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## 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 Grant County is projected to grow by $0.27 \%$ per year over the next five years, underperforming the State of Oklahoma. This would reverse historic population declines in the county which have occurred in every census since 1920.
2. Depressed energy prices, however, may have a significant impact on housing demand in Grant County.
3. Grant County is projected to need a total of 32 housing units for ownership and 10 housing units for rent over the next five years.
4. Median Household Income in Grant County is estimated to be $\$ 47,526$ in 2015, compared with $\$ 47,049$ estimated for the State of Oklahoma. The poverty rate in Grant County is estimated to be $8.80 \%$, compared with $16.85 \%$ for Oklahoma.
5. Homeowner and rental vacancy rates in Grant County are lower than the state averages.
6. Home values and rental rates in Grant County are also lower than the state averages.
7. Average sale price for homes in Medford was $\$ 89,556$ in 2015 , with an aveage price per square foot of $\$ 53.09$. Average year of construction is 1958 . For homes constructed after 2000, the average sale price is $\$ 303,583$.
8. Approximately $16.63 \%$ of renters and $15.96 \%$ of owners are housing cost overburdened.

## Disaster Resiliency Specific Findings:

1. Tornadoes (1959-2014): Number: 73 Injuries: 21 Fatalities: 0 Damages (1996-2014): \$2,190,000.00
2. Social Vulnerability: Below state score at the county level
3. Floodplain: updated flood maps not available.

## Homelessness Specific Findings

1. Grant County is located in the North Central Oklahoma Continuum of Care.
2. There are an estimated 201 homeless individuals in this area, 154 of which are identified as sheltered.
3. There is no record of homeless youth and young adults in this region.
4. The largest subpopulations of homeless in OK 500 include: the chronically homeless (29), chronic substance abusers (23), and domestic violence victims (24).
5. The population of domestic violence victims in this area is disproportionately high.
6. Permanent housing options are significantly limited. More funds should be diverted to meet the long term housing needs of the mentally ill, substance abusers, and victims of domestic violence.

## Fair Housing Specific Findings

1. Units further than 15 miles from a hospital: 8
2. Units located in a food desert: 8
3. Units that lack readily available transit: 8

## Lead-Based Paint Specific Findings

1. We estimate there are 569 occupied housing units in Grant County with lead-based paint hazards.
2. 243 of those housing units are estimated to be occupied by low-to-moderate income households.
3. We estimate that 81 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 Grant 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 Grant 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
- Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA)
- Lead-Based Paint Hazards

This last section is followed by a summary of the conclusions of this report for Grant 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 Grant County, Oklahoma. The analysis will consider existing supply and projected demand and overall market trends in the Grant County area.

## Effective Date of Consultation

The Grant County area was inspected and research was performed during December, 2015. The effective date of this analysis is December 1, 2015. The date of this report is December 31, 2015. The market study is valid only as of the stated effective date or dates.

## Scope of the Assignment

1. The Grant County area was inspected during December, 2015. 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

## Grant County Analysis

## Area Information

The purpose of this section of the report is to provide a basis for analyzing and estimating trends relating to Grant 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

Grant County is located in north-central Oklahoma. It is bordered on the north by Kansas, on the east by Kay County, on the south by Garfield County, and on the west by Alfalfa County. The Grant County Seat, Medford, is approximately 93 miles north of Oklahoma City, 108 miles northwest of Tulsa, and 65 miles southwest of Wichita, Kansas.

Grant County has a total area of 1,004 square miles (1,001 square miles of land, and 3 square miles of water), ranking 21st out of Oklahoma's 77 counties in terms of total area. The total population of Grant County as of the 2010 Census was 4,527 persons, for a population density of 5 persons per square mile of land.

## Access and Linkages

Grant County has average access to state and national highway systems. US Highway 60 crosses the county east to west, and US Highway 81 cross north to south through the central part of the county. I35 is located approximately 22 miles east of Medford and provides access to Oklahoma City to the south and Wichita to the north.

Public transportation is provided on a demand-response basis by Cherokee Strip Transit (a division of the Northern Oklahoma Development Authority), with service in Alfalfa, Blaine, Garfield, Grant, Kay, Kingfisher, Major and Noble counties. However, the primary mode of transportation in this area is private automobiles by far.

Medford Municipal Airport is located just southwest of Medford. It has a single asphalt runway approximately 3,007 feet in length, and averages approximately 83 aircraft operations per week. The nearest full-service commercial airport is Dwight D. Eisenhower National Airport in Wichita, located approximately 60 miles north of Medford.

## Educational Facilities

All of the county communities have public school facilities. The local school system recently annexed a neighboring school system and has taken in the students from those areas. The school system has recently been talking about building single-family homes to be rented out to new teachers who have had difficulty finding rental units in the area due to the lack of rental housing. The nearest higher education offerings include Northern Oklahoma College in Tonkawa, and the Enid branch of Northwestern Oklahoma State University.

## Medical Facilities

County medical services are provided by Great Salt Plains Health Center, a local clinic. The nearest hospital is AllianceHealth Blackwell (formerly Integris Blackwell Regional Hospital). Professional services are offered by local physicians and dentists. The smaller county communities typically have either small outpatient medical services or doctors officing in the community.

## Grant County Area Map



## Medford Area Map



## Demographic Analysis

## Population and Households

The following table presents population levels and annualized changes in Grant 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 | 2010 | Annual | 2015 | Annual | 2020 | Annual |
|  | Census | Census | Change | Estimate | Change | Forecast | Change |
| Medford | 1,172 | 996 | $-1.61 \%$ | 955 | $-0.84 \%$ | 952 | $-0.06 \%$ |
| Grant County | 5,144 | 4,527 | $-1.27 \%$ | 4,528 | $0.00 \%$ | 4,589 | $0.27 \%$ |
| 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 Grant County was 4,527 persons as of the 2010 Census, a $-1.27 \%$ annualized rate of change from the 2000 Census. As of 2015, Nielsen SiteReports estimates the population of Grant County to be 4,528 persons, and projects that the population will show $0.27 \%$ annualized growth over the next five years.

The population of Medford was 996 persons as of the 2010 Census, a $-1.61 \%$ annualized rate of change from the 2000 Census. As of 2015, Nielsen SiteReports estimates the population of Medford to be 955 persons, and projects that the population will be effectively stable over the next five years.

The next table presents data regarding household levels in Grant 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 | 2010 | Annual | 2015 | Annual | 2020 | Annual |
|  | Census | Census | Change | Estimate | Change | Forecast | Change |
| Medford | 480 | 413 | $-1.49 \%$ | 404 | $-0.44 \%$ | 404 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Grant County | 2,089 | 1,910 | $-0.89 \%$ | 1,934 | $0.25 \%$ | 1,976 | $0.43 \%$ |
| State of Oklahoma | $1,342,293$ | $1,460,450$ | $0.85 \%$ | $1,520,327$ | $0.81 \%$ | $1,585,130$ | $0.84 \%$ |
| Family Households | 2000 | 2010 | Annual | 2015 | Annual | 2020 | Annual |
|  | Census | Census | Change | Estimate | Change | Forecast | Change |
| Medford | 305 | 262 | $-1.51 \%$ | 267 | $0.38 \%$ | 267 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Grant County | 1,455 | 1,273 | $-1.33 \%$ | 1,288 | $0.23 \%$ | 1,316 | $0.43 \%$ |
| 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, Grant County had a total of 1,910 households, representing a $-0.89 \%$ annualized rate of change since the 2000 Census. As of 2015, Nielsen SiteReports estimates Grant County to have 1,934
households. This number is expected to experience a $0.43 \%$ annualized rate of growth over the next five years.

As of 2010, Medford had a total of 413 households, representing a -1.49\% annualized rate of change since the 2000 Census. As of 2015, Nielsen SiteReports estimates Medford to have 404 households. This number is expected to be stable over the next five years.

## Population by Race and Ethnicity

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

| 2013 Population by Race and Ethnicity |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Single-Classification Race | Medford |  | Grant County |  |
|  | No. | Percent | No. | Percent |
| Total Population | 944 |  | 4,522 |  |
| White Alone | 860 | 91.10\% | 4,148 | 91.73\% |
| Black or African American Alone | 0 | 0.00\% | 25 | 0.55\% |
| Amer. Indian or Alaska Native Alone | 25 | 2.65\% | 38 | 0.84\% |
| Asian Alone | 6 | 0.64\% | 18 | 0.40\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pac. Isl. Alone | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Some Other Race Alone | 36 | 3.81\% | 60 | 1.33\% |
| Two or More Races | 17 | 1.80\% | 233 | 5.15\% |
| Population by Hispanic or Latino Origin | Medford |  | Grant County |  |
|  | No. | Percent | No. | Percent |
| Total Population | 944 |  | 4,522 |  |
| Hispanic or Latino | 39 | 4.13\% | 167 | 3.69\% |
| Hispanic or Latino, White Alone | 3 | 7.69\% | 47 | 28.14\% |
| Hispanic or Latino, All Other Races | 36 | 92.31\% | 120 | 71.86\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 905 | 95.87\% | 4,355 | 96.31\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino, White Alone | 857 | 94.70\% | 4,101 | 94.17\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino, All Other Races | 48 | 5.30\% | 254 | 5.83\% |

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

In Grant County, racial and ethnic minorities comprise 9.31\% of the total population. Within Medford, racial and ethnic minorities represent $9.22 \%$ of the population.

## Population by Age

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

| Grant County Population By Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2010 <br> Census | Percent of Total | 2015 <br> Estimate | Percent of Total | 2020 <br> Forecast | Percent of Total | 2000-2015 <br> Ann. Chng. | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { 2015-2020 } \\ & \text { Ann. Chng. } \end{aligned}$ |
| Population by Age | 4,527 |  | 4,528 |  | 4,589 |  |  |  |
| Age 0-4 | 262 | 5.79\% | 263 | 5.81\% | 274 | 5.97\% | 0.08\% | 0.82\% |
| Age 5-9 | 280 | 6.19\% | 277 | 6.12\% | 263 | 5.73\% | -0.22\% | -1.03\% |
| Age 10-14 | 277 | 6.12\% | 304 | 6.71\% | 278 | 6.06\% | 1.88\% | -1.77\% |
| Age 15-17 | 207 | 4.57\% | 181 | 4.00\% | 190 | 4.14\% | -2.65\% | 0.98\% |
| Age 18-20 | 146 | 3.23\% | 154 | 3.40\% | 172 | 3.75\% | 1.07\% | 2.24\% |
| Age 21-24 | 138 | 3.05\% | 186 | 4.11\% | 238 | 5.19\% | 6.15\% | 5.05\% |
| Age 25-34 | 418 | 9.23\% | 451 | 9.96\% | 443 | 9.65\% | 1.53\% | -0.36\% |
| Age 35-44 | 477 | 10.54\% | 466 | 10.29\% | 462 | 10.07\% | -0.47\% | -0.17\% |
| Age 45-54 | 749 | 16.55\% | 616 | 13.60\% | 507 | 11.05\% | -3.83\% | -3.82\% |
| Age 55-64 | 611 | 13.50\% | 644 | 14.22\% | 669 | 14.58\% | 1.06\% | 0.76\% |
| Age 65-74 | 469 | 10.36\% | 496 | 10.95\% | 585 | 12.75\% | 1.13\% | 3.36\% |
| Age 75-84 | 357 | 7.89\% | 357 | 7.88\% | 365 | 7.95\% | 0.00\% | 0.44\% |
| Age 85 and over | 136 | 3.00\% | 133 | 2.94\% | 143 | 3.12\% | -0.45\% | 1.46\% |
| Age 55 and over | 1,573 | 34.75\% | 1,630 | 36.00\% | 1,762 | 38.40\% | 0.71\% | 1.57\% |
| Age 62 and over | 1,009 | 22.30\% | 1,046 | 23.11\% | 1,151 | 25.08\% | 0.72\% | 1.92\% |
| Median Age | 45.8 |  | 44.6 |  | 44.4 |  | -0.53\% | -0.09\% |
| Source: Nielsen SiteReport |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

