

SNOHOMISH COUNTY HOUSING AFFORDABILITY REGIONAL TASKFORCE (HART)

Meeting 6 Draft Meeting Summary

Thursday, October 3, 2019 ~ 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.

City of Everett Training Room (5th floor, Wall Street Building) at 2930 Wetmore Ave.

(Underlined Italics indicate action items/decisions; follow up items in bold italics)

Attendees:

Task Force Members and Alternates Present and Voting					
Agnew, Tom (Bothell)	X	Matsumoto Wright, Kyoko (Mountlake Terrace)	X	Tolbert, Barb (Arlington)	X
Earling, Dave (Edmonds)		Nehring, Jon (Marysville)		Wright, Stephanie (Snohomish County)	X
Franklin, Cassie (Everett)	X	Nehring, Nate (Snohomish County)	X	Brier	
Gregerson, Jennifer (Mukilteo)		Quinn, Mike (Woodway)	X	Gold Bar	
Hartman, Matt (Granite Falls)		Rankin, Dan (Darrington)	X	Index	
Hirashima, Gloria (Marysville, <i>Alt.</i>)	X	Smith, Nicola (Lynnwood)	X	Sauk-Suiattle Tribe	
Holtzclaw, Brian (Mill Creek)	X	Somers, Dave (Snohomish County)	X	Stillaguamish Tribe	
Hope, Shane (Edmonds, <i>Alt.</i>)	X	Spencer, John (Lake Stevens)		Sultan	
Kartak, John (Snohomish)	X	Thomas, Geoffrey (Monroe)		Tulalip Tribes	
Kelley, Leonard (Stanwood)					
Non-Voting Alternates also Present					
Ceniza, Art (Lynnwood, <i>Alt.</i>)	X	Harper, Nick (Everett, <i>Alt.</i>)	X	Hayes, Marc (Arlington, <i>Alt.</i>)	X
Staff					
Jackie Anderson, Snohomish County Human Services Department (HSD)	X	Alessandra Durham, Snohomish County Executive's Office	X	Barb Mock, Snohomish County Planning & Development Services (PDS)	X
Kelsey Bang-Olsen, HSD	X	Tina Ilvonen, HSD	X	Karen Reed, Facilitator	X
Mary Jane (MJ) Brell Vujovic, HSD	X	Ken Katahira, HSD	X	Wendy Roullier, HSD	X
Robei Broadous, HSD	X	Nate Marti, HSD	X		

1. Welcome & Introductions

Nicola Smith convened the meeting at 4:05 pm. She welcomed everyone and asked each person to introduce themselves. She explained that a second binder has been provided for each HART member jurisdiction (one for meeting materials and another for meeting logistics and background materials).

2. Review and approval of meeting summary from Meeting 5

Nicola Smith asked for any corrections to the notes. There were none. Kyoko Matsumoto Wright made a motion to approve the meeting summary; Dave Somers seconded the motion; *the meeting summary was approved unanimously.*

3. Review of Today's Agenda

Karen Reed briefly reviewed the agenda including discuss input from the SCT Annual Meeting and a group discussion on the 5-Year Action Plan. She also reviewed the remaining steps in the HART process including a second screening exercise and writing a draft plan after this meeting. Meeting 7 (November 7th) will include review of the second screening exercise results, discussion of draft 5-year housing affordability action plan, continued discussion related to tracking/monitoring the action plan, and reviewing the report outline and problem statement. Meeting 8 (December 5th) will include review and provide direction to finalize draft HART report and action plan and review draft PowerPoint for use by Cities and County in presenting the HART action plan.

4. SCT Assembly Themes, Feedback

Karen shared that approximately 120 people attended the SCT Assembly and that overall there was a high level of interest from attendees. The feedback was generally supportive of HART's goals with very diverse ideas about how to pursue those goals. The discussion notes were transcribed and are included in the meeting packet. Some themes:

- Support for goals – comments included differentiating between urban and rural needs and solutions
- Importance of community outreach and having tools for that – community-specific data would be helpful, clarify what is meant by “affordable housing” vs. “housing affordability,” and keeping it simple
- Some concern about a regional housing levy
- Support for increased density on transit corridors
- Encouraging joint action, shared responsibility – example was joint action on 1406

Dave Somers note that several people commented about public education to support actions and bring the public along. He was impressed by the level of engagement. Nicola Smith commented that it was the first time people had come off the street to attend an SCT meeting.

5. Group Discussion & Report Out

Karen explained the table groups will go through the six parts of the discussion guide handout to provide direction in shaping the 5-year action plan for the next 90 minutes – tables will have time to discuss and report out for each section.

