



King County

The King County Consortium

Consolidated Housing and Community Development Plan

2015-2019



Contents

Executive Summary.....	1
ES-05 Executive Summary -	
The Process	5
PR-05 Lead & Responsible Agencies	5
PR-10 Consultation	7
PR-15 Citizen Participation.....	26
Needs Assessment	35
NA-05 Overview	35
NA-10 Housing Needs Assessment	38
NA-20 Disproportionately Greater Need: Severe Housing Problems.....	48
NA-25 Disproportionately Greater Need: Housing Cost Burdens.....	50
NA-30 Disproportionately Greater Need: Discussion	51
NA-35 Public Housing.....	52
NA-40 Homeless Needs Assessment -	56
NA-45 Non-Homeless Special Needs Assessment	61
NA-50 Non-Housing Community Development Needs.....	63
Housing Market Analysis.....	65
MA-05 Overview	65
MA-15 Housing Market Analysis: Cost of Housing	67
MA-20 Housing Market Analysis: Condition of Housing.....	70
MA-25 Public And Assisted Housing	74
MA-30 Homeless Facilities and Services.....	79
MA-35 Special Needs Facilities and Services	91

MA-40 Barriers to Affordable Housing	93
MA-45 Non Housing Community Development Assets.....	96
MA-50 Needs and Market Analysis Discussion.....	101
Strategic Plan	107
SP-05 Overview	107
SP-10 Geographic Priorities	108
SP-30 Influence of Market Conditions	121
SP-35 Anticipated Resources.....	93
SP-40 Institutional Delivery System.....	123
SP-45 Goals Summary.....	128
SP-50 Public Housing Accessibility and Involvement.....	137
SP-55 Strategic Plan Barriers to Affordable Housing	138
SP-60 Homelessness Strategy - 91.415, 91.215(d)	139
SP-65 Lead-based Paint Hazards - 91.415, 91.215(i)	141
SP-70 Anti-Poverty Strategy - 91.415, 91.215(j)	142
SP-80 Monitoring - 91.230	144
Appendix A Citizen Participation Plan	
Appendix B Fair Housing Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice	

Executive Summary

ES-05 Executive Summary - 91.200(c), 91.220(b)

1. Introduction

The King County Consortium Consolidated Housing and Community Development Plan (Consolidated Plan) guides the investment of federal housing and community development funds, and other federal, state, and local funds. The Consolidated Plan is a requirement of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), through which the King County Consortium (Consortium) receives an annual entitlement, or formula grant, from each of these funds: Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), the HOME Investment Partnerships (HOME) Program, and the Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG). King County and the Consortium anticipate receiving the grant amounts listed below during the fiscal year 2015.

CDBG \$4,873,731

HOME \$2,556,707

ESG \$ 326,105

These funds are used to address housing, homelessness, and community development needs throughout King County over the next five years, from 2015-2019. The King County Consortium includes nearly all of the suburban cities in the county, as well as the unincorporated areas of the county. The King County Consortium is an interjurisdictional partnership of King County and the cities and towns of Algona, Black Diamond, Beaux Arts, Bothell, Burien, Carnation, Clyde Hill, Covington, Des Moines, Duvall, Enumclaw, Hunts Point, Issaquah, Kenmore, Kirkland, Lake Forest Park, Maple Valley, Medina, Mercer Island, Newcastle, North Bend, Pacific, Redmond, Renton, Sammamish, SeaTac, Shoreline, Skykomish, Snoqualmie, Tukwila, Woodinville, and Yarrow Point. The Consortium does not include the City of Seattle. The cities of Auburn, Bellevue, Kent, and Federal Way participate in the Consortium for the use of HOME Investment Partnership Program funds for affordable housing. These four cities receive their own CDBG entitlement and have prepared separate and included Consolidated Plans to guide the investment of those funds.

Data in the Consolidated Plan is based primarily upon the 2007-2011 American Community Survey (ACS) five-year data set. This data provides the most detailed and reliable information available on income, poverty, housing, housing cost burden and other data that is no longer collected by the decennial census. The Consolidated Plan follows HUD's standardized template and is submitted through HUD's Integrated Disbursement and Information System (IDIS). Each part contains questions framed by HUD followed by the Consortium's response.

2. Summary of the objectives and outcomes identified in the Plan

HUD-funded housing and community development programs have a broad national goal: to “develop viable urban communities, by providing decent affordable housing and a suitable living environment, and by expanding economic opportunities, principally for low-and moderate-income persons” (the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended).

Within that broad national goal, Consortium jurisdictions work together as partners to identify and address the needs of low-and moderate-income people, communities, and neighborhoods and have set the following goals identified below.

Goal One: Affordable Housing - Ensure that there is decent, safe, and healthy affordable housing available to income-eligible households throughout the Consortium.

Goal Two: End Homelessness - Collaborate with the Committee to End Homeless in King County (CEH) to plan and to align Consortium funds with CEH initiatives and objectives, to ensure that in the future homelessness is rare, short in duration, and a one-time occurrence.

Goal Three: Community Development - Provide assistance to jurisdictions, community agencies, and communities to establish and maintain a suitable living environment with economic opportunities for low-income members of the community, including communities with disparities in health, income, and quality of life where efforts can be targeted to improve the well-being of residents and the vibrancy of the community.

3. Evaluation of past performance

During the period of the 2010-2014 Consolidated Plan, the King County Consortium jurisdiction members worked closely with the community, nonprofit agencies, the private sector, the State of Washington, HUD, the Veteran’s Administration, and the philanthropic community to make solid progress towards goals. Each year the Consortium prepares a Consolidated Annual Performance Evaluation Report (CAPER) and submits it to HUD by March 31. The CAPER reports out on the specific accomplishments and activities for that year. Past CAPERS are posted on the King County Department of Community and Human Services website.

http://www.kingcounty.gov/socialservices/Housing/PlansAndReports/HCD_Reports/CAPER.aspx

From 2010 to 2013, the King County Consortium reported the accomplishments identified below in the CAPER.

- 1,541 units of affordable housing created or preserved for an average of 385 affordable housing units created or preserved annually.
- 1,792 major and minor home repairs for an average of 448 homes repaired annually.
- 2,575 permanent supportive housing units through the Continuum of Care for an average of 644 supportive housing units annually.
- 2,114 households served through the Housing Stability Program for an average of 529 households served annually.
- 5,494 people served in supportive permanent housing for an average of 1,374 annually.
- 230 families served through homelessness prevention and rapid re-housing for an average of 58 served families served annually.
- 1,345,888 shelter bed nights provided for an average of 336,472 shelter nights annually.

4. Summary of citizen participation process and consultation process

A series of stakeholder and public meetings were held throughout the County in 2012, 2013, and 2014 for Consortium jurisdictions, agencies working in housing, human services, and community development, and citizens. The Consortium solicited public input on community needs, priorities and draft strategies. Public outreach and engagement activities were designed to reduce barriers to participation to ensure public input was broad and representative of program beneficiaries. Notices for public meetings were published in the Seattle Times and on the King County Department of Community and Human Services' website, and were posted at the meeting locations. One of the public open houses, in particular, targeted residents of an area of low-income housing concentration located on the boundary between the City of Tukwila and the City of SeaTac, two communities with extensive older, low-income housing stock. A total of 119 people attended the public forums representing over 30 agencies and jurisdictions. Simultaneously, with the first public open house, the Consortium posted a web-based survey for input and comment on the draft Strategic Plan. The web-based survey was posted on the website from September 3, 2014 to October 20, 2014, and was available online with a laptop computer at the public meetings and by hard copy. The draft of the Consolidated Plan was posted on May 1, 2015 for public comment. A Public Hearing was held on May 20, 2015.

In addition to direct meetings and public outreach, Table 3 lists King County and regional plans which provided tailored input for the Consolidated Plan. These feeder plans provided their own public input and comment process.

5. Summary of public comments

Affordable Housing: Public comments supported making a range of affordable housing available to support a variety of needs, especially for seniors, people who are disabled or have a disabled family member, large families, and homeless and formerly homeless individuals and households. Housing located near high capacity transit, in walkable neighborhoods, and located close to services was an important priority.

Ending Homelessness: Public comments supported a range of housing options for homeless households; programs that provide alternatives such as shelter diversion, homeless prevention services, and temporary housing as needed. Participants emphasized assistance with employment services as an important service component.

Community and Economic Development: Public comments supported the development of community facilities with programs for low-to moderate-income people, including seniors; infrastructure projects such as water and sewer systems; sidewalks; and disability access; playgrounds, and assistance to low income persons seeking to start or stabilize a small business.

6. Summary of comments or views not accepted and the reasons for not accepting them

There were two comments not accepted. One comment recommended using rent controls in the private market as a method of preserving affordable housing. This is not a legal option and was not included as a strategy. The second was a stated opposition to using public funds to create large family housing units. Housing for large families was identified as a priority at all public community forums and is a stated priority for the Consortium.

7. Summary

Consortium partners, the local continuum of care, community members, stakeholders, service providers, housing providers, and public and private funders, provided valuable input in the development of the outcomes and objectives of the Consolidated Plan. The King County Consortium jurisdictions work together as partners to address the needs of very low- and moderate-income people, communities, and neighborhoods. The Consortium works together and with partners to increase the supply of affordable housing so that fewer low-and moderate-income households pay more than 50 percent of their income for housing. We value working together for a coordinated homeless system that utilizes local data; we invest in projects that ensure that homeless families, youth/young adults, and adults without children, are treated with dignity and receive services that emphasize recovery. We are committed to improving the living environment and expanding economic opportunities for low-and moderate-income people.

The Process

PR-05 Lead & Responsible Agencies - 91.200(b)

1. Describe agency/entity responsible for preparing the Consolidated Plan and those responsible for administration of each grant program and funding source

King County and the Consortium administer the CDBG, HOME, ESG and other state and local funds. The King County Department of Community and Human Services is responsible for the preparation the Consolidated Plan guiding the investment of these funds.

Agency Role	Name	Department/Agency
Lead Agency	King County	Department of Community and Human Services/Housing and Community Development Program
CDBG Administrator	King County	Department of Community and Human Services/Housing and Community Development Program
HOME Administrator	King County	Department of Community and Human Services/Housing and Community Development Program
ESG Administrator	King County	Department of Community and Human Services/Housing and Community Development Program

Table 1 – Responsible Agencies

Narrative

The King County Department of Community and Human Services is the lead entity for the Consolidated Plan. The cities of Auburn, Bellevue, Federal Way, and Kent administer their own CDBG funds and prepare their associated Consolidated Plans for the administration of these funds. In addition the cities of Auburn, Bellevue, Federal Way, and Kent contributed to the sections of the Consolidated Plan relating to the HOME program.

The lead staff for King County is identified below.

Regional Planner/Manager – Mark Ellerbrook

Consolidated Plan – Valerie Kendall

CDBG Program – Kathy Tremper

HOME Program – Eileen Bleeker

ESG Program – Janice Hougen

The lead staff for jurisdictions receiving direct CDBG entitlements is identified below.

Auburn CDBG – Michael Hursh
Bellevue CDBG – Emily Leslie
Federal Way CDBG – Jeff Watson
Kent CDBG – Merina Hansen

Consolidated Plan Public Contact Information

Valerie Kendall Affordable Housing Planner Housing and Community Development 401 Fifth Avenue, Suite 510 Seattle, WA 98104 206-263-9076 valerie.kendall@kingcounty.gov	Kathy Tremper Community Development Coordinator Housing and Community Development 401 Fifth Avenue, Suite 510 Seattle, WA 98104 206-263-9097 kathy.tremper@kingcounty.gov
--	---

PR-10 Consultation - 91.100, 91.200(b), 91.215(l)

1. Introduction

This section describes the community consultation process followed by the King County Consortium in developing the Consolidated Plan and the coordination with other local governments, the Continuum of Care, public and private housing providers, and service agencies. King County and the Consortium administer the CDBG, HOME, ESG and other state and local funds. King County worked closely with Consortium partners, citizens, community organizations and other public entities to identify needs and priorities outlined in this plan. The Committee to End Homelessness King County (CEH) has been designated by the King County Council as the local Continuum of Care. This is a voluntary local committee created to advise local government on the creation of a local homeless housing plan and to participate in a local homeless housing program.

Provide a concise summary of the jurisdiction’s activities to enhance coordination between public and assisted housing providers and private and governmental health, mental health and service agencies (91.215(l)).

The Consortium takes a regional approach and engages in ongoing coordination between housing providers, health providers, and service agencies. The 36 members of the King County Consortium (Consortium) conduct and participate in ongoing meetings with each other, the Washington State Housing Finance Commission, the Washington State Department of Commerce, A Regional Coalition for Housing, stakeholders, public housing authorities (PHA’s), including the King County Housing Authority and the Renton Housing Authority, the Continuum of Care, the Seattle Housing Authority, nonprofit housing and service providers, members of the Housing Development Consortium of Seattle-King County, the Seattle-King County Public Health Department, Puget Sound Regional Council, North, East, and South King County Human Services Planners, the Mental Health and Chemical Abuse and Dependency Division within the Department of Community and Human Services, and the Washington State Department of Social and Health Services. This coordination is ongoing throughout the year and informs recommendations for decision making bodies such as the Joint Recommendation Committee (JRC), in addition to the official stakeholder and public meetings held as a part of the planning and funding processes for federal formula grants and local funds.

Describe coordination with the Continuum of Care and efforts to address the needs of homeless persons (particularly chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans, and unaccompanied youth) and persons at risk of homelessness.

The King County Department of Community and Human Services Director is the Co –Chair of the CEH Interagency Council. King County hosts the staff members for CEH. King County and the

City of Seattle staff collaborate on the annual Continuum of Care (CoC) application to HUD. Since 1995, King County and the City of Seattle have applied for these funds on behalf of a regional consortium of service providers, and administered distribution of the funds to approximately 70 programs.

Chronically Homeless Individuals and Families - The Consortium members coordinate closely with the CoC in addressing chronic homelessness for individuals and families. Chronic homelessness is more pronounced with individuals and the CoC is working on developing a coordinated entry system for chronically homeless individuals.

Families with Children - The specific needs of families facing homelessness is a key component of the work being done throughout King County. The Housing and Community Development program centralized resources, leveraging partnerships with the United Way of King County and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, to be innovative in how the crisis response system works with and for families. The CoC and the Consortium launched a pilot coordinated entry system for homeless families in 2013. Two of the features of the coordinated system are the rapid re-housing and homeless diversion programs to assist families to find housing and shorten the length of time families experience homelessness. The rapid re-housing pilot pairs employment navigators with providers to assist participating families in increasing income.

Veterans - The CoC participates in the planning and coordination efforts associated with the Five Year Plan to End Homelessness Among Veterans in King County, 25 Cities Initiative, Supportive Services for Veteran Families Priority 1 Community Plan, Mayors Challenge to End Veteran Homelessness, and the King County Regional Veterans Initiative. The CoC will implement its coordinated assessment and housing placement system for single adults and Veteran service providers will be the first to pilot the new system. The Continuum of Care is also involved in strengthening connections to local landlords and employment opportunities for Veterans.

Unaccompanied Youth and Young Adults - The Homeless Youth and Young Adult Initiative is King County's community-wide response to prevent and end homelessness among young people. The Initiative is led by CEH, advised by agency and government leaders, supported by private philanthropy and the public sector, and grounded in the voices and input of homeless and formerly homeless young people. The Homeless YYA Initiative began coordinated engagement in July 2013 with Youth Housing Connection. Coordinated engagement prioritizes vulnerable youth and aims for all young people to be able to access housing.

Persons at Risk of Homelessness - The CoC and the Consortium does not have a formal definition for Persons at Risk of Homelessness, but they are working to define this. The CoC is gathering information and consulting with other CoC's, to determine the risk factors associated

with homelessness. The CEH Strategic Plan, cites five possible causes of homelessness: 1) increases in rent; 2) areas with high poverty and unemployment; 3) area with single person households; 4) states with lower mental health expenditures; and 5) areas with more recently moved persons.

Describe consultation with the Continuum(s) of Care that serves the jurisdiction's area in determining how to allocate ESG funds, develop performance standards and evaluate outcomes, and develop funding, policies and procedures for the administration of HMIS.

The Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing Act (HEARTH Act) revised the Emergency Shelter Grants Program and renamed it the Emergency Solutions Grants (ESG) Program. The new name reflects the change in the program's focus from addressing the needs of homeless people in emergency shelters to assisting people to quickly regain stability in permanent housing after experiencing homelessness and/or a housing crisis.

Consultation with Continuum of Care - During the planning process, CEH advised the County in stakeholder and public meetings as a part of the development of the Consolidated Plan. The coordination goes both ways and King County Consortium members provided input for the CEH Strategic Plan, which will be the guiding document for CEH into the next period.

Allocation of ESG Funds - The Consortium consults with CEH and works with the JRC to allocate ESG funds. The new HUD ESG regulations set in 2012 added new activities and limits were established on the amount of ESG funds that can be spent on emergency shelter and street outreach. Funds for emergency shelter and street outreach activities are now limited to 60% of the recipients total fiscal year grant for ESG or the hold harmless amount for such activities during the year previous to new regulations. The Consortium opted for the hold harmless amount for emergency shelter which is set at \$187,844. ESG funds will also be used for other homeless housing activities in the crisis response system such as diversion and rapid re-housing. Funding awards are made on a competitive basis through bi-annual funding rounds advertised publically and conducted through the King County Department of Procurement.

Performance Standards and Evaluation of Outcomes - All projects adhere to the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) operating standards and all reporting and program evaluation is completed through HMIS. Within HMIS, data for target populations, youth and young adults, singles, and families, is collected for the following three categories: 1) exit to permanent housing; 2) average program stay; and 3) return to homelessness. This information is collected for emergency shelters, transitional housing, permanent supportive housing, prevention, and rental assistance programs. Actual performance is measured against the target goals.

Funding, Policies and Procedures for HMIS - The Consortium, with King County as the lead, participates in efforts to improve the efficiency and accountability of HMIS, called Safe Harbors. King County HCD staff coordinated with Safe Harbors/HMIS to strengthen the needed infrastructure and refine the process that allows HMIS to act as the data system platform for the coordinated entry and assessment system for homeless families with children, Family Housing Connection. Using HMIS as the platform for the new system allows continued and substantial improvement in the amount and accuracy of data reported to Safe Harbors.

2. Describe Agencies, groups, organizations and others who participated in the process and describe the jurisdictions consultations with housing, social service agencies and other entities.

A wide range of groups and organizations participated in the process including public funders from Washington State and King County partner jurisdictions, the Veteran’s Administration, public housing authorities, members from the Seattle-King County Housing Development Consortium, stakeholders, housing providers for low-and-moderate income persons, agencies who serve persons who are homeless, and Seattle-King County Public Health. In addition to the consultations referenced above, King County and Consortium partner staff coordinate closely with each other and fan out to participate and attend a wide range of standing meetings with city planners, housing and service providers, attend local, statewide, and national meetings including the annual Washington State Housing Conference.

Table 2 – Agencies, groups, organizations who participated

1	Agency/Group/Organization	A Regional Coalition for Housing
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Housing Other government - Local Regional organization Planning organization
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Homelessness Strategy Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless Homeless Needs - Families with children Homelessness Needs - Veterans Homelessness Needs - Unaccompanied youth Non-Homeless Special Needs Market Analysis
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Representatives from ARCH attended the three interactive Roundtable meetings discussion the crisis response system, housing, and priorities and strategies for the Consolidated Plan.

2	Agency/Group/Organization	City of Auburn
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Other government - Local
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Homelessness Strategy Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless Homeless Needs - Families with children Homelessness Needs - Veterans Homelessness Needs - Unaccompanied youth Non-Homeless Special Needs Anti-poverty Strategy
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Representatives from the City of Auburn participated closely in the housing and homelessness strategies.
3	Agency/Group/Organization	City of Bellevue
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Other government - Local
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Homelessness Strategy Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless Homeless Needs - Families with children Homelessness Needs - Veterans Homelessness Needs - Unaccompanied youth Non-Homeless Special Needs Anti-poverty Strategy
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Representatives from the City of Bellevue participated in the housing and homelessness strategies. Ongoing consultation will continue to keep coordination on key housing programs efficient.
4	Agency/Group/Organization	Catholic Community Services
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Housing Services - Housing Services-Children Services-Elderly Persons Services-Persons with Disabilities Services-Persons with HIV/AIDS Services-Victims of Domestic Violence Services-homeless

	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Homelessness Strategy Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless Homeless Needs - Families with children Homelessness Needs - Veterans Homelessness Needs - Unaccompanied youth Non-Homeless Special Needs
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Representatives of Catholic Community Services attended the Roundtable session focusing on homeless strategies, and non-homeless special needs.
5	Agency/Group/Organization	Auburn Food Bank
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Food Bank
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Anti-poverty Strategy
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	King County staff consulted with the Auburn Food Bank about services.
6	Agency/Group/Organization	Compass Housing Alliance
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Housing Services - Housing Services-Children Services-Elderly Persons Services-Persons with Disabilities Services-Persons with HIV/AIDS Services-Victims of Domestic Violence Services-homeless
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Homelessness Strategy Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless Homeless Needs - Families with children Homelessness Needs - Veterans Homelessness Needs - Unaccompanied youth Non-Homeless Special Needs

	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Compass Housing Alliance participated in the stakeholder roundtable session focusing on homeless strategies, and non-homeless special needs. This is an ongoing consultation process and will particularly helpful in coordination for serving persons who are homeless and families, including families of veterans who are experiencing homelessness.
7	Agency/Group/Organization	King County Housing Authority
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Public Housing Authority Services - Housing Services-Children Services-Elderly Persons Services-Persons with Disabilities Services-homeless Planning organization
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Public Housing Needs Homelessness Strategy Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless Homeless Needs - Families with children Homelessness Needs - Veterans Homelessness Needs - Unaccompanied youth Non-Homeless Special Needs
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	The King County Housing Authority was consulted through all phases of the planning process. King County conducts ongoing consultation with the King County Housing Authority for housing and programs that serve people who are homeless.
8	Agency/Group/Organization	LifeWire
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Housing Services - Housing Services-Children Services-Victims of Domestic Violence Services-Employment
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Homelessness Strategy Homeless Needs - Families with children

	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	LifeWire attended the stakeholder roundtable session addressing homeless strategies. Ongoing consultation will continue strategic coordination for programs serving survivors of domestic violence.
9	Agency/Group/Organization	Low Income Housing Institute
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Housing Services - Housing Services-Children Services-Elderly Persons Services-Persons with Disabilities Services-Persons with HIV/AIDS Services-homeless
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Homelessness Strategy Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless Homeless Needs - Families with children Homelessness Needs - Veterans Homelessness Needs - Unaccompanied youth Non-Homeless Special Needs
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	LHI attended the stakeholder roundtable sessions. Ongoing consultation will continue strategic coordination with programmatic goals for housing and serving persons who are homeless.
10	Agency/Group/Organization	Mercy Housing Northwest
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Housing Services - Housing Services-Children Services-Elderly Persons Services-Persons with Disabilities Services-Persons with HIV/AIDS Services-homeless
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Homelessness Strategy Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless Homeless Needs - Families with children Homelessness Needs - Veterans Non-Homeless Special Needs

	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Mercy Housing Northwest attended the stakeholder roundtable session. Ongoing consultation will continue strategic coordination with programmatic goals for housing and serving persons who are homeless.
11	Agency/Group/Organization	City of Covington
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Other government - Local
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Homelessness Strategy Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless Homeless Needs - Families with children Homelessness Needs - Veterans Homelessness Needs - Unaccompanied youth Non-Homeless Special Needs Economic Development Anti-poverty Strategy
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	The City of Covington participated in the roundtable session and as a member of the Consortium will continue to consult for effective and efficient program delivery.
12	Agency/Group/Organization	City of Issaquah
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Other government - Local
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Homelessness Strategy Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless Homeless Needs - Families with children Homelessness Needs - Veterans Homelessness Needs - Unaccompanied youth Non-Homeless Special Needs Economic Development Anti-poverty Strategy
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	The City of Issaquah participated in the roundtable session and as a member of the Consortium will continue to consult for effective and efficient program delivery.
13	Agency/Group/Organization	City of Kent
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Other government - Local

	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Homelessness Strategy Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless Homeless Needs - Families with children Homelessness Needs - Veterans Homelessness Needs - Unaccompanied youth Non-Homeless Special Needs
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	The City of Kent participated in the roundtable sessions and as a member of the Consortium will continue to consult for effective and efficient program delivery.
14	Agency/Group/Organization	City of Kirkland
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Other government - Local
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Homelessness Strategy Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless Homeless Needs - Families with children Homelessness Needs - Veterans Homelessness Needs - Unaccompanied youth Non-Homeless Special Needs Economic Development Anti-poverty Strategy
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	The City of Kirkland participated in the roundtable sessions and as a member of the Consortium will continue to consult for effective and efficient program delivery.
15	Agency/Group/Organization	City of Redmond
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Other government - Local
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Homelessness Strategy Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless Homeless Needs - Families with children Homelessness Needs - Veterans Homelessness Needs - Unaccompanied youth Non-Homeless Special Needs Economic Development Anti-poverty Strategy

	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	The City of Redmond participated in the roundtable sessions and as a member of the Consortium will continue to consult for effective and efficient program delivery.
16	Agency/Group/Organization	City of Seattle Office of Housing
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Other government - Local
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Homelessness Strategy Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless Homeless Needs - Families with children Homelessness Needs - Veterans Homelessness Needs - Unaccompanied youth Non-Homeless Special Needs
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	The City of Seattle participated in the roundtable sessions and as a member of the RAHP Consortium will continue to consult for effective and efficient program delivery.
17	Agency/Group/Organization	City of Tukwila
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Other government - Local
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Homelessness Strategy Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless Homeless Needs - Families with children Homelessness Needs - Veterans Homelessness Needs - Unaccompanied youth Non-Homeless Special Needs Economic Development Anti-poverty Strategy
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	The City of Tukwila participated in the roundtable sessions and as a member of the Consortium will continue to consult for effective and efficient program delivery.

18	Agency/Group/Organization	Solid Ground of Washington
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Housing Services - Housing Services-Children Services-Elderly Persons Services-Persons with Disabilities Services-homeless
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Homelessness Strategy Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless Homeless Needs - Families with children Homelessness Needs - Veterans Homelessness Needs - Unaccompanied youth Non-Homeless Special Needs
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Solid Ground representatives presented to the first roundtable meeting about their housing stability program. Ongoing consultation will keep a high level of coordination for best practices.
19	Agency/Group/Organization	Valley Cities Counseling & Consultation
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Housing Services - Housing Services-Children Services-Persons with Disabilities Services-homeless
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Homelessness Strategy Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless Homelessness Needs - Veterans Homelessness Needs - Unaccompanied youth Non-Homeless Special Needs
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Valley Cities Counseling & Consultation participated in the roundtable sessions for housing and strategies for persons who are homeless. Ongoing consultation will continue to assure implementation of best practices.

20	Agency/Group/Organization	Friends of Youth
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Housing Services - Housing Services-Children Services-homeless
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Homelessness Needs - Unaccompanied youth
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Friends of Youth is an active housing and services provider for youth and young adults. Ongoing consultation will ensure coordination for best practices in serving youth and young adults.
21	Agency/Group/Organization	City of SeaTac
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Other government - Local
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Homelessness Strategy Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless Homeless Needs - Families with children Homelessness Needs - Veterans Homelessness Needs - Unaccompanied youth Non-Homeless Special Needs Economic Development Anti-poverty Strategy
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	The City of SeaTac participated in the roundtable sessions and as a member of the Consortium will continue to consult for effective and efficient program delivery.
22	Agency/Group/Organization	Sound Cities Association
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Regional planning organization
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Homelessness Strategy Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless Homeless Needs - Families with children Homelessness Needs - Veterans Homelessness Needs - Unaccompanied youth Non-Homeless Special Needs Economic Development Anti-poverty Strategy

	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Sound Cities Association participated in the roundtable sessions and actively participated.
23	Agency/Group/Organization	Skyway Solutions
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Community organization
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Homelessness Strategy Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless Homeless Needs - Families with children Non-Homeless Special Needs Economic Development Anti-poverty Strategy
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Skyway Solutions members attended the public community forum and participated in the interactive exhibits.
24	Agency/Group/Organization	Hopelink
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Community organization
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Homelessness Strategy Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless Homeless Needs - Families with children Non-Homeless Special Needs Economic Development Anti-poverty Strategy
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	A Hopelink representative attended the stakeholder meeting and emphasized the importance on food banks in the strategies to address homeless needs, homeless prevention, and as an anti-poverty strategy.
25	Agency/Group/Organization	Refugee Women's Alliance

	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Community Organization for Refugee Women
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Homelessness Strategy Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless Homeless Needs - Families with children Non-Homeless Special Needs Economic Development Anti-poverty Strategy
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	A representative from the Refugee Women’s Alliance attended the south subregion community forum which was held in a restaurant adjacent to their Tukwila offices. Anticipated outcomes include ongoing coordination, equity and social justice priorities, cultural sensitivity, and affordable housing.
26	Agency/Group/Organization	Renton Housing Authority
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Public Housing Authority Services - Housing Services-Children Services-Elderly Persons Services-Persons with Disabilities Services-homeless Planning organization
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Public Housing Needs Homelessness Strategy Homeless Needs - Families with children Homeless Needs - Veterans Non-Homeless Special Needs Economic Development Anti-poverty Strategy
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	A representative from the Renton Housing Authority attended stakeholder meetings and provided information for the public housing sections of the plan.
27	Agency/Group/Organization	WA State Dept. of Social and Health Services
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Other government - State

	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Homelessness Strategy Homeless Needs – Chronically homeless Homeless Needs - Families with children Homeless Needs – Veterans Homeless Needs – Unaccompanied youth Non-Homeless Special Needs Anti-poverty Strategy
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	A representative of the WA State Department of Social and Health Service attended the stakeholder meetings and will continue to coordinate with the Consortium, particularly for housing, homelessness, and special needs populations.
28	Agency/Group/Organization	Aging and Disability Services for Seattle and King County
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Services – Elderly Persons Services – Persons with Disabilities Services – Education
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Non-Homeless Special Needs Anti-poverty Strategy Economic Development
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	A representative from Aging and Disability Services attended a community forum and discussed the needs of senior and person who have disability. Ongoing coordination will continue.
29	Agency/Group/Organization	Senior Service of King County
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Services – Elderly Persons
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Non-Homeless Special Needs Anti-poverty Strategy Economic Development
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	A representative from Senior Services of King County attended a community forum and discussed the needs of seniors. Ongoing coordination will continue.

30	Agency/Group/Organization	King County Bar Association
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Services – Fair Housing
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Fair Housing Housing Need Assessment Homelessness Strategy
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	A representative from the King County Bar Association attended stakeholder meetings to advocate for eviction prevention programs. Ongoing coordination is continuing.
31	Agency/Group/Organization	City of Shoreline
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Other government - Local
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Homelessness Strategy Homeless Needs – Chronically homeless Homeless Needs – Families with children Homeless Needs – Veterans Homeless Needs – Unaccompanied youth Non-Homeless Special Needs Economic Development Anti-poverty Strategy
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	A representative from the City of Shoreline participated in key meetings for the preparation of the Consolidated Plan and will continue to collaborate.
32	Agency/Group/Organization	City of Renton
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Other government - Local
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Homelessness Strategy Homeless Needs – Chronically homeless Homeless Needs – Families with children Homeless Needs – Veterans Homeless Needs – Unaccompanied youth Non-Homeless Special Needs Economic Development Anti-poverty Strategy

How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	A representative from the City of Renton participated in key meetings for the preparation of the Consolidated Plan and will continue to collaborate.
--	--

Identify any Agency Types not consulted and provide rationale for not consulting

No types of agencies involved in housing, homelessness, or community development were excluded from consultation. Every effort was made to ensure advance publication of meetings and opportunities to contribute.

The following table lists some of the local and regional plans and initiatives consulted in the development of the Consolidated Plan.

Other local/regional/state/federal planning efforts considered when preparing the Plan

Name of Plan	Lead Organization	How do the goals of your Strategic Plan overlap with the goals of each plan?
Continuum of Care	Committee to End Homelessness King County	This plan informs and sets priorities and goals that link to all three overarching goals in the Strategic Plan, and particularly, Goal Two Ending Homelessness.
King County Health and Human Services Transformation Vision	King County	King County Health and Human Services Transformation Vision has set a goal for Health & Human Services Transformation that by 2020, the people of King County will experience gains in health and well-being because our community worked collectively to make the shift from a costly, crisis-oriented response to health and social problems, to one that focuses on prevention, embraces recovery, and eliminates disparities. The transformation initiatives have informed elements of the Consolidated Plan, and alignment will continue in the coming years.
King County Equity and Social Justice Report	King County	This report informs and guides principles of the Strategic Plan to ensure that the goal of equal opportunity is contemplated throughout the Consolidated Plan.
King County Comprehensive Plan	King County	Guiding policy document for land use, and development regulations in unincorporated King County and for regional services.

Name of Plan	Lead Organization	How do the goals of your Strategic Plan overlap with the goals of each plan?
King County Countywide Planning Policies	King County	Identifies and sets underlying policy goals for comprehensive plans and long range affordable housing goals for local jurisdictions.
King County Buildable Lands Report 2014	King County	Development information for jurisdictions in King County.
25 Cities Initiative	United States Interagency Council on Homelessness, Veterans Administration	Creates common assessment and housing placement for homeless veterans.
Vision 2040	Puget Sound Regional Council	Vision 2040 is an integrated and long-range vision for maintaining a healthy region. This plan emphasizes triple bottom line decision-making: people, prosperity, and planet.
Quiet Crisis: Age Wave Maxes Out Affordable Housing	Aging and Disability Services, City of Seattle Office of Housing, Seattle Housing Authority, King County	This report called out the increasing need for senior housing as the baby boomers age. This is reflected in the affordable housing goals in the Strategic Plan.
City of Seattle Consolidated Housing and Community	City of Seattle	The HUD required plan guiding the investment of CDBG, ESG, and HOME entitlement grants for the City of Seattle. This includes the HOPWA plan for the region, including King County.

Table 3 – Other local / regional / federal planning efforts

Describe cooperation and coordination with other public entities, including the State and any adjacent units of general local government, in the implementation of the Consolidated Plan (91.215(I))

King County consulted with many public entities and including member jurisdictions of the Consortium during the development and review of the Consolidated Plan. In addition consultations occurred with Seattle-King County Public Health, the Mental Health Chemical Abuse and Dependency Services Division, the Developmental Disabilities Division, the City of Seattle, Washington State Department of Social and Health Services, and the Veteran’s Administration to establish priorities to ensure funding policy alignment and coordination of resources.

PR-15 Citizen Participation - 91.401, 91.105, 91.200(c)

1. Summary of citizen participation process/Efforts made to broaden citizen participation Summarize citizen participation process and how it impacted goal-setting

As a part of the Consolidated Plan development, the King County Housing and Community Development Program solicited public input on community needs, priorities, and draft strategies. Public input was encouraged throughout all phases of the Consolidated Plan as well as through specific stakeholder outreach activities. Public outreach and engagement activities were designed to reduce barriers to participation that are often encountered to ensure public input was broad and representative of program beneficiaries.

Four public community forums were held in order to engage low-and moderate-income persons. The community forums were held in mixed-income and low-income locations around King County that are walkable, accessible by public transit, and had free parking. The venues included areas that are frequented by community members of all economic backgrounds, often in areas with subsidized and affordable housing options. One of the community forums took place in an area that is minority-majority, with only 41 percent of the population being non-Hispanic white. A second community forum was held at the Bellevue Regional Library, a facility that has a high level of participation by Asian immigrant groups and is within close proximity of a shelter for homeless women, some of whom attended and offered input. The third community forum was held at Third Place Books in Lake Forest Park, a popular community gathering space. The Sno Valley Senior Center hosted the last community forum, giving fragile seniors an opportunity to engage with planners and offer input particular to elders. The following table summarizes the citizen comments.

Citizen Participation Outreach

Mode	Target	Summary of response/ attendance	Summary of Comments	Summary of Comments accepted and reasons not	URL (if applicable)
Public Meeting	Persons with disabilities Broad community Seniors	This was a community forum held on October 6, 2014 at the Sno Valley Senior Center in Carnation. The forum was held during lunchtime and 44 citizens participated, including caregivers and the senior center director.	Participants emphasized the importance of affordable housing and services for seniors so they can remain in their communities.	None	N/A
Public Meeting	Minorities Non-English Speaking - Specify other language: Spanish Persons with disabilities Broad community Residents of Public and Assisted Housing	This was a community forum held on September 9, 2014 at the Bellevue regional library. The forum was held in the afternoon and evening and 20 citizens attended. These agencies were represented: 1) DASH; 2) LifeWire; 3) Vashon Youth and Family Services; 4) Sophia's Way; 5) Issaquah-Sammamish Interfaith Coalition; 6) Smartsheet; and 7) Global to Local.	Participants prioritized rental housing for persons with special needs, including homeless populations, seniors, and large families and housing with low screening barriers. Participants prioritized a range of permanent housing options for persons who are homeless, shelter accessibility and support, and jobs programs to assist persons who are formerly homeless secure jobs.	None	N/A

Mode	Target	Summary of response/ attendance	Summary of Comments	Summary of Comments accepted and reasons not	URL (If applicable)
Public Meeting	Minorities Non-English Speaking - Specify other language: Chinese, Spanish, Russian, Thai Persons with disabilities Non-targeted/broad community Residents of Public and Assisted Housing	This was a community forum on September 14, 2014 at an Indian Cuisine restaurant that is a popular community celebration venue among south Asian and African populations in King County. The venue is co-located with the Refugee Women's Alliance (ReWA), one of the most extensive refugee support organizations in the region. Seventeen citizens attended and the following agencies were represented in addition to ReWa: 1) Global to Local; 2) Skyway Solutions; 3) King County Bar Association; 4) Aging and Disability Services; 5) Senior Services; 6) Sound Mental Health; 7) North Highline VAC; and 8) King County Developmental Disabilities Division.	Participants emphasized the importance of place based strategies for specific communities, affordable rental housing to accommodate the needs of large families, people with disabilities and people who are aging. To address homelessness, participants prioritized linkages with main stream services, eviction prevention, shelter accessibility, housing first, and employment opportunities for formerly homeless persons.	None	N/A

Mode	Target	Summary of response/ attendance	Summary of Comments	Summary of Comments accepted and reasons	not URL (If applicable)
Public Meeting	Minorities Non-English Speaking - Specify other language: Spanish Persons with disabilities Broad community Residents of Public and Assisted Housing	This was the North King County public community forum, held on September 10, 2014 at Third Place Books in Lake Forest Park. Thirty eight citizens attended and the following organizations were represented: 1) Kirkland Interfaith Transitional; 2) The Mockingbird Society; 3) YMCA; 4) Sound Mental Health; and 5) Rental Housing Association of Washington.	Participants prioritized a variety of affordable housing options, land trusts as a housing tool, and housing for people with special needs, large families, seniors, with low screening barriers. Housing repair for lower income homeowners was called out as a priority.	None	N/A

Mode	Target	Summary of response/ attendance	Summary of Comments	Summary of Comments not accepted and reasons	URL (If applicable)
Internet Outreach	Minorities Persons with disabilities Broad community Residents of Public and Assisted Housing	Simultaneously with the first public forum, King County Housing and Community Development, published an online-tool to review draft strategy content and provide input. The online tool solicited similar feedback as the public community forums and provided opportunity for respondents to submit additional thoughts. The survey was posted from September 3, 2014 to October 20, 2014.	Respondents ranked the following as the highest priorities for addressing homelessness: 1) a range of housing for homeless households; 2) programs that provide alternatives such as shelter diversion; 3) homeless prevention targeted to those most likely to become homeless; and 4) temporary housing as needed. Participants prioritized the following needs for housing: 1) rental housing for persons with special needs, seniors, large families, and homeless persons; 2) rental housing that is affordable to a range of incomes; and 3) rental housing to accommodate the needs of families for members that have special needs. Participants noted the following community needs: 1) general assistance for seniors; and 2) walkable neighborhoods, sidewalks, and housing, transit, and medical services co-located.	One commenter stated they did not believe public monies should be used to build large family units. This comment was not accepted. Aside from this one comment, there was overwhelming support and need for large family units both through the survey and at public participation at the community forums. A second comment suggested rent control as a policy tool to provide affordable housing. This is not legal and was not accepted.	https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/ConPlan2014

Mode	Target	Summary of response/ attendance	Summary of Comments	Summary of Comments accepted and reasons	not URL (If applicable)
Broad email invitation	Consortium partners and stakeholders	This was a Consortium round table work session held on May 20, 2014 at the King County (Boeing Field) airport. Participants included representatives from A Regional Coalition for Housing, and the following cities: 1) Auburn; 2) Covington; 3) Issaquah; 4) Kent; 5) Kirkland; 6) Redmond; 7) Seattle and 8) Tukwila. Other stakeholders included: 1) Catholic Community Services; 2) Committee to End Homelessness; 3) Compass Housing Alliance; 4) Washington State Department of Social and Health Services; 5) Imagine Housing; 6) King County Housing Authority; 7) King County Bar Association; 8) LifeWire; 8) Low income Housing Institute; 9) Mercy Housing NW; 10) Renton Housing Authority; 11) Solid Ground; and 12) Valley Cities.	King County staff and participants presented and provided input on regional efforts to address homelessness. Participants provided input on funding for homelessness in King county, and funding guidelines for CDBG, ESG, and RAHP programs.	None	N/A

Mode	Target	Summary of response/ attendance	Summary of Comments	Summary of Comments accepted and reasons	not URL (If applicable)
Broad email invitation	Consortium partners and stakeholders	<p>This was a Consortium meeting held on July 17, 2014 at the Mercer Island Community and Event Center to review key inputs in the RAHP program. Attendees included A Regional Coalition for Housing and the following cities: 1) Covington; 2) Issaquah; 3) Redmond; 4) SeaTac; and 5) Tukwila. Stakeholders represented included: 1) Department of Social and Health Services; 2) Friends of Youth; 3) Hopelink; 4) King County Bar Association; 5) King County Housing Authority; 6) Imagine Housing; 7) LifeWire; 8) Low Income Housing Institute; 9) Renton Housing Authority; 10) Solid Ground; and 11) Valley Cities.</p>	Participants reached consensus on RAHP program parameters.	None	N/A

Mode	Target	Summary of response/ attendance	Summary of Comments	Summary of Comments accepted and reasons not	URL (If applicable)
Broad email invitation	Consortium partners and stakeholders	This was a Consortium meeting held on June 26, 2014 at South Seattle Community College. Attendees included A Regional Coalition for Housing; and the following cities: 1) Bellevue; 2) Covington; 3) Kirkland; 4) Redmond; 5) Renton; 6) SeaTac, and 7) Tukwila. Other stakeholders included: 1) Compass Housing Alliance; 2) WA State Department of Social and Health Services; 3) Friends of Youth; 4) Hopelink; 5) Imagine Housing; 6) King County Bar Association; 7) LifeWire; 8) Renton Housing Authority; 9) Sound Cities Association; 10) Solid Ground, and 11) Valley Cities.	The participants agreed upon a series of proposals including: 1) funding for Housing Stability Program; 2) targeting homeless prevention to align with best practices; 3) allow flexibility in the use of RAHP Program funds; and 4) continuing to fund shelters and transitional housing during the conversion work. Participants agreed to meet midway during the Consolidated Plan to assess strategies and review funding for programs.	None	N/A

Mode	Target	Summary of response/ attendance	Summary of Comments	Summary of Comments accepted and reasons	not URL (If applicable)
North Highline Unincorp. Council	North Highline and White Center	The North Highline Unincorporated Council (NHUC) invited King County HCD staff members to introduce draft portions of the Consolidated Plan at their October 4, 2014 meeting. A total of 15 board and community members signed in and there were several more participants in the meeting room.	There were a range of comments and opinions expressed at the meeting. Community members stated a concern that there is a high concentration of poverty in the White Center neighborhood and a desire for a community with more of a mix of incomes. Two families mentioned they purchased their first home at Greenbridge and want to make sure the neighborhood remains well maintained. One person identified a need for sidewalks and pedestrian access. Another resident stated that the NHUC does not want a Neighborhood Revitalization and Stabilization Area (NRSA) in White Center.	None	N/A

Table 4 – Citizen Participation Outreach

Needs Assessment

NA-05 Overview

Needs Assessment Overview

This Needs Assessment provides an assessment of the demographic and economic characteristics of persons and households in King County, the local housing stock, and its ability to serve the housing needs of County residents. Data used for this Needs Assessment is primarily the 2007-2011 American Community Survey (ACS) five-year results. This five-year ACS survey data provides information that is no longer collected by the decennial census.

King County is a partner with most cities outside of Seattle through the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG), and HOME Investment Partnership (HOME) Consortiums, to allocate and administer these formula grants. This plan guides the investment in approximately \$7,500,000 in these federal funds. The County also participates with most cities, including Seattle, in the administration and allocation of Regional Affordable Housing Program (RAHP) funds. In addition, the County participates with all cities in the Growth Management Planning Council (GMPC) to address housing affordability and planning, and partners with Eastside cities through A Regional Coalition for Housing (ARCH) to plan for and provide affordable housing in that region.

Consolidated Plan Definitions:

Affordable Housing: Housing affordable at 30 percent or less of a household's monthly income.

Area Median Income (AMI): Annual household income for the Seattle-Bellevue, WA Metro Area as published on approximately an annual basis by the HUD.

HUD Area Median Family Income (HAMFI): This is the median family income calculated by HUD to determine Fair Market Rents and income limits for HUD programs.

Very low-income households: Households earning 30 percent AMI or less for their household size. In 2014, a two person household in King County with an income at 30 percent AMI earned \$21,200 per year or less.

Low-income households: Households earning 31 percent to 50 percent AMI for their household size. In 2014, a two person household in King County with an income at 50 percent AMI earned \$35,300 per year.


Moderate-income households: Households earning 51 percent to 80 percent AMI for their household size. In 2014, a two person household in King County with an income at 80 percent AMI earned \$56,480 per year.

Middle-income households: Households earning 81 percent to 120 percent AMI for their household size. In 2014, a two person middle –income household in King County at 100 percent AMI earned \$70,600 per year.

This Consolidated Plan is produced by the King County Department of Community and Human Services whose vision is to provide equitable opportunities for people to be healthy, happy, and self-reliant.



The page contains a map illustrating census tracts and the percentage of the population below the poverty level.



NA-10 Housing Needs Assessment - 24 CFR 91.405, 24 CFR 91.205 (a,b,c)

Summary of Housing Needs

The King County Consortium includes 36 cities and unincorporated King County. The population, net of Seattle, in King County has grown 11.21% since 2000.

