

GMHB EXHIBIT 75

2024-01-02 City Council Transcript

APPEARANCES

9:58

if we uh for us to have that in November uh that gives us 7 months to get through

10:04

a code Amendment and and building permit process which puts uh which makes it

10:09

urgent and important that it moves forward quickly and so that's the ask today is that uh when you're reviewing

10:17

all of the things that U the huge uh docket of of items uh that that this

10:24

receives high priority we have an opportunity to really change uh the youth

10:29

um Sport and adult sport uh experience on the island particularly around racket

10:35

Sports and uh we appreciate all your help and have one more uh you know one

10:41

one more ask that we get uh high priority today thank

10:46

you thank you there are no further appearances we will now move on to special business our first item of

AB 6386: Councilmember Oath of Office and Mayor and Deputy Mayor Elections

10:52

special business is AB 6386 council member Oaths of office and

10:58

mayor and Deputy Mayor elections I will conduct the Oaths of office to the successfully elected council members

11:05

Dave rosenbom Wendy wer Craig Reynolds and Jake Jacobson I will then conduct

11:11

the mayor election and turn the meeting over to the new mayor to conduct the election for Deputy Mayor and continue

11:17

leading the meeting or if the new mayor would prefer I can also conduct the election for Deputy Mayor I will be

11:24

administering the Oaths of office in order of position Dave rosenbom position number one

11:29

Wendy wer position number three Craig Reynolds position number five and Jake

11:35

Jacobson position number seven seven I've also presented elected council

11:40

members with their certificate of election I will call on successful candidates in position order to

11:46

administer the Oaths please have your microphone and Camera turned on when it is your turn to

11:52

take the oath if you are attending via Zoom after the election and Oaths for

11:57

mayor and deputy mayor we will take a brief recess to take pictures and change the seating order we will now begin the

12:04

Oaths of office I will ask Council to slide to the side on each side we're

12:10

going to do the Oaths directly behind

12:22

me council member

12:27

rosenbom

12:35

please please raise your right hand and repeat after me I Dave rosenbom I Dave

12:42

rosenbom do solemnly swear do solemnly swear that I will support that I will support the
Constitution of the United

12:48

States of America the Constitution of the United States of America the laws of the state of
Washington the laws of the

12:53

state of Washington and all local ordinances and all local ordinances and that I will
faithfully and impartially

12:58

and I will faithfully and impartially perform and discharge perform and discharge the duties
of office of city

13:04

of Mercer Island the duties of office of city of Mercer Island Council position number one
Council position number one

13:10

according to the law according to the law and to the best of my ability and to the best of my
ability congratulations to the council member

13:21

has council member wer please raise your right

13:27

hand I Wendy wer I Wendy wer do solemnly swear do solemnly swear that I will

13:33

support that I will support the Constitution of the United States of America the Constitution of the United

13:38

States of America and the laws of the state of Washington and the laws of the state of Washington and all local ordinances and all local ordinances and

13:46

that I will faithfully and impartially and that I will faithfully and impartially perform and discharge the duties perform and discharge the duties

13:53

of the office of city of Mercer Island of the office of the city of Mercer Island Council position number three

13:59

Council position number three according to the law according to the law and to the best of my abilities and to the best

14:04

of my abilities congratulations council member

14:14

wer I'm gonna slide onto Zoom for this one council member Reynolds please raise

14:20

your right hand I got a microphone that's

14:26

on I Craig Reynolds I Craig Reynolds do solemnly swear do solemnly swear that I

14:34

will support that I will support Constitution of the United States of America the Constitution of the United

14:41

States of America the laws of the state of Washington the laws of the state of Washington and all local ordinances and

14:48

all local ordinances and that I will faithfully and impartially and that I will faithfully and impartially perform

14:55

and discharge the duties perform and discharge the duties of the office of

15:01

city of Mercer Island of the office of city of Mercer Island Council position number five Council position number five

15:09

according to the law according to the law and to the best of my abilities and to the best of my abilities

15:15

congratulations council member thank

15:24

you and council member Jacobson

15:29

please raise your right hand I Jake Jacobson I Jake Jacobson do solemnly

15:34

swear do solemnly swear that I will support and I will support the Constitution of the United States of

15:40

America the Constitution of the United States of America the laws of the state of Washington the laws of the state of

15:45

Washington and all local ordinances and all local ordinances and that I will faithfully and impartially uh faithfully

15:52

and impartially perform and discharge the duties perform and discharge the duties of the office of city of Merc mer

15:58

island of the office of the city of Mercer Island Council position number seven Council position number seven

16:04

according to the law according to the law and to the best of my abilities and to the best of my abilities congratulations Council thank

16:18

you thank you for that congratulations council members oh thank

16:23

you under Washington state law in a council manager form of government council member choose a mayor and deputy

16:30

mayor from among themselves by by anally at the first meeting of the year the

16:36

election process is outlined in section two of the Mercer Island City Council rules of

16:42

procedure first I will call for nominations of Mayor if there is only one nominee it is appropriate to make a

16:48

motion and have the city clerk conduct a roll call vote for that nomination if

16:53

more than one nomination is made an open election is conducted by roll call vote to decide amongst those nominated who

17:01

shall be elected the roll call vote shall be conducted as follows the city

17:06

clerk shall call each council member by name each council member will reply with

17:12

I may or abstain if they do not wish to vote the city clerk will tally the votes

17:18

if a nominee receives a majority vote of the city council the city clerk shall declare the nominee receiving the

17:24

majority vote as the new mayor elections will continue until the mayor and Deputy

17:29

Mayor have been elected by a majority vote of the city council which is four

17:34

votes upon the election of Mayor the city clerk shall administer the oath of office to the mayor who shall thereupon

17:41

assume the role of chair of the meeting the mayor will then proceed in the same fashion with the election of deputy

17:47

mayor or if they prefer I can conduct the election of Deputy Mayor as well

17:52

okay I will now entertain nominations for a council member to serve as mayor for 2024 four in

17:59

2025 I nominate Sim n

18:05

second nominations don't require a second oh sorry I split the record show

18:10

that I did though are there any further

18:16

nominations there being no other nominations nominations for mayor are now closed seeing that there is only one

18:24

nomination is there a motion for council member niece to be mayor for 2024 and

18:29

2025 so mooves

18:35

second seconded by Jacobson

18:40

and draw it was moved by wer seconded by and draw for council member nce to be

18:46

mayor for 2024 and 2025 I will now conduct a roll call

18:53

vote council member Reynolds I council member rosenbom hi council

19:00

member Weinberg I council member Jacobson hi council member nce I council

19:07

member and draw I and council member wer I thank you congratulations mayor

19:25

n now we will now conduct the both of office for mayor please raise your right hand I

19:33

council member s i council member selem n do solemnly swear do solemnly swear

19:39

that I will faithfully and impartially that I will faithfully and impartially discharge the duties of the office of

19:45

discharge the duties of the office of Mayor of the city of Mercer Island mayor of the city of Mercer Island to the best

19:52

of my ability to the best of my ability congratulations Marines thank

19:57

you would you like me to conduct the El deputy mayor

20:16

election okay congratulations mayor nce he has asked me to conduct the election of the Deputy Mayor so I will now

20:22

entertain nominations for a council member to serve as deputy mayor for 2024 and 2025

20:28

I nominate Dave

20:35

rosenbom are there any further

20:43

nominations there being no other nominations nominations for Deputy Mayor are now

20:48

closed seeing that there is only one nomination is there a motion for council member rosenbom to be deputy mayor for

20:55

2024 and 2025 so much moved

21:01

second it was moved by council member Jacobson seconded by council member andrell that council member Rosen bomb

21:08

be deputy mayor for 2024 and 2025 I will now conduct a roll call vote council

21:14

member andrw I council member mayor nce I

21:19

council member Weinberg I council member Reynolds I council member Jacobson I

21:27

council member wer I and council member Rosen bomb I thank you congratulations Deputy Mayor

21:43

Rosen Deputy Mayor rosenbom please raise your right hand I Dave rosenbom I Dave

21:49

rosenbom do solemnly swear do solemnly swear that I will faithfully and impartially that will faithfully and

21:54

impartially discharge the duties of the office of the sergeant the duties of the office of deputy mayor of the city of

22:00

Mercer Island deputy mayor of the city of Mercer Island to the best of my ability to the best of my ability congratulations Deputy

22:14

L we will now take a 10-minute recess Andre I'm going to interrupt we're going to need more than 10 minutes let's plan

22:20

on coming back at 5:40 perfect we will now recess until

22:26

5:40

45:08

all right welcome back to the meran city council regular meeting we were in recess from

45:13

5:20 pm to 5:45 pm and next item on our agenda is the city manager report and we

CITY MANAGER REPORT

45:20

welcome city manager Jesse Bond uh good evening Mr mayor and

45:26

members of the council happy New Year all right Casey is driving the

45:33

PowerPoint for me uh let's go ahead into the next

45:40

slide uh this is just a reminder whoops there we go uh that with the permanent

45:46

closure of City Hall the easiest way to access City staff uh For assistance with any of your city services is to contact

45:53

our customer service team I've got this slide up here with our phone number and the email address um should you need any

46:00

assistance next slide please all right Council we're back in the swing of things with uh meetings and

46:08

business resuming as usual I'll remind you that your next hybrid city council meeting will be Tuesday January 16th uh

46:15

our boards and commissions are also back to business design commission meets tomorrow at 6 o'clock the parks and rec

46:21

commission meets Thursday at 5:00 and next week the utility board will be meeting on January 9th at 5:00 next

46:29

slide please all right City updates a few things to catch you up on first of all

46:35

uh City Hall transitions uh work uh a lot of work is still underway to address

46:41

uh the permanent closure of our city hall facility uh first up we are back in

46:47

person for City Council meetings thank you to all of the staff and our

46:52

consultants and contractors that helped get this room that we're sitting in tonight the Slater room converted over

46:59

to our council chambers uh I will mention to you city council and also to anyone watching the meeting remotely we

47:06

have a lot of fine-tuning and adjustments to make uh the the room is tight as you know we're pretty squeezed

47:12

in here uh but we welcome your feedback if you have any suggestions things you'd like to change for the next meeting uh

47:19

please just drop Andrea Larson our city clerk uh an email and cc me and we'll we'll keep working on it uh Mercer

47:26

Island Municipal Court is almost fully moved to Newcastle City Hall I say

47:32

almost because uh while the courtroom space which will be in the Newcastle council chambers is uh ready to go with

47:40

kind of the last touches will be in place by Monday uh the staff offices that we've leased on the third floor of

47:46

the building are not quite ready to go yet uh we had a delay with

47:51

carpet installation so that set us back a little bit um but we're making do and

47:57

working away on that we expect to see uh the carpet and the the last remaining um

48:04

tasks wrapped up in the next two to three weeks and then that that will be uh ready to go uh we are making progress

48:11

with the police Modular Buildings Council you may recall that we're bringing in modular buildings to the City Hall parking lot for police uh

48:19

we've had unfortunately um more setbacks than we'd like with that project but the

48:24

utility engineering basically all the work that we needed to do to connect the building to power sewer and water uh is

48:32

moving forward the building designs were approved by I& and the buildings I believed have now been approved to be

48:39

transported uh to City Hall so we're making progress uh we hope to have the buildings in place by the end of the

48:45

month and connected in early February I want to give a shout out um of of all

48:51

the lists I just went through of operational transitions certain certainly the court and the police have

48:57

been the most impacted by the closure of City Hall and I just wanted to say thank you to those staff teams and our patrons

49:03

for their continued flexibility as we work through this big transition all

49:08

right next slide please Casey uh the community center actually where we're uh meeting from tonight was

49:15

closed for the last two weeks and Council I just wanted to share a little bit about the work that was completed uh

49:20

that picture on the right you can see that we moved all the furniture out of the lobby uh we uh steam cleaned all the

49:27

carpets we cleaned all the furniture the Mercer room floor was replaced again you

