

I. CALL TO ORDER

Trish Abbate called the virtual meeting to order at 6:05 PM.

Board member attendees: Dorsol Plants, Ryan Disch-Guzman, Uche Okezie, Andrew Calkins, Aaron Johnson, Maju Qureshi, Jennifer Hurley, Menka Soni, Amy Kangas

Board members absent: Kaitlin Heinen, Linda Smith

Others in attendance: City of Des Moines Councilmember Traci Buxton; Trish Abbate; Angela San Filippo.

II. ADVISORY BOARD MEMBER INTRODUCTIONS / OPENING

Trish opened the meeting at 6:05 pm with an opening icebreaker.

III. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Packet of meeting minutes includes: November, December, January, and February. Unanimous approval of all meeting minutes.

IV. HOUSING CAPITAL FUND PRIORITY SETTING

Trish Abbate reviewed the intention of the housing capital fund priority setting and reminded the group that this is year one in funding and the amount of funding available will dictate how often SKHHP has funding opportunities in the future. The primary goal is to demonstrate we are able to do this work and it will be essential to align priorities with other public funders in the region.

Amount available in for this funding round is estimated to be \$1.3 million available through SHB 1406 contributions from SKHHP partner cities. Abbate reviewed the legislative requirements of SHB 1406 including serving households earning 60% or less of area median income.

Abbate provided an overview of the public funders in the region to help better understand potential partner funders. Public funders include: Washington State Housing Finance Commission (WSFC), Department of Commerce State Housing Trust Fund, King County, and A Regional Coalition for Housing (ARCH) because we often look to ARCH for guidance and wisdom as SKHHP was formed similarly.

Question on area median income (AMI) and about alignment of funds. Generally all of the public funders use the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) provided definition of area median income for the Seattle-Bellevue metro area which includes King and Snohomish Counties.

Question about the tenant homeownership priority identified in the 9% program and question for examples of projects. Staff will look into this priority and see if there are examples to share.

Question about transit and whether the reference includes future transit. Staff will confirm that this includes planned future transit.

Question about housing stock and what is being referenced. Housing stock generally referenced throughout the public funder priorities is existing housing. Discussion on how south King County housing stock compares to areas outside of south King County.

Discussion ensued on what jumped out to Advisory Board members, what was surprising, confusing, and/or concerning. King County could be doing a better job on racial equity, seem to be making some progress in that area and good to see that reflected.

Question on somewhat new concept of single-room occupancy seen in other areas. Would that include converting hotels?

Discussion about ways to gauge success, what has been done so far, and how to measure if we are hitting the mark. Come back to the question of identifying success at the next meeting and what has been done historically or in other areas/programs.

In terms of development experience, there has been more focus on BIPOC led or BIPOC serving organizations but don't necessarily have many BIPOC developers.

There are so many priorities spread across the funders – know in reality everything is weighted towards serving people exiting homelessness. South King County is somewhat more affordable than other areas of the county but there is still a need for housing serving 0-30% AMI.

Discussion on AMI and general understanding that households earning 40-60% AMI are middle class families in South King County and rent increases don't keep up with wage increases.

Observation that funder priorities emphasize preservation but we also need to look forward to create new housing and not just preserve what we have.

Housing can be somewhat siloed as a singular solution. We should be take a holistic approach – need to build more housing and preserve housing but we also need jobs that keep people in place.

SKHHP's mission is born out of focus on the housing piece but partnerships and collaboration with other organizations will help us look at the whole picture and better understand where it might make sense for SKHHP to have a role.

Affordable housing can be a blanket term but it isn't necessarily available or affordable to people that need it most – see people being evicted from LIHTC projects because they can't keep up with rent. Seniors has been a larger issue – senior on SSDI cannot afford SHAG apartment.