Demographics	Base Year: 2000	2007-2011 ACS	% Change
King County net of Seattle			
Population	1,173,670	1,305,205	11.21%
Households	452,417	507,590	12.20%
Median Income	\$53,157	\$70,537	32.75%

Table 5 - Housing Needs Assessment Demographics

2000 Census (Base Year)

2007-2011 ACS (Demographics)

2007-2011 ACS (Economics)

	0-30% HAMFI	>30-50% HAMFI	>50-80% HAMFI	>80-100% HAMFI	>100% HAMFI
Total Households *	54,693	49,336	63,788	51,543	294,390
Small Family Households *	18,302	16,993	23,253	21,023	170,179
Large Family Households *	4,443	3,869	5,248	4,464	22,018
Household contains at least one person 62-74 years of age	8,829	8,548	11,205	8,447	41,875
Household contains at least one person age 75 or older	8,399	8,824	8,307	5,175	14,361
Households with one or more children 6 years old or younger	11,346	8,577	10,338	8,487	35,643

Table 6 - Total Households Table

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

Within the income band at or below 30 percent of HAMFI, families are more likely to have one or more children under the age of six as compared to their above median income counterparts.

Housing Needs Summary Tables

The following tables indicate households with housing problems as defined by HUD. The four housing problems are listed and defined below.

1. Substandard housing lacks complete plumbing.
2. Substandard housing lacks complete kitchen facilities.
3. Overcrowded is defined as more than one person, but fewer than 1.5 persons per bedroom.
 - Severely overcrowded is defined as more than 1.5 persons per bedroom.
4. Cost burdened is defined as paying more than 30 percent of income for housing.
 - Severely cost burdened is defined as paying more than 50 percent of income for housing.

1. Housing Problems (Households with one of the listed problems)

	Renter					Owner				
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total
NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS										
Substandard Housing - Lacking complete plumbing or kitchen facilities	1,219	748	428	309	2,704	84	64	225	159	532
Severely Overcrowded - With >1.51 people per room (and complete kitchen and plumbing)	1,019	359	485	73	1,936	29	110	158	100	397
Overcrowded - With 1.01-1.5 people per room (and none of the above problems)	2,894	1,343	1,542	708	6,487	236	371	541	422	1,570

	Renter					Owner				
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total
Housing cost burden greater than 50% of income (and none of the above problems)	22,701	8,031	1,586	365	32,683	10,705	9,738	10,018	4,784	35,245
Housing cost burden greater than 30% of income (and none of the above problems)	3,900	12,850	12,031	3,634	32,415	2,195	4,838	9,518	12,209	28,760
Zero/negative Income (and none of the above problems)	1,965	0	0	0	1,965	1,403	0	0	0	1,403

Table 7 – Housing Problems Table

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

2. Housing Problems 2 (Households with one or more Severe Housing Problems: Lacks kitchen or complete plumbing, severe overcrowding, severe cost burden)

	Renter					Owner				
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total
NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS										
Having 1 or more of four housing problems	27,836	10,486	4,055	1,466	43,843	11,065	10,278	10,948	5,445	37,736
Having none of four housing problems	8,372	17,219	26,152	18,000	69,743	3,985	11,299	22,626	26,591	64,501

	Renter					Owner				
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total
Household has negative income, but none of the other housing problems	1,965	0	0	0	1,965	1,403	0	0	0	1,403

Table 8 – Housing Problems 2

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

3. Cost Burden > 30%

	Renter				Owner			
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total
NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS								
Small Related	11,976	9,129	5,518	26,623	3,543	5,021	8,504	17,068
Large Related	3,056	1,705	801	5,562	640	1,458	2,173	4,271
Elderly	6,140	4,060	2,177	12,377	6,207	5,671	4,968	16,846
Other	9,765	7,838	5,700	23,303	2,789	2,818	4,537	10,144
Total need by income	30,937	22,732	14,196	67,865	13,179	14,968	20,182	48,329

Table 9 – Cost Burden > 30%

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

4. Cost Burden > 50%

This table and the following graph shows by renter and homeowner the number of households who are severely cost burdened.


	Renter				Owner			
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total
NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS								
Small Related	10,562	3,079	525	14,166	3,154	3,968	4,519	11,641
Large Related	2,317	561	30	2,908	576	1,061	1,019	2,656
Elderly	4,636	1,912	652	7,200	4,590	2,790	2,253	9,633
Other	8,511	2,968	548	12,027	2,586	2,187	2,468	7,241
Total need by income	26,026	8,520	1,755	36,301	10,906	10,006	10,259	31,171

Table 10 – Cost Burden > 50%

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

Severely Cost Burdened Households (in King County Net of Seattle)

About 68% of, or 35,959, very low-income households spend half or more of their total household income on housing. Households in higher income ranges are less likely to be severely cost-burdened, but across all income levels an average of 16% of households spend half or more of their income on housing.



5. Crowding (More than one person per room)

	Renter					Owner				
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total
NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS										
Single family households	3,563	1,462	1,464	622	7,111	200	351	509	299	1,359
Multiple, unrelated family households	200	239	478	120	1,037	65	119	232	202	618
Other, non-family households	150	75	99	49	373	0	4	0	15	19
Total need by income	3,913	1,776	2,041	791	8,521	265	474	741	516	1,996

Table 11 – Crowding Information -

Data 2007-2011 CHAS
Source:

	Renter				Owner			
	0-30% HAMFI	>30-50% HAMFI	>50-80% HAMFI	Total	0-30% HAMFI	>30-50% HAMFI	>50-80% HAMFI	Total
Households with Children Present	9,326	6,014	5,544	20,884	1,552	2,214	4,241	8,007

Table 12 – Crowding Information -

Describe the number and type of single person households in need of housing assistance.

There are approximately 132,000 single person households in King County, net of Seattle. Approximately 64,700 of these households are renters. By conservative estimate, 26,527 of these single person households are low to moderate income and are in need of housing assistance. Many of single person households are senior and elderly. The report “Quiet Crisis: Age Wave Maxes out Affordable Housing in King County 2008-2025” identifies the growing senior population bubble and a need for affordable senior housing.

Estimate the number and type of families in need of housing assistance who are disabled or victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault and stalking.

The local Area Agency on Aging estimates that 10.2 percent of residents in King County over the age of 60 years are in fair to poor health. This can be extrapolated to indicate that approximately 31,900 King County residents aged 60 and over might have a disability. Estimating the number of families in need of housing assistance who are victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault and stalking is not an exact science, partially due to the dynamic of under-reporting these crimes. We estimate that 1,854 families will seek shelter from domestic violence.

What are the most common housing problems?

The shortage of affordable housing is the major housing problem. The most common housing problem is cost burden. Approximately of 66,000 renter households with incomes at or below 80% AMI are severely cost burdened. The majority of renter households that are cost burdened have incomes at or below 30 percent AMI. More than half of the households with incomes at or below 50 percent AMI are cost burdened.

Are any populations/household types more affected than others by these problems?

Single person households are the most likely to be cost burdened. The senior population will grow significantly in the coming decade with an addition of over 200,000 seniors-doubling the current senior population in the next fifteen years. This was a concern voiced in two of the community forums by low income middle aged and senior women. Seventy seven percent of senior renters live by themselves. At a community forum in Carnation at the Sno Valley Senior Center, lunch guests voiced a high need for affordable housing.

Describe the characteristics and needs of Low-income individuals and families with children (especially extremely low-income) who are currently housed but are at imminent risk of either residing in shelters or becoming unsheltered 91.205(c)/91.305(c)). Also discuss the

needs of formerly homeless families and individuals who are receiving rapid re-housing assistance and are nearing the termination of that assistance.

Families with children may have a variety of circumstances that put them at imminent risk of homelessness. Families that are low income and experience a significant change or challenge such as job loss or a member with a major medical condition may be unable to pay their monthly housing expenses. If housing is lost, it may be more difficult to secure replacement housing due to credit issues, criminal background, or lack of money to pay move in fees.

Formerly homeless individuals and families receiving rapid re-housing have a limited time period to obtain employment. Rapid re-housing assistance is short term, and additional assistance is available on a case by case basis for households needing more time for the transition to paying all of their housing costs. Rapid re-housing services are paired with employment navigators to assist people with securing a living wage job.

If a jurisdiction provides estimates of the at-risk population(s), it should also include a description of the operational definition of the at-risk group and the methodology used to generate the estimates:

The Consortium does not have a specific definition of “at-risk” populations and does not have an estimate of the number of at-risk individuals and households. See an explanation for increased risk of homelessness below.

Specify particular housing characteristics that have been linked with instability and an increased risk of homelessness.

As explained in the *PR-10 Consultation*, the CoC does not have a definition of increased risk of homelessness, but they are working on identify those risks. There may be some housing characteristics linked to instability and increased risk of homelessness including mental health or substance abuse issues, extreme cost burden in households earning at or below 50% of AMI, difficulty in maintaining tenancy or securing an apartment due to barriers with securing a rental unit due to a history of eviction, criminal justice involvement, and a lack of documentable income. Nationwide research in the CEH Strategic Plan identifies four areas of risk associated with higher rates of homelessness: 1) rising rents—each \$100 rent increase is associated with a 15% increase in homelessness in metro areas; 2) areas with high poverty and unemployment rates; 3) areas with more single person households; and 4) areas with more recently moved people.

**NA-15 Disproportionately Greater Need: Housing Problems - 91.405, 91.205
(b)(2)**


Assess the need of any racial or ethnic group that has disproportionately greater need in comparison to the needs of that category of need as a whole.

Disproportionality is defined as when the members of a racial or ethnic group experience a housing problem at a greater rate (10 percent or more) than their relative proportion as whole.

Introduction

The pie chart below shows the percentage of the population in King County, outside of Seattle, by race.

Race and Ethnicity in King County outside of Seattle (2013)



The following HUD tables show the four housing needs by the jurisdiction as a whole and by race and ethnicity.

0%-30% of Area Median Income

The following table shows the number of households at 0-30 percent AMI with one or more of the four housing problems.

Black and African Americans are disproportionately likely to have one or more of the four housing problems.

Housing Problems	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	42,944	6,048	2,851
White	26,764	4,258	1,626
Black / African American	4,951	575	259
Asian	4,451	508	615
American Indian, Alaska Native	475	138	34
Pacific Islander	333	30	0
Hispanic	4,964	438	230

Table 13 - Disproportionally Greater Need 0 - 30% AMI

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

30%-50% of Area Median Income

The following table shows the number of households at 30-50 percent AMI with one or more of the four housing problems.

Housing Problems	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	37,843	12,597	0
White	24,117	9,712	0
Black / African American	3,012	410	0
Asian	4,157	1,150	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	353	110	0
Pacific Islander	204	55	0
Hispanic	4,516	948	0

Table 14 - Disproportionally Greater Need 30 - 50% AMI

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

50%-80% of Area Median Income

Housing Problems	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	38,431	34,272	0
White	26,255	25,389	0
Black / African American	2,702	2,042	0
Asian	4,503	2,751	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	180	304	0
Pacific Islander	393	240	0
Hispanic	3,440	2,563	0

Table 15 - Disproportionally Greater Need 50 - 80% AMI

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

***80%-100% of Area Median Income**

Housing Problems	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	20,442	32,605	0
White	15,543	24,498	0
Black / African American	594	1,442	0
Asian	2,606	3,537	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	10	320	0
Pacific Islander	140	150	0
Hispanic	1,088	1,760	0

Table 16 - Disproportionally Greater Need 80 - 100% AMI

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

NA-20 Disproportionately Greater Need: Severe Housing Problems - 91.405, 91.205 (b)(2)

Assess the need of any racial or ethnic group that has disproportionately greater need in comparison to the needs of that category of need as a whole.

Introduction

0%-30% of Area Median Income

Severe Housing Problems*	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	36,567	12,422	2,851
White	22,207	8,827	1,626
Black / African American	4,361	1,179	259
Asian	3,896	1,072	615
American Indian, Alaska Native	410	203	34
Pacific Islander	313	55	0
Hispanic	4,509	888	230

Table 17 – Severe Housing Problems 0 - 30% AMI

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

30%-50% of Area Median Income

Severe Housing Problems*	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	19,090	31,338	0
White	11,628	22,153	0
Black / African American	1,362	2,055	0
Asian	2,592	2,715	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	115	353	0
Pacific Islander	75	189	0
Hispanic	2,461	2,998	0

Table 18 – Severe Housing Problems 30 - 50% AMI

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

50%-80% of Area Median Income

Severe Housing Problems*	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	14,682	58,000	0
White	9,102	42,544	0
Black / African American	729	4,020	0
Asian	2,440	4,832	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	45	440	0
Pacific Islander	194	434	0
Hispanic	1,854	4,160	0

Table 19 – Severe Housing Problems 50 - 80% AMI

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

80%-100% of Area Median Income

Severe Housing Problems*	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	6,061	46,978	0
White	4,307	35,738	0
Black / African American	79	1,959	0
Asian	982	5,176	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	0	331	0
Pacific Islander	60	235	0
Hispanic	533	2,299	0

Table 20 – Severe Housing Problems 80 - 100% AMI

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

**NA-25 Disproportionately Greater Need: Housing Cost Burdens - 91.405, 91.205
(b)(2)**

Assess the need of any racial or ethnic group that has disproportionately greater need in comparison to the needs of that category of need as a whole.

Introduction

Housing Cost Burden

Housing Cost Burden	<=30%	30-50%	>50%	No / negative income (not computed)
Jurisdiction as a whole	314,130	105,240	73,106	3,036
White	245,228	76,578	47,885	1,651
Black / African American	10,083	6,244	5,880	264
Asian	34,620	11,526	9,507	670
American Indian, Alaska Native	1,839	576	495	34
Pacific Islander	1,392	632	329	0
Hispanic	14,985	7,011	6,973	330

Table 21 – Greater Need: Housing Cost Burdens AMI

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

NA-30 Disproportionately Greater Need: Discussion - 91.205 (b)(2)

Are there any Income categories in which a racial or ethnic group has disproportionately greater need than the needs of that income category as a whole?

Nearly all non-white racial and ethnic populations have disproportionately greater housing needs as measured by housing problems, severe housing problems, and particularly, housing cost burden.

If they have needs not identified above, what are those needs?

Through ongoing community input, public, and stakeholder meetings we believe we have identified needs in this plan.

Are any of those racial or ethnic groups located in specific areas or neighborhoods in your community?

Disproportionately greater need exists in the South King County areas. As housing costs rise in Seattle, more low income families of color are moving to communities south of Seattle where there is more affordable housing and larger units for families to rent.



Affordable housing and access to transit are elements that factor into health and well-being, and King County and Consortium members anticipates identifying Communities of Opportunity for targeted investments to improve health and well-being outcomes. The Communities of Opportunities may also apply for designation as a Neighborhood Revitalization Stabilization Area in 2015, the first year of the Consolidated Plan. |

NA-35 Public Housing - 91.405, 91.205 (b)

Introduction

Totals in Use

	Program Type								
	Certificate	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Vouchers			Special Purpose Voucher		
				Total	Project - based	Tenant - based	Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Family Unification Program	Disabled *
# of units vouchers in use	0	0	2,647	10,912	984	9,927	0	0	0

Table 22 - Public Housing by Program Type

*Includes Non-Elderly Disabled, Mainstream One-Year, Mainstream Five-year, and Nursing Home Transition

Data Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)

Characteristics of Residents

	Program Type								
	Certificate	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Vouchers			Special Purpose Voucher		
				Total	Project - based	Tenant - based	Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Family Unification Program	
# Homeless at admission	0	0	0	3	2	1	0	0	
# of Elderly Program Participants (>62)	0	0	1,113	1,941	180	1,761	0	0	
# of Disabled Families	0	0	718	3,798	177	3,620	0	0	
# of Families requesting accessibility features	0	0	2,647	10,912	984	9,927	0	0	
# of HIV/AIDS program participants	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Program Type								
	Certificate	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Vouchers				
				Total	Project - based	Tenant - based	Special Purpose Voucher	
							Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Family Unification Program
# of DV victims	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 23 – Characteristics of Public Housing Residents by Program Type

Data Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)

Race of Residents

Program Type									
Race	Certificate	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Vouchers					
				Total	Project - based	Tenant - based	Special Purpose Voucher		
							Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Family Unification Program	Disabled *
White	0	0	1,601	5,457	537	4,920	0	0	0
Black/African American	0	0	585	4,337	254	4,082	0	0	0
Asian	0	0	396	682	161	521	0	0	0
American Indian/Alaska Native	0	0	44	194	16	178	0	0	0
Pacific Islander	0	0	21	229	16	213	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	13	0	13	0	0	0

***includes Non-Elderly Disabled, Mainstream One-Year, Mainstream Five-year, and Nursing Home Transition**

Table 24 – Race of Public Housing Residents by Program Type

Data Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)

Ethnicity of Residents

Ethnicity	Program Type								
	Certificate	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Vouchers			Special Purpose Voucher		
				Total	Project - based	Tenant - based	Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Family Unification Program	Disabled *
Hispanic	0	0	117	552	82	470	0	0	0
Not Hispanic	0	0	2,530	10,347	902	9,444	0	0	0
*includes Non-Elderly Disabled, Mainstream One-Year, Mainstream Five-year, and Nursing Home Transition									

Table 25 – Ethnicity of Public Housing Residents by Program Type

Data Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)

Section 504 Needs Assessment: Describe the needs of public housing tenants and applicants on the waiting list for accessible units:

The housing authorities do not maintain a separate waiting list for accessible units, however, the needs of tenants and applicants for accessible units are similar to the needs of the other applicants on the waiting list. KCHA and RHA are in compliance with Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act. Unit conversions completed at targeted developments will ensure that at least five percent of the public housing inventory is fully accessible to persons with disabilities.

What are the number and type of families on the waiting lists for public housing and section 8 tenant-based rental assistance? Based on the information above, and any other information available to the jurisdiction, what are the most immediate needs of residents of public housing and Housing Choice voucher holders?

There is a high need for more project based Section 8 units and tenant held vouchers. The needs of public housing residents and voucher holders are reflected in the KCHA's strategic plan and focus on broad themes: expanding and preserving the region's supply of affordable housing, promoting housing choice, and increasing self-sufficiency.

King County has four Public Housing Authorities. The two addressed in this plan are the King County Housing Authority (KCHA) and the Renton Housing Authority (RHA). The other two housing authorities are the Seattle Housing Authority and the Muckleshoot Housing Authority and they report through the Seattle Consolidated Plan and through HUD Tribal Designated Housing Entities respectively. The combined Section 8 waiting list for KCHA and Renton Housing Authority is 4,565 households.

KCHA uses the flexibility of the Moving to Work (MTW) demonstration program to develop innovative solutions. They increased self-sufficiency with place based initiatives in partnership with local school districts Kent, Highline and Bellevue. KCHA place-based educational initiatives involve parents, children, schools and partner agencies pursuing the common goal of starting early to help children succeed in school. This fosters school stability which supports school success.

How do these needs compare to the housing needs of the population at large

The housing authorities serve more vulnerable populations in our community, compared to the population at large. The households served are more likely to suffer a chronic disease, be disabled, very low income, more likely to be unemployed, and earn less when they do have a job.

NA-40 Homeless Needs Assessment - 91.405, 91.205 (c)

Introduction:



Information for the homeless needs assessment came from three sources; 1) 2014 Point-in-Time Count, conducted on the morning of January 24, 2014; 2) Safe Harbors-HMIS system for the local Continuum of Care; and 3) the Committee to End Homelessness Strategic Plan. The 2014 homeless count was higher than the 2013 count and this trend is consistent with the results of the statewide count. The King County Continuum of Care housing stock ranks third in the nation and this system includes emergency shelter, transitional housing, rapid re-housing, and permanent housing with supports.

If data is not available for the categories "number of persons becoming and exiting homelessness each year," and "number of days that persons experience homelessness," describe these categories for each homeless population type (including chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their families, and unaccompanied youth):

The following table reflects data collected in the 2014 Point in Time Count and from the 2014 HMIS report. The 2014 homeless count was higher than the 2013 count and this trend is consistent with the results of the statewide count.

Population	Estimate of persons experiencing homelessness on a given night		Estimate the # experiencing homelessness each year	Estimate the # becoming homeless each year	Estimate the # exiting homelessness each year	Estimate the # of days persons experience homelessness
	Sheltered	Unsheltered				
Persons in Households with Adults and Children	2,920	20	8,820	4,410	1,752	390
Persons in Households with Only Children	29	24	265	130	16	410
Persons in Households with Only Adults	3,264	3,099	19,089	9,545	584	190
Chronically Homeless Individuals	514	507	2,000	N/A	715	580
Chronically Homeless Families	4	0	12	6	8	400
Veterans	592	128	1,620	900	715	715
Unaccompanied child	23	24	125	60	45	190
Persons with HIV	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	

Table 26 - Homeless Needs Assessment

Nature and Extent of Homelessness:

Race:	Sheltered:
White	2,133
Black or African American	2,191
Asian	163
American Indian or Alaska Native	161
Pacific Islander	156
Ethnicity:	Sheltered:
Hispanic	613

Estimate the number and type of families in need of housing assistance for families with children and the families of veterans.

Families experiencing homelessness have extremely low incomes. Most families experiencing homelessness are not homeless long-term. Local data indicated approximately 70 percent of families report that this was their only episode of homelessness in the past three years. Compared with single individuals experiencing homelessness, adult members of homeless families are much less likely to have mental health and substance abuse problems, are more likely to have completed high school, more likely to have recently worked, and more likely to have regular contact with members of their social network.

- Local data show that people of color are overrepresented in the homeless family population served in shelter.
- Around one third are young parents (age 25 or under) and around half of those are between 18-21 years old.
- Domestic violence is common among homeless families. It is not only a leading cause of homelessness for women. The effects of violence in the home severely impact every aspect of stability for both children and parents.
- Refugee and immigrant families are being seen in increasing numbers. They have many issues that affect their housing stability, including limited English proficiency, lack of documentation, medical issues and lack of formal education.

Formerly homeless families receiving RRH and nearing program exit exhibit the following needs; they are extremely low incomes and moderately to severely cost burdened. In many cases, these families struggle with behavioral health needs that impact their housing and family stability. As our homeless system is encouraged to focus more on RRH and housing first, and housing-focused strategies, we will rely more and more on mainstream services for other family stability needs.

Describe the Nature and Extent of Homelessness by Racial and Ethnic Group.

The Committee to End Homelessness King County 2013 Annual Report states that homelessness disproportionately impacts people of color. Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islanders are three times more likely to be homeless. African Americans are six times more likely to be homeless. Native Americans/Alaska Natives are seven times more likely to be homeless.

Describe the Nature and Extent of Unsheltered and Sheltered Homelessness.

During the 2014 One Night Count of People who are Homeless in King County, approximately 9,300 people were homeless on the streets, in shelters, and in transitional housing programs.

Of the 9,300 people who were homeless, about 3,123 people were found unsheltered and 6,171 people were in shelters or transitional housing.

Discussion: Youth and Young Adults

On the night of January 21, 2015, 824 YYA, ages 12-25, were homeless or unstably housed, based on data from HMIS and Count Us In surveys. A consistent profile of young people experiencing homelessness or housing instability is emerging as we compare count results from year to year. Twelve percent of young people are under the age of 18 and 22 percent are LGBTQ – identical to the 2014 count. Remarkably consistent to previous years are the percentages of African American/Black young people – 34percent, and Hispanic young people – 13 percent. This stability in Count Us In demographic results adds confidence to our understanding of the population of young people and their needs. See *Count Us In 2015* report for the point in time count for homeless and unstably housing young people.

NA-45 Non-Homeless Special Needs Assessment - 91.405, 91.205 (b,d)

Introduction

The Consortium and King County fund programs and services to assist the most vulnerable members of our community, including programs for children, youth and young adults, seniors, survivors of domestic violence, persons with developmental disabilities, and veterans returning home and rebuilding their lives. The Consortium supports and maintains vital communities, families, and individuals. Services provided, in addition to the housing and community development needs specifically addressed in this plan, include employment and education resources, the King County Veterans Program, assistance to residents with developmental disabilities and their families, the Child Welfare Early Learning Partnership, and employment. The Mental Health, Chemical Abuse and Dependency Services Division provides direct services for crisis outreach and investigation for involuntary commitment, mental health client services, authorizations to care, and outreach and triage on the streets for people incapacitated by alcohol or drugs.

Describe the characteristics of special needs populations in your community:

In 2014 the King County Regional Support Network (RSN) served 44,615 unduplicated clients, which is an increase of eight from 2013. Twenty-seven percent of the RSN clients were children. Just under half of RSN clients are people of color. The proportion of non-Medicaid clients has dropped six percent in 2014, and this is attributed to the expansion of Medicaid coverage under the Affordable Care Act.

What are the housing and supportive service needs of these populations and how are these needs determined?

The needs for persons with special needs are determined through a network of agencies, service providers, and parallel planning efforts targeting specific populations. Generally persons with special needs have lower incomes and need a housing subsidy either through a Section 8 voucher or some form of affordable housing. The Consortium has a continuum of supportive services, particularly available to residents who live in affordable housing. One approach to addressing service needs, for example health care, is to co-locate housing with health care delivery systems. Universal design principles facilitate aging in place and adapt for changing household conformation, which is especially important for senior housing.

Discuss the size and characteristics of the population with HIV/AIDS and their families within the Eligible Metropolitan Statistical Area:

The City of Seattle is the designated Housing Opportunities for Persons With Aids (HOPWA) grant entitlement recipient for the region. Seattle reports that in King County there are about 6,700 residents living with HIV or AIDS, and they represent only the reported cases that have been diagnosed. There are an estimated addition 7,200 – 7,800 people who are living with HIV but may be unaware of their status.

Discussion:

In King County, HIV and AIDS disproportionately affect African Americans and foreign born black immigrants. Public Health – Seattle & King County reports that clients living with HIV/AIDS need housing assistance to maintain their current housing.

NA-50 Non-Housing Community Development Needs - 91.415, 91.215 (f)NA-50 Non-Housing Community Development Needs - 91.415, 91.215 (f)

Describe the jurisdiction's need for Public Facilities and Public Improvement:

The King County Consortium annually addresses needs and priorities for public facilities and public improvements for the following year. Guided by the Consolidated Plan, Consortium members authorize ranking systems and types of projects such as but not limited to: sidewalks, sewers, parks, community facility buildings, along with evaluating economic development needs.

During the Request for Proposal process, applicants submit Capital Improvement Plans and/or Capital Needs Assessments and project proformas to indicate how the selected eligible activities have been prioritized by the applicant members and citizens.

How were these needs determined?

At the four sub-regional public forums inviting input, comments and sharing of ideas for the jurisdiction's need for public facilities and public improvements, community members and representatives of jurisdictions and stakeholders provided comments and suggestions on community maps. A survey was available at the forums as well as an online survey that was posted from September 3, 2014 to October 20, 2014 .Results were tabulated and informed priorities identified in the Strategic Plan.

King County Community Development staff coordinates with CDBG Consortium city members through its annual consortium-wide meeting and sub-region monthly meetings. Topics focus on the ongoing programs that the cities and nonprofit agencies administer through funding sources sponsored by the County, Cities, and State. Coordinated contracting and shared information brought before various city councils, help to identify emerging needs and success of current programs. Community Development staff attend meetings convened by nonprofit networks. One activity that helps in identifying needs in the communities is the annual preapplication process for the CDBG Capital Non-Housing allocation held before the official request for proposal is released.

Describe the jurisdiction's need for Public Services:

The most common need for Public Services has been identified by the CoC efforts to end homelessness. Services include homelessness prevention through the Housing Stability Program, Rapid Re-housing, shelters, the Landlord Liaison Program, and shelter diversion. In the planning process the Regular Consortium members (excluding the Joint Agreement Cities of Kirkland, Redmond, Renton, and Shoreline) decided to direct emergency services funds to activities serving homeless populations.

The Homeless Housing Program in Housing and Community Development plays a major part in leading the Consortium in identifying public service needs through its allocation processes and ongoing programs.

For King County Housing and Community Development, an important strategy in pursuing Equity and Social Justice is support and funding for Microenterprise programs in South King County. The Microenterprise programs have specific non-English speaking and immigrant outreach components designed to meet the entrepreneurial needs of King County's most diverse area.

How were these needs determined?

Public services needs were determined through the four subregion public community forums, stakeholder meetings with consortium partners, including human services planners, and through ongoing collaboration with CEH.

Housing Market Analysis

MA-05 Overview

Housing Market Analysis Overview:

Home sales have continued to recover in 2014, after a significant decline in prices during the recession. Prices are almost at pre-recession levels. The housing supply is tight, both for sale and the rental inventory, creating high demand. This high demand continues to put upward pressure on prices. Along with a surge in multi-family rental development and high absorption rates, the need for affordable rental homes far outstrips the supply of subsidized housing.

MA-10 Housing Market Analysis: Number of Housing Units - 91.410, 91.210(a)&(b)(2)

Introduction

All residential properties by number of units (not including Seattle)

Property Type	Number	%
1-unit detached structure	335,791	61%
1-unit, attached structure	23,389	4%
2-4 units	31,883	6%
5-19 units	75,799	14%
20 or more units	62,131	11%
Mobile Home, boat, RV, van, etc.	17,283	3%
Total	546,276	100%

Table 277 – Residential Properties by Unit Number

Data Source: 2007-2011 ACS

Unit Size by Tenure

	Owners		Renters	
	Number	%	Number	%
No bedroom	764	0%	6,379	4%
1 bedroom	7,940	2%	49,966	29%
2 bedrooms	53,415	16%	73,680	42%
3 or more bedrooms	277,081	82%	44,490	25%
Total	339,200	100%	174,515	100%

Table 28 – Unit Size by Tenure

Data Source: 2007-2011 ACS

Describe the number and targeting (income level/type of family served) of units assisted with federal, state, and local programs.

The King County Consortium has 10,300 units in the portfolio available to serve low income and special needs populations, as of the end of 2014. More than three quarters of these units serve households with income at or below 50 percent of area median income. To the extent possible projects will serve households with extremely low incomes, persons who are homeless, and persons with disabilities. Approximately 250 units will be added each year by leveraging a wide variety of public and private resources. The units added will serve populations consistent with the priorities identified in the Strategic Plan portion of this plan.

Provide an assessment of units expected to be lost from the affordable housing inventory for any reason, such as expiration of Section 8 contracts.

According to the State of Washington Housing Needs Assessment, there are approximately 2,000 subsidized units with Section 8 contracts which are scheduled to expire by 2017. Preserving existing affordable housing stock and subsidized inventory is a high priority. Preserving expiring Section 8 projects is a high priority. As redevelopment occurs more affordable units are lost.

Does the availability of housing units meet the needs of the population?

There is an adequate supply for households with incomes at or above 80% of AMI. The multifamily market has rebounded from the recession and is almost producing at 2006 levels. There is a need for additional units for households with incomes at or below 50 percent of AMI with the greatest need at the lowest income levels, at or below 30 percent of AMI.

Describe the need for specific types of housing:

The need for additional units of housing affordable to households with incomes at or below 50 percent of AMI ranges depending upon the metrics used to determine need. In all of King County at the 30 percent of AMI income level, there are approximately 48,000 severely cost burdened households, while at the 30 to 50 percent AMI income level there are approximately 14,000 severely cost burdened households. Severe cost burden is defined as paying more than half of income for housing.

Discussion

When discussing the need for additional affordable rental units, it's important to consider the whole spectrum of community indicators, including opportunities for health, education, employment, and access to transit.

MA-15 Housing Market Analysis: Cost of Housing - 91.410, 91.210(a)

Introduction

Cost of Housing

Home Values and Rents	Base Year: 2000	2014	% Change
Median Home Value	279,950	429,900	54%
Median Contract Rent	819	1,304	59%

Table 29 – Cost of Housing

Data Source: Northwest Multiple Listing Services, Dupre & Scott Apartment Advisors

Rent Paid	Number
Less than \$500	16,718
\$500-999	79,992
\$1,000-1,499	52,953
\$1,500-1,999	17,390
\$2,000 or more	7,462
Total	174,515

Table 30 - Rent Paid

Data Source: 2007-2011 ACS

Affordable rent for households earning at or below 50 percent of AMI ranges from \$463 to \$990 per month.

Housing Affordability

% Units affordable to Households earning	Renter	Owner
30% HAMFI	14,219	No Data
50% HAMFI	39,720	17,752
80% HAMFI	76,308	17,964
100% HAMFI	44,554	37,588
More than 100% HAMFI		247,042
	174,801	320,346

Table 31 – Housing Affordability

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

Monthly Rent

Monthly Rent (\$)	Efficiency (no bedroom)	1 Bedroom	2 Bedroom	3 Bedroom	4 Bedroom
Fair Market Rent	771	913	1,123	1,655	1,989
High HOME Rent	791	923	1,128	1,457	1,606
Low HOME Rent	772	827	992	1,146	1,280

Table 32 – Monthly Rent

Data Source: 2014 HUD FMR and HOME Rents

Is there sufficient housing for households at all income levels?

There is a shortage of housing affordable to households with incomes at or below 50% AMI. Over half of the households in this income band are rent burdened.

How is affordability of housing likely to change considering changes to home values and/or rents?

Housing costs and rents are soaring in King County. This puts pressure on lower income individuals and families as demand increases for affordable housing.


How do HOME rents / Fair Market Rent compare to Area Median Rent? How might this impact your strategy to produce or preserve affordable housing?

The Consortium will charge the lesser of HOME rents or fair market rents. Contracts with HOME Program funds, executed in the last ten years, set HOME rents at the low HOME rent level, and this avoids conflicts with rent levels and fair market rents. For all jurisdictions in King County the fair market rent is above a 50% AMI rent level. The King County Housing Authority has a flexible payment standard to make housing choice an option households with a tenant held Section 8 voucher.

Discussion

The Average Apartment Rent Trend graph illustrates the change in rents for a one bedroom unit from March 2004 to March 2014 for sub-regions in King County, Snohomish County, and Pierce County. Also overlaid on the graph are the affordable rents for the 30 percent, 50 percent, and 80 percent affordable rent for King County during the same periods.

Average Apartment Rent Trend



Source: Average Apartment Rent from Dupre & Scott and Affordable Rent based on AMI from HUD.

MA-20 Housing Market Analysis: Condition of Housing - 91.410, 91.210(a)

Introduction

Describe the jurisdiction's definition for "substandard condition" and "substandard condition but suitable for rehabilitation":

Standard condition: A standard housing unit meets HUD Housing Quality Standards and state and local codes. This includes complete plumbing and adequate kitchen facilities.

Substandard condition: A substandard housing unit is defined as housing that does not meeting state and local building code; fire; health; and safety codes; presents health and safety issues to occupants; and rehabilitation is not structurally and financially feasible.

Substandard condition but suitable for rehabilitation: The unit(s) is in poor condition and it is both structurally and financially feasible to rehabilitate.

Condition of Units

Condition of Units	Owner-Occupied		Renter-Occupied	
	Number	%	Number	%
With one selected Condition	114,432	34%	74,153	42%
With two selected Conditions	2,187	1%	6,871	4%
With three selected Conditions	120	0%	558	0%
With four selected Conditions	31	0%	23	0%
No selected Conditions	222,430	65%	92,910	53%
Total	339,200	100%	174,515	100%

Table 33 - Condition of Units

Data Source: 2007-2011 ACS

Year Unit Built

Year Unit Built	Owner-Occupied		Renter-Occupied	
	Number	%	Number	%
2000 or later	46,334	15%	22,271	13%
1980-1999	109,207	35%	67,676	40%
1950-1979	106,209	34%	57,319	34%
1940-1959	26,605	13%	16,977	10%
1939 and earlier	12,195	4%	5,267	3%
Total	339,200	100%	174,515	100%

Table 34 – Year Unit Built

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

Risk of Hazard

Risk of Lead-Based Paint Hazard	Owner-Occupied		Renter-Occupied	
	Number	%	Number	%
Total Number of Units Built Before 1980	169,351	50%	81,630	47%

Risk of Lead-Based Paint Hazard	Owner-Occupied		Renter-Occupied	
	Number	%	Number	%
Housing Units build before 1980 with children age six or younger present	32,325	10%	17,642	10%


Table 35 – Risk of Lead-Based Paint

Data Source: 2007-2011 ACS (Total Units) 2007-2011 CHAS (Units with Children present)

Vacant Units

Information on vacant, abandoned vacant, bank owned and abandoned bank owned property is not readily available. The Consortium does not have an extreme problem with abandoned or vacant units. The market for owner and rental units is strong with vacancy rates for single and multi-family rentals at about 5 percent. This accounts for normal activities to re-rent units when tenants move out and translates to an almost net zero vacancy rate. The owner market has record low inventories of homes available for sale, and at this time, sellers report receiving multiple offers and buyers make decisions regarding engaging in bidding competitions with other buyers.

The following chart, prepared by the King County Office of Economic and Financial Analysis details activity from 2006 to 2014 for Foreclosures in the County. The foreclosure chart shows peak activity in 2011, with a mini peak in 2013, and sustained decline through 2014.



Describe the need for owner and rental rehabilitation based on the condition of the jurisdiction's housing.

There is a high need for homeowner rehabilitation through the Consortium. King County and partner jurisdictions have a Housing Repair Program for low income homeowners. Many of the participants in this program are seniors, aging in place in their homes. Most of the repairs made by the Housing Repair Program are of an urgent nature, such as roof replacements, furnace replacements, and plumbing repairs. The Housing Repair Program is helping to keep this housing stock safe and sanitary. The King County Housing Finance Program has a rental rehabilitation program for properties in the affordable portfolio, but there is not a rental rehabilitation program for other housing. The exception to this is the Housing Repair Housing Access Modification Program for renters with mobility challenges.

The affordable rental housing portfolio is reaching a point of maturity where housing projects placed in service in the 1990's and early 2000's are in need of lifecycle capital improvements, and this is addressed in the Strategic Plan.

Estimate the number of housing units within the jurisdiction that are occupied by low or moderate income families that contain lead-based paint hazards. 91.205(e), 91.405

Approximately half of the housing units in King County were constructed before 1978 with potential lead paint hazard. Children are present in approximately 36,000 housing units in King County constructed prior to 1980 with potential lead paint hazards. We estimate that 20,500 housing units with potential lead based paint hazards are occupied by low or moderate income families. In 2012 there were 6,183 children in King County under the age of 15 were screened for lead poisoning, with the vast majority of children screened under the age of five. Of the children screened, 142 had blood lead levels over 5mcg/dl. In 2013 there were 137 children under the age of 15 with elevated blood lead levels.

Discussion

The housing issues are related to access and the cost of housing. With a real estate market at pre-recession prices and a limited inventory, there is not a major problem with vacant and abandoned properties.

MA-25 Public And Assisted Housing - 91.410, 91.210(b)

Introduction

Totals Number of Units

	Program Type								
	Certificate	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Vouchers					
				Total	Project-based	Tenant-based	Special Purpose Voucher		
							Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Family Unification Program	Disabled *
# of units vouchers available	0	0	3,204	7,974	883	6,776	1,127	0	5,100
*includes Non-Elderly Disabled, Mainstream One-Year, Mainstream Five-year, and Nursing Home Transition									

Table 37 – Total Number of Units by Program Type

Data Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)

Describe the supply of public housing developments:

The King County and Renton Housing Authorities have a combined total of 137 Public Housing projects and 8,078 units.

Describe the number and physical condition of public housing units in the jurisdiction, including those that are participating in an approved Public Housing Agency Plan:

The Consortium Consolidated Plan addresses two housing authorities, the King County Housing Authority (KCHA) and the Renton Housing Authority (RHA). Both housing authorities have proactive and successful maintenance staff and programs to protect the housing stock. The King County Housing Authority is one of 39 housing authorities nationwide selected to be a Moving To Work demonstration program.

Public Housing Condition

Public Housing Development	Average Inspection Score
King County Housing Authority	94%
Renton Housing Authority	93%

Table 28 - Public Housing Condition

Describe the restoration and revitalization needs of public housing units in the jurisdiction:

The King County Housing Authority has embarked upon an ambitious plan to preserve privately owned properties with expiring Section 8 contracts.

The Renton Housing Authority and the City of Renton have a vision for the Sunset Area Community Revitalization and Sunset Terrace Redevelopment. This starts with the redevelopment of 100 units of distressed public housing units and their replacement with higher density and quality, sustainable housing that will be a catalyst for new private housing and business investment in the 269-acre Sunset Area neighborhood. The plan seeks to leverage public investment to catalyze private property development and create opportunities for market-rate and affordable housing, plus retail investment. The following Sunset Area Community Revitalization improvements will benefit the entire community:

- “Complete Streets” upgrades
- Improvements to storm water drainage systems
- New and rehabilitated parks and recreational facilities
- New public library
- New childhood early learning center
- Better connection to support services for public housing residents
- Sustainable infrastructure
- Bike and walking paths
- Mixed income and higher density housing.

The King County Housing Authority joined with the Renton Housing Authority and the City of Renton to submit a Choice Neighborhoods Initiative Application to HUD in 2015 for the Sunset Area Transformation Plan.

Describe the public housing agency's strategy for improving the living environment of low- and moderate-income families residing in public housing:


KCHA has a number of programs designed to improve the living environment of residents. Place-based initiatives in partnership with local school districts in neighborhoods with significant KCHA housing inventory; housing choice and mobility counseling, new housing and classroom stability counseling. Education initiatives include the Race to the Top program that leveraged \$40 million in new federal funding into the region and included focused attention on the schools in the center of KCHA’s place-based initiatives.

A second educational pilot program made possible through MTW utilizes a rapid rehousing initiative for homeless students Working with the Highline School District which reported 917 homeless children during the 2012-2013 school year, they developed an initiative to identify


and rapidly rehouse the families of homeless students. A partner agency, Neighborhood House, helps connect families to counseling, employment and other services that will assist him to be successful in retaining their housing.

Discussion:

Both the King County Housing Authority and the Renton Housing Authority participate in planning and coordination efforts with public funders, the Housing Development Consortium of Seattle-King County, CEH and jurisdiction partners. The King County Housing Authority is completing the market rate homeownership component of a successful Hope VI redevelopment initiative in White Center. The Renton Housing Authority has launched a revitalization effort at Sunset Terrace. Both initiatives replace aging affordable housing stock with mixed income, in higher density developments, in walkable neighborhoods. The following pages show the KCHA housing inventory and the RHA Sunset Terrace redevelopment plan.



Complete Streets Concepts



Sunset Boulevard / SR 900 - State Highway

Sunset Lane - Residential Street

Sunset Area Community Vision

Developed by the public and adopted by the Renton City Council.

- The Sunset Area is a destination for the rest of the city and beyond
- The neighbors and businesses here are engaged and involved in the community
- Neighborhood places are interconnected and walkable
- The neighborhood feels safe and secure
- Neighborhood growth and development is managed in a way that preserves quality of life
- The neighborhood is an attractive place to live and conduct business
- The neighborhood is affordable to many incomes
- The neighborhood celebrates cultural and ethnic diversity

Community Need for Revitalization

Revitalization is needed to improve housing, social, educational, employment, and health outcomes for the residents of this area.

- 27% of households live in poverty
- Average income is \$17,000 less than the city as a whole
- 75% of the students at the neighborhood elementary school qualify for free or reduced lunch
- Violent crime rate is 2.5 times higher than the city as a whole
- 35% of the students at the neighborhood elementary school have limited English proficiency
- 70% of neighborhood housing is substandard, based on King County Assessor's records
- Homeownership has dropped below 40%, compared to 55% in the city as a whole
- Area identified by King County Public Health as high potential for indoor air hazards such as mold, lead based paints, and asbestos

"Altogether, we believe the City of Renton has developed a Planned Action that should achieve the FEIS's predicted long-term benefits - neighborhood revitalization, increased opportunities for healthy active lifestyles and local employment, net stormwater treatment improvements, increased aesthetic appeal, and, reductions in regional energy use and GHG emissions. We support full implementation of this Planned Action and look forward to learning from the City of Renton's efforts to redevelop the Sunset Area into a healthy, livable, affordable, viable and green community."

Christine B. Reichgott, Unit Manager,
Environmental Review and Sediment Management Unit,
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

rentonwa.gov/sunsetarea



Sunset Area Community Revitalization

OVERVIEW

Fall 2014

rentonwa.gov/sunsetarea

Investing in Housing • Jobs • Education • Health • Environment • Transportation

Summary

The Sunset Area Community Revitalization Program will leverage public investment to catalyze private property development and create opportunities for market-rate and affordable housing, plus retail investment. Planned improvements will benefit the entire community.

- Complete Streets upgrades to NE Sunset Boulevard and other local streets (see back page)
- Improvements to stormwater drainage systems
- New and rehabilitated parks and recreation facilities
- New public library
- New early childhood learning center
- Better connections to support services for public housing residents
- Sustainable infrastructure
- Bike and walking paths
- Sunset Terrace public housing will redevelop to include new residential units with a mix of public, affordable, and market-rate homes
- Potential capacity for an additional 2,300 new dwelling units and 1.25 million square feet of service/retail space in the 269-acre neighborhood over the next 20 years



Kirkland Avenue Townhomes



Renton Highlands Library

Partnerships

We have formed public and private partnerships to generate investment in facilities and infrastructure that will support a vibrant and highly livable community. Additional partnerships are desired.



MA-30 Homeless Facilities and Services - 91.410, 91.210(c)

Introduction

The local CoC, The Committee to End Homelessness (CEH) was formed in 2005, and is a growing, strong, and compassionate coalition of stakeholders committed to making homelessness rare, brief, and one time in King County. CEH believes that through collective action government, philanthropic organizations, faith-based groups, nonprofits and individual community advocates can make an immediate and lasting impact.

Facilities Targeted to Homeless Persons in 2014

	Emergency Shelter Beds		Transitional Housing Beds	Permanent Supportive Housing Beds	
	Year Round Beds (Current & New)	Voucher / Seasonal / Overflow Beds	Current & New	Current & New	Under Development
Households with Adult(s) and Child(ren)	563	0	1,147	56	0
Households with Only Adults	1,796	150	821	2,683	262
Chronically Homeless Households	0	0	0	1,522	153
Veterans	65	0	178	386	48
Unaccompanied Youth	102	0	123	0	0

Table 39 - Facilities Targeted to Homeless Persons

Describe mainstream services, such as health, mental health, and employment services to the extent those services are used to complement services targeted to homeless persons

Apple Health is a Washington State Medicaid program. King County Public Health and DCHS engaged in vibrant efforts to help enroll people who became eligible for Medicaid with the eligible expansion through the Affordable Care Act. The Consortium and other partners are working with Washington State leadership to create a Medicaid Supportive Housing Benefit to allow Medicaid to pay for intensive services in permanent supportive housing for individuals who are chronically homeless. This will help to expand the capacity to house chronically homeless persons.

