

# South Shore Region Local Resident Housing Action Plan

## Housing Needs and “Ideas”

November 12, 2019  
Open House Stations and Questions

Presented by (Consultant team):



**WILLIFORD, LLC**



Sponsored by:



**TAHOE PROSPERITY CENTER**

# 1. Housing Needs Information

# Housing Needs

Summary of Housing Needs	
<b>Catch-Up</b>	<b>2,085</b>
Overcrowded Households	165
In-commuters	1,245
Unfilled jobs	675
<b>Keep-Up</b>	<b>1,205</b>
Retiring employees	630
New jobs	575
<b>TOTAL through 2026</b>	<b>3,290</b>
Market rate (43%)	1,410
<b>Housing Gap (lower than market) (57%)</b>	<b>1,880</b>

Housing Needs by Own/Rent – 2026	
<b>Units needed through 2022</b>	<b>3,290</b>
Ownership (38%)	1,265
Rental (62%)	2,025

# Housing Needs

## Homeownership Units Needed

Household Income	Maximum affordable sale price	Ownership distribution
Under \$40,000	Under \$150,000	21%
\$40 to \$49,999	\$200,000	7%
\$50 to \$59,999	\$250,000	7%
\$60 to \$74,999	\$300,000	13%
\$75 to \$89,999	\$350,000	7%
\$90 to \$99,999	\$400,000	8%
\$100 to \$124,999	\$500,000	13%
\$125,000 or more	Over \$500,000	23%
TOTAL	1,265	100%

About 800 Units Priced UNDER Market

# Housing Needs

Rental Units Needed		
Household Income	Maximum affordable monthly rent	Renter distribution
Under \$20,000	Under \$500	8%
\$20 to \$39,999	\$1,000	26%
\$40 to \$49,999	\$1,250	13%
\$50 to \$59,999	\$1,500	8%
\$60 to \$74,999	\$1,875	17%
\$75 to \$99,999	\$2,500	13%
Over \$100,000	Over \$2,500	15%
TOTAL	2,025	100%



About 1,100 Units Priced UNDER Market

## 2. Action Plan Goals/Objectives Station

# Example Goals

	Adopted Plan(s)	Housing Goals and Objectives
Breckenridge, CO	Affordable Housing Action Plan 2008	<p>Provide a variety of housing options; sustain the local economy and preserve the character of the community.</p> <p><b>Build 900 workforce housing units in the Upper Blue by build out. House 47% of the employees</b> working in Town;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Maintain at least 25% of homes occupied</b> by primary residents;</li> <li>• Increase the homeownership rate of 41%</li> <li>• Provide housing for all income levels up to 180% AM</li> <li>• House employees who work in the Upper Blue</li> <li>• Share responsibility: private sector, Town, County, non-profits</li> </ul>
Mammoth Lakes, CA	Mammoth Lakes Community Housing Action Plan (2017) (plan accepted by Council)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Produce between 200 to 300 community housing units</b> over the next five years (completed or permitted).</li> <li>• Serve the full range of incomes in need. Currently, this means renter households earning below 80% AMI (about \$55,000 per year) and owner households earning below 150% AMI (about \$100,000 per year).</li> <li>• Ownership and rental housing should be provided based on need.</li> <li>• Jobs-Housing Relationship. Produce community housing at a rate that exceeds the number of units needed to accommodate new job growth – at least in the near term.</li> <li>• <b>Retain about 58% of employees</b> living in Mammoth Lakes (similar to present)</li> </ul>
Jackson, WY	Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan 2012 Housing Action Plan 2015 Housing Supply Plan FY16/17	<p>Ensure a variety of workforce housing opportunities - <b>at least 65% of those employed locally also live locally</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintain a diverse population</li> <li>• Strategically locate a variety of housing types</li> <li>• Reduce the shortage of housing that is affordable to the workforce</li> <li>• Use a balanced set of tools.</li> </ul>

# Build-Out (Tahoe Basin)

- The Tahoe Basin is 93% built-out based on total development potential established through 2032.
- A total of 3,826 residential allocations and bonus units remain to be distributed throughout the entire Tahoe Basin.

