**ITEM 3: Approval of the February 2024 Meeting Minutes**

Approval of the February Executive Board Meeting minutes

Attachments

1. Summary Minutes to Executive Board Meeting (February 15, 2024)

**A REGIONAL COALITION FOR HOUSING (ARCH)**

Summary Minutes to Executive Board Meeting

Date February 15, 2024 Hybrid Meeting

11:00 am

**Board Members Present:**

Carol Helland, City of Redmond, Planning and Community Development Director

Nathan McCommon, City of Bellevue, Deputy City Manager

David Pyle, City of Sammamish, Director of Community Development

Maia Knox, City of Clyde Hill, Assistant City Administrator

Alison Van Gorp, City of Mercer Island, Deputy CPD Director

Kurt Triplett, City of Kirkland, City Manager

Debbie Bent, City of Kenmore, Community Development Director

Wally Bobkiewicz, City of Issaquah, City Administrator

Kyle Stannert, City of Bothell, City Manager

Simon Foster, King County, Division Director, HHCD

Scott Pingel, City of Newcastle, City Manager

Steve Burns, City of Medina, City Manager

**Board Members Absent:**

Jared Hill, City of Woodinville, Intergovernmental Affairs Coordinator

**Others Present:**

Lindsay Masters, ARCH, Executive Director

Diana Heilman, ARCH, Senior Administrative Assistant

Terrell Edwards, ARCH, Planner

Yelias Bender, ARCH, Senior Program Officer

Mike Stanger, ARCH, Senior Planner

Susie Levy, ARCH, Local Housing Program Manager

Raquel Rodriguez, ARCH, Program Coordinator

Patrick Tippy, ARCH, Bellevue Housing Stability Program Manager

Jen Davis Hayes, City of Issaquah, Economic Development Manager

Cissi Xu, ARCH, Intern

Adam Matza, ARCH, Rental Program Coordinator

Rob Karlinsey, City of Kenmore, City Manager

Hannah Bahnmiller, City of Bellevue, Senior Affordable Housing Planner

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

Chairperson Helland called the meeting to order at 11:05 am.

1. **APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

Chairperson Helland asked if there were any changes to be made to the February 15, 2024 agenda. No changes were made.

*Member Pingel moved that the agenda be approved. Seconded by Member Triplett. Approved 11-0.*

1. **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

Chairperson Helland asked if there were any corrections to the meeting minutes for January 2024. No corrections were requested.

*Member Triplett moved that the minutes be approved as presented. Member Pyle seconded the motion. Approved 11-0.*

**4. PUBLIC COMMENT**

*No public comment was made.*

**5. REPORTS / ACTION ITEMS**

**5a) Update on Kenmore Supportive Housing Project**

Chairperson Helland turned the presentation over to Director Masters for an update on the project.

Director Masters presented a history of the Kenmore Supportive Housing project which concluded with the

Kenmore City Council having voted not to approve the Development Agreement in January 2023. Director Masters outlined recent efforts to find an opportunity to transfer the project to a location in the City of Redmond. On February 13, the Redmond City Council approved the Mayor of Redmond to move forward with transferring a City-owned property for the projects Next steps would include technical assistance to Plymouth to support adaptation of building designs to the Redmond property and zoning code; coordination with project funders to maintain and update funding commitments; and CAB and Executive Board review of the updated project proposal.

*Member Foster left the meeting sometime during the presentation.*

Chairperson Helland added that this project would not be moving forward in Redmond without the work of the Kenmore City staff. Chairperson Helland invited comment from Rob Karlinsey, City of Kenmore City Manager. Rob Karlinsey shared thoughts on the history of this project.

Chairperson Helland commented on the power of planning and expressed appreciation for the work Kenmore had done. The parcel on Cleveland street had been acquired to allow the alignment for Sound Transit. The remainder was planned for affordable housing. Many City planning efforts laid the groundwork to move forward with a project, including a housing action plan, a community strategic plan in which housing choice was identified as a top concern from the community, and early adoption of permanent supportive housing regulations, along with a successful partnership with King County for a Health through Housing project. They were able to point back to goals and intentions already in place.

Member Triplett thanked Kenmore for what they had done.

Member Stannert expressed appreciation for Rob Karlinsey’s willingness to share lessons learned particularly regarding being sure that they had land use code ready, they were procedurally ready, and that they were communications ready.

Chairperson Helland asked Rob Karlinsey to let them know if their staff would like help. The Chairperson also asked for any property transfer documentation that was already prepared by Kenmore.

Rob Karlinsey agreed to provide any documents that Redmond needed and to have more discussion as needed. Rob asked Director Masters how ARCH staff were doing.

Director Masters said it was good to have another project opportunity to funnel energy into. Director Masters affirmed that they would continue talking to Kenmore staff about the future of affordable housing there.

**5b) Public Funding Coordination Update**

Chairperson Helland turned the discussion over to Director Masters.

