



Housing Affordability Regional Taskforce Policy and Regulatory Workgroup

MEMO

To: Housing Affordability Regional Taskforce

From: Housing Affordability Regional Taskforce Outreach and Community Engagement Workgroup

Date: September 9, 2019

Re: Outreach and Community Engagement Template Summary

Outreach & Education Presentation Summary

Snohomish County is immensely diverse and covers nearly 2,200 square miles. Our County encompasses rural, suburban, and a growing urban core. There is a great diversity of industry and employment sectors, many opportunities for continuing education and job skill training, and a wide variety of community assets such as libraries, community centers, and parks and open space. The people of Snohomish County are also very diverse, with a wide variety of socio-economics, education, country of origin, religion, physical abilities, race and ethnicity, veteran status, and thoughts and ideals. One unifying factor that all residents of Snohomish County have, is that they all deserve to have appropriate housing.

A vibrant and balanced community is one in which all members of the community have access to appropriate housing. Snohomish County, as well as many other counties in our region and country, are currently struggling with a limited supply of affordable housing options for current and future residents.

In the context of addressing Snohomish County's dwindling supply of affordable housing, a thoughtful and deliberate effort to conduct meaningful outreach and education should precede discussions and decisions related to policy and funding. Additionally, well-crafted messages about why it is important to create a balanced community that has appropriate housing for all, is an important first step. Approaches to outreach and engagement, policymaking, and funding are interrelated to one another in a mutually supporting way. While a holistic approach to developing tools and strategies to educate community members about the need for and benefit of affordable housing is of great importance, intentional efforts should be made to authentically engage communities of color, low income communities, and historically underserved communities in affordable housing discussions and decision making.

Another prefacing statement is that outreach and community engagement is an area where, broadly speaking, the workgroup agreed government has historically undervalued and under-resourced. The common public perception of government as an obstructive "other" that therefore cannot be trusted to authentically engage and educate, let alone *lead*, is pervasive. The result has been leadership from government through policy and planning, only engaging the public as mandated, in ways that tend to

overwhelm, surprise, or leave out segments of the community, and result in community pushback. Meaningful and effective community engagement results in more inclusive decision-making. This in turn results in government processes, practices, and decisions that are more responsive to community priorities, avoids many unforeseen consequences, and creates a stronger relationship between local government and community members.

The following strategies were identified by HART to address outreach and engagement in regard to housing affordability:

HART Ballot Item E2/E1/E6:

The development of a toolbox of engagement strategies, tactics and messages is crucially important to effectively engage local communities and partners in addressing the need for, and the benefits of, more affordable housing. After general education is accomplished, maintaining strong lines of communication with the entire community in the planning and funding process around affordable housing is a critical and ongoing step.

This ballot item rated highly both in HART and in the workgroup. It has been recognized as a critical starting point for all future action in communication, policy and funding. This action assists all levels of income. It is by no means the first time such a toolkit has been developed – BC Housing in Vancouver, British Columbia has developed an extremely effective toolkit over the last 20 years, that has led to continued success in addressing British Columbia’s very similar (in scope and cause) housing challenges.

HART Ballot Item E5:

Typically, public meetings are held, and notices posted in a one-size-fits-all approach which results in low participation and engagement. The outcome is typically policy that either does not successfully serve the intended population, causes unintended consequences for a segment of the population, or is overwhelmingly rejected. Authentically engaging communities of color, low income communities, and historically underserved communities, results in better informed policy-making, and better conforms with the wants and needs of community members.

The potential impact of this item leans heavily on the level of commitment by government and the time scale for implementation as previously discussed. Similarly, it is easy to write the policy, while putting it into practice and maintaining that in the long term may be much more challenging.

HART Ballot Item E6:

Education about the needs of density is a sub-component of a communication toolkit. Unless the Growth Management Act is fundamentally changed to allow sprawl, density is, ultimately, the only long-term solution to accepting increasing population in the Puget Sound Region. Delivering this message successfully to the public is challenging.

