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Key Findings

Housing Supply Conditions
The housing supply conditions in the Snyderville Basin and East Summit County indicate a serious shortage of affordable housing.

Owner Occupied Market: Housing prices effectively exclude median and moderate income households from homeownership opportunities in Snyderville Basin and seriously limit opportunities in East Summit County. The median sales price of a single family home in the Snyderville Basin in 2016 was $926,000 and in East Summit County $338,000. The high housing prices did not dampen price increases in 2016. The median sales price of a home in Snyderville Basin increased by five percent and in East Summit County 16 percent.

Rental Market: Affordable rental housing is limited. The rental market is extremely “tight”. The current vacancy rate is near zero. Renters have had to contend with low vacancy rates and rising rental rates for years. The typical one bedroom unit rents for $1,250, a two bedroom unit for $1,900, and a three bedroom unit for $2,350.

Housing prices in Snyderville Basin and East Summit County result in severe housing cost burdens for many residents. One out of every five renter households in both Snyderville Basin and East Summit County has household income below $51,700, 50% of the area median income (AMI) and pays more than 50 percent of their income for rent and utilities.1 One out of every eight homeowners in both Snyderville Basin and East Summit County pay at least 50 percent of their income for housing and utilities.

Housing Demand Conditions
The demand for housing has declined as demographic growth has slowed.

Housing prices have and will continue to impede demographic growth of Snyderville Basin and East Summit County. Demographic growth in the area since the Great Recession of 2008-2009 has slowed significantly. Slower growth has widespread implications for residents, local government, school districts, real estate developers and the business community.

Rapid growth in the Hispanic population adds to demand for affordable rental housing. In the Snyderville Basin and East Summit County, the number of Hispanics has increased from four percent of the population in 2000 to 11 percent in 2015. A relatively high percentage of Hispanic households have incomes below the poverty level and live in rental housing.

Demand for high priced housing squeezes out affordable workforce housing. Snyderville Basin is attractive to high income households due to its close proximity to the Salt Lake job market and the natural beauty of the mountain surroundings. This demand pressure,

---

1 $51,700 is the HUD estimated income in 2017 of a four person household at 50 percent of the area median income (Summit County).
for high priced homes, acts to effectively limit the financial feasibility of affordable workforce housing in the area.

Projected Demand for Housing
The five-year projections of housing demand for households with incomes up to 120 percent of the Area Median Income has three categories of demand; (1) current demand of renters with severe cost burdens, (2) projected demand from demographic growth (2018-2022), and (3) projected demand from external demand (commuters). The annual projected demand for renter occupied units for the combined Snyderville Basin and East Summit County Planning Districts is 281 units and the five-year total demand is 1,404 units Table 1. The annual projected demand for owner occupied units is 133 units and the five-year total demand is 665 units Table 2. The analysis showed sufficient demand for a combined owner and renter occupied demand for the planning districts of 414 units annually.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Districts</th>
<th>≤30% AMI</th>
<th>31%-50% AMI</th>
<th>51%-60% AMI</th>
<th>61%-80% AMI</th>
<th>81%-100% AMI</th>
<th>101%-120% AMI</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Demand Snyderville Basin</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Demand East Summit County</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Demand Combined Districts</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five-Year Total Snyderville Basin</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five-Year Total East Summit County</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five-Year Total Combined Districts</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>1,404</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: James Wood.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Districts</th>
<th>50%-60% AMI</th>
<th>61%-80% AMI</th>
<th>81%-100% AMI</th>
<th>101%-120% AMI</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Demand Snyderville Basin</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Demand East Summit County</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Demand Combined Districts</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five-Year Total Snyderville Basin</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five-Year Total 2018-2022</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five-Year Total 2018-2022</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>665</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: James Wood.

Housing Affordability
This study examines housing affordability for households with incomes up to $136,500. Affordability is determined by monthly income available for housing by income group. The housing demand projections measure potential demand for residential units that meet the housing affordability criteria of a specific income group. The monthly income available for housing as well as housing price thresholds are shown in Table 3.
## Table 3
### Income Brackets and Housing Cost by Planning District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning District</th>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>Monthly Income for Housing</th>
<th>Maximum Mortgage Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Snyderville Basin</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Median Income (AMI)</td>
<td>$113,795</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤30% AMI</td>
<td>$0-$34,139</td>
<td>≤$853</td>
<td>$97,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31% to 50% AMI</td>
<td>$34,140-$56,898</td>
<td>$854 to $1,422</td>
<td>$186,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51% to 60% AMI</td>
<td>$56,899-$68,123</td>
<td>$1,423-$1,705</td>
<td>$230,807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61% to 80% AMI</td>
<td>$68,124-$91,036</td>
<td>$1,705 to $2,276</td>
<td>$320,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81%-100% AMI</td>
<td>$91,037-$113,795</td>
<td>$2,277 to $2,845</td>
<td>$410,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%-120% AMI</td>
<td>$113,796-$136,554</td>
<td>$2,846 to $3,414</td>
<td>$492,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East Summit County</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Median Income</td>
<td>$61,354</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤30% AMI</td>
<td>$0-$18,406</td>
<td>≤$462</td>
<td>$35,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31% to 50% AMI</td>
<td>$18,407-$30,677</td>
<td>$463 to $769</td>
<td>$83,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51% to 60% AMI</td>
<td>$30,678-$36,750</td>
<td>$770 to $921</td>
<td>$107,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61% to 80% AMI</td>
<td>$36,750-$49,083</td>
<td>$921 to $1,230</td>
<td>$156,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81%-100% AMI</td>
<td>$49,084-$61,354</td>
<td>$1,231 to $1,538</td>
<td>$204,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%-120% AMI</td>
<td>$61,355-$73,624</td>
<td>$1,539 to 1,846</td>
<td>$245,790</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau and Utah Affordable Housing Finance Tool, Division of Housing and Community Development.
Executive Summary

This housing affordability assessment presents data, analysis, and conclusions for Snyderville Basin and East Summit County. The Snyderville Basin is geographically defined by three Census Designated Places (CDPs); Silver Summit CDP, Snyderville Basin CDP, and Summit Park CDP Map 1. The East Summit County area is defined as that geographic area north and east of the three CDPs; and includes the communities north on I-80; Wanship, Hoytsville, Coalville, and Henefer and the cities, on State Highway 189, of Peoa, Oakley, Kamas, and Francis. The East Summit County boundaries for the purposes of this study coincide with the boundaries of the East Summit County Planning District.

Characteristics of Housing Supply

● The U.S. Census Bureau estimate of the housing inventory in Snyderville Basin for 2015 was 9,415 units. Since 2000 the inventory has doubled although the occupied inventory has increased by only 50 percent. This imbalance is due to the extraordinary increase in seasonal and second home units in Snyderville Basin. The number of seasonal and second home units has increased from a mere 242 units in 2000 to 2,591 units 2015; a nearly ten-fold increase; an average annual growth rate of 17 percent. The number of full-time resident households in occupied units in 2015 was 6,477, including 5,075 owner occupied units and 1,402 renter occupied units Figure 1.

![Share of Housing Inventory by Type of Use in Snyderville Basin](image)


● The U.S. Census Bureau estimate of the housing inventory in East Summit County in 2015 was 8,060 units. The inventory in the East Summit County has grown at a much slower pace,

---

2 Census Designated Places (CDPs) are the statistical counterparts of incorporated places, and are delineated to provide data for settled concentrations of population that are identifiable by name but are not legally incorporated under the laws of the state in which they are located.
increasing by only 31 percent over the fifteen year period, about half the rate of growth of Snyderville Basin. There are an estimated 3,305 owner occupied units and 894 renter occupied units in East Summit County. The fastest growing type of use is seasonal and second home, which has increased from 2,489 units in 2000 to 3,611 units in 2015, an average annual growth rate of 2.5 percent. Forty-five percent of housing units in East Summit County are vacant seasonal and second home units, a much higher share than Snyderville Basin’s 27 percent Figure 2.
The young median age of the housing stock in both Snyderville Basin and East Summit County reflects the rate of demographic growth in the two areas, particularly in the high growth years from 1995 to 2007. The median age of all occupied housing units (excluding seasonal and second homes) in Snyderville Basin is 22 years old and for East Summit County 25 years old.

