

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

<p>AGENDA TITLE: Adoption of the Proposed Action Plan to Address Housing Needs of Seniors with Limited Incomes</p> <p>DEPARTMENT: Office of Human Services</p> <p>PRESENTED BY: Rob Beem, Human Services Manager George Smith, Human Services Planner</p>
--

PROBLEM/ISSUE STATEMENT:

In 2005, the City Council determined that additional policy development work needed to focus on "housing for seniors with limited incomes." While this Action Plan was being developed, the City Council began consideration of undertaking a broader review of the City's role in housing resulting in the development of a Comprehensive Housing Strategy (CSA). This agenda item reviews the results of staff's work with local housing experts in the review of the City's current policy and strategy and proposes a short term action plan to address the needs of this one segment of our population.

ALTERNATIVES ANALYZED:

Staff proposes a set of specific strategies to pursue which will assist seniors with limited incomes to remain in Shoreline either in their current homes or in other housing units. Council has the discretion to direct staff to pursue any or all of these action steps. If Council directs staff to pursue other strategies not outlined in this staff report, staff may need to return to Council to discuss additional resources needed.

- Option 1 Implement the Action Plan as Proposed;
- Option 2 Identify certain elements of the Action Plan to implement now and others to consider within the CHS.
- Option 3 Pursue implementation of the Action Plan following completion of the CHS.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

Implementing the recommended action plan will not require additional staff or financial resources beyond the existing 2006 annual budget. Implementation of item #4, establishing a housing development fund or participating financially in the development or funding of any specific housing project will require commitment of existing Community Development Block Grant revenues and may require additional allocations of local funding. The extent of this impact cannot be projected absent any specific project proposals.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends Option 1, that the Council direct staff to proceed with the Action Plan as outlined, which will result in assisting seniors with limited incomes to age in place and to remain an integral part of the Shoreline community.

Approved By: City Manager  City Attorney _____

INTRODUCTION

In May 2005, the Council formed a Human Services Ad Hoc Committee to assess the community's priority human service needs. The recommendations from the Ad Hoc Committee were presented to the Council at its October 24, 2005 meeting. The Council adopted the recommendations from the Ad Hoc Subcommittee and directed staff to report back to the Council policy options focusing on the development of housing for people with limited incomes.

During Council deliberations in February 2006, Planning and Development Services (PDS) staff was tasked with preparing a proposal for developing a comprehensive housing strategy. This subject is also being considered during the April 3rd Council meeting. This broader review of housing presents opportunities to place some issues raised in this more narrowly focused discussion in a broader more policy focused context.

BACKGROUND

Human Services staff formed a working group with the Assistant City Manager, PDS Director and Economic Development Manager. The work group convened a housing workshop on January 19, 2006. Experts from the non-profit development community, A Regional Coalition for Housing (ARCH), King County Community Development and King County Housing Authority were invited to share their insights about Shoreline's housing situation and to make recommendations to staff and Councilmembers. Mayor Ransom, Deputy Mayor Fimia and Councilmembers Gustafson, McGlashan and Way attended the Workshop.

Some of the key information developed for the workshop participants by City staff prior to the meeting included the following. See the workshop background information in Appendix A.

- 9.5% of Shoreline households have incomes less than 30% of median, less than \$21,050 for a family of three. This is the group most difficult to house since there is no market rate housing available at payments not more than 30% of income, the Housing and Urban Development (HUD) definition of affordability.
- Another 10%, or 2,091 households have incomes between 30% and 50% of median, less than \$35,050 for a family of three. Occupations that fall into this group include teachers, health care workers, retail sales and service industry workers.
- People 65 and older make up 14% of Shoreline's population but 43% of the households with incomes less than 30% of median. Half of older adults rent and half live in owned housing in this economic segment.
- In addition to permanent housing, Shoreline has 50 units of transitional housing serving families, veterans and those with mental health and/or substance abuse.
- King County Housing Authority has 820 units of housing and Section 8 vouchers to serve Shoreline's lowest income households and a long waiting list for housing.

On January 19th, staff convened a housing workshop that brought six experts in housing development and human services to Shoreline. Combined, the panel members represented over 100 years of experience in King County. The panelists were provided with the background data on Shoreline and with a list of potential strategies geared to address the housing needs as identified. The panelists shared their experience and professional perspectives on ways that Shoreline can play an effective role in meeting the housing needs of the community. See Appendix B for the full minutes of the housing workshop.

