

**Housing Needs Assessment
Choctaw County**

Prepared For:

Oklahoma Housing Finance Agency
Oklahoma Department of Commerce
100 NW 63rd Street, Ste. 200
Oklahoma City, OK 73116

Effective Date of the Analysis:

January 9, 2016

This "Statewide Affordable Housing Market Study" was financed in whole or in part by funds from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development as administered by the Oklahoma Department of Commerce and Oklahoma Housing Finance Agency.





January 20, 2016

Mr. Dennis Shockley, Executive Director
Oklahoma Housing Finance Agency
100 NW 63rd Street, Ste. 200
Oklahoma City, OK 73116

SUBJECT: Housing Needs Assessment
 Choctaw County
 IRR - Tulsa/OKC File No. 140-2015-0025

Dear Mr. Shockley:

As per our Agreement with Oklahoma Housing Finance Agency (OHFA), we have completed a residential housing market analysis (the "Analysis") for use by OHFA and the Oklahoma Department of Commerce (ODOC). Per our Agreement, OHFA and ODOC shall have unrestricted authority to publish, disclose, distribute and otherwise use, in whole or in part, the study and reports, data or other materials included in the Analysis or otherwise prepared pursuant to the Agreement and no materials produced in whole, or in part, under the Agreement shall be subject to copyright in the United States or any other country. Integra Realty Resources – Tulsa/OKC will cause the Analysis (or any part thereof) and any other publications or materials produced as a result of the Agreement to include substantially the following statement on the first page of said document:

This "Statewide Affordable Housing Market Study" was financed in whole or in part by funds from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development as administered by the Oklahoma Department of Commerce and Oklahoma Housing Finance Agency.

Attached hereto, please find the Choctaw County Residential Housing Market Analysis. Analyst Sarah Kin personally inspected the Choctaw County area during the month of January 2016 to collect the data used in the preparation of the Choctaw County Market Analysis. The University of Oklahoma College of Architecture Division of Regional and City Planning provided consultation, assemblage and analysis of the data for IRR-Tulsa/OKC.

Mr. Dennis Shockley
Oklahoma Housing Finance Agency
January 20, 2016
Page 2

This market study is true and correct to the best of the professional's knowledge and belief, and there is no identity of interest between Owen S. Ard, MAI, David A. Puckett, or Integra Realty Resources – Tulsa/OKC and any applicant, developer, owner or developer.

If you have any questions or comments, please contact the undersigned. Thank you for the opportunity to be of service.

Respectfully submitted,

Integra Realty Resources - Tulsa/OKC

Owen S. Ard, MAI
Certified General Real Estate Appraiser
Oklahoma Certificate #11245CGA
Telephone: 918-492-4844, x103
Email: oard@irr.com

David A. Puckett
Certified General Real Estate Appraiser
Oklahoma Certificate #12795CGA
Telephone: 918-492-4844, x104
Email: dpuckett@irr.com

Sarah Kin
Market Analyst



Table of Contents

Introduction and Executive Summary	1	Working Families	25
General Information	4	Major Employers	26
Purpose and Function of the Market Study	4	Commuting Patterns	26
Effective Date of Consultation	4	Housing Stock Analysis	28
Scope of the Assignment	4	Existing Housing Units	28
Data Sources	4	Housing by Units in Structure	28
Choctaw County Analysis	6	Housing Units Number of Bedrooms and Tenure	29
Area Information	6	Housing Units Tenure and Household Income	29
Access and Linkages	6	Housing Units by Year of Construction and Tenure	30
Educational Facilities	7	Substandard Housing	31
Medical Facilities	7	Vacancy Rates	32
Demographic Analysis	10	Building Permits	33
Population and Households	10	New Construction Activity	33
Population by Race and Ethnicity	11	Homeownership Market	35
Population by Age	11	Housing Units by Home Value	35
Families by Presence of Children	13	Choctaw County Median Home Values by Census Tract	36
Population by Presence of Disabilities	14	Home Values by Year of Construction	37
Group Quarters Population	16	Hugo Single Family Sales Activity	37
Household Income Levels	17	Foreclosure Rates	38
Household Income Trend	18	Rental Market	40
Poverty Rates	19	Gross Rent Levels	40
Economic Conditions	20	Hugo Rental Survey Data	41
Employment and Unemployment	20	Rental Market Vacancy – Hugo	42
Employment Level Trends	20	Summary of HUD Subsidized Properties	44
Unemployment Rate Trends	21		
Employment and Wages by Industrial Supersector	22		

Table of Contents

Projected Housing Need	49	Homelessness	75
Consolidated Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS)	49	By Continuum of Care	75
Cost Burden by Income Threshold	49	A Snap Shot of Homelessness in the State	78
Substandard Conditions / Overcrowding by Income Threshold	51	Rural Areas	82
Cost Burden by Household Type	54	At Risk For Homelessness	84
Housing Problems by Household Type	56	Findings and Recommendations	86
Housing Problems by Race / Ethnicity	58	Fair Housing	89
CHAS Conclusions	60	Summary	89
Overall Anticipated Housing Demand	62	Key Findings:	89
Hugo Anticipated Demand	62	Recommendations:	89
Choctaw County Anticipated Demand	62	Appendix 1: County affordable housing	
Special Topics	64	Summaries	104
Choctaw County Disaster Resiliency Assessment	65	Lead-Based Paint Hazards	108
C.0 Comprehensive Plans & Hazard Mitigation Plans	65	Choctaw County Findings	110
C.2.1.1. Historical Data on Natural Disasters and Other Hazards	65	Conclusions	121
C.2.1.2; C.2.1.6; C.2.1.7; C.2.1.8 Shelters from Disaster Event	69	Addenda	
C.2.1.3 Public Policy and Governance to Build Disaster Resiliency	69	A. Acknowledgments	
C.2.1.4 Local Emergency Response Agency Structure	69	B. Qualifications	
C.2.1.5 Threat & Hazard Warning Systems	69		
Social Vulnerability	70		

Introduction and Executive Summary

This report is part of a Statewide Affordable Housing Market Study commissioned by the Oklahoma Department of Commerce (ODOC) in partnership with the Oklahoma Housing Finance Agency (OHFA), as an outgrowth of the 2013 tornado outbreak in Oklahoma. It was funded by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (USHUD) through the Community Development Block Grant – Disaster Recovery program (CDBG-DR). This study was conducted by a public/private partnership between Integra Realty Resources – Tulsa/OKC, the University of Oklahoma College of Architecture, Division of Regional and City Planning, and DeBruler Inc. IRR-Tulsa/OKC, The University of Oklahoma, and DeBruler Inc. also prepared a prior statewide study in 2001, also commissioned by ODOC in partnership with OHFA.

This study is a value-added product derived from the original 2001 statewide housing study that incorporates additional topics and datasets not included in the 2001 study, which impact affordable housing throughout the state. These topic areas include:

- Disaster Resiliency
- Homelessness
- Assessment of Fair Housing
- Evaluation of Residential Lead-Based Paint Hazards

These topics are interrelated in terms of affordable housing policy, housing development, and disaster resiliency and recovery. Homeless populations are more vulnerable in the event of a disaster, as are many of the protected classes under the Fair Housing Act. Lead-based paint is typically more likely to be present in housing units occupied by low-to-moderate income persons, and can also present an environmental hazard in the wake of a disaster. Effective affordable housing policy can mitigate the impact of natural and manmade disasters by encouraging the development and preservation of safe, secure, and disaster-resilient housing for Oklahoma's most vulnerable populations.

Housing Market Analysis Specific Findings:

1. The population of Choctaw County is projected to decline by -0.16% per year over the next five years.
2. Median Household Income in Choctaw County is estimated to be \$32,157 in 2015, compared with \$47,049 estimated for the State of Oklahoma. The poverty rate in Choctaw County is estimated to be 27.08%, compared with 16.85% for Oklahoma. Choctaw County's poverty rate is among the highest in the state.
3. Choctaw County's homeowner vacancy rate is slightly lower than the state average, however the rental vacancy rate is higher than the state average. Among habitable units, however, rental vacancy is nearly zero.
4. Home values and rental rates in Choctaw County are significantly lower than the state averages.
5. Average sale price for homes in Hugo was \$50,919 in 2015, with an average price per square foot of \$34.76. Average year of construction for homes sold in 2015 was 1963. The average price of homes constructed since 2005 in Choctaw County is estimated to be \$212,000.

6. Approximately 36.31% of renters and 20.14% of owners are housing cost overburdened.

Disaster Resiliency Specific Findings:

1. Create a shelter registry for location of individual and business-based shelters (online or paper)
2. Tornadoes (1959-2014): Number: 23 Injuries: 45 Fatalities: 0 Damages (1996-2014): \$0
3. Social Vulnerability: Above the state score; at the census tract level Hugo area and tracts on the east and western edges of the county have particularly higher scores
4. Floodplain: updated flood maps not available

Homelessness Specific Findings

1. Choctaw County is located in the Southeastern Oklahoma Continuum of Care.
2. There are an estimated 442 homeless individuals in this area, 225 of which are identified as sheltered.
3. There is a high rate of homelessness in this region, most of which seek shelter in small towns and rural areas.
4. Many of the homeless in this CoC are classified as chronically homeless (73).
5. Other significant homeless subpopulations include the mentally ill (49) and chronic substance abusers (50).

Fair Housing Specific Findings

1. Units at risk for poverty: 312

Lead-Based Paint Specific Findings

2. We estimate there are 883 occupied housing units in Choctaw County with lead-based paint hazards.
3. 519 of those housing units are estimated to be occupied by low-to-moderate income households.
4. We estimate that 147 of those low-to-moderate income households have children under the age of 6 present.

Report Format and Organization

The first section of this report comprises the housing market analysis for Choctaw County. This section is divided into general area information, followed by population, household and income trends and analysis, then followed by area economic conditions. The next area of analysis concerns the housing stock of Choctaw County, including vacancy rates, construction activity and trends, and analyses of the homeowner and rental markets. This section is followed by five-year forecasts of housing need for owners and renters, as well as specific populations such as low-to-moderate income households, the elderly, and working families.

The next section of this report addresses special topics of concern:

- Disaster Resiliency
- Homelessness

- Fair Housing
- Lead-Based Paint Hazards

This last section is followed by a summary of the conclusions of this report for Choctaw County.

General Information

Purpose and Function of the Market Study

The purpose of this market study is to evaluate the need for affordable housing units in Choctaw County, Oklahoma. The analysis will consider existing supply and projected demand and overall market trends in the Choctaw County area.

Effective Date of Consultation

The Choctaw County area was inspected and research was performed during January 2016. The effective date of this analysis is January 9, 2016. The date of this report is January 20, 2016. The market study is valid only as of the stated effective date or dates.

Scope of the Assignment

1. The Choctaw County area was inspected during January 2016. The inspection included visits to all significant population centers in the county and portions of the rural county areas.
2. Regional, city and neighborhood data is based on information retained from national, state, and local government entities; various Chambers of Commerce, news publications, and other sources of economic indicators.
3. Specific economic data was collected from all available public agencies. Population and household information was collected from national demographic data services as well as available local governments. Much data was gathered regarding market specific items from personal interviews.
4. Development of the applicable analysis involved the collection and interpretation of verified data from local property owners/managers, realtors, and other individuals active within the area real estate market.
5. The analyst's assemblage and analysis of the defined data provided a basis from which conclusions as to the supply of and demand for residential housing were made.

Data Sources

Specific data sources used in this analysis include but are not limited to:

1. The 2000 and 2010 Decennial Censuses of Population and Housing
2. The 2009-2013 American Community Survey (ACS)
3. U.S. Census Bureau Residential Construction Branch, Manufacturing and Construction Division
4. The United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, including the Local Area Unemployment Statistics and the Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages programs
5. The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, including the Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS), and the 2013 Picture of Subsidized Households
6. Continuum of Care Assistance Programs

7. The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
8. Nielsen SiteReports (formerly known as Claritas)
9. The Oklahoma State Department of Health
10. The Oklahoma Department of Human Services
11. The Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City, Oklahoma City Branch
12. The Federal Reserve Bank of New York

Choctaw County Analysis

Area Information

The purpose of this section of the report is to provide a basis for analyzing and estimating trends relating to Choctaw County. The primary emphasis is concentrated on those factors that are of significance to residential development users. Residential and commercial development in the community is influenced by the following factors:

1. Population and economic growth trends.
2. Existing commercial supply and activity.
3. Natural physical elements.
4. Political policy and attitudes toward community development.

Location

Choctaw County is located in southeast Oklahoma. The county is bordered on the north by Pushmataha and Atoka counties, on the west by Bryan County, on the south by Texas, and on the east by McCurtain County. The Choctaw County Seat is Hugo, which is located in the central part of the county. This location is approximately 159 miles southeast of Tulsa and 180 miles southeast of Oklahoma City.

Choctaw County has a total area of 800 square miles (770 square miles of land, and 29 square miles of water), ranking 41st out of Oklahoma's 77 counties in terms of total area. The total population of Choctaw County as of the 2010 Census was 15,205 persons, for a population density of 20 persons per square mile of land.

Access and Linkages

The county has average accessibility to state and national highway systems. Multiple major highways intersect within Choctaw County. These are US-70, US-271, OK-147, and OK-109. The nearest interstate highway is I-30, approximately 60 miles to the south. The county also has an intricate network of county roadways.

Public transportation is provided Little Dixie Transit on a demand-response basis, available in Antlers, Hugo, Idabel, Broken Bow and Clayton. The local market perceives public transportation as average compared to other communities in the region of similar size. However, the primary mode of transportation in this area is private automobiles by far.

Stan Stamper Municipal Airport is located just north of Hugo. Its primary asphalt runway is 4,007 feet in length and averages 57 aircraft operations per week. The nearest full-service commercial airport is Dallas-Fort Worth Airport, located approximately 139 miles southwest.


Educational Facilities

All of the county communities have public school facilities. Hugo is served by Hugo Public Schools. Hugo Public Schools is comprised of an elementary school, intermediate school, middle school, and high school. There are no higher education offerings within Hugo or the immediate surrounding area, the nearest community college is Paris Junior College in Paris, Texas.

Medical Facilities

Medical services are provided by the Choctaw Memorial Hospital, an acute-care hospital offering emergency care, in and outpatient services, and a number of additional medical procedures. Additionally, Pushmataha Hospital is within driving distance. The smaller county communities typically have either small outpatient medical services or doctor's officing in the community.

Choctaw County Area Map



Hugo Area Map



Demographic Analysis

Population and Households

The following table presents population levels and annualized changes in Choctaw County and Oklahoma. This data is presented as of the 2000 Census, the 2010 Census, with 2015 and 2020 estimates and forecasts provided by Nielsen SiteReports.

Population Levels and Annual Changes							
	2000 Census	2010 Census	Annual Change	2015 Estimate	Annual Change	2020 Forecast	Annual Change
Hugo	5,536	5,310	-0.42%	5,196	-0.43%	5,142	-0.21%
Choctaw County	15,342	15,205	-0.09%	14,895	-0.41%	14,775	-0.16%
State of Oklahoma	3,450,654	3,751,351	0.84%	3,898,675	0.77%	4,059,399	0.81%

Sources: 2000 and 2010 Decennial Censuses, Nielsen SiteReports

The population of Choctaw County was 15,205 persons as of the 2010 Census, a -0.09% annualized rate of change from the 2000 Census. As of 2015, Nielsen SiteReports estimates the population of Choctaw County to be 14,895 persons, and projects that the population will show -0.16% annualized decline over the next five years.

The population of Hugo was 5,310 persons as of the 2010 Census, a -0.42% annualized rate of change from the 2000 Census. As of 2015, Nielsen SiteReports estimates the population of Hugo to be 5,196 persons, and projects that the population will show -0.21% annualized decline over the next five years.

The next table presents data regarding household levels in Choctaw County over the same periods of time. This data is presented both for all households (family and non-family) as well as family households alone.

Households Levels and Annual Changes							
Total Households	2000 Census	2010 Census	Annual Change	2015 Estimate	Annual Change	2020 Forecast	Annual Change
Hugo	2,309	2,217	-0.41%	2,193	-0.22%	2,188	-0.05%
Choctaw County	6,220	6,270	0.08%	6,169	-0.32%	6,138	-0.10%
State of Oklahoma	1,342,293	1,460,450	0.85%	1,520,327	0.81%	1,585,130	0.84%
Family Households	2000 Census	2010 Census	Annual Change	2015 Estimate	Annual Change	2020 Forecast	Annual Change
Hugo	1,416	1,305	-0.81%	1,311	0.09%	1,306	-0.08%
Choctaw County	4,286	4,140	-0.35%	4,069	-0.35%	4,048	-0.10%
State of Oklahoma	921,750	975,267	0.57%	1,016,508	0.83%	1,060,736	0.86%

Sources: 2000 and 2010 Decennial Censuses, Nielsen SiteReports

As of 2010, Choctaw County had a total of 6,270 households, representing a 0.08% annualized rate of change since the 2000 Census. As of 2015, Nielsen SiteReports estimates Choctaw County to have 6,169 households. This number is expected to experience a -0.10% annualized rate of decline over the next five years.

As of 2010, Hugo had a total of 2,217 households, representing a -0.41% annualized rate of change since the 2000 Census. As of 2015, Nielsen SiteReports estimates Hugo to have 2,193 households. This number is expected to experience a -0.05% annualized rate of decline over the next five years.

Population by Race and Ethnicity

The next table presents data regarding the racial and ethnic composition of Choctaw County based on the U.S. Census Bureau's American Community Survey.

2013 Population by Race and Ethnicity				
Single-Classification Race	Hugo No.	Percent	Choctaw County No.	Percent
Total Population	5,298		15,167	
White Alone	3,036	57.30%	9,657	63.67%
Black or African American Alone	1,139	21.50%	1,563	10.31%
Amer. Indian or Alaska Native Alone	301	5.68%	1,542	10.17%
Asian Alone	7	0.13%	60	0.40%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pac. Isl. Alone	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Some Other Race Alone	37	0.70%	216	1.42%
Two or More Races	778	14.68%	2,129	14.04%
Population by Hispanic or Latino Origin	Hugo No.	Percent	Choctaw County No.	Percent
Total Population	5,298		15,167	
Hispanic or Latino	190	3.59%	479	3.16%
<i>Hispanic or Latino, White Alone</i>	33	17.37%	83	17.33%
<i>Hispanic or Latino, All Other Races</i>	157	82.63%	396	82.67%
Not Hispanic or Latino	5,108	96.41%	14,688	96.84%
<i>Not Hispanic or Latino, White Alone</i>	3,003	58.79%	9,574	65.18%
<i>Not Hispanic or Latino, All Other Races</i>	2,105	41.21%	5,114	34.82%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2009-2013 American Community Survey, Tables B02001 & B03002

In Choctaw County, racial and ethnic minorities comprise 36.88% of the total population. Within Hugo, racial and ethnic minorities represent 43.32% of the population.

Population by Age

The next tables present data regarding the age distribution of the population of Choctaw County. This data is provided as of the 2010 Census, with estimates and forecasts provided by Nielsen SiteReports.

Choctaw County Population By Age								
	2010 Census	Percent of Total	2015 Estimate	Percent of Total	2020 Forecast	Percent of Total	2000 - 2015 Ann. Chng.	2015 - 2020 Ann. Chng.
Population by Age	15,205		14,895		14,775			
Age 0 - 4	1,060	6.97%	999	6.71%	1,007	6.82%	-1.18%	0.16%
Age 5 - 9	1,031	6.78%	984	6.61%	967	6.54%	-0.93%	-0.35%
Age 10 - 14	1,023	6.73%	1,011	6.79%	956	6.47%	-0.24%	-1.11%
Age 15 - 17	565	3.72%	590	3.96%	613	4.15%	0.87%	0.77%
Age 18 - 20	571	3.76%	534	3.59%	552	3.74%	-1.33%	0.67%
Age 21 - 24	621	4.08%	698	4.69%	739	5.00%	2.37%	1.15%
Age 25 - 34	1,624	10.68%	1,625	10.91%	1,661	11.24%	0.01%	0.44%
Age 35 - 44	1,688	11.10%	1,580	10.61%	1,505	10.19%	-1.31%	-0.97%
Age 45 - 54	2,175	14.30%	1,834	12.31%	1,583	10.71%	-3.35%	-2.90%
Age 55 - 64	2,088	13.73%	2,044	13.72%	1,911	12.93%	-0.43%	-1.34%
Age 65 - 74	1,612	10.60%	1,802	12.10%	2,052	13.89%	2.25%	2.63%
Age 75 - 84	838	5.51%	887	5.96%	899	6.08%	1.14%	0.27%
Age 85 and over	309	2.03%	307	2.06%	330	2.23%	-0.13%	1.46%
<i>Age 55 and over</i>	<i>4,847</i>	<i>31.88%</i>	<i>5,040</i>	<i>33.84%</i>	<i>5,192</i>	<i>35.14%</i>	<i>0.78%</i>	<i>0.60%</i>
<i>Age 62 and over</i>	<i>3,076</i>	<i>20.23%</i>	<i>3,302</i>	<i>22.17%</i>	<i>3,524</i>	<i>23.85%</i>	<i>1.43%</i>	<i>1.31%</i>
Median Age	41.6		41.4		40.9		-0.10%	-0.24%
Source: Nielsen SiteReports								

As of 2015, Nielsen estimates that the median age of Choctaw County is 41.4 years. This compares with the statewide figure of 36.6 years. Approximately 6.71% of the population is below the age of 5, while 22.17% is over the age of 62. Over the next five years, the population age 62 and above is forecasted to grow by 1.31% per year.

Hugo Population By Age								
	2010 Census	Percent of Total	2015 Estimate	Percent of Total	2020 Forecast	Percent of Total	2000 - 2015 Ann. Chng.	2015 - 2020 Ann. Chng.
Population by Age	5,310		5,196		5,142			
Age 0 - 4	464	8.74%	409	7.87%	411	7.99%	-2.49%	0.10%
Age 5 - 9	381	7.18%	400	7.70%	390	7.58%	0.98%	-0.51%
Age 10 - 14	362	6.82%	365	7.02%	380	7.39%	0.17%	0.81%
Age 15 - 17	188	3.54%	203	3.91%	217	4.22%	1.55%	1.34%
Age 18 - 20	211	3.97%	185	3.56%	196	3.81%	-2.60%	1.16%
Age 21 - 24	248	4.67%	236	4.54%	253	4.92%	-0.99%	1.40%
Age 25 - 34	623	11.73%	643	12.37%	606	11.79%	0.63%	-1.18%
Age 35 - 44	551	10.38%	541	10.41%	547	10.64%	-0.37%	0.22%
Age 45 - 54	701	13.20%	593	11.41%	490	9.53%	-3.29%	-3.74%
Age 55 - 64	652	12.28%	619	11.91%	596	11.59%	-1.03%	-0.75%
Age 65 - 74	510	9.60%	566	10.89%	614	11.94%	2.11%	1.64%
Age 75 - 84	281	5.29%	306	5.89%	307	5.97%	1.72%	0.07%
Age 85 and over	138	2.60%	130	2.50%	135	2.63%	-1.19%	0.76%
<i>Age 55 and over</i>	<i>1,581</i>	<i>29.77%</i>	<i>1,621</i>	<i>31.20%</i>	<i>1,652</i>	<i>32.13%</i>	<i>0.50%</i>	<i>0.38%</i>
<i>Age 62 and over</i>	<i>987</i>	<i>18.58%</i>	<i>1,058</i>	<i>20.36%</i>	<i>1,100</i>	<i>21.39%</i>	<i>1.40%</i>	<i>0.78%</i>
Median Age	38.2		37.9		37.2		-0.16%	-0.37%
Source: Nielsen SiteReports								

As of 2015, Nielsen estimates that the median age of Hugo is 37.9 years. This compares with the statewide figure of 36.6 years. Approximately 7.87% of the population is below the age of 5, while 20.36% is over the age of 62. Over the next five years, the population age 62 and above is forecasted to grow by 0.78% per year.

Compared with the rest of the state, Choctaw County and Hugo have slightly older populations.

Families by Presence of Children

The next table presents data for Choctaw County regarding families by the presence of children.

2013 Family Type by Presence of Children Under 18 Years

	Hugo		Choctaw County	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Total Families:	1,167		3,910	
Married-Couple Family:	657	56.30%	2,789	71.33%
With Children Under 18 Years	205	17.57%	874	22.35%
No Children Under 18 Years	452	38.73%	1,915	48.98%
Other Family:	510	43.70%	1,121	28.67%
Male Householder, No Wife Present	78	6.68%	213	5.45%
With Children Under 18 Years	34	2.91%	97	2.48%
No Children Under 18 Years	44	3.77%	116	2.97%
Female Householder, No Husband Present	432	37.02%	908	23.22%
With Children Under 18 Years	256	21.94%	495	12.66%
No Children Under 18 Years	176	15.08%	413	10.56%
<hr/>				
Total Single Parent Families	290		592	
Male Householder	34	11.72%	97	16.39%
Female Householder	256	88.28%	495	83.61%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2009-2013 American Community Survey, Table B11003

As shown, within Choctaw County, among all families 15.14% are single-parent families, while in Hugo, the percentage is 24.85%.

Population by Presence of Disabilities

The following table compiles data regarding the non-institutionalized population of Choctaw County by presence of one or more disabilities.

2013 Age by Number of Disabilities

	Hugo No.	Percent	Choctaw County No.	Percent	State of Oklahoma No.	Percent
Civilian Non-Institutionalized Population:	5,112		14,981		3,702,515	
Under 18 Years:	1,453		3,693		933,738	
With One Type of Disability	122	8.40%	154	4.17%	33,744	3.61%
With Two or More Disabilities	8	0.55%	52	1.41%	11,082	1.19%
No Disabilities	1,323	91.05%	3,487	94.42%	888,912	95.20%
18 to 64 Years:	2,785		8,566		2,265,702	
With One Type of Disability	382	13.72%	1,088	12.70%	169,697	7.49%
With Two or More Disabilities	403	14.47%	971	11.34%	149,960	6.62%
No Disabilities	2,000	71.81%	6,507	75.96%	1,946,045	85.89%
65 Years and Over:	874		2,722		503,075	
With One Type of Disability	154	17.62%	474	17.41%	95,633	19.01%
With Two or More Disabilities	312	35.70%	952	34.97%	117,044	23.27%
No Disabilities	408	46.68%	1,296	47.61%	290,398	57.72%
Total Number of Persons with Disabilities:	1,381	27.01%	3,691	24.64%	577,160	15.59%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2009-2013 American Community Survey, Table C18108

Within Choctaw County, 24.64% of the civilian non-institutionalized population has one or more disabilities, compared with 15.59% of Oklahomans as a whole. In Hugo the percentage is 27.01%. Compared with the rest of the state, the populations of Choctaw County and Hugo are more likely to have one or more disabilities.

We have also compiled data for the veteran population of Choctaw County by presence of disabilities, shown in the following table:

2013 Population by Veteran and Disability Status

	Hugo No.	Percent	Choctaw County No.	Percent	State of Oklahoma No.	Percent
Civilian Population Age 18+ For Whom Poverty Status is Determined	3,659		11,288		2,738,788	
Veteran:	281	7.68%	1,041	9.22%	305,899	11.17%
With a Disability	114	40.57%	474	45.53%	100,518	32.86%
No Disability	167	59.43%	567	54.47%	205,381	67.14%
Non-veteran:	3,378	92.32%	10,247	90.78%	2,432,889	88.83%
With a Disability	1,137	33.66%	3,011	29.38%	430,610	17.70%
No Disability	2,241	66.34%	7,236	70.62%	2,002,279	82.30%

Source: 2009-2013 American Community Survey, Table C21007

Within Choctaw County, the Census Bureau estimates there are 1,041 veterans, 45.53% of which have one or more disabilities (compared with 32.86% at a statewide level). In Hugo, there are an estimated 281 veterans, 40.57% of which are estimated to have a disability. Compared with the rest of the state, veterans living in Choctaw County and Hugo are more likely to have disabilities than veterans living in other parts of the state.

Group Quarters Population

The next table presents data regarding the population of Choctaw County living in group quarters, such as correctional facilities, skilled-nursing facilities, student housing and military quarters.