This issue, like all before it, supports a broad range of funding and policy concepts. This concept, perhaps beyond all others, requires broad inclusion of other stakeholders. Density can and should be oriented as a vehicle to address issues of economic vitality, public safety, health, transportation and environmental conservation. Partnering with cross-issue stakeholder coalitions both increases message impact and support. It is a means to an end for a variety of policy and funding items discussed elsewhere.

HART Ballot Item E7:

Expanding engagement of non-governmental partners is both supporting of item E6, and valuable on its own. Government action alone is not enough to address the need for affordable housing in Snohomish County. Broad and ongoing partnership with private and non-profit stakeholders allows for more successful messaging across issues, as well as the informal networking that comes with it, making actual projects more likely and easier to accomplish.

Sharing tools and strategies broadly across stakeholder groups (again, by leading in sharing these items, making their importance known and relevant to non-government stakeholders), is an important element of successful communication and education county-wide.

Summary:

The four outreach and engagement strategies outlined above will not show immediate results, this is undeniably a “long game” solution in building community support for long term success. As with all communication strategies, delivering appropriate messages that resonate throughout the cross sections of our community takes time and commitment. The more resources dedicated to the effort the faster it will deliver results.

Implementation requires no councilmanic action, however there are resources that need to be appropriated to these efforts. The more municipalities, county government(s) and the State government can collaborate and coordinate on these strategies, greater success will be achieved.

Exhibit C

HART Work Group Template #1

To be completed for each item rated 3.5 or higher. Please include ballot item reference number(s).

Workgroup: Outreach and Community Engagement Concepts

<p>Title: Support the education and engagement of local communities, residents, and other partners in efforts to achieve more affordable housing for all income levels.</p> <p>Topic 1: (Proposal E2) Develop messages and tools to educate residents about the need for, and benefit of affordable housing. (4.43)</p> <p>Topic 5: (Proposal E1) Better engage local communities and other partners in addressing the need for and benefits of affordable housing. (4.21)</p> <p>Topic 7: (Proposal E6) Support engagement of local communities and residents in planning efforts to achieve more affordable housing. (3.93)</p>	<p>Ballot Item # (1,5,7 and 2): Proposal E1, E2 and E6 are consolidated to efficiently address the issues of community outreach and education.</p> <p>Proposal E3 (Topic 2) is considered a tactic to assist implementation of other proposed items that HART will use to carry out community outreach.</p>
<p>Brief description: Community engagement and education of local communities, residents, and other partners supports relationship building which will translate into support for increasing affordable housing development in neighborhoods.</p>	
<p>Rating from HART Screening Ballot (scale: 1-5, 5 being very promising) The average rating of three proposals covered in this exhibit is 4.19</p>	
<p>Work group rating: 4.9 Potential impact on housing affordability challenge (High / Medium / Low): Low</p> <p>We anticipate the immediate potential impact of community outreach and education to be low, we expect that with time the impact will build to a high level as trust is established within our communities and our relationships are strengthened with consistent interaction. Advocacy efforts must engage all segments of our communities to build broad public support.</p> <p>Ease of implementation (Easy / Moderate / Difficult): Easy</p>	
<p>Category: <u>Goal _Consolidated E1, E2, E6_ or Strategy/Tactic _E3_</u></p>	<p>Check all applicable</p>
<p>Demand side goal/strategy: Reduces demand for affordable housing/helps people stay in their homes</p>	
<p>Supply side goal/strategy: Targets assistance to build/maintain housing affordable to:</p>	
<p>0-30%AMI</p>	<p>X</p>
<p>30-50% AMI</p>	<p>X</p>
<p>50-80% AMI</p>	<p>X</p>
<p>80%-125% AMI</p>	<p>X</p>

