

Appendix B: Adequate provisions checklists

This appendix provides checklists to use in documenting barriers and programs and actions to achieve housing availability (RCW 36.70A.070(2)(d)). These checklists include the following:

- Exhibit B1: Moderate Density housing barrier review checklist
- Exhibit B2: Low-Rise or Mid-Rise housing barrier review checklist
- Exhibit B3: Supplemental barrier review checklist for PSH and emergency housing
- Exhibit B4: Accessory dwelling unit barrier review checklist
- Exhibit B5: Checklist for local option tools for addressing affordable housing funding gaps

Documentation of the barriers to housing availability and the programs or actions needed to overcome these barriers must be in a public document and typically should be included as an appendix to the comprehensive plan housing element.

Barrier review checklists

Exhibit B1: Moderate Density housing barrier review checklist

Barrier	Is this barrier likely to affect housing production? (yes or no)	Why or why not? Provide evidence.	Actions needed to address barrier.
DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS			
Unclear development regulations	No		
<p>Prohibiting some moderate density housing types, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Duplexes ○ Triplexes ○ Four/five/six-plexes ○ Townhomes ○ Cottage housing ○ Live-work units ○ Manufactured home parks 	Yes	<p>Live-work units are not defined FWRC 19.05 and not explicitly permitted in any zone, except for home occupations approved under FWRC 19.270.</p> <p>Suburban Estates (SE) zone prohibits all moderate density housing types (FWRC 19.195). Although this zone is not particularly appropriate for middle housing considering environmental constraints and existing infrastructure.</p> <p>RS 5.0 permits attached dwelling units and manufactured home park with restricted development regulations require at least 5,000 square feet per unit (FWRC 19.200.020 & .040) and Manufactured home park requires a minimum 3 acres. There is limited RS 5.0 zoned land and most of which not large enough to scale projects.</p> <p>Cottage housing is only allowed in RS 5.0 and RS 7.2 (FWRC 19.250.020)</p> <p>RS 9.6, RS 15.0, RS 35.0 prohibits all moderate density housing types (FWRC 19.195)</p>	<p>Define live-work units in definitions FWRC 19.05.</p> <p>Amend FWRC 19.200 use zone chart to permit moderate density housing potentially including live-work units in more zones such as RS 7.2, RS 9.6, and RS 15.0 and/or consider rezoning to create more smaller lot sizes in the city.</p> <p>Permit Cottage Housing Development zones in more RS zones through amendments to FWRC 19.200 and FWRC 19.250.</p>

Barrier	Is this barrier likely to affect housing production? (yes or no)	Why or why not? Provide evidence.	Actions needed to address barrier.
High minimum lot sizes	Yes	<p>Attached dwelling units in the RS 5.0 zone require a minimum lot size of 10,000 square feet with at least 5,000 square feet per unit FWRC 19.200.020</p> <p>Zero lot line townhomes in RS 5.0 zone have a minimum site area of 10,000 square feet.</p> <p>Multifamily Residential (RM) minimum lot size by zone RM1800, RM 2400, and RM 3600 - 7,200 sq. ft. per FWRC 19.205</p> <p>Zero lot line townhomes minimum lot size of 1,500 sq. ft.in RM1800, RM 2400 and 2,250 sq. ft. in RM 3600</p>	<p>Consider creating new zoning district with smaller minimum lot sizes (such as 3,000 square feet), this would require consistency with the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map and Designations.</p> <p>Consider rezoning some larger RS zone like RS 15.0 and RS 9.6 to zones with smaller minimum lot sizes such as RS 5.0 and 7.2.</p> <p>Remove requirement of 5,000 square feet per unit of attached dwelling units in RS 5.0 zone per FWRC 19.200.020.</p> <p>Consider reducing the minimum lot size square footage needed per unit in RS and RM for attached dwelling units and zero lot line town homes changes required in FWRC 19.200 & 19.205</p>
Low maximum densities or low maximum FAR	Yes	<p>RS 5.0 max 8 units per acre RM1800 max 24 units per acre RM2400 max 18 units per acre RM3600 max12 units per acre</p>	<p>Remove requirement of 5,000 sq. ft. per unit in RS 5.0 zone and increase allowed density FWRC 19.200 to allow higher density.</p>
Low maximum building heights	Yes	<p>Zero lot line townhomes and attached dwelling units permit a max height of 35 feet in RM zones whereas in RS 5.0 max height is 30 ft.</p> <p>RS 5.0 and RS 7.2 Cottage Housing Development 18 feet above average building elevation, not to exceed 24 feet to top of ridge (FWRC 19.200.010).</p>	<p>Consider amending max height to 35ft for zero lot line townhomes in RS 5.0 (FWRC 19.200.020) to be on par with RM.</p>

