

**Housing Needs Assessment**  
**Love County**

**Prepared For:**

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

**Effective Date of the Analysis:**

October 16, 2015

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





December 31, 2015

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

SUBJECT:       Housing Needs Assessment  
                  Love County  
                  IRR - Tulsa/OKC File No. 140-2015-0056

Dear Mr. Shockley:

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

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

Attached hereto, please find the Love County Residential Housing Market Analysis. Analyst Derrick Wilson personally inspected the Love County area during the month of October 2015 to collect the data used in the preparation of the Love County Market Analysis. The University of Oklahoma College of Architecture Division of Regional and City Planning provided consultation, assemblage and analysis of the data for IRR-Tulsa/OKC.

Mr. Dennis Shockley  
Oklahoma Housing Finance Agency  
December 31, 2015  
Page 2

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

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

Respectfully submitted,

**Integra Realty Resources - Tulsa/OKC**

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

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

Derrick Wilson  
Market Analyst



# Table of Contents

<b>Introduction and Executive Summary</b>	<b>1</b>	Housing Units by Year of Construction and Tenure	30
<b>General Information</b>	<b>4</b>	Substandard Housing	31
Purpose and Function of the Market Study	4	Vacancy Rates	32
Effective Date of Consultation	4	Building Permits	33
Scope of the Assignment	4	New Construction Activity	34
Data Sources	4	Homeownership Market	35
<b>Love County Analysis</b>	<b>6</b>	Housing Units by Home Value	35
Area Information	6	Love County Median Home Values by Census Tract	36
Access and Linkages	6	Home Values by Year of Construction	37
Educational Facilities	7	Marietta Single Family Sales Activity	37
Medical Facilities	7	Foreclosure Rates	38
Demographic Analysis	10	Rental Market	40
Population and Households	10	Gross Rent Levels	40
Population by Race and Ethnicity	11	Marietta Rental Survey Data	41
Population by Age	11	Rental Market Vacancy – Marietta	41
Families by Presence of Children	13	Summary of HUD Subsidized Properties	42
Population by Presence of Disabilities	14	<b>Projected Housing Need</b>	<b>47</b>
Group Quarters Population	16	Consolidated Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS)	47
Household Income Levels	16	Cost Burden by Income Threshold	47
Household Income Trend	18	Substandard Conditions / Overcrowding by Income Threshold	49
Poverty Rates	19	Cost Burden by Household Type	52
<b>Economic Conditions</b>	<b>20</b>	Housing Problems by Household Type	54
Employment and Unemployment	20	Housing Problems by Race / Ethnicity	56
Employment Level Trends	20	CHAS Conclusions	58
Unemployment Rate Trends	21	Overall Anticipated Housing Demand	60
Employment and Wages by Industrial Supersector	22	Marietta Anticipated Demand	60
Working Families	26	Love County Anticipated Demand	60
Major Employers	26	Housing Demand – Population Subsets	62
Commuting Patterns	27	Housing Needs by Income Thresholds	62
<b>Housing Stock Analysis</b>	<b>28</b>	Elderly Housing Needs	62
Existing Housing Units	28	Housing Needs for Persons with Disabilities / Special Needs	62
Housing by Units in Structure	28	Housing Needs for Veterans	63
Housing Units Number of Bedrooms and Tenure	29	Housing Needs for Working Families	63
Housing Units Tenure and Household Income	29	Population Subset Conclusions	63

# Table of Contents

<b>Special Topics</b>	<b>65</b>
Love County Disaster Resiliency Assessment	66
C.0 Comprehensive Plans & Hazard Mitigation Plans	66
C.2.1.1. Historical Data on Natural Disasters and Other Hazards	66
C.2.1.2; C.2.1.6; C.2.1.7; C.2.1.8 Shelters from Disaster Event	71
C.2.1.3 Public Policy and Governance to Build Disaster Resiliency	71
C.2.1.4 Local Emergency Response Agency Structure	71
C.2.1.5 Threat & Hazard Warning Systems	71
Social Vulnerability	72
Homelessness	77
By Continuum of Care	77
A Snap Shot of Homelessness in the State	80
Rural Areas	84
At Risk For Homelessness	86
Findings and Recommendations	88
Fair Housing	91
Summary	91
Key Findings:	91
Recommendations:	91
Appendix 1: County affordable housing Summaries	106
Lead-Based Paint Hazards	110
Love County Findings	112
<b>Conclusions</b>	<b>123</b>
<b>Addenda</b>	
A. Acknowledgments	
B. Qualifications	

# 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 Love County is projected to grow by 1.16% per year over the next five years, outperforming the State of Oklahoma.
2. Love County is projected to need a total of 186 housing units for ownership and 59 housing units for rent over the next five years, based solely on new population growth.
3. Median Household Income in Love County is estimated to be \$45,146 in 2015, compared with \$47,049 estimated for the State of Oklahoma. The poverty rate in Love County is estimated to be 16.60%, compared with 16.85% for Oklahoma.
4. Homeowner vacancy rates in Love County are lower than the state averages, though the rental vacancy rate is higher.
5. Home values and rental rates in Love County are also lower than the state averages.
6. Average sale price for homes in Marietta was \$74,676 in 2015, with an average price per square foot of \$59.31. The average year of construction was 1971.
7. Approximately 19.9% of renters and 12.4% of owners are housing cost overburdened.

**Disaster Resiliency Specific Findings:**

1. Create and maintain the county HMP
2. Apply for grants/funding to develop a county hazard mitigation plan.
3. Tornadoes (1959-2014): Number: 20 Injuries:18 Fatalities:13 Damages (1996-2014): \$3,170,000.00
4. Social Vulnerability: Below state score at the county level; The area most vulnerable by census tract is in the populated area of Marietta.
5. Floodplain: updated flood maps not available.

**Homelessness Specific Findings**

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

**Fair Housing Specific Findings**

1. Units in immigrant enclaves: 62

**Lead-Based Paint Specific Findings**

1. We estimate there are 475 occupied housing units in Love County with lead-based paint hazards.
2. 222 of those housing units are estimated to be occupied by low-to-moderate income households.
3. We estimate that 72 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 Love 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 Love County, including vacancy rates, construction activity and trends, and analyses of the homeowner and rental markets. This section is followed by five-year forecasts of housing need for owners and renters, as well as specific populations such as low-to-moderate income households, the elderly, and working families.

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

- Disaster Resiliency
- Homelessness

- Fair Housing
- Lead-Based Paint Hazards

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

## Effective Date of Consultation

The Love County area was inspected and research was performed during October, 2015. The effective date of this analysis is October 16, 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 Love County area was inspected during October, 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

# Love County Analysis

## Area Information

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

Love County is located in south-central Oklahoma. The county is bordered on the north by Carter County, on the west by Jefferson County, on the south by Texas, and on the east by Marshall County and Texas. The county is Marietta, which is located in the central part of the county. This location is approximately 194 miles southwest of Tulsa and 115 miles South of Oklahoma City.

Love County has a total area of 532 square miles (514 square miles of land, and 18 square miles of water), ranking 72nd out of Oklahoma's 77 counties in terms of total area. The total population of Love County as of the 2010 Census was 9,423 persons, for a population density of 18 persons per square mile of land.

## Access and Linkages

The county has above average accessibility to state and national highway systems. Multiple major highways intersect within Love. These are I-35, OK-32, OK-775, OK-76, and OK-77. The nearest interstate highway is I-35, which dissects the county north/south. The county also has an intricate network of county roadways.

Public transportation is provided by the Southern Oklahoma Rural Transportation System (SORTS, a service of Big Five Community Services) which operates a demand-response service in Bryan, Carter, Coal and Love counties. The local market perceives public transportation as average compared to other communities in the region of similar size. However, the primary mode of transportation in this area is private automobiles by far.

Ardmore Downtown Executive Airport is located 18.1 miles north of Marietta in Ardmore. The primary asphalt runway measures 5,001 feet in length. The nearest full-service commercial airport is the Dallas-Fort Worth Airport, located 81.6 miles south.

**Educational Facilities**

All of the county communities have public school facilities. Marietta is served by Marietta Public Schools which operates one high school, one middle school, and one elementary school. The University Center of Southern Oklahoma is a nearby opportunity for higher education located in Ardmore. It offers a wide variety of areas of academic study and degree offerings through the participation of Murray State College, East Central University, and Southeastern Oklahoma State University.


**Medical Facilities**

Medical services are provided by Mercy Health Love County, a critical-care hospital offering surgical, emergency, and in and outpatient's services. The smaller county communities typically have either small outpatient medical services or doctor's officing in the community.

### Love County Area Map



### Marietta Area Map



## Demographic Analysis

### Population and Households

The following table presents population levels and annualized changes in Love 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.

<b>Population Levels and Annual Changes</b>							
	2000 Census	2010 Census	Annual Change	2015 Estimate	Annual Change	2020 Forecast	Annual Change
Marietta	2,445	2,626	0.72%	2,719	0.70%	2,861	1.02%
Love County	8,831	9,423	0.65%	9,957	1.11%	10,546	1.16%
State of Oklahoma	3,450,654	3,751,351	0.84%	3,898,675	0.77%	4,059,399	0.81%

Sources: 2000 and 2010 Decennial Censuses, Nielsen SiteReports

The population of Love County was 9,423 persons as of the 2010 Census, a 0.65% annualized rate of change from the 2000 Census. As of 2015, Nielsen SiteReports estimates the population of Love County to be 9,957 persons, and projects that the population will show 1.16% annualized growth over the next five years.

The population of Marietta was 2,626 persons as of the 2010 Census, a 0.72% annualized rate of change from the 2000 Census. As of 2015, Nielsen SiteReports estimates the population of Marietta to be 2,719 persons, and projects that the population will show 1.02% annualized growth over the next five years.

The next table presents data regarding household levels in Love 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.

<b>Population Levels and Annual Changes</b>							
	2000 Census	2010 Census	Annual Change	2015 Estimate	Annual Change	2020 Forecast	Annual Change
Marietta	2,445	2,626	0.72%	2,719	0.70%	2,861	1.02%
Love County	8,831	9,423	0.65%	9,957	1.11%	10,546	1.16%
State of Oklahoma	3,450,654	3,751,351	0.84%	3,898,675	0.77%	4,059,399	0.81%

Sources: 2000 and 2010 Decennial Censuses, Nielsen SiteReports

As of 2010, Love County had a total of 3,713 households, representing a 0.76% annualized rate of change since the 2000 Census. As of 2015, Nielsen SiteReports estimates Love County to have 3,938 households. This number is expected to experience a 1.21% annualized rate of growth over the next five years.

As of 2010, Marietta had a total of 983 households, representing a 0.32% annualized rate of change since the 2000 Census. As of 2015, Nielsen SiteReports estimates Marietta to have 1,026 households. This number is expected to experience a 1.07% annualized rate of growth over the next five years.

### Population by Race and Ethnicity

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

<b>2013 Population by Race and Ethnicity</b>				
<b>Single-Classification Race</b>	<b>Marietta</b>		<b>Love County</b>	
	<b>No.</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Total Population	2,642		9,496	
White Alone	2,214	83.80%	8,093	85.23%
Black or African American Alone	99	3.75%	192	2.02%
Amer. Indian or Alaska Native Alone	124	4.69%	649	6.83%
Asian Alone	0	0.00%	47	0.49%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pac. Isl. Alone	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Some Other Race Alone	46	1.74%	127	1.34%
Two or More Races	159	6.02%	388	4.09%
<b>Population by Hispanic or Latino Origin</b>	<b>Marietta</b>		<b>Love County</b>	
	<b>No.</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Total Population	2,642		9,496	
Hispanic or Latino	827	31.30%	1,216	12.81%
<i>Hispanic or Latino, White Alone</i>	723	87.42%	985	81.00%
<i>Hispanic or Latino, All Other Races</i>	104	12.58%	231	19.00%
Not Hispanic or Latino	1,815	68.70%	8,280	87.19%
<i>Not Hispanic or Latino, White Alone</i>	1,491	82.15%	7,108	85.85%
<i>Not Hispanic or Latino, All Other Races</i>	324	17.85%	1,172	14.15%

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

In Love County, racial and ethnic minorities comprise 25.15% of the total population. Within Marietta, racial and ethnic minorities represent 43.57% of the population.

### Population by Age

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



<b>Love County Population By Age</b>								
	2010	Percent	2015	Percent	2020	Percent	2000 - 2015	2015 - 2020
	Census	of Total	Estimate	of Total	Forecast	of Total	Ann. Chng.	Ann. Chng.
<b>Population by Age</b>	9,423		9,957		10,546			
Age 0 - 4	616	6.54%	618	6.21%	676	6.41%	0.06%	1.81%
Age 5 - 9	654	6.94%	658	6.61%	642	6.09%	0.12%	-0.49%
Age 10 - 14	644	6.83%	696	6.99%	685	6.50%	1.57%	-0.32%
Age 15 - 17	380	4.03%	410	4.12%	456	4.32%	1.53%	2.15%
Age 18 - 20	301	3.19%	364	3.66%	409	3.88%	3.87%	2.36%
Age 21 - 24	384	4.08%	471	4.73%	541	5.13%	4.17%	2.81%
Age 25 - 34	1,068	11.33%	1,123	11.28%	1,190	11.28%	1.01%	1.17%
Age 35 - 44	1,151	12.21%	1,119	11.24%	1,158	10.98%	-0.56%	0.69%
Age 45 - 54	1,323	14.04%	1,285	12.91%	1,192	11.30%	-0.58%	-1.49%
Age 55 - 64	1,284	13.63%	1,319	13.25%	1,372	13.01%	0.54%	0.79%
Age 65 - 74	971	10.30%	1,165	11.70%	1,400	13.28%	3.71%	3.74%
Age 75 - 84	472	5.01%	545	5.47%	605	5.74%	2.92%	2.11%
Age 85 and over	175	1.86%	184	1.85%	220	2.09%	1.01%	3.64%
<i>Age 55 and over</i>	<i>2,902</i>	<i>30.80%</i>	<i>3,213</i>	<i>32.27%</i>	<i>3,597</i>	<i>34.11%</i>	<i>2.06%</i>	<i>2.28%</i>
<i>Age 62 and over</i>	<i>1,828</i>	<i>19.40%</i>	<i>2,106</i>	<i>21.15%</i>	<i>2,417</i>	<i>22.91%</i>	<i>2.87%</i>	<i>2.79%</i>
<b>Median Age</b>	40.8		40.7		40.8		-0.05%	0.05%

Source: Nielsen SiteReports

As of 2015, Nielsen estimates that the median age of Love County is 40.7 years. This compares with the statewide figure of 36.6 years. Approximately 6.21% of the population is below the age of 5, while 21.15% is over the age of 62. Over the next five years, the population age 62 and above is forecasted to grow by 2.79% per year.