The panelists made the following observations about the current status of housing needs of Shoreline's seniors as well as about overall housing opportunities in Shoreline:

- While Shoreline housing is relatively affordable, market pressures will increase the cost of housing. As a result there will be some conversions from rental to owner occupied. In this case, those people with limited incomes who live in these units will find it more difficult to afford or have the option of remaining in their current unit.
- Shoreline needs more detailed information on housing conditions and land availability and cost for new development. The City needs to understand the dynamics of its housing market.
- Shoreline has a disproportionate amount of single family housing reflecting the fact that most land is zoned single family. An estimated 15% of these units are rental housing. This is a higher proportion than in similar communities.
- Household size continues to decline and is now 2.5 with one quarter of all households consisting of one person.
- Shoreline is fairly well developed so GMA growth targets are relatively small compared to existing housing stock.
- Shoreline should consider higher density zoning for housing along the Aurora Corridor as part of the redevelopment plan.
- Neighborhoods want predictability in terms of where housing, other than traditional single family homes, is to be located.
- Several participants noted that it is less expensive to build on the east side of town because of lower land costs.
- Detached accessory dwelling units (ADUs) are allowed on lots of 10,000 feet or more; otherwise the ADU must be attached to the house. This may account for the low use of ADU's with 20 being approved since the time of incorporation.
- There are a number of federal housing options available, such as HUD Section 202 or tax credits which could partially fund the development of housing for older adults.
- An effective strategy involves pursuing a five-year action plan that communicates priorities.

The participants in the housing workshop also identified several larger more encompassing issues which would ideally be addressed in a broader community context:

- Community acceptance of housing options for people with limited incomes.
- Redevelopment opportunities, particularly along the Aurora Corridor, offer the potential to incorporate affordable housing along with retail and other planned uses.

Staff from Human Services, Planning and Development Services and the City Manager's Office reviewed the workshop's results and identified the following general conclusions and several specific action steps to take focused on the needs of seniors:

- Additional information on housing stock, availability of buildable land and vacancy rates in market rate rental housing is needed to better understand the housing market and form the basis for a successful program.
- While older adults are disproportionately represented in low income owned and rental single family housing and may be a priority group for affordable housing, more information is needed to understand what kinds of support and assistance would allow these households to remain in Shoreline. The City currently funds two home repair programs that assist elderly homeowners with the ongoing major and minor maintenance of their homes. Beyond this there may be other actions the City could take or support that would allow seniors to remain in their current residence and to age in place.

Proposed Action Plan

1. Identify current development opportunities including location and approximate cost, the availability and condition of existing multi-family housing stock, and the availability of land owned by state and local governments and non-profit organizations.
2. Implement strategies that will support seniors' independent living including:
 - Promote increased public understanding of the ADU as a means of housing an aging parent or disabled adult child.
 - Hold community forums on reverse mortgages as a financing mechanism for older adults to support basic living costs and/or the cost of long-term care.
 - Increase community's awareness of home share programs as a means for obtaining in-home assistance.
 - Sponsor a forum, in conjunction with local financial institutions and or Home Sight, for first-time home buyers on the mechanics of qualifying for and obtaining financing to purchase a house or condo.
3. Recruiting a developer to build a new facility using HUD section 202 and/or other government funds to allow rents affordable to older adults in this economic segment.
4. Establish a special fund to support the production or retention of affordable housing units. The funding level could either be tied to the availability and amount of CDBG funds or could be established as a set annual contribution. To the extent that the amounts in this fund exceed current allocations, there may be trade-offs with other general fund supported activities. If this option is accepted, staff will develop more specific details and costs and review those with City Council.

Staff proposes that the action plan be implemented initially over a two-year period. As the plan is implemented, staff will return to Council with periodic updates and/or to seek direction where needed.

The following two issues should be addressed in the context of the Comprehensive Housing Strategy being discussed by the City Council:

- Engage in discussions with the community around how best to meet the needs for housing by residents with limited incomes.
- Address issues of development/redevelopment as ways to accommodate housing that is affordable to people with limited incomes.

ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

In the fall of 2005, the City Council initiated work on development of this Action Plan with a narrow focus on housing needs of Shoreline's seniors with limited incomes. In early February of 2006 the City Council directed staff to develop a proposal for the creation of a Comprehensive Housing Strategy (CHS). The Action Plan proposed here consists of four specific action steps of varying complexity and time frames. It also suggests broader issues that could be more effectively addressed in the context of the Comprehensive Housing Strategy. The steps in the Action Plan increase in complexity from #1 - #4.