2010 Group Quarters Population				
	Hugo		Choctaw County	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Total Population	5,310		15,205	
Group Quarters Population	172	3.24%	172	1.13%
Institutionalized Population	166	3.13%	166	1.09%
Correctional facilities for adults	44	0.83%	44	0.29%
Juvenile facilities	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Nursing facilities/Skilled-nursing facilities	122	2.30%	122	0.80%
Other institutional facilities	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Noninstitutionalized population	6	0.11%	6	0.04%
College/University student housing	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Military quarters	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Other noninstitutional facilities	6	0.11%	6	0.04%

Source: 2010 Decennial Census, Table P42


The percentage of the Choctaw County population in group quarters is somewhat lower than the statewide figure, which was 2.99% in 2010.

Household Income Levels

Data in the following chart shows the distribution of household income in Choctaw County, as well as median and average household income. Data for Oklahoma is included as a basis of comparison. This data is provided by Nielsen SiteReports for 2015.

2015 Household Income Distribution						
	Hugo		Choctaw County		State of Oklahoma	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Households by HH Income	2,193		6,169		1,520,327	
< \$15,000	603	27.50%	1,389	22.52%	213,623	14.05%
\$15,000 - \$24,999	430	19.61%	1,080	17.51%	184,613	12.14%
\$25,000 - \$34,999	313	14.27%	860	13.94%	177,481	11.67%
\$35,000 - \$49,999	260	11.86%	777	12.60%	229,628	15.10%
\$50,000 - \$74,999	259	11.81%	934	15.14%	280,845	18.47%
\$75,000 - \$99,999	131	5.97%	478	7.75%	173,963	11.44%
\$100,000 - \$124,999	89	4.06%	297	4.81%	106,912	7.03%
\$125,000 - \$149,999	56	2.55%	180	2.92%	57,804	3.80%
\$150,000 - \$199,999	34	1.55%	106	1.72%	48,856	3.21%
\$200,000 - \$249,999	8	0.36%	33	0.53%	18,661	1.23%
\$250,000 - \$499,999	8	0.36%	28	0.45%	20,487	1.35%
\$500,000+	2	0.09%	7	0.11%	7,454	0.49%
Median Household Income	\$27,029		\$32,157		\$47,049	
Average Household Income	\$41,256		\$46,684		\$63,390	
Source: Nielsen SiteReports						

As shown, median household income for Choctaw County is estimated to be \$32,157 in 2015. By way of comparison, the median household income of Oklahoma is estimated to be \$47,049. For Hugo, median household income is estimated to be \$27,029. Compared with the rest of the state, households in Choctaw County and Hugo have significantly lower incomes, with much higher concentrations of incomes in brackets under \$25,000. The income distributions can be better visualized by the following chart.



Household Income Trend

Next we examine the long-term growth of incomes in Choctaw County, from the results of the 2000 Census (representing calendar year 1999), through the current 2015 estimates provided by Nielsen SiteReports. This data is then annualized into a compounded annual growth rate to estimate nominal annual household income growth over this period of time. We then compare the rate of annual growth with the rate of inflation over the same period of time (measured using the Consumer Price Index for all urban consumers, South Region, Size Class D, from May 1999 through May 2015). Subtracting the annual rate of inflation from the nominal rate of annual income growth yields a “real” rate of income growth which takes into account the effect of increasing prices of goods and services.

Household Income Trend

	1999 Median HH Income	2015 Median HH Income	Nominal Growth	Inflation Rate	Real Growth
Hugo	\$19,321	\$27,029	2.12%	2.40%	-0.28%
Choctaw County	\$22,743	\$32,157	2.19%	2.40%	-0.21%
State of Oklahoma	\$33,400	\$47,049	2.16%	2.40%	-0.23%

Sources: 2000 Decennial Census, Summary File 3, Table P53; Nielsen SiteReports; CPI All Urban Consumers, South Region, Size Class D

As shown, both Choctaw County and the State of Oklahoma as a whole saw negative growth in “real” median household income, once inflation is taken into account. It should be noted that this trend is not unique to Oklahoma or Choctaw County, but rather a national trend. Over the same period, the

national median household income increased from \$41,994 to \$53,706 (for a nominal annualized growth rate of 1.55%) while the Consumer Price Index increased at an annualized rate of 2.26%, for a “real” growth rate of -0.72%.

Poverty Rates

Overall rates of poverty in Choctaw County and Oklahoma are shown in the following table. This data is included from the 2013 American Community Survey, as well as the 2000 Census to show how these rates have changed over the last decade. We also include poverty rates for single-parent families by gender of householder.

Poverty Rates	2000 Census	2013 ACS	Change (Basis Points)	2013 Poverty Rates for Single-Parent Families	
				Male Householder	Female Householder
Hugo	29.43%	42.07%	1263	58.82%	77.73%
Choctaw County	24.32%	27.08%	276	28.87%	67.07%
State of Oklahoma	14.72%	16.85%	213	22.26%	47.60%

Sources: 2000 Decennial Census Table P87, 2009-2013 American Community Survey Tables B17001 & B17023

The poverty rate in Choctaw County is estimated to be 27.08% by the American Community Survey. This is an increase of 276 basis points since the 2000 Census. Within Hugo, the poverty rate is estimated to be 42.07%. It should be noted that increasing poverty rates over this period of time is a national trend: between the 2000 Census and the 2013 American Community Survey, the poverty rate of the United States increased from 12.38% to 15.37%, an increase of 299 basis points.

Choctaw County has among the highest poverty rates in Oklahoma, and Hugo’s poverty rate is significantly higher still. Further, poverty among single-parent families is much higher than single-parent families in the rest of the state.

Economic Conditions

Employment and Unemployment

The following table presents total employment figures and unemployment rates for Choctaw County, with figures for Oklahoma and the United States for comparison. This data is as of May 2015.


Employment and Unemployment						
	May-2010 Employment	May-2015 Employment	Annual Growth	May-2010 Unemp. Rate	May-2015 Unemp. Rate	Change (bp)
Choctaw County	5,612	5,609	-0.01%	8.8%	7.3%	-150
State of Oklahoma	1,650,748	1,776,187	1.48%	6.8%	4.4%	-240
United States (thsds)	139,497	149,349	1.37%	9.3%	5.3%	-400

Sources: Bureau of Labor Statistics, Local Area Unemployment Statistics and Current Population Survey

As of May 2015, total employment in Choctaw County was 5,609 persons. Compared with figures from May 2010, this represents annualized employment decline of -0.01% per year. The unemployment rate in May was 7.3%, a decrease of -150 basis points from May 2010, which was 8.8%. Over the last five years, both the statewide and national trends have been improving employment levels and declining unemployment rates, and Choctaw County has underperformed both the state and nation in these statistics.

Employment Level Trends

The following chart shows total employment and unemployment levels in Choctaw County from January 2000 through May 2015, as reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Local Area Unemployment Statistics program.



Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics, Local Area Unemployment Statistics


As shown, total employment levels have generally trended upward from 2000 through the 3rd quarter of 2008, when employment levels began to decline due to the national economic recession.

Employment declined since that time until late 2013, when growth resumed to its current level of 5,609 persons (though employment levels are still below pre-recession levels). The number of unemployed persons in May 2015 was 442, out of a total labor force of 6,051 persons.

Unemployment Rate Trends

The next chart shows historic unemployment rates for Choctaw County, as well as Oklahoma and the United States for comparison. This data covers the time period of January 2000 through May 2015, and has not been seasonally adjusted.

Unemployment Rates in Choctaw County, Oklahoma and the United States January 2000 through May 2015



Sources: Bureau of Labor Statistics, Local Area Unemployment Statistics and Current Population Survey

As shown, unemployment rates in Choctaw County increased moderately from 2000 through 2003, and then generally declined until the 4th quarter of 2008 as the effects of the national economic recession were felt. Unemployment rates began to decline again in 2010, to their current level of 7.3%. On the whole, unemployment rates in Choctaw County track very well with statewide figures but are typically above the state, and in many cases are above the national average as well.


Employment and Wages by Industrial Supersector

The next table presents data regarding employment in Choctaw County by industry, including total number of establishments, average number of employees in 2014, average annual pay, and location quotients for each industry compared with the United States. This data is furnished by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages program.

Employees and Wages by Supersector - 2014

Supersector	Establishments	Avg. No. of Employees	Percent of Total	Avg. Annual Pay	Location Quotient
Federal Government	11	42	0.98%	\$47,061	0.49
State Government	10	89	2.08%	\$34,569	0.63
Local Government	37	1,308	30.62%	\$30,286	3.04
Natural Resources and Mining	6	76	1.78%	\$37,187	1.17
Construction	17	102	2.39%	\$36,010	0.53
Manufacturing	14	120	2.81%	\$37,686	0.32
Trade, Transportation, and Utilities	72	938	21.96%	\$34,013	1.15
Information	7	23	0.54%	\$55,069	0.27
Financial Activities	32	143	3.35%	\$30,688	0.60
Professional and Business Services	35	222	5.20%	\$30,832	0.37
Education and Health Services	39	694	16.25%	\$24,658	1.08
Leisure and Hospitality	26	267	6.25%	\$11,678	0.58
Other Services	27	249	5.83%	\$24,350	1.88
Total	331	4,272		\$29,576	1.00

Source: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages

Employment Sectors - 2014

Source: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages

Among private employers, the largest percentage of persons (21.96%) are employed in Trade, Transportation, and Utilities. The average annual pay in this sector is \$34,013 per year. The industry with the highest annual pay is Information, with average annual pay of \$55,069 per year.

The rightmost column of the previous table provides location quotients for each industry for Choctaw County, as compared with the United States. Location quotients (LQs) are ratios used to compare the concentration of employment in a given industry to a larger reference, in this case the United States. They are calculated by dividing the percentage of employment in a given industry in a given geography (Choctaw County in this instance), by the percentage of employment in the same industry in the United States. For example, if manufacturing in a certain county comprised 10% of total employment, while in the United States manufacturing comprised 5% of total employment, the location quotient would be 2.0:

$$10\% (\text{county manufacturing } \%) / 5\% (\text{U.S. manufacturing } \%) = 2.0$$

Location quotients greater than 1.0 indicate a higher concentration of employment compared with the nation, and suggest that the industry in question is an important contributor to the local economic base. Quotients less than 1.0 indicate that the industry makes up a smaller share of the local economy than the rest of the nation.


Within Choctaw County, among all industries the largest location quotient is in Local Government, with a quotient of 3.04. Among private employers, the largest is Other Services, with a quotient of 1.88.

The next table presents average annual pay in Choctaw County by industry, in comparison with Oklahoma as a whole and the United States.

Comparison of 2014 Average Annual Pay by Supersector					
Supersector	Choctaw County	State of Oklahoma	United States	Percent of State	Percent of Nation
Federal Government	\$47,061	\$66,411	\$75,784	70.9%	62.1%
State Government	\$34,569	\$44,721	\$54,184	77.3%	63.8%
Local Government	\$30,286	\$36,300	\$46,146	83.4%	65.6%
Natural Resources and Mining	\$37,187	\$87,445	\$59,666	42.5%	62.3%
Construction	\$36,010	\$47,127	\$55,041	76.4%	65.4%
Manufacturing	\$37,686	\$53,614	\$62,977	70.3%	59.8%
Trade, Transportation, and Utilities	\$34,013	\$40,563	\$42,988	83.9%	79.1%
Information	\$55,069	\$54,513	\$90,804	101.0%	60.6%
Financial Activities	\$30,688	\$53,212	\$85,261	57.7%	36.0%
Professional and Business Services	\$30,832	\$47,890	\$66,657	64.4%	46.3%
Education and Health Services	\$24,658	\$41,536	\$45,951	59.4%	53.7%
Leisure and Hospitality	\$11,678	\$16,568	\$20,993	70.5%	55.6%
Other Services	\$24,350	\$31,669	\$33,935	76.9%	71.8%
Total	\$29,576	\$43,774	\$51,361	67.6%	57.6%

Source: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages

Average Annual Pay - 2014



Source: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages

In comparison with the rest of Oklahoma, Chocow County has higher average wages in the information sector, and lower average wages in all other employment sectors, notably so in natural resources and mining.

Working Families

The following table presents data on families by employment status, and presence of children.

Families by Employment Status and Presence of Children						
	Hugo		Choctaw County		State of Oklahoma	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Total Families	1,167		3,910		961,468	
With Children <18 Years:	495	42.42%	1,466	37.49%	425,517	44.26%
Married Couple:	205	41.41%	874	59.62%	281,418	66.14%
Both Parents Employed	127	61.95%	551	63.04%	166,700	59.24%
One Parent Employed	62	30.24%	274	31.35%	104,817	37.25%
Neither Parent Employed	16	7.80%	49	5.61%	9,901	3.52%
Other Family:	290	58.59%	592	40.38%	144,099	33.86%
Male Householder:	34	11.72%	97	16.39%	36,996	25.67%
Employed	27	79.41%	82	84.54%	31,044	83.91%
Not Employed	7	20.59%	15	15.46%	5,952	16.09%
Female Householder:	256	88.28%	495	83.61%	107,103	74.33%
Employed	158	61.72%	343	69.29%	75,631	70.62%
Not Employed	98	38.28%	152	30.71%	31,472	29.38%
Without Children <18 Years:	672	57.58%	2,444	62.51%	535,951	55.74%
Married Couple:	452	67.26%	1,915	78.36%	431,868	80.58%
Both Spouses Employed	152	33.63%	581	30.34%	167,589	38.81%
One Spouse Employed	86	19.03%	540	28.20%	138,214	32.00%
Neither Spouse Employed	214	47.35%	794	41.46%	126,065	29.19%
Other Family:	220	32.74%	529	21.64%	104,083	19.42%
Male Householder:	44	20.56%	116	14.61%	32,243	25.58%
Employed	27	61.36%	53	45.69%	19,437	60.28%
Not Employed	17	38.64%	63	54.31%	12,806	39.72%
Female Householder:	176	80.00%	413	78.07%	71,840	69.02%
Employed	18	10.23%	138	33.41%	36,601	50.95%
Not Employed	158	89.77%	275	66.59%	35,239	49.05%
<i>Total Working Families:</i>	<i>657</i>	<i>56.30%</i>	<i>2,562</i>	<i>65.52%</i>	<i>740,033</i>	<i>76.97%</i>
<i> With Children <18 Years:</i>	<i>374</i>	<i>56.93%</i>	<i>1,250</i>	<i>48.79%</i>	<i>378,192</i>	<i>51.10%</i>
<i> Without Children <18 Years:</i>	<i>283</i>	<i>43.07%</i>	<i>1,312</i>	<i>51.21%</i>	<i>361,841</i>	<i>48.90%</i>

Source: 2009-2013 American Community Survey, Table B23007

Within Choctaw County, there are 2,562 working families, 48.79% of which have children under the age of 18 present. This compares with 51.10% in Oklahoma as a whole.

Major Employers

Major employers in the Choctaw County area include Wal-Mart, Little Dixie Community Action Agency, Choctaw Memorial Hospital, Lane Frost Health and Rehabilitation Center, and Hugo Public Schools.

Commuting Patterns

Travel Time to Work

The next table presents data regarding travel time to work in Choctaw County.

Workers 16 Years and Over by Commuting Time to Work

	Hugo No.	Percent	Choctaw County No.	Percent	State of Oklahoma No.	Percent
Commuting Workers:	1,543		5,104		1,613,364	
Less than 15 minutes	956	61.96%	2,152	42.16%	581,194	36.02%
15 to 30 minutes	320	20.74%	1,539	30.15%	625,885	38.79%
30 to 45 minutes	161	10.43%	844	16.54%	260,192	16.13%
45 to 60 minutes	23	1.49%	218	4.27%	74,625	4.63%
60 or more minutes	83	5.38%	351	6.88%	71,468	4.43%

Source: 2009-2013 American Community Survey, Table B08303

Within Choctaw County, the largest percentage of workers (42.16%) travel fewer than 15 minutes to work. Although Choctaw County has an active labor market, it appears some residents commute to other labor markets in the region.

Means of Transportation

Data in the following table presents data regarding means of transportation for employed persons in Choctaw County.

Workers 16 Years and Over by Means of Transportation to Work

	Hugo No.	Percent	Choctaw County No.	Percent	State of Oklahoma No.	Percent
Total Workers Age 16+	1,557		5,310		1,673,026	
Car, Truck or Van:	1,410	90.56%	4,816	90.70%	1,551,461	92.73%
<i>Drove Alone</i>	<i>1,225</i>	<i>86.88%</i>	<i>4,133</i>	<i>85.82%</i>	<i>1,373,407</i>	<i>88.52%</i>
<i>Carpooled</i>	<i>185</i>	<i>13.12%</i>	<i>683</i>	<i>14.18%</i>	<i>178,054</i>	<i>11.48%</i>
Public Transportation	4	0.26%	43	0.81%	8,092	0.48%
Taxicab	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	984	0.06%
Motorcycle	0	0.00%	17	0.32%	3,757	0.22%
Bicycle	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	4,227	0.25%
Walked	42	2.70%	65	1.22%	30,401	1.82%
Other Means	87	5.59%	163	3.07%	14,442	0.86%
Worked at Home	14	0.90%	206	3.88%	59,662	3.57%

Source: 2009-2013 American Community Survey, Table B08301

As shown, the vast majority of persons in Choctaw County commute to work by private vehicle, with a small percentage of persons working from home.

Housing Stock Analysis

Existing Housing Units

The following table presents data regarding the total number of housing units in Choctaw County. This data is provided as of the 2000 Census, the 2010 Census, with a 2015 estimate furnished by Nielsen SiteReports.

Total Housing Units					
	2000 Census	2010 Census	Annual Change	2015 Estimate	Annual Change
Hugo	2,798	2,665	-0.49%	2,637	-0.21%
Choctaw County	7,539	7,521	-0.02%	7,500	-0.06%
State of Oklahoma	1,514,400	1,664,378	0.95%	1,732,484	0.81%

Sources: 2000 and 2010 Decennial Censuses, Nielsen SiteReports

Since the 2010, Nielsen estimates that the number of housing units in Choctaw County declined by - 0.06% per year, to a total of 7,500 housing units in 2015. In terms of new housing unit construction, Choctaw County underperformed Oklahoma as a whole between 2010 and 2015.

Housing by Units in Structure

The next table separates housing units in Choctaw County by units in structure, based on data from the Census Bureau's American Community Survey.

2013 Housing Units by Units in Structure						
	Hugo No.	Percent	Choctaw County No.	Percent	State of Oklahoma No.	Percent
Total Housing Units	2,586		7,512		1,669,828	
1 Unit, Detached	1,916	74.09%	5,559	74.00%	1,219,987	73.06%
1 Unit, Attached	72	2.78%	93	1.24%	34,434	2.06%
Duplex Units	253	9.78%	272	3.62%	34,207	2.05%
3-4 Units	104	4.02%	117	1.56%	42,069	2.52%
5-9 Units	86	3.33%	92	1.22%	59,977	3.59%
10-19 Units	18	0.70%	42	0.56%	57,594	3.45%
20-49 Units	10	0.39%	10	0.13%	29,602	1.77%
50 or More Units	16	0.62%	16	0.21%	30,240	1.81%
Mobile Homes	111	4.29%	1,282	17.07%	159,559	9.56%
Boat, RV, Van, etc.	0	0.00%	29	0.39%	2,159	0.13%
Total Multifamily Units	487	18.83%	549	7.31%	253,689	15.19%

Source: 2009-2013 American Community Survey, Table B25024

Within Choctaw County, 74.00% of housing units are single-family, detached. 7.31% of housing units are multifamily in structure (two or more units per building), while 17.45% of housing units comprise mobile homes, RVs, etc.

Within Hugo, 74.09% of housing units are single-family, detached. 18.83% of housing units are multifamily in structure, while 4.29% of housing units comprise mobile homes, RVs, etc.

Housing Units Number of Bedrooms and Tenure

Data in the following table presents housing units in Choctaw County by tenure (owner/renter), and by number of bedrooms.

2013 Housing Units by Tenure and Number of Bedrooms						
	Hugo		Choctaw County		State of Oklahoma	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Total Occupied Housing Units	2,005		6,043		1,444,081	
Owner Occupied:	1,157	57.71%	4,446	73.57%	968,736	67.08%
No Bedroom	0	0.00%	9	0.20%	2,580	0.27%
1 Bedroom	16	1.38%	142	3.19%	16,837	1.74%
2 Bedrooms	205	17.72%	1,004	22.58%	166,446	17.18%
3 Bedrooms	775	66.98%	2,671	60.08%	579,135	59.78%
4 Bedrooms	154	13.31%	562	12.64%	177,151	18.29%
5 or More Bedrooms	7	0.61%	58	1.30%	26,587	2.74%
Renter Occupied:	848	42.29%	1,597	26.43%	475,345	32.92%
No Bedroom	24	2.83%	36	2.25%	13,948	2.93%
1 Bedroom	234	27.59%	289	18.10%	101,850	21.43%
2 Bedrooms	228	26.89%	536	33.56%	179,121	37.68%
3 Bedrooms	333	39.27%	672	42.08%	152,358	32.05%
4 Bedrooms	29	3.42%	59	3.69%	24,968	5.25%
5 or More Bedrooms	0	0.00%	5	0.31%	3,100	0.65%

Source: 2009-2013 American Community Survey, Table B25042

The overall homeownership rate in Choctaw County is 73.57%, while 26.43% of housing units are renter occupied. In Hugo, the homeownership rate is 57.71%, while 42.29% of households are renters.

Housing Units Tenure and Household Income

The next series of tables analyze housing units by tenure, and by household income.

Choctaw County Owner/Renter Percentages by Income Band in 2013

Household Income	Total Households	Total Owners	Total Renters	% Owners	% Renters
Total	6,043	4,446	1,597	73.57%	26.43%
Less than \$5,000	313	162	151	51.76%	48.24%
\$5,000 - \$9,999	553	256	297	46.29%	53.71%
\$10,000-\$14,999	591	330	261	55.84%	44.16%
\$15,000-\$19,999	529	333	196	62.95%	37.05%
\$20,000-\$24,999	463	376	87	81.21%	18.79%
\$25,000-\$34,999	886	641	245	72.35%	27.65%
\$35,000-\$49,999	820	609	211	74.27%	25.73%
\$50,000-\$74,999	996	893	103	89.66%	10.34%
\$75,000-\$99,999	435	406	29	93.33%	6.67%
\$100,000-\$149,999	348	331	17	95.11%	4.89%
\$150,000 or more	109	109	0	100.00%	0.00%
Income Less Than \$25,000	2,449	1,457	992	59.49%	40.51%

Source: 2009-2013 American Community Survey, Table B25118

Within Choctaw County as a whole, 40.51% of households with incomes less than \$25,000 are estimated to be renters, while 59.49% are estimated to be homeowners.

Hugo Owner/Renter Percentages by Income Band in 2013

Household Income	Total Households	Total Owners	Total Renters	% Owners	% Renters
Total	2,005	1,157	848	57.71%	42.29%
Less than \$5,000	129	59	70	45.74%	54.26%
\$5,000 - \$9,999	291	69	222	23.71%	76.29%
\$10,000-\$14,999	269	113	156	42.01%	57.99%
\$15,000-\$19,999	199	78	121	39.20%	60.80%
\$20,000-\$24,999	137	111	26	81.02%	18.98%
\$25,000-\$34,999	317	195	122	61.51%	38.49%
\$35,000-\$49,999	252	172	80	68.25%	31.75%
\$50,000-\$74,999	209	174	35	83.25%	16.75%
\$75,000-\$99,999	91	75	16	82.42%	17.58%
\$100,000-\$149,999	76	76	0	100.00%	0.00%
\$150,000 or more	35	35	0	100.00%	0.00%
Income Less Than \$25,000	1,025	430	595	41.95%	58.05%

Source: 2009-2013 American Community Survey, Table B25118

Within Hugo, 58.05% of households with incomes less than \$25,000 are estimated to be renters, while 41.95% are estimated to be homeowners.

Housing Units by Year of Construction and Tenure

The following table provides a breakdown of housing units by year of construction, and by owner/renter (tenure), as well as median year of construction.

2013 Housing Units by Tenure and Year of Construction

	Hugo No.	Percent	Choctaw County No.	Percent	State of Oklahoma No.	Percent
Total Occupied Housing Units	2,005		6,043		1,444,081	
Owner Occupied:	1,157	57.71%	4,446	73.57%	968,736	67.08%
Built 2010 or Later	0	0.00%	43	0.97%	10,443	1.08%
Built 2000 to 2009	117	10.11%	658	14.80%	153,492	15.84%
Built 1990 to 1999	97	8.38%	700	15.74%	125,431	12.95%
Built 1980 to 1989	248	21.43%	955	21.48%	148,643	15.34%
Built 1970 to 1979	257	22.21%	999	22.47%	184,378	19.03%
Built 1960 to 1969	105	9.08%	347	7.80%	114,425	11.81%
Built 1950 to 1959	107	9.25%	263	5.92%	106,544	11.00%
Built 1940 to 1949	86	7.43%	165	3.71%	50,143	5.18%
Built 1939 or Earlier	140	12.10%	316	7.11%	75,237	7.77%
Median Year Built:		1975		1981		1977
Renter Occupied:	848	42.29%	1,597	26.43%	475,345	32.92%
Built 2010 or Later	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	5,019	1.06%
Built 2000 to 2009	114	13.44%	215	13.46%	50,883	10.70%
Built 1990 to 1999	187	22.05%	292	18.28%	47,860	10.07%
Built 1980 to 1989	187	22.05%	281	17.60%	77,521	16.31%
Built 1970 to 1979	174	20.52%	415	25.99%	104,609	22.01%
Built 1960 to 1969	85	10.02%	182	11.40%	64,546	13.58%
Built 1950 to 1959	54	6.37%	99	6.20%	54,601	11.49%
Built 1940 to 1949	23	2.71%	45	2.82%	31,217	6.57%
Built 1939 or Earlier	24	2.83%	68	4.26%	39,089	8.22%
Median Year Built:		1983		1980		1975
Overall Median Year Built:		1975		1981		1976

Sources: 2009-2013 American Community Survey, Tables B25035, B25036 & B25037

Within Choctaw County, 15.16% of housing units were built after the year 2000. This compares with 15.22% statewide. Within Hugo the percentage is 11.52%.

68.43% of housing units in Choctaw County were built prior to 1990, while in Hugo the percentage is 74.31%. These figures compare with the statewide figure of 72.78%.

Substandard Housing

The next table presents data regarding substandard housing in Choctaw County. The two most commonly cited figures for substandard housing are a lack of complete plumbing, and/or a lack of a complete kitchen. We have also included statistics regarding homes heated by wood, although this is a less frequently cited indicator of substandard housing since some homes (particularly homes for seasonal occupancy) are heated by wood but otherwise not considered substandard.

The Census Bureau definition of inadequate plumbing is any housing unit lacking any one (or more) of the following three items:

1. Hot and cold running water

2. A flush toilet
3. A bathtub or shower

Inadequate kitchens are defined by the Census Bureau as housing units lacking any of the three following items:

1. A sink with a faucet
2. A stove or range
3. A refrigerator

2013 Substandard Housing Units

	Occupied Units	Inadequate Plumbing Number Percent	Inadequate Kitchen Number Percent	Uses Wood for Fuel Number Percent
Hugo	2,005	38 1.90%	52 2.59%	0 0.00%
Choctaw County	6,043	57 0.94%	86 1.42%	274 4.53%
State of Oklahoma	1,444,081	7,035 0.49%	13,026 0.90%	28,675 1.99%

Sources: 2009-2013 American Community Survey, Tables B25040, B25048 & B25052

Within Choctaw County, 0.94% of occupied housing units have inadequate plumbing (compared with 0.49% at a statewide level), while 1.42% have inadequate kitchen facilities (compared with 0.90% at a statewide level). It is likely that there is at least some overlap between these two figures, among units lacking both complete plumbing and kitchen facilities.

Vacancy Rates

The next table details housing units in Choctaw County by vacancy and type. This data is provided by the American Community Survey.

