

Memo

To: King County Affordable Housing Committee Members

From: McCaela Daffern, Regional Affordable Housing Implementation Manager

cc: Housing Interjurisdictional Team

Date: May 14, 2021

Re: Revenue and Expenditure Monitoring for Affordable Housing

Summary and Background

This report summarizes the region's implementation of two recently authorized revenue tools for affordable housing, the Affordable and Supportive Housing Sales and Use Tax Credit (State Sales and Use Tax Credit or Tax Credit) and the Sales and Use Tax Option for Housing and Related Services (Local 0.1% Sales and Use Tax Option or Tax Option).

The findings are largely based on a Housing Interjurisdictional Team (HIJT) survey of the King County jurisdictions that enacted at least one of these tools. Key findings include:

- An estimated \$22.5 million has been collected countywide through the two revenue sources, almost \$13 million from the State Sales and Use Tax Credit and almost \$9.6 million from the Local 0.1% Sales and Use Tax Option.
- Approximately \$15.3 million of the revenue already collected remains uncommitted.
- Despite the influx of new revenue to meet the need, a large revenue gap remains to meet the AHC's near-term goal of 44,000 units by 2024.
- There was inconsistent awareness and application of the Shared Revenue Principles (adopted 11/13/2020) during implementation.
- About \$14.1 million has been committed to build or preserve affordable homes, a figure that includes \$13.3 million that was awarded in advance of collection by the City of Seattle.

At the May 19 Affordable Housing Committee (AHC or Committee) meeting, Committee members will identify steps the AHC can and should take to influence the implementation of existing revenue sources or advocate for new revenue sources in alignment with the Committee's goals and the [Shared Revenue Principles](#).¹ In this review, the HIJT's Revenue Work Group identified several possible Committee actions for consideration, including the following:

- Secure additional local revenue at a level sufficient to meet the region's need
- Continue to advocate for additional state and federal funding
- Encourage local jurisdictions and subregional collaborations to bond against future revenues or commit funds ahead of collection to increase available funds for capital expenses

¹ https://kingcounty.gov/~media/depts/community-human-services/housing-homelessness-community-development/documents/affordable-housing-committee/AHC_Shared_Revenue_Principles_.ashx?la=en

- Encourage local jurisdictions and public funders to prioritize funds for the swift production and preservation of housing that will remain affordable for the long term
- Encourage local jurisdictions and subregional collaborations to consider and align efforts with the Shared Revenue Principles
- Facilitate partnerships to support the capacity building necessary to deploy new revenue
- Consistently track implementation of new revenue and lessons learned
- Assist jurisdictions in identifying equitable processes and achieving equitable outcomes

State Sales and Use Tax Credit

The Legislature passed the State Sales and Use Tax Credit into law as Substitute House Bill (SHB) 1406 in 2019. It is codified in [RCW 82.14.540](#). The tax credit authorized jurisdictions to implement a 0.0073 or 0.0146 percent local sales tax, which would be credited against the state's portion of the sales and use tax, to fund affordable or supportive housing. Participating jurisdictions are permitted to use funds for affordable housing capital, acquisition, or operations and maintenance needs or, for small jurisdictions, rental assistance. Thirty jurisdictions² in King County imposed the Tax Credit. Over the course of 2020, by the end of which all 30 jurisdictions had begun collecting revenue, this tax generated \$9.5 million. The AHC issued [recommendations to King County jurisdictions](#) related to implementation of the Tax Credit in 2019.

Local 0.1% Sales and Use Tax Option

The Legislature passed the Local 0.1% Sales and Use Tax Option into law as HB 1590 in 2020. It is codified within [RCW 82.14.530](#). HB 1590 authorized jurisdictions to impose, through council action, a 0.1 percent local sales and use tax and use the tax to support affordable housing, behavioral health facilities, and related supportive services. A minimum of 60 percent of revenues collected must be used for constructing affordable housing and facilities providing housing-related services, constructing mental and behavioral health-related facilities, or funding the operations and maintenance costs of newly constructed affordable housing, facilities providing housing-related services, or evaluation and treatment centers. The remainder of the moneys collected must be used for health- and housing-related services. Nine jurisdictions³ in King County imposed the Tax Option. King County's [Health through Housing](#) program is supported by these funds. The AHC adopted its Shared Revenue Principles after this tax was enacted but before implementation began. Countywide, this revenue source is projected to generate \$66.2 million in 2021, its first full year of collections.