<b>Marietta Population By Age</b>								
	2010 Census	Percent of Total	2015 Estimate	Percent of Total	2020 Forecast	Percent of Total	2000 - 2015 Ann. Chng.	2015 - 2020 Ann. Chng.
<b>Population by Age</b>	2,626		2,719		2,861			
Age 0 - 4	222	8.45%	215	7.91%	235	8.21%	-0.64%	1.79%
Age 5 - 9	233	8.87%	229	8.42%	219	7.65%	-0.35%	-0.89%
Age 10 - 14	192	7.31%	233	8.57%	231	8.07%	3.95%	-0.17%
Age 15 - 17	95	3.62%	115	4.23%	148	5.17%	3.90%	5.18%
Age 18 - 20	105	4.00%	103	3.79%	127	4.44%	-0.38%	4.28%
Age 21 - 24	132	5.03%	130	4.78%	152	5.31%	-0.30%	3.18%
Age 25 - 34	361	13.75%	377	13.87%	351	12.27%	0.87%	-1.42%
Age 35 - 44	326	12.41%	336	12.36%	358	12.51%	0.61%	1.28%
Age 45 - 54	313	11.92%	300	11.03%	313	10.94%	-0.84%	0.85%
Age 55 - 64	264	10.05%	267	9.82%	291	10.17%	0.23%	1.74%
Age 65 - 74	189	7.20%	226	8.31%	234	8.18%	3.64%	0.70%
Age 75 - 84	121	4.61%	116	4.27%	129	4.51%	-0.84%	2.15%
Age 85 and over	73	2.78%	72	2.65%	73	2.55%	-0.28%	0.28%
<i>Age 55 and over</i>	<i>647</i>	<i>24.64%</i>	<i>681</i>	<i>25.05%</i>	<i>727</i>	<i>25.41%</i>	<i>1.03%</i>	<i>1.32%</i>
<i>Age 62 and over</i>	<i>389</i>	<i>14.82%</i>	<i>422</i>	<i>15.52%</i>	<i>450</i>	<i>15.74%</i>	<i>1.64%</i>	<i>1.30%</i>
<b>Median Age</b>	34.3		33.9		34.1		-0.23%	0.12%

Source: Nielsen SiteReports

As of 2015, Nielsen estimates that the median age of Marietta is 33.9 years. This compares with the statewide figure of 36.6 years. Approximately 7.91% of the population is below the age of 5, while 15.52% is over the age of 62. Over the next five years, the population age 62 and above is forecasted to grow by 1.30% per year.

Compared with the rest of the state, Marietta has a slightly younger population, while Love County as a whole has a moderately older population. The population age 62 and above is projected to increase significantly over the next five years.

### Families by Presence of Children

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

### 2013 Family Type by Presence of Children Under 18 Years

	Marietta		Love County	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Total Families:	620		2,561	
Married-Couple Family:	387	62.42%	2,049	80.01%
With Children Under 18 Years	171	27.58%	663	25.89%
No Children Under 18 Years	216	34.84%	1,386	54.12%
Other Family:	233	37.58%	512	19.99%
Male Householder, No Wife Present	59	9.52%	161	6.29%
With Children Under 18 Years	35	5.65%	94	3.67%
No Children Under 18 Years	24	3.87%	67	2.62%
Female Householder, No Husband Present	174	28.06%	351	13.71%
With Children Under 18 Years	142	22.90%	232	9.06%
No Children Under 18 Years	32	5.16%	119	4.65%
Total Single Parent Families	177		326	
Male Householder	35	19.77%	94	28.83%
Female Householder	142	80.23%	232	71.17%

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

As shown, within Love County, among all families 12.73% are single-parent families, while in Marietta, the percentage is 28.55%.

### Population by Presence of Disabilities

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

**2013 Age by Number of Disabilities**

	Marietta		Love County		State of Oklahoma	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Civilian Non-Institutionalized Population:	2,570		9,419		3,702,515	
Under 18 Years:	894		2,320		933,738	
With One Type of Disability	4	0.45%	43	1.85%	33,744	3.61%
With Two or More Disabilities	19	2.13%	19	0.82%	11,082	1.19%
No Disabilities	871	97.43%	2,258	97.33%	888,912	95.20%
18 to 64 Years:	1,407		5,522		2,265,702	
With One Type of Disability	85	6.04%	217	3.93%	169,697	7.49%
With Two or More Disabilities	106	7.53%	575	10.41%	149,960	6.62%
No Disabilities	1,216	86.43%	4,730	85.66%	1,946,045	85.89%
65 Years and Over:	269		1,577		503,075	
With One Type of Disability	43	15.99%	185	11.73%	95,633	19.01%
With Two or More Disabilities	60	22.30%	276	17.50%	117,044	23.27%
No Disabilities	166	61.71%	1,116	70.77%	290,398	57.72%
<b>Total Number of Persons with Disabilities:</b>	<b>317</b>	<b>12.33%</b>	<b>1,315</b>	<b>13.96%</b>	<b>577,160</b>	<b>15.59%</b>

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

Within Love County, 13.96% of the civilian non-institutionalized population has one or more disabilities, compared with 15.59% of Oklahomans as a whole. In Marietta the percentage is 12.33%. Compared with the rest of the state, the populations of Marietta and Love County as a whole are slightly less likely to have one or more disabilities.

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

**2013 Population by Veteran and Disability Status**

	Marietta		Love County		State of Oklahoma	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Civilian Population Age 18+ For Whom Poverty Status is Determined	1,676		7,099		2,738,788	
Veteran:	103	6.15%	637	8.97%	305,899	11.17%
With a Disability	51	49.51%	171	26.84%	100,518	32.86%
No Disability	52	50.49%	466	73.16%	205,381	67.14%
Non-veteran:	1,573	93.85%	6,462	91.03%	2,432,889	88.83%
With a Disability	243	15.45%	1,082	16.74%	430,610	17.70%
No Disability	1,330	84.55%	5,380	83.26%	2,002,279	82.30%

Source: 2009-2013 American Community Survey, Table C21007

Within Love County, the Census Bureau estimates there are 637 veterans, 26.84% of which have one or more disabilities (compared with 32.86% at a statewide level). In Marietta, there are an estimated 103 veterans, 49.51% of which are estimated to have a disability. Compared with the rest of the state, the veterans in Love County are somewhat less likely to have one or more disabilities, however in Marietta they are somewhat more likely.

## Group Quarters Population

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

	Marietta		Love County	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Total Population	2,626		9,423	
Group Quarters Population	74	2.82%	88	0.93%
Institutionalized Population	61	2.32%	68	0.72%
Correctional facilities for adults	5	0.19%	5	0.05%
Juvenile facilities	0	0.00%	7	0.07%
Nursing facilities/Skilled-nursing facilities	56	2.13%	56	0.59%
Other institutional facilities	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Noninstitutionalized population	13	0.50%	20	0.21%
College/University student housing	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Military quarters	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Other noninstitutional facilities	13	0.50%	20	0.21%

Source: 2010 Decennial Census, Table P42

The percentage of the Love County population in group quarters is significantly 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 Love 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.

<b>2015 Household Income Distribution</b>						
	<b>Marietta</b>		<b>Love County</b>		<b>State of Oklahoma</b>	
	<b>No.</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<b>Households by HH Income</b>	1,026		3,938		1,520,327	
< \$15,000	201	19.59%	581	14.75%	213,623	14.05%
\$15,000 - \$24,999	186	18.13%	479	12.16%	184,613	12.14%
\$25,000 - \$34,999	160	15.59%	468	11.88%	177,481	11.67%
\$35,000 - \$49,999	192	18.71%	652	16.56%	229,628	15.10%
\$50,000 - \$74,999	136	13.26%	685	17.39%	280,845	18.47%
\$75,000 - \$99,999	81	7.89%	461	11.71%	173,963	11.44%
\$100,000 - \$124,999	30	2.92%	268	6.81%	106,912	7.03%
\$125,000 - \$149,999	17	1.66%	156	3.96%	57,804	3.80%
\$150,000 - \$199,999	8	0.78%	80	2.03%	48,856	3.21%
\$200,000 - \$249,999	5	0.49%	31	0.79%	18,661	1.23%
\$250,000 - \$499,999	8	0.78%	52	1.32%	20,487	1.35%
\$500,000+	2	0.19%	25	0.63%	7,454	0.49%
<b>Median Household Income</b>	\$32,875		\$45,146		\$47,049	
<b>Average Household Income</b>	\$44,591		\$61,340		\$63,390	

Source: Nielsen SiteReports

As shown, median household income for Love County is estimated to be \$45,146 in 2015. By way of comparison, the median household income of Oklahoma is estimated to be \$47,049. For Marietta, median household income is estimated to be \$32,875. The median household income of Love County is slightly lower than the statewide figure, while the median household income of Marietta is significantly lower. While the income distribution of Love County is generally very similar to the rest of the state, the distribution of household income in Marietta is much more heavily weighted toward the lower income brackets (incomes under \$50,000 per year). The income distribution can be better visualized by the following chart.



### Household Income Trend

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

### Household Income Trend

	1999 Median HH Income	2015 Median HH Income	Nominal Growth	Inflation Rate	Real Growth
Marietta	\$26,454	\$32,875	1.37%	2.40%	-1.03%
Love County	\$32,558	\$45,146	2.06%	2.40%	-0.34%
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 Love County and the State of Oklahoma as a whole saw negative growth in “real” median household income, once inflation is taken into account. It should be noted that this trend is



not unique to Oklahoma or Love County, but rather a national trend. Over the same period, the national median household income increased from \$41,994 to \$53,706 (for a nominal annualized growth rate of 1.55%) while the Consumer Price Index increased at an annualized rate of 2.26%, for a “real” growth rate of -0.72%.

### Poverty Rates

Overall rates of poverty in Love 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.

	2000	2013	Change (Basis Points)	2013 Poverty Rates for Single-Parent Families	
	Census	ACS		Male Householder	Female Householder
Marietta	16.72%	27.98%	1126	34.29%	57.04%
Love County	11.81%	16.60%	479	26.60%	46.55%
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 Love County is estimated to be 16.60% by the American Community Survey. This is an increase of 479 basis points since the 2000 Census. Within Marietta, the poverty rate is estimated to be 27.98%. It should be noted that increasing poverty rates over this period of time is a national trend: between the 2000 Census and the 2013 American Community Survey, the poverty rate of the United States increased from 12.38% to 15.37%, an increase of 299 basis points.



## Economic Conditions

### Employment and Unemployment

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


<b>Employment and Unemployment</b>						
	May-2010 Employment	May-2015 Employment	Annual Growth	May-2010 Unemp. Rate	May-2015 Unemp. Rate	Change (bp)
Love County	4,550	5,672	4.51%	5.6%	3.9%	-170
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 Love County was 5,672 persons. Compared with figures from May 2010, this represents annualized employment growth of 4.51% per year. The unemployment rate in May was 3.9%, a decrease of -170 basis points from May 2010, which was 5.6%. Over the last five years, both the statewide and national trends have been improving employment levels and declining unemployment rates, and Love County has outperformed both the state and nation in these statistics.

### Employment Level Trends

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



*Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics, Local Area Unemployment Statistics*


As shown, total employment levels have generally trended upward over the last fifteen years. The decline observed in 2010 does not reflect an actual employment decline, but rather a statistical recalibration on the part of the Bureau of Labor Statistics to reflect revised data from the Census Bureau. Employment growth resumed in early 2011, and has continued to grow to its current level of 5,672 persons. The number of unemployed persons in May 2015 was 230, out of a total labor force of 5,902 persons.

**Unemployment Rate Trends**

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



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



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

As shown, unemployment rates in Love County increased moderately from 2000 through 2003, and then generally declined until the 4<sup>th</sup> quarter of 2008 as the effects of the national economic recession were felt. Unemployment rates began to decline again in 2010, to their current level of 3.9%. On the whole, unemployment rates in Love County track very well with statewide figures but are typically below the state. Compared with the United States, unemployment rates in Love 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 Love County by industry, including total number of establishments, average number of employees in 2014, average annual pay, and location quotients for each industry compared with the United States. This data is furnished by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages program.




**Employees and Wages by Supersector - 2014**

Supersector	Establishments	Avg. No. of Employees	Percent of Total	Avg. Annual Pay	Location Quotient
Federal Government	7	23	0.47%	\$43,614	0.23
State Government	8	34	0.69%	\$39,908	0.21
Local Government	21	2,723	55.37%	\$35,718	5.49
Natural Resources and Mining	15	52	1.06%	\$32,823	0.70
Construction	23	71	1.44%	\$51,466	0.32
Manufacturing	6	116	2.36%	\$28,049	0.27
Trade, Transportation, and Utilities	48	587	11.94%	\$36,516	0.62
Information	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Financial Activities	15	81	1.65%	\$25,525	0.29
Professional and Business Services	28	68	1.38%	\$29,907	0.10
Education and Health Services	15	131	2.66%	\$24,585	0.18
Leisure and Hospitality	26	983	19.99%	\$20,684	1.87
Other Services	8	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>220</b>	<b>4,918</b>		<b>\$32,249</b>	<b>1.00</b>

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 (19.99%) are employed in Leisure and Hospitality. The average annual pay in this sector is \$20,684 per year. The industry with the highest annual pay is Construction, with average annual pay of \$51,466 per year.

The rightmost column of the previous table provides location quotients for each industry for Love 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 (Love County in this instance), by the percentage of employment in the same industry in the United States. For example, if manufacturing in a certain county comprised 10% of total employment, while in the United States manufacturing comprised 5% of total employment, the location quotient would be 2.0:

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

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

Within Love County, among all industries the largest location quotient is in Local Government, with a quotient of 5.49. The local government sector includes tribal government, and likely reflects employment at the WinStar Casino which is owned by the Chickasaw Nation. Among private employers, the largest is Leisure and Hospitality, with a quotient of 1.87 (this also likely reflects employment related to the WinStar Casino, but not directly employed by the Chickasaw Nation).