2013 Housing Units by Vacancy

	Hugo No.	Percent	Choctaw County No.	Percent	State of Oklahoma No.	Percent
Total Housing Units	2,586		7,512		1,669,828	
Total Vacant Units	581	22.47%	1,469	19.56%	225,747	13.52%
For rent	146	25.13%	238	16.20%	43,477	19.26%
Rented, not occupied	42	7.23%	66	4.49%	9,127	4.04%
For sale only	58	9.98%	97	6.60%	23,149	10.25%
Sold, not occupied	0	0.00%	21	1.43%	8,618	3.82%
For seasonal, recreational, or occasional use	31	5.34%	343	23.35%	39,475	17.49%
For migrant workers	0	0.00%	2	0.14%	746	0.33%
Other vacant	304	52.32%	702	47.79%	101,155	44.81%
Homeowner Vacancy Rate	4.77%		2.13%		2.31%	
Rental Vacancy Rate	14.09%		12.52%		8.24%	

Source: 2009-2013 American Community Survey, Tables B25001, B25003 & B25004

Within Choctaw County, the overall housing vacancy rate is estimated to be 19.56%. The homeowner vacancy rate is estimated to be 2.13%, while the rental vacancy rate is estimated to be 12.52%.

In Hugo, the overall housing vacancy rate is estimated to be 22.47%. The homeowner vacancy rate is estimated to be 4.77%, while the rental vacancy rate is estimated to be 14.09%.

Building Permits

The next series of table presents data regarding new residential building permits issued in Hugo. This data is furnished by the U.S. Census Bureau Residential Construction Branch, Manufacturing and Construction Division. Please note that average costs reported only represent physical construction costs for the housing units, and do not include land prices, most soft costs (such as finance fees), or builder's profit.

Hugo

New Residential Building Permits Issued, 2004-2014

Year	Single Family Units	Avg. Construction Cost	Multifamily Units	Avg. Multifamily Construction Cost
2004	5	\$70,000	16	\$50,000
2005	32	\$42,000	20	\$19,000
2006	5	\$65,000	0	N/A
2007	3	\$70,000	0	N/A
2008	11	\$91,364	16	\$81,250
2009	1	\$30,000	0	N/A
2010	14	\$107,371	0	N/A
2011	4	\$92,500	0	N/A
2012	0	N/A	0	N/A
2013	0	N/A	0	N/A
2014	0	N/A	0	N/A

Source: United States Census Bureau Building Permits Survey

In Hugo, building permits for 127 housing units were issued between 2004 and 2014, for an average of 12 units per year. 59.06% of these housing units were single family homes, and 40.94% consisted of multifamily units, primarily sporadic duplex units.

New Construction Activity

For Ownership:

Much of the new construction in Choctaw County consists of rural homes on large acreages, and homes built near Lake Hugo. Some new homes for ownership have been constructed in Hugo, typically on infill lots in established subdivisions. Although some new housing construction has been relatively affordable, much has not: the average sale price of homes constructed since 2005 in Choctaw County is \$212,000, or \$147.51 per square foot (for homes sold since January 2014). This is well above what could be afforded by a household earning at or less than median household income, which is estimated to be \$32,157 in 2015 for Choctaw County.

For Rent:

The most notable new housing development for rent in Choctaw County in the recent past is Hugo Affordable Housing, also known as Windhaven Homes. This development consists of four phases: the first two phases are complete and leased, and the third and fourth are under construction. Combined the four phases will comprise 55 affordable rental homes under the Affordable Housing Tax Credit program. These homes have been very well received and leased as soon as they were completed.

Homeownership Market

This section will address the market for housing units for purchase in Choctaw County, using data collected from both local and national sources.

Housing Units by Home Value

The following table presents housing units in Choctaw County by value, as well as median home value, as reported by the Census Bureau's American Community Survey.


2013 Housing Units by Home Value						
	Hugo		Choctaw County		State of Oklahoma	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Total Owner-Occupied Units:	1,157		4,446		968,736	
Less than \$10,000	43	3.72%	158	3.55%	20,980	2.17%
\$10,000 to \$14,999	30	2.59%	161	3.62%	15,427	1.59%
\$15,000 to \$19,999	53	4.58%	201	4.52%	13,813	1.43%
\$20,000 to \$24,999	0	0.00%	108	2.43%	16,705	1.72%
\$25,000 to \$29,999	92	7.95%	237	5.33%	16,060	1.66%
\$30,000 to \$34,999	45	3.89%	131	2.95%	19,146	1.98%
\$35,000 to \$39,999	16	1.38%	143	3.22%	14,899	1.54%
\$40,000 to \$49,999	84	7.26%	227	5.11%	39,618	4.09%
\$50,000 to \$59,999	214	18.50%	500	11.25%	45,292	4.68%
\$60,000 to \$69,999	71	6.14%	288	6.48%	52,304	5.40%
\$70,000 to \$79,999	125	10.80%	420	9.45%	55,612	5.74%
\$80,000 to \$89,999	69	5.96%	295	6.64%	61,981	6.40%
\$90,000 to \$99,999	39	3.37%	148	3.33%	51,518	5.32%
\$100,000 to \$124,999	125	10.80%	449	10.10%	119,416	12.33%
\$125,000 to \$149,999	49	4.24%	258	5.80%	96,769	9.99%
\$150,000 to \$174,999	61	5.27%	175	3.94%	91,779	9.47%
\$175,000 to \$199,999	0	0.00%	91	2.05%	53,304	5.50%
\$200,000 to \$249,999	29	2.51%	182	4.09%	69,754	7.20%
\$250,000 to \$299,999	0	0.00%	71	1.60%	41,779	4.31%
\$300,000 to \$399,999	12	1.04%	167	3.76%	37,680	3.89%
\$400,000 to \$499,999	0	0.00%	20	0.45%	13,334	1.38%
\$500,000 to \$749,999	0	0.00%	7	0.16%	12,784	1.32%
\$750,000 to \$999,999	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	3,764	0.39%
\$1,000,000 or more	0	0.00%	9	0.20%	5,018	0.52%
Median Home Value:	\$60,200		\$71,600		\$112,800	

Sources: 2009-2013 American Community Survey, Tables B25075 and B25077

The median value of owner-occupied homes in Choctaw County is \$71,600. This is -36.5% lower than the statewide median, which is \$112,800. The median home value in Hugo is estimated to be \$60,200.

The geographic distribution of home values in Choctaw County can be visualized by the following map. As can be seen, the highest home values are in the central part of the county, including the area around Hugo Lake, but outside of Hugo city limits.

Choctaw County Median Home Values by Census Tract



Home Values by Year of Construction

The next table presents median home values in Choctaw County by year of construction. Note that missing data fields indicate the Census Bureau had inadequate data to estimate a median value that age bracket.

2013 Median Home Value by Year of Construction			
	Hugo Median Value	Choctaw County Median Value	State of Oklahoma Median Value
Total Owner-Occupied Units:			
Built 2010 or Later	-	\$78,100	\$188,900
Built 2000 to 2009	\$46,200	\$95,300	\$178,000
Built 1990 to 1999	\$58,800	\$72,900	\$147,300
Built 1980 to 1989	\$70,000	\$71,400	\$118,300
Built 1970 to 1979	\$65,400	\$65,400	\$111,900
Built 1960 to 1969	\$89,300	\$83,600	\$97,100
Built 1950 to 1959	\$29,600	\$56,600	\$80,300
Built 1940 to 1949	\$55,000	\$64,400	\$67,900
Built 1939 or Earlier	\$74,400	\$59,700	\$74,400

Note: Dashes indicate the Census Bureau had insufficient data to estimate a median value.
Source: 2009-2013 American Community Survey, Table 25107

Hugo Single Family Sales Activity

The next series of tables provides data regarding single family home sales activity in Hugo. This data was furnished by County Records, Inc. from publicly available data. The data is separated by two, three and four bedroom homes, and then total data for all bedroom types.

Hugo Single Family Sales Activity					
Two Bedroom Units					
Year	2011	2012	2013	2014	YTD 2015
# of Units Sold	8	13	18	10	9
Average Sale Price	\$27,188	\$31,545	\$48,393	\$37,050	\$26,500
Average Square Feet	912	1,076	1,047	1,303	1,175
Average Price/SF	\$29.81	\$29.32	\$46.22	\$28.43	\$22.55
Average Year Built	1964	1966	1964	1963	1956

Source: Choctaw County Assessor, via County Records, Inc.

Hugo Single Family Sales Activity
Three Bedroom Units

Year	2011	2012	2013	2014	YTD 2015
# of Units Sold	35	29	45	35	37
Average Sale Price	\$42,857	\$48,712	\$54,383	\$43,712	\$54,160
Average Square Feet	1,417	1,596	1,464	1,458	1,421
Average Price/SF	\$30.24	\$30.52	\$37.15	\$29.98	\$38.11
Average Year Built	1970	1961	1962	1958	1964

Source: Choctaw County Assessor, via County Records, Inc.

Hugo Single Family Sales Activity
Four Bedroom Units

Year	2011	2012	2013	2014	YTD 2015
# of Units Sold	3	1	5	1	4
Average Sale Price	\$51,333	\$94,000	\$59,800	\$12,000	\$90,333
Average Square Feet	2,041	2,441	1,730	1,300	2,656
Average Price/SF	\$25.15	\$38.51	\$34.57	\$9.23	\$34.01
Average Year Built	1954	1988	1956	1958	1966

Source: Choctaw County Assessor, via County Records, Inc.

Hugo Single Family Sales Activity
All Bedroom Types

Year	2011	2012	2013	2014	YTD 2015
# of Units Sold	50	46	71	49	53
Average Sale Price	\$40,600	\$43,159	\$53,899	\$40,266	\$50,919
Average Square Feet	1,326	1,435	1,352	1,413	1,465
Average Price/SF	\$30.62	\$30.08	\$39.87	\$28.50	\$34.76
Average Year Built	1968	1962	1962	1960	1963

Source: Choctaw County Assessor, via County Records, Inc.

Between 2011 and 2014, the average sale price fluctuated between \$40,000 and \$54,000. The average sale price in 2015 was \$50,919 for an average price per square foot of \$34.76/SF. The average year of construction for homes sold in 2015 is 1963.

Foreclosure Rates

The next table presents foreclosure rate data for Choctaw County, compiled by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. This data is effective as of May 2014.

Foreclosure Rates

Geography	% of Outstanding Mortgages in Foreclosure, May 2014
Choctaw County	4.0%
State of Oklahoma	2.1%
United States	2.1%
Rank among Counties in Oklahoma*:	4

* Rank among the 64 counties for which foreclosure rates are available

Source: Federal Reserve Bank of New York, Community Credit Profiles

According to the data provided, the foreclosure rate in Choctaw County was 4.0% in May 2014. The county ranked 4 out of 64 counties in terms of highest foreclosure rates in Oklahoma. This rate compares with the statewide and nationwide foreclosure rates, both of which were 2.1%. With the 4th highest foreclosure rate in Oklahoma, the area housing market has likely been impacted by foreclosures, which can have a depressing effect on housing prices, lengthening marketing times and making it more difficult for potential buyers to secure financing.

Rental Market

This section will discuss supply and demand factors for the rental market in Choctaw County, based on publicly available sources as well as our own surveys of landlords and rental properties in the area.

Gross Rent Levels

The following table presents data regarding gross rental rates in Choctaw County. Gross rent is the sum of contract rent, plus all utilities such as electricity, gas, water, sewer and trash, as applicable (telephone, cable, and/or internet expenses are not included in these figures).

2013 Rental Units by Gross Rent						
	Hugo		Choctaw County		State of Oklahoma	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Total Rental Units:	848		1,597		475,345	
With cash rent:	812		1,324		432,109	
Less than \$100	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2,025	0.43%
\$100 to \$149	9	1.06%	9	0.56%	2,109	0.44%
\$150 to \$199	54	6.37%	60	3.76%	4,268	0.90%
\$200 to \$249	111	13.09%	137	8.58%	8,784	1.85%
\$250 to \$299	51	6.01%	65	4.07%	8,413	1.77%
\$300 to \$349	46	5.42%	57	3.57%	9,107	1.92%
\$350 to \$399	85	10.02%	105	6.57%	10,932	2.30%
\$400 to \$449	38	4.48%	55	3.44%	15,636	3.29%
\$450 to \$499	64	7.55%	103	6.45%	24,055	5.06%
\$500 to \$549	20	2.36%	71	4.45%	31,527	6.63%
\$550 to \$599	51	6.01%	134	8.39%	33,032	6.95%
\$600 to \$649	62	7.31%	96	6.01%	34,832	7.33%
\$650 to \$699	31	3.66%	62	3.88%	32,267	6.79%
\$700 to \$749	66	7.78%	107	6.70%	30,340	6.38%
\$750 to \$799	30	3.54%	90	5.64%	27,956	5.88%
\$800 to \$899	62	7.31%	95	5.95%	45,824	9.64%
\$900 to \$999	20	2.36%	49	3.07%	34,153	7.18%
\$1,000 to \$1,249	12	1.42%	26	1.63%	46,884	9.86%
\$1,250 to \$1,499	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	14,699	3.09%
\$1,500 to \$1,999	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	10,145	2.13%
\$2,000 or more	0	0.00%	3	0.19%	5,121	1.08%
No cash rent	36	4.25%	273	17.09%	43,236	9.10%
Median Gross Rent	\$459		\$550		\$699	
Sources: 2009-2013 American Community Survey, Tables B25063 and B25064						

Median gross rent in Choctaw County is estimated to be \$550, which is -21.3% less than Oklahoma's median gross rent of \$699/month. Median gross rent in Hugo is estimated to be \$459.

Median Gross Rent by Year of Construction

The next table presents data from the American Community Survey regarding median gross rent by year of housing unit construction. Note that dashes in the table indicate the Census Bureau had insufficient data to provide a median rent figure for that specific data field.

2013 Median Gross Rent by Year of Construction

	Hugo Median Rent	Choctaw County Median Rent	State of Oklahoma Median Rent
Total Rental Units:			
Built 2010 or Later	-	-	\$933
Built 2000 to 2009	\$248	\$473	\$841
Built 1990 to 1999	\$323	\$476	\$715
Built 1980 to 1989	\$757	\$730	\$693
Built 1970 to 1979	\$498	\$601	\$662
Built 1960 to 1969	\$473	\$553	\$689
Built 1950 to 1959	\$397	\$471	\$714
Built 1940 to 1949	\$464	\$459	\$673
Built 1939 or Earlier	-	\$475	\$651

Note: Dashes indicate the Census Bureau had insufficient data to estimate a median gross rent.

Source: 2009-2013 American Community Survey, Table 25111

The highest median gross rent in Choctaw County is among housing units in Hugo constructed between 1980 and 1989 (likely representing single-family rental homes and duplexes), which is \$757 per month. In order to be affordable, a household would need to earn at least \$30,280 per year to afford such a unit.

Hugo Rental Survey Data

The next two tables show the results of our rental survey of Hugo. The data is divided between market rate properties, and affordable properties of all types (project-based Section 8, Low-Income Housing Tax Credit, USDA Rural Development, etc.)

Hugo Rental Properties

Name	Type	Year Built	Bedrooms	Bathrooms	Size (SF)	Rate	Rate/SF	Vacancy
Terry Hill Apartments	Market Rate	N/A	1	1	620	\$357	\$0.576	0.00%
Terry Hill Apartments	Market Rate	N/A	2	1	770	\$406	\$0.527	0.00%
Terry Hill Apartments	Market Rate	N/A	3	2	966	\$492	\$0.509	0.00%
Kiamichi Gardens I & II	LIHTC / USDA / Elderly	2002	1	1	N/A	30%	N/A	0.00%
Kiamichi Gardens I & II	LIHTC / USDA / Elderly	2002	2	1	N/A	30%	N/A	0.00%
Windhaven Homes Phase I	LIHTC / Family	2013	3	2	1,400	\$257	\$0.184	0.00%
Windhaven Homes Phase I	LIHTC / Family	2013	3	2	1,400	\$515	\$0.368	0.00%
Windhaven Homes Phase I	LIHTC / Family	2013	4	2	1,540	\$568	\$0.369	0.00%
Savannah Park	LIHTC / USDA / Elderly	1993	1	1	N/A	30%	N/A	0.00%
Savannah Park	LIHTC / USDA / Elderly	1993	2	1	N/A	30%	N/A	0.00%

The previous rent surveys encompass over one hundred rental units in four complexes. These properties are located throughout the community and provide a good indication of the availability and rental structure of multifamily property. Concessions such as free rent or no deposit were not evident in the competitive market survey. Good quality market-rate apartments are in very short supply in

Hugo, and the Windhaven (Hugo Affordable Housing) project was the first affordable housing development for families constructed in the area in many years.

Rental Market Vacancy – Hugo

All of the rent comparables surveyed had occupancy levels of 100% and the three LIHTC properties operate with waiting list. Windhaven I has a waiting list of approximately 200 households. The overall market vacancy of rental housing units was reported at 14.09% by the Census Bureau as of the most recent American Community Survey: this suggests that vacancy is among relatively poorer quality rental units in substandard condition.



Rent Survey 1
Savannah Park



Rent Survey 2
Windhaven Homes Phase I



Rent Survey 3
Kiamichi Gardens I & II



Rent Survey 4
Terry Hill Apartments


Summary of HUD Subsidized Properties

The following tables present data for housing units and households subsidized by the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development, for Choctaw County, the State of Oklahoma, and the United States. This data is taken from HUD's "Picture of Subsidized Households" data for 2013, the most recent year available.

HUD Programs in Choctaw County						
Choctaw County	# Units	Occupancy Rate	Avg. Household Income	Tenant Contribution	Federal Contribution	% of Total Rent
Public Housing	244	93%	\$10,867	\$173	\$348	33.22%
Housing Choice Vouchers	179	59%	\$10,278	\$248	\$402	38.10%
Mod Rehab	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Section 8 NC/SR	74	93%	\$11,899	\$278	\$382	42.13%
Section 236	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Multi-Family Other	35	83%	\$10,430	\$235	\$203	53.75%
Summary of All HUD Programs	532	81%	\$10,865	\$213	\$355	37.49%
State of Oklahoma						
Public Housing	13,088	96%	\$11,328	\$215	\$371	36.71%
Housing Choice Vouchers	24,651	93%	\$10,766	\$283	\$470	37.57%
Mod Rehab	158	89%	\$7,272	\$129	\$509	20.17%
Section 8 NC/SR	4,756	93%	\$10,730	\$242	\$465	34.24%
Section 236	428	89%	\$8,360	\$192	\$344	35.82%
Multi-Family Other	7,518	91%	\$7,691	\$176	\$448	28.18%
Summary of All HUD Programs	50,599	94%	\$10,360	\$242	\$440	35.49%
United States						
Public Housing	1,150,867	94%	\$13,724	\$275	\$512	34.91%
Housing Choice Vouchers	2,386,237	92%	\$13,138	\$346	\$701	33.04%
Mod Rehab	19,148	87%	\$8,876	\$153	\$664	18.78%
Section 8 NC/SR	840,900	96%	\$12,172	\$274	\$677	28.80%
Section 236	126,859	93%	\$14,347	\$211	\$578	26.74%
Multi-Family Other	656,456	95%	\$11,135	\$255	\$572	30.80%
Summary of All HUD Programs	5,180,467	94%	\$12,892	\$304	\$637	32.30%

Source: U.S. Dept. of Housing and Urban Development, Picture of Subsidized Households - 2013

Among all HUD programs, there are 532 housing units located within Choctaw County, with an overall occupancy rate of 81%. The average household income among households living in these units is \$10,865. Total monthly rent for these units averages \$568, with the federal contribution averaging \$355 (62.51%) and the tenant's contribution averaging \$213 (37.49%).

Percentage of Total Rent Paid by Tenant - HUD Subsidized Properties

Source: 2013 HUD Picture of Subsidized Households


The following table presents select demographic variables among the households living in units subsidized by HUD.

Demographics of Persons in HUD Programs in Choctaw County


Choctaw County	# Units	% Single Mothers	% w/ Disability	% Age 62+	% Age 62+ w/ Disability	% Minority
Public Housing	244	33%	19%	22%	47%	61%
Housing Choice Vouchers	179	61%	10%	12%	55%	54%
Mod Rehab	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Section 8 NC/SR	74	53%	16%	27%	75%	41%
Section 236	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Multi-Family Other	35	0%	10%	100%	10%	13%
Summary of All HUD Programs	532	40%	16%	27%	42%	52%
State of Oklahoma						
Public Housing	13,088	33%	22%	28%	63%	44%
Housing Choice Vouchers	24,651	46%	25%	17%	77%	60%
Mod Rehab	158	46%	17%	13%	67%	42%
Section 8 NC/SR	4,756	14%	32%	52%	28%	25%
Section 236	428	32%	22%	24%	32%	33%
Multi-Family Other	7,518	42%	12%	22%	25%	47%
Summary of All HUD Programs	50,599	38%	23%	25%	53%	50%
United States						
Public Housing	1,150,867	36%	20%	31%	48%	71%
Housing Choice Vouchers	2,386,237	44%	22%	22%	68%	67%
Mod Rehab	19,148	28%	27%	24%	69%	71%
Section 8 NC/SR	840,900	18%	21%	56%	19%	45%
Section 236	126,859	25%	13%	47%	16%	59%
Multi-Family Other	656,456	31%	13%	44%	16%	63%
Summary of All HUD Programs	5,180,467	36%	20%	33%	40%	64%

Source: U.S. Dept. of Housing and Urban Development, Picture of Subsidized Households - 2013

40% of housing units are occupied by single parents with female heads of household. 16% of households have at least one person with a disability. 27% of households have either a householder or spouse age 62 or above. Of the households age 62 or above, 42% have one or more disabilities. Finally, 52% of households are designated as racial or ethnic minorities.


Percentage of Households with Disabilities - HUD Subsidized Properties

Source: 2013 HUD Picture of Subsidized Households

Percentage of Households Age 62+ - HUD Subsidized Properties

Source: 2013 HUD Picture of Subsidized Households

Percentage of Minority Households - HUD Subsidized Properties



Source: 2013 HUD Picture of Subsidized Households

Projected Housing Need

Consolidated Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS)

This section will analyze data from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development's Consolidated Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) dataset for Choctaw County. This data is typically separated into household income thresholds, defined by HUD Area Median Family Income (HAMFI). HUD Area Median Family Income (HAMFI) is equivalent to Area Median Income (AMI) for the purposes of this report. This data is considered the best indicator of housing need available which separates need into household income thresholds as defined by HUD.

Cost Burden by Income Threshold

The next table presents CHAS data for Choctaw County regarding housing cost burden as a percentage of household income. Renter costs are considered to be the sum of contract rent and any utilities not paid by the landlord (such as electricity, natural gas, and water, but not including telephone service, cable service, internet service, etc.). Homeowner costs include mortgage debt service (or similar debts such as deeds of trust or contracts for deed), utilities, property taxes and property insurance.

Households are considered to be cost overburdened if their housing costs (renter or owner) are greater than 30% of their gross household income. A household is "severely" overburdened if their housing costs are greater than 50% of their gross household income.

Choctaw County : CHAS - Housing Cost Burden by HAMFI				
Household Income / Cost Burden	Owners		Renters	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Income < 30% HAMFI	435		545	
Cost Burden Less Than 30%	70	16.09%	125	22.94%
Cost Burden Between 30%-50%	90	20.69%	105	19.27%
Cost Burden Greater Than 50%	235	54.02%	245	44.95%
Not Computed (no/negative income)	40	9.20%	70	12.84%
Income 30%-50% HAMFI	640		455	
Cost Burden Less Than 30%	375	58.59%	245	53.85%
Cost Burden Between 30%-50%	165	25.78%	85	18.68%
Cost Burden Greater Than 50%	100	15.63%	125	27.47%
Not Computed (no/negative income)	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Income 50%-80% HAMFI	840		385	
Cost Burden Less Than 30%	675	80.36%	295	76.62%
Cost Burden Between 30%-50%	105	12.50%	75	19.48%
Cost Burden Greater Than 50%	60	7.14%	15	3.90%
Not Computed (no/negative income)	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Income 80%-100% HAMFI	325		85	
Cost Burden Less Than 30%	280	86.15%	85	100.00%
Cost Burden Between 30%-50%	45	13.85%	0	0.00%
Cost Burden Greater Than 50%	4	1.23%	0	0.00%
Not Computed (no/negative income)	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
All Incomes	4,290		1,790	
Cost Burden Less Than 30%	3,390	79.02%	1,070	59.78%
Cost Burden Between 30%-50%	445	10.37%	265	14.80%
Cost Burden Greater Than 50%	419	9.77%	385	21.51%
Not Computed (no/negative income)	40	0.93%	70	3.91%


Source: 2008-2012 HUD Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy, Table 8

The next table summarizes the data from the previous table for households with cost burden greater than 30% of gross income, followed by a chart comparing these figures for Choctaw County with the State of Oklahoma as a whole, and the United States.

Choctaw County : Households by Income by Cost Burden				
Household Income Threshold	Owners		Renters	
	Total	% w/ Cost > 30% Income	Total	% w/ Cost > 30% Income
Income < 30% HAMFI	435	74.71%	545	64.22%
Income 30%-50% HAMFI	640	41.41%	455	46.15%
Income 50%-80% HAMFI	840	19.64%	385	23.38%
Income 80%-100% HAMFI	325	15.08%	85	0.00%
All Incomes	4,290	20.14%	1,790	36.31%

Source: 2008-2012 HUD Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy, Table 8

Households by Income Threshold: Percentage with Housing Cost Over 30% of Income



Source: 2008-2012 HUD Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy, Table 6

Substandard Conditions / Overcrowding by Income Threshold

The following table summarizes data regarding substandard housing conditions and overcrowding, separated by owner/renter and HAMFI income threshold. Substandard housing conditions are defined by HUD as any housing unit lacking either complete plumbing or a complete kitchen.

A housing unit without “complete plumbing” is any housing unit lacking one or more of the following features (they do not need to all be present in the same room):

1. Hot and cold running water
2. A flush toilet
3. A bathtub or shower

A lack of a complete kitchen is any housing unit lacking any one or more of the three following items:

1. A sink with a faucet
2. A stove or range
3. A refrigerator

Households are considered to be “overcrowded” if the household has more than 1.0 persons per room (note that this definition is “room” including bedrooms, living rooms and kitchens, as opposed to only “bedrooms”), and is “severely overcrowded” if the household has more than 1.5 persons per room.

Choctaw County : CHAS - HAMFI by Substandard Conditions / Overcrowding

Household Income / Housing Problem	Owners		Renters	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Income < 30% HAMFI	435		545	
Between 1.0 and 1.5 Persons per Room	4	0.92%	25	4.59%
More than 1.5 Persons per Room	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Lacks Complete Kitchen or Plumbing	4	0.92%	20	3.67%
Income 30%-50% HAMFI	640		455	
Between 1.0 and 1.5 Persons per Room	15	2.34%	4	0.88%
More than 1.5 Persons per Room	4	0.63%	4	0.88%
Lacks Complete Kitchen or Plumbing	10	1.56%	40	8.79%
Income 50%-80% HAMFI	840		385	
Between 1.0 and 1.5 Persons per Room	4	0.48%	10	2.60%
More than 1.5 Persons per Room	4	0.48%	0	0.00%
Lacks Complete Kitchen or Plumbing	20	2.38%	0	0.00%
Income 80%-100% HAMFI	325		85	
Between 1.0 and 1.5 Persons per Room	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
More than 1.5 Persons per Room	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Lacks Complete Kitchen or Plumbing	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
All Incomes	4,290		1,790	
Between 1.0 and 1.5 Persons per Room	48	1.12%	43	2.40%
More than 1.5 Persons per Room	12	0.28%	4	0.22%
Lacks Complete Kitchen or Plumbing	14	0.33%	64	3.58%


Source: 2008-2012 HUD Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy, Table 3

The next table summarizes this data for overcrowding (i.e. all households with greater than 1.0 persons per room), with a chart comparing this data between Choctaw County, Oklahoma and the nation.

