



Wednesday December 6, 2023

11:00 AM -1:00PM

Virtual Option: [Webex](#)

Attendees:

Board Members: Sophia Benalfew, Jennell Lee Hicks, Jamie Madden, Willard Brown, John Rodriguez, Evelyn Allen, Kaleb Germinaro, Dr. Mark Jones, Diana Paredes

Absent: Lindsay Goes Behind, Quanlin Hu, Abdi Yusuf, Denise Lally

Public: Yordanos Teferi

Public Comment

None

Welcome & Relationship Building

Bana Abera, EDI AB Facilitator

Relationship building and Confirm Attendance.

EDI Division Director Candidates Meet & Greet

Bana Abera, EDI Facilitator

Ongoing Updates*

- *EDI Ordinance –Abesha Shiferaw*

We were hoping to engage with RSET in October. We're still working with LAW and internal coordination so the timeline for the ordinance is now end of May as the target date. So that's about two months later but gives us space to still engage with RSET and finish the internal coordination work.

Q: About when will it come to RSET and what is the expected turn-around time for RSET to meet?

A: Not fixed. We'll come to a meeting to present and answer questions and then exchange feedback. Hopefully one more touch-point after that, so maybe 1-1.5 months but still going for meaningful engagement.

Q: RSET meets once a month so want to make sure that works for the scheduling.

- *RSET-EDI Coordination & Alignment –Board Chair*

The Board was invited to attend RSET executive committee after the exchange of letters. There was an informal commitment to participate in each other's Executive Committee meetings. *So RSET will be invited to the next Board executive committee meeting.*



Q: How often does the RSET exec committee meet?

A: Yes? But there's an opportunity to be flexible

- *Equitable Development Zoning – Nicolas Welch*
We've been doing this for a couple of years on land use barriers that get in the way of EDI projects often experience—community spaces, gathering spaces, etc. These used to require special permits and uses, and we've made these a lot simpler and easier. This was phase one. We're hoping to move onto second phase things that are more complex and complicated policies. CM Morales has been advocating on pilots for mix use, flexibilities, etc and have been working with her office. Pilot on more flexibilities and this would take a couple of years. We want to keep this group informed as things evolve and new council comes onboard in 2024.

Board member: this is important especially for affordable housing—multi-family housing, density, and higher height for development. Strengthen the process and moving passed a lot of barriers and making the process easier is recommended.

Nick: Addressing zoning barriers can be helpful, working on design review has been important as well as other land use issues.

Board member: shorten the process and uses helps the process and community developers.

Nick: will work with OH to make the process more smoothly.

<https://seattle.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=12311277&GUID=C4A5D21F-C8FA-4B4B-A659-E6D70AEB33E9>

Board member: does this do anything for individual homeowners that want to develop additional units for family, etc?

Nick: yes and no, it doesn't address specifically this person's issues. But it would help establish the affordable housing rules, MHA. How a homeowner can work with a developer and have a unit to return to and making policy that accommodates.

Board member: we don't want to give the developer ownership and ability to provide housing units for children and grandchildren, and there needs to be a profit sharing process/structure because this impacts generational wealth building and it can be inequitable. This would take more property from community.



Comprehensive Plan Response to EDI Advisory Board Letter

Jenna: Thank you for the letter. I asked Michael H to prepare the PowerPoint to indicate that OPCD has received the letter and to present an approach to how OPCD will respond to the points of the letter and get feedback on how that response will proceed. We'll accept feedback today but will also present again in January so you have time to digest and provide more feedback then.

Hubner: Thanks for the thoughtful letter. This is to provide an initial response to the elements of the letter and talk about the timeliness of the letter. The draft plan is supposed to go out in February so there's time in the lead-up and then the community engagement portion to talk about these issues.

Item 1: Want more continuity with report backs. OPCD will work to create more structure and have topic sequencing in the agenda and we will respond to issues from prior meetings. This should start in January.

Item 2: Accountability. OPCD is developing an accountability framework for the Draft Plan. OPCD will present this framework after the release of the draft plan.

