

Memo

To: King County Affordable Housing Committee Members
From: McCaela Daffern, Regional Affordable Housing Implementation Manager
cc: Housing Interjurisdictional Team
Date: March 10, 2023
Re: Growth Management Planning Council Motion 21-1 Update

Purpose of the March 16 AHC Meeting

At the March 16 Affordable Housing Committee (AHC or Committee) meeting, AHC staff will brief the Committee on the status of Growth Management Planning Council (GMPC) review of the AHC's recommended response to GMPC Motion 21-1,¹ the recommended components King County Council will potentially adopt and cities ratify, and changes to countywide and jurisdictional housing needs based on final data from the Washington State Department of Commerce (Commerce).

At the meeting, AHC members will review and provide feedback on proposed GMPC member amendments to the AHC's recommendations. Staff will share AHC input with the GMPC at their March 22 meeting, where the GMPC may vote to approve the AHC recommendations.

This staff report includes three exhibits which offer details to support the staff briefing:

- **[Exhibit 1: Proposed GMPC Member Amendments to the AHC's Recommended Response to GMPC Motion 21-1](#)** GMPC member proposed amendments to the AHC's recommendations staff analysis, and draft staff positions on the amendments
- **[Exhibit 2: All Amendments to the 2021 Countywide Planning Policies](#)** All recommended Countywide Planning Policy (CPP) amendments, including staff-proposed amendments in response to GMPC member amendments, AHC's recommended amendments, and staff's administrative amendments. Staff amendments include updated countywide and jurisdictional housing need projections ([Tables H-1](#) and [H-2](#)) based on final housing needs data from Commerce) and technical corrections to fix missing punctuation, address incorrect underlining, and other changes that are intended and expected to have a de minimus effect.
- **[Exhibit 3: Net Change in Jurisdictional Housing Need Between October 2022 Draft and March 2023 Final Housing Needs](#)** A table showing the difference between a jurisdiction's final and draft net new housing needs data.

Background

On December 29, 2022, the AHC transmitted recommended CPP amendments in response to GMPC Motion 21-1.² These recommendations respond to the motion, which directed the AHC to complete, by the end of 2022, a collaborative process to:

¹ AHC's recommended response to GMPC Motion 21-1 [\[link\]](#)

² 2021 GMPC Motion 21-1 [\[link\]](#)

1. **Monitor and report** jurisdictional housing supply, housing affordability, housing needs, and income-restricted housing levels, including disparities between subregions and comparisons to established housing goals and targets, through the Regional Affordable Housing Dashboard and reporting.
2. Establish subregional or **jurisdictional affordable housing needs**, informed by local data and the data and methodology provided by Commerce.
3. Recommend to the GMPC an **accountability and implementation framework** for equitably meeting affordable housing needs across the region. The AHC will consider, at a minimum, the range of Development Patterns and Housing Chapter amendments proposed by GMPC members in June 2021 regarding understanding and accommodating housing need, holding jurisdictions accountable, and allocating resources.
4. Recommend to the GMPC any **CPP amendments** necessary to implement their recommendations.

GMPC Response to AHC Recommendations for GMPC Motion 21-1

GMPC Meeting

In advance of the January 25, 2023 GMPC meeting, the City of Kirkland and the Eastside Affordable Housing Coalition submitted letters expressing support for the AHC's recommended method of allocating jurisdictional housing needs.³ On January 25, AHC staff briefed the GMPC on the Committee's transmitted response to GMPC Motion 21-1. GMPC members considered their readiness to vote to approve the AHC's recommendations at the March 22 GMPC meeting.

A few members expressed that the amount of deliberation needed would likely delay approval to the May 17 GMPC meeting, but other GMPC members encouraged a March decision in order to help jurisdictions know which housing needs to plan for and to meet upcoming comprehensive plan deadlines. A Sound Cities Association (SCA) member also shared that the AHC and GMPC SCA caucuses would meet on February 23 to discuss the AHC's recommendations.

Sound Cities Association Joint GMPC and AHC Caucus Meeting

The two SCA causes met on February 23 as planned to jointly discuss the AHC recommendation. AHC Chair Claudia Balducci and AHC staff attended a portion of the meeting.

Proposed GMPC Amendments

GMPC members had until February 27 to submit proposed amendments to the AHC's recommendations and were instructed to focus amendments on concepts related to GMPC Motion 21-1, including:

- monitoring and reporting requirements on jurisdictional housing supply, housing affordability, housing needs, and income-restricted housing levels;
- establishing jurisdictional housing needs; and
- an accountability and implementation framework for equitably meeting affordable housing needs across the region.

³ The City of Kirkland's January 18, 2023 letter to the GMPC [\[link\]](#). Eastside Affordable Housing Coalition's January 24, 2023 letter to the GMPC [\[link\]](#)

GMPC member and King County Councilmember Sarah Perry submitted two CPP amendments by the amendment submission deadline. See Exhibit 1 for a summary of the proposed amendments and accompanying member effect statements.

The Housing Interjurisdictional Team and Interjurisdictional Team reviewed the proposed amendments and found both to be aligned with CPP goals but recommend an alternative location within the CPPs for one of the policy amendments. See Exhibit 1 for this staff recommendation.

At the March 16 AHC meeting, members can provide input to the GMPC on these proposed amendments.

Updated Countywide Housing Need Projections

On December 9, 2022, the AHC recommended a method of allocating countywide permanent and emergency housing needs based on October 2022 draft countywide housing need projections from Commerce. The AHC instructed AHC staff to update Tables H-1 and H-2 upon Commerce's release of final countywide need projections in early 2023 and report those changes to the GMPC.

On March 1, 2023, Commerce released final countywide housing need projections for King County.

The final countywide need projections for permanent housing reflect updated population projections and demographic data from the Office of Financial Management (OFM) since Commerce released draft projections in October 2022 and countywide emergency housing and permanent supportive housing need changes reflect updates to Commerce's methodology.⁴

As a result, in the final housing needs for King County:

- Total net new countywide and jurisdictional permanent housing needs countywide did not change. Total net new need both countywide and in jurisdictions is equivalent to adopted housing growth targets.
- Countywide and jurisdictional net new permanent housing needs shifted slightly, without affecting total housing unit needs countywide. Notable changes include a decrease in permanent supportive housing need and an increase in need at and above 120% of area median income (AMI).
- Net new emergency housing needs slightly increased as did the estimates of current supply.

Figure 1 illustrates the net change in countywide need between October 2022 and March 2023. Exhibit 3 illustrates these changes at the jurisdictional scale.

Figure 1: Comparison of Draft October 2022 and Final March 2023 Countywide Net New Housing Need

	King County Countywide Net New Permanent Housing Needs								Countywide Net New Emergency Housing Need
	Total	0-30%		>30-50%	>50-80%	>80-100%	>100-120%	>120%	
		Non-PSH	PSH						
Draft Needs	308,677	80,813	48,728	48,220	21,692	14,349	16,274	78,601	57,327
Final Needs	308,677	81,577	42,896	48,213	22,376	14,925	16,928	81,762	58,983
Net Change	0	764	(5,832)	(7)	684	576	654	3,161	1,656

⁴ Commerce reports that changes in emergency housing and permanent supportive housing projections are a result of changes in methodology as well as the fact that these needs are now graduated based on the population projection input into their model. Minor changes in the amount of permanent housing need in other income brackets are largely the result of replacing 2017 OFM population projections and demographic data with 2022 data, which reported a significant reduction in household size. This was caused by new data showing increases in the share of the population projected to be in higher age brackets where household sizes are smaller, resulting in higher projected need at and above 120% AMI.

AHC staff updated the [dashboard](#) and [Tables H-1](#) and [H-2](#) in the proposed CPP amendments with Commerce’s final projections using the allocation methods approved by the Committee. Staff also will brief the GMPC on these changes at their March 22 meeting.

Approval of AHC Recommendations

The AHC’s recommendation includes three components:

1. amendments to the CPPs necessary to implement its recommendations;
2. accountability framework process details; and
3. housing-focused comprehensive plan review standards.

Per the GMPC’s interlocal agreement, the GMPC recommends amendments to the Countywide Planning Policies to King County Council for approval, followed by a city ratification period. Staff project the approval and ratification process to conclude within the first quarter of 2024.

The GMPC typically approves procedural and implementation details of CPPs. Given this standard practice and after consulting with the HIJT and IJT, staff recommend that the GMPC approve the final two components of the recommendation—the accountability framework process details and housing-focused comprehensive plan review standards. King County Council would not adopt and cities would not ratify these two components.

Next Steps

The GMPC meets on March 22 to potentially vote to:

- approve the AHC’s recommended plan review standards and comprehensive plan review standards; and
- recommend King County Council adoption of CPP amendments needed to establish jurisdictional housing needs and an accountability framework for equitably meeting these needs. See Exhibit 2 for recommended CPP amendments.

At the March 22 GMPC meeting, AHC staff will brief the GMPC on changes to countywide and jurisdictional housing needs based on final data from Commerce and AHC input on the proposed GMPC member amendments. If the GMPC does not come to a decision, they may choose to delay their vote until May 17.

At the May 1 AHC meeting, staff will brief the Committee on the outcome of the March 22 GMPC meeting.

Approximately one month after approval, the GMPC Chair will transmit recommended CPP amendments to King County Council. Upon receipt of the GMPC’s recommendations, the King County Council may consider and potentially adopt their recommendations in the fourth quarter of 2023, followed by city and town potential ratification in the first quarter of 2024.

Date	Item
March 22	GMPC briefed on final housing need projections, considers AHC input on GMPC amendments and approval process, and potentially approves AHC recommendations.
May 1	AHC briefed on GMPC progress to approve AHC recommendations.
May 17	GMPC potentially approves AHC recommendations (if not approved in March). Recommended CPP amendments transmitted to King County Council within approximately 30 days.

Date	Item
Q4 2023	King County Council potentially adopts CPP amendments.
Q1 2024	Cities and towns in King County potentially ratify CPP amendments.

Exhibit 1: Proposed Growth Management Planning Council Amendments to the Affordable Housing Committee’s Recommended Response to Growth Management Planning Council Motion 21-1

OVERVIEW

In January 2023, the Growth Management Planning Council (GMPC) developed a process for members to propose amendments to the Affordable Housing Committee’s Recommendations [[LINK](#)]. An amendment proposal form was sent to GMPC members on January 30 with a deadline of February 27. The deadline was established to provide time for staff to compile and distribute the amendments, share them with the GMPC’s staff groups (the Interjurisdictional Team and Housing Interjurisdictional Team), the GMPC’s Affordable Housing Committee (AHC), and then distribute all the materials to GMPC in advance of its March 22 meeting.

By the February 23 deadline, one GMPC member submitted two amendments shown below in **red** in the first column. The table also includes member effect statements, staff review, and draft positions on the amendments. Staff-proposed amendments are shown in **red** in the fourth column.