Data Collected and Key Findings

The HIJT collected publicly available information and surveyed local jurisdictions to gather the following information about these two revenue tools:

- How many and which jurisdictions have enacted the authorized tools
- Revenue collected as of March 2021
- Planned and committed/awarded expenditures
- Resulting or projected housing production
- Implementation alignment with AHC's Shared Revenue Principles
- Equity in processes and outcomes
- Administrative challenges

The HIJT obtained data from the Washington State Department of Commerce through March 31, 2021,

² Auburn, Bellevue, Bothell, Burien, Carnation, Clyde Hill, Covington, Des Moines, Duvall, Enumclaw, Federal Way, Issaquah, Kenmore, Kent, King County, Kirkland, Lake Forest Park, Maple Valley, Mercer Island, Newcastle, North Bend, Redmond, Renton, Sammamish, SeaTac, Seattle, Shoreline, Snoqualmie, Tukwila, Woodinville

³ Bellevue, Covington, Issaquah, Kent, King County, Maple Valley, North Bend, Renton, Snoqualmie

and distributed a survey in April 2021 to the 30 jurisdictions that enacted one or more of these tools, with 25 jurisdictions responding.⁴ Results from the data collection are included as Exhibit 1. What follows is a discussion of the key findings.⁵

Regional Revenue Collections, Commitments, and Uses

Analysis

Collections

- Together, an estimated \$22.5 million has been collected since enactment: about \$13 million from the Tax Credit and \$9.6 million from the Tax Option.
- Combined, this represents about 0.1 percent of the overall \$18 billion needed from existing and new revenue sources between 2019 and 2024 and about 0.5 percent of the local share of \$5 billion in revenue needed.⁶
- This points to the need for substantial new public revenue to meet the 44,000-unit goal by 2024.

Commitments

- About \$14.9 million has been committed by nine jurisdictions for a range of eligible uses: \$14.1 million from the Tax Credit and about \$800,000 from the Tax Option. The rate of commitments has increased since 2019.
- The majority of the funds (\$13.3 million) were committed by the City of Seattle, which forward committed much off their Tax Credit revenue to accelerate affordable unit production. Seattle's total collections only amount to about \$5.5 million.
- Among the other jurisdictions responding to the survey, eight more jurisdictions deployed the remaining \$800,000 of funds.
- Approximately \$15.3 million of the revenue collected remains uncommitted.
- For many jurisdictions, these funds represent the first locally controlled revenue that can be used to support affordable housing development and preservation, so not all jurisdictions had a plan and/or capacity in place to award swiftly.
- Over time, the Tax Option is projected to raise substantially more revenue than the Tax Credit: the Tax Option is projected to generate \$66.2 million in its first full year of collections and is a permanent source of revenue, while the Tax Credit generated \$9.5 million in its first full year of collections and sunsets twenty years after jurisdictions impose the tax.

Use of Funds

- Approximately 94 percent of the \$14.9 million committed (or \$14.1 million) was in support of projects that will build or preserve affordable homes.
- These funds will be leveraged with other funds to build or preserve 678 units affordable at or below 80 percent of AMI, with 454 (67 percent) of these units affordable to households earning at or below 50 percent AMI.
- Approximately four percent (\$530,000) of the commitments made have been committed to health- and housing-related services.

⁴ Department of Commerce data covered revenue collected and expenditures through Sales and Use Tax Credit only. Normandy Park did not notify the State Department of Revenue that they enacted the Tax Credit and thus are excluded from Commerce's data. All other data was self-reported by participating jurisdictions.

⁵ Unless otherwise noted, all numbers and percentages refer to the percentage of jurisdictions that responded to a HIJT survey for each question as not all jurisdictions responded and not all answered every question.

⁶ Revenue collections for State Sales and Use Tax Credit started in 2019 or 2020, depending on when the jurisdiction enacted the tax. Revenue collections for Local 0.1% Sales and Use Tax Option didn't start until late 2020. Revenue collection data may be skewed due to COVID-related fluctuations in the sales and use tax. Annually going forward, the Tax Option is projected to raise substantially more than the Tax Credit.

- Approximately two percent (\$310,000) from the Tax Credit was deployed into the community for rental assistance. This amount could decrease as expanded state and federal resources are deployed and the COVID-19 crisis becomes less acute.