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

**Comparison of 2014 Average Annual Pay by Supersector**

Supersector	Love County	State of Oklahoma	United States	Percent of State	Percent of Nation
Federal Government	\$43,614	\$66,411	\$75,784	65.7%	57.6%
State Government	\$39,908	\$44,721	\$54,184	89.2%	73.7%
Local Government	\$35,718	\$36,300	\$46,146	98.4%	77.4%
Natural Resources and Mining	\$32,823	\$87,445	\$59,666	37.5%	55.0%
Construction	\$51,466	\$47,127	\$55,041	109.2%	93.5%
Manufacturing	\$28,049	\$53,614	\$62,977	52.3%	44.5%
Trade, Transportation, and Utilities	\$36,516	\$40,563	\$42,988	90.0%	84.9%
Information	N/A	\$54,513	\$90,804	N/A	N/A
Financial Activities	\$25,525	\$53,212	\$85,261	48.0%	29.9%
Professional and Business Services	\$29,907	\$47,890	\$66,657	62.4%	44.9%
Education and Health Services	\$24,585	\$41,536	\$45,951	59.2%	53.5%
Leisure and Hospitality	\$20,684	\$16,568	\$20,993	124.8%	98.5%
Other Services	N/A	\$31,669	\$33,935	N/A	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$32,249</b>	<b>\$43,774</b>	<b>\$51,361</b>	<b>73.7%</b>	<b>62.8%</b>

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, Love County has higher average wages in construction and leisure and hospitality, and lower average wages in all other supersectors.

## Working Families

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

<b>Families by Employment Status and Presence of Children</b>						
	<b>Marietta</b>		<b>Love County</b>		<b>State of Oklahoma</b>	
	<b>No.</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<b>Total Families</b>	<b>620</b>		<b>2,561</b>		<b>961,468</b>	
With Children <18 Years:	348	56.13%	989	38.62%	425,517	44.26%
Married Couple:	171	49.14%	663	67.04%	281,418	66.14%
Both Parents Employed	131	76.61%	457	68.93%	166,700	59.24%
One Parent Employed	27	15.79%	171	25.79%	104,817	37.25%
Neither Parent Employed	13	7.60%	35	5.28%	9,901	3.52%
Other Family:	177	50.86%	326	32.96%	144,099	33.86%
Male Householder:	35	19.77%	94	28.83%	36,996	25.67%
Employed	28	80.00%	79	84.04%	31,044	83.91%
Not Employed	7	20.00%	15	15.96%	5,952	16.09%
Female Householder:	142	80.23%	232	71.17%	107,103	74.33%
Employed	118	83.10%	181	78.02%	75,631	70.62%
Not Employed	24	16.90%	51	21.98%	31,472	29.38%
Without Children <18 Years:	272	43.87%	1,572	61.38%	535,951	55.74%
Married Couple:	216	79.41%	1,386	88.17%	431,868	80.58%
Both Spouses Employed	40	18.52%	410	29.58%	167,589	38.81%
One Spouse Employed	108	50.00%	467	33.69%	138,214	32.00%
Neither Spouse Employed	68	31.48%	509	36.72%	126,065	29.19%
Other Family:	56	20.59%	186	11.83%	104,083	19.42%
Male Householder:	24	35.29%	67	13.16%	32,243	25.58%
Employed	10	41.67%	38	56.72%	19,437	60.28%
Not Employed	14	58.33%	29	43.28%	12,806	39.72%
Female Householder:	32	57.14%	119	63.98%	71,840	69.02%
Employed	2	6.25%	32	26.89%	36,601	50.95%
Not Employed	30	93.75%	87	73.11%	35,239	49.05%
<b>Total Working Families:</b>	<b>464</b>	<b>74.84%</b>	<b>1,835</b>	<b>71.65%</b>	<b>740,033</b>	<b>76.97%</b>
<b>With Children &lt;18 Years:</b>	<b>304</b>	<b>65.52%</b>	<b>888</b>	<b>48.39%</b>	<b>378,192</b>	<b>51.10%</b>
<b>Without Children &lt;18 Years:</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>34.48%</b>	<b>947</b>	<b>51.61%</b>	<b>361,841</b>	<b>48.90%</b>

Source: 2009-2013 American Community Survey, Table B23007

Within Love County, there are 1,835 working families, 48.39% of which have children under the age of 18 present. This compares with 51.10% in Oklahoma as a whole.

## Major Employers

Major employers include Dollar Tree's Marietta Distribution Center, CNI Manufacturing, Ferina Carbide Tool Company, the Red River Rural Electric Association, and the WinStar Casino. The influence of the WinStar Casino cannot be understated: it is the largest casino in Oklahoma and among the largest in the world in terms of gaming floor area. In addition to its local employment base, the area is easily accessible to the Ardmore submarket.

## Commuting Patterns

### Travel Time to Work

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

#### Workers 16 Years and Over by Commuting Time to Work

	Marietta		Love County		State of Oklahoma	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
<b>Commuting Workers:</b>	<b>998</b>		<b>3,736</b>		<b>1,613,364</b>	
Less than 15 minutes	418	41.88%	1,119	29.95%	581,194	36.02%
15 to 30 minutes	388	38.88%	1,313	35.14%	625,885	38.79%
30 to 45 minutes	160	16.03%	907	24.28%	260,192	16.13%
45 to 60 minutes	13	1.30%	178	4.76%	74,625	4.63%
60 or more minutes	19	1.90%	219	5.86%	71,468	4.43%

Source: 2009-2013 American Community Survey, Table B08303

Within Love County, the largest percentage of workers (35.14%) travel 15 to 30 minutes to work. Although Love County has an active labor market, many of its residents commute to other labor markets, such as Ardmore or areas of northern Texas.

### Means of Transportation

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

#### Workers 16 Years and Over by Means of Transportation to Work

	Marietta		Love County		State of Oklahoma	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
<b>Total Workers Age 16+</b>	<b>1,031</b>		<b>3,965</b>		<b>1,673,026</b>	
Car, Truck or Van:	969	93.99%	3,649	92.03%	1,551,461	92.73%
<i>Drove Alone</i>	<i>850</i>	<i>87.72%</i>	<i>3,242</i>	<i>88.85%</i>	<i>1,373,407</i>	<i>88.52%</i>
<i>Carpooled</i>	<i>119</i>	<i>12.28%</i>	<i>407</i>	<i>11.15%</i>	<i>178,054</i>	<i>11.48%</i>
Public Transportation	2	0.19%	13	0.33%	8,092	0.48%
Taxicab	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	984	0.06%
Motorcycle	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	3,757	0.22%
Bicycle	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	4,227	0.25%
Walked	15	1.45%	47	1.19%	30,401	1.82%
Other Means	12	1.16%	27	0.68%	14,442	0.86%
Worked at Home	33	3.20%	229	5.78%	59,662	3.57%

Source: 2009-2013 American Community Survey, Table B08301

As shown, the vast majority of persons in Love 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 Love County. This data is provided as of the 2000 Census, the 2010 Census, with a 2015 estimate furnished by Nielsen SiteReports.

<b>Total Housing Units</b>					
	2000 Census	2010 Census	Annual Change	2015 Estimate	Annual Change
Marietta	1,094	1,115	0.19%	1,167	0.92%
Love County	4,066	4,539	1.11%	4,764	0.97%
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 Love County grew by 0.97% per year, to a total of 4,764 housing units in 2015. In terms of new housing unit construction, Love County outpaced Oklahoma as a whole between 2010 and 2015.

### Housing by Units in Structure

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

<b>2013 Housing Units by Units in Structure</b>						
	Marietta		Love County		State of Oklahoma	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
<b>Total Housing Units</b>	<b>1,116</b>		<b>4,521</b>		<b>1,669,828</b>	
1 Unit, Detached	903	80.91%	3,255	72.00%	1,219,987	73.06%
1 Unit, Attached	7	0.63%	32	0.71%	34,434	2.06%
Duplex Units	28	2.51%	28	0.62%	34,207	2.05%
3-4 Units	60	5.38%	79	1.75%	42,069	2.52%
5-9 Units	62	5.56%	68	1.50%	59,977	3.59%
10-19 Units	14	1.25%	14	0.31%	57,594	3.45%
20-49 Units	4	0.36%	4	0.09%	29,602	1.77%
50 or More Units	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	30,240	1.81%
Mobile Homes	38	3.41%	1,033	22.85%	159,559	9.56%
Boat, RV, Van, etc.	0	0.00%	8	0.18%	2,159	0.13%
<b>Total Multifamily Units</b>	<b>168</b>	<b>15.05%</b>	<b>193</b>	<b>4.27%</b>	<b>253,689</b>	<b>15.19%</b>

Source: 2009-2013 American Community Survey, Table B25024

Within Love County, 72.00% of housing units are single-family, detached. 4.27% of housing units are multifamily in structure (two or more units per building), while 23.03% of housing units comprise mobile homes, RVs, etc.

Within Marietta, 80.91% of housing units are single-family, detached. 15.05% of housing units are multifamily in structure, while 3.41% of housing units comprise mobile homes, RVs, etc.

Compared with the rest of the state, Love County has relatively few multifamily housing units, but a much larger percentage of mobile homes.

### Housing Units Number of Bedrooms and Tenure

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

#### 2013 Housing Units by Tenure and Number of Bedrooms

	Marietta		Love County		State of Oklahoma	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
<b>Total Occupied Housing Units</b>	<b>848</b>		<b>3,378</b>		<b>1,444,081</b>	
<b>Owner Occupied:</b>	<b>470</b>	<b>55.42%</b>	<b>2,561</b>	<b>75.81%</b>	<b>968,736</b>	<b>67.08%</b>
No Bedroom	0	0.00%	5	0.20%	2,580	0.27%
1 Bedroom	0	0.00%	56	2.19%	16,837	1.74%
2 Bedrooms	118	25.11%	521	20.34%	166,446	17.18%
3 Bedrooms	301	64.04%	1,648	64.35%	579,135	59.78%
4 Bedrooms	51	10.85%	304	11.87%	177,151	18.29%
5 or More Bedrooms	0	0.00%	27	1.05%	26,587	2.74%
<b>Renter Occupied:</b>	<b>378</b>	<b>44.58%</b>	<b>817</b>	<b>24.19%</b>	<b>475,345</b>	<b>32.92%</b>
No Bedroom	25	6.61%	25	3.06%	13,948	2.93%
1 Bedroom	51	13.49%	85	10.40%	101,850	21.43%
2 Bedrooms	134	35.45%	252	30.84%	179,121	37.68%
3 Bedrooms	137	36.24%	366	44.80%	152,358	32.05%
4 Bedrooms	31	8.20%	81	9.91%	24,968	5.25%
5 or More Bedrooms	0	0.00%	8	0.98%	3,100	0.65%

Source: 2009-2013 American Community Survey, Table B25042

The overall homeownership rate in Love County is 75.81%, while 24.19% of housing units are renter occupied. In Marietta, the homeownership rate is 55.42%, while 44.58% of households are renters. Compared with the rest of the state, Love County as a whole has a higher rate of homeownership, but Marietta has a much lower rate of homeownership.

### Housing Units Tenure and Household Income

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

---

**Love County Owner/Renter Percentages by Income Band in 2013**


---

Household Income	Total Households	Total Owners	Total Renters	% Owners	% Renters
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,378</b>	<b>2,561</b>	<b>817</b>	<b>75.81%</b>	<b>24.19%</b>
Less than \$5,000	113	69	44	61.06%	38.94%
\$5,000 - \$9,999	150	68	82	45.33%	54.67%
\$10,000-\$14,999	223	141	82	63.23%	36.77%
\$15,000-\$19,999	161	112	49	69.57%	30.43%
\$20,000-\$24,999	238	132	106	55.46%	44.54%
\$25,000-\$34,999	477	308	169	64.57%	35.43%
\$35,000-\$49,999	520	428	92	82.31%	17.69%
\$50,000-\$74,999	764	654	110	85.60%	14.40%
\$75,000-\$99,999	397	344	53	86.65%	13.35%
\$100,000-\$149,999	234	210	24	89.74%	10.26%
\$150,000 or more	101	95	6	94.06%	5.94%
<b>Income Less Than \$25,000</b>	<b>885</b>	<b>522</b>	<b>363</b>	<b>58.98%</b>	<b>41.02%</b>

Source: 2009-2013 American Community Survey, Table B25118

---

Within Love County as a whole, 41.02% of households with incomes less than \$25,000 are estimated to be renters, while 58.98% are estimated to be homeowners.

---

**Marietta Owner/Renter Percentages by Income Band in 2013**


---

Household Income	Total Households	Total Owners	Total Renters	% Owners	% Renters
<b>Total</b>	<b>848</b>	<b>470</b>	<b>378</b>	<b>55.42%</b>	<b>44.58%</b>
Less than \$5,000	27	0	27	0.00%	100.00%
\$5,000 - \$9,999	43	14	29	32.56%	67.44%
\$10,000-\$14,999	62	28	34	45.16%	54.84%
\$15,000-\$19,999	54	28	26	51.85%	48.15%
\$20,000-\$24,999	95	11	84	11.58%	88.42%
\$25,000-\$34,999	154	71	83	46.10%	53.90%
\$35,000-\$49,999	127	94	33	74.02%	25.98%
\$50,000-\$74,999	220	176	44	80.00%	20.00%
\$75,000-\$99,999	38	26	12	68.42%	31.58%
\$100,000-\$149,999	9	3	6	33.33%	66.67%
\$150,000 or more	19	19	0	100.00%	0.00%
<b>Income Less Than \$25,000</b>	<b>281</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>28.83%</b>	<b>71.17%</b>

Source: 2009-2013 American Community Survey, Table B25118

---

Within Marietta, 71.17% of households with incomes less than \$25,000 are estimated to be renters, while 28.83% 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.