Barrier	Is this barrier likely to affect housing production? (yes or no)	Why or why not? Provide evidence.	Actions needed to address barrier.
Large setback requirements	Potentially	<p>Attached dwelling units in RS 5.0 and RM zones are consistent with detached dwelling units in RS zones and have required setbacks as follows front 20ft, side and rear 5ft per FWRC 19.200.020, 19.205.010</p> <p>Zero lot line townhomes in RS 5.0 and RM zones have 5ft side yard setbacks for developments between 2-6 units and 10ft for developments of more than 6 units. Front yard setback can be reduced from 20ft to 10ft if parking/garage is not located in the front yard. Rear yard is 5ft or increased to 20ft if garage is accessed via an alley or drive isle reduction depending on site design and parking arrangement. per FWRC 19.200.020 note 4, 19.205.010 note 4</p> <p>Cottage housing developments has a front yard setback of 15 ft, smaller than standard 20 feet in RS zone.</p>	Simplify zero lot line townhome setbacks between RS 5.0 and RM zones. Potentially consider removing increased rear yard setback for developments that have the garage accessed via an alley.
High off-street parking requirements	Partially	<p>Townhomes in RS 5.0 and RM zones require 2 off-street parking spaces including one garage for each per unit. All residential development is subjected to potential guest parking per FWRC 19.130.020, this section of code lacks measurability and can be subjective.</p> <p>Attached dwelling units in RS 5.0 and RM zones are not allowed to back onto any street per FWRC 19.130.200, whereas zero lot line townhouses are not subject to this provision.</p>	<p>Potential amendments in response to proximity to future and existing transit (FWRC 19.200 & 19.205).</p> <p>Consider amending FWRC 19.130.020 to implement standards for guest parking that reduces subjectivity and adds predictability.</p> <p>Consider adding flexibility and adjusting the parking design for attached dwelling units to be more comparable to zero lot line townhomes (FWRC 19.130.200).</p>

Barrier	Is this barrier likely to affect housing production? (yes or no)	Why or why not? Provide evidence.	Actions needed to address barrier.
		Cottage housing developments require 1.8 per unit and 15% of total required spaces shall be designated for guests	
High impervious coverage limits	Yes	Zero lot line townhomes and attached dwelling units allowed in RS 5.0 have a maximum of 60% lot coverage whereas in the RM zone the max lot coverage is not established instead determined by other site development improvements	Consider code amendments to FWRC 19.200.020 to increase max lot coverage or consider establishing consistent development regulations for the same use across zones.
Lack of alignment between building codes and development codes	No		
Other (for example: complex design standards, tree retention regulations, historic preservation requirements)	Yes	Attached dwelling units in the RM zone are subject to larger landscape buffers than zero lot line townhomes per FWRC 19.125.060(3). Tree density standards are inconsistent across zones.	Potentially amend FWRC 19.125.060(3) to reduce landscape buffers for attached dwelling units in RM zone to match zero lot line townhomes. Consider tree density code overhaul to establish consistency and implement tree equity goals identified in the Climate Change and Resiliency Chapter.
PROCESS OBSTACLES			
Conditional use permit process	Yes	In the RS 5.0 and 7.2 zones Cottage Housing Developments that not processed as a subdivision are reviewed as a Use Process IV requiring the decision made by the Hearing Examiner whereas in the RM	Potential code revision FWRC 19.200.010 to review Cottage Housing Developments as a Use Process III like done in RM zones. Potential consider implementing a conditional use process permit process to allow uses not

