

Revised RFP 22-63322-001: Projections of Housing Need

Updates to the previous RFP:

- Please refer to the Summary of Update for RFP 22-63322-001 posted with this revised RFP.
- “Use existing data sources to develop countywide profiles of housing need over 20 years.” This is a tool to communicate needs to state and local elected and appointed officials. The proposal should identify a format and recommendations for the profiles.”
- Reminders: Be sure to review all requirements of the RFP, including, but not limited to: Minimum qualifications, the funding amount – proposals may not exceed this total amount, the proposal contents outlined in Section 3, and sign where needed and include required exhibits.

Questions and Answers from 10-12-21 pre-proposal conference call

The financing for this project shows a breakdown in budget for each of two fiscal years. Are you looking for us to show in our scope of work (SOW) and budget a breakdown that the work will happen in the two time periods (year 1, year 2) or can it be more general?

ANSWER: The proposed SOW and budget does not need to line up specifically with the annual budget breakdown in the RFP. The proposed budget should reflect that deliverables submitted and invoiced in the first fiscal year only total \$131K. Similarly the second fiscal year deliverables and invoices associated with those are limited to \$131K. Funds may not be carried over from one year to the next, because the budget is limited to this equal split. Proposals may want to consider tasks and deliverables that address this accordingly. In other words, the breakdown in funds does not mean that level of work needs to be \$131K in the first year if it continues into second year. Rather, it means that we may not reimburse for more than \$131K in the first year. The level of effort in each biennium is up to you, but we cannot pay funds in years other than when it is allocated. For example, overall work on a specific task may carryover from Year 1 to Year 2, but deliverables for that task should be developed to allow for reimbursement that meets these funding levels. Unspent funds in Year 1 may not be carried over to Year 2.

What are your goals with the data profiles?

ANSWER: We would like a platform and tool that state and local officials could reference and use as a tool to advocate for the changes that need to be made in policies and regulations to address future housing needs. There is data from the Center for Real Estate Research (WCRER), the Out of Reach report, and Up For Growth’s report about underproduction, but we don’t have anything from the state that local officials can rely on and point to help build support for the type of changes that are needed to accommodate housing need. The Affordable Housing Advisory Board is also to produce 5-year reports of housing need. Therefore, the goals is to

develop a new platform and tool that Commerce can offer to local governments that can address these needs. We expect that the profiles would be something that can be updated by Commerce staff.

Will there be review at the county level of deliverables.

ANSWER: Yes. The State Office of Financial Management (OFM) develops a range of future population projections based on a variety of data factors. They have a practice of providing projections to counties to comment on and provide any additional information that could change that projection. We are hoping use that work to our advantage, or piggy-back on that process, and follow a similar process for projected housing needs. We expect that we will be able to use their contacts to perform that check in.

It sounds like Commerce’s plan is to piggy-back on the OFM process of determining future population projections with this future housing needs work?

ANSWER: Yes. The legislation is open to interpretation, but the GMA framework requires that local governments work out how to address countywide projections. Also Washington state does not typically provide top down regulations; Commerce typically only provides recommendations. Because of the countywide method of allocating growth, we cannot envision a separate system for future housing needs.

Is there an expectation that this project will dovetail with the ant-displacement analysis?

ANSWER: Local governments have to do both pieces of work (future housing projections and anti-displacement analysis and policies), so we expect there will be some coordination between the consultants who are working on each of the HB 1220 RFPs. However, the RFPs will cover separate topic areas and have two separate stakeholder groups, so the processes will largely be independent.

Is there anywhere online that says what the WCRER’s upcoming report will be in case it is late?

ANSWER: Yes. The requirements are in RCW 36.70A.610. The 2021 report is due October 15, 2021.

WCRER is producing data on permanent supportive housing (PSH), correct?

ANSWER: WCRER is developing an inventory of existing PSH, but not projected PSH needs, fulfilling the PSH data requirements of RCW 36.70A.610. It is our understanding that WCRER is looking to provide the not only the PSH data that is available from the Housing Finance Commission (HFC), but also other groups as well (HUD, public housing authorities, etc.). The data that they publish will be available for the consultant to use. Commerce also has our Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) database for homeless data. There is also readily available data on the annual Point in Time Count (PIT) (which historically is known to be an under-reporting of actual need), school homelessness count, etc. The applicants should consider other sources of data, and how to best prepare communities to plan for these needs.

You mentioned that California’s disaggregation of need to local communities has not been very successful – is there anything Commerce wants to do differently to prevent issues?

