



**SKHHP Advisory Board**  
**May 5, 2022, 6:00 – 8:00 PM**  
**Virtual – Zoom Meeting**

---

**Zoom Link:** <https://us06web.zoom.us/j/89734407973?pwd=cnIISFU4dXFJaFN5TGlwTWIxZHINZz09>

**Meeting ID:** 897 3440 7973

**Password:** 981696

**Phone:** 253-215-8782

**In person option for public attendance:**

City of Auburn Annex Conference Room 2  
1 East Main Street  
Auburn, WA 98001

---

<u>Time</u>	<u>Agenda</u>
6:00	<b>Welcome</b> (Brian Davis, City of Federal Way Community Development Director)
6:15	<b>Introductions / Opening</b>  <i>Icebreaker: Show &amp; Tell – share or describe the view from your work space</i>
6:25	<b>Approval of April 7, 2022 Meeting Minutes</b> (Attachment A)
6:25	<b>Executive Board Liaison Report Out</b> (Dorsol Plants)
6:35	<b>Housing Capital Fund Priority Setting</b> (Attachment B)
7:10	<b>2023 SKHHP Work Plan</b>
7:40	<b>Educational Opportunities</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- <i>Executive Board meeting education components</i></li><li>- <i>Educational opportunities for Advisory Board</i></li></ul>
7:50	<b>Advisory Board recruitment</b>

- *What does the group think of allowing for Advisory Board members representing an organization to appoint an alternate?*

**7:50**      **Updates / announcements**

**8:00**      **Closing**

DRAFT



**SKHHP Advisory Board Meeting  
April 7, 2022**

**MINUTES**

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

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

**Board member attendees:** Ryan Disch-Guzman, Andrew Calkins, Maju Qureshi, Jennifer Hurley, Menka Soni, Linda Smith, Kaitlin Heinen, Amy Kangas, Uche Okezie

**Board members absent:** Aaron Johnson

**Others in attendance:** Sunaree Marshall; Trish Abbate; Angela San Filippo.

**II. ADVISORY BOARD MEMBER INTRODUCTIONS / OPENING**

Trish opened the meeting at 6:05 pm with an opening icebreaker. Sunaree Marshall, King County DCHS and SKHHP Executive Board member provided welcome and opening statement.

**III. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES**

Unanimous approval of meeting minutes from March 3, 2022.

**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 primary goal is to demonstrate we are able to do this work. It will be essential to align priorities with other public funders in the region. Setting priorities are just for this funding cycle, hoping to fill a gap, show local government support, and align with other public funders.

Reminder that these are priorities rather than requirements and are intended to provide a tool to evaluate applications. As the group discussing the shared google document, Abbate will bring forward suggestions from the staff work group.

*Target populations*

Populations listed are both in need of housing and have been disproportionately impacted by housing crisis. Discussion on how to capture demographics such as criminal history or exiting behavioral health, or caregiving for children. Suggestion to include on self-reporting on applications from developers on priority populations.

Suggestion to include Black population that has been denied housing, Fair Housing Act did not remedy that. Homeownership and homelessness data shows Black populations have historically been denied access to housing.

Suggestion to include people with disabilities (physical and behavioral health). Population receiving SSDI has been marginalized by the housing system.

Kaitlin provided some insight into legality with regard to fair housing, represent a lot of clients in senior (55+) housing, and believes there is a way to reconcile issues with fair housing and

represent those most impacted by housing. AfricaTown example of formerly used space as long-term care facility and transformed as a youth housing. Way to be very specific and intentional to who the project would be targeting.

Discussion on what resources are available to individuals/organizations applying for these funds. Suggestion to capture experience with these types of projects and relationships with specific populations. AfricaTown held listening sessions with community leaders and community support has led to the success of the project.

Clarification on single moms and parents, suggested edit to use non-gendered language and not to specify small children that would create discrepancy with families that have older/teenage children. Change language to caregivers.

Abbate brought up system-connected housing that may relate to criminal justice system, traditional healthcare, mental and behavioral health institutions and potential to use that phrase to more broadly capture target populations. Discussion on encompassing what we're looking for but would like to move away from system language. Suggestion to use boarder umbrella language that references populations that have historically been targeted by unfair housing or redlining.

Concern that from a housing equity and justice viewpoint, if we aren't naming specifically the target population in the process they will get left out. We need to address the historic inequities – Black folks have historically and continue to be disproportionately impacted.

Suggestion to include populations that have historically been denied housing as well as displaced. Importance of affordable housing and also addressing intentional displacement. Suggestion to include Indigenous and Pacific Islander groups.

Suggestion to include people that have been impacted by economic impacts of COVID-19 pandemic, not sure how to classify that segment.

Suggestion to think about people marginalized by systems and need to be inclusive of all people (example of Veterans). We cannot create equity if we aren't mindful of all of the populations that have been marginalized.

Suggestion to include young adult housing, foster young adults aging out of the system.

Suggestion to include students, especially those experiencing homelessness, reference to LIHI project in South Seattle focused on low income students.

#### *Type of housing*

Discussion on whether we want to prioritize income threshold below 60% of area median income (AMI).

Concern that if we prioritize below 60% folks on the threshold will be priced out.

Recommendation to leave as 60% AMI.

