City of Kenmore - 18120 68th Avenue NE - P.O. Box 82607 - Kenmore, WA 98028
Phone: 425-398-8900 - Fax: 425-481-3236 - E-mail: cityhall@kenmorewa.gov

City of Kenmore
Regular City Council Meeting Agenda
7:00 p.m., March 20, 2017
Kenmore City Hall, Council Chambers
18120 68th Ave. NE, Kenmore, WA 98028

If you have any questions or to confirm agenda items prior to the meeting, or if you require special accommodations, please call the City Clerk at 425-398-8900. You may also stop by City Hall at 18120 68th Avenue NE, Kenmore. Council agendas are also available on our website at www.kenmorewa.gov.

I. 6:30 p.m. DINNER WILL BE SERVED

II. 7:00 p.m. CALL REGULAR MEETING TO ORDER

III. ROLL CALL

IV. FLAG SALUTE

V. JOINT MEETING WITH THE NORTHSHORE UTILITY DISTRICT BOARD OF DIRECTORS

VI. CITY UPDATE

A. Walkways and Waterways

B. Capital Improvement Plan
Ordinance No. 16-0430 - 2017-2022 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

C. Downtown Redevelopment

D. Lakepointe Development

VII. NORTHSHORE UTILITY DISTRICT UPDATE

A. Change of Leadership at Northshore Utility District

B. Capital Improvement Plan

VIII. 8:00 p.m. CITIZEN COMMENTS

A. This is an opportunity to express your views on issues that are important to you and to the community. Please limit your comments to three (3) minutes.

IX. BUSINESS AGENDA

A. Housing Strategy Plan Prioritization of Strategies, Debbie Bent, Community Development Director
Agenda Item
Attachment 1
Attachment 2
Attachment 3
Attachment 4

B. Public Comment on Housing Strategies

C. Continued Discussion and Direction on Housing Strategies

X. STAFF REPORT

XI. COUNCILMEMBER REPORTS & COMMENTS

XII. COUNCILMEMBER INITIATIVES

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

Upcoming Meetings:
Tuesday, March 21, 2017 Planning Commission Meeting
Monday, March 27, 2017 Regular Council Meeting
Monday, April 3, 2017 6:00 p.m. For the Love of Kenmore Event
Tuesday, April 4, 2017 7:00 p.m. Special Council Meeting For the Love of Kenmore Debrief with Peter Kageyama

CITY OF KENMORE
WASHINGTON
ORDINANCE NO. 16-0430

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF KENMORE, WASHINGTON, ADOPTING A SIX-YEAR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY; AND ESTABLISHING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, a Proposed 2017-2022 Six-Year Capital Improvement Program was submitted to the City Council and the City Clerk on October 17, 2016; and

WHEREAS, the City Council scheduled and held a Public Hearing on the Proposed 2017-2022 Six-Year Capital Improvement Program on October 24, 2016,

NOW, THEREFORE, THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF KENMORE, WASHINGTON, DO ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

<u>Section 1. Adoption of City of Kenmore, Washington, Capital Improvement Program</u>. The City of Kenmore hereby adopts a new City of Kenmore, Washington, Capital Improvement Program, attached as Exhibit "A."

<u>Section 2. City of Kenmore, Washington, Capital Improvement Program.</u> To the extent the City of Kenmore, Washington, Capital Improvement Program ("Capital Improvement Program") is different from the Capital Facilities Element of the City's Comprehensive Plan, including but not limited to the Capital Facilities Plan portion thereof ("Capital Facilities Element"), the Capital Improvement Program shall supersede and amend the Capital Facilities Element accordingly.

<u>Section 3. Severability</u>. Should any section, paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase of this Ordinance, or its application to any person or circumstance, be declared unconstitutional or otherwise invalid for any reason, or should any portion of this Ordinance be preempted by State or federal law or regulation, such decision or preemption shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this Ordinance or its application to other persons or circumstances.

<u>Section 4. Effective Date</u>. This Ordinance shall be published in the official newspaper of the City, and shall take effect and be in full force five (5) days after the date of publication.

ADOPTED BY THE CITY COUNCIL AT A REGULAR MEETING THEREOF ON THE 24th DAY OF OCTOBER, 2016.

CITY OF KENMORE

Mayor David Baker

ATTEST/AUTHENTICATED:

Patty Safrin, City Clerk

Approved as to form:

Rod P. Kaseguma, City Attorney

ORDINANCE NO. 16-0430
FILED WITH THE CITY CLERK: October 14, 2016
PASSED BY THE CITY COUNCIL: October 24, 2016
PUBLISHED: October 28, 2016
EFFECTIVE DATE: November 2, 2016

