

TASK FORCE MEETING 1 NOTES SUMMARY

Date: Monday, October 25, 2021

Location: Virtual meeting

Time: 1 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.

Attendees present:

Staff team: Brett Houghton (PRR), Michelle Auster (PRR), Whitney Rearick (PRR), Clay White (LDC), Matt Covert (LDC), Dave Andersen (Dept. of Commerce), Dave Pringle (Dept. Commerce)

Task Force members and representatives:

- Elizabeth Allison
- Bill Clarke, Washington Realtors
- Carl Schroeder, Association of Washington Cities
- Deric Gruen, Front and Centered
- Margaret (Maggie) Douglas,
- Rep. Davina Duerr, 1st District
- Tim Gates, Department of Ecology
- Jan Himebaugh, Building Industry Association of Washington
- Joe Tovar, American Planning Association, Washington chapter
- Alice MacLean, House Democratic Caucus
- Noha Mahgoub, Senate Democratic Caucus
- Paul Jewell, Washington State Association of Counties
- Rep. Gerry Pollet, 46th District, Chair of House Local Government Committee
- Brandon Popovac, Senate Housing and Local Government Committee
- Dana Quam
- Kellen Wright, Office of Program Research

- Bryce Yadon, Futurewise

-

Agenda:

ITEM	LEAD
Welcome and introductions	Clay White, LDC Brett Houghton, PRR
Objectives and process	Brett and Clay
2021 issues overview	Clay
Specific issues, deeper dive: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Local government funding for planning ■ Additional year for King, Pierce, Snohomish, and Kitsap Counties (and cities within those counties) to update their comprehensive plans to implement new GMA requirements (June 2024 to June 2025) 	Brett and Clay
Next steps and action items	Matt Covert, LDC Michelle Auster, PRR
Immediate next steps	Clay
Adjourn	--

Summary:

Welcome and Introductions

What would you like to see come out of the process?

- **Direct and tangible approach to housing**
- **Make sure goals and intent of the GMA are being fulfilled**
- **Workable and practical outcomes – common interest in making system work better for everyone re: housing availability and affordability, environmental protection, et cetera.**

Tangible and specific recommendation regarding funding sufficient to meet requirements for local governments

- Climate and environmental justice – self-determination, health and wellbeing, environmental wellbeing, identify gaps
- Actionable solutions
- Informed by reasoned information, implementable
- Make it more possible that WA residents can have affordable homeownership opportunities
- Operational and clear so local govts are clear on what's expected
- Acknowledges work that's come before
- Something that can easily get through legislature – well vetted proposed legislation (don't expect consensus)
- Address shortcomings of previous efforts
- Broad support (at least significant agreement) on recommendations
- Bring in views that might not have been considered previously, especially relating to design of communities and environmental justice – more diverse points of view

Objectives and Process

Inclusion of diverse perspectives

- Agricultural representation – multiple TF members expressed interest in having agricultural perspective represented on Task Force
- Tribal representation – clarity given on their opportunities for inroads and participation down the line as their interests become relevant.

Recommendation sheet

- Add question of who the primary actor responsible for implementing recommendation (plus secondary actors)
- Disparities of impact on specific groups
- Unintended (secondary) impacts/consequences of implementing recommendation

How does "voting" actually work? Is there a quorum requirement?

- Will not use Robert's Rules; more collaborative, less formal
- If there is no agreement on single recommendation, this would be reflected on the sheet.
- "How Pay" and long-term stability and resources? May depend on issue.
- What will actually define (threshold?) whether there is a recommendation?
- Need more conversation about how recommendation emerges out of this group.

What has worked to address these concerns?

- Thresholds for inclusion – how do those most likely to be burdened with or positively impacted by a recommendation get represented in the recommendation?

- Consensus principles for deliberation and decision-making respects those with less traditional power and consideration of principles behind people's views (Rep. Pollet)

Changes to public participation? WAC .140 changes are not on the admin update docket for Commerce.

How does transportation impact the changes in 1099? Clay will follow up directly.

Bringing in voices that don't usually participate – are we expecting them to join the TF aside from the three already identified? We will be bringing in these voices largely through the working group process and Confluence's work with the Tribes.

Will we be having and concluding discussion in one meeting? The idea is to start the conversation in one meeting, draft something from what we heard (recommendation sheet), have working group meetings about those topics, and then come back to the next meeting to finalize and make recommendations if agreement on recommendation is reached.