As of 2015, Nielsen estimates that the median age of Grant County is 44.6 years. This compares with the statewide figure of 36.6 years. Approximately $5.81 \%$ of the population is below the age of 5 , while $23.11 \%$ is over the age of 62 . Over the next five years, the population age 62 and above is forecasted to grow by $1.92 \%$ per year.

| Medford Population By Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $2010$ <br> Census | Percent of Total | $2015$ <br> Estimate | Percent of Total | $2020$ <br> Forecast | Percent of Total | $2000-2015$ <br> Ann. Chng. | 2015-2020 <br> Ann. Chng. |
| Population by Age | 996 |  | 955 |  | 952 |  |  |  |
| Age 0-4 | 57 | 5.72\% | 53 | 5.55\% | 55 | 5.78\% | -1.44\% | 0.74\% |
| Age 5-9 | 63 | 6.33\% | 59 | 6.18\% | 54 | 5.67\% | -1.30\% | -1.76\% |
| Age 10-14 | 59 | 5.92\% | 66 | 6.91\% | 60 | 6.30\% | 2.27\% | -1.89\% |
| Age 15-17 | 49 | 4.92\% | 37 | 3.87\% | 40 | 4.20\% | -5.46\% | 1.57\% |
| Age 18-20 | 30 | 3.01\% | 34 | 3.56\% | 36 | 3.78\% | 2.53\% | 1.15\% |
| Age 21-24 | 25 | 2.51\% | 43 | 4.50\% | 51 | 5.36\% | 11.46\% | 3.47\% |
| Age 25-34 | 92 | 9.24\% | 85 | 8.90\% | 84 | 8.82\% | -1.57\% | -0.24\% |
| Age 35-44 | 99 | 9.94\% | 100 | 10.47\% | 98 | 10.29\% | 0.20\% | -0.40\% |
| Age 45-54 | 154 | 15.46\% | 112 | 11.73\% | 101 | 10.61\% | -6.17\% | -2.05\% |
| Age 55-64 | 147 | 14.76\% | 139 | 14.55\% | 129 | 13.55\% | -1.11\% | -1.48\% |
| Age 65-74 | 103 | 10.34\% | 114 | 11.94\% | 133 | 13.97\% | 2.05\% | 3.13\% |
| Age 75-84 | 87 | 8.73\% | 82 | 8.59\% | 81 | 8.51\% | -1.18\% | -0.25\% |
| Age 85 and over | 31 | 3.11\% | 31 | 3.25\% | 30 | 3.15\% | 0.00\% | -0.65\% |
| Age 55 and over | 368 | 36.95\% | 366 | 38.32\% | 373 | 39.18\% | -0.11\% | 0.38\% |
| Age 62 and over | 234 | 23.50\% | 238 | 24.89\% | 253 | 26.54\% | 0.31\% | 1.23\% |
| Median Age | 46.6 |  | 45.0 |  | 44.8 |  | -0.70\% | -0.09\% |
| Source: Nielsen SiteReports |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

As of 2015, Nielsen estimates that the median age of Medford is 45.0 years. This compares with the statewide figure of 36.6 years. Approximately $5.55 \%$ of the population is below the age of 5 , while $24.89 \%$ is over the age of 62 . Over the next five years, the population age 62 and above is forecasted to grow by $1.23 \%$ per year.

Compared with the rest of the state, Medford and Grant County have relatively older populations, with larger percentages of persons age 62 and over.

## Families by Presence of Children

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

| 2013 Family Type by Presence of Children Under 18 Years |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
|  | Medford |  |  | Grant County |  |
|  | No. | Percent | No. | Percent |  |
| Total Families: | 284 |  | 1,298 |  |  |
| Married-Couple Family: | 240 | $84.51 \%$ | 1,068 | $82.28 \%$ |  |
| With Children Under 18 Years | 78 | $27.46 \%$ | 395 | $30.43 \%$ |  |
| No Children Under 18 Years | 162 | $57.04 \%$ | 673 | $51.85 \%$ |  |
| Other Family: | 44 | $15.49 \%$ | 230 | $17.72 \%$ |  |
| Male Householder, No Wife Present | 17 | $5.99 \%$ | 80 | $6.16 \%$ |  |
| $\quad$ With Children Under 18 Years | 17 | $5.99 \%$ | 56 | $4.31 \%$ |  |
| No Children Under 18 Years | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 24 | $1.85 \%$ |  |
| Female Householder, No Husband Present | 27 | $9.51 \%$ | 150 | $11.56 \%$ |  |
| $\quad$ With Children Under 18 Years | 13 | $4.58 \%$ | 89 | $6.86 \%$ |  |
| $\quad$ No Children Under 18 Years | 14 | $4.93 \%$ | 61 | $4.70 \%$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Single Parent Families | 30 |  | 145 |  |  |
| Male Householder | 17 | $56.67 \%$ | 56 | $38.62 \%$ |  |
| Female Householder | 13 | $43.33 \%$ | 89 | $61.38 \%$ |  |

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

As shown, within Grant County, among all families $11.17 \%$ are single-parent families, while in Medford, the percentage is $10.56 \%$.

## Population by Presence of Disabilities

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

| 2013 Age by Number of Disabilities |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Medford |  | Grant County |  | State of Oklahoma |  |
|  | No. | Percent | No. | Percent | No. | Percent |
| Civilian Non-Institutionalized Population: | 888 |  | 4,423 |  | 3,702,515 |  |
| Under 18 Years: | 150 |  | 1,032 |  | 933,738 |  |
| With One Type of Disability | 7 | 4.67\% | 29 | 2.81\% | 33,744 | 3.61\% |
| With Two or More Disabilities | 3 | 2.00\% | 13 | 1.26\% | 11,082 | 1.19\% |
| No Disabilities | 140 | 93.33\% | 990 | 95.93\% | 888,912 | 95.20\% |
| 18 to 64 Years: | 482 |  | 2,491 |  | 2,265,702 |  |
| With One Type of Disability | 25 | 5.19\% | 153 | 6.14\% | 169,697 | 7.49\% |
| With Two or More Disabilities | 41 | 8.51\% | 121 | 4.86\% | 149,960 | 6.62\% |
| No Disabilities | 416 | 86.31\% | 2,217 | 89.00\% | 1,946,045 | 85.89\% |
| 65 Years and Over: | 256 |  | 900 |  | 503,075 |  |
| With One Type of Disability | 66 | 25.78\% | 213 | 23.67\% | 95,633 | 19.01\% |
| With Two or More Disabilities | 80 | 31.25\% | 210 | 23.33\% | 117,044 | 23.27\% |
| No Disabilities | 110 | 42.97\% | 477 | 53.00\% | 290,398 | 57.72\% |
| Total Number of Persons with Disabilities: | 222 | 25.00\% | 739 | 16.71\% | 577,160 | 15.59\% |
| Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2009-2013 American Community Survey, Table C18108 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Within Grant County, $16.71 \%$ of the civilian non-institutionalized population has one or more disabilities, compared with $15.59 \%$ of Oklahomans as a whole. In Medford the percentage is $25.00 \%$.

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

| 2013 Population by Veteran and Disability Status |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Medford |  | Grant County |  | State of Oklahoma |  |
|  | No. | Percent | No. | Percent | No. | Percent |
| Civilian Population Age 18+ For Whom |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Poverty Status is Determined | 738 |  | 3,391 |  | 2,738,788 |  |
| Veteran: | 105 | 14.23\% | 357 | 10.53\% | 305,899 | 11.17\% |
| With a Disability | 52 | 49.52\% | 162 | 45.38\% | 100,518 | 32.86\% |
| No Disability | 53 | 50.48\% | 195 | 54.62\% | 205,381 | 67.14\% |
| Non-veteran: | 633 | 85.77\% | 3,034 | 89.47\% | 2,432,889 | 88.83\% |
| With a Disability | 160 | 25.28\% | 535 | 17.63\% | 430,610 | 17.70\% |
| No Disability | 473 | 74.72\% | 2,499 | 82.37\% | 2,002,279 | 82.30\% |
| Source: 2009-2013 American Community Survey, Table C21007 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Within Grant County, the Census Bureau estimates there are 357 veterans, $45.38 \%$ of which have one or more disabilities (compared with $32.86 \%$ at a statewide level). In Medford, there are an estimated 105 veterans, $49.52 \%$ of which are estimated to have a disability. Compared with the rest of the state, veterans in Medford and Grant County are more likely to have one or more disabilities.

## Group Quarters Population

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

## 2010 Group Quarters Population

|  | Medford |  |  | Grant County |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
|  | No. | Percent | No. | Percent |  |
| Total Population | 996 |  | 4,527 |  |  |
| Group Quarters Population | 42 | $4.22 \%$ | 73 | $1.61 \%$ |  |
| Institutionalized Population | 42 | $4.22 \%$ | 73 | $1.61 \%$ |  |
| Correctional facilities for adults | 16 | $1.61 \%$ | 16 | $0.35 \%$ |  |
| Juvenile facilities | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |  |
| Nursing facilities/Skilled-nursing facilities | 26 | $2.61 \%$ | 57 | $1.26 \%$ |  |
| Other institutional facilities | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |  |
| Noninstitutionalized population | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |  |
| College/University student housing | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |  |
| Military quarters | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |  |
| Other noninstitutional facilities | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |  |
| Source: 2010 Decennial Census, Table P42 |  |  |  |  |  |

The percentage of the Grant County population in group quarters is moderately 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 Grant 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 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Medford |  | Grant County |  | State of Oklahoma |  |
|  | No. | Percent | No. | Percent | No. | Percent |
| Households by HH Income | 404 |  | 1,934 |  | $1,520,327$ |  |
| $<\$ 15,000$ | 36 | $8.91 \%$ | 199 | $10.29 \%$ | 213,623 | $14.05 \%$ |
| $\$ 15,000-\$ 24,999$ | 37 | $9.16 \%$ | 198 | $10.24 \%$ | 184,613 | $12.14 \%$ |
| $\$ 25,000-\$ 34,999$ | 52 | $12.87 \%$ | 246 | $12.72 \%$ | 177,481 | $11.67 \%$ |
| $\$ 35,000-\$ 49,999$ | 84 | $20.79 \%$ | 388 | $20.06 \%$ | 229,628 | $15.10 \%$ |
| $\$ 50,000-\$ 74,999$ | 61 | $15.10 \%$ | 364 | $18.82 \%$ | 280,845 | $18.47 \%$ |
| $\$ 75,000-\$ 99,999$ | 47 | $11.63 \%$ | 238 | $12.31 \%$ | 173,963 | $11.44 \%$ |
| $\$ 100,000-\$ 124,999$ | 29 | $7.18 \%$ | 119 | $6.15 \%$ | 106,912 | $7.03 \%$ |
| $\$ 125,000-\$ 149,999$ | 15 | $3.71 \%$ | 61 | $3.15 \%$ | 57,804 | $3.80 \%$ |
| $\$ 150,000-\$ 199,999$ | 22 | $5.45 \%$ | 63 | $3.26 \%$ | 48,856 | $3.21 \%$ |
| $\$ 200,000-\$ 249,999$ | 11 | $2.72 \%$ | 27 | $1.40 \%$ | 18,661 | $1.23 \%$ |
| \$250,000-\$499,999 | 7 | $1.73 \%$ | 23 | $1.19 \%$ | 20,487 | $1.35 \%$ |
| $\$ 500,000+$ | 3 | $0.74 \%$ | 8 | $0.41 \%$ | 7,454 | $0.49 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Household Income | $\$ 48,750$ |  | $\$ 47,526$ |  | $\$ 47,049$ |  |
| Average Household Income | $\$ 73,125$ |  | $\$ 63,925$ |  | $\$ 63,390$ |  |

Source: Nielsen SiteReports

As shown, median household income for Grant County is estimated to be $\$ 47,526$ in 2015. By way of comparison, the median household income of Oklahoma is estimated to be $\$ 47,049$. For Medford, median household income is estimated to be $\$ 48,750$. Compared with the rest of the state, Medford and Grant County have nearly the same median household income, however the income distribution is somewhat different, with lower concentration in the lowest income bracket (under $\$ 15,000$ ), and greater concentrations in the middle bracket between $\$ 35,000$ and $\$ 50,000$, and in brackets above \$150,000.