Director Masters directed the Board to the information in their agenda packet. ARCH was involved in an ongoing effort to leverage all the local resources and brought other public investments into east King County. Director Masters referenced a formal collaboration process that ARCH had with state entities that controled resources at the state level as well as the County and Seattle who coordinated on King County’s pipeline. There was more competition for state bond cap in the last four to five years. It had become problematic because developers were putting resources and capital at risk into projects that may not be funded for many years. Our goal was to improve predictability and level of coordination in the public funding system so there was more certainty for developers and clarity as to how projects were selected. ARCH had been part of a collaboration on a more formal framework for prioritizing projects to receive bond cap. Key factors included required local funding commitments, geographic distribution and equity, readiness of projects to get building permits within the year that the bond cap is allocated, and incorporation of more community-based organizations and communities of color into the development process.

Director Masters invited questions. There were none.

**5c) Draft ARCH Strategic Plan – Further Discussion**

Chairperson Helland turned the discussion over to Director Masters.

Director Masters reminded the Board that there was a recommendation from the Planning Committee on a set of strategies. The first discussion by the Board took place in January. There was a good discussion on how to incorporate these strategies into the next Budget and Workplan. There was feedback that more time was needed for the Board members to consult with their councils and stakeholders. It was decided that the Board could be ready in March for final action on the plan. Some requested additional information on how additional staff would be allocated across the membership. This was provided in the packet and by email. Also, there was interest in what the job description for additional staff would be. A draft list of job responsibilities was also in the packet that would continue to be refined. Director Masters wanted to bring forward options in the future for different methods for allocation of dues. This would be the subject of some research and future discussion as to whether per capita was the best method.

Director Masters said there would be more context and information on how the plan would be implemented and monitored over time. The strategic plan itself would not look much different from the executive summary that the Board had. The Director asked if there was other information that the Board would like to incorporate in terms of context, it could be added in the next month. ARCH would prepare a two-page summary for a general audience, but there would be something to be used by the Board that would be more of a dashboard to track timeline and action steps.

Director Masters opened the floor for feedback regarding the strategies and what was the right set of documents that the Board would like ARCH to create. Director Masters turned the floor over to Member Triplett.

Member Triplett asked that the Board give feedback on the original recommendations as well as feedback from their elected officials.

*Member Bobkiewicz joined at 11:37 am.*

Chairperson Helland said they engaged with their Mayor prior to presenting the final document to their Council. The Mayor was very supportive. They noted that there were times where “members’” and “elected officials” are used in sentences in a confusing manner. They suggested that those terms be clarified. Also, their Mayor suggested that ARCH do a survey of private developers with embedded affordable housing as well as developers of projects that were built with direct assistance to understand their frustration and challenges with long term management of those buildings and their operations. This might inform support for production and ensure they were successful over time.

Member Bobkiewicz said they took the strategic plan to their Council and got push back due to concern over the governance issue. They felt the role of the elected official was missing in ARCH. Member Bobkiewicz asked Director Masters to share thoughts on the Issaquah Council feedback.

Director Masters summed up the comments as having expressed interest in the role of elected officials, including a question about why ARCH didn’t look like other organizations that had elected officials on their Board. One councilmember expressed caution about having elected officials involved in the day to day work of ARCH. In The strategic plan incorporated a planned governance study that sought to address this topic.

Chairperson Helland asked Member Bobkiewicz if there was any input on how elected officials would improve the process. Chairperson Helland pointed out recent lessons that depoliticizing processes was one of the best ways to smooth the path to effective production.

Member Bobkiewicz said that the Issaquah Council was concerned that ARCH had not been more effective because it had not been able to get more political consensus between the jurisdictions. These are difficult questions, but the Council in Issaquah felt that ARCH had failed in that regional consensus work. There were lots of compliments to the staff and their work on projects, but depoliticizing such an important issue as affordable housing was not the right way to have looked at it, even if may be more efficient. The will of elected officials may make things messier, but that’s the way the system was set up.

Member Stannert said he had these conversations in January with Bothell elected officials and followed up with the executive summary. There was great support for the idea of going to a biennial budget, as well as interest in the voice of the developer and looking at ways to get stakeholder feedback. From a governance standpoint, there was an interest in leveraging what already existed rather than bringing together a different group of the same elected officials—acknowledging that anytime you tried to do things regionally there is messiness and tension. Finally, recognizing the challenge of funding, there was great appreciation for the goal of aligning legislative priorities.

Member Pyle acknowledged the number of night meetings Director Masters must attend. The Sammamish City Council gave feedback that they were supportive on all levels of the Strategic Plan with a bit of a refocus on the policy angle. There had been quite a bit accomplished by state law and CPPs, and we were on a similar trajectory to comply with those. ARCH could serve an additional policy element by identifying gaps in policy alignment and focusing on how to fill those gaps. There was feedback that elected officials wanted to be more involved and engaged by learning, not in wanting to drive policy, but to understand what the different housing options are so they are aware when they are presented with decisions. One councilmember was interested in an adjunct seat on CAB to learn about what it takes to build projects. They understood the financial implications of adding staff but found value from taking on regional policy alignment.

Member Van Gorp said Director Masters would be joining them the next Tuesday in Mercer Island.

