



South Sound Housing Affordability Partners  
Advisory Board Meeting Minutes

July 18, 2023  
6:00 – 7:55 p.m.

**Advisory Board Members:** Adria Buchanan, Chair – present  
Alex Harrington - present  
Amanda DeShazo - present  
April Elliott - excused  
Ben Ferguson - present  
Corey Orvold - present  
Desniege Haywood - present  
Faaluaina Pritchard - present  
Isabella Rivera Kjaer - present  
Jay Worley - excused  
Jeff Bell - present  
Judson Willis, Vice Chair - present  
Kevin Bates - excused  
Nicholas Carr - present  
Noemi Cagatin-Porter - present  
Rian Booker, Vice Chair - present  
Riley Guerrero - present  
William Towey - present  
Zac Baker - present

**Staff:** Mary Connolly, Program Specialist 2  
Becki Foutz, Administrative Assistant

**Guest:** Dorsol Plants, SKHHP, Jason Gauthier

MINUTES

TOPIC/ WHO	DISCUSSION	ACTION
<b>Call to Order</b> Adria	Adria Buchanan called the meeting to order at 6:01 p.m. She called roll, per above; a quorum was present.	Wel- come!
<b>Review/ Modify Agenda</b> Adria	Any requests to modify the agenda? Rian moved to approve the consent agenda. Lua seconded. Vote was taken - none opposed, no abstentions.	The agenda was ap- proved.
<b>Public Comment</b> Adria	Adria opened for public comment. None. No written comments have been received.	

TOPIC/WHO	DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p><b>Regular Meeting Time &amp; Length</b> Adria</p>	<p>Adria sent a meeting to the Board a couple of weeks ago explaining that the meetings will be two hours. She asked if there was any discussion about that. None.</p>	<p>The next meeting will be on 8/15 at 5:30 p.m.</p>
<p><b>Meeting Norms &amp; Land Acknowledgement</b> Adria</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>South Sound Housing Affordability Partners (SSHA<sup>3</sup>P) Advisory Board Meeting Norms</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Challenge ideas, not individuals</li> <li>2. Assume positive intent; assume responsibility for impact</li> <li>3. Recognize it is more beneficial to share what you are thinking with the group during the discussion than with an individual afterwards</li> <li>4. Listen with curiosity to what everyone has to say – we all come with different perspectives and priorities that bring depth to the conversation</li> <li>5. During discussion, everyone has the opportunity to contribute before members contribute a second time</li> <li>6. Raise hand to speak and wait for acknowledgement from the chair</li> <li>7. Be open to new ways of thinking</li> <li>8. Recognize the best efforts of our staff</li> <li>9. Make our decisions based on the available information, and in the best interest of the Executive Board goals</li> <li>10. Board members come prepared for each meeting.</li> </ol>	
	<p>The above draft meeting norms compiled by Adria and Mary were shared with the Board in advance in the meeting packet. Adria asked if there were any comments about them.</p> <p>Rian asked, in line with #4, if we should specifically add making space for minority opinions. We can't shout down anything; there are 20 members and many opinions. If someone disagrees with something, chances are that there many members of the public feel the same way. Jeff, Nicholas, and Zac indicated that they felt the meeting norms were well-written and they liked them.</p> <p>How does the Board feel about making land acknowledgements? Is it meaningful?</p> <p>Ben doesn't see a downside to having a land acknowledgement. It might be very important to some, and we should honor the people who were here before us.</p>	<p>Language will be added around Rian's suggestion.</p>

TOPIC/WHO	DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p><b>Land Acknowledgement</b> continued</p>	<p>Nicholas generally agrees with Ben; he expressed concern about doing it just to check the box, when in reality a lot of the outcomes the Board will discuss doesn't take tribal issues into consideration. He prefers a call to action, like Ecotrust makes, for members and the public who may be watching to do more performative actions to advance equity, or to advise the Executive Board to do so.</p> <p>Alex said that he questions the usefulness of this body doing it and disagrees with the premise in general; it seems disingenuous to make the acknowledgement without accompanying action, and if that's not the focus of this Board, he'd suggest focusing on the work plan at hand. ...focus more on the work plan at hand.</p> <p>Riley pointed out that Puyallup Tribe is a member of SSHA<sup>3</sup>P – have they been consulted about this question?</p> <p>Mary noted that the SSHA<sup>3</sup>P Executive Board does not currently make a land acknowledgement. The Pierce County Council, and some other Boards, do.</p> <p>Ben sees land acknowledgements as confirmations. If we do it over and over again, it brings it to the front of the mind, and we can't ignore it. It's a good way to approach what's happening in our community respectfully.</p> <p>Isabella agreed that it's a good idea to consult with the Tribe; they have a section on their website about land acknowledgements.</p> <p>Adria hears what everyone's saying. It disrupts the norm to make a land acknowledgement, acknowledging things not consistently acknowledged in the past. As we further develop criteria, this group's work plan, agenda, and other aspects of how we approach the work, we may find that there are opportunities to take proactive measures to advance equity.</p> <p>Rian asked if there's native representation on this Board. Yes, a couple of Board members identified as Native American when they applied. Rian said if we didn't, then we should definitely have a land acknowledgement, but since we do, perhaps we should consult with them.</p>	<p>Adria asked members to send Mary comments about land acknowledgements.</p>