AMENDMENTS

Amendment #1: King County Councilmember Sarah Perry

Member Proposed Amendment #1	Member Effect Statement	Review	DRAFT Position
HOUSING The Countywide Planning Policies in the Housing Chapter support a range of affordable, accessible, and healthy housing choices for current and future residents across King County . 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	The proposed CPP amendments remove countywide language in several policies and replace it with jurisdiction for consistency with the housing needs framework and new monitoring and reporting. This amendment would add “across King County” to the introductory text of the Housing Chapter to continue acknowledging that housing is a countywide issue that extends beyond the boundaries of a single jurisdiction.	This amendment is made to the introductory text of the housing chapter in the adopted 2021 Countywide Planning Policies. As noted in the Member Effect Statement, housing is a countywide-level issue not a jurisdiction-level issue. The member proposed amendment is consistent with this and does not impact any of the underlying requirements that are jurisdiction specific.	Support Member Proposed Amendment as written.

Member Proposed Amendment #1	Member Effect Statement	Review	DRAFT Position
<p>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 burden. 			

Amendment #2: King County Councilmember Sarah Perry

Member Proposed Amendment #2	Member Effect Statement	Review	DRAFT Position
<p>DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS</p> <p>DP-12 GMPC shall allocate <u>housing</u> residential and employment growth to each city and urban unincorporated area in the county. This allocation is predicated on:</p> <p>a) Accommodating the most recent 20-year population projection</p>	<p>Continuing to acknowledge the limited role of the Rural Area in the Regional Growth Strategy, this amendment would add support for residents of the Rural Area to have access to services in neighboring cities.</p>	<p>This amendment is made to a policy in the "Growth Targets" section of the Development Patterns chapter in the adopted 2021 Countywide Planning Policies that guides how growth targets are</p>	<p>Address Member Proposed Amendment by changing two policies related to this issue, as shown below.</p> <p>Amend Development Patterns chapter policy as follows:</p>

Member Proposed Amendment #2	Member Effect Statement	Review	DRAFT Position
<p>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;</p> <p>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 <u>supported by accessible services in neighboring cities</u>, and protection of designated Natural Resource Lands;</p> <p>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;</p> <p>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;</p>	<p>This is language is consistent with VISION 2050 and fits within the scope of GMPC Motion 21-1 because it speaks to the needs of residents that may be included in the urban focus of the housing work.</p>	<p>established. However, the CPPs do not allocate growth targets to the rural area.</p> <p>As noted in the Member Effect Statement, services to residents in the Rural Area are provided by neighboring cities. This is consistent with the long-standing practice in the CPPs, the County Comprehensive Plan, as well as in VISION 2050 policies and its regional growth strategy allocations.</p> <p>The 2021 CPPs already partially address this. In the "Places" section of the Economy chapter, the language states:</p> <p><i>"The Rural Area and Natural Resource Lands are important for their contribution to the regional food network, mining, timber, and craft industries, while Cities in the Rural Area are important for providing services to and being the economic centers for the surrounding Rural Area."</i></p>	<p>"DP-47 Limit growth in the Rural Area to prevent sprawl and the overburdening of rural services, minimize the need for new rural infrastructure, maintain rural character, and protect open spaces and the natural environment. <u>To limit growth pressure in the Rural Area, locate services in Cities in the Rural Area and cities that border the rural area.</u>"</p> <p>Amend Economy chapter text as follows:</p> <p>"The Rural Area and Natural Resource Lands are important for their contribution to the regional food network, mining, timber, and craft industries, while <u>Cities in the Rural Area cities</u> are important for providing <u>access to</u> services to and being the economic centers for the surrounding Rural Area."</p>

Member Proposed Amendment #2	Member Effect Statement	Review	DRAFT Position
<p>e) Improving jobs/housing balance consistent with the Regional Growth Strategy, both between counties in the region and within subareas in the county;</p> <p>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;</p> <p>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></p> <p>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>		<p>This language omits the important role that cities that share a border with the rural area play in providing services, and the policies in the “Rural Area” section of the Development Patterns chapter do not fully capture this idea.</p> <p>Expanding the language in the Economy chapter and in the “Rural Area” section of the Development Patterns chapter would be appropriate location for language changes to address the Member Proposed Amendment.</p>	

Exhibit 2: All Amendments to 2021 Countywide Planning Policies

All Countywide Planning Policy (CPP) amendments, including staff-proposed amendments in response to Growth Management Planning Council member proposed amendments (shown in red), AHC's recommended amendments, and staff's administrative amendments are shown. Administrative amendments correct for technical errors and represent revised Tables H-1 and H-2 to align with the Washington State Department of Commerce's finalized countywide housing need projections. All amendments are shown in ~~((strike through))~~ and underlined text.

In the Countywide Planning Policies Introduction, on page 6, amend as follows:

The King County Countywide Planning Policies

The Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs) create a shared and consistent framework for growth management planning for all jurisdictions in King County in accordance with RCW 36.70A.210, which requires the legislative authority of a county to adopt a countywide planning policy in cooperation with cities located in the county. The comprehensive plan for King County and the comprehensive plans for cities and towns in King County are developed from the framework that the CPPs establish. The 2021 Countywide Planning Policies, as amended, were designed to provide guidance in advance of the 2024 statutory update of comprehensive plans to incorporate changes to the regional policy framework and to reflect new priorities addressing equity and social justice within our communities.

In the Development Patterns Chapter, starting on page 21, amend as follows:

See proposed amendment in Exhibit 1, and see HIJT/IJT recommendation in DP-47 and Economy Chapter text:

DP-12 GMPC shall allocate ~~((residential))~~ housing and employment growth to each city and urban unincorporated area in the county. This allocation is predicated on:

- 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((-)); and
- h) 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.

DP-13 The Growth Management Planning Council shall:

- a) Update housing and employment growth targets and housing needs periodically to provide jurisdictions with up-to-date growth allocations to be used as the land use assumption in state-mandated comprehensive plan updates;
- b) Adopt housing and employment growth targets and housing needs in the Countywide Planning Policies pursuant to the procedure described in policy FW-1;
- c) Create a coordinated countywide process to reconcile and set growth targets that implements the Regional Growth Strategy through countywide shares of regional housing and ~~((jobs))~~ job growth, countywide shares of statewide housing needs, allocations to Regional Geographies, and individual jurisdictional growth targets;
- d) Ensure that each jurisdiction's growth targets and housing need are commensurate with their role in the Regional Growth Strategy by establishing a set of objective criteria and principles to guide how jurisdictional targets and housing needs are determined;
- e) Ensure that each jurisdiction's growth targets allow it to meet the need for housing affordable ~~((housing for))~~ to households with ((low-, very low-, and extremely low- ~~incomes))~~ moderate-, low-, very low-, and extremely low-incomes; and
- f) 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. Net new housing needs for the planning period are shown in Table H-1 and total projected housing needs are shown in Table H-2.

DP- 14 All jurisdictions shall accommodate housing and employment by:

- a) Using the adopted growth targets as the land use assumption for their comprehensive plan;
- b) Establishing local growth targets for regional growth centers and regional manufacturing/industrial centers, where applicable;
- c) Ensuring adopted comprehensive plans and zoning regulations provide sufficient capacity at appropriate densities for residential, commercial, and industrial uses that is sufficient to meet 20-year growth targets, allocated housing needs, and is consistent with the desired growth pattern described in VISION 2050;

- d) 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
- e) Transferring ~~((an))~~ and accommodating unincorporated area housing and employment targets and housing need as annexations occur.

In the Development Patterns Chapter, on page 33, amend as follows:

See proposed amendment in Exhibit 1, and see HIJT/IJT recommendation below:

DP-47 Limit growth in the Rural Area to prevent sprawl and the overburdening of rural services, minimize the need for new rural infrastructure, maintain rural character, and protect open spaces and the natural environment. To limit growth pressure in the Rural Area, locate services in Cities in the Rural Area and cities that border the rural area.

In the Housing Chapter, starting on page 36, amend as follows:

See proposed amendment in Exhibit 1; HIJT/IJT concurrence with proposed edit:

Housing

The Countywide Planning Policies in the Housing Chapter support a range of affordable, accessible, and healthy housing choices for current and future residents across King County. 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.

The policies reflect the region’s commitment to addressing the 2018 findings of the Regional Affordable Housing Task Force (Task Force). Key findings include:

- 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 burden.

~~((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”).))~~

Building on the Task Force’s work, this chapter establishes ~~((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.))~~ goals and policies to ensure all jurisdictions in King County plan for and accommodate their allocated share of ~~((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 in ~~((RCW))~~ Revised Code of Washington 36.70A.020 and 36.70A.070~~((+))~~ and the Countywide Planning Policies in this chapter.

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.

Housing unit production is one, but not the only means to measure whether a jurisdiction has planned for and accommodated housing needs. Success will primarily be defined by whether a jurisdiction has adopted and implemented policies and plans that, taken together and in light of available resources, can be reasonably expected to support and enable the production or preservation of units needed at each affordability level. Policies in this chapter do not require that jurisdictions act outside of current powers or assume full responsibility for the construction of units required to meet housing needs articulated in policy H-1.

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.

All communities must address housing need where it is greatest—housing affordable to extremely low-income households.

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. ~~((These policies))~~ The policies then guide jurisdictions through a ~~((four))~~-five step process:

1. ~~((Conduct))~~ conduct a housing inventory and analysis;
2. ~~((Implement))~~ implement policies and strategies to meet housing needs equitably;
3. review comprehensive plans;
4. ~~((Measure results and provide accountability))~~ monitor and report; and
5. ~~((Adjust))~~ adjust strategies to meet housing needs.

Overarching Goal: *Provide a full range of affordable, accessible, healthy, and safe housing choices to every resident in King County. All jurisdictions work to:*

- *preserve, improve, and expand their housing stock;*
- *promote fair and equitable access to housing for all people; and*
- *take actions that eliminate race-, place-, ability-, and income-based housing disparities.*

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

~~Table H-1 provides additional context on the countywide need for housing.¹~~

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 Conditions ²	105,000	31,000	23,000	159,000
Housing Units Needed to Address Growth Through 2044 ³	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%

Refer to Appendix 4 for the methodology used to calculate countywide need and 2019 jurisdictional affordability levels as compared to countywide need.))

