Table 3. Substantive Amendments to the November 3 Proposed Amendments to the Countywide Planning Policies

This table contains substantive amendments made to the November 3, 2022 proposed Countywide Planning Policy amendments in <u>Table 1</u>. Substantive edits respond to feedback to underlying amendments received during the November 3 AHC meeting and reflect collaboration between Committee members, AHC staff, the Housing Interjurisdictional Team (HIJT) and the Interjurisdictional Team (IJT).

Amend. # and Sponsor	CPP Housing Chapter Amendment Text	Rationale
4.1 HIJT	Housing Chapter Introduction The Countywide Planning Policies in the Housing Chapter support a range of affordable, accessible, and healthy housing choices for current and future residents. Further, they respond to the legacy of discriminatory housing and land use policies and practices (e.g., redlining, racially restrictive covenants, exclusionary zoning, etc.) that have led to significant racial and economic disparities in access to housing and neighborhoods of choice. These disparities affect equitable access to well-funded schools, healthy environments, open space, and employment. The policies reflect the region's commitment to addressing the 2018 findings of the Regional Affordable Housing Task Force (Task Force). Key findings include: • Dramatic housing price increases between 2012 and 2017 resulted in an estimated 156,000 extremely low-, very low-, and	 Responsive to Committee directive to define successful plans and accommodations of housing needs Text drafted by AHC staff in collaboration with HIJT
	 Brainate housing price increases between 2012 and 2017 resulted in an estimated 150,000 externely low, very low, and low-income households spending more than 30 percent of their income on housing (housing cost burdened); and Black, Hispanic, Indigenous, and extremely low-income households are among those most disproportionately impacted by housing cost burden. 	
	While significant housing market activity is needed to reach overall King County housing growth targets, the ability of the region's housing market to address the housing needs of low income households is limited. A large majority of the need will need to be addressed with units restricted to income eligible households—both rent restricted units and resale restricted homes ("incomerestricted units").	
	Building on the Task Force's work—and in alignment with the Growth Management Act, this chapter establishes goals and policies to ensure all jurisdictions in King County plan for and accommodate their allocated share of a countywide need for affordable housing defined as the additional housing units needed in King County by 2044 so that no household at or below 80 percent of Area Median Income (AMI) is housing cost burdened. While the need is expressed in countywide terms, housing affordability varies significantly across jurisdictions. In addressing housing needs, less affordable jurisdictions will need to take significant action to increase affordability across all income levels while more affordable jurisdictions will need to take significant action to preserve affordability. To succeed, all communities must address housing need where it is greatest—housing affordable to extremely low income households.	
	When taken together, all the comprehensive plans of King County jurisdictions must "plan for and accommodate" the existing	

Amend. # and Sponsor	CPI	Rationale				
	Overarching Goal: Provide a full range of afforda County. All jurisdictions work to: • preserve, improve, and expand their hou • promote fair and equitable access to how • take actions that eliminate race-, place-,	sing stock; using for all people; a	and	·	nt in King	
5.1 HIJT	H-1 Plan for and accommodate the jurisdiction's low- and extremely low-income households as we housing. Sufficient planning and accommodation housing elements in Revised Code of Washingto measures to implement the comprehensive plan articulated in this chapter. Projected countywide the planning period is shown in Table H-1.All conhousing affordable to households with low, very that calibrates with the jurisdiction's identified a comprehensive plans in King County meeting cois: 30 percent and below AMI (extremely low) 31 50 percent of AMI (very low) 51-80 percent of AMI (low) 19 percent of total table H-1 provides additional context on the county low)	pportive ments for gulatory with policies are need for ide need for ds, at a level	 Successful plan for and accommodate defined in response to feedback from AHC Committee members at November 3 meeting In defining success, the proposed amendment cites the RCW, the WAC, and the CPPs to define "plan for and accommodate" as opposed to defining it before Commerce releases additional guidance Rounding errors in jurisdictional need numbers corrected in response to quality control measures and baseline emergency housing/shelter units replaced with accurate figure Order of countywide need numbers changed to be consistent with 			
	Table H-1: King County Affordable Housing Need	% AMI	organization in Table H-2			
	Housing Units by Affordability (2019)	70 / 1(1)1				
	Number of Units	<u>346,000</u>				
	As Share of Total Units					
	Additional Affordable Housing Units Needed (20					
	Additional Housing Units Needed to Address Existing Conditions ²	159,000				
	Housing Units Needed to Address Growth Through 2044 ³	39,000	<u>32,000</u>	33,000	<u>104,000</u>	

