Neither co-lead for this workgroup was able to attend, so staff opened the meeting and everyone made a round of introductions.

**Community Resident Preference Policy Presentation and Discussion:**

Maureen Kostyack of the Office of Housing (OH) and Brenda Anibarro of the Office of Civil Rights (OCR) shared a PowerPoint presentation on the City’s exploration of a Residential Preference Policy as a potential anti-displacement strategy.

Staff are following up on MHA resolution direction for the OH to do more work to identify community interest in community preference policy development by:

- What is appropriate and allowable
- Look at what other communities are doing
- Engage in listening sessions with the community for further input

Next Steps - there are two parallel projects:

- Affirmative marketing policy
- Community Resident Preference

Staff will conduct outreach over the next few months and be able to report back at October community event.

This presentation stimulated a great deal of interest and discussion amongst workgroup members. Some of the points discussed include:

- Who needs housing in the CID – people who currently live there and are at risk of displacement, people who work in the CID – for example non-profit staff and service providers.
- Consideration of affirmative marketing and community preference policy/strategy is also relevant for commercial spaces
- What about those already displaced from the CID who may want to move back? (note: Portland model of interest)
- Should also be consideration of immigrants who are moving to Seattle and would like to live in the CID - they would benefit from the services and cultural support.
• Some who do find housing in the CID decide it is not for them – they don’t speak language for example
• City should consider taking some risk – City has your back in carrying out affirmative marketing/community preference policy/strategy
• Focus on people, not housing units.
• Challenges to affirmative marketing in the CID include need for interpretation and translation (e.g. forms not in languages); lack of credit history – people deal primarily in cash.
• Concern that property owners don’t/won’t engage in affirmative marketing or community preference because they feel it is not allowable – goes against federal regulations, HUD interpretation of fair housing laws.

Affirmative Marketing
• Not enough money available to do outreach and translation
• OK to market only within the area near the project? Advertise only in Chinese Post?
• Concern about property owners’ understanding of fair housing law. For example, telling community that Fair Housing does not allow marketing to community. Is this a HUD interpretation?

Barriers to Housing for CID residents
• Lack of rental or credit history

Preference Policies
• Workers should be eligible. Lots of inquiries from small businesses about affordable housing for their workers
• Prioritize: 1) people who live in neighborhood, 2) people who work in neighborhood, 3) residents of other displacement neighborhoods
• Prefer preference for residents of the same neighborhood where project is developed. Specific cultural services available. Life-affirming – eg, language, doctors. Examples of seniors coming to ID from Bellevue for culturally specific services. Residents of other displacement neighborhoods not necessarily comfortable in CID.
• Also preference for people using services. Current residents or those living elsewhere [not clear whether this was intended to be only prior CID residents]
• Also preference for residents already displaced. This has been going on for generations. Need to attract people back – woo them and maintain them. Change dialogue from offering concessions to offering an incentive.
• Reaching back to prior displacement works against [character of] CID as a community of immigrants
• Define what makes CID unique. Services, history, language, etc. These unique qualities also need to be preserved to prevent displacement.
• Anti-displacement must include nonprofits. Services designed to serve POC who do not have access to services. Essential to maintaining CID cultural character and supporting residents.
• City should take on risk. Describe how to provide preference.

Displacement Risk
• Focus on immediate risk of commercial displacement in Little Saigon
• Disagreement about urgency of residential displacement in Historic District – low-income residents of small older buildings can afford 60% AMI rents
• See new Enterprise Report -- % of units without heat, etc. Won’t pass inspection. Relocation assistance [meaning TRAO?] isn’t enough

Displacement Strategies
• Focus on both commercial and residential
• Interested in strategy identified in resolution, which calls for rent assistance so displaced residents can stay in community. Community prioritized this.
• OH should help facilitate communication with housing developers and people working on commercial displacement in CID. Examples: Thai Binh, LIHI.

Other
• Neighborhood is Chinatown ID. Not just ID. Marketing should be clear whether we mean Little Saigon, Chinatown, Japantown.

Housing Strategies Preliminary Recommendations Discussion:
The discussion on Community Resident Preference Policy was so robust, that there was not adequate time for this agenda item. There was time to hand out the latest version of the housing map and a companion table listing the existing housing units; a table illustrating income affordability levels and example jobs and their salaries. The consensus of the group was to pick up this discussion at the June workgroup meeting.

Respectfully submitted by Janet Shull

Next Meeting June 6, 2018 5:00 to 6:30 PM