## Household Income Trend

Next we examine the long-term growth of incomes in Grant 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 | 2015 Median | Nominal | Inflation | Real |
|  | HH Income | HH Income | Growth | Rate | Growth |
| Medford | \$27,708 | \$48,750 | 3.59\% | 2.40\% | 1.19\% |
| Grant County | \$28,977 | \$47,526 | 3.14\% | 2.40\% | 0.74\% |
| 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 Grant County and Medford saw positive growth in median household income between 1999 and 2015, after accounting for inflation. This is contrary to state and national trends: the median household incomes of Oklahoma and the United States declined during this time after adjusting for
inflation. 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 Grant 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 | 2013 | Change | 2013 Poverty Rates for Single-Parent Families |  |
|  | Census | ACS | (Basis Points) | Male Householder | Female Householder |
| Medford | $13.77 \%$ | $8.30 \%$ | -548 | $52.94 \%$ | $69.23 \%$ |
| Grant County | $13.69 \%$ | $8.80 \%$ | -489 | $16.07 \%$ | $52.81 \%$ |
| 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 Grant County is estimated to be $8.80 \%$ by the American Community Survey. This is a decrease of -489 basis points since the 2000 Census. Within Medford, the poverty rate is estimated to be $8.30 \%$. As with income growth, Grant County's decline in poverty rates was contrary to state and national trends: 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.

However, while the population of Grant County as a whole saw a decline in poverty rates (and lower poverty rates than Oklahoma as a whole), poverty rates for single-parent households are higher, particularly for single mothers.

## Economic Conditions

## Employment and Unemployment

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

| Employment and Unemployment |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | May-2010 | May-2015 | Annual | May-2010 | May-2015 | Change |
|  | Employment | Employment | Growth | Unemp. Rate | Unemp. Rate | (bp) |
| Grant County | 2,484 | 3,132 | $4.75 \%$ | $4.5 \%$ | $3.2 \%$ | -130 |
| 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 Grant County was 3,132 persons. Compared with figures from May 2010, this represents annualized employment growth of $4.75 \%$ per year. The unemployment rate in May was $3.2 \%$, a decrease of -130 basis points from May 2010, which was $4.5 \%$. Over the last five years, both the statewide and national trends have been improving employment levels and declining unemployment rates, and Grant County has outperformed both the state and nation in these statistics, with stronger employment growth and significantly lower unemployment rates.

## Employment Level Trends

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


As shown, total employment levels have generally flat from 2000 through late 2013. It is notable that the national economic downturn of late 2008 appears to have had no appreciable impact on the county. Employment growth began in late 2013, and has continued to grow to its current level of 3,132 persons. The number of unemployed persons in May 2015 was 103, out of a total labor force of 3,235 persons.

## Unemployment Rate Trends

The next chart shows historic unemployment rates for Grant 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.


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

As shown, unemployment rates in Grant County increased moderately from 2000 through 2003, and then generally declined until the $4^{\text {th }}$ quarter of 2008 as the effects of the national economic recession were felt, at which point Grant County saw a modest increase in unemployment. Unemployment rates began to decline again in 2010, to their current level of $3.2 \%$. On the whole, unemployment rates in Grant County track very well with statewide figures but are typically below the state. Compared with the United States, unemployment rates in Grant County and Oklahoma are and have historically been well below the national average.

## Employment and Wages by Industrial Supersector

The next table presents data regarding employment in Grant 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 $\mathbf{- 2 0 1 4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | Avg. No. of | Percent of | Avg. Annual | Location <br> Supersector |
| Federal Government | 9 | 31 | $2.12 \%$ | $\$ 38,040$ | 1.06 |
| State Government | 7 | 34 | $2.33 \%$ | $\$ 33,762$ | 0.70 |
| Local Government | 19 | 289 | $19.77 \%$ | $\$ 28,860$ | 1.96 |
| Natural Resources and Mining | 26 | 325 | $22.23 \%$ | $\$ 75,398$ | 14.66 |
| Construction | 8 | 173 | $11.83 \%$ | $\$ 60,303$ | 2.65 |
| Manufacturing | 4 | 8 | $0.55 \%$ | $\$ 35,846$ | 0.06 |
| Trade, Transportation, and Utilities | 40 | 304 | $20.79 \%$ | $\$ 37,871$ | 1.09 |
| Information | 2 | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| Financial Activities | 15 | 97 | $6.63 \%$ | $\$ 48,762$ | 1.18 |
| Professional and Business Services | 9 | 31 | $2.12 \%$ | $\$ 36,861$ | 0.15 |
| Education and Health Services | 9 | 110 | $7.52 \%$ | $\$ 24,608$ | 0.50 |
| Leisure and Hospitality | 7 | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| Other Services | 8 | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 , 4 6 2}$ |  | $\$ 46,477$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ |  |

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 (22.23\%) are employed in Natural Resources and Mining. The average annual pay in this sector is $\$ 75,398$ per year. The industry with the highest annual pay is Natural Resources and Mining, with average annual pay of $\$ 75,398$ per year.

The rightmost column of the previous table provides location quotients for each industry for Grant 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 (Grant 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:
$10 \%$ (county manufacturing \%) / 5\% (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 Grant County, among all industries the largest location quotient is in Natural Resources and Mining, with a quotient of 14.66 . This sector includes both the oil and gas industry, as well as agricultural employment.

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

| Supersector | Grant County | State of Oklahoma | United States | Percent of State | Percent of Nation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Federal Government | \$38,040 | \$66,411 | \$75,784 | 57.3\% | 50.2\% |
| State Government | \$33,762 | \$44,721 | \$54,184 | 75.5\% | 62.3\% |
| Local Government | \$28,860 | \$36,300 | \$46,146 | 79.5\% | 62.5\% |
| Natural Resources and Mining | \$75,398 | \$87,445 | \$59,666 | 86.2\% | 126.4\% |
| Construction | \$60,303 | \$47,127 | \$55,041 | 128.0\% | 109.6\% |
| Manufacturing | \$35,846 | \$53,614 | \$62,977 | 66.9\% | 56.9\% |
| Trade, Transportation, and Utilities | \$37,871 | \$40,563 | \$42,988 | 93.4\% | 88.1\% |
| Information | N/A | \$54,513 | \$90,804 | N/A | N/A |
| Financial Activities | \$48,762 | \$53,212 | \$85,261 | 91.6\% | 57.2\% |
| Professional and Business Services | \$36,861 | \$47,890 | \$66,657 | 77.0\% | 55.3\% |
| Education and Health Services | \$24,608 | \$41,536 | \$45,951 | 59.2\% | 53.6\% |
| Leisure and Hospitality | N/A | \$16,568 | \$20,993 | N/A | N/A |
| Other Services | N/A | \$31,669 | \$33,935 | N/A | N/A |
| Total | \$46,477 | \$43,774 | \$51,361 | 106.2\% | 90.5\% |

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, Grant County has higher average wages in construction, and lower average wages in nearly every other sector, particularly manufacturing and education.

## Working Families

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

| Families by Employment Status and Presence of Children |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Medford |  | Grant County |  | State of Oklahoma |  |
|  | No. | Percent | No. | Percent | No. | Percent |
| Total Families | 284 |  | 1,298 |  | 961,468 |  |
| With Children <18 Years: | 108 | 38.03\% | 540 | 41.60\% | 425,517 | 44.26\% |
| Married Couple: | 78 | 72.22\% | 395 | 73.15\% | 281,418 | 66.14\% |
| Both Parents Employed | 47 | 60.26\% | 232 | 58.73\% | 166,700 | 59.24\% |
| One Parent Employed | 31 | 39.74\% | 159 | 40.25\% | 104,817 | 37.25\% |
| Neither Parent Employed | 0 | 0.00\% | 4 | 1.01\% | 9,901 | 3.52\% |
| Other Family: | 30 | 27.78\% | 145 | 26.85\% | 144,099 | 33.86\% |
| Male Householder: | 17 | 56.67\% | 56 | 38.62\% | 36,996 | 25.67\% |
| Employed | 14 | 82.35\% | 53 | 94.64\% | 31,044 | 83.91\% |
| Not Employed | 3 | 17.65\% | 3 | 5.36\% | 5,952 | 16.09\% |
| Female Householder: | 13 | 43.33\% | 89 | 61.38\% | 107,103 | 74.33\% |
| Employed | 4 | 30.77\% | 57 | 64.04\% | 75,631 | 70.62\% |
| Not Employed | 9 | 69.23\% | 32 | 35.96\% | 31,472 | 29.38\% |
| Without Children <18 Years: | 176 | 61.97\% | 758 | 58.40\% | 535,951 | 55.74\% |
| Married Couple: | 162 | 92.05\% | 673 | 88.79\% | 431,868 | 80.58\% |
| Both Spouses Employed | 61 | 37.65\% | 278 | 41.31\% | 167,589 | 38.81\% |
| One Spouse Employed | 49 | 30.25\% | 239 | 35.51\% | 138,214 | 32.00\% |
| Neither Spouse Employed | 52 | 32.10\% | 156 | 23.18\% | 126,065 | 29.19\% |
| Other Family: | 14 | 7.95\% | 85 | 11.21\% | 104,083 | 19.42\% |
| Male Householder: | 0 | 0.00\% | 24 | 15.38\% | 32,243 | 25.58\% |
| Employed | 0 | 0.00\% | 22 | 91.67\% | 19,437 | 60.28\% |
| Not Employed | 0 | 0.00\% | 2 | 8.33\% | 12,806 | 39.72\% |
| Female Householder: | 14 | 100.00\% | 61 | 71.76\% | 71,840 | 69.02\% |
| Employed | 4 | 28.57\% | 24 | 39.34\% | 36,601 | 50.95\% |
| Not Employed | 10 | 71.43\% | 37 | 60.66\% | 35,239 | 49.05\% |
| Total Working Families: | 210 | 73.94\% | 1,064 | 81.97\% | 740,033 | 76.97\% |
| With Children <18 Years: | 96 | 45.71\% | 501 | 47.09\% | 378,192 | 51.10\% |
| Without Children <18 Years: | 114 | 54.29\% | 563 | 52.91\% | 361,841 | 48.90\% |
| Source: 2009-2013 American Community Survey, Table B23007 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Within Grant County, there are 1,064 working families, $47.09 \%$ of which have children under the age of 18 present. This compares with $51.10 \%$ in Oklahoma as a whole.

## Major Employers

The dominant employers in Grant County are agriculture, as well as the oil and gas company. ONEOK is among the largest single employers in the area, followed by municipal and county government, and local school districts such as Medford and Pond Creek.