The CHS would in all likelihood include some or all elements of the Action Plan that is discussed in this memo. Implementing elements of the Action Plan may be seen to have an effect on choices and options for the Comprehensive Housing Strategy. Council may opt to hold off on items in the Action Plan which they feel commit the City to actions which would potentially be inconsistent or out of sync with the CHS. In addition City Council may wish to delay implementation of any elements of the Action Plan which are seen as raising issues that are more fully addressed in the context of a broader strategy. There are already two such issues which were raised by the Housing Workshop participants that staff has moved into the CHS for exploration.

- Items #1 and #2 in the Action Plan pose the least potential for any downstream conflict with the CHS.
 - Item #1 is focused on research and understanding Shoreline's market. This work will not affect the CHS tasks.
 - Item #2 provides a direct service to seniors about ways to make wise use of existing tools and services. It does not establish any new commitments or ongoing programs.
- Item #3 does requires a commitment to a particular housing proposal and population. While all the data reviewed to date indicates that this population is an appropriate focus for our efforts, the act of selection will limit our choices to address needs of other populations. However, the lead time from initiation of action to the occupancy of new housing units is lengthy. It is highly likely that any selection of a developer or a project would happen after significant progress has been made on the CHS. Any potential conflicts could be addressed as the item moves forward.
- Item #4 requires the longest commitment calling for the City to establish and support a new local funding source. Initially it is envisioned that this fund could be supported with Community Development Block Grant resources.

In this light the following options are available:

- Option 1 Implement the Action Plan as Proposed;
- Option 2 Identify certain elements of the Action Plan to implement now and others to consider within the CHS.
- Option 3 Pursue implementation of the Action Plan following completion of the CHS

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends Option 1 that the Council endorse the strategies proposed and to direct staff to implement the action plan, which will result in assisting seniors with limited incomes to age in place and to remain an integral part of the Shoreline community.

ATTACHMENTS

- A. Background materials distributed at January 19, 2006 Housing Workshop
- B. Minutes from January 19, 2006 Housing Workshop

Attachment A Housing Workshop Materials

DRAFT HOUSING RESOURCES FOR PEOPLE WITH LIMITED INCOMES IN SHORELINE

Policy Background

The Shoreline Comprehensive Plan, 2004 Update, contains a section on affordable housing with several strategies (see attached list of strategies)

Current Situation

- The 2000 Census reported Shoreline as having 20,716 households of which 32.7% of households had an individual under 18. Slightly more than a quarter, 26.4%, is one person households, 10% were female headed households with children and almost a quarter, 23.8%, of householders were 65 or older. Average household size in 2000 was 2.5 and has been declining for the past three decades.
- Numbers of Households by economic groups

Very Low Income < 30% Median	Low Income - 30-49% of Median	Moderate Income – 50-79% of Median
• 2,208	• 2,091	• 3,908

- Homelessness has emerged as a new issue. The 2004 One Night Count documented 38 homeless individuals, a 58% increase over 2003. The Shoreline School District reports serving 45-50 homeless students annually for each of the past two years. There are no shelters for singles in North King County and one family shelter in Kenmore.
- By type of tenure, 68% of households are owner-occupied and 32% renter-occupied.
- By size, 74% of housing units are single family, 1.8% duplex, 10.2% 3-19 units and 13.1% 20 or more units.
- Publicly subsidized housing resources in Shoreline consist of 464 KCHA, units, housing mainly singles and couples, 3 units of LATCH housing and 72 units of tax credit properties. In addition to owned units, KCHA provides 356 Section 8 housing vouchers. The economic value of the section 8 vouchers to private landlords in Shoreline is 2.6 million dollars annually.

Affordability of Rental Housing Units in Shoreline and King County

	<30% of Median	30-49% of Median	50-79% of Median
King County	0.1%	43.9%	50.0%
Shoreline	0.0%	57.9%	41.3%

Source: Communities Count 2005

Based on the HUD standard for affordability, (housing costs no greater than 30% of household monthly income), there is no market-rate housing available to households making less than 30% of median income. For a single person, at 30% of median income or less, monthly rent should not exceed \$409. For this amount, only a room in shared housing would be possible. Those between 30% and 49% of median fare better with 57.9% of rental housing affordable to them.

According to the Dupre and Scott Apartment Vacancy Report for 20 unit and larger properties, the September vacancy rate in Shoreline was 4.9%, down from 8.1% last September. The average rent was \$759 per month, which requires an annual income of \$30,360 to not pay more than 30% of annual income for housing.