<b>2013 Housing Units by Tenure and Year of Construction</b>						
	<b>Marietta</b>		<b>Love County</b>		<b>State of Oklahoma</b>	
	<b>No.</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<b>Total Occupied Housing Units</b>	<b>848</b>		<b>3,378</b>		<b>1,444,081</b>	
<b>Owner Occupied:</b>	<b>470</b>	<b>55.42%</b>	<b>2,561</b>	<b>75.81%</b>	<b>968,736</b>	<b>67.08%</b>
Built 2010 or Later	7	1.49%	50	1.95%	10,443	1.08%
Built 2000 to 2009	14	2.98%	386	15.07%	153,492	15.84%
Built 1990 to 1999	25	5.32%	452	17.65%	125,431	12.95%
Built 1980 to 1989	72	15.32%	599	23.39%	148,643	15.34%
Built 1970 to 1979	132	28.09%	510	19.91%	184,378	19.03%
Built 1960 to 1969	67	14.26%	193	7.54%	114,425	11.81%
Built 1950 to 1959	76	16.17%	181	7.07%	106,544	11.00%
Built 1940 to 1949	45	9.57%	96	3.75%	50,143	5.18%
Built 1939 or Earlier	32	6.81%	94	3.67%	75,237	7.77%
Median Year Built:		1971		1983		1977
<b>Renter Occupied:</b>	<b>378</b>	<b>44.58%</b>	<b>817</b>	<b>24.19%</b>	<b>475,345</b>	<b>32.92%</b>
Built 2010 or Later	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	5,019	1.06%
Built 2000 to 2009	54	14.29%	90	11.02%	50,883	10.70%
Built 1990 to 1999	92	24.34%	203	24.85%	47,860	10.07%
Built 1980 to 1989	48	12.70%	100	12.24%	77,521	16.31%
Built 1970 to 1979	64	16.93%	143	17.50%	104,609	22.01%
Built 1960 to 1969	50	13.23%	69	8.45%	64,546	13.58%
Built 1950 to 1959	45	11.90%	127	15.54%	54,601	11.49%
Built 1940 to 1949	20	5.29%	52	6.36%	31,217	6.57%
Built 1939 or Earlier	5	1.32%	33	4.04%	39,089	8.22%
Median Year Built:		1981		1979		1975
<b>Overall Median Year Built:</b>		<b>1971</b>		<b>1983</b>		<b>1976</b>

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

Within Love County, 15.57% of housing units were built after the year 2000. This compares with 15.22% statewide. Within Marietta the percentage is 8.84%.

65.04% of housing units in Love County were built prior to 1990, while in Marietta the percentage is 77.36%. These figures compare with the statewide figure of 72.78%. This data suggests that most new housing construction in Love County is occurring outside of Marietta.

### Substandard Housing

The next table presents data regarding substandard housing in Love 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	
	Units	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Marietta	848	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	5	0.59%
Love County	3,378	19	0.56%	6	0.18%	74	2.19%
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 Love County, 0.56% of occupied housing units have inadequate plumbing (compared with 0.49% at a statewide level), while 0.18% 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 Love County by vacancy and type. This data is provided by the American Community Survey.

<b>2013 Housing Units by Vacancy</b>						
	<b>Marietta</b>		<b>Love County</b>		<b>State of Oklahoma</b>	
	<b>No.</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<b>Total Housing Units</b>	1,116		4,521		1,669,828	
Total Vacant Units	268	24.01%	1,143	25.28%	225,747	13.52%
For rent	176	65.67%	305	26.68%	43,477	19.26%
Rented, not occupied	4	1.49%	17	1.49%	9,127	4.04%
For sale only	10	3.73%	51	4.46%	23,149	10.25%
Sold, not occupied	30	11.19%	202	17.67%	8,618	3.82%
For seasonal, recreational, or occasional use	21	7.84%	379	33.16%	39,475	17.49%
For migrant workers	0	0.00%	2	0.17%	746	0.33%
Other vacant	27	10.07%	187	16.36%	101,155	44.81%
<b>Homeowner Vacancy Rate</b>	1.96%		1.81%		2.31%	
<b>Rental Vacancy Rate</b>	31.54%		26.78%		8.24%	

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

Within Love County, the overall housing vacancy rate is estimated to be 25.28%. The homeowner vacancy rate is estimated to be 1.81%, while the rental vacancy rate is estimated to be 26.78%.

In Marietta, the overall housing vacancy rate is estimated to be 24.01%. The homeowner vacancy rate is estimated to be 1.96%, while the rental vacancy rate is estimated to be 31.54%.

Compared with the rest of the state, Marietta and Love County as a whole have somewhat lower vacancy among homes intended for ownership, but much higher vacancy among rental units.

## Building Permits

The next table presents data regarding new residential building permits issued in Marietta. 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.

## Marietta

### New Residential Building Permits Issued, 2004-2014

Year	Single Family Units	Avg. Construction Cost	Multifamily Units	Avg. Multifamily Construction Cost
2004	0	N/A	12	\$25,000
2005	17	\$26,765	0	N/A
2006	1	\$136,000	0	N/A
2007	0	N/A	0	N/A
2008	0	N/A	0	N/A
2009	0	N/A	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 Marietta, building permits for 30 housing units were issued between 2004 and 2014, for an average of 3 units per year. 60.00% of these housing units were single family homes, and 40.00% consisted of multifamily units. As noted previously, most new construction in Love County appears to be occurring outside of the city limits of Marietta, where building permits would not be required.

### New Construction Activity

#### For Ownership:

Much of the new construction in Love County has occurred in unincorporated areas outside of Marietta, or in smaller communities such as Thackerville, or around the Falconhead Resort. Some new construction has occurred on infill lots in Marietta, and new homes have been constructed in the McElreath addition. Some of the new construction in Love County has been reasonably affordable, but much is priced well outside of what could be afforded by a household earning at or less than area median income. For homes sold since January 2014, that were constructed after 2000, the average sale price is \$314,452 or \$114.49 per square foot. Excluding sales of homes over \$1,000,000, the average is \$193,630, or \$100.76 per square foot. Either figure is likely far more than can be afforded by a household with an annual income of \$45,146, which is the 2015 estimate of median household income for Love County.

#### For Rent:

To the best of our knowledge, no rental housing units of any kind have been constructed in Love County in the last ten years, and none are planned to our knowledge. At one point in the recent past, 30 homes were proposed for construction in Marietta which would have been subject to the Affordable Housing Tax Credit program, but to our knowledge this development is no longer planned.

## Homeownership Market

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

### Housing Units by Home Value

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

<b>2013 Housing Units by Home Value</b>						
	<b>Marietta</b>		<b>Love County</b>		<b>State of Oklahoma</b>	
	<b>No.</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<b>Total Owner-Occupied Units:</b>	<b>470</b>		<b>2,561</b>		<b>968,736</b>	
Less than \$10,000	6	1.28%	93	3.63%	20,980	2.17%
\$10,000 to \$14,999	16	3.40%	56	2.19%	15,427	1.59%
\$15,000 to \$19,999	0	0.00%	42	1.64%	13,813	1.43%
\$20,000 to \$24,999	33	7.02%	98	3.83%	16,705	1.72%
\$25,000 to \$29,999	10	2.13%	24	0.94%	16,060	1.66%
\$30,000 to \$34,999	25	5.32%	118	4.61%	19,146	1.98%
\$35,000 to \$39,999	25	5.32%	62	2.42%	14,899	1.54%
\$40,000 to \$49,999	17	3.62%	109	4.26%	39,618	4.09%
\$50,000 to \$59,999	73	15.53%	190	7.42%	45,292	4.68%
\$60,000 to \$69,999	71	15.11%	228	8.90%	52,304	5.40%
\$70,000 to \$79,999	61	12.98%	250	9.76%	55,612	5.74%
\$80,000 to \$89,999	52	11.06%	201	7.85%	61,981	6.40%
\$90,000 to \$99,999	26	5.53%	86	3.36%	51,518	5.32%
\$100,000 to \$124,999	15	3.19%	269	10.50%	119,416	12.33%
\$125,000 to \$149,999	9	1.91%	160	6.25%	96,769	9.99%
\$150,000 to \$174,999	14	2.98%	179	6.99%	91,779	9.47%
\$175,000 to \$199,999	5	1.06%	62	2.42%	53,304	5.50%
\$200,000 to \$249,999	3	0.64%	110	4.30%	69,754	7.20%
\$250,000 to \$299,999	0	0.00%	96	3.75%	41,779	4.31%
\$300,000 to \$399,999	9	1.91%	72	2.81%	37,680	3.89%
\$400,000 to \$499,999	0	0.00%	13	0.51%	13,334	1.38%
\$500,000 to \$749,999	0	0.00%	16	0.62%	12,784	1.32%
\$750,000 to \$999,999	0	0.00%	4	0.16%	3,764	0.39%
\$1,000,000 or more	0	0.00%	23	0.90%	5,018	0.52%
<b>Median Home Value:</b>	<b>\$64,200</b>		<b>\$80,500</b>		<b>\$112,800</b>	


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

The median value of owner-occupied homes in Love County is \$80,500. This is -28.6% lower than the statewide median, which is \$112,800. The median home value in Marietta is estimated to be \$64,200.

The geographic distribution of home values in Love County can be visualized by the following map. As can be seen, the lowest home values are in and around Marietta, while the highest are in areas surrounding Marietta, including the Falconhead Resort.



### Love County Median Home Values by Census Tract



## Home Values by Year of Construction

The next table presents median home values in Love 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

	Marietta Median Value	Love County Median Value	State of Oklahoma Median Value
<b>Total Owner-Occupied Units:</b>			
Built 2010 or Later	-	\$136,500	\$188,900
Built 2000 to 2009	\$74,300	\$95,900	\$178,000
Built 1990 to 1999	\$127,500	\$89,200	\$147,300
Built 1980 to 1989	\$68,400	\$102,900	\$118,300
Built 1970 to 1979	\$73,600	\$74,700	\$111,900
Built 1960 to 1969	\$62,100	\$74,300	\$97,100
Built 1950 to 1959	\$53,800	\$54,700	\$80,300
Built 1940 to 1949	\$38,800	\$51,500	\$67,900
Built 1939 or Earlier	\$55,700	\$72,500	\$74,400

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

Source: 2009-2013 American Community Survey, Table 25107

## Marietta Single Family Sales Activity

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

### Marietta Single Family Sales Activity

#### Two Bedroom Units

Year	2011	2012	2013	2014	YTD 2015
# of Units Sold	16	18	17	11	2
Average Sale Price	\$34,036	\$60,667	\$36,312	\$46,182	\$48,250
Average Square Feet	1,217	1,162	1,018	1,029	990
Average Price/SF	\$27.97	\$52.21	\$35.67	\$44.88	\$48.74
Average Year Built	1953	1948	1960	1973	1980

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

---

**Marietta Single Family Sales Activity**  
**Three Bedroom Units**

Year	2011	2012	2013	2014	YTD 2015
# of Units Sold	24	12	21	13	14
Average Sale Price	\$61,071	\$60,750	\$74,095	\$76,769	\$74,357
Average Square Feet	1,437	1,656	1,523	1,448	1,270
Average Price/SF	\$42.50	\$36.68	\$48.65	\$53.02	\$58.55
Average Year Built	1973	1974	1966	1957	1967

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

---

**Marietta Single Family Sales Activity**  
**Four Bedroom Units**

Year	2011	2012	2013	2014	YTD 2015
# of Units Sold	4	1	2	2	1
Average Sale Price	\$62,375	\$127,500	\$207,500	\$66,250	\$132,000
Average Square Feet	1,774	1,698	3,084	1,904	1,637
Average Price/SF	\$35.16	\$75.09	\$67.28	\$34.80	\$80.64
Average Year Built	1970	2011	2003	1922	2010

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

---

**Marietta Single Family Sales Activity**  
**All Bedroom Types**

Year	2011	2012	2013	2014	YTD 2015
# of Units Sold	46	32	40	26	17
Average Sale Price	\$50,462	\$63,089	\$65,436	\$63,019	\$74,676
Average Square Feet	1,363	1,342	1,386	1,306	1,259
Average Price/SF	\$37.02	\$47.01	\$47.21	\$48.25	\$59.31
Average Year Built	1965	1960	1965	1961	1971

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

Between 2011 and 2014, the average sale price grew by 5.71% per year. The average sale price in 2015 was \$74,676 for an average price per square foot of \$59.31/SF. This data suggests a steadily strengthening market for homes, though the market is relatively older with an average age typically in the 1960s.

### Foreclosure Rates

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

---

**Foreclosure Rates**

---

<b>Geography</b>	<b>% of Outstanding Mortgages in Foreclosure, May 2014</b>
Love County	1.1%
State of Oklahoma	2.1%
United States	2.1%
Rank among Counties in Oklahoma*:	55

---

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

---

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

---

According to the data provided, the foreclosure rate in Love County was 1.1% in May 2014. The county ranked 55 out of 64 counties in terms of highest foreclosure rates in Oklahoma. This rate compares with the statewide and nationwide foreclosure rates, both of which were 2.1%. With one of the lowest foreclosure rates in the state, it is likely that foreclosures have not had as significant an impact on Love County as many other areas of Oklahoma.

## Rental Market

This section will discuss supply and demand factors for the rental market in Love 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 Love 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).

<b>2013 Rental Units by Gross Rent</b>						
	<b>Marietta</b>		<b>Love County</b>		<b>State of Oklahoma</b>	
	<b>No.</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<b>Total Rental Units:</b>	<b>378</b>		<b>817</b>		<b>475,345</b>	
With cash rent:	294		562		432,109	
Less than \$100	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2,025	0.43%
\$100 to \$149	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2,109	0.44%
\$150 to \$199	18	4.76%	24	2.94%	4,268	0.90%
\$200 to \$249	20	5.29%	29	3.55%	8,784	1.85%
\$250 to \$299	23	6.08%	23	2.82%	8,413	1.77%
\$300 to \$349	14	3.70%	29	3.55%	9,107	1.92%
\$350 to \$399	0	0.00%	24	2.94%	10,932	2.30%
\$400 to \$449	0	0.00%	12	1.47%	15,636	3.29%
\$450 to \$499	13	3.44%	20	2.45%	24,055	5.06%
\$500 to \$549	6	1.59%	24	2.94%	31,527	6.63%
\$550 to \$599	57	15.08%	112	13.71%	33,032	6.95%
\$600 to \$649	17	4.50%	20	2.45%	34,832	7.33%
\$650 to \$699	25	6.61%	38	4.65%	32,267	6.79%
\$700 to \$749	16	4.23%	53	6.49%	30,340	6.38%
\$750 to \$799	16	4.23%	33	4.04%	27,956	5.88%
\$800 to \$899	56	14.81%	83	10.16%	45,824	9.64%
\$900 to \$999	10	2.65%	25	3.06%	34,153	7.18%
\$1,000 to \$1,249	3	0.79%	8	0.98%	46,884	9.86%
\$1,250 to \$1,499	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	14,699	3.09%
\$1,500 to \$1,999	0	0.00%	5	0.61%	10,145	2.13%
\$2,000 or more	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	5,121	1.08%
No cash rent	84	22.22%	255	31.21%	43,236	9.10%
<b>Median Gross Rent</b>		<b>\$596</b>		<b>\$593</b>		<b>\$699</b>

Sources: 2009-2013 American Community Survey, Tables B25063 and B25064

Median gross rent in Love County is estimated to be \$593, which is -15.2% less than Oklahoma's median gross rent of \$699/month. Median gross rent in Marietta is estimated to be \$596.