## Commuting Patterns

## Travel Time to Work

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

| Workers 16 Years and Over by Commuting Time to Work |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Medford |  | Grant County |  | State of Oklahoma |  |
|  | No. | Percent | No. | Percent | No. | Percent |
| Commuting Workers: | 415 |  | 2,064 |  | 1,613,364 |  |
| Less than 15 minutes | 242 | 58.31\% | 948 | 45.93\% | 581,194 | 36.02\% |
| 15 to 30 minutes | 42 | 10.12\% | 378 | 18.31\% | 625,885 | 38.79\% |
| 30 to 45 minutes | 63 | 15.18\% | 484 | 23.45\% | 260,192 | 16.13\% |
| 45 to 60 minutes | 48 | 11.57\% | 155 | 7.51\% | 74,625 | 4.63\% |
| 60 or more minutes | 20 | 4.82\% | 99 | 4.80\% | 71,468 | 4.43\% |

Within Grant County, the largest percentage of workers (45.93\%) travel fewer than 15 minutes to work. Although many persons living in Grant County are also employed in Grant County, it appears some commute to other labor markets such as Enid.

## Means of Transportation

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

| Workers 16 Years and Over by Means of Transportation to Work |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Medford |  | Grant County |  |  |  |  | State of Oklahoma |  |
|  | No. | Percent | No. | Percent | No. | Percent |  |  |  |
| Total Workers Age 16+ | 429 |  | $\mathbf{2 , 1 1 6}$ |  | $\mathbf{1 , 6 7 3 , 0 2 6}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Car, Truck or Van: | 398 | $92.77 \%$ | 1,957 | $92.49 \%$ | $1,551,461$ | $92.73 \%$ |  |  |  |
| Drove Alone | 363 | $91.21 \%$ | 1,603 | $81.91 \%$ | $1,373,407$ | $88.52 \%$ |  |  |  |
| Carpooled | 35 | $8.79 \%$ | 354 | $18.09 \%$ | 178,054 | $11.48 \%$ |  |  |  |
| Public Transportation | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 1 | $0.05 \%$ | 8,092 | $0.48 \%$ |  |  |  |
| Taxicab | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 984 | $0.06 \%$ |  |  |  |
| Motorcycle | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 8 | $0.38 \%$ | 3,757 | $0.22 \%$ |  |  |  |
| Bicycle | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 3 | $0.14 \%$ | 4,227 | $0.25 \%$ |  |  |  |
| Walked | 10 | $2.33 \%$ | 82 | $3.88 \%$ | 30,401 | $1.82 \%$ |  |  |  |
| Other Means | 7 | $1.63 \%$ | 13 | $0.61 \%$ | 14,442 | $0.86 \%$ |  |  |  |
| Worked at Home | 14 | $3.26 \%$ | 52 | $2.46 \%$ | 59,662 | $3.57 \%$ |  |  |  |
| Source: $2009-2013$ American Community Survey, Table B08301 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

As shown, the vast majority of persons in Grant 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 Grant 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 | 2010 | Annual | 2015 | Annual |
|  | Census | Census | Change | Estimate | Change |
| Medford | 591 | 530 | $-1.08 \%$ | 533 | $0.11 \%$ |
| Grant County | 2,622 | 2,486 | $-0.53 \%$ | 2,514 | $0.22 \%$ |
| 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 Grant County grew by $0.22 \%$ per year, to a total of 2,514 housing units in 2015. In terms of new housing unit construction, Grant County underperformed Oklahoma as a whole between 2010 and 2015.

## Housing by Units in Structure

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

| 2013 Housing Units by Units in Structure |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Medford |  | Grant County |  | State of Oklahoma |  |
|  | No. | Percent | No. | Percent | No. | Percent |
| Total Housing Units | 568 |  | 2,490 |  | 1,669,828 |  |
| 1 Unit, Detached | 498 | 87.68\% | 2,185 | 87.75\% | 1,219,987 | 73.06\% |
| 1 Unit, Attached | 0 | 0.00\% | 5 | 0.20\% | 34,434 | 2.06\% |
| Duplex Units | 3 | 0.53\% | 13 | 0.52\% | 34,207 | 2.05\% |
| 3-4 Units | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 42,069 | 2.52\% |
| 5-9 Units | 19 | 3.35\% | 23 | 0.92\% | 59,977 | 3.59\% |
| 10-19 Units | 4 | 0.70\% | 9 | 0.36\% | 57,594 | 3.45\% |
| 20-49 Units | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 29,602 | 1.77\% |
| 50 or More Units | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 30,240 | 1.81\% |
| Mobile Homes | 44 | 7.75\% | 255 | 10.24\% | 159,559 | 9.56\% |
| Boat, RV, Van, etc. | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 2,159 | 0.13\% |
| Total Multifamily Units | 26 | 4.58\% | 45 | 1.81\% | 253,689 | 15.19\% |
| Source: 2009-2013 American Community Survey, Table B25024 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Within Grant County, $87.75 \%$ of housing units are single-family, detached. 1.81\% of housing units are multifamily in structure (two or more units per building), while 10.24\% of housing units comprise mobile homes, RVs, etc.

Within Medford, $87.68 \%$ of housing units are single-family, detached. $4.58 \%$ of housing units are multifamily in structure, while $7.75 \%$ of housing units comprise mobile homes, RVs, etc.

Compared with the rest of the state, Grant County has a very small percentage of multifamily housing units, with the overwhelming majority of its housing units being single-family structures.

## Housing Units Number of Bedrooms and Tenure

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

| 2013 | Housing Units by Tenure and Number of Bedrooms |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Medford |  | Grant County |  |  |  |  |  | State of Oklahoma |  |
|  | No. | Percent | No. | Percent | No. | Percent |  |  |  |  |
| Total Occupied Housing Units | $\mathbf{4 7 5}$ |  | $\mathbf{1 , 9 5 1}$ |  | $\mathbf{1 , 4 4 4 , 0 8 1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Owner Occupied: | 369 | $\mathbf{7 7 . 6 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 4 7 9}$ | $\mathbf{7 5 . 8 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{9 6 8 , 7 3 6}$ | $\mathbf{6 7 . 0 8 \%}$ |  |  |  |  |
| No Bedroom | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 2,580 | $0.27 \%$ |  |  |  |  |
| 1 Bedroom | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 25 | $1.69 \%$ | 16,837 | $1.74 \%$ |  |  |  |  |
| 2 Bedrooms | 119 | $32.25 \%$ | 365 | $24.68 \%$ | 166,446 | $17.18 \%$ |  |  |  |  |
| 3 Bedrooms | 218 | $59.08 \%$ | 849 | $57.40 \%$ | 579,135 | $59.78 \%$ |  |  |  |  |
| 4 Bedrooms | 24 | $6.50 \%$ | 189 | $12.78 \%$ | 177,151 | $18.29 \%$ |  |  |  |  |
| 5 or More Bedrooms | 8 | $2.17 \%$ | 51 | $3.45 \%$ | 26,587 | $2.74 \%$ |  |  |  |  |
| Renter Occupied: | 106 | $\mathbf{2 2 . 3 2 \%}$ | 472 | $\mathbf{2 4 . 1 9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 7 5 , 3 4 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 2 . 9 2 \%}$ |  |  |  |  |
| No Bedroom | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 13,948 | $2.93 \%$ |  |  |  |  |
| 1 Bedroom | 8 | $7.55 \%$ | 18 | $3.81 \%$ | 101,850 | $21.43 \%$ |  |  |  |  |
| 2 Bedrooms | 65 | $61.32 \%$ | 220 | $46.61 \%$ | 179,121 | $37.68 \%$ |  |  |  |  |
| 3 Bedrooms | 22 | $20.75 \%$ | 207 | $43.86 \%$ | 152,358 | $32.05 \%$ |  |  |  |  |
| 4 Bedrooms | 5 | $4.72 \%$ | 19 | $4.03 \%$ | 24,968 | $5.25 \%$ |  |  |  |  |
| 5 or More Bedrooms | 6 | $5.66 \%$ | 8 | $1.69 \%$ | 3,100 | $0.65 \%$ |  |  |  |  |

Source: 2009-2013 American Community Survey, Table B25042

The overall homeownership rate in Grant County is $75.81 \%$, while $24.19 \%$ of housing units are renter occupied. In Medford, the homeownership rate is $77.68 \%$, while $22.32 \%$ of households are renters.

## Housing Units Tenure and Household Income

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

| Grant County Owner/Renter Percentages by Income Band in 2013 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Household Income | Total Households | Total Owners | Total Renters | \% Owners | \% Renters |
| Total | 1,951 | 1,479 | 472 | 75.81\% | 24.19\% |
| Less than \$5,000 | 30 | 19 | 11 | 63.33\% | 36.67\% |
| \$5,000-\$9,999 | 34 | 24 | 10 | 70.59\% | 29.41\% |
| \$10,000-\$14,999 | 119 | 75 | 44 | 63.03\% | 36.97\% |
| \$15,000-\$19,999 | 79 | 59 | 20 | 74.68\% | 25.32\% |
| \$20,000-\$24,999 | 147 | 70 | 77 | 47.62\% | 52.38\% |
| \$25,000-\$34,999 | 254 | 209 | 45 | 82.28\% | 17.72\% |
| \$35,000-\$49,999 | 408 | 295 | 113 | 72.30\% | 27.70\% |
| \$50,000-\$74,999 | 379 | 298 | 81 | 78.63\% | 21.37\% |
| \$75,000-\$99,999 | 245 | 213 | 32 | 86.94\% | 13.06\% |
| \$100,000-\$149,999 | 132 | 104 | 28 | 78.79\% | 21.21\% |
| \$150,000 or more | 124 | 113 | 11 | 91.13\% | 8.87\% |
| Income Less Than \$25,000 | 409 | 247 | 162 | 60.39\% | 39.61\% |
| Source: 2009-2013 American Community Survey, Table B25118 |  |  |  |  |  |

Within Grant County as a whole, $39.61 \%$ of households with incomes less than $\$ 25,000$ are estimated to be renters, while $60.39 \%$ are estimated to be homeowners.

| Medford Owner/Renter Percentages by Income Band in 2013 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Household Income | Total Households | Total Owners | Total Renters | \% Owners | \% Renters |
| Total | 475 | 369 | 106 | 77.68\% | 22.32\% |
| Less than \$5,000 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 100.00\% | 0.00\% |
| \$5,000-\$9,999 | 0 | 0 | 0 | N/A | N/A |
| \$10,000-\$14,999 | 49 | 27 | 22 | 55.10\% | 44.90\% |
| \$15,000-\$19,999 | 15 | 8 | 7 | 53.33\% | 46.67\% |
| \$20,000-\$24,999 | 40 | 7 | 33 | 17.50\% | 82.50\% |
| \$25,000-\$34,999 | 69 | 62 | 7 | 89.86\% | 10.14\% |
| \$35,000-\$49,999 | 98 | 78 | 20 | 79.59\% | 20.41\% |
| \$50,000-\$74,999 | 84 | 78 | 6 | 92.86\% | 7.14\% |
| \$75,000-\$99,999 | 58 | 50 | 8 | 86.21\% | 13.79\% |
| \$100,000-\$149,999 | 35 | 32 | 3 | 91.43\% | 8.57\% |
| \$150,000 or more | 22 | 22 | 0 | 100.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Income Less Than \$25,000 | 109 | 47 | 62 | 43.12\% | 56.88\% |
| Source: 2009-2013 American Community Survey, Table B25118 |  |  |  |  |  |

Within Medford, $56.88 \%$ of households with incomes less than $\$ 25,000$ are estimated to be renters, while $43.12 \%$ 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.