>125% AMI	X
Facilitates housing preservation —maintaining current affordable inventory	X
Facilitates housing construction generally , providing more units, or units at less cost	
Communication / community engagement strategy	X
Advocacy	X
Other	
Analysis:	
<p>1. Area where this concept would be most effectively deployed (cities individually / Cities acting collectively / countywide / urban growth area/ rural cities / urban centers / transit corridors / rural areas, etc.).</p> <p>Community outreach and education works in all HART target areas (noted above). The education, engagement, and advocacy work must engage all segments of the community regardless of income, to increase understanding and acceptance of affordable housing within our communities, in all noted geographic and demographic areas.</p>	
<p>2. If the concept is a more general “goal” please list some of the more specific <i>strategies or tactics</i> that you recommend be deployed to accomplish the goal. If these strategies appear on the July screening ballot, please note ballot reference numbers. (Conversely, if this template is about a strategy or tactic, what <i>goal</i> does it support? Refer to Rough Draft Outline of Major Goals v.7.29)</p> <p>Proposals E1, E2, and E6 are strategic goals that can be used to engage and educate the community to achieve a broader outcome of furthering affordable housing.</p> <p>Proposal E3 – Developing toolkits to effectively engage communities is a tactic to use in furthering the above mentioned goals. The Housing Authority of Snohomish County (HASCO) has already begun this process by building a relationship with BC Housing in Vancouver British Columbia, the provincial government entity responsible for publicly supported housing in British Columbia. Because our regions share similar housing shortages, economic development issues, and land use and planning processes, HASCO has been able to acquire access to and training in the Community Engagement Toolkit they developed this year to support other public and non-profit housing agencies achieve success when approaching a community in which an affordable housing project is proposed. These toolkits are based on research and achieving outcomes and can easily be models that can be implemented locally. The Housing Consortium also invited BC Housing to present this information at their housing conference last June (2019). This toolkit can be used immediately to begin community engagement activities.</p>	
<p>3. Estimated Impact on addressing housing affordability challenge (low/medium/high). Why?</p> <p>The immediate potential impact of this strategy will be low; but it has been proven to reap a high yield over time. It is essential to engage and educate local communities on the issue first to build community understanding of the issue and then to move the needle on addressing the. As education and engagement efforts are sustained and community trust is established, acceptance of affordable housing projects will follow and lead to higher impact. This strategy plays the “long game” in building community support for sustained affordable housing by leveraging community relationships for support.</p>	
<p>4. Implementation steps: (requires voter approval; councilmatic action; federal action required; state legislation required, etc.; additional data required)</p>	

No legislative actions are required to implement this strategy.

5. Community engagement considerations:

Relationships must be intentionally built and maintained to establish trust before we can expect support for housing projects in our community.

6. Lead Agency/ Key Partners:

The Housing Authorities, the Housing Consortium of Everett and Snohomish County, the Alliance for Housing Affordability, all municipal jurisdictions who are required to plan for housing under the Growth Management Act, and all housing and human service providers who support Snohomish County residents. A holistic, integrated, wrap around approach, is needed to stabilize people in accessible, affordable housing.

7. Other:

Maximum page limit for completed templates: 3 PP.

Exhibit C

HART Work Group Template

To be completed for each item rated 3.5 or higher. Please include ballot item reference number(s).

Workgroup: Outreach and Engagement

<p>Title: Goal 3: Authentically engage communities of color and low-income communities in affordable housing development and policy decisions.</p>	<p>Ballot Item #(s): E5</p>
<p>Brief description: Cities and agencies should use a race and social equity lens and/or a racial equity toolkit when making policy decisions regarding affordable housing. It is of critical importance to nurture and uplift community-led policy making and remove barriers for community members to participate in the planning and implementation of affordable housing strategies.</p>	
<p>Rating from HART Screening Ballot (scale: 1-5, 5 being very promising) 4.36</p>	
<p>Work group rating: 4.75</p> <p>Potential impact on housing affordability challenge: (High / Medium / Low)</p> <p>Ease of implementation: (Easy / Moderate / Difficult)</p>	
<p>Category: <i>Goal _____ or Strategy/Tactic _____</i></p>	<p>Check all applicable</p>
<p>Demand side goal/strategy: Reduces demand for affordable housing / helps people stay in their homes</p>	
<p>Supply side goal/strategy: Targets assistance to build/maintain housing affordable to:</p>	✓
<p>0-30%AMI</p>	✓
<p>30-50% AMI</p>	✓
<p>50-80% AMI</p>	✓
<p>80%-125% AMI</p>	✓
<p>>125% AMI</p>	✓
<p>Facilitates housing preservation—maintaining current affordable inventory</p>	✓
<p>Facilitates housing construction generally, providing more units, or units at less cost</p>	✓
<p>Communication / community engagement strategy</p>	✓
<p>Advocacy</p>	✓
<p>Other</p>	
<p>Analysis:</p> <p>1. Area where this concept would be most effectively deployed (cities individually / Cities acting collectively / countywide / urban growth area/ rural cities / urban centers / transit corridors / rural areas, etc.).</p> <p>This goal should be broadly embraced by cities, the County and partner agencies, to achieve a more equitable and community-accepted approach to affordable housing for all. Cities, the County and partner</p>	