### Median Gross Rent by Year of Construction

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

#### 2013 Median Gross Rent by Year of Construction

	Marietta Median Rent	Love County Median Rent	State of Oklahoma Median Rent
<b>Total Rental Units:</b>			
Built 2010 or Later	-	-	\$933
Built 2000 to 2009	\$614	\$578	\$841
Built 1990 to 1999	\$599	\$656	\$715
Built 1980 to 1989	\$650	\$550	\$693
Built 1970 to 1979	\$666	\$486	\$662
Built 1960 to 1969	\$669	\$681	\$689
Built 1950 to 1959	\$575	\$665	\$714
Built 1940 to 1949	-	\$417	\$673
Built 1939 or Earlier	-	\$588	\$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 Love County is among housing units constructed between 1960 and 1969 (likely representing rental homes rather than apartments), which is \$681 per month. In order to be affordable, a household would need to earn at least \$27,240 per year to afford such a unit.

### Marietta Rental Survey Data

The next two tables show the results of our rental survey of Marietta. There is relatively little multifamily rental housing in Marietta.

#### Marietta Rental Properties - Affordable

Name	Type	Year Built	Bedrooms	Rate
Northpark Apartments	USDA/LIHTC - Family	1980	1	30%
Northpark Apartments	USDA/LIHTC - Family	1980	2	30%
Northpark Apartments	USDA/LIHTC - Family	1980	3	30%

Northpark Apartments comprises 30 units with USDA rental assistance, for family occupancy. It is also subject to the Affordable Housing Tax Credit program. Rental rates at this property are based on 30% of the tenant's income.

#### Rental Market Vacancy – Marietta

The overall market vacancy of rental housing units was reported at 31.54% by the Census Bureau as of the most recent American Community Survey. This figure includes all rental properties in Marietta,

including rental houses. We note that HUD reports the overall occupancy rate of HUD-assisted units in Love County at 88% as of the most recent Picture of Subsidized Households dataset.

## 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 Love 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.

<b>HUD Programs in Love County</b>						
<b>Love County</b>	<b># Units</b>	<b>Occupancy Rate</b>	<b>Avg. Household Income</b>	<b>Tenant Contribution</b>	<b>Federal Contribution</b>	<b>% of Total Rent</b>
Public Housing	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Housing Choice Vouchers	1	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	30	87%	\$9,319	\$219	\$447	32.91%
Section 236	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Multi-Family Other	20	90%	\$13,106	\$287	\$123	70.00%
Summary of All HUD Programs	51	88%	\$10,929	\$250	\$319	43.87%
<b>State of Oklahoma</b>						
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%
<b>United States</b>						
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 51 housing units located within Love County, with an overall occupancy rate of 88%. The average household income among households living in these units is \$10,929. Total monthly rent for these units averages \$569, with the federal contribution averaging \$319 (56.13%) and the tenant's contribution averaging \$250 (43.87%).

**Percentage of Total Rent Paid by Tenant - HUD Subsidized Properties**



Source: 2013 HUD Picture of Subsidized Households

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





---

**Demographics of Persons in HUD Programs in Love County**


---

<b>Love County</b>	<b># Units</b>	<b>% Single Mothers</b>	<b>% w/ Disability</b>	<b>% Age 62+</b>	<b>% Age 62+ w/ Disability</b>	<b>% Minority</b>
Public Housing	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Housing Choice Vouchers	1	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	30	42%	17%	4%	100%	15%
Section 236	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Multi-Family Other	20	0%	0%	100%	0%	6%
<b>Summary of All HUD Programs</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>11%</b>
<b>State of Oklahoma</b>						
Public Housing	13,088	33%	22%	28%	63%	44%
Housing Choice Vouchers	24,651	46%	25%	17%	77%	60%
Mod Rehab	158	46%	17%	13%	67%	42%
Section 8 NC/SR	4,756	14%	32%	52%	28%	25%
Section 236	428	32%	22%	24%	32%	33%
Multi-Family Other	7,518	42%	12%	22%	25%	47%
<b>Summary of All HUD Programs</b>	<b>50,599</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>50%</b>
<b>United States</b>						
Public Housing	1,150,867	36%	20%	31%	48%	71%
Housing Choice Vouchers	2,386,237	44%	22%	22%	68%	67%
Mod Rehab	19,148	28%	27%	24%	69%	71%
Section 8 NC/SR	840,900	18%	21%	56%	19%	45%
Section 236	126,859	25%	13%	47%	16%	59%
Multi-Family Other	656,456	31%	13%	44%	16%	63%
<b>Summary of All HUD Programs</b>	<b>5,180,467</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>64%</b>

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


---

25% of housing units are occupied by single parents with female heads of household. 13% of households have at least one person with a disability. 41% of households have either a householder or spouse age 62 or above. Of the households age 62 or above, 5% have one or more disabilities. Finally, 11% of households are designated as racial or ethnic minorities.

---

**Percentage of Households with Disabilities - HUD Subsidized Properties**

---




Source: 2013 HUD Picture of Subsidized Households

---

---

**Percentage of Households Age 62+ - HUD Subsidized Properties**

---



Source: 2013 HUD Picture of Subsidized Households


---



---

**Percentage of Minority Households - HUD Subsidized Properties**

---



---

Source: 2013 HUD Picture of Subsidized Households

---



## Projected Housing Need

### Consolidated Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS)

This section will analyze data from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development's Consolidated Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) dataset for Love 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 Love 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.

<b>Love County : CHAS - Housing Cost Burden by HAMFI</b>				
<b>Household Income / Cost Burden</b>	<b>Owners</b>		<b>Renters</b>	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
<b>Income &lt; 30% HAMFI</b>	<b>240</b>		<b>195</b>	
Cost Burden Less Than 30%	40	16.67%	110	56.41%
Cost Burden Between 30%-50%	55	22.92%	30	15.38%
Cost Burden Greater Than 50%	100	41.67%	40	20.51%
Not Computed (no/negative income)	45	18.75%	15	7.69%
<b>Income 30%-50% HAMFI</b>	<b>175</b>		<b>180</b>	
Cost Burden Less Than 30%	125	71.43%	100	55.56%
Cost Burden Between 30%-50%	40	22.86%	60	33.33%
Cost Burden Greater Than 50%	15	8.57%	20	11.11%
Not Computed (no/negative income)	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
<b>Income 50%-80% HAMFI</b>	<b>415</b>		<b>175</b>	
Cost Burden Less Than 30%	355	85.54%	150	85.71%
Cost Burden Between 30%-50%	40	9.64%	20	11.43%
Cost Burden Greater Than 50%	15	3.61%	4	2.29%
Not Computed (no/negative income)	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
<b>Income 80%-100% HAMFI</b>	<b>235</b>		<b>85</b>	
Cost Burden Less Than 30%	215	91.49%	85	100.00%
Cost Burden Between 30%-50%	20	8.51%	0	0.00%
Cost Burden Greater Than 50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Not Computed (no/negative income)	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
<b>All Incomes</b>	<b>2,615</b>		<b>875</b>	
Cost Burden Less Than 30%	2,245	85.85%	685	78.29%
Cost Burden Between 30%-50%	195	7.46%	110	12.57%
Cost Burden Greater Than 50%	130	4.97%	64	7.31%
Not Computed (no/negative income)	45	1.72%	15	1.71%


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 Love County with the State of Oklahoma as a whole, and the United States.

<b>Love County : Households by Income by Cost Burden</b>				
<b>Household Income Threshold</b>	<b>Owners</b>		<b>Renters</b>	
	Total	% w/ Cost > 30% Income	Total	% w/ Cost > 30% Income
Income < 30% HAMFI	240	64.58%	195	35.90%
Income 30%-50% HAMFI	175	31.43%	180	44.44%
Income 50%-80% HAMFI	415	13.25%	175	13.71%
Income 80%-100% HAMFI	235	8.51%	85	0.00%
All Incomes	2,615	12.43%	875	19.89%

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

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



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

**Substandard Conditions / Overcrowding by Income Threshold**

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

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

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

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

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

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



**Love County : CHAS - HAMFI by Substandard Conditions / Overcrowding**

Household Income / Housing Problem	Owners		Renters	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
<b>Income &lt; 30% HAMFI</b>	<b>240</b>		<b>195</b>	
Between 1.0 and 1.5 Persons per Room	15	6.25%	25	12.82%
More than 1.5 Persons per Room	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Lacks Complete Kitchen or Plumbing	0	0.00%	10	5.13%
<b>Income 30%-50% HAMFI</b>	<b>175</b>		<b>180</b>	
Between 1.0 and 1.5 Persons per Room	0	0.00%	4	2.22%
More than 1.5 Persons per Room	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Lacks Complete Kitchen or Plumbing	0	0.00%	4	2.22%
<b>Income 50%-80% HAMFI</b>	<b>415</b>		<b>175</b>	
Between 1.0 and 1.5 Persons per Room	4	0.96%	10	5.71%
More than 1.5 Persons per Room	0	0.00%	4	2.29%
Lacks Complete Kitchen or Plumbing	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
<b>Income 80%-100% HAMFI</b>	<b>235</b>		<b>85</b>	
Between 1.0 and 1.5 Persons per Room	4	1.70%	20	23.53%
More than 1.5 Persons per Room	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Lacks Complete Kitchen or Plumbing	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
<b>All Incomes</b>	<b>2,615</b>		<b>875</b>	
Between 1.0 and 1.5 Persons per Room	38	1.45%	69	7.89%
More than 1.5 Persons per Room	0	0.00%	4	0.46%
Lacks Complete Kitchen or Plumbing	0	0.00%	18	2.06%

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 Love County, Oklahoma and the nation.

**Love County : Households by Income by Overcrowding**

Household Income Threshold	Total	Owners		Renters	
		% > 1.0 Persons per Room	Total	% > 1.0 Persons per Room	Total
Income < 30% HAMFI	240	6.25%	195	12.82%	195
Income 30%-50% HAMFI	175	0.00%	180	2.22%	180
Income 50%-80% HAMFI	415	0.96%	175	8.00%	175
Income 80%-100% HAMFI	235	1.70%	85	23.53%	85
All Incomes	2,615	1.45%	875	8.34%	875

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

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



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

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

**Love County : Households by Income by Substandard Conditions**


Household Size/Type	Total	Owners		Renters	
		% Lacking Kitchen or Plumbing	Total	% Lacking Kitchen or Plumbing	Total
Income < 30% HAMFI	240	0.00%	195	5.13%	195
Income 30%-50% HAMFI	175	0.00%	180	2.22%	180
Income 50%-80% HAMFI	415	0.00%	175	0.00%	175
Income 80%-100% HAMFI	235	0.00%	85	0.00%	85
All Incomes	2,615	0.00%	875	2.06%	875

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





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



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

**Cost Burden by Household Type**

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

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



<b>Love County : CHAS - Housing Cost Burden by Household Type / HAMFI</b>						
	Total	Owners			Renters	
		No. w/ Cost > 30% Income	Pct. w/ Cost > 30% Income	Total	No. w/ Cost > 30% Income	Pct. w/ Cost > 30% Income
<b>Income &lt; 30% HAMFI</b>	<b>240</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>62.50%</b>	<b>195</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>38.46%</b>
Elderly Family	40	35	87.50%	0	0	N/A
Small Family (2-4 persons)	60	20	33.33%	75	35	46.67%
Large Family (5 or more persons)	20	15	75.00%	15	10	66.67%
Elderly Non-Family	45	40	88.89%	65	10	15.38%
Non-Family, Non-Elderly	80	40	50.00%	40	20	50.00%
<b>Income 30%-50% HAMFI</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>30.29%</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>45.56%</b>
Elderly Family	50	20	40.00%	20	10	50.00%
Small Family (2-4 persons)	55	14	25.45%	55	29	52.73%
Large Family (5 or more persons)	0	0	N/A	30	25	83.33%
Elderly Non-Family	65	15	23.08%	30	4	13.33%
Non-Family, Non-Elderly	10	4	40.00%	50	14	28.00%
<b>Income 50%-80% HAMFI</b>	<b>415</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>14.94%</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>13.14%</b>
Elderly Family	145	4	2.76%	15	0	0.00%
Small Family (2-4 persons)	130	19	14.62%	95	19	20.00%
Large Family (5 or more persons)	25	10	40.00%	0	0	N/A
Elderly Non-Family	70	14	20.00%	10	0	0.00%
Non-Family, Non-Elderly	40	15	37.50%	55	4	7.27%
<b>Income 80%-100% HAMFI</b>	<b>235</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>8.09%</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.00%</b>
Elderly Family	85	15	17.65%	4	0	0.00%
Small Family (2-4 persons)	70	4	5.71%	25	0	0.00%
Large Family (5 or more persons)	30	0	0.00%	20	0	0.00%
Elderly Non-Family	50	0	0.00%	0	0	N/A
Non-Family, Non-Elderly	4	0	0.00%	40	0	0.00%
<b>All Incomes</b>	<b>2,615</b>	<b>326</b>	<b>12.47%</b>	<b>875</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>20.57%</b>
Elderly Family	660	78	11.82%	49	10	20.41%
Small Family (2-4 persons)	1,205	87	7.22%	405	83	20.49%
Large Family (5 or more persons)	165	25	15.15%	90	35	38.89%
Elderly Non-Family	310	73	23.55%	109	14	12.84%
Non-Family, Non-Elderly	279	63	22.58%	235	38	16.17%


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

**Love County : Households under 80% AMI by Cost Burden**

Household Size/Type	Total	Owners		Renters	
		No. w/ Cost > 30% Income	Pct. w/ Cost > 30% Income	No. w/ Cost > 30% Income	Pct. w/ Cost > 30% Income
<b>Income &lt; 80% HAMFI</b>	<b>830</b>	<b>265</b>	<b>31.93%</b>	<b>550</b>	<b>32.73%</b>
Elderly Family	235	59	25.11%	35	28.57%
Small Family (2-4 persons)	245	53	21.63%	225	36.89%
Large Family (5 or more persons)	45	25	55.56%	45	77.78%
Elderly Non-Family	180	69	38.33%	105	13.33%
Non-Family, Non-Elderly	130	59	45.38%	145	26.21%

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).