Takeaways and Possible Committee Next Steps

- An estimated \$22.5 million has been collected, but a large revenue gap remains to meet the AHC’s near-term goal of 44,000 units (Shared Revenue Principle 1). To increase the revenue available, the Committee could:
 - Identify and implement local revenue sources with a magnitude sufficient to meet the region’s need
 - Continue to advocate for more state and federal funding for affordable housing
- Because of the small scale of the Tax Credit, even pooled collections will take time to accumulate enough to support capital projects. More funding from these tools would be available for capital investments in the near term if a portion of future revenue were made available up front for capital investments through the issuance of bonds of forward commitment of funds in advance of collections. For example, if \$1 million in annual revenues of State Sales and Use Tax Credit was bonded against over the next 18 years, it would generate \$14 million in upfront capital to address the region’s housing crisis more quickly. Bonded funds can only be used for capital purposes; therefore, funding for operating, maintenance and services would need to be considered in balance. To increase near-term impact, the Committee could:
 - Encourage jurisdictions and subregional collaborations to bond against future revenues or commit funds ahead of collection to increase available funds for capital expenses.
- Of the revenue committed and deployed, 94 percent (\$14.1 million) is being used for affordable housing capital or acquisition. Approximately \$15.3 million of the revenue collected remains uncommitted. Managing housing funding is a new endeavor for most jurisdictions. To ensure alignment and increase the speed of commitments, the Committee could:
 - Identify ways to encourage local agencies enacting these and future revenue tools to do so in a manner aligned with the Shared Revenue Principles, at a pace commensurate with the scale of the need, and targeted toward the production, preservation, operation, maintenance, and services of housing that will remain affordable for the long term.
 - Continue to track implementation to ensure decisions align with the funding priorities, approach, and outcomes articulated in the Shared Revenue Principles.

Jurisdictional Collaboration

Analysis

- The AHC recommended jurisdictions collaborate regionally and subregionally in the implementation and distribution of housing funding in the Shared Revenue Principles.
- Several jurisdictions have not yet committed any funds because they are still developing implementation plans or forming the partnerships and agreements necessary to award these funds in collaboration with other jurisdictions.
- Most South King Housing and Homelessness Partners (SKHHP) member jurisdictions plan to pool their resources to establish SKHHP’s first-ever capital fund, still under development.
- Several SKHHP cities cited that it has been a challenging and slow process to establish the shared agreements, mechanism, and process necessary to pool and award funds.
- ARCH cities report that allocation of collections to the Housing Trust Fund has been smooth— a testament to the value of existing partnerships and collaborations.

Takeaways and Possible Committee Next Steps

- Managing housing funding is a new endeavor for most jurisdictions, and most are still in the planning phase. About half of jurisdictions that responded are pooling their funds at the subregional level (57 percent for the Tax Option and 40 percent for the Tax Credit). To support effective collaboration, the Committee could:
 - Help facilitate the partnerships between jurisdictions and subregional collaborations with relatively little experience in managing affordable housing revenue and established public funders like Seattle, King County, and ARCH to support the capacity-building necessary to deploy this revenue or implement future revenue sources.
 - Continue to identify lessons learned to inform future efforts to secure and implement new revenue tools in a regionally coordinated manner.

Equitable Processes and Outcomes

Analysis

- A quarter of respondents implementing the Tax Credit and half of respondents implementing the Tax Option reported community involvement focused on those most impacted by housing instability during enactment or implementation.
- More than half of respondents for the Tax Option reported that equity is a stated principle in the legislative or implementation documents.
- Eleven jurisdictions responded that none of the listed pro-equity steps had been taken during enactment or implementation planning for the Tax Credit, with several citing that they deferred to the subregional collaborations to ensure equity in the funding process.
- One jurisdiction suggested it would have been helpful to have guidance on the process to establish equity-based and county-aligned priorities.

Takeaways and Possible Committee Next Steps

- Most jurisdictions are considering equity in their processes and outcomes, but some would also like additional guidance. To support equitable implementation of revenue sources, the Committee could:
 - Convene jurisdictions and/or meet with the public funders group to share best practices and explore opportunities to prioritize equitable processes and outcomes in future funding award decisions or in the development of implementation plans for these revenue sources.

Knowledge of and Alignment with AHC Shared Revenue Principles

Analysis

- Among the 22 jurisdictions that answered the question, 11 reported that decision-makers had reviewed the AHC's Shared Revenue Principles during the decision-making or implementation planning processes, compared to seven that did not and four that did not know.
- The intended use of funds in most cases aligns with some but not all these principles and other AHC recommendations. For example, about half of respondents were pooling resources for both revenue tools, and about half reported intending to prioritize the use of funds for capital projects that create or preserve affordable housing.

