Blaine County
HOUSING

Countywide Conversation on
Shared Housing Goals and Strategies

February 1, 2022 | 10am-12pm
Housing Action Plan Stages

**CONTEXT**
November - January

**NEEDS & PREFERENCES**
- Survey
- Stakeholder Sessions
- Data Analysis

**BEST PRACTICES**
- Strategy/Policies
- Programs
- Projects

**OUTPUT:** Findings Summary

**OUTPUT:** Housing Toolkit

**STAKEHOLDER REVIEW**

**DEVELOP**
January - February

**ACTION PLAN**
- Vision/Goals
- Focus Areas
- Actions

**OUTPUT:** Housing Action Plan

**STAKEHOLDER REVIEW**

**FUNDING OPTIONS**
- LOT & in-lieu
- Philanthropic
- Business
- Federal/state
- Tax credits

**OUTPUT:** Funding Scenarios

**STAKEHOLDERS + IMPLEMENTATION PARTNERS**
- Task Force
- Ketchum City Council, Planning & Zoning Commission, Ketchum Urban Renewal Agency (KURA)
- Neighboring governments, Blaine County Housing Authority
- Community

**ACTION**
March +

**IMPLEMENT PLAN**
- Implement actions upon approval

**OUTPUT:** Policies, Programs, Projects

**L.O.T. ON BALLOT**
- Ballot language (March)
- Election (May)

**OUTPUT:** Funding for housing initiatives
Invitation List
Ketchum Housing Matters Task Force

STAKEHOLDERS + IMPLEMENTATION PARTNERS
• Task Force
• Ketchum City Council, Planning & Zoning Commission, Ketchum Urban Renewal Agency (KURA)
• Neighboring governments, Blaine County Housing Authority
• Community
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Susan Scovell
Tim Carter

The Hunger Coalition
Cookbook
Ketchum City Council
Blaine County School District
Wilson Construction
Engel & Volkers, Real Estate
Johnny G’s
Sun Valley Economic Development
Community Organizer
Cellar Pub
Blaine County, Sustainability Manager
Casino Bartender/Local Employee
Blaine County Charitable Foundation
St. Luke’s Health System
Affordable Housing Coalition of Ketchum
Sun Valley Realtors
Spur Community Foundation
Blaine County Housing Authority
Wood River Land Trust
Independent Goods
Ketchum Urban Renewal Agency
Idaho Mountain Builders/Ketchum P&Z
Our Team

**Ellen Campfield Nelson, AICP**

**Project Role** – Project Manager

**Areas of Specialty** – Urban Planning, Public Engagement, Housing, Parks and Trails

**Diana Lachiondo**

**Project Role** – Outreach & Engagement Specialist

**Areas of Specialty** – Stakeholder Engagement, Policy Analysis, Housing and Homelessness

**Seana Doherty**

**Project Role** – Housing Strategist

**Areas of Specialty** – Housing Coalitions, Housing Policy and Implementation, Mountain/Resort Town Housing
TODAY

Welcome and Introductions
- Welcome and Brief Introductions
- Review Meeting Objectives

Regional Context + Models to Consider
- Countywide and Ketchum Data
- Community Survey Analysis
- Partnership Framework from other resort towns

Around-the-Table Discussion
- Discuss Issues, Solutions and Partnership Potential

What's Next
- Agreements
- Next meeting?
- Final Feedback
Countywide Conversation – Objectives

