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Title: Protect communities of color and low-income communities from displacement by gentrification

Ballot Item #(s): P02

Brief description:
People of color and people with lower incomes are at risk of displacement when affordable neighborhoods become desirable to higher income households, usually as a result of the neighborhood’s close proximity to transit and amenities, and increased capital investments in the housing stock that allow landlords to charge higher rents that make living there unaffordable to lower income households. This issue can be addressed through implementation of anti-displacement strategies in areas that pose a high risk of displacement, along with increasing housing choices for people of color and low-income households in high opportunity areas.

Rating from HART Screening Ballot (scale: 1-5, 5 being very promising) 3.79

Work group rating:

Potential impact on housing affordability challenge: (High / Medium / Low)

Ease of implementation: (Easy / Moderate / Difficult)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Goal X or Strategy/Tactic</th>
<th>Check all applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demand side goal/strategy:</td>
<td>Reduces demand for affordable housing / helps people stay in their homes</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply side goal/strategy:</td>
<td>Targets assistance to build/maintain housing affordable to:</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-30%AMI</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30-50% AMI</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50-80% AMI</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80%-125% AMI</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;125% AMI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitates housing preservation—maintaining current affordable inventory</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitates housing construction generally, providing more units, or units at less cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication / community engagement strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analysis:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 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.).  
   - Areas of the County where communities of color and low-income communities are at the greatest risk of displacement |
| 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) |
| This goal supports the HART 5-Year Action Plan **Goal 3 to identify and act on strategies to preserve existing affordable housing.** It is supported by the following strategies:  
   - P04 – Encourage cities to enter into cooperation agreements with the County Housing Authority  
   - F06 – Establish a county growth fund to help fund affordable housing construction  
   - F18 – Provide loan guarantees for housing authority projects  
   - F03 – Seek voter approval for a county-wide property housing levy  
   - F04 – Seek voter approval for a 0.1% sales tax to fund affordable housing  
   - F14 – Encourage cities to consider proposing local housing levies  
   - NEW – Implement local policies/zoning changes to increase Snohomish County’s competitiveness for State and federal funding |
| 3. Estimated Impact on addressing housing affordability challenge (low/medium/high). Why?  
   Pursuing this goal would have a high impact on the affordable housing challenge because it would keep communities together to ensure cultural survival, prevent homelessness, and ensure that communities of color and low-income households share in the benefits of the growing economy in Snohomish County. |
| 4. Implementation steps: (requires voter approval; councilmanic action; federal action required; state legislation required, etc.; additional data required)  
   For the strategies listed above, please see templates on those strategies for explanations on implementation for each strategy. Additional implementation steps include:  
   - Determine areas in the County that are at a high risk of displacing communities of color and low-income households due to increasing market pressures, proximity to job centers, and the arrival of Link light rail. Census data could be analyzed for racial demographic trends in the County, along with market data on rent escalation.  
   - Develop template for cities to use to identify where displacement of communities of color and low-income communities might happen. The Alliance for Housing Affordability could assist cities with this type of analysis. |
- In areas at high risk of displacement, target affordable housing preservation and development, enhance community anchors, and support other public investments in economic development, parks and transit.

- Pursue a preservation property tax exemption in these areas to incentivize private market landlords to invest in their properties and create affordability. This will require State legislation and has been under consideration at the State level for the past several years.

- Support partnerships between communities of color, community land trusts, and other key partners like Forterra to encourage acquisition, stewardship, and development of land assets by communities of color.

- If communities of color or low-income communities will be displaced because of redevelopment, cities should consider adopting relocation ordinances, as permitted under state law.\(^1\)

5. Community engagement considerations:

Engage communities of color and low-income communities to identify areas of the County that are at high risk of displacement and to assist in policy development and decision-making.

6. Lead Agency/ Key Partners:

- Leaders of communities of color
- Leaders of low-income communities
- Snohomish County and cities
- NW Community Land Trust Coalition can facilitate conversations with individual communities.
- Homes and Hope Community Land Trust operates in Snohomish County and Forterra has facilitated anti-displacement projects in neighboring jurisdictions.

7. Other:

\(^1\) RCW 59.18.440
### Prioritize affordability and accessibility with a half mile walkshed of existing and planned frequent transit services, with a particular priority for high-capacity transit stations

Require affordable housing in developments near transit hubs

#### Ballot Item #(#s):
- P-05
- P-21

#### Brief description:
Affordable housing must be paired with affordable, accessible, safe and equitable transportation. People below 50% AMI may not have ready access to private transportation, so housing that is walkable to transit options or within the ADA ¾ mile boundary is essential to any life/work scenario.

Ready accessibility to transportation options (rail, bus, walking routes, bicycle pathways) from housing provides ability to travel to work, healthcare, and education as well as food and recreation.

#### Rating from HART Screening Ballot (scale: 1-5, 5 being very promising)
- P05 (4.36)
- P21 (3.54)

#### Work group rating:
- Potential impact on housing affordability challenge: (High / Medium / Low)
- Ease of implementation: (Easy / Moderate / Difficult) Moderate to Difficult

#### Category:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Strategy/Tactic</th>
<th>Check all applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demand side</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduces demand for affordable housing / helps people stay in their homes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Supply side:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supply side goal/strategy:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Targets assistance to build/maintain housing affordable to:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-30%AMI</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-50% AMI</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-80% AMI</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%-125% AMI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;125% AMI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Facilitates housing *preservation*—maintaining current affordable inventory
Facilitates **housing construction generally**, providing more units, or units at less cost

| 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 area / rural cities / urban centers / transit corridors / rural areas, etc.).
   
   This concept would be most effectively deployed by cities individually, county-wide, in the urban growth areas and urban centers as well as transit corridors.

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)

   **This strategy addresses Goal # 2 and 4 from the Outline of Major Goals:**

   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. All income segments should be addressed.”

   4. “Take steps to increase density of housing on transit corridors and in job centers, while acknowledging that additional housing is needed across the entire County.”

   It also addresses (to a lesser degree) #3

   3. “Identify and action on strategies to preserve existing affordable housing while acknowledging that the need for increased density may create tension with this goal in some instances”

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

   Providing housing in conjunction with high capacity transit lines could have a **medium impact**. The potential for TOD is positive with the proviso that a significant number of units are low-income – those residents who are typically transit dependent. The downside to such development is in its potential desirability for higher wage earners (convenience, cost, proximity to other amenities that typically follow TOD) to completely displace low-wage earners in such developments.

4. Implementation steps: (requires voter approval; councilmatic action; federal action required; state legislation required, etc.; additional data required)
Regional planning, zoning and local planning, zoning and council action would be required to implement any action on providing affordable housing in conjunction with high capacity transit.

5. Community engagement considerations:

Significant considerations in outreach to people of color, those experiencing homelessness, low-income, seniors, and those with disabilities are necessary. These groups are typically lost in most community engagement scenarios. Outreach must be intentional, targeted and built upon significant efforts in relationship building to these communities. Recent surveys in our region identify “lack of access to transportation” as the number one issue for many immigrant populations but finding ways to quantify this need via surveys and other data collection is lacking.

6. Lead Agency/ Key Partners:

Lead Agencies: Mobility Coalitions, Transit agencies, County planning, County and private Housing authorities
Key partners: County Planning and development, County Human services, City planning, Housing Authorities

7. Other:

This template does not address the need for transportation options that are linked to highly affordable housing options in rural and suburban areas. The need for transportation options that are linked to housing is significant across Snohomish County.

Maximum page limit for completed templates: 3 PP.
# HART Work Group Template

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

Workgroup: Policy and Regulatory – Affordable Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title:</th>
<th>Ballot Item #(s):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preserve affordable housing for low-income households that is at risk of rapid rent escalation or redevelopment.</td>
<td>P06 (Affordable Housing Preservation)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Brief description:**

Affordable housing for households making less than 50% AMI is provided through less expensive private market housing, and through rent-restricted publicly funded affordable housing. The restrictions on publicly-funded affordable housing that keep rent affordable to low-income households expire once the affordability period ends so as, these properties near the end of their affordability periods, they can become at risk of redevelopment or rapid rent escalation just like less expensive private market housing. Housing becomes at risk of redevelopment if the market dynamics underlying the housing allow private developers to profit from demolition of the old housing and construction of new housing, usually at significantly higher rents. In addition, a competitive housing market can result in rapidly escalating rents as more households compete for the same housing. It is critical to ensure a comprehensive housing preservation strategy in concert with the housing growth that is needed to keep pace with increasing demand in the County.

**Rating from HART Screening Ballot (scale: 1-5, 5 being very promising):** 3.62

**Work group rating:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential impact on housing affordability challenge: (High / Medium / Low)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of implementation: (Easy / Moderate / Difficult)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Category:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal X or Strategy/Tactic</th>
<th>Check all applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demand side goal/strategy:</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduces demand for affordable housing / helps people stay in their homes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply side goal/strategy:</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targets assistance to build/maintain housing affordable to:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-30%AMI</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-50% AMI</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-80% AMI</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%-125% AMI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;125% AMI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 | 
Other | 

**Analysis:**

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.).
   - Countywide in areas of the County that pose the greatest risk of rapid rent escalation and redevelopment

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)

This goal supports the HART 5-Year Action Plan **Goal 3 to identify and act on strategies to preserve existing affordable housing.** It is supported by the following strategies:
- P04 – Encourage cities to enter into cooperation agreements with the County Housing Authority
- F18 – Provide loan guarantees for housing authority projects
- F03 – Seek voter approval for a county-wide property housing levy
- F04 – Seek voter approval for a 0.1% sales tax to fund affordable housing
- F14 – Encourage cities to consider proposing local housing levies
- NEW – Implement local policies/zoning changes to increase Snohomish County’s competitiveness for State and federal funding

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

   Pursuing this goal would have a high impact on the housing affordability challenge if appropriate funding strategies were implemented to allow nonprofits and housing authorities to acquire properties at risk of rent escalation and redevelopment. It is less expensive to purchase and renovate existing housing than it is to build new housing, and ownership by nonprofits and housing authorities would ensure that rent restrictions would be extended or made permanent.

4. Implementation steps: (requires voter approval; councilmanic action; federal action required; state legislation required, etc.; additional data required)
   - Determine which multifamily properties and areas in the County are at a high risk of rapid rent escalation and redevelopment
   - Implement funding strategies that allow nonprofits and housing authorities to acquire and preserve properties. Please see templates on various strategies for explanations on implementation for each strategy
- Affordable housing owners acquiring properties with a call for offers compete with investors who are willing to close on acquisitions quickly. Therefore, any funding strategies that would be used to acquire these types of properties would need to ensure that the time from application to loan closing was no more than 3 to 4 weeks.

5. Community engagement considerations:

There is generally little community opposition to acquisitions of properties by nonprofits and housing authorities. However, if a property is located outside of a housing authority’s operating area, the jurisdiction has to authorize a housing authority to operate in the jurisdiction to acquire the property. There are several jurisdictions in the County that have denied the housing authority’s requests over the years to acquire certain multifamily rental properties for affordable housing preservation. This could be because the governing bodies of the jurisdictions believed that their citizens would oppose preservation of affordable housing. More can be done to engage and educate the public on the benefits of preserving affordable housing for all economic segments of the community, including those earning less than 60% AMI. Neighbors can stay neighbors and the community stability is not disrupted as a result of families and elderly neighbors having to leave because they can no longer afford the rising rent.

6. Lead Agency/ Key Partners:

- Snohomish County and Cities
- Housing Authority of Snohomish County and Everett Housing Authority
- Housing Consortium of Everett and Snohomish County
- Nonprofit housing owners and operators

7. Other:
Title: Increase construction of affordable homes for low-income households

Ballot Item # (s): P06 (Affordable Housing Production)

Brief description:
The private market does not construct homes affordable to families earning less than 50% AMI because the rent levels that are affordable to this income segment do not produce enough revenue to make new construction projects pencil. To ensure that the housing needs of this income segment of the community are met, jurisdictions can implement policies that reduce construction costs, and support public funding strategies that help bridge the funding gap for affordable housing projects for this segment of the population.