As a result of the high cost of rental housing, many spend more than they can afford on housing. According to the 2000 Census, 10% of Shoreline renters spend 30-34.9% of their income on housing and 27.2% spend more than 35% of their income on rent.

Characteristics of Households with Less Than 30% of Median Income

Based on a special analysis of the 2000 census conducted by HUD, (SOCDS CHAS Data) there are 2,028 Shoreline households, (9.5% of households vs. 11.1% for the county as a whole), with incomes below 30% of median (\$ < 21,050 for a family of three). The characteristics of these households is shown in the table below.

Renters <30%					Owners < 30%				
Elderly 1 & 2 members	Small Related 2-4 members	Large Related 5 or more members	All Other	Total Renters	Elderly 1 & 2 members	Small Related 2-4 members	Large Related 5 or more members	All Other	Total Owners
439	339	54	454	1,286	434	128	30	150	742

People 65 and older make up 14% of the city’s population, yet comprise 43% of households having less than 30% of median income, evenly split between renters and home owners. The KCHA has enough units and section 8 vouchers for 820 households, enough to house 64% of the 1,286 households, with incomes < 30% of median, living in permanent rental housing.

Characteristics of Households with more than 30% but less than 50% of Median Income

The characteristics of the 2,091 households at 30-49% of median income (\$21,050 - \$35,050 for a family of three) are shown in the following table.

Renters >30% <49%					Owners >30% <49%				
Elderly 1 & 2 members	Small Related 2-4 members	Large Related 5 or more members	All Other	Total Renters	Elderly 1 & 2 members	Small Related 2-4 members	Large Related 5 or more members	All Other	Total Owners
292	308	113	315	1,028	484	389	55	135	1,063

Elderly renters and owners make up 37% of all households in this economic group, while comprising 14% of the city population. The split between home owners and renters is almost even. In this economic group, small families make up one third of the households.

The 30-50% of median contains a variety of occupational groups including minimum wage earners, new entrants to the work force and single parents with many in service occupations such as day care worker, nurse’s aide, teacher and retail sales person.

Attachment B

CITY OF SHORELINE

**SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL
SUMMARY MINUTES OF HOUSING WORKSHOP**

Thursday, January 19, 2006
1:00 p.m.

Shoreline Fire Department Headquarters
17525 Aurora Avenue N

PRESENT: Mayor Ransom, Deputy Mayor Fimia, Councilmembers Gustafson, McGlashan, and Way

STAFF:

Julie Modrzejewski, Assistant City Manager; Rob Beem, Human Services Manager; George Smith, Human Services Planner; Paul Cohen, Planner; Nora Smith, Neighborhoods Coordinator; Ray Allshouse, Building Official; Joyce Nichols, Communications and Intergovernmental Relations Director; Steve Szafran, Planner; Debbie Tarry, Finance Director; Bethany Wolbrecht-Dunn, Grants Specialist; Joe Tovar, Planning and Development Services Director; and Scott Passey, City Clerk

PANEL MEMBERS:

Andrew Brand, Housing Developer, Lutheran Alliance to Create Housing (LATCH)
Robin Amadon, Senior Housing Developer, Low Income Housing Institute (LIHI)
Deborah Gooden, King County Housing Authority, General Manager of Greenbridge Redevelopment Project
Allan Johnson, Affordable Housing Planner, King County
Arthur Sullivan, Director, A Regional Coalition for Housing (ARCH)
Jan Dickerman, Director of Housing and Child Development, Hopelink

1. WELCOME AND PURPOSE

At 1:15 p.m., Ms. Modrzejewski welcomed attendees and reviewed the purpose of the meeting, which is to explore what can be done in Shoreline to meet the housing needs for people with limited incomes. She said this meeting is an opportunity to educate City staff and the Council as they approach the City's goal-setting process.

2. WORKSHOP FORMAT AND INTRODUCTION OF PANEL

Mr. Beem elaborated on the purpose of the meeting and urged attendees to share their recommendations on how the City can maximize its efforts in low-income housing.

Participants then introduced themselves, providing their backgrounds and experience in the area of affordable/low-income housing.