Housing units estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau show that from 2000 to 2015 the number of housing units in Snyderville Basin increased by 4,743 units compared to an increase of 1,904 units in East Summit County. Residential building permit data gathered by local agencies are not reported at the CDP level, but we do know from the construction activity in the unincorporated county, which includes Snyderville Basin plus the unincorporated area in East Summit County, there was a significant residential construction boom from 2000 to 2007. During the 2000-2007 period an average of 510 residential building permits were issued annually in the unincorporated area. From 2008-2016 the average fell to 120 units annually. Residential construction in Snyderville Basin and East Summit County has not returned to the exceptional levels of 2002 Olympics and pre-recession era. Annually, over the 2000 to 2016 period, the average number permits issued for residential units was 322.

Summit County is the least affordable housing market in Utah. In 2016 the median sales price for a home (single family and condominium combined) was $675,000, forty percent higher than second ranked Wasatch County, which had a median sales price of $404,257. Of course the countywide figure includes the high priced Park City market. Disaggregating to the Snyderville Basin and East Summit County areas shows a substantial difference in housing prices between the two areas. The median sale price of a single family home in 2016 in Snyderville Basin was $926,000 compared to $338,000 in East Summit County. The median sales price of a condominium in Snyderville Basin in 2016 was $412,500. The number of condominiums sales in East Summit County was too small to determine reliable median price data.
● Housing prices in Snyderville Basin effectively exclude median income and moderate income households from homeownership. Only 4.2 percent of the homes sold in Snyderville Basin since January 2016 were affordable to households at or below the median income ($113,796), a total of 15 homes. Only 1.1 percent (four homes) were affordable to households at or below the moderate income threshold of 80 percent AMI ($91,036).

● While housing in East Summit County is much more affordable than Snyderville Basin, the area is still a relatively high priced housing market. The median sales price of $338,000 for an existing home is 15 percent higher than the median sales price in Salt Lake County. Since 2016 only eight percent of the homes sold in East Summit County were affordable to a household with income at or below the moderate income threshold of 80 percent AMI. For households at or below the median income level 23 percent of homes sold were affordable.

● The median sales price of a home in Snyderville Basin has increased by 54 percent in the past four years, an average annual growth rate of 11 percent. The most remarkable year of the recent price acceleration was 2015 when the median sales price increased by $100,000. Housing price increases in East Summit County have been much more measured. The median sales price has returned to the pre-recession price of $338,000. The median sales price however, had the largest single year increase of the recovery in 2016; with an increase of $48,000 for East Summit County.

● The rental market in the county is extremely “tight” and rental rates are increasing. The 347 tax credit units in Snyderville Basin and East Summit County are 100 percent occupied. The tax credit units represent 15 percent of the rental inventory, well above the tax credit share statewide of 9.2 percent. Unfortunately there is no annual locally published survey of rental and vacancy rates in Summit County. A review of rental rate estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau and HUD provide the following estimates of median rental rates in the county: studio $800, one bedroom $1,250, two bedroom $1,900, and three bedroom $2,350.

*Characteristics of Demand: Demographic and Economic Trends*

● The demographic growth of Snyderville Basin and East Summit County have slowed considerably over the past several years. The Great Recession brought an abrupt end to rapid demographic growth. Building permit data suggest that demographic growth has dropped below two percent annually.

● Certainly two important and related factors slowing population and household growth in Snyderville Basin and East Summit County are housing affordability and land cost/availability. These factors will continue to hamper future demographic and economic growth of the county.

● As population growth has slowed the median age of the population has increased. In 2000 the median age of Snyderville Basin and East Summit County was very close to 31 years but by 2015 it had increased to over 35 years.

● Snyderville Basin and East Summit County are overwhelmingly white. In 2000 the decennial Census reported the white population at 95 percent of the combined area. In 2015 the ratio of whites to other races remains at 95 percent. However, the composition of whites has changed as
the number of Hispanics (an ethnic group not race) has increased. In 2000 only four percent of the population of the Snyderville Basin and East Summit County areas were Hispanics, by 2015 the share had increased to 11 percent.

Residents of Summit County have the highest incomes in the state. The U.S. Census Bureau reports the median income in 2015 at $91,733 however; HUD has recently published their income guidelines for tax credit projects. HUD estimates the Summit County median income at $103,400 in 2017. There is a wide gap in the median income of residents of Snyderville Basin and East Summit County. I have calculated the median income in Snyderville Basin at $113,796 for 2015 and $61,534 for East Summit County.\(^3\)

These income numbers would be even higher, if not for the growing number of low income Hispanic households. The income disparity between white households and Hispanic households contributes to income inequality. The median income for a Hispanic household in 2015 was $24,270 compared to $91,733 for a white households. According to the federal government’s Gini Coefficient Summit County ranks first among all Utah Counties in income inequality.

Employment data from Utah’s Department of Workforce Services does not include unincorporated areas or CDPs, therefore Summit County employment trends serve as a proxy for job conditions. Since 2001 Summit County has had the fastest growing labor market of any county in Utah. Over the fifteen year period employment increased at an average annual growth rate of 4.3 percent.

Employment at the CDP level however, is estimated by the U.S. Census Bureau in their Longitudinal Employer Household Dynamics (LEHD) tool. In 2014 the LEHD estimates the employment in the Snyderville Basin CDP at 9,504 jobs. Seventy percent of workers in Snyderville Basin commute from outside Summit County. Outside Summit County commuting into Snyderville Basin has increased by 145 percent since 2005, an increase of approximately 3,974 commuters.

The high levels of commuting into Summit County for employment suggests strong external demand for affordable housing. Estimates and projections of this external demand are included in the report and key findings. The existing level of commuting, wage rates, and expected growth in employment support the proposition that increasing the supply of affordable housing will create the demand for that housing.

Summit County’s position as a bedroom community for the Wasatch Front labor market continues to grow. Out-of-county commuting by residents has increased substantially since 2005. Snyderville Basin’s out-of-county commuting has increased by 2,519 commuters (72 percent increase) and for Coalville, Kamas, and Oakley by 525 commuters (96 percent increase). Fifty-four percent of the Snyderville Basin residents in the work force commute outside the

\(^3\) The Snyderville Basin household income estimate is from the American Community Survey for Zip Code 84098. The boundaries of this Zip Code coincides with the boundaries of the Snyderville Basin Planning District. The median income for East Summit County was derived by weighting the median income estimate for each of the cities by number of households.
county and 54 percent of residents of Kamas, Oakley, and Coalville commute outside the county for work.