ANSWER: Commerce is aware of anecdotal reports that some California communities, including those in San Francisco, were not happy with the allocation of housing that was allotted to them. We expect this project to provide guidance, rationale, and recommendations for breaking down the allocations at a countywide level. We would like to encourage incorporation of such policies in the countywide planning policies (CWPPs).

Commerce does not certify comprehensive plans, implementation has typically depended on a system of appeals to test various approaches.

What is the role of the consultant at the end of the project as communities will still have to implement HB 1220 in their periodic update (2024-2028) across the state?

ANSWER: The consultant is setting the table with the guidance, data, and example policies and Commerce will be taking the information and implementing the work with communities.

Questions and Answers from 08-18-21 RFP pre-proposal conference call:

With respect to stakeholder engagement with the advisory committee, has commerce identified anyone they want on this committee?

ANSWER: Commerce has identified some agencies that should be engaged as they provide the majority of the base data.

- OFM (Office of Financial Management) and local demographers, including King County would be interested in the methodology, and examples countywide planning policies for disaggregation for housing need by income band.
- For the special housing types, individuals who work on countywide homeless plans and counts should be engaged to understand the data points and get feedback on methodology.

For the policy recommendations, we would expect the consultant to develop some policy recommendations, which may include these prior groups, and engage with Commerce’s newsletter to gather comments, and may include a meeting for feedback.

Do you anticipate the advisory group being one group or multiple groups by geography? What do you think will work best?

ANSWER: Commerce prefers to engage local planners as we develop statewide guidance, and they would like the ability to be involved, engage and comment. Whether regionally or statewide is up to you. It may not be one advisory committee but rather different types of meetings with different people at different times.

Would the Washington Center for Real Estate Research (WCRER) be involved in this stakeholder engagement?

ANSWER: RCW 36.70A.610 requires WCRER to produce a report in October of 2021, and October 2022. The data will be available as per the statute, but we do not anticipate involvement of the agency.

Would MPOs/RTPOs be involved as stakeholder?

ANSWER: Possibly MPOs (Metropolitan Planning Organizations) may be involved in population projections, but not aware of RTPOs (Regional Transportation Planning Organizations) who get involved in housing population projections.

What about different approaches between King County and this process? How would Commerce handle conflicts between different county methodologies? Is this intended to be a set of guidelines or something that is more solidly established?

ANSWER: We take direction from legislature, we are to determine housing needs for the future as set out in HB 1220. Commerce has added the interpretation that this will happen at countywide level, because that is how the GMA works. King County has already developed some projections, and the consultant is to be sensitive to and aware of this work.

Is this intended for all counties and not just those under the GMA?

ANSWER: Technically, projections of housing need are only required for counties planning under the GMA, however, because housing affordability is a statewide problem, providing resources to our smallest and under-resourced counties is Commerce’s preference.

Identification of the needs for the housing targets – Is there more detail that would be needed from the housing projection, such as housing size and type?

ANSWER: Commerce recommends local governments make assumptions about the size and type of housing needed to “plan for and accommodate” housing need. So developing recommendations to help local governments make those assumptions is important.

With the recommendations that you are anticipating, do you anticipate there will be some range? A minimum that they should achieve at those income bands?

ANSWER: For that, look at OFM projections. They provide a range – minimum and maximum. Counties choose within that range and then they disaggregate at the countywide level. It is up to you to develop a methodology to make housing projections within that framework. Guidance for disaggregating the housing needs from counties to cities is very controversial, so clear guidance that will provide cover to local governments is important.

With respect to training webinars, and with some of the other elements, would this imply that there would be some tools that would be developed as part of this process that would assist local governments?

ANSWER: We are looking for 1) a set of numbers for housing need, 2) methodology and recommendations to address housing need, and 3) policy recommendations for moderate density housing, etc. The second and third pieces will be included in final housing element update document, and will be used as the basis for updating our Washington Advisory Code (WAC) for housing.

Our goal is to provide guidance and tools that local governments can use to do their work. Developing other tools is at your option. For policies, we have found it very successful to use policies that have already been adopted in the state. We will also have one ongoing staff at Commerce to assist local governments as they do this work.

One thing we have not done here is develop a platform for data – not part of this RFP, but something we would like to do.

What are local communities looking for with this data platform?

ANSWER: The state was considering the potential for greater efficiency by having the state provide basic housing needs assessments for each jurisdiction. At this point, we will have census and market data from the WCRER data (Washington Center for Real Estate Research), OFM population projections, and these projections of housing need. It would be great if we could put this all together, but we do not have the capacity at this time.

Is there an envisioned framework for coordinating between the two HB 1220 RFPs?

ANSWER: We are not envisioning a specific framework. At a minimum the project consultants would be aware of each other's work.