Item 3: Anti-Displacement Framework and RET. OPCD is creating both a framework and the RET progress report. OPCD can provide a summary of those documents and then present the full documents after the release of the draft plan.

Item 3: Citywide vs Neighborhood needs. The Comp Plan is a city-wide plan and high-level policies. The draft plan recognizes that there is a need for neighborhood-based planning. OPCD can provide a written summary on the topic and brief the board for further discussion.

Item 4: Funding and collaboration. There are gaps in funding and a need for collaborative approaches. OPCD will try to elevate these concerns in the draft plan. OPCD will work with the EDI team and brief the Board after the draft plan is released.

Item 5: Housing. The housing needs section will address housing issues. There is an opportunity to discuss innovative approaches to housing and the draft plan should include these topics. OPCD will brief the board after the release of the draft plan.

Item 6: Community Outreach. OPCD is revising the Community Engagement Strategy in preparation of the release of the draft plan. We'd begin that process after the draft plan is released. The January meeting can be the opportunity to review that strategy and see if there are any additional changes that need to be made. We'd also like to talk about how the Board could support the work and be a connection point to community members.

Q: What is the power distribution within OPCD. How do staff within OPCD influence actual decision-making. Since a lot of this conversation is "we will do this" but that hasn't resulting in action within OPCD.



A: The project has taken longer than we'd hoped. The last phase of active engagement was the winter of 2022-2023. Since then, the work has been largely internal. We'd have liked more community engagement but are behind because of the internal work and the schedule delays. We're not sure about the question about power dynamics per se, but there are a lot of staff involved in the work and we've included community-based organizations in the outreach processes. We'd hope to do more with that model. OPCD would love to hear more from the board about the engagement plan.

Q: It doesn't really answer the question. For example, there doesn't seem to be inclusion of school communities despite our feedback about this for over a year. But the Board isn't seeing it reflected still.

Q: The City has a real blind spot about families in urban neighborhoods. But the idea of a job center doesn't reflect the needs of families so the planning for needs: parks, road safety, schools. There doesn't seem to be any acknowledgement of the residents and families within downtown. It seems like the City only listens to property owners and business interests in terms of downtown needs.

Q: Who has the authority to get the various City departments to have a real discussion into how resources are deployed in the neighborhoods. It seems like each department works as a stand-alone entity and that is a problem that should be included in the comprehensive plan. Georgetown, South Park, Delridge, and White Center have huge investment needs and the various departments could have a coordinated strategy for their investment needs. How can the comp plan process support the coordination of these investments of the next 10, 15, 20 years.

A: This is a big conversation about how the departments work together. When we write the policies, we work with the relevant departments for the appropriate sections. When we get community feedback, we bring that information to those departments. The goal of the Comp Plan is to get better at moving in the same direction while being informed by community input into the decisions.

A: Accountability for implementation is a question between those department leaders and who they report to. That could be Mayor and Council and/or the cabinet level. The challenge is bigger than the comp plan because it is about implementation within each department and division level.

Q: also the public facing info of the comp plan, so there's very little visual accountability for the comp plan team, where the community isn't the most aware of the people behind the comp plan which is an issue because this work going forward needs to have relationships at the core

Q: Departments can't be let off the hook. There needs to be accountability to the community in the departments. There needs to be accountability insisted on more strongly. The comp plan needs to have this be part of the accountability framework. The implementation needs to have meaning and teeth since this impacts the lives of the citizens.



Q: There should be more commitment than designing agendas together for the first concern of unaddressed concerns of the EDI Board.

Q: The accountability piece needs to be written into the plan with measurements for success.

A: Accountability needs to be a continued point of discussion with the board so that this conversation continues through the duration of the planning process.

Q: Who are the Comp Plan team? Who are the accountable to? How have they ensured they represent community values? If 50k people get displaced by 2035, who is responsible?

A: If 50-100k get displaced, it won't only be because of this plan.