<b>Love County : CHAS - Housing Problems by Household Type and HAMFI</b>						
	Total	Owners			Renters	
		No. w/ Housing Problems	Pct. w/ Housing Problems	Total	No. w/ Housing Problems	Pct. w/ Housing Problems
<b>Income &lt; 30% HAMFI</b>	<b>240</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>64.58%</b>	<b>195</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>46.15%</b>
Elderly Family	40	35	87.50%	0	0	N/A
Small Family (2-4 persons)	60	20	33.33%	75	35	46.67%
Large Family (5 or more persons)	20	15	75.00%	15	15	100.00%
Elderly Non-Family	45	40	88.89%	65	20	30.77%
Non-Family, Non-Elderly	80	45	56.25%	40	20	50.00%
<b>Income 30%-50% HAMFI</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>30.86%</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>46.67%</b>
Elderly Family	50	20	40.00%	20	10	50.00%
Small Family (2-4 persons)	55	15	27.27%	55	30	54.55%
Large Family (5 or more persons)	0	0	N/A	30	25	83.33%
Elderly Non-Family	65	15	23.08%	30	4	13.33%
Non-Family, Non-Elderly	10	4	40.00%	50	15	30.00%
<b>Income 50%-80% HAMFI</b>	<b>415</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>15.42%</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>16.57%</b>
Elderly Family	145	4	2.76%	15	0	0.00%
Small Family (2-4 persons)	130	20	15.38%	95	25	26.32%
Large Family (5 or more persons)	25	10	40.00%	0	0	N/A
Elderly Non-Family	70	15	21.43%	10	0	0.00%
Non-Family, Non-Elderly	40	15	37.50%	55	4	7.27%
<b>Income Greater than 80% of HAMFI</b>	<b>1,790</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>4.64%</b>	<b>325</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>12.31%</b>
Elderly Family	425	20	4.71%	10	0	0.00%
Small Family (2-4 persons)	960	35	3.65%	180	20	11.11%
Large Family (5 or more persons)	125	20	16.00%	45	20	44.44%
Elderly Non-Family	130	4	3.08%	4	0	0.00%
Non-Family, Non-Elderly	150	4	2.67%	85	0	0.00%
<b>All Incomes</b>	<b>2,620</b>	<b>356</b>	<b>13.59%</b>	<b>875</b>	<b>243</b>	<b>27.77%</b>
Elderly Family	660	79	11.97%	45	10	22.22%
Small Family (2-4 persons)	1,205	90	7.47%	405	110	27.16%
Large Family (5 or more persons)	170	45	26.47%	90	60	66.67%
Elderly Non-Family	310	74	23.87%	109	24	22.02%
Non-Family, Non-Elderly	280	68	24.29%	230	39	16.96%


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

**Love County : Households under 80% AMI by Housing Problems**

Household Size/Type	Total	Owners		Renters		
		No. w/ Housing Problems	Pct. w/ Housing Problems	No. w/ Housing Problems	Pct. w/ Housing Problems	
<b>Income &lt; 80% HAMFI</b>	<b>830</b>	<b>273</b>	<b>32.89%</b>	<b>550</b>	<b>203</b>	<b>36.91%</b>
Elderly Family	235	59	25.11%	35	10	28.57%
Small Family (2-4 persons)	245	55	22.45%	225	90	40.00%
Large Family (5 or more persons)	45	25	55.56%	45	40	88.89%
Elderly Non-Family	180	70	38.89%	105	24	22.86%
Non-Family, Non-Elderly	130	64	49.23%	145	39	26.90%

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

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



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

**Housing Problems by Race / Ethnicity**

Data presented in the following tables summarizes housing problems (as previously defined), by HAMFI threshold, and by race/ethnicity, for Love 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.”



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

Income, Race / Ethnicity	Total	Owners		Renters		
		No. w/ Housing Problems	Pct. w/ Housing Problems	Total	No. w/ Housing Problems	Pct. w/ Housing Problems
<b>Income &lt; 30% HAMFI</b>	<b>240</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>64.6%</b>	<b>195</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>43.6%</b>
White alone, non-Hispanic	140	105	75.0%	155	50	32.3%
Black or African-American alone	30	30	100.0%	0	0	N/A
Asian alone	0	0	N/A	0	0	N/A
American Indian alone	40	15	37.5%	14	10	71.4%
Pacific Islander alone	0	0	N/A	0	0	N/A
Hispanic, any race	12	4	33.3%	15	15	100.0%
Other (including multiple races)	14	4	28.6%	10	10	100.0%
<b>Income 30%-50% HAMFI</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>28.6%</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>47.2%</b>
White alone, non-Hispanic	150	45	30.0%	105	50	47.6%
Black or African-American alone	0	0	N/A	29	4	13.8%
Asian alone	0	0	N/A	0	0	N/A
American Indian alone	19	4	21.1%	0	0	N/A
Pacific Islander alone	0	0	N/A	0	0	N/A
Hispanic, any race	8	4	50.0%	50	30	60.0%
Other (including multiple races)	0	0	N/A	0	0	N/A
<b>Income 50%-80% HAMFI</b>	<b>410</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>14.6%</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>20.0%</b>
White alone, non-Hispanic	325	50	15.4%	125	30	24.0%
Black or African-American alone	15	0	0.0%	0	0	N/A
Asian alone	0	0	N/A	0	0	N/A
American Indian alone	19	4	21.1%	14	4	28.6%
Pacific Islander alone	0	0	N/A	0	0	N/A
Hispanic, any race	44	4	9.1%	8	4	50.0%
Other (including multiple races)	4	0	0.0%	35	0	0.0%
<b>Income 80%-100% HAMFI</b>	<b>235</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>10.6%</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>23.5%</b>
White alone, non-Hispanic	200	25	12.5%	75	20	26.7%
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	10	0	0.0%	10	0	0.0%
Pacific Islander alone	0	0	N/A	0	0	N/A
Hispanic, any race	25	0	0.0%	0	0	N/A
Other (including multiple races)	0	0	N/A	0	0	N/A
<b>All Incomes</b>	<b>2,610</b>	<b>345</b>	<b>13.2%</b>	<b>870</b>	<b>240</b>	<b>27.6%</b>
White alone, non-Hispanic	2,170	275	12.7%	635	165	26.0%
Black or African-American alone	85	30	35.3%	29	4	13.8%
Asian alone	20	0	0.0%	0	0	N/A
American Indian alone	168	23	13.7%	42	14	33.3%
Pacific Islander alone	0	0	N/A	0	0	N/A
Hispanic, any race	119	22	18.5%	123	49	39.8%
Other (including multiple races)	48	4	8.3%	49	10	20.4%


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

**Love County : Households under 80% AMI by Race/Ethnicity**

Household Size/Type	Total	Owners		Renters		
		No. w/ Housing Problems	Pct. w/ Housing Problems	Total	No. w/ Housing Problems	Pct. w/ Housing Problems
<b>Income &lt; 80% HAMFI</b>	<b>825</b>	<b>265</b>	<b>32.12%</b>	<b>550</b>	<b>205</b>	<b>37.27%</b>
White alone, non-Hispanic	615	200	32.52%	385	130	33.77%
Black or African-American alone	45	30	66.67%	29	4	13.79%
Asian alone	0	0	N/A	0	0	N/A
American Indian alone	78	23	29.49%	28	14	50.00%
Pacific Islander alone	0	0	N/A	0	0	N/A
Hispanic, any race	64	12	18.75%	73	49	67.12%
Other (including multiple races)	18	4	22.22%	45	10	22.22%

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 Love 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 150 renter households that are cost overburdened, and 210 homeowners that are cost overburdened.
- Among **elderly** households with incomes less than 50% of Area Median Income, there are 24 renter households that are cost overburdened, and 110 homeowners that are cost overburdened.



- 67.1% of Hispanic renters with incomes less than 80% of Area Median Income have one or more housing problems, and 50.0% of American Indian renters with incomes less than 80% of Area Median Income have one or more housing problems.



## Overall Anticipated Housing Demand

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

### Marietta Anticipated Demand

Households in Marietta grew at an annually compounded rate of 0.32% from 2000 to 2010. Nielsen SiteReports estimates households have grown 0.86% per year since that time, and that households will grow 1.07% per year through 2020. For these reasons we will rely on the Nielsen SiteReports forecast of 1.07% per year in forecasting future household growth for Marietta.

The percentage of owner households was estimated at 55.42% with renter households estimated at 44.58%, 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.

<b>Future Housing Demand Estimates for Marietta</b>						
<b>Year</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>2019</b>	<b>2020</b>
Household Estimates	1,026	1,037	1,048	1,059	1,071	1,082
Owner %: 55.42%	569	575	581	587	593	600
Renter %: 44.58%	457	462	467	472	477	482
	<b>Total New Owner Households</b>					<b>31</b>
	<b>Total New Renter Households</b>					<b>25</b>

Based on an estimated household growth rate of 1.07% per year, Marietta would require 31 new housing units for ownership, and 25 units for rent, over the next five years. Annually this equates to 6 units for ownership per year, and 5 units for rent per year.

### Love County Anticipated Demand

Households in Love County grew at an annually compounded rate of 0.76% from 2000 to 2010. Nielsen SiteReports estimates households have grown 1.18% per year since that time, and that households will grow 1.21% per year through 2020. For these reasons we will rely on the Nielsen SiteReports forecast of 1.21% per year in forecasting future household growth for Love 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.

<b>Future Housing Demand Estimates for Love County</b>						
<b>Year</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>2019</b>	<b>2020</b>
Household Estimates	3,938	3,986	4,034	4,083	4,133	4,183
Owner %: 75.81%	2,986	3,022	3,059	3,096	3,133	3,171
Renter %: 24.19%	952	964	976	988	1,000	1,012
<b>Total New Owner Households</b>					<b>186</b>	
<b>Total New Renter Households</b>					<b>59</b>	

Based on an estimated household growth rate of 1.21% per year, Love County would require 186 new housing units for ownership, and 59 units for rent, over the next five years. Annually this equates to 37 units for ownership per year, and 12 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 Love 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 Love 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.

<b>Love County: 2015-2020 Housing Needs by Income Threshold</b>					
	Owner	Renter			
	Subset %	Subset %	Owners	Renters	Total
Total New Demand: 2015-2020	100.00%	100.00%	186	59	245
Less than 30% AMI	9.18%	22.29%	17	13	30
Less than 50% AMI	15.87%	42.86%	29	25	55
Less than 60% AMI	19.04%	51.43%	35	30	66
Less than 80% AMI	31.74%	62.86%	59	37	96

### 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.

<b>Love County: 2015-2020 Housing Needs Age 62 and Up</b>					
	Owner	Renter	Elderly	Elderly	Elderly
	Subset %	Subset %	Owners	Renters	Total
Total New Elderly (62+) Demand: 2015-2020	37.09%	18.06%	69	11	80
Elderly less than 30% AMI	3.25%	7.43%	6	4	10
Elderly less than 50% AMI	7.65%	13.14%	14	8	22
Elderly less than 60% AMI	9.18%	15.77%	17	9	26
Elderly less than 80% AMI	15.87%	16.00%	29	9	39

### 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.

---

**Love County: 2015-2020 Housing Needs for Persons with Disabilities**


---

	Owner Subset %	Renter Subset %	Disabled Owners	Disabled Renters	Disabled Total
Total New Disabled Demand (2015-2020)	25.76%	32.00%	48	19	<b>67</b>
Elderly less than 30% AMI	3.82%	11.43%	7	7	<b>14</b>
Elderly less than 50% AMI	6.30%	16.57%	12	10	<b>22</b>
Elderly less than 60% AMI	7.56%	19.89%	14	12	<b>26</b>
Elderly less than 80% AMI	10.69%	25.71%	20	15	<b>35</b>

---

**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.

---

**Love County: 2015-2020 Housing Needs for Veterans**


---

	Owner Subset %	Renter Subset %	Veteran Owners	Veteran Renters	Veteran Total
Total New Demand (2015-2020)	100.00%	100.00%	186	59	245
Total Veteran Demand	8.97%	8.97%	17	5	<b>22</b>
Veterans with Disabilities	2.41%	2.41%	4	1	<b>6</b>
Veterans Below Poverty	0.30%	0.30%	1	0	<b>1</b>
Disabled Veterans Below Poverty	0.17%	0.17%	0	0	<b>0</b>

---

**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).

---

**Love County: 2015-2020 Housing Needs for Working Families**


---

	Owner Subset %	Renter Subset %	Owners	Renters	Total
Total New Demand (2015-2020)	100.00%	100.00%	186	59	245
Total Working Families	54.32%	54.32%	101	32	<b>133</b>
Working Families with Children Present	26.29%	26.29%	49	16	<b>64</b>

---

**Population Subset Conclusions**

Based on population and household growth over the next five years, a total of 245 housing units will be needed in Love County over the next five years. Of those units:

- 66 will be needed by households earning less than 60% of Area Median Income

- 26 will be needed by households age 62 and up, earning less than 60% of Area Median Income
- 26 will be needed by households with disabilities / special needs, earning less than 60% of Area Median Income
- One will be needed by veterans living below the poverty line
- 64 will be needed by working families with children present

This data suggests a strong need in Love County for housing units that are both affordable and accessible to persons with disabilities / special needs, as well as a strong need for homes for working families with children present.

## Special Topics

## Love County Disaster Resiliency Assessment

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

### C.0 Comprehensive Plans & Hazard Mitigation Plans

The key city within the county is Marietta.

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

No comprehensive plan was found for the City of Marietta.

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

No hazard mitigation plan was identified for the City of Marietta or Love County.

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

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

No HMP was found for Love County.

#### Flooding

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

City-Data.com show that Love County has had 17 declared natural disasters. Eleven have been Presidential Declared Major Disasters. Six are declared emergencies.

#### Tornadoes


This includes 3 tornadoes prior to 1950 and 22 tornadoes since 1950; -1 F4 tornado and 3 F3 tornadoes.


- On 4/2/1957, a category F4 (max. wind speeds 207-260 mph) tornado 27.3 miles away from the Marietta city center killed 2 people and injured 6 people and caused between \$500,000 and \$5,000,000 in damages.
- On 4/2/1982, a category F3 (max. wind speeds 158-206 mph) tornado 2.4 miles away from the city center caused between \$500,000 and \$5,000,000 in damages.