Chairperson Helland shared that choosing to advocate with production in mind created more comfort with the Mayor of Redmond because of its alignment with ARCH’s mission. Planning was critical to this conversation, when they had policies put in place by their Council, it determined how Board members presented and showed up so that they voted in a manner consistent with what Councils had put in place. That had been part of the deliberation and rigor brought to being in this room and how to approach their service to ARCH.

Member Triplett summed up the comments and brought attention back to the draft proposal. The Planning Committee did not contemplate radical changes to the structure, and it sounded like there was interest in that question. However, they did look at governance and have a method for starting to have that conversation. Their focus was on pragmatic strategies that can move forward. They also heard that Councilmembers wanted to be engaged and informed and have a policy-based discussion, and this was what led to the idea of proposing strategic new staff positions to help with that. To have a fully activated, committed and supported set of councils who wanted to move in this space, there was too much on the current staff’s plate with projects, maintenance, and preservation of programs that already existed. There does need to be a thorough discussion of the impact on budgets, but the question now was whether these were concepts worth translating into budget discussions. They may still choose to fund some but not all of these, or modify the dues, but overall it sounded like they were headed in the right direction.

Member Pyle said that the Sammamish council asked why they were reviewing the budget in the first quarter of 2024, when it had been implemented. Member Pyle proposed that the budget be before the councils for approval prior to the year that they were implemented so that it is not a ceremonial approval.

Member Triplett responded that they all have recognized this issue. A biennial budget needed to be considered.

Member Van Gorp commented that they changed their process and now they bring the budget to their council in the fall each year as part of their own budgeting process. That had worked well. Chairperson Helland confirmed that they do the same in Redmond.

Member Triplett said it might lead to further discussion about process improvements and the idea of when to take non-voted issues to councils. Director Masters brings the budget discussions to them over a series of months, so there were opportunities to check in. Board members needed to be able to get early insights. Member Triplett asked if there was anything else missing from the Board’s perspective, beyond feedback regarding elected officials.

Chairperson Helland said that the need for a feedback loop from developers was heard from the Redmond elected officials and that should be part of the plan.

Director Masters asked for clarification. Director Masters said they had collected input from the developers in the survey. That could be shared, but was the idea that to engage more going forward?

Chairperson Helland saw this was a need going forward. A survey could be sent out annually regarding barriers, what was going well, and what could be done better. This could be helpful in creating a legislative agenda and smooth the path to barriers, and they could continue to encounter resistance if they didn’t take notice of impacts developers were experiencing after the housing is constructed.

*Member Bobkiewicz left the meeting at 12:15.*

Member Stannert added the importance of a feedback loop to let folks know they have heard and considered their input. Director Masters asked for clarification. Director Masters asked if the desire was for that to happen before the Board approved the plan. Member Stannert said he would leave that to the committee.

Member Knox said they also shared the plan and didn’t get a lot of feedback, but those they did speak with were interested in what the return was on their investment in ARCH. They were interested in becoming more familiar with ARCH does. Member Knox expressed the desire for elected officials to be more involved. The council did not feel the pressure from residents for affordable housing so there needed to be a way to encourage and support membership of ARCH.

Member Triplett commented that the issue of staying engaged with the developer community fit within both job descriptions being considered, either communications or government relations and policy. This could be highlighted as a benefit and a need they could meet if they added some staff. Member Triplett thanked the Board and said the committee would refine the Strategic Plan and bring it back at the next meeting.

**6) OTHER BUSINESS**

Chairperson Helland turned the floor over to Director Masters to go over the verbal updates.

**6a] Verbal Updates**

* **Community Advisory Board Recruitment**

Director Masters said that there were vacancies for between 1 and 4 new members. Additional outreach efforts will be made. Director Masters asked for volunteers from the Board to help with the interviews. Member Stannert and Member McCommon volunteered.

* **ARCH Legislative Priorities**

Director Masters reminded the Board about ARCH’s two legislative priorities had been identified – local funding options and transit-oriented development. Director Masters discussed the efforts to take the real estate excise tax bill and bring the local option back or to enable flexibility to REET 2. Those efforts did not succeed this year but could be brought forward in 2025. They may also circle back on the TOD bill and what the implications were for local implementation if it was adopted.

* **ARCH Legal Services**

Director Masters reminded the Board that they had approved one time funding as well as ongoing funding to bring in outside legal services contracted through the City of Bellevue. After interviews some qualified candidates were identified. ARCH had a newly assigned attorney in the City Attorney office.

* **Middle Housing Planning Coordination**

Director Masters announced that they would be kicking off a new workgroup on Middle Housing. They would be using the feasibility model developed last year. There would be nine or ten cities participating.

* **Housing 101 potential dates: April 3, 4, 17 or 18 (1 – 4 pm)**

Director Masters asked for feedback on dates for the Housing 101 event.

Director Masters asked for additional feedback on the Strategic Plan to be communicated before the next meeting.

**7) ADJOURNMENT**

Meeting was adjourned at 12:24 pm.