**Purpose:** Evaluate the potential benefits and structure of a collaborative countywide approach to housing.

**Meeting Objectives:**
Bring together representatives from a broad-based cross-section of Blaine County leaders to:

- Share sample housing data and survey analysis.
- Share examples of housing partnership framework models from other communities.
- Explore options for proceeding with the work together.
## Today’s Invited Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jim Foudy</td>
<td>Blaine County School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dick Fosbury</td>
<td>Blaine County, Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angenie McLeary</td>
<td>Blaine County, Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muffy Davis</td>
<td>Blaine County, Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandy Pomeroy</td>
<td>Blaine County, County Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathan Harvill</td>
<td>Blaine County Housing Authority, ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nate Hart</td>
<td>Blaine County Housing Authority, Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabina Gilbert</td>
<td>Blaine County Housing Authority, Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Michael</td>
<td>Blaine County Housing Authority, Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason Fredrickson</td>
<td>Blaine County Housing Authority, Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tara Bell</td>
<td>Blaine County Housing Authority, Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynne Barker</td>
<td>Blaine County, Sustainability Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn Goldman</td>
<td>City of Bellevue, Mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane Shay</td>
<td>City of Bellevue, City Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Mecham</td>
<td>City of Carey, Mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha Burke</td>
<td>City of Hailey, Mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather Dawson</td>
<td>City of Hailey, City Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil Bradshaw</td>
<td>City of Ketchum, Mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jade Riley</td>
<td>City of Ketchum, City Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carissa Connelly</td>
<td>City of Ketchum, Housing Strategist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Hendricks</td>
<td>City of Sun Valley, Mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walt Femling</td>
<td>City of Sun Valley, City Administrator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please briefly share your name and affiliation.

Thank you for being here.

Mayor Kathryn Goldman, City of Bellevue
Mayor Sarah Mecham, City of Carey
Mayor Martha Burke, City of Hailey
Mayor Peter Hendricks, City of Sun Valley
Mayor Neil Bradshaw, City of Ketchum
Commissioner Sarah Michael, Chair BCHA
Commissioner Angenie McLeary, Blaine County

HOUSING: What are you seeing and working on in your community?
METHODOLOGY
Local Knowledge and Context

WHAT WE HEARD
Interviews and Community Survey
- Raise awareness, give voice.
- Assess community-wide perceptions and sentiments.
- Gauge interest in potential solutions and action.

WHAT WE GATHERED
Data Collection and Analysis
- Provide an analysis framework for ongoing use.
- Answer key questions about current supply/demand.
- Ground truth local experience with data.
Stakeholder Interviews

**Interviewees**

- More than 30 individuals
- Including, but not limited to:
  - Community advocates
  - Developers
  - Nonprofits
  - Community residents
  - Employers

**Key Response Themes**

- Housing Needs & Transparency
- Intentional Housing Framework
- Community "Fortitude"
Community Survey (open Nov 15, 2021-Jan 3, 2022)

Survey Publicity
- Channels
  - Direct email contact
  - Earned media
  - Online media
  - Spanish translation
  - Paper distribution and flyers
  - Partner amplification
- Response Goal = 500
  - 1,117 total received

Who Did We Hear From?
- All locations represented
- 95% of respondents live and work in the Wood River Valley
- Homeowners and renters represented in proportion
- Robust spectrum of income levels

https://www.ketchumidaho.org/administration/project/housing-matters

Targeted outreach occurred to:
- Non-white populations
- Younger populations, particularly younger members of the workforce (18-24)
- Older populations (65+)
Who We Heard From...

Survey responses were collected from a diverse population representing:

- Residents of Ketchum (43%), Hailey (29%), Sun Valley (7%), Bellevue (7%), Carey (2%), unincorporated Blaine County (8%) and other locations.
- A regional workforce - Ketchum (52%), Hailey (25%), Sun Valley (4%) Bellevue (4%).
- Homeowners (63%), Renters (28%) and individuals with other housing situations (9%).
- 1% of respondents indicated they were currently experiencing homelessness.
- 8.5% of respondents identified as Hispanic or Latino.
- A range of household incomes from under $15,000 to over $1,000,000.
- Average household size of 2.5 individuals.
Housing Analysis

Method

• Standard data sources such as U.S. Census, American Community Survey (ACS), HUD
• Shared local data and reports
• Worked to synthesize, pare down and focus in

Purpose

• Center the key trends likely influencing Ketchum’s housing crisis.
• Cross-walk with anecdotal information, local knowledge and narratives.