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. Sufficient planning and accommodations are those that comply with the Growth Management Act requirements for housing elements in Revised Code of Washington 36.70A.020 and 36.70A.070, that outline regulatory and nonregulatory measures to implement the comprehensive plan (Washington Administrative Code 365-196-650), and that comply with policies articulated in this chapter. Projected countywide and jurisdictional net new housing needed to reach projected future need for the planning period is shown in Table H-1.¹

Table H-1: King County Countywide and Jurisdictional Housing Needs 2019-2044

		Countywide Net New Permanent Housing Units Needed, 2019-2044 ²							Countywide Net New Emergency Housing Needs ³	
		Total	0-30%		>30-50%	>50-80%	>80-100%	>100-120%	>120%	
			Non-PSH	PSH						
Countywide Total Future Housing Needed: 2044		1,269,628	113,790	49,064	139,718	177,590	195,934	136,061	457,471	65,054
Countywide Baseline Housing Supply: 2019 ⁴		960,951	32,213	6,168	91,505	155,214	181,009	119,133	375,709	6,071
Countywide Net New Housing Needed: 2019-2044		308,677	81,577	42,896	48,213	22,376	14,925	16,928	81,762	58,983
		Jurisdictional Net New Permanent Housing Units Needed, 2019-2044 ⁵							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	11,925	6,270	8,780	2,671	703	798	3,853	6,688
	Seattle	112,000	28,572	15,024	19,144	7,986	5,422	6,150	29,702	21,401
Core Cities	Auburn	12,000	1,543	812	309	616	1,146	1,299	6,275	2,293
	Bothell	5,800	2,100	1,105	819	654	147	167	808	1,108
	Burien	7,500	1,444	759	524	407	574	650	3,142	1,433
	Federal Way	11,260	1,799	946	842	208	981	1,112	5,372	2,152
	Issaquah	3,500	1,093	575	868	460	66	75	363	669
	Kent	10,200	1,872	984	788	318	820	929	4,489	1,949
	Kirkland	13,200	4,842	2,546	3,052	1,022	228	259	1,251	2,522
	Redmond	20,000	7,025	3,694	3,870	2,765	348	394	1,904	3,822
	Renton	17,000	4,110	2,161	1,624	1,019	1,062	1,205	5,819	3,248
	SeaTac	5,900	646	340	183	143	603	683	3,302	1,127
	Tukwila	6,500	896	471	274	214	610	692	3,343	1,242
	High Capacity Transit	Des Moines	3,800	790	415	231	227	281	318	1,538
Kenmore		3,070	1,063	559	483	393	75	85	412	587
Lake Forest Park		870	313	164	143	140	14	16	80	166
Mercer Island		1,239	339	178	202	488	4	5	23	237
Newcastle		1,480	627	329	433	22	9	10	50	283
Shoreline		13,330	3,617	1,902	2,710	740	573	650	3,138	2,547

Cities and Towns	<u>Woodinville</u>	<u>2,033</u>	<u>854</u>	<u>449</u>	<u>354</u>	<u>156</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>158</u>	<u>388</u>
	<u>Algona</u>	<u>170</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>76</u>	<u>32</u>
	<u>Beaux Arts⁵</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	<u>Black Diamond</u>	<u>2,900</u>	<u>745</u>	<u>392</u>	<u>203</u>	<u>410</u>	<u>151</u>	<u>171</u>	<u>828</u>	<u>554</u>
	<u>Carnation</u>	<u>799</u>	<u>239</u>	<u>126</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>85</u>	<u>43</u>	<u>48</u>	<u>235</u>	<u>153</u>
	<u>Clyde Hill</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	-	-	-	<u>2</u>
	<u>Covington</u>	<u>4,310</u>	<u>1,016</u>	<u>535</u>	<u>603</u>	-	<u>283</u>	<u>321</u>	<u>1,552</u>	<u>824</u>
	<u>Duvall</u>	<u>890</u>	<u>268</u>	<u>141</u>	-	<u>266</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>155</u>	<u>170</u>
	<u>Enumclaw</u>	<u>1,057</u>	<u>162</u>	<u>85</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>61</u>	<u>93</u>	<u>106</u>	<u>511</u>	<u>202</u>
	<u>Hunts Point⁵</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	<u>Maple Valley</u>	<u>1,720</u>	<u>542</u>	<u>285</u>	<u>320</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>72</u>	<u>81</u>	<u>394</u>	<u>329</u>
	<u>Medina</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>8</u>	-	-	-	<u>4</u>
	<u>Milton</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>7</u>	-	<u>8</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>10</u>
	<u>Normandy Park</u>	<u>153</u>	<u>41</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>29</u>
	<u>North Bend</u>	<u>1,748</u>	<u>433</u>	<u>228</u>	<u>121</u>	<u>221</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>111</u>	<u>536</u>	<u>334</u>
	<u>Pacific</u>	<u>135</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>26</u>
	<u>Sammamish</u>	<u>2,100</u>	<u>950</u>	<u>499</u>	<u>419</u>	<u>232</u>	-	-	-	<u>401</u>
	<u>Skykomish</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	-	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>2</u>
	<u>Snoqualmie</u>	<u>1,500</u>	<u>472</u>	<u>248</u>	<u>233</u>	<u>82</u>	<u>61</u>	<u>69</u>	<u>335</u>	<u>287</u>
	<u>Yarrow Point</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	-	-	-	<u>2</u>
	UU <u>Urban</u>									
	<u>Unincorporated⁶</u>	<u>5,412</u>	<u>1,157</u>	<u>608</u>	<u>571</u>	<u>292</u>	<u>366</u>	<u>415</u>	<u>2,003</u>	<u>1,034</u>

((⁴Table 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 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.)

³Estimates of housing units needed to address growth assume income distribution of households added through growth is the same as existing income distribution.)

¹ Refer to Table H-2 in Appendix 4 for countywide and jurisdictional future housing needed in 2044 and baseline housing supply in 2019.

²The 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.

³ "Emergency Housing" includes emergency housing and emergency shelter and is in addition to permanent housing needs

⁴ 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.

⁵ Beaux 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.

⁶ This includes all Potential Annexation Areas within the High Capacity Transit Communities and Urban Unincorporated King County regional geographies.

In the Housing Chapter, on page 38, amend as follows:

~~((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.))~~

In the Housing Chapter, starting on page 39, amend as follows. Renumber policies H-6-H-10 as H-5-H-9, respectively:

~~H-((4))~~**3** 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:

- 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:
 - 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;
- b) Number of existing housing units by housing type, age, number of bedrooms, condition, tenure, and ~~((AMI))~~ area median income limit (for income-restricted units);
- c) Number of existing emergency housing, emergency shelters, and permanent supportive housing facilities and units or beds, as applicable;
- d) Percentage and geographic distribution of residential land zoned for ~~((and geographic distribution of))~~ moderate- and high-density housing and accessory dwelling units in the jurisdiction;
- e) 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;
- f) Household characteristics, by race/ethnicity:
 - 1) ~~((Income))~~ income (median and by ~~((AMI))~~ area median income bracket),
 - 2) ~~((Tenure))~~ tenure (renter or homeowner),
 - 3) ~~((Size))~~~~((4))~~ ~~((Housing))~~ housing cost burden and severe housing cost burden;

- g) Current population characteristics:
 - 1) ~~((Age))~~ age by race/ethnicity;
 - 2) ~~((Disability))~~ disability;
- h) Projected population growth;
- i) Housing development capacity within a half-mile walkshed of high-capacity or frequent transit service, if applicable;
- j) Ratio of housing to jobs in the jurisdiction;
- k) Summary of existing and proposed partnerships and strategies, including dedicated resources, for meeting ~~((countywide))~~ housing needs, particularly for populations disparately impacted;
- l) 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;
- m) The housing needs of communities experiencing disproportionate harm of housing inequities including Black, Indigenous, and People of Color ~~((BIPOC))~~; and
- n) 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.

H-~~((5))~~4 Evaluate the effectiveness of existing housing policies and strategies to meet ~~((a significant share of countywide need))~~ the jurisdiction's housing needs. Identify gaps in existing partnerships, policies, and dedicated resources for meeting ~~((the countywide))~~ housing needs and eliminating racial and other disparities in access to housing and neighborhoods of choice.

In the Housing Chapter, on page 42, amend as follows. Renumber policies H-11 and H-12 as H-10 and H-11, respectively:

Increased Housing Supply, Particularly for Households with the Greatest Needs

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.

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.

In the Housing Chapter, on page 44, amend as follows. Renumber policies H-20 and H-21 as H-21 and H-22, respectively:

H-20 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.

In the Housing Chapter, starting on page 45, amend as follows. Renumber policies H-23 and H-24 as H-24 and H-25, respectively:

H-((22))23 Adopt and implement policies that protect housing stability for renter households; expand protections and supports for moderate-, low-, very low- and extremely low-income renters and renters with disabilities.

~~((Measure Results and Provide Accountability))~~ Review, Monitor, Report, and Adjust

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.

Review Comprehensive Plans

H-26 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:

- Offer early guidance and assistance to jurisdictions on comprehensive plan alignment with the CPP Housing Chapter;
- Ensure plans address all Housing Chapter goals and policies and include required analyses;
- 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
- Collect data on jurisdictional implementation details to inform future monitoring and evaluation during the remainder of the planning period.

Monitor and Report

Each jurisdiction has a responsibility to ~~((address))~~ plan for and accommodate its share of the countywide housing need. The ~~((county))~~ County and cities will collect and report housing data at least annually to help evaluate progress in ~~((planning for meeting this shared responsibility))~~ achieving the goals and advancing the policies of this chapter. The ~~((county))~~ County will help coordinate a ~~((transparent))~~ necessary data collection and ~~((sharing))~~ reporting process with cities. Further detail on monitoring and reporting procedures is contained in Appendix 4.

H-~~((25))~~27 Monitor progress toward meeting countywide and jurisdictional housing ~~((growth targets, countywide))~~ needs 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.

- a) Jurisdictions, including the ~~((county))~~ County for unincorporated areas, will report annually to the ~~((county))~~ County ~~((using guidance developed by the County on housing AMI levels))~~:
 - 1) In the first reporting year, total income-restricted units, total units, by tenure, ~~((AMI))~~ area median income limit, address, and term of rent and income restrictions, for which the ~~((city))~~ jurisdiction 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~~((-))~~;
 - 2) 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~~((-))~~;
 - 3) New strategies (e.g., land use code changes, dedicated fund sources, conveyance of surplus property) implemented during the reporting period to advance the policies of this chapter. This includes strategies to increase housing diversity, ~~((or))~~ strategies to increase the supply of income-restricted units in the jurisdiction and implementation details identified in the jurisdiction's comprehensive plan; and
 - 4) 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.
- b) The ~~((county))~~ County will, where feasible, consolidate housing data across jurisdictions ~~((to provide clarity and assist jurisdictions with housing data inventory))~~ and ~~((will))~~ report annually on:
 - 1) Countywide housing inventory of:

- i. Total housing units, by affordability to ~~((AMI))~~ area median income bands;
 - ii. Total income-restricted units, by ~~((AMI))~~ area median income 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, ~~((AMI))~~ area median income 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 ~~((county's))~~ County'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 ~~((county's))~~ County'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 H-~~((6))~~5~~((:))~~;
 - 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 in King County; and
 - 7) Number of individuals and households experiencing homelessness, by race and ethnicity.
- c) Where feasible ~~((jurisdictions will also collaborate to report))~~:
 - 1) Jurisdictions will collaborate to report ((Net)) net new units accessible to persons with disabilities((:));and
 - 2) 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.

