

---

## housing musings for 10/22 meeting

---

**From** Alex Beach <abeach18@gmail.com>

**Date** Tue 10/22/2024 3:41 PM

**To** Held, Andy <AndyH@townoffrisco.com>; Skrzypczak-Adrian, Elizabeth <ElizabethS@townoffrisco.com>; Kent, Katie <katiek@townoffrisco.com>

**Cc** Vickie Lewis <VickieL@summithousing.us>; info@summithousing.us <info@summithousing.us>; CBurr@summithousing.us <CBurr@summithousing.us>

Good afternoon,

I will be speaking during public comments tonight but also wanted to send my ideas to you all in writing so hopefully some work can be done in the future. These are just a list of musings on certain aspects of the deed restricted housing process that I believe need to be addressed:

1) Waitlist v lottery. Yes, again. And I know it is being addressed in a future work session. But I heard an infuriating anecdote the other week that highlights this issue. In regards to the Nellie's Neighborhood drawing, I know for a fact that one of the winners is a relatively new resident and that was the first ever SCHA lottery that this individual entered. Good for them for winning on first try but come on. Longtime locals such as myself put the effort and time into getting projects like Nellie's off the ground, advocating for them, going to public meetings and work sessions regarding them, and then a new resident in their first lottery gets to benefit. Unacceptable.

2) I know there are some concerns, legal and otherwise, about going to a waitlist. The SCHA has their own reservations. If we are using a lottery, how about a system like hunting tags or whitewater rafting permits where if you do not win the lottery, your entries multiply. And they multiply each subsequent lottery loss until you win. Not the "weighted system" that some lotteries have now where you get 1 or 2 extra entries for certain criteria. EVERY lost lottery results in more entries until you win. Still allows for recent residents the opportunity such as in the point above, but gives increasingly more weight to people who have been in this process for a long time.

3) SCHA needs to have some discretion in regards to approving certain deed requirements or not. From personal experience I am referring to asset limits on some units, but this can also apply to things I've heard from other people such as contract/gig/self employed work that isn't currently counted. As for asset limits, the idea in practice is a good idea. If you have sufficient assets to buy a market rate unit then you shouldn't have access to a deed restricted unit. However our current housing climate does not work that way anymore. I am ineligible to apply for a number of units due to having too much money in savings. 5 years ago I might have been able to use that amount of money to buy a market rate unit. That is not possible anymore. Yes I have a huge down payment but no bank will give someone making 50k a year a 500k+ loan to buy a market rate condo. The only reason I have that much in assets is I have been living frugally and saving aggressively for a decade to buy a unit and have been unable to. But now I have too much money to buy a unit? It doesn't make any sense. There needs to be exceptions for some of these deed requirements. How about something along the lines of if your AMI is under a certain percentage (resulting in not being able to secure a large enough home loan for anything but deed restricted, regardless of a large down payment), asset limits don't apply? Keeps the spirit of the asset limit in place but allows for nuance for specific circumstances.

4) I've said it before at council but I'll keep saying it. What constitutes a "Frisco" job needs to be expanded to include unincorporated Frisco. Copper, the middle school, and the hospital need to be included. No one can make a reasonable argument that these aren't Frisco jobs held by Frisco people providing benefits to our Frisco

community. I've worked at restaurant jobs in town with middle school teachers who are contemplating quitting teaching so they can get a "Frisco job" to qualify for housing. This is wrong.

5) Maybe it's time to carve out some sort of protection or exemption for people who are displaced from the community. What happens when someone's longtime home is sold for development or converted to STR and we lose housing and have to move out of the county and can no longer work sufficient hours in the county to qualify for housing? In my specific example I have been here 11 years and have met the deed restrictions every year and have been actively trying to buy. My house is being sold in 6 months. Obviously it's incredibly difficult to find housing in Summit. If I have to temporarily move out of the county or down to the front range to live with my brother for a bit while looking for housing in my community up here, I will no longer be able to work 30 hours a week and will no longer qualify for housing. No housing, not enough work. Not enough work, no housing. Positive feedback loop. You'll never be able to get back in the community. There should be some protections for people being displaced who have shown commitment to this community but are going to first get screwed by losing their homes to development and then screwed again by not being able to meet all the deed requirements in the future as a direct result of losing their homes. Again the SCHA should have some discretion in overriding a part of a deed restriction for extenuating circumstances.

Well that's not all going to fit in my 3 minutes tonight. So I'll keep seeing you all every other week until I have the opportunity to buy a home or more likely am kicked out of town and no longer have the standing to speak at town council. I guess that's one way to quiet dissenting voices. Just wait until we are all priced out of town then there will be no one left to complain about housing. Problem solved!

Regards,

Alex Beach