Within the King County Department of Community and Human Services (DCHS) there is extensive cross-coordination regarding services to homeless persons between the housing programs, the mental health programs, which administer public mental health services through the Regional Support Network, substance abuse service programs and workforce/employment programs. DCHS also coordinates with the Public Health Department regarding homeless services, and all of these King County agencies maintain a working relationship with the Committee to End Homelessness. DCHS is actively involved in migrating to a streamlined behavioral health integration system, which will allow clients to access mental health, substance abuse and physical health services in a much more holistic manner.

The Health Care for the Homeless Network (HCHN), a program of the Public Health Department, provides quality, comprehensive health care for people experiencing homelessness in King County and provides leadership to help change the conditions that deprive our neighbors of home and health. HCHN collaborates with twelve community-based partner agencies who work with homeless people in over 60 locations throughout King County. Examples of sites served include shelters, day centers, transitional housing programs, and clinics and outreach programs. Interdisciplinary, interagency HCHN teams provide a broad range of medical, mental health, substance abuse, case management, and health access services for homeless adults, families, and youth.

The Housing Health Outreach Team, another program of the Public Health Department, provides chemical dependency counselors, mental health specialists, nurses and physicians to residents in permanent supportive housing projects.

Career Connections is a workforce development program in DCHS designed to complement our region's Rapid Re-housing programs, and to support Veterans and their families. Services are also offered to paroled offenders, and to some households identified as being in high need of human services. Clients are accepted by referral from partner housing agencies that provide affordable housing. The goal of the Career Connections program is to promote self-sufficiency for its participants by providing job training and job search assistance in an effort to raise client

incomes sufficiently to support their household in the same residence after their subsidy expires.

List and describe services and facilities that meet the needs of homeless persons, particularly chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their families, and unaccompanied youth. If the services and facilities are listed on screen SP-40 Institutional Delivery Structure or screen MA-35 Special Needs Facilities and Services, describe how these facilities and services specifically address the needs of these populations.

The tables on the following pages list the facilities for homeless and special needs populations.

The following table is a list of permanent supportive housing in King County.

Project Type	Organization Name	Project Name
Permanent Supportive Housing	Sound Mental Health	Homestead Family Housing
Permanent Supportive Housing	Valley Cities Counseling and Consultation	Families First
Permanent Supportive Housing	KITH	Petter Court Permanent Supportive Housing
Permanent Supportive Housing	Sound Mental Health	Homestead Family Housing
Permanent Supportive Housing	Valley Cities Counseling and Consultation	Families First
Permanent Supportive Housing	Valley Cities Counseling and Consultation	Pathways First
Permanent Supportive Housing	Wellspring Family Services	Hope through Housing
Permanent Supportive Housing	Seattle Housing Authority	VASH
Permanent Supportive Housing	King County / Plymouth Housing Group (PHG)	Shelter Plus Care
Permanent Supportive Housing	Compass Housing Alliance	VASH - Renton Regional Veterans Program
Permanent Supportive Housing	King County Housing Authority	VASH
Permanent Supportive Housing	King County Housing Authority	VASH - Francis Village
Permanent Supportive Housing	Valley Cities Counseling and Consultation	Coming Up
Permanent Supportive Housing	Valley Cities Counseling and Consultation	Homeless Services Enhancement Program
Permanent Supportive Housing	Archdiocesan Housing Authority (AHA)	Bakhita Gardens
Permanent Supportive Housing	Archdiocesan Housing Authority (AHA)	Dorothy Day
Permanent Supportive Housing	Archdiocesan Housing Authority (AHA)	Parke Studios (at the Josephinum)
Permanent Supportive Housing	Low Income Housing Institute (LIHI)	Broadway House
Permanent Supportive Housing	The Sophia Way	Sophia's Home
Permanent Supportive Housing	YWCA Seattle - King - Snohomish	Opportunity Place
Permanent Supportive Housing	Archdiocesan Housing Authority (AHA)	Frederic Ozanam House (Westlake 2)
Permanent Supportive Housing	Archdiocesan Housing Authority (AHA)	Westlake
Permanent Supportive Housing	Asian Counseling and Referral Services (ACRS)	The Beacon
Permanent Supportive Housing	Compass Housing Alliance	Nyer Urness House
Permanent Supportive Housing	Downtown Emergency Service Center (DESC)	Canaday House
Permanent Supportive Housing	Downtown Emergency Service Center (DESC)	Rainier Supportive Housing
Permanent Supportive Housing	LIHI / Sound Mental Health	McDermott Place
Permanent Supportive Housing	Plymouth Housing Group (PHG)	Simons Building (3rd and Blanchard)
Permanent Supportive Housing	Sound Mental Health	Kasota

Permanent Supportive Housing	Valley Cities Counseling and Consultation	Valley Cities Landing
Permanent Supportive Housing	Archdiocesan Housing Authority (AHA)	Wintonia
Permanent Supportive Housing	Avalon Way Mutual Housing	Avalon Way (Transitional Resources)
Permanent Supportive Housing	Catholic Community Services (CCS)	Patrick Place
Permanent Supportive Housing	Compass Housing Alliance	The Karlstrom
Permanent Supportive Housing	Downtown Emergency Service Center (DESC)	1811 Eastlake
Permanent Supportive Housing	Downtown Emergency Service Center (DESC)	Aurora Supportive Housing
Permanent Supportive Housing	Downtown Emergency Service Center (DESC)	Cottage Grove Apartments
Permanent Supportive Housing	Downtown Emergency Service Center (DESC)	Evans (415 10th)
Permanent Supportive Housing	Downtown Emergency Service Center (DESC)	Interbay Supportive Housing
Permanent Supportive Housing	Downtown Emergency Service Center (DESC)	Kerner Scott - Permanent Supportive Housing
Permanent Supportive Housing	Downtown Emergency Service Center (DESC)	Lyon Building
Permanent Supportive Housing	Downtown Emergency Service Center (DESC)	Morrison Hotel
Permanent Supportive Housing	Downtown Emergency Service Center (DESC)	Scattered Site for MI Adults
Permanent Supportive Housing	Downtown Emergency Service Center (DESC)	Union Hotel
Permanent Supportive Housing	Evergreen Treatment Services	REACH Respite Case Management
Permanent Supportive Housing	King County / Plymouth Housing Group	Shelter Plus Care - HIV
Permanent Supportive Housing	LIHI / Sound Mental Health	Gossett Place
Permanent Supportive Housing	Low Income Housing Institute (LIHI)	Frye Hotel
Permanent Supportive Housing	Plymouth Housing Group (PHG)	Cal Anderson House
Permanent Supportive Housing	Plymouth Housing Group (PHG)	David Colwell Building
Permanent Supportive Housing	Plymouth Housing Group (PHG)	Gatewood
Permanent Supportive Housing	Plymouth Housing Group (PHG)	Humphrey
Permanent Supportive Housing	Plymouth Housing Group (PHG)	Pacific Hotel
Permanent Supportive Housing	Plymouth Housing Group (PHG)	Plymouth on Stewart
Permanent Supportive Housing	Plymouth Housing Group (PHG)	Plymouth Place
Permanent Supportive Housing	Plymouth Housing Group (PHG)	Plymouth Place - HIV
Permanent Supportive Housing	Plymouth Housing Group (PHG)	Scargo
Permanent Supportive Housing	Plymouth Housing Group (PHG)	St. Charles
Permanent Supportive Housing	Plymouth Housing Group (PHG)	Williams Apartments
Permanent Supportive Housing	Solid Ground	P.G. Kenney Place
Permanent Supportive Housing	Sound Mental Health	Housing Voucher Program (Co-Star)
Permanent Supportive Housing	Sound Mental Health	Pacific Court
Permanent Supportive Housing	Sound Mental Health	South County Pilot

Permanent Supportive Housing	Transitional Resources	Avalon Place
Permanent Supportive Housing	LIHI / Sound Mental Health	VASH - McDermott Place
Permanent Supportive Housing	Archdiocesan Housing Authority (AHA)	Traugott Terrace
Permanent Supportive Housing	Asian Counseling and Referral Services (ACRS)	HOPES
Permanent Supportive Housing	CHHIP / Lifelong AIDS Alliance (LLAA)	Permanent Supportive Housing at CHHIP
Permanent Supportive Housing	Community Housing Mental Health	Leighton Apartments
Permanent Supportive Housing	Consejo Counseling and Referral	Las Brisas del Mar
Permanent Supportive Housing	Low Income Housing Institute (LIHI)	Ernestine Anderson Place
Permanent Supportive Housing	Low Income Housing Institute (LIHI)	Tyree Scott - Permanent Supportive Housing
Permanent Supportive Housing	Low Income Housing Institute (LIHI)	White River Gardens
Permanent Supportive Housing	Plymouth Housing Group (PHG)	Pacific Hotel - HIV
Permanent Supportive Housing	Sound Mental Health	Jordan House
Permanent Supportive Housing	Sound Mental Health	Kenyon Housing
Rapid Re-housing	Catholic Community Services (CCS)	CCS Rapid Re-housing Pilot
Rapid Re-housing	DAWN	DAWN Rapid Re-housing Pilot
Rapid Re-housing	El Centro de la Raza	Rapid Re-Housing
Rapid Re-housing	Solid Ground	Rapid Re-Housing Rental Assistance
Rapid Re-housing	YWCA Seattle - King - Snohomish	Rapid Re-Housing
Rapid Re-housing	Multiservice Center (MSC)	Rapid Re-Housing for Households without Children
Rapid Re-housing	Wellspring Family Services	Wellspring Rapid Re-housing Pilot

The following is a list of transitional housing projects in King County.

Project Type	Organization Name	Project Name
Transitional Housing	Development Association of Goodwill Baptist church	Aridell Mitchell
Transitional Housing	Friends of Youth Transitional Housing	New Ground – Sand Point (Harmony House)
Transitional Housing	Friends of Youth Transitional Housing	New Ground Transitional Housing
Transitional Housing	Kent Youth Transitional Housing and Family Services	Watson Manor (Kent)
Transitional Housing	Abused Deaf Women Advocacy Services (ADWAS)	A Place of Our Own - Transitional Housing
Transitional Housing	Archdiocesan Housing Transitional Housing (AHA)	Spruce Park Apartments
Transitional Housing	Transitional Housing Catholic Community Services (CCS)	Alder Crest
Transitional Housing	Transitional Housing Catholic Community Services (CCS)	FUSION
Transitional Housing	Transitional Housing Catholic Community Services (CCS)	FUSION
Transitional Housing	Transitional Housing Catholic Community Services (CCS)	Harrington House (Bellevue)
Transitional Housing	Community Psychiatric Clinic (CPC)	Transitional Housing Willows
Transitional Housing	Compass Housing Alliance	HomeStep
Transitional Housing	Compass Housing Alliance	Transitional Units
Transitional Housing	Consejo Counseling and Referral	Mi Casa
Transitional Housing	Consejo Counseling and Referral	Villa Esperanza
Transitional Housing	El Centro de la Raza	Rental Assistance
Transitional Housing	El Centro de la Raza	Ferdinand/Shelton Houses
Transitional Housing	Exodus Housing	Transitional Housing
Transitional Housing	First Place School	Housing Stabilization Program
Transitional Housing	Friends of Youth Transitional Housing	New Ground Avondale Park
Transitional Housing	Hopelink	Avondale Park II (Redmond)
Transitional Housing	Hopelink	Heritage Park/ Alpine Ridge
Transitional Housing	Hopelink	Hopelink Place
Transitional Housing	International District Housing Alliance	Solace Transitional at Samaki Commons
Transitional Housing	KITH Housing	Housing at Crossroads
Transitional Housing	KITH Housing	Petter Court Transitional
Transitional Housing	Lifewire	My Friend's Place
Transitional Housing	Lifewire	Transitional Housing Rental Assistance
Transitional Housing	Low Income Housing Institute (LIHI)	Cate Apartments
Transitional Housing	Low Income Housing Institute (LIHI)	Columbia Court
Transitional Housing	Low Income Housing Institute (LIHI)	Denny Park
Transitional Housing	Low Income Housing Institute (LIHI)	Meadowbrook View
Transitional Housing	Low Income Housing Institute (LIHI)	Tyree Scott - Transitional Housing
Transitional Housing	Multiservice Center (MSC)	Family Transitional Program - S. King county

Transitional Housing	Muslim Housing Services	Transitional Housing
Transitional Housing	Salvation Army	Hickman House
Transitional Housing	Solid Ground	Belehem House
Transitional Housing	Solid Ground	Broadview
Transitional Housing	Solid Ground	Rent Assistance at Journey Home
Transitional Housing	Solid Ground	SandPoint Family Program
Transitional Housing	St Stephen Housing Association	City Park Townhouses Transitional Housing (Auburn)
Transitional Housing	St Stephen Housing Association	Nike Manor Transitional Housing
Transitional Housing	Valley Cities Counseling and Consultation	Valley Cities Transitional Housing
Transitional Housing	Vine Maple Place	Vine Maple Place (Maple Valley
Transitional Housing	Vision House	Family Program (Renton)
Transitional Housing	Vision House	Jacob's Well
Transitional Housing	Way Back Inn	Transitional - scattered Site
Transitional Housing	Wellspring Family Services	Transitional Housing
Transitional Housing	YWCA Seattle - King - Snohomish	Anita Vista confidential
Transitional Housing	YWCA Seattle - King - Snohomish	Auburn Transitional Housing
Transitional Housing	YWCA Seattle - King - Snohomish	Central Area Transitional Housing
Transitional Housing	YWCA Seattle - King - Snohomish	Family Village - Case Managed Units
Transitional Housing	YWCA Seattle - King - Snohomish	Family Village (Redmond)
Transitional Housing	YWCA Seattle - King - Snohomish	Villa Capri
Transitional Housing	Acres of Diamonds	Transitional Housing (Duvall)
Transitional Housing	New Beginnings	Transitional Housing
Transitional Housing	Seattle's Union Gospel Mission	Son Rise House
Transitional Housing	Compass Housing Alliance	GPD - Renton Regional Veteran's Program
Transitional Housing	Low Income Housing Institute (LIHI)	GPD - Cate Apartments
Transitional Housing	Low Income Housing Institute (LIHI)	Martin Court
Transitional Housing	Salvation Army	Bridges to Housing
Transitional Housing	Transitional Housing Catholic Community Services	Transitional Housing Katherine's House
Transitional Housing	Catholic Community Services	Rita's House (Auburn)
Transitional Housing	Compass Housing Alliance	Cascade Women's Transitional
Transitional Housing	Compass Housing Alliance	Mary Witt House
Transitional Housing	Compass Housing Alliance	Rosa Parks House
Transitional Housing	Elizabeth Gregory Home	Maple Leaf House
Transitional Housing	Jubilee Women's Center	Jubilee House
Transitional Housing	Multiservice Center (MSC)	Titusville Station
Transitional Housing	Sojourner Place	Transitional Housing
Transitional Housing	Transitional Housing Sophia Way	Sophia Way
Transitional Housing	Catholic Community Services (CCS)	GPD Michael's Place
Transitional Housing	Compass Housing Alliance	Pioneer Square Men's Program
Transitional Housing	Salvation Army	GPD - Veterans Transitional Program

Transitional Housing	Vietnam Veterans Leadership Program (VVLP) / Compass Housing Alliance	Bennett House
Transitional Housing	Vietnam Veterans Leadership Program (VVLP) / Compass Housing Alliance	Burien
Transitional Housing	Auburn Youth Transitional Housing Resources	Severson House
Transitional Housing	Archdiocesan Housing Authority	Traugott Terrace
Transitional Housing	Bread of Life Mission	LifeChange
Transitional Housing	Catholic Community Services (CCS)	Native American House
Transitional Housing	Compass Housing Alliance	Cedar House
Transitional Housing	Compass Housing Alliance	Cesar Chavez House
Transitional Housing	Compass Housing Alliance	Magnolia House
Transitional Housing	Compass Housing Alliance	Miracle Manor
Transitional Housing	Compass Housing Alliance	Phinney House
Transitional Housing	Multiservice Center (MSC)	Men's Transitional Housing (Federal Way)
Transitional Housing	Salvation Army	William Boo Transitional Housing Center
Transitional Housing	Seattle's Union Gospel Mission	Men Ministry Recovery Program
Transitional Housing	Seattle's Union Gospel Mission	Riverton Place
Transitional Housing	United States Mission	Transitional Housing
Transitional Housing	Vision House	Men's Program (Boulevard Park)
Transitional Housing	Vision House	Men's Program (Carr Road House - Renton)
Transitional Housing	Compass Housing Alliance	GPD - Veterans Program (Shoreline)
Transitional Housing	Low Income Housing Institute (LIHI)	GPD - Arion Court
Transitional Housing	Pioneer Human Services	GPD - Mark Cooper House
Transitional Housing	Solid Ground	Santos Place
Transitional Housing	Community Psychiatric Clinic (CPC)	Cedar House
Transitional Housing	Compass Housing Alliance	Bryant House (YAIL)
Transitional Housing	Friends of Youth	New Ground Kirkland
Transitional Housing	United Indians of all Tribes	United Indians Youth Housing Home
Transitional Housing	Urban League of Seattle	MJ Harder House
Transitional Housing	YMCA	Step-Up
Transitional Housing	YMCA	YMCA Shared Homes
Transitional Housing	YMCA	Young Adults in Transition
Transitional Housing	Youth Housing Care	Home of Hope
Transitional Housing	Youth Housing Care	Passages (Sand Point)
Transitional Housing	Youth Housing Care	Ravenna House
Transitional Housing	Youth Housing Care	Straley House
Transitional Housing	Catholic Community Services (CCS)	Aloha Inn
Transitional Housing	Catholic Community Services (CCS)	First Nations Transitional Housing
Transitional Housing	Community Psychiatric Clinic (CPC)	El Rey
Transitional Housing	Compass Housing Alliance	Evanston House
Transitional Housing	Compass Housing Alliance	Othello House
Transitional Housing	Interaction Transition	Transitional Housing

Transitional Housing	Lifelong AIDS Alliance	Josephinum
Transitional Housing	Plymouth Transitional Housing Healing Communities	House of Healing
Transitional Housing	Youth Transitional Housing and Outreach Services	DOVE House
Transitional Housing	Youth Transitional Housing Care	Pathways Transitional Housing (Sand Point)

The following is a list of emergency shelters in King County

Proj. Type	Organization Name	Project Name
Emergency Shelters	Catholic Community Services (CCS)	Emergency Shelter Vouchers
Emergency Shelters	Hopelink	Avondale Park
Emergency Shelters	Hopelink	Kenmore Family Shelter
Emergency Shelters	Mamma's Hands	House of Hope I and II
Emergency Shelters	Multiservice Center (MSC)	MSC Family Shelter (Kent)
Emergency Shelters	Seattle's Union Gospel Mission	Emergency Family Shelter
Emergency Shelters	Solid Ground	Broadview Shelter
Emergency Shelters	Solid Ground	Family Shelter
Emergency Shelters	Solid Ground	Voucher Program
Emergency Shelters	Wellspring Family Service	Housing Service Emergency Shelters Intervention - Interim Housing
Emergency Shelters	YWCA Seattle - King - Snohomish	East Cherry
Emergency Shelters	YWCA Seattle - King - Snohomish	Holly Court Shelter Program
Emergency Shelters	YWCA Seattle - King - Snohomish	SIS Late Night Shelter
Emergency Shelters	YWCA Seattle - King - Snohomish	South King County Family Shelter
Emergency Shelters	Abused Deaf Women Advocacy Service (ADWAS)	A Place of Our Own - Emergency Shelters
Emergency Shelters	Catholic Community Services (CCS)	Sacred Heart
Emergency Shelters	DAWN	Confidential Shelter
Emergency Shelters	Lifewire	My Sister's Home
Emergency Shelters	Lifewire	Vouchers
Emergency Shelters	New Beginnings	Emergency Shelter
Emergency Shelters	Salvation Army	Catherine Booth House
Emergency Shelters	Seattle's Union Gospel Mission	Hope Place
Emergency Shelters	Seattle's Union Gospel Mission	Hope Place
Emergency Shelters	The Sophia Way	Eastside Winter Emergency Shelter Response Shelter - Women & Children
Emergency Shelters	YWCA Seattle - King - Snohomish	Women's Emergency Shelter Resource Center
Emergency Shelters	Archdiocese Housing Authority (AHA)	Noel House
Emergency Shelters	Archdiocese Housing Authority (AHA)	St. Mark's
Emergency Shelters	Catholic Community Service Emergency Shelters (CCS)	HOME for Women (Kent)
Emergency Shelters	Compass Housing Alliance	Hammond House
Emergency Shelters	Downtown Emergency Service Center	Kerner Scott Women's Shelter
Emergency Shelters	Hospitality House	Hospitality House (Burien)
Emergency Shelters	Salvation Army	Pike Street

Emergency Shelters	SHARE	Lakeview Methodist
Emergency Shelters	SHARE	University Lutheran
Emergency Shelters	The Sophia Way	The Sophia Way
Emergency Shelters	WHEEL	Frye Hotel - Winter Emergency Shelter Response
Emergency Shelters	WHEEL	Frye Hotel - Winter Shelter Response
Emergency Shelters	YWCA Seattle - King - Snohomish	Angeline Shelter
Emergency Shelters	Compass Housing Alliance	EH - Pioneer Square Men's Program
Emergency Shelters	Salvation Army	William Booth (lower level)
Emergency Shelters	Bread of Life Mission	Shelter
Emergency Shelters	Catholic Community Services (CCS)	ARISE (Renton)
Emergency Shelters	Catholic Community Services (CCS)	HOME Program (Kent)
Emergency Shelters	Catholic Community Services (CCS)	Reach Out (Federal Way)
Emergency Shelters	Catholic Community Services (CCS)	St. Martin de Porres
Emergency Shelters	Compass Housing Alliance	FASC / Operation NightWatch
Emergency Shelters	Compass Housing Alliance	First United Methodist Church
Emergency Shelters	Congregations for the Homeless	Congregations for the Homeless Shelter
Emergency Shelters	Congregations for the Homeless	Eastside Winter Emergency Shelter Response Shelter - Men
Emergency Shelters	Downtown Emergency Service Center (DESC)	Auxiliary Shelter
Emergency Shelters	Salvation Army	King County Admin Building - Winter Response
Emergency Shelters	Seattle's Union Gospel Mission	Extended Care
Emergency Shelters	Seattle's Union Gospel Mission	Union Gospel Mission
Emergency Shelters	Seattle's Union Gospel Mission	Phinney Ridge Winter Shelters
Emergency Shelters	SHARE	Bethany Lutheran
Emergency Shelters	SHARE	OFB / Downtowner
Emergency Shelters	SHARE	University Friends
Emergency Shelters	SHARE	Woodland Park UMC
Emergency Shelters	Auburn Youth Resources	Arcadia Shelter
Emergency Shelters	Friends of Youth	The Landing
Emergency Shelters	Shalom Zone Nonprofit Association	ROOTS Young Adult Shelter
Emergency Shelters	YouthCare	Orion Shelter
Emergency Shelters	Catholic Community Services (CCS)	HEN Emergency Shelter
Emergency Shelters	Community Psychiatric Clinic (CPC)	Ballard Ecumenical Ministry
Emergency Shelters	Compass Housing Alliance	Roy Street
Emergency Shelters	Downtown Emergency Service Center (DESC)	Crisis Emergency Shelter Respite
Emergency Shelters	Downtown Emergency Service Center	Main Shelter
Emergency Shelters	Harborview Mental Health Services	Emergency Shelter Respite Beds
Emergency Shelters	Salvation Army	City of Seattle Winter Emergency Shelter Response
Emergency Shelters	Seattle King County Public Health	Edward Thomas House
Emergency Shelters	Seattle King County Public Health	Tuberculosis Control Program
Emergency Shelters	Seattle's Union Gospel Mission	Lake City Rotating Winter Shelter
Emergency Shelters	Seattle's Union Gospel Mission	Lake City Rotating Winter Shelter
Emergency Shelters	SHARE	Bunkhouse (day)
Emergency Shelters	SHARE	Bunkhouse (night)
Emergency Shelters	SHARE	Christ Episcopal

Emergency Shelters	SHARE	Gift of Grace
Emergency Shelters	SHARE	Maple Leaf
Emergency Shelters	SHARE	Safe Haven
Emergency Shelters	SHARE	St. John's
Emergency Shelters	SHARE	St. Luke's Episcopal
Emergency Shelters	SHARE	Vets at Trinity UMC
Emergency Shelters	Congregations for the Homeless	Snoqualmie Valley Winter Shelter
Emergency Shelters	Congregations for the Homeless	Snoqualmie Valley Winter Shelter
Emergency Shelters	DAWN	Vouchers
Emergency Shelters	El Centro de la Raza	Motel Voucher Program
Emergency Shelters	Lifelong AIDS Alliance	Emergency Shelter Vouchers
Emergency Shelters	Friends of Youth	Youth Haven (Bellevue)
Emergency Shelters	Friends of Youth	Youth Haven (Kenmore)
Emergency Shelters	Auburn Youth Resources	South County Youth Shelter
Emergency Shelters	YouthCare	The Shelter
Supportive Housing	Community Psychiatric Clinic (CPC)	Harbor House
Supportive Housing	Downtown Emergency Service Center (Emergency Shelters)	Kerner Scott Safe Haven

MA-35 Special Needs Facilities and Services – 91.410, 91.210(d)

Introduction

The Consortium works closely with the Committee to End Homelessness (CEH) and others such as Public Health of Seattle & King County, the faith community, private foundations, the Seattle, King County, and Renton Housing Authorities, United Way, a robust community of nonprofit agencies that have worked with special needs populations for decades, King County Mental Health Chemical Abuse and Dependency Services Division, Washington State Department of Social and Health Services, and the Veteran’s Administration to provide facilities and services for special needs persons.

The Consortium increased the number of persons receiving Medicaid benefits after the implementation of the Affordable Health Care Act and expanded coverage through efforts to assist individuals with registration. Another area of potential benefit is the possible expansion of a housing benefit for Medicaid eligible clients.

Including the elderly, frail elderly, persons with disabilities (mental, physical, developmental), persons with alcohol or other drug addictions, persons with HIV/AIDS and their families, public housing residents and any other categories the jurisdiction may specify, and describe their supportive housing needs.

Special needs populations share a common need for affordable housing with universal design features, that is located near transit and health services being prominent. In addition to an annual minimum goal of 50 housing units a year targeted to persons with special needs, many multi-family tax credit projects include a 20 percent set aside for persons who have a disability. With baby boomers aging, the Consortium is making senior housing with enhanced management for providing connections to mainstream services a priority. In the public input process seniors stressed the importance of housing within their own communities, particularly in East King County.

The King County Housing Finance Program consults with the King County Disabilities Division, within the Department of Community and Human Services, and works to develop units specifically for families with a member who has a developmental disability. This will be an ongoing priority.

The King County Mental Health and Chemical Abuse and Dependency Services Division serves persons with mental health diagnoses and substance use disorders.

Seattle is the local Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA) entitlement. The federal HOPWA program funds efforts to prevent homelessness among people diagnosed with HIV/AIDS and their families. The Seattle Human Services Department is the regional coordinator

of these funds for programs in King and Snohomish counties. Housing and service providers serve up to 500 people a year through a variety of programs.

The King County Housing Authority is working with residents to increase self-sufficiency. These include: place-based initiatives in partnership with local school districts, housing choice and mobility, and rapid rehousing for homeless students. Place-based education initiatives involve parents, children, schools and partner agencies and share a common goal: Starting early to help children succeed in school. This revolves around three elements: engage families in early learning; that children enter kindergarten ready to learn; and that students read at standard by the end of third grade.

The Consortium works closely with the other special needs populations, particularly survivors of domestic violence and contracts directly with agencies with a full range of services for parents and children, including emergency shelter and permanent housing.

Describe programs for ensuring that persons returning from mental and physical health institutions receive appropriate supportive housing.

King County contracts with a number of housing and service providers who have staff at hospitals and jails helping to coordinate discharge into the community. These providers help develop a discharge plan and help individuals access Medicaid, behavioral health services and services through the Washington State Department of Social and Health Services.

Specify the activities that the jurisdiction plans to undertake during the next year to address the housing and supportive services needs identified in accordance with 91.215© with respect to persons who are not homeless but have other special needs. Link to one-year goals. 91.315©.

Each year the King County Housing Finance Program sets a goal of developing 250 new units of which 50 will be set aside for people with disabilities. These units are a contractual requirement for the 50 year term of the contract. King County works with housing funders, mainstream service systems (such as the developmental disabilities system, the drug/alcohol system, and the mental health system), and housing referral information and advocacy organizations to plan for community-based housing options for persons with special needs. The King County Housing Repair Program conducts a Housing Access Modification program for homeowners and renters, to make it possible for people to remain safely in their homes.

MA-40 Barriers to Affordable Housing – 91.410, 91.210©

Describe any negative effects of public policies on affordable housing and residential investment.

King County and the Consortium member jurisdictions engage in ongoing efforts to advance public policy for the purpose of increasing the supply of affordable housing. This includes the following activities: 1) evaluation regulatory barriers to housing production and affordability, 2) coordinated planning activities among the jurisdictions, 3) streamlining permitting, and 4) incentive zoning features, such as allowing accessory dwelling units. The following chart lists some of the tools available to develop affordable housing in King County. One of the challenges is the number of jurisdictions in King County (39) and the differing policies regarding various housing tools.

Multi-family Housing/Affordable Housing Development Tools	Jurisdictions
Eliminate units-per-acre zoning, or replace with floor-area ratio limits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kirkland (Downtown, Totem Lake) • Redmond • Bellevue (Bel-Red)
Cluster subdivisions/developments, lot-size averaging, multiplexes, or cottages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kirkland • Redmond • Federal Way • Kent • Burien – policy language only to date • Unincorporated King County
SROs or “mini-suites”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kirkland • Redmond
Up-zones with affordability required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kirkland • Redmond • Sammamish • Kenmore • Newcastle • Issaquah • Unincorporated King County – Master Planned Developments
Mandatory Zoning Requirements for Developer Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Redmond (specific areas) • Federal Way • Kenmore downtown • Unincorporated King County, Issaquah and Snoqualmie (master planned developments)

<p>Voluntary increased development capacity (e.g. height, density) with affordability</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bellevue (Bel-Red) • Mercer Island • Sammamish • Issaquah • Federal Way • Kent – density bonus in PUDs • Tukwila – additional height bonus in Transit Oriented Development District with affordable housing or other benefit incentive • Unincorporated King County
<p>Accessory Dwelling Units</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kirkland • Redmond • Bellevue • Sammamish • Kenmore • Newcastle • Issaquah • Mercer Island • Federal Way • Kent • Burien • Unincorporated King County
<p>Multi-family Property Tax Exemption</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kirkland • Mercer Island • Kenmore • Bellevue – policy support • Federal Way • Burien – in Downtown Commercial (DC) zone • Tukwila – under consideration for adoption
<p>Permit and Impact Fee Waivers</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bellevue • Issaquah • Kirkland (revised) • Newcastle • Sammamish (partial) • Newcastle – individual project • Redmond – individual project • Kent • Unincorporated King County
<p>Land Donations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bellevue • Kirkland • Redmond • Sammamish • Issaquah

Parking Reductions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kent • Burien – flexible parking requirements allow less parking in transit rich areas • Bellevue
SEPA exemption	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kent – planned action EIS • Burien – urban infill SEPA exemption where current density and intensity of use is lower than called for in city’s Comprehensive Plan
Transfer of Development Rights	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unincorporated King County

MA-45 Non-Housing Community Development Assets – 91.410, 91.210(f)

Introduction

King County enjoys a robust economy and strong job growth. While the region is experiencing rapid growth and a rising housing market, there are a number of communities in King County with large disparities in the built environment that present barriers to individuals in reaching their full potential.

Economic Development Market Analysis

Business Activity

Business by Sector	Number of Workers	Number of Jobs	Share of Workers %	Share of Jobs %	Jobs less workers %
Agriculture, Mining, Oil & Gas Extraction	2,206	1,505	1	0	0
Arts, Entertainment, Accommodations	38,533	37,470	10	10	0
Construction	17,200	17,114	4	5	0
Education and Health Care Services	50,201	38,082	13	10	-3
Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate	23,644	16,930	6	5	-2
Information	40,169	56,130	10	15	5
Manufacturing	43,210	47,397	11	13	2
Other Services	21,395	15,640	6	4	-1
Professional, Scientific, Management Services	43,278	32,122	11	9	-2
Public Administration	0	0	0	0	0
Retail Trade	43,124	40,078	11	11	0
Transportation and Warehousing	14,643	20,398	4	6	2
Wholesale Trade	22,586	20,734	6	6	0
Total	360,189	343,600	--	--	--

Table 40 – Business Activity

Data 2007-2011 ACS (Workers), 2011 Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics (Jobs)

Source:

Labor Force

Total Population in the Civilian Labor Force	713,509
Civilian Employed Population 16 years and over	663,107
Unemployment Rate	7.05%
Unemployment Rate for Ages 16-24	24.87%
Unemployment Rate for Ages 25-65	5.66%

Table 41 – Labor Force

Data Source: 2007-2011 ACS

Occupations by Sector	Number of People
Management, business and financial	166,901

Occupations by Sector	Number of People
Farming, fisheries and forestry occupations	17,383
Service	39,896
Sales and office	112,544
Construction, extraction, maintenance and repair	34,741
Production, transportation and material moving	22,942

Table 42 – Occupations by Sector

Data Source: 2007-2011 ACS


Travel Time

Travel Time	Number	Percentage
< 30 Minutes	349,936	57%
30-59 Minutes	214,306	35%
60 or More Minutes	50,302	8%
Total	614,546	100%

Table 43 – Travel Time

Data Source: 2007-2011 ACS

The below map, developed by the Center for Neighborhood Technology, demonstrates that moving away from urban centers for affordable housing does not reduce combined housing and transportation costs.



Education:

Educational Attainment by Employment Status (Population 16 and Older)

Educational Attainment	In Labor Force		Not in Labor Force
	Civilian Employed	Unemployed	
Less than high school graduate	23,116	2,972	11,396
High school graduate (includes equivalency)	70,278	5,913	20,942
Some college or Associate’s degree	131,617	8,142	31,017
Bachelor’s degree or higher	195,972	7,908	34,978

Table 44 – Educational Attainment by Employment Status

Data Source: 2007-2011 ACS

Educational Attainment by Age

	Age				
	18–24 yrs	25–34 yrs	35–44 yrs	45–65 yrs	65+ yrs
Less than 9 th grade	1,478	4,146	4,727	6,443	5,364
9 th to 12 th grade, no diploma	10,258	7,452	6,208	8,508	6,129
High school graduate, GED, or alternative	20,627	24,056	25,179	47,969	27,005
Some college, no degree	23,456	27,347	29,112	65,155	22,818
Associate’s degree	4,786	11,030	13,101	25,369	5,401
Bachelor’s degree	8,703	39,295	46,246	71,205	20,259
Graduate or professional degree	487	17,052	24,576	40,720	11,906

Table 45 – Educational Attainment by Age

Data Source: 2007-2011 ACS

Educational Attainment – Median Earnings in the Past 12 Months

Educational Attainment	Median Earnings in the Past 12 Months
Less than high school graduate	22,312
High school graduate (includes equivalency)	31,798
Some college or Associate’s degree	39,605
Bachelor’s degree	57,086
Graduate or professional degree	72,621

Table 46 – Median Earnings in the Past 12 Months

Data Source: 2007-2011 ACS

Based on the Business Activity table above, what are the major employment sectors within your jurisdiction?

The major employment sectors are in management and business. The Puget Sound Area has a thriving technology sector with established companies such as Microsoft and burgeoning

startups. Boeing is Washington State's largest employer and has a manufacturing plant operating in King County.

Major industry sectors in King County with more than 100,000 estimated jobs include professional and business services, education and health services, government, leisure and hospitality, retail trade and manufacturing.

The unemployment rate in King County has been steadily and consistently declining since reaching a peak level of 9.6 percent in early 2010. Throughout the recession and recovery, King County's unemployment rate has been lower than that of Washington State. As of July 2014, the not seasonally adjusted unemployment rate in King County was 4.9 percent.

Describe the workforce and infrastructure needs of the business community:

With the explosive growth of the information technology sector, there is a high demand for skilled workers to fill jobs in the ever expanding field of information technology. Other workforce needs include bio technology, healthcare/health services, construction, food industries, select areas of the service sector, such as air transportation, select areas of the manufacturing sector and the maritime industry. Transportation infrastructure is a high need, and long term expansion of the transportation infrastructure has created new jobs in that sector.

While our region is experiencing extremely rapid growth and a soaring housing market, community friendly infrastructure development has not been equitable in the region, and there are a number of communities in King County with large disparities in the built environment that are barriers to individuals in those communities reaching their full potential. Such infrastructure issues include lack of safe and well-lit places to walk and make connections to businesses, services and leisure activities, including exercise, lack of cohesion and place-making in the business district and between the business district and residential neighborhoods, lack of well-designed open space to complement a "coherent sense of place" and lack of active transportation connections for cyclists, joggers, walkers, etc.

Describe any major changes that may have an economic impact, such as planned local or regional public or private sector investments or initiatives that have affected or may affect job and business growth opportunities during the planning period. Describe any needs for workforce development, business support or infrastructure these changes may create.

Sound Transit (ST) is continuing to develop a regional mass transit light rail system. There are currently a number of approved and funded extension legs that will move forward over the coming years, and there are planned for many more extensions that have not yet been funded. Washington State is starting to replace aging large-scale aging infrastructure, such as major bridges, and has plans to continue replace such aging infrastructure in the coming years.

King County works closely with our region's Workforce Development Council to create job training opportunities, programs and job entry opportunities at multiple levels so that all persons in our County who can work have access to jobs. Employment security and ability to thrive economically are key elements of King County Health and Human Services Transformation work. The Communities of Opportunity Initiative of Transformation will work closely with communities that have high unemployment rates at the community level and at the policy level, and will bring in multiple partners that can help to reduce employment disparities across the County.

How do the skills and education of the current workforce correspond to employment opportunities in the jurisdiction?

This is mixed – we have many very highly educated residents who are very well matched for employment opportunities. We also have an influx of highly educated people moving to the region for such jobs. We have a mismatch, however, for too many people who do not have the skills or training for many of the job opportunities in the region. This is one of our greatest challenges in the coming years if we are going to reduce the very large disparities we are seeing between communities – with some communities not able to share in the increased prosperity of the region.

As discussed throughout this plan, and particularly in Section SP-80, Anti-Poverty Strategy, King County has set a clear path through our transformation work to move our investments much further upstream so that every person in King County has the opportunity to reach their full potential and to thrive economically. To this end we will be working with multiple partners, including the Consortium jurisdictions, the Puget Sound Regional Council, and many others across the County to achieve common transformative goals.

Current Action Initiatives with Regional Partners Regarding Economic Prosperity are identified below.

- Increase high-demand degree capacity (including certain STEM degrees) at the state’s two- and four-year post-secondary institutions.
- Work with the maritime industry to identify skills to create a coordinated response for high demand occupations.
- Develop policies to support a robust tourism industry in the region.
- Support initiatives such as High Skills High Wages, Excellent Schools Now, Eastside Pathways, the Community Center for Education Results and other similar programs to strengthen the K-12 education system.

There are several universities in the County, as well as great local community colleges and vocational education institutions. Many of these institutions are willing to partner to help increase workforce opportunities for all people in the County

Describe any current workforce training initiatives, including those supported by Workforce Investment Boards, community colleges and other organizations. Describe how these efforts will support the jurisdiction’s Consolidated Plan.

The Workforce Development Council of Seattle-King County is a nonprofit workforce think-tank and grant-making organization whose mission is to support a strong economy and the ability of each person to achieve self-sufficiency. They work throughout the community, bringing employers, jobseekers, youth, educators, labor groups and other nonprofits together to find and fund-solutions for workforce gaps.

The Employment and Education Resources Program (EER), in the Department of Community and Human Services (DCHS), receives funding from the WDC and conducts the essential operator role for the WorkSource system in King County, including youth and adult employment and education programs. Programs under EER offer services throughout King County in partnership with numerous community organizations.

The WorkSource system provides full service one-stop centers throughout King County that are certified by the Workforce Development Council of Seattle. King County DCHS plays a leadership role serving as the operator of this system to improve the quality of workforce programs and opportunities for the people of King County, which has been recognized by national, state and local partners. King County DCHS also leads a local Veteran’s Program and works specifically on workforce programs for veterans.

These coordinated efforts to develop workforce training and jobs link to the Consolidated Plan through Goal Three: Community Development - Provide assistance to jurisdictions, community agencies, and communities to establish and maintain a suitable living environment with economic opportunities for low-income members of the community, including communities

with disparities in health, income, and quality of life where efforts can be targeted to improve the well-being of residents and the vibrancy of the community.

Does your jurisdiction participate in a Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS)?

King County has participated in a broader four-county CEDS with the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC), our Metropolitan Planning Organization. PSRC's mission is to ensure a thriving central Puget Sound now and into the future through planning for regional transportation, growth management and economic development.

PSRC works for a common vision, expressed through three connected major activities: VISION 2040, the region's growth strategy; Transportation 2040, the region's long-range transportation plan; and the Regional Economic Strategy, the region's blueprint for long-term prosperity. The Regional Economic Strategy is a plan for strengthening the region's economic foundations and supporting industries that offer outstanding potential for good-paying jobs and long-term sustainability. The five strategic areas include:

- Education & Workforce Development
- Business Climate
- Entrepreneurship and Innovation
- Infrastructure
- Quality of Life

For King County, specific economic development policies and strategies are contained in the King County Comprehensive Plan, last adopted in 2012, and in the early phases of being updated by the end of 2016. Sections covered in the Comprehensive Plan include general economic development policies, business development, workforce development, infrastructure development, sustainable development in the private sector, and the rural economy. Related to the strategies in the Comprehensive Plan, King County has adopted the Health and Human Services Transformation Vision, and is currently working on a number of Transformation initiatives, including place-based community strategies that will address transformational economic development strategies as one aspect of the work. This is also discussed in section SP-80 of this plan, the *Anti-Poverty Strategy*.

If so, what economic development initiatives are you undertaking that may be coordinated with the Consolidated Plan? If not, describe other local/regional plans or initiatives that impact economic growth.

King County will make at least one application under the new Consolidated Plan for a Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Area as part of the work of the Communities of

Opportunity Initiative of Health & Human Services Transformation. The NRSA will cover outcome goals at the intersection of health, housing and economic prosperity, and will focus on prevention, embracing recovery, and eliminating disparities. See section *SP-80 Anti-Poverty Strategy* for more information on the Transformation initiatives.

MA-50 Needs and Market Analysis Discussion


Are there areas where households with multiple housing problems are concentrated? (Include a definition of “concentration”)

***Concentration:** is defined as a number 10 percent above the overall proportion or distribution in the County.*

There are areas in South King County where there are a concentration of households who are low income, severely cost burdened, and have other housing problem(s), such as crowding. As housing costs increase in the City of Seattle, more households are moving south or north into more affordable communities.

Are there any areas in the jurisdiction where racial or ethnic minorities or low-income families are concentrated?

Yes, these same neighborhoods in South King County have a concentration of low income families of color. The following map from the Puget Sound Regional Council demonstrates concentrations of people of color.



Map from Puget Sound Regional Council

What are the characteristics of the market in these areas/neighborhoods?

Housing is more affordable in this part of the County. The housing stock is older and there are more housing units with housing problems in need of rehabilitation.

Are there any community assets in these areas/neighborhoods?

Yes, these communities have great cultural assets and a cultural richness. There is potential for improved transportation with Rapid Ride bus routes and a new light rail corridor that will be built and an existing conventional train, and transit centers.

Are there other strategic opportunities in any of these areas?

King County, working with local jurisdictions, will be identifying Communities of Opportunity and with the Seattle Foundation will be working to create greater health, social, economic, and racial equality in these communities. See SP-70 Anti-Poverty Strategy for more information.

Strategic Plan

SP-05 Overview

Strategic Plan Overview

The Strategic Plan is the heart of the Consolidated Housing and Community Development Plan (Consolidated Plan) and where the Consortium's goals, objectives and specific strategies designed to make progress towards those goals and objectives are expressed. Most of the strategies have output goals which are based on the funding we project to be available for the five-year period of the Consolidated Plan. If funding changes during the five-year period of the Consolidated Plan, the Consortium may amend the output goals through its Joint Recommendations Committee (JRC).

Values: We invest in projects that predominantly serve households at or below 50% AMI; mixed-income projects that serve a portion of households at or below 30% AMI; projects that are inclusive of homeless households and people with special needs; projects that reduce their screening barriers and consider mitigating information in order to reflect values of equity and social justice; projects that embrace evidence-based best practices; projects that are located and designed thoughtfully, considering connectivity, health and access to transit; affordable housing in transit-oriented developments.

Values for the South Sub-region emphasize acquisition and rehabilitation of substandard housing stock, preservation of affordable housing, and mixed-income housing development; and for the North/East Sub-region emphasize high density new affordable housing units, and a broad range of affordable housing project types.

The Consortium's desired outcomes for each goal are impacted by many factors, especially the larger economy, the health of other federal programs, such as the Section 8 program, and other funding streams that we don't control, and are far beyond the capability of the Consortium's strategies to accomplish single-handedly. For that reason it is particularly important that we work across sectors towards shared outcomes that will help us all make progress towards our goals. While our goals and outcome statements may exceed our reach, it is only by making the reach that we can hope to influence them. Annual output goals for each of the strategies in this plan are dependent upon the continuation of the applicable fund sources.

SP-10 Geographic Priorities – 91.415, 91.215(a)(1)

General Allocation Priorities

CDBG, ESG, and HOME funds are allocated throughout King County. King County has two target areas: SeaTac and Skyway. Both are potential areas for a Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Area. More target areas may be added during the period of this plan.

CDBG and ESG

CDBG and ESG funds are allocated based upon the percentage of low-and-moderate income populations in the two sub-regions North/East and South. A map of the King County Consortium regions is included on the following page.

The North/East Sub-region consists of the following cities, towns, and census designated places.

