

King County Affordable Housing Committee Meeting Minutes

April 8, 2022 | 1:30 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

Location: Zoom Meeting

Introductions

Members & Voting Alternates	Present	Alternate	Members & Voting Alternates	Present	Alternate
Jennifer Anderson			CM Marli Larimer	X	
CC Claudia Balducci	X		CM Ryan McIrvine	X	
Don Billen	X	Thatcher Imboden	CM Teresa Mosqueda	X	
Susan Boyd	X		Michael Ramos	X	
Alex Brennan	X		Kelly Rider	X	Ivan Miller
Jane Broom	X		Mayor Lynne Robinson	X	CM Amy Falcone
Kelly Coughlin	X		Brett Waller	X	
CM Jeanne Kohl-Welles			Tim Walter	X	Andrew Calkins
Mayor Nigel Herbig	X				

Non-voting Alternates

DM Dana Parnello	X
CM Chris Stearns	X
CP Lindsey Walsh	X
CM Dan Strauss	

* 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 February 9, 2022 Meeting Minutes

- Vote to approve by CM Ryan McIrvine, seconded by Mayor Nigel Herbig
- Approved

Briefing: Community Partners Table

- Sarah Ballew, Change Management and Policy Consultant with Headwater People, provided an update on Community Partners Table progress and the development of their first recommendations report
- Sarah invited present Community Partners Table members to share the following highlights from their first four meetings and recommendations report:
 - In comparison to other areas in the county, East King County has less housing stock affordable to those earning less than 80% area median income. 50,000 Latinos live in East King County, and there is a great need for affordable housing. Involve more housing

developers of color in affordable housing projects to meet the needs of Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) communities more effectively.

- Ensure community members with disabilities have full access to all areas in their housing complexes and increase gender-diverse housing options.
- Make space for BIPOC communities to share their unique stories and needs. Think critically about how to build communities to support those needs. Increase housing stability to foster opportunity and eliminate potential future barriers.

Input: Growth Management Planning Council (GMPC) Motion 21-1

- McCaela Daffern, lead staff to the Committee with King County's Department of Community and Human Services, briefed the AHC on GMPC Motion 21-1, including:
 - AHC 2022 work phases
 - Project updates
 - Accountability framework considerations
 - Summary overview of the framework actions:
 - 1a. Review plans
 - 1b. Review and certify plans
 - 2a. Monitor and report
 - 2b. Monitor, report, and require adjustments
- Members read the staff report for five minutes

Action 1a: Review Plans

- McCaela reviewed Action 1a in detail
- Members were asked the following questions in a straw poll:
 - Do you support the AHC offering early guidance and assistance to jurisdictions during the housing element drafting process?
 - Voting members all responded yes
 - Do you support empowering the County AHC staff or AHC to review periodic updates to comprehensive plans and provide comments prior to adoption?
 - Voting members all responded yes
- The Chair opened up the floor for member discussion on *Action 1a*. Members discussed the following:
 - This action could be a beneficial step to advance housing planning across the county. Figure out how to create an independent and objective plan review process.
 - Consider providing model code or plan sections. Create checklists of best practices for cities to implement. This action is a good middle ground and pursuing certification is not necessarily needed.
 - Continue exploring this action. There are concerns about capacity to do work, and uncertainty around what will make the most impact.
 - Model code and resources would help constrained cities. The goal should be to create less burden on city staff.