Takeaways and Possible Committee Next Steps

- Half of responding jurisdictions reported that decision-makers had reviewed the AHC's Shared Revenue Principles during the decision-making or implementation planning. The intended use of funds in most cases aligns with some but not all these principles and other AHC recommendations. To increase awareness and ensure better alignment, the Committee could:
 - Identify opportunities to encourage local and regional decision makers to consider and align efforts with the Shared Revenue Principles.

Exhibit 1: Survey Results

Table 1a: State Sales and Use Tax Credit (HB 1406/RCW 82.14.540)

Jurisdictions shaded in gray did not provide data.

Jurisdiction	Revenue	Use of Funds					
	Total Collections (\$)	Rental Assistance	Capital Projects (\$)	Facility O & M (\$)	Housing, 0-30% AMI	Housing, 30-50%	Housing, 50-80%
Auburn	\$193,601		\$193,601				
Bellevue	\$626,711						
Bothell	\$67,393		\$163,765				
Burien	\$87,868						
Carnation	\$2,912						
Clyde Hill	\$3,433						
Covington	\$50,551	\$87,827					
Des Moines	\$28,705						
Duvall	\$8,943						
Enumclaw	\$31,818						
Federal Way	\$149,403						
Issaquah	\$113,277						
Kenmore	\$32,703						
Kent	\$181,484						
King County	\$4,630,548						
Kirkland	\$142,661						
Lake Forest Park	\$2,408						
Maple Valley	\$15,918						
Mercer Island	\$43,070	\$64,184					
Newcastle	\$13,637						
North Bend	\$13,013		\$13,023			2	5
Redmond	\$344,330		\$145,000		86	162	219
Renton	\$123,620						
Sammamish	\$58,821						
SeaTac	\$76,216						
Seattle	\$5,564,624		\$13,290,231		204		
Shoreline	\$105,748	\$157,929					
Snoqualmie	\$13,801						
Tukwila	\$185,211						
Woodinville	\$48,211						
Total	\$12,960,638	\$309,940	\$13,805,620	\$0	290 units	164 units	224 units

Table 1b: State Sales and Use Tax Credit (HB 1406/RCW 82.14.540)

Jurisdictions shaded in gray did not provide data.

Jurisdiction	Alignment with Shared Revenue Principles							Pro-Equity Steps Taken				
	Reviewed Shared Revenue Principles	Capital projects	Support for 0-30% AMI households	Opportunity, anti-displacement, wealth-building for BIPOC communities	Pool resources	None of these	Other inter-jurisdictional collaboration	Community involvement	Equity as guiding principle	Identify impacts to communities of color	Direct benefits to communities of color	None of these
Auburn	No				Yes							
Bellevue	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes				Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	None
Bothell	Yes	Yes			Yes							
Burien	No	Yes			Yes							
Carnation	Yes		Yes								Yes	
Clyde Hill												
Covington	No					Yes			Yes			
Des Moines												
Duvall	?						None					
Enumclaw	No						None	Yes				
Federal Way	Yes				Yes	Yes						
Issaquah	No				Yes							
Kenmore	?				Yes							
Kent	?				Yes				Yes			
King County	No	Yes	Yes			Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Kirkland												
Lake Forest Park	No				Yes							
Maple Valley												
Mercer Island	Yes						None					None
Newcastle												
North Bend	Yes	Yes	Yes									
Redmond	?	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes		Yes				
Renton	No	Yes			Yes							
Sammamish												
SeaTac	0											
Seattle	0											
Shoreline	No						None					None
Snoqualmie	Yes	Yes			Yes			Yes		Yes	Yes	
Tukwila												
Woodinville	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes							

Table 2a: Local 0.1% Sales and Use Tax Credit (HB 1590/RCW 82.14.530)

Jurisdictions shaded in gray did not provide data.