	Residential Units	% of Units
Total Development Potential	51,097	100%
Built or allocated	47,271	93%
Bonus units (unused)	1,452	3%
Remaining allocations (through 2032)	2,374	5%
TOTAL to be allocated	3,836	-

- The ability to convert development rights from commercial or tourism uses to residential uses adds flexibility to “find” more residential development potential in the Basin. For example, if all banked and pooled development rights (rights that have been issued, but are currently not utilized/built) in the City of South Lake Tahoe and the two counties were converted to multi-family residential units of use, this would result in another 2,380 allocations for multi-family homes.

## TRPA Conversion Exchange Rates

Existing Development Rights	Equivalent Development Rights			
	CFA	TAU	SF	MR
300 sq. ft. CFA	300 sq. ft.	1	1	3/2
1 TAU	300 sq. ft.	1	1	3/2
1 Single Family RUU	300 sq. ft.	1	1	3/2
1 Multi-Family RUU	200 sq. ft.	2/3	2/3	1



# Objectives

## - Income Targeting and Tenure -

### QUESTIONS:

1. *Should local resident housing be developed for the full range of incomes in need OR should priority be placed on building local resident housing for certain income groups over others?*
2. *How would you modify the “suggested objective”?*

**Suggested objective:** Facilitate the provision of local resident housing for the full range of incomes in need, but focus housing subsidies and assistance on homes for local residents that need to be priced below what the market can produce. Currently, this means renter households earning below 80% AMI (about \$50,000 per year) and owner households earning below 150% AMI (about \$100,000 per year).

### **Background:**

- As market housing prices increase, the income levels targeted by local resident housing efforts are increased to fill the gap
- Focusing on low-income housing primarily helps workers in tourism-related industries, which predominate in the community (over 50% of jobs).
- Serving a diversity of incomes allows income diversification to remain in the community – low-income (renters, entry-level workers) through middle- and upper-incomes (entry- or upper-ownership, management).

### **Input from Housing Tahoe Partnership Meeting (October 31, 2019):**

- Increase the diversity of the type of housing for local residents – not just single family homes and duplexes: co-living, micro units, ADU, townhome/condo, etc.
- Focus housing programs/subsidies on the 1,880 homes that are needed below market
- Support the community environment as well as the natural environment

# Objectives

## - Jobs:Housing Relationship-

**QUESTIONS:** *Should the objective be to:*

3. *Match the rate of growth in jobs by providing up to 575 units by 2026 (about 100 units/year – similar to the current rate of new development, except 57% of homes should be priced under market).*
4. *Occur at a slower pace meaning more in-commute in the future as growth continues, as employees retire, etc.*
5. *Occur faster than job growth (build more than 575 units), addressing some of existing (catch-up) housing deficiency, accounting for retiring employees, etc.*

**Suggested objective:** Provide local resident housing at a rate that exceeds the number of units needed to accommodate new job growth – at least in the near term. This will help address the current housing shortage and provide opportunities for in-commuters who want to move to the South Shore Region.

**Background:**

Jobs/Housing relationship is often a primary housing goal/objective:

- Breckenridge, CO: house 47% of workforce in town.
- Jackson, WY: house 65% of workforce in town.
- Mammoth Lakes, CA: retain at least 58% of the workforce in town.

South Shore Region:	Considerations:
26,880 jobs; 17,920 employees	In-commuters are working in the area and finding homes outside of the South Shore Region
575 units needed to keep up with new jobs by 2026; another 630 units due to retiring employees by 2026	In-commuting increases public service/parking expenditures in the community; VMT; environmental impacts
About 25% to 30% of employees commute in (4,500 to 5,500 workers);	In-commuting adds to housing costs; loss of employees (take jobs near home)
40% of in-commuters would prefer to live in the South Shore	60% of in-commuters prefer to live outside of the Region

## - Build-Out Considerations -

### QUESTIONS:

6. *Can/will affordable housing development occur to the extent it is needed without setting buildout targets?*
7. *What is a realistic target for allocating new and existing/unused/underutilized allocations? Is local resident occupancy the right focus?*
8. *What role does redevelopment/repurposing of existing properties need to play in “finding” local resident homes?*

**Suggested objective:** Incorporate local resident housing as a necessary component of build-out in the South Shore. At least 46% of housing units in the South Shore Region should be occupied by year-round residents upon reaching buildout in 2032 to support local employers and preserve the community environment.