|  | Medford |  | Grant County |  | State of Oklahoma |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. | Percent | No. | Percent | No. | Percent |
| Total Occupied Housing Units | 475 |  | 1,951 |  | 1,444,081 |  |
| Owner Occupied: | 369 | 77.68\% | 1,479 | 75.81\% | 968,736 | 67.08\% |
| Built 2010 or Later | 0 | 0.00\% | 3 | 0.20\% | 10,443 | 1.08\% |
| Built 2000 to 2009 | 0 | 0.00\% | 56 | 3.79\% | 153,492 | 15.84\% |
| Built 1990 to 1999 | 12 | 3.25\% | 79 | 5.34\% | 125,431 | 12.95\% |
| Built 1980 to 1989 | 31 | 8.40\% | 144 | 9.74\% | 148,643 | 15.34\% |
| Built 1970 to 1979 | 78 | 21.14\% | 255 | 17.24\% | 184,378 | 19.03\% |
| Built 1960 to 1969 | 63 | 17.07\% | 243 | 16.43\% | 114,425 | 11.81\% |
| Built 1950 to 1959 | 108 | 29.27\% | 268 | 18.12\% | 106,544 | 11.00\% |
| Built 1940 to 1949 | 29 | 7.86\% | 95 | 6.42\% | 50,143 | 5.18\% |
| Built 1939 or Earlier | 48 | 13.01\% | 336 | 22.72\% | 75,237 | 7.77\% |
| Median Year Built: |  | 60 |  | 962 |  | 77 |
| Renter Occupied: | 106 | 22.32\% | 472 | 24.19\% | 475,345 | 32.92\% |
| Built 2010 or Later | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 5,019 | 1.06\% |
| Built 2000 to 2009 | 0 | 0.00\% | 5 | 1.06\% | 50,883 | 10.70\% |
| Built 1990 to 1999 | 0 | 0.00\% | 16 | 3.39\% | 47,860 | 10.07\% |
| Built 1980 to 1989 | 8 | 7.55\% | 42 | 8.90\% | 77,521 | 16.31\% |
| Built 1970 to 1979 | 21 | 19.81\% | 93 | 19.70\% | 104,609 | 22.01\% |
| Built 1960 to 1969 | 17 | 16.04\% | 43 | 9.11\% | 64,546 | 13.58\% |
| Built 1950 to 1959 | 19 | 17.92\% | 67 | 14.19\% | 54,601 | 11.49\% |
| Built 1940 to 1949 | 24 | 22.64\% | 54 | 11.44\% | 31,217 | 6.57\% |
| Built 1939 or Earlier | 17 | 16.04\% | 152 | 32.20\% | 39,089 | 8.22\% |
| Median Year Built: |  | 966 |  | 954 |  | 75 |
| Overall Median Year Built: |  | 960 |  | 960 |  | 76 |
| Sources: 2009-2013 American Community Survey, Tables B25035, B25036 \& B25037 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Within Grant County, $3.28 \%$ of housing units were built after the year 2000. This compares with $15.22 \%$ statewide. Within Medford, it is estimated that effectively no housing units in the community were built after 2000: other data sources suggests that there is a small number of homes in Medford of more recent vintage, based on building permits issued and records from the Grant County Assessor.
$91.85 \%$ of housing units in Grant County were built prior to 1990, while in Medford the percentage is $97.47 \%$. These figures compare with the statewide figure of $72.78 \%$. Compared with the rest of the state, both Medford and Grant County have significantly older housing stocks.

## Substandard Housing

The next table presents data regarding substandard housing in Grant 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 | Inadequate Plumbing |  | Inadequate Kitchen |  | Uses Wood for Fuel <br>  <br>  <br> Units |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |  |  |
| Medford | 475 | 3 | $0.63 \%$ | 3 | $0.63 \%$ | 3 | $0.63 \%$ |
| Grant County | 1,951 | 7 | $0.36 \%$ | 14 | $0.72 \%$ | 77 | $3.95 \%$ |
| 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 Grant County, $0.36 \%$ of occupied housing units have inadequate plumbing (compared with $0.49 \%$ at a statewide level), while $0.72 \%$ 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 Grant County by vacancy and type. This data is provided by the American Community Survey.

## 2013 Housing Units by Vacancy

|  | Medford |  | Grant County |  | State of Oklahoma |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | No. | Percent | No. | Percent | No. | Percent |
| Total Housing Units | 568 |  | 2,490 |  | $1,669,828$ |  |
| Total Vacant Units | 93 | $16.37 \%$ | 539 | $21.65 \%$ | 225,747 | $13.52 \%$ |
| For rent | 9 | $9.68 \%$ | 41 | $7.61 \%$ | 43,477 | $19.26 \%$ |
| Rented, not occupied | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 9,127 | $4.04 \%$ |
| For sale only | 3 | $3.23 \%$ | 10 | $1.86 \%$ | 23,149 | $10.25 \%$ |
| Sold, not occupied | 10 | $10.75 \%$ | 12 | $2.23 \%$ | 8,618 | $3.82 \%$ |
| For seasonal, recreational, |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| or occasional use | 20 | $21.51 \%$ | 125 | $23.19 \%$ | 39,475 | $17.49 \%$ |
| For migrant workers | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 746 | $0.33 \%$ |
| Other vacant | 51 | $54.84 \%$ | 351 | $65.12 \%$ | 101,155 | $44.81 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Homeowner Vacancy Rate | $0.79 \%$ |  | $0.67 \%$ |  | $2.31 \%$ |  |
| Rental Vacancy Rate | $7.83 \%$ |  | $7.99 \%$ |  | $8.24 \%$ |  |

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

Within Grant County, the overall housing vacancy rate is estimated to be $21.65 \%$. The homeowner vacancy rate is estimated to be $0.67 \%$, while the rental vacancy rate is estimated to be $7.99 \%$.

In Medford, the overall housing vacancy rate is estimated to be $16.37 \%$. The homeowner vacancy rate is estimated to be $0.79 \%$, while the rental vacancy rate is estimated to be $7.83 \%$.

Most of the vacancy in both Medford and Grant County is attributable to "other vacant" units, which are typically housing units that are unsuitable for occupancy due to their deteriorated state, or housing units that are vacant but not offered for sale or for rent.

## Building Permits

The next series of tables present data regarding new residential building permits issued in Medford. 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.

## Medford

New Residential Building Permits Issued, 2004-2014

| Year | Single Family <br> Units | Avg. Construction <br> Cost | Multifamily <br> Units | Avg. Multifamily <br> Construction Cost |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2004 | 1 | \$57,171 | 0 | N/A |
| 2005 | 0 | N/A | 0 | N/A |
| 2006 | 0 | N/A | 0 | N/A |
| 2007 | 0 | N/A | 0 | N/A |
| 2008 | 0 | N/A | 0 | N/A |
| 2009 | 1 | $\$ 72,500$ | 0 | N/A |
| 2010 | 0 | N/A | 0 | N/A |
| 2011 | 0 | N/A | 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 Medford, building permits for 2 housing units were issued between 2004 and 2014, both single family homes.

## New Construction Activity

## For Ownership:

New construction in Grant County has been relatively limited over the last ten years. The total number of housing units in the county declined between the 2000 and 2010 Census (likely due to a combination of demolition and units falling into such as state of disrepair that they became uninhabitable), however current estimates show a modest net increase. New housing construction is largely occurring on medium to larger acreages in unincorporated areas of the county, along with some limited new construction in communities such as Medford and Pond Creek. New construction on rural acreages is typically custom in nature.

## For Rent:

To the best of our knowledge, no new housing units for rent have been constructed in Grant County in many years, likely since at least the 1980s, excepting occasional single-family housing units that are rented rather than owned.

## Homeownership Market

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

## Housing Units by Home Value

The following table presents housing units in Grant 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 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Medford |  | Grant County |  | State of Oklahoma |  |
|  | No. | Percent | No. | Percent | No. | Percent |
| Total Owner-Occupied Units: | 369 |  | 1,479 |  | 968,736 |  |
| Less than \$10,000 | 11 | 2.98\% | 80 | 5.41\% | 20,980 | 2.17\% |
| \$10,000 to \$14,999 | 10 | 2.71\% | 30 | 2.03\% | 15,427 | 1.59\% |
| \$15,000 to \$19,999 | 3 | 0.81\% | 44 | 2.97\% | 13,813 | 1.43\% |
| \$20,000 to \$24,999 | 14 | 3.79\% | 76 | 5.14\% | 16,705 | 1.72\% |
| \$25,000 to \$29,999 | 21 | 5.69\% | 61 | 4.12\% | 16,060 | 1.66\% |
| \$30,000 to \$34,999 | 26 | 7.05\% | 65 | 4.39\% | 19,146 | 1.98\% |
| \$35,000 to \$39,999 | 16 | 4.34\% | 58 | 3.92\% | 14,899 | 1.54\% |
| \$40,000 to \$49,999 | 40 | 10.84\% | 147 | 9.94\% | 39,618 | 4.09\% |
| \$50,000 to \$59,999 | 46 | 12.47\% | 149 | 10.07\% | 45,292 | 4.68\% |
| \$60,000 to \$69,999 | 42 | 11.38\% | 105 | 7.10\% | 52,304 | 5.40\% |
| \$70,000 to \$79,999 | 23 | 6.23\% | 94 | 6.36\% | 55,612 | 5.74\% |
| \$80,000 to \$89,999 | 40 | 10.84\% | 83 | 5.61\% | 61,981 | 6.40\% |
| \$90,000 to \$99,999 | 11 | 2.98\% | 75 | 5.07\% | 51,518 | 5.32\% |
| \$100,000 to \$124,999 | 20 | 5.42\% | 70 | 4.73\% | 119,416 | 12.33\% |
| \$125,000 to \$149,999 | 9 | 2.44\% | 87 | 5.88\% | 96,769 | 9.99\% |
| \$150,000 to \$174,999 | 13 | 3.52\% | 96 | 6.49\% | 91,779 | 9.47\% |
| \$175,000 to \$199,999 | 0 | 0.00\% | 22 | 1.49\% | 53,304 | 5.50\% |
| \$200,000 to \$249,999 | 8 | 2.17\% | 35 | 2.37\% | 69,754 | 7.20\% |
| \$250,000 to \$299,999 | 0 | 0.00\% | 40 | 2.70\% | 41,779 | 4.31\% |
| \$300,000 to \$399,999 | 10 | 2.71\% | 49 | 3.31\% | 37,680 | 3.89\% |
| \$400,000 to \$499,999 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 13,334 | 1.38\% |
| \$500,000 to \$749,999 | 0 | 0.00\% | 3 | 0.20\% | 12,784 | 1.32\% |
| \$750,000 to \$999,999 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 3,764 | 0.39\% |
| \$1,000,000 or more | 6 | 1.63\% | 10 | 0.68\% | 5,018 | 0.52\% |
| Median Home Value: |  | ,500 |  | ,800 |  | 2,800 |

The median value of owner-occupied homes in Grant County is $\$ 62,800$. This is $-44.3 \%$ lower than the statewide median, which is $\$ 112,800$. The median home value in Medford is estimated to be $\$ 59,500$.

The geographic distribution of home values in Grant County can be visualized by the following map.

Grant County Median Home Values by Census Tract


## Home Values by Year of Construction

The next table presents median home values in Grant 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 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Medford <br> Median Value | Grant County <br> Median Value | State of Oklahoma <br> Median Value |
| Total Owner-Occupied Units: |  |  |  |
| Built 2010 or Later | - | - | $\$ 188,900$ |
| Built 2000 to 2009 | - | $\$ 157,100$ | $\$ 178,000$ |
| Built 1990 to 1999 | $\$ 112,500$ | $\$ 73,900$ | $\$ 147,300$ |
| Built 1980 to 1989 | $\$ 69,400$ | $\$ 70,000$ | $\$ 118,300$ |
| Built 1970 to 1979 | $\$ 82,900$ | $\$ 91,100$ | $\$ 111,900$ |
| Built 1960 to 1969 | $\$ 61,900$ | $\$ 57,800$ | $\$ 97,100$ |
| Built 1950 to 1959 | $\$ 53,300$ | $\$ 52,500$ | $\$ 80,300$ |
| Built 1940 to 1949 | $\$ 55,000$ | $\$ 81,000$ | $\$ 67,900$ |
| Built 1939 or Earlier | $\$ 41,800$ | $\$ 54,500$ | $\$ 74,400$ |

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

## Medford Single Family Sales Activity

The next series of tables provides data regarding single family home sales activity in Medford. This data was furnished by County Records, Inc. from publicly available data. Due to the relatively low volume of sales data in Meford, the data is presented only for all bedroom types as a whole.