~~H-((26))28~~ The ~~((county))~~ County will ~~((provide guidance to jurisdictions on goals for housing AMI levels annually))~~ provide necessary, ((transparent)) ongoing information ~~((measuring))~~ on jurisdictions' progress toward ~~((meeting countywide affordable housing need, according to H-25,))~~ planning for and accommodating their housing needs using public-facing tools such as the King County's Affordable Housing Dashboard. 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.

H-29 Five years after adoption of a periodic update to a comprehensive plan, the Growth Management Planning Council or its designee will review monitoring and reporting data collected through annual reporting and other local data and analysis. The Growth Management Planning Council will identify significant shortfalls in planning for and accommodating housing needs, provide findings that describe the nature of the shortfalls, and make recommendations that jurisdictions take action to address shortfalls. Jurisdictions with significant shortfalls shall identify and implement actions to address the shortfalls, such as amending the comprehensive plan, land use regulations, or other legislative or administrative actions. Implementation of this policy shall be coordinated with the requirement in Revised Code of Washington 36.70A.130(9)(c) to produce and take actions pursuant to a 5-year implementation progress report.

In the Economy Chapter, on page 51, amend as follows:

See proposed amendment in Exhibit 1, and HIJT/IJT recommendation below:

The Rural Area and Natural Resource Lands are important for their contribution to the regional food network, mining, timber, and craft industries, while ~~((Cities in the Rural Area))~~ cities are important for providing access to services ~~((to))~~ and being the economic centers for the surrounding Rural Area.

In Appendix 4: Housing Technical Appendix, starting on page 70, amend as follows:

Appendix 4: Housing Technical Appendix

Policy H-1: ~~((Countywide))~~ Housing Needs

Each jurisdiction, as part of its ~~((Comprehensive))~~ comprehensive ((Plan)) 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 ~~((extremely low-, very low-, and low-))~~ moderate-, low-, very- low-, and extremely- low-income housing, as well as permanent supportive housing and emergency housing, a ~~((four-step))~~ five-step approach should be followed:

1. ~~((Conduct))~~ conduct a housing inventory and analysis;
2. ~~((Implement))~~ implement policies and strategies to equitably meet housing needs;
3. review comprehensive plans;
4. ~~((Measure results and provide accountability))~~ monitor and report; and
5. ~~((Adjust))~~ adjust strategies to meet housing needs.

~~((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.~~

Estimating Local Housing Need

~~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:~~

- ~~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:~~
- ~~(i) Units for moderate, low, very low, and extremely low income households;~~

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:

- 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

The sample jurisdictional calculations use fictional data from Table H-3.

Table H-2: Fictional Jurisdictional Data

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	
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
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	15,75	15%	15,750	15%	19,950	19%	70,000	35,000	105,000

	0								
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
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			

Jurisdiction A: Large, generally unaffordable

Analysis: 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.

Potential Policy Response: 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.

Jurisdiction B: Medium, currently affordable to all but the lowest incomes

Analysis: Jurisdiction B is a medium-sized jurisdiction with a large supply of housing affordable to households at 31-80 percent of AMI. If that 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.))~~

Calculating Total Countywide Permanent and Emergency Housing Needs

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.

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 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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

County Method for Allocating Permanent Housing and Emergency Housing Needs

This section describes how countywide housing need was allocated to jurisdictions.

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.

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.

Net new countywide emergency housing need was allocated to jurisdictions based on their percent share of planned countywide housing growth.

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 provides 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.

Table H-2: King County Countywide and Jurisdictional Housing Needs 2019-2044

		Countywide Permanent Housing Needs ⁷								Countywide		
		Total	0-30%		>30-50%	>50-80%	>80-100%	>100-120%	>120%	Emergency		
			Non-PSH	PSH						Housing Needs ⁸		
Countywide Total Future Housing Needed: 2044		1,269,628	113,790	49,064	139,718	177,590	195,934	136,061	457,471	65,054		
Countywide Baseline Housing Supply: 2019 ⁹		960,951	32,213	6,168	91,505	155,214	181,009	119,133	375,709	6,071		
Countywide Net New Housing Needed: 2019-2044		308,677	81,577	42,896	48,213	22,376	14,925	16,928	81,762	58,983		
		Jurisdictional Permanent Housing Needs ¹⁰								Jurisdictional		
		Total	0-30%		>30-50%	>50-80%	>80-100%	>100-120%	>120%	Emergency		
			Non-PSH	PSH						Housing Needs ¹¹		
Metropolitan Cities	Bellevue	Total Future Need: 2044	99,687	13,680	6,392	11,121	8,213	13,622	9,186	37,473	6,888	
		Baseline Supply: 2019	64,687	1,755	122	2,341	5,542	12,919	8,388	33,620	200	
		Net New Need: 2019-2044	35,000	11,925	6,270	8,780	2,671	703	798	3,853	6,688	
	Seattle	Total Future Need: 2044	480,307	42,041	20,255	45,691	62,050	76,752	50,327	183,191	25,734	
		Baseline Supply: 2019	368,307	13,469	5,231	26,547	54,064	71,330	44,177	153,489	4,333	
		Net New Need: 2019-2044	112,000	28,572	15,024	19,144	7,986	5,422	6,150	29,702	21,401	
	Core Cities	Auburn	Total Future Need: 2044	40,049	2,619	1,049	8,338	8,691	5,573	4,601	9,178	2,351
			Baseline Supply: 2019	28,049	1,076	237	8,029	8,075	4,427	3,302	2,903	58
			Net New Need: 2019-2044	12,000	1,543	812	309	616	1,146	1,299	6,275	2,293
Bothell		Total Future Need: 2044	18,482	2,487	1,105	2,077	2,401	2,679	2,026	5,707	1,119	
		Baseline Supply: 2019	12,682	387	-	1,258	1,747	2,532	1,859	4,899	11	
		Net New Need: 2019-2044	5,800	2,100	1,105	819	654	147	167	808	1,108	
	Burien	Total Future Need: 2044	28,285	2,434	759	4,457	5,849	4,346	3,354	7,086	1,683	
		Baseline Supply: 2019	20,785	990	-	3,933	5,442	3,772	2,704	3,944	250	
		Net New Need: 2019-2044	7,500	1,444	759	524	407	574	650	3,142	1,433	
	Federal Way	Total Future Need: 2044	48,937	3,424	1,024	7,754	13,283	8,190	4,528	10,734	2,259	
		Baseline Supply: 2019	37,677	1,625	78	6,912	13,075	7,209	3,416	5,362	107	
		Net New Need: 2019-2044	11,260	1,799	946	842	208	981	1,112	5,372	2,152	
	Issaquah	Total Future Need: 2044	20,803	1,829	575	1,604	1,955	3,534	2,120	9,186	673	
		Baseline Supply: 2019	17,303	736	-	736	1,495	3,468	2,045	8,823	4	

High Capacity Transit	<u>Kent</u>	<u>Net New Need:</u> <u>2019-2044</u>	<u>3,500</u>	<u>1,093</u>	<u>575</u>	<u>868</u>	<u>460</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>75</u>	<u>363</u>	<u>669</u>
		<u>Total Future</u> <u>Need: 2044</u>	<u>59,357</u>	<u>3,953</u>	<u>984</u>	<u>9,770</u>	<u>15,367</u>	<u>11,275</u>	<u>8,142</u>	<u>9,866</u>	<u>2,118</u>
		<u>Baseline Supply:</u> <u>2019</u>	<u>49,157</u>	<u>2,081</u>	<u>-</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:</u> <u>2019-2044</u>	<u>10,200</u>	<u>1,872</u>	<u>984</u>	<u>788</u>	<u>318</u>	<u>820</u>	<u>929</u>	<u>4,489</u>	<u>1,949</u>
	<u>Kirkland</u>	<u>Total Future</u> <u>Need: 2044</u>	<u>53,218</u>	<u>5,882</u>	<u>2,558</u>	<u>4,836</u>	<u>4,756</u>	<u>8,369</u>	<u>5,472</u>	<u>21,345</u>	<u>2,671</u>
		<u>Baseline Supply:</u> <u>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:</u> <u>2019-2044</u>	<u>13,200</u>	<u>4,842</u>	<u>2,546</u>	<u>3,052</u>	<u>1,022</u>	<u>228</u>	<u>259</u>	<u>1,251</u>	<u>2,522</u>
	<u>Redmond</u>	<u>Total Future</u> <u>Need: 2044</u>	<u>51,739</u>	<u>7,778</u>	<u>3,752</u>	<u>5,274</u>	<u>4,949</u>	<u>9,618</u>	<u>5,233</u>	<u>15,135</u>	<u>4,023</u>
		<u>Baseline Supply:</u> <u>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:</u> <u>2019-2044</u>	<u>20,000</u>	<u>7,025</u>	<u>3,694</u>	<u>3,870</u>	<u>2,765</u>	<u>348</u>	<u>394</u>	<u>1,904</u>	<u>3,822</u>
	<u>Renton</u>	<u>Total Future</u> <u>Need: 2044</u>	<u>60,362</u>	<u>5,520</u>	<u>2,393</u>	<u>7,830</u>	<u>10,278</u>	<u>11,925</u>	<u>8,193</u>	<u>14,223</u>	<u>3,362</u>
		<u>Baseline Supply:</u> <u>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:</u> <u>2019-2044</u>	<u>17,000</u>	<u>4,110</u>	<u>2,161</u>	<u>1,624</u>	<u>1,019</u>	<u>1,062</u>	<u>1,205</u>	<u>5,819</u>	<u>3,248</u>
	<u>SeaTac</u>	<u>Total Future</u> <u>Need: 2044</u>	<u>17,674</u>	<u>960</u>	<u>352</u>	<u>3,217</u>	<u>4,184</u>	<u>2,886</u>	<u>1,558</u>	<u>4,517</u>	<u>1,127</u>
		<u>Baseline Supply:</u> <u>2019</u>	<u>11,774</u>	<u>314</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>3,034</u>	<u>4,041</u>	<u>2,283</u>	<u>875</u>	<u>1,215</u>	<u>-</u>
		<u>Net New Need:</u> <u>2019-2044</u>	<u>5,900</u>	<u>646</u>	<u>340</u>	<u>183</u>	<u>143</u>	<u>603</u>	<u>683</u>	<u>3,302</u>	<u>1,127</u>
	<u>Tukwila</u>	<u>Total Future</u> <u>Need: 2044</u>	<u>15,243</u>	<u>1,148</u>	<u>559</u>	<u>2,548</u>	<u>3,275</u>	<u>2,210</u>	<u>1,317</u>	<u>4,186</u>	<u>1,242</u>
		<u>Baseline Supply:</u> <u>2019</u>	<u>8,743</u>	<u>252</u>	<u>88</u>	<u>2,274</u>	<u>3,061</u>	<u>1,600</u>	<u>625</u>	<u>843</u>	<u>-</u>
		<u>Net New Need:</u> <u>2019-2044</u>	<u>6,500</u>	<u>896</u>	<u>471</u>	<u>274</u>	<u>214</u>	<u>610</u>	<u>692</u>	<u>3,343</u>	<u>1,242</u>
	<u>Des Moines</u>	<u>Total Future</u> <u>Need: 2044</u>	<u>17,022</u>	<u>1,246</u>	<u>415</u>	<u>2,857</u>	<u>3,537</u>	<u>2,933</u>	<u>1,948</u>	<u>4,086</u>	<u>726</u>
		<u>Baseline Supply:</u> <u>2019</u>	<u>13,222</u>	<u>456</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>2,626</u>	<u>3,310</u>	<u>2,652</u>	<u>1,630</u>	<u>2,548</u>	<u>-</u>
		<u>Net New Need:</u> <u>2019-2044</u>	<u>3,800</u>	<u>790</u>	<u>415</u>	<u>231</u>	<u>227</u>	<u>281</u>	<u>318</u>	<u>1,538</u>	<u>726</u>
	<u>Kenmore</u>	<u>Total Future</u> <u>Need: 2044</u>	<u>12,659</u>	<u>1,422</u>	<u>559</u>	<u>1,318</u>	<u>1,576</u>	<u>1,352</u>	<u>1,602</u>	<u>4,830</u>	<u>620</u>
		<u>Baseline Supply:</u> <u>2019</u>	<u>9,589</u>	<u>359</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>835</u>	<u>1,183</u>	<u>1,277</u>	<u>1,517</u>	<u>4,418</u>	<u>33</u>
		<u>Net New Need:</u> <u>2019-2044</u>	<u>3,070</u>	<u>1,063</u>	<u>559</u>	<u>483</u>	<u>393</u>	<u>75</u>	<u>85</u>	<u>412</u>	<u>587</u>
	<u>Lake Forest Park</u>	<u>Total Future</u> <u>Need: 2044</u>	<u>6,434</u>	<u>441</u>	<u>173</u>	<u>428</u>	<u>515</u>	<u>712</u>	<u>1,056</u>	<u>3,109</u>	<u>166</u>
		<u>Baseline Supply:</u> <u>2019</u>	<u>5,564</u>	<u>128</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>285</u>	<u>375</u>	<u>698</u>	<u>1,040</u>	<u>3,029</u>	<u>-</u>
		<u>Net New Need:</u> <u>2019-2044</u>	<u>870</u>	<u>313</u>	<u>164</u>	<u>143</u>	<u>140</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>80</u>	<u>166</u>