Rating from HART Screening Ballot (scale: 1-5, 5 being very promising) 3.62

Work group rating:
Potential impact on housing affordability challenge: (High / Medium / Low)
Ease of implementation: (Easy / Moderate / Difficult)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Goal X or Strategy/Tactic</th>
<th>Check all applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demand side goal/strategy:</td>
<td>Reduces demand for affordable housing / helps people stay in their homes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply side goal/strategy:</td>
<td>Targets assistance to build/maintain housing affordable to:</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-30%AMI</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30-50% AMI</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50-80% AMI</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80%-125% AMI</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;125% AMI</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Facilitates housing preservation—maintaining current affordable inventory
Facilitates housing construction generally, providing more units, or units at less cost
Communication / community engagement strategy X
### Advocacy

### Other

### Analysis:

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.).**
   - County and cities acting collectively regarding funding strategies to accomplish the goal.
   - County and cities act individually on policy changes, targeted to urban/job centers and transit corridors

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)**

   This goal supports the HART 5-Year Action Plan Goal 2 to increase housing growth to achieve a variety of housing types. It is supported by the following strategies currently under consideration:
   - P29 – Revise local zoning to encourage ADUs
   - P48/P23 – Provide surplus and underutilized land for affordable housing
   - P44 – Allow supportive housing in all multifamily zones
   - P16 – Remove barriers to reducing construction costs and delays
   - P04 – Encourage cities to enter into cooperation agreements with the County Housing Authority
   - P13/P19 – Waive or reduce utility connection charges for affordable housing projects
   - P20/P33 – Waive or reduce impact and mitigation fees for affordable housing
   - P34/P12/P18/P45 – Reduce parking requirements for multifamily affordable housing
   - F23 – Implement state sales tax offset to fund affordable housing
   - F10 – Create and implement a regional land acquisition and development strategy to increase affordable housing
   - F06 – Establish a county growth fund to help fund affordable housing construction
   - F26 – Fund local operating costs for housing service providers
   - F18 – Provide loan guarantees for housing authority projects
   - F03 – Seek voter approval for a county-wide property housing levy
   - F4 – Seek voter approval for a 0.1% sales tax to fund affordable housing
   - F14 – Encourage cities to consider proposing local housing levies
   - **NEW** – Implement local policies/zoning changes to increase Snohomish County’s competitiveness for State and federal funding

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

   Focusing policy changes and funding resources towards affordable housing for households earning less than 60% AMI would have a high impact on the affordable housing crisis countywide. Wage growth has not kept pace housing cost, especially for households making less than 60% AMI, where most have seen their wages not even keep pace with inflation. Of all Snohomish County households, 18 percent (52,000 households) earn less than 50% AMI and do not live in housing
that is affordable to them. They spend more than 30% of their income on housing and utilities and are sacrificing basic needs such as healthcare and food in order to pay for rent. For 33,000 of these households, the situation is particularly dire in that they are paying more than 50% of their income on housing and utilities. These households are considered severely housing cost-burdened and are often one financial crisis away from losing their home.

4. Implementation steps: (requires voter approval; councilmanic action; federal action required; state legislation required, etc.; additional data required)
   Please see templates on various strategies for explanations on implementation for each strategy

5. Community engagement considerations:
   More needs to be done to engage and educate the public on the benefits of providing affordable housing to all economic segments of the community, including those that earn less than 60% AMI. Neighbors can stay neighbors and the community stability is not disrupted as a result of families and elderly neighbors having to leave because they can no longer afford the rising rent. Affordable housing construction typically results in economic growth and decreasing crime in the areas where it is built.

6. Lead Agency/ Key Partners:
   - Snohomish County and cities
   - Alliance for Housing Affordability
   - Housing Consortium of Everett and Snohomish County

7. Other: BC Housing has a Toolkit on Community Acceptance of Non-Market Housing
**Title:**
Encourage cities to enter into cooperation agreements with the County Housing Authority

**Ballot Item #**(s):
P04

**Brief description:**
Public housing authorities can be effective partners with cities in the creation and preservation of affordable housing. Cities that do not have a city-specific housing authority can maximize this partnership by authorizing the county housing authority to operate in the city and by signing a cooperation agreement with the county housing authority that outlines how the partnership will work and clarifies expectations.

**Rating from HART Screening Ballot (scale: 1-5, 5 being very promising):** 3.62

**Work group rating:**

**Potential impact on housing affordability challenge:** (High / Medium / Low)

**Ease of implementation:** (Easy / Moderate / Difficult)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Demand side goal/strategy: Reduces demand for affordable housing / helps people stay in their homes</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supply side goal/strategy: Targets assistance to build/maintain housing affordable to:</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-30%AMI</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30-50% AMI</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50-80% AMI</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80%-125% AMI</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;125% AMI</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilitates housing preservation—maintaining current affordable inventory</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilitates housing construction generally, providing more units, or units at less cost</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication / community engagement strategy</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Analysis:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.</strong></td>
<td>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.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cities individually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.</strong></td>
<td>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)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This strategy supports the HART 5-Year Action Plan Goal 2 to increase housing growth, Goal 3 to preserve existing affordable housing, and Goal 4 to increase density of housing in transit corridors and job centers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.</strong></td>
<td>Estimated Impact on addressing housing affordability challenge (low/medium/high). Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation of this strategy would have a medium impact on addressing the affordable housing crisis. Cities that authorize the Housing Authority of Snohomish County (HASCO) to operate in the city allow HASCO to compete with the private market to acquire existing properties in that city that are at risk of rapid rent escalation. These properties tend to be affordable to households between 50% and 100% AMI. HASCO’s acquisition of these properties ensure they remain affordable to these income segments and that rental revenue is invested back into the properties. This also allows HASCO to acquire existing rent-restricted properties and use available funding resources like 4% tax credits to rehabilitate properties and extend their affordability periods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housing authorities can help cities meet the housing needs of a variety of income segments. Under State law, housing authorities can serve a range of income levels, with the minimum restriction that half of the units in a development must be restricted and affordable to households at or below 80% AMI and the remaining units may be rented at market rate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The impact of this strategy is limited to HASCO’s available resources, which will only allow for the preservation of a limited number of multifamily apartments throughout the County. This strategy would increase in effectiveness if coupled with the availability of a local acquisition loan fund and other funding resources for affordable housing preservation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.</strong></td>
<td>Implementation steps: (requires voter approval; councilmanic action; federal action required; state legislation required, etc.; additional data required)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Per State law,¹ if a city determines 1) that insanitary or unsafe inhabited dwelling accommodations exist in the city, 2) that there is a shortage of safe or sanitary dwelling accommodations available to low-income households at rentals they can afford, or 3) that there is a shortage of safe or sanitary dwellings, apartments, mobile home parks, or other living accommodations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

¹ RCW 35.82.030
accommodations available for senior citizens, then the city shall adopt a resolution declaring that there is a need for a housing authority to function in the city.

- HASCO was created by the Snohomish County Council in 1971 and HASCO’s area of operation is the unincorporated area of Snohomish County as of 1971. In order for HASCO to operate within the city’s boundaries that existed in 1971, that city must pass a resolution that states that there is a need for a housing authority to operate within the city and that authorizes HASCO to operate within the city.

- HASCO and the city sign the interlocal cooperation agreement that clarifies expectations, including provisions that HASCO keep the city informed about HASCO’s property acquisition and housing operation activities in their city.

- HASCO can provide cities with templates for resolutions and interlocal cooperation agreements.

5. Community engagement considerations:

Some cities, such as the City of Lynnwood and the City of Snohomish, have been able to pass resolutions authorizing HASCO to operate in their city with little or no resistance from the public. However, certain jurisdictions might be concerned that their citizens would not support such an arrangement. Some cities may want to consider inviting HASCO to present at a work session so the public can attend, learn more about the affordable housing conditions within their city, and get more information about HASCO’s work before the city decides on passing a resolution and entering into an interlocal cooperation agreement.

6. Lead Agency/ Key Partners:

- Cities
- Housing Authority of Snohomish County

7. Other:

Housing authorities are public corporations that acquire, construct and operate nonprofit housing. Nonprofit affordable housing development organizations also perform the same functions. However, nonprofits are private organizations that do not have to obtain permission from a city’s governing body to operate in the city the way that housing authorities do. In addition, a housing authority is a governmental entity that is accountable to the public through their board of commissioners, who are appointed by the governing body of the municipality that created the housing authority, and are subject to many of the same laws that cities are, including open public meetings and public records laws. Housing authorities can also issue different types of bonds to finance affordable housing projects, such as multifamily revenue bonds, general revenue bonds, and private activity bonds for tax credit projects.
HART Work Group Template

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

Workgroup: Policy and Regulatory – Long Range Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title:</th>
<th>Create and support an ongoing structure for regional collaboration around production of affordable housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ballot Item #(s):</td>
<td>P07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Brief description:

Regional collaboration facilitates a greater focus on housing issues related to policy changes and additional funding to support affordable housing in a constantly evolving market. The majority of cities have limited staffing and resources to devote to development and implementation of strategies to facilitate housing production outcomes effectively.

Rating from HART Screening Ballot (scale: 1-5, 5 being very promising) 3.73

Work group rating:

Potential impact on housing affordability challenge: (High / Medium / Low)

Ease of implementation: (Easy / Moderate / Difficult)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category:</th>
<th>Goal _____ or Strategy/Tactic_____</th>
<th>Check all applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demand side goal/strategy:</td>
<td>Reduces demand for affordable housing / helps people stay in their homes</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply side goal/strategy:</td>
<td>Targets assistance to build/maintain housing affordable to:</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-30%AMI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-50% AMI</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-80% AMI</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%-125% AMI</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;125% AMI</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitates housing preservation—maintaining current affordable inventory</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitates housing construction generally, providing more units, or units at less cost</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication / community engagement strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis:

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.).

Cities and the County acting collectively.
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)

Regional collaboration and pooling of resources expands capacity to assist jurisdictions to meet the following goals:
1. Developing and implementing outreach and education programs to raise awareness of affordable housing challenges and support for action to address those challenges;
2. Promoting greater housing growth and diversity for all income segments of communities;
3. Identifying and acting on strategies to preserve existing affordable housing;
4. Supporting increased density of housing on transit corridors and in job centers; and
5. Tracking progress and support for ongoing regional collaboration around the creation of more affordable housing.

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

Regional collaboration provides the climate for coordinated action, information sharing, and pooling and directing resources for a common goal and more targeted outcomes. This concept has a high potential to bring more resources and expertise into the County and cities on a regional level, provide dedicated attention to housing challenges, and facilitate action by cities to implement policies that result in increased housing production.

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

There is currently an existing collaborative structure in place that could be expanded to include a larger regional focus related to bringing resources back to the community and providing more direct assistance to cities to develop housing strategy plans. This concept was studied at the direction of the Snohomish County Tomorrow Steering Committee as guided by the Countywide Planning Policies. In 2013, the Alliance for Housing Affordability was established through an interlocal agreement between Snohomish County, 13 member cities, and the Housing Authority of Snohomish County as a venue for jurisdictions to work together to understand local housing challenges and share resources to address these challenges. The Alliance is modeled after other successful collaborations across the nation including A Regional Coalition for Housing (ARCH) serving eastside communities in King County for over 20 years. The interlocal agreement describes the purpose and scope of work broad enough to include an expanded regional role in facilitating increased housing production in the County. The Alliance could participate in setting specific housing project priorities on a county-wide basis to assist members in achieving Comprehensive Plan affordable housing goals. The collaboration could also include engagement with the affordable housing development community and the public.

5. Community engagement considerations:

Community engagement consideration as a collaboration’s mission would be to conduct outreach activities in all parts of the County to provide education and information about the housing continuum and the needs across the spectrum of diverse communities.
6. **Lead Agency/ Key Partners:**

Snohomish County Tomorrow, Alliance for Housing Affordability, Snohomish County, Snohomish County cities, Puget Sound Regional Council, Department of Commerce, other public funders.

7. **Other:**

Maximum page limit for completed templates: 3 PP.
### Title: Establish specific affordable housing goals (targets) in Comprehensive Plans

Provide more accurate information for Comprehensive Land Use Plans

### Ballot Item # (s):

P22

P47

### Brief Description:

Set housing unit production targets for very-low income households in Comprehensive Plans to support focus on and address some of the current unmet need and expected population growth since the private market cannot address the demand at this household income level.

### Rating from HART Screening Ballot (scale: 1-5, 5 being very promising) 3.69 and 3.82

### Work group rating:

Potential impact on housing affordability challenge: (High / Medium / Low)

Ease of implementation: (Easy / Moderate / Difficult) Unknown. Fair share targets previously existed and were part of the Snohomish County Tomorrow planning process.

### Category:

Goal _____ or Strategy/Tactic____

Check all applicable

#### Demand side goal/strategy:

Reduces demand for affordable housing / helps people stay in their homes

#### Supply side goal/strategy:

Targets assistance to build/maintain housing affordable to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-30%AMI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-50% AMI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-80% AMI</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%-125% AMI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;125% AMI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Facilitates housing preservation—maintaining current affordable inventory

Facilitates housing construction generally, providing more units, or units at less cost

#### Communication / community engagement strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advocacy</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Analysis:

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.).
This concept would be most effectively deployed countywide.

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)

Setting specific housing targets in Comprehensive Plans would support a greater emphasis on aligning policy, regulations, and funding needed for increased housing production particularly for affordable housing units serving very low-income households (earning <50% of area median income) that the private market struggles to provide. Housing targets would address the current and projected unmet housing needs identified in the jurisdiction’s Housing Element and/or the HO-5 Report, or another method of designating need such as a “fair share” county-wide allocation measure. At the Comprehensive Plan level, specific targets could facilitate alignment of other land use policies and zoning/regulations implementation to create a more conducive development environment for non-profit housing developers. Enhanced land use and planning analysis could forecast the nature of household size in a community, income and affordability levels and stage of life to inform types of housing units necessary to meet the need related to a jurisdiction’s land use and zoning capacity. This could be difficult for smaller cities who have limited staffing resources. However, the Alliance for Housing Affordability could provide support to complete the work for member cities by including a report or tool kit for best practices to assist with Comprehensive Plan updates with a focus on households earning <50% AMI. And finally, funding sources or other financial considerations for affordable housing that is under the influence of a jurisdiction could be designated to incentivize housing production. Note that for most cities, the County holds responsibility for public funding sources designated for affordable housing.