mend. # and Sponsor		Rationale									
	Total Additional Affor	rdable Hou	sing Units		<u>144,000</u>						
	Total Affordable Housin	-									
	Number of Units		<u> </u>	· · ·	188,000		185,000	236,	900	609,000	-
	As Share of Total Un	<u>its</u>			15%		<u>15%</u>	ź	<u>19%</u>	<u>49%</u>	
	Refer to Table H-2 in Appendix 4 for countywide and jurisdictional future housing needed in 2044 and baseline housing supply in 2019. Table H-1 includes both homeownership and rental units. Estimates of additional affordable units needed to address existing cost burden and provide housing for persons experiencing homelessness. The estimates are based on a model in which adding units for households within a given low-income category (e.g., < 30% AMI) allows those households to vacate units affordable within the next income category (e.g., greater than 30% AMI and less than or equal to 50% of AMI), in turn addressing needs of cost burdened households in that income level. (Estimates shown assume that housing units equal to 1/25 th of cost burdened households in each category are added annually in each income category until cost burden is eliminated; a range of estimates is possible depending on inputs to this model.) Estimates of housing units needed to address growth assume income distribution of households added through growth is the same as existing income distribution. Refer to Appendix 4 for the methodology used to calculate countywide need and 2019 jurisdictional affordability levels as compared to countywide need.										
	Table H-1: King County (<u>CountyWide</u>		manent Ho		eas 2019-2 v Income Levi	<u>:044</u> ol (% of Area Me c	lian Income) Units	Needed,	<u>Countywide</u>	
						<u>19-20445</u>		,		Net New	
		Total	<u>0-309</u> <u>Non-PSH</u>		>20 50%	>E0 90%	>90 100%	>100 100%	>120%	Emergency Housing	
	Countywide Baseline Housing Supply: 2019 ⁷	<u>Total</u> <u>960,951</u>	32,115	<u>PSH</u>	>30-50% 91.505	>50-80% 155.214	>80-100% 181.009	>100-120% 119.133		<u>Needs⁶</u>	
	Countywide Net New Housing Needed: 2019 2044	308,677	<u>80,813</u>	48,728	<u>48,220</u>	21,692	<u>14,349</u>	<u>16,274</u>	78,601	57,327	
	Countywide Total Future Housing Needed: 2044	1,269,628	112,927	54,994	139,725	176,906	195,358	<u>135,408</u>	454,310	63,318	
	Countywide Baseline Housing Supply: 2019 ⁷		32.115	6,266	91.505	155.214	181,009	119.133	375,709	8.330 5,975	
	Countywide Net New Housing Needed: 2019- 2044	308,677	80,813	48,728	48,220	21,692	<u>14,349</u>	<u>16,274</u>	<u>78,601</u>	<u>57,327</u>	