Cities & Towns		2019-2044									
	<u>Mercer Island</u>	Total Future									
		Need: 2044	<u>11,808</u>	<u>613</u>	<u>178</u>	<u>487</u>	<u>674</u>	<u>1,510</u>	<u>1,239</u>	<u>7,107</u>	<u>237</u>
		Baseline Supply:									
		2019	<u>10,569</u>	<u>274</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>285</u>	<u>186</u>	<u>1,506</u>	<u>1,234</u>	<u>7,084</u>	<u>-</u>
		Net New Need:									
		2019-2044	<u>1,239</u>	<u>339</u>	<u>178</u>	<u>202</u>	<u>488</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>237</u>
	<u>Newcastle</u>	Total Future									
		Need: 2044	<u>6,952</u>	<u>703</u>	<u>329</u>	<u>566</u>	<u>399</u>	<u>614</u>	<u>514</u>	<u>3,827</u>	<u>283</u>
		Baseline Supply:									
		2019	<u>5,472</u>	<u>76</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>133</u>	<u>377</u>	<u>605</u>	<u>504</u>	<u>3,777</u>	<u>-</u>
		Net New Need:									
		2019-2044	<u>1,480</u>	<u>627</u>	<u>329</u>	<u>433</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>283</u>
	<u>Shoreline</u>	Total Future									
		Need: 2044	<u>37,372</u>	<u>4,776</u>	<u>1,991</u>	<u>4,234</u>	<u>4,499</u>	<u>5,059</u>	<u>4,109</u>	<u>12,704</u>	<u>2,620</u>
		Baseline Supply:									
		2019	<u>24,042</u>	<u>1,159</u>	<u>89</u>	<u>1,524</u>	<u>3,759</u>	<u>4,486</u>	<u>3,459</u>	<u>9,566</u>	<u>73</u>
		Net New Need:									
		2019-2044	<u>13,330</u>	<u>3,617</u>	<u>1,902</u>	<u>2,710</u>	<u>740</u>	<u>573</u>	<u>650</u>	<u>3,138</u>	<u>2,547</u>
	<u>Woodinville</u>	Total Future									
		Need: 2044	<u>7,928</u>	<u>921</u>	<u>449</u>	<u>640</u>	<u>625</u>	<u>1,360</u>	<u>902</u>	<u>3,031</u>	<u>388</u>
		Baseline Supply:									
		2019	<u>5,895</u>	<u>67</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>286</u>	<u>469</u>	<u>1,331</u>	<u>869</u>	<u>2,873</u>	<u>-</u>
		Net New Need:									
		2019-2044	<u>2,033</u>	<u>854</u>	<u>449</u>	<u>354</u>	<u>156</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>158</u>	<u>388</u>
	<u>Algona</u>	Total Future									
		Need: 2044	<u>1,219</u>	<u>55</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>318</u>	<u>407</u>	<u>196</u>	<u>88</u>	<u>138</u>	<u>32</u>
		Baseline Supply:									
		2019	<u>1,049</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>310</u>	<u>400</u>	<u>182</u>	<u>72</u>	<u>62</u>	<u>-</u>
		Net New Need:									
		2019-2044	<u>170</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>76</u>	<u>32</u>
	<u>Beaux Arts</u>	Total Future									
		Need: 2044	<u>120</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>94</u>	<u>-</u>
		Baseline Supply:									
		2019	<u>119</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>94</u>	<u>-</u>
		Net New Need:									
		2019-2044	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>
	<u>Black Diamond</u>	Total Future									
		Need: 2044	<u>4,742</u>	<u>826</u>	<u>392</u>	<u>445</u>	<u>641</u>	<u>512</u>	<u>498</u>	<u>1,428</u>	<u>554</u>
		Baseline Supply:									
		2019	<u>1,842</u>	<u>81</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>242</u>	<u>231</u>	<u>361</u>	<u>327</u>	<u>600</u>	<u>-</u>
		Net New Need:									
		2019-2044	<u>2,900</u>	<u>745</u>	<u>392</u>	<u>203</u>	<u>410</u>	<u>151</u>	<u>171</u>	<u>828</u>	<u>554</u>
	<u>Carnation</u>	Total Future									
		Need: 2044	<u>1,614</u>	<u>244</u>	<u>126</u>	<u>164</u>	<u>215</u>	<u>130</u>	<u>111</u>	<u>624</u>	<u>153</u>
		Baseline Supply:									
		2019	<u>815</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>141</u>	<u>130</u>	<u>87</u>	<u>63</u>	<u>389</u>	<u>-</u>
		Net New Need:									
		2019-2044	<u>799</u>	<u>239</u>	<u>126</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>85</u>	<u>43</u>	<u>48</u>	<u>235</u>	<u>153</u>
	<u>Clyde Hill</u>	Total Future									
		Need: 2044	<u>1,106</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>52</u>	<u>104</u>	<u>865</u>	<u>2</u>
		Baseline Supply:									
		2019	<u>1,096</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>52</u>	<u>104</u>	<u>865</u>	<u>-</u>
		Net New Need:									
		2019-2044	<u>10</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>2</u>
	<u>Covington</u>	Total Future	<u>11,460</u>	<u>1,087</u>	<u>535</u>	<u>1,165</u>	<u>1,821</u>	<u>1,875</u>	<u>1,457</u>	<u>3,520</u>	<u>824</u>

	Need: 2044									
	Baseline Supply:									
	2019	<u>7,150</u>	<u>71</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>562</u>	<u>1,821</u>	<u>1,592</u>	<u>1,136</u>	<u>1,968</u>	<u>-</u>
	Net New Need:									
<u>Duvall</u>	2019-2044	<u>4,310</u>	<u>1,016</u>	<u>535</u>	<u>603</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>283</u>	<u>321</u>	<u>1,552</u>	<u>824</u>
	Total Future									
	Need: 2044	<u>3,668</u>	<u>316</u>	<u>141</u>	<u>221</u>	<u>341</u>	<u>323</u>	<u>321</u>	<u>2,005</u>	<u>195</u>
	Baseline Supply:									
<u>Enumclaw</u>	2019	<u>2,778</u>	<u>48</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>221</u>	<u>75</u>	<u>295</u>	<u>289</u>	<u>1,850</u>	<u>25</u>
	Net New Need:									
	2019-2044	<u>890</u>	<u>268</u>	<u>141</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>266</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>155</u>	<u>170</u>
	Total Future									
<u>Hunts Point</u>	Need: 2044	<u>6,422</u>	<u>436</u>	<u>85</u>	<u>1,520</u>	<u>1,665</u>	<u>1,141</u>	<u>461</u>	<u>1,114</u>	<u>202</u>
	Baseline Supply:									
	2019	<u>5,365</u>	<u>274</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>1,481</u>	<u>1,604</u>	<u>1,048</u>	<u>355</u>	<u>603</u>	<u>-</u>
	Net New Need:									
<u>Maple Valley</u>	2019-2044	<u>1,057</u>	<u>162</u>	<u>85</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>61</u>	<u>93</u>	<u>106</u>	<u>511</u>	<u>202</u>
	Total Future									
	Need: 2044	<u>186</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>147</u>	<u>-</u>
	Baseline Supply:									
<u>Medina</u>	2019	<u>185</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>147</u>	<u>-</u>
	Net New Need:									
	2019-2044	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>
	Total Future									
<u>Milton</u>	Need: 2044	<u>11,155</u>	<u>706</u>	<u>285</u>	<u>752</u>	<u>1,070</u>	<u>2,372</u>	<u>2,065</u>	<u>3,905</u>	<u>329</u>
	Baseline Supply:									
	2019	<u>9,435</u>	<u>164</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>432</u>	<u>1,044</u>	<u>2,300</u>	<u>1,984</u>	<u>3,511</u>	<u>-</u>
	Net New Need:									
<u>North Bend</u>	2019-2044	<u>1,720</u>	<u>542</u>	<u>285</u>	<u>320</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>72</u>	<u>81</u>	<u>394</u>	<u>329</u>
	Total Future									
	Need: 2044	<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>
	Baseline Supply:									
<u>Normandy Park</u>	2019	<u>1,132</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>45</u>	<u>107</u>	<u>904</u>	<u>-</u>
	Net New Need:									
	2019-2044	<u>19</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>4</u>
	Total Future									
<u>Pacific</u>	Need: 2044	<u>737</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>211</u>	<u>119</u>	<u>224</u>	<u>74</u>	<u>82</u>	<u>10</u>
	Baseline Supply:									
	2019	<u>687</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>211</u>	<u>111</u>	<u>221</u>	<u>71</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>-</u>
	Net New Need:									
<u>North Bend</u>	2019-2044	<u>50</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>10</u>
	Total Future									
	Need: 2044	<u>2,960</u>	<u>170</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>166</u>	<u>285</u>	<u>230</u>	<u>826</u>	<u>1,262</u>	<u>29</u>
	Baseline Supply:									
<u>North Bend</u>	2019	<u>2,807</u>	<u>129</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>134</u>	<u>268</u>	<u>224</u>	<u>820</u>	<u>1,232</u>	<u>-</u>
	Net New Need:									
	2019-2044	<u>153</u>	<u>41</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>29</u>
	Total Future									
<u>North Bend</u>	Need: 2044	<u>4,699</u>	<u>562</u>	<u>228</u>	<u>526</u>	<u>626</u>	<u>462</u>	<u>383</u>	<u>1,912</u>	<u>334</u>
	Baseline Supply:									
	2019	<u>2,951</u>	<u>129</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>405</u>	<u>405</u>	<u>364</u>	<u>272</u>	<u>1,376</u>	<u>-</u>
	Net New Need:									
<u>Pacific</u>	2019-2044	<u>1,748</u>	<u>433</u>	<u>228</u>	<u>121</u>	<u>221</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>111</u>	<u>536</u>	<u>334</u>
	Total Future									
	Need: 2044	<u>2,601</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>814</u>	<u>889</u>	<u>474</u>	<u>157</u>	<u>195</u>	<u>26</u>