Cities, towns, and census designated places include: 1) Beaux Arts Village 2) Bellevue; 3) Bothell (King County portion); 4) Carnation; 5) Fall City; 6) Ames Lake; 7) Eastgate; 8) Lake Marcel-Stillwater; 9) Wilderness Rim; 10) Lake Forest Park; 11) Medina; 12) Mercer Island; 13) Newcastle; 14) North Bend; 15) Baring; 16) Fall City; 17) Riverbend; 18) Union Hill-Novelty Hill; 19) Shoreline; 20) Skykomish; 21) Snoqualmie; 22) Sammamish; 23) Issaquah; 24) Cottage Lake; 25) Klahanie; 26) Tanner; and 27) Unincorporated King County.


South sub-region


The South sub-region includes the following cities, towns and census designated places: 1) Algona; 2) Auburn; 3) Black Diamond; 4) Boulevard Park; 5) Burien; 6) Bryn-Mawr-Skyway; 7) Covington; 8) Des Moines; 9) East Hill-Meridian; 10) East Renton Highlands; 11) Fairwood; 12) Federal Way; 13) Kent; 14) Lake Holm; 15) Lakeland North; 16) Lakeland South; 17) Lake Morton-Berrydale; 18) Maple Heights-Lake Desire; 19) Maple Valley; 20) Mirrormont; 21) Pacific; 22) Ravensdale; 23) Renton; 24) Riverton; 25) SeaTac; 26) Shadow Lake; 27) Tukwila; 28) Vashon; 29) White Center; and 31) Unincorporated King County.


HOME

HOME funds are awarded through the Housing and Community Development Housing Finance Program competitive process. Funds are distributed countywide to the members of the HOME Consortium. The HOME Consortium includes the cities listed above and additionally the cities of Auburn, Bellevue, Kent, and Federal Way.

The following maps show the North/East and South regions and the low to moderate income percentages by block group.







U.S. Housing and Urban Development Low & Moderate Income Census Block Groups: Northeast King County

Data Source: U.S. Dept. of Housing & Urban Development



The information included on this map has been compiled by King County staff from a variety of sources and is subject to change without notice. King County makes no representation or warranty, express or implied, as to accuracy, completeness, timeliness, or rights to the use of such information. This document is not intended for use as a warranty. No other King County shall not be liable for any general, special, indirect, incidental, or consequential damages (including, but not limited to, lost revenues or lost profits) resulting from the use or misuse of the information contained on this map, in whole or in part. Information on this map is prohibited except by written permission of King County.
 \giscenter\projects\hugs\client_wm\workspace\ConsolidatedPlan\project_ConsolidatedPlan.mxd
 11/15/13


Block Groups


% Low Mod

- 0% - 42.94%
- 42.95% - 51%
- 51.01% - 99.02%
- No data

Consortium Status

- Non Consortium
- Incorporated Areas





U.S. Housing and Urban Development Low & Moderate Income Census Block Groups: West central King County

Data Source: U.S. Dept. of Housing & Urban Development



The information included on this map has been compiled by King County staff from a variety of sources and is subject to change without notice. King County makes no representations or warranties, express or implied, as to accuracy, completeness, timeliness, or rights to the use of such information. This document is not intended for use as a survey product. King County shall not be liable for any general, special, indirect, incidental, or consequential damages including, but not limited to, lost revenues or lost profits resulting from the use or misuse of the information contained on this map. Any sale of this map or information on this map is published except by written permission of King County.
 I:\GIS\Projects\Housing\GIS\Map\DC\H\GIS\ConsolidatedPlan\ConsolidatedPlan.mxd
 M. Wilson


Block Groups


% Low Mod

- 0% - 42.94%
- 42.95% - 51%
- 51.01% - 99.02%
- No data

Consortium Status


- Non Consortium
- Incorporated Areas





U.S. Housing and Urban Development Low & Moderate Income Census Block Groups: Southwest King County

Data Source: U.S. Dept. of Housing & Urban Development



The information included on this map has been compiled by King County staff from a variety of sources and is subject to change without notice. King County makes no representations or warranties, express or implied, as to accuracy, completeness, timeliness, or rights to the use of such information. This document is not intended for use as a survey product. King County shall not be liable for any general, special, indirect, incidental, or consequential damages (including, but not limited to, lost revenue or lost profits) resulting from the use or misuse of the information contained on this map, any sale of this map or information on this map is published except by written permission of King County.
 g:\esri\proj\maps\census\2010\ConsolidatedPlan\proj\ConsolidatedPlan.mxd
 M. Ulrich

Block Groups	Consortium Status
% Low Mod	<input type="checkbox"/> Non Consortium <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Incorporated Areas
<input type="checkbox"/> 0% - 42.94% <input type="checkbox"/> 42.95% - 51% <input type="checkbox"/> 51.01% - 99.02% <input type="checkbox"/> No data	1.5 0.75 0 1.5 Miles



Describe the basis for allocating investments geographically within the jurisdiction.

The Consortium allocates funds to address the strategies under the three overarching goal areas: 1) Affordable Housing; 2) Ending Homelessness; and 3) Community Development. Investments are distributed throughout the County, and there are guidelines adopted by the Consortium to balance investments geographically over time. Allocation guidelines are determined through use of low to moderate income population data, and other data, as applicable. In addition, the Consortium follows the King County Countywide Planning Policies to share responsibility for regional affordable housing goals.

King County and the Consortium also consider other plans and initiatives in making allocation decisions, such as climate change, transit oriented development, equity and social justice, and Health & Human Services Transformation Initiatives. Examples of intersections with such initiatives and plans are included below.

Housing and Community Development near High Capacity Transit Nodes

Following upon the Consortium's work on the regional Growing Transit Communities grant, the Consortium will prioritize investments in affordable housing and eligible community development projects near high capacity transit, including high capacity bus routes, bus rapid transit and light rail. Future light rail lines will be completed by 2023 serving East King County, North King County, and South King County. The Consortium has been a partner in creating an acquisition fund to acquire land for affordable housing and community development near high capacity transit nodes before the land is too expensive to acquire. That fund is the Regional Equitable Development Initiative (REDI) Fund, and has geographic targets. Access to good regional transportation for low to moderate-income households is key to opening up opportunities to thrive.

Communities of Opportunity Initiative (Health & Human Services Transformation)


Communities of Opportunity (COO) is a place-based initiative that aims to improve race, health and socio-economic equity in King County by working in co-design through a collective impact model with local communities that have the greatest disparities in health, housing and socio-economic outcomes. The Consortium anticipates that one or two Neighborhood Revitalization Strategies targeting COO communities will be submitted under this Consolidated Plan over the next five years. COO is working in the 20 percent of census tracts (highlighted in the two darkest shades of green) that rank lowest on an index of the ten measures in the table below. There are almost 400 census tracts in King County, each with an approximate population size of 5,000. The following table contains health, housing and economic measures.

KING COUNTY HEALTH, HOUSING AND ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY MEASURES

Legend


— City Boundaries

Ranking



Population Measures

	Lowest ranked	Highest ranked
Life expectancy	74 years	87 years
Health, broadly defined:		
Adverse childhood experiences	20%	9%
Frequent mental distress	14%	4%
Smoking	20%	5%
Obesity	33%	14%
Diabetes	13%	5%
Preventable hospitalizations	1.0%	0.4%
Housing:		
Poor housing condition	8%	0%
Economic opportunity:		
Income below 200% poverty	54%	6%
Unemployment	13%	3%



Priority Needs: In the following Priority Needs tables, the Sort Order column is an identifying system for Priority Needs to reference activities listed in *Table 52 Goals Summary*. The Sort Order does not indicate a priority tier.

Table 29 – Priority Needs Summary

1	Priority Need Name	Affordable Housing
	Priority Level	High
	Population	Extremely Low Income Low Income Moderate Income Middle Income Large Families Families with Children Elderly Public Housing Residents Chronic Homelessness Individuals Families with Children Mentally Ill Chronic Substance Abuse veterans Victims of Domestic Violence Unaccompanied Youth Elderly Frail Elderly Persons with Mental Disabilities Persons with Physical Disabilities Persons with Alcohol or Other Addictions Victims of Domestic Violence
	Geographic Areas Affected	Countywide and potential Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Areas
	Associated Goals	Affordable Housing

Description	The Consortium will engage in other housing activities, collaborations and partnerships to enhance opportunities for equitable development and the creation/preservation of affordable housing. During the course of the Consolidated Plan, funding may be prioritized for coordination with the intended Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Area (s) in the South Sub-region, as identified through the Communities of Opportunity Initiative. The Consortium will plan for and support fair housing strategies and initiatives designed to affirmatively further fair housing choice and to increase access to housing and housing programs. Fair housing will be reported on annually.
Basis for Relative Priority	Our region will have an adequate supply of affordable housing so that each sub-region of the County can meet the housing needs of low to moderate-income population. We invest in projects that predominantly serve households at or below 50 percent AMI; mixed-income projects that serve a portion of households at or below 30 percent AMI; projects that are inclusive of homeless households and people with special needs; projects that reduce their screening barriers and consider mitigating information in order to reflect values of equity and social justice; projects that embrace evidence-based best practices; projects that are located and designed thoughtfully, considering connectivity, health and access to transit; and affordable housing in transit-oriented developments.

2	Priority Need Name	Ending Homelessness
	Priority Level	High
	Population	Extremely Low Income and Low Income Large Families Families with Children Elderly Public Housing Residents Rural Chronic Homelessness Individuals Families with Children Mentally Ill Chronic Substance Abuse veterans Victims of Domestic Violence Unaccompanied Youth Elderly Frail Elderly Persons with Mental Disabilities Persons with Physical Disabilities Persons with Developmental Disabilities Persons with Alcohol or Other Addictions Victims of Domestic Violence Non-housing Community Development
	Geographic Areas Affected	Countywide and potential Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Areas
	Associated Goals	Ending Homelessness

	Description	We value working together with collective impact to continue the work to develop a cohesive and coordinated homeless system that is grounded in the principle of Housing First and shared outcomes; we invest in projects that ensure that homeless households from all sub-populations are treated with dignity and respect; are returned to permanent housing as quickly as possible; receive strength-based services that emphasize recovery, as needed; are supported to graduate from temporary homeless housing as rapidly as possible, and from permanent supportive housing as soon as they are ready; receive only what they need to be returned to housing quickly and to be as self-reliant as possible; we are not a one size fits all system.
	Basis for Relative Priority	We value shared outcomes. Shared outcome include, but are not limited to, the following: 1) reduce the number of households becoming homeless; 2) reduce the length of time that households are homeless; 3) increase the rate of exits to permanent housing; and 4) reduce the number of households that re-enter the homeless system after exit to permanent housing.
3	Priority Need Name	Community and Economic Development
	Priority Level	High
	Population	Extremely Low Income, Low Income, and Moderate Income Large Families Families with Children Elderly Rural Chronic Homelessness Individuals Families with Children Mentally Ill Chronic Substance Abuse veterans Victims of Domestic Violence Unaccompanied Youth Elderly Frail Elderly Persons with Mental Disabilities Persons with Physical Disabilities Persons with Developmental Disabilities Persons with Alcohol or Other Addictions Victims of Domestic Violence Non-housing Community Development

Geographic Areas Affected	Consortium-wide, North/East sub-region, South sub-region, and potential Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Areas
Associated Goals	Community and Economic Development
Description	Establish and maintain a suitable living environment and expand economic opportunities for low-and moderate-income people. Our investments across the Consortium in low-income communities, and for the benefit of low-income people, help to ensure equitable opportunities for good health, happiness, safety, self-reliance and connection to community. Specific strategies include: 1) improve the ability of health and human services agencies to serve our low to moderate-income residents safely and effectively, 2) improve the living environment in low to moderate-income neighborhoods and communities; and 3) expand economic opportunities for low to moderate-income residents of the Consortium.
Basis for Relative Priority	Our investments in new developments in eligible communities are designed to promote a healthy lifestyle, reflect the range of income levels in our region, and have accessible connectivity with amenities, services and opportunities. We invest capital in projects that serve eligible low-income persons at or below 80 percent of AMI, and eligible low-income communities, that improve the livability for such persons and communities, and emphasize environmental stewardship, and the health and well-being of the persons that will access the projects.

Narrative (Optional)

The Consortium’s desired outcomes for each goal are impacted by many factors, especially the larger economy, the health of other federal programs, such as the Section 8 program, and other funding streams that we don’t control, and are far beyond the capability of the Consortium’s strategies to accomplish single-handedly. For that reason it is particularly important that we work across sectors towards shared outcomes that will help us all make progress towards our goals. While our goals and outcome statements may exceed our reach, it is only by making the reach that we can hope to influence them. Annual output goals for each of the strategies in this plan are dependent upon the continuation of the applicable fund sources.

SP-30 Influence of Market Conditions – 91.415, 91.215(b)

Influence of Market Conditions

Affordable Housing Type	Market Characteristics that will influence the use of funds available for housing type
Tenant Based Rental Assistance (TBRA)	Income inequality and the thinning of the middle income and more persons at the lower and higher income levels will increase the need for tenant based rental assistance.
TBRA for Non-Homeless Special Needs	With increasing rents, more persons priced out of market rate housing and in need of affordable housing.
New Unit Production	The increasing cost of land and construction coupled with declining federal resources
Rehabilitation	The aging affordable housing portfolio will require capital investments.
Acquisition, including preservation	Preservation will be a major initiative. Housing authorities and nonprofits will be competing with market rate developers to preserve expiring Section 8 projects.

Table 30 – Influence of Market Conditions

SP-35 Anticipated Resources – 91.420(b), 91.215(a)(4), 91.220(c)(1,2)

Introduction

The Consortium receives three federal entitlement grants on an annual basis. These federal funds: 1) CDBG in the approximate annual amount of \$4,500,000; 2) HOME in the approximate annual amount of \$2,700,000; and 3) ESG in the approximate annual amount of \$300,000, are the first three resources listed on Table 49 Anticipated Resources below. Other federal, state, and local funds are listed as well. Like the federal formula grants, the other resources come with restrictions and regulatory requirements regarding allowed uses. Additionally some, such as Low Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC) and Continuum of Care funds, are secured through competitive applications and are not a guaranteed source. Nevertheless, we have included these other resources to demonstrate the full resource picture. Some of these funds, such as the Regional Affordable Housing Program (RAHP) provide leverage for federal dollars.

- Consolidated Homeless Grant: \$4,000,000
- Housing and Essential Needs: \$11,000,000
- Regional Affordable Housing Program: \$1,750,000
- Mental Illness and Drug Dependency: \$2,000,000
- King County Veterans and Human Services Levy: \$2,850,000
- King County Document Recording Fee: \$6,407,000
- Suburban Cities: \$1,900,00

Anticipated Resources

Program	Source of Funds (including leverage funds)	Uses of Funds	Expected Amount Available Year 1				Expected Amount Available Remaining Four Years of ConPlan	Narrative Description
			Annual Allocation:	Program Income:	Prior Year Resources:	Total for Year One:		
CDBG	Federal-HUD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community Facilities • Public Improvements • Public Services • Economic Development • Housing • Administration • Planning 	\$4,873,731	\$522,067	\$237,124	\$5,632,922	\$19,096,096	Resources anticipated based upon 2015 entitlement.
HOME	Federal-HUD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permanent housing for rental and homeownership • Administration 	\$2,556,707	\$340,724	0	\$2,877,431	\$11,509,724	Resources anticipated based upon 2015 entitlement..
ESG	Federal-HUD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Homeless Prevention • Emergency Housing • Administration 	\$326,105	0	0	\$326,105	\$1,304,420	Resources anticipated based upon 2015 entitlement..
Total Federal Grant Resources			\$7,756,543	\$862,792	\$237,124	\$8,629,191	\$31,910,240	

Table 48 Anticipated Resources

Explain how federal funds will leverage those additional resources (private, state and local funds), including a description of how matching requirements will be satisfied.

Federal funds leverage private, state and local funds. The sources of matching funds for housing funded with HOME are King County's local general fund, the Regional Affordable Housing Program (RAHP) funds and Veterans and Human Services Levy capital funds. The RAHP funds are a dedicated state adopted housing resource (a document recording fee surcharge) administered by King County, and targeted to the creation of affordable housing. Veterans and Human Services levy capital funds are local fund source targeted to housing development projects that provide permanent supportive housing to homeless veterans and other homeless families and individuals. The source of match for the HOME-funded ownership occupied rehabilitation activities are owner contributions. The primary source of match for ESG projects is the RAHP fund.

If appropriate, describe publically owned land or property located within the jurisdiction that may be used to address the needs identified in the plan.

On July 22, 1996, the Metropolitan King County Council unanimously passed an ordinance that provides that if a parcel of property is surplus to the needs of King County, and is suitable for housing, then it should be sold or leased for the purpose of affordable housing. The Facilities Management Division shall determine whether any of the County departments has a need for surplus property that is related to the provision of essential government services. If the property is not needed for the provision of essential government services, the Facilities Management Division shall determine if the property is suitable for affordable housing. Each year, by September 30th, the Property Services Division of King County issues a list of properties that are surplus to the needs of King County which are suitable for housing.

Discussion

In addition to King County surplus land a number of partner jurisdictions in the Consortium have similar legislation and have made land available for affordable housing either through donation or a long term lease at favorable terms.

SP-40 Institutional Delivery Structure – 91.415, 91.215(k)

Explain the institutional structure through which the jurisdiction will carry out its consolidated plan including private industry, non-profit organizations, and public institutions.

Responsible Entity	Responsible Entity Type	Role	Geographic Area Served
King County Department of Community and Human Services – Housing and Community Development	Government	Lead for King County Consortium. Staffs the Regional Joint Recommendations Committee	King County
Regional Joint Recommendations Committee (JRC)	Governmental inter-jurisdictional body	Provides funding recommendations and advice on guidelines and procedures for King County and its consortia city partners	King County CDBG, HOME, and RAHP Consortium
City of Auburn	Government	Administrates CDBG entitlement for City of Auburn	City of Auburn
City of Bellevue	Government	Administrates CDBG entitlement for City of Bellevue	City of Bellevue
City of Federal Way	Government	Administrates CDBG entitlement for City of Federal Way	City of Federal Way
City of Kent	Government	Administered CDBG entitlement for City of Kent	City of Kent
City of Kirkland	Government	Joint Agreement City member of the Consortium	City of Kirkland
City of Redmond	Government	Joint Agreement City member of the CDBG Consortium	City of Redmond
City of Renton	Government	Joint Agreement City pass through member of the CDBG Consortium	City of Renton
City of Shoreline	Government	Joint Agreement City member of the CDBG Consortium	City of Renton

Table 51 – Institutional Delivery Structure

Assess of Strengths and Gaps in the Institutional Delivery System

Strengths

The Consortium works closely with public and private funders to maximize program delivery and to leverage other funds, such as low income housing tax credits, the King County and Renton Housing Authorities by providing Section 8 and VASH vouchers, private foundation funds, and local jurisdiction resources.

The Joint Recommendations Committee (JRC) is an inter-jurisdictional body that provides specific funding recommendations and advice on guidelines and procedures for King County and its consortia city partners on a wide range of housing and community development issues. The JRC was created through the interlocal cooperation agreements that formed the King County Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Consortium, the King County HOME Investment Partnerships (HOME) Consortium and the King County Regional Affordable Housing Program (RAHP) Consortium, and is now codified in the King County Code in Title 24, Chapter 24.13.

The JRC is made up of three King County representatives appointed by the King County Executive, and eight representatives of cities outside the City of Seattle that participate in the King County Consortia. The City of Seattle participates on the JRC for some meetings regarding regional fund sources that include the City of Seattle. JRC meetings are open to the public. Some meetings are designated meetings for the gathering of public testimony and are specially advertised as such.

The King County Housing and Community Development Program staffs the JRC and prepares and presents reports and recommendations for funding awards and procedures that guide the housing and community development programs. In fulfilling its duties, the JRC considers the advice of interjurisdictional sub-regional advisory committees, made up of one representative from each participating jurisdiction in a sub-region. The advisory committees are convened to assist HCD staff in the review and recommendation of projects and programs undertaken in the sub-region.

The Community Development Coordinator is the CDBG lead who works closely with the jurisdiction cities. The Housing Finance Coordinator is the HOME lead who works closely with the HOME Consortium. King County has a strong CoC with leadership from the public and private sectors, the King County and Renton Housing Authorities, nonprofits, foundations, and faith based communities.

Identified gaps

- Decreasing public funds for programs
- Loss or temporary closing of human service agencies due to loss of funding
- Increases in administrative cost burdens
- Need for more proactive early childhood programs.

Availability of services targeted to homeless persons and persons with HIV and mainstream services

Within the CDBG Consortium there are Regular Consortium members and Joint Agreement Consortium members. Regular Consortium members (28 of the 32 CDBG partners) through the Interlocal Agreement process determined to direct all human service funding to services for homeless populations or for the prevention of homelessness. The Joint Agreement Consortium members make independent funding decisions regarding the use of CDBG human service funding. Persons with HIV are assisted but the Consortium does not have services targeted to people with HIV. The City of Seattle is the designated HOPWA entitlement recipient and they have reported on services targeted to persons with HIV in the City of Seattle Consolidated Plan.

Homelessness Prevention Services	Available in the Community	Targeted to Homeless
Homelessness Prevention Services		
Counseling/Advocacy	X	X
Legal Assistance	X	X
Mortgage Assistance	X	
Rental Assistance	X	X
Utilities Assistance	X	X

Homelessness Prevention Services	Available in the Community	Targeted to Homeless
Street Outreach Services		
Law Enforcement	X	X
Mobile Clinics	X	X
Other Street Outreach Services	X	X
Supportive Services		
Alcohol & Drug Abuse	X	X
Child Care	X	X
Education	X	X
Employment and Employment Training	X	X
Healthcare	X	X
HIV/AIDS	X	
Life Skills	X	X
Mental Health Counseling	X	X
Transportation	X	X
Other		
Cultural Navigation	X	

Table 31 – Homeless Prevention Services Summary

Describe how the service delivery system including, but not limited to, the services listed above meet the needs of homeless persons (particularly chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their families, and unaccompanied youth).

CEH, the local CoC released draft Strategic Plan for 2015-2018. It is framed around Rare (Prevention, Availability of Affordable Housing, End Criminalization); Brief + One Time (Address crisis as quickly as possible, Match and place to appropriate housing, Right-size our homeless system); and Governance (Create a community to end homelessness; provide effective and accountable leadership). The local system implemented coordinated entry for families and youth and young adults in the past two years and continues to refine those systems. The CoC is working on a coordinated entry system for homeless single adults. Refer to *PR 10-Conclusion* for efforts to coordinate on service delivery for families, families with children, veterans and their families and unaccompanied youth.

Describe the strengths and gaps of the service delivery system for special needs population and persons experiencing homelessness, including, but not limited to, the services listed above.

Strengths of the service delivery system are identified below.

- Leaders that take a regional approach to homelessness

- The Affordable Care Act
- A long standing, dedicated, and sophisticated CoC
- Staff in government, foundations and nonprofits that are forward thinking and provide regional leadership active at the National level
- Coordination with the Veteran’s Administration
- Strong ties to private foundations such as United Way, the Gates Foundation, the Seattle Foundation, and the Raikes Foundation
- A robust nonprofit environment
- Three strong public housing authorities working in collaboration with the public funders and the CEH. The King County Housing Authority is a Moving to Work housing authority

Gaps of the service delivery system are identified below.

- Shrinking federal funds
- Increasing numbers of low income households, due to the shrinking of the middle class
- Some inefficiencies in the health care delivery and services systems, which are being addressed
- Persons with serious mental illness and a shortage of mental health beds
- Persons involved with the justice system.

Provide a summary of the strategy for overcoming gaps in the institutional structure and service delivery system for carrying out a strategy to address priority needs.

Rather than reduce expectations and goal outcomes for service delivery, in light of shrinking federal grant amounts, the Consortium is undertaking an ambitious King County Health & Human Services Transformation Vision. Under the Transformation Vision, King County staff across departments, including Public Health of Seattle & King County, Community and Human Services, the Department of Natural Resource and Parks and the Department of Transportation is working with a large variety of partners on a number of initiatives to move close to realization of the Transformation goals.

Furthermore, the Consortium along with partners in the CEH, are working in support of a housing benefit for persons receiving Medicaid to further stretch scarce resources and provide more housing and care.

SP-45 Goals – 91.415, 91.215(a)(4)

Goals Summary Information

The following table outlines activities and specific goal outcome indicators. The numbers on the left side demonstrate which of the three overarching goals the activity supports. The other columns identify the specific activity, program beneficiaries, sources of funding supporting the activity and outcomes. The annual goal outcomes are a one year goal. The three goals are:

Goal One: Affordable Housing - Ensure that there is decent, safe, and healthy affordable housing available to income-eligible households throughout the Consortium.

Goal Two: End Homelessness - Collaborate with the Committee to End Homeless in King County (CEH) to plan and to align Consortium funds with CEH initiatives and objectives, to ensure that in the future homelessness is rare, short in duration, and a one-time occurrence.

Goal Three: Community Development - Provide assistance to jurisdictions, community agencies, and communities to establish and maintain a suitable living environment with economic opportunities for low-income members of the community, including communities with disparities in health, income, and quality of life where efforts can be targeted to improve the well-being of residents and the vibrancy of the community.

SP-45 Goals - 91.415, 91.215(a)(4)

Goals Summary Information

Sort Order	Goal Name	Start Year	End Year	Category	Geographic Area	Needs Addressed	Funding	Goal Outcome Indicator
1	Affordable Housing	2015	2019	Affordable Housing Homeless Non-Homeless Special Needs Public Housing	Consortium-wide North/East Sub-Region South Sub-Region Skyway SeaTac	Affordable Housing Ending Homelessness	CDBG: \$1,924,938 HOME: \$2,877,431	Rental units constructed: 25 Household Housing Unit Homeowner Housing Added: 2 Household Housing Unit Homeowner Housing Rehabilitated: 250 Household Housing Unit Direct Financial Assistance to Homebuyers: 5 Households Assisted

Sort Order	Goal Name	Start Year	End Year	Category	Geographic Area	Needs Addressed	Funding	Goal Outcome Indicator
2	Ending Homelessness	2015	2019	Homeless Affordable Housing	Consortium-wide North/East Sub-Region South Sub-Region Skyway SeaTac Seattle	Ending Homelessness	CDBG: \$739,250 ESG: \$326,105	Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit: 15,000 Persons Assisted Rapid Re-Housing: 50 Households Assisted Emergency Shelter: 1,800 Persons Assisted Homelessness Prevention: 300 Persons Assisted Homelessness Diversion: 15 Households Assisted

Sort Order	Goal Name	Start Year	End Year	Category	Geographic Area	Needs Addressed	Funding	Goal Outcome Indicator
3	Community and Economic Development	2015	2019	Non-Homeless Special Needs Non-Housing Community Development	Consortium-wide North/East Sub-Region South Sub-Region Skyway SeaTac	Community and Economic Development	CDBG: \$2,968,735	Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit: 5,000 Persons Assisted Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit: 50,000 Persons Assisted Facade treatment/business building rehabilitation: 2 Business Businesses assisted: 140 Businesses Assisted

Table 32 – Goals Summary

Goal Descriptions

1	Goal Name	Affordable Housing
	Goal Description	Preserve and expand the supply of affordable housing. This will be accomplished through: 1) competitive funding for new affordable rental and homeownership projects; 2) preservation of existing rental units that provide housing for income-eligible households; 3) housing repair for income eligible homeowners; and 4) innovative housing models. The Consortium will engage in other housing activities, collaborations and partnerships to enhance opportunities for equitable development and the creation/preservation of affordable housing. During the course of the Consolidated Plan, funding may be prioritized for coordination with the intended Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Area (s) in the South Sub-region, as identified through the Communities of Opportunity Initiative. The Consortium will plan for and support fair housing strategies and initiatives designed to affirmatively further fair housing choice and to increase access to housing and housing programs. Fair housing will be reported on annually.
2	Goal Name	Ending Homelessness
	Goal Description	We value working together with collective impact to continue the work to develop a cohesive and coordinated homeless system that is grounded in the principle of Housing First and shared outcomes; we invest in projects that ensure that homeless households from all sub-populations (families, youth/young adults, and adults without children) are treated with dignity and respect; are returned to permanent housing as quickly as possible; receive strength-based services that emphasize recovery, as needed; are supported to graduate from temporary homeless housing as rapidly as possible, and from permanent supportive housing as soon as they are ready; receive only what they need to be returned to housing quickly and to be as self-reliant as possible; we are not a one size fits all system. Support: 1) a range of housing options; 2) programs and services; 3) address the temporary housing needs and other needs of households when homelessness occurs; and 4) programs that prevent homelessness and that assist households in being diverted from having to enter the homeless system. Specific programs include: 1) rapid re-housing; 2) emergency shelters; 3) transitional housing; 4) housing stability; and 5) shelter diversion. The Consortium will engage in planning and other activities and initiatives to end homelessness in collaboration with CEH; work in partnerships to enhance opportunities to engage our region in exploring evidence-based best practices and promising practices to ensure that homelessness is rare, short in duration, and a one-time occurrence.

3	Goal Name	Community and Economic Development
	Goal Description	Our investments across the Consortium in low-income communities, and for the benefit of low-income people, help to ensure equitable opportunities for good health, happiness, safety, self-reliance and connection to community. Our investments in new developments in eligible communities are designed to promote a healthy lifestyle, reflect the range of income levels in our region, and have accessible connectivity with amenities, services and opportunities.

Estimate the number of extremely low-income, low-income, and moderate-income families to whom the jurisdiction will provide affordable housing as defined by HOME 91.315(b)(2)

These goal numbers represent the number of new units that are HOME-Assisted households assisted in a program year.

HOME-Assisted Households

Housing Type	Units
Permanent Housing	25
Homeownership	22
Total	47
Income Level	Units
Affordable to 0%-30% of Area Median Income	18
Affordable to 31%-50% of Area Median Income	17
Affordable to 51%-80% of Area Median Income	12
Total	47

SP-50 Public Housing Accessibility and Involvement - 91.415, 91.215(c)
Need to Increase the Number of Accessible Units (if Required by a Section 504 Voluntary Compliance Agreement)

Both housing authorities addressed in this plan have met their Section 504 requirements.

Activities to Increase Resident Involvements

Both KCHA and RHA have numerous activities to increase resident involvement including extensive school programs, the Family Self-Sufficiency program to help residents reach financial independence, and work toward long-term goals such as training for a job, education, starting a business and buying a home.

Is the public housing agency designated as troubled under 24 CFR part 902?

No, neither the King County Housing Authority nor the Renton Housing Authority is designated as troubled public housing agencies.

Plan to remove the ‘troubled’ designation

This is not applicable to KCHA or RHA.

SP-55 Strategic Plan Barriers to Affordable Housing - 91.415, 91.215(h)

Barriers to Affordable Housing

King County and the Consortium member jurisdictions engage in ongoing efforts to advance public policy for the purpose of increasing the supply of affordable housing. This includes the following activities: 1) evaluation regulatory barriers to housing production and affordability, 2) coordinated planning activities among the jurisdictions, 3) streamlining permitting, and 4) incentive zoning features, such as allowing accessory dwelling units.

Strategy to Remove or Ameliorate the Barriers to Affordable Housing

The King County Growth Management Planning Council, member jurisdictions and the Consortium conduct regular efforts to identify and address barriers to people accessing affordable housing. Among these efforts was the 2014 Buildable Lands Analysis which informs the member jurisdictions with appropriate information to support development of the Housing Elements portion of their Comprehensive Plans.

SP-60 Homelessness Strategy - 91.415, 91.215(d)

Describe how the jurisdiction's strategic plan goals contribute to:

Reaching out to homeless persons (especially unsheltered persons) and assessing their individual needs

Although not funded through the ESG grant, there are numerous programs that focus on street outreach to homeless persons in King County. Longstanding programs focus on mentally ill persons and chronic substance abusers. A mobile medical outreach team operates in south King County, and Healthcare for the Homeless Network nurse/mental health outreach teams operate in six cities. Outreach to homeless/LGBTQ/at-risk youth is provided by coordinated ProYouth outreach workers. Kids Plus works with families on the streets or in tent cities or car camps countywide. This is an example of collaboration and coordination with other providers and systems. The CoC has implemented a coordinated entry system for homeless families and youth and young adult. Coordinated entry for single adults is the next goal.

Addressing the emergency and transitional housing needs of homeless persons

The Strategic Plan sets goals for shelter and transitional housing, as well as discussing innovation programs such as Rapid Re-housing and Shelter Diversion. The Strategic Plan is aligned with the CEH Strategic Plan for 2015-2018 which is framed around making homelessness rare, brief, and one time, and on governance through working with CEH.

Helping homeless persons (especially chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their families, and unaccompanied youth) make the transition to permanent housing and independent living, including shortening the period of time that individuals and families experience homelessness, facilitating access for homeless individuals and families to affordable housing units, and preventing individuals and families who were recently homeless from becoming homeless again.

The King County Consortium is in alignment with the local CoC and through a strong network of housing and mental health providers to ensure that homelessness is rare, brief and one-time. The community is working to address the causes of homelessness, to shift funding and programming to meet the needs of people experiencing homelessness, and to follow best practices.

Help low-income individuals and families avoid becoming homeless, especially extremely low-income individuals and families who are likely to become homeless after being discharged from a publicly funded institution or system of care, or who are receiving assistance from public and private agencies that address housing, health, social services, employment, education or youth needs

King County has established policies, system guidelines, and processes regarding discharge of persons from publicly funded institutions or systems of care (such as health care facilities, foster care, other youth facilities, or correction programs and institutions) in order to help prevent such discharge from resulting in homelessness.

SP-65 Lead-based Paint Hazards - 91.415, 91.215(i)

Actions to address LBP hazards and increase access to housing without LBP hazards

King County has participated on a statewide lead task force that was responsible for developing Washington State Lead-Based Paint Legislation. The legislation was signed by the governor and effective as of June 10, 2004. The legislation created Washington State eligibility for federal lead hazard reduction funds. King County participates in a Western Washington networking group that discusses home repair issues, including lead hazards and lead legislation.

The King County Housing Repair Program, which coordinates the consortium's home repair programs for existing ownership housing of low to moderate-income households conducts lead hazard reduction work in-house. Three staff persons are currently EPA certified and soon to be Washington State certified risk assessors; they conduct paint inspections and risk assessments of each home that is eligible for the program. If lead hazard reduction is required for a given home repair project, the hazard reduction work is incorporated into the scope of the rehabilitation work to be done on the home. Housing Repair Program staff members monitor the lead hazard reduction work and perform clearance inspections when required.

The King County Housing Finance Program, which administers the capital contracts for affordable rental and ownership housing projects for the consortium, requires all projects to comply with lead paint requirements.

How are the actions listed above related to the extent of lead poisoning and hazards?

The actions of the King County Consortium Housing Repair Program and the King County Housing Finance Program ensure a consistent and systematic approach to work on homes and apartment buildings with lead-based paint present.

How are the actions listed above integrated into housing policies and procedures?

The King County Housing Repair Program is an E.P.A. certified firm with qualifications issued by Washington State. They follow HUD protocols for repairs to housing, and for houses built before 1978 they conduct lead based paint testing or they presume lead is present. The Housing Finance Program has contracting process protocols with a due diligence item requiring a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment and if suspect materials are noted a follow up Phase II Environmental Review.

SP-70 Anti-Poverty Strategy - 91.415, 91.215(j)

Jurisdiction Goals, Programs and Policies for reducing the number of Poverty-Level Families

How are the Jurisdiction poverty reducing goals, programs, and policies coordinated with this affordable housing plan

King County Health & Human Services Transformation Vision has set a goal that by 2020, the people of King County will experience gains in health and well-being because our community worked collectively to make the shift from a costly, crisis-oriented response to health and social problems, to one that focuses on prevention, embraces recovery, and eliminates disparities. Under the Transformation vision, King County staff across departments, including Public Health, Community and Human Services, DNRP and Transportation is working with a large variety of partners on a number of initiatives to move closer to realization of the Transformation goals. Initiatives include:

- Familiar Faces (FF) Design Team – This cross sector staff team working with a broad range of partners inside and outside of King County to improve life circumstances for approximately 1,300 individuals a year who cycle through the King county jail system at least four times per year. Shared data has revealed that the vast majority of these individuals have behavioral health, chemical dependency and/or other health issues, and are homeless. Jail is not an appropriate place for these individuals, and the FF Design Team has worked to create a future state system design that will create a different pathway to better life outcomes for this population. FF are a sentinel population for designing system change and it is anticipated that more work will follow concerning other populations.
- Best Starts for Kids Prevention Levy – King County hopes to place an initiative on the ballot in 2015 for a voter-approved levy to fund upstream prevention programs in three areas: 1.) Birth to Early School Aged, 2.) Youth and Young Adults, 3.) Communities of Opportunity – funding for communities that are working in collective impact in a community-driven, pro-active model to bring about positive results in life outcomes for our children and families in King County.
- Communities of Opportunity – King County is partnering with the Seattle Foundation for the Communities of Opportunities initiative with the ambitious goal of creating greater health, social, economic and racial equity in King County so that all people thrive and prosper.
- Accountable Communities of Health – King County Public Health staff are coordinating across departments and with multiple community partners to move forward changes in our approach to health and well-being, moving us to an approach that better integrates services and supports, values the social determinants of health and focuses on the

determinants of equity. Behavioral health integration is an essential component of the work to better integrate behavioral health, health services and preventative healthcare.

These specific initiatives are tied together through a broad results-based framework to effect profound changes that will move us to a system that is primarily preventative rather than primarily crisis-oriented, to alleviate poverty. Policy and system change issues will be identified through this work at many levels of government, and work will be done across sectors to try to impact such policy and system changes.

How are the Jurisdiction poverty reducing goals, programs, and policies coordinated with this affordable housing plan?

The Transformation initiatives and Consolidated Plan have been in development side by side and are aligned with regards to a number of cross-over elements. The Consolidated Plan contains elements in a number of strategies that support funding for affordable housing and community development in coordination with the Transformation initiatives.

SP-80 Monitoring - 91.230

Describe the standards and procedures that the jurisdiction will use to monitor activities carried out in furtherance of the plan and will use to ensure long-term compliance with requirements of the programs involved, including minority business outreach and the comprehensive planning requirements

The King County Community Services Division (CSD) Contract Monitoring Handbook expands the procedures called out in the Department of Community and Human Services (DCHS) Procedures for Contract Compliance Monitoring. It establishes appropriate and effective mechanisms for ensuring compliance with federal and non-federal requirements to assure that contract goals are achieved. The procedures integrate financial and programmatic monitoring.

Federal and state funds have strict monitoring requirements. Monitoring of County funded contracts is a good business practice and stewardship of public funds. Contractors who receive funding in the amount of \$100,000 or more are required to submit a financial audit and contractors who expend over \$750,000 of federal funds are required to submit a Single Audit (formerly referred to as an A-133 Audit). Fiscal staff reviews all audits. A contract monitoring team reviews each submitted quarterly report and monitors program progress.

The Housing and Community Development Section implements CDBG, HOME, ESG, and HUD Continuum of Care funded activities. Contracts with subrecipients include project goals and requirements. This ensures that subrecipients are complying with applicable federal regulations, Office of Management and Budget circulars and King County ordinances (regulatory requirements) relating to financial management systems, procurement and contracting, property management and disposition, labor standards, record keeping and reporting requirements.

Procedures include site visits to monitor program performance, compliance with federal requirements, fiscal monitoring, and desk monitoring. All invoices are reviewed for accuracy. Activities are reviewed for federal cross-cutting requirements such as environmental review, relocation, and labor standards.

The Consortium supports activities under Goal Three: Establish and Maintain a Suitable Living Environment and Economic Opportunities for low-and moderate-income persons in order to assist small business owners, including minority owned businesses, with technical assistance, access to business opportunities and loans. An important strategy in pursuing Equity and Social Justice work is support and funding for Microenterprise programs in South King County. Microenterprise programs have specific non-English speaking and immigrant outreach components designed to meet the entrepreneurial needs of King County's most diverse area.


Appendix A

King County Consortium

Citizen Participation Plan



Consolidated Housing and Community Development Plan 2015-2019



King County Consortium Citizen Participation Plan

Table of Contents

I. Consolidated Housing and Community Development Plan1

II. Public Review of the Consolidated Plan.....1

III. Proposed Use of Funds Each Year: The Annual Action Plan1

IV. Joint Recommendations Committee2

V. Metropolitan King County Council2

VI. Amendments to the Five-Year Consolidated Plan and Annual Action Plans.....2

VII. Availability of the Consolidated Plan5

VIII. Distribution of federal CDBG, HOME and ESG funds from HUD5

IX. Availability of Annual Funds to Meet Objectives of the Consolidated Plan.....6

X. Pre-applications and Technical Assistance to Applicants for Capital Funds7

XI. Annual Program Performance: Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report ..8

XII. Citizen Involvement Guide8

XIII. King County Housing & Community Development Contacts9

King County Consortium Citizen Participation Plan

I. Consolidated Housing and Community Development Plan (Consolidated Plan)

Every five years the King County Consortium (Consortium) produces an updated Consolidated Plan that guides the use of federal Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG), HOME Investments Partnerships Program (HOME), other federal and some state and local funds for affordable housing, ending homelessness and community/economic development. The Consortium provides many opportunities for public and stakeholder input during the development process and uses the input in the production of the plan. Public input forums are held at various locations in the county, especially in places that facilitate input from low to moderate-income members of the community. The locations of the public input forums are announced in the local newspaper, on the County website, and through flyers distributed to community-based agencies. Stakeholders are invited to participate in forums to provide input to the development of the consolidated plan. For the 2015-2019 Consolidated Plan update, three public meetings were held in September 2014 to receive input from stakeholders and citizens on the updated needs assessment and on proposed changes to the strategic plan.

II. Public Review of the Consolidated Plan

- A. The public is invited to comment on the final proposed Consolidated Plan for a period of 30 days prior to its adoption by the Metropolitan King County Council. A notice of availability of the proposed Consolidated Plan is published in the legal section of the Seattle Times and other selected local newspapers and on the King County Housing and Community Development (HCD) website and through community-based agencies. Copies of the Draft Consolidated Plan are available during the period of public review by mail, at the King County HCD office and via the King County website, which can be accessed at any public library.
- B. The public is also invited to comment at the King County Council hearings where the Consolidated Plan is discussed and adopted. All comments that are submitted in writing or provided orally during the public comment period or at public hearings or meetings shall be considered in preparing the final plan. A summary of comments received and how they were incorporated or addressed, including the reasoning behind the rejection of any comments that are not accepted for inclusion in the Consolidated Plan will be included in the Public Comment Section.

III. Proposed Use of Funds Each Year: The Annual Action Plan

The five-year Consolidated Plan establishes the template for the King County Consortium's required annual Action Plan. Each year after the Consortium has announced the availability of funds, generally through a competitive process, it determines the specific projects it will fund in the coming year and the amounts of funds that will be dedicated or awarded to those specific projects. Those specific goals and activities to be funding are reported in the Consortium's annual Action Plan. Action Plan projects and activities must be consistent with the goals, objectives and strategies

King County Consortium Citizen Participation Plan

outlined in the Consolidated Plan. The Action Plan must be submitted to HUD every year after the Consortium receives final HUD grant amounts for CDBG, HOME and ESG.

IV. Joint Recommendations Committee (JRC)

The CDBG/ESG/HOME Consortium is guided by an interjurisdictional JRC. The JRC recommends the allocation of CDBG, ESG, HOME funds and some local funds to specific projects, and advises on specific guidelines and procedures for King County and the Consortium partners. The JRC consists of eight cities representatives¹ (elected officials or high-level staff) and three County representatives (Executive staff and/or department directors). For purposes of the Regional Affordable Housing Program (RAHP) Consortium, the JRC will include a representative for Seattle (elected official, department director or comparable level staff).

V. Metropolitan King County Council

The Metropolitan King County Council appropriates an overall budget for the Consortium's CDBG, HOME and ESG funds to broad categories in November as part of its annual budget process. The Council is also the body that approves the Consortium's Interlocal Agreements for signature by the King County Executive, and approves a new or updated Consolidated Housing and Community Development Plan.

VI. Amendments to the Five-Year Consolidated Plan and Annual Action Plans

The process for making minor changes or amendments to the Consolidated Plan and Annual Action Plans are provided below:

A. Consolidated Plan

1. Minor Changes to the Consolidated Plan

Minor changes are edits, updates and/or corrections that do not alter the activities, purpose or intended beneficiaries of any of the strategies adopted in the Strategic Plan section. These changes do not require King County Council action, public notice or a public comment period, but will require review by the Consortium's JRC at the next available JRC meeting before the minor change is made final.

2. Substantial Amendments to the Consolidated Plan

- a) Substantial amendments to the Consolidated Plan are those which: 1) alter the activities, purpose or intended beneficiaries of a strategy identified in the Strategic Plan section of the Consolidated Plan; 2) add or delete a strategy in the strategic plan section; 3) alter the annual accomplishment goals and/or the long-term goals of the major strategies in the strategic plan; 4) add or amend a

¹ Four city representatives from the Regular CDBG Consortium, two city representatives from the Joint Agreement cities and two city representatives from the HOME-only cities.

King County Consortium Citizen Participation Plan

neighborhood revitalization strategy for a specific neighborhood located in a geographic area of the King County CDBG Consortium.

- b) Substantial amendments will not require King County Council action, but will require public notice and an opportunity for the public to comment for 30 days prior to the date set for a Consortium JRC meeting to take action on the substantial change(s) to the Consolidated Plan. Public notice will be placed in a major local paper, on the King County website, and through email to local community agencies.
- c) All comments that are submitted, either orally or in writing during the comment period shall be considered in any substantial amendment to the Consolidated Plan. A summary of public comments made and how they influenced the amendment, as well as the reasoning for comments that were rejected and did not influence the amendment, will be attached to the substantial amendment. The County will submit the amended Consolidated Plan to HUD.

B. Annual Action Plan

After the Action Plan is submitted to HUD each year, changes to the Action Plan must follow the processes described below. The County and Joint Agreement Cities are responsible for providing citizens with reasonable notice in their local newspaper and an opportunity to comment whenever certain amendments to the plan, as specified below, are being proposed for CDBG, HOME or ESG funds.

1. Minor Changes to the Annual Action Plan

- a) A change in the amount of any single source of federal funds awarded to a project by 50 percent or less is a minor change.
- b) A change in the location of a project as long as it does not impact project eligibility, or a change in the scope of a project that impacts the estimated number of intended beneficiaries by less than 50 percent.
- c) A minor change does not include changes in the eligibility of an activity, a change in the purpose of an activity, or a change in the scope of an activity that impacts the estimated number of intended beneficiaries of a project by 50 percent or more or a change in the intended beneficiaries of an activity.
- d) Minor changes do not require public notice. A contractor or sub-recipient requesting a minor change(s) will inform King County HCD in writing of the change request. King County HCD will evaluate the change to determine if the change is minor. A minor change will be reviewed by the JRC before it is made final and implemented. Minor changes that do not require review by the JRC include changes due to under expenditure from cost savings resulting in projects not spending the full amount, and projects moving forward under contingency plans.