Choctaw County : Households by Income by Overcrowding

Household Income Threshold	Total	Owners		Renters	
		% > 1.0 Persons per Room	Total	% > 1.0 Persons per Room	Total
Income < 30% HAMFI	435	0.92%	545	4.59%	
Income 30%-50% HAMFI	640	2.97%	455	1.76%	
Income 50%-80% HAMFI	840	0.95%	385	2.60%	
Income 80%-100% HAMFI	325	0.00%	85	0.00%	
All Incomes	4,290	1.40%	1,790	2.63%	

Source: 2008-2012 HUD Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy, Table 3

Households by Income Threshold: Percentage with More than 1.0 Persons per Room

Source: 2008-2012 HUD Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy, Table 3


The table following summarizes this data for substandard housing conditions, with a comparison chart between Choctaw County, the state and the nation.

Choctaw County : Households by Income by Substandard Conditions

Household Size/Type	Total	Owners		Renters	
		% Lacking Kitchen or Plumbing	Total	% Lacking Kitchen or Plumbing	
Income < 30% HAMFI	435	0.92%	545	3.67%	
Income 30%-50% HAMFI	640	1.56%	455	8.79%	
Income 50%-80% HAMFI	840	2.38%	385	0.00%	
Income 80%-100% HAMFI	325	0.00%	85	0.00%	
All Incomes	4,290	0.33%	1,790	3.58%	

Source: 2008-2012 HUD Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy, Table 3

Households by Income Threshold: Percentage Lacking Complete Plumbing and/or Kitchen



Source: 2008-2012 HUD Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy, Table 3

Cost Burden by Household Type

The following table provides a breakdown of households by HAMFI, and by household type and size, and by housing cost burden. The categories of household type provided by HUD are:

- Elderly Family: Households with two persons, either or both age 62 or over.
- Small Family: 2 persons, neither age 62 or over, or families with 3 or 4 persons of any age.
- Large Family: families with 5 or more persons.
- Elderly Non-Family (single persons age 62 or over, or unrelated elderly individuals)
- Non-Elderly, Non-Family: all other households.

Choctaw County : CHAS - Housing Cost Burden by Household Type / HAMFI


Income, Household Size/Type	Total	Owners		Total	Renters	
		No. w/ Cost > 30% Income	Pct. w/ Cost > 30% Income		No. w/ Cost > 30% Income	Pct. w/ Cost > 30% Income
Income < 30% HAMFI	435	333	76.55%	545	350	64.22%
Elderly Family	50	50	100.00%	4	0	0.00%
Small Family (2-4 persons)	170	140	82.35%	175	155	88.57%
Large Family (5 or more persons)	4	8	200.00%	35	35	100.00%
Elderly Non-Family	105	80	76.19%	110	55	50.00%
Non-Family, Non-Elderly	105	55	52.38%	220	105	47.73%
Income 30%-50% HAMFI	640	264	41.25%	455	213	46.81%
Elderly Family	160	50	31.25%	35	10	28.57%
Small Family (2-4 persons)	130	60	46.15%	170	95	55.88%
Large Family (5 or more persons)	75	35	46.67%	10	4	40.00%
Elderly Non-Family	260	115	44.23%	160	80	50.00%
Non-Family, Non-Elderly	20	4	20.00%	85	24	28.24%
Income 50%-80% HAMFI	840	167	19.88%	385	94	24.42%
Elderly Family	225	30	13.33%	25	0	0.00%
Small Family (2-4 persons)	255	95	37.25%	205	70	34.15%
Large Family (5 or more persons)	30	10	33.33%	35	0	0.00%
Elderly Non-Family	170	24	14.12%	55	20	36.36%
Non-Family, Non-Elderly	160	8	5.00%	70	4	5.71%
Income 80%-100% HAMFI	325	43	13.23%	85	0	0.00%
Elderly Family	95	4	4.21%	4	0	0.00%
Small Family (2-4 persons)	120	10	8.33%	25	0	0.00%
Large Family (5 or more persons)	15	4	26.67%	0	0	N/A
Elderly Non-Family	40	10	25.00%	35	0	0.00%
Non-Family, Non-Elderly	55	15	27.27%	25	0	0.00%
All Incomes	4,290	871	20.30%	1,790	657	36.70%
Elderly Family	965	159	16.48%	78	10	12.82%
Small Family (2-4 persons)	1,860	330	17.74%	750	320	42.67%
Large Family (5 or more persons)	239	57	23.85%	105	39	37.14%
Elderly Non-Family	725	239	32.97%	390	155	39.74%
Non-Family, Non-Elderly	505	86	17.03%	485	133	27.42%

Source: 2008-2012 HUD Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy, Table 7

Choctaw County : Households under 80% AMI by Cost Burden

Household Size/Type	Total	Owners		Total	Renters	
		No. w/ Cost > 30% Income	Pct. w/ Cost > 30% Income		No. w/ Cost > 30% Income	Pct. w/ Cost > 30% Income
Income < 80% HAMFI	1,915	764	39.90%	1,385	657	47.44%
Elderly Family	435	130	29.89%	64	10	15.63%
Small Family (2-4 persons)	555	295	53.15%	550	320	58.18%
Large Family (5 or more persons)	109	53	48.62%	80	39	48.75%
Elderly Non-Family	535	219	40.93%	325	155	47.69%
Non-Family, Non-Elderly	285	67	23.51%	375	133	35.47%

Source: 2008-2012 HUD Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy, Table 7

Households Under 80% of AMI: Percentage Housing Cost Overburdened

Source: 2008-2012 HUD Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy, Table 7

Housing Problems by Household Type

The next set of tables presents data by household type and whether or not the household is experiencing **any** housing problems. Housing problems are defined by HUD as any household meeting any of the three following criteria:

1. Housing costs greater than 30% of income (cost-overburdened).
2. Living in a housing unit lacking complete plumbing or a complete kitchen (substandard housing unit).
3. Living in a housing unit with more than 1.0 persons per room (overcrowding).

Choctaw County : CHAS - Housing Problems by Household Type and HAMFI


Income, Household Size/Type	Total	Owners		Total	Renters	
		No. w/ Housing Problems	Pct. w/ Housing Problems		No. w/ Housing Problems	Pct. w/ Housing Problems
Income < 30% HAMFI	435	324	74.48%	545	370	67.89%
Elderly Family	50	45	90.00%	4	0	0.00%
Small Family (2-4 persons)	170	140	82.35%	175	160	91.43%
Large Family (5 or more persons)	4	4	100.00%	35	35	100.00%
Elderly Non-Family	105	80	76.19%	110	55	50.00%
Non-Family, Non-Elderly	105	55	52.38%	220	120	54.55%
Income 30%-50% HAMFI	640	289	45.16%	455	225	49.45%
Elderly Family	160	50	31.25%	35	10	28.57%
Small Family (2-4 persons)	130	60	46.15%	170	95	55.88%
Large Family (5 or more persons)	75	55	73.33%	10	10	100.00%
Elderly Non-Family	260	120	46.15%	160	85	53.13%
Non-Family, Non-Elderly	20	4	20.00%	85	25	29.41%
Income 50%-80% HAMFI	840	184	21.90%	385	99	25.71%
Elderly Family	225	40	17.78%	25	0	0.00%
Small Family (2-4 persons)	255	95	37.25%	205	65	31.71%
Large Family (5 or more persons)	30	20	66.67%	35	10	28.57%
Elderly Non-Family	170	25	14.71%	55	20	36.36%
Non-Family, Non-Elderly	160	4	2.50%	70	4	5.71%
Income Greater than 80% of HAMFI	2,375	140	5.89%	405	8	1.98%
Elderly Family	530	30	5.66%	15	0	0.00%
Small Family (2-4 persons)	1,305	45	3.45%	200	4	2.00%
Large Family (5 or more persons)	130	20	15.38%	25	4	16.00%
Elderly Non-Family	190	25	13.16%	60	0	0.00%
Non-Family, Non-Elderly	225	20	8.89%	110	0	0.00%
All Incomes	4,290	937	21.84%	1,790	702	39.22%
Elderly Family	965	165	17.10%	79	10	12.66%
Small Family (2-4 persons)	1,860	340	18.28%	750	324	43.20%
Large Family (5 or more persons)	239	99	41.42%	105	59	56.19%
Elderly Non-Family	725	250	34.48%	385	160	41.56%
Non-Family, Non-Elderly	510	83	16.27%	485	149	30.72%

Source: 2008-2012 HUD Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy, Table 16

Choctaw County : Households under 80% AMI by Housing Problems

Household Size/Type	Total	Owners		Total	Renters	
		No. w/ Housing Problems	Pct. w/ Housing Problems		No. w/ Housing Problems	Pct. w/ Housing Problems
Income < 80% HAMFI	1,915	797	41.62%	1,385	694	50.11%
Elderly Family	435	135	31.03%	64	10	15.63%
Small Family (2-4 persons)	555	295	53.15%	550	320	58.18%
Large Family (5 or more persons)	109	79	72.48%	80	55	68.75%
Elderly Non-Family	535	225	42.06%	325	160	49.23%
Non-Family, Non-Elderly	285	63	22.11%	375	149	39.73%

Source: 2008-2012 HUD Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy, Table 7

Households Under 80% of AMI: Percentage with Housing Problems

Source: 2008-2012 HUD Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy, Table 7

Housing Problems by Race / Ethnicity

Data presented in the following tables summarizes housing problems (as previously defined), by HAMFI threshold, and by race/ethnicity, for Choctaw County. Under CFR 91.305(b)(1)(ii)(2), racial or ethnic groups have disproportionate need if “the percentage of persons in a category of need who are members of a particular racial or ethnic group in a category of need is at least 10 percentage points higher than the percentage of persons in the category as a whole.”

Choctaw County : CHAS - Housing Problems by Race / Ethnicity and HAMFI


Income, Race / Ethnicity	Total	Owners		Total	Renters	
		No. w/ Housing Problems	Pct. w/ Housing Problems		No. w/ Housing Problems	Pct. w/ Housing Problems
Income < 30% HAMFI	435	325	74.7%	550	365	66.4%
White alone, non-Hispanic	315	250	79.4%	320	200	62.5%
Black or African-American alone	49	35	71.4%	109	90	82.6%
Asian alone	0	0	N/A	0	0	N/A
American Indian alone	12	4	33.3%	30	20	66.7%
Pacific Islander alone	0	0	N/A	0	0	N/A
Hispanic, any race	15	15	100.0%	4	4	100.0%
Other (including multiple races)	40	20	50.0%	85	50	58.8%
Income 30%-50% HAMFI	640	290	45.3%	455	225	49.5%
White alone, non-Hispanic	500	245	49.0%	260	120	46.2%
Black or African-American alone	85	10	11.8%	65	25	38.5%
Asian alone	0	0	N/A	0	0	N/A
American Indian alone	19	15	78.9%	90	50	55.6%
Pacific Islander alone	0	0	N/A	0	0	N/A
Hispanic, any race	10	10	100.0%	10	10	100.0%
Other (including multiple races)	19	4	21.1%	25	15	60.0%
Income 50%-80% HAMFI	835	180	21.6%	385	100	26.0%
White alone, non-Hispanic	550	145	26.4%	190	40	21.1%
Black or African-American alone	60	10	16.7%	115	25	21.7%
Asian alone	0	0	N/A	0	0	N/A
American Indian alone	65	15	23.1%	60	25	41.7%
Pacific Islander alone	0	0	N/A	0	0	N/A
Hispanic, any race	4	0	0.0%	8	4	50.0%
Other (including multiple races)	160	10	6.3%	10	0	0.0%
Income 80%-100% HAMFI	325	45	13.8%	85	0	0.0%
White alone, non-Hispanic	250	25	10.0%	55	0	0.0%
Black or African-American alone	4	4	100.0%	30	0	0.0%
Asian alone	0	0	N/A	0	0	N/A
American Indian alone	24	4	16.7%	0	0	N/A
Pacific Islander alone	0	0	N/A	0	0	N/A
Hispanic, any race	4	0	0.0%	0	0	N/A
Other (including multiple races)	45	10	22.2%	4	0	0.0%
All Incomes	4,285	930	21.7%	1,795	700	39.0%
White alone, non-Hispanic	3,135	740	23.6%	1,009	364	36.1%
Black or African-American alone	333	59	17.7%	349	140	40.1%
Asian alone	4	0	0.0%	10	0	0.0%
American Indian alone	284	42	14.8%	215	95	44.2%
Pacific Islander alone	0	0	N/A	0	0	N/A
Hispanic, any race	53	35	66.0%	42	18	42.9%
Other (including multiple races)	478	48	10.0%	163	69	42.3%

Source: 2008-2012 HUD Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy, Table 1

Choctaw County : Households under 80% AMI by Race/Ethnicity

Household Size/Type	Total	Owners		Total	Renters	
		No. w/ Housing Problems	Pct. w/ Housing Problems		No. w/ Housing Problems	Pct. w/ Housing Problems
Income < 80% HAMFI	1,910	795	41.62%	1,390	690	49.64%
White alone, non-Hispanic	1,365	640	46.89%	770	360	46.75%
Black or African-American alone	194	55	28.35%	289	140	48.44%
Asian alone	0	0	N/A	0	0	N/A
American Indian alone	96	34	35.42%	180	95	52.78%
Pacific Islander alone	0	0	N/A	0	0	N/A
Hispanic, any race	29	25	86.21%	22	18	81.82%
Other (including multiple races)	219	34	15.53%	120	65	54.17%

Source: 2008-2012 HUD Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy, Table 7

Households Under 80% of AMI: Percentage with Housing Problems by Race

Source: 2008-2012 HUD Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy, Table 7

CHAS Conclusions

The previous data notes many areas of need (and severe need) among the existing population of Choctaw County. The greatest needs are among households with incomes less than 30% of Area Median Income. Several other areas of note:

- Among households with incomes less than 50% of Area Median Income, there are 560 renter households that are cost overburdened, and 590 homeowners that are cost overburdened.
- Among **elderly** households with incomes less than 50% of Area Median Income, there are 145 renter households that are cost overburdened, and 295 homeowners that are cost overburdened.

- 81.82% of Hispanic renters with incomes less than 80% of Area Median Income have one or more housing problems, and 94.9% of Hispanic homeowners with incomes less than 80% of Area Median Income have one or more housing problems.

Overall Anticipated Housing Demand

Future demand for housing units in Choctaw County can be estimated from population and household growth. Population estimates are based on known factors such as noted increases in the city employment base and indications from demographic services. In this case we have considered data from both the U.S. Census Bureau and Nielsen SiteReports. The estimates of changes in households and population were presented in a previous section of this report. The anticipated future demand is estimated for Hugo, as well as Choctaw County as a whole. The calculations are shown in the following tables.

Hugo Anticipated Demand

As indicated throughout the report, the population, households and number of housing units have decreased over the last fifteen years. The following table summarizes population, household, and housing unit changes.

Hugo Historical Population and Housing Changes					
	2000 Census	2010 Census	% Change	2015 Estimate	% Change
Population	5,536	5,310	-0.42%	5,196	-0.43%
Households	2,309	2,217	-0.41%	2,193	-0.22%
Housing Units	2,798	2,665	-0.49%	2,637	-0.21%

Sources: 2000 and 2010 Decennial Censuses, Nielsen SiteReports

As shown, the number of housing units and the population declined at almost identical rates from 2000 to 2010. It is the opinion of this analyst that population decline will not be as rapid in the next several years but that the deterioration of the housing stock will continue at current rates. This will lead to reduced availability of housing units in the city of Hugo.

According to local officials, there is very high demand for rental units that is not currently satisfied in the market. This is evident from very high occupancy rates for market rate rental units. High occupancy rates reduce options for potential residents of Hugo and may lead people who are employed in Hugo to live outside the city limits. There also appears to be high demand for affordable owner-occupied property. There has been limited single-family development in the past decade. There is an adequate supply of housing units that are valued below \$60,000. Sporadic development of custom-built housing units priced above \$150,000 has also occurred. Households that prefer housing units valued between \$60,000 and \$80,000 have a limited product available in the city of Hugo. In general, there appears to be unsatisfied demand for median-income rental and owner-occupied property.

Choctaw County Anticipated Demand

As indicated throughout the report, the population, households and number of housing units have decreased over the last fifteen years. The following table summarizes population, household, and housing unit changes.

Choctaw County Historical Population and Housing Changes					
	2000 Census	2010 Census	% Change	2015 Estimate	% Change
Population	15,342	15,205	-0.09%	14,895	-0.41%
Households	6,220	6,270	0.08%	6,169	-0.32%
Housing Units	7,539	7,521	-0.02%	7,500	-0.06%

Sources: 2000 and 2010 Decennial Censuses, Nielsen SiteReports

As mentioned previously, the population is declining at a rate faster than the number of housing units declined. The loss of housing units may be attributed to demolitions outpacing new construction. The percentage loss of households was not as high as the percentage population loss due to declining average household size. It is unlikely that the average household size will significantly decrease in the future.

Although a large portion of the housing stock was torn down during the 2000s, there were 1,251 more housing units than households in the county according to the 2010 Census. It is the opinion of this analyst that minimal demand exists for new housing units. This opinion is based on the projection that the population of Choctaw County will continue to decline in the future. However, the housing stock of Choctaw County is rapidly aging and deteriorating. A small amount of affordable new housing would improve the county's housing infrastructure and give more housing options to current residents of Choctaw County, and the 3rd and 4th phases of Hugo Affordable Housing should go far in meeting these needs.

Special Topics

Choctaw County Disaster Resiliency Assessment

The purpose of this section is to assess at the county level key components of disaster resiliency. Housing location and quality as well as planning activities can help reduce impacts from disaster events and allow for faster recovery. Disasters can include tornadoes, extreme weather, high winds, as well as man-made events. These events may largely be inevitable, but the ability to reduce damage and casualties as well recovery can be improved with good planning

C.0 Comprehensive Plans & Hazard Mitigation Plans

There are 7 key cities within Choctaw County (Hugo, Fort Towson, Boswell, Soper, Grant, Swink, Sawyer).

Comprehensive plans are the guiding documents for cities of various sizes to address key aspects of their community from land use, transportation, environment, housing, and economic development.

No comprehensive plan for the City of Hugo or Choctaw County was found.

The other key plan for a city to manage, mitigate and plan for recovery related to disasters is a **Hazard Mitigation Plan** (or Emergency Management Plan). Often low density counties, the Hazard Mitigation Plan is done at the county level, though some cities may augment the county plan with a city plan.

The county does have an identified emergency management director however no Hazard Mitigation Plan was found for Choctaw County. No website was found for the City of Hugo or Choctaw to obtain general information.


C.2.1.1. Historical Data on Natural Disasters and Other Hazards


Data on historical damages and casualties is typically collected as part of a **Hazard Mitigation Plan** preparation to determine the appropriate planning measures and actions to take before and after an event.


Flooding, based on FEMA FIRM maps, does not show floodplain areas in the county. The National Flood Hazard Layer (Official) is not available for this area. Flash flooding is a concern for all parts of the state after heavy precipitation.

NOAA data shows the following historic data on disaster events for the county:

Historic data on tornados between 1950-2014 there are 22 tornados documented. There were 45 injuries that occurred connected to these tornados, with 29 of those injuries happening in the 1982 tornado. There were 0 fatalities connected to tornadoes during this time period. Property losses between 1950-1996 ranged from \$1,172,500.00 to \$11,725,000.00. (The accounting methods used for losses changed in 1996.) The losses estimated between 1996-2014 was \$0.







C.2.1.2; C.2.1.6; C.2.1.7; C.2.1.8 Shelters from Disaster Event

No information regarding public or private storm shelters was found.

C.2.1.3 Public Policy and Governance to Build Disaster Resiliency

No information regarding public policy and governance was found. This information is typically include in Comprehensive Plans, Hazard Mitigation Plans, or other public documents. None of this information was found for Choctaw County.

C.2.1.4 Local Emergency Response Agency Structure

The structure for response and to address any perceived vulnerabilities in the county should be included in the Hazard Mitigation Plan. No HMP was acquired for Choctaw County. However according to state resources, the county and the City of Hugo are listed to have emergency managers. See <https://www.ok.gov/publicsafetybroadband/documents/EmergencyManagementCounty.pdf>


C.2.1.5 Threat & Hazard Warning Systems

No hazard warning systems were found for Choctaw County or the City of Hugo.


Social Vulnerability


Based on the research work done by the Texas A&M University Hazard Reduction and Recovery Center, an added component is being included in this section. Social vulnerability can place households at a further disadvantage during and after a disaster. This analysis is assessing for the county the levels of social vulnerability based on demographic indicators to highlight 'hotspots' or counties that have higher social vulnerability. That combined with Hazard Mitigation Plans – or lack thereof – can highlight places where additional work is needed to reduce impacts on households.

Social Vulnerability Analysis - Choctaw County			
Base Social Vulnerability Indicators (%)		2nd Order	3rd Order
1.) Single Parent Households	15.14%	0.219	3.599 Social Vulnerability 'Hotspot' or Area of Concern
2.) Population Under 5	6.80%	(Child Care Needs)	
3.) Population 65 or Above	18.50%	0.353	
4.) Population 65 or Above & Below Poverty Rate	16.75%	(Elder Needs)	
5.) Workers Using Public Transportation	0.81%	0.094	
6.) Occupied Housing Units w/o Vehicle	8.56%	(Transportation Needs)	
7.) Housing Unit Occupancy Rate	80.44%	2.58 (Temporary Shelter and Housing Recovery Needs)	
8.) Rental Occupancy Rate	26.43%		
9.) Non-White Population	36.88%		
10.) Population in Group Quarters	1.28%		
11.) Housing Units Built Prior to 1990	68.43%		
12.) Mobile Homes, RVs, Vans, etc.	17.45%		
13.) Poverty Rate	27.08%		
14.) Housing Units Lacking Telephones	3.76%	0.354 (Civic Capacity Needs)	
15.) Age 25+ With Less Than High School Diploma	19.50%		
16.) Unemployment Rate	11.27%		
17.) Age 5+ Which Cannot Speak English Well or Not At All	0.86%		
Sources: Shannon Van Zandt, Texas A&M, Hazard Planning materials, and 2009-2013 American Community Survey, Tables B11003, B01001, B17001, B08301, B25044, B25001, B25042, B02001, B03002, B26001, B25036, B17001, B25043, S1501, B23025 & B06007			



Social Vulnerability - Impacts on Housing & Disaster Resiliency





Social vulnerability combined with the devastating impacts of a natural or man-made disaster can compound a household's ability to recover and in fact can place those individuals at an even great gap or disadvantage prior to the event (Shannon Van Zandt, Texas A&M, Hazard Planning materials).

This county has an elevated score per this index for social vulnerability when comparing as a county to other counties in the state. Looking at the census tract level, the Hugo area and tracts on the east and western edges of the county have particularly higher scores for social vulnerability. People in these areas may have additional difficulties during a hazard event due to transportation and family needs. Additionally recovery for socially vulnerable populations can be slow and may require additional outside assistance.

Recommendations for this county:

- Update the HMP for Choctaw County, the county should pursue funding/grants for the development of an HMP and have the plan approved by the state and FEMA. The county should also continually maintain and update the HMP.
- Special efforts should be given to strengthen building codes related to tornadoes and natural disasters; such as the suggestion of using "hurricane clips" in new residential development.
- Choctaw County should pursue funding/grants for public storm shelters.
- Planning for shelters from disaster events for multifamily, HUD and LIHTC units, in addition to all housing in the community should be incorporated with any effort to increase housing.

Homelessness

By Continuum of Care

Oklahoma is comprised of eight Continuums of Care (CoC). These entities manage the provision of services to the homeless, among other functions. By definition, CoCs involve nonprofit homeless providers; victim service providers; faith-based organizations; governments; businesses; advocates; public housing agencies; school districts; social service providers; mental health agencies; hospitals; universities; affordable housing developers; law enforcement and other organizations that serve the homeless and those at risk of becoming homeless (Continuum of Care Network pamphlet, 2015). These entities are governed by a community plan that helps them deliver services to the homeless and/or to prevent a return to the homeless. CoCs provide a variety of services aimed at outreach, engagement and assessment, including emergency shelter, rapid re-housing, transitional housing, and permanent housing, among others (Continuum of Care Network pamphlet, 2015).

The data below describes the characteristics of those receiving or eligible for the CoC in which Choctaw County is located. This data is collected by the CoCs on last day of January each year and reported on an annual basis. It is currently the best source of data available at the State level of understanding the demographics of these populations.

OK 507 Southeastern Oklahoma

OK 507 represents McCurtain, Choctaw, Pushmataha, Bryan, Carter, Love, Pontotoc, Coal, Murray, Johnson, Atoka, Marshall, Pittsburg, Latimer, LeFlore, Haskell, McIntosh, Hughes, Okfuskee, Okmulgee, and Muskogee counties. There is a high rate of homelessness in this region, most of which seek shelter in small towns and rural areas. The majority of the homeless in this CoC are classified as chronically homeless (73). There are also a significant number of homeless that are mentally ill (49) and chronic substance abusers (50). The location of a correctional facility in this area may contribute to the disproportionate number of homeless in the CoC.

OK 507 Southeastern OK Regional	Emergency Shelter(sheltered)	Transitional Housing(sheltered)	Unsheltered	Total
Households without children	121	10	70	201
Households with at least 1 adult & 1 child	32	1	20	53
Households with only children	0	0	0	0
total homeless households	153	11	90	254
Persons in households without children	126	10	104	240
persons age 18-24	19	1	23	43
persons over age 24	107	9	81	197
Persons in households with at least 1 adult & 1 child	86	3	113	202
children under age 18	49	2	46	97
persons age 18-24	9	0	23	32
persons over 24	28	1	44	73
persons in households with only 1 children	0	0	0	0
Total homeless persons	212	13	217	442
Subpopulations	Sheltered		Unsheltered	Total
Chronically Homeless	23		50	73
Chronically Homeless Individuals	13		40	53
Chronically Homeless Persons in Families	10		10	20
Severely Mentally Ill	20		29	49
Chronic Substance Abuse	25		25	50
Veterans	8		13	21
HIV/AIDS	1		2	3
Victims of Domestic Violence	26		3	29

CoC Number: OK-507

CoC Name: Southeastern Oklahoma Regional CoC

Summary of all beds reported by Continuum of Care:

	Family Units ¹	Family Beds ¹	Adult-Only Beds	Child-Only Beds	Total Yr-Round Beds	Seasonal	Overflow / Voucher	Subset of Total Bed Inventory		
								Chronic Beds ²	Veteran Beds ³	Youth Beds ³
Emergency, Safe Haven and Transitional Housing	54	145	206	0	351	0	3	n/a	0	0
Emergency Shelter	53	142	189	0	331	0	3	n/a	0	0
Transitional Housing	1	3	17	0	20	n/a	n/a	n/a	0	0
Permanent Housing	19	71	23	0	94	n/a	n/a	2	32	0
Permanent Supportive Housing*	15	58	21	0	79	n/a	n/a	2	32	0
Rapid Re-Housing	4	13	2	0	15	n/a	n/a	n/a	0	0
Grand Total	73	216	229	0	445	0	3	2	32	0

COC Conclusion

Each of the CoC's represents a unique area. It's important to note that the Point In Time data serves as a baseline. It is likely that the homeless population is much larger than counted. Generally, the State's homeless population is over the age of 24. In some areas of the State, there is a disproportionately high rate of homeless youth. More detailed exploration is necessary to understand the reasons which led them to this State and the needs of homeless youth. Domestic violence victims comprise a significant portion of the homeless population in the State. In some areas, the presence of social service providers for this subpopulation has reduced homeless rates. The same is true with respect to homeless veterans. As anticipated, the majority of the homeless population across the state can be classified as: mentally ill, chronically homeless, and chronic substance abusers. The needs of these difficult to house homeless must remain a priority across the State.

A Snap Shot of Homelessness in the State

Point in Time data was last collected on January 29, 2015 across the State. On that date, counts revealed a homeless populations of more than 3,000 residents. The majority of those counted (2,603 individuals) were classified as households without children. The majority of this group lives in emergency shelters (1,652) or transitional housing (376) with 575 classified as unsheltered.

The number of households with children is seemingly small totaling 343. The vast majority of those in this classification live at emergency shelters (201) or transitional housing (104) with only 38 classified as unsheltered. Homeless service providers in Oklahoma City and Tulsa emphasized that this group was likely undercounted across the State because they are less visible than other categories of homeless. They emphasized that emergency shelters, as presently designed, do not meet the needs of families with children in terms of both privacy and safety.

