

I. CALL TO ORDER

Nancy Backus called the virtual meeting to order at 1:01 PM.

a. ROLL CALL/ESTABLISHMENT OF QUORUM

Executive Board members present: Nancy Backus, City of Auburn; Dana Ralph, City of Kent; Kristina Soltys, City of Covington (Alternate); Traci Buxton, City of Des Moines; Brian Davis, City of Federal Way; Sunaree Marshall, King County; Sue-Ann Hohimer, City of Normandy Park; Mark Santos-Johnson, City of Renton (Alternate); Tom McLeod, City of Tukwila.

Other attendees: Angela San Filippo, SKHHP; Trish Abbate, SKHHP; John Howell, Cedar River Group; Robert Feldstein, Cedar River Group; Nicole Nordholm, City of Des Moines; Marty Kooistra, Housing Development Consortium; Tim Thomas, Urban Displacement Project; Merina Hanson, City of Kent; Eric Lane, City of Des Moines; Laurel Humphrey, City of Tukwila; Ben Bakkenta, PSRC; Benita Horn, City of Renton; JC Harris, City of Des Moines; Amy Arrington, City of Normandy Park; McCaela Daffern, King County; Nicole Gaudette, City of Burien

II. REVIEW AGENDA/AGENDA MODIFICATIONS

No agenda modifications.

III. APPROVAL OF JULY 23, 2021 MINUTES

Dana Ralph moved to approve the July 23, 2021 minutes as presented; Traci Buxton seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously (9-0).

IV. EDUCATION ITEM

Trish Abbate introduced Tim Thomas, Research Director at the Urban Displacement Project and Principal Investigator for the Evictions Study a multi-metropolitan analysis on the neighborhood drivers of eviction. Tim holds a Ph.D. in Sociology from the University of Washington and his dissertation identified racial and gender disparities in eviction filings in South King county in 2013, along with associated neighborhood segregation, housing market, and rent burden trends. In 2019, his team's work on evictions provided empirical evidence that helped pass several tenant protection laws in Washington State.

Tim began his presentation by covering the topic of forced migration via evictions and the relationship between economic status and residential mobility. Those with greatest economic status can mobilize as they wish, to be closer to jobs, networks, or personal preference, with folks in mid economic status range are immobile due to work and/or family obligations, and those with lowest economic status are in a position of forced mobility due to rising housing costs, with evictions making up the extreme end of forced mobility. On an individual level, evictions are often the result of increasing rent combined with housing burden (not enough income) and inadequate social services for support. A Milwaukee study of evictions in 2012 found evictions disproportionately impact women and Black individuals and families, with the majority of evictions occurring in poor and racially diverse neighborhoods. Most of the people evicted were paying 80-90% of their income toward rent. The level of diversity of a neighborhood acts as the best predictor of likelihood of eviction.

With regard to King County, eviction filings have decreased between 2004 to 2017 while evictions in Pierce County have increased. The theory is that lower income people have been displaced out of King County and into Pierce County. Pierce County currently shows the greatest risk of eviction within the state of Washington. King County overall presents a relatively low risk of eviction, but the highest eviction risk is in South King County, which represents 57% of all of King County's eviction filings. Looking at sex and race, Black individuals are being evicted at a rate 4 times that of whites and Latinx at a rate 1.4 times the amount of whites. Black females are evicted at a rate 7 times the amount of white females and Black males are evicted at a rate 5.4 times the amount of white males. Between 2013-2017 evictions in Pierce County were disproportionately impacting Black adults. 1 in 6 Black adults (18%) in Pierce County have been evicted, 1 in 11 Black adults (9.6%) in King County and 1 in 16 Black adults (6.1%) in Snohomish County, the total Black population in both King and Pierce counties is approximately 9%. Within King County, the more diverse the neighborhood, the higher the eviction numbers and within all neighborhood categories, evictions disproportionately impact Black individuals. Eviction filings are also the highest in the neighborhoods with the lowest rents. Within King County, in 2006 evictions were highest in South Seattle and in South King County, in 2017 eviction filings were the highest in the most southern parts of South King County, indicating the evictions are migrating south into Pierce County. Between 2000 and 2016 poverty has been increasing in South King County, in part as a result of people seeking the historically lower rents of South King County and creating increased competition for those homes, impacting the market and driving up the costs of rents in those areas.

Discussion occurred about eviction risk after the covid-related eviction moratorium lifts. The national average eviction rate is currently 2%, however there are estimates that 15% of US households are uncertain they can afford their rent. The three actions that could help prevent evictions include local jurisdictions enacting policy protections, aggressive organizing pointing out where evictions are happening, along with rent assistance and legal representation. The areas in this region with the greatest risk and least resiliency are South King County and Pierce County.

Discussion occurred around where people are going when they are displaced. Migration theory demonstrates that if possible, people make short moves. There are fewer options for affordable housing in King County so it's more uncertain where folks are going.

Discussion occurred around the possibility for SKHHP to do outreach and connect with vulnerable landlords who might be selling properties before they hit the investment market, which was substantiated as one of the best ways to help preserve affordable housing alongside community land trust creation. Additional policy recommendations can be found in the Urban Displacement Project website.

V. OLD BUSINESS

a. SKHHP Housing Capital Fund with Cedar River Group

i. Timeline

ii. Matrix

iii. Evaluation Criteria

Robert Feldstein and John Howell reviewed Staff Work Group progress on the housing capital fund timeline, matrix and evaluation criteria. The timeline and matrix were attached to meeting agenda packet. Feldstein invited feedback and then reviewed the general timeline.

Discussion around how staff can begin to prepare now to ensure the approval process moves as smoothly as possible. Feldstein shared the vision that the first year or two may be aided by illustrating

for councils the amount of work that has been done by the various groups and staff by the time it comes to them for approval. Discussion around how the staff work group is a valuable resource for elected officials during decision making.

John Howell introduced the matrix and highlighted feedback from the Staff Work Group including the following: The list of eligible applicants currently includes for profit developers and local governments but may be revised once the Advisory Board and Executive Board set targets and priorities.

“Moderate income” was clarified to include the definition of households up to 80% area median income. Short-term direct tenant assistance or operating expenses are not eligible as the SKHHP capital fund will not be large enough initially to support operating expenses.

Discussion occurred around supporting operating expenses with the capital fund and how that is dependent on the sources of funding and limitations. In terms of the types of funding awards, loans are more common practice for developers accessing tax credits while grants are utilized for smaller projects or projects with community service components. Applications will also require a “Letter of consistency” from jurisdiction where the project will be located affirming the project is consistent with the Consolidated Plan, local comprehensive plan and its housing element, and any local housing action plans as a replacement for letter of support.

Evaluation criteria introduced but not discussed due to time constraints.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

a. 2021 Quarter 2 Progress Report

San Filippo will send out the report as a tool to share with staff and councils and asked for comments and questions to be emailed directly to her.

VII. UPDATES/ANNOUNCEMENTS

No announcements.

VIII. NEXT MEETING – September 24, 2021 – 1-3pm

IX. ADJOURN

Backus adjourned the meeting at 3:04pm.