49:33

might recall it was replaced a year ago but the product was faulty so we waited

49:38

until uh this last December to do it all again so we hope that's the last

49:43

replacement for a while uh we went through the building we did a lot of touch-up work painting uh we had a lot

49:49

of uh work to do on the hbac system uh some of that is still being resolved and

49:54

then we also did some finishing touches on this room the Slater room uh and we

49:59

reopened to the public today and it was actually pretty busy here I worked here most of the day so nice job to the uh

50:04

Community Center staff and the facility staff for getting all of that done next slide

50:09

please uh just a few features even though many of us took time off over the holidays our maintenance teams were out

50:17

and very busy uh water team was out working on uh leaking service line from

50:23

the water M and that 4100 Block of 94th Avenue Southeast that's the picture there on the right uh they also did

50:29

quite a bit of annual maintenance work last month U mostly on the pressure reducing station in the 8100 block of

50:36

West Mercer way keeping our utilities operational next slide

50:41

please H the storm water team uh is is uh battling a beaver that is uh very

50:48

busy building a dam uh on the right there they conducted uh drainage clearing including several days clearing

50:56

a storm water trash rack that's that picture on the right on Southeast 53rd

51:01

where as I just mentioned we have a very busy beaver uh working to make that space um his or her home uh they also

51:09

jetted and cleared a 12in storm water pipe near 602nd actually on the south end of the island uh this was uh really

51:16

important during these heavy rains to clear out that root intrusion next slide

51:22

please and the rightaway team also so uh still very busy uh they were out

51:29

dressing a broken limb that was hanging high up in a fur tree and had become dangerous thank you for addressing that

51:35

right away uh we also are still cleaning up a leaf and uh fall blow down debris

51:43

so they've been out sweeping uh the roads and the Town Center really trying to stay ahead of all that uh they also

51:51

uh are the team that kept all of the lights on in town center and and uh we thank them for uh keeping everything

51:58

very festive uh during this winter season next slide

52:03

please uh the island Crestway project 4004 Island Crestway if you've been by

52:09

it's looking really great I drove by this morning uh we completed the installation of irrigation top so soil

52:16

uh Mulch and plants uh the lawn area has been seated

52:22

will take a little while for that to obviously take hold uh I mentioned last time I was in front of you the sidewalks

52:28

are done so this project is substantially complete while we just wait for that grass to come in thank you

52:34

to all the team members that worked on uh cleaning up that parcel and making it look uh really quite

52:42

amazing all right heads up on a couple upcoming events uh we made the transition

52:49

yesterday to Eastside fire and rescue uh congratulations to all of our team

52:55

members we had many many promotions and uh we got to celebrate all of those team

53:01

members last month uh now as we are into January 2024 we'd like to invite uh

53:08

Council certainly you and members of our community out to the fire stations to meet uh our team members and also learn

53:16

a little bit more about Eastside fire and rescue we have two open houses scheduled uh the first one is Wednesday

53:22

January 10th at station 91 that's our fire station in town center that's at 5:30 and the second open house is

53:29

station 92 that's on the south end near the QFC shopping center that is Saturday

53:35

January 13th uh from 10: to noon so come on out and meet your fire

53:41

team okay some good news and I'll wrap it up uh illuminate Mi was really

53:47

successful we added more lights and certainly got a lot of very positive feedback from our community on the event

53:54

the lights will will be up for just a little while longer uh but I wanted to take a moment tonight and thank our

54:00

sponsors uh for making it happen again this year pet Sound Energy Street treats

54:05

Haba and John L Scott real estate thank you very

54:10

much next slide also a big shout out and thank you

54:16

to all of the donors that supported the yfs holiday programs uh we were able to distribute

54:23

food assistance to 130 9 families for holiday meals as well as holiday gifts

54:29

to 95 children uh these programs were supported by all of our community

54:34

members and the businesses and obviously happened in a strong partnership with

54:40

the yfs foundation all right next

54:45

slide okay I had to wrap it up with a a quick go dogs I'm not sure the ulcer of

54:50

my stomach has fully uh recovered from watching last night's game but uh

54:56

whether you're a husky fan or not it's certainly an honor to see one of our universities represented uh in the

55:02

national championship game so a big go dogs go Huskies uh will be cheering you

55:08

on thank you very much very good thank you all right next item on the agenda is

CONSENT AGENDA

55:14

the consent agenda which contains AB 6387 December 1 2023 payroll certification AB 6388 December 15 2023

55:24

payroll certification certification of claims for December 1 815 and 22 2023 city council meeting

55:31

minutes of December 5 2023 regular hybrid meeting AB 6380 Luther Burbank

55:37

boiler building phase uh lbb 1 bid award council is there a motion to approve the

55:43

consent agenda as presented so moved second okay moved by council member Weinberg seconded by council member

55:49

Jacobson city clerk please call the RO thank you Mr Mayor council member wer

55:56

hi council member Jacobson hi mayor ni hi council member andrw I council member

56:04

Weinberg I council member Rosen bomb I and council member Reynolds hi thank you

56:11

Mr Mayor very good consent agenda passes our first item of regular business is AB 6385 2024 comprehensive plan periodic

AB 6385: 2024 Comprehensive Plan Periodic Update, Housing Element – HB 1220 Implementation

56:19

update housing element hb220 implementation for which we welcome CPD

56:24

director Jeff Thomas welcome Jeff hey thank you mayor uh good evening Council

56:30

uh for the record Jeff Thomas for CPD and while we're firing up a presentation here I'd like to introduce our senior

56:37

planner Adam Zach he'll be doing the bulk of the presentation this evening and our deputy director Allison van gorp

56:42

is also in the virtual audience uh to support our conversation on this this

56:48

evening we'll roll right to slide number two Adam if you will I'm be brief here with my

56:55

introductory remarks and then turn it over to Adam um the purpose of this item

57:01

here this evening is to provide an overview on two important uh reports that are needed to uh not only

57:07

successfully um support the implementation of House Bill 1220 which um is one of the more frequently

57:14

referenced uh pieces of State legislation here in recent years but also to uh Drive our effort forward to

57:22

complete our required uh periodic update to our comprehensive plan which is

57:27

due currently at least due no later uh than December 31st uh the end of this

57:35

year um so what we've got for you here this evening are um presentations on two

57:41

reports uh that have been drafted uh the L Capacity Analysis supplement which is

57:48

exhibit one to agenda Bill 6385 in your packet as well as the racially dispar

57:54

impacts evaluation which is exhibit two to that same agenda bill um Council

57:59

will recall that in July of last year 2023 it approved a supplemental scope of

58:06

work for our um update to our comprehensive plan uh these two reports

58:11

that are uh in your packet and being presented here this evening are that supplemental scope of work that Council

58:17

approved so um we had our initial scope that was approved in the spring of 2022

58:23

we had been working on that for a fairly lengthy period of time Commerce came out with some implementation guidance

58:29

related to this house bill 1220 so we had to take a slight detour here over the last number of months to get that

58:36

supplemental scope of work pulled together have Council approve it do the actual work and then bring it to you

58:41

here this evening uh for presentation last comment I'm going to make on this slide these these reports

58:49

um council is not required to take formal action on these two reports similar to a couple coup of other

58:55

reports uh for our comprehensive Plan update that were presented to you in the fall of

59:00

2022 related to Economic Development and the housing needs assessment um that said what we are

59:07

going to be asking Council for on January 16th uh perhaps some

59:13

direction here this evening at the end of our item will be to uh provide some direction on three options that are

59:19

going to be presented to you at the end of this presentation on how to uh close a

59:26

capacity problem it's a it's a paper math exercise problem essentially

59:31

related to an affordable housing Target that we now have to incorporate into our comprehensive Plan update again

59:38

originating from this house bill 1220 so say that one more time just for clarity

59:44

no action required on these two reports formal action from Council but we will need direction on at least one of three

59:50

options um to help solve an affordable housing Target capacity problem next

59:57

Slide the agenda for uh tonight's presentation we've broken it down into a few different sections um Adam's going

1:00:04

to cover a really brief um three or four slide background in addition to what I've said here at the top of the

1:00:11

presentation and then we're going to get right into providing an overview of the

1:00:16

RDI evaluation we will stop after um that set of slides for question and

1:00:23

answer and then we'll move on to the laye Capacity Analysis we'll stop again

1:00:29

after Adam presents that set of slides and then we'll have a short set of slides related to those three options

1:00:35

that I just referenced a moment ago for solving this uh this capacity problem uh

1:00:40

then mayor we'll wrap it up and we'll turn it back to you uh for uh any Q&A any additional Q&A and uh discussion so

1:00:49

with that Adam I'm going to turn things over to Hugh and uh we'll get right into the presentation thank you

1:00:55

thank you um so as Jeff mentioned we are currently in the process of updating our

1:01:02

comprehensive plan and this is a periodic review that's required by the Statewide law um and we um in this

1:01:09

process here we're in this orange slice of the pie at the top here the comprehensive plan periodic review and

1:01:16

that fits within this kind of larger process uh where whereby after we adopt

1:01:22

that periodic review where we set our goals of policies that provide kind of the highlevel direction of how we'll

1:01:28

manage growth in the Years following the adoption of that periodic review um the

1:01:34

updated comprehensive plan we then Implement those policies um and that

1:01:40

will include some new annual reporting and monitoring uh requirements that were

1:01:45

established in the state law um by the legislature last year um and then it at

1:01:51

the five-year point so five years after we've updated the the periodic review or updated the comprehensive plan um we

1:01:58

then have a a check-in and this is a new thing that we'll be doing with um Commerce and King County kind of look at

1:02:05

our progress towards achieving our comprehensive plan or realizing the the plan then we would continue to work on

1:02:13

implementing those um the goals and policies of the comp plan uh before again returning to another periodic

1:02:20

review um currently scheduled for 2034 so that's kind of the the larger process

1:02:26

under the growth management act and tonight we're going to talk quite a bit about House Bill 1220 um

1:02:34

this is a bill that was enacted in 2021 by the Washington State Legislature that changes how we plan for housing under

1:02:41

the growth management act and it really established a couple of key um new

1:02:46

requirements for housing um one is that cities must look at projected housing

1:02:52

need at different income levels rather than just a total overall housing Target

1:02:58

um that's been disaggregated Now by um projected income level so that we're

1:03:04

kind of planning for those um accommodating those different income levels there's also a new requirement

1:03:11

added by House Bill 1220 that we review housing policies for potential racially disparate impacts um and um finally it

1:03:21

we have new requirements for how we regulate emergency housing and accessory dwelling units um coming out of house

1:03:28

build 1220 so those are the kind of key pieces of of that

1:03:34

legislation to um address those new requirements Commerce issued guidance

1:03:40

earlier this year um and the two big pieces that came out of that Commerce

1:03:46

guidance um are the two reports that we'll be looking at tonight um the first

1:03:51

is an evaluation of our data and and um City policies to examine whether or not

1:03:58

racially disparate impacts um have occurred um and then look at um displacement risk and potential

1:04:05

exclusion in housing policies so that's that RDI evaluation we'll look at first tonight and then also uh the Commerce

1:04:13

guidance recommended uh a land Capacity Analysis to determine whether or not there is adequate uh capacity for those

1:04:20

housing needs at the different income levels um so we'll take a look at that

1:04:26

um that that'll be the second report that we take a look at um

1:04:31

tonight um as Jeff mentioned the scope of work was updated earlier this year to direct us to undertake these two um

1:04:39

reports and so we'll be um taking a look at that um racially disparate impacts report and uh land Capacity Analysis

1:04:46

report um and don't think I need to say anything more about that so we'll just

1:04:52

get right into the racial disparate impacts evaluation um this is exhibit two of the agenda bill
um

1:05:01

6385 starting um first I just wanted to give you the um definition of racially

1:05:07

disparate impact um this is kind of the thing that we're um evaluating the data

1:05:13

for um to see if there's um if these are occurring in merer island and the um

1:05:21

racially disparate impacts are defined as when policy IES practices rules or other systems
result in a