Develop a systematic method to track affordability levels of new housing units placed into service in each jurisdiction. Information could be requested through the permitting process, or could be collected at the time of lease-up through market sources, if available, to establish a baseline of what the housing market is producing and the income levels that the properties will be serving. Without knowing what the housing market is developing, it is difficult for jurisdictions to establish programs designed to serve the portion of the market that is not being served. It is also therefore difficult to identify the gap between the identified housing needs in the Housing Elements of Comp Plans without knowing the portions of the market that are being served, or not, by new housing production, in order to tailor policies, strategies and programs to address this unmet market need. This information can be provided by applicants as part of the permitting process and identify how their project addresses the Housing Elements of Comp Plans.

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

Many Snohomish County jurisdictions have identified specific affordable and market rate housing current and future needs based on the HO5 Report produced by the County as part of the Snohomish County Tomorrow Countywide Planning Policies process. However, many communities do not designate specific affordable housing “targets” and some communities in the past have been resistant to the idea of designating a “fair share” of the countywide affordable housing need. It is not entirely clear if this could have a high impact on addressing the affordability challenge countywide although it
has been shown to have some level of effectiveness in other parts of the state and nationwide when there is clear policy direction along with implementation strategies.

Because of the previous experience with the “fair share” approach some years ago, the County and cities should, at a minimum, develop affordable housing targets for their own jurisdiction’s current unmet and projected unmet need within each jurisdiction, based on population growth projections. This may be done by looking at best practices and other successful methods being implemented in the state and/or nationally.

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

Cities and the County will begin a Comprehensive Plan update due in 2023 that will involve several levels of staff, commissions, councils, and community members. A key implementation step includes monitoring of progress towards meeting targets at regular intervals more often than at a Comprehensive Plan update. A countywide affordable housing database at the site-specific level could be updated and evaluated annually. Similarly, data could be collected on housing production generally, to track the portion of the housing markets being served by each new development within each jurisdiction.

5. Community engagement considerations:

The County and cities should actively engage with their communities about affordable housing and direct outreach to housing developers, identified housing groups, and other interested stakeholders.

6. Lead Agency/ Key Partners:

City and County planning departments, Alliance for Housing Affordability, city and County planning commissions, city and county councils.

7. Other:

The Growth Management Act requires a Comprehensive Plan Housing Element in jurisdictions planning under GMA. The components in state law RCW 36.70A.070(2) include:

“2) A housing element ensuring the vitality and character of established residential neighborhoods that: (a) Includes an inventory and analysis of existing and projected housing needs that identifies the number of housing units necessary to manage projected growth; (b) includes a statement of goals, policies, objectives, and mandatory provisions for the preservation, improvement, and development of housing, including single-family residences; (c) identifies sufficient land for housing, including, but not limited to, government-assisted housing, housing for low-income families, manufactured housing, multifamily housing, and group homes and foster care facilities; and (d) makes adequate provisions for existing and projected needs of all economic segments of the community.”

While prescriptive, State laws lacks detailed guidance regarding establishing specific housing targets other than identifying the need, providing for local flexibility in how this is implemented.
HART Work Group Template

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

Workgroup: **LONG RANGE PLANNING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title: P36 – Ensure adequate buildable land supply</th>
<th>Ballot Item #(#s): 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Brief description:**
Affordable housing is lacking in our county and as the population growth continues so does the need for safe and affordable housing for all levels of income. It’s vital for stabilizing our economy while preventing or reducing poverty in our communities. Housing Accountability Laws need to be created/enforced to ensure equitable and affordable housing is included in all development in Washington State.

**Rating from HART Screening Ballot (scale: 1-5, 5 being very promising)**

| Work group rating: 4.0 |

**Potential impact on housing affordability challenge:** (High / Medium / Low)

**Ease of implementation:** (Easy / Moderate / Difficult)

**Category: Buildable Land Supply - Long Range Planning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal or Strategy/Tactic</th>
<th>Check all applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demand side goal/strategy:</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduces demand for affordable housing / helps people stay in their homes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply side goal/strategy:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targets assistance to build/maintain housing affordable to:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-30%AMI</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-50% AMI</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-80% AMI</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%-125% AMI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;125% AMI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitates housing preservation — maintaining current affordable inventory</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitates housing construction generally, providing more units, or units at less cost</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication / community engagement strategy</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other - Introduction of new/amended RCW 36.70A.540**

**Analysis:**

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.).
   - State level AG to enforce within all presiding jurisdictions in WA
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)

- RCW 36.70A.540 - "(c) If a developer chooses not to participate in an optional affordable housing incentive program adopted and authorized under this section, a city, county, or town may not condition, deny, or delay the issuance of a permit or development approval that is consistent with zoning and development standards on the subject property absent incentive provisions of this program."

- This current law allows developers an optional commitment to building affordable housing incentives. The problem that allows developers an "optional" choice provides leeway to discrimination of low/medium income populations to have no access to affordable housing and ultimately contributes to the housing crisis. Local cities such as Lynnwood City Council had just passed "development agreement amendments without affordable housing mandates"

- California passed several laws previously to address their housing crisis and create more effective low income affordable housing incentives for developers and local city governments. The AG is enforcing these laws onto all jurisdictions to ensure they comply with fair housing laws. There may be some ideas for policy recommendations for amendments or creating new bills.

- Ensure there are laws for greener energy living with minimal impact on local wildlife and fisheries ie, salmon, orca or any other keystone species in Washington.

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

- The programs are already in place is that many if not all are considered "optional" which has a ripple effect to local counties when it comes to legal development and counties agreements. If we can change or adopt some specific areas of law like California’s SB-167 Housing Accountability Act we will be able to prevent homelessness or affordable housing shortage in Washington State. We will also be able to avoid local governments from opting out of low and affordable housing incentives already in place by legislators.

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

- Confirm we don’t have similar laws as California for housing accountability and how we can create similar laws/policies -Legislative Summary July 1st 2019

- Collaborate with other committees working on similar goals/tasks - I am serving on Governor Jay Inslee Poverty Reduction Work Group and I would bring it to our committees attention regarding the HART Task force policy recommendations. Housing aligns with ending childhood poverty, a statistic I learned was “for every $1 dollar spent to prevent childhood poverty yields a $7 return”

- WLH/A/RAP/ - We will be developing the new policy recommendations for the next session and we also work with California RUN/Community Change that can assist in some data or info.
5. Community engagement considerations:

- Educating our local communities on homelessness and how affordable housing is crucial to ensuring all Washingtonians are thriving in their areas. This will also impact who is elected into local offices by educating our communities by fair and equitable housing development.
- Local non-profits are currently working to engage the community on several of these issues locally and statewide; community collaboration and data sharing would fast track information collection and assist with projected impacts on stable affordable housing.

6. Lead Agency/ Key Partners:

- Governor Jay Inslee - [Policy & Resource Recommendations](#) (PRWG)
- Legislators
- Washington Low Income Housing Alliance & Resident Action Project
- Local Mayors & City Council Jurisdiction

7. Other:

Maximum page limit for completed templates: 3 PP.
**Title:** P51 – Move out the Urban Growth area (UGA) boundary

**Ballot Item #:** P51

**Brief description:** Expand the UGA to increase the supply of vacant land for housing development at urban densities.

**Rating from HART Screening Ballot (scale: 1-5, 5 being very promising)**

P51 = 3.17

**Work group rating:**

**Potential impact on housing affordability challenge:** (High / Medium / Low)

**Ease of implementation:** (Easy / Moderate / Difficult)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category:</th>
<th>Check all applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demand side goal/strategy:</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supply side goal/strategy:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-30%AMI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-50% AMI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-80% AMI</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%-125% AMI</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;125% AMI</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilitates housing preservation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilitates housing construction generally,</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Communication / community engagement strategy**

| | |
| --- | |
| **Advocacy** | |
| **Other** | |

**Analysis:**

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.).

   If deployed, this option could potentially be applied by the County in the areas adjacent to the existing UGA boundary which are currently rural areas.

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
This strategy may support Goal 2 – Promote greater housing growth and diversity . . .

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

If applied in undeveloped areas adjacent to UGAs with high demand for new housing that are experiencing rapid development, increasing the supply of vacant land may lead to development of new homes that are a similar price to other homes recently built in the same proximity, not necessarily more affordable, unless other strategies are also deployed in order to encourage or require more affordable development within the expanded UGA.

Development in undeveloped areas will require investments in new infrastructure by developers and the public that could impact housing costs.

In addition, it is unlikely that new market rate housing can be expected to fill the housing needs of low and very low income households, so other strategies would need to be deployed in order to serve those households.

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

Expansion of the UGA boundary must be consistent with the Growth Management Act (GMA) in state law, the Multicounty Planning Policies (MPPs) adopted through Puget Sound Regional Council, the Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs), and the County’s GMA Comprehensive Plan.

- Under GMA, sizing of the UGA must be sufficient to accommodate 20-year growth projections developed by the State Office of Financial Management with a limited amount of additional capacity as a safety factor.
- The MPPs provide limited possibility of UGA expansions, although the MPPs are currently being updated through the Vision 2050 process.
- The CPPs identify conditions under which there can be consideration of UGA changes. There needs to be a determination that remaining capacity within the County’s UGAs is inadequate to accommodate adopted growth targets. For UGA expansions to be considered further, the safety factor of additional population capacity within the UGA beyond that needed to exactly accommodate projected population growth cannot exceed 15%. The next step is to complete an assessment of “reasonable measures” that could be taken to accommodate the projected growth within the existing UGA boundary by encouraging infill and redevelopment. An updated UGA land capacity analysis is required documenting the UGA capacity following implementation of reasonable measures. If those CPP requirements are met, a UGA expansion can be allowed under one or more conditions: 1) there is a need based on the most recent buildable lands review; 2) the UGA expansion is based on a review of the UGA during the periodic update of the Comprehensive Plan every eight years; 3) at some point between periodic updates, the population or employment growth in the UGA (cities and unincorporated portion) equals or exceeds 50% of the additional population or employment capacity estimated for the UGA at the start of the planning period; or 4) it can be demonstrated that the UGA meets any one of seven additional characteristics, one of which is
a declaration that the UGA expansion is necessary to address a critical shortage of affordable housing, and that the UGA expansion will provide affordable housing.

The County Council has the responsibility to adopt the UGA boundary. Proposals to expand the UGA are submitted and reviewed through the County docket process. Prior to consideration by the County Council, an environmental impact analysis would need to be performed consistent with the State Environmental Protection Act (SEPA).

5. Community engagement considerations:

Considerable public engagement effort is required under GMA. This would include early public engagement with affected cities, residents and property owners; SEPA requirements for scoping and comment on the Environmental Impact Statement; review and hearing by the County Planning Commission; followed by consideration by the County Council.

6. Lead Agency/ Key Partners:

County, cities and towns, tribes, development community, real estate community, neighborhood residents, affordable housing advocates, environmental advocates.

7. Other:

Maximum page limit for completed templates: 3 PP.
HART Work Group Template

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

Workgroup: Policy/Regulatory and Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title:</th>
<th>Implement the multi-family property tax exemption (MFTE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ballot Item #(#s):</td>
<td>P40 Implement the multi-family property tax exemption (MFTE). F-17 Encourage Cities to establish Multi-Family Tax Exemption (MFTE) programs (F-17) F-16 Advocate for changes in state law that would enable the County to implement a Multi-Family Tax Exemption (MFTE) program as cities are currently authorized to do (F-16)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Brief description:
A state law (RCW 84.14) helps cities attract residential development. Cities may exempt multifamily housing from property taxes in urban centers with insufficient residential opportunities. The city defines a residential target area or areas within an urban center; approved project sites are exempt from ad valorem property taxation on the residential improvement value for a period of eight or 12 years. The 12-year exemption requires a minimum level of affordable housing to be included in the development (at least 20% of the units or 100% if the building is solely owner-occupied). The eight-year exemption leaves the public benefit requirement—in both type and size—to the jurisdiction’s discretion. The eight-year exemption carries no affordable housing requirement. Cities must pass an enabling ordinance to enact the MFTE and to allow applications for the exemption.

Rating from HART Screening Ballot (scale: 1-5, 5 being very promising)
P40 – 3.58; F17 – 3.58; F16 – 3.36

Work group rating:
Potential impact on housing affordability challenge: (High / Medium / Low)
Ease of implementation: (Easy / Moderate / Difficult)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category:</th>
<th>Check all applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demand side goal/strategy: Reduces demand for affordable housing / helps people stay in their homes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply side goal/strategy: Targets assistance to build/maintain housing affordable to:</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-30%AMI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-50% AMI</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-80% AMI</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%-125% AMI</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;125% AMI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitates housing preservation—maintaining current affordable inventory</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitates housing construction generally, providing more units, or units at less cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication / community engagement strategy</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Analysis:

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.).