Q: What happened to the black people displaced from the Central District? Why is there no accountability from the previous Comp Plan for the failure of the previous plan to prevent that displacement. We have the community preference plan but it's only voluntary. Again, where is the accountability and when is it being implemented by a for-profit developer?

A: All staff are trying to be accountable to the history of harm. We are trying to be better and hopefully the anti-displacement framework is supposed to highlight opportunities and tools. How can we measure. That's something we can bring back from the board. A Comp Plan cannot affect everything over the next 20 years in terms of market forces and funding availability, but we can elevate more community input and have a better plan that's more successful. We want to identify data and outcomes.

Q: It only takes an increase of about \$200 dollars a month for folks to become homeless or be displaced from a residence. Redlining. Financial support for residents in the gentrified areas to account for increases in property taxes. The missing purpose that is always missing from these plans is financial accountability. New developments increase property taxes. My property taxes have gone up to \$6,000 and there's no thought to how the new developments affect the residents who are currently living there. So where is the responsibility?

Q: also property taxes connect to school funding and school communities, so how can we collectively navigate and set a tone / precedent for these complex issues? (we understand it's complex, we all navigate this complexity doing justice work)

Q: And there should also be more participation of our board, more inputs, because that's why we're here for, for example my concern is when I see or read that south Seattle is not going to be hyper-focused in that comp plan, it's something that should be discussed and worries me.

Q: Question about the follow-ups. The solution in the presentation may not be enough. If the next meeting is three months down the line. How do we know that issues are resolved? How can we know in-between meetings what progress is happening.



A: That's one of the questions for the Board, to let us know what kind of check-ins you want. Do you want deeper dive meetings on these topics on each agenda and how much time do you want to allocate on the agendas?

Q: Example, we asked how refugee communities are not included. OPCD said "oh yes we will work on this". But there doesn't seem to be any action on this. So this is just an example but we don't have information about whether or not it happened and if not, why not.

A: It can be either briefings or discussion. Or we can provide those updates in writing if we want to save time in the Board meetings. The Board needs to tell OPCD how it wants to be engaged.

Staff Q: Is the Board open to the community engagement framework for the January meeting?

Public Benefits Policy Recommendation from Policy Committee

EDI Staff: to refresh you, one of the key priority areas for the Policy Committee was to clarify the Public Benefit, contracting requirement to meet the underlining goals of EDI. We put presented at the September meeting sharing the problem statement, questions, research and results, and next steps. Today is to follow up on that and to share and reflect the committee's proposal and practice transparency and further refine the policy and today is not about voting.

What are the goals/outcomes of redefining Public Benefit and contracting process?

- Celebrate and honor
- Address underlining question or honoring the contribution of the EDI grantee
-

Phase 1: quicker attainable things grantees and team can do to move the process forward like update template to include stronger language about celebrating grantee contributions that may not be direct public benefit, update award letter and/or RFP with stronger info re: contracting, public benefit, and what is to come with capital project contract, developing internal shared staff process—stronger push to have the same language for all contract—

Phase 2: define expectation for capacity contract and our expectation for support, including owners' rep, legal counsel, etc. Some of our grantees don't want or can get legal counsel and that makes it an imbalance negotiation. Develop easily/accessible training on the City's EDI contracts/covenant/deed of trust. How can we use our programmatic goals and eval to inform our contracting process. We also walked through the financial value of certain community and social



activities into our public benefit calculations and there are a lot of academic research that supports this.

Board member: Giulia has been supporting and navigating the work with the committee and providing something to work with and next steps.

Board member: Documenting the contracting process, is this a one time thing?

Staff: In our contracting, we determine the PB is and it's determined by the State's constitution and legal parameters. But the grantee reports out how they're maintaining the PB. It ranges from 5-25yrs and we have a couple of contracts that have temp reporting process in the interim until the actual launch of their project.

Board member: Can you provide the link to the social capital research?

Staff: I can send out what we've collected of the different report. But we haven't used all the activities because it's a wide range of activities.

