

# King County Affordable Housing Committee Meeting Minutes

September 29, 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			Ryan Makinster	X	
Susan Boyd			CM Ryan Mclrvn	X	
Alex Brennan	X		CM Teresa Mosqueda	X	
Jane Broom	X		Michael Ramos	X	
Kelly Coughlin	X		Kelly Rider	X	
Russell Joe	X		Mayor Lynne Robinson	X	
CM Jeanne Kohl-Welles	X		Tim Walter	X	
Mayor Nigel Herbig	X		Maiko Winkler-Chin	X	

## Non-voting Alternates

CM Amy Falcone	X
DM Dana Parnello	
CM Chris Stearns	X
CM Dan Strauss	
CM Lindsey Walsh	X
Brady Nordstrom	X

\* 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 July 27, 2022 Meeting Minutes

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

### Briefing: Community Partners Table

- Sarah Ballew, Operations and Development Director with Headwater People, provided an update on Community Partners Table (Table) progress and the Table's support for jurisdictional housing need Option 3
- Sarah invited present Table members to share comments:
  - Table member discussed the importance of having clear guidelines to meet the community's needs. Every community is different and it is important to know the needs for each region. Community leaders and community members need to be engaged with to develop plans. For example, the households served by their organization have more

people in one household than the countywide average, so they have a higher need for multi-family housing than the countywide average. There is a huge gap between the number of people with disabilities and the number of units available to this population. These are important factors to be aware of before going into implementation. Some populations have additional needs such as being close to transportation or health care services.

- Another Table member emphasized the importance of building complete communities – not just houses. Holistic needs of the wider community as well as the needs of the individual household should be examined. Black, Indigenous, and people of color communities have very clear needs.
- The Chair appreciated that the Community Partners Table takes what can be esoteric data analysis and turn it into a focus on human need. She asked the Table to elaborate why they support Option 3:
  - Table member stated that Option 3 represents the most equitable distribution of housing throughout the County. Option 3 deals the best with displacement. It encourages more places to build more affordable housing units and does not concentrate affordable housing units in one area.
  - Another Table member stated that lower-income workers commute into different communities from where they could afford to live. If these workers could afford to live in the same place where they work, they probably would. Option 3 tells a fuller picture.
  - Sarah stated that the Table members talk about the need for increased housing choice in places where there are not very many affordable housing choices currently.

#### **Action Item: Selection of Jurisdictional *By Income Level* Housing Need Option**

- Sunaree Marshall, Housing Policy and Special Projects Manager with King County’s Department of Community and Human Services, briefed the AHC on:
  - The Washington State Department of Commerce’s work to establish countywide housing need
  - Three jurisdictional *by income level* housing need options
  - Analysis of the policy implications of each option and their alignment with key principles
  - September 28 Growth Management Planning Council member input
- The Chair opened the floor for questions:
  - A Committee member asked about a slide showing the implications of different options. The slide showed that Option 3 doesn’t have that big of an effect on 0-30% area median income housing needs. For Bellevue, experiencing so much growth, that slide is inaccurate. The actual amount of 0-30% area median income housing Bellevue would be committing to with Option 3 is a lot.
  - Another Committee member explained that the Sound Cities Association (SCA) caucus had a robust discussion, and all agreed on sense of urgency on housing crisis. There is also a frustration that there is a need to act not just plan, but an acknowledgement that plans lead to action. The SCA caucus was split between Option 2 and Option 3, with a slight preference for Option 3. Option 2 is clear but is too cookie cutter. There is still some uncertainty and questions on Option 3, but appreciation that Option 3 is the most thoughtful and aligned. The member proposed pausing on the vote until next meeting on November 3 in order to unpack numbers and policy a bit more in Option 3. There is strong concern for outlier options in Option 3. The SCA caucus requested flexibility and thoughtfulness in numbers, and accounting for outliers. Cities need assurances that the

expectation is that cities have supportive policies and zoning to meet affordable housing needs, not necessarily build the units themselves. It is important to provide policy guidance for cities to incorporate into their comprehensive plans since this will be a bigger challenge for small cities.