agencies should align outreach and engagement efforts to empower communities most impacted by barriers to affordable housing which will result in better decision-making.

2. If the concept is a more general “goal” please list some of the more specific *strategies or tactics* that you recommend be deployed to accomplish the goal. If these strategies appear on the July screening ballot, please note ballot reference numbers. (Conversely, if this template is about a strategy or tactic, what *goal* does it support? Refer to Rough Draft Outline of Major Goals v.7.29)
 - *Use a racial equity toolkit during the initial stages of discussions on affordable housing to set goals and expectations for equitable outreach and engagement.*
 - *Identify stakeholders and underrepresented groups:*
 - Find out who are the stakeholders most affected by, concerned with, or have experience relating to the policy, program or initiative.
 - The most important step in providing authentic outreach and engagement is to know your community. Whether it is Snohomish County as a whole, your city, or your service area. Important community data can be discovered on the US Census Bureau’s website: <https://data.census.gov/cedsci/profile?q=&g=0500000US53061>. The use of heat mapping is another great tool to identify intersections of underrepresented groups based on geography.
 - Use your local trusted messengers to learn about the wants and needs of your community. Ask trusted messengers how best to inform and engage diverse communities.
 - Examples of underrepresented groups (not a complete listing):
 - Communities of Color
 - Immigrants and refugees, and limited English-speaking individuals
 - Religious and faith-based groups
 - Disabled / differently abled
 - Veterans
 - Seniors / Older Adults
 - Tribes and Tribal Members
 - Individuals afflicted with mental health issues, alcohol or substance abuse
 - Victims of Domestic Violence and survivors
 - Individuals living in poverty / low income individuals
 - Work in relationship with local and regional racial justice leaders from all communities and sectors to advance racial justice and equitable practices.
 - *Include stakeholders in the decision-making process. Ask for their thoughts/suggestions/feedback and incorporate it into your planning documents. Report back to stakeholders where/how their feedback was incorporated.*

3. Estimated Impact on addressing housing affordability challenge (low/medium/high). Why?

Inclusive and equitable engagement should be practiced during all stages of developing affordable housing, from planning, to budgeting, fund raising, and awareness efforts.

By authentically engaging communities and groups of individuals that have historically been left out of decision making, cities, Snohomish County and partner agencies will achieve greater outcomes for all. Inclusive decision-making results in government processes, practices, and decisions that are more responsive to community priorities, avoids many unforeseen consequences, and creates a stronger relationship between local government and community members. When local residents have more control over the decisions that affect their lives and their communities there is a positive correlation to greater health and wellness indicators.

4. Implementation steps: (requires voter approval; councilmatic action; federal action required; state legislation required, etc.; additional data required)

No formal action is required to implement equitable outreach and engagement practices. However, formal decree by a city or agency of a race and social justice initiative or practice is a strong indicator to community members that their engagement will be valued.

5. Community engagement considerations:

There is a broad spectrum of public participation and a city or organization should be familiar with the various tools and techniques and understand which tools to implement considering the decision to be made, the identified stakeholders, and the agency's commitment to community-led decision making.

- **Inform** is a one-way communication and education about a topic. This can be done through newsletters, social media, informational flyers, etc.
- **Consult** is to gather information and ask for advice on a topic. This can be done through focus groups, surveys, public meetings, and workshops, etc.
- **Collaborate** is working in partnership with stakeholders and sharing in the decision-making. This can be done through advisory committees, charrettes, participatory decision-making, etc.
- **Shared Decision-Making** is when decision-making authority is delegated to stakeholders. This can be done through ballots, delegates, etc.