### Background:

Other community examples:

- Breckenridge set a numerical target: Build **900 workforce housing units** in the Upper Blue by build out.
- Crested Butte set a percentage target: Ensure that **25% of the housing inventory** is deed restricted for locals.

### Considerations:

- The entire Tahoe Basin is about 93% built-out. (see data to the left)
- The South Shore Region has been losing year-round resident households.
- Homes are also no longer predominately occupied by a full-time resident.

	2000	2010	2017
Primary (resident)	61% (16,660)	54% (15,520)	46% (14,790)
Second Home/vacant	39%	46%	54%

# **Additional Questions:**

- Are there other goals that are important: Write your own:

Please complete these sentences:

- This Housing Action Plan will be a success if.....
- This Housing Action Plan will be a disappointment if....

### 3. Regulations and Incentives Station

*How do we make local resident housing happen?  
&  
How do we make local resident housing easier?*

## INCENTIVES – How do we make local resident housing easier?

Tools	Definition	Ownership or Rental	Income*	Examples
Density Bonus	Providing additional density or FAR in exchange for local resident housing. Must be large enough to entice development yet small enough for livability and compatibility.	Both	Low-Middle	Crested Butte, CO Frisco, CO Whitefish, MT
Fee Waivers	Water/sewer tap fees, building permit or other fees waived in part or whole to reduce cost to build affordable housing. General funds or other source need to cover cost of fees waived.	Both	Low-Middle	Breckenridge, CO Crested Butte, CO Truckee, CA
Fast Track Processing	Gives priority to development applications w/ affordable housing.	Both	Low-Middle	Truckee, CA Longmont, CO
Accessory Dwellings	Allowing/encouraging accessory units if used to house local employees. Appropriate in many neighborhoods yet compliance monitoring is needed.	Rental	Low-Moderate	Crested Butte, CO Telluride, CO Truckee, CA
Removal of Regulatory Barriers	Updating/modifying code provisions and procedures that impede affordable housing development. Complex PUD requirements can be barriers to local resident housing. Complete code review and rewrite might be required.	Both	Low-Middle	Mammoth Lakes, CA Buena Vista, CO

\*Typical income served, though some tools vary – Low: <80% AMI; Middle: 80% - 120% AMI; Moderate: 120% - 150% AMI; Upper: above 150% AMI

## INCENTIVES – How do we make local resident housing easier?

Tools	Definition	Ownership or Rental	Income*	Examples
<b>Flexible Development Standards</b>	Reductions in parking, setbacks, open space, height limits, road widths, etc. Quality, compatibility, safety and neighborhood impacts are concerns.	Both	Low-Middle	Breckenridge, CO
<b>Zoning for Affordability</b>	Small lots for modest/tiny homes, complete neighborhoods, live/work, multi-family allowed in commercial/mixed-use zones, by-right affordable housing in all or most zones.	Both	Low-Middle	Breckenridge, CO Crested Butte, CO Jackson, WY Telluride, CO
<b>Short-term rental (STR) Restrictions</b>	Prohibitions in zones where residents and employees reside, limiting the number in defined areas, requirements that units be occupied as primary residences part time, prohibiting STR of deed restricted housing.	Both	Low-Middle	Mammoth Lakes, CA Breckenridge, CO Crested Butte, CO Durango, CO
<b>Development Rights/Transfer of Development Rights</b>	Incentivizing local resident housing production by ensuring development rights available for deed restricted housing. May include free development rights, exempting deed restricted homes from the development cap, allowing more than one deed restricted home to be built per development right, etc.	Both	Low-Moderate	Petaluma, CA Breckenridge, CO Pitkin County, CO

\*Typical income served, though some tools vary – Low: <80% AMI; Middle: 80% - 120% AMI; Moderate: 120% - 150% AMI; Upper: above 150% AMI