Jurisdiction	Revenue		Use of Funds					
	Total Collections (\$) <i>Enactment-3/31/21</i>	Projected 2021 Total Collections (\$)	Health- and Housing- Related Services (\$)	Capital Projects (\$)	Facility O & M (\$)	Housing, 0-30% AMI (# units)	Housing, 30-50% AMI (# units)	Housing, 50-80% AMI (# units)
Bellevue		\$6,208,249						
Covington	\$586,845	\$413,117	\$234,738	\$293,434				
Issaquah	\$282,984	\$1,209,012						
Kent	\$258,472	\$2,119,149	\$300,000					
King County	\$8,148,231	\$53,122,570						
Maple Valley		\$305,657						
North Bend	\$23,825	\$231,261						
Renton	\$273,838	\$2,347,721						
Snoqualmie	\$5,000	\$229,731						
Total	\$9,579,195	\$66,186,468	\$534,738	\$293,434	\$0	0 units	0 units	0 units

Table 2b: Local 0.1% Sales and Use Tax Credit (HB 1590/RCW 82.14.530)

Jurisdiction	Alignment with Shared Revenue Principles							Pro-Equity Steps Taken				
	Reviewed Shared Revenue Principles	Capital projects	Support for 0-30% AMI households	Opportunity, anti-displacement, wealth-building for BIPOC communities	Pool resources	None of these	Other inter-jurisdictional collaboration	Community involvement	Equity as guiding principle	Identify impacts to communities of color	Direct benefits to communities of color	None of these
Bellevue	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Covington	No	Yes	Yes		Yes							None
Issaquah	No	Yes										None
Kent	?				Yes			Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
King County	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes		
Maple Valley												
North Bend	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes							None
Renton	Yes	Yes	Yes						Yes			
Snoqualmie	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes			

Table 3a: State Sales and Use Tax Credit (HB 1406/RCW 82.14.540)

<p>Which of the following strategies does the intended use of funds from this revenue source align with? (Check all that apply.)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Otherwise collaborate with other jurisdictions programmatically or financially (please describe)</p>	
Covington	We have contracted with two different vendors to provide rental assistance.
Federal Way	Just a comment that the implementation plan will be developed with SKHHP so the priorities are not yet selected and may still align with the options included here.
King County	When resources are deployed there will be coordinating with the jurisdictions within which programs and projects are located. If there is ability to leverage resources collectively we will do that.
Redmond	Redmond is part of A Regional Coalition for Housing (ARCH). We have programmed a portion of our funds for ARCH's Housing Trust Fund. Remaining funds are not allocated yet.
<p>What challenges has your jurisdiction faced in implementing this program or deploying funds from this revenue source? What support would be or would have been helpful?</p>	
Auburn	Making sure that other cities agree to pool funds. And because the legislation allows cities below 100,000 to use for rental assistance it has the potential to create differing opinions in an organization like SKHHP where some cities are below 100,000 and are allowed to use funds this way and other cities are (or will be) above 100,000 and are precluded from using funds in this way.
Burien	Given the city's challenging budgets, we are grateful for 1406 funds as it is likely the only way we could invest in affordable housing but even with pooling funds with other cities, it will take time and other large investments to collect enough funds to actually build a project.
Carnation	Dollar Amounts are not significant to disperse at this time. No Affordable/Low Income housing exists in our jurisdiction at this time. Working to establish that with local partner in the future.
Covington	The two vendors that we are using we already within our human services network so it was an easy transition since they already provided rental assistance to residents.
Duvall	The City plans on partnering with a non-profit to provide rental assistance to qualified low income residents
Enumclaw	None, our funds are used solely for rental assistance to tenants.
Federal Way	The City is committing 100% of the 1406 funds to pooling with SKHHP. Developing the ILA for the capital fund is concluding. I am not sure other support would have reduced the length of time.
Issaquah	It would be helpful to know pros and cons of different options for deploying the collected funds for the City Council to decide on the best option that meets the needs of the Issaquah community.
Kent	Kent has committed to pooling HB 1406 funds with SKHHP, and equity will be a key consideration with SKHHP's capital funding process. Planning is still in development and boxes that are not checked in preceding questions may very well be part of current/pending planning. One challenge with the funding is that it does not cover administrative costs for the planning, implementation and deployment of the funds.

King County	Collections were much lower than expected in 2019-2020, funds have not yet been deployed. Looking forward to starting deployment of these funds in 2021.
Lake Forest Park	Being a small city, cash flow from this source is small. We will partner with either other cities or non-profits to utilize our limited funds.
Mercer Island	Mercer Island has not faced any challenges in implementing/deploying funds from the HB 1406 sales tax revenue. This funding was integrated into an existing program (Mercer Island Youth and Family Services Emergency Assistance), so the infrastructure for deploying the funds was already established and there were no challenges and no support needed. In 2020, \$29,183.81 was expended for Rental Assistance for income-qualified Mercer Island residents. \$16,281.84 has been expended so far in 2021, and we anticipate using all available funds.
North Bend	Same comments as [under this section in Table 3b].
Redmond	We have not had problems. Total amount collected has been \$309,000 and \$290,000 was allocated to ARCH HTF. Funds are small compared to the need. This is one tool we use.
Renton	Challenge and time of drafting the legal infrastructure (ILA) to actually have the mechanism to pool the funds. Capital fund, into which funds are pooled, does not have articulated priorities, process, or an established Advisory Committee to provide equity/community perspective to funding.