The Point in Time data reveals less than 100 households comprised of only children. Of these 74 counted households, 35 live in emergency shelters and 39 are unsheltered. This population is likely significantly undercounted as youth who are homeless typically seek to avoid identification for fear of being returned to their homes. These young people often have specific needs for supportive services that are difficult to deliver because the population remains unseen. Homeless advocates in the State hold up Tulsa as a good example of the State for serving homeless youth. OKC's Be the Change is also a leader in identifying and providing needed service to homeless youth in the metropolitan region. The problem of homeless youth is not just isolated to large urban areas. Mid-sized and smaller cities also look for innovative ways to service. Cities like El Reno and Enid have their own drop in centers for homeless youth. Social networks in smaller cities fill similar functions.

Oklahoma City public schools also tracks homeless students within the district. There are homeless students attending 78 elementary and middle schools in Oklahoma City. This data suggests that the majority of the city's homeless students are African American or Hispanic. There are 664 homeless African American students, 724 homeless Hispanic students, and 254 homeless Caucasian students. There are ten high schools in OKC that have reported having homeless students. Douglass and Capitol Hill high schools have the highest homeless student populations. Douglass has 50 homeless African American students. Capitol Hill has 49 homeless Hispanic students. The majority of these students can be classified as "couch homeless" or doubled up, meaning that they are finding

shelter with extended family members, friends, and other non-relatives for a brief amount of time due to hardship.

The majority of Oklahoma's homeless population is over 24 years old. This classification system is not particularly useful in helping to assess the number and needs of the elderly population, which is reported to be a substantial subset of this population.

The Point in Time data categorizes the homeless population into two categories: Hispanic/Latino and Non-Hispanic/Non-Latino. The lion's share of homeless in Oklahoma are Non-Hispanic/Non-Latino (3,528). In Oklahoma City, 62% of the homeless served are classified as Caucasian. Twenty-five percent of the homeless population is African American. Seven percent of the homeless in OKC identify as Native American. Less than one percent of those identified as homeless in OKC are Asian. By contrast, a relatively small fraction of the State's homeless population is Hispanic/Latino. The Point in Time data identified a relatively small Hispanic homeless population, including less than 250 individuals. This follows OKC counts that identify 7% of the city's homeless population as Hispanic. Homeless advocates in OKC indicate that social networks, including churches and extended families, keep the number of homeless in the Hispanic population proportionately lower than their Non-Hispanic/Non-Latino counterparts. However, these individuals likely classify as "couch homeless" and are in a continued state of being vulnerable to becoming homeless.

The PIC data indicates that there are more homeless males (2,237) than females (1,535). This follows national trends. Care should be taken when interpreting this data, as women are less likely to participate in Point in Time counts. There is a growing population of homeless in Oklahoma that identifies as transgender. PIC data identified 5 individuals identifying as transgender. This population is likely much higher and will continue to grow due to family and national attitudes about this population. Transgender populations may require special housing accommodations, especially in the emergency shelter context, to provide for their social and emotional needs.

Another group of homeless individuals that merits special consideration in the distribution of resources is those identified as having special needs. This classification includes persons with "physical, mental or behavioral disabilities, persons with HIV/AIDS and/or persons with alcohol or drug addictions. The Point in Time data estimates that there are nearly 1300 homeless persons with special needs in OKC alone.

The Point in Time data is coarse and does not do an effectively track homeless populations with specific needs, such as those persons who are homeless and living with HIV/AIDS. This special population of homeless is likely growing in Oklahoma. According to the Oklahoma State Department of Health there were an estimated 5,375 cases of persons living with HIV/AIDS by the end of 2013. There were a total of 437 newly diagnosed HIV/AIDS cases in 2013 for the state of Oklahoma. The vast majority of populations living with HIV/AIDS (nearly 72%) reside in urban areas. In OKC alone, the Point in Time data identified at least 25 homeless individuals living with HIV/AIDS. This is likely an undercount. Based on this information and anecdotal data from homeless service providers, special effort must be made to understand the housing, medical, and supportive services needs of homeless persons living with HIV/AIDS.

Shelter is crucial for homeless persons with HIV/AIDS in the management of this illness. However, traditional shelter setting(s) may not be suitable to house this population. Those with suppressed immune systems are vulnerable to the spread of infectious diseases which may be present in open shelters. In addition, shelter personnel may not be properly trained in handling AIDS related issues. For these reasons, as well as resources made available by the federal government, homeless persons living with HIV/AIDS are often given housing choice vouchers, created by HOPWA, so that they secure housing on the private market. This can be challenging in constrained rental markets like Norman, for example, where affordable housing options are limited. It is estimated that more than 60 individuals living in OKC with HIV/AIDS are homeless because they have been unable to find a landlord that will accept their housing choice voucher.

State Name: Oklahoma**Point-in Time Date:** 1/29/2015**Summary by household type reported:**

	Sheltered		Unsheltered	Total
	Emergency Shelter	Transitional Housing*		
Households without children ¹	1,652	376	575	2,603
Households with at least one adult and one child ²	201	104	38	343
Households with only children ³	35	0	39	74
Total Homeless Households	1,888	480	652	3,020

Summary of persons in each household type:

Persons in households without children ¹	1,676	397	623	2,696
Persons Age 18 to 24	214	61	110	385
Persons Over Age 24	1,462	336	513	2,311
Persons in households with at least one adult and one child ²	595	293	108	996
Children Under Age 18	373	176	57	606
Persons Age 18 to 24	40	29	13	82
Persons Over Age 24	182	88	38	308
Persons in households with only children ³	38	0	47	85
Total Homeless Persons	2,309	690	778	3,777

Demographic summary by ethnicity:

	Sheltered		Unsheltered	Total
	Emergency Shelter	Transitional Housing*		
Hispanic / Latino	154	43	52	249
Non-Hispanic / Non-Latino	2,155	647	726	3,528
Total	2,309	690	778	3,777

Demographic summary by gender:

Female	1,004	272	259	1,535
Male	1,302	416	519	2,237
Transgender	3	2	0	5
Total	2,309	690	778	3,777

Rural Areas

Homelessness in the rural areas of the State is much more difficult to calculate. Given the population density of the State, the majority of services that serve the homeless are concentrated in urban and semi-urban areas. Even if beds are available, many rural homeless lack knowledge about the services or a means to travel to receive the same. As a part of this study, OU students were dispatched into the 77 counties in the State to, among other issues, attempt to understand the degree to which there is rural homelessness in the State. Their qualitative inquiries yielded very little data, in part, because rural homeless is difficult to identify and often ignored. For the purposes of this report, a literature review was prepared on the topic of rural homelessness in the United States. The goals of this academic review is to assist policymakers and service providers in the State in uncovering the dimensions of this illusive population.

In the U.S., the rural homeless population is predominantly Caucasian. This population is comprised of single mothers, widowed wives and husbands, divorced and separated men and women, and young people. A study examining rural homelessness in Ohio found that nearly 40% of those who classify as homeless were divorced, separated, or widowed (First, Richard J., John C. Rife, and Beverly G. Toomey, 1994, pg. 101). Ohio's rural homeless were also relatively young. Close to 80% of homeless population in this study was between the ages of 18 and 39 years old (First et al, 1994, pg. 101). Rural homelessness is often less visible than urban homelessness because these populations commonly take shelter are at a friend's house, in their vehicles, or on abandoned properties. These populations can also be found on "...campgrounds or in hollows, desert canyons, farmers' fields, state parks, and highway rest areas" (Milbourne and Cloke, 2006, pg. 17).

The causes of rural homelessness mirror, in most ways, the plight of the urban homeless. The study of homelessness in rural Ohio revealed family problems and substance abuse issues as primary causes of rural homelessness. The incidence of homelessness resulting from situations of domestic violence is high in rural areas (Cummins et al, 1998). Substance abuse issues are a common cause for homelessness in rural America. The literature reveals that this population tends to be homeless because they have isolated themselves from family and people who want to help (First et al, 1994). In the case of both domestic violence and substance abuse, it is often difficult for these individuals to find shelter and the supportive services they require in rural areas where options are limited, if available at all. The thought of moving to an urban area to find both shelter and supportive services is sometimes not considered at all by these vulnerable populations.

Rural areas are also more prone to the kind of poverty that puts individuals and families at risk for homelessness. The number of people living at or below the poverty line in rural places is higher than anywhere else in the United States (Moore, 2001). The statement "rural homelessness is a microcosm of national economic and political developments" cannot be truer for American rural communities (Vissing, 1996, pg. 103). The disinvestment of small towns and their inability to attract long-term sustainable business development, cripples a small town's economy. In effect, this is a main contributor for why poverty is such a common theme for rural communities. As a result, the State should carefully consider its investments in rural Oklahoma. While there is a need for shelter in these places, the construction of this housing type should be weighed with long term opportunities for employment in the area.

It is not surprising that rural areas typically lack both emergency shelters and temporary housing options. Services that provide temporary housing and provide relief and support services for those who cannot find food are virtually nonexistent in rural communities across the United States (Moore, 2001). Sheltering the homeless is undercapitalized in rural areas because communities do not see a concentration of homeless individuals (Vissing, 1996, pg. 146). As a result, the homeless must satisfice where they are. For instance, for families who are homeless, some of them use a friend's house to store clothes or to seek shelter, while some receive assistance from churches (Cummins et al, 1998). Others migrate to urban areas where services are available and more accessible (Rollinson, Paul A., and John T. Pardeck, 2006).


The absence of affordable housing in rural areas is a root cause of homelessness (Levinson, David, and Marcy Ross, 2007). In fact, it was noticed that many of the people were receiving monetary assistance or previously had some money saved up to spend on housing, but these measures were not enough to keep them afloat (First et al, 1994, pg. 101). Housing costs rise in rural areas typically rise as a result of competition for a limited amount of housing stock. In some rural areas, low income families are spending 70% of their household incomes on housing, sometimes substandard housing (Vissing, 1996, pg. 124). As Levinson et al explain, "housing costs are lower but so are incomes, with the result of placing a heavier rent burden in the community" (Levinson, David, and Marcy Ross, 2007, pg. 45). Renters in rural communities, as a result, are far more susceptible to becoming homeless than their urban or suburban counterparts because they do not have the financial safety net sometimes associated with homeownership (Fitchen, 1991, pg. 193).

While this brief review of the literature describes the state of homelessness across rural America, many of the lessons learned are easily translated to an Oklahoma context. The condition and supply of affordable housing units is relatively poor in many rural portions of the State. Rent burden, as more fully characterized in the Consolidated Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) section of this report, is high. This leaves families living and working in relatively weak economies vulnerable to homelessness. Once homeless, supportive services in these areas are relatively limited, especially for the chronically homeless, those with substance abuse problems, and victims of domestic violence. Services available to these populations in urban areas may not be attractive to individuals and families who are accustomed to life in rural communities. Where practicable, more consideration must be given to providing supportive services and temporary and permanent housing to homeless populations wishing to remain in rural areas.

At Risk For Homelessness

Poverty is the primary factor that places Oklahoma families at risk of being homeless. There are many factors experienced by those living in poverty which leave residents more or less vulnerable to homelessness. For the purposes of this study, a social vulnerability index has been constructed to measure the likelihood or risk that residents living in poverty might find themselves homeless. This index includes factors such as single headed households, concentration of young and elderly residents, the reliance on public transportation, private vehicle availability, racial composition, housing type, presence or absence of a telephone in the household, amongst other factors. This index is additive and seeks to understand the collective impact of these factors in estimating the vulnerability of a local population. While employed in more significant detail in the section of this report focusing on disaster resiliency, this tool is useful in identifying areas of the State where populations may be most vulnerable to homelessness. The index utilized in this section is different from the one crafted in the Disaster Resiliency chapter of this report in that it estimates social vulnerability at the county level, rather than by census tract. The decision to study vulnerability to homelessness at the county level was made to help policymakers understand, more generally, where resources and economic interventions are most necessary to stave off the potential effects of homelessness. This maps presents vulnerability to homelessness on the county level, depicting the most vulnerable counties in dark green.

Social Vulnerability - Impacts on Housing & Disaster Resiliency



The Oklahoma families most likely at risk are those living in public and subsidized housing. They live below the poverty line. Even those who are employed, remain vulnerable to homeless because an unexpected expense, like a medical emergency, threatens their ability to pay for their share of rent owed or utilities. A missed payment can easily lead to eviction and homeless.

Through the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Oklahoma service providers have been vested with more than 24,000 housing choice vouchers. Their spatial distribution is outlined below. Of significance is the size of the waiting lists for public housing units and housing choice vouchers in cities across the State. These individuals are the most vulnerable to being homeless.

		Authorized Vouchers	Public Housing Waiting List	Voucher waiting list
Ada	OK024	110	Unknown	Unknown
Bristow	OK033	87	Unknown	Unknown
Broken Bow	OK006	217	Unknown	Unknown
Fort Gibson	OK118	44	Unknown	Unknown
Henryetta	OK142	115	Unknown	Unknown
Hugo	OK044	178	14	56
Lawton	OK005	92	Unknown	Unknown
McAlester	OK062	73	118	36
Miami	OK027	243	126	179
Muskogee	OK099	843	Unknown	230
Norman	OK139	1,185	Unknown	313
Oklahoma City	OK002	4,219	830	8021
Oklahoma HFA	OK901	10,708	Unknown	11,155
Ponca City	OK111	134	70	148
Seminole	OK032	189	53	44
Shawnee	OK095	497	320	623
Stillwater	OK146	656	550	420
Stilwell	OK067	29	Unknown	Unknown
Tecumseh	OK148	31	90	171
Tulsa	OK073	4,808	4951	5859
Wewoka	OK096	154	Unknown	
Oklahoma		24,612		

Findings and Recommendations

The chronically homeless population remains high in Oklahoma and follows national trends. While this population does not appear to be growing, the needs of the chronically homeless merit continued attention. Ample emergency shelters and soup kitchens must be made available for these sizable population in both urban and rural contexts. Social service providers should be clustered, to the extent possible, where these groups of homeless populations cluster. Given the future projections for the increase in the number of cold and hot days in the region, social service providers must provide places that allow these individuals to seek refuge from the elements.

Those living with HIV/AIDS tend to underreport their status and needs. Given the cost of medical care these individuals face, the need for permanent and stable housing is critical. Housing providers must work to ensure that there are enough units for this undercounted population. Working with county health care providers, OHFA is much more likely to estimate the size and needs of this population of homeless and potentially homeless persons. Special care must be taken to ascertain the barriers these individuals face when using vouchers to secure housing in the marketplace.

Victims of domestic violence require temporary and transitional housing statewide. CoCs with high supportive services tend to better accommodate the housing needs for these population. Cleveland County provides a good model for the State. However, many homeless victims of domestic violence live in rural areas that are underserved. Efforts must be undertaken to work with social services provides, schools, churches, and the police to help identify these individuals and to lead them to available housing and supportive services.

While not mentioned in the PIC data, estimates must be prepared to calculate the number and needs of homeless populations with felonies. In particular, there has been a rise nationally in the number of homeless sex offenders. Zoning regulations and discrimination from the private market has pushed many registered sex offenders to the periphery of many communities. Given their criminal histories, this population of homeless is harder to house but should not be forgotten for health and safety of these individuals and the communities they inhabit.

The size of the homeless veteran population seems to be decreasing as a result of national initiatives to end homelessness for veterans in Oklahoma. The needs of homeless veterans are highest in areas of the State near VA facilities. Temporary and permanent housing should be constructed at a higher rate in these areas to meet demand. Care should be taken to make certain that the housing constructed is built to meet the psychological needs of veterans, particularly those suffering from PTSD.

Rural homelessness, in general, is a challenge to assess and characterize. The rate of homelessness in rural areas is most likely much higher than annual counts demonstrate. The majority of rural homeless likely find shelter out of public view. Some may shelter in their cars, in undeveloped areas or in the homes of those who allow them to stay. They are not likely to find their way to urban areas given their lack of transportation options and preferences for rural living. Programs that are developed to provide shelter to the rural homeless must be developed to allow sheltering in place where possible. Sheltering in place should only be allowed, however, in places where individuals are likely to be able to find what they need, including opportunities to work.

Very little is known about the age distribution of homeless over the age of 24. It is likely that the homeless population, including those who are chronically homeless, is aging. Elderly homeless individuals have special needs. Counts must be more sensitive to understanding the size and needs of this population. This does not mean arbitrarily building units to house this population unless a need can be demonstrated for the same.

Waiting lists for public housing and section 8 vouchers are high across the State. This is not uncommon to Oklahoma. However, when we are considering the size of the population that is at risk to homelessness, these waiting lists are an important factor to consider. Resources should be spent in a manner which is preventative so that these individuals' and families' needs are met before they become homeless.

The absence of affordable housing alternatives across some parts of the State is the largest threat to homelessness. In markets that are constrained by an aging housing stock or those that are rapidly growing, individuals and families who live on the economic margins are at risk for becoming homeless. Communities must work to ensure that zoning regulations promote the development of housing types serving all income levels, including the providing of temporary and permanent housing to meet the needs of the presently homeless and those at risk for becoming the same. Funding distributions should be targeted to communities with the highest needs who are willing to do what is necessary to meet the needs of the homeless and those at risk for the same.

Works Cited

Continuum of Care Network Pamphlet. 2015

Cummins, L. K., R. J. First, and B. G. Toomey. "Comparisons of Rural and Urban Homeless Women." *Affilia* 13.4 (1998): 435-53. Web. 24 Oct. 2015.

First, Richard J., John C. Rife, and Beverly G. Toomey. "Homelessness in Rural Areas: Causes, Patterns, and Trends." *Social Work* 39.1 (1994): 97-108. Web. 24 Oct. 2015.

Fitchen, Janet M. "Homelessness in Rural Places: Perspectives from Upstate New York." *Urban Anthropology and Studies of Cultural Systems and World Economic Development* 20.2 (1991): 177-210. Institute, Inc. Web. 23 Oct. 2015.

Levinson, David, and Marcy Ross. *Homelessness Handbook*. N.p.: Berkshire Group, 2007.

Milbourne, Paul, and Paul J. Cloke. *International Perspectives on Rural Homelessness*. London: Routledge, 2006.

Moore, Robert M. *The Hidden America: Social Problems in Rural America for the Twenty-first Century*. Selinsgrove: Susquehanna UP, 2001.

Rollinson, Paul A., and John T. Pardeck. *Homelessness in Rural America: Policy and Practice*. New York: Haworth, 2006.

Vissing, Yvonne Marie. *Out of Sight, out of Mind: Homeless Children and Families in Small-town America*. Lexington, KY: U of Kentucky, 1996.

Fair Housing

Summary

Fair housing addresses discrimination in the provision of housing as well as discrimination in access to opportunities provided by the location of affordable housing. Recent actions by the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and the United States Supreme Court focus our attention on localized access to opportunity.

These findings are intended to aid the Oklahoma Housing Finance Agency (OHFA) determine the location of new affordable housing in relation to vulnerable populations and explore ways to expand the opportunities available to help communities of existing affordable housing achieve self-sufficiency.

Key Findings:

- 70% of affordable housing units are located in census tracts marked by poverty
- 62% of affordable housing is located in census tracts where a majority of the residents are not white
- 13% of affordable housing units have no access to transit services and 56% have access to limited service, on-demand transit
- 2.6% of affordable housing units have limited access to a hospital
- 7.8% of affordable housing units are located in food deserts

Recommendations:

Continued efforts to improve the quality of life for affordable housing residents and reduce discrimination associated with affordable housing will likely need to include strategies that integrate new affordable housing as well as support existing communities of affordable housing. This will likely include public policies and funding designed to integrate low-income and workforce housing into a more diverse set of communities. Additionally, those living existing affordable housing communities need increased opportunities to stay in place, become self-sufficient, and participate in determining the future of their neighborhood. OHFA may consider partnering with other state, non-profit, and for-profit agencies to explore strategies for helping communities thrive economically, socially, and environmentally.

What is Fair Housing?

Fair housing addresses discrimination in the provision of housing as well as discrimination in access to opportunities provided by the location of affordable housing. On one hand, this protects the ability of individuals to obtain housing regardless of personal characteristics such as race, skin color, national origin, gender, familial status, or disability. It also focuses attention on more subtle forms of discrimination that cluster low-income housing in ways that inhibit the ability of communities to access services and amenities that support self-sufficiency and autonomy.

Recent actions by the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and the United States Supreme Court focus our attention on localized access to opportunity. In 2014, HUD released the Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) rule for public comment. The draft rule

“directs HUD’s program participants to take significant actions to overcome historic patterns of segregation, achieve truly balanced and integrated living patterns, promote fair housing choice, and foster inclusive communities that are free from discrimination” (HUD 2015). In 2015, the United States Supreme Court provided legal support for actions taken to remedy patterns that impede the upward mobility and opportunity of low-income individuals and communities. In the case of *Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs v. The Inclusive Communities Project* the court reiterated the need to address disparate impacts in considering the location of affordable housing and reinforced the importance of AFFH (Bostic 2015). Housing discrimination from this perspective is not only felt by individual residents, it can also be the result of actions that work to limit the opportunities to improve the quality of life in local communities.

Approach

In Oklahoma, a combination of federal and state programs work to support the opportunities provided to individuals and families who rest safely and comfortably in an apartment or home. Here we use publicly available data for units that are part of the Low Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) Program, the Rural Rental Housing Loans, or OHFA administered programs such as Oklahoma Affordable Housing Tax Credit (AHTC), the HOME investment partnership program, the Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher Program, and multi-family bonds. Collectively, these programs represent state efforts to assist individuals who are unable to afford housing.

Indicators of disparate impact vary but seem to contingent upon the contextual characteristics of a particular neighborhood. In an effort to help communities investigate and understand community level disparate impacts, HUD created a Fair Housing Assessment Tool (http://www.huduser.gov/portal/affht_pt.html#affh). The assessment tool includes measures on indicators of disparate impacts based on the clustering of potentially vulnerable populations, including:

- Race/Ethnicity of Residents
- National Origin of Residents
- English Proficiency of Residents
- Job Accessibility
- Transit Accessibility
- Level of Poverty
- Environmental Exposure (e.g. pollution, crime, food, health care, etc.)
- Disability

This report uses the Fair Housing Assessment Tool in conjunction with readily available data to initiate a more thorough investigation of the potential for disparate impacts in the state. The findings are intended to aid the Oklahoma Housing Finance Agency regarding future location of new fair housing in relation to vulnerable populations and the future opportunities available to help communities of existing affordable housing achieve self-sufficiency.

Data

Data for this report are compiled from a variety of sources including the United States Census, the University of Oklahoma Center for Spatial Analysis, and primary data collected as part of ongoing research efforts at the University of Oklahoma. Data are aggregated into census tracts and reported statewide as well as by county (see Appendix 1).


1. Urban/Rural

A majority of the affordable housing in Oklahoma is situated in rural communities. Urban communities including Edmond, Lawton, Norman, Oklahoma City, and Tulsa are home to just over 1/3 of the affordable housing units in the state.

	Total Affordable Housing Units		Situated an Urban Setting		Situated in a Rural Setting
OHFA	35,292		11,699 (33.1%)		23,593 (66.9%)
515	5,384		0		5,384 (100%)
LIHTC	23,537		8,255 (35.1%)		15,282 (64.9%)
Total	64,213		19,954 (31.1%)		44,259 (68.9%)

2. Poverty


Approximately 70% of affordable housing units in Oklahoma are located in census tracts where the number of residents living in poverty is above the state average. About half of these units are located in areas of extreme poverty, where the number of individuals who are economically vulnerable exceeds 994, more than one standard deviation (411) from the mean (583).



	Total Affordable Housing Units	Situated in Poverty	Situated in Extreme Poverty
OHFA	35,292	12,295 (34.8%)	12,464 (35.3%)
515	5,384	2,093 (38.9%)	1,839 (34.2%)
LIHTC	23,537	7,483 (31.8%)	8,924 (38.0%)
Total	64,213	21,796 (33.9%)	23,227 (36.2%)

3. Non-white Enclaves


Just over 60% of affordable housing units in Oklahoma are located in census tracts where a majority of the residents are non-white. With just fewer than 24% of the total affordable housing units in census tracts heavily populated with residents who are not white – identified as census tracts where the number of non-white residents is more than 1,595 - one standard deviation (653) greater than the mean (542).



	Total Affordable Housing Units	Situated in Majority Non-White Community	Situated in Heavily Non-White Community
OHFA	35,292	12,814 (36.3%)	7,907 (22.4%)
515	5,384	2,229 (41.4%)	1,288 (23.9%)
LIHTC	23,537	10,285 (43.7%)	5,677 (24.1%)
Total	64,213	25,328 (39.4%)	14,872 (23.2%)

4. Immigrant Enclaves


One-third of affordable housing units in Oklahoma are located in census tracts where more than the average number of residents are immigrants. About half of these units are located in areas dense with immigrants, where the number of individuals who are not citizen exceeds 349, more than one standard deviation (219) from the mean (130).



	Total Affordable Housing Units	Situated in Immigrant Enclave	Situated in Heavily Immigrant Enclave
OHFA	35,292	8,114 (23.0%)	3,358 (9.5%)
515	5,384	1,017 (18.9%)	159 (3.0%)
LIHTC	23,537	5,457 (23.2%)	3,364 (14.3%)
Total	64,213	14,588 (22.7%)	6,881 (10.7%)

5. Limited English Proficiency


Almost 17,000 existing affordable housing units in Oklahoma are located in census tracts where more residents than average do not speak English very well. A little more than half of these units are located in areas dense with individuals with limited English proficiency, where the number of individuals who speak English less than very well exceeds 380, more than one standard deviation (240) from the mean (140).



	Total Affordable Housing Units	Community with more than average number of Limited English Speakers	Community dense with limited English Speakers
OHFA	35,292	6,250 (17.7%)	3,122 (8.8%)
515	5,384	799 (14.8%)	240 (4.5%)
LIHTC	23,537	4,034 (17.1%)	3,475 (14.8%)
Total	64,213	11,083 (17.3%)	6,837 (10.6%)

6. Disability


Almost 60% of existing affordable housing units in Oklahoma are located in census tracts where more residents than average have a disability. A little more than half of these units are located in areas dense with individuals with a disability, where the number of individuals who are disabled is greater than 831, more than one standard deviation (289) from the mean (542).



	Total Affordable Housing Units	Community with more than average number of Disabled Residents	Community dense with Disabled Residents
OHFA	35,292	10,098 (28.6%)	10,722 (30.4%)
515	5,384	1,686 (31.3%)	2,594 (48.8%)
LIHTC	23,537	7,074 (30.1%)	6,289 (26.7%)
Total	64,213	18,858 (29.4%)	19,605 (30.5%)

7. Hospitals


There are no affordable housing units more than 30 miles from a hospital. Approximately 2.6% of affordable housing units are farther than 15 miles from the nearest hospital. As indicated by the larger percentage of Rural Rental Housing Loan units, most of these are located in rural areas.



	Total Affordable Housing Units	More than 15 miles to nearest hospital	More than 30 miles to nearest hospital
OHFA	35,292	628 (1.8%)	0
515	5,384	500 (9.3%)	0
LIHTC	23,537	532 (2.3%)	0
Total	64,213	1,660 (2.6%)	0

8. Grocery Stores


Approximately 7.8% of affordable housing units are in areas that are classified as food deserts. According to the United States Department of Agriculture, food deserts exist in urban environments further than 1 mile from a grocery store and in rural environments further than 10 miles from a grocery store (<https://apps.ams.usda.gov/fooddeserts/foodDeserts.aspx>).



	Total Affordable Housing Units	Urban > 1 Mile from nearest Grocer	Rural > 10 miles to nearest Grocer
OHFA	35,292	1,493 (4.2%)	1,097 (3.1%)
515	5,384	0	466 (8.7%)
LIHTC	23,537	1,175 (5.0%)	769 (3.3%)
Total	64,213	2,668 (4.2%)	2,332 (3.6%)

9. Transit

A little over 69% of affordable housing in Oklahoma is located in a census tract with limited or no access to transit services. This includes 8,367 affordable housing units in areas that lack public transit services all together as well as 36,363 units that are situated in areas that have on-demand transportation services that often have limited operation times and may only serve elderly and disabled populations or those going to a medical appointment.