3. REVIEW OF CURRENT HOUSING SITUATION FOR PEOPLE WITH LIMITED INCOMES

Mr. Smith reviewed the current housing situation in Shoreline as provided on the blue handout. He noted that one in five Shoreline residents live at or below the 50% of median income level (the King County average is 22%). He pointed out that people 65 and older make up 14% of the City's population, yet they comprise 43% of the households having less than 30% of median income. He emphasized that the elderly, who play an important role in the functioning of the community, are overrepresented in these figures.

4. DISCUSSION WITH PANEL AND ATTENDEES OF THREE KEY ISSUES

Mr. Beem then led a group discussion focusing on the following questions:

- a) Is Shoreline's situation mostly the same or different from the housing situation of other smaller cities in an urbanized county? If you have attempted a project in Shoreline, were you successful? What, if any, obstacles did you encounter and could the city have done anything differently to assist?
- b) We have developed a list of strategies – based on your experience, which ones are most likely to produce the most units of housing? Have we missed any options?
- c) What's needed to implement these strategies in Shoreline?

Panelists and participants shared the following points:

- 1) According to census figures, household size continues to decrease, as do the number of school enrollments (G. Smith).
- 2) Higher enrollment levels at private schools may partially account for the decrease in public school enrollments. Some figures suggest that 25% of school-age children in Shoreline attend private schools (Ransom).
- 3) There are a number of federal housing options available, such as HUD Section 202 for senior housing. Housing built by non-profit developers can free-up existing housing stock for others. Shoreline could consider the option of accessory dwelling units (ADUs) (Amadon).
- 4) The City of Shoreline allows ADUs; about 14 ADUs have been built in Shoreline in the past five years. Detached ADUs are only allowed on lots in excess of 10,000 square feet, otherwise an ADU must be attached to the principal residence (Cohen).
- 5) Shoreline is a community that is fairly well developed; therefore, Shoreline's GMA growth targets are relatively small compared to existing housing stock and other jurisdictions. However, owner occupancy is relatively high. Shoreline has a high percentage of single family housing (74%), versus 57% for King County and 50% for Seattle. The difference between 74% single family and 68% owner occupied would indicate some single-family stock is rental housing. The data also shows that Shoreline is

apt to have a higher percentage of its rental housing in single-family units as opposed to multi-family units. The statistics should influence the policy decisions about strategies for redevelopment and increasing density (Sullivan).

- 6) As median home prices increase, housing choices for the less-than 30% of median income residents decrease (Dickerson).
- 7) Shoreline is similar to King County in terms of percentage of people below 50% of median income, but housing and zoning are different. Shoreline is not really a small city; it is the fifth largest in King County. The housing mix affects perception. Affordability disappears as home prices increase. It is advisable to try to make multi-family housing work in Shoreline (Johnson).
- 8) All communities need more information on housing condition and land availability for new development. It is important to really know the dynamics of your housing market. Jurisdictions need interest, political will, knowledge of zoning, and a strong focus on strategy and planning. Shoreline should commit to a 5-year action plan that communicates its priorities. This should not be outlined in its Comprehensive Plan, but it should be detailed elsewhere (Gooden).
- 9) Shoreline housing is relatively affordable, but there is a possibility of market-rate inflation problems in the future. As the value of single-family housing increases, the private market will shift these units from the relatively lower-cost rentals to higher-cost owner-occupied. Shoreline must take a close look at its rental housing stock. Shoreline has a disproportionate amount of single-family zoning. Shoreline could consider higher-density development in the Aurora Corridor. Cottage housing is controversial because it is difficult to predict where it can be built (Brand).
- 10) Shoreline is somewhat different in its mix of housing types and ownership profiles. The stated goal is housing strategies that meet the need of households with less-than 50% of median income (Beem).
- 11) Meeting housing needs can benefit the community by ensuring youth have a stable housing situation; academic achievement is compromised when students have to move frequently. It is less expensive to build multi-family housing on the east side of Shoreline. Demographic data suggests more emphasis should be placed on the needs of the elderly (Ransom).
- 12) Can Section 8 and voucher programs benefit both landlord and tenant in terms of market value and affordability? (McGlashan)
- 13) Section 8 and voucher programs are constantly changing and under attack. Landlords generally cannot get highest market value. Landlords get a stable, predictable, flow of rents. Landlord philanthropy can make a difference (Gooden).
- 14) Section 8 programs benefit landlords in term of consistency of payments. The City might explore ways to administer such programs on a local level (Amadon).

Mr. Beem posed the question of how some specific targets can be established and met.