Suggestion to look more at space equity – Capitol Hill as an example and the history of what it used to be. Look at how homelessness is reflected in our own environment. In SeaTac they cannot find any space to locate and build, all the space they have is privately owned and selling it to someone with more capital to build increasing the price which creates gentrification – pushing people out of King County entirely and into Pierce County and in some cases out of Washington State entirely.

Staff will take into consideration what everyone has shared and the insights and values are emerging that will lead to establishing priorities.

General agreement that the needs are broad across the full housing spectrum, focus on how we can best do good with the estimated \$1.3 million we have.

Importance of communication with groups planning on applying, focus on collaboration, and possibility to provide technical assistance. Make sure applicants are going to be set up for success, devastating if organization was awarded funding but the project wasn't able to move forward.

In terms of populations served – didn't see category for folks exiting criminal justice system or treatment facilities. What types of programs/populations have not historically received this type of funding.

Notes will be sent out in a follow-up email and next month the hope will be to finalize priorities. Suggestion to include in application for funding whether they have had access to these types of funding, what involvement they have had in the community, and how do they involve community in decision making.

Last year Department of Commerce provided a grant to MultiService Center (MSC) and MSC had to provide 6 references, 3 references had to be for staff and 3 for the agency. It was a lot of work to get the references and it was just one component of the grant writing process, but also an interesting way to get feedback.

Suggestion to reach out to other stakeholders to get their feedback, for example: Resident Action Project. Currently we don't have a process built for this. Staff will come back to this suggestion.

Discussion on programs that mention supportive housing and staffing issues that come up with mental health issues and case management and constraints around building as well as staffing for services.

Staff will send out a shared document to collect additional feedback from the group prior to the next meeting. Priorities will be drafted next month.

V. EXECUTIVE BOARD LIASION REPORT OUT

The avenue that we have created so far to build relationships with the Executive Board is through an Advisory Board liaison and provide opportunity for liaison to come back to the Advisory Board with their perspective on the meeting they attended. Staff provides support to the Executive Board but it is their meeting, the Chair can call on staff or other attendees but it is not necessarily a venue for us to add input or intervene. The Executive Board is mostly elected officials that have different level of knowledge and experience with housing topics.

Maju attended February meeting of the Executive Board. Overall it was great presentation by Marty Kooistra now with Civic Commons on Black Homeownership Initiative, and HomeSight will be part of this exciting pivotal program. All Executive Board members seem very supportive, one member made some concerning comments during the meeting. Suggestion for SKHHP staff to speak individually with that member and provide ongoing opportunities for education. Also interesting to hear how they run the meeting. Board members expressed need for homelessness service and response, interesting to hear the members seek some suggestions for increasing behavioral health opportunities. Larger educational component around homelessness that needs to be addressed in SKHHP partner cities. How can SKHHP create spaces to help inform elected officials and community members that have skewed perspectives on people experiencing homelessness.

VI. RELATIONSHIP BUILDING BRAINSTORMING

Abbate asked for suggestions from the group on ways to build relationships with the Executive Board and potentially the staff work group and how we can utilize your expertise as much as possible.

Suggestions included a quarterly joint meeting that provides opportunity to get to know on another and learn from each other. Advisory Board members are all doing really meaningful work and staff want to uplift you all as the experts that you are while also being respectful of your time. Tours of properties were also suggested.

Staff will share out the housing policy matrix that helps get at some of the questions that have come up related to zoning and land use policies. The policy matrix has potential as an advocacy tool, as well as identifying gaps across the region and SKHHP provides space for jurisdiction collaboration.

VII. EXECUTIVE BOARD WELCOME

Welcome from SKHHP Executive Board member and City of Des Moines Councilmember, Traci Buxton. Buxton asked the group to introduce themselves and share what they are most excited about in their Advisory Board capacity.

VIII. UPDATES / ANNOUNCEMENTS

Reminder to complete open public meetings act training and email certificate of completion to Trish.

IX. CLOSING

Abbate adjourned the meeting at 8:00 pm.