   In cities with a population of at least 5,000, that are required to plan or choose to plan under the growth management act within urban centers where the governing authority of the affected city has found there is insufficient affordable housing opportunities.

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)

   (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. All income segments should be addressed.

   (4) Take steps to increase density of housing on transit corridors and in job centers, while acknowledging that additional housing is needed across the entire County.

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

   The MFTE provides an 8 or 12 year period of property tax exemption for qualified properties specified by the local jurisdiction. The 12-year exemption requires a minimum level of affordable housing to be included in the development (at least 20% of the units in a multifamily building of at least 4 units, or 100% if the building is solely owner-occupied). The reduced operating costs from the property tax exemptions offset the rent limits/restrictions for the affordable units, which would otherwise reduce Net Operating Income.

   "Affordable housing" means residential housing that is rented by a person or household whose monthly housing costs, including utilities, do not exceed 30% of the household's monthly income. For the purposes of housing intended for owner occupancy, "affordable housing" means residential housing that is within the means of Low-income (<80% AMI) or Moderate-income (80-115% AMI) households, using HUD-established AMI levels. Jurisdictions can choose the number of units and the AMI levels, and can select higher than the minimum required # of units and lower AMI income levels than required in the RCWs, in order to meet identified local housing needs. Jurisdictions can also add other public benefit provisions, such as including affordability requirements for the 8 year exemption, or [Seattle’s current proposal to limit rent increases on tenants in MFTE affordable units](#).

   At the end of the MFTE period, the property tax exemption ends, and the affordable units are no longer rent restricted. It is likely rents would increase for those tenants to then market rents. Cities considering the program need to weigh the temporary (8-12 years) loss of tax revenue against the potential attraction of new investment, as well as the public benefit from increased affordability to targeted areas, and ensure there is not a windfall benefit to the developer that is not commensurate with the public benefit.

4. Implementation steps: (requires voter approval; councilmatic action; federal action required; state legislation required, etc.; additional data required)
The MFTE implementation process is guided by state law in RCW 84.14. In general, the process includes preparing a resolution of intent to adopt a designated area, holding a public hearing and adopting and implementing standards and guidelines to be utilized in considering applications for the MFTE. Among other criteria, the designated area must lack “sufficient available, desirable, and convenient residential housing, including affordable housing, to meet the needs of the public who would be likely to live in the urban center, if the affordable, desirable, attractive, and livable places to live were available” (RCW 84.14.040). The intent of the MFTE is to facilitate the development of affordable units in specified "Residential targeted areas" - meaning an area within an urban center or urban growth area that has been designated by the governing authority as a residential targeted area.

A property owner applying for an MFTE must meet the criteria (per RCW 84.14.030). The applicant must enter into a contract with the city or county approved by the governing authority, or an administrative official or commission authorized by the governing authority, under which the applicant has agreed to the implementation of the development on terms and conditions satisfactory to the governing authority. This may be done through a regulatory covenant or agreement. The rents should be monitored to ensure that they remain affordable during the tax exemption period.

Jurisdictions can calculate the amount of exempt taxes as well as the rent loss from the affordable housing units for the compliance period to determine whether the public benefit from exempted taxes is equitable to the housing cost reduction to tenants. Jurisdictions can model various AMI levels and numbers of affordable units to be specified for the MFTE. There should be a demonstrated “buy down” of affordability below the market rents for comparable units as the public benefit offset, in exchange for the granting of property tax exemptions by the jurisdiction.

5. Community engagement considerations:
Prior to adopting MFTE, jurisdictions can solicit community input to determine target areas and if there is a sufficient public benefit in rent affordability at certain numbers of units and AMI affordability levels to meet community needs, and to attract developers to participate in the program.

6. Lead Agency/ Key Partners:
Snohomish County cities. A number of jurisdictions have implemented MFTE programs, both in Snohomish County and King County, including Everett, Marysville, Edmonds, Lynnwood, Shoreline, Seattle, Issaquah, and other Washington cities such as Bellingham, Spokane, Tacoma, Yakima and Wenatchee.

PSRC and MRSC have useful information on MFTEs.

Snohomish County legislators, Washington State Assn of Counties, WA Low Income Housing Alliance

7. Other:
Need to research/determine if Snohomish County qualifies under the RCW 84.14 to implement MFTE in unincorporated urban centers. RCW 84.14.010(4) definitions: “…“County” means a county with an unincorporated population of at least Three hundred and fifty thousand.” The State Office of Financial Management population count as of 4/1/19 had Snohomish County’s unincorporated population at 365,480. Clarify whether this qualifies SnoCo for MFTE in urban centers in unincorporated areas. If not, advocate to amend RCW 84.14 in the State legislature to allow Snohomish County (and other counties), other than Rural Counties, to implement MFTE (possibly amend RCW 84.14.040).
HART Work Group Template

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

Workgroup: Policy & Regulatory – Taxes, Fees, and Incentives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title: Waive / Reduce impact and connection fees for affordable housing</th>
<th>Ballot Item #(s): P13, P19, P20, P33</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Brief description:
Impact fees are charged by cities and school districts to help pay for increased infrastructure needs due to population growth. Connection fees help pay for the water/sewer system.

Rating from HART Screening Ballot (scale: 1-5, 5 being very promising) Average rating 3.43

Work group rating:

Potential impact on housing affordability challenge: (High / Medium / Low) Medium to High – Impact and connection fees can easily amount to hundreds of thousands of dollars for multifamily housing developments. Waiving or significantly reducing these fees can finance more units of affordable housing and in some cases can be the difference between a project moving ahead or not.

Ease of implementation: (Easy / Moderate / Difficult) Moderate – Some cities may be reluctant to forgo impact / connection fees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category:</th>
<th>Goal ____ or Strategy/Tactic______</th>
<th>Check all applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Demand side goal/strategy:**
Reduces demand for affordable housing / helps people stay in their homes

**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
- >125% AMI

Facilitates housing preservation—maintaining current affordable inventory
Facilitates housing construction generally, providing more units, or units at less cost X

**Communication / community engagement strategy**

**Advocacy**

**Other**

**Analysis:**

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.). Countywide
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 of promoting housing growth and diversity to achieve a variety of housing types and range of affordability.

3. Estimated Impact on addressing housing affordability challenge (low/medium/high). Why?
High – Income restricted affordable housing for households at <50%AMI cannot be built by the private sector and generally requires public financing. These funds are scarce and usually awarded on a competitive application basis. Waiving impact and connection fees lowers the overall per unit development cost of the project making the application more competitive to other affordable housing lenders and funders.

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

Needs council action only to establish program parameters for fee reductions
Establish mechanisms to ensure the benefit is for affordable housing (eg. agreements, covenants). It should be noted that not every jurisdiction, including Snohomish County, provides utilities and therefore would need to engage with the applicable utility districts. Sewer District Boards would need to approve utility connection fee reductions as well as potentially enter into an interlocal agreement with the appropriate jurisdiction.

5. Community engagement considerations:

This issue does not typically generate community pushback. It may facilitate council passage if included in a comprehensive set of actions taken to increase the number of affordable housing units.

6. Lead Agency/ Key Partners:

Local elected officials from permitting jurisdictions, local utility districts
King County Metro
### 7. Other:
Jurisdictions that already have fee waivers for affordable housing include: Everett, Marysville, Monroe.

Maximum page limit for completed templates: 3 PP.
Title: Surplus and underutilized land for affordable housing

Ballot Item # (s): P48 / P23

Brief description:
Public entities can use surplus and underutilized land for affordable housing by 1) selling land suitable for affordable housing at reduced cost or zero cost to affordable housing developers, 2) selling land suitable for market rate housing to developers at market value and requiring a certain percentage of units to be affordable, and 3) selling land for other purposes and depositing sale proceeds into a fund to allocate for affordable housing development.

Rating from HART Screening Ballot (scale: 1-5, 5 being very promising) 4.15 / 3.77

Work group rating:
Potential impact on housing affordability challenge: (High / Medium / Low)
Ease of implementation: (Easy / Moderate / Difficult)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Goal _____ or Strategy/Tactic X</th>
<th>Check all applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demand side goal/strategy:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduces demand for affordable housing / helps people stay in their homes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply side goal/strategy:</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targets assistance to build/maintain housing affordable to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-30%AMI</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-50% AMI</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-80% AMI</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%-125% AMI</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;125% AMI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitates housing preservation—maintaining current affordable inventory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitates housing construction generally, providing more units, or units at less cost</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Communication / community engagement strategy

Advocacy | X |

Analysis:
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.).
   
   - County and cities acting collectively, targeted at surplus sites in urban centers, transit corridors, and job centers

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)
   
   This strategy supports the HART 5-Year Action Plan Goal 2 to increase housing growth and Goal 4 to increase density of housing in transit corridors and job centers.

3. Estimated Impact on addressing housing affordability challenge (low/medium/high). Why?
   
   The lack of affordable housing has intensified with the rising cost of land and construction. State law allows counties and cities to dispose of surplus property at no or low cost for a public benefit purpose to a public, private, or nongovernmental body.\(^1\) Making publicly owned land available for affordable housing at reduced or no cost would have a medium to high impact on addressing the affordable housing crisis, particularly in urban areas where buildable lands are much less common. Land typically accounts for 10 to 20 percent of the total development cost of a housing project, so reducing or eliminating that cost from the budget could result in more projects moving forward and/or could increase the number of units that could be developed on sites. The degree of impact will depend on how many surplus and underutilized public properties are suitable for affordable housing and made available at low or no cost, and which public entities would be willing to sell them below fair market value for affordable housing.

4. Implementation steps: (requires voter approval; councilmanic action; federal action required; state legislation required, etc.; additional data required)
   
   - The WA State Department of Commerce, in coordination with other State agencies, is required to create an inventory of under-utilized State-owned property suitable for affordable housing development by December 1st each year. Ensure that a designated local entity obtains the list of Snohomish County properties annually. State agencies are also required to notify the applicable county, city and special purpose district at least 60 days before signing a disposition agreement to sell surplus land to a private entity and must give those local public agencies right of first refusal.\(^2\) Local public agencies should coordinate to ensure that any state-owned lands suitable for affordable housing are acquired before disposition to private entities.

   - A lead local agency should coordinate with all local public agencies to create an inventory of local underutilized publicly-owned properties (owned by the County, cities, school districts, and utilities), and to evaluate the properties for their suitability for affordable housing development based on industry accepted standards such as location, lot size and slope, current land use designation and zoning classification, and presence of contamination.

---

\(^1\) RCW 39.33.015
\(^2\) RCW 43.17.400
• Snohomish County could take the lead in developing a surplus property disposition policy that
1) prioritizes affordable housing, 2) offers property at no or low cost when used for affordable
housing, secured by long-term covenants specifying income levels to be served, and 3) provides
that if land is sold at fair market value, that sale proceeds be deposited into an affordable
housing trust fund for development of affordable housing elsewhere. This could then be used
as a model policy by other local public entities.

• Each public entity would need to ensure necessary internal interdepartmental consents related
to the policy provisions, especially due to the financial impact of a revenue loss on a particular
department if property is sold for no and low cost, which impacts that department’s ability to
achieve its goals unrelated to affordable housing.

• Partner with Sound Transit to make surplus land available for affordable housing, potentially
in coordination/alignment with other public funding for affordable housing (e.g. Sound Transit
and the City of Seattle completed a joint RFP for Roosevelt Station that included a land sale at
less than FMV in exchange for development of rent/income-restricted units along with public
funding for the affordable housing development).

• Sound Transit is required to contribute funds into a revolving loan fund to support TOD
opportunities. Determine what Snohomish County can do to position itself to be competitive
for these funds.

• County and cities can mandate the co-development of affordable housing in conjunction with
new public buildings and investments such as community centers, libraries, public schools, and
other learning institutions.

• County and cities can each identify one property within their jurisdiction that could be made
available at less than fair market value for affordable housing within the next 5 years

• The Washington State constitution currently prohibits a land sale at less than fair market value
if gas tax funds were originally used by the DOT to acquire the property. Similar restrictions
may apply to other public entities based on the original funding source restrictions – eg. federal
funds. Research the potential for legislative action that could eliminate these restrictions.

5. Community engagement considerations:

   HART will need to engage with other public entities like Sound Transit, school districts, and utilities
   for information on available underutilized properties and coordination on implementation of
   policies to prioritize land for affordable housing, including creative mixed uses. The County and
cities will need to engage with other stakeholders when specific sites are identified

6. Lead Agency/ Key Partners:

   • Enterprise and Futurewise (they are currently mapping all of the public land in the City of
     Seattle, including information on surplus and underutilized properties)
   • Snohomish County and cities
   • Alliance for Housing Affordability (on behalf of some member cities)

7. Other: See the following 2017 reports: Enterprise - Public Benefit from Publicly Owned Parcels;
   and Enterprise - Public Benefit from Publicly Owned Parcels - Puget Sound
Title:
P38: Encourage cities and county to utilize authority of HB 1377 (2019) to grant density bonuses on church-owned property

Brief Description:
This bill requires that cities give density bonuses to faith based organizations that use, lease, or sell their real property for the purposes of providing <80% AMI housing. Cities can act preemptively to both define what a “density bonus consistent with local needs” is, and inform local faith communities about this bill.