Honoring local and historical data

• Visit Sun Valley
• Blaine County Housing Authority
• Sun Valley Realtors
• Previous City Needs Assessments

• Sun Valley Company
• Sun Valley Economic Development
• ARCH Community Housing Trust
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- Key trends in Ketchum
- Countywide trends
- Estimated demand by 2030
**Topline summary:** Ketchum has an increasingly challenging housing environment for local, year-round residents, especially those earning 120% or below of the area’s median income (AMI). The lack of supply is translating into Ketchum losing its local workforce and limiting housing opportunity for people at differing stages of life. The underlying fundamentals follow a consistent and worsening trend over at least the past two decades:

1. Long-term rentals have decreased in Ketchum,
2. Affordability for renting or owning has not improved,
3. Residential development (non-seasonal/non-luxury) has slowed,
4. Seasonal and short-term rentals have increased,
5. Housing costs (construction and rent/own) have increased,
6. Land available for development is constrained,
7. Local residents are experiencing literal homelessness.

**“Pandemic Acceleration:”** The past 2 years has seen a severe acceleration of these trends (except short-term rentals), along with a substantial increase in year-round population.

**Take-away:** Housing strategy and actions should focus on addressing each key trend.
Topline summary: A high-level scan indicates that Blaine County and the cities within it are all experiencing concerning trends and reaching a “housing tipping point.”

- Demand is increasingly outpacing supply.
- Household incomes and housing costs are not aligned.

Blaine County and its cities are experiencing trends and challenges like those experienced by Ketchum (see summary of trends on previous slide). The underlying fundamentals match Ketchum’s and follow a consistent trend over at least the past 10 years.

These challenges may currently be less pronounced for some communities, as there is some variation among municipalities within the County.

A fuller examination of countywide and municipal housing and population data, as well as sharing development cost and land analysis data may reveal important nuances and is an important step to inform a more effective and collaborative countywide housing strategy.
Why It Matters

“Is there anything we can do to learn more about and potentially influence these trends?”
### Housing Model Projection – Ketchum 2030

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HISTORIC GROWTH (1% per year)</th>
<th>HIGH GROWTH (3% average)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Households</strong> in need of stabilization/at-risk</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(includes cost burdened, people experiencing homelessness, substandard housing, overcrowding)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total New Households</strong> by 2030 (population growth)</td>
<td>+224</td>
<td>+546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Households</strong> Units by 2030 Can include:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Convert existing units to affordable rents</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rent assistance and stabilization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units needed per year to keep pace with growth and address at-risk populations</td>
<td>66 units/year</td>
<td>98 units/year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Initial Housing Model Projection – Blaine County 2030

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Households in need of stabilization/at-risk</th>
<th>HISTORIC GROWTH (1% per year)</th>
<th>HIGH GROWTH (3% average)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Includes:</td>
<td>3,041</td>
<td>3,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• cost burdened households</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• people experiencing homelessness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• people living in substandard housing,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• households with overcrowding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total New Households by 2030 (population growth)   | 1,675                        | 3,320                    |
| Total Households Units by 2030                     | 4,717                        | 6,361                    |
| Units can include:                                  |                              |                          |
| • Convert existing units to affordable rents        |                              |                          |
| • New construction                                 |                              |                          |
| • Rent assistance and stabilization                 |                              |                          |

Units needed per year to keep pace with growth and address at-risk populations: 471 units/year, 636 units/year

DATA REVIEW DETAILS
A closer look: LTR and Seasonal/STR dynamics

Take a closer look at a few trends…

• **Long-term rentals have decreased in Ketchum and in Blaine County.**
• Affordability for renting or owning has not improved.
• Residential development has slowed.
• **Seasonal and short-term rentals have increased.**

“**Pandemic Acceleration:**” The past 2 years has seen a severe acceleration of these trends (except short-term rentals), along with a substantial increase in year-round population.
In the last decade alone...

- **Seasonal/Short-term Rental Units**: Seasonal and short-term units represent between 50%-70% of total Ketchum housing supply. The proportion of STRs has been steadily increasing.

- **Long-term Rental Units**: About 335 long-term rental units have been “lost” in Ketchum since 2010, with a significant proportion likely converted to seasonal or short-term use.
In the last decade alone...

- **Seasonal/Short-term Rental Units**: Seasonal and short-term units represent between 30%-41% of total Blaine County supply. The proportion of STRs has been steadily increasing at a similar rate to Ketchum.

- **Long-term Rental Units**: About 500 long-term rental units have been “lost” in Blaine County since 2010, with a significant proportion likely converted to seasonal or short-term use.
In the last decade alone...