## REQUIREMENTS – How do we make local resident housing happen?

Tools	Definition	Ownership or Rental	Income*	Examples
<b>Inclusionary Zoning (IZ)</b>	A percentage of residential units in new subdivisions/PUD's are local resident housing. Market homes support community units. Only effective if new subdivisions/PUD's are developed.	Both Ownership more common	Low-Middle	Truckee, CA Eagle Co, CO San Miguel Co, CO
<b>Residential Linkage (Also called Impact Fee)</b>	Requiring new homes to contribute to housing for employees relative to demand generated by residential units. Mitigation rate often increases with house size. Fees in lieu provides revenue stream that fluctuates with building activity. Nexus required.	Either Rental more common	Low	Aspen, CO Mt. Crested Butte Crested Butte, CO Telluride, CO Jackson, WY
<b>Commercial Linkage</b>	Requiring new commercial development to provide housing for a portion of employees generated. Nexus required. Alternatives in application and compliance methods (on site, off site, land, fees in lieu) create flexibility yet complexity.	Both	Low - Moderate	Truckee, CA Mt. Crested Butte Crested Butte, CO Telluride, CO
<b>Annexation Policies</b>	Negotiating affordable housing as part of annexation agreements. Policy based. Municipalities have discretion in negotiations.	Both	Low - Middle	Breckenridge, CO Crested Butte, CO

\*Typical income served, though some tools vary – Low: <80% AMI; Middle: 80% - 120% AMI; Moderate: 120% - 150% AMI; Upper: above 150% AMI



# Station Questions:

- Which options provided (if any) will work best in the South Shore Region?
- What is missing – what additional ideas do you have to improve the provision of local resident housing?
- What is the greatest challenge moving forward? How can it be overcome?

## 4. Preservation and Programs Station

*How do we keep what we create?  
&  
How do we get people into homes?*

## HOUSING PROGRAMS – How do we get people into homes?

Tools	Definition	Ownership or Rental	Income*	Examples
Public Sector Development	Initiating, designing, financing and constructing homes by municipalities, counties and/or housing authorities.	Both	Low - Moderate	Breckenridge, CO Crested Butte, CO Telluride, CO
Home Buyer Assistance	Down payments or second mortgages for purchasing units. Can be used for deed restricted or market units. Federal and state funds typically limited to 120% AMI max; private financing can serve higher-income households.	Ownership	Low - Middle	Mammoth Lakes, CA Whitefish, MT Truckee, CA
Land Banking	Acquiring land through purchase or USFS trades for eventual housing development when specific project not known.	Both	Low - Moderate	Summit Co, CO Vail, CO
Habitat for Humanity	International organization with local chapters that use volunteers and donations to build modest homes. Affordability may not be permanent.	Ownership	Low	Crested Butte, CO Jackson, WY Whitefish, MT
Self Help Build	Home-buyers receive low interest loans and technical assistance for their construction of homes. Requires large time commitment.	Ownership	Low	Crested Butte, CO Jackson, WY Whitefish, MT
Co-op or Co-Housing	Common ownership and management of purpose-built communities. Co-op ownership can be used to share large homes by multiple employees. Co-op can be a method to preserve mobile home parks by placing them in occupant ownership.	Ownership	Middle-Moderate	Boulder, CO
Community Land Trusts	Community nonprofit owns land, develops housing and provides long-term oversight for permanent affordability through leases.	Ownership	Low-Moderate	NW MT Community Land Trust
Senior Housing	High density, smaller, low maintenance units designed for retiring employees. Could free up housing for employees if strategy prevents purchase by second-home buyers or STR conversion.	Rental Ownership Possible	Low	Truckee, CA Whitefish, MT

\*Typical income served, though some tools vary – Low: <80% AMI; Middle: 80% - 120% AMI; Moderate: 120% - 150% AMI; Upper: above 150% AMI

