



Arlington ^Edmonds ^Everett ^Granite Falls ^HASCO ^
Lake Stevens ^Lynnwood ^Marysville ^Mill Creek ^Mountlake Terrace ^
Mukilteo ^Snohomish ^Snohomish County ^Stanwood ^Woodway ^

Alliance for Housing Affordability Joint Board

Tuesday, October 28, 2014

Housing Authority of Snohomish County

4:30 - 6:00 PM

Meeting Minutes

Participating:

Bill Anderson	Town of Woodway
Owen Dennison	City of Snohomish
Bob Davis	HASCO
Edith Duttlinger	City of Mountlake Terrace
Allan Giffen	City of Everett
Jennifer Gregerson	City of Mukilteo
Chris Holland	City of Marysville
Shane Hope	City of Edmonds
Ken Katahira	Snohomish County
Ryan Larsen	City of Stanwood
Corbitt Loch	City of Lynnwood
Glen Pickus	City of Mukilteo
Tom Rogers	City of Mill Creek
Mary Jane Brell Vujovic	Snohomish County
Kyoko Wright	City of Mountlake Terrace

1. **Call to Order and Introductions:**

The meeting was called to order by Bill Anderson at 4:34.

2. **Approval of Minutes:**

Motion was made by Jennifer Gregerson and seconded by Tom Rogers to approve the minutes of the July 23, 2014 meeting as written. Motion passed unanimously.

3. **Presentation and discussion of King County ARCH's approach to housing planning collaboration**

Arthur Sullivan presented an overview of ARCH's activities and answered questions from those present. ARCH's activities are concentrated in two areas: shared projects, like the trust fund, and projects for individual jurisdictions. In those areas, each jurisdiction is still making its own decisions. The same model is not applied to everyone. ARCH is there to help the city understand issues, and provide staff support. Work for individual jurisdictions typically flows out of the needs analysis and strategy plan ARCH prepares for each jurisdiction. Items in the strategy plans aren't overly specific to the cities, but are intended to provide a big list of possible ideas with a range of purposes that the cities can prioritize. Arthur instructs the cities not to remove items from the list necessarily, but to make them low priority. Some ARCH cities use the strategy

plans, others do not – depends on how each city works. Once the strategy plans have been developed, they look for areas where there is enough common interest that there should be collaboration across the group. The ARCH trust fund is always the group’s most significant collective project. It was established at the same time as the group, and has funded many units. It is a small funder within each project, however, but this still serves to attract developers to affordable housing projects. As a funder, ARCH is able to direct new projects to match the actual need. Other examples of collective projects include multifamily tax exemptions, coordinating development on surplus properties, employer incentives, land use incentives, and planning for commercial centers. Another common role ARCH serves is in program enforcement – the same legal documents are used in every ARCH jurisdiction. Every year, ARCH works with the cities to develop individual work plans from the strategy plans and other identified projects. Arthur stressed the need to bring housing into the discussion along with zoning changes, rather than after development has already taken place – to anticipate and plan for market changes. With this strategy, if a jurisdiction is still struggling to get developers to work with a new affordable housing provision of some kind, the jurisdiction should offer more relaxed standards to the first developers willing to try.

At this point, meeting attendees asked Arthur questions and had a general discussion about ARCH’s methods. This discussion included more detail on the ARCH trust fund, and other specific projects, including projects that ARCH has partnered with its member jurisdictions to complete. Arthur clarified that contributions to the trust fund were initially voluntary, then, after a few years, they developed a formula to find a high/low goal for funding from each jurisdictions. Contributions are still voluntary, but jurisdictions generally donate around the midpoint, whether in cash or in land/other contributions. During this discussion Arthur stated that most of ARCH’s successful ideas originally came from city councilmembers or community members. As these kinds of projects typically reach multiple “dead ends”, it’s necessary to have strong support to keep moving. It’s also necessary to listen to community feedback while providing education. The group expressed interest in inviting a developer to talk at an upcoming meeting.

5. Staff Update

Kristina Gallant provided a brief update on her work since the previous meeting

6. Next Steps

The next meeting was planned for Wednesday, February 25 at 4:30 PM at Snohomish County Admin East.

9. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:56 PM by Jennifer Gregerson.