- Another Committee member appreciates all the work the Chair has done for the AHC work. The committee member discusses Bellevue's progress. In 2018, Bellevue put 76 affordable housing units, in 2019 – 330 units, and 2020 – 904 units. Something good is happening. Our city leans towards Option 2 because it is closer to CPPs we already approved. Option 3 makes it difficult for Bellevue to plan for and accommodate the goals. It would require 80% of Bellevue's housing between now and 2044 to be at 80% AMI or below and more than half of that at 30% AMI or below. That means more than 17,000 units we would have to build at 30% AMI. We can't mandate that level of affordability so we would have to subsidize it and that would cost \$9 billion. Option 3 would require more 30% AMI units than Seattle. For Bellevue, Option 2 works a lot better. I like the idea of coming back as a group so we choose an option that works for every city.
- Another Committee member wanted to build on the Community Partners Table comments. Table members talked about the need for family housing and that many low-wage workers would live in the same place that they work if there were affordable options in those cities so they could be near services and their job. This is about creating a more livable region across jurisdictions. The reality has happened over decades. Cities are being asked to step in after years of not enough resources and proactive planning to play catch up. Units don't have to be available immediately, but the Committee must act urgently to not lose more time. The member requested moving forward with a decision on jurisdictional housing needs today so jurisdictions have the guidance for comprehensive plans. Option 3 looks at the full income spectrum. If there is not enough 30% area median income housing, higher income households push out lower income households. There is a concern that Option 2 creates a permissive environment for displacement. Adopting a methodology that puts some jurisdictions in the negative like Option 2 does not set up a proactive position to tackle a regional crisis that continues to worsen. The member expressed support for Option 3 because it acknowledges current conditions in communities, accounts for balance of existing affordable housing, and looks at the scale of affordable housing needed. It identifies where to create housing near jobs. Locating housing near jobs and transit is good for the local economy and environment. Option 3 is not a one-size fits all approach. It allows for a tailored approach and supports preservation. It gives credit to jurisdictions for past actions to create more affordable housing. It prevents sprawl and promotes preservation of green space. It builds housing across all income levels.
- A Committee member requested clarification about a previous Committee member's comment about growth targets.
  - A Committee member talked about how the slide shows that for a town without much growth, the 0-30% area median income housing need is low, but in reality, for Bellevue, with lots of growth, that number is super high. It would be almost 20,000 units at 0-30% area median income as opposed to 2,000 units shown on the slide.
  - The Chair states that growth targets are a ceiling for each jurisdiction that was established a long time ago. The need is bigger than the growth targets collectively.

- Sunaree stated that the accountability for production of units will be within AHC. The accountability for planning and land capacity sits with GMPC and Commerce.
- Puget Sound Regional Council staff messaged that they review and provide comment on local comprehensive plans, including housing elements. Certification of a plan is a board decision. The Growth Management Policy Board recently discussed plan certification and housing. More information in the [9/1/22 GMPB agenda packet](#), starting on page 20.
- Commerce staff stated that the statute says that jurisdictions must have sufficient capacity for all housing needs and adequate provisions to accommodate those needs. For land capacity, to provide for certain levels of affordability, more dense housing options are needed. Communities will need to show they have sufficient capacity for higher density types that would lead to more affordable housing types. Jurisdictions can't control what does and doesn't get built. Commerce proposes that jurisdictions show they have enough land that could meet the needs of low-income households. After capacity, adequate provisions will be focus of next meeting. Commerce is considering requiring that communities need to show that they have programs and options in place, considered incentives, and revised development regulations to encourage the market to build that type of housing to meet those needs. They might not achieve it but they need to show they are working towards it. Commerce is currently thinking through how House Bill 1220 requirements will flow into the 5 year check-in reports requirement that just passed. They are looking for feedback and likely at the minimum, jurisdictions will need to show land capacity and show of efforts of programs, policies, incentives.
- The other major piece of Commerce's work is the development of guidance to address racially disparate impacts and displacement in the housing element. They released [draft guidance](#) last week and are accepting comments.
- Another Committee member urged the AHC to consider certain criteria when selecting a housing need option. They leaned towards Option 3. They shared that their organization collaborated with the government to prevent displacement and preserve 76 affordable housing units in Bellevue. The second factor to consider is a racial justice lens. The third factor is the impact on homelessness. King County has the 3<sup>rd</sup> highest level of homelessness and the Committee cannot not talk about it. Policies should reduce the level of homelessness. There is a nexus between homelessness and rent increases. The Committee should look at these factors to continue a discussion before a vote.
- Another Committee member pointed out that King County is the 3<sup>rd</sup> largest mega commuter in the nation, meaning people spend a very long time to commute. We are contributing to global climate change because we don't have enough housing near where people work. There are a lot of reasons Option 3 is the best. There was a strong request to move forward with a decision.
- A Committee member stated that he is open to better understanding the options but leaning towards supporting Option 3. It sounds like Option 1 is not being considered because it doesn't look at past investments. Option 3 balances equity, and there was lots of great reasoning from the Table and others to support Option 3.
- A Community Partners Table member stated that we can either create greater division or disassemble this division. Many communities of color feel like they are not welcome in many places given the way the environments are built and policies put in place. We need to change that because we need fully functional communities where we can live and work.