1:05:27

disproportionate impact on one or more racial groups um and that comes straight from the
Commerce guidance for um for

1:05:35

evaluating these potential impacts um

1:05:43

then um also so now that we've defined racially disparate impacts um I wanted

1:05:48

to give you just a quick look at what is the racially disparate impacts evaluation

1:05:54

um this is a report that will ident or that identifies policies that might have resulted in these
racially disparate

1:06:01

impacts um it identifies potential policy amendments um to begin to address

1:06:07

and um undo those impacts and it identifies areas that may be at a higher

1:06:12

risk of displacement from Market forces and all three of these things are um things that we um need to do to satisfy

1:06:20

the GMA requirements that were established by um House Bill 12

1:06:26

20 there were three steps in preparing the RDI evaluation uh the first was a

1:06:33

review of our demographic data some of the other data that was available um

1:06:38

then the second step was to look at um and identify areas that are um where

1:06:43

there's an elevated risk of displacement um and then finally an evaluation of our housing policies to

1:06:51

identify those that may need um Amendment during our comp plan

1:06:57

update so after reviewing the demographic data um there were some trends that came out of um that that

1:07:05

jumped out there's in the report there's about 30 uh exhibits uh that looked at

1:07:11

different tables and and data sources um throughout the report um I'm just going

1:07:17

to highlight a couple of kind of the key take takeaways um from that but there's there's a lot of information in the

1:07:24

if um if you're interested in reading more um so after reviewing and comparing

1:07:32

uh Mercer Islands population with the larger King County population there were a couple of groups that um stood out as

1:07:38

being underrepresented in our Mercer Island population compared to the larger uh County that's the black or

1:07:45

africanamerican H uh households or persons sorry are um about five

1:07:51

percentage points fewer a share of the population compared Mercer Island to

1:07:56

King County another race alone is about four percentage points fewer and then

1:08:02

two or more races um is uh slightly slightly less than uh one percentage

1:08:08

Point fewer so those are the under under represented groups um heard the data

1:08:15

some of the other uh things that were um remarkable or um from the data or the

1:08:23

more renting house households are cost burdened than home owning households and cost burden is um a measure of when a

1:08:30

when a household is paying more than 30% of their household income um for housing

1:08:35

costs and those renting households are cost burdened at a rate more than 20 percentage points higher than home

1:08:41

owning households households of color are eight percentage points more likely than white

1:08:48

households to be housing cost burdened um and um with in that group um black or

1:08:56

African-American households in merer island are severely curn at more than double the rate of any other racial

1:09:02

group so we found some um that was one of the um one of the impacts that we

1:09:09

found um after reviewing the data the next uh section of the report

1:09:18

looks at areas at risk of displacement um and displacement is when a household is forced or pressured to move from

1:09:24

their Community by factors outside of their control um so a lot of times this is like an economic uh displacement

1:09:32

where a household is no longer able to afford to um rent increases and housing

1:09:38

cost increases in their community and um or then need to move to a lower cost

1:09:45

Community what we found in reviewing the data is that overall the displ

1:09:50

displacement risk is low um so the Puget Sound Regional Council actually undertook a displacement risk mapping um

1:09:58

for the counties in western Washington that they um serve so that's Noom M King

1:10:04

Pierce and Kitsap counties and in their uh displacement risk mapping they showed

1:10:09

the entirety of Mercer Island as being lower risk uh relative to the other um

1:10:14

areas surveying and then but we did identify some characteristics of areas

1:10:20

that still may have some displacement risk um and that would be areas with a higher proportion of renting households

1:10:26

um given the cost Burden rate among renting households and then those lock

1:10:33

groups that have a greater share of older buildings um because those buildings are more likely to redevelop

1:10:41

um over time and then finally the multif family and mixed use zones because those

1:10:46

are going to be places where we have a higher proportion of renters again kind of pointing back to that um higher rate

1:10:52

of cost burden among renters so when we look through the city for places with those characteristics we

1:10:59

found three areas um where there's uh an elevated risk of displacement um and

1:11:06

that would be the south end of town Town Center shown here in the orange outline on the left side of the um

1:11:14

Slide the multif family Zone surrounding Town Center um shown in the the map in

1:11:19

the middle there um so those are kind of uh shoed around the um town center and

1:11:26

then the multif family zones east of town center um shown in the map on the

1:11:32

right side of this the slide here those are um that would be Shorewood is that

1:11:39

larger um area highlighted and then uh Covenant shores would be the area along

1:11:45

the um along the lakefront there across I90 so those are the three areas that

1:11:53

are highlighted as having an elevated risk of displacement and what that means

1:11:58

is through this process we'll need to um take a look at policies to um that are

1:12:06

directed at uh reducing displacement risk um so now that we have some areas

1:12:12

identified where that may be um an elevated risk uh we can direct policy

1:12:17

there um later in the comp plan update process so the final uh piece of the RDI

1:12:26

evaluation was El um evaluating our housing policies um based on the data

1:12:32

review that was done in the first step um and um the Second Step um and based

1:12:39

on the Commerce Guidance the Commerce provided a framework for evaluating um

1:12:45

policies for this report um we found that there were about five housing

1:12:50

policies or housing element policies that that may need to be amended during the comp
plan update and there were

1:12:57

about six land use element policies that related to housing that would also need

1:13:02

um we'll need to take a look at with the housing work group um as we're updating the comp
plan um or potential

1:13:11

Amendment um hey Adam I'm gonna jump in here briefly just for a moment city

1:13:17

council um and members of the public they're viewing this I Adam mentioned it there
several slides though but I I

1:13:24

think it's worth reiterating this appendix a in the RDI evaluation and these policies and the

1:13:31

one goal that are listed here on this slide these are existing policies and ex an existing

1:13:38

goal from our land use element that are actually in the 2015 comprehensive plan

1:13:45

that is our current the city's current comprehensive plan so the exercise here

1:13:51

that was put before us from uh host Bill 1220 in the State Department of Commerce to go through

1:13:58

this RDI evaluation was to evaluate existing goals and policies in the

1:14:05

current city comprehensive plan related to housing so

1:14:12

those related housing goals and policies primarily in our 2015 comprehensive plan

1:14:20

lie within the housing element of the comp princi of plan as well as some in

1:14:27

the land use element so what this what this um this RDI

1:14:33

evaluation which appendix a is part of did was it looked at our entire current

1:14:39

housing element and then also the appropriate other goals and policies in other elements which which in our case

1:14:46

uh was I believe strictly limited to the also the land use element so again just

1:14:52

to be clear these are existing goals and policies from the 2015 comensal plan what this does this helps informs us

1:14:59

moving forward as we move forward to updating or preparing a a fresh

1:15:08

housing element and also land use element for our 2024 periodic update of

1:15:14

our comprehensive plan is RDI evaluation will help inform um and Adam's going to

1:15:21

get to this here in the next slide why don't you flip to the next slide Adam um it will help inform the work of the

1:15:28

housing work Group which we hope to reconvene here uh later this month and

1:15:33

then also um the Planning Commission here uh through late winter into spring

1:15:39

and then ultimately the city council um to review and take action on

1:15:45

our 2024 Conference of plan so I just wanted to make sure that was emphasized

1:15:51

um just for everyone's clar it on where those goals and policies came from and

1:15:57

uh what exactly we're doing with the information go ahead Adam finish the slide up and I think we're done this

1:16:02

section yeah thanks Jee um so the only other thing here is that there um with

1:16:09

looking at our next steps um there is some public Outreach that will be planned um a as part of this to kind of

1:16:17

follow on to the findings of the report um we're planning to do to conduct a

1:16:22

targeted survey for um of renting renting households um to get some input from them that can

1:16:29

help us as we update the comprehensive plan um because there we kind of

1:16:34

identified those those impacts to renters in particular um and then also the public

1:16:40

can comment on um our comprehensive Plan update kind of throughout um the process

1:16:46

and as we start drafting the housing element we'll be soliciting comments there putting out those drafts for

1:16:52

public review and then when we get to more or less the final draft before going to the public hearing we plan on

1:16:58

holding it up in the house where we'll get some um input from the public on um

1:17:04

the housing element before the Planning Commission holds their public hearing and makes their U final

1:17:10

recommendation Adam if we could just pause for a question from council member Reynolds yeah are we at the end of this

1:17:16

section because I can wait until we are if we're not we are we are yeah um Mr

1:17:22

Zach I wonder if you can just help me reconcile two things that I heard um one was a statement that

1:17:29

overall we have low displacement risk and then a slide or two after that we

1:17:34

talked about three areas that have not low displacement risk and and in

1:17:39

particular i' I'd like to he your comments on when in the next stage of this we

1:17:44

talk about the options for creating additional housing it seems like at least two of the options the Town Center option and the shorwood option could

1:17:51

have the impact of increasing displacement and to what extent have you considered that will we consider that

1:17:57

when is the appropriate time to consider that and in particular do we need to understand the racial makeup of those

1:18:02

neighborhoods in order to appropriately and compliantly evaluate the impact of the

1:18:09

displacement so there's a couple of those yeah a couple of questions there

1:18:15

first I think that um you know the the purpose of identifying those areas um

1:18:21

that have some degree of displacement risk is that then we can make better decisions about um the policies that

1:18:28

might affect those areas um so we can take that kind of into consideration um if we were to pursue an

1:18:36

option that would affect one of those areas we just would need to be aware of that elevated displacement risk there

1:18:42

and the displacement imp implications of that so it's not necessarily like those are identified as like a no-go Zone um

1:18:50

it's just we we need to be aware of those risks and then in terms of like when the appropriate time is um to kind

1:18:58

of enact those policies and and address that um that would be through the policymaking process with the housing

1:19:04

workgroup and the Planning Commission as we update the housing element so we have to um one of the charges of House

1:19:11

Bill 1220 is to adopt some policies that um that address that displacement risk

1:19:17

and we can we can do that as we update the housing element in the next step the next phase helpful if I can quick

1:19:24

followup so would it be fair to summarize and say before 1220 the

1:19:29

displacement risk of those groups was of those areas was low of the whole island was low but if we do the wrong thing here

1:19:37

whatever that may mean it's it's at least there's there are three areas that we could create some non- low risk is

1:19:43

that a fair way to say it yeah I think that that's reasonable yeah okay thank

1:19:50

you very good Council any other questions Council

1:19:55

androll thanks for walking through this with us this was quite dense and the

1:20:00

slides helped a lot so I appreciate that um as you were going through the I I was

1:20:06

struck by um a kind of an inconsistency in the way the data is being presented um for example if you look at exhibit

1:20:14

10 um median household income by race or ethnicity and then you look at exhibit

1:20:19

22 uh percent of households experiencing housing cost burden um the categories

1:20:25

there just don't match up uh and I'm wondering can we

1:20:32

get an explanation about why there are um you

1:20:39

know a more categories in exhibit 10 and B how um other race and persons of color

1:20:48

in exhibit 22 fits into the other categories that are set forth in exhibit

1:20:56

10 because and and one of the things one of the reasons I ask is because it it occurred to me

1:21:02

that if you combine black or African-American with persons of color

1:21:09

um it might it it's probably going to change the percentages

1:21:14

and don't see persons of color delineated as a separate category in

1:21:20

exhibit 10 so I'm trying to get a match of the data so exhibit 22 comes from the um

1:21:29

Department of Housing and Urban Development um their comprehensive housing affordability strategy and that

1:21:35

was um whereas exhibit 10 comes from the

1:21:40

Census Bureau so the difference in source is one of the reasons that there may be some slightly different

1:21:46

categories and then in exhibit 22 that persons of color category as I

1:21:52

understand that is um essentially it's combining all of the non-white

1:21:58

households in the rest of the table and providing a statistic

1:22:04

for the other households within that within that category um or within that table so I

1:22:13

think I I'm not sure if that answers your question but I think that those are likely the the reason that there's some

1:22:19

different categories there is there um a way to get the actual

1:22:26

numbers underlying exhibit 22 as opposed to just percentages um I believe I can get those