Appendix B: Adequate provisions checklists

Barrier	Is this barrier likely to affect housing production? (yes or no)	Why or why not? Provide evidence.	Actions needed to address barrier.
		<p>zones Cottage Housing Developments can be approved via a Use Process III (administratively).</p> <p>The City of Federal Way does not have a conditional use permit, although we have the ability to add conditions to any land use permits to allowed uses.</p>	<p>permitted as a tool to potential allow more housing types in more areas of the city. This would require amendments to existing code and likely development of a new chapter.</p>
Design review	Yes	All residential development except single-family residential requires design review (FWRC 19.115.030)	Consider amending code for exemption to apply to middle housing (FWRC 19.115.030)
Lack of clear and accessible information about process and fees¹	Potentially	<p>The City's website is a work in progress and is not very intuitive. Informational handouts are long, wordy and exclusively in English.</p> <p>Fee schedule could be easier to find and also should be made searchable (currently it's a scanned document and not easily searchable). If requested, the Permit Center can provide fees estimates and permitting timelines.</p>	Continue to improve and enhance customer service online through website updates.
Permit fees, impact fees and utility connection fees	Yes	Attached dwelling units require a use process (FWRC 19.200.020) a substantially more time intensive and expensive processes than what is required for a detached dwelling unit which is exempt from land use process.	Consider amendments to FWRC 19.200.020 to reduce review process of small-scale middle housing comparable to detached single family dwelling units.

¹ For example: guidance resources are unclear or difficult to find, no digital permit tracking system, staff do not provide fee estimates or permitting time estimates are unavailable or inaccurate.

Barrier	Is this barrier likely to affect housing production? (yes or no)	Why or why not? Provide evidence.	Actions needed to address barrier.
Processing times and staffing challenges	Potentially	<p>Intake process to apply for permit applications can be backed up and have take more time than other jurisdictions.</p> <p>In RS zones, Cottage Housing Developments require Process IV (hearing examiner) or be approved via subdivision (FWRC 19.200.010). in the RM zones Cottage Housing Developments require a Process III (FWRC 19.205.030) if not approved via subdivision.</p> <p>Zero lot line townhomes are reviewed with 9 lots or fewer are reviewed via short subdivision plat (FWRC 18.30) and townhome development 10 or more lots are reviewed via preliminary plat and final plat subdivision plat (FWRC 19.35 and 19.40)</p>	<p>Completely implement My Building Permit which is intended to help streamline the intake and permitting process.</p> <p>Amend FWRC 19.200.010 to reduce review to a Process III for Cottage Housing Developments in RS to be the same as RM.</p>
SEPA process	No	Categorical exemptions for minor new construction of multifamily dwelling units is only 60 units (FWRC 14.15.030(1)(a)) is not considered a barrier to moderate density middle housing	none
LIMITED LAND AVAILABILITY AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSTRAINTS			
Lack of large parcels for infill development	Yes	2021 King County Buildable Lands report capacity for 40 middle housing units in the RS 5.0 zone. There is a lack of RS 5.0 zoning and a lack of large lot RS 5.0 parcels for infill development	Consider rezoning to create more RS 5.0 zoning in the city.
Environmental constraints	Potentially	Per FWRC 19.145.080 reasonable use requires just a UPIII for SF and UPIV for everything else.	Potentially consider revisions to treat residential the same for review process.