	Total Affordabl e Housing Units	No Transit	Urban Transit	On-Demand Transit
OHFA	35,292	4,035 (11.4%)	11,265 (31.9%)	19,992 (56.6%)
515	5,384	767 (14.2%)	0	4,617 (85.8%)
LIHTC	23,537	3,565 (15.1%)	8,217 (34.9%)	11,755 (49.9%)
Total	64,213	8,367 (13.0%)	19,482 (30.3%)	36,363 (56.6%)

What does this mean for Oklahoma?

This report suggests a number of possible ways forward for the Oklahoma Housing Finance Agency as it continues to support quality low-income and workforce housing for residents of the state. Across a number of indicators of opportunity, affordable housing in the state clusters in ways that raise concerns about the opportunities available to affordable housing residents in comparison to other residents.

Continued efforts to improve the quality of life for affordable housing residents and reduce discrimination associated with affordable housing will likely need to include strategies that integrate new affordable housing as well as support existing communities of affordable housing. This will likely include public policies and funding designed to integrate low-income and workforce housing into a more diverse set of communities. Additionally, those living existing affordable housing communities need increased opportunities to stay in place, become self-sufficient, and participate in determining the future of their neighborhood. OHFA may consider partnering with other state, non-profit, and for-profit agencies to explore strategies for helping communities thrive economically, socially, and environmentally.

Moving ahead, Oklahoma should be wary of a narrowly focused vision focused solely on the problems of existing affordable housing and the integration of these residents into other communities. The relocation of residents harkens back to the physical and social destruction brought about by urban renewal. Such an approach pits efforts to enhance existing affordable housing through community development against efforts to build a more integrated and diverse society (Goetz 2015). Rather, Oklahoma has the opportunity to work closely with local municipalities to improve the conditions of current affordable housing communities while simultaneously advancing integration of low-income and workforce housing through the construction in new settings.

For future new development, a number of case studies and emerging scholarship on the importance of neighborhood effects provide guidance on possible ways forward for Oklahoma. For instance, in El Paso, Texas a public private partnership between the Housing Authority of the City of El Paso and private developers led to the development of a mixed income housing development. Eastside Crossings (<http://www.hacep.org/about-us/eastside-crossings>) provides 74 traditional affordable housing units, 79 affordable housing units, and 45 market rate units in partnership with the Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs (Housing Authority of El Paso 2015). In Sacramento, partnership between private developers and the Capital Area Redevelopment Authority resulted in the adaptive reuse of a building listed on the National Register of Historic Buildings into affordable Housing (Vellinga 2015). Located in a dense, walkable, transit-oriented community, the Warehouse Artist Lofts (<http://www.rstreetwal.com>) are home to 116 units, 86 of which are affordable and 13,000 square feet of ground floor retail.

For existing affordable housing, strategies exist to help enhance localized opportunities and build a culture of community participation around housing. Across the nation, there is a need to refocus the discussion away from the deficits found in many communities to look for closely at opportunities (Lens 2015) and to think about the consequences of physical, social, and economic isolation (Clarke, Morenoff, Debbink, Golberstein, Elliott, & Lantz, 2014.).

The Oklahoma Housing Finance Agency may need to collaborate more closely with other governmental agencies to develop comprehensive strategies that not only improve existing housing but also work toward enhancing access to food, recreation, amenities, jobs, and quality schools. By doing so, OHFA could help build the social and physical resiliency of these communities so that residents would be empowered to choose for themselves whether or not they want to stay and be part of their existing community or move elsewhere in search of a better quality of life. A set of tools for doing some of this work is available through Policy Link (<http://www.policylink.org/equity-tools/equitable-development-toolkit/about-toolkit>). For those who are relocated due to circumstances that make staying in place impossible, intensive case management may be required to ensure that these residents avoid pitfalls and thrive in a new environment (Theodos, Popkin, Guernsey, & Getsinger, 2010). But evidence continues to suggest that stability, particularly in the lives of children, is an essential part of ensuring that everyone has the opportunity to succeed and thrive (HUD 2014).

Bibliography

Bostic, R. 2015. A clear SCOTUS statement on disparate impact and AFFH. Rooflines: the Shelterforce blog, 15 July. Retrieved from

http://www.rooflines.org/4181/a_clear_scotus_statement_on_disparate_impact_and_affh/

Clarke P., Morenoff J., Debbink M., Golberstein E., Elliott M.R., Lantz P.M. 2014. Cumulative exposure to neighborhood context: consequences for health transitions over the adult life course. *Research on Aging*. 36(1):115-142.

Goetz, E.G. 2015. From Breaking Down barriers to Breaking Up Communities: the expanding spatial strategies of fair housing advocacy. *Urban Affairs Review* 51(6): 820-842.

Housing Authority of El Paso. 2015. Eastside Crossings. Retrieved from <http://www.hacep.org/about-us/eastside-crossings>

United States Department of Housing and Urban Development. 2015. Federal Register 80(136): 42272-42371. Retrieved from <https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2015-07-16/pdf/2015-17032.pdf>

United States Department of Housing and Urban Development. 2014. Housing's and Neighborhoods' Role in Shaping Children's Future. Evidence Matters. Retrieved from <https://www.huduser.gov/portal/periodicals/em/fall14/highlight1.html>

Lens, M.C. 2015. Measuring the Geography of Opportunity. *Progress in Human Geography*. doi: 10.1177/0309132515618104

Theodos, B., S. Popkin, E. Guernsey, & L Getsinger. 2010. Inclusive Public Housing: Services for the Hard to House. Washington: Urban Institute. Retrieved from <http://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/alfresco/publication-pdfs/412035-Inclusive-Public-Housing-Services-for-the-Hard-to-House.PDF>

Vellinga, M.L. 2015. This Week: Warehouse Artists Lofts gets Grand Opening Thursday. Sacramento Bee. April 5. Retrieved from <http://www.sacbee.com/news/local/article17467076.html>

Data Sources

2014 American Community Survey Estimates

- Poverty: ACS_13_5YR_S1701 > HC02_EST_VC01 > Below poverty level; Estimate; Population for whom poverty status is determined
- Non-white enclaves: ACS_13_5YR_BO2001 > HD01_VD02 > [Total Population] - Estimate; Total: - White alone
- Immigrant enclaves: ACS_13_5YR_BO5001 > HD01_VD06 > Estimate; Total: - Not a U.S. citizen
- Limited English Proficiency: ACS_13_5YR_S1601 > HC03_EST_VC01 > Percent of specified language speakers - Speak English less than "very well"; Estimate; Population 5 years and over
- Disability: ACS_13_5YR_S1810 > HC02_EST_VC01 > with a disability; estimate; total civilian noninstitutionalized population

University of Oklahoma Center for Spatial Analysis: Data Warehouse

- Hospital locations as of 2008 derived from Oklahoma State Department of Health, Health Care Information Division.

University of Oklahoma Division of Regional and City Planning

- Grocery store locations retrieved from Internet search conducted by faculty and student research assistants at the University of Oklahoma.
- Transit locations retrieved from Oklahoma Department of Transportation (<http://www.okladot.state.ok.us/transit/pubtrans.htm>) and geocoded by faculty and student research assistants at the University of Oklahoma.

Appendix 1: County affordable housing Summaries

County	Total Units	Units at Risk for Poverty	Units in mostly Non-white Enclaves	Units in Community of Immigrants	Units in Limited English Neighborhood	Units nearer Elevated Number of Disabled	Units farther than 15 miles to Hospital	Units located in a Food Desert	Units that lack readily available Transit
Adair	676	676	676	0	0	177	0	0	0
Alfalfa	93	0	0	0	0	0	93	0	23
Atoka	145	121	0	0	0	0	24	145	24
Beaver	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Beckham	343	87	228	0	228	315	0	28	0
Blaine	169	0	0	127	127	0	24	0	42
Bryan	1,005	538	501	0	0	501	0	0	0
Caddo	658	292	387	0	0	292	95	0	0
Canadian	1,655	0	248	0	0	0	48	24	0
Carter	1,040	373	938	189	0	972	24	24	24
Cherokee	1,359	986	412	0	0	436	0	13	0
Choctaw	433	312	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cimarron	69	0	0	0	0	0	8	69	69
Cleveland	2,389	1,080	194	758	648	601	0	214	718
Coal	71	0	0	0	0	71	0	0	0
Comanche	1,214	200	182	0	0	225	123	151	24
Cotton	114	0	0	0	0	0	114	0	0
Craig	290	0	0	0	0	157	0	72	0
Creek	1,359	163	163	0	0	670	0	0	0
Custer	255	78	0	0	0	172	0	0	0
Delaware	712	695	285	0	0	712	28	0	0
Dewey	75	0	0	0	0	0	16	0	0
Ellis	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Garfield	824	683	127	0	0	0	0	52	50

County	Total Units	Units at Risk for Poverty	Units in mostly Non-white Enclaves	Units in Immigrant Enclaves	Units in Limited English Neighborhood	Units nearer Elevated Number of Disabled	Units farther than 15 miles to Hospital	Units located in a Food Desert	Units that lack readily available Transit
Garvin	557	0	0	0	0	265	0	0	0
Grady	758	71	0	0	0	621	71	0	0
Grant	8	0	0	0	0	0	8	8	8
Greer	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harmon	62	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
Harper	50	0	0	0	0	0	14	36	50
Haskell	63	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hughes	341	0	0	0	0	0	0	76	0
Jackson	322	18	18	0	18	0	30	30	0
Jefferson	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Johnston	517	493	0	0	0	493	0	0	0
Kay	1,001	196	168	0	0	344	0	0	0
Kingfisher	153	0	0	8	8	0	8	8	40
Kiowa	143	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Latimer	220	0	0	0	0	220	0	0	0
Le Flore	1,050	204	0	0	0	573	166	0	0
Lincoln	705	143	0	0	0	705	42	0	705
Logan	629	0	0	0	0	300	0	0	158
Love	62	0	0	62	0	0	0	0	0
Major	76	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76
Marshall	134	0	109	109	109	109	0	0	0
Mayes	546	382	218	0	0	382	0	0	0
McClain	346	55	0	0	47	299	0	0	0
McCurtain	767	767	746	0	0	767	57	315	0
McIntosh	488	0	0	0	0	169	0	0	488

County	Total Units	Units at Risk for Poverty	Units in mostly Non-white Enclaves	Units in Community of Immigrants	Units in Limited English Neighborhood	Units nearer Elevated Number of Disabled	Units farther than 15 miles to Hospital	Units located in a Food Desert	Units that lack readily available Transit
Murray	224	95	0	0	0	224	0	0	224
Muskogee	1,572	642	59	0	0	44	48	0	0
Noble	387	0	0	0	0	0	42	30	345
Nowata	229	0	0	0	0	185	0	0	229
Okfuskee	214	169	0	0	0	213	0	1	0
Oklahoma	11,497	3,920	3,518	2,445	2,641	456	0	1,202	25
Okmulgee	663	303	227	0	0	127	0	0	0
Osage	1,544	538	700	0	0	1,391	42	0	0
Ottawa	409	0	0	0	0	96	0	84	0
Pawnee	65	0	0	0	0	0	37	20	0
Payne	1,797	1,209	0	120	120	648	0	0	971
Pittsburg	1,268	0	50	0	0	284	16	16	0
Pontotoc	810	311	286	0	0	336	0	0	0
Pottawatomi	1,715	1,009	587	0	0	954	0	284	0
Pushmataha	381	234	0	0	0	381	147	381	0
Roger Mills	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	0
Rogers	973	0	0	0	0	0	36	0	0
Seminole	426	76	75	0	0	75	0	123	0
Sequoyah	1,449	922	922	0	0	726	243	0	0
Stephens	841	0	0	0	0	310	12	0	0
Texas	816	0	372	782	782	372	60	6	75
Tillman	114	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tulsa	9,868	4,750	1,807	2,281	2,109	1,419	0	1,441	2,220
Wagoner	1,094	691	461	0	0	701	0	0	0
Washington	1,262	0	108	0	0	108	0	0	1,262
Washita	189	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

County	Total Units	Units at Risk for Poverty	Units in mostly Non-white Enclaves	Units in Community of Immigrants	Units in Limited English Neighborhood	Units nearer Elevated Number of Disabled	Units farther than 15 miles to Hospital	Units located in a Food Desert	Units that lack readily available Transit
Woods	65	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	65
Woodward	161	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	0

Lead-Based Paint Hazards

Findings / Health and Well-being

Lead is known to be highly toxic particularly to young children 5 years of age and under. Excessive exposure results in reduced intelligence, impaired hearing, reduced stature and a host of other negative health effects. It is well documented that a common source of lead exposure for children is lead-based paint in older housing along with the dust and soil it generates. Children are exposed to lead-based paint most commonly by directly eating paint chips or indirectly by ingesting lead-contaminated house dust or soil through normal hand-to-mouth contact.

For purposes of this analysis, the federal definition of “lead-based paint hazard” at 24 CFR Part 35.86 was applied. Under this definition, lead-based paint hazard is defined as, “...any condition that causes exposure to lead from lead-contaminated dust, lead-contaminated soil, or lead-contaminated paint that is deteriorated or present in accessible surfaces, friction surfaces, or impact surfaces that would result in adverse human health effects as established by the appropriate Federal agency.”

It is noteworthy estimates presented can only be stated as dwellings that “potentially” have LBP hazards because there are no real-time surveys or studies of residential structures built prior to 1978. However, there have been previous estimations provided in the state’s Consolidated Plan.

Statewide Findings

Using methodology which will be discussed later in this section, we have estimated the number of housing units in Oklahoma with lead-based paint hazards as defined in 24 CFR Part 35.86. Our estimates are shown in the following table.

Lead-Based Paint Hazards in Oklahoma		
	Number	Percent
Total Housing Units	1,432,730	
Total Housing Units with Lead-Based Paint Hazards	240,229	16.8%
Owner-Occupied Units w/LBP Hazards	159,861	66.5%
Renter-Occupied Units w/LBP Hazards	80,368	33.5%
Housing Units w/LBP Hazards Occupied by Low-to-Moderate Income Households	113,931	47.4%
Housing Units w/LBP Hazards with Children < 6 Years of Age Present	37,426	15.6%
Housing Units w/LBP Hazards Occupied by LMI Households and Children < 6 Years of Age Present	19,761	52.8%

Sources: American Healthy Homes Survey Table 5-1 & CHAS Tables 12 & 13

As shown, we estimate that there are 240,229 housing units in Oklahoma containing lead-based paint hazards, representing 16.8% of Oklahoma’s total housing stock. 66.5% of those units are owner-occupied, while 33.5% are renter-occupied. Of the 240,229 housing units containing lead-based paint hazards, 113,931 units, or 47.4%, are occupied by households with low-to-moderate incomes as defined by HUD. Among all housing units with lead-based paint hazards, 37,426 units have children under the age of six present, and 52.8% of those units, or 19,761 units total, are households with low-to-moderate incomes. Exhibits 2 through 6, found at the end of this section, graphically summarize our statewide findings at a county level.

Disaster Resiliency/ Economy and Society, Infrastructure and Environment

While communities strive to address lead-based paint hazards through education and removal when detected in connection with federally funded local housing rehabilitation initiatives, hazard detection and mitigation may have special considerations in terms of disaster resiliency.

Many disasters are accompanied by widespread damage to residential structures often times scattering building material debris across the landscape necessitating removal by heavy equipment and disposal in landfills. When building materials contaminated with lead-based paint become part of non-contaminated debris disposal, it presents an environmental hazard that can span well beyond recovery and rebuilding efforts.

Leadership and Strategy

Given the albeit large but finite number of potential housing units with lead hazards, the state and local communities may wish to consider initiatives aimed at reducing and/or eventually eliminating residential lead-based paint hazards, particularly in housing occupied by low and moderate income households with young children present. One such initiative could be the use of the state's various federal and state housing programs' competitive funding selection criteria. By designing rating criteria that specifically awards points to applicants that purposefully seek out properties within counties known to have higher percentages of lead hazards, housing developers along with those engaged in rehabilitation may be incentivized to engage in hazard mitigation.

State and local governments may wish to capitalize on the results of this study by using the data to support competitive applications to the Federal Home Loan Bank Topeka's Affordable Housing Program funding for owner occupied rehabilitation which, among other competitive rating criteria, awards points for the "Abatement of Hazardous Environmental Conditions". Similarly, this report's data may be used to document hazards and need in applications for competitive health care grants offered at the federal level.

Similar to initiatives undertaken by USHUD, the state may want to consider undertaking a real-time sample survey of homes built prior to 1978 across the state's community sizes and counties to more accurately ascertain the extent of the hazard and/or conducting real-time surveys of LBP Risk Assessors licensed by the ODEQ.

Survey of Previous Lead-based Paint Studies

Using a combination of US Census Bureau and US Department of Housing and Urban Development Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy data and age of housing stock built prior to 1980, the Oklahoma Department of Commerce's, "State of Oklahoma Five-Year E-Consolidated Plan FY 2014 – 2018" estimated 59% of the owner occupied and 65% of the renter occupied housing had the potential of containing lead-based paint. To address lead paint hazards, the Consolidated Plan recommended assessment of hazard presence be conducted at the point dwelling rehabilitation is undertaken and that nonprofits advise persons receiving federal rehabilitating assistance regarding the dangers of lead exposure.

At the national level, between 1998 and 2000, USHUD Office of Health Homes and Lead Hazard Control staff and the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences conducted a real-time

random sampling of 831 permanently occupied housing units (multifamily, single family and mobile homes) taken from all 50 states and the District of Columbia. The results indicated an estimated 38 million (39% of the 96 million total housing units) of the nation's housing units had lead-based paint hazards. Of that total, 24 million had significant lead hazards with 1.2 million of those units occupied by low income families. It was further estimate that 35% of all low income housing had lead-based paint hazards. The study also noted the prevalence of lead-based paint increases with age of housing. However, most painted surfaces, even in older homes don't have lead paint. Geography was found to be related to the incidence of lead-based paint with the Northeast and Midwest having 2 times the prevalence of lead paint than the South and West. Finally, the study recommends "public-private sector resources be directed units posing the greatest risk" as a preventive measure to avoid lead poisoning.

In April 2011, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Healthy Homes and Lead Hazard Control updated its 1998-2000 nationwide report in its publication, "American Healthy Homes Survey, Lead and Arsenic Findings". This report, conducted from June 2005 through March 2006, estimated 37.1 million homes (34.9%) out of a total of 106 million total housing units have lead-based paint somewhere in the building. Of the 65.6 million homes built before 1978, 34.4 million (52%) have lead-based paint. The study reaffirmed the previous finding that the prevalence of lead-based paint is higher in the Northeast and Midwest parts of the United States than South and West. It also confirmed earlier finding that the incidence of lead-based paint increases with age of housing with 86% of the homes built prior to 1940 containing lead. An estimated 3.6 million homes with children less than 6 years of age have lead-based paint hazards of which 1.1 million are low income households. Of the 16.8 million homes with children under the age of 6, 5.7 million (34%) have lead-based paint, about the same incidence of lead-based paint in all homes.

In June 2006, the Oklahoma State Department of Health's Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Program (OCLPPP) received a 5-year project grant "Oklahoma Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Program Focusing in High Risk Groups". That program focused on communities evidencing high numbers of children 6-72 months of age who are at high risk for lead poisoning.

In order to more effectively target high-risk areas and populations, the OCLPPP identified 21 high-risk target area (HRTA) zip codes (see Exhibit #1) located within Oklahoma, Tulsa, Muskogee, Jackson, Okmulgee, Ottawa, Kay, Garfield, and Hughes counties. These 21 zip codes were narrowed from a list of 57 zip codes out of the state's approximately 700 zip codes that with populations of 5,000 or more persons; greater than or equal to 22% of housing stock built prior to 1950; and, greater than or equal to 18% of children under the age of 6 years living below the poverty level.

The 57 zip codes were further compared and evaluated based on selected characteristics such as EBL cases and proportion of minority population. Zip codes with higher EBL prevalence and/or minority populations (Hispanic/African American/American Indian) were ranked higher and given the designation as HRTA zip codes.

Choctaw County Findings

The number of housing units in Choctaw County containing lead-based paint hazards can be estimated by applying the percentages of housing units with such hazards reported by the American Healthy

Homes Survey, to the number of occupied homes in Choctaw County, by year of construction. The following table presents the percentage of housing units in the Census Bureau South Region based on the AHHS findings.

Housing Units in the South Census Region with Lead-Based Paint Hazards by Year of Construction			
Year of Construction	No. of Housing Units (000s)	Units w/ LBP Hazards (000s)	Percent of Units w/ LBP Hazards
1978-2005	18,625	664	3.6%
1960-1977	11,724	1,311	11.2%
1940-1959	5,575	2,145	38.5%
1939 or Earlier	3,072	1,947	63.4%
Total	38,996	6,067	15.6%

Source: U.S. Dept. of Housing and Urban Development, American Healthy Homes Survey, Table 5-1

These percentages can then be applied to the number of housing units in Choctaw County, by year of construction and by tenure (owner-occupied versus renter-occupied), as reported by HUD's Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) data for Choctaw County.

Total Housing Units in Choctaw County with Lead-Based Paint Hazards by Tenure			
Total Owner-Occupied Housing Units	Total Housing Units	Percent w/LBP Hazards	Number w/LBP Hazards
1978 or Later	2,193	3.57%	78
1960-1977	1,238	11.18%	138
1940-1959	560	38.48%	215
1939 or Earlier	265	63.38%	168
Total	4,255	14.10%	600
Total Renter-Occupied Housing Units	Total Housing Units	Percent w/LBP Hazards	Number w/LBP Hazards
1978 or Later	785	3.57%	28
1960-1977	720	11.18%	81
1940-1959	190	38.48%	73
1939 or Earlier	160	63.38%	101
Total	1,855	15.26%	283
Total Housing Units	Total Housing Units	Percent w/LBP Hazards	Number w/LBP Hazards
1978 or Later	2,978	3.57%	106
1960-1977	1,958	11.18%	219
1940-1959	750	38.48%	289
1939 or Earlier	425	63.38%	269
Total	6,110	14.45%	883

Sources: American Healthy Homes Survey Table 5-1 & CHAS Table 12

Finally, we can use the same methodology to estimate the number of housing units in Choctaw County with lead-based paint hazards, occupied by households with low-to-moderate incomes, by tenure:

Housing Units in Choctaw County with Lead-Based Paint Hazards by Tenure, Occupied by Low-Income Families				
Owner-Occupied Housing Units < 50% AMI	Total Housing Units	Percent w/LBP Hazards	Number w/LBP Hazards	
1978 or Later	525	3.57%	19	
1960-1977	311	11.18%	35	
1940-1959	130	38.48%	50	
1939 or Earlier	110	63.38%	70	
Total	1,075	16.11%	173	
Renter-Occupied Housing Units < 50% AMI	Total Housing Units	Percent w/LBP Hazards	Number w/LBP Hazards	
1978 or Later	430	3.57%	15	
1960-1977	450	11.18%	50	
1940-1959	100	38.48%	38	
1939 or Earlier	60	63.38%	38	
Total	1,040	13.67%	142	
Total Housing Units < 50% AMI	Total Housing Units	Percent w/LBP Hazards	Number w/LBP Hazards	
1978 or Later	955	3.57%	34	
1960-1977	761	11.18%	85	
1940-1959	230	38.48%	88	
1939 or Earlier	170	63.38%	108	
Total	2,115	14.91%	315	
Sources: American Healthy Homes Survey Table 5-1 & CHAS Table 12				

Housing Units in Choctaw County with Lead-Based Paint Hazards by Tenure, Occupied by Moderate-Income Families				
Owner-Occupied Housing Units 50%-80% AMI	Total Housing Units	Percent w/LBP Hazards	Number w/LBP Hazards	
1978 or Later	456	3.57%	16	
1960-1977	275	11.18%	31	
1940-1959	120	38.48%	46	
1939 or Earlier	40	63.38%	25	
Total	890	13.31%	118	
Renter-Occupied Housing Units 50%-80% AMI	Total Housing Units	Percent w/LBP Hazards	Number w/LBP Hazards	
1978 or Later	146	3.57%	5	
1960-1977	144	11.18%	16	
1940-1959	35	38.48%	13	
1939 or Earlier	80	63.38%	51	
Total	405	21.11%	85	
Total Housing Units 50%-80% AMI	Total Housing Units	Percent w/LBP Hazards	Number w/LBP Hazards	
1978 or Later	602	3.57%	21	
1960-1977	419	11.18%	47	
1940-1959	155	38.48%	60	
1939 or Earlier	120	63.38%	76	
Total	1,295	15.75%	204	
Sources: American Healthy Homes Survey Table 5-1 & CHAS Table 12				

To conclude, we estimate that there are a total of 883 homes in Choctaw County containing lead-based paint hazards, 600 owner-occupied and 283 renter-occupied. Of the 883 homes in the county estimated to have lead-based paint hazards, 315 are estimated to be occupied by households with low-incomes (incomes less than 50% of Area Median Income), and 204 are estimated to be occupied by households with moderate incomes (between 50% and 80% of Area Median Income), for a total of 519 housing units in Choctaw County with lead-based paint hazards occupied by households with low or moderate incomes.

Lead-Based Paint Hazards in Homes with Children Present

Using the same methodology, we can estimate the number of housing units in Choctaw County occupied by households with children under the age of six present. For this analysis we apply the lead-based paint hazards percentages from the American Healthy Homes Survey to the data in HUD CHAS Table 13, which details housing units by year of construction, household income, and presence of children under the age of six. The data is presented in the following table:

Housing Units in Choctaw County with Lead-Based Paint Hazards with Children under Age 6 Present Occupied by Low or Moderate-Income Families				
Housing Units < 50% AMI w/ Children under 6 Present	Total Housing Units	Percent w/LBP Hazards	Number w/LBP Hazards	
1978 or Later	144	3.57%	5	
1940-1977	175	19.98%	35	
1939 or Earlier	55	63.38%	35	
Total	374	20.03%	75	
Housing Units 50%-80% AMI w/ Children under 6 Present	Total Housing Units	Percent w/LBP Hazards	Number w/LBP Hazards	
1978 or Later	82	3.57%	3	
1940-1977	124	19.98%	25	
1939 or Earlier	20	63.38%	13	
Total	225	17.89%	40	
Total LMI Housing Units w/ Children Present	Total Housing Units	Percent w/LBP Hazards	Number w/LBP Hazards	
1978 or Later	226	3.57%	8	
1940-1977	298	19.98%	60	
1939 or Earlier	75	63.38%	48	
Total	599	19.23%	115	
Total Housing Units w/ Children Present	Total Housing Units	Percent w/LBP Hazards	Number w/LBP Hazards	
1978 or Later	415	3.57%	15	
1940-1977	378	19.98%	76	
1939 or Earlier	90	63.38%	57	
Total	883	16.69%	147	

Sources: American Healthy Homes Survey Table 5-1 & CHAS Table 13

As shown, we estimate there are 147 housing units in Choctaw County with lead-based paint hazards and children under the age of six present, and that 115 of those housing units are occupied by families with low to moderate incomes.

Research Footnotes/Sources

Oklahoma Department of Commerce, "State of Oklahoma Five-Year E-Consolidated Plan FY 2014 – 2018"

"The Prevalence of Lead-Based Paint Hazards in U.S. Housing", Environmental Health Perspectives, Volume 110, Number 10, October 2002


U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Healthy Homes and Lead Hazard Control, "American Healthy Homes Survey, Lead and Arsenic Findings", April 2011

Oklahoma State Department of Health, Oklahoma Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Program Focusing in High Risk Groups"


U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS), 2007-2011

Exhibit #1

Map 2: High-Risk Target Areas (HRTA) Zip Codes for Childhood Lead Poisoning



Percentage of Housing Units Containing Lead-Based Paint Hazards




Percentage of Housing Units Containing Lead-Based Paint Hazards Occupied by Low to Moderate Income Households



Sources:
HUD Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy Data 2007-2011, Table 13
HUD American Healthy Homes Survey, Table 5-1

Percentage of Housing Units Containing Lead-Based Paint Hazards
with Children Age 6 or Younger Present




Percentage of Housing Units Occupied by Low to Moderate Income Households
Containing Lead-Based Paint Hazards with Children Age 6 or Younger Present



Sources:
HUD Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy Data 2007-2011, Table 13
HUD American Healthy Homes Survey, Table 5-1

Percentage of Housing Units Occupied by Low to Moderate Income Households
Containing Lead-Based Paint Hazards with Children Age 6 or Younger Present
High-Risk Target Area (HRTA) Zip Codes Highlighted in Red



Sources:
HUD Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy Data 2007-2011, Table 13
HUD American Healthy Homes Survey, Table 5-1

Conclusions

The previous analysis has attempted to describe the state of the residential housing market in Choctaw County, Oklahoma. Where possible, information regarding the population centers of the county was included to assess need on a community level. Much of the information is based on demographic information from local authorities and national information services. However, personal interviews were performed with property owners and managers, real estate professionals, and community officials in an effort to substantiate information from the national organizations and understand current market conditions. Several important issues regarding housing have become apparent through this analysis and are identified below.