1:22:33

um The Source data from The Source data I I would appreciate that thank

1:22:39

you very good council member Jacobson I think this is a a similar

1:22:46

question before I go there I would commend the CPD for putting together the

1:22:52

this voluminous uh material from whatever sources it came and also my colleagues uh Ted Weinberg and uh Craig

1:23:01

Reynolds for asking a number of good and pointed questions which will focus uh uh

1:23:07

I think all of our attention and I confess I did not have time to re review the answers that came out around 4 this

1:23:13

afternoon so I know a lot of work went into that and I'm look forward to digesting that and my question may be

1:23:19

somewhat similar to uh to uh council member andrel and that

1:23:26

is I don't understand if people of color are not if that's an ethnic call or it's

1:23:34

a racial call because the whatever the sources they seem to be coming from that

1:23:39

those issues uh differently and um for example are Hispanics a different racial

1:23:47

group or are they just a different ethnic group and who says that and who's What entity has the final call on that

1:23:54

because that uh I think is suggested by uh council member Andel I think that may

1:23:59

make a difference in in what the data shows and then uh Drive what action uh

1:24:06

is taken at some subsequent point in the in the revised comp

1:24:11

plan so the the question because there that question of race and ethnicity and

1:24:18

what the difference is there um that was uh um that was challenging at times in

1:24:26

compiling the report um in general where um in exhibits where that's those are

1:24:34

when an ethnicity is presented alongside uh racial categories I just deferred to

1:24:40

the um the data source for how that would be presented so in the how the Census Bureau would present that

1:24:47

information um I presented that the same or and then like an exhibit 22 that came

1:24:53

from HUD um I just presented it the way that that was um presented by The Source

1:24:59

um so there may be some slight differences uh throughout the report depending on the

1:25:09

sources well I the question is if we are using

1:25:16

different sources that Define uh the populations uh which whose housing fate

1:25:23

we're considering uh describe it differently how H how do we decide what

1:25:29

to do unless we find some singular definition that we apply across the board and that I I believe also that

1:25:36

would apply would it not to the uh risk of uh uh being you know losing Shorewood

1:25:45

or losing some existing multif family

1:25:51

housing yeah I don't know Jeff do

1:25:58

you do you have a thoughts

1:26:04

there yeah to council member Jacobson's question and the one before that

1:26:09

actually the Adam can you just speak briefly to some of this we weren't given

1:26:15

a lot of creative license with this right it was we received our charge through the Commerce guidance

1:26:22

um it was uh fairly structured in terms of do

1:26:28

this do that um subtract a from B and get your answer essentially if that if

1:26:34

that makes sense council member Jacobson it was a recipe that was handed to us to produce this evaluation to

1:26:42

satisfy um the requirement of 1220 as interpreted through the Department of Commerce so I I completely understand a

1:26:51

couple of the Vari are being um cited here with differences between uh census

1:26:58

gives us this and this format something else gives us that in a slightly different format and how does all that

1:27:04

get reconciled um we're our job was to go through and

1:27:11

compile uh the data as it was as it was charged out in the in the guidance and

1:27:17

here we are with the evaluation so is it perfect no um is it

1:27:23

imperfect yes there's just been two citations by two council members of uh

1:27:29

situations where it probably is imperfect um when we move through and we get to

1:27:36

you know as we worked our way through the recipe to get to appendix a of the

1:27:43

evaluation um we put a lot of time and thought into that to try and figure out

1:27:48

what does it really mean to the city and more specifically what does it mean for

1:27:54

moving forward to trying to get a new housing element or an updated housing element put together so that we can um

1:28:02

attempt to complete this periodic review that's in front of us the in discussions with um you know

1:28:11

with Adam and with Allison as we we touched base with Arch along the way um

1:28:17

our our affordable housing Coalition group The the important thing

1:28:24

here that really came out to me was that we're able to we're able to look at our

1:28:30

current goals and policies and we're able to say um we want to make sure that our next

1:28:38

housing element is going to be not only GMA compliant but it's also going to be compliant

1:28:44

with House Bill 1220 as it incorporates into GMA and it is going to give us the best

1:28:52

opportunity to be successful to achieve our affordable housing targets while

1:28:58

being mindful of this RDI evaluation as we look at adding the necessary capacity

1:29:05

in doing what we need to do from a regulatory perspective to be successful in this

1:29:10

next 20-year planning period And I understand that was a really long answer council member Jacobson I just gave you

1:29:17

but um I do recognize that this was not necessarily an Apples

1:29:23

to Apples process and staff struggled with that a little bit as we've moved through the last 3 to three and a half

1:29:30

months that we spent time working on this um we asked some of those same questions ourselves

1:29:37

internally this you know this says one thing this says something slightly different um can we ever get this 100%

1:29:43

reconciled the answer is probably

1:29:49

no thank you I understand the problem okay I'm gonna take a quick stab at this

1:29:55

um so Jeff the the RDI is is working as a component of the GMA and the GMA says

1:30:03

plan for and accommodate housing units 1220 has an affordable housing

1:30:09

requirement that says plan for and accommodate these Ami banss and the RDI

1:30:14

seeks to not cause displacements and any and all of that so now that I'm starting

1:30:20

to understand the way you look at RDI which is almost a do not do list right

1:30:25

an area of let's let's look at Town Center and we'll talk about the horseshoe around town center that uh

1:30:32

Adam kind of pointed out if if they do not do the RDI component says Try Not to

1:30:38

cause displacements here in the south end of town center for example but we do have to plan for an

1:30:45

accommodate housing units right so we have to upzone something how does the GMA which doesn't

1:30:51

want us to spot Zone things expect us to land that plane where we're trying to

1:30:57

not cause a displacement but add some capacity but in an area of a sub region

1:31:03

that you know set in another way starts to sound an awful lot like a spot Zone like how does that

1:31:09

work yeah that's a good question and some cities um some cities could really

1:31:15

end up struggling with that uh in areas you know where you've got uh a limited

1:31:21

mix of different types of zoning and and different types of uses um I want to go

1:31:26

back to something maybe Adam said uh during that that um first part of the

1:31:31

slide deck there um we're not necessarily in a do not do this there

1:31:39

situation but there may it may be a case where we've got to consider policies and

1:31:44

implementing policies moving forward in our 2024 comprehensive plan that um May

1:31:51

look at try not to do something there and but

1:31:57

if it must be done there then we need to look at different policies that can perhaps help mitigate that so um but to

1:32:05

answer your question M about the zoning um we're going to have to consider that very

1:32:11

carefully and I think one of the options that we have put forward for the council

1:32:16

to consider here at this will be at the the final part of the presentation here this evening is is looking at a zoning

1:32:22

District that um doesn't currently have any housing in it so that is one

1:32:28

opportunity for us merer Island where we can look at that and we can say hey we've got an opportunity to maybe

1:32:34

address this capacity uh affordable housing Target capacity uh problem that the map is

1:32:41

showing where we can add some capacity perhaps into a zoning District to make

1:32:47

it a little bit more of a uh not as not a mixed use District as we think of town

1:32:52

center but a slightly different type of mixed use District in the commercial office zone so I think that's an option

1:32:58

that we're going to talk about later in the presentation and that's certainly something that we can um we can discuss

1:33:04

and and you know see what the council thinks of that that sort of alternative perfect so Council any other

1:33:10

questions before we move forward nope Let's uh push forward there okay Adam's

1:33:16

going to cover the next set of slides which will um be related to the land Capacity Analysis

1:33:23

great thanks um see so next we'll take a look at the

1:33:29

land Capacity Analysis supplement um and the land Capacity Analysis or LCA

1:33:35

supplement um evaluates our housing capacity at different affordability levels um based on the Commerce guidance

1:33:42

that was issued earlier this year and this is a supplement to the land Capacity Analysis that we initially uh

1:33:50

prepared with K County um in 2021 um or which was adopted in 2021 um

1:33:58

in the um Urban growth capacity report or the ugc report and what the ugc

1:34:04

report looked at was really the total number of housing units that are possible or that are allowed given um

1:34:11

current zoning um and current levels of development but it was looking at that like total amount of capacity that's

1:34:19

there whereas this LCA supplement we'll be looking at tonight is looking at of

1:34:24

that total capacity how many um units are available at or would be affordable

1:34:31

at different um income levels um and an important part of this LCA supplement is

1:34:37

that it is part of the docum documentation that will help our comp plan update um satisfy those GMA

1:34:44

requirements um so it's required by the state law so the first piece of this is to

1:34:50

look at the housing need by income level um this is a new uh metric that we're

1:34:56

using um for this comp plan update um and this was directed by that um House

1:35:02

Bill 1220 um required all cities and counties to establish their income need

1:35:09

at different um income levels so this is table one from the LCA supplement um and

1:35:15

this was uh adopted by this is our housing need um which was adopted by

1:35:20

King County ordinance 19660 um so this is set in the countywide planning policies and now um

1:35:27

we're we're planning for these numbers here and you'll see the total here in the first col or in the second column

1:35:34

here that total of 12239 that's the original that's our housing Target um

1:35:39

that was set in uh 2022 um so that that original housing Target and So within

1:35:46

that that's our total um all of these other numbers to the right are sub

1:35:51

subset of that total amount um so each column here is a um a different subset

1:35:57

of that total 12239 um and so moving from left to

1:36:02

right you can see our housing targets at each of the different income levels um starting with less than 30% we have um

1:36:11

339 units of non-permanent Supportive Housing and 178 units of permanent

1:36:17

Supportive Housing that lower income level um then 202 units needed at um 30 to 50%

1:36:27

488 at that 50 to 80% of the Ami and then four at 80 to 100 five at 100 to

1:36:35

120 and 23 at 20 %c or greater um so those are our housing need

1:36:44

um our housing targets at those different um income levels and the LCA

1:36:49

is looking at with our current capacity our current zoning capacity um how can

1:36:56

we accommodate those housing needs at the different levels there um then the

1:37:02

final column in this table at the right there the emergency housing column I've separated that out a little bit because

1:37:08

that's actually a different type of capacity that we need to take a look at um because emergency housing is for um

1:37:16

like homeless shelters um those those types of um units and they're not really

1:37:21

full dwelling they're typically not full dwelling units like an apartment would be or um single family home so they they

1:37:29

have some different requirements we need to look at for emergency housing so with that housing need then

1:37:36

we look at our housing capacity um as determined in that uh ugc report um so

1:37:42

these are the total units that are um that are possible um given our current

1:37:49

levels of development and um current regulations um we see that total overall

1:37:55

we have capacity for 1,428 units so we have enough capacity

1:38:00

for our total number of units but then we'll get into um in the subsequent slides kind of looking at how that

1:38:07

breaks down for affordability but we see in our um in our very low density zones

1:38:13

which is like R15 and R12 we have 120 um units of capacity and our low density

1:38:20

which is our R 9.6 and R 8.4 zones we have 235 units of

1:38:27

capacity then in our medium low density uh we have 10 units of capacity and that

1:38:32

would be like our mf2 l zone and then in medium high density zones mf2 and mf3 we

1:38:40

have 535 units of capacity and then in our high density Zone which Our Town

1:38:45

Center zones we have 528 units of capacity so that's our current level of

1:38:52

capacity in those different zones at at different density levels um and that'll

1:38:58

be important as we get um later into the report so after we after we compiled

1:39:04

that um level of housing need um disaggregated by income level and then

1:39:09

our housing capacity disaggregated by Zone uh we took a look at housing

1:39:15

affordability um levels uh given current housing prices um so the table that you

1:39:21

see here is summarizing three tables from the land Capacity Analysis supplement tables four five and six um

1:39:29

just in the interest of time I kind of pulled those together into this um single table and so we took a look at

1:39:36

the average sale price as tracked by the Washington Center For Real Estate

1:39:41

research in and in 2022 the average single family home sale price detached

1:39:47

single family home that sale price was a little more than \$2.6 million then the average sale

1:39:56

price for town homes and condos in 2022 was \$660,000 or a little more than \$660,000