UU ¹²	Sammamish	Baseline Supply:									
		2019	2,466	37	-	810	883	462	144	130	-
		Net New Need:									
		2019-2044	135	23	12	4	6	12	13	65	26
		Total Future									
		Need: 2044	24,643	1,060	499	760	773	1,899	2,024	17,628	401
	Skykomish	Baseline Supply:									
		2019	22,543	110	-	341	541	1,899	2,024	17,628	-
		Net New Need:									
		2019-2044	2,100	950	499	419	232	-	-	-	401
		Total Future									
		Need: 2044	163	11	1	67	19	25	7	33	2
	Snoqualmie	Baseline Supply:									
		2019	153	9	-	67	18	24	6	29	-
		Net New Need:									
		2019-2044	10	2	1	-	1	1	1	4	2
		Total Future									
		Need: 2044	6,174	521	248	379	349	413	630	3,634	318
UU ¹²	Yarrow Point	Baseline Supply:									
		2019	4,674	49	-	146	267	352	561	3,299	31
		Net New Need:									
		2019-2044	1,500	472	248	233	82	61	69	335	287
		Total Future									
		Need: 2044	423	8	2	7	9	20	39	338	2
	Urban Unincorporated	Baseline Supply:									
		2019	413	4	-	4	8	20	39	338	-
		Net New Need:									
		2019-2044	10	4	2	3	1	-	-	-	2
		Total Future									
		Need: 2044	90,067	3,770	608	7,079	11,218	11,018	9,252	47,122	1,109
UU ¹²	Urban Unincorporated	Baseline Supply:									
		2019	84,655	2,613	-	6,508	10,926	10,652	8,837	45,119	75
		Net New Need:									
		2019-2044	5,412	1,157	608	571	292	366	415	2,003	1,034

⁷ 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.

⁸ "Emergency Housing" includes emergency housing and emergency shelter and is in addition to permanent housing needs.

⁹ 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.

¹⁰ Beaux 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.

¹¹ "Emergency Housing" includes emergency housing and emergency shelter and is in addition to permanent housing needs.

¹² This includes all Potential Annexation Areas within the High Capacity Transit Communities and Urban Unincorporated King County regional geographies.

In Appendix 4: Housing Technical Appendix, starting on page 74, amend as follows:

Policy H-3: Housing Supply and Needs Analysis

As set forth in policy H-((4))3, 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 ~~((Housing))~~ housing ~~((Elements))~~ 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 4, the))~~ The housing analysis must ~~((consider local as well as countywide housing needs))~~ include the jurisdiction's established housing needs expressed in Table H-1 and Table H-2 because each jurisdiction has a responsibility to ~~((address))~~ plan for and accommodate its allocated share of the countywide ~~((affordable))~~ housing needs.

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)))~~ (February 2023)," 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 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 Jurisdiction	Housing Units (HU) 2017 ^a								HU 2019 ^b	
	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%	6,263	11%	46,400	81%	57,327	62,372
Seattle	10,330	6%	32,655	10%	55,910	17%	212,875	66%	320,770	367,806
Core Cities										
Auburn	1,235	5%	9,400	38%	6,590	26%	7,660	31%	24,985	27,291
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
Clyde 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
Enumclaw	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	1,223
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%	2,290	2,783
Pacific	40	2%	934	39%	840	35%	600	25%	2,414	2,460
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	92,179
Countywide Total HU, 2017⁵	38,539	5%	109,333	13%	160,401	19%	538,834	64%	847,107	956,128
Countywide Total HU, 2019⁶	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	

⁴Source: CHAS 2013-2017 (released August 25, 2020)

⁵Source: 2019 data from Office of Financial Management's April 1 postcensal estimates of housing: 1980, 1990-present. Percentages are rounded.

⁶Extrapolated 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.))

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))~~ County datasets, ~~((state))~~ State datasets, and ~~((federal))~~ 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 1979, built 1960 to 1969, built 1950 to 1959, built 1940 to 1949, built 1939 or earlier.
- *Number of bedrooms* means no bedroom, 1 bedroom, 2 or 3 bedrooms, and 4 or more bedrooms.
- *Condition* means lacking complete plumbing facilities, lacking complete kitchen facilities, and/or no telephone service available.
- *Tenure* means renter-occupied and owner-occupied.
- *Income-restricted units* should be reported by ~~((AMI))~~ area median income limit (i.e., \leq 30 percent ~~((AMI))~~ area median income, \leq 50 percent ~~((AMI))~~ area median income, and \leq 80 percent ~~((AMI))~~ area median income).
- *Moderate-density housing* 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.
- 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.
- *Household income by* ~~((AMI))~~ area median income means equal to or less than 30 percent ~~((AMI))~~ area median income, above 30 percent to 50 percent ~~((AMI))~~ area median income; above 50 percent to 80 percent ~~((AMI))~~ area median income, above 80 percent to 100 percent ~~((AMI))~~ area median income, above 100 percent to 120 percent ~~((AMI))~~ area median income, and above 120 percent ~~((AMI))~~ area median income.
- *Housing cost burden* means a household spends more than 30 percent of its household income on housing costs.
- *Severe housing cost burden* means a household spends more than 50 percent of its household income on housing costs.
- *Displacement risk* means where residents and businesses are at greater risk of displacement based on ~~((PSRC's))~~ Puget Sound Regional Council's index or equivalent composite set of risk indicators such as: socio-demographics, transportation qualities, neighborhood characteristics, housing, and civic engagement.

Policy H-~~((5))~~4: Evaluate Effectiveness

Prior to updating their comprehensive plan, a jurisdiction must evaluate the effectiveness of existing housing policies and strategies to ~~((meet))~~ plan for and accommodate ~~((a significant))~~

their allocated 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.

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.

Policy H-((6))5: Racial Exclusion and Discrimination

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:

- 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.

Jurisdictions must also identify local policies and regulations that result in racially disparate impacts, displacement, and exclusion in housing, including but not limited to:

- zoning that may have a discriminatory effect;

- disinvestment; and
- infrastructure availability.

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.

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.

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.

For further guidance on this analysis, refer to guidance on conducting a racially disparate impact analysis from the Department of Commerce.

Policy H-((7))6: Collaborate Regionally

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:

- 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.

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.

Partners collaborating with jurisdictions are encouraged to support the following needs:

- 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.

Policies H-((9))8 through H-((24))25: Implement Policies and Strategies to Meet Housing Needs Equitably

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 Program ⁽⁽⁷⁾⁾¹³ 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. 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-11 and on other adequate provisions jurisdictions can take to plan for and accommodate housing needs.

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.

((7))¹³ ((PSRC’s)) Puget Sound Regional Council’s Housing Innovations Program <https://www.psrc.org/hip>

In Appendix 4: Housing Technical Appendix, starting on page 83, amend as follows. Unamended sections of Table H-4 and sections with only renumbered policies from the following table are excluded. Renumber policies H-9, H-20, and H-21 to H-8, H-21, and H-22, respectively:

Table H-((3))<u>4</u> Suggested Strategies for Achieving Policy Goals	
Policy	Suggested Strategies
H-((10))<u>9</u> Adopt intentional, targeted actions that repair harms to Black, Indigenous, and People of Color ((B-POC)) households from past and current racially exclusive and discriminatory land use and housing practices (generally identified through Policy H-((6)) <u>5</u>). Promote equitable outcomes in partnership with communities most impacted.	<p>A suggested approach to identifying reparative strategies includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Looking at how current policies are working to undo past racially exclusive and discriminatory land use and housing practices or where they might be perpetuating that history When current policies are perpetuating the harm, implementing equitable countermeasures to remove those policies and their impacts and mitigate disparate impacts on housing choice, access, and affordability Using ((PSRC’s)) <u>Puget Sound Regional Council’s</u> Regional Equity Strategy and associated tools and resources to center equity in comprehensive planning processes and intended outcomes <p>Specific policies and strategies include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduce or eliminate exclusionary zoning Implement anti-displacement strategies, which include addressing housing stability for low-income renters and owners as well as preserving cultural diversity of the community Implement policies that increase affordable homeownership opportunities for Black, Indigenous, and People of Color communities Distribute affordable housing throughout a jurisdiction, with a focus on areas of opportunity

Table H-((3))4 Suggested Strategies for Achieving Policy Goals

Policy	Suggested Strategies
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider environmental health of neighborhoods where affordable housing exists or is planned and plan for environmentally healthy neighborhoods • Support and prioritize projects that promote access to opportunity, anti-displacement, and wealth-building opportunities for Black, Indigenous, and People of Color communities <p>Strategies for promoting equitable outcomes in partnership with communities most impacted include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Utilize an equity impact review tool when developing or implementing policies or strategies • Create and utilize a community engagement toolkit • Intentionally include and solicit engagement from members of communities of color or low-income households in policy decision-making and committees
<p>H-((11))10 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 ((meet)) <u>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