Exhibit B2: Low-Rise or Mid-Rise housing barrier review checklist

Barrier	Is this barrier likely to affect housing production? (yes or no)	Why or why not? Provide evidence.	Actions needed to address barrier.
DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS			
Unclear development regulations	No		
High minimum lot sizes	No	RM zones are the only which have a minimum lot size and it is only 7,200 sq ft per FWRC 19.205.040	None
Low maximum densities or low maximum FAR	Potentially	<p>RM1800 max density of 24 units per acre (FWRC 19.205.040 note 1) RM2400 max density of 18 units per acre (FWRC 19.205.040 note 1) RM3600 max density of 12 units per acre (FWRC 19.205.040 note 1)</p> <p>BN max density of 18 dwelling units per acre (FWRC 19.215.050 note 4). BN zone requires ground floor no residential uses. The low maximum density other applicable development regulations are believed to have been a barrier to mixed-use development in this zone.</p>	Consider increasing the maximum density in BN through amending FWRC 19.215.050 note 4.
Low maximum building heights	Yes	<p>RM zones max height 30 feet for multifamily dwelling units. In RM 1800, height permitted up to 35 feet unless it is within 100ft of Single-Family residential zone (FWRC 19.205.040).</p> <p>BN max height for multifamily is determined by the ground floor use (FWRC 19.215.050).</p> <p>BC max height reduced from 65ft to 30ft if within 100ft of single-family zone (FWRC 19.220.050 note 2)</p>	<p>Amend FWRC 19.205.040 to consider increase max building height for multifamily to 35 for all RM zones and remove conditions in special regulation note (5)</p> <p>Consider removing or reducing the 100ft buffer from single family zones</p>

Barrier	Is this barrier likely to affect housing production? (yes or no)	Why or why not? Provide evidence.	Actions needed to address barrier.
		CC-F max height is between 70-85ft but reduced to 30ft for structures within 100ft of single-family zone (FWRC 19.230.060)	that reduce allowed building height for RM, BN, BC, CC-F
Large setback requirements	Yes	<p>In RM, BN, BC, if multifamily development is within 100ft of are single-family residential zone, then the structure must be setback 20ft from property line (FWRC 19.205.040 note 5 & 8, FWRC 19.215.050 note 5, FWRC 19.220.050 note 2.).</p> <p>Minimum landscape buffers apply and often extend setbacks along perimeter lot lines for multifamily, FWRC 19.125.060. Setbacks are misleading when landscape buffer requirement is larger.</p>	<p>Consider reducing or eliminating the 20ft setback for buildings within 100 ft of single-family zones.</p> <p>Consider reducing/revising landscape buffer requirement per FWRC 19.125.060 that extend beyond required setbacks.</p>
High off-street parking requirements	Yes	<p>RM zones, BC, and BN require parking based on bedroom size of unit per FWRC 19.205.040, FWRC 19.215.050, FWRC 19.220.050, as follows: Efficiency dwelling units – 1.0 per unit, One bedroom dwelling units – 1.5 per unit, Studio dwelling units – 1.25 per unit, Dwelling units with two bedrooms or more – 2.0 per unit.</p> <p>CC-C zone requires 1 stall per unit per FWRC 19.225.070 CC-F zone requires 1 stall per unit if underground of structured parking and 1.7 per unit if surface parked per FWRC 19.230.060</p> <p>RM zones, BC, and BN require substantially more parking stalls per unit and development than CC-C & CC-F.</p>	<p>Consider reductions in required parking in RM, BN, and BC zones if near existing and future transit by amending FWRC 19.205.040, 19.215.050, 19.220.050.</p>