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

Historic data on tornados between 1950-2014 shows 20 tornados documented. There were 18 injuries that occurred connected to these tornados. There were 13 fatalities connected to tornadoes during this time period. Property losses between 1950-1996 ranged from \$51,071,050.00 to \$510,710,500.00 . (The accounting methods used for losses changed in 1996.) The losses estimated between 1996-2014 was \$3,170,000.00.









### Earthquakes

- On 6/16/1978 at 11:46:54, a magnitude 5.3 (4.4 MB, 4.6 UK, 5.3 ML, Class: Moderate, Intensity: VI - VII) earthquake occurred 219.5 miles away from the city center
- On 9/6/1997 at 23:38:00, a magnitude 4.5 (4.5 LG, 4.2 LG, Depth: 3.1 mi, Class: Light, Intensity: IV - V) earthquake occurred 63.6 miles away from Marietta center
- On 1/18/1995 at 15:51:39, a magnitude 4.2 (4.0 LG, 4.2 LG, Depth: 3.1 mi) earthquake occurred 64.0 miles away from the city center
- On 4/28/1998 at 14:13:01, a magnitude 4.2 (3.9 MB, 4.2 LG, Depth: 3.1 mi) earthquake occurred 94.4 miles away from the city center
- On 11/15/1990 at 11:44:41, a magnitude 3.9 (3.6 LG, 3.9 LG, Depth: 3.1 mi, Class: Light, Intensity: II - III) earthquake occurred 63.0 miles away from Marietta center
- On 6/8/2004 at 00:15:09, a magnitude 3.5 (3.5 LG, Depth: 3.1 mi) earthquake occurred 22.0 miles away from the city center

### Flooding

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

See the following historic data on disaster events for Love County and the City of Marietta:

<http://www.srh.noaa.gov/oun/?n=tornadodata-county-ok-love> & <http://www.city-data.com/city/Marietta-Oklahoma.html>

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

No information available

### **C.2.1.3 Public Policy and Governance to Build Disaster Resiliency**

No information available

### **C.2.1.4 Local Emergency Response Agency Structure**

No hazard mitigation plan was found for McCurtain County. However, Love County does have an Emergency Management Director and an Assistant Director. See the following link:

<http://love.okcounties.org/departments/emergmgt/emergmgt.aspx>

### **C.2.1.5 Threat & Hazard Warning Systems**

The identified Threat & Hazard Warning Systems for Love County include:

- Sirens (Though no counts of sirens were determined according to the following link, the City of Marietta/Love County does have outdoor warning sirens: [https://www.facebook.com/permalink.php?story\\_fbid=10151980626759768&id=237657479767](https://www.facebook.com/permalink.php?story_fbid=10151980626759768&id=237657479767))
- Social Media (The City of Marietta/Love County operate a Facebook webpage for Emergency Management. See the following link: <https://www.facebook.com/MariettaLove-County-Emergency-Management-237657479767/>)


## Social Vulnerability

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


### Social Vulnerability Analysis - Love County

Base Social Vulnerability Indicators (%)		2nd Order	3rd Order
1.) Single Parent Households	12.73%	0.19	<b>3.086</b> <b>Social Vulnerability</b> <b>'Hotspot' or Area of</b> <b>Concern</b>
2.) Population Under 5	6.31%	(Child Care Needs)	
3.) Population 65 or Above	17.22%	0.274	
4.) Population 65 or Above & Below Poverty Rate	10.15%	(Elder Needs)	
5.) Workers Using Public Transportation	0.33%	0.044	
6.) Occupied Housing Units w/o Vehicle	4.11%	(Transportation Needs)	
7.) Housing Unit Occupancy Rate	74.72%	<b>2.298</b> (Temporary Shelter and Housing Recovery Needs)	
8.) Rental Occupancy Rate	24.19%		
9.) Non-White Population	25.15%		
10.) Population in Group Quarters	1.04%		
11.) Housing Units Built Prior to 1990	65.04%		
12.) Mobile Homes, RVs, Vans, etc.	23.03%		
13.) Poverty Rate	16.60%	<b>0.28</b> (Civic Capacity Needs)	
14.) Housing Units Lacking Telephones	4.06%		
15.) Age 25+ With Less Than High School Diploma	16.60%		
16.) Unemployment Rate	3.50%		
17.) Age 5+ Which Cannot Speak English Well or Not At All	3.84%		

Sources: Shannon Van Zandt, Texas A&M, Hazard Planning materials, and 2009-2013 American Community Survey, Tables B11003, B01001, B17001, B08301, B25044, B25001, B25042, B02001, B03002, B26001, B25036, B17001, B25043, S1501, B23025 & B06007



# Social Vulnerability - Impacts on Housing & Disaster Resiliency



# Social Vulnerability - Impacts on Housing & Disaster Resiliency


## Tornado Events 1950 - 2014

### Love County

**Tornado Magnitude**




**Social Vulnerability Index**



Sources: Shannon Van Zandt, Texas A&M, Hazard Planning materials, and 2009-2013 American Community Survey, Tables B11003, B01001, B17001, B08301, B25044, B25001, B25042, B02001, B03001, B26001, B25036, B17001, B25043, S1501, B25025 & B06007

19XX or 20XX Year of Event  
 Selected County Boundary  
 Oklahoma Municipal Boundaries  
 COUNTY NAME





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

This county falls below the state score per this index for social vulnerability when comparing as a county to other counties in the state. The area most vulnerable by census tract is in the populated area of Marietta.

**Recommendations for this county:**

- Apply for grants/funding to develop a county hazard mitigation plan. The HMP must then be approved by the state and FEMA. Include attention to areas within the county that may have compounding social vulnerability factors.
- Pursue efforts to strengthen building codes related to tornadoes and natural disasters should be considered (such as the use of "hurricane clips" for all new residential construction).
- Pursue funding/grants for public shelters. As city pursues planning for shelters from disaster events for multifamily, HUD and LIHTC units, in addition to all housing in the community should be incorporated with any effort to increase housing.

## Homelessness

### By Continuum of Care

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

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

### OK 507 Southeastern Oklahoma

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

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

**CoC Number: OK-507****CoC Name: Southeastern Oklahoma Regional CoC****Summary of all beds reported by Continuum of Care:**

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

### **COC Conclusion**

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

### **A Snap Shot of Homelessness in the State**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**State Name:** Oklahoma

**Point-in Time Date:** 1/29/2015

**Summary by household type reported:**

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

**Summary of persons in each household type:**

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

**Demographic summary by ethnicity:**

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

**Demographic summary by gender:**

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



## Rural Areas

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

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

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

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

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


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

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

### At Risk For Homelessness

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

### Social Vulnerability - Impacts on Housing & Disaster Resiliency



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

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

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

## Findings and Recommendations

There remains a significant homeless population in the urban and rural areas of Oklahoma. This population is very likely significantly undercounted in the Point In Time data. Local homeless advocates and service providers are highly aware of this undercount and are using innovative tools to find and serve the homeless. One example of these extra efforts to identify homeless populations is the data being collected by schools about the number of youth who are homeless or “couch” homeless. In this study, the research team also considered those families living at the economic margins and makes the case for the need for funding to support the housing needs of those that live a pay check or two from being homeless.

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

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

While not mentioned in the PIT data, estimates must be prepared to calculate the number and needs of homeless populations with felonies. In particular, there has been a rise nationally in the number of homeless sex offenders. Zoning regulations and discrimination from the private market has pushed many registered sex offenders to the periphery of many communities. This population must not be forgotten by policymakers.

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

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

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

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

**Works Cited**

Continuum of Care Network Pamphlet. 2015

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Fair Housing

### Summary

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

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

### Key Findings:

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

### Recommendations:

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

### What is Fair Housing?

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

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



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

### Approach

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

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

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

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

### Data

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


#### 1. Urban/Rural

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

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

2. Poverty


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



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

### 3. Non-white Enclaves


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



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

#### 4. Immigrant Enclaves


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



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

5. Limited English Proficiency


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



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

6. Disability


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



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

7. Hospitals

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




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



8. Grocery Stores


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



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

9. Transit

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



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

**What does this mean for Oklahoma?**

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Bibliography**

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

[http://www.rooflines.org/4181/a\\_clear\\_scotus\\_statement\\_on\\_disparate\\_impact\\_and\\_affh/](http://www.rooflines.org/4181/a_clear_scotus_statement_on_disparate_impact_and_affh/)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Data Sources**

## 2014 American Community Survey Estimates

- Poverty: ACS\_13\_5YR\_S1701 > HC02\_EST\_VC01 > Below poverty level; Estimate; Population for whom poverty status is determined
- Non-white enclaves: ACS\_13\_5YR\_BO2001 > HD01\_VD02 > [Total Population] - Estimate; Total: - White alone
- Immigrant enclaves: ACS\_13\_5YR\_BO5001 > HD01\_VD06 > Estimate; Total: - Not a U.S. citizen
- Limited English Proficiency: ACS\_13\_5YR\_S1601 > HC03\_EST\_VC01 > Percent of specified language speakers - Speak English less than "very well"; Estimate; Population 5 years and over
- Disability: ACS\_13\_5YR\_S1810 > HC02\_EST\_VC01 > with a disability; estimate; total civilian noninstitutionalized population

## University of Oklahoma Center for Spatial Analysis: Data Warehouse

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

## University of Oklahoma Division of Regional and City Planning

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

**Appendix 1: County affordable housing Summaries**

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

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



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

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

## Lead-Based Paint Hazards

### Findings / Health and Well-being

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

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

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

### Statewide Findings

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

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

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

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

**Disaster Resiliency/ Economy and Society, Infrastructure and Environment**

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

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

**Leadership and Strategy**

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

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

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

**Survey of Previous Lead-based Paint Studies**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### **Love County Findings**

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

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

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

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

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

<b>Total Housing Units in Love County with Lead-Based Paint Hazards by Tenure</b>			
Total Owner-Occupied Housing Units	Total Housing Units	Percent w/LBP Hazards	Number w/LBP Hazards
1978 or Later	1,441	3.57%	51
1960-1977	774	11.18%	87
1940-1959	405	38.48%	156
1939 or Earlier	65	63.38%	41
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,685</b>	<b>12.47%</b>	<b>335</b>
Total Renter-Occupied Housing Units	Total Housing Units	Percent w/LBP Hazards	Number w/LBP Hazards
1978 or Later	401	3.57%	14
1960-1977	185	11.18%	21
1940-1959	240	38.48%	92
1939 or Earlier	20	63.38%	13
<b>Total</b>	<b>845</b>	<b>16.56%</b>	<b>140</b>
Total Housing Units	Total Housing Units	Percent w/LBP Hazards	Number w/LBP Hazards
1978 or Later	1,842	3.57%	66
1960-1977	959	11.18%	107
1940-1959	645	38.48%	248
1939 or Earlier	85	63.38%	54
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,530</b>	<b>13.45%</b>	<b>475</b>

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

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

---

**Housing Units in Love County with Lead-Based Paint Hazards by Tenure,  
Occupied by Low-Income Families**


---

Owner-Occupied Housing Units < 50% AMI	Total Housing Units	Percent w/LBP Hazards	Number w/LBP Hazards
1978 or Later	208	3.57%	7
1960-1977	158	11.18%	18
1940-1959	50	38.48%	19
1939 or Earlier	20	63.38%	13
<b>Total</b>	<b>435</b>	<b>13.09%</b>	<b>57</b>

---

Renter-Occupied Housing Units < 50% AMI	Total Housing Units	Percent w/LBP Hazards	Number w/LBP Hazards
1978 or Later	160	3.57%	6
1960-1977	86	11.18%	10
1940-1959	135	38.48%	52
1939 or Earlier	10	63.38%	6
<b>Total</b>	<b>390</b>	<b>18.85%</b>	<b>74</b>

---

Total Housing Units < 50% AMI	Total Housing Units	Percent w/LBP Hazards	Number w/LBP Hazards
1978 or Later	367	3.57%	13
1960-1977	243	11.18%	27
1940-1959	185	38.48%	71
1939 or Earlier	30	63.38%	19
<b>Total</b>	<b>825</b>	<b>15.81%</b>	<b>130</b>

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

---

---

**Housing Units in Love County with Lead-Based Paint Hazards by Tenure,  
Occupied by Moderate-Income Families**


---

Owner-Occupied Housing Units 50%-80% AMI	Total Housing Units	Percent w/LBP Hazards	Number w/LBP Hazards
1978 or Later	215	3.57%	8
1960-1977	86	11.18%	10
1940-1959	95	38.48%	37
1939 or Earlier	15	63.38%	10
<b>Total</b>	<b>410</b>	<b>15.43%</b>	<b>63</b>

---

Renter-Occupied Housing Units 50%-80% AMI	Total Housing Units	Percent w/LBP Hazards	Number w/LBP Hazards
1978 or Later	91	3.57%	3
1960-1977	50	11.18%	6
1940-1959	35	38.48%	13
1939 or Earlier	10	63.38%	6
<b>Total</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>15.44%</b>	<b>29</b>

---

Total Housing Units 50%-80% AMI	Total Housing Units	Percent w/LBP Hazards	Number w/LBP Hazards
1978 or Later	305	3.57%	11
1960-1977	135	11.18%	15
1940-1959	130	38.48%	50
1939 or Earlier	25	63.38%	16
<b>Total</b>	<b>595</b>	<b>15.43%</b>	<b>92</b>

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

---

To conclude, we estimate that there are a total of 475 homes in Love County containing lead-based paint hazards, 335 owner-occupied and 140 renter-occupied. Of the 475 homes in the county estimated to have lead-based paint hazards, 130 are estimated to be occupied by households with low-incomes (incomes less than 50% of Area Median Income), and 92 are estimated to be occupied by households with moderate incomes (between 50% and 80% of Area Median Income), for a total of 222 housing units in Love County with lead-based paint hazards occupied by households with low or moderate incomes.