**Housing Demand from 2018-2022** – The summaries below give the affordable housing demand for renter and owner occupied units. Over the 2018-2022 period the projected demand for rental units is 1,404 units including 985 units in Snyderville Basin and 419 units in East Summit County *Table 1*. The five-year demand for affordable owner occupied units is 665 units including 498 units in Snyderville Basin and 167 units in East Summit County. The total demand for residential units is 2,069 units.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Five-Year Total</th>
<th>Annual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Renter Occupied Units</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snyderville Basin</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Summit</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,404</strong></td>
<td><strong>281</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Owners Occupied Units</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snyderville Basin</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Summit</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>665</strong></td>
<td><strong>133</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Residential Units</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snyderville Basin</td>
<td>1,483</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Summit</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,069</strong></td>
<td><strong>414</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: James Wood.*

The more detailed projections are given in *Tables 2-7* show the projected demand for renter occupied units for the six income groups from ≤30% AMI to 120% AMI. For owner households the demand is projected for the four income groups from 50% AMI to 120% AMI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Demand</th>
<th>≤30% AMI</th>
<th>31%-50% AMI</th>
<th>51%-60% AMI</th>
<th>61%-80% AMI</th>
<th>81%-100% AMI</th>
<th>101%-120% AMI</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Renters with Severe Cost Burdens</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Demographic Growth 2018-2022</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth in Commuters 2018-2022</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Commuters</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five-Year Total 2018-2022</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Demand 2018-2022</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: James Wood.*
### Table 3
Demand for Renter Occupied Units, East Summit County
2018-2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Demand</th>
<th>≤30% AMI</th>
<th>31%-50% AMI</th>
<th>51%-60% AMI</th>
<th>61%-80% AMI</th>
<th>81%-100% AMI</th>
<th>101%-120% AMI</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Renters with Severe Cost Burdens</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Demographic Growth 2018-2022</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth in Commuters 2018-2022</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Commuters</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five-Year Total 2018-2022</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Demand 2018-2022</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: James Wood.*

### Table 4
Demand for Renter Occupied Units, Snyderville Basin and East Summit County
2018-2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Demand</th>
<th>≤30% AMI</th>
<th>31%-50% AMI</th>
<th>51%-60% AMI</th>
<th>61%-80% AMI</th>
<th>81%-100% AMI</th>
<th>101%-120% AMI</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Renters with Severe Cost Burdens</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Demographic Growth 2018-2022</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth in Commuters 2018-2022</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Commuters</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five-Year Total 2018-2022</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>1,404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Demand 2018-2022</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: James Wood.*

### Table 5
Demand for Owner Occupied Units, Snyderville Basin
2018-2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Demand</th>
<th>50-60% AMI</th>
<th>61%-80% AMI</th>
<th>81%-100% AMI</th>
<th>101-120% AMI</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projected Demographic Growth 2018-2022</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth in Commuters 2018-2022</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Commuters</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five-Year Total 2018-2022</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Demand</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: James Wood.*

### Table 6
Demand for Owner Occupied Units, East Summit County
2018-2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Demand</th>
<th>50-80% AMI</th>
<th>61%-80% AMI</th>
<th>81%-100% AMI</th>
<th>101-120% AMI</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projected Demographic Growth 2018-2022</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth in Commuters 2018-2022</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Commuters</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five-Year Total 2018-2022</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Demand</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: James Wood.*
# Table 7
**Demand for Owner Occupied Units, Snyderville Basin and East Summit County 2018-2022**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Demand</th>
<th>50-80% AMI</th>
<th>61%-80% AMI</th>
<th>81%-100% AMI</th>
<th>101-120% AMI</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projected Demographic Growth 2018-2022</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth in Commuters 2018-2022</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Commuters</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five-Year Total 2018-2022</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Demand</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: James Wood.*
I. Characteristics of the Housing Supply: Snyderville Basin and East Summit County

This section follows the *Recommended Affordable Housing Plan Outline* provided by the Utah Department of Housing and Community Development. The objective is to provide a statistical summary of the trends and current conditions of the housing market in Snyderville Basin and East Summit County. The data for the unincorporated county was derived by subtracting Park City, the incorporated cities, and the three CDPs from the Summit County totals. The three CDPs are Snyderville, Summit Park, and Silver Summit.

*Changes in the Housing Inventory* – The current housing inventory in Summit County totals 27,083 housing units. The geographic distribution of the housing units through the county is the following: Park City 9,608 units (36 percent share), Snyderville Basin’s three CDPs 9,415 units (35 percent share), and East Summit County (including municipalities) 8,060 units (29 percent share). Just a little more than half of all the housing units in Snyderville Basin are owner occupied. Another fifteen percent is renter occupied, leaving approximately 30 percent vacant. Of the vacant units 2,600 are vacant seasonal or second home units *Figure 1*. The East Summit County, which includes the incorporated cities along I-80 and State Highway 189 plus the unincorporated area has even a higher concentration of vacant seasonal and second home units. Forty–five percent of 8,060 housing units in East Summit County are seasonal or second home units. Renter occupied units (894 units) in East Summit County account for only 11 percent of the housing inventory of the area. The small share of housing units that are rental units is a reflection of the high land and development costs in the county and underscores the unmet demand for affordable rental housing *Figure 2*. Statewide thirty percent of all occupied housing units are renter occupied and seventy percent owner occupied.

![Figure 1: Share of Housing Inventory by Type of Use in Snyderville Basin](image)

*Figure 1: Share of Housing Inventory by Type of Use in Snyderville Basin* (9,415 total units)

- Owner Occupied Units, 5,075, 54%
- Renter Occupied Units, 1,402, 15%
- Vacant, 347, 4%
- Vacant Seasonal, Recreational, 2,591, 27%

---

*Housing affordability Assessment: Snyderville Basin and East Summit County*
In terms of numeric change, Snyderville Basin has experienced a much higher level of growth. From 2000 to 2015, the number of housing units in Snyderville Basin has doubled, increasing from 4,672 in 2000 to 9,415 in 2015, an annual growth rate of 4.7 percent. The most significant growth has occurred in the seasonal and second home category, where the number of units increased from 242 units in 2000 to nearly 2,600 in 2015, an annual growth rate of 17.1 percent. Undoubtedly, this surge in second home development was bolstered by the 2002 Olympics, which gave the Park City area national and international exposure over a two-week period. Table 1.

Since 2000, occupied housing units in Snyderville Basin have increased by 56 percent (3 percent annually) and totaled 6,477 units; considerably higher than the 4,199 occupied units in East Summit County. While East Summit County has not had the level of growth experienced by Snyderville, the seasonal and second home inventory in East Summit continues to be much larger share of the market than in Snyderville. The total number of seasonal and second home units in the East Summit County area is 3,611 units. Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2015*</th>
<th>Numeric Change</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Housing Units</td>
<td>4,672</td>
<td>9,415</td>
<td>4,743</td>
<td>101.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied</td>
<td>4,157</td>
<td>6,477</td>
<td>2,320</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of Total Units</td>
<td>89.0%</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>2,938</td>
<td>2,423</td>
<td>470.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of Total Units</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner Occupied</td>
<td>3,408</td>
<td>5,075</td>
<td>1,667</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of Occupied Units</td>
<td>82.0%</td>
<td>78.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter Occupied Units</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>1,402</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>87.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of Occupied Units</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Seasonal, Recreational</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>2,591</td>
<td>2,349</td>
<td>970.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of Total Units</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*average 2011-2015
Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey.
Table 2

Characteristics of Housing Inventory for the East Summit County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2015*</th>
<th>Numeric Change</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Housing Units</td>
<td>6,156</td>
<td>8,060</td>
<td>1,904</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied</td>
<td>3,470</td>
<td>4,199</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of Total Units</td>
<td>56.4%</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>2,686</td>
<td>3,861</td>
<td>1,175</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of Total Units</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner Occupied</td>
<td>2,745</td>
<td>3,305</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of Occupied Units</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
<td>78.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter Occupied Units</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of Occupied Units</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Seasonal, Recreational</td>
<td>2,489</td>
<td>3,611</td>
<td>1,122</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of Total Units</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*average 2011-2015

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey.