- **The 5-Year Housing Action Plan – overview, structure**

- **A. Overview of the Action Plan – what will it include**

- Karen explained the Action Plan will be a focused list of recommended action items for consideration by all Cities and the County. There are currently 46 concepts sorted by goal and categorized by policy/regulatory, funding, and advocacy actions. A second screening exercise is proposed (colored table handout) to confirm the concepts to include in the countywide list. Tables were provided time to review the concepts currently under consideration. Group comments in the report out included:

- Table 1:
 - Likes the plan and the idea of reviewing the concepts to determine if we endorse the items
 - Table 2:
 - Want to make sure the cover report has enough substance to outline the problem
 - Also discussed wages
 - Need a better definition of affordability/affordable housing

- Reiterated that we are talking about all housing – it's all needed; government can have a part in intervening in various different roles for all housing types and incomes, including policy changes
- Table 3:
 - Since there is more in the private sector and builders want to build to make a profit, need to know how to bring in the private sector, include them in the process, get their input to make sure their voice is heard (example Microsoft grant for preserved housing on the East side in King County.)
- Table 4 (stakeholder table):
 - We know the challenge of population growth and other data. Through that lens, would like to see the report showing the impact each concept and/or goal has on creating housing (example: if we do __, it will create _ # of units)

B. Proposed Structure of the Plan

Karen explained the proposed structure of the plan. It is similar to how it was presented to the SCT Assembly showing *what HART recommends we do* (Goals 1 – 3), and then, *how HART recommends we do these things* (Goals 4 – 5).

- Cassie Franklin wanted to make sure we're not just talking about Government funding (Goal 1B). She noted there are other ways to impact the 0-80% AMI population including policy changes - not all communities have money to assist, so they need other options including partnerships.

Karen explained how the second screening ballot is sorted. Some strategies support multiple goals, so they will show up under each goal as a strategy for that goal. Think about what we should start first (early action priorities) and items that can be collaborative (joint action priorities).

- John Kartak asked if HART will be asked to support Sub-goal A (all income levels), Sub-goal B (0-80% AMI), or having both sub-goals is an option. Karen explained HART has previously voted on concepts in both areas, but it will be up to HART to determine if you want them separated, listed together, and/or only want one or the other.

Tables were asked to review the proposed structure; discuss if the basic structure makes sense and/or what changes/additions are suggested. Comments in the report out included:

- Table 1:
 - Questioned if Sub-goal A and Sub-goal B could be combined – makes sense to merge them
 - Thought it might be good to consider SCT as a work group forum
 - Wanted information about how the work groups would be organized
- Table 2:
 - Organization proposed is logical
 - Concerned about timing as some changes will take longer than others
 - Work groups could include private sector for input
- Table 3:
 - Suggested some wordsmithing to increase specificity (ex. goal 3 change to or as some jurisdictions may not have both; goal 2 fairly vague – and reminder that redevelopment may cause some displacement)
 - Goal 4 – communities need to be at the table; the strategies may need to be looked at in a variety of types (i.e., urban, rural)
- Table 4:
 - Sub-goal B should be separated at 0-60% instead of the current 0-80%

- Could format the table for those concepts that support both to have them merged
 - Could separate by jurisdiction type: all (countywide), urban, rural
- **Reviewing the Current List of Potential Action Items**

Karen asked everyone to look at the proposed second screening ballot. She explained all concepts rated 3.5 or higher in the first round are included. Also included are a small number of additional lower-rated items that were proposed by work groups (blue text), and items proposed by HART after the initial rating was completed (red text). Green text indicates items that can reduce cost of housing construction without necessarily reducing revenues; goldenrod highlights indicate potential new funding (MFTE is not considered new funding because it is an offset not new funds). Ballot makes note of workgroup ratings regarding impact and ease of implementation. When completing the ballot, you may want to have the work group templates with you. The ballot asks for your input on which items should be “early action” or “joint action” and to rate your support for each – or indicate whether you think the item should be removed from the plan. Tables were asked to briefly review the ballot to determine if there are changes that need to be made.

C. Additional Discussion Questions

1. Overall Reactions:

Karen asked groups to consider the questions on page 3 of the discussion guide, regarding: (1) whether there are gaps in the list of concepts now under consideration; (2) whether the action plan should include many items or just a few; (3) is there support to do the second screening ballot; (4) is there support for the current framework goals (any edits?); and (5) should those goals be prioritized?. Comments in the report out included:

- Table 1:
 - Gaps – public education and outreach
 - Fairly long list preferred to cover everyone’s wants/needs (give choices)
 - Second screening yes
 - Change to goals: split Sub-goal B at 0-60% rather than 0-80%
 - No prioritizing (allow jurisdictions to choose based on their need)
- Table 2:
 - Liked current list, no significant gaps, but need to bring private sector in to find problems/solutions
 - Would be good to have a priority short list (early actions) with remainder of items listed
 - Second screening – yes
 - Goals are good, but split Sub-goal B at 0-60%
 - Some thought prioritize strategies not goals, others need further discussion; Cassie Franklin noted identifying top goals will narrow further discussions – look for high-impact, low-hanging fruit; Shane Hope shared we can’t have such a long list that people can’t get through them
- Table 3:
 - Emphasize involvement of private sector; Karen asked how they recommended doing this; Dan Rankin suggested by inviting private sector that’s community oriented, it’s in industry’s best interest to retain their workforce; Karen asked if anyone had any objections about adding a concept for outreach to private developers to the ballot; there was consensus to add this item.