King County Consortium Citizen Participation Plan

2. Amendments to the Annual Action Plan

- a) A change in the amount of any single source of federal funds awarded to a project of more than 50 percent.
- b) A change in an eligible activity, a change in the purpose of an activity, or scope of an activity such that the estimated number of intended beneficiaries are impacted by 50 percent or more, or a change in the intended beneficiaries of an activity.
- c) A cancellation of a project/activity or addition of a new project(s)/activity funded with federal funds, including new housing projects selected by the JRC after the Action Plan is submitted to HUD.
- d) All amendments to adopted projects must be approved by the JRC or Joint Agreement City, whichever body initially awarded the funds, and submitted for public comment for 14 days before the amended Action Plan is submitted to HUD. Amendments that have been approved by the JRC or the city will be published in a local newspaper at least 14 days before they are implemented and the public will be invited to comment during the 14 day period. All public comments will be considered before implementation, and before the amended Action Plan is submitted to HUD.
- e) Amendments to the Joint Agreement Cities' CDBG projects can be adopted by their City Councils through a consent agenda or regular Council meeting. The Joint Agreement Cities will work with King County HCD staff to have the amendment(s) included in the Action Plan for submittal to HUD by HCD.
- f) Amendments to add new housing development projects selected can be adopted by the JRC at a regular meeting, and are also subject to the 14 day public comment period before the amended Action Plan is submitted to HUD.
- g) All comments that are submitted, either orally or in writing, during the comment period shall be considered in any amendment to the Action Plan. A summary of public comments made and how they influenced the amendment, as well as the reasoning for comments that were rejected and did not influence the amendment, will be attached to the substantial amendment. The County will submit the amended Action Plan to HUD.

3. Substantial Change to the Annual Action Plan

- a) A substantial change involves a modification in the amount of CDBG, HOME, or ESG funds awarded to a project(s) by more than 35 percent of the annual entitlement for that fund source.
- b) A substantial change must be approved by the JRC or Joint Agreement City of its pass through portion of the entitlement, whichever body initially awarded the funds, and must be submitted for public comment for a period of 30 days before the county submits the amended Action Plan to HUD.

King County Consortium Citizen Participation Plan

- c) A substantial change that is approved by the JRC or a Joint Agreement City will be published in the regional and/or local newspaper at least 30 days before they are implemented and the public will be invited to comment during the 30-day period. All public comments will be considered before implementation, and before the amended Action Plan containing the substantial change is submitted to HUD.
- d) All comments that are submitted, either orally or in writing, during the comment period shall be considered in any substantial change to the Action Plan. A summary of public comments made and how they influenced the change, as well as the reasoning for comments that were rejected and did not influence the amendment, will be attached to the substantial change. The County will submit the amended Action Plan to HUD.

VII. Availability of the Consolidated Plan

The adopted Consolidated Plan will be available on the King County HCD website:

http://www.kingcounty.gov/socialservices/Housing/PlansAndReports/HCD_Plans

The Consolidated Plan is also available to view in hard copy at the King County HCD offices and at each library in the King County Public Library system.

VIII. Distribution of federal CDBG, HOME and ESG funds from HUD

King County is the official grantee that receives and administers funds on behalf of the King County Consortia. King County prepares the Consolidated Plan for both the King County CDBG/ESG Consortium and the HOME Consortium.

A. CDBG/ESG Consortium

1. The CDBG/ESG Consortium was organized in 1975 as a HUD-designated “urban county” to receive Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds and is comprised of 32 cities and towns, plus the unincorporated areas of the County. The cities of Seattle, Bellevue, Kent, Federal Way and Auburn do not participate in the CDBG Consortium because they receive their own CDBG funds directly from HUD. The cities of Milton and Normandy Park have opted out of both the King County HOME and CDBG Consortia (Milton participates with Pierce County).
2. Four cities – Kirkland, Renton, Redmond and Shoreline – are eligible for their own CDBG funds from HUD, but have entered into three-year CDBG/ESG Joint Interlocal Cooperation Agreements with King County. Under the joint agreements, King County HCD and the cities share administrative duties with respect to the city’s portion of funds. These cities contribute a portion of funds to consortium-wide activities and make decisions about how to spend a portion of

King County Consortium Citizen Participation Plan

the funds, with King County taking the lead project contracting role for capital projects.

3. King County has negotiated a three year Regular CDBG/ESG Consortium Interlocal Cooperation Agreement with the remaining 28 cities. The CDBG Regular Consortium Agreements and CDBG/ESG Joint Agreements will expire at the end of 2017 and will be renegotiated for the 2018 to 2020 period.
4. The Regular CDBG/ESG Interlocal Cooperation Agreement specifies Consortium-wide activities, and divides the remainder of the CDBG/ESG funds between the North/East sub-region and the South sub-region. These funds are allocated competitively to projects serving the residents of these sub-regions, based on the Consortium-wide objectives in the Consolidated Plan.

B. HOME Consortium

1. The City of Seattle receives and administers its own CDBG, HOME and ESG funds and does not participate in the King County Consortia with respect to HOME or any federal formula funds. Seattle does participate with respect to other locally funded Consortium programs and with respect to Continuum of Care funds.
 - a) The cities of Bellevue, Auburn, Federal Way and Kent, which receive their own CDBG funds, participate only in the King County HOME Consortium (HOME-only cities), as well as other locally funded Consortium programs. These cities also participate in the ESG Consortium.
 - b) All but two of the remaining King County jurisdictions participate in the HOME Consortium, which was organized in 1992 for the purpose of sharing federal HOME funds for affordable housing. The HOME Consortium is larger than the CDBG Consortium, comprising 36 cities, plus the unincorporated areas of the County.
 - c) HOME funds are allocated as a single Consortium-wide source of funds, with administration by the King County HCD Program through an annual HCD Housing Finance Program Request for Proposals (RFP) process.
 - d) Federal direct and Washington State pass-through Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) funds are also administered by King County HCD as a Consortium-wide source of ESG funds, and are coordinated through both the Consortium's JRC and the Committee to End Homelessness in King County. HCD announces the availability of these funds through a periodic RFP process.

IX. Availability of Annual Funds to Meet Objectives of the Consolidated Plan

- A. CDBG capital funds available through the Consortium are announced every spring with pre-applications due in early spring and full applications generally due in May or June. Notifications regarding CDBG funds available are made via newspaper, notices to stakeholders, and the HCD and King County Procurement websites.

King County Consortium Citizen Participation Plan

- B. Joint Agreement Cities conduct separate application processes to award their cities capital and human services funds, with those processes generally starting in the spring. Awards of Joint City CDBG funds are approved through their city councils. Once awarded, Joint City capital fund projects are contracted for and lead by King County HCD staff, whereas human services contracts are administered directly by Joint City staff.
- C. King County HCD administers the HOME funds. Allocation decisions are made in collaboration with the cities in the HOME Consortium, with final funding recommendations approved through the JRC. Funds available for affordable housing projects are announced through the HCD and King County Procurement websites, with applications generally due in August or September. King County HCD coordinates the annual affordable housing capital funding cycle with other local and state funders of affordable housing, and collaborates with them to fully fund projects cooperatively. The public funders of affordable housing work together to have good communication with the Seattle-King County Housing Development Consortium.
- D. ESG and CDBG funds for homeless housing programs and services are announced through a Request for Proposals process by King County HCD approximately every two years, generally in the spring, and are usually awarded in annual and multi-year awards. Final funding recommendations for these funds are approved through the JRC. Consultation and coordination concerning ESG funds occurs through the regional Continuum of Care, which is the Committee to End Homelessness, prior to approval of awards by the JRC.

X. Pre-applications and Technical Assistance to Applicants for Capital Funds

- A. Every spring HCD organizes application workshops in collaboration with Consortium city partners at various locations in each sub-region of the county to provide technical assistance to potential applicants for funds. The workshops provide information about federal requirements, local priorities, and application instructions. Technical assistance may be provided to individual applicants upon request prior to an RFP being posted.
- B. The HCD Housing Finance Program conducts preapplication meetings every spring/summer. A notification is sent out to a broad distribution list and agencies are invited to meet with the Housing Finance Program to discuss potential projects prior to an RFP being posted.
- C. The HCD Housing Repair Program conducts an open loan intake process all year. Potential applicants are informed about the program requirements through an initial intake protocol during a telephone information session. The Housing Repair Program managers participate in numerous public outreach efforts year round.

XI. Annual Program Performance: Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report

- A. Every year in mid-March, a notice of availability of the Consortium's Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER) is published in the legal section of the Seattle Times newspaper. Copies of the CAPER are available on the HCD website and at the HCD office. The CAPER evaluates program performance, pursuant to the goals and objectives articulated in the Consolidated Plan, for the prior year's activities

http://www.kingcounty.gov/socialservices/Housing/PlansAndReports/HCD_Reports/CAPER.aspx

- B. The public is invited to a meeting to review and comment on the CAPER report at least 15 days before it is submitted to HUD.

XII. Citizen Involvement Guide

- A. The King County CDBG/ESG/HOME Consortium (Consortium) invites its citizens to participate in the planning processes for the allocation of federal, state and local funds for housing and community development programs, including the planning process for the CDBG, HOME Investment Partnership Program (HOME) and the ESG.

- B. The Consortium publishes a Citizen Involvement Guide that is available on the King County website at the following address.

<http://www.kingcounty.gov/socialservices/Housing/PlansAndReports.aspx>

The guide can also be obtained in the mail by contacting staff listed at the end of this section of the plan.

- C. The guide contains the following information:
1. An overview of the sources and uses of Consortium funds administered by the King County Housing and Community Development (HCD) Program
 2. An overview of the King County Consortium
 3. An overview of how decisions are made in the Consortium
 4. An annual calendar of activities that includes fund application cycles and meetings of the Consortium Joint Recommendations Committee (JRC)
 5. HCD Program contact names and phone numbers.

King County Consortium Citizen Participation Plan

XIII. King County Housing & Community Development Staff Contacts

For information about the Consolidated Plan
or the CAPER:

Valerie Kendall
HCD Affordable Housing Planner
valerie.kendall@kingcounty.gov
206-263-9076

For information about the Annual Action Plan:

Kathy Tremper
Coordinator, Community
Development Section
kathy.tremper@kingcounty.gov
206-263-9097

HCD Office Information:

Housing and Community Development
Program
401 Fifth Avenue, Suite 510
Seattle, WA 98104-1818
Mark Ellerbrook
Regional Housing and Community Development
Manager
mark.ellerbrook@kingcounty.gov
206-263-1117

Appendix B

King County Consortium

Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice

King County Consortium Fair Housing Analysis of Impediments Summary

2015-2019 Consolidated Plan

Vision: *King County Consortium jurisdictions work together as partners to address the needs of very low-income people, communities, and neighborhoods.*

Overview: The King County Consortium (Consortium) is required to submit to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) certification that it is affirmatively furthering fair housing. The certification has the following three parts:

1. Complete an Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice;
2. Take actions to overcome the effects of any impediments identified through the analysis; and
3. Maintain records of actions taken and report to HUD actions in the Consolidated Annual Performance Evaluation Report (CAPER).

The Consortium collaborated with the Puget Sound Regional Council in a four-county Fair Housing Equity Assessment (FHEA) that brought together a full range of stakeholders and agencies. This FHEA document is incorporated into the King County Analysis of Impediments. Fair Housing through access to housing is included in Goal One of the Consolidated Plan.

Goal One of the Consolidated Plan - Affordable Housing: Ensure there is decent, safe, and healthy affordable housing available to income-eligible households throughout the Consortium.

Objective One - Fair Housing: Plan for and support fair housing and equity strategies and initiatives.

- I. The FHEA for the Puget Sound Region is incorporated into this document and those findings are summarized below.
 - A. Of fair housing complaints filed in King County, the largest percentage were filed for disability (35%), followed by race (24%), national origin (11%), retaliation (11%), and familial status (7%).
 - B. Fair Housing testing was completed in existing and future high capacity transit areas of our region – a total of 90 multi-family properties were tested. Persons protected by race, national origin, and disability were found to be 60 percent more likely to be treated differently in an adverse way, including being shown fewer units, quoted higher rent, fees and/or deposit, and not being informed about special offers¹.
 - C. Home Mortgage Disclosure Act data revealed that non-white applicants for home loans had higher denial rates and failure rates for successful applications, with black households being the most impacted.
 - D. In a survey completed by residents of our region, a majority of respondents expressed the observations detailed below.

¹ People in the protected classes of national origin and race experienced the highest percentage of positive tests for being treated in an adverse manner, with both of these groups having approximately 70% positive tests; people in the disability class had approximately 40% positive tests.

- 1) In their experience discrimination is either occasional or common in the rental of apartments and the sale of homes.
 - 2) People in the community do not know where or how to file a fair housing complaint.
 - 3) Families with children have a difficult time renting a housing unit.
 - 4) Landlords are often unwilling to rent to people with subsidized rental assistance, including Section 8.
 - 5) Access to transportation is very important.
 - 6) Landlords are generally positive in responding to requests for reasonable accommodation by a person that is disabled.
- E. In public comment forums, many members of the public expressed the following:
- 1) Concern about discrimination with respect to housing subsidies and Section 8, and felt that this is a huge barrier for low-income people;
 - 2) Believe that cultural competency is an important factor in the success of community projects;
 - 3) Believe that high quality, affordable transportation and housing, and access to both will be a major factor in the success of people in our region, so that people can move around the region and access job and education centers and areas of higher opportunity – access to affordable housing and transportation, and ultimately opportunity, is a fair housing issue;
 - 4) Public and elected officials need more fair housing education;
 - 5) Screening barriers to housing entry are too prevalent, especially when an applicant has a prior criminal record, even if it is a very old record. Criminal record denials may have a disproportionate impact on communities of color (race, color and national origin protected classes); and

Opportunity mapping was completed for the region to analyze access to opportunity, defined as a condition that places individuals in a position to be more likely to excel or reach their potential. The map was created using twenty indicators under the sub-measures of economic health, housing/neighborhood quality, education, mobility & transportation and health/environment. High and very high opportunity areas are those where conditions are optimal for individuals to succeed and reach their potential.

Objective 2 - Fair Housing: Actions to address FHEA findings, discriminatory barriers, potential disparate impacts and other barriers to equitable housing access and opportunities for successful life/ health outcomes.

I. Fair Housing Education and Information

- A. Work with regional funding partners and fair housing agency partners to increase the visibility of fair housing enforcement resources.
- B. Work with regional funding partners and fair housing agency partners to consider funding specific enforcement initiatives for rental housing in high opportunity areas and high capacity transit areas.
- C. Work with regional funding partners and fair housing agency partners to provide fair housing education and training, including specific education for public and elected officials – assess need for funding for specific educational campaigns.
- D. Work with regional funding partners and fair housing agency partners to develop new informational materials and publications that will increase participation in the affirmative furthering of fair housing in our region.

II. Landlord/Housing Barriers

- A. Work with partners, stakeholders, and private landlords to reduce housing screening barriers, including disparate treatment of protected classes and criminal background barriers that have a disparate impact on persons of color.
- B. Work with partners, stakeholders, and private landlords on initiatives and requirements that will actively promote fair housing choice and increase access to housing for protected classes, including potential expansion of the Landlord Liaison Program.
- C. Work with partners to add the coverage of source of income/rental assistance/Section 8 discrimination at the State level and at the local level for jurisdictions that do not currently include this as a protected class and that have the capacity to administer such a program, and explore other opportunities to reduce barriers to the use of Section 8 and other rental assistance in housing.
- D. Provide technical assistance to help agencies get their questions answered by the appropriate fair housing professional.

III. Access to Opportunity

- A. In coordination with funding and community partners, make strategic investments in affordable housing in regions of the Consortium that have high access to opportunity.
- B. In coordination with funding partners and community partners, make strategic investments that will catalyze additional public and private investment in regions of the Consortium that have low access to opportunity.
- C. Work across sectors on shared outcomes to increase health, well-being and the vitality of communities located in areas of low access to opportunity.
- D. Work with partners on legislative matters, incentive programs, and tools that encourage responsible development in areas of low access to opportunity, and ensure that there are plans to address displacement of low-income persons, if such may occur.

Fair Housing Equity Assessment

for the Central Puget Sound Region



Neighborhood Matters

Matching Opportunity with Community



The Growing Transit Communities Partnership is funded by the Sustainable Communities Regional Planning Grant Program of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Additional funding for this document provided in part by member jurisdictions, grants from the U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Transit Administration, Federal Highway Administration and Washington State Department of Transportation.

The work that provided the basis for this publication was supported by funding under an award with the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. The substance and findings of the work are dedicated to the public. The author and publisher are solely responsible for the accuracy of the statements and interpretations contained in this publication. Such interpretations do not necessarily reflect the views of the Government.

PSRC fully complies with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and related statutes and regulations in all programs and activities. For more information, or to obtain a Title VI Complaint Form, see <http://www.psrc.org/about/public/titlevi> or call 206-464-4819.

American with Disabilities Act (ADA) Information:

Individuals requiring reasonable accommodations may request written materials in alternate formats, sign language interpreters, physical accessibility accommodations, or other reasonable accommodations by contacting the ADA Coordinator, Thu Le, at 206.464.6175, with two weeks' advance notice. Persons who are deaf or hard of hearing may contact the ADA Coordinator, Thu Le, through TTY relay 711.

Servicios de Traducción Disponible 206-971-3052, Diana Martinez.

Có dịch vụ thông dịch sang tiếng Việt. Xin liên lạc Thu Lê số 206-464-6175.

Additional copies of this document may be obtained by contacting: Puget Sound Regional Council
Information Center
1011 Western Avenue, Suite 500
Seattle, Washington 98104-1035
206-464-7532 • FAX 206-587-4825
info@psrc.org • psrc.org



Fair Housing Equity Assessment

for the Central Puget Sound Region



Neighborhood Matters

Matching Opportunity with Community

Project Contributors

Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) Staff

Ben Bakkenta

Michael Hubner

Sara Maxana

Tim Parham

Lauren Engels

Carol Naito

Neil Kilgren

Rebeccah Maskin

Christy Lam

A Regional Coalition for Housing (ARCH) Staff

Mike Stanger

Fair Housing Center of Washington Staff

Lauren Walker

Katy Sheehan

Omar Barraza

Bess Scott

Rusty George Creative Staff

Rusty George

Chris Cowan

Jacquelyn Marcella

Leah Ettenhofer

Contents

Tables | 4

Figures | 5

Fair Housing Committee | 6

Executive Summary | 8



Section I. Introduction | 12

What is a Fair Housing Equity Assessment? | 12

The Growing Transit Communities Partnership | 12

The Fair Housing Equity Assessment | 13

Relationship between the FHEA and Jurisdictional Analysis of Impediments | 14

Fair Housing in the Central Puget Sound Region | 15

Historical Context of the Fair Housing Act | 15

Federal, State, and Local Protected Classes | 16

Recognizing Disability As A Protected Class | 18

The Growth Management Act | 19

History of Segregation in the Puget Sound Region | 19

Fair Housing versus Affordable Housing | 21

Document Overview | 22



Section II. Regional Profile | 23

Demographic Data | 23

Population Growth | 25

Race and Ethnicity | 26

Income | 31

Racially/Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty | 34

Measures of Segregation | 36

Dissimilarity Index | 37

A Geography of Segregation within the Region | 39

Predicted Racial/Ethnic Composition Ratio | 41

Access to Opportunity | 44

Opportunity Defined in the Central Puget Sound Region | **44**
Opportunity Distribution by Geography | **46**
Opportunity Distribution by Demographics | **48**
Implications of Inequitable Access to Opportunity | **50**

Addressing Fair Housing and Opportunity
Through Housing and Transportation Infrastructure | **51**

Housing Overview | **51**
Housing Cost | **52**
Housing and Transportation Affordability Index | **55**
Opportunity Distribution and Housing Assistance | **55**
Regulatory Context for Fair Housing and Opportunity | **56**
Transportation Infrastructure Investments | **58**



Section III. Fair Housing Infrastructure | 63

Overview | **63**

Analyses of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice
in the Central Puget Sound Region | **63**

Fair Housing Enforcement | **65**

U.S. Department of Justice | **65**
HUD Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity Office | **65**
Fair Housing Initiatives Program (FHIP) | **66**
Fair Housing Assistance Program | **66**
Fair Housing Partners of Washington | **67**

Recent Litigation - Cases Addressing Issues Involving Affirmatively
Furthering Fair Housing Enforcement | **67**

Complaint Data | **68**

Distribution of Fair Housing Cases by County | **70**

Puget Sound Fair Housing Complaints Tell a Story | **71**

Regional Transit Communities Fair Housing Testing Audit | **72**

Overview | **72**
Housing Discrimination Occurring in Snohomish,
King and Pierce County Transit Communities | **72**
Discrimination in Proximity to Transit Communities | **74**

Findings | **75**

Puget Sound Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA) Data | **75**

Foreclosures in the Puget Sound After the 2008 Collapse | **77**

Public Comment | **77**

Fair Housing Survey | **78**

Survey Comments | **80**

Community Forums and Individual Interviews | **80**

Conclusions from Public Comment | **81**

What Does All This Tell Us About Fair Housing in the Puget Sound Region? | **82**

Education Prevents Litigation | **82**



Section IV. Findings and Strategies | **83**

Findings | **83**

Fair Housing Equity Assessment (FHEA) | **83**

Fair Housing in the Central Puget Sound Region | **83**

Demographic Data | **84**

Access to Opportunity | **84**

Housing and Access to Opportunity | **85**

Transportation and Infrastructure | **85**

Fair Housing Infrastructure | **86**

Fair Housing Complaints | **86**

Evidence of Discrimination from Fair Housing Testing | **86**

Strategies | **87**

Fair Housing | **87**

Access to Opportunity | **87**

Affordable Housing | **88**

Next Steps | **89**

Appendix I: Predicted Racial/Ethnic Composition by Small Area | **90**

Appendix II: Cases of Note | **94**

Appendix III: Introduction to Testing Methodology | **96**

Appendix IV: Public Comment/Individual Interview Themes | **97**

Tables

Table 1: Protected Classes in the Puget Sound Region by Jurisdiction/Enforcement Agency | **18**

Table 2: Protected Classes in Puget Sound Cities Without Local Enforcement Agencies | **21**

Table 3: Tribes Located in the Puget Sound Region | **21**

Table 4: Population by County, 1990-2010 | **25**

Table 5: Demographic Overview - Central Puget Sound Region | **27**

Table 6: Median Income and Poverty by County, 2007-2011 | **31**

Table 7: Population and Demographics of R/ECAPs | **36**

Table 8: Dissimilarity Index for Central Puget Sound Region 2000 and 2010 | **38**

Table 9: Black-White Dissimilarity Index Comparisons to Peer Regions | **39**

Table 10: Central Puget Sound Region Comprehensive Access to Opportunity Index Sub-Measures and Indicators | **45**

Table 11: Existing Housing Stock and Racial Segregation | **52**

Table 12: Housing Affordability Benchmarks | **52**

Table 13: A List of the Region's Most Common Barriers to Fair Housing Choice | **64**

Table 14: HUD Fair Housing Complaints Nationwide vs. Central Puget Sound Region 2007-2011 | **68**

Table 15: Fair Housing Complaints by County 2007-2011 | **69**

Table 16: Regional Fair Housing Complaints by Type for 2007-2011 | **70**

Table 17: Difference In Treatment Favoring Control Tester | **73**

Table 18: 2012-2013 Testing Audit Results | **74**

Table 19: Discrimination in Proximity to Transit Communities | **74**

Table 20: 2010 Regional Home/Mortgage Disclosure Act Application Outcomes by Race | **75**

Table 21: 2010 Regional Home/Mortgage Disclosure Act Application Outcomes by Ethnicity | **76**

Table 22: Fair Housing Survey Findings | **78**

Figures

- Figure 1:** The Central Puget Sound Region | 24
- Figure 2:** 2010 Regional Population Shares by County | 25
- Figure 3:** Regional Population by Race 2010 | 26
- Figure 4:** Demographic Trends, 1990-2010 | 28
- Figure 5:** Percent Minority by Census Tract, 1990 | 29
- Figure 6:** Percent Minority by Census Tract, 2000 | 29
- Figure 7:** Percent Minority by Census Tract, 2010 | 29
- Figure 8:** Change in Minority Share of Population, 2000-2010 | 30
- Figure 9:** Median Income and Race/Ethnicity by County | 32
- Figure 10:** Median Household Income | 33
- Figure 11:** Racially/Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty | 35
- Figure 12:** Race/Ethnicity Concentrations | 40
- Figure 13:** Predicted Racial/Ethnic Composition Ratio | 43
- Figure 14:** Comprehensive Opportunity Map for the Central Puget Sound Region | 47
- Figure 15:** Opportunity Distribution by Demographic Group | 48
- Figure 16:** Opportunity Distribution and Poverty | 49
- Figure 17:** Opportunity Distribution by Race and Poverty | 49
- Figure 18:** Median Home Values by City | 53
- Figure 19:** Median Rental Rates | 54
- Figure 20:** Opportunity Distribution and Housing Assistance | 56
- Figure 21:** Planned Housing Stock and Opportunity | 57
- Figure 22:** Environmental Justice Analysis of Transportation 2040 | 59
- Figure 23:** Environmental Justice Analysis of 2013-2016 TIP (Minorities) | 60
- Figure 24:** Environmental Justice Analysis of 2013-2016 TIP (Low Income Housholds) | 61
- Figure 25:** Fair Housing Complaint % by County, 2007-2011 | 71

Fair Housing Subcommittee

Alaric Bien, City of Redmond

Alex Brennan, Capitol Hill Housing

Alexander Maurice, King County

Allyson O'Malley Jones, Northwest Justice Project

Amy Pow, Pierce County Health Department

Andra Kranzler, Columbia Legal Services

Anna Nelson, VanNess, Feldman, GordonDerr

Ben Miksch, Washington Low Income Housing Alliance

Brock Howell, Cascade Bicycle Club

Brooke Buckingham, City of Redmond

Chandler Felt, King County

Charlie Gray, Pierce County Housing Authority

Cheryl Collins, City of Seattle

Cheryl Markham, King County

Connie Brown, Tacoma Pierce County Housing Development Consortium

Dan Cardwell, Pierce County

Daniel L. Carlson, University of Washington

Dean Weitenhagen, Snohomish County

Denise Lathrop, City of Des Moines

Dinah Wilson, City of Kent

Eileen Canola, Snohomish County

Emily Alvarado, King County Housing Development Consortium

Eric Chipps, Sound Transit

Eva Wong, King County

Gina Custer, YWCA

Gloria Gould-Wessen, City of Kent

Gwenn Rousseau, City of Bellevue

Heidi Hall, Impact Capital

Ike Nwankwo, Washington State Department of Commerce

Jay Clarke, Snohomish County

Jaimie Reavis, City of Tukwila

Jan Meston, City of Everett

Janet Lewine, City of Bellevue

Jonathan Grant, Tenants Union of Washington State

Joseph Adriano, City of Bellevue

Julie West, King County Public Health

Kate Lichtenstein, Sound Transit

Kathy Temper, King County

Kelly Rider, King County Housing Development Consortium

Kirsten Jewell, Kitsap Regional Council

Kristin Pula, Homesight

Laura Hewitt Walker, City of Seattle

Linda Bremmer, City of Tacoma

Lindsay Masters, City of Seattle

Marianne Seifert, Pierce County Public Health Department

Marya Gingery, City of Tacoma

Megan Farley Hyla, King County Housing Authority

Michael Chin, City of Seattle

Michele Thomas, Washington Low Income Housing Association

Miranda Redinger, City of Shoreline

Miriam Roskin, City of Seattle

Monica Beach, City of Seattle

Naomi Goodman, Seattle Housing Authority

Ngozi Oleru, King County Public Health

Nicholas Nyland, Pierce County

Rosemary Curran, King County

Rudy Asunsolo, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

Ryan Curren, City of Seattle

Sarah Stiteler, City of Redmond

Scott Mingus, King County

Sharon Anderson, City of Kirkland

Sheryl Whitney, WhitneyJennings

Shane Hope, City of Mountlake Terrace

Siri Kushner, Kitsap County Public Health

Stephanie Bray, Pierce County

Steve Fredrickson, Northwest Justice Project

Steve Toy, Snohomish County

Sue Tracy, Snohomish County

Suzanne D Withers, University of Washington

Tina McLeod, City of Tacoma

Tony To, Homesight

Tricia Ruiz, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

Troy Holbrook, Snohomish County

Valerie Kendall, King County

Williams, Kelli, King County

Executive Summary

What is the Regional Fair Housing Equity Assessment (FHEA)?

The four-county central Puget Sound region is expected to grow to 5 million people by the year 2040. VISION 2040, the region's long range plan, envisions a sustainable future that achieves social equity and supports a healthy environment and strong economy. This regional Fair Housing Equity Assessment (FHEA) advances this goal with analysis and recommendations aimed at ensuring equitable access to housing and opportunity for all residents of the region, including racial and ethnic minority populations, people with disabilities, and other classes of people protected under the federal Fair Housing Act. The FHEA, funded through a regional planning grant from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), has a two-fold objective:

- **To ensure that the regional plans link fair housing considerations with issues of transportation, employment, education, land use planning, and environmental justice; and**
- **To ensure that affordable housing is located in areas that offer access to opportunity and that such housing is available to all people regardless of race, family status, disability, source of income or other personal characteristics protected under federal and state civil rights statutes.**

The FHEA is the first attempt to bring together a full range of regional stakeholders and agencies around a coordinated approach to affirmatively furthering fair housing through cross-jurisdictional affordable housing development, jobs planning, transportation, education, and health initiatives. As such, the recommendations of this report are intended to guide regional and local plans, regulations, investments and other policies and actions.

The Civil Rights Act (1964), the Fair Housing Act (1968), and subsequent statutes, regulations, guidelines, and case law, have created a framework at the federal level to designate protected classes and address issues of

Key Terms

Equity

means that all people, regardless of where they live, have access to opportunities that improve their quality of life and let them reach their full potential. Social equity also requires that low income communities, communities of color and other historically under-represented populations are active participants in planning and policy making.

Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing

means including real and effective fair housing strategies in planning and development process which correspond to the spirit of the Fair Housing Act to rectify the consequences of a history of inequality.

Access to Opportunity

opportunity measures community conditions—such as education quality, mobility, and economic health—that places individuals in a position to be more likely to succeed or excel.

segregation and fair housing access. There are currently 16 classes protected at either the federal, state, or local level in the central Puget Sound region. They are: race, color, religion, national origin, sex, gender identity, sexual orientation, familial/parental status, handicap/disability, creed, marital status, veteran/military status, age, section 8 recipient, ancestry, and political ideology.

As in other parts of the country, the central Puget Sound region has a history of segregation based on race and national origin. Practices such as restrictive covenants, redlining, and loan discrimination, helped contribute to concentration of blacks and other racial/ethnic minorities. A regional FHEA addresses both the lingering effects of historical segregation as well as ongoing discriminatory practices and conditions that create barriers to housing choice and access to opportunity.

Summary of Findings

The region is becoming much more diverse.

The four-county central Puget Sound region has experienced 34% population growth in the last 20 years. Nearly one-third of the 3.6+ million person population in 2010 identified as a racial/ethnic minority, representing a substantial increase in number, proportion, and geographic spread between 1990 and 2010.

Income and race are linked.

Median household incomes of white and Asian populations are higher than the region's median income, while median household incomes of black and Hispanic populations are lower than the region's median income. There are four census tracts that meet the HUD-definition for Racially/Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty in the region, meaning over 40% of the population is below the poverty level and over 50% of the population is a racial/ethnic minority. There are 13 additional census tracts in which at least 25% of households are below poverty and 40% of residents are non-white.

Moderate levels of segregation persist in the region, particularly for black residents.

Three measures indicate varying levels of segregation in the central Puget Sound region. A regional "dissimilarity index" describes a region that is characterized by low to moderate segregation which has declined over the past decade. Blacks continue to be the most segregated racial group in the region. Blacks and Hispanics live predominantly in south Seattle, south King County, and Tacoma. Asians reside predominantly in these areas along with east King County. Data suggest that income differences among racial groups do not explain the patterns of segregation in the region.

Race and income are linked to access to opportunity.

There is a strong association between geography and access to opportunity. Communities near the central cities of Seattle and Bellevue and east King County generally have high and very high access to opportunity. Areas in south King County and Pierce County generally are characterized by moderate, low, and very low access to opportunity. To the north, areas of southwest Snohomish County are associated with mixed access to opportunity. There is a relationship between race/ethnicity and access to opportunity. Whites and Asians are more likely to live in census tracts with high or very high access to opportunity than the population overall. Meanwhile, foreign-born, American Indian, Hispanic and African American residents are more likely to live in census tracts with low or very low access to opportunity than the total population. Living in poverty is associated with a higher likelihood of living in an area of low or very low access to opportunity. Blacks and Hispanics living in poverty are more likely to live in areas of low or very low access to opportunity than whites or Asians.

Housing choices are linked to access to opportunity.

Housing costs vary considerably across the region. High housing prices and rents are significant barriers to racial and ethnic minorities, immigrants, and other protected classes from securing housing generally, and especially in communities with good access to opportunity. The cost of transportation compounds the cost burden for housing alone that many low and even moderate income households in the region face. Comprehensive plans, implemented in part through land use regulations, include policies for accommodating growth with a range of housing types and densities. Affordability and access to high opportunity communities will be challenging in areas where displacement of existing affordable units is threatened and where higher-cost high-density is being developed.

While regional analysis shows an equitable distribution of recent and planned transportation investments, disparate infrastructure and community development needs persist within the region.

Environmental justice analyses conducted by the Puget Sound Regional Council for Transportation 2040 and the 2013-2016 Transportation Improvement Program conclude that at a regional scale, both past and planned transportation investments, have equitably benefited minority and low-income households. Results of the opportunity mapping analysis show inequitable access to opportunity in the areas of mobility, economic health, education, and public health. These findings strongly suggest that at the local level, inequitable gaps exist between the need for community infrastructure in these areas and the provision of adequate community infrastructure.

Fair housing complaint data show that discrimination occurs in the region.

Demand for fair housing training for housing providers and consumers alike outweighs the resources available to HUD, FHAP, and FHIP agencies in the region to provide for all education needs. Nearly 1,400 fair housing complaints were made between 2007 and 2011, with most related to disability or racial discrimination. People with disabilities have difficulty getting equal access to the housing market through reasonable accommodations. Racial and ethnic minorities experience more harassment and retaliation than whites.

Testing reveals evidence of discrimination.

Audits of fair housing testing in the region revealed that minority races, foreign born residents, and disabled people seeking housing had a 60% chance of being treated differently when looking for housing, particularly in areas that are highly served by transit and in areas with good access to opportunity. Among protected classes, racial and ethnic minorities were most likely to be treated differentially when seeking housing. Though it is not a protected class in most jurisdictions, discrimination due to source of income (Section 8) may have restricted housing for many of the region's most vulnerable people.

Recommendations

The FHEA recommends strategies to affirmatively further fair housing and equity in the region through three main areas: Fair Housing, Access to Opportunity, and Affordable Housing. These strategies are highlighted below.

Fair Housing

- Continue and expand regional coordination of fair housing assessment and enforcement.
- Adopt regional fair housing goals and monitor outcomes.
- Evaluate impacts of regional and local policies and investments on protected classes.
- Promote diversity and prevent discrimination through supporting fair housing educational efforts.
- Increase funding for fair housing programs in the region.

Access to Opportunity

- Use opportunity mapping analysis to prioritize housing, infrastructure, and community development investments.
- Encourage affordable housing development and preservation in areas with high access to opportunity.
- Prioritize investments to improve access to opportunity in areas with low access to opportunity.
- Promote economic development programs in areas of low and very low access to opportunity.
- Invest in equitable access to high quality education.
- Provide sufficient transit investments to provide for the mobility of transit dependent populations, particularly between areas of low and high access to opportunity.

Affordable Housing

- Increase efforts to provide sufficient choices of affordable, safe, healthy, and adequately sized housing throughout the region to meet the region's existing and future housing needs.
- Implement locally appropriate and effective incentives to encourage the development and preservation of affordable housing.
- Ensure that local zoning and building regulations allow and promote sufficient housing supply and housing types to meet the needs of households at a full range of incomes, household types, and special needs.
- Manage foreclosed homes to best serve areas of low and high access to opportunity respectively.
- Protect housing choice voucher holders from housing discrimination based on source of income.

Next Steps

- Use the data, analyses, findings, and recommendations contained in the FHEA as a resource for the local AIs, as well as a source of data and guidance to support policies and actions by entitlement jurisdictions, other regional partners, and the region as a whole.
- Continue to engage regional partners in developing a regional Analysis of Impediments based on the work done for the regional FHEA.
- Implement recommendations of the FHEA through the PSRC housing work plan.
- Understand and take regional and local action based on final updated HUD fair housing rules.



Section I: Introduction

What is a Fair Housing Equity Assessment?

On June 16, 2009, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT), and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) joined together in a new Partnership for Sustainable Communities to help communities nationwide improve access to affordable housing, increase transportation options, and lower transportation costs while protecting the environment.

The Partnership works to coordinate housing, transportation, and other infrastructure investments to make neighborhoods more prosperous, allow people to live closer to jobs, save households time and money, and reduce pollution. The partnership agencies incorporate six principles of livability into federal funding programs, policies, and future legislative proposals (see sidebar).

As part of the Partnership, in 2010, HUD created an Office of Sustainable Housing and Communities (OSHC), with a mission to create strong, sustainable communities by connecting housing to jobs, fostering local innovation, and helping to build a clean energy economy.

In February 2010, OSHC announced the availability of funding through a new Sustainable Communities Regional Planning Grant Program, intended to build support for actions that will create more equitable regions.

Livability Principles

Provide more transportation choices.

Develop safe, reliable, and economical transportation choices to decrease household transportation costs, reduce our nation's dependence on foreign oil, improve air quality, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and promote public health.

Promote equitable, affordable housing.

Expand location- and energy-efficient housing choices for people of all ages, incomes, races, and ethnicities to increase mobility and lower the combined cost of housing and transportation.

Enhance economic competitiveness.

Improve economic competitiveness through reliable and timely access to employment centers, educational opportunities, services and other basic needs by workers, as well as expanded business access to markets.

Support existing communities.

Target federal funding toward existing communities—through strategies like transit-oriented, mixed-use development and land recycling—to increase community revitalization and the efficiency of public works investments and safeguard rural landscapes.

Coordinate and leverage federal policies and investment.

Align federal policies and funding to remove barriers to collaboration, leverage funding, and increase the accountability and effectiveness of all levels of government to plan for future growth, including making smart energy choices such as locally generated renewable energy.

Value communities and neighborhoods.

Enhance the unique characteristics of all communities by investing in healthy, safe, and walkable neighborhoods—rural, urban, or suburban.



The Growing Transit Communities Partnership

In 2010 the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC)¹, in collaboration with 17 community partners, applied for and received a \$5 million Sustainable Communities Regional Planning Grant from the HUD Office of Sustainable Housing and Communities. The grant funded the creation of the Growing Transit Communities Partnership, with a work program intended to address some of the greatest barriers to implementing the central Puget Sound region's² integrated plan for sustainable development—VISION 2040—and securing equitable outcomes. A significant goal of the grant-funded effort is to identify unique roles and opportunities associated with transit investment through the coordination and direct involvement of a wider array of stakeholders, both public and private. The tools and templates funded by

the grant will greatly improve the region's capacity to foster compact, equitable development, while providing affordable housing, reduced transportation costs, better environmental outcomes, and access to jobs for low-income households and communities of color in areas receiving major transit and housing investments.

The Growing Transit Communities Partnership has provided a unique opportunity to establish a more inclusive conversation on regional issues, drawing in those who have traditionally been marginalized from the community planning process. These voices provide new insight into the burdens and benefits experienced by different groups across the region.

The Fair Housing Equity Assessment

As a condition of participation in Sustainable Communities Regional Grant program, HUD has required that all grantees complete a Fair Housing Equity Assessment (FHEA). Equity in this context means that “all people, regardless of where they live, have access to the resources and opportunities that improve their quality of life and let them reach their full potential. Social equity also requires that low income communities, communities of color and other historically underrepresented populations are active participants in planning and policy making by having the knowledge and other tools required for full participation.”

When developing the regional FHEA concept, HUD established two specific requirements for grantees:

1. **The findings of the FHEA must inform the regional planning effort and the decisions, priorities and investments that flow from it; and**

2. **The regional planning consortium members and leaders must engage in the substance of the FHEA and understand the implications for planning and implementation.**

The FHEA includes a detailed look at regional demographics and market conditions as they pertain to housing choice for people of color, families with children, persons with disabilities, and other protected classes. It provides insight into existing fair housing conditions within the region. The objective of the FHEA is twofold:

1. **To ensure that the regional plans link fair housing considerations with issues of transportation, employment, education, land use planning, and environmental justice; and**
2. **To ensure that affordable housing is located in**

1 The Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) is the metropolitan planning organization for Washington State's central Puget Sound region comprised of King, Kitsap, Pierce and Snohomish counties. PSRC is charged with integrating planning for regional transportation, land use, and economic development planning under authority embodied in state and federal laws.

2 The Puget Sound Regional Council is designated by the governor of the State of Washington, under federal and state laws, as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) and Regional Transportation Planning Organization (RTPO) for the central Puget



areas that offer access to opportunity and that such housing is available to all people regardless of race, family status, disability, source of income or other personal characteristics protected under federal and state civil rights statutes.

Currently there is no consistent regional coordination of fair housing planning by non-fair housing agencies. For fair housing agencies, regional coordination takes place among the Region 10 HUD office, four governmental departments responsible for fair housing, one nonprofit fair housing agency, and numerous stakeholder agencies. This regional FHEA is the first attempt to bring together city and county agencies that have not been formally engaged in this

coordination together to address affirmatively furthering fair housing through cross-jurisdictional affordable housing development, jobs planning, transportation, education, and health initiatives. As such, the recommendations of this report are intended to guide regional and local plans, regulations, investments and other policies and actions.

Relationship Between The FHEA and Jurisdictional Analysis of Impediments

Fourteen jurisdictions in the central Puget Sound region are recipients of either Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) or HOME funds from HUD and are thus required to prepare an Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice (“AI”) for their individual jurisdictions.

The FHEA follows much of the format required by HUD’s Fair Housing Planning Guide for jurisdictional AI. Like an AI, the FHEA examines regional demographics and conditions of racial and ethnic segregation. It considers public sector activities affecting housing choice, such as zoning and land use regulation, deployment of affordable housing resources across the central Puget Sound region, as well as the interaction of housing choice with public resources for transportation and similar investments. It looks at evidence concerning the level and types of discrimination that occur in the four counties and 82 cities and towns in the region, and the capacity of the entities to respond appropriately to those conditions. The FHEA discusses recent or current allegations against private or public entities of systemic discrimination, including civil rights lawsuits, pending fair housing enforcement actions, settlements, and consent decrees that signal the presence or resolution of key fair housing and civil rights concerns.

There are, however, several areas in which the requirements of the FHEA and AI differ. Historically, the focus of the AI has been on the local level. Jurisdictions

receiving and allocating federal funding have the responsibility to identify and address impediments to access fair housing within their borders. Jurisdictions with a local-level fair housing certification requirement must identify strategies and actions that will be taken to address the fair housing issues raised in the AI. The obligation to conduct an AI in connection with the use of CDBG and HOME funds is statutory. Jurisdictions that fail to carry out the steps required by the AI certification are at risk of an enforcement action. The FHEA is regional in scope and examines fair housing conditions from a regional standpoint. There is no comparable enforcement framework in the Sustainable Communities program or in the FHEA. The Puget Sound Regional Council has no power to compel the communities with which it works to further fair housing. However, jurisdictions are always required to abide by applicable fair housing laws and if they do not they may risk litigation.



Fair Housing in the Central Puget Sound Region

Historical Context of the Fair Housing Act

The civil rights movement of the 1950s and 1960s resulted in landmark legislation known as the Civil Rights Act of 1964 which guarantees the right of all people to enjoy equal treatment regardless of race or color. Because of the painful history of segregation and inequality among the races regarding housing in particular, shortly thereafter Congress passed the Civil Rights Act of 1968, commonly known as the Fair Housing Act. The law guarantees that all people have the right to equal housing opportunities regardless of race, color, religion, national origin, or other federally protected classes. The Act prohibits not only intentional discrimination but also unintentional discrimination, where neutral policies and practices have a negative or disparate impact on members of a protected class.³ Equal housing rights protected under the Fair Housing Act extend to nearly all types of housing, including publicly and privately funded housing and rental and owner-occupied housing.

To ensure compliance with the Fair Housing Act, Congress assigned the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) the responsibility of enforcing the law through administrative processes or if necessary, through lawsuits filed in federal court. The Act was amended in 1988, increasing HUD's enforcement powers.

Enforcement responsibilities also include the requirement that all agencies of the federal government which administer and/or oversee programs involving housing and community development “affirmatively further fair housing.” This requirement arises in large part from the need to repair the effects of the government’s not so long ago discriminatory policies which restricted minority housing opportunities. The idea is that no federal money should be spent in furthering discriminatory practices, and in fact, federal money should actually be spent on rectifying the injustices caused by housing discrimination in the past and promoting integrated and sustainable communities.

