



South Sound Housing Affordability Partners
Advisory Board Meeting Minutes

August 15, 2023

5:30 – 7:31 p.m.

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

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

Guest: Ted Thelin

MINUTES

TOPIC/ WHO	DISCUSSION	ACTION
Call to Order Adria	Adria Buchanan called the meeting to order. Mary called roll, per above; a quorum was present.	Wel- come!
Approval of Consent Agenda Adria	Any requests to modify the agenda? Lua moved and Corey seconded to approve the consent agenda. Vote was taken - none opposed, no abstentions.	The agenda was ap- proved.
Public Comment Adria	Adria opened for public comment. None. No written comments have been received.	

TOPIC/WHO	DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>Resolution 2023-03, Amending Regular Meeting Schedule Adria</p>	<p>Resolution 2023-03 amends the Board meeting start time, to begin at 5:30 p.m. instead of 6:00 p.m. Meetings are expected to take about two hours, thus it's proposed to begin them a half-hour earlier. Rian moved and Lua seconded to adopt Resolution 2023-03. Adria asked if there was any discussion. None. Vote was taken – none opposed, no abstentions.</p>	<p>Resolution 2023-03 was adopted. Meetings will begin at 5:30.</p>
<p>Review Meeting Agreements Adria</p>	<p>Mary shared the meeting agreements, and Adria read through them. <small>SSHA³P Advisory Board Meeting August 15, 2023</small></p> <p style="text-align: center;">South Sound Housing Affordability Partners (SSHA³P) Advisory Board Meeting Norms</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Challenge ideas, not individuals 2. Assume positive intent; assume responsibility for impact 3. Recognize it is more beneficial to share what you are thinking with the group during the discussion than with an individual afterwards 4. Listen with curiosity to what everyone has to say – we all come with different perspectives and priorities that bring depth to the conversation 5. Be respectful and make space for minority opinions or points of view 6. During discussion, everyone has the opportunity to contribute before members contribute a second time 7. Raise hand to speak and wait for acknowledgement from the chair 8. Be open to new ways of thinking 9. Recognize the best efforts of our staff 10. Make our decisions based on the available information, and in the best interest of the Executive Board goals 11. Board members come prepared for each meeting 	
<p>Buddy System Discussion Adria</p>	<p>To facilitate more interaction among Advisory Board members, members have been assigned buddies. Members were encouraged to set up meetings with their buddies prior to the next Board meeting. Adria called for questions: none.</p>	<p>Please contact your buddies!</p>
<p>Evaluation Framework Discussion Mary</p>	<p>Mary shared the updated Evaluation Framework. Members' feedback was used to revise it from the version presented at the last meeting.</p> <p>The framework will be used to evaluate policy and program ideas on a set of criteria. Its purpose is to assist in selecting policies and programs to include in the 2024 Work Plan.</p>	<p>Informational</p>

TOPIC/WHO	DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>Evaluation Framework Discussion continued</p>	<p>Jeff noted that it's important to have the weighting, so we remember where our focus is, however, he struggles with how race, equity, social barriers, and disabilities are currently weighted.</p> <p>The group reviewed the framework for a few minutes and then went through it together section by section. No concerns on the "Effort" section.</p> <p>Impact section: Housing Inventory Jay pointed out that housing is needed across the board. Can social housing, in which residents pay 30% of their income, be fitted into the framework? The framework lists models currently in use. Adria suggested that it might fit under Financial Barriers.</p> <p>Rian asked if we need to differentiate single housing from family housing. There's a difference between beds and doors. Having enough beds, but not enough doors means that families get broken up, or there are no places for them. Adria asked if we need to define units in this framework, or is another category suggested? Families would fall under Social Barriers. What's better, building single resident tiny homes or refurbishing existing housing to create congregate living for six? Number of people housed vs. units created?</p> <p>Jay noted that there are different types of housing, built and priced differently. A bed with 70 sq ft is considered a habitat for one person. Adria said those would be considered policies. Would those categories of increasing number of units created or preserved and affordable to those under 80% AMI, does that still fit under affordability, or do we need to break out the units vs. people?</p> <p>Jay said that state Ordinances are changing, and single-family residences can't be built in certain areas anymore. Corey said that, when we're talking about numbers, we should remember that some cultures are multi-generational. Allowing some leeway for that would be beneficial to our work.</p> <p>Adria asked if members think that we need to build in a category that accommodates that nuance. Rian said that single people have an AMI rating and families do as well, so we might be covered in terms of inventory. Whether we prefer units that accommodate families would be a policy differentiation.</p> <p>Mary was thinking about the discussion last meeting and said that unit size might not really matter when scoring criteria.</p> <p>Riley said that AMI doesn't account for the fact that we have some large families, of nine, for example. Maybe we'll come across a proposal in which someone's developing five-bedroom units and someone else is developing single units. There's a cultural component to that and we need to be mindful of the equity. Scorers need to understand how size of units could potentially disenfranchise certain groups.</p>	<p>Discus- sion</p>