Rating from HART Screening Ballot (scale: 1-5, 5 being very promising):

Work Group Rating:

Potential Impact on Housing Affordability Challenge (High / Medium / Low)

Ease of Implementation (Easy / Moderate / Difficult)

Category: Check All applicable

Demand Strategy:
Reduces demand for affordable housing / helps people stay in their homes

Supply side strategy:
Targets assistance to build/maintain housing affordable to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage AMI</th>
<th>Check</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-30% AMI</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-50% AMI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-80% AMI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-125% AMI</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;125% AMI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Facilities housing preservation – maintaining current affordable inventory
Facilitates housing construction generally, providing more units, or units at less cost X

Communication / community engagement strategy / Advocacy X

Other

Analysis:
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.)

Cities individually – unless there are opportunities for communication between local collaborations of government and faith organizations (like the Archdiocese), this is a city-specific action.
2. If the concept is a more general “goal” or “strategy” list some of the more specific tactics what [sic] could be deployed to accomplish the goal/strategy.

This is a strategy to support Goal 2.

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. All income segments should be addressed

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

Relative to the current and projected need for affordable housing at all income spectra, the number of participating faith organizations and the impact they can make regionally is small. However, every unit built, especially with density bonuses, is helpful and should not be discounted.

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

Councilmanic. Preemptively planning for this bill is just at the direction of the mayor and/or city council. Concurrently, outreach can be conducted to faith organizations within the city limits to inform them of this bill and that the city will be prepared if the faith organization is motivated by the passage of this bill to act. The steps to implement this action (preemptively planning), are very easy.

5. Community engagement considerations:

Minimal, however there are examples county-wide of faith organizations trying to put surplus land to use for affordable housing and receiving community pushback. Therefore, this measure (as all measures should) include preparation for community pushback along typical lines of stereotyping affordable housing development, amplified by a variance to build beyond the site’s zoning.

6. Lead agency / Key Partners:

Mayor & Planning staff (lead)
Archdiocese or other faith organizations acting regionally, pastors and local faith group stakeholders

7. Other:

A city’s role in HB1377 is largely reactive – state law mandates density variances in cases where a faith organization wishes to use their land (through sale, lease, or active management) for affordable housing for 50 years. If a faith organization takes advantage of the bill, the city must respond appropriately. However, cities can choose to be preemptive instead of reactive in planning for this bill. The first step is defining what a “density bonus consistent with local needs” is. Increasing clarity preemptively will likely lead to increased utilization.

Furthermore, local faith communities may not be aware of this bill, so notifying faith communities of the bill and providing clarity on what a density bonus would be on their land (in an objective way), could increase utilization.

Maximum page limit for completed templates: 3PP.
### HART Work Group Template

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

**Workgroup: Policy & Regulation – Process**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title: Increase SEPA categorical exemption threshold for larger multifamily developments</th>
<th>Ballot Item #(s): P11, P46</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brief description:</strong> Prior to the GMA, environmental protections were exclusively handled in SEPA. Post-GMA, redundancy exists in the notice process and subsequent delays, adding to time and unpredictability in the review process, translating to greater expense to the buyer or tenant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rating from HART Screening Ballot (scale: 1-5, 5 being very promising)</strong> P11 3.67 and P46 3.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work group rating:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential impact on housing affordability challenge: (High / Medium / Low)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of implementation: (Easy / Moderate / Difficult)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Category:

**Demand side goal/strategy:** Reduces demand for affordable housing / helps people stay in their homes

**Supply side goal/strategy:**

- Targets assistance to build/maintain housing affordable to:
  - 0-30%AMI
  - 30-50% AMI
  - 50-80% AMI
  - 80%-125% AMI
  - >125% AMI

Facilitates housing preservation—maintaining current affordable inventory

Facilitates housing construction generally, providing more units, or units at less cost

**Communication / community engagement strategy**

**Advocacy**

**Other**

**Analysis:**

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.).

Urban centers & all urban development that have been zoned for multifamily development should be categorically exempt from SEPA review. All areas that have been designated and zoned for development above the current use and have been analyzed a programmatic environmental review.
should not have to subject a housing project to a redundant SEPA review processes because environmental review at a site level are addressed in regulations.

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)

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. All income segments should be addressed

5 – Identify an ongoing means of tracking our progress and supporting ongoing regional collaboration around the creation of more affordable housing

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

Time spent in SEPA review is considerable, again for redundant, already-assured protections of the environment through existing regulations. The opportunity for public opposition to otherwise permitted (and planned for through the public process by the city) development is given another chance to slow the process and make it more expensive. Ultimate risk to the developer is high, while the financial barrier to this SEPA appeal process for a resident is considerably lower, making this not an uncommon situation. In spite of this, a vast majority of SEPA reviews are findings of non-significance, meaning cost for effectively no additional benefit (that is, protection of the environment).

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

State legislature action required; city and county council action subsequent to state action. Evaluate how E2SHB 1923 may have addressed this issue.

5. Community engagement considerations:

Action on this could be perceived to mean removal of environmental protections and impact analysis of projects, as well as removing public opportunity to comment on projects. However, all applicable development regulations already apply and require consistency with adopted Comprehensive Plans and zoning regulations, this is a procedural step that is unnecessary in the modern regulatory environment. Communicating that to the public is critical.

6. Lead Agency/ Key Partners:


7. Other:

Land use designations, zoning designations, and city land use regulations already go through a level of environmental review prior to passage. Requiring developers to repeat this process is unnecessarily duplicative. SEPA review in these cases (particularly urban areas) is is often redundant or does not provide additional information and it should be removed as a barrier to affordable housing.
The existing SEPA process is often misused to stop projects and process at the SEPA review. It has been found that a majority of SEPA reviews are found non-significant, and go forward in spite of public opposition when a project has been determined to be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, Zoning, and land use regulations. This leads to project unpredictability, delays, and added costs, while also resulting in a public sentiment that suggests government is unresponsive to their comments.
HART Work Group Template

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

Workgroup: Policy and Regulatory – Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title: Facilitate more efficient deal assembly and development timelines / Promote cost-effectiveness through consolidation, coordination, and simplification</th>
<th>Ballot Item #(s): P17 / P15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brief description: This is a broad concept related to alignment and simplification of overlapping funding, regulations and process for housing projects.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating from HART Screening Ballot (scale: 1-5, 5 being very promising)</td>
<td>4.00 / 3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work group rating:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential impact on housing affordability challenge: (High / Medium / Low)</td>
<td>Potentially high impact on housing affordability depending on the depth of alignment and simplification of the complexities of housing production.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of implementation: (Easy / Moderate / Difficult)</td>
<td>Moderate to Difficult</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category:</th>
<th>Goal _____ or Strategy/Tactic <em><strong>X</strong></em>_</th>
<th>Check all applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demand side goal/strategy:</strong></td>
<td>Reduces demand for affordable housing / helps people stay in their homes</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supply side goal/strategy:</strong></td>
<td>Targets assistance to build/maintain housing affordable to:</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-30%AMI</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30-50% AMI</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50-80% AMI</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80%-125% AMI</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;125% AMI</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilitates housing preservation—maintaining current affordable inventory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilitates housing construction generally, providing more units, or units at less cost</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Communication / community engagement strategy**

**Advocacy**

**Other**

**Analysis:**

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.).

Countywide
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)

Relates to goal 2: Promote greater housing growth and diversity to achieve a variety of housing types at range of affordability.

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

Potentially medium to high impact on addressing housing affordability challenge by facilitating coordinated and simplified components of housing production. Aligning funding and process timelines could save significant costs for housing project. Savings could also be realized where consolidated monitoring can be coordinated among public funders and reduced redundancies in regulations and permit processing.

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

Additional information and analysis is required to more fully identify redundancies and opportunities for coordination and collaboration among public agencies. State legislation and councilmanic actions could be required.

5. Community engagement considerations:

Changes to regulations and public process will require extended community engagement outreach efforts for the public to understand how housing projects will be funded and permitted including when in the process there is public input opportunities. Making clear the removal of redundancies does not negatively impact community opportunities for input, and environmental protections remain in place, will be important.

6. Lead Agency/ Key Partners:

City and County planning and building permit departments, public funding agencies, housing development community partners

7. Other:

This concept requires more in-depth analysis of the overlaps and redundancies in funding, processes, and regulations in order to recommend potential streamlined systems and understanding how the public sector can better support housing production.

Maximum page limit for completed templates: 3 PP.
**Title:**
Remove barriers to reducing construction costs and delays and expedite the permit process

**Ballot Item #(#s):**
P16, P35

**Brief description:**
The development community consistently provides feedback that the time it takes to obtain approvals and permitting is overly burdensome and difficult. This concept seeks ways to reduce the amount of time it takes to receive entitlements, approvals and permits, which ultimately translate into higher prices paid by developers and ultimately passed on to tenants or owners. The development community has consistently communicated that delays in all levels of the process create unpredictability and therefore affect the finances of a potential project.

**Rating from HART Screening Ballot (scale: 1-5, 5 being very promising):** P16 3.64 and P 35 3.93

**Work group rating:**

**Potential impact on housing affordability challenge:** (High / Medium / Low)

**Ease of implementation:** (Easy / Moderate / Difficult)

**Category:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>or</th>
<th>Strategy/Tactic</th>
<th>Check all applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Demand side goal/strategy:**
Reduces demand for affordable housing / helps people stay in their homes

**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

**Analysis:**

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.).

   This concept could have the greatest impact through a collaboration of cities and Snohomish County, as permitting requirements and processes are universal. Cities and the County could collaborate on
aligning business processes, permits, forms and timeframes for enhanced impact and/or developing a set of “best practices” that could be used by any jurisdiction to improve process timelines.

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)

#5. Regional collaboration around affordable housing. Reducing the amount of time needed for the permit process results in potentially significant reduction in holding costs, interest and rework due to scheduling conflicts.

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

There are other complex issues associated with affordability, however, lack of predictably for planning purposes and avoidable delays due to complex processes and inadequate staffing results in adding to the overhead costs of the permit process that is passed on to the final buyer or tenant.

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

Requires a holistic look at all contemporary code adoptions in light of the conflicts they bring coupled with an already time-consuming permit process due to the desire for public participation. Some elements of the notice and appeal process creates additional risk during SEPA and Land Appeals including court actions for projects already deemed consistent with Policy and Land Use Regulations.

Suggestions are a more robust comprehensive plan process to include public engagement that communicates the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning designation process is the public participation opportunity for those future projects that will be permitted outright and limited input opportunities will be available at the project permit level. Consider amending development regulations by allowing more “by-right” development, recognizing this is a challenging, but productive reform.

5. Community engagement considerations:

This item considerably overlaps with work done in Outreach & Community Engagement items, as it may involve a revision to the public’s involvement in a more enhanced Comprehensive Plan and zoning approval outreach and engagement planning process (see item 4, related to public appeals). Include this idea with the Community Outreach team recommendations.

6. Lead Agency/ Key Partners:

   County and City planning departments, State Legislature, Department of Commerce and Department of Ecology, Federal agencies may have a role due to the process association with federal permits.

7. Other:

   Note that local governments have limited or no influence on all impacts to construction costs related to labor and materials.

Maximum page limit for completed templates: 3 PP.
**Title:**
Reduce short plat threshold for affordable housing projects

**Ballot Item #(s):**
P32

**Brief description:**
Jurisdictions could immediately adopt revised development regulations to allow shortplats for up to 9 lots instead of 4 lots as authorized under state law to allow more lots to be created through an administrative process. The County and cities could lobby for a change in state law to allow up to 20 lots for a short plat, thereby reducing time, public hearings and holding costs to incentivize more residential lot creations.

**Rating from HART Screening Ballot (scale: 1-5, 5 being very promising):** 3.73

**Work group rating:**

Potential impact on housing affordability challenge: (High / Medium / Low) May have a higher impact in areas with more vacant and greenfield lands than highly urbanized areas.

Ease of implementation: (Easy / Moderate / Difficult)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Demand side goal/strategy: Reduces demand for affordable housing / helps people stay in their homes</th>
<th>Supply side goal/strategy: Targets assistance to build/maintain housing affordable to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0-30%AMI X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30-50% AMI X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50-80% AMI X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80-125% AMI X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;125% AMI X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Facilitates housing preservation—maintaining current affordable inventory
Facilitates housing construction generally, providing more units, or units at less cost

**Communication / community engagement strategy**

**Advocacy**

**Other**

**Analysis:**

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.).

   Countywide, cities, urban areas/centers. The benefit of raising the threshold for shortplats would be most realized where denser housing of potential infill areas in highly urbanized areas could develop, urban growth areas, transit centers, and rural cities.
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)

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. All income segments should be addressed.

4) Take steps to increase density of housing on transit corridors and in job centers, while acknowledging that additional housing is needed across the entire County.

5) Identify an ongoing means of tracking our progress and supporting ongoing regional collaboration around the creation of more affordable housing.