In the central Puget Sound Region there are fourteen entitlement jurisdictions⁴ that, because of the federal grants they receive, are subject to the requirement to affirmatively further fair housing. They include:

- Counties: King, Kitsap, Pierce, Snohomish
- Cities: Auburn, Bellevue, Bremerton, Everett, Federal Way, Kent, Lakewood, Marysville, Seattle, Tacoma

Though all communities must abide by fair housing law, entitlement jurisdictions need to go a step further. In terms of practical application for entitlement jurisdictions,

³ The following actions are common violations of the FHA if based on any of the protected classes: Refusing to rent or sell a dwelling after a bona fide offer has been made; Refusing to negotiate for the sale or rental of a dwelling; Setting different terms, conditions, or privileges related to the sale or rental or to the use of facilities and services provided at a dwelling; Misrepresentation of availability of a unit; Making a profit by convincing owners to sell or rent properties based on fear of declining property values because members of a protected class are moving into a neighborhood (an action known as ‘blockbusting’); Advertising in a way that implies a preference for or limits usage to a certain type of buyer or renter; Denying access to, or membership in, or setting any different terms and conditions for membership to any organization in the business of selling or renting housing; Refusing to make or give information about a mortgage loan; Setting different terms or conditions for loans; Discriminating in the appraisal of property; Refusing to purchase a loan or setting different terms for the purchase of a loan; Interfering in any way with a person’s exercise of their fair housing rights

⁴ Entitlement Jurisdictions, discussed in Section I, are those jurisdictions which receive federal grant money related to housing development and which are subject to the affirmatively furthering fair housing provisions in the Fair Housing Act (discussed in Section III of this report) namely, CDBG, ESG, HOME funds. The Puget Sound Regional Council is designated by the governor of the State of Washington, under federal and state laws, as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) and Regional Transportation Planning Organization (RTPO) for the central Puget



this means that recipients of federal housing funds are required to include real and effective fair housing strategies in their planning and development process which correspond to the spirit of the Fair Housing Act and rectify the consequences of a history of inequality. In other words, to receive federal money, jurisdictions are required to create a housing plan which affirmatively furthers fair housing.⁵ The equity assessment, which identifies the key issues of equity and fair housing in the region, is one of the first steps a jurisdiction must take toward affirmatively furthering fair housing because it examines, among other things, segregation and poverty in relation to protected classes as well as the location of areas of opportunity. Such an assessment informs past, present, and future investments in infrastructure that assist with fair housing planning towards more diverse, equitable, and sustainable communities.

Since the Fair Housing Act’s passage in 1968 there have been numerous attempts to address the broader issues of segregation. In 1996, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) published fair housing planning guides for government entities to deeply analyze discriminatory housing practices in their communities. Attempting to understand how discrimination works in individual communities, government entities are required to examine policies and practices that fostered segregation and unequal housing and then come up with an action plan to address what they found. Jurisdictions in receipt of federal housing money⁶ are required to complete Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice. HUD has been fine tuning these efforts in recent years to find ways to effectively address the impact of our policy decisions on the successes and failures in our communities.

Federal, State, and Local Protected Classes

The Fair Housing Act has been amended over time to include additional protected classes. The Act now prohibits discrimination in the sale, rental, and financing of housing based on race, color, religion, sex, national origin, family status and/or disability.⁷ Though not specifically stated in federal law, discrimination due to gender identity or sexual orientation is also prohibited because of a 2010 HUD policy.⁸

Washington State and some local governments have elected to extend protection from housing discrimination by enacting fair housing laws with additional protected classes, such as sexual orientation, marital status, age, and political ideology, within their jurisdictions. Tables 1 and 2 on the following page categorize the federal, state, and local protected classes.

The Fair Housing Act prohibits discrimination in the sale, rental and financing of housing based on:

- race**
- color**
- religion**
- sex**
- national origin**
- family status**
- disability**

⁵ 42 U.S.C. §3608(d); 24 C.F.R. §570.601(a)(2)

⁶ Community Development Block Grant, HOME, Emergency Services Grant funds

⁷ Federal Register, 24 CFR Part 14 et al., Implementation of the Fair Housing Amendments Act, 1988: Final Rule, (Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1989), 3284.

⁸ HUD Issues Guidance on LGBT Housing Discrimination Complaints – Department addresses housing discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity (July 1, 2010) - http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/HUD?src=/press/press_releases_media_advisories/2010/HUDNo.10-139



Table 1 Protected Classes in the Puget Sound Region
by Jurisdiction/Enforcement Agency

Basis	Federal/HUD	State/WSHRC	King County/ KCOCR	Seattle/SOCR	Tacoma/ THRC
Race	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Color	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Religion	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
National Origin	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Sex	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Gender Identity	✓ ⁹	✓	✓	✓	✓
Sexual Orientation	✓ ¹⁰	✓	✓	✓	✓
Familial Status/Parental Status	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Handicap/Disability	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Creed		✓		✓	
Martial Status		✓	✓	✓	✓
Veteran or Military Status		✓		✓	✓
Age			✓	✓	✓
Section 8 Recipient			✓	✓	
Ancestry			✓		✓
Political Ideology				✓	

“List of Fair Housing Agencies” available at: <http://www.kingcounty.gov/exec/CivilRights/FH/FHresources.aspx>

Note: Agencies referenced above are Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Washington State Human Rights Commission (WSHRC), King County Office of Civil Rights (KCOCR), Seattle Office for Civil Rights (SOCR), and City of Tacoma Human Rights (THR).

⁹ Gender Identity and Sexual Orientation are protected classes insofar as they are covered under the HUD’s Guidance on LGBT Housing Discrimination Complaints issued July 1, 2010.

¹⁰ Id.



Table 2 Protected Classes in Puget Sound Cities without Local Enforcement Agencies*

Basis	Everett	Bremerton	Burien	Renton
Sexual Orientation	✓			
Gender Identity				
Age	✓		✓	
Ancestry		✓		
Source of Income	✓			✓

“List of Fair Housing Agencies” available at: <http://www.kingcounty.gov/exec/CivilRights/FH/FHresources.aspx>

* State and Federal protected classes apply in all jurisdictions in Washington.

Among the agencies that are active in the fair housing arena, actual enforcement provisions vary. Though the intention may be to protect people from discrimination, without enforcement provisions laws are less effective, which is why the charts above are broken up into jurisdictions with laws that have enforcement agencies, and those that do not.

Recognizing Disability as a Protected Class

The disability rights movement arrived relatively recently to the civil rights table. The Fair Housing Act was amended in 1988 to include disability as a protected class, and in 1991 the Americans with Disabilities Act was passed by the US Congress prohibiting discrimination in employment, transportation, public accommodation, communications and governmental activities. In 1971, Washington State enacted the Education for All Act, the nation’s first state mandatory special education law that would serve as a template for a national law passed years later. The state legislature passed the Washington State Freedom from Discrimination Law in 1993¹¹.

Discrimination against people with disabilities is multifaceted and may manifest differently than discrimination based on other factors. Disability-related discrimination may include refusal to negotiate with a person because of their disability or withholding access to people with disabilities by failing to reasonably

accommodate a person with disabilities so that they may access their equal rights to education, employment, housing, and public spaces. In regards to segregation/ integration issues, creating accessible housing and public spaces is a major consideration for planners and developers as they plan for communities that can be used by everyone. In terms of access to equal opportunity, reasonable accommodation and modification policies help promote and ensure that people with disabilities are not excluded from opportunities because of their disabilities.

¹¹ RCW 49.60.030 – Freedom from Discrimination – Declaration of civil rights.



The Growth Management Act

Washington’s Growth Management Act (GMA) provides the framework for planning at all levels in the state, including identifying and protecting critical environmental areas, developing multi-county and county-wide planning policies, and crafting local comprehensive plans (Chapter 36.70A, Revised Code of Washington— RCW). Multi-county planning policies contained in VISION 2040 – the central Puget Sound region’s adopted long range growth management, environmental, economic and transportation strategy – and the related county-wide planning policies provide a common framework for local and regional planning in the region. At a minimum, multi-county planning policies are to address designating an urban growth area, contiguous and orderly development, siting capital facilities, transportation, housing, joint planning, and economic development.

The completeness of a jurisdiction’s treatment of the mandatory “housing” elements of the Growth Management Act will go a long way towards affirmatively furthering fair housing. The GMA requires that the local comprehensive plan housing element:

- Include an inventory and analysis of existing and projected housing needs that identifies the number of housing units necessary to manage projected growth;
- Include a statement of goals, policies, objectives, and mandatory provisions for the preservation, improvement, and development of housing, including single-family residences; and
- Identify sufficient land for housing, including, but not limited to, government-assisted housing, housing for low-income families, manufactured housing, multifamily housing, and group homes and foster care facilities; and makes adequate provisions for existing and projected needs of all economic segments of the community.

History of Segregation in the Central Puget Sound Region

As in other parts of the country, the central Puget Sound region has a history of segregation based on race, national origin, and other characteristics. Practices such as “red lining” and restrictive covenants on property have had long-lasting impacts on neighborhoods.

Across the region, communities have been shaped by racially restrictive covenants. These covenants took the form of terms in a deed that prevented people of minority races, religions, and ethnicities from purchasing the home. The U.S. Supreme Court indirectly validated racially restrictive covenants in a 1926 case ruling that they were private contracts, not created by the government and the government was not responsible for the acts of private citizens. Thereafter the restrictions occurred frequently in private deeds all over the country, including the central Puget Sound region¹². Because

the restrictions were an enforceable contract, owners who disregarded the contract terms were subject to the consequences outlined within the document which usually meant that violators of the racially restrictive covenant would forfeit their property as a penalty.

As a result of these private contracts, neighborhoods throughout the region prohibited the sale to or rental of property by blacks, Jews, as well as Asians. In 1948 the Supreme Court ruled that racially restrictive covenants were not enforceable (in other words, if racially restrictive covenants existed in a deed there was not a court in the country that could force a violator to forfeit the property which meant the covenant could not be enforced and was effectively null and void).¹³ Even with this ruling, the decision did not change already segregated communities that had formed or

¹² Corrigan v. Buckley, 271 U.S. 323 (1926)

¹³ SHELLEY V. KRAEMER, 334 U.S. 1 (1948)



the informal structures that perpetuated segregation within well-established communities. Also, despite the ruling, it was still legal for realtors and property owners to discriminate because of race and national origin until Congress passed the Fair Housing Act in 1968.

Another discriminatory practice which affected the entire nation, including the central Puget Sound region, relates to the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) loans that were available to returning veterans after WWII. As part of the GI Bill, FHA home mortgage loans were approved for veterans with very low interest rates. Veterans of color, however, were only given FHA loans in certain neighborhoods and were therefore prevented from moving into majority white neighborhoods through what amounted to a governmental redlining program.¹⁴

In 1900, blacks lived in all fourteen of Seattle's wards. Through redlining and other practices, however, they were segregated into the two neighborhoods that would become the International District and the Central District.¹⁵ Blacks could not rent or buy housing outside of these areas, and in many parts of the city they were not allowed in hospitals, restaurants, theaters, and nightclubs. Racially restrictive covenants were common in the rest of Seattle, but particularly north of the Ship Canal Bridge, Capitol Hill, Madison Park, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and lakeside neighborhoods from Madrona to Rainier Beach. There were fewer restrictive deeds in Beacon Hill and Rainier Valley and people of color had very little chance of finding housing outside of the central neighborhoods.¹⁶

In Pierce County, redlining was used as a form of discrimination to segregate blacks within the Hilltop neighborhood as well as the eastside of Tacoma. Within Tacoma, there were certain neighborhoods, including

the Hilltop, where neither government nor private banks would invest. Without these investments in schools, businesses, and public infrastructure pockets of poverty and dilapidated communities evolved. As in other counties, the use of racially restrictive covenants in Pierce County segregated neighborhoods and formal, overt laws were not needed to actively discriminate against people because of race.

During World War II, the military continued to segregate by race. At Fort Lewis, in south Pierce County, people of color were segregated into separate camps and housing areas. At this time Washington State had three black army camps which were separated from whites: Camp Hathaway in Vancouver, Camp George Jordan in Seattle, and South Fort Lewis near Tacoma.¹⁷ In both Seattle and Tacoma there was restricted seating for blacks in theaters, as well as discrimination by store clerks in the downtown areas.

World War II also saw the relocation and internment of thousands of Japanese-Americans in the central Puget Sound region. The process decimated the thriving Japantown community in Seattle, and affected hundreds of Japanese-American owned farms in east King and Kitsap Counties. Residents of Japanese descent were given less than a week's notice to liquidize assets, including real estate. As a result, many families lost their homes, businesses and livelihoods, in addition to the trauma of the three-year internment camps relocation.

Within Snohomish County, people of color have always been underrepresented. Only recently have significant populations of people of color begun to move into Snohomish County. Though the area has begun to diversify, the northern part of the central Puget Sound region was, and still is, the least diverse in comparison with South King and Pierce Counties.

14 "Race and the Power of Illusion," California Newsreel, 2003 at http://www.pbs.org/race/000_General/000_00-Home.htm

15 Lesson Twenty-One: African Americans in the Modern Northwest," Center for the Study of the Pacific Northwest, University of Washington at <http://www.washington.edu/uwired/outreach/cspn/Website/Classroom%20Materials/Pacific%20Northwest%20History/Lessons/Lesson%2021/21.html>

16 Silva, Catherine. "Racial Restrictive Covenants: Enforcing Neighborhood Segregation in Seattle," Seattle Civil Rights & Labor History Project at http://depts.washington.edu/civilr/covenants_report.htm

17 Colt Denfeld, Duane. "Washington's Black Army Camps – Camp Hathaway, Camp George Jordan, South Fort Lewis," Sept. 27, 2012 at http://www.historylink.org/index.cfm?DisplayPage=output.cfm&file_id=10127

18 Kerley, Joni. "Does Your Home's CCR's Include Bizarre Restrictions?" Everett Area Real Estate Blog – Discovering All of Snohomish County WA. Mar. 12, 2012 at <http://activerain.com/blogsviw/3035622/does-your-home-s-ccr-s-include-bizarre-restrictions->



As elsewhere in the central Puget Sound region, some housing development in Snohomish County had racially restrictive covenants¹⁸ which prevented people of color from moving north of Seattle. Unlike King and Pierce Counties, there was no area where people of color were pushed like the International/Central District in Seattle or the Hilltop in Tacoma, and therefore there has been no historic neighborhood for people of color. As a result, few people of color settled north of Seattle until very recently.¹⁹

Native American tribes in the central Puget Sound region are numerous and diverse in comparison with other areas in the state and nation (see Table 3). Like other people of color they have experienced significant discrimination in housing, though there are some differences insofar as they were largely restricted to reservations as Washington State was settled by people of European descent. The chart below lists the federally recognized and non-recognized tribes in the central Puget Sound region.

Table 3 Tribes Located in the Central Puget Sound Region

	Snohomish	King	Pierce	Kitsap
Federally Recognized	Tulalip	Snoqualmie	Puyallup	Suquamish
	Stillaguamish	Muckleshoot		Port Gamble's S'Klallam
Non-Federally Recognized	Snohomish	Duwamish	Steilacoom	None
	Kikiallus Indian Nation			

Fair Housing Versus Affordable Housing

While interrelated, “fair housing” and “affordable housing” are distinct concepts in law and policy. Fair housing is a broader concept which protects people in protected classes from discrimination in housing transactions including both the public and private housing markets because both markets may have conditions which restrict housing choice. Affordable housing affects fair housing because housing and other public policies influence housing markets as well as the distribution of subsidized affordable housing units in a given area. In these ways, public policy can repair or create patterns of residential segregation.

Fair housing for a region means affordable housing options are available in all communities to allow

people to live where they want to live. In areas where there is low access to opportunity²⁰ or where the housing quality is low, new affordable housing units may improve the value of the housing stock. In areas where there is high access to opportunity or where the housing is generally very expensive, affordable housing units add diversity to the community and allow access to opportunities to low income families.

Generally, the more affordable housing units there are in a community the better. However, over concentration of affordable housing can hinder fair housing efforts and actually further residential segregation, especially in communities with low access to opportunity or segregated communities of color.

¹⁹ Lobos, Ignacio. “Snohomish Minorities Seek Clout,” Seattle Times. Apr. 18, 1990 at <http://community.seattletimes.nwsourc.com/archive/?date=19900418&slug=1067105>

²⁰ For a complete discussion of access to opportunity, see Section II of this report.



The 2007 U.S. Supreme Court challenge, *United States v. Westchester County, New York*,²¹ provides a good example of what not to do. In this case, Westchester County, NY, one of the most segregated counties in the United States, allegedly failed to affirmatively further fair housing after having received millions in federal housing grants.²² Though Westchester County certified that it had analyzed the impediments to fair housing choice and that it was addressing those impediments, the court ruled that County had not done anything related to furthering fair housing.

Westchester County argued that efforts to provide more affordable housing in low income areas where there were high percentages of racial minorities improved the housing in those areas. The real effect of the policy of building affordable housing units solely in communities with high populations of low income minorities was that they further segregated those populations, confining affordable housing units to minority communities rather than changing housing patterns within an already racially polarized county. Meanwhile, the county had not built any affordable housing in high opportunity areas which were primarily white communities.

As a result of the Westchester case, HUD has been reinvigorated to promote and enforce its authority to affirmatively further fair housing. Since 2009, HUD and the Department of Justice have filed cases against jurisdictions in many part of the country (e.g., the State of Texas; the State of Louisiana; St. Bernard Parish, LA; Danville, IL; Joliet, IL; Sussex Co. DE; and Marin County, CA) that were allegedly not meeting these requirements .

Promoting affordable housing in all neighborhoods affirmatively furthers fair housing and dismantles residential segregation. When a jurisdiction expands affordable housing opportunities in historically homogeneous communities with more opportunity, members of protected classes have access to good schools, employment, and healthy homes which they have been excluded from in the past. Diversifying the housing market diversifies a community's population.

Document Overview

This report proceeds in the following sections. Section II provides a regional profile that includes data on demographics, access to opportunity, and characteristics of the built environment, such as housing and transportation. Section III follows with a description and evaluation of the region's fair housing infrastructure. Finally, Section IV summarizes overarching findings from the report's analysis and recommends strategies to improve equitable access to housing in the central Puget Sound region.



Section I
Introduction



Section II
Demographics, Access to Opportunity,
and Characteristics of the Built
Environment



Section III
Description and Evaluation of the
Region's Fair Housing Infrastructure



Section IV
Summarizes Overarching Findings From
the Report's Analysis and Recommends
Strategies for Improvement

²¹ United States of American ex rel. Anti-Discrimination Center of Metro New York v. Westchester County, New York 495 F.Supp.2d 375 (2007).

²² To view a map of percentages of minority populations by region in Westchester County: http://giswww.westchestergov.com/wcgis/Census/2010_Tracts_Minority.pdf



Section II: Regional Profile

The central Puget Sound region in Washington State consists of the four counties of King, Kitsap, Pierce, and Snohomish, and 82 cities. The region's 3,690,942 residents comprise over half of the state's population. See Figure 1.

The following Regional Profile section describes and assesses key characteristics of the region that relate to fair housing. These characteristics include demographic patterns and trends, such as race, disability status, and national origin, and measures of segregation within the region. Access to opportunity is measured, mapped, and analyzed with respect to the communities where different racial and cultural communities currently live. Finally, various aspects of the built environment, such as housing and public investments, are highlighted as they relate to providing fair access to all current and future residents.

For each of the three subsections, a description of current conditions and recent trends is followed by an evaluation that relates the data to implications for fair housing choice and equity.

Demographic Data

Data in this section describes select regional demographic characteristics, including the interplay of geography with population growth, race and ethnicity, income, and concentrations of poverty. United States Census and American Community Survey data from 1990, 2000 and 2010, as well as information collected by the Puget Sound Regional Council as part of regional data monitoring, serve as the primary sources of data to support these profiles. The data is presented by region, county, and where appropriate, cities.

Each subsection first presents a data snapshot of the central Puget Sound region today, followed by trend data that indicate change over the twenty year period from 1990-2010. Finally, an

assessment discusses how the data relate to issues of fair housing choice and equity, including geographic trends, housing affordability, and poverty rates.

Figure 1 The Central Puget Sound Region






Population Growth

Figure 2

The central Puget Sound region encompasses four counties, King, Kitsap, Pierce, and Snohomish, with a total 2010 population of 3,690,042. In 2010, King County had the largest share of the population with over half of the region’s residents. Pierce and Snohomish counties were close in size at 22% and 19%, respectively, of the region’s population. Kitsap County was home to 7% of the population. See Figure 2.

2010 Regional Population Shares by County



- King
- Kitsap
- Pierce
- Snohomish

Source: US Census, 2010

34%

Population growth from 1990-2010 in the central Puget Sound Region

The region grew by over 34% between 1990 and 2010, from over 2.7 million residents to nearly 3.7 million residents. Snohomish County grew the most rapidly during this time, increasing by 53% over the 20-year period. Pierce County grew by 36%, and Kitsap by 32%. King County, the most urbanized of the counties with Seattle as its major city, experienced the lowest relative growth rate at 28%, but the highest absolute increase in population, growing by more than 400,000 people over the 20-year period. See Table 4 below.

Table 4 Population by County 1990-2010

	1990	2000	2010	% Change (1990-2010)
King	1,507,319	1,737,034	1,931,249	28%
Kitsap	189,731	231,969	251,133	32%
Pierce	586,203	700,820	795,225	36%
Snohomish	465,642	606,024	713,335	53%
Region	2,748,895	3,275,847	3,690,942	34%

Source: US Census



Race and Ethnicity

Figure 3 shows the demographic breakdown for the central Puget Sound region reflected in the most recent 2010 Census. Approximately a third of the overall population identifies as a racial or cultural minority. Asians are the largest minority group, at 12%. Hispanics tied with Census responders that indicated “other” or “two or more races” as the next most prominent minority groups with 9% of the population each. Black (African American) residents of the region make up about 5% of the total population.


1/3 Approximately a third of the overall population identifies as a racial or cultural minority

These statistics represent only the most recent snapshot of a central Puget Sound region that has become increasingly diverse. The central Puget Sound Region’s population grew rapidly in the last twenty years, increasing by 34% from 1990 to 2010 (see Table 4). During this period, the region diversified with the percentage of Whites decreasing from 87% of the population in 1990 to 73% in 2010. Persons of color doubled to about 27%, with fully 31% of the population in a minority, including white Hispanics (see Table 5 and Figure 4). The growth in diversity was due primarily to an increasing population of Asian/Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, Hispanics, and people who were “other” races/two or more races²³. In the same period the percentage of Blacks and Native Americans in the region remained steady, making up approximately 5% and 1% of the population respectively in 1990, 2000, and 2010.

Table 5 also shows a significant and growing population in the region that is foreign born. Over the 20-year period, the proportion of the region’s population that had immigrated to this country nearly doubled to about 15%. Many of the most recent immigrants came here as refugees. In fact, Washington State ranked 9th in the United States with 909,312 of the country’s refugees (out of 40,377,860 nationwide)²⁴.

Figure 3

Regional Population by Race 2010



Total Minority: 31% Hispanic (any race): 9%

- White
- Black or African American
- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Asian, Hawaiian, or Other Pacific Islander
- Some Other Race (alone), or Two or More Races

Source: U.S. Census

²³ The 1990 Census did not have an option to select more than one race as a response. The introduction of the multiple race response data in 2000 and 2010 both inflates the apparent increase in this category between 1990 and 2000 and likely reduces the increase in other minority categories.

²⁴ Migration Policy Institute: <http://www.migrationinformation.org/DataHub/state.cfm?ID=WA>



Table 5 Regional Growth by Democratic Category 1990-2010


	1990	2000	2010	% Change
Total Population	2,748,895	3,275,847	3,690,942	34%
White	2,385,511	2,579,305	2,682,265	12%
Black or African American	126,607	159,366	198,617	57%
American Indian or Alaska Native	36,279	37,895	40,859	13%
Asian, Hawaiian, or Other Pacific Islander	172,846	286,995	435,876	152%
Some Other Race (alone), or Two or More Races	27,652	212,286	333,325	N/A
Hispanic/Latino (any race)	77,019	172,062	325,162	322%
All Racial/Ethnic Minorities	409,403	771,837	1,151,923	181%
Foreign-born	209,717	397,004	556,992	166%
People with Disabilities ²⁵	N/A	N/A	376,399	N/A
Total Households	1,071,424	1,282,984	1,454,695	36%
Households with Persons under 18 Years Old	370,105	440,269	461,382	25%
Housholds with Persons 65 and older	205,586	234,273	295,410	44%

Source: U.S. Census

²⁵ Due to changes in the way that the Census defines “people with disabilities” the statistics for 2000 and 1990 cannot be compared with the statistic for 2010.



Figure 4 Demographic Trends 1990-2010



Source: U.S. Census


As the region as a whole has become more diverse, so has the geographic extent of minority communities expanded beyond what historically had been minority and mixed-race urban neighborhoods in central cities to other cities and communities along major transportation corridors in suburban areas. Figures 5, 6, and 7 illustrate that trend. Census tracts on the map shaded blue indicate areas where the percentage of minority residents exceeds 25%, with the darkest blue indicating over 50% (majority minority) neighborhoods.

In 1990, communities with high numbers of minority residents were primarily limited to central and southeast

neighborhoods of Seattle and Tacoma. By 2000, as overall minority populations in the region increased, so did the number and geographic spread of communities where minorities exceeded a quarter of the population, especially areas of south King County and further along the I-5 corridor. That trend continued and expanded to other parts of the region through the most recent census in 2010, by which time minority communities were even more evident throughout south King County through Tacoma, and, as a more recent trend, in Bellevue and Redmond in east King County, and also north along the I-5 corridor into Snohomish County.




Figure 5 1990




Source: U.S. Census

Figure 6 2000



Source: U.S. Census

Figure 7 2010



Source: U.S. Census

1990 Minority residents primarily limited to central and southeast neighborhoods of Tacoma/Seattle

Figure 5: Percent Minority by Census Tract, 1990

2000 Minority populations increase, exceeded a quarter of the population, especially in King County area


Figure 6: Percent Minority by Census Tract, 2000

2010 Minority communities more evident throughout King County and Tacoma, and in Bellevue, Redmond, and Snohomish County

Figure 7: Percent Minority by Census Tract, 2010



Figure 8 Change in Minority Share of Population 2000-2010



Source: U.S. Census

A trend toward more minority residents of the region living in more communities throughout the region is one indication, at least on a broad geographic scale, that the central Puget Sound region is becoming more integrated. Another way of depicting this trend is shown in the map of demographic change in Figure 8. Blue areas have increasing shares of minorities, yellow areas have decreasing shares. The map clearly shows that across the entire arc of suburbs surrounding the region's

central cities, communities are generally becoming more diverse. However, the map also suggests that a more complex trend may be occurring in Seattle and other central city locations, where the proportional loss of minority residents may reflect displacement of historical communities in areas that have been experiencing gentrification. As well, the figure shows that the trend toward integration has apparently skipped over some neighborhoods, a factor that deserves further research.



Income

Household income is one key factor in determining where people live within the region. Overall, the central Puget Sound region has higher incomes compared with Washington State and the country as a whole (see Table 6). With the exception of Pierce County, all counties have incomes that are higher than the state median and all four counties are higher than that for the nation as a whole. Fewer people live in poverty in the region compared to the state and country as well with the percentage of households below the poverty line in all four counties falling below the state and national rates. While such comparisons provide important context, they do not tell the whole story of income in the region.

There is a strong relationship between income and race and ethnicity. Data for the four counties that comprise the central Puget Sound region reveal this disparity (see Figure 9). Income for blacks is the most disparate, with black households earning about half to a third less than what white non-Hispanic households earn. Hispanic households are also at a significant disadvantage in terms of income, earning a third to a quarter less than white non-Hispanics. The income picture for Asian households is mixed, with incomes for Asians on par with whites in King, Snohomish, and Kitsap counties and falling somewhat below the median income for white households in Pierce County.


Table 6 Median Income and Poverty by County 2007-2011

	Median Household Income	% of Households Living Below Poverty Level
Snohomish	\$67,777	9.3%
King	\$70,567	10.5%
Pierce	\$58,824	11.6%
Kitsap	\$61,112	9.8%
WA State	\$58,890	12.5%
National	\$52,762	14.3%

Source: American Community Survey (2007-2011 Estimates)



Figure 9 Median Income and Race/Ethnicity by County




Source: American Community Survey (2007-2011 Estimates)

The costs of housing vary from city to city, neighborhood to neighborhood. Transportation becomes more costly for residents of areas that are far from employment centers and transit lines. These realities are reflected in the resulting distribution of income in the region. Figure 10 shows the median household income for census tracts throughout the central Puget Sound region. Darker shades of blue indicate higher income areas. The highest income areas are located along Puget Sound and Lake Washington as well as more broadly in east King County. The lowest income areas, on average, are in south King County and Pierce County. King County has the highest median income and the second highest percentage of households living below the poverty level, indicating that there is the largest income gap in King County between the highest earners and the number of people living in poverty.



Figure 10 Median Household Income



Source: American Community Survey (2007-2011 Estimates)



Racially/Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty

As defined by HUD, Racially/Ethnically Concentrated Area of Poverty (R/ECAPs) focus attention on the problematic intersection of poverty and race within single neighborhoods. A Racially/Ethnically Concentrated Area of Poverty is exactly what it sounds like, a neighborhood where there is extreme poverty and where the majority of the population is non-white. The technical definition used by HUD for R/ECAP is a census tract where 40% or more households in the tract live in poverty and more than 50% of the population is non-white.

Racial and ethnic income gaps are perpetuated and may widen in these neighborhoods for many reasons. Neighborhoods with concentrated poverty tend to have high crime rates, health disparities relating to close proximity to environmental hazards, stress, inadequate health care facilities, and poor quality food.²⁶ Children who grow up in densely populated poor neighborhoods and attend low-income schools face barriers to academic and occupational achievement while children who live in mixed-income communities are less likely to drop out of high school and/or become pregnant as teenagers.²⁷

The central Puget Sound region has four census tracts that qualify as R/ECAPs according to the HUD definition. Figure 11 shows the location and extent of census tracts that meet each of the thresholds established by HUD. The blue shaded areas are tracts where more than half of the population identifies in one or more minority groups. Consistent with the data presented earlier in this report, large areas of south Seattle and south King County, Tacoma and Pierce County, and selected tracts to the east and north of Seattle are “majority minority” communities.

A much smaller portion of the region is characterized by a rate of poverty that exceeds the federal threshold of 40%. Less than 1% of the region’s population lives in tracts that exceed this threshold. This finding is consistent with the regional context of relatively high incomes and strong employment markets. However, high regional

**the poorest areas
in the region are the most
racially concentrated**

prosperity means that the disparity between well-to-do and impoverished neighborhoods is all the more marked.

In the whole region there are only four census tracts where 40% or more of the households live in poverty, thereby meeting HUD’s definition of “area of poverty”. However, all four census tracts also are 50% or more non-white. Essentially, the poorest areas in the region are racially concentrated.

Two of the R/ECAPs are in Seattle and two are in Tacoma. The R/ECAPs in Seattle are adjacent to one-another and together comprise portions of the Central Area and International District. The R/ECAPs in Tacoma are located in the Hilltop and Eastside neighborhoods. With respect to the historical context of racial discrimination, both the Central/International District in Seattle and the Hilltop in Tacoma were the two areas where people of color were historically segregated. The Tacoma Eastside neighborhood includes a large HUD affordable housing development, known as Salishan.²⁸ The Seattle tracts include Yesler Terrace, a large public housing development planned for transformation to a mix-use, mixed-income district in the coming decades.


²⁶ Jens Ludwig, Greg J. Duncan, Lisa A. Gennetian, Lawrence F. Katz, Ronald C. Kessler, Jeffrey R. King, and Lisa Sanbonmatsu, “Long-Term Neighborhood Effects on Low-Income Families: Evidence from Moving to Opportunity,” *American Economic Review Papers and Proceedings* 103, no. 3 (May 13): 226-231

²⁷ Sharkley, Patrick. “Neighborhoods and the Black-White Mobility Gap,” *Economic Mobility Project; The Pew Charitable Trusts*. July 2009

²⁸ “Salishan – History and Overview of the Redevelopment Effort,” *Tacoma Housing Authority*. May 1, 2013



Figure 11 Racially/Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty





As enumerated in Table 7, just over 14,000 people live in the four R/ECAPs, less than 1% of the total regional population. Nearly 3 in 5 of the residents of these four tracts is a member of a minority. Blacks are the most numerous minority group, at about a quarter of the population, followed by Asians and Hispanics.

Due to the relatively high household incomes prevalent in the region, there is value in looking beyond the HUD definition for R/ECAPs at tracts with somewhat lower rates of poverty, though well above the regional average. A total of 17 census tracts meet the more inclusive criteria of more than 25% of the households in poverty and more than 40% of the people minorities. These neighborhoods are located in south Seattle, Renton, and Kent in King County, and in Tacoma and south unincorporated Pierce County. A total of 77,630 people live in these areas.

Table 7

Population and Demographics of R/ECAPs

Total Population	14,055	100%
White Alone	5,949	42%
All Minorities	8,106	58%
Black	3,506	25%
Hispanic	1,378	10%
Asian	2,015	14%
Pacific Islanders	495	4%
Native Americans	331	2%
Two or More Races/Other	761	5%

Measures of Segregation

For the purposes of this analysis, segregation is defined as an observed pattern of settlement within a region or community where people who belong to different racial or ethnic groups tend to reside in different neighborhoods. As will be discussed in this section, several measures can be used to analyze the overall degree of segregation within a region, locations where it is prevalent, and potential causes.

Segregation may be caused by a number of factors that fall into three categories: self-segregation, active segregation in the form of discriminatory practices or policies, and segregation that results from structural inequities in the society.

Positive residential preferences play a part in segregation in the form of self-segregation. Put simply, people do affirmatively consider the race of their neighbors when they choose a place to live. For example, immigrants often locate in places with significant co-ethnic populations, forming homogenous enclaves with shared cultural affinities and language. A local example is the International District with Seattle’s dense population of people from Asian countries and cultures. Studies have

Segregation:

an observed pattern of settlement within a region or community where people who belong to a different racial or ethnic groups tend to reside in different neighborhoods

shown that self-selection by other minority groups, such as blacks and Hispanics, also occurs. However, evidence suggests that self-segregation is only one of many factors shaping where people choose to and are able to reside.

Active segregation due to discrimination has occurred in multiple forms in the United States, both historically and up to the present. Overt barriers to residence, such as racial covenants and redlining, were used for many years to bar minorities from certain neighborhoods. The pattern of racial segregation enforced by such practices in the past is still evident in many neighborhoods in the region. Fortunately, the more overt forms of discrimination have been in decline, a factor that contributes to the demographic trends toward a more broadly diverse region illustrated in Figures 5-7.



In addition to the effects of discrimination in the past, discriminatory real estate practices in the present continue to promote segregation in the region. More subtle forms of discrimination have been emerging in housing markets. Testing, Fair Housing Complaints, and jurisdictions' analyses of impediments confirm that discrimination occurs in the region.²⁹

Structural causes of segregation continue to have a pervasive effect across communities, whether or not self-segregation or discrimination are also at play. People are residentially sorted by economic status. High-priced neighborhoods as well as neighborhoods with limited rental housing fail to provide feasible housing choices for low- and moderate income households. The role of housing affordability (or lack there-of) in segregation will be explored further in a later section. In the central Puget Sound region, as well as most metropolitan areas, socioeconomic status and race are linked (see Figure 9). The correlation between race and income translates to spatial segregation as people of color are concentrated in neighborhoods, in part, because of lower incomes.

Forms of segregation can interact and reinforce each other as well. For example, self-segregation by whites in the form of “white flight” from central cities to suburbs shaped the demography of Seattle and many other cities in the second half of the 20th Century.³⁰ However, the extreme segregation that often resulted from this phenomenon was accentuated by both active discrimination that barred minorities from living in suburban communities as well as public policy that limited the availability of housing types that would be affordable to lower income households. Because of the interaction of these factors, segregation is not a simple problem with a simple solution.

Segregation involves a host of issues that have a history of conflict and emotional impact for many people. The discussion of segregation in this report is not intended to blame individuals for segregation in communities in the region, nor to imply a preference for people to live where they do not want to live. The thrust of a fair housing perspective on the issues and recommendations for action moving forward is to ensure that people have choice in where they live. If someone wants to live in a certain area they should not be limited by their race, ethnicity, or status within other protected class.

Dissimilarity Index

The dissimilarity index is one measure used to assess the degree of segregation present in a community or region. The index measures segregation as the relationship between the pattern of residence of any two demographic groups (e.g., black – white). The calculated value of the dissimilarity index can fall between zero (0), which represents complete integration, and one (1) which represents complete segregation. Loosely interpreted, the index represents the percentage of one group that would need to move in order for each small area to match the composition of the larger region. Based on guidelines provided by HUD³¹, a dissimilarity index value of < 0.40

indicates “low” levels of segregation, a value of 0.41 – 0.54 indicates “moderate” levels of segregation, and an index value of > 0.50 indicates “high” levels of segregation.

Using Census tract data from the years 2000 and 2010 for the 4-county central Puget Sound region, dissimilarity indices were calculated for five different demographic pairings: white-minority, white-black, white-Hispanic, white-Asian/Pacific Islander, and white-Native American. The results are shown in Table 8.

²⁹ For more discussion about discrimination in housing see Section III: Fair Housing Infrastructure.

³⁰ Ihlanfeldt, Keith R., and Benjamin Scafidi. “Whites’ Neighbourhood Racial Preferences and Neighbourhood Racial Composition in the United States: Evidence from the Multi-City Study of Urban Inequality.” *Housing Studies* 19 (3): 325–59. 2004. Woodward, Mikala. “Southeast Seattle Schools: World War II to Present.” *Neighborhoods Southeast Seattle Community History Project*: 1-3. 2011.

³¹ “FHEA Data Documentation,” HUD, 2013.



Table 8

Dissimilarity Index for Central Puget Sound Region 2000 and 2010

	2000	2010	
White - Minority	0.34	0.32	Low Segregation (<0.40)
White - Black	0.54	0.50	Moderate Segregation (0.41-0.54)
White - Hispanic	0.33	0.34	Low Segregation (<0.40)
White - Asian/Pacific Islander	0.40	0.39	Low Segregation (<0.40)
White - Native American	0.35	0.36	Low Segregation (<0.40)

Source: U.S. Census, HUD, PSRC

Overall, the dissimilarity index results describe a region that is characterized by low to moderate segregation and that has seen modest desegregation over the past decade. However, the data also indicate that some groups experience more segregation than others.

For whites vs. all minorities, a 2010 index of 0.32 is significantly below the HUD threshold of 0.40. The decline in the index from 2000 for all minorities shows a modest decrease in what was already a “low” level of segregation at that time. The situation for blacks, as a subset of that overall minority population, is quite different vis-a-vis segregation. In the year 2000, the white-black dissimilarity index was 0.54, just below the threshold that indicates “high” segregation. Over the ensuing decade, the white-black index declined to 0.50, a significant improvement, but still far above the HUD threshold of 0.40 for “moderate” segregation. Segregation between whites and Hispanics with an index value of 0.32 and 0.33 respectively for 2000 and 2010, is “low” but clearly not improving. In the year 2000, the dissimilarity index for whites-Asian/Pacific Islander stood at 0.40, just shy of what HUD would consider “moderate” segregation. By 2010, the index had declined slightly to 0.39. Finally, segregation between whites and Native Americans in the region also scores as “low” for both 2000 and 2010.

The dissimilarity index is limited as a measure of segregation that may be experienced by more specific demographic subgroups than are reflected in the Census data. For example, “blacks” includes both descendants of African slaves and also more recent African immigrants; “Hispanic” applies to both white and non-white races and includes people with a variety of national origins; “Asian/Pacific Islander” is a very diverse category that includes people of widely varying cultures and national origins. The actual experience of any of these sub-groups may be substantially different than the larger group with respect to segregation and discrimination in our region, with those different experiences not reflected in these data.

A comparison of the dissimilarity index for this region with that for other peer regions nationally reveals that the Seattle metropolitan area offers a moderately segregated social landscape. Of the 318 metro areas ranked by the dissimilarity indices nationally, the Seattle-Bellevue-Everett area ranked 172nd for dissimilarity between whites and blacks (see Table 9), 207th between whites and Asians, and 157th between whites and Native Americans.³²

The highest dissimilarity index in the Puget Sound region is between whites and blacks. However, in comparison with other metro areas of similar size (between 2-3 million) Seattle, Bellevue-Everett is doing very well, ranking 11th out of 12 in its dissimilarity index between whites and blacks.

32 http://www.censusscope.org/us/rank_dissimilarity_white_black.html



Table 9 **Black-White Dissimilarity Index Comparisons to Peer Regions**

Urban Regions Between 2-3 Million in Population Comparison

Region	Regions with 2-3 Million in Population Ranked by Dissimilarity Index	Black-White Dissimilarity Index	Overall Ranking (Disregarding Area Population)
Newark, NJ	1	0.84	6
Cleveland-Lorain-Elyria, OH	2	0.80	9
Nassau-Suffolk, NY	3	0.79	11
St. Louis, MO-IL	4	0.78	13
Miama, FL	5	0.76	22
Pittsburg, PA	6	0.73	38
Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL	7	0.68	72
Oakland, CA	8	0.664*	83
Denver, CO	9	0.662*	86
San Diego, CA	10	0.582*	171
Seattle-Bellevue-Everett, WA	11	0.579*	172
Orange County, CA	12	0.44	282

*Rounded to the third decimal because of close proximity of index for ranked areas.


Source: HUD

A Geography of Segregation Within the Region


Segregation can also be measured and mapped using Census tract data on existing demographic make-up of individual communities. The maps in Figure 12 show how the proportion of minority groups within each tract compares with the regional average for that group. Red shaded tracts are more than one standard deviation above the regional average, indicating areas where each of the groups is relatively highly concentrated.




Figure 12 Race/Ethnicity Concentrations




All Minorities



Asians



Blacks



Hispanics

Source: U.S. Census, PSRC



In Figure 12, the map at upper left shows the share of total population identifying as a minority. With a regional average of 31% and a standard deviation of 16%, the areas of concentration (47% or higher) roughly align with the federal threshold of 50% minority for “areas of racial concentration” (see Figure 11). Existing concentrations are in southeast Seattle, south King County, Tacoma, and, to a lesser degree east King County and along the I-5 corridor in Snohomish County.

At lower left, blacks are shown to be highly concentrated in southeast Seattle, parts of south King County, Tacoma, and further south to Fort Lewis. With a regional average share of just over 5% of the population, blacks are the most highly concentrated racial group. Red shaded tracts indicate areas where the share of blacks is more than twice the regional average.

At upper right, Asians are shown to be more broadly represented within the region, particularly in southeast Seattle, south and east King County, and Snohomish County. As the largest minority group in the region, Asians comprise people whose origins span across many parts of that continent, including China, Japan, Korea, southeast Asia, the Philippines, south Asia, and others. Within the overall geography of Asian peoples living in the region, communities of shared national origin are seen to cluster in particular areas (such as southeast Asians in central and southeast Seattle, or south Asians in east King County). Finally, the map at lower right shows that people of Hispanic origin reside primarily from south Seattle down through Tacoma, in the Lynnwood area of Snohomish County, and in selected tracts in east King County.

Predicted Racial/Ethnic Composition Ratio

Another measure of segregation recommended for use by HUD is the Predicted Racial/Ethnic Composition Ratio. The ratio is one way to identify racial segregation, as opposed to income segregation, in communities throughout a region. This value distinguishes between socioeconomic and racial components of residential segregation by taking into consideration current household income characteristics for each community, and predicting the expected racial/ethnic composition of the community. The ratio represents the gap between the predicted and actual percentage of minorities in each community.

Some socioeconomic segregation is expected, based on the ability of different groups of people to afford high-priced real estate. With this in mind, it is possible to predict the racial make-up of the population that would be expected to reside in a jurisdiction based on the region’s income distribution by race and ethnicity. The predicted number of minority residents in a community can be determined by multiplying the incidence of minority persons for each income category by the number of people the jurisdiction has in each income category, and then summing the products.

The ratio helps identify the jurisdictions where minorities are underrepresented or overrepresented with respect to local income levels. If patterns of race segregation

were entirely the result of income segregation, that ratio would fall close to a value of 1. The extent to which the ratio diverges from 1 indicates that factors other than merely income are at play in determining where different races live. HUD recommends a threshold of 10% above (>110%) or 10% below (<90%) as indicating the influence of non-income factors.

The map in Figure 13 shows the results of this analysis, in which the Predicted Racial/Ethnic Composition Ratio was calculated for each city in the region. Appendix I lists each of the locations with ratio results.

The map suggests a pattern where generally, racial and ethnic minorities are “overrepresented” in centralized places and “underrepresented” at the periphery of the urban area, indicating that factors other than income have shaped the racial make-up of these places. The region’s most urban places, particularly along the southern part of the I-5 Corridor, are the areas where the predicted racial/ethnic composition is higher than expected based on income. The predicted racial/ethnic composition ratio is the lowest on average in the region’s smaller towns in rural and suburban areas and in the northern part of the I-5 Corridor. This is consistent with the demographic data insofar as until recently, suburban areas were populated mainly by whites. Though that




trend is shifting towards more diversity, it is clear that suburban areas, particularly those that are far from the urban core, are still under-populated by people of color.

The analysis underscores that income alone does not explain why more minorities have not moved to suburbs, especially more outlying communities. However, it should be noted that the analysis does not indicate what factors other than income are at play, or specifically what factor discrimination may play in perpetuating the segregation. In addition, while the findings are significant for minorities as a whole, the experience of different racial and ethnic groups likely varies. Race vs. income data for individual groups, such as blacks and Hispanics, for whom other data suggest higher levels of segregation regionally, may show an even more disparate relationship between income and where those races live within the region.



Figure 13 Predicted Racial/Ethnic Composition Ratio



Source: HUD

Note: Data reported by HUD for cities and parts of cities. In cases where partial-city results varied across a single jurisdiction, the mixed results of the Predicted Racial/Ethnic Composition Ratio are indicated per the map legend. Actual results for all measurement areas are shown in Appendix 1.



Access to Opportunity

The demographic profile presented in the previous section discussed where people live within the central Puget Sound region—particularly people who have historically been actively discriminated against, such as racial and ethnic minorities. The profile revealed a historic pattern of moderate segregation that decreased to some extent in the most recent decade as minority populations moved out of historically segregated areas. This trend has led to greater racial/ethnic and income diversity in many—but not all—other areas of the region. Despite greater geographic diversity, patterns also indicate co-concentrations of minority and low income communities, suggesting that race/ethnicity and poverty still intersect.

This section builds on the demographic profile by examining how people live in different communities in the region. There are many critical community attributes and

resources that support the opportunities for residents to thrive through access to housing, jobs, other services, and healthy environments. Understanding the presence of these conditions in different communities, including the disparity that exists between communities, provides context for the broader discussion of fair housing and housing choice in the region. The data underlying this framework can inform investments to improve the quality of disadvantaged neighborhoods, as well as expand access to advantaged neighborhoods for diverse populations.

Opportunity Defined in the Central Puget Sound Region

In 2012, the Puget Sound Regional Council partnered with the The Ohio State University's Kirwan Institute, through funding from the federal Partnership for Sustainable Communities and as part of the Growing Transit Communities Partnership work program, to analyze "Access to Opportunity" within the central Puget Sound region's urban growth area.³³ The Kirwan Institute defines "Access to Opportunity" as a situation or condition that places individuals in a position to be more likely to succeed or excel. Kirwan has worked with communities around the nation to take this broad concept and translate it into datasets that can be shown in spatial terms, creating maps that roughly portray the relative levels of "opportunity" across a region.