- **Seasonal/Short-term Rental Units**: Seasonal and short-term units represent between 26%-35% of total Blaine County supply if you exclude the Ketchum Market.

- **Long-term Rental Units**: About 150 long-term rental units have been “lost” in Blaine County (outside of Ketchum) since 2010, with a significant proportion likely converted to seasonal or short-term use.
Short-Term Rental Snapshot

- 37% of STR units are listed “full-time.” (“full-time” = available at least 180 days/year)
- Currently, at least 1,036 STRs operating. (This is 28% of the housing market today.)

Survey Comment: “I do not believe there is a direct correlation between the lack of housing and the STR's in our community.”

STR Management

- 70% Owner Managed
- 30% Professionally Managed

# of Active Listings in Ketchum/Sun Valley

Source: Visit Sun Valley Transient Inventory Study, May 2021 and AirDNA.co
Data combines Ketchum and Sun Valley.
Long-Term Housing Occupancy/Vacancy Trends

**Figure 1:** Housing occupancy and vacancy characteristics, and total population, in Ketchum from 1970 – 2015 (U.S. Decennial Census, 1970 – 2010; American Community Survey 2015 5-Year Estimates). *Housing vacancy characteristics are not available pre-1990. **Percent's may not add up to 100 due to rounding.*

Over the past decade the population in Ketchum has steadily increased with a spike in 2020. During that time, units used for short-term purposes has increased by 49%.

The portion of renter-occupied housing units has steadily decreased while rental costs have increased, indicating a tight rental market.

Housing and Population Trends – Blaine County

Population is increasing…

…while the number of housing units is relatively flat.

Over the past decade Blaine County population has gradually increased by about 14%. During this same time units used for short-term purposes has increased by 42%

The number of long-term renter-occupied housing units has decreased by about 17% while rental costs have increased.

Housing and Population Trends – Blaine County (excluding Ketchum)

Population is increasing…

…while the number of housing units is relatively flat.

Over the past decade Blaine County population has gradually increased by about 11%. During this same time units used for short-term purposes has increased by 37%.

The number of long-term renter-occupied housing units has decreased by about 7% while rental costs have increased.

A closer look: Affording Housing

Take a closer look at a few trends…

• Long-term rentals have decreased in Ketchum.
• **Affordability for renting or owning has not improved.**
• Residential development has slowed.
• Seasonal and short-term rentals have increased.

“**Pandemic Acceleration:**” The past 2 years has seen a severe acceleration of these trends (except short-term rentals), along with a substantial increase in year-round population.
Ketchum’s tourist economy supported by lowest income earners

- Recreation, services, accommodation and retail are lowest-earning industries
- Education, healthcare & social assistance earn low- and middle-income wages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Hourly wage</th>
<th>Annual Earnings</th>
<th>Household #</th>
<th>Household %</th>
<th>Affordable rent</th>
<th>Industry by median earnings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low-Income &gt; 50% AMI</td>
<td>$15.12</td>
<td>$30,246</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>$756</td>
<td>Recreation, *healthcare support, *food prep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Income (traditional LIHTC) 50% to 60% AMI</td>
<td>$18.15</td>
<td>$36,295</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>$907</td>
<td>Retail, accommodation, food services, administrative &amp; support, **educational support and teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Income (LIHTC + HUD) 60% to 80% AMI</td>
<td>$24.20</td>
<td>$48,393</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>$1,210</td>
<td>Construction, **educational support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Income 80 to 120% AMI</td>
<td>$36.29</td>
<td>$72,589</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>$1,815</td>
<td>Educational services, healthcare, social assistance, professional, scientific, management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


* [https://livingwage.mit.edu/counties/16013](https://livingwage.mit.edu/counties/16013)


Interview Comment: “People say they are for affordable housing, ‘But it needs to be someplace else.’ Attitudes need to change about who actually lives in affordable housing.”
Ketchum’s tourist economy supported by lowest income earners

American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, 2019 for Ketchum, Idaho. Industry by median earnings, past 12 months for full-time, year-round civilian employed population.
* https://livingwage.mit.edu/counties/16013
The Cost of Housing

**Rent**
Median Rent Price: $2,575/mo
Income Needed to Afford Avg Rent: $8,585/mo
*Source: Blaine County Housing Authority*

**Survey Says...**
Most (65%) respondents pay more than the affordable rate at an average wage.
(Average monthly housing cost for individuals in this group is $2,306.)