Table H-((3))4 Suggested Strategies for Achieving Policy Goals

Policy	Suggested Strategies
	<p>incentive/ inclusionary housing units to achieve deeper affordability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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-((12))11 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 care facilities; emergency housing; emergency shelters; permanent supportive housing; and within an urban growth area boundary, duplexes, triplexes, and townhomes.</p>	<p>((An approach to identifying sufficient capacity for housing types is:</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 any unhoused people may still need to provide sufficient capacity for this population if unmet need exists within the county or subregion • 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>Refer to the Washington State Department of Commerce's guidance on land capacity analysis for guidance on identifying sufficient capacity of land.</u></p>
<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><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</u></p>

Table H-((3))4 Suggested Strategies for Achieving Policy Goals

Policy	Suggested Strategies
	<p><u>plan policies and implementation of these policies end up supporting the intent of policy H-12. 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>
<p>H-13 Implement strategies to overcome cost barriers to housing affordability. Strategies to do this vary but can include updating development standards and regulations, shortening permit timelines, implementing online permitting, optimizing residential densities, reducing parking requirements, and developing programs, policies, partnerships, and incentives to decrease costs to build and preserve affordable housing.</p>	<p>Suggested strategies to overcome cost barriers to housing affordability to consider addressing include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce vehicular parking requirements • Reduce permitting timelines • Increase the predictability of the permitting process • Reduce sewer fees for affordable housing • Reduce utility, impact and other fees for affordable housing and ((Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs))) <u>accessory dwelling units</u>

Table H-((3))4 Suggested Strategies for Achieving Policy Goals

Policy	Suggested Strategies
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Streamline permitting process for affordable housing development and ((ADUs)) <u>accessory dwelling units</u> • Update building codes to promote more housing growth and innovative, low-cost development • Explore incentives similar to the Multifamily Tax Exemption for the development of ((ADUs)) <u>accessory dwelling units</u> for low-income households • Maximize and expand use of the Multifamily Tax Exemption • Offer suitable public land at reduced or no cost for affordable housing development • Before implementing a policy, consider how it will impact the cost to build affordable homes
<p>H-14 Prioritize the use of local and/ regional resources (e.g., funding, surplus property) for income-restricted housing, particularly for extremely low-income households, populations with special needs, and others with disproportionately greater housing needs. Consider projects that promote access to opportunity, anti-displacement, and wealth-building for Black, Indigenous, and People of Color communities to support implementation of policy H-10.</p>	<p>Suggested strategies to effectively prioritize the use of resources include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partner with communities most disproportionately impacted by the housing crisis, including extremely low-income households and Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (((BIPOC))) communities to inform resource design and allocation decisions. These decisions should prioritize strategies that reduce and undo disproportionate harm to these communities consistent, recognizing that specific needs of these communities may vary based on location • Identify and prioritize underutilized publicly owned land and nonprofit/ faith communities for the creation of income-restricted housing, both rental and homeownership • Prioritize sites near transit, quality schools, parks and other neighborhood amenities • Fund acquisition and development of prioritized sites • Prioritize public funding resources in a manner consistent with policy H-((9))8 • Consider the countywide median income levels of ((BIPOC)) <u>Black, Indigenous, and</u>

Table H-((3))4 Suggested Strategies for Achieving Policy Goals

Policy	Suggested Strategies
	<p><u>People of Color</u> households when designing affordable homeownership programs and set the affordability levels such that they are accessible to the median ((BPOC)) <u>Black, Indigenous, and People of Color</u> households considered</p>
<p>H-15 Increase housing choices for everyone—particularly those earning lower wages—that is co-located with, accessible to, or within a reasonable commute to major employment centers and affordable to all income levels. Ensure there are zoning ordinances and building policies in place that allow and encourage housing production at levels that improve jobs-housing balance throughout the county across all income levels.</p>	<p>Strategies to increase housing choice near employment and affordable to all include but are not limited to⁽⁽⁸⁾⁾¹⁴:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update zoning and land use regulations (including in single-family low-rise zones) to increase density and diversify housing choices, including but not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU) and Detached Accessory Dwelling Units (DADUs) ○ Duplex, Triplex, Four-plex ○ Zero lot line townhomes, row houses, and stacked flats ○ Micro/efficiency units ○ Manufactured housing preservation ○ Group homes ○ Foster care facilities ○ Emergency housing ○ Emergency shelters ○ Permanent supportive housing ○ Low-rise and high-density multifamily development ○ Housing development that accommodates large households and/or multiple bedrooms • Implement strategies that provide for affordable housing near employment centers, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Project-level tools like affordability covenants when funding income-restricted units or development agreements ○ Incentives such as density bonuses,

Table H-((3))4 Suggested Strategies for Achieving Policy Goals

Policy	Suggested Strategies
	<p>incentive zoning, or Multifamily Tax Exemption</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Other regulatory tools such as commercial linkage fees, inclusionary zoning, or TOD overlays ○ Other financial tools such as public land for affordable housing
<p>H-17 Support the development and preservation of income-restricted affordable housing that is within walking distance to planned or existing high-capacity and frequent transit.</p>	<p>Preservation strategies to consider include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify areas that may be at higher risk of displacement from market forces that occur with changes to zoning development regulations and public capital investments and establish anti-displacement policies, with consideration given to the preservation of historical and cultural communities as well as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ investments in low-, very low-, and extremely low-income housing equitable development initiatives ○ inclusionary zoning ○ community planning requirements; tenant protections ○ public land disposition policies ○ consideration of land that may be used for affordable housing • Collect data to better understand the impacts of growth, and the risks of residential, economic, and cultural displacement. Verify this data with residents at the greatest risk of displacement, particularly those most disproportionately impacted by housing cost burden and neighborhood-based small business owners. Supplement this information with regional data about displacement risk and ongoing displacement trends that can inform and drive policy and programs. • Prioritize affordable housing investments, incentives, and preservation tools in areas where increases in development capacity and new public capital investments are

Table H-((3))4 Suggested Strategies for Achieving Policy Goals

Policy	Suggested Strategies
	<p>anticipated to allow current low-income residents to stay</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the acquisition, rehabilitation, and preservation of income-restricted and naturally occurring affordable housing in areas with a high displacement risk, for long-term affordability serving households at or below 80 percent ((AMH)) <u>area median income</u> • Leverage new development to fund affordable housing in the same geography using zoning tools such as incentive/inclusionary zoning • Implement anti-displacement policies (e.g., community preference, tenant opportunity to purchase, no net loss of affordable units, right-to-return, community benefits agreements) • Prioritize publicly owned land for affordable housing in areas at high risk of displacement • Support community land trust and other permanent affordability models • Identify, preserve, and improve cultural assets • Increase education to maximize use of property tax relief programs to help sustain homeownership for low-income individuals • Expand targeted foreclosure prevention • Preserve manufactured housing communities and improve the quality of the housing and associated infrastructure to improve housing stability and health for the residents while also expanding housing choices affordable to these residents, including opportunities to cooperatively own their communities • Encourage programs to help homeowners access support needed to participate in and benefit from infill development
<p>H-19 Lower barriers to and promote access to affordable homeownership for extremely low-, very low-, and low-income, households. Emphasize:</p> <p>a. supporting long-term affordable</p>	<p>Suggested strategies to increase access to affordable homeownership for lower-income households include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support alternative homeownership models that lower barriers to ownership and provide

Table H-((3))4 Suggested Strategies for Achieving Policy Goals

Policy	Suggested Strategies
<p>homeownership opportunities for households at or below 80 percent ((AMI)) <u>area median income</u> (which may require up-front initial public subsidy and policies that support diverse housing types); and</p> <p>b. remedying historical inequities in and expanding access to homeownership opportunities for Black, Indigenous and People of Color communities.</p>	<p>long-term affordability, such as community land trusts, and limited or shared equity co-ops</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage programs to help homeowners, particularly low-income homeowners, access financing, technical support or other tools needed to participate in and benefit from infill development opportunities • Increase educational efforts to ensure maximum use of property tax relief programs to help sustain homeownership for low-income individuals • Expand targeted foreclosure prevention • Preserve existing manufactured housing communities through use-specific zoning or transfer of development rights
<p>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.</u></p>	<p><u>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:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Establishing partnerships with local community-based organizations headed by and/or serving populations most affected by housing cost burden, with a focus on Black, Indigenous, and People of Color-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, co-ops, 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</u>

Table H-((3))4 Suggested Strategies for Achieving Policy Goals

Policy	Suggested Strategies
	<p><u>community-serving uses and housing projects, in partnership with disparately impacted communities.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <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>H-((22))23 Adopt and implement policies that protect housing stability for renter households; expand protections and supports for <u>moderate-, low-, very low-, and extremely low-income</u> 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 • 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

Table H-((3))4 Suggested Strategies for Achieving Policy Goals

Policy	Suggested Strategies
	<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
<p>H-((23))24 Adopt and implement programs and policies that ensure healthy and safe homes.</p>	<p>Strategies to improve the quality and safety of housing include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish and promote healthy housing standards • Provide home repair assistance for households earning at or below 80 percent ((AMI)) <u>area median income</u> • Implement proactive rental inspection programs • Implement just cause eviction to protect tenants from landlords retaliating if they request basic maintenance and repairs to maintain a healthy and safe living environment • Partner with Aging & Disability organizations to integrate accessibility services <p>See the King County Board of Health Guideline and Recommendation on Healthy Housing for additional guidance. ((9))15</p>
<p>H-((24))25 Plan for residential neighborhoods that protect and promote the health and well-being of residents by supporting equitable access to parks and open space, safe pedestrian and bicycle routes, clean air, soil and water, fresh and healthy foods, high-quality education from early learning through ((K-12)) <u>kindergarten through twelfth grade</u>, affordable and high-quality transit options and living wage jobs and by avoiding or</p>	<p>When planning for residential neighborhoods that protect and promote health and well-being of residents, suggested strategies include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan for housing in conjunction with other infrastructure investments to support equitable access to opportunity for households with a range of incomes and ensure the siting of homes is not in close to environmental hazards and pollutants • Analyze disparities in access to amenities and invest in affordable housing in areas with high

Table H-((3))4 Suggested Strategies for Achieving Policy Goals	
Policy	Suggested Strategies
mitigating exposure to environmental hazards and pollutants.	access to these amenities while providing services and investment in areas where low-income people live

((8))¹⁴ ((PSRC's)) Puget Sound Regional Council's Housing Innovations Program ((HIP)) website provides a searchable database of dozens of suggested strategies. Please refer to their database for a more comprehensive list of strategies.