1:40:04

um and then the next step um directed by the Commerce guidance was to take that

1:40:11

average sale price and then calculate an average monthly cost for those different housing types and so um to do this for

1:40:20

the owner occupied um unit so for single family homes and town homes and condos

1:40:26

we used the Fanny May mortgage calculator to determine um what the

1:40:32

average monthly cost or average monthly payment would be for the uh that average

1:40:37

um sale price and so for a \$2.6 million home according to that mortgage

1:40:43

calculator the average monthly payment would be about 15 thou a little more than 15,000 um dollars a month um for

1:40:50

for a town home or a condo at that \$660,000 range um the average monthly cost would

1:40:58

be \$4,085 and then for apartments the Washington Center For Real Estate

1:41:03

research provided uh or provides uh the average monthly rent um for rental units

1:41:11

and in 2022 that average monthly rent was 2528 dollars a month so th that middle

1:41:19

column there that average monthly cost that tells us how much um households are roughly paying for um the average unit

1:41:27

um in in those different housing uh type categories then finally we use that um

1:41:35

the average monthly cost um based on a formula from the Commerce guidance uh to

1:41:41

calculate what um what income would be required to afford that monthly housing

1:41:47

cost um relative to the area median income or Ami um so we basically this is

1:41:54

assuming that someone was that um housing doesn't uh takes up about 30% of

1:42:00

your household income um so we found that at that the single family home the

1:42:06

average single family home sale price um and monthly average monthly cost that

1:42:12

would take uh a household income about 433 per greater um or 433 per of the

1:42:21

area median income and then for tow houses and condos um that would require a household

1:42:28

income um the average uh would require a household income uh of about 112% of the

1:42:36

Ami and then for uh apartments based on that average monthly rent um it would

1:42:42

require a household income at about 69% of the area median income so that gives

1:42:49

us an income that income ranges that each of those housing types would be affordable to um just at the market rate

1:42:56

based on the current average um monthly cost so then from there once we have

1:43:03

that um we're uh we were able to look at housing affordability um for um the different

1:43:12

housing types and we can connect that to our different zones um based on what's allowed in those different zones and

1:43:19

what we found is that um well I just um summarized that first bullet um so basically all of our

1:43:27

housing need um below 120% of the area median income is likely to be

1:43:35

accommodated in those denser housing types because Condominiums and town

1:43:40

homes um require an income around 112% of the Ami to be affordable and

1:43:48

apartments require an income a household income around 69% of the Ami to be

1:43:53

affordable so all of our housing need below 120% of the Ami is expected to be

1:44:00

accommodated in Condominiums town homes and apartments and that's that's consistent

1:44:06

with um the Commerce guidance for um evaluating this capacity which um

1:44:13

essentially um it it's expected that um denser housing types are going to be are

1:44:20

more likely to be affordable um and so as we look at whether or not we have

1:44:26

enough capacity to accommodate that housing need um we um can look at um the

1:44:33

capacity in those zones where denser housing types such as Apartments um and

1:44:41

uh Condominiums would be allowed and that would be our medium low medium high and high density zones and then um

1:44:51

and so what that looks like we if we look at um this is summarizing uh tables

1:44:58

8 and N from the um from the LCA

1:45:03

supplement um so as we look at you know our our housing

1:45:08

um so in our Zone categories the very low and low density are most likely to

1:45:14

be single family homes um developed in those zones and so we assume that then they're

1:45:21

accommodating that income level um at greater than 120% of the

1:45:28

Ami and then from table two of the report um we have capacity in our very

1:45:33

low and low density zones for 355 dwelling units but our total need at

1:45:41

uh for households greater than 120% of the Ami is 23 units so we have a surplus

1:45:50

Us in the very low and low density zones of about 332 um units of

1:45:57

capacity now when we look at the medium low medium high and high density zones

1:46:03

so these are the zones where apartments and condos are allowed um there we're

1:46:09

we're planning on those zones to accommodate or those zones are most likely to accommodate households earning

1:46:15

below um 120% of the area Medan

1:46:21

and in these zones in the medium low medium high and high density zones we have capacity for

1:46:29

1,73 dwelling units um in those zones and then in the housing need um below

1:46:37

120% the area median income we have a need for

1:46:43

1,216 um households to accommodate in those zones so what that

1:46:50

that means is that we we have 143 unit shortfall in our medium high or medium

1:46:56

low medium high and high density zones to accommodate that housing need below

1:47:02

120% of the Ami so that's really the key finding of this report is that um that

1:47:10

capacity deficit because at the at the end of the day um the city needs to be

1:47:15

able to accommodate its housing needs and um it's affordable housing needs and

1:47:23

generally those are going to need to be accommodated in our higher density zones

1:47:28

where apartments and town homes are allowed um and we need about 143 more

1:47:34

units of multi family and mixed use development um to to satisfy our housing

1:47:40

need um below 120% of the

1:47:46

Ami Adam I'm gonna just jump in here briefly before we turn it back over to

1:47:52

the mayor here this is the end of this subsection here of the presentation Adam can you just go back quickly to slide

1:47:59

24 so Council just repackaging this slide a little bit differently from what

1:48:04

Adam said the punchline here is that our single family development low and

1:48:10

low density type development is not going to contribute or contribute

1:48:16

significantly or measurably to achieving this affordable housing Target uh

1:48:22

mandate that we've been um handed here just like all other cities um in King

1:48:27

County so the focus here is on the the medium and higher density type zones

1:48:36

right to help with this not only do does the math in the

1:48:41

LCA report that's in your packet suggest that but Commerce themselves um have

1:48:47

suggested that through their guidance that this is where cities are going to have to look to um to be able to plan

1:48:54

for capacity to achieve the affordable housing Target in especially in those um

1:49:00

you know those lower percentage brackets that Adam walked through earlier

1:49:05

so in the second column from the right the 1216 number and the 23 number

1:49:13

equal 1239 which is our housing Target that we were originally assigned um as part of

1:49:21

the gmpc process and King County process for U employment and um residential

1:49:29

targets there a couple years ago part of that isn't going to be of great use to us so we've had to focus on

1:49:36

adding more capacity again in those those medium to higher density zones which is why now we're coming out with a

1:49:43

negative number is because we don't have enough of that portion of our capacity

1:49:49

existing capacity capacity to be able to handle um the need at the these income

1:49:57

uh these Ami brackets that we've talked about so we've got to make up this 143

1:50:04

so once we get done with Q&A for this subsection of slides we're going to talk about three options that will help um

1:50:13

address this 143 to be able to have sufficient paper capacity to be able to

1:50:19

move forward with the rest of our process with that mayor I'll I'll turn it back over to you

1:50:25

for Q&A very good so looks like councilman Reynolds has the first

1:50:30

question here hey Mr Zach can you back up to I believe it was table one that showed the housing need by income

1:50:39

strata

1:50:46

yeah yeah that's what I'm thinking of how much do we have an estimate of

1:50:51

how much housing on Mercer Island currently is Affordable at less than 30%

1:50:56

of Ami I'm assuming Z yeah it's not

1:51:04

um we don't have like hard and fast numbers we have some data on which

1:51:09

households in those different income Vans are cost burdened but that's slightly different than like a number of

1:51:15

units um what I'm worried about here is it it it seems like we're embarked on

1:51:21

a plan that is doomed to failure no matter which of the options we choose

1:51:26

because if we only add 143 units even if they're all by some magic

1:51:32

we managed to add 143 units that are all affordable at less than 30% Ami we're

1:51:37

not going to meet that category we're probably not going to meet the 30 to 50% category we might meet the 50 to 80 but

1:51:44

given that the apartments were at uh 69% of Ami was what the the average was for

1:51:50

those I could conceive we could meet that but how are we possibly going to meet the others even if you know would

1:51:57

we have to take some that are existing affordable only at above 70% of Ami and miraculously make them

1:52:04

cheaper no um but but part of this part of this process includes um updating the

1:52:12

policies of the comp plan so we this first step is really addressing the

1:52:18

capacity piece of it how many the raw number of units that are allowed and what type of those units but then

1:52:25

through our policies we can respond to those other kind of questions about getting those numbers to

1:52:33

develop getting those units to develop um at different affordability levels so

1:52:38

for example in the in the Town Center we currently have a height um a height bonus where in order to build to the

1:52:46

maximum Building height you must include a certain amount of affordable units um

1:52:52

in the Town Center we could look at adjusting that during the comprehensive Plan update as as part of kind of the

1:52:58

next step of this process but correct if I'm wrong even if that height bonus we said to do it 100% of your units have to

1:53:06

be affordable we still wouldn't meet the 339 goal because we'd only be adding 143

1:53:13

units they're all really inexpensive and we still haven't met our criteria the 140 three is additional

1:53:22

capacity zoning capacity that's being added over and above the existing

1:53:27

capacity that already exists so we're not creating a capacity of just 143 units we're it's it's additive we're

1:53:34

adding the capacity to the all existing capacity that we

1:53:39

have and I think Adam just went to that to that slide there from the ugc report from a couple years ago Reynolds though

1:53:46

I do I do want to actually highlight though your your question probably the the most important part of

1:53:53

your question that you asked was it's this this is something that really needs to be realized right by everybody is

1:53:59

that this this framework that we've been presented with not just Mercer Island

1:54:05

but all the cities and counties that it's being applied to this is a very long

1:54:11

game type of of um objective here that's been put in

1:54:16

front of us when Adam had that pie chart I it was slide five or six of the

1:54:21

presentation back in the background section the pie chart that showed where we're at now and then kind of going through essentially a 10e cycle to

1:54:30

2034 um the the check-in that Adam referenced in 2029

1:54:38

is Go I mean I I can't say this with certainty but the the expectation as I

1:54:44

understand it for this check-in in 2029 is going to be to see a that we got our comp plan done which which hopefully we

1:54:50

will this year but then B what other what policy implementation and

1:54:57

Regulatory measures has the city embarked on to match up with this

1:55:02

affordable housing Target that we need to provide this Zone capacity for so

1:55:07

that's five years out like that's that's you know that stage we're talking five years from now let alone 10 years from

1:55:14

now which will be the same process that we're going through right now this periodic update of the comprehensive

1:55:19

plan so the reason why I say that is because this exercise that's in front of us with

1:55:24

this LCA uh supplement that Adam's walked you through here at a very high level in that senior

1:55:31

packet and this this item it's almost like a checklist item that the way that

1:55:36

we've been looking at it at the staff level we have to demonstrate through this 2024 update that we've got the Zone

1:55:43

capacity we're going to have to demonstrate by 2029 that we've taken steps into Implement policy that come

1:55:50

out of our comprehensive plan in 2024 and believe it or not the whole

1:55:57

process will start over again probably in late 2030 to go through the exact same process we're on right now so this

1:56:03

is one very small step in a very long-term play basically to increasing

1:56:12

affordable housing across King County and you know all cities including Mercer

1:56:18

Island there's all kinds of other variables that are going to go into this on the heels of this comprehensive Plan

1:56:24

update one of which Mercer Island has talked about extensively through the last two legislative sessions which is

1:56:31

providing additional funding at the state level to help cities and counties achieve these mandates that are coming

1:56:39

down in addition to that something else that Mercer Island um spe specifically

1:56:45

brought up in the last legislative session was

1:56:51

these these um housing bills that were being contemplated by the state legislature and a few of them that

1:56:57

passed is having affordable mandates as part of those individual respective

1:57:03

housing bills and I believe I don't want to speak for the city here in this session but I I do believe that that's

1:57:10

going to be part of our you know our position moving forward with future housing bills as well is we need to have

1:57:17

the state help us with you know uh sending these mandates forward so that we can specifically Target trying to

1:57:25

achieve what's been put before us with house built 1220 so this is one piece

1:57:31

in a lot of pieces being put together for for a very longterm

1:57:36

situation that's helpful and in particular uh the comment I was thinking about the 143 wrong it's the 1428 or

1:57:43

whatever that's relevant it still strikes me as a very ambitious goal but I'll uh you know I I do not I do not