**Home Price**
Median Blaine County Home Sale Price in 2020: $660K *(38% increase from 2019)*
Number Blaine County of Home Sales in 2020: 796 *(23% increase from 2019)*
*Source: Sun Valley Board of Realtors*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Ketchum</strong></th>
<th><strong>Blaine County</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost burdened households = about 40%</td>
<td>Cost burdened households = about 33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since 2010, the # lower-earning households of $75,000 or less, annually jumped from 57% to 60%</td>
<td>Since 2010, the # lower-earning households of $75,000 or less, annually jumped from 60% to 63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$800-$1,800 = affordable range of housing costs for households 120% AMI and below.</td>
<td>$700-$1,700 = affordable range of housing costs for households 120% AMI and below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Size for renters increased from 1.74 to 2.92 between 2010-2019.</td>
<td>Average Household Size for renters increased from 2.31 to 3.01 between 2010-2019.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(cost burdened = paying more than 30% of household income for housing costs – this is consistent over the past decade and is true for both homeowners and renters)

*Source: U.S. Census and HUD Data Exchange*
Affording housing is increasingly challenging.

Of survey respondents, 47% of renters were satisfied with their housing arrangements compared to 87% of homeowners.

(24% of non-white and Hispanic respondents indicated living with a roommate. Cost was the most cited reason for having roommates (76%) followed by a lack of availability of units within budgets (50%).

Survey Comment:
“Things are fundamentally broken when licensed professionals and nurses live in cars.”
Renters are especially cost-burdened

- More than 40% of all survey respondents reported being “cost burdened.”
- Renters report at significantly higher rates than homeowners.
- The rent-burdened trend worsens for Ketchum residents and workers.

**Percent of Monthly Income Spent on Housing**

```
Homeowners  Renters
---  ---
0 to 10%  19.4%  2.5%
11-20%  21.7%  10.6%
21-30%  30.0%  27.0%
31-50%  23.4%  42.9%
Greater than 50%  5.4%  17.0%
```

“cost burdened” = paying more than 30% of household income towards housing costs.
Ketchum’s owner-occupied housing values are skewing higher

- Indicates likelihood of decreased ability for lower income households to become local homeowners, or to “upsize” their housing as families grow.
- Can contribute to higher degree of cost-burdened homeowners.

**Survey Comment:**
“Family is outgrowing the house and although we could easily sell, there is no where to buy!”

**Value of Owner-Occupied Housing, 2000-2019**

- Indicates likelihood of decreased ability for lower income households to become local homeowners, or to “upsize” their housing as families grow.
- Can contribute to higher degree of cost-burdened homeowners.
Owner-occupied housing values in Blaine County are skewing higher but are more stable than Ketchum.

Value of Owner Occupied Housing 2010-2019

- $300K+
- $500K to $999,999
- $50K to $99,999
- Less than $50,000

These categories show the percentage distribution of housing values from 2000 to 2019, with notable increases in higher value brackets.
Owner-occupied housing values in Blaine County are skewing higher but are more stable than Ketchum.
A closer look: Housing Development

Take a closer look at a few trends…

• Long-term rentals have decreased in Ketchum and Blaine County.
• Affordability for renting or owning has not improved.
• **Residential development has slowed.**
• Seasonal and short-term rentals have increased.

“**Pandemic Acceleration:**” The past 2 years has seen a severe acceleration of these trends (except short-term rentals), along with a substantial increase in year-round population. This trends is less pronounced in Blaine County.