In the central Puget Sound region, a stakeholder and data-driven effort to refine that definition with specific measures tailored to this region resulted in a report and online mapping tool (available at <http://www.psrc.org/growth/growing-transit-communities/>

[regional-equity/opportunity-mapping/](http://www.psrc.org/growth/growing-transit-communities/regional-equity/opportunity-mapping/)). The resulting Comprehensive Access to Opportunity Index is based on twenty community indicators, developed within topic areas as a series of maps to illustrate the geographic distribution of access to opportunity. As a result of this work, the Growing Transit Communities Strategy contains recommended strategies to improve conditions in areas with limited access to opportunity and increase housing choices and transportation access to areas with good access to opportunity. While the analysis does not provide insight on how previous public investments may have led to disparate access to opportunity across geographies or populations, it is a forward-looking tool that suggests which communities may benefit from future investments, such as improvements in infrastructure, job access, neighborhood safety and education quality.

Five sub-measures, each comprising several individual indicators, informed the Comprehensive Access to Opportunity Index. The sub-measures included: education,

³³ For a complete explanation of the Opportunity Index and methodology used for the central Puget Sound region please see Equity, Opportunity, and Sustainability in the Central Puget Sound Region – Kirwan Institute and Puget Sound Regional Council Report May 2012 found: http://www.kirwaninstitute.osu.edu/reports/2012/05_2012_PugetSoundOppMapping.pdf



economic health, housing and neighborhood quality, mobility and transportation, and health and environment. See Table 10 for a description of the five sub-measures and the individual indicators that informed each. Indicators include those that are impediments to opportunity (negative factors such as neighborhood crime index or percentage of the community that is within a food desert) or, conversely, sources of opportunity (positive factors such as access to living wage jobs and access to transit services).

A comprehensive opportunity score was then calculated for each census tract in the urban segments of the region. The results were divided into quintiles, classifying 20% of the population by census tract into five categories of

access to opportunity: low, very low, moderate, high and very high. These opportunity categories describe the relative access to opportunity in neighborhoods and communities throughout the region. The mapped index can be used to analyze other data of interest that pertain to equity in access to opportunity for all peoples in the region.

While the quintiles do not denote an absolute quantitative measure of the access to opportunity for any specific neighborhood or population, they do provide insight into how factors, such as geography, demographics and income, suggest varying levels of opportunity access, and highlight areas and populations that would benefit from future investments to improve access to opportunity.

Table 10 Central Puget Sound Region Comprehensive Access to Opportunity Index Sub-Measures and Indicators

Central Puget Sound Region Comprehensive Access to Opportunity Index Factors

Sub-Measure	Indicators
Education Quality of local schools and educational resources	Reading Test Scores (4th Grade WASL) Math Test Scores (4th Grade WASL) Student Poverty Rate Teacher Qualifications Graduation Rates
Economic Health Proximity to, and participation in, the labor market	Auto and Transit Access Living Wage Jobs Job Growth Trends 2000-2010 Unemployment Rate
Housing and Neighborhood Quality The health of neighborhoods and their housing stock and market	Housing Vacancy Rate Foreclosure Rate High Cost Loan Rate Housing Stock Condition Crime Index
Mobility and Transportation Resident mobility by different modes	Transportation Commute Cost Proximity to Express Bus Stops Average Transit Fare Cost Percent of Commutes by Walking
Health and Environment Proximity to healthy open space and access to food	Distance to Nearest Park/Open Space Proximity to Toxic Waste Release Percent of Area With a Food Desert

Source: Equity, Opportunity, and Sustainability in the Central Puget Sound Region
 Kirwan Institute and Puget Sound Regional Council Report May 2012




Opportunity Distribution by Geography

Mapping census tracts by Comprehensive Access to Opportunity Index (Figure 14) reveals geographic patterns of disparate access to opportunity across the region. As the map shows, areas near the central cities of Seattle and Bellevue and east King County generally have high and very high access to opportunity. Areas in south King County and Pierce County generally are characterized by moderate, low, and very low access to opportunity. To the north, areas of southwest Snohomish County are associated with mixed access to opportunity.

These data suggest a strong association between geography and access to opportunity, and major disparities among residents of different parts of the region. The findings highlight areas that would benefit from public investments to improve opportunity, as well as areas that would benefit from housing and transportation improvements to allow greater access for residents of low access to opportunity areas to those areas of higher access to opportunity.



Figure 14 Comprehensive Opportunity Map for the Central Puget Sound Region



Source: Equity, Opportunity, and Sustainability in the Central Puget Sound Region
Kirwan Institute and Puget Sound Regional Council Report May 2012




Opportunity Distribution by Demographics

Due to persistent segregation within the region, not all groups of people have equal access to opportunity. Figures 15, 16, and 17 present the correlations between opportunity distribution and demographic group, poverty, and the intersection of poverty and race.

Figure 15 presents the levels of access to opportunity for seven demographic groups (six racial/ethnic groups, plus persons with disabilities). As a point of comparison the distribution across the total population is also given (by 20% quintiles, as noted above). The groups are shown in descending order from the group with the highest percentage of residents living in areas of high or very high access to opportunity (whites), to the group with the lowest percentage of residents living in areas of high or very high access to opportunity (blacks).

The data suggest that white and minority residents alike live in areas of varying access to opportunity, from very low opportunity to very high opportunity. Among racial and ethnic groups, however, whites and Asians are more likely to live in census tracts with high or very high access to opportunity than the total population. Meanwhile, foreign-born, American Indian, Hispanic and African American residents are more likely to live in census tracts with low or very low access to opportunity than the total population. Over half of the populations of American Indian, Hispanic and African Americans live in areas of low or very low access to opportunity.

Figure 15 Opportunity Distribution by Demographic Group




Source: Equity, Opportunity, and Sustainability in the Central Puget Sound Region
Kirwan Institute and Puget Sound Regional Council Report May 2012



Figure 16, below, shows the intersection of opportunity with poverty. Approximately half of all people living in poverty and households receiving some form of public assistance are located in areas with low or very low access to opportunity, relative to only 40% of the total population living in areas with low or very low access to opportunity.


Figure 17 further explores the intersection of poverty and race in the distribution of access to opportunity. The data demonstrate that for those living below poverty, race is associated with different levels of access to opportunity. For example, blacks living below poverty are nearly twice as likely to live in areas of low or very low access to opportunity as whites living below poverty level (32.4% versus 17.5%). Furthermore, whites and Asians living below poverty are more likely to live in areas with high or very high access to opportunity as the total population (42.6% and 43.5%, respectively, versus 40% for the total population).

Figure 16 Opportunity Distribution and Poverty



Source: Equity, Opportunity, and Sustainability in the Central Puget Sound Region, Kirwan Institute and Puget Sound Regional Council Report May 2012

Figure 17 Opportunity Distribution by Race and Poverty



Source: Equity, Opportunity, and Sustainability in the Central Puget Sound Region Kirwan Institute and Puget Sound Regional Council Report May 2012



Implications of Inequitable Access to Opportunity

Measuring access to opportunity is a useful tool to evaluate current conditions of neighborhoods on attributes and resources that promote life success, and compare how geographies and populations differ in relative opportunity access. While the analysis does not measure what historic trends or investments have led to current conditions, it may be used to inform future public investments to improve access to opportunity for geographies or populations with relatively lower access today, as well as improve housing and transportation choices in areas of higher access to opportunity to give more opportunities for people to live and work in those areas. Two important observations may be drawn from the Access to Opportunity tool:

- **First, the tool clearly demonstrates that race and income are associated with disparate levels of access to opportunity in the region.**

With the exception of Asians, racial/ethnic minorities are more likely to live in areas of low or very low access to opportunity, as are lower income households. Race and income interact such that racial/ethnic minorities living below poverty are more likely to live in areas of low or very low access to opportunity than indicated by race and income separately.

- **Second, there are specific geographic areas of the region that correspond to lower access to opportunity—particularly communities in south King County, Pierce County, and portions of southwest Snohomish County.**

These areas would likely benefit from investments to improve access to quality education, economic health, housing and neighborhood quality, mobility and transportation, and health and environment. Investments in transportation linkages, particularly transit, can help to provide that access by connecting these areas with part of the region that have high access to opportunity.



Addressing Fair Housing and Opportunity Through Housing and Transportation Infrastructure

Two key aspects of the built environment—housing and transportation—are essential to achieving fair housing goals and ensuring equitable access to opportunity in the central Puget Sound region. Housing, especially the availability of housing that is affordable to households earning a full range of incomes, determines who can and who can't live in a community. Lack of housing affordability may be a barrier to protected classes, many of whom are lower income, being able to live in communities with good access to opportunity. Transportation investments knit

the region together, connecting residences with places of employment, services, education, and recreation. Maintaining and improving the region's roadways, transit networks, and pedestrian and bicycle facilities can increase access to opportunity and enhance community value. This section will briefly address key data indicators of the intersection of housing and transportation systems with fair housing and opportunity in the region.

Housing Overview

The central Puget Sound region has a population of approximately 3.7 million. Available to house those residents are more than 1.5 million housing units. 60% of those units are single-family detached homes. 40% are units in buildings with more than one dwelling unit, including apartments and condominiums. Of the total housing units in the region, 62% are owner-occupied and 38% are renter occupied. The type and tenure of the housing stock plays a critical role in determining whether low or even moderate income households³⁴ can afford to live in a community. Rental housing and multifamily dwellings tend to be more affordable for households of limited resources.

Table 11 shows how the housing stock is distributed across neighborhoods with respect to the percent minority in that neighborhood. Census tracts were classified based on the percent minority relative to the regional minority share of 31% of the total population. Tracts that fell between 23% and 39% minority (1/2 standard deviation around the mean) will be referred to as "integrated" because they most closely mirror the demographic mix at large. About a third of the regional

3.7M

Population of the Puget Sound Region

31%

Minority of the Puget Sound Region

population resides in "integrated" tracts. Tracts above and below this range will be called "segregated white," "somewhat segregated white," "somewhat segregated minority," and "segregated minority," depending on how far from the mean the minority share in those census tracts is. Approximately one out of six people in the region lives in a "segregated minority" census tract.

³⁴ The PSRC has adopted definitions for "low income" up to 50% of area median income and "moderate income" up to 80% of area median income.



Table 11 Existing Housing Stock and Racial Segregation

Percent Minority Population Per Census Tract

	Segregated White	Somewhat Segregated White	Integrated	Somewhat Segregated Minority	Segregated Minority
	< 15%	15%-23%	23%-39%	39%-47%	>47%
Population	551,176	799,297	1,278,417	413,246	648,806
Housing Units	231,320	347,849	551,685	174,818	264,990
% Single-Family	80%	67%	57%	50%	45%
% Owner Occupied	81%	69%	61%	52%	46%

Source: U.S. Census, PSRC

Segregated white neighborhoods tend to have housing that is predominantly single-family and owner-occupied. Segregated minority communities tend to have housing that is mixed single family - multifamily and mixed tenure as well. This finding, while unsurprising, has several implications. First, it

underscores the importance of housing tenure and type in accommodating minority households, which generally have lower incomes than white households. Second, the data suggest that regulatory or market practices that shape the type and tenure of housing in a community can effectively limit the minority population.

Housing Cost

The cost of housing has an enormous effect on where people of different races and ethnicities can live within the region. In particular, as shown in Figure 9 on page 26, blacks and Hispanics earn significantly lower incomes, on average, than other demographic groups. Housing markets vary across the region,

including both the price of ownership housing and prevailing rents. The maps in Figures 18 and 19 show how median home values and rents vary widely from jurisdiction to jurisdiction, revealing marked sub-regional patterns. Table 12 below provides benchmarks against which to compare the values shown in the maps.


Table 12 Housing Affordability Benchmarks

	Area Median Income (AMI)	Affordable Purchase Price at AMI	Affordable Rent at 60% of AMI
King/Snohomish	\$85,600	\$301,000	\$1,284
Kitsap	\$71,900	\$247,200	\$1,079
Pierce	\$69,600	\$238,100	\$1,044

Source: PSRC



Figure 18 Median Home Values by City



Source: American Community Survey (2007-2011 Estimates)


The maps in figures 18 and 19 illustrate dramatic disparities in the cost of housing across the region. Home values in central and eastern King County, including the City of Seattle and Eastside cities, are significantly higher than what would be affordable to a household earning the area median income. Homes in east King County

cost more than twice what homes cost in south King County, and especially Pierce County and other outlying areas. Rents show a similar disparity, with especially high rents in east King County.³⁵ Most important, generally, the areas with higher housing costs are areas of the region with greater access to opportunity.

³⁵ The reported rent amounts for Seattle may be skewed lower by two factors: concentration of smaller units and concentration of subsidized apartments in the city



Figure 19 Median Rental Rates



Source: American Community Survey (2007-2011 Estimates)



Housing + Transportation Affordability Index

The cost of transportation compounds the cost burden to low and moderate income households of living in any particular community. The Housing + Transportation Affordability Index is a tool that has been developed by the Center for Neighborhood Technology to measure how the proportion of income a typical household spends on housing and transportation costs based on market factors and access to mobility choices. The variables used to determine this transportation cost index include residential density, walkability, transit access, and employment access of the block group, the costs to own/operate a car, and the costs to ride transit. Housing costs are considered affordable if they are less than 30% of a household's income. An area is considered affordable for housing + transportation costs if a household uses less than 45% of their income.

In the central Puget Sound region, the Housing + Transportation Index calculated for Census tracts shows

that 38% of neighborhoods are cost burdened for a household earning area median income by housing costs only, while 67% of neighborhoods in the region are housing + transportation cost burdened for such households. The Housing + Transportation cost burden for “moderate-income” households in the region (those households whose income equals 80% of the regional median, or in other words, poorer households) are even heavier. Moderate income households are cost burdened in their housing costs in 62% of neighborhoods and cost burdened in 92% of neighborhoods for housing + transportation costs. Due to the correspondence between income and race, the Housing + Transportation cost burden falls especially heavily on non-white households. This indicates that transportation is a significant cost to households in the region. For more details on this tool, visit <http://htaindex.cnt.org/map/>.

Opportunity Distribution and Housing Assistance

In any community, market-rate housing cannot meet the needs of all households at all income levels. Housing assistance, currently and for the foreseeable future, is essential to providing housing access to many people in the central Puget Sound region. Yet another way to understand the distribution of access to opportunity is to overlay housing assistance data with the Comprehensive Access to Opportunity Index results. Figure 20, below, indicates the relationship between several measures of housing need and assistance, such as Section 8 voucher use and subsidized units, and distribution of access to opportunity. The distribution of total units and cost burdened households across opportunity categories is provided for context.


The data show that over half of households using Section 8 vouchers live in areas of low or very low access to opportunity. Only 30% of Section 8 vouchers are used in areas of high or very high access to opportunity. This figure is below the 40% benchmark that would indicate proportional distribution within the region and perhaps even further behind the level of usage in communities with good access to opportunity that would be necessary to remedy existing racial inequities. The distribution of subsidized units across opportunity categories closely matches the total housing stock. However, the majority of subsidized units³⁶ in areas with high or very high access to opportunity are located in and around downtown Seattle, with relatively

³⁶ As part of the Growing Transit Communities work, PSRC compiled a mapped database of of subsidized housing units. The data includes dwellings (single-family homes or apartments) where the prices are kept affordable by a contract between a funding agency or local government and the property owner for a defined period of time. Affordable prices may be a percentage (usually 30%) of the income of the actual occupant, or set at 30% of an established level of the area median income (e.g., 50%, 60%, or 80% of AMI) regardless of the occupant's income; in any case, the units are reserved for moderate-, low-, or very low-income households. Most of these units have received cash subsidies, low-interest loans, tax breaks, land, or other direct financial benefits, but some are “subsidized” by land use incentives, such as density bonuses. The list does not include group homes or count individual beds, as in assisted living facilities.



fewer subsidized units in outlying neighborhoods of the city and especially in high opportunity suburban communities. If the region adopts a goal of increasing mobility of subsidized housing residents to high opportunity areas, then the benchmark for evaluating the fair housing impacts of subsidized units would not be proportional distribution, but rather an increased proportion of subsidized units in those communities.

Figure 20 Opportunity Distribution and Housing Assistance³⁷



Regulatory Context for Fair Housing and Opportunity

The housing stock is not fixed; it changes over time with new development and redevelopment. The type of housing that can be built in any given location is determined by local plans and zoning. The type of housing developed (single-family detached, townhomes, apartments, condominiums) is highly correlated with the cost of housing and tenure (rent vs. own), both

of which are crucial to determining whether lower or even moderate income households can obtain housing in a community, and particularly housing in communities which offer high access to opportunity.

Figure 21 shows how the planned future housing stock is distributed across areas that are currently in the five

³⁷ Note that “Total Units” does not equate to total population, and therefore the opportunity distribution by units does not fall into the same equal 20% quintiles as does the total population.




opportunity categories. The housing units and types shown in this figure represent what the housing in the region would look like if all the land uses identified in local comprehensive plans were realized through new development. The state Growth Management Act requires consistency between the plans these data are based on and zoning. Potential future housing units are divided into four categories based on density:

- **Large-lot single family** (< 4 dwelling units per acre); lot size is associated with higher home prices

- **Small-lot single family** (4 – 10 dwelling units per acre); homes on urban-sized lots are generally less expensive
- **Mid-density multifamily** (10 – 50 dwelling units per acre); housing in this density range is generally less costly to build because it can be done with all wood frame construction
- **High-density multifamily** (>50 dwelling units per acre); building types that achieve higher densities likely to require more expensive materials and engineering, such as concrete podiums and steel frame construction

Figure 21 Planned Housing Stock and Opportunity



Source: PSRC

The following observations can be made from these results:

- Across very low opportunity areas of the region, plans and zoning call for housing that is primarily small-lot single-family and high-density multifamily. While much of the single-family potential has already been realized through past development, high-density multifamily is almost entirely future potential. The equity impacts of implementing the planned housing will be shaped by the cost of any new higher density housing and the degree to which existing affordable housing units are displaced with new development and upward market pressure.
- Across low and moderate opportunity areas of the region, plans and zoning call for housing that is primarily small-lot single-family and moderate density multifamily. Again, the small-lot single-family is primarily existing housing stock. Much of the moderate density housing in these opportunity categories is also existing stock, with potential for further infill of the types of multifamily construction that provide the best opportunities for affordability.
- Emphasis on high density multifamily housing to accommodate future growth increases for high opportunity areas and especially for very high opportunity communities, where more than half of the housing will be in this densest category. Without significant subsidy, high-density multifamily presents challenges to providing units that are affordable to low and even moderate income households.



Transportation Infrastructure Investments

Among public investments, transportation infrastructure and services can have significant impacts, both positive and negative, on communities throughout the region. Transportation improvements can increase access to jobs and services, and generally enhance safe and convenient travel by automobile, transit, and non-motorized modes of travel such as walking and biking. Increased access and improved circulation can increase the attractiveness and market value of real estate. Such investments can spur private investment in development of housing, places of employment, and community-serving retail and other businesses. Transportation investments can disadvantage communities as well, such as through physical or market-driven displacement of people and businesses, or by creating barriers within neighborhoods.

PSRC has undertaken several recent efforts that address equitable impacts of transportation investments.

Transportation 2040, the regional transportation plan, was adopted by PSRC in 2010. As part of that effort, an environmental justice analysis of the plan was done pursuant to the Title VI requirements of the Civil Rights Act. The planning process generated five alternatives, along with a preferred alternative, for consideration by PSRC's boards. As part of the environmental justice analysis, PSRC estimated the net annual benefits to transportation system users generally, and also specifically to poor and minority users within the region. The analysis found that the Preferred Alternative outperformed all of the other alternatives. The analysis also showed that benefits to poor and minority transportation system users were higher than benefits accrued by users generally. Geographic areas with higher percentages of low-income and minority populations were found to have greater user benefits than the region as a whole. Figure 22 below shows the results of this comparative modeling exercise.

Perhaps the most significant impact of the plan on equitable outcomes is the emphasis on transit. Transportation 2040 calls for significant expansion of transit service in the region over the next 30 years, including approximately \$100 billion in improvements to commuter rail, light rail, streetcar, and bus transit infrastructure and service levels. Poor and minority households tend to rely more heavily on transit for daily travel to jobs, services, and other activities.

Many poor and minority households lack access to an automobile, rendering them completely transit dependent. People with disabilities are uniquely dependent on transit and paratransit services, both of which would be expanded under Transportation 2040.

In contrast to the long-range plan to expand transit in the region, recent and ongoing financial challenges have significantly reduced, and are threatening to reduce, transit service in King, Pierce, and Snohomish counties. Despite the fact that the bus transit agencies for each of the counties (King County Metro, Pierce Transit, and Community Transit) have adopted policies and procedures to mitigate impacts of any transit cuts on transit dependent populations and are subject to Title VI requirements, as a general observation, transit cuts disproportionately impact protected classes due to their greater dependence on transit.




Figure 22 Environmental Justice Analysis of Transportation 2040

Annual Benefits to Environmental Justice Populations

	Alt 1	Alt 2	Alt 3	Alt 4	Alt 5	Preferred Alternative Constrained (PA-C)	Preferred Alternative (PA)
(Millions of 2008 Dollars)							
Low-Income Populations	\$141	\$244	\$328	\$252	\$158	\$692	\$876
Minority Populations	\$180	\$290	\$378	\$320	\$197	\$747	\$946

Changes in Total User Benefits Per Personal Trip from 2040 Baseline



Source: Transportation 2040 Final Environmental Impact Statement, PSRC 2010


As one means to implement Transportation 2040 through shorter-term investments, PSRC funds selected transportation projects throughout the region through its Regional Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). Like Transportation 2040, the TIP is subject to the requirements of Title VI, with an environmental justice analysis conducted with each funding cycle. The results of this analysis for the most recent 2013-2016 TIP provide more information on the benefits and impacts of transportation improvements for low-income and minority households.

Unlike the analysis performed for Transportation 2040, which looked at the net benefits of future transportation improvements through the year 2040, the environmental justice analysis for the 2013-2016 TIP looked at the impacts of past investments made since 1992. The maps in figures 23 and 24 shows the location of TIP funded projects

over the past 20 years in relationship to concentrations of poor and minority populations respectively. For the purpose of this analysis, proximity to a project was assumed to indicate a net benefit to residents of the communities where the improvements were located.



Figure 23 Environmental Justice Analysis of 2013-2016 TIP (Minorities)




Source: 2013-2016 Regional TIP Documentation, PSRC 2013



Figure 24

Environmental Justice Analysis of 2013-2016 TIP (Low Income Households)



Source: 2013-2016 Regional TIP Documentation, PSRC 2013



Overall, TIP funded projects were found to benefit both minorities and low-income households at a marginally higher level than they have benefited the regional population as a whole. For example, of the people residing in the census blocks shown in Figure 23 that were touched by TIP-funded projects, approximately 35% are minority, slightly higher than the regional minority share of about 31%.

The analysis also looked at benefits of projects by project type. The TIP-funded projects can be classified as one of the following:

- General purpose capacity
- High occupancy vehicle capacity
- Intelligent transportation systems
- Nonmotorized
- Other roadway
- Rehabilitation
- Transportation demand management
- Transit
- Planning

Across nearly all project types, communities benefiting from the improvements or projects were equitably divided with respect to minority and income status. A small number of planning projects did not achieve the same level of equity, a finding which may be due to locations for new corridor facilities in suburban parts of the region.



Section III: Fair Housing Infrastructure

Overview

The purpose of this section is to provide an overview of key fair housing court decisions and to identify the fair housing resources available in the region, and to evaluate whether there is systemic discrimination and corresponding barriers to fair housing choices in the central Puget Sound Region. Systemic discrimination involves a pattern, practice or policy where the alleged discrimination has a broad, long-term impact on a group, industry, or geographic area. In order to identify the most common fair housing issues in the region, the following discussion will review data from recent litigation, discrimination complaints, testing audits, analyses of impediments from jurisdictions within the region, Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA) data, foreclosure data, and public surveys and direct input from the community. In areas where impediments to fair housing choice have been identified, the discussion will turn to how to take action to address them.

Analyses of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice in the Central Puget Sound Region

In 1995, HUD released guidance on how to further fair housing across the country. Simply put, the guidance stated that recipients of federal housing funds were required to ensure equal housing opportunity and to affirmatively further fair housing. As part of those requirements entitlement jurisdictions who received federal housing funds needed to conduct an analysis of impediments to fair housing choice in addition to an action plan to address the impediments in order to receive their funding³⁸.

In the Central Puget Sound Region there are fourteen entitlement jurisdictions including Snohomish, King, Pierce and Kitsap Counties, Seattle, Tacoma,

Bellevue, Bremerton, Everett, Lakewood, Kent, Marysville, Auburn, and Federal Way. The Analyses of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice for these entitlement jurisdictions were reviewed, and barriers of a regional nature are summarized in Table 13 below.

³⁸ In late 2013 or early 2014 changes to the requirement to affirmatively further fair housing are anticipated in the form of a new rule. The proposed changes include changing the requirement for an “Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice” for each entitlement jurisdiction to the option of conducting analyses through a more regional approach.



Table 13

A List of the Region's Most Common Barriers to Fair Housing Choice

Rental Housing

- Disability, race/color, national origin, and familial status are the most common fair housing complaints.
- The majority of fair housing complaints involve rental units.
- Lack of just cause eviction protection in many areas of the region may disguise discriminatory terminations of tenancy.
- Landlord screening processes can have discriminatory impacts on protected classes.
- Some homeless housing programs and shelters do not allow single father or two parent households
- Occupancy restrictions often have discriminatory impact on families with children
- Fear of retaliation is common for immigrant populations and other protected classes

For Sale Housing

- The denial and withdrawal rate of all homeownership loan products is higher for blacks, Hispanics, and Native Americans than for whites.
- Asians, in some entitlement jurisdictions, have better access to loans than Whites.
- FHA lending is concentrated among Hispanic households.
- Protected classes have greater vulnerability to foreclosures and potential decline in home values.

Fair Housing Resources

- Housing consumers and providers lack sufficient up to date information on fair housing laws, where to file a complaint, and how to address a reasonable accommodation.
- Public officials, policy makers, residents, housing providers and the general public are poorly informed on fair housing protected classes and applicable laws.
- Lack of fair housing documents translated into different languages creates a barrier for housing consumers for whom English is not their first language and for housing providers who have difficulties with their housing related interactions.
- Funding for fair housing education is not sufficient to meet the need

Source: Analyses of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice prepared by Snohomish, King, Pierce and Kitsap Counties, Seattle, Tacoma, Bellevue, Bremerton, Everett, Lakewood, Kent, Auburn, and Federal Way



Fair Housing Enforcement

Enforcement of fair housing law at the federal level is overseen by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and the Department of Justice (DOJ). Discrimination against a person in a protected class under state or local laws is enforced by an agency certified by HUD as part of one of its Fair Housing Assistance Programs (FHAP agencies). FHAP-certified enforcement agencies have equivalent enforcement powers as HUD and DOJ within their jurisdictions.

U.S. Department of Justice

The Housing and Civil Enforcement Section of the United States Department of Justice has broad authority under the Fair Housing Act. Through this section, DOJ brings cases that allege a pattern and practice of discrimination or the denial of fair housing that raise an issue of general public importance. This authority includes the duty to investigate complaints, and the discretion to file both cases involving the legality of

state or local regulations related to housing. These cases may be adjudicated either through administrative law judges or litigated in federal court. Department of Justice cases brought by the Division can have industry-wide impact in terms of deterrence and reform.³⁹

HUD Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity Office

The fair housing enforcement process typically begins when an individual files a discrimination complaint with either HUD's Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity (FHEO) or a state or local governmental fair housing enforcement agency (FHAP agency). Many of these complaints are referrals by private nonprofit fair housing organizations that conduct testing and investigation of housing discrimination allegations.

The enforcement process is intended to provide an impartial investigation of claims filed with HUD and FHAP agencies. The Fair Housing Act requires that complaints be investigated within 100 days if feasible. There is also a statutory obligation to engage in conciliation efforts to attempt to resolve complaints. At the close of the investigation, the investigating agency

The enforcement process is intended to provide an **impartial investigation** of claims filed with HUD and FHAP agencies.

makes a determination as to whether or not there is reasonable cause to believe that discrimination has occurred. If a determination of reasonable cause is made, the government charges the respondent with violating the law and brings a complaint on behalf of the complainant in an administrative hearing before a HUD administrative law judge or a judicial proceeding.

³⁹ For more background on federal fair housing enforcement, see "The Future of Fair Housing: Report of the National Commission on Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity" <http://www.civilrights.org/publications/reports/fairhousing/enforcement-hud.html>



Fair Housing Initiatives Program (FHIP)

Fair housing organizations and other non-profits that receive funding through the Fair Housing Initiatives Program (FHIP) assist people who believe they have been victims of housing discrimination.

In addition to assisting people who may have experienced discrimination with their fair housing complaints, FHIP programs also conduct investigation of claims, including “testing” properties for housing discrimination. Testing refers to the use of “testers” who pose as prospective renters or purchasers of homes in order to collect housing information. Some of the testers are in a protected class and some are not. The purpose of collecting this information is to determine whether a housing provider engages in a pattern or practice of discriminatory treatment towards people in protected classes, in violation of fair housing laws.

FHIP programs promote awareness of fair housing laws and the right to equal opportunity in housing. Where a FHAP agency must remain impartial in order to reach a determination on a case, a FHIP’s role is to assist and support complainants in preparing and filing complaints with the appropriate administrative agency or in filing lawsuits.

The HUD designated FHIP agency serving the central Puget Sound region is the Fair Housing Center of Washington, located in Tacoma, WA⁴⁰. The Fair Housing Center regularly provides fair housing information and training to consumers, housing providers, lending institutions, social service and government agencies and coalitions relating to the homelessness, disabilities and new immigrants. The Fair Housing Center of Washington also assists with the filing of housing discrimination complaints, conducts testing in the region, and provides other fair housing resources and coordination to the community.

Fair Housing Assistance Program

As already noted, the right to equal opportunity in housing is ensured not only by the Fair Housing Act, but also by State and local laws. HUD’s Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity (FHEO) provides Fair Housing Assistance Program (FHAP) funding annually to State and local agencies that enforce fair housing laws.

Within Washington State there are four FHAP agencies certified by HUD which have equivalent enforcement powers as HUD and DOJ within their jurisdictions. All four FHAP agencies operate within the Puget Sound Region. They include:

- Washington State Human Rights Commission
- King County Office of Civil Rights
- Seattle Office for Civil Rights
- City of Tacoma Human Rights

⁴⁰ <http://www.fhcwashington.org/>



Fair Housing Partners of Washington

The central Puget Sound region is home to a unique collaboration of fair housing enforcement and advocacy agencies. The Fair Housing Partners of Washington includes HUD, the Washington State Human Rights Commission, the King County Office for Civil Rights, the City of Seattle Office for Civil Rights, the City of Tacoma Human Rights, and the Fair Housing Center of Washington. The partners work collectively on issues that relate to fair housing enforcement and education and outreach efforts in Washington state. The group meets quarterly and conducts free bi-monthly trainings that are open to the public. The agencies collaborate on public information materials in order to ensure

consistent messaging on rights under federal and state fair housing law across the state. The partnership is unique in the nation in the collaborative approach and strives to make efficient use of limited resources.

The bi-monthly fair housing training conducted by the Fair Housing Partners of Washington is well-subscribed and usually fully booked, demonstrating a desire on the part of the public to learn about fair housing issues and to receive training to address them. The popularity of the trainings suggests that the need for fair housing education exceeds the resources available even with effective use of resources.

Recent Litigation

Cases Addressing Issues Involving Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing

This section reviews recent national court cases addressing fair housing issues. Generally, recent suits which involve systemic discrimination issues relate to the requirement to affirmatively further fair housing under the Fair Housing Act. None of these cases involved jurisdictions from Washington State. Nevertheless, judicial interpretations on how to affirmatively further fair housing affect any jurisdiction that receives federal funds for housing programs and therefore cases filed outside Washington still may affect Washington law. The line of cases in which courts interpreted the requirement to affirmatively further fair housing mostly involved allegations that a jurisdiction receiving federal funds made efforts to prevent development of affordable housing, multi-family housing, or other types of housing that proportionately have high populations of people in protected classes.

The discriminatory behavior cited in these cases included: exclusionary zoning practices which prevented multi-family

housing development, interfering with funding sources to prevent development of affordable housing, creating restrictive requirements that favor residents already living in the jurisdiction, and effectively preventing diversification of a given location, among other behaviors.⁴¹ Plaintiffs argued that these types of practices have a discriminatory effect on people in protected classes whether or not the discrimination was intentional or unintentional and that by engaging in these discriminatory efforts they were violating the requirement to affirmatively further fair housing.⁴²

The overriding message from these cases is that jurisdictions should make sure that any effort to prevent carefully. Local analysis of practices and programs should include review of whether people in protected classes are affected more than the general population, and whether there is discriminatory intent to exclude certain people from living in an area.

⁴¹ Cases of note include: *Get Back Up, Inc. v. city of Detroit*, 878 F. Supp. 2d 794 (E.D. Mich. 2013); *City of Fort Lauderdale v. Scott*, 888 F. Supp. 2d 1279 (S.D. Fla. 2012); *Cinnamon Hills Youth Crisis Center, Inc. v. St. George City*, 685 F3d 917 (10th Cir. 2012); *Nikolich v. Vill. Of Arlington Heights*, 2012 WL 2359313 (N.D. Ill 2012); *Inclusive Communities Project v. Texas Dept of Hous. & Community Affairs.*, 860 F. Supp.2d 312 (N.D. Tex2012); *City of Joliet v. Mid-City Nat'l Bank of Chicago*, 2012 WL 2514936 (N.D. Ill. June 28, 2012); *Fair Hous. Justice Ctr. V. Town of Yorktown*, Fair Housing-Fair Lending ¶ 4.9, No. 10-CIV-9337 (S.D.N.Y. Feb. 27, 2010)

⁴² See Appendix for cases and explanation



Complaint Data⁴³

A review of Fair Housing complaints filed in the central Puget Sound region shows that they were substantially similar to the nation as a whole (see Table 14 below). Race, religion, and disability fair housing complaints for the region were 2% higher than the nation. Fair housing complaints based on familial status, sex, national origin, and color were lower than national percentages. Complaints based on national origin were 12% at the national level, whereas they comprised only 6% of complaints in the Puget Sound Region.

The largest difference between the central Puget Sound region and the nation is in other non-specified fair housing complaints. Eighteen percent (18%) of complaints reported in the Puget Sound Region were non-specified, compared to 7% for the nation. This difference for the region may be accounted for by the expansion of fair housing complaints to non-federal categories in accordance with local programs and regulations, and/or complaints alleging discrimination based on multiple protected classes.

Table 14 HUD Fair Housing Complaints Nationwide vs. Central Puget Sound Region 2007-2011⁴⁴

	Nation	Central Puget Sound Region
Race	32%	34%
Disability	55%	58%
Familial Status	12%	8%
Sex	10%	7%
National Origin	12%	6%
Color	2%	0%
Religion	3%	5%
Other	7%	18%

*Discrimination due to multiple protected classes accounts for the percentage summing to more than 100%

Source: HUD Region 10

⁴³ Information in this section reviews fair housing complaint data gathered in the Puget Sound region from 2007 to 2011. Data in this section is reviewed by jurisdiction, type, and outcome.

⁴⁴ Sources: HUD Region 10 Office; National Fair Housing Alliance. (2012, April). Fair Housing in a Changing Nation: 2012 Fair Housing Trends Report. Washington, D.C. : Author. Retrieved from: <http://www.nationalfairhousing.org>



As summarized in Table 15 below, in the central Puget Sound region, 1,366 fair housing complaints were filed from 2007 to 2011. Strikingly, 850 or 64% of the fair housing complaints reported in the region related to disability or race. Complaints related to disability account for 39% of all fair housing complaints. Approximately 27% of the region’s fair housing complaints were made on the bases of familial status, national origin, and retaliation. The smallest number of complaints was made based on color, religion, sex, and sexual orientation.

Table 15 Fair Housing Complaints by County 2007-2011

	King	Kitsap	Pierce	Snohomish	Region	Region %
Disability	317	21	146	51	535	39%
Race	212	13	71	19	315	23%
Color	7	0	3	0	10	1%
Familial Status	67	3	21	11	102	7%
National Origin	99	2	23	12	136	10%
Religion	27	0	3	1	31	2%
Sex	45	1	27	4	77	6%
Retaliation	94	1	40	7	142	10%
Marital Status	1	0	0	0	1	0%
Sexual Orientation	13	0	3	1	17	1%
Total	882	41	337	106	1,366	100%

Source: HUD Region 10 Office; National Fair Housing Alliance. (2012, April). Fair Housing in a Changing Nation: 2012 Fair Housing Trends Report. Washington, D.C. : Author. Retrieved from: <http://www.nationalfairhousing.org>

In response to complaints filed between 2007 and 2011, monetary settlements and/or damages totaled \$267,348. The distribution by type of discrimination for which settlements and damages were made by monetary compensation was similar to the overall distribution by type of discrimination for fair housing complaints overall (see Table 16 below). The highest proportion of fair housing complaints were filed based on disability status and those complaints yielded the greatest amount of monetary compensation. Complaints based on familial status yielded the second highest amount of compensation even though they represent only 7% of the fair housing complaints for the region. Complaints based on race had the biggest gap. While

fair housing complaints based on race represented nearly a quarter of the complaints in the region, complainants in this category received less than 14% of the monetary settlements and/or damages. Retaliation cases also had a gap of just over 4% between the percentage of cases file and the percentage of financial compensation.



Table 16 Regional Fair Housing Complaints by Type for 2007-2011

	% Complaints Filed	% of Total Regional Compensation
Disability	39.2%	48.7%
Race	23.1%	13.7%
Color	0.7%	0.0%
Familial Status	7.5%	18.0%
National Origin	10.0%	11.1%
Religion	2.3%	0.8%
Sex	5.6%	1.5%
Retaliation	10.4%	6.2%
Marital Status	0.1%	0.0%
Sexual Orientation	1.2%	0.0%
Total	100%	100%


Source: HUD Region 10 Office; National Fair Housing Alliance. (2012, April). Fair Housing in a Changing Nation: 2012 Fair Housing Trends Report. Washington, D.C. : Author. Retrieved from: <http://www.nationalfairhousing.org>

Distribution of Fair Housing Cases by County

Figure 25 below compares the bases of fair housing complaints among the four counties in the central Puget Sound region. Throughout the region, the highest percentage of fair housing complaints was filed on the basis of disability, followed by race. Some variation can be noted between the counties with respect to complaints filed for other protected classes. The third highest percentage of fair housing complaints was filed on the basis of national origin in Snohomish County; retaliation in Pierce County; familial status in Kitsap County; and national origin (closely followed by retaliation) in King County. The lowest percentages of fair housing complaints were filed on the basis of color, sex, marital status, religion and sexual orientation in all four counties.



Figure 25 Fair Housing Complaint % by County, 2007-2011



Source: HUD Region 10 Office; National Fair Housing Alliance. (2012, April). Fair Housing in a Changing Nation: 2012 Fair Housing Trends Report. Washington, D.C. : Author. Retrieved from: <http://www.nationalfairhousing.org>

Puget Sound Fair Housing Complaints Tell a Story

Discrimination in the housing market happens in a number of ways. The most common ones are: refusing to rent or sell to someone in a protected class; refusing to negotiate with someone in a protected class; setting different terms, conditions or privileges that favor certain people over those in a protected class; failing to make a reasonable accommodations for persons with a disability; retaliating against people in a protected class; and harassing people in a protected class.

Based on analysis of central Puget Sound region complaint data, certain allegations often correlate

with certain protected classes. For example, failure to make a reasonable accommodation was always filed by people with disabilities. Harassment was often the allegation of people claiming discrimination due to sex and race. Refusal to rent or sell a dwelling was associated with discrimination claims due to family status, national origin, and race. Retaliation was often the allegation of claims filed by people in protected classes due to disability or race.

From this data we can tell that people with disabilities have difficulty getting equal access to the housing



market through reasonable accommodations. People of color experience more harassment and retaliation and have fewer housing opportunities than whites. Landlords appear to be more reticent to rent to families or people of a different national origin and women experience harassment more frequently than men.

Certain housing providers also appear to correlate with fair housing complaints based on certain protected class. For example, people with disabilities file complaints against housing authorities, homeowner associations, and providers of non-profit housing

and supportive services, mobile home parks, and senior housing. People filing because of race often filed against housing authorities, homeowner associations, non-profit housing and supportive services, and landlords of single-family rental homes.

Though many of the central Puget Sound region's 1,366 complaints did not meet the legal evidentiary standards to show that the discrimination occurred, they do show that people feel that they have suffered discrimination and that a more thorough investigation may be needed.

Regional Transit Communities Fair Housing Testing Audit

Overview

In order to evaluate whether complaints are valid, certified fair housing enforcement agencies (FHAPs) and advocacy groups (FHIPs) often conduct tests to determine whether a consistent pattern of discrimination exists. In 2012-2013, the Fair Housing Center of Washington conducted a testing audit on behalf of the Washington State Human Rights Commission (WSHRC) to determine the frequency of differences in treatment of persons in protected classes in the central Puget Sound region's existing and future high capacity transit areas, as defined by the audit. The agency tested 90 properties in Snohomish, King, and Pierce Counties⁴⁵ for discriminatory treatment due to race, national origin, and disability. Appendix III contains a more detailed description of testing and the methodology used.

Housing Discrimination Occuring in Snohomish, King, and Pierce County Transit Communities

Tests were done at 90 rental housing properties over a multiple month period. The results of this testing are summarized in Table 17. Positive test results were an indication of potential discrimination due to multiple types of differences in treatment which favor the control tester. The WSHRC audit showed that in 63% of the positive tests the control tester was told about or shown more units than the protected class tester. Notably, in 13% of the positive

tests, the protected class tester was not shown any units because they were told that an appointment was required to get information about availability of units, however the control tester was given a tour and information at the same location on the same day. In other words, rental agents gave a person of a protected class no information about available housing units, but on the same day gave a white person information about available units and/or a tour.

⁴⁵ Although Kitsap County is part of the central Puget Sound region and included in the Regional Profile contained in Section II, testing focused on areas associated with high capacity transit corridors in King, Pierce and Snohomish counties.



Table 17

Differences in Treatment Favoring Control Tester ⁴⁶	% of Time Different Treatment Occurs in Positive Tests for WSHRC Audit*
Control tester told about/shown more units	63%
Lower rent, fees, deposit for control tester	35%
Better specials for control tester	30%
Less requirements to rent for control tester	24%
Earlier date of availability for control tester	22%
Courtesy significantly better for control tester	15%
Appointment not required for control tester while protected class tester turned away.	13%
No reasonable accommodation granted for service animal	9%
Follow up contact received by control tester and not protected class tester	7%

Source: FHCW, 2013

As summarized in Table 18 below, the testing audit showed that people protected by race, national origin, or disability seeking housing had a 60% chance of being treated differently when seeking housing in transit communities, as defined by the audit. These patterns of discrimination are consistent with the Fair Housing Center’s testing in Western Washington for the last 18 years, in that over half of the tests demonstrated preferences in treatment that favored the non-protected class tester.

When breaking the audit results down by protected class, other potential trends were revealed. Regionally, tests based on race of applicant indicated discriminatory treatment in 69% of the tests. For tests based on disability, 39% indicated discriminatory treatment. For tests based on national origin of the applicant, 70% indicated discriminatory treatment. While the sample sizes are small and may not be statistically significant, other results for subsets of the data are interesting. In Snohomish County Hispanic testers were more likely to experience discrimination (83% were positive) and South East Asian were less likely to experience discrimination (20% were

60%

The chance that people protected by race, national origin, or disability seeking housing are treated differently.

positive). In King County discrimination rates were high for both South East Asian testers (81% positive) and Hispanics (67% positive) based on the results of the testing.

The audit showed overall high discrimination rates regionwide, with some variation by county. The following percentages of tests showed differences in treatment due to one of the three protected classes tested: Snohomish County 50%; King County 65%; and Pierce County 75%.

⁴⁶ Multiple types of differences in treatment may occur in one test.

**Table 18** 2012-2013 Testing Audit Results

% Tests Showing Differences in Treatment due to:	National Origin	Race	Disability	Total Differences in Treatment Due to a Protected Class
Snohomish County	54%	57%	33%	50%
King County	79%	79%	43%	65%
Pierce County	50%	100%	0%	50%
Region	70%	69%	39%	60%

Source: FHCW, 2013

Discrimination in Proximity to Transit Communities

The WSHRC Testing Audit was conducted in Snohomish, King, and Pierce Counties generally along high capacity transit corridors associated with the Interstate 5 corridor, paying particular attention to major transit nodes. The testing that was conducted shows that there are areas where a person in a given protected class is more likely to experience discriminatory treatment than in other areas. Results are summarized below in Table 19.

Table 19

Neighborhood/Area	County	% Positive Tests
North Seattle	King	100%
Mercer Island	King	83%
Bellevue	King	80%
Lynnwood	Snohomish	66%
Federal Way/Milton/Fife Area	King/Pierce	60%
Des Moines/Kent	King	60%
Mukilteo/South Everett	Snohomish	57%*
University District	King	50%
SeaTac/Tukwila	King	50%
Shoreline/Mt. Lake Terrace/Edmonds	Snohomish	33%
South Lake Union	King	20%

Note: Broken down into protected class, National Origin tests showed 100% positive while disability tests were 25%.

Source: FHCW, 2013



Findings

In the testing audit 60% of the tests were positive. Testing indicates that people of minority national origin (70% positive tests) and minorities races (69% positive tests) are the most likely to be discriminated against in the region's transit communities. People with disabilities were the least likely to experience discrimination in this testing audit (39% positive tests).

The most likely form of discrimination is a person in a protected class being told about or shown fewer units

(occurred in 68% of all positive tests). This suggests that people in protected classes may have access or knowledge of fewer housing opportunities in the region. The next two most common forms of discrimination are being quoted higher rent, fees, and/or deposits, and being told about less beneficial offers/specials. This indicates that people in protected classes in the Puget Sound region could be affected financially by discrimination.

Puget Sound Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA) Data

Fair housing choice can be impacted by the ability to access financing to purchase a home. Evaluation of home mortgage data by protected class, where the data are available, can provide insight into home ownership opportunities. People in the Puget Sound applied for almost 48,300 mortgage loans in 2010. In Table 20 below, loan applications are broken down by race and ethnicity and their outcomes.