TOPIC/WHO	DISCUSSION	ACTION
-----------	------------	--------

<p>Evaluation Framework Discussion continued</p>	<p>Jay said that a large problem is that large, multi-generational families cannot find housing unless they find a few units close to each other. We need both family and single units. Quad units are rare, and more are needed. There are also cases of, for example, one person with disabilities who has five pets. Adria said that we can come back to this if we find it's not covered in the framework.</p> <p>Rian suggested flexible unit sizes that can support different sizes of families.</p> <p>Corey appreciates this dialogue so much! From a realtor standpoint of what we're seeing, Jay hit the nail on the head when saying affordability's needed across the board. For example, it's difficult for Habitat to be successful when building only single unit dwellings.</p> <p>Jeff feels that the rubric works well for the group. Earlier he was reacting to the points and value they're aligned with.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="626 888 1018 1507"> <thead> <tr> <th>Points</th> <th>Value</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>High</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>Medium-High</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>Medium</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>Low-Medium</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>Low</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>He thinks the point system works if we strip the words away. Seeing "Low," or "Low-Medium" might make people question this Board's values. It's semantics, but sometimes semantics are important.</p> <p>Adria said perhaps we can wordsmith a way to explain the points a bit better.</p> <p>Housing Barriers: Lua said she didn't see anything about language and cultural barriers. Not speaking English is a hindrance to finding housing.</p>	Points	Value	4	High	3	Medium-High	2	Medium	1	Low-Medium	0	Low	<p>Discus- sion</p>
Points	Value													
4	High													
3	Medium-High													
2	Medium													
1	Low-Medium													
0	Low													

TOPIC/WHO	DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>Housing & Related Services Sales Tax (Maureen Howard Affordable Housing Act) Expenditure Plan Presentation Bryan Schmid</p>	<p>Bryan Schmid, Pierce County Human Services (HS) Affordable Housing (AH) Supervisor, attended to present on the Housing and Related Services Sales Tax. He'd like comments and input after his presentation. Feedback will be incorporated into the final draft.</p> <p>In 2015 the State legislature passed HB 2263, creating a local option sales and use tax for housing and related services. It required passage by both the legislative authority of a City or County and a public vote.</p> <p>In 2020 the State legislature passed HB 1590, amending the RCW to allow a City or County to impose a sales tax of up to 1/10 of 1% (10 cents on a \$100 purchase) for housing and related services (removing the public vote requirement.)</p> <p>At least 60% of the funds collected must be used for constructing AH, constructing behavioral health-related facilities, or funding the operation and maintenance costs of new AH units, facilities where housing-related programs are provided, or newly constructed evaluation and treatment centers.</p> <p>Programs must be provided to persons at 60% or below of the AMI, with behavioral health disabilities, veterans, seniors, who are homeless or at risk of being homeless, unaccompanied homeless youth, persons with disabilities or domestic violence survivors. The remainder must be used for operation, delivery, or evaluation of behavioral health treatment programs and services or housing-related services.</p> <p>In 2021 the Tacoma City Council passed Ordinance 28747, implementing the above-mentioned sales tax within the City of Tacoma, generating roughly \$7M annually. The Cities of Orting and Ruston also passed Ordinances adopting the tax. Pierce County passed Ordinance 2022-81s (The Maureen Howard AH Act) in March 2023, implementing the tax for the rest of Pierce County outside Tacoma, Orting, and Ruston. This will generate nearly \$20M dollars of revenue, a four-fold increase in AH resources in Pierce County.</p> <p>The Ordinance directs HS to create a six-year advisory expenditure and implementation plan, based on the allowed uses of the fund (RCW), the Council's identified priorities, the goals and strategies contained in the 2022 Piece County Housing Action Strategy, the Comprehensive Plan to End Homelessness and the most recent Behavioral Health Implementation Plan.</p> <p>Council priorities (from the Ordinance) are to attract AH development, address the racial and rural wealth gap through increasing homeownership, and to dedicate up to 30% of the funds to individuals at or below 30% AMI, 50% to those between 30 and 60% AMI, and 20% towards housing-related services and behavioral health.</p>	<p>Informa-tional</p>

TOPIC/WHO	DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>Housing & Related Services Sales Tax continued</p>	<p>Key Goals: increase AH production for lower-income households, create diversity of housing options expand permanent housing options for homeless households, and prevent homelessness all with geographic and racial equity.</p> <p>The draft plan is to use 80% of funds on capital development and preservation of AH and ops and maintenance of newly created AH.</p> <p>50% would be allocated to AH targeted at households between 30 and 60% AMI.</p> <p>30% would be targeted at households with income below 30% AMI.</p> <p>20% of funds would be used for the delivery of housing services to support the homeless crisis response system. Funding target to maintain and expand supportive housing.</p> <p>Capital development is needed, as Pierce County is a gap funder. Projects are far below market and don't generate market rents. Far less debt can be obtained, so public funding's needed. Typically, low-income housing developers come to the County first, then funds are layered with federal and state funds. Pierce County's been historically underfunded by the Department of Commerce. We usually get \$4.5 to \$5M a year, so an additional \$20M more is quite significant!</p> <p>Document recording fees (DRF) are an unreliable source to fund homeless services, because when home purchases are down, there's funding's inadequate. Sales tax fluctuates as well, but not at the rate DRFs do.</p> <p>Funding will be administered through competitive Notices of Funding Available (NOFAs) and through contract with the Pierce County Community Development Corporation. The CDC is a public non-profit entity staffed by HS employees and has an independent Board. It does a lot of lending for home ownership activities, down payment assistance, rental housing activity and is a vehicle to use for land acquisition.</p> <p>Eligible project types: rental housing homeownership housing, PSH.</p> <p>All expenditures must be approved by the County Executive and County Council. HS will present biennial performance reports to the Council. The program will be audited every six years and will be monitored consistent with existing AH programs. The Council will review the need for the fund every 10 years.</p>	<p>Informa- tional</p>