## PRESERVATION/REHABILITATION – How do we keep what we create?

Tools	Definition	Ownership or Rental	Income*	Examples
<b>Housing Rehabilitation and Weatherization</b>	Repairing, updating, enlarging, improving energy efficiency, and providing handicapped accessibility, typically with Federal or State grants. Staff/time intensive.	Ownership Rental possible	Low	Crested Butte, CO Whitefish, MT
<b>STR Conversion</b>	Providing rent guarantees and property management in exchange for renting units long term that were vacant or rented short term.	Rental	Middle-Moderate	Summit Co, CO
<b>Acquisition of Market Units</b>	Usually involves buying down units with public funds. Deed restrictions imposed for permanent affordability. Inability to obtain condo mortgages can result in units being rented.	Both	Middle-Moderate	Breckenridge, CO Telluride, CO Whitefish, MT Vail, CO
<b>No-Net Loss Policy</b>	Requiring replacement of housing occupied by the workforce and residents when redevelopment occurs. Similarly-priced units should be replaced on site or another site, or a fee-in-lieu of replacement could be allowed.	Both rental more common	Low-Moderate	Basalt, CO
<b>Condominium Conversion Policy</b>	Limiting or prohibiting conversion of apartments to condominiums to retain rental housing. May require some portion of converted units to be deed restricted affordable or provide first right of refusal of sales to apartment occupants, among other conditions.	Ownership	Low-Moderate	Mammoth Lakes, CA Jackson, WY Truckee, CA
<b>Mobile Home Rent Stabilization</b>	Ordinances that limit the frequency and amount of lot rent increases that may occur in mobile home parks – typically limited to once per year with the increase frequently linked to the Consumer Price Index. Rent refers to the amount charged a mobile home owner to lease lot space in a mobile home park on which their home is located. See California Civil Code §798.17	Both (can be owned homes on rented lots)	Low - Moderate	San Jose, CA Fremont, CA (100 jurisdictions in California have such ordinances)

\*Typical income served, though some tools vary – Low: <80% AMI; Middle: 80% - 120% AMI; Moderate: 120% - 150% AMI; Upper: above 150% AMI

# Preservation Data

## Condition of homes:

- About one-third of renters are dissatisfied with the condition of their unit and 20% reside in units with deferred maintenance.

Comments: 2019 Household and Employee Survey

*“House is old and run down but that’s why the rent is low. If it was nice and fixed up the rent would double and I wouldn’t be able to afford it.”*

*“Houses are too expensive for the poor condition they are in.”*

*“It's a rental. I can't afford to own a home in town and rentals come with the constant fear of being kicked out and poor maintenance.”*

*“Mice.”*

***“If your homes needs repairs, why have repairs not been made?”***

	South Shore Owners	South Shore Renters
Cost of repair - too expensive	71%	31%
Do not want to spend more money on the home	15%	19%
Landlord not taking responsibility	0%	58%
Other	24%	24%

# Preservation Data

## Rentals:

- Over the past five years, 15% of resident renters (about 970 renter households) were forced to move because the owner sold the rental.
- About 10% of renters (625 total) were forced to move over the past five years because their unit was converted to a short-term rental.

## Redevelopment (recent):

- Removal of the 155-unit Tahoe Shores mobile home park that was fully vacated in 2015. As required mitigation, the developer purchased and deed-restricted existing apartments (54 units). No new homes were built to replace those lost.

## Condemnation:

- One condemnation displaced six families last December;

# Programs Data

***“Which of the following types of help with housing would you consider for you and your household?”***

**Use a scale of 1 =Would not consider to 5=Would definitely consider**

South Shore Households	Own	Rent
Down payment assistance	2.8	4.2
Low interest loan to improve current home	3.3	3.7
A home you could own, built with sweat equity	2.9	3.7
Rent Assistance	2.0	4.1
Buying a deed-restricted home (a home priced affordable for your household with appreciation limits of 3 to 5% per year)	2.3	3.6

Source: 2019 Household and Employee survey

# Station Questions:

- Which options provided (if any) will work best in the South Shore Region?
- What is missing – what additional ideas do you have to improve the provision of local resident housing?
- What is the greatest challenge moving forward? How can it be overcome?



