

SNOHOMISH COUNTY HOUSING AFFORDABILITY REGIONAL TASKFORCE (HART)

Meeting 4 Draft Meeting Summary

Thursday, July 18, 2019 ~ 3:00 p.m. to 5:00 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)		Nehring, Jon (Marysville)		Vignal, Stephanie (Mill Creek, <i>Alt.</i>)	X
Earling, Dave (Edmonds)		Nehring, Nate (Snohomish County)		Wright, Stephanie (Snohomish County)	X
Franklin, Cassie (Everett)	X	Quinn, Mike (Woodway)	X	Brier	
Gregerson, Jennifer (Mukilteo)		Rankin, Dan (Darrington)	X	Gold Bar	
Hartman, Matt (Granite Falls)	X	Smith, Nicola (Lynnwood)	X	Index	
Holtzclaw, Brian (Mill Creek)		Somers, Dave (Snohomish County)	X	Sauk-Suiattle Tribe	
Hope, Shane (Edmonds, <i>Alt.</i>)	X	Spencer, John (Lake Stevens)		Stillaguamish Tribe	
Kartak, John (Snohomish)	X	Stevens-Wajda, Yorik (Snohomish County (2), <i>Alt.</i>)	X	Sultan	
Kelley, Leonard (Stanwood)		Thomas, Geoffrey (Monroe)		Tulalip Tribes	
Matsumoto Wright, Kyoko (Mountlake Terrace)	X	Tolbert, Barb (Arlington)	X		
Non-Voting Alternates also Present					
Keniza, Art (Lynnwood, <i>Alt.</i>)	X	Nick Harper (Everett, <i>Alt.</i>)	X	Hayes, Marc (Arlington, <i>Alt.</i>)	X
Staff					
Jackie Anderson, Snohomish County Human Services Department (HSD)		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	Nate Marti, HSD	X	Wendy Roullier, HSD	X

Welcome and Introductions of Taskforce Members, Presenters, Guests, and Staff

Mayor Nicola Smith welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order at 3:03 pm. She mentioned the Snohomish County Cities (SCC) meeting will be held tonight at the Nile Country Club in Mountlake Terrace. Mayor Smith mentioned the roundtable session at Lynnwood Council last month; councilmembers invited housing stakeholders to join a conversation with Council and it was very well received. The next HART meeting is September 12th and has been extended to 3 hours (3 pm – 6 pm). Mayor Smith welcomed Mike Katterman from the City of Bothell to the Taskforce. Attendees introduced themselves.

Review of Today's Agenda

Facilitator Karen Reed reviewed the agenda and the process for today's meeting: review and discuss ballot results; additions and amendments process to the ballot results; small group

exercise to frame out goals for the 5-year action plan; launch 3 work groups to develop further info on high-rated ballot items.

Mary Jane Brell Vujovic (MJ) reviewed several informational documents included in the meeting packets:

- Press Release for new report from the Joint Center for Housing Studies of Harvard University (JCHS):
 - Figure 8. Residential Land Prices: increased 50-99% in SnoCo
 - Figure 22. Affordability of Homeownership: 25-49% of recently sold homes are affordable to median-income households in Snohomish County
 - Figure 30. Low-Rent Stock: 50% decline in low-rent housing (rents under \$800) in Snohomish County between 2011 and 2017
 - Figure 34: what kinds of things people give up to afford housing (by how cost-burdened the household is)
- Washington State Income & Rent Limits for Snohomish County 2019 (HUD)
- 2019 Out of Reach Facts Overview infographics

Review and approval of meeting summary from Meeting 3

Nicola Smith asked if anyone had any changes to the meeting 3 summary; *Dave Somers made a motion to approve the minutes; Stephanie Wright seconded; motion passed unanimously.*

Potential Action: Revised Mission Statement

Cassie Franklin made a motion to approve the revised mission statement; Shane Hope seconded; Dave Somers added the intent of this group is to look at all housing types and needs; motion passed unanimously.

Presentation and Discussion of Screening Ballot Results

Karen explained the ballot results document: the concepts are sorted by category and then by average score (with rank listed); the color in the 2nd column helps identify those that had a result greater than 3.0; the top 12 items (overall) are include on a separate page, with a range of the scores for each concept. Karen reminded HART Members that there is a lot of overlap with some concepts in each category. Additional suggestions provided by HART members are listed on the back page. Members were given time to review the results.