TOPIC/WHO	DISCUSSION	ACTION
-----------	------------	--------

<p>Housing & Related Services Sales Tax continued</p>	<p>Affordable Housing Target Goals:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="305 380 1221 758"> <thead> <tr> <th>Biennium Budget</th> <th>Units Below 30% of AMI</th> <th>Units 30% to 60%</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2024-2025</td> <td>195</td> <td>325</td> <td>520</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2026-2027</td> <td>210</td> <td>350</td> <td>560</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2028-2029</td> <td>230</td> <td>370</td> <td>600</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Per above, we think we can generate 1680 units by 2029.</p> <p>The plan is in the public engagement and outreach phase right now. Final review will take place in October. The plan will be submitted to the County Council in November, and they will take action with a Resolution or Ordinance. Funding will be distributed to the community in 2024.</p> <p>One thing this fund will allow us to do is publish separate NOFAs and RFPs. In the past we have issued one, since there was less money to distribute. This time we'll have three or four AH projects: Targeted Homeownership, Rental Housing Development, Operations and Maintenance, and Preservation. This is similar to what the Department of Commerce does.</p> <p>Jay shared some important background information. This year, due to the DRFs decreasing, there was 40% less homeless funding available, resulting in hits to the system.</p> <p>Rian has a few questions for Bryan (Bryan's laptop battery died immediately after his presentation) about the funding percentages, and if the \$20M is total, or an increase. (It's an increase.)</p> <p>Jay has worked with the CoC on houseless applications. Part of the problem is that NOFAs are funded by reimbursement. If it's reimbursement only, players will be in the same spot. Some are reluctant to get into the bidding process when it's reimbursement. If not enough people apply, the funding won't get out. Jay has several points of concern about the plan.</p> <p>Adria called for comments or suggestions about how to use the last ten minutes of the meeting. Mary said her updates will be quick and she can share Bryan's contact information if they have questions. The group resumed reviewing the Evaluation Framework.</p>	Biennium Budget	Units Below 30% of AMI	Units 30% to 60%	Total	2024-2025	195	325	520	2026-2027	210	350	560	2028-2029	230	370	600	<p>Informational</p>
	Biennium Budget	Units Below 30% of AMI	Units 30% to 60%	Total														
2024-2025	195	325	520															
2026-2027	210	350	560															
2028-2029	230	370	600															

TOPIC/WHO	DISCUSSION	ACTION
Evaluation Framework Discussion continued	<p>Other Priorities: Racial equity and Home Ownership opportunities: Riley suggested that Racial Equity should either be broken out more or weighted higher. Jay agreed with Riley that it should be weighted higher.</p> <p>Jay would like to add Redistribution of Land Wealth due to past redlining.</p> <p>Alex said it might be valuable to dive deeper into definitions to clarify what we're trying to achieve in racial equity.</p> <p>Adria asked for any other comments. Is there a specific weight people would like for Racial Equity? Riley said it should be at least a 2, potentially a 3. There's strong argument for a 4. Amanda agreed with Riley's suggestion (3). Alex wouldn't feel comfortable changing the weighting number until there's a clear definition.</p> <p>Jay will send Mary a research paper by Carol Wise on racial equity in housing, and its effect on the BIPOC community.</p>	<p>Jay will send Mary a research paper by Carol Wise.</p> <p>Staff and the sub committee will update the framework and bring it back to the full group.</p>
SSHA³P Staff Updates Mary	<p>If they haven't already, members may schedule a time with Jason Gauthier, SSHA³P Manager, to provide input on SSHA³P's Federal and State legislative priorities. He'll use the feedback to develop SSHA³P's legislative agenda.</p> <p>At the next Advisory Board meeting Jason will present SSHA³P's 2024 Work Plan that was officially adopted by the Executive Board in July.</p> <p>2024 Work Plan – was officially adopted by the Exec Board in July – included in the meeting packet for Board Members' reference.</p>	Informational
Board Members' Updates & Comments Group	None currently.	
Adjournment	Rian moved to adjourn the meeting. April seconded. Vote was taken; none opposed, no abstentions. The meeting adjourned at 7:31 p.m.	Meeting adjourned!

The next SSHA³P Advisory Board meeting will be Tuesday, September 19 at 5:30 p.m. via Zoom.
Becki Foutz, Administrative Assistant