Barrier	Is this barrier likely to affect housing production? (yes or no)	Why or why not? Provide evidence.	Actions needed to address barrier.
High impervious coverage limits	Potentially	Per FWRC 19.205.040: RM3600 has max lot coverage of 60% and RM2400 & RM1800 has max lot coverage of 70%	Consider allowing other development regulations to determine lot coverage like done in BN, BC, CC-F and CC-C.
Lack of alignment between building and development codes	no		
Other (for example: ground floor retail requirements, open space requirements, complex design standards, tree retention regulations, historic preservation requirements)	Partially	<p>Ground floor commercial use in RM zone sets a maximum depth of 15ft (per FWRC 19.205.040 note 4.) which is prohibitively narrow and inconsistent with ground floor commercial use requirement for mixed-use buildings in BN (FWRC 19.215.050 note 3.) and BC (FWRC 19.220.050 note 1.) zones which set a minimum depth of 15 ft.</p> <p>HAPI grant funded code audit resulting in Ord 23-958 which reduced and clarified ground floor retail requirements, removed requirement for roof design provision in BC, CC-F, and CC-C zone to remove barriers.</p> <p>In RM and BN zones, all buildings must be gabled with pitched roofs (FWRC 19.205.040 note 2. And FWRC 19.215.050 note 1.) which is inconsistent with most podium style development presenting as a barrier in the BN zone.</p>	<p>Amend FWRC 19.205.040 note 4 to be consistent with dimensional requirements of ground floor retail in other mixed-use zones.</p> <p>Amend FWRC 19.205.040 note 2. And FWRC 19.215.050 note 1. to remove gabled roof requirement in RM and BN zone.</p>
PROCESS OBSTACLES			
Conditional use permit process	No	Low and midrise multifamily development projects do not require process IV review in RM, BN, BC, CC-C, and CC-F zones	None

Barrier	Is this barrier likely to affect housing production? (yes or no)	Why or why not? Provide evidence.	Actions needed to address barrier.
Design review	Potentially	FWRC 19.115 Community Design Guidelines can be subjective and often rely on director waiver authority to should vs shall issues.	This problem should be resolved when complying with HB 1293.
Lack of clear and accessible information about process and fees	Potentially	The City's website is a work in progress and is not very intuitive. Informational handouts are long, wordy and exclusively in English. If requested, the Permit Center can provide fees estimates and permitting timelines.	TBD
Permit fees, impact fees and utility connection fees	No	See process review	
Process times and staffing challenges	Potentially	Process II review for multifamily in all zones unless SEPA is triggered, then the review is Process III.	Compliance with SB 5290 should resolve these issues
SEPA process	Yes	Categorical exemptions for minor new construction of multifamily dwelling units is only 60 units (FWRC 14.15.030(1)(a)), whereas WAC 197.11.800(1)(d) sets the maximum exemption level to 200 units.	Consider increasing codified categorical exemption per FWRC 14.15.030.
LIMITED LAND AVAILABILITY AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSTRAINTS			
Lack of large parcels for infill development	No	The BC, CC-, and CC-C zone are largely vacant and redevelopable per the King County Buildable Lands Report including large parcel for infill development	None
Environmental constraints	No		

Exhibit B3: Supplementary barrier review checklist for PSH and emergency housing

Barrier	Is this barrier likely to affect housing production? (yes or no)	Why or why not? Provide evidence.	Actions needed to address barriers.
DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS			
Spacing requirements (for example, minimum distance from parks, schools or other emergency/PSH housing facilities)²	Yes	<p>PSH spacing requirement of more than 3 units is one and one-third miles (7,040 ft.) from any property with more than three units of permanent supportive housing and/or transitional housing, (RS FWRC 19.200.045 note 2., RM FWRC 19.205.080 note 1., BN FWRC 19.215.070 note 1., BC FWRC 19.220.100 note 1. CC-C FWRC 19.225.075 note 1., CC-F FWRC 19.230.065 note 1.</p> <p>Emergency housing spacing requirement of 1,000 ft from other emergency housing and shelter, public schools (BC FWRC 19.220.105 note 2., CC-C FWRC 19.225.055 note 2., CC-F FWRC 19.230.055 note 2., CE FWRC 19.240.095 note 2.)</p>	Reassess and reevaluate the appropriate spacing requirements.
Parking requirements	Yes	<p>For all zones permitting PSH and Emergency housing parking requirement is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Efficiency units – 1.0 per unit + one per two employees Studio units – 1.25 per unit + one per two employees One bedroom units – 1.5 per unit + one per two employees Units with two bedrooms or more – 2.0 per unit + one per two employees <p>There are examples of Health through Housing projects failing to meet the minimum parking requirements</p>	Consider reduction in required parking to be less than multifamily.