- 15) GMA targets can be achieved through multi-family density (Johnson).
- 16) Low-income earners are surviving in a very unstable situation and pay a large portion of their income for housing. This results in high rates of turnover and neighborhood instability. Preserving existing rental stock will create stability and decrease the likelihood of rent increases due to redevelopment. Acquisition and rehabilitation have been used effectively in Bellevue to address this situation. Section 8 programs also create stability (Sullivan).
- 17) Preserving existing housing stock essentially “takes a market-rate unit out of the game” and maintains that unit at a relatively more affordable level (G. Smith).
- 18) Preserving existing housing is a good strategy but it probably requires a change in ownership to maintain an income-restricted situation (Amadon).
- 19) Shoreline should analyze all the relevant information (zoning, ownership, demographics, etc.) while focusing on the most critical needs, and then air the options politically. Create a constituency around affordable development. It is important to engage your community and then start your first development within the community’s “comfort zone.” Some areas of Aurora Avenue might be more suitable for housing (Gooden).

Mr. Beem asked for feedback on effective strategies.

- 20) Shoreline should explore partnerships between families who have been previously homeless and developers to create a tiered system that addresses their particular needs (Dickerson).
- 21) Density bonuses can be a volatile concept in suburban areas. The City should consider gifting permit fees to provide incentives to developers. The City could also income-restrict a certain number of units in a market-rate development (Amadon).
- 22) Expedited permit processing and other incentives can make a big difference. If this is an issue, the City should explore new approaches to permitting (Gooden).
- 23) There are ways to make density bonuses work, such as linking the bonus to the size/scale of the house, parking considerations, etc. Density bonuses offered as a package are proven to more effective (Johnson).
- 24) There are a number of incentives available, but affordable housing incentives are generally the last alternative that private developers choose (Sullivan).
- 25) What is the right combination of the things we want, and how do we proceed without degrading quality? There are distinctions between the east side and west side of Shoreline (Way).
- 26) A key question is how to provide housing that is compatible with community values (Beem).

- 27) Seattle and other jurisdictions have neighborhood design review boards, which address the compatibility question. The quality of affordable housing is actually higher than market-rate housing due to higher investment in design (Amadon).
- 28) There are places in Shoreline, such as Aurora Avenue, where housing would be a better use than the current use. Some housing is strategically placed to “build the community.” Housing should be built not only to meet the immediate need but also for community development. Public funding shows a commitment and can often leverage 5-15 times the original investment (Gooden).
- 29) Compatibility is not just a design issue. The community’s “buy-in” should be sought for an overall strategy on compatibility (Tovar).
- 30) Shoreline should have an inventory of surplus sites and consider the potential to co-locate housing with other uses, such as Echo Lake and Aurora Avenue (Johnson).
- 31) The community should be polled on who it thinks needs housing the most, as well as what the housing should look like. There are ways to achieve multi-family housing in single-family zones if there is community will. The City should try to understand the “why” (Sullivan).
- 32) The City should start with a needs-based analysis first, but the concept of neighborhood design review might also be effective (Gooden).
- 33) The public wants predictability, and a community conversation about target groups (seniors, homeless, previously homeless) should lead that effort. The City should also consider its position in the region (Cohen).
- 34) Kirkland and Redmond have been successful at cottage housing because they began with demonstration (study area) projects. A discussion of the process can help make the product successful. It’s also what’s happening around you that affects housing prices. Note the Crossroads development in Bellevue as a good example of a successful housing project (Sullivan).
- 35) There has been a stigma surrounding affordable housing; the City should inform and educate the community (Brand).
- 36) Noticing can be “the seed of either a good process or a bad process.” When neighbors are adequately notified of potential development, they are more likely to support them (Way).
- 37) The City should consider creative ways to co-locate housing. The King County Library System is considering ways to incorporate housing in their future designs (Dickerson).
- 38) Shoreline should look at target groups and effective strategies, but it should not discount the density bonus entirely. In order to ensure healthy market cycles, housing should be viewed holistically. The City should explore ADUs and the land-trust system, where the trust owns the land but the individual owns the unit (Johnson).

39) Shoreline should consider how the potential redevelopment of the Fircrest property might help address low-income housing needs in the future (Fimia).

40) King County increased the loan amount for ADUs; Shoreline now has 50 units of transitional housing (G. Smith).

5. WRAP UP AND SUMMARY

Mr. Beem provided a summary of the dialogue and thanked panelists and attendees for their participation. The meeting concluded at 3:30 p.m.

/S/ Scott Passey, City Clerk, CMC

This page intentionally left blank.