## 5. Funding Station

*How do we pay for it?*

FUNDING – How do we pay for it?				
Tools	Definition	Ownership or Rental	Income*	Examples
<b>General Funds</b>	An annual or occasional budget allocation to support local resident housing needs, such as staffing, pre-development and gap financing.	Both	Varies	Mammoth Lakes, CA Breckenridge, CO Crested Butte, CO Truckee, CA
<b>Impact Fees</b>	A fee directly linked to the need for housing generated by new development through jobs created. Nexus required. Fees imposed on a per-unit, as opposed to per square foot, basis is a disincentive to smaller unit development.	Both	Low – Middle	Mammoth Lakes, CA Gunnison Co, CO Summit Co, CO
<b>Taxes dedicated for housing</b>	Sales, property, lodging, real estate transfer, excise tax. Voter approval required in most states. Revenue stream can be used for most housing-related activities. Recent ballot initiatives have had mixed results. Approval requires extensive public education.	Both Can respond to changing needs	Varies	Aspen, CO Breckenridge, CO Jackson, CO Telluride, CO
<b>LIHTC (Low Income Housing Tax Credits)</b>	Provides project equity for public, non-profit and private developers. Market for credits uncertain with reduction in corporate tax rate. Widely used in mountain towns. Often done through public/private partnerships. Multifamily sites needed.	Rental	Low	Mammoth Lakes, CA Breckenridge, CO Crested Butte, CO Vail, CO
<b>Tax Increment Financing (TIF)</b>  <b>California: Enhanced Infrastructure Financing Districts (EIFD)</b>	Allocation of new property and/or sales tax in defined districts.  California allows cities, counties, and special districts to form Enhanced Infrastructure Finance Districts (EIFDs) and issue TIF bonds with 55% voter approval. The acquisition, construction, or rehabilitation of housing for persons of low and moderate income is a specified use of EIFD.	Both	Varies	Portland, OR Denver, CO  West Sacramento, Sacramento, CA
<b>Debt Financing with Favorable Terms</b>	Low interest loans, tax exempt bonds, certificates of participation and other forms of development financing available to housing authorities, cities, counties and some non profits.	Both Mostly rental	Varies	Breckenridge, CO Telluride, CO Eagle County, CO

\*Typical income served, though some tools vary – Low: <80% AMI; Middle: 80% - 120% AMI; Moderate: 120% - 150% AMI; Upper: above 150% AMI

FUNDING – How do we pay for it?				
Tools	Definition	Ownership or Rental	Income*	Examples
Private Donations/Grants	Tax deductible contributions to a non-profit organization, which purchases or develops housing. Competes with other charitable causes.	Both	Varies	Jackson, WY
Federal and State Grants/Loans* – CDBG, HOME, CalHOME, USDA/Rural Development	Most only serve low income households (<50%, 60% or 80% AMI), limiting their use in high-cost areas. Competitive and complicated grant application and administration process.  California SB2 can serve up to 120% AMI; California Affordable Housing Sustainable Communities (AHSC) may be able to assist over 80% AMI with the ability for mixed income projects.	Both	Low	Mammoth Lakes, CA Truckee, CA
Section 8 Rent Subsidies	Project-based and tenant-choice vouchers that pay difference between market rents and 30% of household income. Not frequently used in mountain towns – few rentals are available at HUD Fair Market Rents and few vouchers are available.	Rental	Low	Whitefish, MT
Opportunity zones	The Opportunity Zones investment incentive was established in 2017 to encourage long-term private investments in low-income communities. Two Opportunity Zones are eligible to receive private investments through opportunity funds in the South Shore Region. The program does not explicitly address local resident housing, but might be designed to do so.	Potentially both	Potentially the full range	Several in the works: Cook County, IL Sacramento, CA

\*Typical income served, though some tools vary – Low: <80% AMI; Middle: 80% - 120% AMI; Moderate: 120% - 150% AMI; Upper: above 150% AMI

# Development Costs est.

Cost Category	Single Family (1,000 sq. ft.; 2-bed/1-bath)		Multi- Family (1,000 sq. ft.; 2-bed/1-bath)	
	per sq. ft.	per unit	per sq. ft.	per unit
Land, Coverage, Development rights (no cost)	0	0	0	0
Construction	\$300	\$300,000	250	\$250,000
Construction Contingency -5%	\$15	\$15,000	13	\$12,500
Soft Costs (Financing, A&E,) 20%	\$60	\$60,000	50	\$50,000
Local permit Fees	36	\$35,570	30	\$30,000
Profit (5% of Construction)	15	\$15,000	15	\$15,000
Site Work	30	\$30,000	10	\$10,000
TOTAL	\$456	\$455,570	\$368	\$367,500

# Subsidy Gap Estimate

Homeownership	Single Family		Multi- Family	
Sales Price / Debt Supported	\$300,000	\$400,000	\$300,000	\$367,500
	Free Land	Free Land	Free Land	Free Land
Cost to Develop	\$455,570	\$455,570	\$367,500	\$367,500
<b>Additional Funds Required (GAP)</b>	<b>\$155,570</b>	<b>\$55,570</b>	<b>\$67,500</b>	<b>0</b>