Identifying the appropriate public outreach and engagement tools and techniques is an important aspect of equitable decision-making. The following things should be considered when developing engagement strategies:

- Translated materials and interpreters available
- Engaging in non-traditional government forums. Joining meetings where people are already congregating, meeting in the neighborhood, etc.
- World Cafes and revolving conversations to include all voices
- Access to childcare or transportation

6. Lead Agency/ Key Partners:

Lead Agency:

- All

Key Partners (Not a complete listing):

- Communities of Color Coalition
- NAACP of Snohomish County
- Refugee and Immigrant Service NW

- Leadership Snohomish County
- Human Rights Commission of Snohomish County
- Edmonds School District Diversity, Equity & Outreach
- City of Lynnwood Diversity, Equity & Inclusion Commission
- City of Edmonds Diversity Commission
- Latino Educational Training Institute (LETI)
- YWCA of Seattle | King | Snohomish
- Homage and the Center for Healthy Living
- NW Indian Housing Association
- Tulalip Tribe

7. Other:

Maximum page limit for completed templates: 3 PP.

Exhibit C

HART Work Group Template #3

To be completed for each item rated 3.5 or higher. Please include ballot item reference number(s).

Workgroup: Outreach & CE

Title: Educate the community about the benefits of density		Ballot Item #(s): E8
<p>Brief description:</p> <p>It is estimated that Snohomish County’s population will grow by 136,577 by 2035. (OFM estimate) This translates into approximately 50,000 new households all looking for a place to live. Land suitable and available for new residential development is already in short supply. Increasing allowable densities in existing SF & MF residential zones is key to addressing this issue.</p> <p>Yet, proposals to increase density often run up against citizen opposition who may feel their way of life is under siege. Creating an outreach and engagement strategy that offers alternative and positive scenarios of increased density will help decrease that opposition and offer some relief to city planners and elected officials who are tasked with planning for their jurisdictions population increase.</p>		
Rating from HART Screening Ballot (scale: 1-5, 5 being very promising): 4.00		
Work group rating: 4.9		
Potential impact on housing affordability challenge: (High / Medium / Low)		
Ease of implementation: (Easy / Moderate / Difficult) Easy to develop and implement a community outreach strategy about the benefits of density		
Category:		Check all applicable
Goal _____ or Strategy/Tactic <u>X</u>		
Demand side goal/strategy: Reduces demand for affordable housing / helps people stay in their homes		X
Supply side goal/strategy: Targets assistance to build/maintain housing affordable to:		
0-30%AMI		X
30-50% AMI		X
50-80% AMI		X
80%-125% AMI		X
>125% AMI		X
Facilitates housing preservation —maintaining current affordable inventory		
Facilitates housing construction generally , providing more units, or units at less cost		X
Communication / community engagement strategy		X
Advocacy		X
Other		
Analysis:		

1. Area where this concept would be most effectively deployed (cities individually / Cities acting collectively / countywide / urban growth areas / rural cities / urban centers / transit corridors / rural areas, etc.).

Cities/Urban centers/Transit corridors/UGAs

2. If the concept is a more general “goal” please list some of the more specific *strategies or tactics* that you recommend be deployed to accomplish the goal. If these strategies appear on the July screening ballot, please note ballot reference numbers. (Conversely, if this template is about a strategy or tactic, what *goal* does it support? Refer to Rough Draft Outline of Major Goals v.7.29)

The concept supports

Goal 2: Promote greater housing growth and diversity to achieve a variety of housing types at a range of affordability and improve the jobs/housing connections.

It also supports, directly for some and somewhat tangentially for others, the following strategies:

E1: Better engage local communities and other partners in addressing the need for and benefits of affordable housing

E2: Develop messages and tools to educate residents about the need for and benefit of affordable housing

E3: Develop toolkits for cities to use to effectively engage local communities when a new affordable housing project is being considered.

E6: Support engagement of local communities and residents in planning efforts to achieve more affordable housing.

