed by local data and Commerce’s data.
- A Committee member stated that rents have outpaced incomes. The McKinsey Report states that King County lost 100,000 affordable housing units. Because the county has a supply and demand issue and rent will continue to outpace income, the county will continue to have a significant loss of affordable housing units. The Low Income Housing Tax Credit program is the largest producer of affordable housing in the country but these properties are not affordable in perpetuity and many tax credits are expiring. Is there accounting for the number of income restricted units that are being lost?
 - Commerce’s methods are complex but they do not generally predict the future and assume that units affordable today will still exist in the future. There is no assumption that units are being lost, so these numbers are likely underestimates of the need. While

the model does not assume there will be a loss of income-restricted units, the County's policies and programs should account for that loss.

- Staff stated that the County has created an income-restricted database and is collecting information on the expiration of covenants. Eventually, the County will be able to track the net new affordable units.
- Jesse Warren, Affordable Housing and Housing Stability Evaluator with King County's Department of Community and Human Services, briefed the Committee on:
 - Option 3: Focus on new growth adjusted for local factors
 - How to use the dashboard
- Staff invited members to ask questions: Is there anything staff should consider while developing the target options?
 - A Committee member asked about income data that is used, because the Census does not provide a deep level of detail.
 - Staff reported that the US Bureau of Labor Statistics Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics data set provides the best level of detail, but because of the data limitations, the best gauge for low-wage worker is someone who makes at or less than \$3,333 monthly.
 - A Committee member expressed appreciation for the work. She asked about the year of the data staff is using for these projections. Bellevue has significantly increased the number of affordable housing units, and while not enough, this would change projections quite a bit. Would these recently-built units be considered? Committee member stated that Option 2 is the most reasonable to achieve, but is still tough. There are a lot of factors to consider beyond affordable housing that determine where people live. Bellevue is very committed to building the recommended amount of housing.
 - A Committee member stated that some jurisdictions have a greater proportion of housing that is not income-restricted and might be at risk of displacement. How did the models contemplate preservation? The models focus on new growth. To what degree should cities focus on preservation of existing units rather than new units?
 - Staff responded that jurisdictions that are relatively affordable today will likely get lower targets. The preservation piece is encouraged at the policy level.
 - Chair stated that if the baseline data is using 2019 date and targets are built from that point, any affordable housing built after 2019 would count towards the targets. If a baseline was newer, conditions would be more accurately reflected. Another Committee member agreed in the chat.
 - Staff stated that Commerce's data is fluid and is currently accepting public comment. Commerce has pulled together another workgroup around racially disparate impacts to provide guidance as well.
 - The Chair summarized that the Committee is thinking about accounting for naturally occurring affordable housing and income-restricted housing. Chair urged the Committee to ask any questions they have so they are prepared to select an option at the next meeting.

Wrap-Up and Next Steps

- The Chair wrapped up with possible agenda items for the next meeting on September 29, including:
 - Community Partners Table update
 - Consideration and selection of a preferred affordable housing target option for by income band
 - Consideration of recommended approach to addressing 2021 GMPC member amendments
 - Possible direction to staff on various accountability framework or CPP amendment questions