EXHIBIT A

CITY OF KENMORE, WASHINGTON
PROPOSED CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
FOR THE YEARS 2017-2022

EXPENDITURES	2017 Proposed	2018 Proposed	2019 Proposed	2020 Proposed	2021 Proposed	2022 Proposed	2017-2022 Totals
PARKS							
P 1 Twin Springs Interim Use Plan	$40,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$40,000
P 2 Tolt Pipeline Trail Phase One	206,936	0	0	0	0	0	206,936
P 6 Moorlands Park Improvements	1,000,095	566,925	0	0	0	0	1,567,020
P 18 Rhododendron Park Waterfront & Natural Open Space A	160,000	615,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	795,000
P18a Rhododendron Park Float	60,000	200,000	25,000	0	0	0	285,000
P 26 Squires Landing Dock/Float	195,000	0	0	0	0	0	195,000
P 27 Squires Landing Park Waterfront & Open Space Access	250,000	600,000	500,000	220,000	1,715,000	1,690,000	4,975,000
P 28 Log Boom Park Waterfront Access and Viewing	200,000	400,000	300,000	120,000	1,090,000	1,065,000	3,175,000
P 29 St Edward Ballfield Improvements & Lighting	TBD	TBD	0	0	0	0	0
Total Parks	**$2,112,031**	**$2,381,925**	**$830,000**	**$345,000**	**$2,810,000**	**$2,760,000**	**$11,238,956**
TRANSPORTATION							
T 6 SR 522 West A 61st to 65th	$667,400	$127,200	$0	$0	$0	$0	$794,600
T 8 SR 522 West B 57th to 61st	0	0	0	600,000	7,400,000	4,000,000	12,000,000
T 27 Sidewalk Program:							
South side NE 181st ST Construction	123,600	0	0	0	0	0	123,600
North side NE 181st ST	181,800	0	0	0	0	0	181,800
NE 202nd ST (198th -66th)	1,180,310	10,640	0	0	0	0	1,190,950
62nd Ave NE	778,520	6,985	0	0	0	0	785,505
Arrowhead Dr	11,100	132,800	726,133	0	0	0	870,033
NE 153rd Pl	11,100	132,400	604,938	0	0	0	748,438
NE 181st (65th -67th)	136,730	668,475	0	0	0	0	805,205
Sidewalk Gaps	0	0	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	400,000
T 35 Overlay	450,000	805,351	450,000	450,000	450,000	450,000	3,055,351
T 37 West Samm Bridge	2,098,962	910,999	7,425,888	7,422,054	3,724,341	33,395	21,615,639
T 39 Neighborhood Traffic Calming Improvements	55,000	55,000	0	0	0	0	110,000
T 41 Juanita Dr Pedestrian & Bicycle Safety All Segments	600,000	1,500,000	4,162,000	2,156,667	2,156,667	2,156,666	12,732,000
T 42 68th Ave Pedestrian & Bicycle Safety All Segments	250,000	987,000	60,000	2,000,000	1,803,000	0	5,100,000
T 43 SR 522 Pedestrian Crossing Study	0	282,500	272,500	0	0	0	555,000
T 44 61st Ave Survey and Conceptual Plan	0	90,000	0	0	0	0	90,000
Total Transportation	**$6,544,522**	**$5,709,350**	**$13,801,459**	**$12,728,721**	**$15,634,008**	**$6,740,061**	**$61,158,121**
SW 8 190th Culvert at 61st	$1,500,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$1,500,000
SW 8 Trust Fund Loan Repayment	0	153,000	153,000	153,000	153,000	153,000	765,000
SW 19 NE 192nd St Culvert Replacement	885,634	0	0	0	0	0	885,634
SW 20 Small Works Projects	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	300,000
SW 25 Strawberry Hills SW Tank Retrofit	100,000	360,000	0	0	0	0	460,000
SW 29 Infiltration Tank Retrofit at 61st Ave NE/NE 190th St	120,000	0	500,000	0	0	0	620,000
SW 30 Drainage Improvements at153rd/NE Arrowhead Dr	125,000	0	0	0	0	0	125,000
SW 31 Drainage Impr & Street Repair at 66th Ave NE /196th	115,000	0	0	0	0	0	115,000
Total Surface Water	**$2,895,634**	**$563,000**	**$703,000**	**$203,000**	**$203,000**	**$203,000**	**$4,770,634**
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	**$11,552,187**	**$8,654,275**	**$15,334,459**	**$13,276,721**	**$18,647,008**	**$9,703,061**	**$77,167,711**

Business of the City Council
City of Kenmore, WA

Subject/Topic: Housing Strategy Plan – Prioritization of strategies **Proposed Council Action/Motion:** Prioritize the Housing Strategy Plan strategies for assignment to the Planning Commission docket and the City Council work program.	**For Council Meeting Agenda of:** 3/20/17 **Department:** Community Development **Prepared by:** Debbie Bent, Director **Initial & Date** **Approved by Department Head:** LA for DB, 3/3/17 **Approved by City Attorney:** — **Approved by Finance Director:** **Approved by City Manager:** RBK **Exhibits/Attachments:** 1. List of direct assistance strategies with staff recommendations 2. Planning Commission's top four strategies with staff recommendations 3. Unabridged housing strategy plan (text and matrix) 4. Response to Council questions

Expenditure Required: $0 **Amount Budgeted**: $0 **Appropriation Required**: $0

At your meeting on February 13, staff and ARCH introduced the direct assistance strategies to be considered as part of the Housing Strategy Plan. Following are the goals for the March 20 meeting:

1) Prioritize the five direct assistance strategies and determine which of these strategies, if any, should be added to the City Council work program for this year;
2) Determine whether the top four strategies recommended by the Planning Commission are appropriate;
3) Adopt the overall Housing Strategy Plan (overall report including priority strategies and unabridged matrix); and
4) Determine which one of the prioritized land use related strategies should be assigned to this year's Planning Commission docket.

In light of the discussion on the 13th, staff has developed a priority recommendation for the direct assistance strategies (see Attachment 1), with the staff-recommended top priorities highlighted. (As directed, the Planning Commission did not consider or rank the direct assistance strategies, reserving that task for the City Council.)

Attachment 2 identifies the four highest priority strategies recommended by the Planning Commission. As in Attachment 1, the staff recommendation for the top priority among the four Planning Commission strategies is highlighted. That strategy would have the Commission consider ways to preserve existing affordable housing, in particular considering treatment of the manufactured housing communities and the ability to do density transfers from affordable properties. This issue is timely and would, potentially, protect already-existing affordable housing in Kenmore.

Attachment 3 is the unabridged matrix of strategies, including all of the Planning Commission recommendations. The matrix includes the review criteria for each strategy.

Attachment 4 is a response to the questions the City Council raised in February. Although the strategy selection is only the first step in analyzing whether or not an approach may be appropriate for Kenmore, this information will be useful moving forward as the related strategy is being assessed.

FISCAL CONSIDERATION: None.

COUNCIL GOAL/BUDGET OBJECTIVE BEING ADDRESSED: "Adopt a Housing Strategy Plan that outlines action steps and priorities" (Comprehensive Plan implementation measure)

Attachment 1

HOUSING STRATEGY PLAN
DIRECT ASSISTANCE STRATEGIES

Staff-recommended highest priorities are highlighted in yellow

DIRECT ASSISTANCE.

a. Provide local funding assistance for affordable housing:

i. Continue or expand use of city general funds.

ii. Dedicated local revenue source(s) for affordable housing.

- Property tax levy or portion of revenue resulting from new growth (e.g. construction sales tax).
- New source authorized by state legislation (see regional/state initiatives).
- Local voluntary employers fund.