Vacancy Status - The most recent vacancy data from the 2015 American Community Survey shows the number of vacant units by type for Snyderville Basin and East Summit County, Tables 3 and 4. The local housing market is unique in the large number of vacant second home units but when compared with other resort communities conforms to a familiar pattern; high number of second homes, small number of apartment units, and an owner occupied market characterized by very high housing prices.

Table 3

Vacant Units in Snyderville Basin
(units)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2015*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Vacant</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>2,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Rent</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Sale</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented or Sold Not Occupied</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasonal, Recreational</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>2,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Migrant Workers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Vacant</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*average 2011-2015

Source: U.S. Census Bureau.

Table 4

Vacant Units in East Summit County
(units)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2015*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Vacant</td>
<td>2,686</td>
<td>3,861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Rent</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Sale</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented or Sold Not Occupied</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasonal, Recreational</td>
<td>2,489</td>
<td>3,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Migrant Workers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Vacant</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*average 2011-2015.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau.

Bedroom Types – The owner occupied housing inventory in Snyderville Basin is dominated by large homes; nearly sixty percent of the homes have at least four bedrooms. In East Summit
County homes are not quite as large, where about 43 percent have four or more bedrooms. The renter occupied units in both Snyderville Basin and East County also have a higher percentage of units with three or more bedrooms than the statewide rental inventory. And five bedroom rental units have a presence in the market, which is quite unusual. In summary, both areas are unusual in the share of housing units devoted to large configurations of three, four, and five bedroom units Table 5-6.

**Table 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Units by Number of Bedrooms in Snyderville Basin, 2015*</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>% Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Occupied Units</td>
<td>6,477</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner Occupied</td>
<td>5,075</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Bedroom</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Bedroom</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bedrooms</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>7.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Bedrooms</td>
<td>1,588</td>
<td>31.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Bedrooms</td>
<td>1,706</td>
<td>33.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more Bedrooms</td>
<td>1,312</td>
<td>25.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter Occupied</td>
<td>1,402</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Bedroom</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Bedroom</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>12.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bedrooms</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>38.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Bedrooms</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>19.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Bedrooms</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>20.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more Bedrooms</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>5.71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*average 2011-2015.
Source: U.S. Census Bureau.

**Table 6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Units by Number of Bedrooms in East Summit County, 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Occupied Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner Occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Bedroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Bedroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bedrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Bedrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Bedrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more Bedrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter Occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Bedroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Bedroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bedrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Bedrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Bedrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more Bedrooms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*average 2011-2015.
Source: U.S. Census Bureau.

Age of Housing Inventory – The median year housing units were built in Snyderville Basin and East Summit reflect, particularly in the case of Snyderville Basin, the growth over the past ten to fifteen years. Almost uniformly the median age for both rental units and owner occupied units is about twenty years old, i.e. the median year built is near the mid-1990s Table 7. The one
exception, almost an outlier, is rental units in East Summit County. The median age of rental units in East Summit County is 36 years.

### Table 7

**Median Year Housing Unit Built**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Snyderville Basin</th>
<th>East Summit County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner Occupied</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter Occupied</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau.

A more detailed measure of the age of housing shows that the 1990s and 2000s were extraordinary periods of housing development *Tables 8-9*. For example, prior to the 1990s owner occupied construction in Snyderville Basin had never exceeded 800 units *over a decade*, but in the 1990s decade 2,300 new owner occupied homes were added to the inventory and another 1,300 in the 2000s.

The decade of the 2000s was the period of greatest owner occupied development in East Summit County. About one out of every three owner occupied units in East Summit County were built during this decade and one out of every five rental units

### Table 8

**Tenure by Year Housing Unit Built in Snyderville Basin 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>% Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner Occupied</td>
<td>5,075</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 or later</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 to 2013</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 to 2009</td>
<td>1,287</td>
<td>25.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990 to 1999</td>
<td>2,343</td>
<td>46.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980 to 1989</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>15.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970 to 1979</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>7.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960 to 1969</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>1.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950 to 1959</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940 to 1949</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939 or earlier</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter Occupied</td>
<td>1,402</td>
<td>100.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 or later</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 to 2013</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>8.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 to 2009</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>32.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990 to 1999</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>33.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980 to 1989</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>16.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970 to 1979</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>6.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960 to 1969</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950 to 1959</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940 to 1949</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939 or earlier</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau.
Table 9
Tenure by Year Housing Unit Built in East Summit County
2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>% Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner Occupied</td>
<td>3,305</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 or later</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 to 2013</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 to 2009</td>
<td>1,034</td>
<td>31.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990 to 1999</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>21.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980 to 1989</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>8.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970 to 1979</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>11.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960 to 1969</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>8.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950 to 1959</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>4.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940 to 1949</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>3.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939 or earlier</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>9.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter Occupied</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 or later</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 to 2013</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 to 2009</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>19.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990 to 1999</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>8.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980 to 1989</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>11.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970 to 1979</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>31.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960 to 1969</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950 to 1959</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940 to 1949</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939 or earlier</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>14.77%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau.

Housing Problems: Kitchen and Plumbing Facilities - HUD classifies housing units “with problems” as those units that do not have complete kitchen or plumbing facilities. Census data show that these types of “housing problems” are nearly absent in the Snyderville Basin and East Summit County areas Table 10. In every case only a fraction of one percent of housing units are without complete kitchens or bathroom facilities.

Table 10
Housing Units Without Complete Kitchen or Bathrooms, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Snyderville Basin</th>
<th>Eastern County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Housing Units</td>
<td>6,477</td>
<td>4,199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacking Complete Plumbing Facilities</td>
<td>&lt;0.01%</td>
<td>&lt;0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacking Complete Kitchen Facilities</td>
<td>&lt;0.01%</td>
<td>&lt;0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Telephone Service</td>
<td>&lt;0.01%</td>
<td>&lt;0.01%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau.

Permit Authorized Residential Construction – Since 2000 a total of 5,158 building permits have been issued for residential units in unincorporated Summit County Figure 3 and Table 11. It’s necessary to use the data on the unincorporated area as a proxy for Snyderville Basin construction activity since building permits are not reported at the level of a Census Designated Place. The unincorporated area comprising the three CDPs undoubtedly is the location for the vast major of construction activity in Summit County’s unincorporated area. Although there has
certainly been some activity in the unincorporated area of East Summit County that activity would be only a fraction of the total residential construction activity.

The construction data tell a tale of two periods, the construction boom from 2000 to 2007, followed by the severe contraction that continues through to 2016 with very low levels of new construction. The 2008 contraction—a 84% percent in activity in a single years—is one of the steepest of any city, county, or community in the state. Since 2008 the most active year was 2010 when Cowboy Partners developed Liberty Peak Apartments near Tanger Outlets. On only two occasions since 2008 has building activity in the unincorporated area exceeded 200 units and in both cases it was by just a few units. The historic average (1980-2016) for residential permits in the unincorporated area of Summit County is 326 permits. Since 2010 residential activity (average of 131 units) in the unincorporated area has been less than half the historic average.

Single family construction accounts for 60 percent of the residential construction activity in the unincorporated area since 2000. A total of 3,014 single family units have received building permits. The condominium market has been active with nearly 2,000 permits issued for new units. Apartment construction has been minimal; 177 new units in sixteen years, only three percent of new residential units Figure 4.

Figure 3
Permits Issued for Residential Construction Unincorporated Summit County

### Table 11
Permits Issued for Residential Units in Unincorporated Summit County

(boom years, shaded area)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Single Family</th>
<th>Condominiums</th>
<th>Apartment</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,014</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,967</strong></td>
<td><strong>177</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,158</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ivory-Boyer Construction Database, Kem Gardner Policy Institute, University of Utah.