Amend. # and Sponsor	CPP Housing Chapter Amendment Text											Rationale
			Inits Needed, 2	2019-204	4 by Incom		6 of Area					
		Median Income) ⁸							<u>Net New</u> <u>Emergency</u>			
			<u>Total</u>	<u>0-30%</u> Non-PSH	PSH	<u>>30-50%</u>	>50-	>80-	>100-	<u>>120%</u>	<u>Housing</u>	
							<u>>50-</u> <u>80%</u>	<u>>80-</u> 100%	>100- 120%		<u>Needs</u>	
	임	<u>Bellevue</u>	<u>35,000</u>	<u>11,827</u> 11,828	7,131 7,132	<u>8,810</u> <u>8,811</u>	<u>2,549</u>	<u>615</u>	698 697	3,370 3,368	<u>6,500</u>	
	Metro	<u>Seattle</u>	112,000	28,333 28,336	<u>17,084</u> 17,085	<u>19,181</u> 19,183	7,731 7,732	<u>5,212</u> 5,211	5,911 5,910	28,548 28,543	20,800	
		<u>Auburn</u>	12,000	<u>1,526</u>	920	299	610	1,136	1,288	6,221	<u>2,229</u>	
		<u>Bothell</u>	<u>5,799</u> 5,800	2.078 2 .079	<u>1,253</u>	<u>813</u>	640 641	<u>133</u>	<u>151</u>	731 730	<u>1,077</u>	
		<u>Burien</u>	7,499 <u>7,500</u>	<u>1,428</u> 1,429	<u>861</u>	<u>519</u>	<u>397</u>	<u>564</u>	<u>640</u>	3.090	<u>1,393</u>	
		Federal Way	<u>11,260</u>	<u>1,779</u>	<u>1,073</u>	<u>840</u>	<u>190</u>	<u>969</u>	<u>1,099</u>	<u>5,310</u>	<u>2,091</u>	
	<u> </u>	<u>Issaquah</u>	3,499 3,500	<u>1,086</u>	<u>655</u>	<u>870</u> 871	<u>452</u>	<u>57</u>	<u>65</u>	314	<u>650</u>	
	Core Cities	Kent	<u>10,201</u> <u>10,200</u>	<u>1,850</u>	<u>1,116</u>	<u>785</u>	<u>302</u>	<u>808</u> 807	916	4,424	<u>1,894</u>	
	ŏ 	<u>Kirkland</u>	<u>13,200</u>	<u>4,797</u> <u>4,798</u>	<u>2.893</u>	<u>3.057</u>	<u>975</u>	<u>194</u>	<u>220</u>	1,064 1,063	<u>2,451</u>	
		Redmond	20,000	<u>6,965</u> <u>6,966</u>	<u>4,200</u>	<u>3,862</u> <u>3,863</u>	2,720	<u>296</u>	336 335	<u>1,621</u> <u>1,620</u>	<u>3,714</u>	
		Renton	<u>17,001</u> <u>17,000</u>	<u>4,065</u>	<u>2,451</u>	<u>1,613</u>	<u>988</u>	<u>1,036</u>	<u>1,175</u> <u>1,174</u>	<u>5,673</u>	<u>3,157</u>	
		<u>SeaTac</u>	<u>5,900</u>	<u>639</u>	<u>385</u>	<u>180</u>	<u>138</u>	<u>599</u>	<u>679</u>	<u>3,280</u>	<u>1,096</u>	
		<u>Tukwila</u>	<u>6,500</u>	<u>885</u>	<u>534</u>	<u>270</u>	<u>208</u>	<u>605</u>	<u>686</u>	<u>3,312</u>	<u>1,207</u>	
	=	<u>Des Moines</u>	<u>3.801</u> <u>3.800</u>	<u>781</u>	<u>471</u>	<u>227</u>	222 221	<u>276</u>	<u>313</u>	<u>1,511</u>	<u>706</u>	
	lans S	<u>Kenmore</u>	<u>3.070</u>	<u>1,053</u>	<u>635</u>	<u>480</u>	<u>386</u>	<u>68</u>	<u>77</u>	<u>371</u>	<u>570</u>	
	Capacity Tra	Lake Forest Park	<u>870</u>	<u>310</u>	<u>187</u>	<u>142</u>	<u>138</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>67</u>	<u>162</u>	
	apac mm	Mercer Island	<u>1,239</u>	<u>338</u>	<u>204</u>	<u>200</u>	<u>489</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>230</u>	
	High Capacity Transit Communities	<u>Newcastle</u>	<u>1,481</u> 1,480	<u>620</u>	<u>374</u>	<u>435</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u> <u>5</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>275</u>	
		<u>Shoreline</u>	<u>13,330</u>	3.587 3.588	<u>2,163</u>	<u>2,721</u>	<u>702</u>	<u>546</u>	<u>619</u>	2 <u>.992</u> 2 <u>.991</u>	<u>2,476</u>	