Table 3b: Local 0.1% Sales and Use Tax Credit (HB 1590/RCW 82.14.530)

Which of the following strategies does the intended use of funds from this revenue source align with? (Check all that apply.)	
<input type="checkbox"/> Otherwise collaborate with other jurisdictions programmatically or financially (please describe)	
Bellevue	Bellevue has not established the parameters for the 1590 fund as yet, but we may consider opportunities to partner with King County.
King County	Yes, the County is collaborating closely with jurisdictions on the implementation and coordinating on identifying property in their jurisdiction that could be utilized to support the County's new Health through Housing initiative funded by 1590.
Snoqualmie	Partnerships with non-profits, service providers, etc
What challenges has your jurisdiction faced in implementing this program or deploying funds from this revenue source? What support would be or would have been helpful?	
Bellevue	We are currently evaluating barriers through stakeholder outreach and interviews.
Covington	Our Council has adopting a policy to help guide the decision making process.
Issaquah	The Council amended the tax to be “automatically repealed if (a) a memorandum of understanding providing at least \$2 Million of funding for Issaquah Transit Oriented Development Project tenant improvements is signed with King County or (b) if King County does not enact a county-wide one-tenth of one percent housing and related services tax on or before December 31, 2020.” The City has asked for an inter-local agreement for use of funds and the County prefers an MOU. The County is also simultaneously trying to work with all the rest of the cities in King County on spending of this money. Issaquah is collecting the sales tax and holding it
Kent	It is a challenge to answer the questions comprehensively at this time given we are still in the process of drafting an implementation plan. (Responses to question 5 are related to planning that is in progress or pending.) Kent hopes to pool the capital portion with SKHHP along with 1406 funds to maximize the capacity for South King County projects. One challenge with the funding source is that it does not allow for covering administrative costs associated with the planning, implementation and deployment of the funds.
King County	The County is in the process of implementing Health Through Housing now supported by 1590 funds and developing the long term Implementation plan. Coordinating with multiple jurisdictions and external partners does take additional and needed time as well staff resources but is necessary to achieve our collective goal.
North Bend	We are just at the beginning phase and need a Housing Needs Assessment and Inventory completed as well. Funds for those documents would be helpful.
Renton	Challenge of setting and coordinating priorities with a funding source that has multiple uses and target populations. Challenge to define qualified uses of funds in terms of operating dollars. It would have been helpful to have guidance on the process to established equity-based and county-aligned priorities.
SeaTac	We felt the amount was too small to be impactful and letting KC manage it was a better option.
Snoqualmie	Lack of specificity in the legislation that would aid in implementation and annual reporting, guidance

Table 3c: Reflections

Do you have any other comments to share with the Affordable Housing Committee related to the use of these or other sources of public revenue for affordable housing in your jurisdiction or the region?	
Auburn	It's hard to answer a couple of the questions in this survey because we are relying upon SKHHP to determine how to spend the money, how to incorporate equity into decision making, evaluation of AHC priorities and objectives. When we select "none of the above" to a question it doesn't mean we aren't incorporating the choices provided into our decision making in other areas. It's just that we see the city directing funding to the Executive Board of SKHHP where they will conduct the evaluations.
Burien	The AHC could do more advocacy on state and federal funding requests to support SKHHP and other regional efforts so that we could amass more funds more quickly to address this affordable housing crisis!
Kent	Questions were answered to the best of my current understanding. Boxes that were not checked does not mean that those aren't priorities that will be considered going forward, but I do not have enough information at this time to respond in the affirmative. Thank you!
King County	The County typically blends several resources together to fund affordable housing developments as well as support programs providing support services to residents. New resources are examined in the context with other available local, state and federal resources to fully fund projects and programs to the extent feasible.
Mercer Island	Our jurisdiction used the HB1406 sales tax revenue to support our emergency rental assistance program. This additional revenue has been key in expanding the program to assist residents through the impacts of the COVID emergency.
Shoreline	Current options for the use of these funds in Shoreline are limited, in terms of investing these funds in capital projects.