Discussion about results:

- Cassie Franklin stated she was disappointed to see the housing levy ranked so low as it is the best option for increasing funding. She would like to see this continued to work groups
- Cassie Franklin also noticed that many of the items in the Outreach & Community Education (E-numbered concepts) could be condensed
- Many of the concepts may already be used in jurisdictions
- Dave Somers noted there may be things in our toolkits that we are not using. We need to review why we're not using them. He also explained each jurisdiction may use different tools. Action items need to be pursued as desired by jurisdictions.
- John Kartak expressed concern that the housing levy to make housing more affordable may have a negative result (much like a gas tax makes gas even more expensive)
- Barb Tolbert explained it would be nice to know what tools other jurisdictions are currently using so we can know what we may not be using (i.e. are cities having success? If so, I want to hear it to consider implementing in my city)
- Karen Reed mentioned the pink pages in the notebooks provide some of the information about what each city/town is currently doing and/or the challenges they are experiencing
- Dave Somers noted the market cannot supply all types of housing; the low-end must be subsidized somehow. We need to make recommendations for the whole spectrum

- Cassie Franklin said knowing the impact of the various concepts would be helpful (those that have big impact should be included)
- Karen Reed explained the Work Groups will be providing information about importance and/or impact for each item they review. They can also add items if the Subject Matter Experts (SME) feel something important is missing.

Consideration of Additional Items:

- Outreach & Community Engagement: three comments were included in the ballots for this category:
 1. All of the above (concepts in the ballot) relate to all housing types at all price points. This is an issue impacting all economic segments. “Affordable housing,” left undefined, overly narrows the focus. *Proposed Concept:* Outreach and community engagement efforts should address housing types at all price points.
 2. Are housing types like tiny homes, mobile homes and manufactured homes included? *Proposed Concept:* include outreach on options such as tiny homes, mobile homes and manufactured homes
 3. Develop a media plan to achieve the desired outcomes of E1, E2, E3, E5, E7, and E8. *Proposed Concept:* Develop a media plan to address high-rated items included within the group of following items: E1, E2, E3, E5, E7

The group discussed these additional items. Shane Hope commented that we should make sure outreach includes all housing types (which covers items #1 and #2). *The group agreed to add the concept, “develop a media plan,” but Barb Tolbert suggested the using the term “communication plan.”*

- Policy & Regulatory: two comments were included in the ballots for this category:
 1. Regarding the GMA – the consensus at the Housing Conference in Bellevue, is that the GMA needs to be reformed, some even say eliminate it. *Proposed Concept:* Eliminate the GMA
 2. Preservation of mobile home parks. *Proposed Concept:* Preserve mobile home parks.

The group discussed these additional items and declined adding “Eliminate the GMA” (item #1). The group decided that preservation of mobile home parks (item #2) is included with concepts related to preservation of all housing types (P02, P06).

Requests for Reconsideration of any Items:

- Cassie Franklin made a motion *to include item F03 (Seek voter approval for a County-wide property housing levy) in the Funding category;* Stephanie Wright seconded. After a brief discussion, HART members *voted 7-6 to include the concept.* The Funding Work Group will be asked to provide information about a countywide levy.
- Barb Tolbert requested *P51 (Move out the urban growth boundary [UGA]) be included;* Matt Hartman seconded. Shane Hope stated this is a big deal, but did not know if this group can have a valid discussion without additional information; Karen Reed reminded everyone that the Work Groups will provide information about impact, scope, etc; Barb reminded everyone that this is a 5-year plan; Dave noted the UGA will be discussed at council to make adjustments at both the County and the Cities; Barb suggested we can look at a formula related to buildable lands; John Kartak commented about the buildable lands and report; Matt noted we could change the concept to “adjust the boundary” which would allow cities to shift their boundary to allow an increase in buildable lands; Nick Harper explained the purpose of the UGA is to help jurisdictions rethink housing development and that it may run counter to increasing density, especially around transportation corridors; HART members *voted 9-3 to include the concept.* The Policy and Regulatory Work Group will be asked to provide information about the UGA.

Karen asked the group what they suggest for the threshold for concepts to be included in Work Groups. Cassie explained she's concerned about the Work Groups having enough time to review and respond to all the concepts; Mike Quinn suggested each category could have a different level or maybe the top X number of concepts; Karen asked if there was a motion for the cut-off rating (ex. 3.0, 3.25, 3.5); Stephanie clarified if we pick a higher number, the Work Group could still add items they think are important and made a *motion to use 3.5 as the cut-off*; Dave seconded; Yorik Stevens-Wajda noted that threshold does split the concepts to be reviewed approximately by half as compared to the number of ballot items. Motion *approved*.