nd			CPP Ho	using Chapt	er Amendı	ment Te	ct				Rationale
	Woodinville	2 <u>.032</u> 2.033	<u>844</u> <u>845</u>	<u>509</u>	352 353	<u>148</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>27</u>	129 128	<u>378</u>	
	<u>Algona</u>	<u>170</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>8</u>	7	<u>14</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>75</u>	<u>32</u>	
	Beaux Arts	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	=	=	=	=	Ξ	=	=	
	Black Diamond	2,900	737 738	445	<u>199</u>	<u>408</u>	<u>146</u>	<u>166</u> 165	<u>799</u>	<u>539</u>	
	<u>Carnation</u>	<u>799</u>	<u>236</u>	<u>142</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>41</u>	<u>47</u>	<u>227</u>	<u>148</u>	
	Clyde Hill	<u>10</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	=	Ξ	=	2	
	<u>Covington</u>	<u>4,310</u>	<u>998</u>	<u>602</u>	<u>602</u>	=	<u>277</u>	<u>314</u>	<u>1,517</u>	<u>800</u>	
	<u>Duvall</u>	<u>890</u>	264	<u>159</u>	Ξ	<u>267</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>144</u>	<u>165</u>	
	Enumclaw	<u>1,058</u> 1,057	161 160	97	<u>38</u>	<u>60</u>	92	<u>105</u>	<u>505</u>	<u>196</u>	
	<u>Hunts Point</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	=	=	=	=	Ξ	=	=	
Cities and Towns	Maple Valley	1.719 1,720	<u>536</u>	323	<u>320</u>	19 20 8	<u>68</u>	<u>78</u>	<u>375</u>	319	
Sal	<u>Medina</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>8</u>	=	Ξ	=	<u>4</u>	
Citie	<u>Milton</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>8</u>	=	<u>8</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>9</u>	
	Normandy Park	<u>153</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>28</u>	
	North Bend	1.749 1.748	<u>429</u> 428	<u>258</u>	<u>119</u>	220	<u>95</u>	<u>108</u>	<u>520</u>	325	
	<u>Pacific</u>	<u>136</u> 135	429 428 23 22 926 918	<u>14</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>64</u>	<u>25</u>	
	<u>Sammamish</u>	2,117 2,100	926 918	<u>558</u> 554	<u>411</u> 408	222 220	=	Ξ	Ξ	390	
	<u>Skykomish</u>	9 10	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	Ξ	<u>±</u> <u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>4</u>	2	
	<u>Snoqualmie</u>	<u>1.500</u>	<u>467</u>	<u>282</u>	<u>232</u>	<u>77</u>	<u>58</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>318</u>	<u>279</u>	
	Yarrow Point	9 10	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>±</u> 2	Ξ	Ξ	=	2	
	<u>Urban</u> <u>Unincorporated⁹</u>	5.411 5.412	<u>1.145</u>	<u>690</u>	<u>569</u>	283 284	<u>358</u>	<u>406</u>	1,960	<u>1.005</u>	
target	countywide need projecti ts for the planning period ergency Housing" include	l to ensure jurisdic	tions are planni	ng for growth t	hat is consis	tent with t	he goals o	f the Deve	elopment Pa		

Amend. # and Sponsor	CPP Housing Chapter Amendment Text	Rationale
	Housing Affordability Strategy and 2020 Public Use Microdata Sample data on the distribution of units at different income levels. These data sources are used to align with Department of Commerce countywide need baseline data, even though the King County growth target setting process began in 2019. *Beaux Arts Village and Hunts Point both have growth targets of one unit, meaning their total need allocated is also one unit. The allocation process divides that unit up into multiple area median income bands, but to get need allocations that are whole numbers, we round all allocations in each area median income band and the emergency housing/shelter category. **This includes all Potential Annexation Areas within the High Capacity Transit Communities and Urban Unincorporated King County regional geographies.	
19.1 SCA Caucus Chair Kirkland Councilmember Amy Falcone	H-29 Five years after adoption of a periodic update to a comprehensive plan, the Growth Management Planning Council or its designee will review monitoring and reporting data collected through annual reporting and other local data and analysis. The GMPC will identify significant shortfalls in planning for and accommodating housing needs, provide findings that describe the nature of the shortfalls, and make recommendations that jurisdictions take action to address shortfalls. Five years after adoption of a periodic update to a comprehensive plan to identify jurisdictions with significant shortfalls in planning for and accommodating housing needs and require those jurisdictions to take reasonable measures to adjust plans, strategies, actions, or land use maps to address identified shortfalls. The Growth Management Planning Council or its designee will develop new Housing Chapter Countywide Planning Policies amendments establishing adequacy standards for jurisdictional efforts to plan for and accommodate housing needs and the implications for jurisdictions required to take reasonable measures no earlier than 2024. Jurisdictions with significant shortfalls shall identify and implement actions to address the shortfalls, such as amending the comprehensive plan, land use regulations, or other legislative or administrative actions. Implementation of this policy shall be coordinated with the requirement in RCW 36.70A.130(9)(c) to produce and take actions pursuant to a 5-year implementation progress report.	 Synthesis of feedback from Committee member Bellevue Mayor Lynne Robinson and HIJT/IJT feedback Intended to remove a requirement to meet affordable housing needs, as opposed to plan for and accommodate housing needs, and to provide assurance that jurisdictions will be given information regarding the nature of shortfalls identified by the GMPC, without the GMPC recommending how a jurisdiction is required to solve the problem