- A city staff member puts in the chat a point of clarification - Seattle under Option 3 would need to focus on 44,000 units for those at 30% area median income and below, which is 26,000 more than Bellevue.
- A Committee member thanks everybody for their hard work on this. He states that a 0-30% area median income units will not happen without some sort of subsidy. This message needs to get up to the state and federal government. When cities are more open to allow this type of units, it allows housing authorities to leverage vouchers and similar resources in these communities.
- Members did not reach consensus on a preferred option, opting to allow jurisdictions a question-and-answer period about options and to delay selection of a preferred option to November 3. The Chair directed AHC staff to draft CPP materials using Option 3 in the meantime.

**Action Item: Direction on Establishing *Special Housing Needs***

- Sunaree briefed the Committee on:
  - Two types of special housing need
  - Key differences in complementary work underway
  - A process to develop permanent supportive housing and emergency housing/shelter needs
  - A contingency plan for an alternative allocation approach in case KCRHA'S subregional projections are not ready in time
- Alexis Rinck, Director of Sub-Regional Planning and Equitable Engagement at King County Regional Homelessness Authority (KCRHA), briefed the Committee on KCRHA'S work to project new emergency housing/shelter units needed between 2022-2026 for budgeting and planning purposes for each of the KCRHA-defined seven subregions within King County
- The Chair opened the floor for questions:
- Commerce staff clarified that they shared draft special housing need numbers with King County and a caveat that they are based on 2017 OFM population projects because 2022 numbers are not yet available.

**Action Item: Direction on Responding to 2021 Growth Management Planning Council (GMPC) Member Amendments**

- McCaela Daffern, lead staff to the Committee with King County'S Department of Community and Human Services, briefed the AHC on:
  - GMPC member amendment summaries and recommended AHC actions
  - September 28 GMPC member feedback
- McCaela stated that the HIJT CPP Work Group will draft CPP amendments reflecting AHC feedback for AHC consideration at the November meeting

**Discussion: Draft 2023 AHC State Legislative Priorities**

- Sunaree briefed the Committee on draft 2023 AHC state legislative priorities and the adoption process
- The Chair invites Committee members to ask questions or provide feedback on the proposed state legislative priorities:

- A Committee member asked if there are various bills or legislation that comes up during session, is there a process for AHC to weigh in and consider at that point?
  - Sunaree said AHC staff usually provides updates and bill numbers as information sharing. If there is time on the agendas, sometimes AHC members will speak to bills they are excited about, and AHC staff flags which bills align with legislative priorities.
- A Committee member asked for clarification about the legislative priority 4b. and how much longer the notices would be.
  - Sunaree explained it was written broadly because something like notice period lengths would change through negotiation.

### **Wrap-Up and Next Steps**

- The Chair wrapped up with possible agenda items for the next meeting on November 3, including:
  - Community Partners Table update
  - Approval of a jurisdictional *by income level* housing need option
  - Adoption of 2023 State Legislative Priorities
  - Direction to staff on:
    - Jurisdictional special housing needs
    - Comprehensive plan review standards
    - New data and benchmarks to collect and track annually
    - CPP amendments
    - Plan certification pilot recommendation
    - Recommendation of future work for AHC