Staff Recommendation: The City will be addressing these issues in conjunction with the ARCH Executive Board. It is anticipated that discussions will begin in Fall 2017 and conclude in June 2018. For this reason, staff recommends that this strategy be assigned a Tier 1 (top) priority.

b. Explore ways to utilize existing and/or new funding programs to address local conditions:

i. Target preservation and rehabilitation of existing manufactured housing and multifamily housing (including small properties).

ii. Funding to assist low- and mod-income residents if displaced in existing manufactured or multifamily housing.

iii. Homeownership programs:

- Downpayment assistance program for first-time homeowners.
- Support for affordable ownership units such as land trusts, sweat equity (Habitat).

iv. Revolving loan fund to support 4% tax credits.

v. A revolving land loan program (REDI).

vi. Support development of emergency and permanent housing with services for homeless individuals and households.

vii. Home repair program for low/moderate income homeowners (see Support for countywide program).

viii. Fund infrastructure that supports affordable housing development (e.g., streetscape, park)

ix. Funding for home visits, meals.

Staff Recommendation: Items b.i. and b.ii. could be coordinated with the top Planning Commission strategy recommended by staff (see Attachment 2). For this reason, staff recommends that these strategies be assigned Tier 1 (top) priority.

Likewise, item b.vi. is timely and should be considered a Tier 1 (top) priority, given the interest in Mary's Place.

Item b.vii. is an existing program that staff recommends be monitored over time.

The remaining items, b.iii., b.iv., b.v., b.viii., and b.ix. would be new programs and staff recommends that they be given a Tier 2 (medium) priority. In addition, as the current policy of cities providing funding through the ARCH Housing Trust Fund is to fund a balance of different housing needs, many of the items on this list (e.g. Homeownership, REDI) have been and can continue to be funded through the Housing Trust Fund.

c. Review permit & impact fees for affordable housing:

i. Reduce development permit fees for projects with affordable housing.
ii. Review provisions for reducing impact fees for projects with affordable housing.

Staff Recommendation: The City has previously addressed impact fee reductions for affordable housing. Reducing development permit fees for projects with affordable housing has not yet been considered. Staff recommends that c.ii. become a monitoring item, while c.i. be a Tier 2 (medium) priority.

d. Surplus land available for affordable housing:

i. Inventory of city-owned and other public property real property for potential suitability.
ii. Prioritize affordable housing integrated into proposals for development of publicly-owned properties.

Staff Recommendation: The City has an inventory of city-owned property and is aware of most, if not all, other public properties that could be considered for suitability for affordable housing. For this reason, staff recommends that item d.i. become a monitoring item. Staff recommends that item d.ii. also be assigned as a monitoring item to be assessed any time development of publicly-owned properties is considered.

e. Utilize non-cash subsidies, such as credit enhancement.

Staff Recommendation: As Arthur Sullivan with ARCH mentioned at the February 13 City Council meeting, this housing strategy is complicated and is one that the City may not want to take a leadership role on. For that reason, staff recommends that item e. become a Tier 3 (low) priority.

Attachment 2

PLANNING COMMISSION'S TOP 4 HOUSING STRATEGY PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff-recommended highest priority is highlighted in yellow

REGULATORY APPROACHES.

- Allow flexible reuse of tax-exempt or publicly-owned sites through a special process to increase housing supply and enable more diverse forms of housing, if linked to providing some affordable housing. Consider possible opportunity at Park-and-Ride.

- Consider expanding density bonuses, adding density transfers, and other methods with mixed-use and multi-family developments:
  - Review and consider expanding density bonuses, including mandatory programs with increased development capacity in mixed-use and multi-family zones.
  - Encourage layering local incentives to create greater affordability (e.g. MFTE w/ density incentives).

- Consider strategies for preserving existing affordable housing:
  - Density transfers from affordable properties to areas where additional density has been proposed.
  - Manufactured housing community overlay (e.g. Bothell).

- Accessory dwelling units:
  - Review current code provisions.
  - Review permitting process and fees / utility requirements.
  - Clemency program to legalize existing ADUs.

STRATEGY	Housing Element Policy	CODE UP-DATE	OTHER COUNCIL ACTION	COORD. W/ OTHERS REQUIRED	INCOME SERVED--IMPACT: VERY LOW	LOW	MOD	MKT	POPULATION SERVED--IMPACT: SR	WORK-FORCE	YOUNG ADULTS	HOME-LESS	FAMILIES, KIDS	OTHER CRITERIA: Broader Vision	Timeliness	Public Cost	Not Already Addressed	PRIORITY
A. REGULATORY APPROACHES.																		
1. **Infill/Increased Capacity/ Housing Diversity.**																		
a. Consider some form of overlay zoning for senior housing linked to providing some affordable housing.	H-1.3.1	X						•										**Tier 1**
b. Allow flexible reuse of tax-exempt or publicly-owned sites through a special process to increase housing supply and enable more diverse forms of housing, if linked to providing some affordable housing.	H-1.3.1	X						•										**Tier 1**
i. Possible opportunity at Park-and-Ride.																		
c. Consider provisions, including design guidelines, to allow some flexibility in single family neighborhoods for small scale housing (e.g. cottages, duplexes).	H-1.3.2	X						•										**Tier 2**
e. Modify land use and building codes to maximize economical wood frame construction:	H-3.3.3	X						•										
i. Allow 6-story wood frame construction.																		Tier 3
ii. Increase zoning code height limits.																		Tier 3
f. Provide a flexible development process for preserving environmentally constrained property that accommodates alternative building types.	H-1.2.7; H-3.3.3	X						•										**Tier 2**
h. For multifamily housing, consider code amendments to limit project sizes based on height, setbacks, and/or FAR, not units per acre.	H-1.3.2	X						•										**Tier 2**
j. Reduce number of projects subject to SEPA:	H-1.4.1; H-3.3.3	X						•										**Tier 2**
i. Expand projects eligible for categorial exemptions.								•										
ii. Complete planned action EIS for targeted neighborhoods (planning areas).								•										
l. Consider code amendments to facilitate rental property preservation:	H-3.1	X						•										Tier 3
i. Rental inspection program.								•										Tier 3
ii. Consider provisions to limit conversion of rental housing to condominiums.								•										Tier 3
2. **Support for Special Needs Housing.**																		
a. Ensure development regs address housing accessibility.	H-1.2.2	X						•										**Tier 2**
c. Housing options and services enabling seniors to stay in their homes or neighborhoods:	H-2.1.3	X																