**Survey Comment:** “Without affordable housing, the WRV will no longer be able to attract new homeowners of any kind without restaurants, stores and services.”
Residential construction has slowed

Nearly half of the existing housing stock in Ketchum was built between 1970 and 1989.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau: American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates (2013-2019), cross-referenced with City of Ketchum building permit data
Ketchum’s population increased by almost 25% between 2019 and 2020. (About 700 people were added – in comparison, Blaine County’s population grew by 5% or 2.7% excluding Ketchum’s population)

This “pop” caused a vacancy decrease

2020 Effect: the housing supply did not increase, but the vacancy decreased.

In one year, Ketchum filled 785 vacant units – occupied units jumped from about 1,100 to almost 1,900.

In one year, Blaine County filled 2,236 vacant units – occupied units jumped from about 8,000 to over 10,000.

2020 Effect: the housing supply did not greatly increase, but the vacancy decreased.
Blaine County Vacancy Changes – Excluding Ketchum

2020 Effect: the housing supply did not greatly increase, but the vacancy decreased.

In one year, Blaine County filled 1,451 vacant units – occupied units jumped from about 8,000 to over 10,000.

Regional Context Questions?

• Observations or questions about the analysis?
• What additional analysis would you suggest?
Regional Partnership Frameworks to Consider
Regional Housing Partnership Framework Steps

Collective Action for Housing Solutions

1. COMMON DATA
   Define the problem. Use the same data set/analysis Countywide.

2. COMMITTED COORDINATION
   Agree to work together. Determine structures for ongoing coordination. Each partner commits resources.

3. COMMON GOALS
   Supported by localized tactics.
Inspiration from Other Places

What other resort communities are tying housing needs with community strategies to catalyze regional action?

Examples:
- Mountain Housing Council (North Tahoe), CA
- Big Sky, MT
- South Shore (Tahoe), CA

Also:
- Teton Counties (ID, WY)/Jackson
- Bozeman
- Aspen/Pitkin County
TAHOE TRUCKEE COMMUNITY FOUNDATION

MOUNTAIN HOUSING COUNCIL OF TAHOE TRUCKEE
1 Community
1 Town
3 Counties
Community Partners

Placer County
Squaw Valley | Alpine Meadows
Squaw Valley Public Service District
Tahoe City Public Utilities District
Tahoe Donner Association
Tahoe Forest Hospital District
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Tahoe Truckee Unified School District
Town of Truckee
Truckee Donner Public Utilities District
Truckee Tahoe Airport District
Vail Resorts/Northstar California

Community Collaborative of Truckee Tahoe
Contractors Association of Truckee Tahoe
Family Resource Center of Truckee
Martis Fund
Mountain Area Preservation
North Lake Tahoe Resort Association
North Lake Tahoe Public Utility District
North Tahoe Family Resource Center
Sierra Business Council
Sugar Bowl Resort
Tahoe Prosperity Center
Tahoe Sierra Board of Realtors
Tahoe Truckee Community Foundation
Truckee Chamber of Commerce
Truckee Downtown Merchants Association
Truckee North Tahoe Transportation Management Association

29 Partners
Working Together!
Regional Housing
Needs + Solutions
Our Collective Goal: Achievable Local Housing

Achievable Local Housing Bridge
Funding + Types of Housing at Various Income Levels

- **Moderate to Middle Incomes**
  - **Very Limited State & Federal Funds**
    - **Housing Types**
    - Rentals
    - For Sale
    - First Time Buyers
    - Accessory Dwelling Units

- **Upper-Middle Incomes**
  - **No State & Federal Funds**
    - **Housing Types**
    - For Sale
    - Rentals
    - Accessory Dwelling Units

- **Affordable / Low Incomes**
  - **Eligible for State & Federal Funds**
    - **Housing Types**
    - Shelters
    - Rentals

- **80% AMI**
- **120% AMI**
- **195% AMI**
Communicating Collective Results

- 339 homes built
- Attracted $46M in capital/$20M local bond measure passed by 84%
- Local employers created 82 units
- Another 363 homes in the works
- 5 Policy Papers created
- 10 State Housing Policies Advocated For
Roles Clarified

Housing Delivery Roles
Working in Concert to Accelerate Solutions to Achievable Local Housing

Local Government
- Land Use: Zoning, Codes, Permits
- Compliance: STRs, Deed Restrictions
- Collect Taxes
- Distribute Funds