Discussion on the vast need at 0-30% AMI and folks experiencing homelessness. Hard to find developers that want to build 0-30% housing. Developers are going to build housing at the highest income level they can.

Recommendation to keep it at 60% but include language that emphasizes the need for housing at 0-30% and somehow assign points or otherwise emphasize applications that address 0-30%.

*Amy Kangas joined at 7:00 pm*

Discussion on specific set asides at income levels and whether that is too prescriptive, maybe state something about mixed incomes between 0-60%. Example of MultiService Center Veteran's housing with service connected benefits, without those benefits they would be eligible but was part of the reason that they were ineligible.

Example working with seniors, the majority of seniors on social security don't qualify for housing because they don't meet the requirement to have income that is two times the amount of the rent. Reference to the King County nonprofit wage survey – majority of people working in the nonprofit sector are in the 40-60% range, lower end is where the higher need is but also acknowledge what is feasible for developers.

Example of Belltown senior apartments – \$496 for studio, \$700ish for 1-bedroom, they only have to have 1.5 times the rent if they can demonstrate they have been able to make rent in the past, maybe there's a way to factor those considerations into the priorities.

Observation that nonprofit developers are more likely to reach deeper into 0-30% and offer services. For profit developers are going to be more in the 40-60% range.

Homeownership came up in staff work group, may be unlikely to be funded at 0-60% AMI. Recommendation to list homeownership as a priority type of housing, it will take lots of layers to reach below 60% AMI but it's not impossible.

*Location*

Abbate suggested including a statement acknowledging goal for geographic distribution across all areas in SKHHP. Discussion on whether there should be priorities for projects near amenities/services. Suggestion to include current or emerging TOD sites.

*Type of project*

Like the type of projects and local supports – gets at community connections and those that haven't necessarily received funding opportunities.

Discussion on the importance of preservation especially for housing that has affordability requirements that are about to expire, building new units doesn't help if existing units are exiting out of the system. Recommendation to include preservation.

Recommendation to demonstrate how they have engaged the community in construction/development of the project and experience with specific populations they are hoping to serve.

Discussion on local versus out of state developers and how to determine whether they have a relationship with the community or connection to community. Suggestion to start reaching out to community groups to do this in collaboration with us.

Suggestion to include a letter of support from community organizations, churches, community centers, or schools in the area where the development is proposed or serves the area where

the development is proposed. Letter of community support as subset of demonstrated community engagement/connection.

Discussion on how to define community, how far away can the church be, can church in Auburn write a letter for project in Federal Way. Organization that serve or at least make an attempt to serve diverse group of the community.

Suggestion removing the priority focused on development cost.

Discussion on predevelopment versus construction phase. Staff work group cautioned around using funds for predevelopment may not be a good fit for this fund at this time when we are primarily focused on demonstrating success.

Leverage other public and private investments, and suggestion to include priority for project that already have funding committed.

#### **V. EXECUTIVE BOARD LIASION REPORT OUT**

Dr. Linda Smith attended the March 18, 2022 SKHHP Executive Board meeting. Discussion included approval of Federal Legislative Priorities – increase access to affordable housing, establish safe parking program, direct funds to SKHHP housing capital fund. Kathleed Hosfeld presented on Community Land Trust project and history and how they have created housing. Also heard about permanent supportive housing in Tukwila. Interesting part of each project was developing relationships and partnering with organizations along with infusing government funding.

#### **VI. EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES**

Agenda item moved to next meeting.

#### **VII. UPDATES / ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Staff work group meeting invitations extended to advisory board members – meetings occur the 1<sup>st</sup> Wednesday of every month from 11 am – 1 pm. Abbate stressed this would be completely voluntary and, but wanted to convey the invitation.

Ryan will not be at the next meeting.

#### **VIII. CLOSING**

Abbate adjourned the meeting at 8:00 pm.

## DRAFT SKHHP Housing Capital Fund Priorities

### Target Populations

- Caregivers
- LGBTQ+
- People with disabilities
- People existing the criminal justice system
- People exiting behavioral health treatment
- Populations historically denied housing and displaced populations
  - Black
  - Indigenous
  - Asian Pacific Islander
- People disproportionately impacted by COVID-19
- Seniors
- Students
- Veterans
- Young adults & youth aging out of foster care

### Type of Housing

- SKHHP Housing Capital Fund will serve 0-60% AMI
  - Priority consideration for 0-30% AMI
- Supportive housing – priority to support more of a holistic approach vs. simply housing
- Homeownership for <60% AMI

### Location

- Transit Oriented Development (current/future)
- SKHHP's objective is to produce housing across SKHHP member jurisdictions through the creation of a broad distribution in the location of all types of affordable housing over time to maximize choice for individuals and families seeking affordable homes without SKHHP's geographic purview

### Type of Projects

- Collaborative (local organizations working in partnership with local BIPOC and/or community based organizations)
- Preservation of affordable housing with expiring affordability requirements

### Local Support

- Developers have demonstrated community connections and direct experience with populations they are proposing to serve
  - Letter of support from community organizations, churches, community centers or schools
- Demonstrated community engagement
- Demonstrated involvement of community in decision making

### Funding

- Leverage other public and private investments
- Projects that already have funding secured

### Other

- Focus on racial equity