² Note that RCW 35A.21.430 expressly states requirements on occupancy, spacing, and intensity of use may not prevent the siting of a sufficient number of permanent supportive housing, transitional housing, indoor emergency housing or indoor emergency shelters necessary to accommodate each code city's projected need for such housing and shelter under RCW 36.70A.070(2)(a)(ii). The restrictions on these uses must be to protect public health and safety.

Barrier	Is this barrier likely to affect housing production? (yes or no)	Why or why not? Provide evidence.	Actions needed to address barriers.
On-site recreation and open space requirements	Unsure		
Restrictions on support spaces, such as office space, within a transitional or PSH building in a residential zone	Unsure		
Arbitrary limits on number of occupants (in conflict with RCW 35A.21.314)	Yes	<p>PSH SE 19.195.015 note 2., max of 10 residences within a single structure per lot RS 19.200.045 note 3., max of 6 residences within a single structure per lot RM 19.205.080 note 2., BN 19.215.070 note 2., max of 50 residences within a single facility or complex max density also applies BC 19.220.100 note 2., max of 50 residences within a single facility or complex CC-C 19.225.075 note 2., max of 150 residences within a single facility or complex CC-F 19.230.065 note 2., CE 19.240.085 note 2., Max of 110 residences within a single facility or complex</p> <p>Emergency housing and shelter BC 19.240.085 note 3., CC-C 19.225.055 note 3., CC-F 19.230.055 note 3.,</p> <p>The maximum number of residents and the number of dwelling units or occupancy rooms or suites permitted determined by the city based on criteria a-d.</p>	TBD (sensitive)
Requirements for PSH or emergency housing that are different than the requirements imposed on housing developments generally (in conflict with RCW 36.130.020)	Unsure		
Other restrictions specific to emergency shelters, emergency housing, transitional housing and permanent supportive housing	Unsure		

Exhibit B4: Accessory dwelling unit barrier review checklist

Barrier	Is this barrier likely to affect housing production? (yes or no)	Why or why not? Provide evidence.	Actions needed to address barriers.
DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS			
<p>Consistent with HB 1337 (2023)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Must allow two ADUs on each lot in urban growth areas; ○ May not require the owner to occupy the property, and may not prohibit sale as independent units, but may restrict the use of ADUs as short term rentals; ○ Must allow an ADU of at least 1,000 square feet; ○ Must set parking requirements based on distance from transit and lot size; ○ May not charge more than 50% of the impact fees charged for the principal unit; ○ Must permit ADUs in structures detached from the principal unit; ○ May not restrict roof heights of ADUs to less than 24 feet, unless that limitation applies to the principal unit; ○ May not impose setback requirements, yard coverage limits, tree retention mandates, restrictions on entry door locations, aesthetic requirements, or requirements for design review for ADUs that are more restrictive than those for principal units; ○ Must allow an ADUs on any lot that meets the minimum lot size required for the principal unit; ○ Must allow detached ADUs to be sited at a lot line if the lot line abuts a public alley, unless the city or county routinely plows snow on the public alley; ○ Must allow conversions from existing structures, even if they violate current code requirements for setbacks or lot coverage; and ○ May not require public street improvements as a condition of permitting ADUs. 	Yes	<p>Ord 23-963 passed in 2023 resolved many but not all of the requirements in HB 1337. Future amendments are needed to fully comply with HB 1337 as follows:</p> <p>Only one ADU is permitted per lot (FWRC 19.200.180 note 2.) & FWRC 19.195.180 note 2.).</p> <p>ADUs are not exempt to the Park Impact Fee and are charged the same rate as the principal unit (FWRC 19.92.080).</p> <p>ADU access door is regulated different than single family (FWRC 19.200.180(8)).</p>	Possible amendments to remove the barriers identified in FWRC 19.200.180, FWRC 19.195.180, FWRC 19.92.080,
Unclear development regulations	No	Code amended in 2023 via Ord. 23-963 to streamline permitting, remove regulatory barriers, and reduce costs for ADU production in the city.	None