TOPIC/WHO	DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p><b>Policies &amp; Programs to Consider for Work Plan Inclusion</b> Mary</p>	<p>Mary provided an overview of the work plan. It will outline the Board's work areas for 2023 and 2024 and will be updated annually and will include analysis of and recommendations on policies and programs (P&amp;Ps) to include in SSHA<sup>3</sup>P's housing toolkit, for eligible member governments to consider for adoption.</p> <p>P&amp;Ps should relate to SSHA<sup>3</sup>P's mission to create and preserve affordable, attainable, and accessible housing in Pierce County, and must be able to be implemented by city, county, and/or tribal government.</p> <p>P&amp;Ps should also align with the Executive Board's priorities: increasing number of units developed, increasing speed of development to meet housing targets over the next 20 years, encourage regional alignment without a one-size-fits-all approach, and consider equity in P&amp;Ps.</p> <p>P&amp;Ps in the workplan should be neither too vague, nor too specific.</p> <p>The process will be as follows: brainstorm ideas, evaluate P&amp;Ps, seek feedback from the Executive Board and staff, then submit recommended work plan to the Executive Board.</p> <p>The P&amp;Ps suggested come from an advisory board survey, one on one conversations between Board members and staff, and policies considered by the Executive Board last year.</p> <p>The housing typology spectrum ranges from single family homes to middle housing (duplex, triplex, fourplex, cottage housing, courtyard apts and townhomes) to multifamily mid- and high-rise housing.</p> <p>Mary gave a quick overview of the P&amp;P categories: Incentives, Permitting and Planning, Programming, and Accessibility.</p> <p>Pierce County's currently working on a capacity building grant opportunity to establish a community land trust!</p> <p>Adria asked Board members to review the raw data in the Excel spreadsheet included in the meeting packet. Are there any suggested additional ideas to consider?</p>	<p>Informational</p>

TOPIC/WHO	DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p><b>Discussion on P&amp;Ps</b> Adria &amp; Group</p>	<p>Adria asked Board members to look at the raw data in the Excel spreadsheet included in the meeting packet to see if there are any other ideas to consider.</p> <p>Amanda suggested more funding for affordable housing, such as a trust fund or down payment assistance. <a href="#">HB 1220</a> requires that all jurisdictions create affordable housing. Equity's one of the things we're concerned about – what does that look like? Do we use a tool to analyze potential racial equity measure impacts of policies? Adria said that equity will be considered as part of the evaluation step.</p> <p>Nicholas pointed out that affordable housing public funding often comes with strings and requirements that make it expensive. He suggested considering a public bank. In theory there could be a public infrastructure bank, offering financing on a mass scale for public and private developers. Also, a scale back opportunity to alleviate construction costs could help. He added that the list provided is great.</p> <p>Alex noted that raising short plat thresholds was mentioned, in addition to that, changing density calculations from net (only after roads, wetlands) to gross (entire area) would raise the number of units 25%. Also, in addition to the in-lieu, we should think about shared roadways, and how to use existing roadways to accommodate more units than are currently allowed.</p> <p>Corey said that down payment assistance (DPA) is only offered to low-income homebuyers, but those with moderate incomes need it too. DPA interest rates need to be addressed; they're significantly higher than other homebuyers' interest rates. (Adria wants to come back to this – in terms of a policy or program, what would be the language around that?) DPA is effective, however other homebuyers have an advantage. People from the BIPOC community don't have, for example, as many financial gifts from family, accounts available, etc. This widens the wealth gap. (How would we articulate that in a policy? Set up a reserve?) Can we offer an owner-occupied incentive? Some people with extra funds are investors.</p> <p>Ben sees his clients apprehensive about creating affordable housing – property managers have tried and true ways of vetting tenants and they don't want to create new ones for lower affordability. Maybe SSHA<sup>3</sup>P or the County could create an augmentation to mitigate developers' risk. If we could get most housing developers to make some units affordable, it would open up a ton of units in a short amount of time. Perhaps a nonprofit or government entity specialized in vetting affordable tenants could augment the onboarding process so developers and property managers would be less apprehensive.</p>	<p>Discus- sion</p>