## Medford Single Family Sales Activity

All Bedroom Types

| Year | $\mathbf{2 0 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ | YTD 2015 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| \# of Units Sold | 19 | 25 | 22 | 24 | 9 |
| Average Sale Price | $\$ 37,268$ | $\$ 72,896$ | $\$ 43,417$ | $\$ 68,347$ | $\$ 89,556$ |
| Average Square Feet | 1,356 | 1,752 | 1,434 | 1,584 | 1,687 |
| Average Price/SF | $\$ 27.48$ | $\$ 41.61$ | $\$ 30.28$ | $\$ 43.15$ | $\$ 53.09$ |
| Average Year Built | 1946 | 1959 | 1951 | 1956 | 1958 |
| Source: Grant County Assessor, via County Records, Inc. |  |  |  |  |  |

Between 2011 and 2014, the average sale of homes in Medford varied from \$37,000 to nearly $\$ 73,000$. The average sale price in 2015 was $\$ 89,556$ for an average price per square foot of $\$ 53.09 /$ SF. The average year of construction for homes sold varied from the mid-1940s to the mid1950s, comparatively older than the median age of homes in Oklahoma.

## Foreclosure Rates

Due to the small size of Grant County, reliable foreclosure rate data was unavailable to us. . It does not appear that foreclosures have had an undue impact on the local housing market compared with other parts of the state or country.

## Rental Market

This section will discuss supply and demand factors for the rental market in Grant 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 Grant 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 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Medford |  | Grant County |  | State of Oklahoma |  |
|  | No. | Percent | No. | Percent | No. | Percent |
| Total Rental Units: | 106 |  | 472 |  | 475,345 |  |
| With cash rent: | 91 |  | 333 |  | 432,109 |  |
| Less than \$100 | 0 | 0.00\% | 3 | 0.64\% | 2,025 | 0.43\% |
| \$100 to \$149 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 2,109 | 0.44\% |
| \$150 to \$199 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 4,268 | 0.90\% |
| \$200 to \$249 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 8,784 | 1.85\% |
| \$250 to \$299 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 8,413 | 1.77\% |
| \$300 to \$349 | 3 | 2.83\% | 9 | 1.91\% | 9,107 | 1.92\% |
| \$350 to \$399 | 0 | 0.00\% | 2 | 0.42\% | 10,932 | 2.30\% |
| \$400 to \$449 | 0 | 0.00\% | 23 | 4.87\% | 15,636 | 3.29\% |
| \$450 to \$499 | 24 | 22.64\% | 43 | 9.11\% | 24,055 | 5.06\% |
| \$500 to \$549 | 20 | 18.87\% | 66 | 13.98\% | 31,527 | 6.63\% |
| \$550 to \$599 | 15 | 14.15\% | 37 | 7.84\% | 33,032 | 6.95\% |
| \$600 to \$649 | 10 | 9.43\% | 29 | 6.14\% | 34,832 | 7.33\% |
| \$650 to \$699 | 4 | 3.77\% | 22 | 4.66\% | 32,267 | 6.79\% |
| \$700 to \$749 | 8 | 7.55\% | 37 | 7.84\% | 30,340 | 6.38\% |
| \$750 to \$799 | 3 | 2.83\% | 9 | 1.91\% | 27,956 | 5.88\% |
| \$800 to \$899 | 0 | 0.00\% | 5 | 1.06\% | 45,824 | 9.64\% |
| \$900 to \$999 | 0 | 0.00\% | 21 | 4.45\% | 34,153 | 7.18\% |
| \$1,000 to \$1,249 | 4 | 3.77\% | 21 | 4.45\% | 46,884 | 9.86\% |
| \$1,250 to \$1,499 | 0 | 0.00\% | 6 | 1.27\% | 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\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 5,121 | 1.08\% |
| No cash rent | 15 | 14.15\% | 139 | 29.45\% | 43,236 | 9.10\% |
| Median Gross Rent | \$546 |  | \$578 |  | \$699 |  |

Median gross rent in Grant County is estimated to be $\$ 578$, which is $-17.3 \%$ less than Oklahoma's median gross rent of $\$ 699 /$ month. Median gross rent in Medford is estimated to be $\$ 546$.

## 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 | Medford <br> Median Rent | Grant County <br> Median Rent | State of Oklahoma <br> Median Rent |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Rental Units: |  |  |  |
| Built 2010 or Later | - | - | $\$ 933$ |
| Built 2000 to 2009 | - | - | $\$ 841$ |
| Built 1990 to 1999 | - | - | $\$ 715$ |
| Built 1980 to 1989 | - | $\$ 920$ | $\$ 693$ |
| Built 1970 to 1979 | $\$ 523$ | $\$ 558$ | $\$ 662$ |
| Built 1960 to 1969 | $\$ 553$ | $\$ 534$ | $\$ 689$ |
| Built 1950 to 1959 | $\$ 700$ | $\$ 620$ | $\$ 714$ |
| Built 1940 to 1949 | $\$ 525$ | $\$ 490$ | $\$ 673$ |
| Built 1939 or Earlier | $\$ 475$ | $\$ 643$ | $\$ 651$ |

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 Grant County is among housing units constructed between 1980 and 1989, which is $\$ 920$ per month. In order to be affordable, a household would need to earn at least $\$ 36,800$ per year to afford such a unit.

## Medford Rental Survey Data

Medford has no multifamily properties of any note. The only affordable housing in Grant County is an 8-unit apartment development in Pond Creek subsidized by the US Department of Agriculture.

## 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 Grant 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 Grant County |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grant County | \# Units | Occupancy <br> Rate | Avg. <br> Household <br> Income | Tenant Contribution | Federal Contribution | \% of <br> Total <br> Rent |
| Public Housing | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Housing Choice Vouchers | 2 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Mod Rehab | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Section 8 NC/SR | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Section 236 | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Multi-Family Other | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Summary of All HUD Programs | 2 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 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 2 housing units located within Grant County, both being housing units occupied by tenants with housing choice vouchers. No demographic data regarding these households is available from HUD due to privacy concerns.

## 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 Grant 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 Grant 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.

| Grant County : CHAS - Housing Cost Burden by HAMFI |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Owners |  |  |  |  |
| Household Income / Cost Burden | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Income < 30\% HAMFI | $\mathbf{8 5}$ |  | 55 |  |
| Cost Burden Less Than 30\% | 20 | $23.53 \%$ | 25 | $45.45 \%$ |
| Cost Burden Between 30\%-50\% | 15 | $17.65 \%$ | 10 | $18.18 \%$ |
| Cost Burden Greater Than 50\% | 40 | $47.06 \%$ | 15 | $27.27 \%$ |
| Not Computed (no/negative income) | 10 | $11.76 \%$ | 4 | $7.27 \%$ |
| Income 30\%-50\% HAMFI | $\mathbf{1 5 0}$ |  | $\mathbf{8 5}$ |  |
| Cost Burden Less Than 30\% | 80 | $53.33 \%$ | 55 | $64.71 \%$ |
| Cost Burden Between 30\%-50\% | 70 | $46.67 \%$ | 35 | $41.18 \%$ |
| Cost Burden Greater Than 50\% | 4 | $2.67 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Not Computed (no/negative income) | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Income 50\%-80\% HAMFI | $\mathbf{2 7 5}$ |  | $\mathbf{1 2 0}$ |  |
| Cost Burden Less Than 30\% | 220 | $80.00 \%$ | 105 | $87.50 \%$ |
| Cost Burden Between 30\%-50\% | 50 | $18.18 \%$ | 15 | $12.50 \%$ |
| Cost Burden Greater Than 50\% | 10 | $3.64 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Not Computed (no/negative income) | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Income 80\%-100\% HAMFI | $\mathbf{1 6 5}$ |  | $\mathbf{7 0}$ |  |
| Cost Burden Less Than 30\% | 150 | $90.91 \%$ | 65 | $92.86 \%$ |
| Cost Burden Between 30\%-50\% | 15 | $9.09 \%$ | 4 | $5.71 \%$ |
| Cost Burden Greater Than 50\% | 4 | $2.42 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Not Computed (no/negative income) | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| All Incomes | $\mathbf{1 , 4 6 0}$ |  | $\mathbf{4 7 5}$ |  |
| Cost Burden Less Than 30\% | 1,230 | $84.25 \%$ | 395 | $83.16 \%$ |
| Cost Burden Between 30\%-50\% | 165 | $11.30 \%$ | 64 | $13.47 \%$ |
| Cost Burden Greater Than 50\% | 68 | $4.66 \%$ | 15 | $3.16 \%$ |
| Not Computed (no/negative income) | 10 | $0.68 \%$ | 4 | $0.84 \%$ |
| 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 Grant County with the State of Oklahoma as a whole, and the United States.

## Grant County : Households by Income by Cost Burden

|  | Owners |  |  | Renters |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | $\%$ w/ Cost > |  | $\%$ w/ Cost > |
| Household Income Threshold | Total | $30 \%$ Income | Total | $30 \%$ Income |
| Income < 30\% HAMFI | 85 | $64.71 \%$ | 55 | $45.45 \%$ |
| Income 30\%-50\% HAMFI | 150 | $49.33 \%$ | 85 | $41.18 \%$ |
| Income 50\%-80\% HAMFI | 275 | $21.82 \%$ | 120 | $12.50 \%$ |
| Income 80\%-100\% HAMFI | 165 | $11.52 \%$ | 70 | $5.71 \%$ |
| All Incomes | 1,460 | $15.96 \%$ | 475 | $16.63 \%$ |

[^0]

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.

| Grant County : CHAS - HAMFI by Substandard Conditions / Overcrowding |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Owners |  |  |  |  |
| Household Income / Housing Problem | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Income < 30\% HAMFI | $\mathbf{8 5}$ | $\mathbf{5 5}$ |  |  |
| 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 | 4 | $4.71 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Income 30\%-50\% HAMFI | $\mathbf{1 5 0}$ |  | $\mathbf{8 5}$ |  |
| Between 1.0 and 1.5 Persons per Room | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 4 | $4.71 \%$ |
| More than 1.5 Persons per Room | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Lacks Complete Kitchen or Plumbing | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 4 | $4.71 \%$ |
| Income 50\%-80\% HAMFI | $\mathbf{2 7 5}$ |  | $\mathbf{1 2 0}$ |  |
| Between 1.0 and 1.5 Persons per Room | 4 | $1.45 \%$ | 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 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Income 80\%-100\% HAMFI | $\mathbf{1 6 5}$ |  | $\mathbf{7 0}$ |  |
| 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 | $\mathbf{1 , 4 6 0}$ |  | $\mathbf{4 7 5}$ |  |
| Between 1.0 and 1.5 Persons per Room | 4 | $0.27 \%$ | 4 | $0.84 \%$ |
| More than 1.5 Persons per Room | 4 | $0.27 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Lacks Complete Kitchen or Plumbing | 8 | $0.55 \%$ | 4 | $0.84 \%$ |

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 Grant County, Oklahoma and the nation.

| Grant County : Households by Income by Overcrowding |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Owners |  |  | Renters |
|  |  | \% > 1.0 |  | \% > 1.0 |
|  |  | Person |  | Persons per |
| Household Income Threshold | Total | Room | Total | Room |
| Income < 30\% HAMFI | 85 | 0.00\% | 55 | 0.00\% |
| Income 30\%-50\% HAMFI | 150 | 0.00\% | 85 | 4.71\% |
| Income 50\%-80\% HAMFI | 275 | 1.45\% | 120 | 0.00\% |
| Income 80\%-100\% HAMFI | 165 | 0.00\% | 70 | 0.00\% |
| All Incomes | 1,460 | 0.55\% | 475 | 0.84\% |

[^1]

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 Grant County, the state and the nation.