((9))¹⁵ See link: <https://kingcounty.gov/depts/health/board-of-health/~media/depts/health/board-of-health/documents/guidelines/guideline-recommendation-18-01-attachment-A.ashx>

((Policies H-25 and H-26: Measure Results and Provide Accountability))Review, Monitor, Report, and Adjust

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.

H-26: Comprehensive Plan Review

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.

H-27: Jurisdictional and County Reporting Requirements

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.

The purpose of (~~“measuring results and providing accountability”~~) monitoring and reporting is to motivate and enhance learning, collaboration, and progress. While some (~~(CPPs)~~) Housing Chapter Countywide Planning Policies 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.

~~((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.))~~

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.

H-28: Annual Monitoring

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.

H-~~(27)~~29: Adjust Strategies to Meet Housing Needs

~~((The data))~~ Data 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 (~~(the countywide)~~) housing 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.))~~

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 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.

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.

In the Glossary, on page 106, amend as follows:

Glossary

~~((**Countywide Need:** Also called the countywide affordable housing need, this is the number of additional, affordable homes needed in King County by 2044 so that no household earning at or below 80 percent of area median income is housing cost burdened. The countywide need for housing is estimated at 263,000 affordable homes affordable at or below 80 percent area median income built or preserved by 2044 as shown in Table H-1.))~~

Housing Needs: The number of housing units needed in King County by the end of the planning period to ensure sufficient and attainable housing for all households. Jurisdictional housing needs are shown in Table H-2.

Net New Housing Needs: The total number of new units needed in addition current housing units to meet projected housing needs by the end of the planning period.

Exhibit 3: Net Change in Jurisdictional Housing Need Between October 2022 Draft and March 2023 Final Housing Needs

		Net New Jurisdictional Permanent Housing Needs								Net New Jurisdictional Emergency Housing Needs
		Total	0-30%						Total	
			Non- PSH	PSH	>30- 50%	>50- 80%	>80- 100%	>100- 120%		
Bellevue	Draft Need	35,000	11,828	7,132	8,811	2,549	615	697	3,368	6,500
	Final Need	35,000	11,925	6,270	8,780	2,671	703	798	3,853	6,688
	Net Change	-	97	(862)	(31)	122	88	101	485	188
Seattle	Draft Need	112,000	28,336	17,085	19,183	7,732	5,211	5,910	28,543	20,800
	Final Need	112,000	28,572	15,024	19,144	7,986	5,422	6,150	29,702	21,401
	Net Change	-	236	(2,061)	(39)	254	211	240	1,159	601
Auburn	Draft Need	12,000	1,526	920	299	610	1,136	1,288	6,221	2,229
	Final Need	12,000	1,543	812	309	616	1,146	1,299	6,275	2,293
	Net Change	-	17	(108)	10	6	10	11	54	64
Bothell	Draft Need	5,800	2,079	1,253	813	641	133	151	730	1,077
	Final Need	5,800	2,100	1,105	819	654	147	167	808	1,108
	Net Change	-	21	(148)	6	13	14	16	78	31
Burien	Draft Need	7,500	1,429	861	519	397	564	640	3,090	1,393
	Final Need	7,500	1,444	759	524	407	574	650	3,142	1,433
	Net Change	-	15	(102)	5	10	10	10	52	40
Federal Way	Draft Need	11,260	1,779	1,073	840	190	969	1,099	5,310	2,091
	Final Need	11,260	1,799	946	842	208	981	1,112	5,372	2,152
	Net Change	-	20	(127)	2	18	12	13	62	61
Issaquah	Draft Need	3,500	1,086	655	871	452	57	65	314	650
	Final Need	3,500	1,093	575	868	460	66	75	363	669
	Net Change	-	7	(80)	(3)	8	9	10	49	19
Kent	Draft Need	10,200	1,850	1,116	785	302	807	916	4,424	1,894
	Final Need	10,200	1,872	984	788	318	820	929	4,489	1,949
	Net Change	-	22	(132)	3	16	13	13	65	55
Kirkland	Draft Need	13,200	4,798	2,893	3,057	975	194	220	1,063	2,451
	Final Need	13,200	4,842	2,546	3,052	1,022	228	259	1,251	2,522
	Net Change	-	44	(347)	(5)	47	34	39	188	71
Redmond	Draft Need	20,000	6,966	4,200	3,863	2,720	296	335	1,620	3,714
	Final Need	20,000	7,025	3,694	3,870	2,765	348	394	1,904	3,822
	Net Change	-	59	(506)	7	45	52	59	284	108
Renton	Draft Need	17,000	4,065	2,451	1,613	988	1,036	1,174	5,673	3,157
	Final Need	17,000	4,110	2,161	1,624	1,019	1,062	1,205	5,819	3,248
	Net Change	-	45	(290)	11	31	26	31	146	91
SeaTac	Draft Need	5,900	639	385	180	138	599	679	3,280	1,096
	Final Need	5,900	646	340	183	143	603	683	3,302	1,127
	Net Change	-	7	(45)	3	5	4	4	22	31
Tukwila	Draft Need	6,500	885	534	270	208	605	686	3,312	1,207
	Final Need	6,500	896	471	274	214	610	692	3,343	1,242
	Net Change	-	11	(63)	4	6	5	6	31	35
Des Moines	Draft Need	3,800	781	471	227	221	276	313	1,511	706
	Final Need	3,800	790	415	231	227	281	318	1,538	726
	Net Change	-	9	(56)	4	6	5	5	27	20
Kenmore	Draft Need	3,070	1,053	635	480	386	68	77	371	570
	Final Need	3,070	1,063	559	483	393	75	85	412	587
	Net Change	-	10	(76)	3	7	7	8	41	17
Lake Forest Park	Draft Need	870	310	187	142	138	12	14	67	162
	Final Need	870	313	164	143	140	14	16	80	166
	Net Change	-	3	(23)	1	2	2	2	13	4

		Net New Jurisdictional Permanent Housing Needs								Net New Jurisdictional Emergency Housing Needs
		Total	0-30%						Total	
			Non- PSH	PSH	>30- 50%	>50- 80%	>80- 100%	>100- 120%		
Mercer Island	Draft Need	1,239	338	204	200	489	1	1	6	230
	Final Need	1,239	339	178	202	488	4	5	23	237
	Net Change	-	1	(26)	2	(1)	3	4	17	7
Newcastle	Draft Need	1,480	620	374	435	14	5	5	27	275
	Final Need	1,480	627	329	433	22	9	10	50	283
	Net Change	-	7	(45)	(2)	8	4	5	23	8
Shoreline	Draft Need	13,330	3,588	2,163	2,721	702	546	619	2,991	2,476
	Final Need	13,330	3,617	1,902	2,710	740	573	650	3,138	2,547
	Net Change	-	29	(261)	(11)	38	27	31	147	71
Woodinville	Draft Need	2,033	845	509	353	148	23	27	128	378
	Final Need	2,033	854	449	354	156	29	33	158	388
	Net Change	-	9	(60)	1	8	6	6	30	10
Algona	Draft Need	170	31	19	8	7	14	16	75	32
	Final Need	170	32	17	8	7	14	16	76	32
	Net Change	-	1	(2)	-	-	-	-	1	-
Beaux Arts Village	Draft Need	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Final Need	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Net Change	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black Diamond	Draft Need	2,900	738	445	199	408	146	165	799	539
	Final Need	2,900	745	392	203	410	151	171	828	554
	Net Change	-	7	(53)	4	2	5	6	29	15
Carnation	Draft Need	799	236	142	22	84	41	47	227	148
	Final Need	799	239	126	23	85	43	48	235	153
	Net Change	-	3	(16)	1	1	2	1	8	5
Clyde Hill	Draft Need	10	3	2	2	3	-	-	-	2
	Final Need	10	3	2	2	3	-	-	-	2
	Net Change	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Covington	Draft Need	4,310	998	602	602	-	277	314	1,517	800
	Final Need	4,310	1,016	535	603	-	283	321	1,552	824
	Net Change	-	18	(67)	1	-	6	7	35	24
Duvall	Draft Need	890	264	159	-	267	26	30	144	165
	Final Need	890	268	141	-	266	28	32	155	170
	Net Change	-	4	(18)	-	(1)	2	2	11	5
Enumclaw	Draft Need	1,057	160	97	38	60	92	105	505	196
	Final Need	1,057	162	85	39	61	93	106	511	202
	Net Change	-	2	(12)	1	1	1	1	6	6
Hunts Point	Draft Need	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Final Need	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Net Change	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Maple Valley	Draft Need	1,720	536	323	320	20	68	78	375	319
	Final Need	1,720	542	285	320	26	72	81	394	329
	Net Change	-	6	(38)	-	6	4	3	19	10
Medina	Draft Need	19	5	3	3	8	-	-	-	4
	Final Need	19	5	3	3	8	-	-	-	4
	Net Change	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Milton	Draft Need	50	13	8	-	8	3	3	15	9
	Final Need	50	13	7	-	8	3	3	16	10
	Net Change	-	-	(1)	-	-	-	-	1	1
Normandy Park	Draft Need	153	40	24	32	17	5	6	29	28
	Final Need	153	41	21	32	17	6	6	30	29
	Net Change	-	1	(3)	-	-	1	-	1	1
North Bend	Draft Need	1,748	428	258	119	220	95	108	520	325
	Final Need	1,748	433	228	121	221	98	111	536	334
	Net Change	-	5	(30)	2	1	3	3	16	9

		Net New Jurisdictional Permanent Housing Needs								Net New Jurisdictional Emergency Housing Needs
		Total	0-30%						Total	
			Non- PSH	PSH	>30- 50%	>50- 80%	>80- 100%	>100- 120%		
Pacific	Draft Need	135	22	14	4	6	12	13	64	25
	Final Need	135	23	12	4	6	12	13	65	26
	Net Change	-	1	(2)	-	-	-	-	1	1
Sammamish	Draft Need	2,100	918	554	408	220	-	-	-	390
	Final Need	2,100	950	499	419	232	-	-	-	401
	Net Change	-	32	(55)	11	12	-	-	-	11
Skykomish	Draft Need	10	1	1	-	2	1	1	4	2
	Final Need	10	2	1	-	1	1	1	4	2
	Net Change	-	1	-	-	(1)	-	-	-	-
Snoqualmie	Draft Need	1,500	467	282	232	77	58	66	318	279
	Final Need	1,500	472	248	233	82	61	69	335	287
	Net Change	-	5	(34)	1	5	3	3	17	8
Yarrow Point	Draft Need	10	3	2	3	2	-	-	-	2
	Final Need	10	4	2	3	1	-	-	-	2
	Net Change	-	1	-	-	(1)	-	-	-	-
Unincorporated King County	Draft Need	5,412	1,145	690	569	284	358	406	1,960	1,005
	Final Need	5,412	1,157	608	571	292	366	415	2,003	1,034
	Net Change	-	12	(82)	2	8	8	9	43	29