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

While there are other factors that enter into the cost of housing, removing time barriers to getting projects permitted, started and finished will lead to returns in lower end housing cost. This strategy could further support and incentivize both infill development and redevelopment and vacant development. This strategy has a medium impact on addressing the housing affordability challenge due to the relatively nature of shortplats being small number of new lots/units it could produce.

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

County and cities could lobby state legislators to change state law to support an increase in the shortplat thresholds, councilmanic action, state department of commerce, planning departments

5) Community engagement considerations:

Perception from the public may be that government is removing their ability to provide input and comments stop development for a larger number of projects. Addressing this concern and the benefits of this action would be critical to allowing councils and legislators the latitude to implement this strategy.

6) Lead Agency/ Key Partners:

State legislative delegation, development community, Department of Commerce, Association of Washington Cities, Washington Association of Counties, planning departments.

7) Other:

Note that some Snohomish County cities have already adopted the 9-lot shortplat threshold.
Title: Increase housing variety at a range of affordability levels, including within single family zones and with connection to jobs

Ballot Item(s):
P01, P27, and P53

Brief description: Allowing a greater variety of housing types than the most prevalent options available today – single family detached on its own lot, and large multi-family developments – can increase housing supply, and provide more options for households that either cannot afford, or who prefer not, to live in those two options. Increasing flexibility in single family zones by allowing duplex, triplex, fourplexes, and courtyard apartments can accommodate families or households that prefer not to live in standard multi-family developments. Locating more housing types near job centers or near access to transit that serves job and opportunity centers improves the jobs-housing balance, reduces vehicle miles traveled and air emissions, and protects greenspace and the natural environment.

Rating from HART Screening Ballot (scale: 1-5, 5 being very promising)
P01 = 4.64; P53 = 4.50; P27 = 4.14;

Work group rating:

Potential impact on housing affordability challenge: (High / Medium / Low) It would open opportunities for adding additional housing on currently developed single family lots, or to replace existing single family homes with housing that is more affordable on a price per unit basis. The ultimate impact on affordability depends heavily on the scope of change to zoning and land use as described above. Simply modifying codes to allow additional ADUs, or restricting upzones into the fringes of urban centers would have low impact. Minneapolis’ re-imagining of single family zoning is a current example of how this could have a high impact.

Ease of implementation: (Easy / Moderate / Difficult) It will take political will and public acceptance more than technical expertise to craft appropriate development standards and design guidelines.

Category:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demand side goal/strategy:</th>
<th>Supply side goal/strategy:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduces demand for affordable housing / helps people stay in their homes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targets assistance to build/maintain housing affordable to:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-30%AMI</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-50% AMI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-80% AMI</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%-125% AMI</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;125% AMI</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitates housing preservation—maintaining current affordable inventory</td>
<td>Yes and no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitates housing construction generally, providing more units, or units at less cost</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Analysis:**

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.).

   If added to the Countywide Planning Policies, each city and the county would have to address in their comprehensive plan and development regulations, but that will not occur prior to mid-2023. However, nothing precludes individual jurisdictions to try this sooner. The legislature nearly preempted local zoning this past session with state rules that would mandate all of these housing types in single family zones.

   One spin to applying these housing types in all single family zones would be to create a separate zone in which all of these housing types would be allowed, and rezone sufficient land to this new zone to create opportunity local government to observe the results of a comparatively unrestricted market response to housing demand. This would have a greater potential for success if it applied in undeveloped areas, rather than areas where existing single family development is prevalent.

   This option could apply in any city or in urban areas of the county, in single family zones or zones at the lower end of the density spectrum, for example, a zone that already allows duplexes would now be able to add triplexes or fourplexes.

   As for preserving existing affordable housing stock, in some cases it may, because an existing home would be preserved while other housing units are built on the site, while in other cases, the existing house may be removed to allow for an entirely new building.

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)

   *This supports Goals 2*

   **Goal 2 – Promote greater housing growth and diversity . . .**

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

   If applied in undeveloped areas zoned for single family housing, it would open up more potential for a variety of housing types. If applied in already developed neighborhoods, it will have a slower impact as each homeowner would have to decide whether or not it is worth the effort to add, redevelop, or sell to a developer (who would then make this consideration). Redevelopment is much more challenging than starting with vacant land.

   However, increasing the types of housing allowed may not necessarily address housing affordability at all income levels, such as 50% AMI or lower, or even up to 80% AMI levels. As the region’s housing market costs increase, even allowing for these additional types of developments will not ensure those units will be affordable and provide the range of housing affordability needed to serve the community.

4. Implementation steps: (requires voter approval; councilmatic action; federal action required; state legislation required, etc.; additional data required)
For adding to the countywide planning policies, county council action is required, but only after a collaborative process with cities. To add to individual jurisdiction land use regulations, it will take political will by city councils or the county council. No state or federal action is required, but state legislation could (and almost did) pre-empt local zoning to allow more variety in the types of housing permitted in single family zones.

5. **Community engagement considerations:**

There would have to be a considerable public engagement effort to get most citizens (and therefore a majority of council members) to be supportive of the benefits without being fearful of the worst possible impacts of incompatible housing development in established neighborhoods. This approach would require considerable lead time in preparing, hinging largely on work coming from the Outreach & Community Engagement proposals.

6. **Lead Agency/ Key Partners:**

County and cities, development community, real estate community, neighborhood advocates, housing advocates, Futurewise, etc.

7. **Other:**

Some good examples of where this has worked would be necessary to show the benefits to the public. Good design standards, limits on bulk, and proper siting of off-street parking are the typical impacts people are concerned about. The City of Minneapolis is one example of this idea being put into practice, see [https://minneapolis2040.com/](https://minneapolis2040.com/).
### Title: Increase housing variety at a range of affordability levels, including within single family zones and with connection to jobs

| Ballot Item #(#s): | P08, P39, and P24 |

#### Brief description:
These 3 items relate to increasing affordable housing units, increasing zoning density, and providing inclusionary/ incentive housing policies, all in proximity to existing or planned frequent transit service. These have been combined to address since they have the common goal of increasing housing near transit. P39 and P24 are nearly identical as they refer to incentives or inclusionary policies to increase affordable housing near frequent transit. P08 only mentions increasing zoning density along transit corridors.

#### Rating from HART Screening Ballot (scale: 1-5, 5 being very promising)
- P08 = 4.07
- P24 = 3.38
- P39 = 4.08

### Work group rating:

**Potential impact on housing affordability challenge:** (High / Medium / Low) It would open opportunities for adding additional affordable and market rate housing on corridors with frequent transit service. The ultimate impact on affordability depends heavily on: a) the number of housing units achieved through higher permitted densities; b) the number of affordable housing units allowed through incentives or inclusionary policies; and c) income restrictions applied to additional bonus units that are required to be affordable, and those additional units allowed as the reward for providing affordable housing units.

**Ease of implementation:** (Easy / Moderate / Difficult) It will take political will and public acceptance more than technical expertise to craft appropriate incentives or inclusionary standards for affordable vs. additional market rate dwellings.

### Category:

| Goal _____ or Strategy/Tactic _____ | X____ |

#### Demand side goal/strategy:
Increases supply of affordable housing / increases supply of housing / increases housing in proximity to frequent transit service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AMI Range</th>
<th>0-30%AMI</th>
<th>30-50% AMI</th>
<th>50-80% AMI</th>
<th>80%-125% AMI</th>
<th>&gt;125% AMI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Facilitates housing preservation—maintaining current affordable inventory

Facilitates housing construction generally, providing more units, or units at less cost

| Communication / community engagement strategy | X |
## Analysis:

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.).
   
   These actions are geared to providing additional housing and additional affordable housing near transit service. Frequent transit service is most likely to be established in designated light rail, bus rapid transit corridors and in regional and locally designated urban centers.

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)

   **This supports Goals 4**

   **Goal – Take steps to increase density of housing on transit corridors and in job centers . . . . . .

3. Estimated Impact on addressing housing affordability challenge (low/medium/high). Why?
   
   These strategies – increasing permitted zoning density; and incentive / inclusionary policies for affordable housing have the potential to increase supply of both affordable and market rate housing.

   Affordable housing supply would be increased through incentives and inclusionary policies, and market rate housing would be increased by allowing additional supply of market rate housing by increasing permitted densities, and by increasing the ability to develop market rate housing in return for building a certain percentage of affordable housing units. Inclusionary / incentive policies require the market rate housing units to subsidize the affordable housing units, so it can be tricky to determine the bonus proper housing ratio allowed for the market rate housing and the affordability level for the privately subsidized affordable housing. If the bonus is not profitable for the developer, they will not build the affordable units.

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

   These actions, increasing density, and establishing incentive / inclusionary policies require local legislative action city and county councils. This is more likely to be acceptable to the residents of the community, and therefore easier for the elected officials to enact, in corridors with frequent transit service than other areas in a community. The difficulty will be in determining what incentive / inclusionary standards will actually result in a private for-profit builder building housing. It must be profitable enough with the market rate units that the developer can afford to privately subsidize the affordable units. This may not be possible in some markets. For example, Everett allows unlimited density in the Evergreen Way Bus Rapid Transit corridor, and without the requirement for affordable housing units. However, even unlimited density without subsidizing affordable units is not profitable enough for any housing to be built here. There has been only one multi-family building developed in this corridor since 2012 when the zoning was changed to allow the unlimited density.

5. Community engagement considerations:

   There would have to be a sound public engagement effort to get the public (and therefore a majority of council members) to be supportive of the benefits without being fearful of increased density, and fearful of
affordable housing. This approach would require some lead time in preparing, hinging largely on work coming from the Outreach & Community Engagement proposals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Lead Agency/ Key Partners:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County and cities, development community, real estate community, neighborhood advocates, housing advocates, Futurewise, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. Other:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We need additional information about where incentives and inclusionary policies have been successful, and what has made them successful. There are critical housing market factors that will determine if incentives / inclusionary policies will work. If it is not profitable for the developer to provide affordable units, none will be built through inclusionary / incentive policies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maximum page limit for completed templates: 3 PP.
**HART Work Group Template**

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

**Workgroup:** Policy and Regulations – Zoning Regulations, Uses and Density

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title: Increase housing variety at a range of affordability levels, including within single family zones and with connection to jobs</th>
<th>Ballot Item #(#s):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P08, P39, and P24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Brief description:** These 3 items relate to increasing affordable housing units, increasing zoning density, and providing inclusionary / incentive housing policies, all in proximity to existing or planned frequent transit service. These have been combined to address since they have the common goal of increasing housing near transit. P 39 and P 24 are nearly identical as they refer to incentives or inclusionary policies to increase affordable housing near frequent transit. P08 only mentions increasing zoning density along transit corridors.

**Rating from HART Screening Ballot (scale: 1-5, 5 being very promising)**

P08 = 4.07; P24 = 3.38; P39 = 4.08

**Work group rating:**

Potential impact on housing affordability challenge: (High / Medium / Low) *It would open opportunities for adding additional affordable and market rate housing on corridors with frequent transit service. The ultimate impact on affordability depends heavily on: a) the number of housing units achieved through higher permitted densities; b) the number of affordable housing units allowed through incentives or inclusionary policies; and c) income restrictions applied to additional bonus units that are required to be affordable, and those additional units allowed as the reward for providing affordable housing units.*

Ease of implementation: (Easy / Moderate / Difficult) *It will take political will and public acceptance more than technical expertise to craft appropriate incentives or inclusionary standards for affordable vs. additional market rate dwellings.*

**Category:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demand side goal/strategy:</th>
<th>Supply side goal/strategy:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increases supply of affordable housing / increases supply of housing / increases housing in proximity to frequent transit service</td>
<td>Targets assistance to build/maintain housing affordable to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-30%AMI</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-50% AMI</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-80% AMI</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%-125% AMI</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;125% AMI</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Facilitates housing preservation—maintaining current affordable inventory

Facilitates housing construction generally, providing more units, or units at less cost

Communication / community engagement strategy

---

Supplemental Report, Part 2: Policy and Regulatory Work Group Templates
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.).
   These actions are geared to providing additional housing and additional affordable housing near transit service. Frequent transit service is most likely to be established in designated light rail, bus rapid transit corridors and in regional and locally designated urban centers.

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)

   This supports Goals 4 only if implemented in transit corridors. There is not a stated goal on the HART Outline of Major Goals that directly relates to increasing density except in transit corridors.

   Goal – Take steps to increase density of housing on transit corridors and in job centers . . . . .

3. Estimated Impact on addressing housing affordability challenge (low/medium/high). Why?
   These strategies – increasing permitted zoning density; and incentive / inclusionary policies for affordable housing have the potential to increase supply of both affordable and market rate housing.

   These two concepts do not mention housing affordability. However, increasing supply can improve affordability, and tying increased densities to incentives may be successful, depending on the housing market and the incentives allowed.

4. Implementation steps: (requires voter approval; councilmatic action; federal action required; state legislation required, etc.; additional data required)
   These actions, increasing zoning capacity, and requiring minimum densities (instead of limiting maximum density) require local legislative action.