Board member: there are just some things that are not able to be quantifiable in the data and we need to work towards shifting the City's view of what's valuable, at least not through the collecting data.

Board member: One thing that would be good to advocate for is a taskforce of the environmental values of EDI holding some of the spaces and properties and how we can tell the stories of this with the storytelling committee and the quantifiable and not quantifiable data.

Staff: Having a Ph.D student work on how we could have a stronger analysis on the impact of community holding land, the clean up, and community contribution in that way would be great.

Board member: KC has capital project program and in the KC's data, there isn't a lot of quantifiable information and we may need to chart the way in this area and it will be a challenge.

2023 RFP Reflection, EDI Stakeholder Survey, & RFP Revamp

Staff: Reminder 2023 was a flurry of a year in terms of the RFP process went. When we got the 2023 budget, there was convo with the board to put out money through a faster process in alignment with a strategic planning process and integrate the feedback from the board and move the projects through the development process and expedite. The plan was to release status update to projects within our pipeline and not have them go through an app process but get an update and make a decision based on that update. That morphed into half the projects going through the status update app process based on the define timeline and urgency, and the rest of the money



was half back to go through the regular RFP process. The second fund was released in May and there were a lot of factors. So not a lot of projects move through our process based of these factors. The rest of the funds were deploy in August and from that summer award one project closed. The capacity building contracts are being executed, but not all, some are working on their scope, and hope to be executed by end of year.

Because we were running two process, we didn't have the bandwidth to do the integration of feedback and survey, etc. into our planning process. The original intention wasn't able to be implemented.

The budget has been approved by Council at \$24M for EDI, a million more than what we had last year including SIF. The other budget piece is that staffing used to come from gen fund and now has moved to PET as a budget swap. There are internal conversations with aligning the revamp of the RFP and strategic planning process and this is a good time to get your feedback and thoughts to OPCD leadership

Board member: For the 2023 budget that hasn't been released, it won't be mixed with the 2024 pot and 2023 or 2024 fund won't be impacted, is that true?

Staff: there is some money that will come back and add because of the new rollover fund policy approved by the board. Historically, funding will be held over as long as grantee is in communication and coordination with staff and holding the funds. There is one project that didn't use the CB fund and we're taking it back because they didn't have the scope or capacity to use it. We do need guidance on when a project is underperforming and out of compliance. Historically, we've been flexible because we're trying to be more equitable, but it's becoming less sustainable and need guidance on the line of when accountability is broken like when folks don't use their CB funding and may lose it. This needs board opinion to address the nuance and complexity of the practice.

Board member: what's the timeline for the 2024 RFP?

Staff: we're still working on that and the board should have input, answer some of the above questions in order to incorporate them, and will work on a timeline.

Board member: It's important to prioritize capacity building, it's as important as funding capital projects. We have to review and discuss. Any org that applies or needs funding for capital



project, it's a new org or really needs it. My org received capacity building and it was meaning for. Along with capacity building providing mentoring and technical support to support orgs towards their capital project goals. And we need to prioritize mentorships, education, and providing guidance to grantees towards the outcomes. It's really important.

Board member: we're working on an EDI Grantee convening in 2024 and want to include some of these discussions are policies, priorities and other process and how we can make things easier and fully understood. We are working on forming an ad hoc committee to support the convening planning, so there's an opportunity to align today's discussion and the policy committee's work with the convening.

EDI Division Director: This is all great to hear and the process to support community led development project vision and how we can carve out resources to support this and other tools. I've talked to board members about the funds to support this convening, identifying objectives, barriers, etc. I want to emphasize that there are resources to support this and how we can integrate all these items into this opportunity.

Staff: it's important to think about what your priorities are so when we start the discussion and planning of the RFP process we can center that.

Approval of November Meeting Minutes

Willard Brown moves to approve. Seconded by Dr. Mark Jones.

Call for additional comments/edits

- All in favor as is – all
- No – Nay or abstain – 0
- Abstain – 0

Minutes approved.