Developers
- Financial Package
- Land Owners
- Building
- Entitlements

Mountain Housing Council
- ID Needs
- Regional Collaboration
- Policy and Research
- Education
- Funding
- State Advocacy
- Attract Capital
- Public Process

Community and Neighbors
- Engagement in Local Land Use and Projects
- Tax Payers
- Voters
- Nonprofits: Programs, Advocacy

Grassroots Advocacy Group
- Advocate for Local Projects and Policy
- Mobilize Local Community
- Who: TBD

Special Districts
- Service Providers
- Land Owners
- Fee Chargers

Employers
- Jobs
- Employee Housing Programs
- Generate Sales and TOT Taxes
Policies & Process
Private Investors
Employers
State Advocacy
Land
Local Funding

Actions Prioritized
Employer Housing Solutions

Employee Housing

JPA (joint powers agreement)

Details

- Work together to create solutions for employees through master-leasing
- Targets not yet set
Housing for Homeless

Supportive Housing Project

Details
- To create a supportive housing project in Truckee
- Funding through Nevada County
- 6 units for chronically homeless individuals
Down Payment Assistance Program

Details

- $1.3M in assistance since 2016
- 33 families served
Project Level Collaborations

Dollar Creek Development Project

- Secured $2.6M for land / ALH
- $550k from TTAD for purchase
- Hired developer
- Engaged in public process

Details
Soft-Financing Efforts

Soft Financing for Artists Lofts Project

Details
- 76 units
- $3.8M leveraged for $12M+ in funding
Value of Mountain Housing Council
PURPOSE:
That those who live and/or work in Bozeman can afford to purchase or rent. This includes apartments, townhomes, condominiums, emergency shelters, accessory dwelling units, mobile homes and single-family homes—all dwelling types—serving the entire spectrum of housing needs.
Bozeman Housing Action Plan Summary
Bozeman Partnership Framework
South Shore Region Local Resident Housing Action Plan

Purpose:
Dwellings of all types that those who live and/or work in the South Shore Region can afford to purchase or rent, serving the entire range of household incomes.
South Shore (Tahoe)

3,290 Homes Needed by 2026

*Income source: 2019, California REBound calculated income levels for 2-person households for El Dorado County.
Action Plan Strategies

**Funding**
- Paying for it
  - Taxes Dedicated to Housing
  - State/Federal Grants/Loans
  - Private Donations/Grants

**Incentives**
- Helping it happen
  - Incentivize Housing Using State Codes as a Model:
    - Density bonus, Parking reductions, Streamlining, Accessory dwelling units
  - Defer/Waive Fees to Build
  - Reduce Regulatory Barriers:
    - Simplify development codes
    - Redevelopment planning/assistance
    - Welcome mat initiative to help developers

**Partnerships**
- Working together
  - Build Homes on Public/Institutional Land
    (3 developments in process)
  - Land Banking/Acquisitions
  - Employer Assisted Housing/Programs

**Programs**
- Getting people into homes
  - Homebuyer Assistance
  - Second home conversion to long-term rental
  - Inclusionary zoning
    - Residential/Commercial linkage

**InCREASE LOCAL RESIDENT HOUSING**

**Preservation**
- Keeping what we create
  - Permanent Deed restrictions
  - Community Land Trust
  - Improve Rental Conditions

**Regulations**
- Making it happen
### Action Plan Roles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy priority</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Douglas County</th>
<th>El Dorado County</th>
<th>TRPA</th>
<th>EDCF</th>
<th>Conservancy</th>
<th>SJCLT</th>
<th>TPC</th>
<th>TaHoCo</th>
<th>TTD</th>
<th>Tahoe Chamber</th>
<th>South Tahoe Chamber</th>
<th>Employers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development #1 - TTD/Pacific/City partnership*</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Home to Long-term rental*</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Donations/Grants*</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Land Trust*</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development #2 - City/SJCLT partnership*</td>
<td>L/S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentivize Housing Using State Codes as a Model*</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal and State Grants/Loans*</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L - State</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development #3 - Conservancy land*</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code Simplifications</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Deed Restriction/Guidelines*</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Banking/Acquisition*</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcome Mat Initiative*</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer Assisted Housing</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Rental Conditions</td>
<td>L - 1</td>
<td>L - 2</td>
<td>L - 2</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homebuyer Assistance*</td>
<td>L/S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee Waivers/Deferrals*</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redevelopment Assistance</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L - regs</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusionary Zoning</td>
<td>L - 1</td>
<td>L - 2</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential/Commercial Linkage</td>
<td>L - 1</td>
<td>L - 2</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes Dedicated for Housing</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:**
- **Lead:** Pull needed partners together to coordinate action
- **Support:** Analysis, coordination, expertise, advocacy
- **Convener:** May support through further analysis/discussion
- **Further Explore:** L-1 (Implement first); L-2 (Implement second)
Partnership Framework
Take-aways