5. Community engagement considerations:
   There would have to be a sound public engagement effort to get the public (and therefore a majority of council members) to be supportive of the benefits without being fearful of increased density. This approach would require some lead time in preparing, hinging largely on work coming from the Outreach & Community Engagement proposals.

6. Lead Agency/ Key Partners:
   County and cities, development community, real estate community, neighborhood advocates, housing advocates, Futurewise, etc.

7. Other:
   We need examples of where minimum densities have been successful, and with what types of housing products, e.g.; single-family, townhouse, garden apartments, urban apartment, high rise multi-family, etc.
## HART Work Group Template

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

**Workgroup:** Policy and Regulatory – Zoning Regulations, Uses and Density

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title: Increase density along transit; increase minimum density; allow zoning incentives in exchange for affordable housing; increase zoning capacity.</th>
<th>Ballot Item #(s): P09, P8, P30, P37 and P39</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Brief description:** Use zoning density and capacity and other zoning tools to incentivize more multi-family housing, including affordable.

**Rating from HART Screening Ballot (scale: 1-5, 5 being very promising):**
- P09 = 3.79
- P8 = 4.07
- P37 = 3.86
- P39 = 4.08

**Work group rating:** To be discussed

**Potential impact on housing affordability challenge:** *(High / Medium / Low)* High

**Ease of implementation:** *(Easy / Moderate / Difficult)* increasing density Moderate, zoning more land for multi-family Difficult

**Category:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal_____ or Strategy/Tactic_____X_____</th>
<th>Check all applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Demand side goal/strategy:**
Reduces demand for affordable housing / helps people stay in their homes

**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**

**Advocacy**

**Other**

**Analysis:**

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.). Urban growth area.*
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)

Specific strategies include: Increase zoning density along transit corridors (P8 and P39); increase minimum density (P52); allow increased incentives (such as height) in exchange for affordable housing (P09 and P39); increase zoned capacity (i.e. zone more land for multi-family) increasing density and height allowances (P37).

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

High, because it directly reduces the cost of multi-family housing (including affordable) or slows the escalation in multi-family housing costs by adding significantly to supply (depending on the extent to which it’s adopted), or encourages the private market to participate in the provision of affordable housing production.

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

County and City Council actions; review of zoning codes, research into options for incentive zoning, inclusionary zoning, transfer of development rights or other options. Research with development community re most efficient way to increase density (Floor Area Ratio, setbacks, height, open space, parking).

5. Community engagement considerations:
Anticipate public resistance to increased density and particularly to zoning more land for multi-family or increasing densities.

6. Lead Agency/ Key Partners:
Planning Departments of County and Cities; County and City Councils/ developers; neighborhood groups

7. Other: Increase density along transit corridors:

Multi-family land costs have increased from about $15,000 per unit to $30,000 to $40,000 per unit over the last five years. The majority of multi-family land in unincorporated Snohomish County is zoned 21 units/acre. Some cities have higher densities and Snohomish County itself has a significant amount of Urban Center zoned land that allows much higher density. Developers can build up to about 32-34 units/acre with adequate parking without triggering the premium construction costs of structured parking. All the existing multi-family zoned land in Snohomish County (whether along transit corridors or not) could be zoned up to at least 34 units/acre to make efficient use of the existing stock of multi-family zoned land.
**Increase minimum density:** Developers generally will maximize profits (or in the case of non-profits – the public benefit of affordability) by measuring the higher costs per square foot of higher density against the yield of units. However, in the last several years, some multi-family zoned land has been developed as townhomes, often at densities below the 21 units/acre maximum that generally applies in unincorporated Snohomish County. Typically, those townhouses have not been affordable. To the extent it is considered a more important priority (a) to have multi-family zoned land developed with as many units as reasonably possible, than (b) to offer a variety of housing types such as townhouses (few of which would be affordable), then it may make sense to mandate a minimum density in the range of 21 units/acre.

**Allow increased densities (such as height), or require, affordable housing:**
Increased densities per se, while they may reduce a developer’s costs per unit by spreading fixed development costs over more units, does not necessarily directly translate to more affordability to the end user. There are various methods jurisdictions have implemented to provide affordable housing through zoning codes, which are one of the few police powers jurisdictions have to prioritize the types of development uses in designated areas to meet the jurisdiction’s overall community health. (Police power is defined as the power to regulate for the advancement and protection of the health, morals, safety or general welfare of the community as a whole.) Within residential zoning uses, affordability is typically not a defined use in land use codes to address the community’s housing needs. Two types of approaches have been used to address affordability for both renters and homeowners.

Affordable Housing Bonus Programs, such as **Incentive zoning**, which is a broad regulatory framework for encouraging and stimulating development that provides a desired public benefit as established in adopted planning goals. An incentive zoning system is implemented on top of an existing base of development regulations and works by offering developers regulatory allowances in exchange for public benefits. It can incorporate one or several incentives including density bonuses, flexible development regulations, parking reductions, fee waivers or reductions and permitting priority. Common public benefits achieved through incentive programs include affordable housing... If a jurisdiction is considering increasing zoning densities, to promote affordable housing, the increased density could be achieved by the provision of some affordable housing units. This should be in place prior to upzoning the underlying base density, or there will be no incentive to provide affordable units. A variation on providing development bonuses is through a Transfer of Development Rights program for affordable housing, which allows the sale of unused development rights from existing or new affordable housing sending sites to developers who wish to purchase additional development rights for a non-affordable housing project.

**Inclusionary zoning** is a tool that stipulates that new residential development in certain zones include some proportion or number of affordable housing units, or meet some type of alternative compliance. In order to ensure that costs are offset, jurisdictions often increase the development rights (i.e., density) of a proposed project. Adopting this combination—mandatory affordable housing and increased density—into the local code a priori to an actual development application distinguishes inclusionary zoning from other types of incentive zoning may be applied in ownership and rental developments, single-family and multi-family zones, and can be tied to specific geographic areas. Jurisdictions should craft inclusionary zoning policies that best reflect the needs of their residents, paying close attention to details relating to program management and monitoring. In the state of Washington all units developed through an inclusionary zoning program
must remain affordable for at least 50 years (RCW 36.70A.540). Over time, an inclusionary
requirement adjusts the market value of the land to reflect the zoning potential.

The Legal Basis for Inclusionary Zoning is found in State law (RCW 36.70A.540) provides authority
for GMA cities and counties to establish mandatory requirements for the inclusion of affordable
housing under certain circumstances; see also WAC 365-196-870(2). That statute allows a GMA city
or county to require a minimum number of affordable housing units that must be provided by all
residential developments in areas where the city or county decides to increase residential capacity
(in other words, in areas it decides to upzone).

http://mrsc.org/Home/Stay-Informed/MRSC-Insight/November-2016/Inclusionary-Zoning-for-
Affordable-Housing.aspx

The affordability levels reflected in either incentive or inclusionary programs are developed by the
jurisdiction to reflect its housing needs and current housing market conditions. Typically
affordability for the designated affordable housing units in these programs has ranged from 50%
AMI (Area Median Incomes) to 80% AMI (sometimes higher). The affordability levels can be set at
various combinations of AMI levels, based on local priorities and are usually set at AMI levels not
adequately addressed in the private housing market. To acknowledge the reduced rent potential
for lower AMI levels, jurisdictions generally require fewer units at 50% AMI than they would for the
80% AMI requirements. In some market areas, the AMI thresholds may be close to current market
rent levels, and would not adversely affect the marketability of those units; in rapidly escalating
markets, these AMI levels can capture and retain future affordability, as rents escalate above these
AMI levels.

In both incentive and inclusionary program there are often Fee-in-Lieu options where a developer
with a requirement to provide the affordable units on-site in their project has an option to satisfy
this off-site, by providing payments to either a jurisdiction for an affordable housing finance
program, or to another off-site affordable housing project to meet their obligation. The pricing of
this Fee-in-Lieu should be commensurate to the cost of producing that unit on-site. Many
developers have chosen the fee-in-lieu option so as not to have to manage their properties to
ensure affordability to qualified lower income renters. This fee-in-lieu payment provides an
additional source of financing for affordable housing developers to develop affordable housing
projects for which they can operate.

As there will never be sufficient affordable housing financing dollars available to produce the
number of affordable housing units needed to meet a community's affordable housing needs, the
participation of the private sector in producing some affordable units is needed. According to the
Grounded Solutions Network, inclusionary zoning laws existed in 886 jurisdictions at the end of
2016, in a total of 25 states and the District of Columbia. The large majority of these jurisdictions
are in Massachusetts, New Jersey, and California, which have statewide rules that mandate
inclusionary zoning.

Washington jurisdictions that have implemented inclusionary zoning programs include: Bothell,
Federal Way, Redmond, Issaquah, Seattle, Sammamish, and possibly others.

http://mrsc.org/Corporate/media/MediaLibrary/SampleDocuments/ArtDocMisc/InsNouts.pdf
**Increased the amount of multifamily zoned designations**: Increasing the supply of multi-family zoned land will have the biggest impact on the cost and number of all multi-family units developed, which could potentially help with more affordability. Neighborhoods will oppose, and owners of existing multi-family sites and even existing multi-family properties may oppose. To mitigate the harm to those on the downside, one could increase the supply somewhat gradually. For example, add 20-30 acres per year.
## HART Work Group Template

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

Workgroup: Policy and Regulatory – Zoning, Regulations, Uses, and Density

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title: Allow increased building heights in exchange for production of affordable housing</th>
<th>Ballot Item #(s): P09, P39</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brief description:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>This proposal would allow developer's in urban areas, along existing and proposed high capacity transit (HCT) corridors, an increase to their building height in exchange for providing affordable housing as part of their development.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating from HART Screening Ballot (scale: 1-5, 5 being very promising)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P09 = 3.79, P39 = 4.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work group rating:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potential impact on housing affordability challenge: (High / Medium / Low)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of implementation: (Easy / Moderate / Difficult)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Category:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category:</th>
<th>Goal _____ or Strategy/Tactic ____ X</th>
<th>Check all applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Demand side goal/strategy:

| Reduces demand for affordable housing / helps people stay in their homes |

### Supply side goal/strategy:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Targets assistance to build/maintain housing affordable to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-30%AMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-50% AMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-80% AMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%-125% AMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;125% AMI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 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 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advocacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Analysis:

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.).
   - *This strategy could be implemented throughout urban areas of the County and cities along existing and proposed high-capacity transit corridors.*
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)

This strategy supports the following goals:

- HART 5-Year Action Plan Goal 4: Increase density of housing in transit corridors and job centers
- P09: Allow increased building heights in exchange for production of affordable housing.
- P39: Provide incentives/zoning to locate affordable housing units are able to be located in proximity to transit and other services.
- P05: Prioritize affordability accessible within a half mile walkshed of existing and planned frequent transit services, with a particular priority for high-capacity transit stations.

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

This could have a medium impact on addressing the affordable housing challenge, but that depends on a substantial change in development strategies within Snohomish County. Current development strategies are land intensive and limited to current practices. Although greater capital is required for construction of taller buildings, these structures require less land for parking, if placed near HCT stations, and a smaller footprint for building construction, while also adding additional units to meet affordable housing goals.

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

- **Additional Data/Council Action:** Currently Snohomish County allows building construction of up to 90' ([SCC 30.34A.040](#)) in Urban Centers and an additional building height of 35’ (for a total of 125’) is allowed when the project is within 1/8th mile of a HCT station. Recommend exploring option of revising the code to allow the additional 35’ of building height when within ½ mile of a HCT station and affordable housing is provided to a predetermined ratio, for example 20%. Considerations when exploring this option should include looking at transitioning building heights from 1/8 to ½ mile from HCT stations and current allowances in Urban Centers for transfer of development rights, floor ratio area bonuses, and green buildings.

- **Additional Data/Council Action:** Wood constructed buildings typically have an approximate maximum height of 60'-70'. Recommend exploring option of increasing building heights, where zoning is feasible, from current max heights of 30'-40' ([SCC 30.23.030](#)) up to 75’, when within ½ mile of HCT corridor and affordable housing is provided to a predetermined ratio, for example 20%. Currently ([SCC 30.23.032(14)](#)) allows building height of up to 75 feet for multifamily structures on sites with appropriate zoning in the Southwest Urban Growth Area where any portion of the site is east of State Route 525 and within 2,000 feet of the west side or 800 feet from the east side of State Route 99.

- **Additional Data:** Research and coordinate with affordable housing developers to determine reasonable ratios for providing affordable housing with each zoning type. This could be a progressively rising ratio as building heights increase above currently allowed levels.
- **Additional Data:** Identify areas within Snohomish County and cites whose jurisdictional boundaries are within ½ mile of existing and proposed HCT stations. The County is currently developing a sub area plan for HCT stations near 128th and 164th. This work could be coordinated with neighboring cities for a regional approach along the HCT corridor.

- **Additional Data/Council Action:** Snohomish County allows a 40% reduction in parking for new developments where applicant demonstrates viable options to automobile use, i.e. within walking distance to HCT station ([SCC 30.26.040(3)]). Recommend exploring an exemption from parking for all affordable housing units within the development when within ½ mile of a HCT station.