#### Lead-Based Paint Hazards in Homes with Children Present

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



<b>Housing Units in Love County with Lead-Based Paint Hazards with Children under Age 6 Present Occupied by Low or Moderate-Income Families</b>			
Housing Units < 50% AMI w/ Children under 6 Present	Total Housing Units	Percent w/LBP Hazards	Number w/LBP Hazards
1978 or Later	56	3.57%	2
1940-1977	55	19.98%	11
1939 or Earlier	8	63.38%	5
<b>Total</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>15.19%</b>	<b>18</b>
Housing Units 50%-80% AMI w/ Children under 6 Present	Total Housing Units	Percent w/LBP Hazards	Number w/LBP Hazards
1978 or Later	48	3.57%	2
1940-1977	57	19.98%	11
1939 or Earlier	4	63.38%	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>14.34%</b>	<b>16</b>
Total LMI Housing Units w/ Children Present	Total Housing Units	Percent w/LBP Hazards	Number w/LBP Hazards
1978 or Later	104	3.57%	4
1940-1977	112	19.98%	22
1939 or Earlier	12	63.38%	8
<b>Total</b>	<b>228</b>	<b>14.78%</b>	<b>34</b>
Total Housing Units w/ Children Present	Total Housing Units	Percent w/LBP Hazards	Number w/LBP Hazards
1978 or Later	252	3.57%	9
1940-1977	278	19.98%	56
1939 or Earlier	12	63.38%	8
<b>Total</b>	<b>542</b>	<b>13.32%</b>	<b>72</b>

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

As shown, we estimate there are 72 housing units in Love County with lead-based paint hazards and children under the age of six present, and that 34 of those housing units are occupied by families with low to moderate incomes.

#### Research Footnotes/Sources

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

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

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

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

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

Exhibit #1

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




Exhibit #2

### Percentage of Housing Units Containing Lead-Based Paint Hazards





Exhibit #3

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




Compiled by Integra Realty Resources - Tulsa/OKC

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

Exhibit #4

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




Compiled by Integra Realty Resources - Tulsa/OKC

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

Exhibit #5

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




Compiled by Integra Realty Resources - Tulsa/OKC

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



Exhibit #6

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



Compiled by Integra Realty Resources - Tulsa/OKC

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



## Conclusions

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

Love County has undergone steady growth over the last fifteen years, in terms of population, households and employment levels. Major drivers of growth in the area include the Chickasaw Nation, as well as tourism and recreation. Population and household growth is projected to continue in Love County over the next five years.

Some of the new construction in Love County has been reasonably affordable, but much is priced well outside of what could be afforded by a household earning at or less than area median income. For homes sold since January 2014, that were constructed after 2000, the average sale price is \$314,452 or \$114.49 per square foot. Excluding sales of homes over \$1,000,000, the average is \$193,630, or \$100.76 per square foot. Either figure is likely far more than can be afforded by a household with an annual income of \$45,146, which is the 2015 estimate of median household income for Love County.

Love County has a relatively moderate rate of renters with high rent costs (19.89%) as well as homeowners with high ownership costs (12.43%). The county's poverty rate is also slightly below the state, at 16.60% compared with 16.85% statewide.

In terms of disaster resiliency we note that 20 tornadoes have impacted the county between 1959 and 2014, with 18 injuries and 13 fatalities combined. We recommend Love County create and maintain a Hazard Mitigation Plan.

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

In terms of fair housing issues, 62 affordable housing units are considered to be located in immigrant enclaves. No other fair housing issues are noted.

Due to the age of the county's housing stock, lead-based paint hazards are an issue, with an estimated 475 occupied housing units with such hazards, and 72 of those units occupied by low-to-moderate income households with children under the age of 6 present.



In summary, it is apparent that new housing in several categories is required in Love County. While the upper end of the market is being satisfied, the lower end of the population that requires rental and moderate cost ownership property has a more limited product available. As the population continues to grow in Love County as a whole, this demand will continue to increase. We estimate the county will need 186 housing units for ownership and 59 housing units for rent over the next five years, in order to accommodate projected population and household growth. These units should include a mixture of both market rate rental units, affordable housing units, and housing for ownership affordable to a range of incomes. Given the age of Love County's housing stock, consideration should also be given to preservation or rehabilitation of existing housing stock.

**Addendum A**  
**Acknowledgments**



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

**University of Oklahoma Intern Team**

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

**Federal Agencies**

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

US Federal Emergency Management Agency, Harold Latham

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

**Oklahoma State Agencies**

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

Department of Human Services, Connie Schlittler

Department of Emergency Management Dara Hayes

Department of Commerce, Rebekah Zahn-Pittser

**Local Organizations**

Regional Council of Governments and Oklahoma Association of Regional Councils

Continuums of Care Network

Hazard Mitigation Plan personnel/administrators

Community economic development professionals

City Managers and Planners

Community Action Agencies

Chambers of Commerce

Affordable housing developers, owners and investors

Homeless Alliance, Dan Straughan, Sunshine Hernandez



## Addenda

---

Pathways, Patrice Pratt

Women's Resource Center, Vanessa Morrison

AIDS Care Fund, Sunshine Schillings

## **Addendum B**

### **Qualifications**

# Owen S. Ard, MAI

## Experience

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

## Professional Activities & Affiliations

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

## Licenses

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

## Education

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

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

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

## Qualified Before Courts & Administrative Bodies

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

[oard@irr.com](mailto:oard@irr.com) - 918-492-4844

## Integra Realty Resources

### Tulsa/OKC

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

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

[irr.com](http://irr.com)



# Owen S. Ard, MAI

## Qualified Before Courts & Administrative Bodies (Cont'd)

Kansas Board of Tax Appeals  
United States Federal Bankruptcy Court, Tulsa, Oklahoma  
United States Federal Bankruptcy Court, Minneapolis, Minnesota  
United States Federal Bankruptcy Court, Jackson, Mississippi

### Integra Realty Resources

Tulsa/OKC

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

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

[irr.com](http://irr.com)

[oard@irr.com](mailto:oard@irr.com) - 918-492-4844



# David A. Puckett

## Experience

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

## Professional Activities & Affiliations

Appraisal Institute-Candidate for Designation

## Licenses

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

## Education

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

Successfully completed the following Appraisal Institute courses and seminars:

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

## Integra Realty Resources

Tulsa/OKC

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

T 918-492-4844

F 918-493-7155

irr.com





# Integra Realty Resources, Inc.

## Corporate Profile

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

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

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

MIAMI/PALM BEACH, FL - Anthony M. Graziano, MAI, CRE, FRICS  
MINNEAPOLIS, MN - Michael F. Amundson, MAI, CCIM, FRICS  
NAPLES, FL - Carlton J. Lloyd, MAI, FRICS  
NASHVILLE, TN - R. Paul Perutelli, MAI, SRA, FRICS  
NEW JERSEY COASTAL - Halvor J. Egeland, MAI  
NEW JERSEY NORTHERN - Matthew S. Krauser, CRE, FRICS  
NEW YORK, NY - Raymond T. Cirz, MAI, CRE, FRICS  
ORANGE COUNTY, CA - Steve Calandra, MAI  
ORLANDO, FL - Christopher Starkey, MAI, MRICS  
PHILADELPHIA, PA - Joseph D. Pasquarella, MAI, CRE, FRICS  
PHOENIX, AZ - Walter "Tres" Winus III, MAI, FRICS  
PITTSBURGH, PA - Paul D. Griffith, MAI, CRE, FRICS  
PORTLAND, OR - Brian A. Glanville, MAI, CRE, FRICS  
PROVIDENCE, RI - Gerard H. McDonough, MAI, FRICS  
RALEIGH, NC - Chris R. Morris, MAI, FRICS  
RICHMOND, VA - Kenneth L. Brown, MAI, CCIM, FRICS  
SACRAMENTO, CA - Scott Beebe, MAI, FRICS  
ST. LOUIS, MO - P. Ryan McDonald, MAI, FRICS  
SALT LAKE CITY, UT - Darrin W. Liddell, MAI, FRICS, CCIM  
SAN DIEGO, CA - Jeff A. Greenwald, MAI, SRA, FRICS  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA - Jan Kleczewski, MAI, FRICS  
SARASOTA, FL - Carlton J. Lloyd, MAI, FRICS  
SAVANNAH, GA - J. Carl Schultz, Jr., MAI, FRICS, CRE, SRA  
SEATTLE, WA - Allen N. Safer, MAI, MRICS  
SYRACUSE, NY - William J. Kimball, MAI, FRICS  
TAMPA, FL - Bradford L. Johnson, MAI, MRICS  
TULSA, OK - Owen S. Ard, MAI  
WASHINGTON, DC - Patrick C. Kerr, MAI, FRICS, SRA  
WILMINGTON, DE - Douglas L. Nickel, MAI, FRICS  
CARIBBEAN/CAYMAN ISLANDS - James Andrews, MAI, FRICS

### Corporate Office

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



**DAWN EVE JOURDAN, ESQ., PH.D.**

---

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

**EDUCATION:**

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

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

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

**RESEARCH INTERESTS:**

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

**WORK EXPERIENCE:**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**AWARDS:**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**COURSES TAUGHT:**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**PUBLICATIONS:**

**Refereed Journal Articles**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**PUBLICATIONS:**

**Refereed Journal Articles**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### **Books**

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

#### **Book Chapters and Entries**

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

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

#### **Non-Refereed Publications**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### **Books**

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

#### **Book Chapters and Entries**

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

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

#### **Non-Refereed Publications**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**SPONSORED RESEARCH:**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

**PROFESSIONAL SERVICE AND AFFILIATIONS:**

**Professional Services**

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

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

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

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

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

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

Member of the ICCHP Committee (2009-2010)

Member of DCP Faculty Council (2009-2012)

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

UF Commencement Marshall (2008-2010)

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

**Professional Affiliations**

American Planning Association

Oklahoma Chapter of the APA

Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning

Member of the Illinois Bar

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

Journal of the Community Development Society

Journal of Planning History

US-China Law Review

UF Journal of Law and Public Policy

Journal of Planning Education and Research

National Science Foundation

**CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS:**

**International Conferences-Refereed Presentations**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### **National Conferences**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### **National Conferences – Invited Discussant and/or Moderator**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### **State Conferences –Presentations by Invitation**

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

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

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

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

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

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

**REFERENCES AVAILABLE UPON REQUEST**



**K. MEGHAN WIETERS, PH.D., AICP**

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

**EDUCATION**

---

Texas A&M University  
**Ph.D in Urban Regional Science** **2003 – August 2009**  
 Dissertation: "Integrating Walking for Transportation and Physical Activity for Sedentary Office Workers In Texas"

University of Texas at Austin  
**Masters of Science in Community & Regional Planning** **1993-1995**  
 Thesis: "Building a Community: Transit Options in the Land Development Code and Land Development Process"

Trinity University  
**Bachelors of Arts** **1989-1993**  
 Majors: Philosophy, International Studies (concentration on Latin America), Minor: Spanish

**TEACHING**

---

<b>Assistant Professor - University of Oklahoma</b>	<b>Fall 2009 – to present</b>
RCPL 5813 Environmental Planning Methods	RCPL 5013 History and Theory of Urban Planning
RCPL 5513 Subdivision Planning	RCPL 5823 Rural and Regional Planning
RCPL 5493 Transportation and Land Use Planning	RCPL 5990 Public Health & Built Environment

**PREVIOUS RESEARCH POSITIONS & PRACTICE**

---

<b>Texas A&amp;M University</b>	<b>August 2006</b>
Graduate Assistant	<b>May 2009</b>
<b>Texas Transportation Institute</b>	<b>August 2003 –</b>
Graduate Research Assistant	<b>August 2006</b>
<b>City of Austin - Transportation, Planning &amp; Sustainability Department</b>	<b>August 1998 –</b>
Principal Planner / Senior Planner	<b>August 2003</b>
<b>Capital Metropolitan Transportation Authority</b>	<b>April 1994 –</b>
Land Use/Transportation Planner	<b>August 1998</b>

**PUBLICATIONS & REPORTS**

---

- Wieters, K M. Office Workers Stuck at their Desks: Built Environment Implications on Walk Trips. Under review – *Health & Place*, April 2014.
- Wieters, K M. Advantages of Online Methods in Planning Research: Capturing Walking Habits in Different Built Environments. Under Review -- *Sage Open*, February 2014
- Wieters, K M, Kim, J-H, Lee, C. "Assessment of Wearable Global Positioning System Units for Physical Activity Research", *Journal of Physical Activity & Health*, September 2012 (published)
- Zietsman, J, Villa, J.C., Forrest, T. L., and Storey, J. M. (2005) "Mexican Truck Idling Emissions at the El Paso - Ciudad Juarez Border Location" Report 473700-00033. Prepared for Southwest Region University Transportation Center.



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

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

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

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

#### CONFERENCE & INVITED PRESENTATIONS

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



INVITED LECTURES

---

University of Oklahoma  
Department of Geography & Sustainability, Spring Colloquium  
"Walking & Biking: Active Transportation and the Built Environment" January 2014

Kansas State University – Big 12 Fellowship

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

Department of Biostatistics and Epidemiology College of Public Health,  
University of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center

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

GRANT FUNDING

---

Received Ed Cline Faculty Development Award (\$1450), Spring 2014  
Received Big 12 Faculty Fellowship Program Award (\$2500) June 2013  
Received College of Architecture IT recipient (\$3450) July 2013  
Sooner Parents Mini-Grant Funding (\$500) for student mentoring –prepared and submitted to assist RCPL Student Planning Association July 2013  
Received Junior Faculty Research (\$7,000) for summer research on rural planning and physical activity opportunities. University of Oklahoma, Summer 2012  
Robert Wood Johnson Active Living Research Dissertation Grant (\$25,000), Texas A&M University, 2007

SERVICE

---

*University-Level Service*

- Advisory Committee Course Management Systems (ACCMS) Spring 2013

*College-Level Service*

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

SERVICE

---

*State-level / City-Level Service*

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

*National-Level Service*

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

## Bryce C. Lowery, PhD

### Contact

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

### Academic Experience

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

### Education

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

### Publications

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

### Presentations

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

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

Teaching Experience

---

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

Other Experience

---

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

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

**Byron DeBruler**

DeBruler, Inc.

8200 NE 139th Street

Edmond, OK 73103

United States of America

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

**BACKGROUND SUMMARY**

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

**EXPERIENCE**

**DeBruler, Inc.**

Vice President, Oklahoma City, August 2001 to Present

Provide services including:

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

**Oklahoma Housing Finance Agency**

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

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

While employed by the agency:

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

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

### **Oklahoma Department of Commerce**

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

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

**City of Oklahoma City** January 1984 to February 1988

Division Head, Code Inspections Division/Department of Environmental Services

Assistant Superintendent, Utility Services Division/Water Department

Administrative Assistant, Street Maintenance Division, Public Works Department

Management Intern, Personnel Department

### **EDUCATION**

Masters of Public Administration, University of Oklahoma 1983

Bachelor of Arts Political Science, University of Oklahoma, 1979