Local government funding for planning

Commerce proposal

- Why \$10 million? Enough to provide local govts a decent amount of money for update processes (periodic update formula, equity in funding classes). This drives the yellow bar in the graph. Idea is to provide predictable, stable funding over time.
- Restoration of buildable lands funding (gray in the graph).
- Orange is money for research to help local govts answer fundamental questions and provide data necessary to have conversation on GMA implementation.
- Could be general fund or combination of sources (dedicated state portion of REET for example).

Should State provide cities and counties with consistent and permanent funding to assist with updating comprehensive plans and development regulations as required by GMA?

- Solid general fund funding, as this is a public good that helps everyone.
- How is funding reaching the places it needs to reach?
- Question of WHO deserves funding – do all jurisdictions get this money regardless of what they are or are not doing? There is not currently any funding, so we are starting from a point of everyone having inadequate funding for planning.
- Some jurisdictions have more capability, so there is a big equity question here.
- How grant funding gets distributed – baseline level of capacity for periodic updates and things like traffic study.
- Demonstration projects

- Funding best practices (permit timelines, for example)

Should funding be geared only toward new GMA requirements or be geared to provide funding for plan updates regardless of new requirements?

- What are jurisdictions doing now that they don't need to be doing anymore to spend money that exists better? This will come back under 2023 session, but it's difficult to talk about funding more/new.
- Funding for robust public participation needed
- GMA has clause for null/void for new requirements – state must provide reasonable and adequate funding 2 years in advance of requirement being required, but it's opt-in. Came out of a negotiated settlement (2003).

If yes, how should funding be provided? General fund, Commerce budget, permanent funding source?

- Support for use of general fund funding. Robust baseline funding. Should make sure it is not subject to the annual appropriations process.
- Options: need to start looking at what it means to get extra revenue streams. Need to understand intent of these streams to avoid a situation where wealthy communities get more and less wealthy ones get less.
- State property tax revenues that feed the general fund as an option
- We don't know what it "costs" to plan. Work has been done to categorize what planning costs at various levels. It's all over the map.
- Actuarial study of what it should cost to do various planning requirements – research for where there are redundancies
- Support for strategy of having base level of funding and then creating incentives that can direct outcomes that we want

If permanent funding source is preferred (like HB 1157), what sources should be explored? Should TF recommend a general fund allocation so 2024 jurisdictions can receive grants and take up options for more permanent funding sources for next year?

- RCW 90.58.250 and RCW 90.58.080(6)(a) require state funds for SMP periodic updates – possible model

Additional time for 2024 jurisdictions to update comp plans

- Still an application process with scope of work and budget if funds are allocated for updates. Generally contracts are out in October; funds available for expenditure that can be back-dated to July.
- Adding new requirements comes with more community conversation needed.
- Updating development regulations to reflect new policies must also be done by the deadline, not just the plans.
- Legislature already tinkered with SMA schedule, grouping of counties, and timelines in 2020 (HB 2342).

Should cities and counties with a June 2024 deadline to update comp plans be given an additional amount of time in anticipation of bills that could pass this session?

- Concern expressed about extending timeline. Timeline for implementation of development regulations can stretch for years in some cases. Concern about getting this into a bill that's likely to pass as is. What is the larger context?
- Staggered implementation for resilience element with hazard mitigation plan (within HB 1241).
- Does this mean we're on a 10-year timeline without passing a 10-year timeline? Or, alternately, will this cause a significant backlog at Commerce?
- What happens if nobody updates their development regulations to be consistent with the new policies?

If yes, would another year be appropriate?

- Outcome of giving more time for the early adopters had fairly broad support but people are open to various methods of providing that extra room.
- If the grant process is altered too, could create a wave crunch in funding
- Early adopters issue – concerns related to something as big as climate change or salmon recovery being integrated in work that has already begun.

Other options?

- Should clean up .130 (Dave A., echoed by others)

Next steps and action items

- Prior to next meeting, project team to provide Task Force members with more specific ideas for how recommendations will be made and the threshold for what constitutes a recommendation.
- Clay will discuss the transportation and 1099 issue with Bryce directly.
- Analysis of how other states do funding
- Data on which jurisdictions have started the process and what's already been started
- Present task force with additional options for how to do the timeline issue

Other

- Recommendation to add a definition of "middle housing" to RCW 36.70A.030. Add consistency across statutes (Joe).
- On-call contracts to help address permit processes (Carl).
- Model codes and ordinances, redundancies and overlaps will be addressed elsewhere.