TOPIC/WHO	DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p><b>Discussion on P&amp;Ps continued</b></p>	<p>Nicholas suggested considering a supplemental fund to use when someone qualifies and has down payment assistance and closing assistance from the Covenant Reinvestment Account (CRA) and is outbid, for example. Tacoma Housing Authority (THA) does income verifications for their voucher program, and their process is robust enough that the City of Tacoma accepts it – it alleviates private landlords from doing the vetting process. Expanding THA’s verifications purview to non-voucher holders would create a lot more work for THA, but it makes sense. We could create programs within SSHA<sup>3</sup>P jurisdictions so that landlords won’t need to do the vetting. If there’s a baseline denominator qualification program, it would take the burden off of property managers or others who want to develop affordability and allow THA essentially to do the work to ensure that there are qualified people to enter into affordable units. One agency could serve each region.</p> <p>Zac noted that third party compliance is interesting. 98% of his development company’s portfolio is affordable. There are third party services that do vetting; it wouldn’t necessarily need to be THA. He agrees with Alex about gross vs. net density calculations. He also agrees with creating a supplemental fund for bidding wars and rate buydown; he agreed that DPA has a much higher rate.</p> <p>Riley (from PCHA) noted that PCHA’s significantly smaller (40 people – 2000 voucher holders) than THA. They would love to have developers encouraged to create more units – doing the vetting would be a big lift and we need to be mindful that there’s liability and it’s going to get complicated.</p> <p>Adria encouraged the group to think about things without limitations.</p> <p>Rian would like to see incentive programs for first-time buyers or people who would be the first in their family to own a home. Generational wealth generally establishes homeownership.</p> <p>Corey wants to be sure that the recommended policies incorporate the BIPOC community.</p> <p>Ben sees failures in the system, where it’s easier not to do something than to do something. He’s hoping that the government will be able to create incentives significant enough to make a difference and help people do the right thing.</p> <p>Adria pointed out that there is a dramatized narrative that certain populations are more high-risk than others.</p> <p>Rian suggested offering a public bounty for housing solutions; we could offer a financial reward for coming up with good proposals, to spur people to think about and do innovative, pilot work. We could build on those ideas.</p>	<p>This will be added to the list.</p>

TOPIC/WHO	DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p><b>Discussion on P&amp;Ps continued</b></p>	<p>Jeff offered comments and contextual thoughts – for the last 25 years he’s been out of the business. When he looked at the list, one thing that struck him was there were meetings held 25 years ago regarding the identical issues. How do we make sure that what we’re doing is not just doing the same things, expecting different outcomes? We have an opportunity to do something truly profound, and to be a model for communities across the country. This would require a lot of out-of-the-box thinking. As we consider policies, we need to do a gut check to see if we’re being bold and transformative enough.</p> <p>Adria said that the Executive Committee –Judson, Rian, Mary, and herself, have been thinking a lot about how to get people to think of innovative projects, and she’s quite pleased with this conversation.</p> <p>Nicholas said that he really likes Rian’s bounty idea.</p> <p>William asked about how we can make sure we’re heading in the right direction around probability and impact? Are we considering a format for evaluating all the suggestions? (Good segue to next topic!)</p>	<p>Discus- sion</p>
<p><b>SSHA<sup>3</sup>P 2024 Work Plan Next Steps</b> Mary</p>	<p>Mary provided an overview of next steps. Typically, staff presents information to gather feedback from Board members, staff will then make a recommendation based on the feedback, have the Board discuss and finalize it, then submit to the Executive Board.</p> <p>Mary brought forward two recommendations: one on evaluation framework, and one on forming a subcommittee.</p> <p>Mary presented a template of a recommended evaluation framework, using a matrix to evaluate P&amp;Ps on a set of criteria. Evaluation results to discuss tradeoffs and select P&amp;Ps for inclusion in the work plan.</p> <p><b>CRITERIA:</b> <u>Minimum</u> criteria for P&amp;Ps included in the workplan: <u>can be implemented by local or tribal government and aligns with SSHA<sup>3</sup>P’s mission.</u></p> <p><u>Resources</u> needed to implement will be considered as criteria as well: staff time needed to implement, staff time needed for ongoing administration, and financial resources to implement.</p> <p><u>Impact:</u> Measurable, potential on number of housing units created or preserved, units created or preserved affordable to households with less than 80% AMI, impact on racial equity, and short-term or long-term.</p> <p><u>Other Priorities:</u> Increases homeownership opportunities for low-income households, aligns with new housing legislation.</p>	<p>Informa- tional</p>