STRATEGY	Housing Element Policy	CODE UP-DATE	OTHER COUNCIL ACTION	COORD. W/ OTHERS REQUIRED	INCOME SERVED--IMPACT				POPULATION SERVED--IMPACT					OTHER CRITERIA				PRIORITY
					VERY LOW	LOW	MOD	MKT	SR	WORK-FORCE	YOUNG ADULTS	HOME-LESS	FAMILIES, KIDS	Broader Vision	Timeliness	Public Cost	Not Already Addressed	
d. Consider ordinance to prohibit Housing Choice Voucher discrimination.	H-3.3.4		X															Tier 3
e. Consider revisions to land use incentive program to link voucher units to affordable units.	H-3.2.1	X																**Tier 2**
3. **Affordable Housing.**																		
a. Consider expanding density bonuses, adding density transfers, and other methods with mixed-use and multi-family developments: i. Review and consider expanding density bonuses, including mandatory programs with increased development capacity in mixed-use and multi-family zones. iii. Encourage layering local incentives to create greater affordability (e.g. MFTE w/ density incentives).	H-1.2.8; H-1.4.2; H-3.2.4	X						•										**Tier 1**
b. Consider strategies for preserving existing affordable housing: i. Density transfers from affordable properties to areas where additional density has been proposed. ii. Manufactured housing community overlay (e.g. Bothell).	H-3.1	X						•										**Tier 1**
c. Accessory dwelling units: i. Review current code provisions. ii. Review permitting process and fees / utility requirements. iii. Clemency program to legalize existing ADUs.	H-3.3.2; H-1.3.2	X																**Tier 1**
d. Expedite permitting for projects with affordable housing.	H-3.2.1.d	X																Tier 3
B. DIRECT & INDIRECT ASSISTANCE.																		
1. **Direct Assistance.** (Note for Planning Commission draft: Direct Assistance, such as relocation costs and loan programs, will be discussed by the City Council, who will determine specific strategies and priorities.)																		
a. Provide local funding assistance for affordable housing:	H-3.2.5		X															
i. Continue or expand use of city general funds.			X															
ii. Dedicated local revenue source(s) for affordable housing.			X															
o Property Tax Levy / Portion of revenue resulting from new growth (e.g. construction sales tax).			X															
o New source authorized by state legislation (see regional/state initiatives).			X	X														
o Local Voluntary Employers Fund.				X														

STRATEGY	Housing Element Policy	CODE UP-DATE	OTHER COUNCIL ACTION	COORD. W/ OTHERS REQUIRED	INCOME SERVED--IMPACT: VERY LOW	LOW	MOD	MKT	POPULATION SERVED--IMPACT: SR	WORK-FORCE	YOUNG ADULTS	HOME-LESS	FAMILIES, KIDS	OTHER CRITERIA: Broader Vision	Timeliness	Public Cost	Not Already Addressed	PRIORITY
b. Explore ways to utilize existing and/or new funding programs to address local conditions.	H-3.2.5		X	X														
i. Target preservation and rehabilitation of existing manufactured housing and multifamily housing (including small properties).	H-3.1		X															
ii. Funding to assist low- and mod-income residents if displaced in existing manufactured or multifamily housing.	H-3.1.2	X	X															
iii. Homeownership programs:			X															
o Downpayment assistance program for first-time homeowners.	H-3.2.5		X															
o Support for affordable ownership units such as land trusts, sweat equity (Habitat).	H-3.2.1		X															
iv. Revolving loan fund to support 4% tax credits.	H-3.2.5		X															
v. A revolving land loan program (REDI).	H-3.2.5		X					X										
vi. Support development of emergency and permanent housing with services for homeless individuals and households.	H-3.2.1		X															
vii. Home repair program for low/moderate income homeowners (see Support for countywide program).	H-3.1.1		X															
viii. Fund infrastructure that supports affordable housing development (e.g. streetscape/park)	H-3.2.5		X															
ix. Funding for home visits, meals.	H.2.1.3		X															
c. Review permit/impact fees for affordable housing:		X	X															
i. Reduce development permit fees for projects with affordable housing.	H-3.2.1.d	X																
ii. Review provisions for reducing impact fees for projects with affordable housing.	H-3.2.4	X																
d. Surplus land available for affordable housing:			X	X														
i. Inventory of city-owned and other public property real property for potential suitability.	H-3.2.3			X														
ii. Prioritize affordable housing integrated into proposals for development of publicly-owned properties.	H-3.2.1.a		X	X														
e. Utilize non-cash subsidies, such as credit enhancement.	H-3.2.1		X															
2. <u>Indirect Assistance.</u>																		
a. Support applications by housing developers for capital and operating assistance of local affordable housing projects.	H-3.2.1.c			X														**<u>Tier 1</u>**