1:57:51

disagree with you on that okay okay Council any other

1:57:56

questions I I have another one when and when the others are done okay just uh

1:58:02

look for your raised hand there on on the the virtual meeting council member

1:58:07

Jacobson uh in a calculation of Ami are government transfer payments taken into

1:58:16

account um I don't believe so but I don't I don't know for certain okay well

1:58:22

that's not an answer requires or not a question requires an answer at the moment but if you run across something

1:58:28

and let me know by email thatd be fine thank you very good c Reynolds yeah just

1:58:34

as I think about potential Solutions here it seems from the questions I asked and the answers I got before the meeting

1:58:40

and thank you very much for those by the way were perhaps unnecessarily limiting ourselves by not thinking about

1:58:47

adus and I I wondered if you can comment on why we're not allowing for some of this capacity to be met in the single

1:58:53

family zones through Adu creation so that's uh it is uh tricky so

1:59:02

we do allow adus throughout our single family zones um and we don't necessarily

1:59:09

cap the numbers that are allowed um but we have seen recently that um we haven't

1:59:16

had that many adus uh constructed in the last few years and so some of how the

1:59:24

original ugc report was calculated it basically um it used these assumed

1:59:30

densities that took into account like recent uh development densities and that

1:59:36

didn't necessarily include that additional um capacity from

1:59:41

adus um so we kind of carried that forward I mean there they will provide

1:59:47

some kind of some amount of additional housing capacity and whether or not that would be affordable it's

1:59:53

kind of difficult to say because there's this other piece that we don't have a lot of good um data on the price of

2:00:00

those when they are rented out because there isn't like a data set that says you know adus were rented out at this

2:00:07

monthly rent and so it's difficult to say where they would fit kind of within this framework so there's kind of those

2:00:13

two pieces one we haven't seen very many of them um constructed and two we

2:00:18

haven't we don't have a lot of data on price for an

2:00:23

Adu okay it if there is a way to get the data and I realize there may not be that

2:00:29

would be very helpful to the housing work group to have I believe so Adam maybe I can step in just

2:00:35

for a moment but council member Reynolds the the growth management act allows us to plan for and accommodate a housing

2:00:41

Target which we must show uh that we have the capacity during the periodic

2:00:47

updates the adus have been allowed to be counted for attainment but never for

2:00:52

zoning capacity so even if you could have an Adu on every single family home and you could have 7,000 single family

2:00:58

homes but then out an Adu we under the GMA were never allowed to count any of

2:01:04

that capacity just the production of the housing units so in Mercer Island which is one of the jurisdictions that added

2:01:10

adus to the development codes very early on we have individually counted Year by year

2:01:15

the Adu creation and that's counted towards our G ma uh Target of attainment

2:01:22

but not zoning capacity so that's kind of puts that to the side the the other piece of that that um Department of

2:01:29

Commerce has put together is a model kind of comprehensive planning cycle so when Adam talks about medium low medium

2:01:37

high and high density zones being the zones that we can count capacity towards

2:01:42

the 50% 30% 0% push those those income

2:01:47

ban's it's because because Department of Commerce has guided us and said if you create that capacity in those zones then

2:01:54

you'll be compliant the alternative to having that capacity outside those zones is very

2:02:00

complex it requires uh looking at cost of housing and loans and all sorts of

2:02:06

things that we would fail to test on so we're kind of forced into this narrow path of conforming to uh Department of

2:02:12

commerce's kind of standard uh table-based uh Zoning for this and so

2:02:19

all of the capacity for these 50% and below are going to have to occur in these higher density zones and then

2:02:26

there's another column in the Department of Commerce guidance that says with subsidy so if you're at 50% Ami and

2:02:33

Below you have to be in these higher densities and you require a subsidy so to your earlier question about well you

2:02:40

know 100% of all the capacity of town center has to be built at basically 50%

2:02:45

Ami and Below yes we know that uh we know that's not realistic IC we know that our incentive codes at 10% to to

2:02:52

yield a 65% Ami unit is not going to get us anywhere near there you'd have to

2:02:58

have an order of magnitude greater density than what we have uh but it does say in Commerce that if you put them in

2:03:04

these density zones and we assume that with a subsidy they could be built that you're compliant and so that's kind of

2:03:11

the the homework exercise that we have to conform to but I agree that you know if we have if we have a deficit of

2:03:20

143 and then by adding a story in town center we create the capacity of

2:03:26

153 we technically meet commerce's homework exercise but as soon as a

2:03:31

market rate development gets built you now have a deficit right because you you didn't get 100% 50% Ami and Below units

2:03:39

so uh it might behoove the council to look at trying to add some head room to the capacity number ever so slightly so

2:03:46

we're not just constantly playing a game of leap for FR you know up zoning after every Market raid development gets

2:03:54

built very helpful thank you so this feels more like an exercise in planning

2:04:00

than implementation so Jesse this question is more for you in terms of like conversations over the next decade

2:04:06

once we do this exercise by Commerce that sounds like a formula rather than sort of a reality check is there

2:04:13

conversation at the city manager level or SCA or AWC level that over time we

2:04:18

can bring more sense to this these buildings might actually get done to meet this population housing we're

2:04:23

trying to get like what is the actual reality of all this exercise to actually

2:04:28

get housing for these folks at these lowest income levels I mean I know there might be some incentives coming but it's

2:04:34

not going to be enough to really do what we're trying to do so I love that we're getting Capac and we have some creative ideas and all these great reports and

2:04:40

information but really at the at the leadership level for cities and city managers what what is actually happening

2:04:47

and what should be changed that we can Lobby for in the next few years thanks uh council member Waker and

2:04:53

I I'm I think I'm mostly going to restate what Jeff Thomas said earlier uh you're correct this is a planning

2:04:59

exercise it sets up the framework that we need to be able to implement you know work items in the future uh certainly we

2:05:07

don't have the resources uh and in some cases maybe not even all of the tools to do this alone

2:05:14

so um are are folks thinking about it outside of the Cities our associations

2:05:20

that we work with I would say yes uh it's going to take us and our advocacy

2:05:26

to make sure that this remains a priority um I imagine at the conclusion

2:05:32

of 2024 and as we look into 20125 uh so let's say our 2025 City

2:05:38

Council planning session we would likely uh take the freshly adopted

2:05:44

comprehensive plan and use that to inform you know work plan discussions

2:05:49

for the the following year um so get get the framework in place this

2:05:55

year uh and then absolutely we have more work to do that

2:06:00

it's a hard question to answer council member wer and I'm not dodging you on it I think it's going to take everyone

2:06:06

state county cities our associations working together and it it's such a deep

2:06:12

policy wonky discussion that I think we're going to lose your average citizen who might still be paying attention at

2:06:17

this point not falling asle sleep um it's really complicated tough work and

2:06:23

so keeping Vigilant and making sure these legislators when they throw these bills around and staff have to do it

2:06:29

that we somehow keep it on our Collective to-do list down at the bottom somewhere to not let it fall through the

2:06:34

cracks I guess for advocacy where we can improve on the edges until we can improve at the core absolutely let us

2:06:41

not forget in the affordable housing realm that we have uh our friends at Arch which we are a member and I certain

2:06:48

certainly hope a lot of this will organize and land under that type of structure it's

2:06:54

going to be a lot for a city like Mercer Island uh to single-handedly be able to implement

2:07:00

successfully Jeff anything else uh you would add well

2:07:07

said okay Council any other questions before they move on not seeing

2:07:14

any Okay so we've got a final final set of about a half dozen

2:07:20

slides here that um Adam's going to uh run through the three options a couple

2:07:25

of them have come up already in the um conversation here this evening so Adam here you go great thanks um so just as a

2:07:34

reminder so we're not necessarily looking or asking for direction on these three options tonight um as Jeff

2:07:42

mentioned earlier when we um in the introduction of this topic um we'll be

2:07:47

coming back um on January 16th to get the council Direction on a preferred

2:07:52

option uh for addressing that capacity deficit three of the options that are

2:07:58

presented in U or staff presented three options in the LCA supplement um the

2:08:05

first option is to increase height in town center by one story the second

2:08:10

option in the report was to allow multifam in the commercial office zone

2:08:16

or the co Zone and then the third option presented in the report is to increase

2:08:22

the maximum density in the mf3 zone um or the multifam um three Zone these

2:08:29

options are discussed in detail beginning on page 23 of the report so you can see the analysis of each of

2:08:37

these options in in detail there and then um some of the implications of uh

2:08:43

the benefits and drawbacks associated with each of the options

2:08:49

so to start with uh the first option as I mentioned was to increase the height um in town center um this option as

2:08:56

analyzed would is would add an additional story of height in each of

2:09:01

the Town Center sub area plan or sub areas and this would add about 153 units

2:09:08

of capacity to um the Town Center zone or Town Center zones um it would

2:09:15

increase the height in the TC3 and TCM F3 which is the pink and yellow area

2:09:21

here at the south end of T Town Center on the map um they would increase those

2:09:27

zones from a three story height limit to a four story height

2:09:32

limit and then in the TC nf4 and the tc4 zone so that would be the olive Zone and

2:09:39

this uh Royal Blue Zone kind of in the center of town center that would go those those areas

2:09:46

would go from four stories to maximum of five stories and then in the tc5 and the

2:09:53

tc4 which are the purple and tan zones at the north end of town center um this

2:09:59

this option looked at increasing the height there from five stories to six

2:10:05

stories um and this is the first option discussed in the report you can see the

2:10:10

analysis um uh beginning on page 23 I see Jeff

2:10:15

jumped on here yep just real quick Council um one of the questions that was

2:10:21

posed to staff leading up to tonight's meeting was uh rather than do this blanket one

2:10:28

story approach in the TC is it possible to possibly do two stories in some areas

2:10:36

and not increase the stories in other areas of the Town Center the answer to that question is yes um for Simplicity

2:10:44

sake and you know trying to come up with a couple of uh viable options here to

2:10:50

address this paper capacity deficit we you know we started with the one story

2:10:57

throughout the entire town center um it worked ma the math worked so we you know

2:11:03

that's where we stopped with the town center and then we moved on to a couple of other options but um I just want to

2:11:10

make that clear given that the map is in front of you here on this slide um there are variations of this in the Town

2:11:16

Center that the math most likely we can get to make work it's just this is the one that seemed the simple simplest to

2:11:24

take one story across the entire boundary and see what the math

2:11:29

produced Adam well and um I neglected to mention this at first but what we're

2:11:35

really looking for with all three of these options is a highlevel direction about the approach um and then the finer

2:11:42

details of what that exactly looks like we can work out later in the process but we didn't want to start um

2:11:50

heading down a road that the council wasn't interested in so we really want to get that highlevel um Direction you know this

2:11:58

this one kind of General approach um is is the preferred alternative and then

2:12:03

like I said we'll work out with the housing work group um and the Planning Commission and ultimately the city

2:12:09

council what the the fine details of each of these will be later in the

2:12:14

process so the the second um option analyzed in the report is an option to

2:12:20

allow multifam in the commercial office Zone um the the co zone is the area

2:12:27

along 36th um surrounding uh the city hall

2:12:33

property um it's shown it's highlighted in Orange on the map here um and

2:12:40

allowing multif family residential uses within this Zone um would add um at

2:12:47

least 100 43 units and it could add up to 895 units of capacity depending on

2:12:53

how those um the development standards in that zone that would apply to multifam would would ultimately be um

2:13:01

shaped so those development standards can really pretty greatly modulate um

2:13:06

what the total capacity increase would look like um so for example if there was

2:13:12

a a maximum lot coverage that could reduce how much um development could

2:13:17

have on a lot or depending on the building height um that can that can really influence capacity so we would we

2:13:25

could take a look at that but in general because this Zone doesn't currently allow residential uses um allowing

2:13:32

multif family in the zone is expected to produce enough units to um address that

2:13:38

capacity deficit um and then the discussion of this option begins on page 28 of the

