

HART Meeting 6 Discussion Guide: Direction on Shaping the 5-Year Housing Action Plan

A: Overview of the Action Plan—what will it include

What we are planning...and we want to confirm direction on today...

The Action Plan will include:

- HART's Framework Goals (the 5 goals – *as they may be edited/amended*)
- HART's endorsed strategies and actions to support each of those Framework Goals.
 - We are proposing a second screening exercise to confirm the countywide list of concepts to include in the Action Plan
- A plan for launching the work in 2020 to begin implementation
 - Work groups to be formed around key tasks
 - Guidelines about membership, timing, deliverables
 - HART's continuing role in 2020, if any

The Action Plan will be accompanied by:

- A short cover report outline the housing affordability challenge
- Materials (PPT +) for each City to use to inform their City Council and community about the housing affordability challenge, and the actions that HART is recommending (*see sample from Portland Metro*)
- An appendix of all the Workgroup Briefings.

What we do not have staff & elected official capacity or time to do by December:

- A detailed implementation plan for each item in the Action Plan—in part because every City is unique in terms of what it needs and wants to do.

The Action Plan is essentially a focused list of recommended action items for consideration by all Cities and the County. The real work on education, outreach and implementation starts next year.

Discussion Questions:

- Does this make sense? Questions?
- If not, what changes would you recommend?

B: Proposed Structure of the Plan:

Part 1: What HART is recommending as actions to increase housing affordability:

	Goal 1		Goal 2	Goal 3
GOAL:	More housing, more housing types, at all income levels	More housing, more housing types, at 0-80% AMI	Preservation of existing affordable housing	Increase density on transit corridors and in job centers
Policy and Regulatory Strategies:				
Funding strategies:				
Advocacy items:				

- We have more detailed suggestions around some Framework Goals than others.
- Some recommendations support multiple goals.
- We can expect that workgroups will come up with new ideas to be considered over time as we work on implementation of the Action Plan.
- HART could try to identify “**early action priorities**” or “**joint action priorities**”

Part 2: How HART proposes to do this:

	Goal 4	Goal 5
GOAL:	Outreach and Education -- countywide efforts, and action by individual jurisdictions	Ongoing regional collaboration and tracking of our progress
Recommended Strategies:		

- The 2nd rating exercise is focused on what to include in the *countywide Action Plan*.
- At Meeting 7, we will ask for your feedback on whether some items may be most helpful for **highly urban/transit corridor cities** to work on, and which may be most helpful for **rural cities** or **suburban cities** to work on.
- Workgroups could be created around groups of cities, or specific Goals.
- Work groups could help create model ordinances and/or briefing materials for cities to tailor to their own purpose—to avoid everyone recreating the wheel. And/or work groups could be built around cross-jurisdictional coordination issues.

Discussion Questions:

- Does this basic structure make sense?
- What changes/additions would you suggest?

C: Additional Discussion Questions:

After reviewing the Table of Recommendations under Consideration:

1. Overall reactions?

- a. What are your thoughts about the current combined (HART + Workgroups) list of concepts? Are there gaps you are concerned about?
- b. Is it better to have a longer list of potential action items, so Cities and the County have more ideas to choose from, or to have a much shorter list?
- c. Do you agree we should have a second screening exercise to confirm what goes in the Plan or what comes out?
- d. Do we need more or different framework goals? If so, suggestions?
- e. Should we prioritize goals, or leave them all on the same level?

2. Grouping potential action items.

- a. Does it make sense to you to try to identify **early action items** in the Plan—things that are time sensitive or low hanging fruit? Examples?
- b. Does it make sense to you to identify **joint action items**?
- c. Do you like the idea of identifying items for **different types of cities** (rural, suburban, urban)?
- d. Would other workgroups be helpful (around each goal, or...)?

3. Scoping out Goal 5: continued regional collaboration and tracking our progress

- a. Is this Plan mostly about creating “learning circles” to collaborate and share ideas and encourage cities and the County to act? Or do we want to get into targets for jurisdictions in this effort (versus leaving that to comprehensive plan updates)?
- b. What role should HART have next year (or beyond)?
- c. Should there be a central group tracking progress by each jurisdiction? If so who?
- d. Should we create a work group to refine our methodology around how many affordable units we need in the County (and track that over time)? --- Not to assign targets to any jurisdiction, but just to figure out what is happening on the ground in terms of affordability, numbers of units, etc.

4. Outreach & Community Engagement: what will help your jurisdiction?

- a. Explaining affordability: we are using the definition used by most of the country, based on federal guidelines, that *housing is considered affordable to a household if that household is spending no more than 30% of its income on housing costs including utilities*. What would help you help explain this to your constituents?
- b. Other thoughts about the toolkit on outreach & community engagement?