STRATEGY	Housing Element Policy	CODE UP-DATE	OTHER COUNCIL ACTION	COORD. W/ OTHERS REQUIRED	INCOME SERVED--IMPACT				POPULATION SERVED--IMPACT					OTHER CRITERIA				PRIORITY
					VERY LOW	LOW	MOD	MKT	SR	WORK-FORCE	YOUNG ADULTS	HOME-LESS	FAMILIES, KIDS	Broader Vision	Timeliness	Public Cost	Not Already Addressed	
b. Information/referral/outreach.				X				•										**Tier 2**
i. Information to seniors regarding housing options; e.g., ARCH website, other efforts.	H-2.1.3			X														
ii. Accessory dwelling units: community education and outreach.	H-3.3.2			X														
iii. Promote use of weatherization programs.				X														
iv. Promote Universal Design awareness.	H-1.2.2			X														
d. Encourage residential energy and water efficiency as addressed in Utilities Element.	H-1.2.4		X	X				•										Tier 3
i. Support water conservation programs of the NUD.	U-4.1.1																	
ii. Promote use of water conservation features in design or rehab of residential structures.	U-4.1.3																	
iii. Promote higher density and infill developments that are located near major transportation and transit links.	U-4.3.4																	
iv. Encourage the rehabilitation of existing buildings as an alternative to demolition, where appropriate, to encourage the conservation of energy, building materials, and historic preservation.	U-4.3.5																	
e. Increase transportation access between special needs housing and community facilities and programs: sidewalks, ramps, etc.	H-2.2.2		X	X				•										Tier 3
f. Partner with employers to provide affordable housing for their employees.	H-3.2.1			X														Tier 3
C. REGIONAL & STATEWIDE INITIATIVES.																		
1. Promote housing repair/rehabilitation assistance (e.g., from King County) for homeowners and landlords.	H-3.1.1																	**Tier 2**
a. Participate in regional Universal Design rehab program.	H-1.2.2		X	X				•										
2. Support various housing-related consumer protection programs.			X	X				•										**Tier 1**
a. Resources to tenants facing eviction due to temporary financial hardships (e.g. housing stabilization program).	H-3.1.1																	Tier 3
b. Foreclosure counseling/assistance.	H-3.2.5																	
c. Financial counseling/ first-time buyer classes.	H-3.2.5																	
3. Collaborate with other local governments (directly and through PSRC and other organizations) on regional housing strategies, including programs serving homeless.	H-3.2.7			X				•										**Tier 1**
4. Work with other cities in evaluating county, state, and federal legislation and funding that address local housing efforts:	H-3.2.8		X	X				•										**Tier 1**

STRATEGY	Housing Element Policy	CODE UP-DATE	OTHER COUNCIL ACTION	COORD. W/ OTHERS REQUIRED	INCOME SERVED--IMPACT: VERY LOW	LOW	MOD	MKT	POPULATION SERVED--IMPACT: SR	WORK-FORCE	YOUNG ADULTS	HOME-LESS	FAMILIES, KIDS	OTHER CRITERIA: Broader Vision	Timeliness	Public Cost	Not Already Addressed	PRIORITY
5. Transportation services--work with providers.	H-2.2.2		X	X														**Tier 2**
D. OVERSIGHT & MONITORING.																		
5. Monitor the benefits of energy and water efficiency programs.	H-1.2.4			X														**Tier 2**
6. Participate in or cooperate with Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing study to ensure that no city programs, regs, or actions result in housing discrimination.				X														**Tier 2**
7. Monitor accessibility between special needs housing and community facilities and programs.	H-2.2.2			X														**Tier 2**

Attachment 4

Responses to City Council Questions from February Council Meeting

1. History of Kenmore General Fund contributions to ARCH Trust Fund*

Year	General Fund for Affordable Housing
2002	$75,000
2003	$75,000
2004	$75,000
2005	$75,000
2006	$75,000
2007	$75,000
2008	$75,000
2009	$75,000
2010	$75,000
2011	$75,000
2012	$75,000
2013	$50,000
2014	$50,000
2015	$30,000
2016	$30,000
2017	$30,000
2018	$30,000

*This does not include the amount of County CDBG funds credited to the City (ranged between $5,000 to $38,000 annually based on total CDBG funds reserved for affordable housing in East King County), or value of city impact fee waivers (approximately $155,000 over the past 10 years).

2. What % of our general fund was that $75k back in 2002, and what would our donation have been in the 2017 budget if we donated the same % this year?

$75,000 was .87% of the 2003 General Fund Expenditure budget of $8,590,990.

If we donated the same .87% in 2017, that amount would be $98,869. (2017 General Fund Expenditure budget of $11,364,213.)

3. What is the buying power of that $75k in 2002 dollars, versus what would that $75k be worth in 2017 dollars?

ARCH is going through a similar evaluation of the change in the time value of contributions. It is using a CPI-W index, which is the same index the city uses for inflationary factors in its budget.

Since 2002 the CPI-W index has increased by 33%. Therefore, adjusting for inflation, $75,000 contribution in 2002 would be $100,000 in 2017.

4. Housing trust fund contributions from other jurisdictions compared with their: tax base, budget, and per capita.

Attached is a summary of all other city contributions toward affordable housing over the past 18 years. It is a report prepared for member cities as part of ARCH 'Parity' report. In the late 1990's council members of ARCH members came together to develop:

- An overall goal for cities providing assistance for affordable housing;
- How any overall goal would be distributed among members to create local goals; and
- How cities could provide direct assistance.

The formulas used to develop local goals is based on three factors: local population, city employment growth goals and city housing growth goals. Local budgets was also considered, but not included because council members felt that their budgeting process differed enough from one another that it would be difficult to create a meaningful comparison.

ARCH prepares a report annually to members with updated information to cities. It is important to note that there are no explicit requirements under Parity. It is information provided to help inform each city in their process for making funding and other resources available. A version of that report is attached.

In response to the councilmember's request, we've also attached a chart that compares contributions using only the per capita figure. However, for the reason noted above, staff has not been able to prepare an analysis comparing contributions based on local budgets. It is also noted that the ARCH Executive Board and council representatives have been discussing updating the Parity goals and it is expected a report back to full councils will occur in mid-2017, and as mentioned above will likely account for multiple factors and not just per capita.

General Funds for Affordable Housing

	General Fund Contribution		Per Capita	
	2015	2011 - 2015 Annual Average	2015	2011 - 2015
Bellevue	$412,000	$349,600	$2.96	$2.51
Clyde Hill	$15,000	$15,000	$4.90	$4.90
Hunts Point	$2,500	$2,500	$6.02	$6.02
Issaquah	$50,000	$75,000	$1.43	$2.15
Kenmore	$30,000	$56,000	$1.34	$2.51
Kirkland	$315,000	$284,400	$3.72	$3.36
Medina	$12,340	$12,340	$3.90	$3.90
Mercer Is.	$20,000	$20,000	$0.85	$0.85
Newcastle	$25,000	$25,000	$2.25	$2.25
Redmond	$150,000	$120,000	$2.48	$1.98
Sammamish	$10,000	$10,000	$0.16	$0.16
Woodinville	$12,500	$12,500	$1.08	$1.08
Yarrow Point	$4,000	$3,959	$3.85	$3.81
Total	**$1,058,340**	$986,299	$2.32	$2.16