2:13:46

report Adam can you um for for the council and the public but also uh for

2:13:54

me actually can you remind us that's a that's a wide range of numbers there on

2:14:01

the screen 143 to 895 can you can you just quickly um walk through

2:14:09

um what those two bookends represent in terms of the math yeah sorry thank you so the 143

2:14:18

units um it like I said because there isn't currently multifam or mixed use

2:14:25

development allowed in this Zone we expect that any addition of a of

2:14:31

allowing multifam would would address that that minimum deficit then that

2:14:37

upper bound the 8.95 that was we we analyzed this Zone what the capacity

2:14:44

implications would be um of um essential using the same assumptions as the tc4

2:14:51

zone so assuming a three over one mixed use development where there' be commercial on the first floor and then

2:14:58

three floors of residential development on top um again that's that's kind of

2:15:03

that highlights that point that um you know development regulations how we

2:15:09

allow the use could really influence how much capacity we actually add there um

2:15:15

but that 8.95 upper is is look looking at um if we applied the tc4 regulations

2:15:22

to multif family development in the commercial office

2:15:30

so all right and then the the final option that was examined in the report

2:15:36

is to increase density in the mf3 zone um the mf3 zone is shown in the map or

2:15:43

on the map here on the right side of the slide with the um the pink slashes um

2:15:49

for those lots um and basically currently in mf3 the

2:15:58

maximum density is 26 dwelling units per acre um increasing that to 30 units per

2:16:05

acre would add or could add up to 174 units of development capacity um in that

2:16:12

zone um you know this is a a relatively simple amendment in terms of the

2:16:18

um in terms of the the amount of code that would be need to be amended for

2:16:24

this um as we but there's like some other pieces of this you'll see in the

2:16:30

report we discussed this a bit that there's some other regulations within that zone that would need to be looked

2:16:36

at at the same time because ma maximum density isn't the only development regulation that's really um limiting

2:16:43

development in in these zones so we we need to take a look at those other pieces to if this is the preferred

2:16:49

approach um and as as we discussed earlier in the RDI evaluation discussion

2:16:56

this is an area that we did highlight as having some displacement risk so we would need to be mindful of that um if

2:17:03

if this were the the selected uh option as well um and those are discussed in more um detail in the report and this

2:17:11

this third option the mf3 density option um begins on page 34 of the

2:17:19

report um so those are the those are the three options as as I mentioned earlier

2:17:24

as we mentioned earlier um we'll be coming back um to get your preferred approach on January 16th um and then

2:17:33

looking ahead after that after we get your direction on a high level um preferred option we would then um resume

2:17:40

working with the housing work group and we're um currently aiming to start um to

2:17:46

find a meeting date the week of January 22nd um that would work for the work group um so we'll get them started back

2:17:53

up and looking at these options and then we're aiming to get a housing element draft um to the Planning Commission um

2:18:01

by the end of March um to keep on on schedule with our comp plan update um

2:18:07

and that concludes our uh or my presentation um so I'll turn it over for

2:18:15

any questions at this time very good I think we have a question from council member and all yeah thank you um so of

2:18:22

the three options that we've had a chance to look at here um as I've been thinking about this over the weekend and

2:18:28

of course because of the holiday um didn't get a chance to give you a heads up at all but since we're not deciding

2:18:34

anything today um can you talk about the Southend um business area I can't

2:18:40

remember what the acronym for that is but where the QFC is um it was that

2:18:45

under consideration at all because it it seems to me that it would tick some of the same boxes as allowing residential

2:18:51

in the commercial office Zone and [Music] um I'm I'm just interested to know

2:18:58

whether it was considered and and if it should be considered um the so the acronym is PBZ

2:19:06

the planned business Zone um and that was not um analyzed as an option in the

2:19:13

report um it could be um that could be something if the council was interested

2:19:19

in taking um going that direction we could we could look at that but it

2:19:24

wasn't included in the report but I mean so it's it's it just

2:19:32

is there a reason why when like I said to me at least from the way it lives and

2:19:38

works it it feels like you know commercial or or a subset of town center

2:19:43

so um it seems like if you're considering changes to to those that this was just categorically not even on

2:19:50

the table much less on the table and then off I'm just curious about that I

2:19:56

think the options the the MF the co and and obviously the Town Center options um

2:20:03

that we did we did take a look at we were

2:20:09

um we were focused on the North End of the island um out of respect for access

2:20:16

to public trans it um that that was certainly a driver in the areas that we

2:20:21

looked at but as Adam mentioned um we could certainly um at Council direction

2:20:28

we could certainly look at uh the south in the ppz area and uh come back and report to Council on that as to what the

2:20:35

math how the math speaks to that okay Deputy Mayor

2:20:43

rosom thanks yeah Jeff actually my question is around something some of you just said about Transit um Adam in the

2:20:51

numerous uh guidances and laws that you were tasked with trying to compile uh to

2:20:57

create this document and I know there were many of them was there any guidance that was given around how we should

2:21:03

consider existing Transit versus future plan transit my my guess here is that

2:21:10

the further you move to the left on the chart of Ami the more important that becomes um
can you give us a little

2:21:17

color here as we think about how to what option makes the most sense going forward yeah
so there isn't a

2:21:25

requirement um in terms of House Bill 1220 there isn't a requirement that we locate this
proximate to Transit I mean

2:21:32

it's generally it's a good practice because that can allow you to um it

2:21:38

makes it easier to access the services and employment and I mean there's there's a lot of
reasons to do it but

2:21:44

there isn't necessarily a requirement but there is in house bill 1110 which is

2:21:50

the middle housing bill that we'll um be looking at immediately following the

2:21:57

comp plan update um 1110 does require some additional affordable housing um

2:22:04

requirements around within a half mile of Transit and so there there will be

2:22:09

some uh some changes there um some there's a a density bonus um I can't

2:22:16

remember the exact numbers off the top of my head but 1110 has some addresses

2:22:22

Transit as well and there's also now as we'll see the legislature kicking off here in a

2:22:28

few days the possibility of a to Bill coming back um yes you know make some

2:22:33

more challenges in terms of our long-term planning but um I think it's something to keep in mind as we think

2:22:39

about what option makes the most sense yeah and to the deputy mayor's point there he just made about a potential to

2:22:46

Bill could very well have semblance to last year which was not only requiring your

2:22:53

Transit but also significantly reducing if not in some cases eliminating parking

2:22:58

requirements so um which makes the geography all that more important we

2:23:04

start looking at Transit facilities and so forth to comply with something like

2:23:09

that thanks very good council member wer um skipping ahead here a little bit

2:23:15

should we look at option b can you talk about how we might regulate housing in a commercial Zone and know there's a

2:23:22

little Nuance that mayor nce wants to bring up but in general how does it work in other cities when you change to allow

2:23:28

this kind of use in this kind of Zone Jeff did you yeah maybe I can give

2:23:36

the short answer and Adam you can either correct me or expand where appropriate um council member wer

2:23:43

the um we've got a lot of flexibility right with how we um we would need to update development

2:23:50

regulations in a commercial office Zone if we were to pursue that type of option uh but there's no hard and fast

2:23:58

rules we we certainly have some a lot of different a lot of variability we could

2:24:03

look at and how we craft those development standards and how the council ultimately through the housing

2:24:10

workg group and the Planning Commission would like to see housing in that zone if uh if that option was to was to be

2:24:18

pursued we used ad don't remind me it was the TC the tc4 was that what it was

2:24:24

the tc4 we use that really just for the purposes of of doing the math but um we

2:24:30

could certainly take elements of Regulation from the Town Center zones and apply it to a TC Zone which would

2:24:37

become kind of like a mixed juice Zone but it would still we'd still want to see commercial office type uses there

2:24:42

rather than you know just having restaurant retail for example like we do in the Town Center so um we can do a lot

2:24:50

of different things with you know with with massing and and Architectural type standards that we how we would want that

2:24:57

to look so lot kind of a blank canvas sort of speak um in that se zone so yeah

2:25:04

we can go a lot of different directions that would all be not only lawful but also you know aesthetically uh pleasing

2:25:12

to to the city so very good all right so um C member

2:25:20

Jacobson yes um you're probably GNA stick more pins

2:25:25

in the Jake doll once once you hear this question but uh I have actually I think

2:25:30

two semi-related questions one is is it to our advantage either strategically or

2:25:36

tactically short-term versus the long-term game about which you've been um uh lecturing us on or reminding us of

2:25:44

uh Mr Thomas um are we better off maximizing our

2:25:50

capacities going Beyond you know 143 150 or whatever that that uh

2:25:58

shortage we have if we if we go beyond that is that to our

2:26:04

advantage no no pin in the Jake doll required for that answer um I think the

2:26:10

mayor uh the mayor may have said it earlier uh in one of his comments the

2:26:15

the concept of leap frogging where if we do create a little bit more

2:26:20

capacity up front um we may not have to revisit this as frequently

2:26:29

um it would make it a less frequent subject of conversation perhaps with

2:26:34

both the staff and the community and the council uh where we create some room

2:26:40

where we can kind of work up to it over time um I don't know you know just to be

2:26:47

candid and I don't think Adam knows either but he'll tell me if if he does I I don't think we're
g to have

2:26:53

this we are going to have some annual I suspect we'll have some annual reporting
requirements it may not be in the exact

2:26:59

form of 1220 reporting but um there will be some State reporting required some of

2:27:06

the reporting requirements have changed here recently um probably if we're able to

2:27:14

create some additional capacity we don't have to Leap Frog as often so that could be a good thing

2:27:21

where we may have to cycle through it a little less frequently than perhaps what some other cities may have to do um

2:27:29

that's the best answer I can give you at this point council member to that well my second question would be uh

2:27:37

and I preface it by saying I understand at this stage all right the idea is not

2:27:42

to broaden the number of possibilities we have but to narrow things down so your department can get to work and

2:27:49

really along with a housing group and and and get to a solution on this

2:27:55

but I'm wondering um and I have not you know played with the advantages

2:28:01

and disadvantages if we were to pick some parts of excuse me uh all three of these kinds

2:28:09

of things we would we perhaps eliminate pain maximize uh uh our capacity and do

2:28:17

some things and I I that's I guess an opinion being cloaked in a question but

2:28:23

uh picking pick I haven't thought it through to the implications would be and

2:28:29

maybe they're all bad if we do that but um that's a that's a question and again it's not one that that probably is

2:28:35

easily answered or answered right this minute picking uh picking some

2:28:40

combination of the three rather than just one of the three could certainly have some it it um the primary thing

2:28:48

that pops to my mind is that it could excuse me preserve uh some future flexibility for

2:28:55

the city so um the MF the MF option um I

2:29:02

think this may have gotten mentioned earlier as well at some point um the MF option you know when we

2:29:09

look at that option we look primarily to the Shorewood area and I think there's a couple things

2:29:15

in play with Shorewood area um one would be uh you know we talked about

2:29:22

displacement possibility earlier in the presentation I think that that certainly exists there with a Shorewood

2:29:28

Redevelopment or partial Redevelopment but the other thing up in that area is I I think there's some uh some potential

2:29:36

uh infrastructure issues that uh would really have to you know

2:29:43

the that may have to be addressed before we ever see fruit being born on that

2:29:48

tree up in the MF you know that MF Zone um so maybe you know looking at a

2:29:55

combination of options or the co options and the Town Center options that certainly is

2:30:00

something that could certainly uh give us some additional flexibility here as we move forward in time and you know

2:30:07

either learn more about how Commerce use this or looking at new requirements that

2:30:13

are coming down uh coming down the the pipe here sooner than later from the state so those were those were both good

2:30:20

questions thank you thank you very good Council Reynolds yeah Mr Mayor this may

2:30:25

be a question for you as much as anybody else since you've been so involved with the gmpc but I'm wondering about the

2:30:31

politics of of the overshooting so for example if we plan for

2:30:36

1428 and then later the gmpc says you know we really need to create some more capacity because growth is bigger than

2:30:42

we thought are we wise to have kept some capacity in our back pocket ET and not

2:30:47

exposed it because if we say 1,800 now well they just add 200 more on top of that whereas we would have rather had