- Let Cities reduce the list according to City needs
- Yes, second screening
- Ok with goals as is
- Prioritized goals
- Table 4:
 - No gaps
 - Wouldn't want to see things to do be less
 - Second screen may shorten the list
 - Happy with the goal, but like 0-60%
 - Don't prioritize goals
- Dave Somers:
 - SEPA categorical exceptions for housing generally not just multi-family seems to be a gap in the concepts – maybe the concept just missed the mark, could modify the language of the concept; Karen Reed suggested adding another concept that provides a broader SEPA categorical exemption; there was group consensus to add to screening ballot.
- Karen asked for consensus on a couple of topics that came up:
 - Prioritize goals or prioritize strategies?
 - Mike Quinn replied they are all different, and not equal
 - Karen confirmed they are different in the 'what' as opposed to the 'why'
 - Alessandra Durham added if we prioritize goals, it may not be as clear to community as if we prioritize strategies
 - Art Ceniza added we want to be able to build success and keep the momentum going – create the strategies with early action items.
 - Consensus to not prioritize goals.
 - Changing the Goal 1 Sub-goal B from 0-80% to 0-60%?
 - Consensus was keep Sub-goals, but change B to 0-60%.
 - Split transit centers and job centers (Goal 3)
 - Consensus was to add "/or" to the existing wording.
- Further discussion:
 - Brian Holtzclaw asked to confirm that planning grants (HB 1923) are included on the ballot
 - Mike Kattermann asked if it would be beneficial to specify which concepts benefit which income level; Karen noted the items are already sorted by Sub-goals A and B (which are all incomes or incomes at 0-60%) and if they fit both are included in both Sub-goal areas.

2. Grouping Potential Action Items

Karen directed everyone to look at question 2 on page 3 of the discussion guide. She asked tables to discuss if: (1) it makes sense to identify early action items; (2) joint action items; (3) possibly have sub-groups for different types of jurisdictions; and (4) would other workgroups be helpful? Comments in the report out included:

Table 1:

- Early action – yes
- Joint action – yes
- Let the cities/municipalities decide what additional work groups to create
- Regulation/policy of building and land use
- Table 2:
 - Early action – yes
 - Joint action – yes

- Unclear how you separate cities (i.e. density, population, etc.)
- Table 3:
 - Early action – yes
 - Joint action – yes
 - Sub-groups are a good idea
 - Philanthropic organizations
- Table 4:
 - Low hanging fruit is gone. Can't spend time on things that won't create housing. Early action should be something that everyone could work on first in 2020.
 - Joint action – applying for grant, everyone committed to, legislative action; could make siting of different housing more equitable
 - Transit-area jurisdictions should form a work group
 - Another workgroup: funding/financing
- Dave Somers and Nicola Smith:
 - Early action – yes
 - Joint action – yes, could be linked; Joint action for legislative/applying for grants
 - Let cities decide or transit-oriented
 - SEPA and 1406

3. Scoping Out Goal 5: continued regional collaboration and tracking

Karen asked everyone to discuss what role HART should have next year or beyond, should there be a central group tracking progress, should there be a work group to refine methodology around the progress of creating affordable housing. Comments in the report out included:

- Table 1:
 - Learn and collaborate – Cities and County can determine targets on their own and work together in collaboration to identify individual targets
 - HART role should roll into SCT along with tracking
 - Suggest AHA to track and refine methodology
- Table 2:
 - HART should support learning circles with targets after
 - HART should meet a few times per year, touch base before/after legislative session
 - Central tracking at SCT
 - AHA for methodology
- Table 3:
 - Learning circles seems too touchy feely
 - HART should continue next year
 - SCT should oversee
 - Yes, targets – don't know who (AHA doesn't have every city as a member)
- Table 4:
 - Somewhere between learning and targets
 - Central tracking through County or SCT (already collecting data, rather than look historically)
 - Methodology group should be created.

4. Outreach & Engagement

Karen asked members to think about what tools will help their jurisdiction explain affordability, what should be included in the toolkits. She shared a

factsheet created by Oregon that could be modified to include Snohomish County data.

6. Next Steps:

Ballot will come out next Wednesday. Call Wendy Roullier if you have an issue with the ballot.

7. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m.