Choctaw County has undergone slow but steady decline in population since 2000. This trend is projected to continue over the next five years, and although there has been some recovery in employment levels in the last 18 months, total employment remains well below pre-recession levels. Choctaw County is among the lowest income counties in Oklahoma, with a significantly higher poverty rate as compared with the rest of the state (27.08%). Though housing prices and rental rates in the area are lower than the rest of the state, they do not offset significantly lower incomes: 36.31% of renter are rent overburdened, and 20.14% of homeowners are cost overburdened.

In terms of disaster resiliency we note that 23 tornadoes have impacted the county between 1959 and 2014, with 45 injuries and no fatalities. We recommend the creation of a registry of the location of individual and business-based shelters.

Choctaw County is located within the Southeastern Oklahoma Continuum of Care (CoC), which provides services to the area's homeless populations among other functions. Throughout the entire Southeastern Oklahoma CoC, there are an estimated 442 homeless persons, 225 of which are estimated to be sheltered. Many in the region are chronically homeless (73 persons) and other notable subpopulations include the mentally ill and chronic substance abusers.

In terms of fair housing issues, 312 affordable housing units are located in areas at risk for poverty (which is to be expected given high poverty throughout the county). No other fair housing issues were noted.

Due to the age of the county's housing stock, lead-based paint hazards are an issue, with an estimated 883 occupied housing units with such hazards, and 147 of those units occupied by low-to-moderate income households with children under the age of 6 present.

In summary, it is apparent that some limited new housing in several categories is required in Choctaw County. The area's housing stock is rapidly aging, which will require either rehabilitation or replacement (particularly in cases of homes with lead-based paint hazards). Both renters and homeowners show high housing cost burdens, suggesting a need for more affordable housing options. As the rapid absorption of Hugo Affordable Housing (phases I and II) demonstrates, there is demand for such housing. Though the county is declining in population, some housing to replace aging

housing stock and help alleviate high housing cost burdens is still needed in the area in limited amounts.

Addendum A

Acknowledgments

The Housing Needs Assessment research team extends a special thanks to the following individuals and organizations for their many contributions of data, program information and time that helped make this project possible:

University of Oklahoma Intern Team

Derrick “Rhys” Wilson, Eyakem Gulilat, Chase Phillips, Jane Wyrick, Charlotte Adcock, Sam Shreder, Jacquelyn Porter, Amy Wilson, Kevin Wang, Lora Gwartney, Forrest Bennett, Maryam Moradian, Salma Al Nairab

Federal Agencies

Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City-Oklahoma City Branch, Steven Shepelwich

US Federal Emergency Management Agency, Harold Latham

US Department of Housing and Urban Development Oklahoma City Field Office, Jackie McBride

Oklahoma State Agencies

Department of Health Karen Fenserly, Susan J. Quigley and Marisa New

Department of Human Services, Connie Schlittler

Department of Emergency Management Dara Hayes

Department of Commerce, Rebekah Zahn-Pittser

Local Organizations

Regional Council of Governments and Oklahoma Association of Regional Councils

Continuums of Care Network

Hazard Mitigation Plan personnel/administrators

Community economic development professionals

City Managers and Planners

Community Action Agencies

Chambers of Commerce

Affordable housing developers, owners and investors

Homeless Alliance, Dan Straughan, Sunshine Hernandez

Pathways, Patrice Pratt

Women's Resource Center, Vanessa Morrison

AIDS Care Fund, Sunshine Schillings

Addendum B

Qualifications

Owen S. Ard, MAI

Experience

Senior Managing Director of Integra Realty Resources - Tulsa/OKC, a full service valuation and consulting firm. Actively engaged in real estate valuation and consulting assignments since 1984, Mr. Ard has performed appraisal services consisting of narrative and summary real estate appraisals, ad valorem tax protests, consulting, litigation support services, market and feasibility studies, reviews, market study analyses and appraisals in connection with allocation of tax credits, brokerage services for commercial and residential transactions, property management, and expert litigation testimony. All types of real property are encompassed -apartments, ranches, theaters, hotel/motel, multi-purpose and resort properties, golf courses, high-rise and garden office buildings, manufacturing facilities, warehousing and distribution centers, nursing homes, assisted living facilities, banks, shopping centers and malls, residential subdivisions, industrial parks, and sports arenas. Valuations and market studies have been prepared on proposed, partially completed, renovated and existing structures. Appraisals have been made for condemnation purposes, estates, mortgage financing, equity participation and due diligence support. Clients served include corporations, law firms, financial institutions, investment firms and public/private agencies.

Professional Activities & Affiliations

Central Oklahoma Chapter, Appraisal Institute (Past Chapter President)
National Association of Realtors
Urban Land Institute
National Council of Affordable Housing Market Analysts
Appraisal Institute National Committees
Tulsa Metropolitan Area Planning Commission
Tulsa Preservation Commission
Tulsa Local Development Act Review Committee
Appraisal Institute, Member (MAI)

Licenses

Oklahoma, Oklahoma General Appraiser License, 11245CGA, Expires April 2018

Education

B.S.B.A. Degree, Marketing, University of Tulsa, Tulsa, Oklahoma (1984)

Successfully completed numerous real estate related courses and seminars sponsored by the Appraisal Institute, accredited universities and others.

Currently certified by the Appraisal Institute's voluntary program of continuing education for its designated members.

Qualified Before Courts & Administrative Bodies

District Court of Tulsa County, Oklahoma
District Court of Oklahoma County, Oklahoma
District Court of Garfield County, Oklahoma
Tulsa County Board of Equalization

oard@irr.com - 918-492-4844

Integra Realty Resources

Tulsa/OKC

1323 E. 71st. Street
Suite 105
Tulsa, OK 74136

T 918-492-4844
F 918-493-7155

irr.com



Owen S. Ard, MAI

Qualified Before Courts & Administrative Bodies (Cont'd)

Kansas Board of Tax Appeals

United States Federal Bankruptcy Court, Tulsa, Oklahoma

United States Federal Bankruptcy Court, Minneapolis, Minnesota

United States Federal Bankruptcy Court, Jackson, Mississippi

Integra Realty Resources

Tulsa/OKC

1323 E. 71st. Street
Suite 105
Tulsa, OK 74136

T 918-492-4844
F 918-493-7155

irr.com



David A. Puckett

Experience

Senior Director with Integra Realty Resources - Oklahoma, a full service valuation and consulting firm. Actively engaged in real estate valuation and consulting assignments since May 2002, Mr. Puckett has performed appraisal services consisting of narrative and summary real estate appraisals. All types of real property are encompassed-apartments, garden office buildings, manufacturing and warehouse industrial buildings, mobile home parks, restaurants and retail structures. Valuations and market studies have been prepared on proposed and existing structures. Appraisals have been made for estates, mortgage financing, equity participation and due diligence support. Prior to his employ at Integra Realty Resources - Oklahoma, Mr. Puckett was an employee of the University of Oklahoma Center for Business and Economic Development, working as a data analyst for the All County Affordable Housing Study commissioned by the Oklahoma Department of Commerce. Responsibilities included demographic, economic and real estate data collection from federal, state and local sources, as well as interviews of regional planning district, county and municipal officials, real estate market experts and local economic development experts. Mr. Puckett was responsible for site visits of 23 of the 77 Oklahoma counties, and personally authored 18 of the final reports. As an employee of IRR-Oklahoma, Mr. Puckett also performed the site visits and authored the final reports for four of the nine entitlement cities: Tulsa, Broken Arrow, Shawnee and Lawton. Mr. Puckett has also completed numerous housing market studies for use in applications for Federal Low-Income Housing Tax Credits in Oklahoma, Kansas, Missouri and Arkansas, and has performed market studies and appraisals for use in H.U.D.'s Multifamily Accelerated Processing (M.A.P.) program. Clients served include corporations, financial institutions, investment firms and public/private agencies.

Professional Activities & Affiliations

Appraisal Institute-Candidate for Designation

Licenses

Oklahoma, Oklahoma General Appraiser License, 12795CGA, Expires December 2016

Education

University of Oklahoma, Norman – Bachelor of Arts (Economics)

Successfully completed the following Appraisal Institute courses and seminars:

- Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice, 15-Hour
- Introduction to Income Capitalization Seminar
- Basic Income Capitalization 310
- Advanced Income Capitalization 510
- Highest and Best Use and Market Analysis 520
- Advanced Sales Comparison and Cost Approaches 530
- Report Writing and Valuation Analysis 540
- Advanced Concepts and Case Studies
- Real Estate Finance Statistics and Valuation Modeling
- Business Practices and Ethics 420

Integra Realty Resources

Tulsa/OKC

1323 E. 71st St., Suite 105
Tulsa, OK 74136

T 918-492-4844

F 918-493-7155

irr.com



Integra Realty Resources, Inc.

Corporate Profile

Integra Realty Resources, Inc. offers the most comprehensive property valuation and counseling coverage in North America with over 60 independently owned and operated offices located throughout the United States and the Caribbean. Integra was created for the purpose of combining the intimate knowledge of well-established local firms with the powerful resources and capabilities of a national company. Integra offers integrated technology, national data and information systems, as well as standardized valuation models and report formats for ease of client review and analysis. Integra's local offices have an average of 25 years of service in the local market, and virtually all are headed by a Senior Managing Director who is an MAI member of the Appraisal Institute.

A listing of IRR's local offices and their Senior Managing Directors follows:

ATLANTA, GA - Sherry L. Watkins, MAI, FRICS
AUSTIN, TX - Randy A. Williams, MAI, SR/WA, FRICS
BALTIMORE, MD - G. Edward Kerr, MAI, MRICS
BIRMINGHAM, AL - Rusty Rich, MAI, MRICS
BOISE, ID - Bradford T. Knipe, MAI, ARA, CCIM, CRE, FRICS
BOSTON, MA - David L. Cary, Jr., MAI, MRICS
CHARLESTON, SC - Cleveland "Bud" Wright, Jr., MAI
CHARLOTTE, NC - Fitzhugh L. Stout, MAI, CRE, FRICS
CHICAGO, IL - Eric L. Enloe, MAI, FRICS
CINCINNATI, OH - Gary S. Wright, MAI, FRICS, SRA
CLEVELAND, OH - Douglas P. Sloan, MAI
COLUMBIA, SC - Michael B. Dodds, MAI, CCIM
COLUMBUS, OH - Bruce A. Daubner, MAI, FRICS
DALLAS, TX - Mark R. Lamb, MAI, CPA, FRICS
DAYTON, OH - Gary S. Wright, MAI, FRICS, SRA
DENVER, CO - Brad A. Weiman, MAI, FRICS
DETROIT, MI - Anthony Sanna, MAI, CRE, FRICS
FORT WORTH, TX - Gregory B. Cook, SR/WA
GREENSBORO, NC - Nancy Tritt, MAI, SRA, FRICS
GREENVILLE, SC - Michael B. Dodds, MAI, CCIM
HARTFORD, CT - Mark F. Bates, MAI, CRE, FRICS
HOUSTON, TX - David R. Dominy, MAI, CRE, FRICS
INDIANAPOLIS, IN - Michael C. Lady, MAI, SRA, CCIM, FRICS
JACKSON, MS - John R. Praytor, MAI
JACKSONVILLE, FL - Robert Crenshaw, MAI, FRICS
KANSAS CITY, MO/KS - Kenneth Jagers, MAI, FRICS
LAS VEGAS, NV - Charles E. Jack IV, MAI
LOS ANGELES, CA - John G. Ellis, MAI, CRE, FRICS
LOS ANGELES, CA - Matthew J. Swanson, MAI
LOUISVILLE, KY - Stacey Nicholas, MAI, MRICS
MEMPHIS, TN - J. Walter Allen, MAI, FRICS

MIAMI/PALM BEACH, FL - Anthony M. Graziano, MAI, CRE, FRICS
MINNEAPOLIS, MN - Michael F. Amundson, MAI, CCIM, FRICS
NAPLES, FL - Carlton J. Lloyd, MAI, FRICS
NASHVILLE, TN - R. Paul Perutelli, MAI, SRA, FRICS
NEW JERSEY COASTAL - Halvor J. Egeland, MAI
NEW JERSEY NORTHERN - Matthew S. Krauser, CRE, FRICS
NEW YORK, NY - Raymond T. Cirz, MAI, CRE, FRICS
ORANGE COUNTY, CA - Steve Calandra, MAI
ORLANDO, FL - Christopher Starkey, MAI, MRICS
PHILADELPHIA, PA - Joseph D. Pasquarella, MAI, CRE, FRICS
PHOENIX, AZ - Walter 'Tres' Winus III, MAI, FRICS
PITTSBURGH, PA - Paul D. Griffith, MAI, CRE, FRICS
PORTLAND, OR - Brian A. Glanville, MAI, CRE, FRICS
PROVIDENCE, RI - Gerard H. McDonough, MAI, FRICS
RALEIGH, NC - Chris R. Morris, MAI, FRICS
RICHMOND, VA - Kenneth L. Brown, MAI, CCIM, FRICS
SACRAMENTO, CA - Scott Beebe, MAI, FRICS
ST. LOUIS, MO - P. Ryan McDonald, MAI, FRICS
SALT LAKE CITY, UT - Darrin W. Liddell, MAI, FRICS, CCIM
SAN DIEGO, CA - Jeff A. Greenwald, MAI, SRA, FRICS
SAN FRANCISCO, CA - Jan Kleczewski, MAI, FRICS
SARASOTA, FL - Carlton J. Lloyd, MAI, FRICS
SAVANNAH, GA - J. Carl Schultz, Jr., MAI, FRICS, CRE, SRA
SEATTLE, WA - Allen N. Safer, MAI, MRICS
SYRACUSE, NY - William J. Kimball, MAI, FRICS
TAMPA, FL - Bradford L. Johnson, MAI, MRICS
TULSA, OK - Owen S. Ard, MAI
WASHINGTON, DC - Patrick C. Kerr, MAI, FRICS, SRA
WILMINGTON, DE - Douglas L. Nickel, MAI, FRICS
CARIBBEAN/CAYMAN ISLANDS - James Andrews, MAI, FRICS

Corporate Office

Eleven Times Square, 640 Eighth Avenue, 15th Floor, Suite A, New York, New York 10036
Telephone: (212) 255-7858; Fax: (646) 424-1869; E-mail info@irr.com
Website: www.irr.com



DAWN EVE JOURDAN, ESQ., PH.D.

Director and Associate Professor
Regional and City Planning
College of Architecture
830 Van Vleet Oval, Gould Hall, Room 180
Norman, OK 73019-4141
Phone: (405) 325-3502
Fax: (405) 325-7558
E-MAIL: Dawn.E.Jourdan-1@ou.edu

EDUCATION:

Ph.D. Urban and Regional Planning, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL, 2004.

J.D./M.U.P. Law and Urban Planning, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS, 2000.

B.S. Urban Affairs and Theatre Arts, Bradley University, Peoria, IL, 1996.

RESEARCH INTERESTS:

The legal aspects of land use, affordable housing, historic preservation and aesthetics regulation at the federal, state, and local level.

WORK EXPERIENCE:

Associate Professor and Director of Regional and City Planning, University of Oklahoma (07/12-present)

Assistant Professor with a Joint Appointment in Planning and Law, University of Florida (01/08-6/12)

Director of the Center for Building Better Communities, University of Florida (05/11-06/12)

Assistant Professor and Minor Program Coordinator, Texas A&M University (01/05-12/07)

Lecturer, Rutgers University Bloustein Institute (01/06-present)

Lecturer, Texas A&M University (01/04-12/04)

Adjunct Professor, Florida State University (01/03-12/03)

Graduate Teaching Assistant, Florida State University (05/02-12/03)

Legal Intern, 1000 Friends of Florida (05/02-12/03)

Associate, Holland & Knight LLP (05/00-08/01)

AWARDS:

Student Planning Award for the Pinellas County Post Disaster Ordinance Drafting Project from the Florida Chapter of the American Planning Association, Fall, 2011.

Award for Service as the University Liaison to the Florida Chapter of the American Planning Association, Fall, 2010.

Teacher of the year award by the UF Student Planning Association, April, 2010.

Best paper in the real estate valuation category by the Appraisal Institute with Kimberly Geideman and Shan Gao, Fall, 2009.

Excellence in Teach Award by the College of Architecture of Texas A & M University, September, 2005.

Student Planning Award by the Texas Chapter of the American Planning Association, Fall, 2007.

Early Dissertation Research Grant to Study the Effects of Intergenerational Planning on Relocation Grief from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, November, 2003.

COURSES TAUGHT:

Principles and Practice of Urban Planning (graduate level, at the University of Oklahoma)

Land Use Controls (graduate level, at the University of Oklahoma)

Sociology of Housing (graduate level, at the University of Oklahoma with Dean Charles Graham)

Growth Management Powers II (graduate-law course, at the University of Florida)

Growth Management Powers I (graduate-law course, at the University of Florida)

Affordable Housing Law (graduate-law course, at the University of Florida)

Planning History and Theory (graduate level, at the University of Florida and Texas A&M University)

Land Use Planning Law (law school, at the University of Florida College of Law)

Land Development Law (graduate level, at Texas A&M University)
Historic Preservation Law (graduate level, at Texas A&M University)
Introduction to Urban Planning (undergraduate level, at Texas A&M University and Florida State University)
Attorney-Client Communications (undergraduate level, at Florida State University)
Legal Communications (undergraduate level, at Florida State University)
Environmental Law (continuing education, at Rutgers University)
Historic Preservation Law (continuing education, at Rutgers University)
Ordinance Drafting (continuing education, at Rutgers University)

PUBLICATIONS:

Refereed Journal Articles

K. Frank, J. Macedo, and **D. Jourdan**, Fostering Rural Adaptive Capacity for Sea Level Rise Planning Using Methods of Community Engagement (pending review- special edition of the Journal of the Community Development Society).

D. Jourdan and S. Pilat, Preserving Public Housing: Federal, State and Local Efforts to Preserve the Social and Architectural Forms Associated with Housing for the Poor in the *Journal of Preservation Education and Research* (forthcoming).

Ozor, B., K. Frank, and **D. Jourdan**, Confronting Wicked Problems with Games: How Role-Play Informs Planning for Sea Level Rise in Northeast Florida (pending review).

Jourdan, D., A. Ray, and L. Thompson, Relocating from Subsidized Housing in Florida: Are Residents Moving to Opportunity in *Journal of Housing and Community Development Law* (forthcoming).

Jourdan, D., K. Hurd, W. Gene Hawkins, and K. Winson Geideman, Evidence Based Sign Regulation: Regulating Signage on the Basis of Empirical Wisdom in *The Urban Lawyer*, 45:2, Spring 2014, 327-348.

Jourdan, D. S. Van Zandt, and E. Tarleton, Coming home: Resident satisfaction regarding return to a revitalized HOPE VI community in *Cities available at: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0264275113000322>*, 2013.

Jourdan, D., A Response to Mandelker's Free Speech Law for On Premise Signs in *Planning and Environmental Law*, 65:4, 2013, 4-10.

Land Development Law (graduate level, at Texas A&M University)
Historic Preservation Law (graduate level, at Texas A&M University)
Introduction to Urban Planning (undergraduate level, at Texas A&M University and Florida State University)
Attorney-Client Communications (undergraduate level, at Florida State University)
Legal Communications (undergraduate level, at Florida State University)
Environmental Law (continuing education, at Rutgers University)
Historic Preservation Law (continuing education, at Rutgers University)
Ordinance Drafting (continuing education, at Rutgers University)

PUBLICATIONS:

Refereed Journal Articles

K. Frank, J. Macedo, and **D. Jourdan**, Fostering Rural Adaptive Capacity for Sea Level Rise Planning Using Methods of Community Engagement (pending review- special edition of the Journal of the Community Development Society).

D. Jourdan and S. Pilat, Preserving Public Housing: Federal, State and Local Efforts to Preserve the Social and Architectural Forms Associated with Housing for the Poor in the *Journal of Preservation Education and Research* (forthcoming).

Ozor, B., K. Frank, and **D. Jourdan**, Confronting Wicked Problems with Games: How Role-Play Informs Planning for Sea Level Rise in Northeast Florida (pending review).

Jourdan, D., A. Ray, and L. Thompson, Relocating from Subsidized Housing in Florida: Are Residents Moving to Opportunity in *Journal of Housing and Community Development Law* (forthcoming).

Jourdan, D., K. Hurd, W. Gene Hawkins, and K. Winson Geideman, Evidence Based Sign Regulation: Regulating Signage on the Basis of Empirical Wisdom in *The Urban Lawyer*, 45:2, Spring 2014, 327-348.

Jourdan, D. S. Van Zandt, and E. Tarleton, Coming home: Resident satisfaction regarding return to a revitalized HOPE VI community in *Cities available at: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0264275113000322>*, 2013.

Jourdan, D., A Response to Mandelker's Free Speech Law for On Premise Signs in *Planning and Environmental Law*, 65:4, 2013, 4-10.

Jourdan, D., Enhancing HOPE VI Revitalization Processes with Participation, in *Journal of the Community Development Society*, Vol. 39:No. 2, 2008, pp. 75-90.

Jourdan, D., Reducing Pre-Relocation Grief with Participation in a HOPE VI Grant Application Process, in *International Journal of Public Participation*, Vol. 2:No. 2, 2008, pp. 75-92.

Jourdan, D., Mending Fences: Resolving Neighbor Disputes With Squatters Settlements in Belize, in *PACE Institute for Environmental and Regional Studies Proceedings*, Vol. 4, 2004, pp. 135-149.

White, S. M. and **D. Jourdan**, Neotraditional Development: A Legal Analysis, in *Land Use Law and Zoning Digest* (1999).

Books

Jourdan, D. and E. Strauss. *Planner's Guide to Land Use Law: Planning for Wicked Problems*, NY: Routledge (under contract).

Book Chapters and Entries

Jamal, T. and **D. Jourdan**. Interdisciplinary Tourism Education in Interdisciplinary Teaching and Learning in Higher Education: theory and practice. *Interdisciplinary Learning and Teaching in Higher Education: theory and practice*. Dr Balasubramanyam Chandramohan and Dr Stephen Fallows (eds.), London: Routledge Falmer. (2008).

D. Jourdan. Grounding Theory: Developing New Theory on Intergenerational Participation in Qualitative Methods for Housing Research. *Qualitative Housing Research Methods*. Paul Maquin (ed.), London: Elsevier. (2008).

Non-Refereed Publications

Jourdan, D., Hawkins, G., Winson-Geideman, K., and R. Abrams. The Model Sign Code. International Sign Association (December, 2008).

Winson-Geideman, K., **D. Jourdan** and S. Gao. The Effects of Adaptive Reuse by the Savannah College of Art & Design on Property Value and Community Change in Savannah, Georgia. *Lincoln Land Institute Working Papers* (December, 2006).

Jourdan, D. Bomb Proof Schools. *Plan Canada*. (Fall, 2006).

Van Zandt, S., Jourdan, D., Martin, J., and C. Giusti. Final Report for Beaumont's HOPE VI Project. Prepared for the Beaumont Housing Authority (December 2012)

Jourdan, D., Enhancing HOPE VI Revitalization Processes with Participation, in *Journal of the Community Development Society*, Vol. 39:No. 2, 2008, pp. 75-90.

Jourdan, D., Reducing Pre-Relocation Grief with Participation in a HOPE VI Grant Application Process, in *International Journal of Public Participation*, Vol. 2:No. 2, 2008, pp. 75-92.

Jourdan, D., Mending Fences: Resolving Neighbor Disputes With Squatters Settlements in Belize, in *PACE Institute for Environmental and Regional Studies Proceedings*, Vol. 4, 2004, pp. 135-149.

White, S. M. and **D. Jourdan**, Neotraditional Development: A Legal Analysis, in *Land Use Law and Zoning Digest* (1999).

Books

Jourdan, D. and E. Strauss. *Planner's Guide to Land Use Law: Planning for Wicked Problems*, NY: Routledge (under contract).

Book Chapters and Entries

Jamal, T. and **D. Jourdan**. Interdisciplinary Tourism Education in Interdisciplinary Teaching and Learning in Higher Education: theory and practice. *Interdisciplinary Learning and Teaching in Higher Education: theory and practice*. Dr Balasubramanyam Chandramohan and Dr Stephen Fallows (eds.), London: Routledge Falmer. (2008).

D. Jourdan. Grounding Theory: Developing New Theory on Intergenerational Participation in Qualitative Methods for Housing Research. *Qualitative Housing Research Methods*. Paul Maquin (ed.), London: Elsevier. (2008).

Non-Refereed Publications

Jourdan, D., Hawkins, G., Winson-Geideman, K., and R. Abrams. The Model Sign Code. International Sign Association (December, 2008).

Winson-Geideman, K., **D. Jourdan** and S. Gao. The Effects of Adaptive Reuse by the Savannah College of Art & Design on Property Value and Community Change in Savannah, Georgia. *Lincoln Land Institute Working Papers* (December, 2006).

Jourdan, D. Bomb Proof Schools. *Plan Canada*. (Fall, 2006).

Van Zandt, S., Jourdan, D., Martin, J., and C. Giusti. Final Report for Beaumont's HOPE VI Project. Prepared for the Beaumont Housing Authority (December 2012)

Van Zandt, S., Jourdan, D., Martin, J., and C. Giusti. Interim Report for Beaumont's HOPE VI Project. Prepared for the Beaumont Housing Authority (December 2011).

Van Zandt, S., **Jourdan, D.**, Martin, J., and C. Giusti. Interim Report for Beaumont's HOPE VI Project. Prepared for the Beaumont Housing Authority (December 2009).

Van Zandt, S., **Jourdan, D.**, Martin, J., and C. Giusti. Interim Report for Beaumont's HOPE VI Project. Prepared for the Beaumont Housing Authority (December 2008).

Van Zandt, S., **Jourdan, D.**, Martin, J., and C. Giusti. Baseline Report for Beaumont's HOPE VI Project. Prepared for the Beaumont Housing Authority (December 2007).

Van Zandt, S., **Jourdan, D.**, Martin, J., and C. Giusti. Need and Demand for Affordable Housing in the Brazos Valley. Report to Brazos Valley Affordable Housing Corporation. (June 2006).

SPONSORED RESEARCH:

Co-PI, Tribal Climate Change and Extreme Event Response Studies to Identify Vulnerabilities, South Central Climate Science Center, 2014-2015.

PI, Oklahoma City, Sustainability Audit, May 2013-present.

PI, Shimberg Center for Housing Studies, The Lost Properties and Moving To Opportunity, October 2010 – Present.

Investigator and Collaboration Lead, Planning for Sea Level Rise: A Pilot Study to Evaluate and Improve the Development and Delivery of Habitat Vulnerability Assessments and Adaptive Conservation Designs to Coastal Decision Makers, National Estuarine Research Reserve System Science Collaborative, 2011-2014.

Co-PI, Rural Coastal Region Adaptation Planning for Sea Level Rise, Florida Sea Grant, 2012-14.

Co-PI, Development of Sea Level Rise Adaptation Planning Procedures and Tools Using NOAA Sea Level Rise Impacts Viewer, Gulf of Mexico Regional Research Competition, 2012-14.

Co-PI, Impact of Parking Supply and Demand Management on Central Business District (CBD) Traffic Congestion, Transit Performance and Sustainable Land Use, Florida Department of Transportation, January 2010 – October 2011.