- **Additional Data:** In Transit Oriented Development light rail station areas, consider a TOD zoning overlay which could include affordable housing requirements or other desired uses at these station centers to promote equitable development in these highly site locations.

5. **Community engagement considerations:**

- Recommend working with affordable housing developers to determine the appropriate ratio of affordable housing units required for each zoning type.

- Might be a good exercise to explore typical transportation methods and automobile use with those living in affordable housing developments situated within ½ mile of HCT.

6. **Lead Agency/ Key Partners:**

- Snohomish County and Cities
- Alliance for Housing Affordability
- Affordable Housing Developers

7. **Other:**

- Snohomish County Planning and Development Services is developing a sub area plan for light rail stations in Snohomish County. Much of the considerations in the implementation stage of this document, including building heights and parking could be explored via that current process.

Maximum page limit for completed templates: 3 PP.
### Supportive Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title: Supportive Housing</th>
<th>Ballot Item #s: P44, P14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brief description: Two related items to allow supportive housing in all multi-family zones (P14) or in all zones (P44).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating from HART Screening Ballot (scale: 1-5, 5 being very promising) 3.36 (P14); 3.69 (P44)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work group rating: Potential impact on housing affordability challenge: (High / Medium / Low) Difficult to quantify in that it targets a relatively small segment of the population; however, for people who need this type of housing, particularly some people experiencing homelessness, this housing is addressing a significant need.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of implementation: (Easy / Moderate / Difficult) Permanent supportive housing can raise concerns and opposition from neighbors. The state mandate to allow in multi-family areas will raise some concerns; expanding to allow in single family areas would likely trigger opposition and be much more difficult.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Category: Goal or Strategy/Tactic

| Demand side goal/strategy: Reduces demand for affordable housing / helps people stay in their homes |
| Supply side goal/strategy: Targets assistance to build/maintain housing affordable to: 0-30%AMI X 30-50% AMI 50-80% AMI 80%-125% AMI >125% AMI |
| 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 |
| Other |

#### Analysis:

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.).

Theoretically this could be deployed virtually anywhere if allowed in all zones. However, even if jurisdictions expanded beyond the new state mandate to allow in all multi-family areas, there would likely be limitations on where supportive housing would be allowed. Presumably the most desirable locations
would be in any areas that allow residential, including single family, multi-family and mixed use. These projects are typically more multi-family in character and require access to health care and other social services. For those reasons they would be most effective in urban areas of higher density to be close to these services and also transit – not all residents will have access to a personal vehicle.

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)

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. All income segments should be addressed.

Permanent supportive housing serves a significant housing need, especially for the many people experiencing homelessness along with physical, mental, emotional and substance dependency problems. It is a variety of housing type that does not get much attention in the broader discussion of affordable housing and it is often viewed negatively by the community.

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

Impact medium to high depending on how broadly it is applied. The income level served is typically 50% AMI and below.

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

E2SHB 1923 already requires cities, including code cities, (counties are not named) to allow permanent supportive housing in zones that permit multi-family housing (P14). Cities with regulations that do not comply with the new legislation will need to amend their codes.

Individual jurisdictions that decide to expand where permanent supportive housing is allowed, beyond the state mandate, would need to determine which zones would be included and any additional development regulations that would be applied. These are all local actions. Additional information to help educate the public, elected officials and city staff about this type of housing, as well as data about potential impacts and mitigation of this type of housing would be helpful to jurisdictions in crafting the code amendments.

5. Community engagement considerations:

Supportive housing can raise concerns and opposition in communities depending on the size of facility and the disabilities of the people living there. Residents are people with physical, mental, emotional or other disabilities that society in general fears or disdains. There should be an educational component to this item ahead of any code amendments.

6. Lead Agency/ Key Partners:
Cities, counties/supportive housing providers, health and human service agencies, homeless advocates, other service providers.

7. Other:

Permanent supportive housing providers should be an early partner in implementing this item. They can provide valuable information about the scale, locational and site development needs to help craft code amendments. They can also provide important information about the people they serve and help educate the public, elected officials and city staff.

Maximum page limit for completed templates: 3 PP.
HART Work Group Template

Title: Reduce parking requirements.  
Ballot Item #(s): P12, P18, P45

Brief description:
All three items speak to reducing off-street parking requirements for various circumstances (e.g. affordable housing, multi-family, located near transit.

Rating from HART Screening Ballot (scale: 1-5, 5 being very promising)  
Same 3.14 rating for each ballot item.

Work group rating:

Potential impact on housing affordability challenge: (High / Medium / Low)
HIGH for lower income, subsidized units because it will lower overall project cost and allow more units to be built and/or a smaller parcel of land to develop the same number of units with reduced parking.  
MEDIUM for market rate projects because savings applied to offset cost of affordable units and parking is often packaged with other incentives.

Ease of implementation: (Easy / Moderate / Difficult)  
MODERATE to DIFFICULT depending on local concerns about adequate parking and timing of high capacity transit service. Usually parking requirements are regulated by the Zoning Code and amendments must be passed by Council.

Category: 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>or</th>
<th>Strategy/Tactic</th>
<th>Check all applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Demand side goal/strategy:
Reduces demand for affordable housing / helps people stay in their homes

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 |

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
Other

Analysis:
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.).
One scenario for deployment would be for cities individually targeting urban centers, transit corridors and transit-oriented development (TOD). The county could deploy in areas served/to be served by high capacity transit as defined by PSRC. A possible collective action would be for the county and cities to jointly develop parking standards that could be applied in different circumstances (e.g. level of affordability, proximity to transit, incentive v. mandatory).

Another scenario could be countywide. For income restricted affordable housing serving certain populations it makes sense to reduce parking requirements even when not located near transit. For example, housing serving the frail elderly, developmentally disabled, mentally ill and other populations that do not drive. Some of these exemptions already exist but it is patchwork that varies by jurisdiction.

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)

This strategy supports goal #2 and goal #4.

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. All income segments should be addressed. Parking reductions can decrease the amount of land devoted to parking and allow for additional units on a site thus increasing housing growth.

Goal #4: Take steps to increase density of housing on transit corridors and in job centers, while acknowledging that additional housing is needed across the entire County. Parking reductions along transit corridors can increase amount of land available and the number of housing units.

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

Impact medium to high depending on how it is applied. Higher impact when reducing parking for projects serving AMI below 50%-60% because cost savings often translate into more units. For projects that are more market rate reduced parking is an incentive, often part of a package, to reduce developer costs of affordable units.

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

E2SHB 1923 requires reduction for housing affordable to 50% AMI and below when the housing is located within 0.25 mile of frequent transit service. This could be an impetus for jurisdictions to consider applying reductions other than the state mandate. Ultimately the reductions are applied through local development regulations. There is existing research about reduced parking standards that jurisdictions could adapt to local circumstances.

Parking reductions will require council action by each jurisdiction amending its code. There could be a cooperative effort by cities and county through the Snohomish County Tomorrow process to adopt amendments that provide as much consistency as possible. Some cities allow community development
director or equivalent to make parking adjustments without council approval if certain conditions are met or additional parking studies are provided.

5. Community engagement considerations:

Parking is an issue in some communities and there could be opposition because of perceived or potential impacts on street parking in surrounding areas. The other issue will be timing of development with reduced parking versus timing of high capacity transit service – housing is likely to precede transit in many areas.

6. Lead Agency/ Key Partners:

Cities/transit agencies, affordable and market rate housing developers.

7. Other:

According to the cityobservatory.org is as follows:
- Surface parking: $5,000 to 10,000 per space
- Structured parking: $25,000 to 50,000 per space

Maximum page limit for completed templates: 3 PP.
**HART Work Group Template**

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

**Workgroup: Policy & Regulatory – Zoning, Regulations, Zoning, and Density**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title:</th>
<th>Revise local zoning to encourage accessory dwelling units (ADU)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ballot Item #(#s):</td>
<td>P29 (Ranked #2, 4.5 average rating)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Brief description:**
Revise zoning restrictions to allow 1-2 accessory dwelling units per single-family residence, regardless of occupancy status or lot size—except 0-lot-line, with minimal parking, setback, and architectural requirements.

**Rating from HART Screening Ballot (scale: 1-5, 5 being very promising)** 4.5

**Work group rating:**

**Potential impact on housing affordability challenge:** (High / Medium / Low)
Medium, the ADU/DADU units are small and tend to fill a need for singles/couples/very small families within established neighborhoods, and they come into the market one unit at a time. BUT! Frequently, people with ADUs rent them to family members who are disabled or with other special needs, so some of the shelter and transitional spaces may be freed up as more ADUs come online.

**Ease of implementation:** (Easy / Moderate / Difficult)
Easy, but response/effect is slow due to the nature of the public adding one unit at a time, and permitting offices will need to staff up or find streamlined efficiencies.

**Category:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Goal _____ or Strategy/Tactic______</th>
<th>Check all applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demand side goal/strategy:</td>
<td>Reduces demand for affordable housing / helps people stay in their homes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply side goal/strategy:</td>
<td>Targets assistance to build/maintain housing affordable to:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-30%AMI</td>
<td>occasionally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30-50% AMI</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50-80% AMI</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80%-125% AMI</td>
<td>occasionally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;125% AMI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilitates housing preservation—maintaining current affordable inventory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilitates housing construction generally, providing more units, or units at less cost</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication / community engagement strategy</td>
<td>needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis:**

1. Area where this concept would be most effectively deployed (cities individually / Cities acting
This strategy is best deployed county-wide with minimal “tweaks” allowed by municipalities. Especially viable in urban growth areas, cities and suburbs. Less effective or viable in rural areas where septic systems are the norm.

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)

This strategy is a tool for encouraging the private market to build and facilitate more housing units for people of moderate income. It is also a strategy for helping seniors stay in their communities. It is important that the messaging be consistent and clear.

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

   Medium impact because of the slower turn time that is required for individual landowners to decide to go forward and then implement that decision. It also really only impacts the supply of smaller homes, rather than reducing some of the scarcity that exists for larger families who need large homes.

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

   This can be implemented through council action. A voter initiative may be an alternate pathway, but most of the recent ADU law changes were implemented by the legislative bodies.

5. Community engagement considerations:

   Nimby can be an issue-- traffic and emergency response are often used as barriers. It is important to address these concerns early in the conversations. This is one housing solution where market influences will drive the product to be more attractive, but people will be concerned about “shacks” and shoddy
workmanship. Using the senior landowner discussion—reverse mortgage alternative—will help tremendously. Perhaps an OO premium versus a NOO basic package will help ameliorate concerns; NOO owners can build only X, but OO owners can build X that is bigger, or has a deferred tax assessment increase. (There is a consultant in Portland who can help with developing a messaging campaign.)

6. Lead Agency/ Key Partners:
Local permitting offices are the key partners, as they will face the owners seeking answers and permits. Other partners are construction firms, architectural firms and prefab companies, of which there are a few in Snohomish County.

7. Other:
We could boost the impact on affordable housing supply by deed restricting the ADU to some income level, BUT! That of course, increases the concern about housing for “them” and “those people.” I think it is safer to allow the market forces to dictate the details of each ADU development/concept/construction. This is one of the tools for increasing supply that truly can be done by entirely private money and having privately funded solutions to public problems is a great idea!

Nationally, nearly 40% of ADUs are occupied by extended family members of the landowner. This means that families will be able to help each other in ways that feel meaningful to them and also helps to reduce the strain on publicly-funded affordable housing.

Encouraging, and facilitating, nonprofit SFR landowners to build ADUs will have a direct impact on the supply of specialized housing units; for example, Parkview Services built a studio in the garage of one of their houses to provide a home for a semi-independent man with developmental/intellectual disabilities.

Maximum page limit for completed templates: 3 PP.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Bereskin-Delia</td>
<td>Community Services Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy</td>
<td>Blair</td>
<td>Snohomish County Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristen</td>
<td>Cane</td>
<td>Housing Authority of Snohomish County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brook</td>
<td>Chesterfield</td>
<td>Snohomish County Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Collier</td>
<td>Alliance for Housing Affordability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alessandra</strong></td>
<td><strong>Durham</strong></td>
<td>Snohomish County Executive Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allan</td>
<td>Giffen</td>
<td>City of Everett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marianna</td>
<td>Hanefeld</td>
<td>SNOTRAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Hull</td>
<td>Everett Gospel Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Hunden</td>
<td>DevCo, LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken</td>
<td>Katahira</td>
<td>Snohomish County Human Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Kattermann</td>
<td>City of Bothell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley</td>
<td>Lommers-Johnson</td>
<td>Everett Housing Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becky</td>
<td>McCrary</td>
<td>City of Everett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Barb</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mock</strong></td>
<td>Snohomish County Planning &amp; Development Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cami</td>
<td>Morrill</td>
<td>Realtor's Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony</td>
<td>Nabors</td>
<td>Everett Housing Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Housing Consortium of Everett and Snohomish Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>Toskey</td>
<td>Homes and Hope Community Land Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley</td>
<td>Winchell</td>
<td>City of Lynnwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mindy</td>
<td>Woods</td>
<td>Community Services Advisory Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bold = County Convener**