## Rental

Sources of Funds	Multi- Family*	
	\$1,250 Rent	\$1,750 Rent
Sales Price / Debt Supported per unit**	\$162,000	\$240,000
	Free Land	Free Land
<b>TOTAL SOURCES</b>	<b>\$162,000</b>	<b>\$240,000</b>
<b>Additional Funds Required (GAP per unit)</b>	<b>\$205,500</b>	<b>\$127,500</b>

\*30 unit development, not subsidized or income restricted, \$2,500/ unit in operating costs annually

# Station Questions:

- Which options provided (if any) will work best in the South Shore Region?
- What is missing – what additional ideas do you have to improve the provision of local resident housing?
- What is the greatest challenge moving forward? How can it be overcome?

## 6. Partnerships/Land Station

*How do we work together?*

## PUBLIC/PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS – How do we work together?

Tools	Definition	Ownership or Rental	Income	Examples
Public Land	Partnering with developers to build homes on publicly-owned site. Competes with other uses for public land. RFQ/RFP process effective for selecting development partners. Ownership of land can be retained with long term leases.	Both	Low-Moderate	Crested Butte, CO Breckenridge, CO Vail, CO
Employer Assisted Housing	Master leasing, development, mortgage assistance, units for temporary relocation. Public sector can provide technical assistance to help develop projects. Housing for emergency services personnel and seasonal workers often provided by employers.	Both Rental more common	Low - Middle	Breckenridge, CO Crested Butte, CO Vail, CO Jackson, WY Mammoth Lakes, CA
Property Management	Contracting to manage affordable rental units. Could work both ways – public sector hires private firm or private sector hires public/non-profit. Could be used with Employer Assisted Housing and conversion of STR's to LTR's.	Rental	Low - Moderate	Breckenridge, CO Mammoth Lakes, CA
Housing for the Workforce – No Income and/or Price Restrictions	Providing housing with few restrictions other than employment, which allows developers to charge what the local's market can bear. Prices increases can make it difficult to sell homes to the workforce.	Both	Moderate - Upper	Crested Butte, CO San Miguel Co., CO Vail, CO Frisco, CO

\*Typical income served, though some tools vary – Low: <80% AMI; Middle: 80% - 120% AMI; Moderate: 120% - 150% AMI; Upper: above 150% AMI



# South Shore Region Active Partners

- St. Joseph Community Land Trust (SJCLT)
- Tahoe Coalition for the Homeless
- El Dorado Community Foundation (EDCF)
- Tahoe Home Connection
- Tahoe Prosperity Center (TPC)
- South Tahoe Chamber of Commerce
- Tahoe Chamber
- Barton Hospital; Vail Resorts; other employers
- Lake Tahoe Community College (LTCC)
- California Tahoe Conservancy (CTC)
- City of South Lake Tahoe
- Douglas County
- El Dorado County
- El Dorado County Housing Authority (EDCHA)
- South Tahoe Public Utility District (STPUD)
- Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA)
- Tahoe Transportation District (TTD)

# Public, Institutional, Vacant Private Land

El Dorado County*	Acreage	Douglas County Land owners	Acreage by location		
			Zephyr Cove	Other East Shore	Stateline
<b>El Dorado County</b>	31	Douglas County	112	0.13	54
<b>Department of Transportation</b>	35	Douglas County Schools	31	0	56
<b>Lake Tahoe Cmty College</b>	4	Fire Stations	1	1	2
<b>Lake Tahoe Unified School Dist.</b>	22	Town/General Impvmt. Dist.	134	2.4	26
<b>Lake Valley Fire Protection Dist.</b>	2	State of Nevada	34	715	624
<b>South Tahoe Public Utility Dist.</b>	64	Vacant Private	58	536	322
<b>California Tahoe Conservancy</b>	1,100				
<b>Other State of California</b>	4,963				
<b>Vacant Private</b>	1,247				

\*includes parcels ½-acre or larger only

\*\*Not all land is potentially buildable. For example, much of El Dorado County's land is Stream Environment Zone (SEZ)/wetland under TRPA's land system.

# Station Questions:

- Which options provided (if any) will work best in the South Shore Region?
- What is missing – what additional ideas do you have to improve the provision of local resident housing?
- What is the greatest challenge moving forward? How can it be overcome?