## Grant County : Households by Income by Substandard Conditions

|  | Owners |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | \% Lacking <br> Kitchen or |  |
| Household Size/Type | Total | Plumbing | Total |

[^2]

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.

| Grant County : CHAS - Housing Cost Burden by Household Type / HAMFI |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Owners |  |  | Renters |  |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. w/ } \\ & \text { Cost > 30\% } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Pct. w/ } \\ & \text { Cost > 30\% } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. w/ } \\ & \text { Cost > 30\% } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Pct. w/ } \\ & \text { Cost > 30\% } \end{aligned}$ |
| Income, Household Size/Type | Total | Income | Income | Total | Income | Income |
| Income < 30\% HAMFI | 85 | 62 | 72.94\% | 55 | 26 | 47.27\% |
| Elderly Family | 15 | 14 | 93.33\% | 0 | 0 | N/A |
| Small Family ( $2-4$ persons) | 25 | 24 | 96.00\% | 10 | 10 | 100.00\% |
| Large Family (5 or more persons) | 0 | 0 | N/A | 10 | 4 | 40.00\% |
| Elderly Non-Family | 30 | 14 | 46.67\% | 15 | 8 | 53.33\% |
| Non-Family, Non-Elderly | 15 | 10 | 66.67\% | 20 | 4 | 20.00\% |
| Income 30\%-50\% HAMFI | 150 | 79 | 52.67\% | 85 | 38 | 44.71\% |
| Elderly Family | 20 | 10 | 50.00\% | 4 | 4 | 100.00\% |
| Small Family ( $2-4$ persons) | 30 | 14 | 46.67\% | 30 | 4 | 13.33\% |
| Large Family (5 or more persons) | 4 | 0 | 0.00\% | 4 | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Elderly Non-Family | 70 | 35 | 50.00\% | 35 | 30 | 85.71\% |
| Non-Family, Non-Elderly | 30 | 20 | 66.67\% | 15 | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Income 50\%-80\% HAMFI | 275 | 58 | 21.09\% | 120 | 14 | 11.67\% |
| Elderly Family | 65 | 15 | 23.08\% | 4 | 4 | 100.00\% |
| Small Family ( $2-4$ persons) | 85 | 35 | 41.18\% | 55 | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Large Family (5 or more persons) | 10 | 0 | 0.00\% | 4 | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Elderly Non-Family | 65 | 4 | 6.15\% | 20 | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Non-Family, Non-Elderly | 50 | 4 | 8.00\% | 35 | 10 | 28.57\% |
| Income 80\%-100\% HAMFI | 165 | 22 | 13.33\% | 70 | 4 | 5.71\% |
| Elderly Family | 40 | 8 | 20.00\% | 4 | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Small Family ( $2-4$ persons) | 70 | 10 | 14.29\% | 50 | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Large Family (5 or more persons) | 4 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0 | N/A |
| Elderly Non-Family | 25 | 4 | 16.00\% | 4 | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Non-Family, Non-Elderly | 25 | 0 | 0.00\% | 15 | 4 | 26.67\% |
| All Incomes | 1,460 | 241 | 16.51\% | 475 | 82 | 17.26\% |
| Elderly Family | 295 | 55 | 18.64\% | 16 | 8 | 50.00\% |
| Small Family (2-4 persons) | 680 | 91 | 13.38\% | 220 | 14 | 6.36\% |
| Large Family (5 or more persons) | 53 | 0 | 0.00\% | 33 | 4 | 12.12\% |
| Elderly Non-Family | 235 | 57 | 24.26\% | 84 | 38 | 45.24\% |
| Non-Family, Non-Elderly | 195 | 38 | 19.49\% | 120 | 18 | 15.00\% |

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

Grant County : Households under 80\% AMI by Cost Burden

|  | Owners |  |  | Renters |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. w/ } \\ & \text { Cost > 30\% } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Pct. w/ } \\ & \text { Cost > 30\% } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. w/ } \\ & \text { Cost > 30\% } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Pct. w/ } \\ & \text { Cost > 30\% } \end{aligned}$ |
| Household Size/Type | Total | Income | Income | Total | Income | Income |
| Income < 80\% HAMFI | 510 | 199 | 39.02\% | 260 | 78 | 30.00\% |
| Elderly Family | 100 | 39 | 39.00\% | 8 | 8 | 100.00\% |
| Small Family ( $2-4$ persons) | 140 | 73 | 52.14\% | 95 | 14 | 14.74\% |
| Large Family (5 or more persons) | 14 | 0 | 0.00\% | 18 | 4 | 22.22\% |
| Elderly Non-Family | 165 | 53 | 32.12\% | 70 | 38 | 54.29\% |
| Non-Family, Non-Elderly | 95 | 34 | 35.79\% | 70 | 14 | 20.00\% |

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).

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

|  | Owners |  |  | Renters |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Income, Household Size/Type | Total | No. w/ Housing Problems | Pct. w/ <br> Housing <br> Problems | Total | No. w/ <br> Housing <br> Problems | Pct. w/ <br> Housing <br> Problems |
| Income < 30\% HAMFI | 85 | 55 | 64.71\% | 55 | 22 | 40.00\% |
| Elderly Family | 15 | 10 | 66.67\% | 0 | 0 | N/A |
| Small Family (2-4 persons) | 25 | 25 | 100.00\% | 10 | 10 | 100.00\% |
| Large Family (5 or more persons) | 0 | 0 | N/A | 10 | 4 | 40.00\% |
| Elderly Non-Family | 30 | 10 | 33.33\% | 15 | 4 | 26.67\% |
| Non-Family, Non-Elderly | 15 | 10 | 66.67\% | 20 | 4 | 20.00\% |
| Income 30\%-50\% HAMFI | 150 | 75 | 50.00\% | 85 | 44 | 51.76\% |
| Elderly Family | 20 | 10 | 50.00\% | 4 | 4 | 100.00\% |
| Small Family (2-4 persons) | 30 | 10 | 33.33\% | 30 | 10 | 33.33\% |
| Large Family (5 or more persons) | 4 | 0 | 0.00\% | 4 | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Elderly Non-Family | 70 | 35 | 50.00\% | 35 | 30 | 85.71\% |
| Non-Family, Non-Elderly | 30 | 20 | 66.67\% | 15 | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Income 50\%-80\% HAMFI | 275 | 62 | 22.55\% | 120 | 14 | 11.67\% |
| Elderly Family | 65 | 15 | 23.08\% | 4 | 4 | 100.00\% |
| Small Family (2-4 persons) | 85 | 35 | 41.18\% | 55 | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Large Family (5 or more persons) | 10 | 4 | 40.00\% | 4 | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Elderly Non-Family | 65 | 4 | 6.15\% | 20 | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Non-Family, Non-Elderly | 50 | 4 | 8.00\% | 35 | 10 | 28.57\% |
| Income Greater than 80\% of HAMFI | 950 | 53 | 5.58\% | 215 | 4 | 1.86\% |
| Elderly Family | 200 | 15 | 7.50\% | 15 | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Small Family ( $2-4$ persons) | 540 | 20 | 3.70\% | 120 | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Large Family (5 or more persons) | 40 | 4 | 10.00\% | 15 | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Elderly Non-Family | 70 | 4 | 5.71\% | 10 | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Non-Family, Non-Elderly | 95 | 10 | 10.53\% | 50 | 4 | 8.00\% |
| All Incomes | 1,460 | 245 | 16.78\% | 475 | 84 | 17.68\% |
| Elderly Family | 300 | 50 | 16.67\% | 23 | 8 | 34.78\% |
| Small Family (2-4 persons) | 680 | 90 | 13.24\% | 215 | 20 | 9.30\% |
| Large Family (5 or more persons) | 54 | 8 | 14.81\% | 33 | 4 | 12.12\% |
| Elderly Non-Family | 235 | 53 | 22.55\% | 80 | 34 | 42.50\% |
| Non-Family, Non-Elderly | 190 | 44 | 23.16\% | 120 | 18 | 15.00\% |

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

| Grant County : Households under 80\% AMI by Housing Problems |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Owners |  |  |  |  |  | Renters |
|  |  | No. w/ | Pct. w/ | No. w/ | Pct. w/ |  |
| Household Size/Type | Housing | Housing |  | Housing | Housing |  |
| Income < 80\% HAMFI | $\mathbf{5 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 2}$ | $\mathbf{3 7 . 6 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 6 0}$ | $\mathbf{8 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 0 . 7 7 \%}$ |
| Elderly Family | 100 | 35 | $35.00 \%$ | 8 | 8 | $100.00 \%$ |
| Small Family (2-4 persons) | 140 | 70 | $50.00 \%$ | 95 | 20 | $21.05 \%$ |
| Large Family (5 or more persons) | 14 | 4 | $28.57 \%$ | 18 | 4 | $22.22 \%$ |
| Elderly Non-Family | 165 | 49 | $29.70 \%$ | 70 | 34 | $48.57 \%$ |
| Non-Family, Non-Elderly | 95 | 34 | $35.79 \%$ | 70 | 14 | $20.00 \%$ |

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

Households Under 80\% of AMI: Percentage with Housing Problems


Renters

Owners

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 Grant 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."

| Grant County : CHAS - Housing Problems by Race / Ethnicity and HAMFI |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Owners |  |  | Renters |  |
| Income, Race / Ethnicity | Total | No. w/ <br> Housing <br> Problems | Pct. w/ <br> Housing <br> Problems | Total | No. w/ <br> Housing <br> Problems | Pct. w/ <br> Housing <br> Problems |
| Income < 30\% HAMFI | 85 | 55 | 64.7\% | 54 | 25 | 46.3\% |
| White alone, non-Hispanic | 79 | 55 | 69.6\% | 44 | 25 | 56.8\% |
| Black or African-American alone | 0 | 0 | N/A | 4 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Asian alone | 0 | 0 | N/A | 0 | 0 | N/A |
| American Indian alone | 0 | 0 | N/A | 4 | 4 | 100.0\% |
| Pacific Islander alone | 0 | 0 | N/A | 0 | 0 | N/A |
| Hispanic, any race | 0 | 0 | N/A | 0 | 0 | N/A |
| Other (including multiple races) | 8 | 4 | 50.0\% | 10 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Income 30\%-50\% HAMFI | 155 | 75 | 48.4\% | 85 | 40 | 47.1\% |
| White alone, non-Hispanic | 140 | 70 | 50.0\% | 85 | 40 | 47.1\% |
| Black or African-American alone | 0 | 0 | N/A | 0 | 0 | N/A |
| Asian alone | 0 | 0 | N/A | 0 | 0 | N/A |
| American Indian alone | 4 | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0 | N/A |
| Pacific Islander alone | 0 | 0 | N/A | 0 | 0 | N/A |
| Hispanic, any race | 0 | 0 | N/A | 0 | 0 | N/A |
| Other (including multiple races) | 14 | 4 | 28.6\% | 0 | 0 | N/A |
| Income 50\%-80\% HAMFI | 275 | 60 | 21.8\% | 120 | 15 | 12.5\% |
| White alone, non-Hispanic | 270 | 60 | 22.2\% | 120 | 15 | 12.5\% |
| Black or African-American alone | 0 | 0 | N/A | 0 | 0 | N/A |
| Asian alone | 0 | 0 | N/A | 0 | 0 | N/A |
| American Indian alone | 4 | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0 | N/A |
| Pacific Islander alone | 0 | 0 | N/A | 0 | 0 | N/A |
| Hispanic, any race | 0 | 0 | N/A | 0 | 0 | N/A |
| Other (including multiple races) | 8 | 4 | 50.0\% | 0 | 0 | N/A |
| Income 80\%-100\% HAMFI | 165 | 15 | 9.1\% | 69 | 4 | 5.8\% |
| White alone, non-Hispanic | 160 | 15 | 9.4\% | 50 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Black or African-American alone | 0 | 0 | N/A | 0 | 0 | N/A |
| Asian alone | 0 | 0 | N/A | 4 | 4 | 100.0\% |
| American Indian alone | 0 | 0 | N/A | 0 | 0 | N/A |
| Pacific Islander alone | 0 | 0 | N/A | 0 | 0 | N/A |
| Hispanic, any race | 0 | 0 | N/A | 4 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Other (including multiple races) | 4 | 0 | 0.0\% | 4 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| All Incomes | 1,460 | 235 | 16.1\% | 473 | 84 | 17.8\% |
| White alone, non-Hispanic | 1,399 | 230 | 16.4\% | 439 | 80 | 18.2\% |
| Black or African-American alone | 0 | 0 | N/A | 8 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Asian alone | 0 | 0 | N/A | 4 | 4 | 100.0\% |
| American Indian alone | 12 | 0 | 0.0\% | 4 | 4 | 100.0\% |
| Pacific Islander alone | 0 | 0 | N/A | 0 | 0 | N/A |
| Hispanic, any race | 15 | 0 | 0.0\% | 4 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Other (including multiple races) | 44 | 12 | 27.3\% | 18 | 0 | 0.0\% |