ARCH Parity Program - Goals / Annual Commitments / Annual Average
All Contributions

		Average	ANNUAL GOALS *		Per Capita	
CITY	2015	2011-2015	LOW	HIGH	2015	2011-15 Avg
Bellevue	$1,270,428	$1,177,121	$395,000	$605,000	$9.11	$8.44
Bothell	$55,377	$52,847	$78,000	$152,000	$1.25	$1.19
Clyde Hill	$17,155	$16,815	$0	$17,420	$5.61	$5.50
Hunts Point	$2,907	$2,873	$0	$3,020	$7.00	$6.92
Issaquah	$104,538	$102,973	$55,000	$135,000	$2.99	$2.95
Kenmore	$100,647	$97,776	$50,000	$108,000	$4.51	$4.38
Kirkland	$478,476	$440,676	$159,000	$269,000	$5.65	$5.20
Medina	$14,839	$14,555	$0	$17,780	$4.69	$4.60
Mercer Is.	$48,237	$43,072	$32,000	$124,000	$2.04	$1.82
Newcastle	$44,007	$27,790	$47,000	$75,000	$3.97	$2.51
Redmond	$286,366	$565,871	$244,000	$552,000	$4.73	$9.34
Sammamish	$162,515	$149,603	$25,000	$196,000	$2.65	$2.44
Woodinville	$27,523	$26,866	$37,000	$83,000	$2.38	$2.32
Yarrow Point	$4,723	$4,615	$0	$5,880	$4.54	$4.44
Beaux Arts	$214	$204	$0	$1,660	$0.71	$0.68
TOTAL	**$2,617,952**	$2,532,724	$1,122,000	$2,344,760	$5.22	$5.05

ARCH Parity Program - Goals / Annual Commitments / Annual Average

CITY	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	TOTAL	Annual Avg 1999-2015	Average 2011-2015	ANNUAL GOALS * LOW	HIGH
Bellevue	$510,538	$456,366	$772,115	$2,876,160	$1,270,428	$16,857,454	$967,380	$1,177,121	$395,000	$605,000
Bothell	$43,504	$63,086	$56,079	$46,188	$55,377	$1,205,359	$68,019	$52,847	$78,000	$152,000
Clyde Hill	$16,501	$17,297	$16,629	$16,495	$17,155	$243,532	$13,375	$16,815	$0	$17,420
Hunts Point	$2,798	$2,963	$2,873	$2,824	$2,907	$29,292	$1,560	$2,873	$0	$3,020
Issaquah	$31,330	$143,226	$146,026	$89,746	$104,538	$8,513,011	$495,848	$102,973	$55,000	$135,000
Kenmore	$101,613	$114,746	$94,815	$77,060	$100,647	$1,524,975	$103,855	$97,776	$50,000	$108,000
Kirkland	$277,885	$430,441	$424,107	$592,470	$478,476	$5,527,852	$301,720	$440,676	$159,000	$269,000
Medina	$14,158	$14,775	$14,666	$14,339	$14,839	$181,972	$10,484	$14,555	$0	$17,780
Mercer Is.	$38,233	$46,582	$43,088	$39,222	$48,237	$1,287,762	$70,786	$43,072	$32,000	$124,000
Newcastle	$9,576	$39,356	$36,428	$9,584	$44,007	$804,049	$45,214	$27,790	$47,000	$75,000
Redmond	$206,247	$238,872	$1,919,617	$178,251	$286,366	$7,387,165	$419,581	$565,871	$244,000	$552,000
Sammamish	$20,454	$499,354	$35,020	$30,670	$162,515	$1,271,094	$100,983	$149,603	$25,000	$196,000
Woodinville	$24,431	$29,872	$27,543	$24,960	$27,523	$520,561	$29,130	$26,866	$37,000	$83,000
Yarrow Point	$4,453	$4,711	$4,606	$4,582	$4,723	$45,508	$2,411	$4,615	$0	$5,880
Beaux Arts	$168	$244	$217	$179	$214	$2,769	$152	$204	$0	$1,660
TOTAL	**$1,301,889**	**$2,101,891**	**$3,593,829**	**$4,002,730**	**$2,617,952**	**$45,402,355**	$2,573,285	$2,532,724	$1,122,000	$2,344,760

*Annual Goals are based on several factors including population, planned housing growth and planned employment growth.

PARITY PROGRAM DESCRIPTION (1998)

The overall objective of the Parity program is to establish a means for members to attain a proportional distribution of resources being contributed for affordable housing.

State goal for each city as a range rather than as a single figure.

Formulas used to establish each city's range are based on several factors: Current Population / Projected Housing Growth / Projected Jol Growth

Establish an overall range of $1 million annually (past levels of contribution) to $2 million annually (an acknowledgment of the levels of n the community).

Measure accomplishments over a 5-year period: Years of relatively low commitment can be offset by years with higher commitments

Encourage a variety of means for cities to accomplish their goal:

- o Direct monetary assistance from general funds or CDBG funds
- o Indirect monetary assistance such as fee waivers
- o In-kind contributions such as donated land

ARCH Parity Program: Annual Detail

	1999			1999 Total	2000			2000 Total	2001			2001 Total
	CDBG	General Fund	Other		CDBG	General Fund	Other		CDBG	General Fund	Other	
Bellevue	$128,900	$412,000	$620,200	$1,161,100	$150,000	$412,000	$485,776	$1,047,776	$50,000	$412,000	$594,384	$1,056,384
Bothell	$106,977			$106,977	$80,758			$80,758	$77,101			$77,101
Clyde Hill	$167			$167	$980	$10,000		$10,980	$1,038	$10,000		$11,038
Hunts Point	$41			$41	$224			$224	$238			$238
Issaquah	$20,000			$20,000	$41,200	$48,000		$89,200	$43,161	$49,531		$92,692
Kenmore												
Kirkland	$137,628	$77,000		$214,628	$193,525	$60,000		$253,525	$164,465	$63,852	$7,129	$235,446
Medina	$218			$218	$1,270	$14,805		$16,075		$10,273		$10,273
Mercer Is.	$60,165	$165,000		$225,165	$70,270	$10,954		$81,224	$61,217	$19,878		$81,095
Newcastle	$698	$47,000		$47,698	$4,255	$47,000	$22,000	$73,255	$4,503	$47,000	$28,129	$79,632
Redmond	$90,000	$200,000		$290,000	$99,141	$200,000	$751,675	$1,050,816	$182,025	$221,277	$1,304	$404,606
Sammamish												
Woodinville	$1,722			$1,722	$10,622	$5,485	$31,922	$48,029	$11,274	$10,000	$61,892	$83,166
Yarrow Point	$51			$51	$298	$2,000		$2,298	$314	$2,000		$2,314
Beaux Arts	$21			$21	$117			$117	$132			$132
Grand Total	$546,588	$901,000	$620,200	$2,067,788	$652,660	$810,244	$1,291,373	$2,754,277	$595,468	$845,811	$692,838	$2,134,117