### Figure 4
Share of Permits Issued for Residential Units by Type in Unincorporated Summit County 2000-2016

- Condominiums, 1,967, 38%
- Single Family, 3,014, 59%
- Apartments, 177, 3%

Source: Ivory-Boyer Construction Database, Kem Gardner Policy Institute, University of Utah.
Residential building permit activity is reported for three cities in East Summit County; Coalville, Kamas, and Oakley. Residential construction in these three communities has a similar pattern to the unincorporated area. Building activity has been at less than half the pre-recession level when the number of permits issued in some years reached 60 units Figures 5-6 and Table 12. However, unlike the unincorporated area residential construction in the three East Summit cities is almost entirely single-family homes. Ninety-four percent of the residential units receiving permits since 2000 have been single family homes. Only a few condominiums have been developed during this period.

![Permits Issued for Residential Construction in Coalville, Kamas, and Oakley](image)

Source: Ivory-Boyer Construction Database, Kem Gardner Policy Institute, University of Utah.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Single Family</th>
<th>Condominiums</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ivory-Boyer Construction Database, Kem Gardner Policy Institute, University of Utah.
Housing Prices – Summit County is the highest priced housing market in Utah. In 2016 the median sales price of a home (combined single-family, condominiums, townhomes) was $675,000 see Map 1. Another measure, the multiple listing service, provides an estimate of just single family homes, a more meaningful estimate of housing prices. In 2016 the median sales price of a single family home in the Snyderville Basin area was $926,000 Table 13. This remarkably high sales price is more than three times the median sales price of a single family home in Salt Lake County, which was $305,000 in the second quarter of 2017. The median sales price in 2016 in East Summit County was $338,000, although significantly lower than Snyderville Basin, still a relatively high priced housing market.

Table 13
Median Sales Price of Existing Homes in Snyderville Basin and East Summit County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Snyderville Basin</th>
<th>East Summit Co.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$799,000</td>
<td>$339,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
<td>$261,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$597,775</td>
<td>$294,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$621,500</td>
<td>$205,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$599,000</td>
<td>$245,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>$290,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$765,000</td>
<td>$269,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$882,000</td>
<td>$290,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$926,000</td>
<td>$338,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: UtahRealEstate.com
Housing prices in both Snyderville Basin and East Summit County have recovered from the recession. The median sales price in East Summit is back to the pre-recession level while in Snyderville Basin the median sales price is 16 percent higher than in 2007 see Figure 7.

Figure 7
Median Sales Price of Single Family Homes in Snyderville Basin and East Summit County
The median sales of condominiums have also recovered from the Great Recession. In most housing markets condominiums provide an affordable housing alternative but in Snyderville Basin condominiums carry high prices as well. In 2016 the median sales price of a condominium was $412,500. Prices did drop to a low of $237,900 in 2011, a precipitous decline from $409,500 just four years earlier, but the strong recovery has restored price levels Table 14. There have been only a handful of condominium sales in East Summit County, an insufficient number to provide meaningful estimates.

### Table 14
Median Sales Price of Condominium, Townhomes, and Twin Homes in Snyderville Basin and East Summit County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Snyderville Basin</th>
<th>East Summit County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$409,500</td>
<td>Less than 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$315,000</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$310,000</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$246,000</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$237,900</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$238,750</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$295,250</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$329,850</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$365,500</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$412,500</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Utah Real Estate. Com

**Rental Rates and Occupancy Rates** - There is no regularly published survey of rental rates in Summit County. As is the case with most rental markets outside the metropolitan area, there are only a handful of traditional apartment projects. Beyond the six tax credit projects in the county and the twelve CROWN homes (discussed below), which are all 100% occupied and have long waiting lists, there are very few traditional apartment units for rent. Most rental units, beyond the tax credit and Rural Development assisted projects, are condominium units for rent.

From a survey of about 100 units currently for rent in Summit County listed on the websites of Zillow, Trulia, Apartments.com, and KSL.com, I have calculated the following median rental rates by type of unit: one bedroom $1,250 (29 units surveyed), two bedroom two bath units $1,900 (39 units surveyed) and three bedroom two bath units $2,350 (27 units surveyed). I excluded units that had three or four bathrooms and rental homes.

**Affordable Rental Inventory** - There are six tax credit apartment projects in Summit County with a total of 347 units Table 15. Four of the projects are quite small in terms of number of units. Two projects (Richer Place) and (New Park Studios) are targeted for workforce housing, emphasizing studio and one bedroom units. But at 50% AMI the rent for a one bedroom unit is $970, which is not affordable to the typical retail or restaurant worker in Summit County. The average wage for a restaurant worker is $21,972 and for a retail worker $28,008. To avoid a housing cost burden these workers cannot pay more than $700 a month for rent and utilities.

Two large projects are located in Snyderville Basin, Elk Meadows with 96 units and Liberty Peak with 152 units. Both of these projects have AMI target rents about 50% AMI, therefore
they are not affordable to the retail, restaurant, and hospitality workers in the local labor market. The rent structure of the tax credit projects is heavily weighted to rents above 50% AMI. Seventy percent of the tax credit units have rents equal to a more than 50 percent AMI Table 16.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 15</th>
<th>Unit Mix of Tax Credit Projects in East Summit County and Snyderville Basin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Summit County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Bluffs Crown</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadow View I</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadow View II</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scattered Sites Crown</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snyderville Basin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Park Studios</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elk Meadows</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty Peak</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richer Place</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 16</th>
<th>Tax Credit Units by AMI Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMI Target</td>
<td>Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53%</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56%</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Units</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Utah Housing Corporation.

A look at the tax credit inventory as a share of the rental inventory shows that Snyderville Basin has a high share of tax credit units. Twenty-two percent of the rental inventory of 1,400 units are tax credit units Table 17. Although affordability of these units does not reach many of the workers in the market, the presence of 311 units does provide reasonably priced rental opportunities for households with incomes above 50 percent AMI. Tax credit units in East Summit County account for only four percent of the rental inventory.
## Table 17
**Tax Credit Units as Percent of Rental Inventory by County - 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Total Units in Tax Credit Projects*</th>
<th>Tax Credit Units</th>
<th>Rental Inventory</th>
<th>Tax Credit Units as Share of Rental Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Snyderville Basin</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>1,402</td>
<td>22.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>21.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summit</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>3,171</td>
<td>21.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tooele</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>4,327</td>
<td>16.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box Elder</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>3,628</td>
<td>15.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>1,290</td>
<td>12.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasatch</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>1,991</td>
<td>12.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weber</td>
<td>2,656</td>
<td>2,499</td>
<td>22,909</td>
<td>10.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake</td>
<td>14,739</td>
<td>12,374</td>
<td>116,355</td>
<td>10.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>2,346</td>
<td>2,187</td>
<td>21,693</td>
<td>10.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Juan</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>9.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>5,622</td>
<td>9.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>2,355</td>
<td>9.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>1,381</td>
<td>1,347</td>
<td>14,821</td>
<td>9.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duchesne</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>1,670</td>
<td>8.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaver</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>7.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kane</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>7.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cache</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>12,335</td>
<td>7.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sevier</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>1,613</td>
<td>6.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uintah</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>2,737</td>
<td>5.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juab</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>4.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanpete</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>2,051</td>
<td>4.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East Summit</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>894</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>1,890</td>
<td>1,767</td>
<td>47,549</td>
<td>3.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emery</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>3.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garfield</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>2.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millard</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,038</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daggett</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piute</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>28,008</strong></td>
<td><strong>24,923</strong></td>
<td><strong>271,589</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.20%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Some tax credit projects also have market rate units. The difference between column 2 and 3 is the number of market rate units. Source: Utah Housing Corporation.
II. Characteristics of Housing Demand: Demographic and Employment Trends

Growth Trends for Population and Households - The population and household growth in Snyderville Basin and East Summit County has slowed considerably since the Great Recession. Prior to the Great Recession demographic growth, particularly in Snyderville Basin, was registering well above three percent annually. This growth was produced, in part, by the 2002 Olympics, which raised the visibility and cachet of the Park City area. From 2000 to 2013 the average annual population growth rate was 3.15% and for households 3.47% Table 1. In 2015 the population of the Snyderville Basin was 18,045. Over the past four years, as demographic growth has slowed due to high real estate prices. Population growth is estimated at 2.35 percent annually and household growth at 2.38 percent annually.