Framing for the 5-Year Action Plan: Key Goals (Small Group Exercise): Karen explained the process for the exercise, defined goals vs. strategies (major items vs. specific actionable ideas), and shared an example from King County's housing affordability plan goals. She explained the discussion will be split between urban centers (Cassie Franklin volunteered to lead), suburban/rural cities (Barb Tolbert and Stephanie Vignal agreed to lead), and countywide (Dave Somers agreed to lead). Karen explained guests could form their own small groups and alternates were welcome to participate. Karen provided specific instructions to each table. Each group was asked to select a scribe.

Group Report outs from the exercise are presented at Attachment A to the minutes.

Karen asked if there were any observations of what was shared. There were no comments. She asked the scribes to submit their completed templates.

Karen explained that we did not discuss the "other" category from the ballots because the Co-Chairs will work on the concepts included in this section, which is primarily focused on governance and implementation. They will present recommendations to the HART meeting in October.

Work Groups: Mission, Staffing, Timeline:

The list of current volunteers for the Work Groups is in your packet. We had over 40 volunteers from all different areas. The Work Group Template will be completed by the volunteers for each concept for their group. Names for additional volunteers can still be submitted – please send suggestions to Alessandra. County staff will convene the groups and the Work Groups will select their own leadership. Each group will meet three times between now and the first week of September. Work Groups will present their recommendations to HART in September. As a reminder, they can add concepts they think are important that were not requested by HART. The Template includes the potential impact, ease of implementation, where it would best be implemented, and many other questions to inform the HART group in making the final decision; responses are limited to three pages. Staff will try to get the completed Templates distributed to HART Members by Monday, September 9, 2019.

Karen noted that six of the seven King County goals were also highly ranked here, and the seventh was only slightly less than the agreed upon cut-off rating.

Next Meeting: Thursday, September 12, 2019 at 3:00 p.m. – 6:00 p.m. at the City of Everett Training Room (5th floor, Everett Municipal Building) at 2930 Wetmore Ave. The agenda will include a Review of Work Group reports and Preparations for Snohomish County Tomorrow Presentation and Exercise for the September 25, 2019 meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p. m.

Attachment A: Results of Small Group Exercise on Housing Action Plan Goals

Attachment A: Results of Small Group Exercise on Housing Action Plan Goals

Questions (paraphrased)	Urban Centers Group	Suburban and Rural Cities Group	Countywide Group
1. Should outreach and education goals—for the region and individual cities—be included in the 5 year plan? Why?	Yes. Must be understood to be supported	Yes. Must be two way. We need to reach all communities and use layman’s terms.	Yes. Goals must include engaging regionally. Role clarity is needed. Definitions of terms must be clear.
2. Should we include a goal to track progress on the 5 year action plan? Who should be tasked with this?	Yes. County role. Metrics should help us measure our progress	Yes. Metrics are needed. We need a starting point. City by City reporting up to Countywide level.	Yes. Accountability and monitoring. Perhaps SCT could oversee. Jurisdictions could report out annually.
3. Should we have a goal to increase the types of housing options available, numbers of units built, and their affordability to different income levels?	Yes. More of all types of housing are needed and targets needed for all types.	Yes. We need more types of housing	Note sure. Goals are important. But how do we define them. Ask stakeholders to help. Some things we can’t control
4. Should we have a goal around preserving existing affordable housing?	Yes. With caveats— there can be conflict between goal of preservation and need for increased density.	Yes.	Yes. Maintenance is important part of preservation, e.g., homeowner and renter supports.
5. Should we recommend where new housing is built?	Yes. Transit corridors and job centers should be the priority for more density.	Yes. Transit corridors & job centers should be the priority. Upzoning needed for multi-family.	Everywhere! Urban and rural. Not sure we should prioritize areas.
6. Is it important to focus more on lower income households?	Yes & No. Private sector alone is insufficient. But we have only focused on the bottom income ranges to date.	No. No one segment is more important than others.	No. Full spectrum needs attention.
7. What goals are most important to your group?	Incentives for density and funding Housing and mobility linkages.	Ensure benefits go to homeowners and renters, not just developers. Need more incentives for affordable housing.	<i>-skipped--</i>
8. Should the plan outline implementation steps?	Yes. Accountability builds trust.	Yes. Yearly implementation steps.	Yes. Connects to Question 2 above
9. Other comments?	Identify City and county properties for redevelopment?		Information sharing between cities would be helpful. We should also look at out of county things that are impacting us.