P08: Increase zoning density along transit corridors

P09: Allow increased building heights in exchange for production of affordable housing

P30: Encourage adoption of mandatory inclusionary zoning

P37: Increase zoned capacity, particularly increase size of areas with multi-family zoning, and the level of multi-family zoning (height, size)

P39: Provide incentives/zoning to locate affordable housing units are able to be located in proximity to transit and other services

3. Estimated Impact on addressing housing affordability challenge (low/medium/high). Why?

High, but measurable success is unlikely in the near term.

Successfully changing the public’s understanding and comfort with density would likely lead to significantly increased political latitude to implement more quantifiable actions related to affordable housing. Examples include:

- Land use reforms (form based codes, expanding acceptable uses in currently single family detached zones, more robust urban cores, etc.),
- Permit expediting (the permitting process is often cited as both a way to maintain community look and feel, *as well as* a method of stifling development, intentionally or otherwise, that would result in undesirable density in communities),
- Greater housing diversity in urban and suburban areas

Second order impacts from the above changes include positive impacts on utilization of mass transit, better service (healthcare, food, education, childcare, mental health etc.) delivery, and environmental protection, which are highly sought after in Puget Sound communities.

4. Implementation steps: (requires voter approval; councilmanic action; federal action required; state legislation required, etc.; additional data required)

Implementation requires action at the highest level of government willing to take on this issue as a priority. For the greatest success, the higher a level of government that can adopt addressing this issue as a priority, the better. After all, if one city initiates a robust outreach campaign around the benefits of density, the impacts of such a campaign (more development, housing, and so on), would deliver minimal regional (and thus regional social benefit) gains, at the expense of great political (and real) capital. If a county initiates such a campaign, the scope is considerably larger, touching all cities in the county. A county collaboration has yet greater impact, and so on. Ultimately, this message is one of adjusting or re-visiting the understanding of the American Dream, which is truly an issue of the national consciousness, with regional variation. It would be appropriate, but highly unlikely, for this issue to be truly grappled with and led by Congress, with regional state collaborations interpreting Congressional action and policy setting into locally appropriate action.

More reasonably, the implementation step for this plan, within the scope of HART, is County and city council action to task staff (current, or create new positions), to collaborate on a outreach and education strategy around this task. High points include economic and social benefits, maximization of transportation infrastructure, and environmental/greenspace protection.

5. Community engagement considerations:

Community engagement is at the core of this item. It is all about engaging, and more importantly informing, the public's understanding of what issues face them, their friends and their families, as well as future generations. It then needs education on available solutions, which VISION 2050 summarizes: Transit focused (density), stay the course, or re-think the GMA (sprawl). Each of these is a short academic course's worth of information that needs to be made if not understood, available and digestible to the public.

6. Lead Agency/ Key Partners:

Communications specialists from involved jurisdictions, private business stakeholders (via economic development councils or EASC), human services service providers, faith community, community stakeholder groups (Kiwans club, rotary club, local community groups)

7. Other:

Maximum page limit for completed templates: 3 PP.

Exhibit C

HART Work Group Template #4

To be completed for each item rated 3.5 or higher. Please include ballot item reference number(s).

Workgroup: Outreach and Engagement

<p>Title: Goal 4: Expand engagement of non-governmental partners (philanthropy, employers, investors, private developers, and faith communities) to support efforts to build and site more affordable housing.</p>	<p>Ballot Item #(s): E7</p>
<p>Brief description: There is a need to expand support and engagement from non-government partners that will help fill the gap in services and be a value add to our communities. The question is how do we engage, or, what value is there to offer agencies to step up and play an active role in affordable housing with our existing partnerships? That is why county and city municipalities have to foster and support these growing relationships by bringing value to the table.</p>	
<p>Rating from HART Screening Ballot (scale: 1-5, 5 being very promising) 4.31</p>	
<p>Work group rating: 4.95</p> <p>Potential impact on housing affordability challenge: (High / Medium / Low)</p> <p>Ease of implementation: (Easy / Moderate / Difficult)</p>	
<p>Category: <i>Goal <u>X</u> or Strategy/Tactic _____</i></p>	<p>Check all applicable</p>
<p>Demand side goal/strategy: Reduces demand for affordable housing / helps people stay in their homes</p>	
<p>Supply side goal/strategy: Targets assistance to build/maintain housing affordable to:</p>	
<p>0-30%AMI</p>	<p>✓</p>
<p>30-50% AMI</p>	<p>✓</p>
<p>50-80% AMI</p>	<p>✓</p>
<p>80%-125% AMI</p>	<p>✓</p>
<p>>125% AMI</p>	<p>✓</p>
<p>Facilitates housing preservation—maintaining current affordable inventory</p>	<p>✓</p>
<p>Facilitates housing construction generally, providing more units, or units at less cost</p>	<p>✓</p>
<p>Communication / community engagement strategy</p>	<p>✓</p>
<p>Advocacy</p>	<p>✓</p>
<p>Other</p>	
<p>Analysis:</p>	
<p>1. Area where this concept would be most effectively deployed (cities individually / Cities acting collectively / countywide / urban growth area/ rural cities / urban centers / transit corridors / rural areas, etc.).</p>	