2:30:53

have ADD 20000 to 1428 yeah that's a good question um I

2:30:59

don't think there's any hidden capacity Advantage you know if you look at Mercer Island we're the 10th most Den densely

2:31:04

populated island in the US contiguous us anybody could Envision Mercer Island being Manhattan you know concrete

2:31:12

concrete uh Lake Shore to Lake Shore so I don't think we're tipping our hat there I I think it's actually the other

2:31:18

way around in the 2029 check-in when the gmpc looks at comprehensive plans and

2:31:23

makes an assessment of over the previous five years how has a jurisdiction done

2:31:29

towards meeting its Ami goals what you don't want them to do is be looking at capacity and then pointing the finger

2:31:35

and saying that's your problem well what we'd like to do is add a little head room so that when you get to 2029

2:31:41

there's still some capacity on the books and we're able to say you know we had incentives we we had uh subsidies we

2:31:48

turned Reit over to Arch you know we did all this that and the other and we we underperformed but it's not because of a

2:31:56

lack of capacity and and I think that would be the reason that I would go towards adding a floor in town center

2:32:03

mostly because I think to is going to happen to us and so that's a foregone conclusion and then adding a limited

2:32:09

kind of incrementally scaling element to the co Zone which was the amendment that

2:32:14

I sent out uh basically allowing uh the three over one on Co

2:32:20

Parcels not uh immediately abing a residential Zone and then as development patterns and practices change you would

2:32:27

add some incremental capacity in the co Zone it would be kind of a mild uh

2:32:32

Redevelopment risk okay very helpful thank you okay so

2:32:37

Council on January 16th this is planned to come back on consent if we can land a plane tonight and that is you know what

2:32:44

the council decides on tonight the other option is to just punt on that and have a

2:32:49

discussion January 16th is there I mean do we think we have enough consensus tonight to try and uh give staff

2:32:57

guidance so that it's coming back on consent with a an option that we all agree

2:33:03

on I I know that I want more information on the PBZ but I certainly got no ground

2:33:09

spell of support on that from anybody else so I to me it just seems bizarre to

2:33:14

be making this kind of a ision excluding the only other piece of property that

2:33:21

doesn't currently allow for multif family or residential use so I certainly

2:33:27

would like more information on that um if we're not going to get that if if you know three other council members don't

2:33:33

want to give a thumbs up on that extra work and we want to just move forward on these three options um I I don't know

2:33:39

where I am

2:33:45

okay counc member Weber yeah so I I had 15 questions I submitted um uh to staff

2:33:53

last week uh and my compliments to uh Jeff and Adam and Allison uh and others

2:33:58

who were involved for putting together very thorough answers to that for uh before the meeting I I don't have any

2:34:05

follow-up questions on that I I do want to uh share my uh some of the concerns

2:34:11

that have been expressed uh tonight about the feasibility of achieving the assigned housing numbers and I do think

2:34:18

along the lines of what uh Jeff was saying that there are going to be infrastructure issues likely with all of these options uh when you add more

2:34:25

people you need more infrastructure um exactly what those infrastructure issues are going to be we we'll find out as we analyze it further

2:34:32

but I encourage everyone not to let the perfect be the enemy of the good here I think creating a broader spectrum of

2:34:39

housing on the island is a positive change even if we don't uh achieve the

2:34:45

aspirational numbers of uh hb220 uh and commerce uh I think we're

2:34:51

moving in the right direction we're moving the direction that we have to according to uh the state law and I

2:34:57

think we'll we'll get there in bits and pieces so just while we're still on you

2:35:03

do you do you feel like you want to have more discussion on January 16th or do you feel that you have enough data at

2:35:09

this point to provide direction to sta I think it would be useful to have more discussion on January 16th than to hear

2:35:15

from the public on this um I think that uh we we don't have you know 100 people

2:35:20

in the audience tonight but I think that uh if there's uh some now that now that

2:35:27

this discussion has taken place there may be more people that want to uh uh talk to us about it between now and the

2:35:33

16th or even on the 16th very good all right council member Reynolds I had a similar reaction this

2:35:39

this feels to me like one of the biggest decisions we've made in a while and are likely to make for a while I think

2:35:45

having a little more time time to to ponder it and and seek input from the public is wise got it KES wer so I'll just say we

2:35:53

have a long way to go and uh with the hope of getting some direction here I would be in support of moving forward

2:36:01

with recommending staff look deeper into option b with Lisa's PBZ addition or compliment or whatever

2:36:08

that would look like and bring us something to talk about on January 16th I don't think we need two hours on the 16th but I think if we have a little

2:36:15

more data about our commercial zones I'm inclined to go there because I think our town center is pretty built out we know

2:36:22

legislation's coming and I don't think messing with Shorewood given their infrastructure and capacity and knowing

2:36:28

they get their water from Seattle rather than our system like that just feels more complicated especially when you add

2:36:33

that RDI risk so I think option b is our best bet especially with mayor niece's

2:36:39

um recommendation that that housing regulations be really clear on the border with any single family properties

2:36:46

so I'm going to put a stake in the ground and see if we can get support for four to move forward with B with the

2:36:51

caveat of the PBZ and uh the very clear standards at the start about not having

2:36:58

four-story buildings next to somebody's backyard okay Deputy Mayor Rosal yeah uh

2:37:04

question for Jeff and Adam Adam I know this this draft took months and months and what would work I don't know uh I I

2:37:12

agree with uh with council member and all that I think getting more will be helpful but I I I don't know if that is

2:37:18

something you can reasonably do in a couple weeks here um could you talk to

2:37:24

that um Adam Adam is the the math Runner

2:37:29

here um so Adam I guess that's a question for you to answer is that a is

2:37:35

it reasonable that we could we could run a a similar mathematical approach for the

2:37:40

PBZ uh area at the south end and then um report out on the math results here in a

2:37:47

timely fashion for the 16th well so it's definitely possible to

2:37:53

run the numbers for PBZ it seems it it might be tough to get it all together by

2:38:00

the 16th um but I think if that was if option b had that asterisk we could do

2:38:06

that math as part of what we bring to the housing work group and it could just get added to the record as we move

2:38:12

forward to if that's uh if we're not able to get it by the

2:38:21

16th okay so College try sounds like um so it sounds like this will be

2:38:27

coming back for another discussion January 16th we don't need to provide any other direction tonight unless anybody has something to provide Council

2:38:34

M Jacobson I I would just say this I I would like more time to absorb this and

2:38:39

think about it and hopefully uh ask some questions uh in advance in our next uh

2:38:45

January 16th session I would say I think as I understand it Sherwood is the

2:38:51

largest single multifamily chunk we've got I think there's 660 units or

2:38:57

something like that and uh given the size of it and the

2:39:03

infrastructure problems with it I have great reluctance in fooling around with shwood I think I don't I don't I think

2:39:12

that just beet with problems and uh uh the other thing is I think the PBC is

2:39:18

not a very good idea either and putting aside the the Uproar that will come from that neighborhood which happened when it

2:39:25

was uh uh incorrectly zoned Co four

2:39:30

years ago uh in some maps and uh that led to quite a lot of back and forth uh

2:39:38

to put it mildly um and so I'm I'm I'm stuck between some

2:39:44

part of a and b downtown but and the the thing I see

2:39:49

there is that if we put our eggs in that basket that's the end of uh Commercial

2:39:55

Business in downtown because what's built down there the small businesses of

2:40:01

the uh uh terab Bellas the the experiences these kinds of things aren't

2:40:07

going to be able to be afford to be there Island books either um but that

2:40:13

may that's probably going to happen anyway the boy collection's gone Tabit square is gone to want a single

2:40:18

developer and it's just a matter of time until all those buildings come down and the permits go into Jeff's shop to build

2:40:25

a large multif family thing and that's at that point that clears out and a good

2:40:31

part portion of the small businesses there probably 12 businesses that're in that area and they'll be gone and they

2:40:36

won't come back there's no place for them to go so so I I'd like to wait until the 16th and I promise to do

2:40:44

better job of my homework here so okay very good that's my all yeah well I

2:40:49

would just say that um for further Direction I would be also in support of

2:40:55

not further pursuing the Shorewood option because of the infrastructure issues there and the displacement

2:41:00

issues um and I I know the council member Jacobson and I may disagree on

2:41:06

further analysis on the PBZ um but if additional capacity there allows us to

2:41:13

um not up in town center then I think it's worth at least getting the answer to the

2:41:19

questions and then you know philosophically and policy-wise we can make whatever decisions we want to but at least we'll have done it in an

2:41:25

informed way very good all right any other discussion let see we'll move on thank

2:41:32

you uh Jeff and Adam and may if I may just before you move on

2:41:37

so just for clarity so what we'll do then uh we'll do our best the old College Tri as you put it before the

2:41:43

16th we'll take the tc4 um we'll take the tc4 from the town

2:41:50

center and we'll apply it to the PBZ and we'll see what the math says um

2:41:57

for the 16th that would be the same as what we did for the co option and so that means three over one right yes got

2:42:05

it okay okay that's what we'll do thank you not seeing okay thank you very good

OTHER BUSINESS | EXECUTIVE SESSION | ADJOURNMENT

2:42:11

so uh moving on we now have other business and planning schedule and we welcome back city manager Jesse

2:42:18

Bon uh thank you Mr Mayor look ahead Council your next meeting is Tuesday

2:42:24

January 16th uh the day prior is the Martin Luther King holiday so we'll be factoring that into our planning uh I

2:42:31

will note this is a kind of a heavy Capital project update meeting we'll also be providing the parks Levy annual

2:42:38

progress report uh as you look at the planning schedule right now the calendar looks a little light that is uh a bit deceiving

2:42:45

I just need to uh get on the staff a little bit about getting all the items added to the calendar so welcome back to

2:42:51

2024 we will um make it a priority to get that planning schedule updated so that uh we can plan ahead thank you very

2:42:59

good all right uh council member reports council member and and all anything to

2:43:04

report um no I don't expect much coming back from the holidays no happy New Year

2:43:10

council member Jacobson um I uh attended by Zoom the uh December 13th uh AWC

2:43:20

meeting or I'm not sure it was AWC but and voted for their slate and then they

2:43:26

moved on to the area we don't belong to so I did my I did what I was told to do

2:43:32

thank you for doing that your duty I have nothing to report council member Reynolds anything to report happy New Year all right Deputy Mayor rosenbom I I

2:43:40

I just want to say thanks to everyone uh it's been a pleasure of being Deputy Mayor last two years and I appreciate the opportunity continue to serve uh

2:43:47

I'll do my best as I took the oath and appreciate that um so I just want to say thank you everyone appreciate it and

2:43:53

look forward the next two years all right we appreciate your service too council member

2:43:58

wer uh three things first I love hearing those kids play basketball next door

2:44:03

this is great for setting up City Hall thank you staff for getting that done in time for the new year uh mayor and

2:44:08

Deputy Mayor thank you for your service again appreciate you stepping up for two more years of uh leadership and then

2:44:14

finally ADC is having their Olympia City action days on February 7th and 8th so

2:44:20

if you all want to come down and Lobby our legislators on all manner of things housing Transportation Economic Development and

2:44:27

taxes whether you agree with AWC or not come down and talk to your people very good councilman Weinberg I just wanted

2:44:33

my send my compliments to uh the city staff uh congratulations on successfully converting this room the Slater room

2:44:41

into uh council chambers uh it's great to be back in person again here here all

2:44:46

right uh the next hybrid meeting of the city council is scheduled for Tuesday January 16 2023 at 5:00 pm the time is

2:44:53

now 7:44 p.m. the city council will go into executive session for approximately 30 minutes to discuss with legal council

2:44:59

pending or potential litigation pursuant to RCW 4230 one10 P1 close pen pen Li

2:45:06

close pen no action will be taken following the executive session as a reminder for the city council please stay seated until the Staff has

2:45:12

terminated the broadcast good evening

English (auto-generated)