Barrier	Is this barrier likely to affect housing production? (yes or no)	Why or why not? Provide evidence.	Actions needed to address barriers.
Large setback requirements	No	ADUs do not have more restrictive setbacks than principal unit (FWRC 19.200.180 & 19.195.180)	None
Off-street parking requirements	No	Code amended in 2023 via Ord. 23-963 allowing wider driveways for properties that serve an ADU. Also, if an ADU is located within 1/4 mile of a major transit stop no off-street parking is required for the ADU (FWRC 19.195.180 note 11. And 19.200.180 note 12.)	None
Other (for example: burdensome design standards, tree retention regulations, historic preservation requirements, open space requirements, etc.)	Yes	Design requirement prohibiting the front door of an ADU and primary dwelling unit from facing the same direction.	Consider removal of requirement
PROCESS OBSTACLES			
Lack of clear and accessible information about process and fees	No	City has informational handout and webpage for virtual assistance and has hosted a community workshop to explain ADU regulation updates to public in promotion of ADU production.	None
Permit fees, impact fees and utility connection fees that are not proportionate to impact	Yes	Code amended in 2023 via Ord. 23-96 exempted ADUs from School Impact Fees. The Park Impact Fee applied to ADUs is equal to a single-family house (FWRC 19.92.080)	Amend FWRC 19.92.080 to reduce ADUs from Park Impact Fees consistent with HB 1337.
Processing times and staffing challenges	No	Code amended in 2023 via Ord. 23-963 resulting in ADUs no longer needing an AU land use permit. Now applicants instead go straight to applying for a building permit.	None

Exhibit B5: Checklist for local option tools for addressing affordable housing funding gaps

Local option tools for addressing affordable housing funding gaps*	Implementation status	Plans for implementation
Housing and related services sales tax (RCW 82.14.530)	This has not enacted by the City. The City cannot enact this sales tax anymore since King County enacted the sales tax.	None
Affordable housing property tax levy (RCW 84.52.105)	Not implemented.	?
REET 2 (RCW 82.46.035) – GMA jurisdictions only and only available through 2025	Not implemented.	?
Affordable Housing Sales Tax Credit (RCW 82.14.540) – was only available to jurisdictions through July 2020	The City has enacted this tax credit and have an existing ILA to contribute tax collected to the SKHHP housing capital fund.	Continue to contribute tax collected to SKHHP.
Lodging Tax (RCW 67.28.150 and RCW 67.28.160) to repay general obligation bonds or revenue bonds	Not implemented.	
Mental Illness and Drug Dependency Tax (RCW 82.14.460) – jurisdictions with a population over 30,000	King County enacted this tax before January 1, 2011. The City is no longer eligible.	None
Donating surplus public lands for affordable housing projects (RCW 39.33.015)	Not implemented.	
Impact fee waivers for affordable housing projects (RCW 82.02.060)	Not implemented.	
Application fee waivers or other benefits for affordable housing projects (RCW 36.70A.540)	Projects of 25 units of more are required to set aside 4% of units to be affordable at 50% AMI for 50 years. Parking is not required for the mandatory affordable units. Recently amended via Ord. 23-958.	No amendments to the existing program are planned at this time.

Local option tools for addressing affordable housing funding gaps*	Implementation status	Plans for implementation
Multifamily Tax Exemption (MFTE) with affordable housing requirement (RCW 84.14)	8-year and 12-year programs are implemented and recently amended to expand residential target area and improve flexibility via Ord. 23-969 and Ord 23-964	Consider expansion to future zones in the South Station Subarea Plan area, implement 20-year program, and allow program extension.
General funds (including levy lid lifts to increase funds available)	Not implemented.	

* Some tools may be unavailable for certain jurisdictions. For example, only GMA jurisdictions can use REET 2, or the surrounding county may have already implemented the housing and related services sales tax. See MRSC's summary of [Affordable Housing Funding Sources](#) for more details and the Association of Washington Cities (AWC)/MRSC booklet on [Homelessness & housing toolkit for cities](#) (2022).