Table 1
Population and Household Growth in Snyderville Basin*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Average Household Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>12,064</td>
<td>4,157</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>18,045</td>
<td>6,477</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>19,350</td>
<td>6,950</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Annual Growth Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000-2013</td>
<td>3.15%</td>
<td>3.47%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2017</td>
<td>2.35%</td>
<td>2.38%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Estimates for 2013 are from the 2011-2015 average from the American Community Survey.
Source: U.S. Census Bureau.

Demographic growth has been slower in East Summit County. Both population and household growth has been at about half the rate of Snyderville Basin. From 2000 to 2013 the population of East Summit increased from 10,300 to 12,500, an average annual growth rate of 1.5 percent. The number of household in East Summit by 2013 was 4,200. Population and households have increased at a very modest 1.18 percent annually from 2013 to 2017.

Table 2
Population and Household Trends in East Summit County*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Average Household Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>10,304</td>
<td>3,470</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>12,513</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>4,375</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Annual Growth Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000-2013</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2017</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Estimates for 2013 are from the 2011-2015 average from the American Community Survey.
Source: U.S. Census Bureau.

Summit County ranks ninth among Utah’s 29 counties in population growth since 2010. The average annual growth rate for the county over this period was 1.68 percent. The countywide growth when compared to the demographic growth of Snyderville Basin and East Summit County do indicate that Park City and East Summit are relatively slow growth, less than two
percent annually, while Snyderville Basin grows at a slighter faster pace, above two percent annually.

Table 3
Counties Ranked by Population Growth Rate 2010 to 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>% Chg.</th>
<th>AAGR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wasatch</td>
<td>23,629</td>
<td>30,528</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>4.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>9,527</td>
<td>11,437</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>3.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>138,443</td>
<td>160,245</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>2.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Juan</td>
<td>14,797</td>
<td>16,895</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>2.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>520,118</td>
<td>592,299</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>2.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uintah</td>
<td>32,446</td>
<td>36,373</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>1.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>307,978</td>
<td>342,281</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>1.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tooele</td>
<td>58,517</td>
<td>64,833</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>1.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summit</td>
<td>36,465</td>
<td>40,307</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>1.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>2,775,326</td>
<td>3,051,217</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>1.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duchesne</td>
<td>18,560</td>
<td>20,337</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>1.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake</td>
<td>1,033,172</td>
<td>1,121,354</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>1.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cache</td>
<td>113,365</td>
<td>122,753</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>1.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>46,264</td>
<td>49,937</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>1.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juab</td>
<td>10,222</td>
<td>11,010</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weber</td>
<td>232,214</td>
<td>247,560</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>1.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box Elder</td>
<td>50,147</td>
<td>53,139</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>0.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanpete</td>
<td>27,882</td>
<td>29,409</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>0.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand</td>
<td>9,298</td>
<td>9,579</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich</td>
<td>2,251</td>
<td>2,319</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kane</td>
<td>7,123</td>
<td>7,334</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>0.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sevier</td>
<td>20,772</td>
<td>21,267</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>0.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daggett</td>
<td>1,076</td>
<td>1,095</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>0.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millard</td>
<td>12,513</td>
<td>12,694</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>2,765</td>
<td>2,702</td>
<td>-2.3%</td>
<td>-0.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaver</td>
<td>6,648</td>
<td>6,463</td>
<td>-2.8%</td>
<td>-0.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garfield</td>
<td>5,175</td>
<td>4,986</td>
<td>-3.7%</td>
<td>-0.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon</td>
<td>21,421</td>
<td>20,399</td>
<td>-4.8%</td>
<td>-0.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piute</td>
<td>1,556</td>
<td>1,466</td>
<td>-5.8%</td>
<td>-0.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emery</td>
<td>10,982</td>
<td>10,216</td>
<td>-7.0%</td>
<td>-1.20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Utah Department of Workforce Services.

Population by Age Group – Tables 4-5 show the population by five year age group. The aging of the population in Snyderville Basin is pronounced. Every age group from 20-24 years to 75-84 years has a higher share of the population in 2015 than in 2000. And of course conversely, the share of children has dropped. The 45-54 year age group has the largest share of the population in 2015 at 19 percent. In 2000 that distinction was held by the 35-44 year age group.

The change in the age distribution from 2000 to 2015 in East Summit follows a similar pattern of aging but not nearly as exaggerated as Snyderville Basin. Children under fourteen are a greater share of the population in East Summit and the 45-54 year age group represents 12.9 percent of the population compared to 19 percent in Snyderville Basin. By comparison the population of East Summit is young and more evenly spread throughout the five-year age groups.
Table 4
Population by Age in Snyderville Basin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>% Share</th>
<th>2011-2015</th>
<th>% Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12,054</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>18,045</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 to 5</td>
<td>911</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9</td>
<td>1,091</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>1,378</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 14</td>
<td>1,165</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>1,725</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 19</td>
<td>911</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>1,334</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 24</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 34</td>
<td>1,533</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>1,432</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 44</td>
<td>2,869</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>2,760</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 54</td>
<td>2,093</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>3,423</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>1,497</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 to 64</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1,188</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 to 74</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1,117</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-84</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau.

Table 5
Population by Age in East Summit County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>% Share</th>
<th>2011-2015</th>
<th>% Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10,311</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>12,513</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 to 5</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>1,104</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 14</td>
<td>958</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>1,026</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 19</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 24</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 34</td>
<td>1,378</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>1,828</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 44</td>
<td>1,752</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>1,766</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 54</td>
<td>1,279</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>1,620</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 to 64</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 to 74</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-84</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau.

Race and Ethnicity - Race and ethnicity are important to the housing demand assessment. First, race (people of color) and ethnicity (Hispanic origin) are classifications used by HUD in the designation of protected classes. Federal law prohibits housing discrimination based on a person’s color or ethnicity. While all of the planning areas are predominately white (white alone not Hispanic), each planning area does have a share of residents who are of Hispanic origin. (Hispanic is an ethnicity not a race.) Most Hispanics are generally part of the white population except when the white population is defined as white alone not Hispanic.

Since 2000 the share of whites in Snyderville Basin has changed very little, holding at about 95 percent of the population while in East Summit the share of whites has increased from nearly 96 percent to over 98 percent. The most important demographic development regarding race and ethnicity is the growing share of Hispanics in both areas. Again, Hispanics are not a race but...
rather an ethnic group. Most Hispanics, unless they report to the Census that they are of a different race than white, end up classified racially as white.

The U.S. Census however, makes estimates of the population by ethnicity. The estimates of population by ethnicity show that the number of Hispanics in Snyderville Basin increased from 487 individuals in 2000 to 1,513 in 2015. Their share of the population increased from four percent to 8.4 percent Table 6. In East Summit County the Hispanic population was 1,661 in 2015, an increase of nearly 1,200 individuals in fifteen years. Hispanics account for 13.3 percent of the population in East Summit County Table 7. The Hispanic population in East Summit is growing at a slightly faster pace than in Snyderville Basin and Hispanics have a greater share of the population in East Summit.