	2002			2002 Total	2003			2003 Total	2004			2004 Total
	CDBG	General Fund	Other		CDBG	General Fund	Other		CDBG	General Fund	Other	
Bellevue	$100,000	$412,000	$100,828	$612,828	$100,000	$256,000	$147,135	$503,135	$90,000	$412,000	$103,668	$605,668
Bothell	$81,160			$81,160	$115,503			$115,503	$148,889			$148,889
Clyde Hill	$1,106	$10,000		$11,106	$239	$10,000		$10,239	$364	$10,000		$10,364
Hunts Point	$243			$243	$52			$52	$80			$80
Issaquah	$20,000	$63,469		$83,469	$32,046			$32,046	$54,710		$195,917	$250,627
Kenmore	$25,326	$75,000		$100,326	$5,469	$75,000		$80,469	$8,342	$75,000		$83,342
Kirkland	$187,109	$26,000		$213,109	$204,048	$27,000	$6,865	$237,913	$94,242	$117,000	$6,171	$217,413
Medina		$10,273		$10,273		$10,000		$10,000		$10,000		$10,000
Mercer Is.	$116,767	$20,000		$136,767	$61,919	$21,966	$1,966	$85,851	$78,699	$19,351		$98,050
Newcastle	$4,775	$47,000		$51,775	$1,031	$47,000	$560	$48,591	$1,573	$47,000		$48,573
Redmond	$114,391	$416,637	$210,853	$741,881		$271,277	$7,479	$278,756	$50,000	$271,277	$3,671	$324,948
Sammamish	$16,511			$16,511								
Woodinville	$10,710	$12,500		$23,210	$2,313	$37,500		$39,813	$3,528	$12,500		$16,028
Yarrow Point	$345	$2,000		$2,345	$74			$74	$113			$113
Beaux Arts	$152			$152	$33			$33	$50			$50
Grand Total	$678,595	$1,094,879	$311,681	$2,085,155	$522,725	$755,743	$164,005	$1,442,475	$530,590	$974,128	$309,427	$1,814,145

ARCH Parity Program: Annual Detail

	2005			2005 Total	2006			2006 Total	2007			2007 Total
	CDBG	General Fund	Other		CDBG	General Fund	Other		CDBG	General Fund	Other	
Bellevue	$90,000	$412,000	$807,445	$1,309,445	$100,000	$412,000	$882,756	$1,394,756	$90,000	$412,000	$268,873	$770,873
Bothell	$23,330			$23,330	$41,327			$41,327	$47,985			$47,985
Clyde Hill	$239	$10,000		$10,239	$1,590	$10,000		$11,590	$1,846	$15,000		$16,846
Hunts Point	$52			$52	$185	$2,500		$2,685	$215	$2,500		$2,715
Issaquah	$39,939			$39,939	$14,345	$84,953	$83,014	$182,312	$16,656	$115,000		$131,656
Kenmore	$5,469	$75,000		$80,469	$23,036	$75,000		$98,036	$26,747	$75,000	$102,097	$203,844
Kirkland	$5,967	$184,000	$4,857	$194,824	$52,892	$200,000	$3,961	$256,853	$61,413	$166,000	$2,000	$229,413
Medina		$10,000		$10,000		$10,000		$10,000		$2,500		$2,500
Mercer Is.	$61,411	$18,099		$79,510	$15,372	$16,899		$32,271	$17,848	$20,000		$37,848
Newcastle	$1,031	$47,000		$48,031	$6,281	$50,000		$56,281	$7,293	$46,500		$53,793
Redmond		$150,000	$888	$150,888	$47,857	$150,000	$3,267	$201,124	$55,253	$100,000	$94,689	$249,942
Sammamish					$4,514			$4,514	$5,241	$100,000		$105,241
Woodinville	$2,313	$12,500		$14,813	$9,848	$12,500		$22,348	$11,435	$12,500		$23,935
Yarrow Point	$74			$74	$509			$509	$591	$3,603		$4,194
Beaux Arts	$33			$33	$164			$164	$190			$190
Grand Total	$229,858	$918,599	$813,190	$1,961,647	$317,920	$1,023,852	$972,998	$2,314,770	$342,713	$1,070,603	$467,659	$1,880,975

	2008			2008 Total	2009			2009 Total	2010			2010 Total
	CDBG	General Fund	Other		CDBG	General Fund	Other		CDBG	General Fund	Other	
Bellevue	$90,000	$412,000	$215,089	$717,089	$85,102	$412,000	$282,514	$779,616	$78,033	$412,000	$111,144	$601,177
Bothell	$68,786			$68,786	$46,415			$46,415	$53,862			$53,862
Clyde Hill	$2,647	$15,000		$17,647	$1,786	$15,000		$16,786	$1,272	$15,023		$16,295
Hunts Point	$308			$308	$208	$2,500		$2,708	$304	$2,500		$2,804
Issaquah	$23,876	$50,000	$44,460	$118,336	$16,111	$150,000	$6,552,340	$6,718,451	$36,906		$118,914	$155,820
Kenmore	$38,342	$75,000		$113,342	$25,872	$75,000		$100,872	$29,394	$75,000		$104,394
Kirkland	$88,035	$216,000		$304,035	$59,403	$216,000	$9,100	$284,503	$64,196	$216,000	$4,005	$284,201
Medina					$1,205			$1,205	$2,079	$12,340		$14,419
Mercer Is.	$25,585	$20,000		$45,585	$17,264	$20,000		$37,264	$27,341	$20,032		$47,373
Newcastle	$10,454	$55,143		$65,597		$53,457		$53,457		$3,000		$3,000
Redmond	$79,205	$100,000	$2,543	$181,748	$53,445	$150,000	$4,591	$208,036	$64,443	$150,000	$6,341	$220,784
Sammamish	$7,513	$100,000		$107,513	$5,070			$5,070	$23,956	$100,000		$123,956
Woodinville	$16,391	$17,400		$33,791	$11,060	$12,500		$23,560	$14,409	$16,064		$30,473
Yarrow Point	$847			$847	$572			$572	$582	$3,931		$4,513
Beaux Arts	$273			$273	$184			$184	$208			$208
Grand Total	$452,262	$1,060,543	$262,092	$1,774,897	$323,697	$1,106,457	$6,848,545	$8,278,699	$396,985	$1,025,890	$240,404	$1,663,279

