

HB 1220: Housing Element Updates

Laura Hodgson
SENIOR PLANNER

03/08/2023



Washington State
Department of
Commerce

We strengthen communities



HOUSING AND
HOMELESSNESS



INFRASTRUCTURE AND
BROADBAND



SMALL BUSINESS
ASSISTANCE



ENERGY



PLANNING AND TECH
ASSISTANCE



COMMUNITY
SERVICES AND FACILITIES



CRIME VICTIMS AND
PUBLIC SAFETY



ECONOMIC
DEVELOPMENT

Agenda

- HB 1220 updated numbers
- Final guidance – forthcoming changes
- Planning for UGAs
- Persons per household
- Consideration of transit in allocations

Housing needs projections

- **Housing for All Planning Tool is finalized and should be used to determine:**
 - Total future housing needs and
 - Total countywide housing needs by income bracket
- **Changes since December draft tool:**
 - Minor changes in total housing need (+140 total need) and percentage of needs in each income bracket due to new demographic info from OFM
 - Emergency housing and PSH needs are now graduated based on population projection (formerly only Medium pop projection) and minor changes in methodology

2044 Population Projection	346,385
Total Future Housing Need (Dec 2022)	143,736
Total Future Housing Need (March 2023)	143,876
Difference	140 units

Projected housing by income bracket

Housing Needs Projections for Selected County, Projection Year, and Population Target

Complete Steps 1, 2, and 3 to access countywide projections

Step 1
Select a County
Kitsap ✓

Step 2
Select a Projection Year
2044 ✓

Step 3
Enter Population Target in Range
346,385 ✓

Table 1: OFM GMA Population Projections, 2044

Kitsap County Projected Population, 2044

	Low	Medium	High	VISION 2050
Projected Population (2044)	281,339	324,969	412,109	344,137

Table 2: Projected Countywide Housing Needs Based on User Inputs

Kitsap County

Population Target = 346,385

	Total	Affordability Level (% of Area Median Income)						
		0-30%		30-50%	50-80%	80-100%	100-120%	120%+
		Non-PSH	PSH					
Total Future Housing Needed (2044)	143,876	10,416	2,873	17,138	38,444	21,676	14,381	38,948
Estimated Housing Supply (2020)*	110,914	4,123	114	11,737	33,907	19,338	12,078	29,617
Net New Housing Needed (2020-2044)	32,962	6,293	2,759	5,401	4,537	2,338	2,303	9,331

Emergency
Housing/Shelter
Beds

1,871

481

1,390

* Note: Supply of PSH in 2020 is beds. However, projections of Net New Housing Needed (2020-2044) are in housing units. See Overview tab for details.

Overview of final housing guidance

- **Allocation Guidance – Forthcoming changes include**
 - Updates on how the housing needs are presented and how to use the tool
 - Clarifying in the minimum standards that every county should document how all housing needs by income bracket within the county add up to total
 - Added information on relationship of allocated housing needs to housing needs assessments within housing elements
 - Recommendation to use Method A as default if county has difficulty deciding on alternative allocation method
 - Added guidance for allocating housing needs outside of incorporated and urbanized areas (i.e., where there is or can be infrastructure – i.e., LAMIRDs)
 - Changed terminology of “special housing needs” to “emergency housing and PSH needs”

Overview of final housing guidance

- **Projection Methodology – Forthcoming changes include:**
 - Clarification in Methodology Overview where adjustment is made to address recreational use homes and where this data comes from
 - Clarification that housing needs should be considered cumulative across all income brackets
 - Explained how projected housing needs for emergency housing (EH) and PSH were interpolated between low, medium and high projections
 - Further clarified that EH & PSH projections were based on an assumption that the state would not produce all affordable housing needed in 20 years
 - Changes to EH and PSH methodology based on expert input of those working in these fields, plus clarifications
 - Updated examples of EH and PSH methodology calculations

Over of final housing guidance

- **Land Capacity Guidance – Forthcoming changes include:**
 - Clarification that densities used in the land capacity analysis (LCA) should be assumed densities, not achieved or allowed
 - Explanation of how to consider density bonuses and incentives in LCA
 - Clarification that even if a jurisdiction does not assume full zoning capacity of some areas because of lack of infrastructure, infrastructure must be consistent with zoning capacity at the end of comp period
 - Clarification of what the minimum requirements for LCA for emergency housing are for counties
 - Clarification that a minimum requirement for LCA for PSH is to allow PSH in all residential zones (per Sections 3 & 4 of HB 1220)
 - Clarifying text between housing needs and housing targets
- **Adequate Provisions Guidance – Comments still under review**

Planning for UGAs

- HAPT tool does not provide a function to allocate housing needs in unincorporated county areas between specific UGAs or between UGAs and rural areas
- To allocate housing in unincorporated UGAs in the county – we recommend:
 - Breaking down unincorporated need in relation to capacity and population per area (Silverdale, Central Kitsap, Kingston, etc.)
 - Reviewing any overriding policy that directs where the need should go within the county
 - There is no particular way this has to be done, as long as you meet the minimum allocation standards

Persons per household

- “LUTAC is exploring the idea of adjusting the persons per household estimate based on each jurisdiction’s actual persons per household.”
 - What would this different persons per household number be used for?
- **Minimum allocation standards:**
 - Use any selected population projection from within OFM range
 - Based on selected population target, use countywide housing needs from the tool
 - Sum of all housing needs allocated to jurisdictions must add up to countywide total

Station area planning

- Kitsap Transit is encouraging LUTAC to think about how station area planning can be a factor in the housing allocation methodology. How have other counties incorporated transit planning/station area planning into their methodologies?
 - King County – Took transit into consideration when it set housing targets. Did not include transit as a factor in allocation of needs by income.
 - Snohomish County – Took transit into consideration when it set housing targets. Is not currently looking at transit as a factor in allocation of housing needs by income.
 - Pierce County – Took transit into consideration when it set housing targets. Has barely started allocation discussions.



Washington State
Department of
Commerce

www.commerce.wa.gov



Questions?

Laura Hodgson

SENIOR PLANNER

Laura.Hodgson@commerce.wa.gov

360.764.3143