Table 6
Race and Ethnicity – Snyderville Basin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2015*</th>
<th>% Share 2000</th>
<th>% Share 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12,054</td>
<td>18,045</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>11,486</td>
<td>17,035</td>
<td>95.3%</td>
<td>94.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>1,513</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Average 2011-2015.
Source: U.S. Census Bureau.

Table 7
Race and Ethnicity – East Summit County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2015*</th>
<th>% Share 2000</th>
<th>% Share 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10,311</td>
<td>12,513</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>9,879</td>
<td>12,298</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
<td>98.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>1,661</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Average 2011-2015.
Source: U.S. Census Bureau.

**Household Income and Wages** - Summit County ranks first among Utah Counties in median household income. In 2015 the median household income of the county was $91,733 Table 8. The county ranks first in terms of income inequality with a Gini Index of .4589. Salt Lake County’s Gini Coefficient is .4321. The higher the Gini Index number the more unequal the income distribution. Perfect income equality would have an index value of 0 and perfect inequality would have an index of 1.
Changes in the median household income for Snyderville Basin and East Summit are shown in Tables 8-10. The median income in Snyderville Basin in 2015 was estimated at $113,796; in East Summit County the median income was $61,534. The median income in Snyderville Basin has increased by 35 percent since 1999 and by 31 percent in East Summit County.

### Table 8
**Counties Ranked by Household Income, 2015***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Median Household Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summit</td>
<td>$91,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>$74,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>$72,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uintah</td>
<td>$66,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasatch</td>
<td>$66,486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake</td>
<td>$65,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>$65,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tooele</td>
<td>$63,552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duchesne</td>
<td>$61,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daggett</td>
<td>$56,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weber</td>
<td>$56,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box Elder</td>
<td>$55,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>$54,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juab</td>
<td>$54,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand</td>
<td>$53,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millard</td>
<td>$51,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich</td>
<td>$50,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cache</td>
<td>$50,518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanpete</td>
<td>$50,323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaver</td>
<td>$50,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kane</td>
<td>$50,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emery</td>
<td>$49,787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon</td>
<td>$46,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sevier</td>
<td>$46,291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>$43,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garfield</td>
<td>$42,614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Juan</td>
<td>$41,484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>$40,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piute</td>
<td>$35,980</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Average 2011-2015
Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey.

### Table 9
**Median Household Income Snyderville Basin**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Median Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>$83,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$102,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$113,796</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| % Chg. 1999-2015 | 35% |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau.
Table 10
Household Income in East Summit County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Median Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>$46,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$57,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$61,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Chg. 1999-2015</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau.

Wages Rates – There are no published wage rates for Snyderville Basin. The most recent data (2015) for Coalville and Kamas show relatively low average wages of $30,192 and $37,692 respectively. The best measure of wage rates and trends is countywide data which capture the economic activity in the unincorporated area, which includes wages in Snyderville Basin and East Summit County. The wage data confirm that the Summit County economy is a low wage economy Table 11. While the county has the highest income level in the state the average wage has historically been below the average statewide wage rate. In 2015 the average wage was about ninety five percent of the statewide average. For most of the past ten years the county’s average wage rate has been more than 10 percent below the statewide average. The average annual wage in 2016 of workers in Summit County was $41,460 compared to the median household income of residents of $103,000.

Table 11
Comparison of Average Wage Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Park City</th>
<th>Summit</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Park City as % of Summit Average Wage</th>
<th>Summit Co. as % of State Average Wage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$30,504</td>
<td>$30,888</td>
<td>$34,596</td>
<td>98.8%</td>
<td>89.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$32,856</td>
<td>$33,180</td>
<td>$36,516</td>
<td>99.0%</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$32,988</td>
<td>$33,072</td>
<td>$37,452</td>
<td>99.7%</td>
<td>88.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$32,292</td>
<td>$32,556</td>
<td>$38,052</td>
<td>99.2%</td>
<td>85.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$32,664</td>
<td>$34,380</td>
<td>$38,820</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
<td>88.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$33,876</td>
<td>$35,028</td>
<td>$39,660</td>
<td>96.7%</td>
<td>88.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$34,068</td>
<td>$36,036</td>
<td>$40,644</td>
<td>94.5%</td>
<td>88.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$34,800</td>
<td>$36,588</td>
<td>$41,064</td>
<td>95.1%</td>
<td>89.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$36,060</td>
<td>$38,424</td>
<td>$42,180</td>
<td>93.8%</td>
<td>91.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$38,148</td>
<td>$41,088</td>
<td>$43,452</td>
<td>92.8%</td>
<td>94.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$41,460</td>
<td>$44,460</td>
<td>93.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Utah Department of Workforce Services.

Household Income and Tenure - Household income by tenure shows that 40 percent of homeowners in Snyderville Basin have incomes at or above $150,000 Figure 1. And another 25 percent have incomes between $100,000 and $150,000. Only 20 percent of owners in Snyderville Basin have incomes below $75,000 whereas in East Summit half of all owners have incomes below $75,000.

The difference in the income of renters is not quite as stark but Snyderville Basin has a larger share of high income renters and fewer low income renters. In Snyderville Basin only 20 percent of renters have incomes below $35,000 while in East Summit County 43 percent of the renters have incomes below $35,000.
**Figure 1**
Household Income of Owners in Snyderville Basin, 2015
(total owners = 5,075)

**Figure 2**
Household Income of Owners in East Summit County, 2015
(total owners = 3,305)
Employment Characteristics and Trends – The U.S. Census Bureau’s OnTheMap tool provides employment estimates for each of the CDPs. A time series of the employment data are included in Table 12 and Figure 5. Of the three CDPs Snyderville Basin has by far the largest employment base with about 6,194 jobs in 2016. The Silver Summit and Summit Park CDPs each have an employment base of around 1,600-1,700 jobs. The combined total for the three CDPs is 9,504 jobs. The combined employment share of the CDPs has grown from 16.5 percent of county employment in 2002 to 37 percent in 2015. A large share of the job growth has
occurred in the Snyderville Basin CDP, with the expansion of retail and hospitality establishments around the Kimball Junction area. Employment data for cities in East Summit show very low levels of jobs. Kamas and Oakley combined have a job base of about 1,000 jobs.

Table 12
Employment in Snyderville Basin Compared to Summit County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Snyderville Basin</th>
<th>Silver Summit</th>
<th>Summit Park</th>
<th>Total CDPs</th>
<th>Summit County</th>
<th>% Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1,641</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>2,715</td>
<td>16,432</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1,959</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>3,216</td>
<td>16,418</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2,236</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>3,732</td>
<td>17,517</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2,506</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>4,165</td>
<td>18,899</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>3,109</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>5,043</td>
<td>20,620</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>3,313</td>
<td>1,246</td>
<td>1,114</td>
<td>5,673</td>
<td>21,900</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>3,416</td>
<td>1,473</td>
<td>1,159</td>
<td>6,048</td>
<td>22,716</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>3,983</td>
<td>1,319</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>6,240</td>
<td>20,755</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3,767</td>
<td>1,124</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>5,872</td>
<td>20,681</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>4,979</td>
<td>1,275</td>
<td>1,083</td>
<td>7,337</td>
<td>21,877</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>5,435</td>
<td>1,511</td>
<td>1,272</td>
<td>8,218</td>
<td>22,666</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>6,007</td>
<td>1,444</td>
<td>1,382</td>
<td>8,833</td>
<td>23,379</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>5,375</td>
<td>1,521</td>
<td>1,617</td>
<td>8,513</td>
<td>24,356</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>6,194</td>
<td>1,728</td>
<td>1,592</td>
<td>9,504</td>
<td>25,388</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, OnTheMap.