ARCH Parity Program: Annual Detail

	2010 Total	2011			2011 Total	2012			2012 Total	2013			2013 Total
		CDBG	General Fund	Other		CDBG	General Fund	Other		CDBG	General Fund	Other	
Bellevue	$601,177	$68,986	$256,000	$185,552	$510,538	$44,498	$256,000	$155,868	$456,366	$44,498	$412,000	$315,617	$772,115
Bothell	$53,862	$43,504			$43,504	$63,086			$63,086	$56,079			$56,079
Clyde Hill	$16,295	$1,027	$15,000	$474	$16,501	$1,489	$15,000	$808	$17,297	$1,324	$15,000	$305	$16,629
Hunts Point	$2,804	$245	$2,500	$53	$2,798	$356	$2,500	$107	$2,963	$316	$2,500	$57	$2,873
Issaquah	$155,820	$29,804		$1,526	$31,330	$43,226	$100,000		$143,226	$38,425	$100,000	$7,601	$146,026
Kenmore	$104,394	$23,741	$75,000	$2,872	$101,613	$34,428	$75,000	$5,318	$114,746	$30,604	$50,000	$14,211	$94,815
Kirkland	$284,201	$51,850	$216,000	$10,035	$277,885	$126,309	$291,000	$13,132	$430,441	$112,280	$300,000	$11,827	$424,107
Medina	$14,419	$1,679	$12,340	$139	$14,158	$2,435	$12,340		$14,775	$2,164	$12,340	$162	$14,666
Mercer Is.	$47,373	$17,597	$20,000	$636	$38,233	$25,517	$20,000	$1,065	$46,582	$22,683	$20,000	$405	$43,088
Newcastle	$3,000	$8,567		$1,009	$9,576	$12,423		$26,933	$39,356	$11,043		$25,385	$36,428
Redmond	$220,784	$52,050	$150,000	$4,197	$206,247	$77,355	$150,000	$11,517	$238,872	$87,774	$75,000	$1,756,843	$1,919,617
Sammamish	$123,956	$19,349		$1,105	$20,454	$28,059		$471,295	$499,354	$24,942	$10,000	$78	$35,020
Woodinville	$30,473	$11,396	$12,500	$535	$24,431	$16,525	$12,500	$847	$29,872	$14,690	$12,500	$353	$27,543
Yarrow Point	$4,513	$470	$3,931	$52	$4,453	$681	$3,931	$99	$4,711	$605	$3,931	$70	$4,606
Beaux Arts	$208	$168			$168	$244			$244	$217			$217
Grand Total	**$1,663,279**	$330,433	$763,271	$208,185	**$1,301,889**	$476,631	$938,271	$686,989	**$2,101,891**	$447,644	$1,013,271	$2,132,914	**$3,593,829**

	2014			2014 Total	2015			2015 Total	2016			2016 Total
	CDBG	General Fund	Other *		CDBG	General Fund	Other *		CDBG	General Fund	Other *	
Bellevue	$68,986	$412,000	$2,395,174	$2,876,160	$68,900	$412,000	$789,528	$1,270,428		$412,000		$412,000
Bothell	$46,188			$46,188	$55,377			$55,377	$49,032			$49,032
Clyde Hill	$1,090	$15,000	$405	$16,495	$1,307	$15,000	$848	$17,155	$1,158	$15,000		$16,158
Hunts Point	$261	$2,500	$63	$2,824	$312	$2,500	$95	$2,907	$277	$2,500		$2,777
Issaquah	$31,648	$50,000	$8,098	$89,746	$37,944	$50,000	$16,594	$104,538	$33,597	$50,000		$83,597
Kenmore	$25,206	$50,000	$1,854	$77,060	$30,220	$30,000	$40,427	$100,647	$26,758	$30,000	$14,242	$71,000
Kirkland	$92,477	$300,000	$199,993	$592,470	$105,259	$315,000	$58,217	$478,476	$83,610	$315,000		$398,610
Medina	$1,783	$12,340	$216	$14,339	$2,137	$12,340	$362	$14,839	$1,892	$12,340		$14,232
Mercer Is.	$18,682	$20,000	$540	$39,222	$22,399	$20,000	$5,838	$48,237	$19,832	$20,000	$44,565	$84,397
Newcastle	$9,095		$489	$9,584	$10,905	$25,000	$8,102	$44,007	$9,665	$25,750		$35,415
Redmond	$95,757	$75,000	$7,494	$178,251	$115,924	$150,000	$20,442	$286,366	$104,283	$150,000		$254,283
Sammamish	$20,543	$10,000	$127	$30,670	$24,630	$10,000	$127,885	$162,515	$21,808	$10,000	$128,468	$160,276
Woodinville	$12,099	$12,500	$361	$24,960	$14,506	$12,500	$517	$27,523	$12,844	$12,500		$25,344
Yarrow Point	$499	$4,000	$83	$4,582	$598	$4,000	$125	$4,723	$529	$4,000		$4,529
Beaux Arts	$179			$179	$214			$214	$190			$190
Grand Total	$424,493	$963,340	$2,614,897	**$4,002,730**	$490,632	$1,058,340	$1,068,980	**$2,617,952**	$365,475	$1,059,090	$187,275	**$1,611,840**