Action 1b: Review and Certify Plans

- McCaela reviewed *Action 1b* in detail
- Members were asked the following question in a straw poll:

- Do you support empowering the GMPC, with assistance from the AHC, to issue plan certification decisions?
 - 7 members responded no, 4 said yes, and 4 abstained or did not vote
- The Chair opened up the floor for member discussion on *Action 1b*. Members discussed the following:
 - Staff can flesh out a certification process in further detail. Certification may be valuable if paired with something objective like a checklist.
 - Agreement that there needs to be teeth for accountability to impact meaningful change. Support for staff coming back with more information on this action. Concerns with having enough time to do this well. More information and assurance from staff to see what this could look like for this comprehensive planning cycle would go a long way to get more support.
 - Without a carrot, it doesn't make sense to pursue certification right now. A good set of goal metrics in the timeframe needed wouldn't be possible. A checklist of best practices is a good alternative. Certification may be more worthwhile in a future comprehensive plan update cycle.
 - The absence of a stick makes this action more collaborative and less imposing
 - No desire to take certification off the table yet, but questions remain about the amount of back and forth needed between jurisdictions and the County in this process
 - Agreement that having accountability shared across all cities is important. Futurewise has long advocated that Commerce certify comprehensive plans. One idea for a carrot - if Commerce certifies a plan and someone appeals, Commerce provides funding for legal defense. Is there a way that the GMPC could pool funds to provide legal defense support for cities who get plans certified during this process?
 - Achieving buy-in from all parties and implementing this action within the needed timeframe is not pragmatic. *Action 1a* is collaborative and cooperative. *Action 1b* feels premature, especially given the timeline this year with only four AHC meetings remaining. More time is needed to get certification right.
 - Acknowledge the extra work this would require for cities. However, refrain from kicking the can down the road on accountability. There is a lot of agreement on goals but the "how" is challenging.
 - Add more detail to *Action 1b*, bring it back to the Committee and see if members feel any differently
 - A Commerce staff member stated in the chat: "To address the local capacity issue, I do want to add that Commerce will be providing significant resources in this region in the next few years. There will be formula funding for each jurisdiction to do their periodic update, with a state checklist, coordinating with PSRC as well. Commerce also is implementing a proviso and providing optional grant funding to address middle housing, including significant technical assistance."

Action 2a: Monitor and Report

- McCaela reviewed *Action 2a* in detail
- Members were asked the following questions in a straw poll:
 - Do you support modifying the current annual monitoring system to measure benchmark and data trends that more closely align with this framework?
 - Voting members all responded yes

- Do you support comparing jurisdictions based on their progress toward specific benchmarks?
 - All but one voting members responded yes
- The Chair did not open up the floor for member discussion on *Action 2a* given the general support expressed

Action 2b: Monitor, Report, and Require Adjustments

- McCaela reviewed *Action 2b* in detail
- Members were asked the following questions in a straw poll:
 - Do you support a midcycle review of jurisdictional progress to accommodate their affordable housing targets?
 - Voting members all responded yes
 - Do you support empowering the GMPC, with assistance from the AHC, to require adjustments to address shortfalls?
 - Voting members all responded yes
- The Chair opened up the floor for member discussion on *Action 2b*. Members discussed the following:
 - What constitutes a significant shortfall and what are reasonable measures? Consider providing both qualitative and quantitative benchmarks.
 - Support for the need for teeth or accountability, but a significant amount of time is needed to develop the right metrics and standards. This would be burdensome to staff during this comprehensive planning cycle. This action would ensure that comprehensive plans are doing what they need to do and encourage steps to produce the intended results. This action goes beyond just planning, which is ideal.
 - Commerce is doing similar work with comprehensive plan implementation progress reports. This work should complement what Commerce is planning. This is the one hesitancy with this action.
 - Staff are working with Commerce to coordinate efforts. Commerce is not likely to address this work this year, so they may look to the AHC for guidance if the Committee chooses to take this up.

Briefing: State Legislative Session Update

- Sunaree Marshall, Housing Policy and Special Projects Manager with King County’s Department of Community and Human Services, reviewed the outcomes of bills related to the AHC’s 2022 state legislative agenda
- The Chair shared that the Committee will scope 2023 state legislative priorities in early fall

Wrap-Up and Next Steps

- The Chair wrapped up with possible agenda items for the next meeting on May 18, including:
 - Community Partners Table update
 - Approval of CPP accountability framework
 - Briefing and discussion of Commerce’s countywide need disaggregation methodology