Table 20 2010 Regional Home/Mortgage Disclosure Act Application Outcomes by Race

Race	Applications (% of Total Applications)	Originations (% of Applications That Were Successful)	Failure* (% of Applications That Failed)	Denial** (% of Applications Denied)
American Indian or Alaska Native	359 (0.7%)	227 (63.2%)	73 (20.3%)	59 (16.4%)
Asian	6,049 (12.5%)	4,129 (68.30%)	1,150 (19.1%)	770 (12.7%)
Black or African American	1,452 (3.0%)	925 (63.7%)	304 (20.9%)	223 (15.4%)
Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	484 (1.0%)	314 (64.9%)	98 (20.3%)	72 (14.9%)
White	33,462 (69.4%)	24,324 (72.7%)	5,766 (17.2%)	3,372 (10.1%)
Other	6,492 (13.4%)	4,348 (67.0%)	1,431 (22.0%)	713 (11.0%)
Total	48,298 (100%)	34,267 (71.0%)	8,882 (18.3%)	5,209 (11.0%)

* Failed applications are those that were not completed for some reason

** Denied applications were completed but denied for some reason

Source: Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council, 2013



As seen in Table 21, below, on average, of the 48,298 home loan mortgage applications that were submitted in 2010, 71.0% were approved, 11.0% were denied, and the remaining 18.3% failed for some reason. For white applicants, successful applications were slightly higher at 72.7%. Asian-American applicants were approved at a rate of 68.3%, black applicants at 63.7%, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islanders at 64.9%, and those

reporting “other” race at 67.0%. In the case of each racial category, nearly 2/3 of applicants were approved for home loans. However, based on these data, ethnic minorities can also be seen as having somewhat lower approval rates, and therefore less access to financial resources to purchase homes when compared to whites. This comparative lack of financial resources could potentially limit household mobility and location choice.

Table 21 2010 Regional Home/Mortgage Disclosure Act Application Outcomes by Ethnicity

Ethnicity	Applications (% of Total Applications)	Originations (% of Applications That Were Successful)	Failure* (% of Applications That Failed)	Denial** (% of Applications Denied)
Hispanic or Latino	1,698 (3.5%)	1,136 (66.9%)	310 (18.3%)	252 (14.8%)
Not Hispanic or Latino	39,928 (82.7%)	28,720 (71.9%)	7,045 (17.6%)	4,163 (10.4%)
Other or no Information	6,672 (13.8%)	4,411 (66.1%)	1,467 (22.0%)	794 (11.9%)
Total Count	48,298 (100%)	34,267 (71.0%)	8,882 (18.3%)	5,209 (11.0%)

* Failed applications are those that were not completed for some reason

** Denied applications were completed but denied for some reason

Source: Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council, 2013

When looking at Hispanic or Latino applicants, 66.9% of applications were approved, compared to the 72.7% success rate of white applicants. As with other ethnic minorities, 2/3 of applicants were approved for home loans. However, based on these data, Hispanic or Latino applicants have about 5% lower approval rates, and therefore less access to financial resources to purchase homes when compared to white applicants.

This comparative lack of financial resources could potentially limit household mobility and location choice.

According to this data people of color in the region are denied at higher rates than whites. Even if there is no intentional discrimination, this may be unfair and contribute to segregation.

46 Multiple types of differences in treatment may occur in one test.



Foreclosures in the Puget Sound After the 2008 Collapse

It is generally accepted that the higher the homeownership rate in a neighborhood, the more stable the community. During the 1990s and 2000s, neighborhoods like the Hilltop in Tacoma made great strides in working toward increasing stability and reducing crime by increasing the homeownership rate. In 1991, the City of Tacoma contracted with a private consultant to analyze the impact of low homeownership rates in the Hilltop neighborhood. Successful efforts were implemented to increase the homeownership rate to first time homebuyers and reduce the number of investors who were often absentee landlords. Crime rates improved prompting more investment in the community. However, in 2008 many of the gains from the previous decades were lost when the foreclosure rates rose and homeownership rates dropped to 1991 levels.

In 2008 the economy collapsed, due mainly to the concurrent foreclosure crisis and failure of the housing market. The peak housing prices of 2006 plummeted and with them millions of dollars of

wealth vanished. Federally supported programs encouraging homeownership, financial institutions, regulators, credit agencies, and subprime loans directed disproportionately toward lower income families of color resulted in the highest foreclosure rate in history.

The foreclosure rate in Washington hit low opportunity areas in the region the hardest.⁴⁷ Areas of the Eastside and South End neighborhoods of Tacoma and west side of Federal Way had the highest intrastate foreclosure risk scores (that measure subprime lending, foreclosures, delinquency, and vacancies) were at 64.1 up to 100 points. The Hilltop neighborhood of Tacoma along with Spanaway of south Pierce County; portions of Puyallup and Marysville (the latter of which is in Snohomish County) are within the 50 to 60 foreclosure risk scores. Arlington, Everett, Kent, Puyallup, and Sumner appear in the 39.4-50 scores. The south of Seattle neighborhoods between Tukwila and Burien and Des Moines appear in the 34-38.3 score category.

Public Comment

Public input from stakeholders is an important piece of the Fair Housing Equity Assessment because numbers and data cannot fully describe the experience and knowledge of the people in our communities. Several strategies were used to collect public input including a fair housing survey, three public meetings held in Snohomish, King, and Pierce Counties, meetings with numerous stakeholder groups throughout the region, and private interviews. Individual interviews were conducted with representatives of housing and social service agencies within the region.⁴⁸

⁴⁷ 09-2012 Foreclosure Risk Scores, Analysis by the Local Initiative Support Corporation provided by the Foreclosure Response project.

⁴⁸ Including the Somali Youth and Family Club, Mercy Housing, Sound Mental Health, Northwest Justice Project, HUD, and individual private real estate developers.



Fair Housing Survey

In the development of the Fair Housing Equity Assessment, public comment was solicited and recorded through surveys, public meetings, and individual interviews. All of these tools were designed to gather information that reflects the public’s experience with fair housing and housing discrimination in general. The survey was distributed throughout the Puget Sound Region as well as online. Nine hundred twenty three (923) surveys were returned from throughout the region. Participants included tenants (13%), homeowners (49%), social service providers (10%), government employees (7%), landlords (13%), home mortgage professionals (less than 1%), and Other (6%). For the most part, participants resided in Everett, Seattle, and Tacoma. Where relevant, comments from all phases are included below to supplement the responses. The results of the survey are summarized in Table 22 below.

Table 22 Fair Housing Survey Findings (Self-Scored)

Understanding of Fair Housing Laws	
Understand the Basics	42%
Have a Thorough Understanding	20%
Understand a Little	20%
Did Not Respond	18%
Perception of Discrimination in the Sale of Homes	
Discrimination is Non-Existent or Rare	19.7%
Discrimination is Occasional	41.3%
Discrimination is Common	16.4%
Don’t Know	22.6%
Perception of Discrimination in the Rental of Homes	
Discrimination is Non-Existent or Rare	17.2%
Discrimination is Occasional	39.5%
Discrimination is Common	28.9%
Don’t Know	14.4%
Individuals Know Where to File a Housing Discrimination Complaint	
True	4.9%
Somewhat True	21.1%
Not True	51%
Don’t Know	23%

(continued...)



Findings of Note

Felt that it was either not true or somewhat true that landlords welcome persons of all races, national origin and language.	64%
Participants either disagreed or only partially agreed that private landlords welcome immigrants.	52.8%
Participants believed that families with children either have or partially have a difficult easily renting housing.	56.4%
Participants stated that it is not true that housing is available to individuals with criminal histories.	52.9%
Participants did not believe or had questions about landlords' willingness to rent to individuals with Section 8 certificates.	51.4%
Participants did not agree or only partially agreed that group homes/ low income housing is welcome in all neighborhoods.	45.8%
Participants did not agree that there is sufficient outreach and education on fair housing.	47.2%
Participants believed that building codes and zoning encourage the development of affordable housing.	10.4%
Participants who thought criminal history was a protected class.	42.4%
Participants who thought homelessness is a protected class.	32.0%
Participants feelings about public transportation being available in their communities.	Positive
Participants feelings about the availability of accessible housing	Negative
Participants feelings about landlords granting reasonable accommodations.	Positive
Participants were confused about where to file a housing discrimination complaint.	Most
Participants were fairly clear about federal and state protected classes.	Most
Participants felt that their neighborhoods include a variety of races and national origin.	Most
Participants felt that Real Estate agents show their clients housing in a variety of neighborhoods	Most

Of the respondents, 62% felt they had a thorough or basic understanding of fair housing issues. The greatest number of respondents (42%) felt that discrimination in the sale of housing was occasional, while 16.4% felt that it was common. When it came to rental housing, 68.4% of respondents felt that discrimination in renting is either occasional or common. The majority of respondents (51%) felt that individuals do not know where to file a complaint in the event of perceived discrimination.



Survey Comments

A considerable number of participants perceived that the greatest amount of housing discrimination takes place in Bellevue, East King County, and South King County.

Individual comments of note include:

“There is discrimination toward refugee and immigrants in East King County. Our clients tell us about situations where fair housing standards are not being followed.”

“The region is highly segregated by income. Income correlates to protected class membership. These factors largely determine where a person lives and what housing choices they will have. The discriminatory effects are visible on a collective level.”

“Redlining STILL exists throughout the City – more common in the South and Southwest quadrants of the City.”

During redevelopment of projects, “they displace existing residents and disrupt the minority community.”

“I feel there is a lot of discrimination against people that have a Section 8 Vouchers. Landlords openly advertise that they do not take Section 8.”

Community Forums and Individual Interviews

Three community forums were conducted in King, Pierce, and Snohomish counties. Each forum included a presentation describing fair housing principles, presentation and discussion of regional opportunity maps, and the preliminary findings of the FHEA. The attendees were then asked to participate in a discussion forum. Sixty-eight people attended the three countywide forums.

Individual interviews included discussions with representatives from the Somali Youth and Family Club, Mercy House, Sound Mental Health, Northwest Justice Project, HUD, and individual private real estate developers.

The themes that emerged from these discussions included issues relating to familial and community connections, market practices, Section 8 and fair market rates, transportation/jobs/affordable housing, the impact of government policy, “Not in My Backyard” (NIMBY) issues, culture gaps, the power of institutions, and access to high opportunity areas.



Conclusions From Public Comment

Major themes revealed in public comment centered around several common themes, including:

- Access to high opportunity areas
- The power of institutions
- Culture gaps
- “Not in My Backyard” (NIMBY) attitudes
- Impact of government policy
- Transportation/Jobs/Affordable Housing
- Section 8 and fair market rates
- Market practices
- Family and community connections

Appendix IV contains a more thorough discussion of these themes.

Public perception appears to be consistent with the findings of this report with the exception of how often discrimination occurs. The survey compared to the testing evidence shows that the public does not realize how often people in protected classes are treated differently.

While the survey indicates that the public is not generally knowledgeable about fair housing laws or the frequency of discrimination, public comment and interviews show that the public generally has a very clear grasp about what affects the housing, transportation, and social issues in their communities. Public comments show that people know that discrimination against protected classes occurs in the housing market, though they do not believe it occurs as frequently as testing indicates. As revealed in comments regarding Section 8 housing vouchers, there is a belief that discrimination does occur, and is a major obstacle to housing for low income people. Respondents felt that cultural competency is an important factor in the success of community projects, and that the availability of high quality, affordable transportation is a major factor in assessing how people move around the region to job and education centers, and areas of higher opportunity. Commenters also felt that government and institutions play a large part in preventing discrimination, though without care they can be barriers to facilitating access to fair housing choice.



What Does All This Tell Us About Fair Housing in the Puget Sound Region?

This chapter has discussed fair housing issues in the region through review of recent case law, analysis of complaint data, testing data, an evaluation of barriers to fair housing choice in the region's 13 entitlement jurisdictions' *Analyses of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice*, home mortgage disclosure data (HMDA), and public comments.

The most common themes are:

- **Discrimination occurs most frequently due to disability, race, national origin and family status.**
- **People of color are denied mortgage loans at higher rates than whites.**
- **Jurisdictions that receive federal funds must make genuine efforts to affirmatively further fair housing.**
- **Testing indicates that differences in treatment towards people in protected classes occurs much more frequently than the public realizes.**
- **More fair housing education is needed for the public and elected officials.**
- **Access to affordable housing and transportation (and ultimately, opportunity) is a fair housing issue.**

Education Prevents Litigation

In distilling all this data down to the key points, we find that there are two major conclusions to make.

- **Discrimination occurs in the central Puget Sound region which requires investment in enforcement efforts.**
- **Demand for Fair Housing resources outweighs supply and requires investment in education efforts.**

Discrimination must be identified and addressed through effective and meaningful enforcement. In looking forward, educating the public, landlords (in both the public and private sectors), elected officials, and government staff about the region's fair housing issues is critical. Education could reduce the amount of money landlords spend responding to discrimination complaints and improve the public's understanding of their rights under federal, state and local fair housing law, and improve their access to advocacy and enforcement agencies.

By supporting fair housing educational efforts throughout the region, jurisdictions, at the most fundamental level, help meet the requirement to affirmatively further fair housing. Providing education to government officials and staff helps ensure that the principles of equity in housing inhabit the decision making process.



Section IV: Findings and Strategies

Findings

Fair Housing Equity Assessment (FHEA)

- The FHEA is an opportunity to examine the impacts of programs and policies on the access and availability of housing choices to racial and ethnic minorities, people with disabilities, and other protected classes.
- The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development requires that the FHEA be developed by a broad set of regional stakeholders and be used to inform regional planning and investments.
- While there are fourteen entitlement jurisdictions in the central Puget Sound region that are required to complete a local Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice, the FHEA is regional in scope and perspective.
- There is currently no consistent ongoing regional coordination of fair housing planning or activities in the central Puget Sound region. In addition, there is no regional authority to compel the implementation of regional fair housing programs and policies. The FHEA is the first attempt at regional coordination on these issues.

Fair Housing in the Central Puget Sound Region

- The Civil Rights Act (1964), the Fair Housing Act (1968), and subsequent statutes, regulations, guidelines, and case law, have created a framework at the federal level to designate protected classes and address issues of segregation and fair housing access.
- There are 16 classes protected at either the federal, state, or local level in the central Puget Sound region. They are: race, color, religion, national origin, sex, gender identity, sexual orientation, familial/parental status, handicap/disability, creed, marital status, veteran/military status, age, Section 8 recipient, ancestry, and political ideology.
- As in other parts of the country, the central Puget Sound region has a history of segregation based on race and national origin. Practices such as restrictive covenants, redlining, and loan discrimination, helped contribute to concentration of African Americans and other racial/ethnic minorities in certain areas of Seattle and Tacoma.
- Recent trends have indicated greater racial and ethnic diversity in many historically white areas of the region. Promoting affordable housing in all neighborhoods affirmatively furthers fair housing and helps promote racial/economic integration.



Demographic Data

- The four-county central Puget Sound region has experienced 34% population growth in the last 20 years. Nearly one-third of the 3.7 million person population in 2010 identified as a racial/ethnic minority, representing a substantial increase in number, proportion, and geographic spread between 1990 and 2010.
- The central Puget Sound region has a higher median income and lower poverty level than the state and national levels. There is a relationship between income and race in the region, such that median household incomes of white and Asian populations are higher than the region's median income, while median household incomes of black and Hispanic populations are lower than the region's median income.
- There are four census tracts that meet the HUD-definition for Racially/Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty in the region, meaning over 40% of the population is below the poverty level and over 50% of the population is a racial/ethnic minority. There are 13 additional census tracts, totaling 77,630 in population, where at least 25% of households are below poverty and 40% of residents are non-white.
- Segregation in the central Puget Sound region and across the nation stems from self-segregation, active segregation in the form of discriminatory practices or

policies, and segregation that results from structural inequities in the society. Three measures indicate segregation in the central Puget Sound region:

- ◆ The dissimilarity index results describe a region that is characterized by low to moderate segregation and that has seen modest desegregation over the past decade. For whites versus all minorities, the dissimilarity index is well below the HUD threshold for segregation. For white-black, the index shows moderate segregation.
- ◆ Census tract data reveals concentrations of black and Hispanic populations in south Seattle, south King County, and Tacoma. Concentrations of Asian populations also extend into areas of east King County.
- ◆ The Predicted Racial/Ethnic Composition Ratio, which identifies racial segregation, as opposed to income segregation, suggests a pattern where generally, racial and ethnic minorities are “overrepresented” in centralized places and “underrepresented” at the periphery of the urban area.

Access to Opportunity

- There is a strong association between geography and access to opportunity, including in the areas of mobility, public health, education, public safety, and economic opportunity. Communities near the central cities of Seattle and Bellevue and east King County generally have high and very high access to opportunity. Areas in south King County and Pierce County generally are characterized by moderate, low, and very low access to opportunity. To the north, areas of southwest Snohomish County are associated with mixed access to opportunity.
- There is a relationship between race/ethnicity and access to opportunity. Whites and Asians are

more likely to live in census tracts with high or very high access to opportunity than the population overall. Meanwhile, foreign-born, American Indian, Hispanic and African American residents are more likely to live in census tracts with low or very low access to opportunity than the total population.

- Living in poverty is associated with a higher likelihood of living in an area of low or very low access to opportunity. Blacks and Hispanics living in poverty are more likely to live in areas of low or very low access to opportunity than whites or Asians.



Housing and Access to Opportunity

- Segregated white neighborhoods tend to have housing that is predominantly single-family and owner-occupied. Segregated minority communities tend to have housing that is mixed SF/MF and mixed tenure as well.
- Housing costs vary considerably across the region. High housing prices and rents are significant barriers to racial and ethnic minorities, immigrants, and other protected classes from securing housing generally, and especially in communities with good access to opportunity.
- The cost of transportation compounds the cost burden for housing alone that many low and even moderate income households in the region face. The Housing + Transportation Index shows that 38% of neighborhoods in the region are cost burdened by housing costs only, while 67% of neighborhoods in the region are housing + transportation cost burdened for the average household.
- Data on the geographic distribution of housing assistance in the region shows that subsidized units are roughly proportional to the overall housing stock in communities with high and very high access to opportunity. However, this may not be sufficient to overcome existing inequities in access to opportunity.
- Over half of households using Section 8 vouchers live in areas of low or very low access to opportunity.
- Comprehensive plans, implemented in part through land use regulations, include policies for accommodating growth with a range of housing types and densities. Affordability and access to high opportunity communities will be challenging in areas where displacement of existing affordable units is threatened and where higher-cost high-density is being developed.

Transportation and Infrastructure

- Environmental justice analyses conducted by the Puget Sound Regional Council for Transportation 2040 and the 2013-2016 Transportation Improvement Program conclude that at a regional scale, both past and planned transportation investments, have equitably benefited minority and low-income households.
- Results of the opportunity mapping analysis show inequitable access to opportunity in the areas of mobility, economic health, education, and public health. These findings strongly suggest that at the local level, inequitable gaps exist between the need for community infrastructure in these areas and the provision of adequate community infrastructure.



Fair Housing Infrastructure

- Demand for fair housing training for housing providers and consumers alike outweighs the resources available to HUD, FHAP, and FHIP agencies in the region to provide for all education needs.

Fair Housing Complaints

- Fair housing complaints in the region are similar in types of protected classes and allegations of the forms of discrimination compared to those nationally. More than half of complaints relate to disability and about a third to racial discrimination. Complaints of discrimination based on family status and national origin occur less frequently.
- Within the central Puget Sound region, a similar pattern exists, with about two-thirds of the nearly 1,400 complaints made from 2007-2011 related to disability or racial discrimination.
- Complaint data indicate that people with disabilities have difficulty getting equal access to the housing market through reasonable accommodations. People of color experience more harassment and retaliation than whites.

Evidence of Discrimination from Fair Housing Testing

- Testing audit results revealed that minority races, foreign born, and disabled people seeking housing had a 60% chance of being treated differently when looking for housing along the transit lines of focus. Racial and ethnic minorities were most likely to be treated differently.
- The most common form of difference in treatment was that protected testers were told about fewer units followed by protected testers being quoted higher amounts for rent, deposits, fees, and told about fewer specials. Discrimination occurs most frequently in the rental market.
- Racial and ethnic minorities have somewhat lower approval rates for home mortgages, and therefore less access to financial resources to purchase homes when compared to whites.
- Though it is not a protected class in most jurisdictions, discrimination due to source of income (Section 8) has restricted housing for many of the region's most vulnerable people.



Strategies

Fair Housing

Continue regional coordination of fair housing assessment and enforcement.

Determine roles for regional organizations, entitlement and other jurisdictions, enforcement and advocacy agencies.

Adopt regional fair housing goals and monitor outcomes.

Entitlement jurisdictions should work with other jurisdictions, housing and equity stakeholders, and other regional partners to develop and adopt regional fair housing goals and a system to monitor progress and change over time.

Evaluate impact of regional and local policies and investments on protected classes.

Entitlement jurisdictions should work with other jurisdictions, housing and equity stakeholders, to develop and implement evaluation tools to determine and address the potential impacts of regional and local policies and investments on protected classes in the region.

Promote diversity and prevent discrimination through supporting fair housing educational efforts.

Efforts should include: educate housing providers about affirmative marketing, educate government officials and staff about affirmatively furthering fair housing, and provide fair housing training and outreach to communities where local opposition to affordable housing creates a barrier to furthering fair housing for all the region's residents.

Increase funding for fair housing programs in the region.

Access to Opportunity

Use opportunity mapping analysis to prioritize housing, infrastructure and community development investments.

Where possible, use the Comprehensive Access to Opportunity Index, or appropriate sub-measure, to provide context to and help direct public investments in housing, infrastructure, and community development.

Encourage affordable housing development and preservation in areas with high access to opportunity.

Establish regional goals and target public and private investments to increase affordable housing in areas with high and very high access to opportunity.

Prioritize investments to improve access to opportunity in areas with low access to opportunity.

Use the Comprehensive Access to Opportunity Index sub-measures data as a starting point to assess community needs in areas with low access to opportunity. Target appropriate investments to improve access to opportunity for those areas.

Promote economic development programs in areas of low and very low access to opportunity.

Use tax incentives and other tools to encourage development in areas of low access to opportunity. Promote and implement a regional economic development goal of providing access to family and living wage jobs for all residents, and especially low-income and minority households, and those living in areas of low or very low access to opportunity.

Invest in equitable access to high quality education.

Promote policies and investments at all levels of government to ensure that there is an equitable distribution of educational resources within the region. Use a full range of tools to support educational programs in all communities. Prioritize investments and programs to communities that currently have low or very low access to high quality education indicated by the Opportunity Mapping analysis. Implement innovative tools to support



education quality and outcomes in communities with low access to opportunity, such as housing authority/public school partnerships that provide housing vouchers in exchange for commitment to stay in school⁴⁹.

Provide sufficient transit investments to provide for the mobility of transit dependent populations, particularly between areas of low and high access to opportunity.

Local jurisdictions and transit agencies should work with the state legislature to enable sufficient funding authority to provide transit service to meet the need of transit dependent populations.

Affordable Housing

Increase efforts to provide sufficient choices of affordable, safe, healthy, and adequately sized housing throughout the region to meet the region’s growing housing needs.

Create more housing choices through preservation and new development, including housing trust funds, a transit-oriented development property acquisition fund and other gap-financing tools, equitable value-capture financing tools, and funding and incentives for rehabilitation and preservation of affordable housing units.

Implement appropriate incentives to encourage the development and preservation of affordable housing.

Develop incentive tools such as zoning bonus programs, road impact fee waivers, school fee exemptions, expedited permitting, and tax abatement programs to encourage affordable housing development and preservation. In determining the appropriate mix of incentives for each community, consider market conditions, housing needs and existing regulations.

Ensure that local zoning and building regulations allow and promote sufficient housing supply and housing types to meet a full range of affordability needs.

Ensure that regulations do not create barriers to the development of affordable housing projects, group homes for special needs populations, or homeless shelters.

Manage foreclosed homes to best serve areas of low and high access to opportunity respectively.

Protect housing choice voucher holders.

Support legislative efforts to make “Source of Income” a protected class and include enforcement provisions. Support efforts to expand housing choices for voucher holders to move into areas with high access to opportunity.

⁴⁹ Tacoma Housing Authority/McCarver Elementary



Next Steps

While the completion of this Fair Housing Equity Assessment for the Central Puget Sound Region satisfies the requirements and expectations of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the value and potential use of the FHEA for public agencies and fair housing stakeholders in the region do not end there. Several key areas of activity, listed below, are important next steps in carrying this body of work and the recommendations that emerged from it forward.

Fair Housing Equity Assessment as Resource to Guide Regional and Local Actions.

The data, analyses, and findings of the FHEA are resources with particular value to entitlement jurisdictions in the region. Data provide regional context to consider locally by entitlement jurisdictions in completing an Analysis of Impediments (AI). Analyses provide models for tailoring the approaches used regionally at a sub-regional scale. Finally, and perhaps most important, the findings and recommendations contribute a consensus list of policies and tools that, with broad implementation, can benefit fair housing conditions in communities throughout the region.

Engage regional partners in developing a Regional Analysis of Impediments.

A regional AI would build on and strengthen the findings and recommendations of the FHEA, specifically in identifying a broader array of barriers to housing choice and in documenting more thoroughly a set of strategies and an action plan intended to affirmatively further fair housing in the region. Stakeholders involved in the FHEA process should continue their collaboration to identify options, tasks, and lead agencies for a regional AI.

Housing work plan at the Puget Sound Regional Council.

PSRC has developed a proposed housing work plan for the next two years. This work plan represents a commitment of PSRC to continuing to support housing planning and implementation in the region, building on the housing work done pursuant to the Growing Transit Communities work plan. PSRC has identified several key areas for its housing work, including: data and technical assistance, guidance on comprehensive and other plan updates, housing needs analysis, regulatory and financial tools to promote affordable housing preservation and development, and development of a regional housing strategy. As the housing work plan continues to evolve, PSRC should identify specific recommendations of the FHEA that will be advanced through its work.

Understand and take action based on final updated HUD fair housing rules.

Housing and Urban Development has developed draft rules addressing requirements for affirmatively furthering fair housing. Once these rules are finalized in 2014, PSRC and its regional partners should assess the recommendations of this FHEA in light of those requirements to identify any new recommendations or approaches to implementing the current recommendations that may be suggested through the HUD rule making process.

Appendix I

Predicted Racial/Ethnic Composition by Small Area

- Predicted Racial/Ethnic Composition is Higher Than Expected
- Predicted Racial/Ethnic Composition Falls Within 90%-110% (Expected Range)
- Predicted Racial/Ethnic Composition is Lower Than Expected

	Actual % Non-White/Predicted % Non-White
Algona city, Auburn CCD, King County, Washington	92.71%
Arlington city (part), Arlington CCD, Snohomish County, Washington	49.41%
Arlington city (part), Marysville CCD, Snohomish County, Washington	55.13%
Arlington Heights CDP, Arlington CCD, Snohomish County, Washington	37.26%
Auburn city (part), Auburn CCD, King County, Washington	100.83%
Auburn city (part), Enumclaw Plateau CCD, King County, Washington	86.91%
Auburn city (part), Puyallup CCD, Pierce County, Washington	125.02%
Auburn city (part), Seattle CCD, King County, Washington	127.51%
Bainbridge Island city, Bainbridge Island CCD, Kitsap County, Washington	30.12%
Beaux Arts Village town, East Seattle CCD, King County, Washington	39.61%
Bellevue city, East Seattle CCD, King County, Washington	143.98%
Black Diamond city, Enumclaw Plateau CCD, King County, Washington	6.79%
Bonney Lake city (part), Puyallup CCD, Pierce County, Washington	43.50%
Bothell city (part), East Seattle CCD, King County, Washington	61.44%
Bothell city (part), Edmonds CCD, Snohomish County, Washington	39.28%
Bothell city (part), Maltby CCD, Snohomish County, Washington	76.61%
Bremerton city (part), Bremerton CCD, Kitsap County, Washington	81.44%
Brier city, Edmonds CCD, Snohomish County, Washington	79.86%
Buckley city, Buckley CCD, Pierce County, Washington	39.43%
Burien city, Seattle CCD, King County, Washington	117.49%
Carbonado town (part), Buckley CCD, Pierce County, Washington	21.08%
Carnation city, Snoqualmie Valley CCD, King County, Washington	73.67%
Clyde Hill city, East Seattle CCD, King County, Washington	57.36%
Covington city, Tahoma-Maple Valley CCD, King County, Washington	76.45%
Darrington town, Darrington CCD, Snohomish County, Washington	31.62%

- Predicted Racial/Ethnic Composition is Higher Than Expected
- Predicted Racial/Ethnic Composition Falls Within 90%-110% (Expected Range)
- Predicted Racial/Ethnic Composition is Lower Than Expected

	Actual % Non-White/Predicted % Non-White
Des Moines city (part), Auburn CCD, King County, Washington	77.73%
Des Moines city (part), Seattle CCD, King County, Washington	128.17%
DuPont city, Fort Lewis-DuPont CCD, Pierce County, Washington	106.47%
Duvall city, Snoqualmie Valley CCD, King County, Washington	78.48%
Eatonville town, Eatonville CCD, Pierce County, Washington	23.28%
Edgewood city (part), Puyallup CCD, Pierce County, Washington	37.23%
Edmonds city, Edmonds CCD, Snohomish County, Washington	55.64%
Enumclaw city (part), Enumclaw Plateau CCD, King County, Washington	34.90%
Everett city (part), Everett CCD, Snohomish County, Washington	86.61%
Federal Way city (part), Auburn CCD, King County, Washington	149.19%
Federal Way city (part), Seattle CCD, King County, Washington	232.29%
Fife city (part), Puyallup CCD, Pierce County, Washington	58.60%
Fife city (part), Tacoma CCD, Pierce County, Washington	177.97%
Fircrest city, Tacoma CCD, Pierce County, Washington	68.19%
Gig Harbor city, Gig Harbor Peninsula CCD, Pierce County, Washington	38.46%
Gold Bar city, Skykomish CCD, Snohomish County, Washington	57.25%
Granite Falls city, Granite Falls CCD, Snohomish County, Washington	27.67%
Hunts Point town, East Seattle CCD, King County, Washington	29.72%
Index town, Skykomish CCD, Snohomish County, Washington	16.96%
Issaquah city (part), East Seattle CCD, King County, Washington	103.94%
Issaquah city (part), Issaquah Plateau CCD, King County, Washington	94.50%
Kenmore city (part), East Seattle CCD, King County, Washington	83.38%
Kenmore city (part), Seattle CCD, King County, Washington	99.36%
Kent city (part), Auburn CCD, King County, Washington	190.02%
Kent city (part), Enumclaw Plateau CCD, King County, Washington	164.57%
Kent city (part), Seattle CCD, King County, Washington	168.65%
Kent city (part), Tahoma-Maple Valley CCD, King County, Washington	115.00%
Kirkland city, East Seattle CCD, King County, Washington	87.93%
Lake Forest Park city, Seattle CCD, King County, Washington	48.66%

- Predicted Racial/Ethnic Composition is Higher Than Expected
- Predicted Racial/Ethnic Composition Falls Within 90%-110% (Expected Range)
- Predicted Racial/Ethnic Composition is Lower Than Expected

	Actual % Non-White/Predicted % Non-White
Lake Stevens city (part), Lake Stevens CCD, Snohomish County, Washington	63.43%
Lake Stevens city (part), Marysville CCD, Snohomish County, Washington	59.56%
Lakewood city (part), Tacoma CCD, Pierce County, Washington	144.07%
Lynnwood city, Edmonds CCD, Snohomish County, Washington	133.26%
Maple Valley city (part), Enumclaw Plateau CCD, King County, Washington	52.89%
Maple Valley city (part), Tahoma-Maple Valley CCD, King County, Washington	45.07%
Marysville city (part), Marysville CCD, Snohomish County, Washington	58.26%
Marysville city (part), Snohomish CCD, Snohomish County, Washington	60.99%
Marysville city (part), Stanwood CCD, Snohomish County, Washington	39.60%
Medina city, East Seattle CCD, King County, Washington	48.07%
Mercer Island city, East Seattle CCD, King County, Washington	96.93%
Mill Creek city (part), Edmonds CCD, Snohomish County, Washington	83.23%
Mill Creek city (part), Everett CCD, Snohomish County, Washington	124.42%
Milton city (part), Auburn CCD, King County, Washington	84.56%
Milton city (part), Tacoma CCD, Pierce County, Washington	66.33%
Monroe city, Monroe CCD, Snohomish County, Washington	58.62%
Mountlake Terrace city, Edmonds CCD, Snohomish County, Washington	104.12%
Mukilteo city (part), Edmonds CCD, Snohomish County, Washington	116.58%
Mukilteo city (part), Everett CCD, Snohomish County, Washington	66.56%
Newcastle city, East Seattle CCD, King County, Washington	106.99%
North Bend city, Snoqualmie Valley CCD, King County, Washington	34.38%
Orting city (part), Puyallup CCD, Pierce County, Washington	21.16%
Pacific city (part), Auburn CCD, King County, Washington	85.69%
Port Orchard city (part), Port Orchard CCD, Kitsap County, Washington	48.70%
Poulsbo city, Poulsbo CCD, Kitsap County, Washington	53.70%
Puyallup city (part), Puyallup CCD, Pierce County, Washington	54.93%
Redmond city, East Seattle CCD, King County, Washington	137.84%
Renton city (part), East Seattle CCD, King County, Washington	170.68%
Renton city (part), Seattle CCD, King County, Washington	170.79%

- Predicted Racial/Ethnic Composition is Higher Than Expected
- Predicted Racial/Ethnic Composition Falls Within 90%-110% (Expected Range)
- Predicted Racial/Ethnic Composition is Lower Than Expected

	Actual % Non-White/Predicted % Non-White
Roy city, Roy CCD, Pierce County, Washington	78.01%
Ruston town, Tacoma CCD, Pierce County, Washington	73.17%
Samish CCD, Samish CCD, Skagit County, Washington	47.38%
Sammamish city (part), East Seattle CCD, King County, Washington	102.60%
Sammamish city (part), Issaquah Plateau CCD, King County, Washington	119.38%
SeaTac city, Seattle CCD, King County, Washington	181.03%
Seattle city, Seattle CCD, King County, Washington	115.15%
Shoreline city, Seattle CCD, King County, Washington	104.97%
Snohomish city, Snohomish CCD, Snohomish County, Washington	41.12%
Snoqualmie city, Snoqualmie Valley CCD, King County, Washington	82.19%
South Prairie town, Buckley CCD, Pierce County, Washington	12.54%
Stanwood city, Stanwood CCD, Snohomish County, Washington	31.34%
Steilacoom town, Tacoma CCD, Pierce County, Washington	100.93%
Sumner city, Puyallup CCD, Pierce County, Washington	52.13%
Tacoma city, Tacoma CCD, Pierce County, Washington	121.23%
Tukwila city, Seattle CCD, King County, Washington	189.00%
University Place city, Tacoma CCD, Pierce County, Washington	107.72%
Wilkeson town (part), Buckley CCD, Pierce County, Washington	28.57%
Woodinville city, East Seattle CCD, King County, Washington	72.57%
Woodway city, Edmonds CCD, Snohomish County, Washington	74.82%
Yarrow Point town, East Seattle CCD, King County, Washington	51.05%

Source: HUD

Appendix II

Cases of Note

- I. *United States v. City of New Orleans* 3¹** – The City of New Orleans stopped development of an affordable housing project by putting a moratorium on the funding source. Two non-affordable housing developments with the same type of funding were allowed to continue as “exceptions” while exception status was denied to the affordable housing. The Department of Justice filed suit claiming that the city of New Orleans had discriminated against the affordable housing development because it would house higher percentages of people of color and people with disabilities. The City of New Orleans filed a motion to dismiss the case for failure to state a claim, however the court determined that there was enough evidence to state a claim and the case will be considered in court and is on-going.
- II. *United States v. St. Bernard Parish* 2** - The Department of Justice filed a complaint against St. Bernard Parish alleging that the Parish violated the Fair Housing Act by limiting rental housing opportunities for African-Americans through exclusionary zoning practices after Hurricane Katrina. These practices included the establishment of a restrictive permit-approval process for single-family rentals, the elimination of multi-family zoning from most of the parish zoning map, and repeated attempts to block the construction of multi-family affordable-housing developments on pretextual grounds. The settlement reached was valued at more than \$2.5 million to resolve separate lawsuits by the United States and private plaintiffs.
- III. *United States ex rel. Anti-Discrimination Center of metro New York, Inc. v. Westchester County, New York* 3** - On July 13, 2011, HUD notified the County that it had failed to meet a consent decree requirement when the County Executive vetoed legislation to incorporate corrective actions which promote source-of-income legislation and plans to overcome exclusionary zoning practices. That same year the Monitor submitted a report stating that Defendant breached its obligation in the consent decree. On May 29, 2013, after a long dispute the Court of Appeals affirmed the District Court decision, agreeing that Defendant violated the terms of the consent decree, and allowing the full adoption of the Monitor’s Report. 712 F.3d 761. This case is still ongoing.
- IV. *United States v. Sussex County* 4** – The Department of Justice filed suit alleging that the county’s planning and zoning commission denied land use approval for an affordable housing subdivision proposed by a developer which had a disparate impact on African Americans and Latinos. The consent decree requires the county to pay \$750,000 to the developer, to reconsider the proposed land use using nondiscriminatory criteria, prevents the county from obstructing or delaying any affordable housing that is proposed by the developer without a substantial justification that is neutral on its face and consistent with applicable zoning laws and finally, requires the county to take affirmative steps to provide for future affordable housing.

1 United States v. City of New Orleans, 2012 WL 1767787 (E.D. La. April 24, 2013)

2 “Justice Department Charges St. Bernard Parish, Louisiana for Limited Rental Housing Opportunities for African-Americans,” Jan. 31, 2012. At: <http://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/2012/January/12-crt-143.html>. “Settlement Agreement between the United States and St. Bernard Parish,” May 10, 2013. At: <http://www.justice.gov/crt/about/hce/documents/stbernardsettle.pdf>.

3 United States ex rel. Anti-Discrimination Center of metro New York, Inc. v. Westchester County, New York, 712 F.3d 761 (2nd Cir. 2013).

4 United States v. Sussex Cnty., No. 12cv1591 (D. Del. Consent Decree filed Nov. 28, 2012)

V. Fair housing case of note not related to affirmatively furthering: *United States v. Wells Fargo Bank, NA*⁵ - Consent Decree was reached in the case which alleged that Wells Fargo engaged in a pattern or practice of discrimination against qualified African-American and Hispanic borrowers in its mortgage lending from 2004 to 2009. The settlement provides \$125 million in compensation for borrowers who, because of their race or national origin, were steered into subprime mortgages or who paid higher fees and rates even when they qualified for prime mortgages and lower fees that were offered to white borrowers. Wells Fargo was also required to pay \$50 million in direct down payment assistance to borrowers in communities around the country where the Department of Justice identified large numbers of discrimination victims and which were hard hit by the housing crisis.

⁵ United States v. Wells Fargo Bank, NA 891 F. Supp2d 143 (D.D.C. 2012)

Appendix III

Introduction to Testing Methodology

Testing provides a snapshot of the housing market and gives voice to the experience of renters, particularly those in protected classes. Testing refers to the use of individuals who, without a bona fide intent to rent or purchase a home, apartment, or other dwelling, pose as prospective renters or purchasers to obtain information for the purpose of evaluating the compliance of housing providers with fair housing laws. In the landmark case, *Havens v. Coleman*, the United States Supreme Court recognized the importance, legality, and power of testing as a mechanism for measuring and correcting discriminatory housing practices.

Fair housing testing utilizes rigorous protocols to ensure that any discrepancies identified in the course of testing can be attributed to differential treatment. Because of the multiple variables involved in a housing transaction, testing results are not definitive measures of discriminatory conduct in the rental housing market. Nonetheless, the aggregate results of testing conducted in the region provide an objective opportunity to identify geographical and protected class trends critical to the identification of impediments to fair housing choice.

For the purposes of this report, testing results are defined as either “positive” or “negative.” A test will be defined as “positive” when one or more adverse differences are identified in the information provided to the protected class tester compared to their non-protected counterpart. For example, if a protected class tester is provided a higher quote for security deposit than the control tester, the test will be defined as “positive” because of its evidence of differential treatment. Tests are defined as negative when testers are provided equivalent information (or given equal treatment) regarding housing opportunities (no differential treatment). Overall, while testing may provide an objective means to identify differential practices, the presence of differences does not necessarily mean that a housing provider is engaging in housing discrimination. Likewise, the lack of observed differences at a particular site does not preclude the existence of discriminatory practices.

Appendix IV

Public Comment/Individual Interview Themes

Access to High Opportunity Areas

Snohomish and Pierce County forum participants were distinguished in identifying challenges for rural communities in accessing or developing high opportunity areas.

King County participants identified differences between the City of Seattle and the rest of the county. The key distinction observed by participants in the King County forum was high opportunity areas in Seattle are more engaged in promoting opportunity whereas communities in suburban areas are protective of opportunity resources and discourage widening access to opportunity resources.

The Power of Institutions

Forum participants observed that social service, education, government, and business institutions operate on policies and practices that perpetuate the status quo of segregating high opportunity and low opportunity areas. Institutional policies and practices are focused on controlling behavior and using resources as an award for good behavior rather than improving access to opportunity.

Institutional racism was identified as being a persistent problem in the central Puget Sound region and a major contributor to limiting access to high opportunity areas. Institutional racism was identified as a top reason why opportunity gaps are geographically distinct.

Culture Gaps

Projects aimed at furthering access to opportunity often lack cultural competency. Forum participants observed that efforts to improve access to opportunity are “one size fits all”. Barriers to opportunity vary. Immigrants may require support around learning English as a second language or getting access to capital investments for their businesses. Blacks may need more support around fighting discriminatory practices in the private rental market. Efforts to bridge the opportunity gap need to be multimodal and have the flexibility to address the challenges of diverse communities.

“Not in My Backyard” (NIMBY)

Forum participants were quick to observe efforts to improve access to opportunity are met with resistance. People who live in high opportunity areas may oppose diversifying access to their resources because they believe they have a proprietary claim to resources and/or they believe extending resources to more people will diminish the benefit for their own communities. Participants observed racism was a significant influence in NIMBY attitudes.

Impact of Government Policy

Government policy was cited as an area with potential for influence in bridging the opportunity gaps in the central Puget Sound region. Communities in the region generally have shown support for progressive policies such as investing in housing or schools across region (Seattle Housing Levy, King County Veterans Levy/Landlord Liaison Program), but community support alone cannot ensure the success of these policies. Participants at the forum believed by educating politicians, policy-makers, and community leaders on issues such as housing discrimination, common barriers to opportunity, and the benefits of community-based/targeted public investments, they will be able to craft effective interventions.

The condition of the economy over the past five years combined with growing partisanship on the local, state, and federal level, makes it increasingly difficult to build the coalitions and infrastructure needed to improve access to opportunity.

Interestingly, land use rules were identified as a possible place to begin. Land use rules are a well-established area of governance. Similarly, land/property is a resource common to all localities. Significant gains could be made in bridging opportunity gaps by examining how land use practices could be tailored to promote affordable housing, transitioning people out of homelessness, and improving access to community resources (job training, child care, health care, education, and social services).

Transportation/Jobs/Affordable Housing

The conversations about transportation, jobs, and access to housing were interconnected. Together, they are the three pillars supporting access to opportunity. When all three areas are secure and well-supported, access to opportunity resources is significantly improved. Unfortunately, having uncertainty in just one of the three areas can hinder access to opportunity resources and perpetuate poverty.

Transportation and transportation costs influence where people live and their jobs. People with conventional jobs—where they work eight hours a day, Monday through Friday—have great transportation options. Metro Transit, Sound Transit, and other regional public transportation systems are designed to provide reasonable commuting options during peak hours to urban areas. People who lived in low opportunity areas; however, are more likely to work in jobs that have non-standard hours or have more than one job. Another challenge can be a commute that may require more than one stop. For example, a single parent who needs to drop off his or her child to daycare may not be able to benefit from the use of public transportation unless the transfer points and time schedules are favorable.

The transportation infrastructure is also biased to deliver people to major downtown areas. People who are trying to get to one neighborhood to another may experience extremely long commutes. For example, a person trying to get to Burien from North Seattle will have to use two bus routes and spend nearly two hours on the trip. Similarly, it can take nearly two hours to get to parts of West Seattle and the Rainier Valley from North Seattle. Many people who live in low opportunity areas will devote more of their income toward maintaining their own transportation to avoid such significant time loss.

Areas with affordable housing lack transit access (Snohomish and Pierce Counties). Lack of transit options decreases employability because many low wage jobs have work schedules that don't coincide with public transit schedules. Difficulty of reaching areas of higher opportunity as can be the result of tolls and transportation costs.

Employment and affordable housing are closely related. Living close to where one works is considered a great benefit of urban living. Participants in the

forums readily identified that people who live in low opportunity areas have no such benefit; instead, they face a dilemma: live in an area they can afford where there are no jobs, or try to live in an area with jobs with housing that may be too expensive to sustain.

Section 8 and Fair Market Rates

The affordable housing program that produced the most comments from the forum participants was the Housing Choice Voucher Program (Section 8). The payment standards used to determine the amount of subsidy program participants receive is not aligned to the Fair Market Rates (FMR) for rent in the high opportunity areas of the region. The Section 8 program allows program participants to contribute up to 40% of their household income for rent and utilities, but the FMR's are increasing while the income of Section 8 participants remains flat. The effect results in Section 8 participants being unable to move to high opportunity areas even though they receive housing assistance.

Forum participants observed the majority of housing assistance programs are concentrated in urban areas, and generally rural areas do not have access to as many affordable housing resources. Some participants felt some programs are designed to increase the density of affordable housing, thus creating an urban bias.

Market Practices

Criminal background checks and application costs associated with renting were identified as being barriers to renting in high opportunity areas. Market assessments of criminal history, credit history, domestic violence, and history of homelessness impede employability and housing choice. An idea identified by forum participants was to create a portable background check or a background check registry.

The distribution of affordable housing for families overlaps in areas of high racial and ethnic concentration. For example: White Center and Skyway tend to have larger units but not areas of high opportunity. High opportunity areas do not have family-sized units that are affordable to the working poor.

Familial and Community Connections

Families living in low opportunity areas identified the

need to be close to, or within easy transportation, of community services. Families often face the dilemma of choosing between opportunity and family/community connections. Families who have the resources to move to areas higher in the opportunity spectrum, like by using a Housing Choice Voucher, travel greater distances from established family and existing social support systems. Moving to a high opportunity area may offer tangible benefits, but fear of social isolation deters families from leaving their established communities.