A Parameterized Climate Change Projection Model for Hurricane Flooding, Wave Action, Economic Damages, and Population Dynamics, sponsored by NOAA, September 2009-September 2011, Role, Co-Principal Investigator.

HOPE VI Community Services Study for the Redevelopment of Magnolia Gardens in Beaumont, Texas, sponsored by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Beaumont Public Housing Authority, January 2007-December 2011, Role, Co-Principal Investigator.

Preserve America Grant for an Intergenerational Oral History for Hearne, Texas, sponsored by the National Parks Service, January 2007-December 2007, Role, Investigator.

A Hedonic Model of the Effects of Adaptive Reuse on Community Change in Savannah, Georgia, sponsored by the Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, Role, Investigator.

Legal Analysis and Policy Formulation Regarding the Use of Regional Rural Landbanking to Enhance the Development of Affordable Housing Opportunities in Brazos Valley Texas, sponsored by the Brazos Valley Affordable Housing Corporation, January 2007-August 2007, Role, Co-Principal Investigator.

Market Study of the Barriers to the Provision of Affordable Housing in Brazos Valley Texas, sponsored by the Brazos Valley Affordable Housing Corporation, January 2006-August 2006, Role, Co-Principal Investigator.

Comparative Analysis of the Effects of the Location of Big Box Retail on Housing Prices in Urban and Suburban Areas, sponsored by Texas A&M College of Architecture, December 2005-December 2006, Role, Principal Investigator.

PROFESSIONAL SERVICE AND AFFILIATIONS:

Professional Services

Chair of the Academic Advisory Council for Sign Research and Education (August 2014-present)

Chair of the Planner Outreach Subcommittee for the International Sign Association (January 2014-present)

Appointed to the Alachua County Affordable Housing Advisory Board (April 2010-2011)

University Liaison to the Florida Chapter of the American Planning Association (September 2007-September 2010)

Fellow to the Center for Children and Families at the Levin College of Law (May 2007-2012)

Member of the Law School Honor Code Committee (2009-2010)

Member of the ICCHP Committee (2009-2010)

Member of DCP Faculty Council (2009-2012)

Member of UF Historic Buildings and Structures Committee (2009-2010)

UF Commencement Marshall (2008-2010)

Ad Hoc Member of the Amicus Committee for the American Planning Association
Fellow for the Center for Heritage Conservation at Texas A&M University (2005-2007).

Professional Affiliations

American Planning Association

Oklahoma Chapter of the APA

Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning

Member of the Illinois Bar

Served as a manuscript and grant proposal reviewer for the following:

Journal of the Community Development Society

Journal of Planning History

US-China Law Review

UF Journal of Law and Public Policy

Journal of Planning Education and Research

National Science Foundation

CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS:

International Conferences-Refereed Presentations

Jourdan, D., K. Hurd, H. G. Hawkins, and K. Winson-Geideman. Evidence-based Sign Regulation: Regulating Signage on the Basis of Empirical Wisdom. Presented at the AESOP-ACSP Conference in Dublin, Ireland, July 2013.

Nolon, J., Call, C., Murtaza, A. and **Jourdan, D.** Property Rights, Political Drama, and Smart Growth: The Challenges of Sustainable Development in 2011. Presented at the National Conference of the American Bar Association in Toronto, August 2011.

Jourdan, D., Wal-Mart in the Garden District- Does the Arbitrary and Capricious Standard of Review Lessen the Right of Citizens to Participate. Presented at the

International Association of Planning Law and Property Rights, Aalborg, Denmark, February, 2008.

Jourdan, D. and VanZandt, S, Creating Regional Landbanks to Meet Rural Affordable Housing Needs. Presented at the Joint International Conference of the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning (ACSP) and the Association of European Planning Schools (AESOP), Chicago, IL, July 2008.

Jourdan, D., Should Children Have the Right to Speak for Themselves: The legal rights of youth to participate in national level policymaking. Presented at the International Conference on the Rights of Children, Ghent, Belgium (2006).

Jourdan, D., Grounding Theory: Developing New Theory on Intergenerational Participation. Presented at the Joint International Conference of the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning (ACSP) and the Association of European Planning Schools (AESOP), Mexico City, Mexico (2006).

Jourdan, D., Planning to Reduce Worry. Presented at the Making Cities Livable Conference, Venice, Italy (2005).

National Conferences

Jourdan, D. Community Aesthetics and Sign Regulations: How far can a city go to prescribe aesthetics?" Presented at the National Signage Research and Education Conference in Cincinnati, OH, October, 2013.

Jourdan, D. and J. Kellaris, Collaborating with City Officials on Urban Signage, Presented at the International Sign Expo, in Las Vegas, NV, April, 2012.

Jourdan, D. Evidence-Based Sign Regulation: Regulating Signage on the Basis of Empirical Wisdom. Presented at the National Signage Research and Education Conference in Cincinnati, OH, October, 2012.

Jourdan, D., Ray, A., and Thompson, L. Relocating from Subsidized Housing in Florida: Are Residents Moving to Opportunity? Urban Affairs Association, Pittsburgh, PA, April 2012.

Frank, K., **Jourdan, D.**, Easley, G., and F. Eddleton. Leveraging community historical identity for climate change adaptation planning. Society for American City and Regional Planning History Conference, Baltimore, MD, November 17-20, 2011.

Frank, K., **Jourdan, D.**, and Obonyo, E. Sea level rise adaptation planning for rural coastal areas in Florida. Initiative on Climate Adaptation Research and Understanding through the Social Sciences: Climate Vulnerability and Adaptation (ICARUS II). May 5-8, Ann Arbor, MI, 2011.

Steiner, R., **Jourdan, D.**, Blanco, A., Mackey, J., Hanley, G., Sucar, V., and Shmaltzuyev, M., Understanding the Connection between Parking Management and Transit Usage: A Case Study of Miami and Fort Lauderdale Central Business Districts. Presented at the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning (ACSP) Conference, Minneapolis. Oct. 13 – 16, 2011.

Steiner, R., Blanco, A. and **Jourdan, D.**, Impact of Parking Supply And Demand Management on Central Business District (CBD) Traffic Congestion. Presented at the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning (ACSP) Conference. Minneapolis. Oct. 5 – 10, 2010.

Jourdan, D. Coming Home: The Relocation Effects of Expedited HOPE VI Revitalization Processes. Presented at the Urban Affairs Association, New Orleans, LA, 2011.

Zhao, J. and **Jourdan, D.** Zoning Variance Administration in Practice: Influencing Factors and Trends. Presented at the ACSP Conference in Minneapolis, MN, November, 2010.

Jourdan, D., Valuing Grief: A Proposal to Compensate Relocated Public Housing Residents for Intangibles. Presented at the ACSP Conference, Washington, D.C., October, 2009.

Jourdan, D., Garvin, E. and Stroud, N. Potential Legal Challenges to Form Based Codes: the Miami 21 Test Case. Presented at the IMLA Conference, Miami, FL, October, 2009.

Jourdan, D., Creating Regional Landbanks to Meet Rural Affordable Housing Needs. Presented at the Joint ACSP/AESOP Conference, Chicago, IL, July 2008.

VanZandt, S. and **Jourdan, D.** Landbanking to Meet Affordable Housing Needs. Presented at the National Conference of the American Planning Association Conference, Las Vegas, NV, April, 2008.

Jourdan, D. and Wieters, M. Serious Play: Constructing Learning to Promote Meaningful Dialogue in the Planning Classroom. Presented at the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning National Conference, Fort Worth, TX, 2006.

Geideman, K. and **Jourdan, D.** Preserving Who's Neighborhood: The Effects of Adaptive Reuse by the Savannah College of Art & Design on Property Value and Community Change in Savannah, Georgia. Presented at the Lincoln Land Institute, Cambridge, MA, 2006.

Jourdan, D., Sentencing Goldilocks. Presented at the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning National Conference, Kansas City, MO, 2005.

Jourdan, D., Public Housing: Is it Worth Preserving?"Presented at the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning National Conference, Kansas City, MO, 2005.

Jourdan, D., Grieving for a Lost Home?: A Case Study of How Participation in an Intergenerational Planning Process Lessened the Pre-Relocation Grief Effects of Experienced by the Youth and Adult Residents of the McDaniel Glenn Public Housing Community in Atlanta. Presented at the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning National, Portland, OR, 2004.

Jourdan, D., Mending Fences: Resolving Neighbor Disputes With Squatter Settlements in Belize. Presented at Pace University, NYC, April 2004.

Jourdan, D., Increasing Youth Participation in the Planning Process. Presented at the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning National Conference, Baltimore, MD, 2002.

National Conferences – Invited Discussant and/or Moderator

Jourdan, D. Institute for Quality Communities Placemaking Conference in Norman, OK (2013) on the topic of "Healthy, Walkable Communities."

Jourdan, D. Annual Conference of the ACSP in Washington D.C. (2009) on the topic of "Comparative Jurisprudence Relating to Takings and Due Process Law."

Jourdan, D. Joint ACSP/AESOP Conference, Chicago, IL, (2008) on the topic of "Comparative Legal Jurisprudence on Property Rights."

Jourdan, D. Annual Conference of the ACSP in Fort Worth, TX (2006) on the topic of "Researching Wal-Mart."

Jourdan, D. Annual Conference of the ACSP in Kansas City, MO (2005) on the topic of "Research Wal-Mart."

Jourdan, D. Annual Conference of the ACSP in Portland, OR (2004) on the topic of "What Planners Should Know About the Law."

Jourdan, D. Sustainable Campus Planning, Annual Conference of the ACSP in Baltimore, MD (2002).

State Conferences –Presentations by Invitation

Jourdan, D. The New Urbanism: Optimizing Imagination, Creativity, Innovation, and Human Flourishing, Presented at the State Creativity Forum in Oklahoma City, OK, November, 2013.

Jourdan, D. So You Want to Take on Your Sign Code, Presented at the State Conference of the Oklahoma Chapter of the American Planning Association in Tahlequah, OK, October, 2013.

Steiner, R., Blanco, A., and **Jourdan, D.** Parking as a Smart Growth Strategy, Presented at the Florida Chapter of the American Planning Association Conference September 2011.

Silver, C. and **Jourdan, D.** Legal Aspects of Sustainable Development, Presented at the Florida Chapter of the American Planning Association Conference, September, 2011.

Jourdan, D. The Land Use Revolution: The Tea Party's Influence on Planning Process. Presented at the Annual Conference of the Utah Land Institute, Salt Lake City, Utah, November 2011.

Jourdan, D., Measuring the Winds of Change: the Introduction of Qualitative Research Methods in Planning Processes. Presented at the Annual Conference of the Texas Chapter of the American Planning Association, Corpus Christi, TX (2006).

REFERENCES AVAILABLE UPON REQUEST



K. MEGHAN WIETERS, PH.D., AICP

University of Oklahoma, Regional & City Planning, 830 Van Vleet Oval - Gould Hall RM 162
Norman, OK 73019, kmeghanwieters@ou.edu

EDUCATION

Texas A&M University

Ph.D in Urban Regional Science

2003 – August 2009

Dissertation: "Integrating Walking for Transportation and Physical Activity for Sedentary Office Workers In Texas"

University of Texas at Austin

Masters of Science in Community & Regional Planning

1993-1995

Thesis: "Building a Community: Transit Options in the Land Development Code and Land Development Process"

Trinity University

Bachelors of Arts

1989-1993

Majors: Philosophy, International Studies (concentration on Latin America), Minor: Spanish

TEACHING

Assistant Professor - University of Oklahoma

Fall 2009 – to present

RCPL 5813 Environmental Planning Methods

RCPL 5013 History and Theory of Urban Planning

RCPL 5513 Subdivision Planning

RCPL 5823 Rural and Regional Planning

RCPL 5493 Transportation and Land Use Planning

RCPL 5990 Public Health & Built Environment

PREVIOUS RESEARCH POSITIONS & PRACTICE

Texas A&M University

August 2006

Graduate Assistant

May 2009

Texas Transportation Institute

August 2003 –

Graduate Research Assistant

August 2006

City of Austin - Transportation, Planning & Sustainability Department

August 1998 –

Principal Planner / Senior Planner

August 2003

Capital Metropolitan Transportation Authority

April 1994 –

Land Use/Transportation Planner

August 1998

PUBLICATIONS & REPORTS

Wieters, K M. Office Workers Stuck at their Desks: Built Environment Implications on Walk Trips. Under review – *Health & Place*, April 2014.

Wieters, K M. Advantages of Online Methods in Planning Research: Capturing Walking Habits in Different Built Environments. Under Review -- *Sage Open*, February 2014

Wieters, K M, Kim, J-H, Lee, C. "Assessment of Wearable Global Positioning System Units for Physical Activity Research", *Journal of Physical Activity & Health*, September 2012 (published)

Zietsman, J., Villa, J.C., Forrest, T. L., and Storey, J. M. (2005) "Mexican Truck Idling Emissions at the El Paso - Ciudad Juarez Border Location" Report 473700-00033. Prepared for Southwest Region University Transportation Center.

Zietsman, J., Bubbosh, P., Li, L., Bochner, B., Villa, J. (2005) "National Deployment Strategy for Truck Stop Electrification". Prepared for U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

Zietsman, J., Bynum, J., Wieters, K., and Bochner, B. (2005) "Reducing School Bus Emissions in Texas". Prepared for Texas Department of Transportation. Proceedings of the 2005 Mid-Continent Transportation Research Symposium.

Wieters, K. and J. Borowiec. (2004) "An Examination of Methods for Increasing On-Airport Revenue". Prepared for Texas Department of Transportation: Aviation Division.

Hard, Ed. et al. (2003) "TxDOT Involvement in the Local Development Process", Report 4429-1.

CONFERENCE & INVITED PRESENTATIONS

Wieters, K, M Wiens, T.O. Bowman. Walkability: A Tool for Promoting Health, Better Planning and Building Community. Presentation at "Planning Oklahoma Together" OKAPA Conference, Tahlequah, OK, October 2013.

Gibson, H and K. Wieters, Talking Green in Red States. Kansas APA Conference, Manhattan, KS October 2013

Wieters, K. Teaching, Learning and Implementing Walkability in Oklahoma City. Oklahoma Service Learning Conference, "The Art of Teaching through Science of Service", Friday November 22, 2013

Wieters, K, D Hess, P Firth. Invited panelist for Pedestrian and Bicycle University Education, Transportation Research Board 82nd Annual Meeting, January 13-17, 2013.

Wieters, K, J Fees, and B McCann. Why should we care about those silly pedestrians and bicyclists? Barriers to Adoption of Complete Streets Ordinances in Cowboy Country. Presented paper at the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning Conference, Cincinnati, OH, 2012

Wieters, K. Office workers -- Sedentary by Practice: How can we integrate physical activity as part of daily routines at work. Oklahoma Public Health Association Conference, Health Equity Caucus, April 2012

Wieters, K M, L Fithian, T McCuen, and C Barrett. Teaching How to Manage Competing Interests: Planners, Architects and Construction Science Students Developing a Subdivision Together. Presented paper at the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning Conference, Salt Lake City, UT; 2011.

Wieters K M. Methodology in assessing walking behavior for office workers using online survey methods. Presented paper at the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning Conference. Minneapolis, MN; 2010.

Lee C, Wieters M, Giusti C, Lord D. The Environment and Obesity among Latino Adults: A case study exploring the roles of built environments in promoting physical activity and reducing obesity among colonia residents. Inter-University Program for Latino Research. University of Notre Dame; 2010.

Wieters KM, Kim J-H, Lee C. A walk to grab a cup of coffee: Assessment of available research instruments for measuring physical activity. Presented paper at the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning Conference Chicago, IL; 2008.

Jourdan, D., Wieters, K. "Serious Play: Constructing Learning To Promote Meaningful Dialogue In The Planning Classroom". Co-Presented paper at the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning Conference. Milwaukee, WI; 2006.

INVITED LECTURES

University of Oklahoma

Department of Geography & Sustainability, Spring Colloquium

"Walking & Biking: Active Transportation and the Built Environment" January 2014

Kansas State University – Big 12 Fellowship

- The messiness of random sampling spatially Oct. 21, 2013
- Watershed Functions & Impacts from Development Oct. 21, 2013
- Creating an audit tool and operationalizing data Oct. 23, 2013
- Bicycle Facility Design & Planning Oct. 23, 2013
- Observational Methods Oct. 23, 2013
- Pedestrian Planning and Design: How does the environment we live in impact our lives? Oct. 2013
- Office workers – Sedentary by Practice: How can we integrate physical activity as part of daily routines at work – Formal presentation to faculty and students Oct. 2013

Department of Biostatistics and Epidemiology College of Public Health,

University of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center

- Planning, Built Environment, and Public Health: How does the environment we live in impact our lives? March 11, 2013

GRANT FUNDING

Received Ed Cline Faculty Development Award (\$1450), Spring 2014

Received Big 12 Faculty Fellowship Program Award (\$2500) June 2013

Received College of Architecture IT recipient (\$3450) July 2013

Sooner Parents Mini-Grant Funding (\$500) for student mentoring –prepared and submitted to assist RCPL Student Planning Association July 2013

Received Junior Faculty Research (\$7,000) for summer research on rural planning and physical activity opportunities. University of Oklahoma, Summer 2012

Robert Wood Johnson Active Living Research Dissertation Grant (\$25,000), Texas A&M University, 2007

SERVICE

University-Level Service

- Advisory Committee Course Management Systems (ACCMS) Spring 2013

College-Level Service

- Graduate Liaison for Regional & City Planning Division (Fall 2013 – present)
- Graduate Research & Curriculum Committee (Fall 2013 – present)
- RCPL orientation (Fall 2010- present)
- Search committee for new RCPL hires, new LA hire (Summer 2011, Summer 2012, Spring 2013, Spring 2014)
- IT Committee (member since 2012), Chair (Fall 2013-Spring 2014)
- Model Shop Committee (member since 2012-Fall 2013)
- RCPL website (2011- present)
- GHGI committee (Gould Hall Green Initiative) (Fall 2011)
- Co-hosting and arranging guest seminar: Dr. Chanam Lee – "The Built Environment and Disparities in Physical Activity", December 2012.

SERVICE

State-level / City-Level Service

- President – Health Equity Caucus, subgroup of Oklahoma Public Health Association
- APA/AICP member
- Bicycle Advisory Committee, City of Norman – Committee member (Spring 2013 – 2016)

National-Level Service

- Secretary/Treasurer of Faculty Women's Interest Group (FWIG), committee under Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning (ACSP).
- CDC Weight of the Nation Conference planning, Built Environment & Transportation Subcommittee
- Reviewer for Journal of Physical Activity and Health

Bryce C. Lowery, PhD

Contact

University of Oklahoma
College of Architecture - Division of Regional and City Planning
830 Van Vleet Oval
Gould Hall 255
Norman, OK 73019
(405) 325-8953
bryce.c.lowery@ou.edu

Academic Experience

Assistant Professor	2014 - present
<i>College of Architecture – Division of Regional and City Planning</i>	
<i>University of Oklahoma – Norman, OK</i>	

Education

Doctor of Philosophy – Policy, Planning, and Development	2014
<i>Sol Price School of Public Policy</i>	
<i>University of Southern California - Los Angeles, CA</i>	
<i>Dissertation: Social Construction of the Experience Economy: The spatial ecology of outdoor advertising in Los Angeles</i>	
Jack Dyckman Award - Best Dissertation in Planning & Development	
Committee:	David Sloane, PhD Tridib Banerjee, PhD Pierrette Hondagneu-Sotelo, PhD (Sociology)
Master of Landscape Architecture	2008
<i>College of Environmental Design</i>	
<i>California State Polytechnic University - Pomona, CA</i>	
Master of Science – Environmental Policy and Behavior	2000
<i>School of Natural Resources and Environment</i>	
<i>University of Michigan - Ann Arbor, MI</i>	
Bachelor of Arts – Economics and Environmental Studies	1996
<i>Dornsife College of Letters, Arts, and Sciences</i>	
<i>University of Southern California - Los Angeles, CA</i>	

Publications

The Prospects and Problems of Integrating Sketch Maps with Geographic Information Systems (GIS) to Understand Environmental Perception: A case study of mapping youth fear in Los Angeles gang neighborhoods	2014
<i>Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design</i> 41(2): 251-271. Curtis, J.W., E. Shiao, B. Lowery, D. Sloane, K. Hennigan and A. Curtis	
The Prevalence of Harmful Content on Outdoor Advertising in Los Angeles: Land use, community characteristics, and the spatial inequality of a public health nuisance	2014
<i>American Journal of Public Health</i> 104(4): 658-664. Lowery, B.C. and D.C. Sloane	

Presentations

**From Regional Center to Sign District:
Regulating outdoor advertising in Los Angeles, 1881-2012**
Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning - Philadelphia, PA – November 1, 2014
with David Sloane

- Do Farmers' Markets Improve the Availability of Healthy Foods for All Communities?**
A case study of 19 markets in Los Angeles.
Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning – Philadelphia, PA – October 30, 2014
 with Denise Payan, LaVonna Blair Lewis and David Sloane
- If You See Something, Say Something:**
Community response (and non-response) to outdoor advertising regulation in Los Angeles
Council of Educators in Landscape Architecture – Austin, TX – March 29, 2013
- The Spatial Ecology of Outdoor Advertising in Los Angeles:**
The unjust impact of the commercial landscape
Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning – Cincinnati, OH – November 3, 2012
 with David Sloane
- Employing Social Network Analysis to Understand the Formation of Sustainable Social Capital**
Council of Educators in Landscape Architecture – Tucson, AZ – January 15, 2009

Teaching Experience

Assistant Professor	
<i>University of Oklahoma – College of Architecture</i>	2014-present
Subdivision and Site Planning (graduate)	
Computer Mapping and GIS in Planning (graduate)	
Comprehensive Planning Studio (graduate)	
Lecturer	
<i>University of California, Irvine – School of Social Ecology</i>	2014
Design and Planning Graphics (graduate)	
Teaching Assistant	
<i>University of Southern California - Sol Price School of Public Policy</i>	2008-2013
Citizenship and Public Ethics (undergraduate)	
History of Planning and Development (undergraduate)	
Planning History and Urban Form (graduate)	
Smart Growth and Urban Sprawl (graduate)	
Urban Context for Policy and Planning (undergraduate)	
Urban Planning and Development (undergraduate)	
Urban Planning and Social Policy (graduate - online)	
Graduate Student Instructor	
<i>University of Michigan - School of Natural Resources and Environment</i>	1999-2000
Introduction to Environmental Policy (undergraduate)	
Introduction to Natural Resource Management (undergraduate)	

Other Experience

Research Assistant	2009 - 2014
<i>Sol Price School of Public Policy - University of Southern California</i>	
Editorial Assistant – Terry L. Cooper	2011 - 2012
<i>The Responsible Administrator:</i> <i>An Approach to Ethics for the Administrative Role, 6th Edition, 2012.</i>	
Research Associate	2005 - 2006
<i>Lodestar Management/Research Inc. (now Harder+Company)</i>	
Project Coordinator	2004 - 2005
<i>Perinatal Advisory Council of Los Angeles County</i>	
Community Researcher	2002 - 2004
<i>Children's Planning Council - Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors</i>	
Assistant Director	2000 - 2002
<i>Health DATA Program - UCLA Center for Health Policy Research</i>	

Curriculum Coordinator <i>UCLA Labor, Occupational, Safety and Health Program</i>	2000
Research Coordinator <i>The Wild Thornberry's Television Series</i> <i>Klasky-Csupo Incorporated/Nickelodeon Studios</i>	1996 - 1998
Activities and Service	
Committee Member <i>University of Oklahoma</i> Anna Siprikova – Master of City and Regional Planning Thesis	2014 - present
Reviewer <i>American Journal of Public Health</i> <i>Council of Educators in Landscape Architecture</i>	
Member <i>American Planning Association</i> <i>American Public Health Association</i> <i>American Society of Landscape Architects</i> <i>Association of American Geographers</i> <i>Environmental Design Research Association</i>	
Member <i>Creating/Making Facilities Coordination Team</i> <i>University of Oklahoma – College of Architecture</i>	2014 - present
Member <i>Billboard and Visual Landscape Visioning Group</i> <i>City of Los Angeles</i>	2013
Area Chairperson <i>Hollywood Hills West Neighborhood Council – Area 2: Cahuenga Pass</i> <i>City of Los Angeles</i>	2010 - 2012
Vice-Chairperson	2010 - 2012
Appointee <i>Cahuenga/Ventura Corridor Specific Plan Review Board</i> <i>City of Los Angeles - Council District 4</i>	2008 - 2012
President	2011 - 2012
Member <i>Cahuenga Pass Property Owners' Association</i>	2000 - 2012

Byron DeBruler

DeBruler, Inc.

8200 NE 139th Street

Edmond, OK 73103

United States of America

Phone: 405/396-2032 Cell Phone: 405/202-1610

BACKGROUND SUMMARY

Executive Manager with extensive experience in public sector resource design, management and evaluation. Knowledge and skills include: structuring and design of state and local service programs and initiatives, developing written proposals for project financing, identifying community economic development resources and training.

EXPERIENCE

DeBruler, Inc.

Vice President, Oklahoma City, August 2001 to Present

Provide services including:

- ✓ Researching public and private resources and preparing applications for financial assistance in response to client requests for economic and community development projects.
- ✓ Technical assistance to nonprofits and units of local government regarding federal and state resources and structuring project-beneficial partnerships; preparing strategic and business plans for public and private sector entities.
- ✓ Group facilitation services.
- ✓ Technical training for nonprofits and units of local government regarding federal and state financial assistance programs. Conducting organizational assessments and developing capacity building curriculums.

Oklahoma Housing Finance Agency

Team Leader, Housing Development Team, Oklahoma City, July 1998 to July 2001

Provided direct supervision and oversight of sixteen staff engaged in the administration of multiple federal and state affordable housing program resources.

While employed by the agency:

- ✓ Reorganized state's Single Family Mortgage Revenue Bond, Low-income Housing Tax Credit, HOME Investment Partnerships and Housing Trust Fund Programs into a single work unit.
- ✓ Streamlined Low-income Housing Tax Credit Program administrative rules to provide for market responsive design flexibility.
- ✓ Streamlined affordable housing resources by developing a singular application package and process for the agency's affordable housing development resources and established e-information network.
- ✓ Facilitated the development of working partnerships between the state's nonprofit and for-profit housing development organizations and agency's mortgage revenue bond lenders.
- ✓ Financed the development of affordable housing by leveraging public sector development funds with private investments.

- ✓ Facilitated legislative task force on rural affordable housing issues and devised legislative and programmatic actions to spur rural development.
- ✓ Developed, financed and implemented the state's first statewide affordable housing market analysis in partnership with a major university center.
- ✓ Drafted enabling legislation, capitalized and implemented state's Housing Trust Fund.

Oklahoma Department of Commerce

Program Manager/Department Head, Oklahoma City, March 1988 to July 1998

- ✓ In response to market-based demand, directed a team of professional agency staff with diverse skills, in the redesign of the state's HOME Investment Partnerships Program from primarily rehabilitation services to the production of rural affordable housing units.
- ✓ Led HOME Program administrative team in the relocation of the Program from its state agency environment to the Oklahoma Housing Finance Agency, a public trust.
- ✓ Leveraged HOME Program development resources with other public and private debt capital to finance the development of rural affordable housing statewide.
- ✓ Formulated and implemented a legislative agenda to enact and capitalizing the state's Housing Trust Fund.
- ✓ Provided daily oversight and administration for several state administered federal programs including: U.S. Department of Energy State Energy Program, Community Development Block Grant, Home Investment Partnerships, Rental Rehabilitation, Solar Energy and Energy Conservation Bank, and State Appropriated Funds for regional councils of government.

City of Oklahoma City January 1984 to February 1988

Division Head, Code Inspections Division/Department of Environmental Services

Assistant Superintendent, Utility Services Division/Water Department

Administrative Assistant, Street Maintenance Division, Public Works Department

Management Intern, Personnel Department

EDUCATION

Masters of Public Administration, University of Oklahoma 1983

Bachelor of Arts Political Science, University of Oklahoma, 1979