TOPIC/WHO	DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p><b>SSHA<sup>3</sup>P 2024 Work Plan Next Steps continued</b></p>	<p>Adria added that the Executive Committee wants to put together a very transparent process, so that everyone understands how the Board arrived at the work plan. With input from this meeting, there are approximately 75 ideas. Ideally a subcommittee would evaluate the programs against the agreed-upon criteria.</p> <p>One of the things discussed at the Exec Committee was that the Board could begin the criteria conversation, task the subcommittee to flesh it out, and discuss it further at the next meeting.</p> <p>Mary said that staff will recommend that a subcommittee flesh out the framework. Staff will bring back the final version at the next meeting.</p> <p>Jeff likes the framework presented. It's important to be careful how we look at the scoring – some programs could score low but have the most profound impact of any program suggested. For example, a very expensive program could have financial offsets. We need to go big and not do what's already been done.</p> <p>Nicholas agreed: if the impact of a program is high enough, the other factors shouldn't matter. Having said that, he likes Mary's framework.</p> <p>Rian said that he'd like to see the affordability and accessibility impact clearly included, to be sure we're on track with the mission.</p> <p>Amanda would like impact on racial equity included. Cost shouldn't prohibit a program from being recommended, although jurisdictions should take the costs into account. Adria agreed. We need to think about the parameters to evaluate equity and racial equity.</p> <p>William enjoyed the graphic and observed that the matrix grades our ideas. Ratings aren't necessarily tethered to how effective they are, such as staff time, for example. We should consider the likelihood of ideas being enacted and creating meaningful impact.</p> <p>Adria said that perhaps we a number system should be considered, rather than High, Medium &amp; Low. Then the total numbers could be used to consider recommendations.</p> <p>Ben suggested that it might be worth weighting – there might be something that's important, but if we put it up against another category that rates the same, but one is 20x more impactful...we should weigh criteria by priority. Nicholas agreed.</p> <p>Adria pointed out that we should consider political will and/or will of the Executive Board to implement a program. Rian thinks that could fold into the first criterion – can be implemented by local or tribal government.</p>	<p>Discus- sion</p>



TOPIC/WHO	DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p><b>SSHA<sup>3</sup>P 2024 Work Plan Next Steps continued</b></p>	<p>Rian acknowledged that Adria and Mary have done a lot of work offline to create the list and framework and it's very much appreciated. When staff takes recommendations to the Exec Board it should give us a hint re: political will.</p> <p>Adria called for an Ad Hoc subcommittee of up to nine members, based on the staff recommendation.</p> <p><b>STAFF RECOMMENDATION</b></p> <p>Form a subcommittee of up to 9 people to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meet with staff in between full board meetings.</li> <li>• Finalize evaluation framework with Advisory Board feedback.</li> <li>• Use evaluation framework to evaluate policies and programs of interest.</li> <li>• Create a draft work plan based on evaluation.</li> <li>• Use feedback from the full Advisory Board to revise work plan. Iterate as needed.</li> <li>• Incorporate feedback on the work plan from the Executive Board and staff workgroup.</li> </ul> <p>The subcommittee will meet at least once a month for the next four months. Staff will support the subcommittee's activities. Work products will be presented to the Advisory Board for discussion and feedback.</p> <p>It will take some time to go through all of the 70-some programs and policies and evaluate them!</p> <p>Lua, Nicholas, Riley, Rian, Zac, Amanda, Alex, Isabella, Desniege, and Adria volunteered to serve on the subcommittee.</p>	<p>Discus- sion</p>
<p><b>SSHA<sup>3</sup>P Staff Update Mary</b></p>	<p>What to expect at future meetings: Mary will email those who volunteered to serve on the subcommittee about when their first meeting will be.</p> <p>At the next Advisory Board meeting, members will approve the evaluation framework, and decide whether they'd like 5:30 to be the regular start time. Jason Gauthier will present on SSHA<sup>3</sup>P legislative priorities and request feedback from the Board. Adria asked if Jason could speak to the process, including how the Executive Board arrived at their legislative priorities.</p>	<p>Informa- tional</p>

TOPIC/WHO	DISCUSSION	ACTION
<b>Board Members' Updates &amp; Comments Group</b>	<p>Nicholas thanked Mary – it was a heavy agenda and a lot of work to prepare – great job!</p> <p>Adria brought forward the idea of a buddy system. Essentially, the Executive Committee will assign groups of three. The idea is to encourage connection between meetings, and to build community, at whatever frequency is desired.</p>	<p>Members will be notified who's in their group.</p>
<b>Adjournment</b>	<p>Ben moved to adjourn the meeting. Lua seconded. Vote was taken; none opposed. The meeting adjourned at 7:55 p.m.</p> <p>Corey asked if we'd had any community members attend. No, we've had Mary's counterpart from SKKHP and Jason Gauthier tonight. Mary explained to Corey how to view attendees.</p>	<p>Meeting adjourned!</p>

The next SSHA<sup>3</sup>P Advisory Board meeting will be Tuesday, August 15 at 5:30 p.m. via Zoom.

Becki Foutz  
 Administrative Assistant