Expanding engagement and developing strategies around this goal would include coordinating with county government and cities acting collectively to first; identify opportunity areas of interest to develop, describe any and all incentives for partners to develop that area, and to develop a key stakeholder list of organizations to engage. With Snohomish County's leadership, and in partnership with Cities, we can strategically guide the growth of affordable housing partnerships across the county.

2. If the concept is a more general "goal" please list some of the more specific *strategies or tactics* that you recommend be deployed to accomplish the goal. If these strategies appear on the July screening ballot, please note ballot reference numbers. (Conversely, if this template is about a strategy or tactic, what *goal* does it support? Refer to Rough Draft Outline of Major Goals v.7.29)

- *E1 – A way to engage other partners is to host workshops that lead to an RFP/NOFA being released. Identify what incentives would motivate a new or expansive audience. No honey...no bears.*
- *E3 – Once incentives and a new/updated list of partners emerge – a well-constructed toolkit for cities will engage key stakeholders to bring housing to their area.*
- *F08 – Maintain a list of properties that are up for recindication and engage prior to year 15*
- *F01 – Utilize existing funding to support and expand needed services*
- *F07 – Add surplus properties within the county or city to expand our toolkit*
- *F10 – Create and implement a regional land acquisition/development strategy, that will address the high taxes and fees associated with the development process*
- *F16 – Advocate for expanded MFTE to Counties as Cities are currently able to access*
- *F25 – Provide financial assistance through capital, donated/leased land, reduced permitting fees, etc.*
- *F06 – Establish a county growth fund through taxing new construction that is not affordable.*

3. Estimated Impact on addressing housing affordability challenge (low/medium/high). Why?

We cannot fight this good fight one soldier or one company at a time. But, how can we collectively solve our affordable housing crisis as a unified front? If partners or developers are provided enough incentives to build, we can help guide the counties and cities growth strategy. If provided with enough tools in the toolkit, we would be able to leverage the attention of developers and investors that are less dependent on government funding.

4. Implementation steps: (requires voter approval; councilmatic action; federal action required; state legislation required, etc.; additional data required)

This cannot be rushed. This will require coordination with County and City Government to agree to, and develop a toolkit that incentivizes non-governmental partnerships. All available resources within the county and city (surplus property, CoC funding, MFTE, PBVs) may require a level of voter approval or council action beyond my understanding.

5. Community engagement considerations:

- Once Snohomish County has collaborated with City govt, engage the public in each city to provide input on the growth strategy through a series of public meetings. Engaging the public means that we intentionally bring in folks that the strategy will affect. For example, for more affordable senior housing – let's make sure they are representative in the meetings...and so on.

6. Lead Agency/ Key Partners:

Lead Agency:

- Snohomish County & corresponding Cities

Key Partners (Building from group #3 list):

- Current developers
- Private Investors/developers
- Faith Based Organizations
- Employers
- Hospitals
- Communities of Color Coalition
- Refugee and Immigrant Service NW
- Leadership Snohomish County
- Human Rights Commission of Snohomish County
- Latino Educational Training Institute (LETI)
- YWCA of Seattle | King | Snohomish
- Other non-profits...

7. Other:

Maximum page limit for completed templates: 3 PP.