[^3]
## Grant County : Households under 80\% AMI by Race/Ethnicity

|  | Owners |  |  |  | Renters |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | No. w/ | Pct. w/ |  | No. w/ | Pct. w/ |
| Household Size/Type | Housing | Housing |  | Housing | Housing |  |
| Income < 80\% HAMFI | $\mathbf{5 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 6 . 8 9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 5 9}$ | $\mathbf{8 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 0 . 8 9 \%}$ |
| White alone, non-Hispanic | 489 | 185 | $37.83 \%$ | 249 | 80 | $32.13 \%$ |
| Black or African-American alone | 0 | 0 | N/A | 4 | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Asian alone | 0 | 0 | N/A | 0 | 0 | N/A |
| American Indian alone | 8 | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 4 | 4 | $100.00 \%$ |
| Pacific Islander alone | 0 | 0 | N/A | 0 | 0 | N/A |
| Hispanic, any race | 0 | 0 | N/A | 0 | 0 | N/A |
| Other (including multiple races) | 30 | 12 | $40.00 \%$ | 10 | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |

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 Grant 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 60 renter households that are cost overburdened, and 129 homeowners that are cost overburdened.
- Among elderly households with incomes less than 50\% of Area Median Income, there are 42 renter households that are cost overburdened, and 73 homeowners that are cost overburdened. This suggests that more than have of the low-income households in Grant County with housing problems are age 62 and up.
- Among renter households with incomes less than $80 \%$ of Area Median Income, $60.0 \%$ of households with members with one or more disabilities have one or more housing problems (rent overburdened, overcrowded, or substandard housing).


## Overall Anticipated Housing Demand

Future demand for housing units in Grant 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 Medford, as well as Grant County as a whole. The calculations are shown in the following tables.

## Medford 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.

Medford Historical Population and Housing Changes

|  | 2000 Census | 2010 Census | \% Change | 2015 Estimate $\%$ Change |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Population | 1,172 | 996 | $-1.61 \%$ | 955 | $-0.84 \%$ |
| Households | 480 | 413 | $-1.49 \%$ | 404 | $-0.44 \%$ |
| Housing Units | 591 | 530 | $-1.08 \%$ | 533 | $0.11 \%$ |

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 Medford.

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 Medford and may lead people who are employed in Medford to live outside the city limits. There also appears to be 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 Medford. In general, there appears to be unsatisfied demand for median-income rental and owner-occupied property.

## Grant County Anticipated Demand

Households in Grant County grew at an annually compounded rate of -0.89\% from 2000 to 2010. Nielsen SiteReports estimates households have grown $0.25 \%$ per year since that time, and that households will grow $0.43 \%$ per year through 2020. For these reasons we will rely on the Nielsen SiteReports forecast of $0.43 \%$ per year in forecasting future household growth for Grant County.

The percentage of owner households was estimated at $75.81 \%$ with renter households estimated at 24.19\%, based on data from the U.S. Census Bureau. The estimated number of additional units needed to service increasing demand can be estimated by applying this percentage to the anticipated growth in households. It should be noted that this is an estimate of rental and owner requirements and should be relied upon only as a guideline for possible new demand. The calculations are shown below.

| Future Housing Demand Estimates for Grant County |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Year | $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ |
| Household Estimates | 1,934 | 1,942 | 1,951 | 1,959 | 1,968 | 1,976 |
| Owner \%: | $75.81 \%$ | 1,466 | 1,472 | 1,479 | 1,485 | 1,492 |
| Renter \%: | $24.19 \%$ | 468 | 470 | 472 | 474 | 476 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 478 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Total New Owner Households | $\mathbf{3 2}$ |  |
|  |  |  | Total New Renter Households | $\mathbf{1 0}$ |  |  |

Based on an estimated household growth rate of $0.43 \%$ per year, Grant County would require 32 new housing units for ownership, and 10 units for rent, over the next five years. Annually this equates to 6 units for ownership per year, and 2 units for rent per year.

## Housing Demand - Population Subsets

This section will address 5-year forecasted needs and trends for population special population subsets for Grant County. These forecasts are based on the previously forecasted overall trends for the next five years.

## Housing Needs by Income Thresholds

The first table will address future housing needs and trends for households in Grant County by income threshold: households within incomes below 30\%, 50\%, 60\% and 80\% of Area Median Income, by tenure (owner/renter). These forecasts are primarily based on HUD Consolidated Housing Affordability Strategy data presented previously. Households with incomes below 60\% of Area Median Income (AMI) are estimated at 120\% of the households at 50\% of AMI. Note that these figures are cumulative and should not be added across income thresholds.

| Grant County: 2015-2020 Housing | Needs by | Income Threshold |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Owner | Renter |  |  |  |
|  | Subset $\%$ | Subset $\%$ | Owners | Renters | Total |
| Total New Demand: 2015-2020 | $100.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ | 32 | 10 | 42 |
| Less than 30\% AMI | $5.82 \%$ | $11.58 \%$ | 2 | 1 | $\mathbf{3}$ |
| Less than 50\% AMI | $16.10 \%$ | $29.47 \%$ | 5 | 3 | $\mathbf{8}$ |
| Less than 60\% AMI | $19.32 \%$ | $35.37 \%$ | 6 | 4 | $\mathbf{1 0}$ |
| Less than 80\% AMI | $34.93 \%$ | $54.74 \%$ | 11 | 6 | $\mathbf{1 7}$ |

## Elderly Housing Needs

The next table will address future housing needs and trends for households with elderly persons (age 62 and up). Like the previous table, this data is based on the overall trends previously defined, and the 2008-2012 CHAS data previously discussed (specifically CHAS Table 16). It is further broken down by income threshold and tenure.

| Grant County: 2015-2020 Housing | Needs Age $\mathbf{6 2}$ and Up |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |  | Owner |
|  | Renter | Elderly | Elderly | Elderly |  |
| Total New Elderly (62+) Demand: 2015-2020 | $36.30 \%$ | $21.05 \%$ | 12 | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{1 4}$ |
| Elderly less than 30\% AMI | $3.08 \%$ | $3.16 \%$ | 1 | 0 | $\mathbf{1}$ |
| Elderly less than 50\% AMI | $9.25 \%$ | $11.37 \%$ | 3 | 1 | $\mathbf{4}$ |
| Elderly less than 60\% AMI | $11.10 \%$ | $13.64 \%$ | 4 | 1 | $\mathbf{5}$ |
| Elderly less than $80 \%$ AMI | $18.15 \%$ | $16.42 \%$ | 6 | 2 | $\mathbf{7}$ |

## Housing Needs for Persons with Disabilities / Special Needs

The following table will address future trends and needs for households with at least one household member with at least one disability as identified by HUD CHAS Table 6 (hearing or vision impairments, ambulatory limitations, cognitive limitations, self-care limitations, or independent living limitations). As with the previous tables, this data is also further broken down by income threshold and tenure.

| Grant County: 2015-2020 Housing | Needs for | Persons with Disabilities |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Owner | Renter | Disabled | Disabled | Disabled |
|  | Subset $\%$ | Subset $\%$ | Owners | Renters | Total |
| Total New Disabled Demand (2015-2020) | $34.59 \%$ | $23.16 \%$ | 11 | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{1 3}$ |
| Disabled less than 30\% AMI | $2.74 \%$ | $3.16 \%$ | 1 | 0 | $\mathbf{1}$ |
| Disabled less than 50\% AMI | $8.56 \%$ | $12.63 \%$ | 3 | 1 | $\mathbf{4}$ |
| Disabled less than 60\% AMI | $10.27 \%$ | $15.16 \%$ | 3 | 2 | $\mathbf{5}$ |
| Disabled less than $80 \%$ AMI | $15.75 \%$ | $15.79 \%$ | 5 | 2 | $\mathbf{7}$ |

## Housing Needs for Veterans

This section will address housing needs for households with at least one veteran. This data is not available through HUD's Consolidated Housing Affordability Strategy, so we have instead relied on data from the U.S. Census Bureau, specifically the 2009-2013 American Community Survey, Table C21007. This data is further broken down by tenure, poverty status, and disability status.

| Grant County: 2015-2020 Housing | Needs for Veterans |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Owner | Renter | Veteran | Veteran | Veteran |
|  | Subset $\%$ | Subset $\%$ | Owners | Renters | Total |
| Total New Demand (2015-2020) | $100.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ | 32 | 10 | 42 |
| Total Veteran Demand | $10.53 \%$ | $10.53 \%$ | 3 | 1 | $\mathbf{4}$ |
| Veterans with Disabilities | $4.78 \%$ | $4.78 \%$ | 2 | 0 | $\mathbf{2}$ |
| Veterans Below Poverty | $0.86 \%$ | $0.86 \%$ | 0 | 0 | $\mathbf{0}$ |
| Disabled Veterans Below Poverty | $0.12 \%$ | $0.12 \%$ | 0 | 0 | $\mathbf{0}$ |

## Housing Needs for Working Families

The final table addresses housing needs for working families. Working families are in this case defined as families (households with at least two members related by blood or marriage) with at least one person employed. Like the forecasts for veteran needs, this data cannot be extracted from the HUD CHAS tables, so we have again relied on the Census Bureau's American Community Survey (table B23007 in this instance). The data is further broken down by the presence of children (below the age of 18).

| Grant County: 2015-2020 Housing |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Owner | Renter |  |  |  |
|  | Subset $\%$ | Subset $\%$ | Owners | Renters | Total |
| Total New Demand (2015-2020) | $100.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ | 32 | 10 | 42 |
| Total Working Families | $54.54 \%$ | $54.54 \%$ | 17 | 6 | $\mathbf{2 3}$ |
| Working Families with Children Present | $25.68 \%$ | $25.68 \%$ | 8 | 3 | $\mathbf{1 1}$ |

## Population Subset Conclusions

Based on population and household growth over the next five years, a total of 42 housing units will be needed in Grant County over the next five years. Of those units:

- 10 will be needed by households earning less than $60 \%$ of Area Median Income
- 5 will be needed by households age 62 and up, earning less than $60 \%$ of Area Median Income
- 5 will be needed by households with disabilities / special needs, earning less than $60 \%$ of Area Median Income
- 11 will be needed by working families with children present

This data suggests a need in Grant County for housing units that are both affordable and accessible to persons with disabilities / special needs.


[^0]:    Source: 2008-2012 HUD Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy, Table 8

[^1]:    Source: 2008-2012 HUD Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy, Table 3

[^2]:    Source: 2008-2012 HUD Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy, Table 3

[^3]:    Source: 2008-2012 HUD Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy, Table 1