• No one entity or organization can solve these big issues alone – the problem is simply too big.

• It seems to work.

• Creating connected networks creates more, not less.

• Results are better for our community.

• It makes hard work more sustainable and fun!
Ingredients for Successful Partnership Frameworks

- Willing partners
- Funding
- Agreements
- Leadership
- Time
- Neutral, trusted convener
- Paid staff/facilitator + project manager
- **One mission**
Building a Sustainable Housing Strategy

Housing Solutions

Communications + Outreach

Resources + $$

Org Capacity
Example “Swim lanes” for collaborators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOVERNMENT: CITIES and COUNTIES</th>
<th>HOUSING AUTHORITY</th>
<th>PRIVATE: PHILANTHROPY</th>
<th>PRIVATE: MARKET</th>
<th>EMPLOYERS</th>
<th>NONPROFITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


Example “Swim lanes” for collaborators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOVERNMENT: CITIES and COUNTIES</th>
<th>HOUSING AUTHORITY</th>
<th>PRIVATE: PHILANTHROPY</th>
<th>PRIVATE: MARKET</th>
<th>EMPLOYERS</th>
<th>NONPROFITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purchase and hold land</td>
<td>Purchase and hold land</td>
<td>Contribute private financing for housing development and programs</td>
<td>Contribute financing for housing development and programs</td>
<td>Provide employer-assisted housing programs, units</td>
<td>Provide supportive services and referrals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribute public financing for housing development and programs</td>
<td>Administer regional housing programs, rent assistance</td>
<td>Collect and share housing data</td>
<td>Raise awareness of needs and solutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administer local housing programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Raise awareness of needs and solutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raise awareness of needs and solutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Raise awareness of needs and solutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Housing development and financing
Q: Who is the community looking to?

A: All of us.

Respondents generally felt that a mix of public and private actors should work to address community housing.

Who should be primarily responsible for addressing community housing?

- City of Ketchum and other local municipalities: 72.8%
- Blaine County: 57.3%
- Major Employers: 54.5%
- Private developers: 52.4%
- Housing Authority: 39.3%
- State of Idaho: 18.9%
- Nonprofits: 10.2%

(Respondents were asked to select their top 3 responses.)
Regional Housing Partnership Framework Steps

1. **COMMON DATA**
   Define the problem. Use the same data set/analysis Countywide.

2. **COMMİTTED COORDINATION**
   Agree to work together. Determine structures for ongoing coordination. Each partner commits resources.

3. **COMMON GOALS**
   Supported by localized tactics.
Regional Housing Partnership Framework Steps

1. COMMON DATA
   Define the problem. Use the same data set/analysis Countywide.

2. COMMITTED COORDINATION
   Agree to work together. Determine structures for ongoing coordination. Each partner commits resources.

3. COMMON GOALS
   Supported by localized tactics.

Do you like this framework concept?

Would your organization be interested in putting resources (time and/or funding) into moving this forward?
Moving forward

Next Steps

1. Form Partnership Committee.
2. Partnership Committee develops charter (proposal for how to work together).
3. Meet about 3 times.
4. Share back recommendations with partners.

Key Questions

• Who else should we invite to the conversation?
• Who can convene and facilitate?
THANK YOU!

Questions? Follow-up?

Carissa Connelly
cconnelly@ketchumidaho.org

Ellen Campfield Nelson, AICP
ellen@agnewbeck.com

Seana Doherty
seana@agnewbeck.com