Figure 5
Employment Trend in Silver Summit, Summit Park and Snyderville

Summit County employment data provide a broader picture of the rapidly growing local labor market. Over the past 15 years Summit County has had the greatest percentage increase in employment of any county in Utah. The number of jobs has almost doubled in this period, increasing from 15,850 to 29,650, an increase of 4.3 percent annually over 15 years Table 13. This substantial increase in jobs has occurred during a period of very modest demographic
growth. The imbalance between job growth and demographic growth is reconciled by increased levels of out of county commuting into Summit County.

About half of all workers in Summit County are employed in retail trade, accommodations and food services, and arts, entertainment and recreation Table 14. The average annual wage in these three sectors is around $30,000. The highest wage sector is finance and insurance with an average annual income of $109,908. The lowest wage sector is retail trade with an average annual income of $28,080

### Table 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>% Chg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Summit</td>
<td>15,846</td>
<td>29,650</td>
<td>87.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Wasatch</td>
<td>4,727</td>
<td>8,330</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>35,740</td>
<td>62,204</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>154,056</td>
<td>242,031</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Duchesne</td>
<td>5,122</td>
<td>7,560</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>87,579</td>
<td>123,386</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Tooele</td>
<td>11,646</td>
<td>16,080</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Cache</td>
<td>42,537</td>
<td>58,201</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>1,636</td>
<td>2,168</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>13,960</td>
<td>18,406</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>1,110</td>
<td>881</td>
<td>-20.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Utah Department of Workforce Services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Average Wage</th>
<th>% Share of Summit County Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>$29,340</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>$74,424</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>$84,288</td>
<td>0.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$46,404</td>
<td>5.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>$76,032</td>
<td>2.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>$108,780</td>
<td>0.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>$28,080</td>
<td>13.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Warehousing</td>
<td>$34,788</td>
<td>1.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>$68,808</td>
<td>1.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Insurance</td>
<td>$109,908</td>
<td>1.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate and Rental Leasing</td>
<td>$45,072</td>
<td>4.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and Scientific &amp; Tech.</td>
<td>$81,120</td>
<td>4.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of Companies</td>
<td>$93,132</td>
<td>0.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin. Support</td>
<td>$41,868</td>
<td>3.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Services</td>
<td>$31,824</td>
<td>1.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care</td>
<td>$46,488</td>
<td>5.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, Entertainment and Recreation</td>
<td>$33,180</td>
<td>13.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation and Food Services</td>
<td>$29,184</td>
<td>23.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>$37,200</td>
<td>2.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Government</td>
<td>$49,428</td>
<td>0.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Government</td>
<td>$39,492</td>
<td>0.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>$39,012</td>
<td>9.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26,500</td>
<td>$41,460</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Utah Department of Workforce Services.
The growth in employment in Summit County has consistently been higher than the demographic growth rate. Consequently the employment to population ratio has increased gradually over the past generation. In 1990 employment in the county was about 50 percent of the population Table 15. By 2015 that ratio had increased to 64 percent. This escalating ratio is underscores the role population centers and labor markets outside the county play as sources of labor for Summit County employers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Employment to Population Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>15,690</td>
<td>7,989</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>17,051</td>
<td>8,273</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>18,546</td>
<td>8,963</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>20,221</td>
<td>9,945</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>21,863</td>
<td>11,143</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>23,632</td>
<td>12,076</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>25,051</td>
<td>12,705</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>26,224</td>
<td>13,001</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>27,674</td>
<td>13,764</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>28,799</td>
<td>14,348</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>30,012</td>
<td>15,896</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>30,329</td>
<td>15,585</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>31,357</td>
<td>16,432</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>32,053</td>
<td>16,418</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>32,847</td>
<td>17,517</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>33,600</td>
<td>18,899</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>34,051</td>
<td>20,620</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>34,864</td>
<td>21,900</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>35,540</td>
<td>22,716</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>35,802</td>
<td>20,755</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>36,496</td>
<td>20,681</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>37,208</td>
<td>21,877</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>37,904</td>
<td>22,666</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>38,486</td>
<td>23,379</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>39,136</td>
<td>24,356</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>39,633</td>
<td>25,388</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Utah Department of Workforce Services.

**Commuting Patterns of Residents and Workers** - The Longitudinal Employment Household Dynamics (LEHD) tool from the U.S. Census Bureau shows the home origin of workers in Snyderville Basin. In the case of East Summit County the employment base is rather small so commuting into the cities is limited. However, most residents of the cities in East Summit commute outside the cities for employment.

**Out of County Commuting into Snyderville Basin** – The Census’ LEHD tool estimates the total employment in Snyderville Basin at 9,504 in 2015. No out of county location dominates as the city of origin. Salt Lake City leads with 827 commuters into Snyderville Basin, followed by Heber at 418, then Millcreek, Sandy, and West Valley Table 16. Over the past ten years commuters into Snyderville Basin have consistently accounted for about 70 percent of the workforce in the Snyderville Basin Table 17 and Figure 6. Unlike commuting into Snyderville,
the commuting into East Summit County from outside counties is very limited and does not represent a meaningful source of housing demand.

Table 16
City Origin for Workers Commuting into Snyderville Basin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City of Origin</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>% Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Employment</td>
<td>9,504</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heber</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millcreek</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Valley</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total In County Workers</td>
<td>2,794</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Out of County Commuting</td>
<td>6,710</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census, Longitudinal Employment Household Dynamics.

Table 17
Share of Worker Commuting into Snyderville Basin from Out of County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Employment</th>
<th>Workers Living Out of County</th>
<th>% Share of Workers Living Out of County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>4,165</td>
<td>2,736</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>4,953</td>
<td>3,401</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>5,673</td>
<td>4,038</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>6,093</td>
<td>4,271</td>
<td>70.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>6,240</td>
<td>4,079</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>5,872</td>
<td>4,030</td>
<td>68.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>7,337</td>
<td>5,132</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>8,218</td>
<td>5,729</td>
<td>69.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>8,833</td>
<td>6,169</td>
<td>69.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>8,513</td>
<td>6,140</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>9,504</td>
<td>6,710</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census, Longitudinal Employment Household Dynamics.

Figure 6
Out of County Commuting into Snyderville Basin
Commuting by Residents to Out of County Locations – In the Snyderville Basin Planning District there were 10,994 residents in the workforce in 2015. Forty-six percent of the employed residents worked in Summit County (5,011 workers) and the remaining 54 percent (5,983 workers) commuted to out of county locations. Salt Lake County dominates as the out of county location with 37 percent of residents of Snyderville Basin working in Salt Lake County, followed by Utah County, a distance second with only 5 percent.

Fifty-four percent of the residents of Coalville, Kamas, and Oakley who are in the workforce commute outside of Summit County for work. Prime locations are cities in Salt Lake and Utah Counties. In 2015 1,985 residents of the three cities were in the workforce and 1,072 commuted to work outside Summit County.
III. Housing Affordability and Demand Analysis

Demand for Affordable of Rental Housing

Affordability Calculator - Household income is one of the most important factors in assessing a city or county’s housing affordability. The household income used for the three jurisdictions in this study relies on U.S. Census Bureau estimates. The household income along with an estimated mortgage interest rate of five percent, monthly utilities costs of $200, and mortgage insurance cost of one percent were all entered into the Utah Division of Housing and Community Development’s Utah Affordable Housing Forecast Tool. This tool then calculated the monthly income for housing expenses and maximum mortgage payment for households with incomes at 30% AMI, 30%-50% AMI, 50%-80% AMI, 80% to 100% AMI, and 100% to 120% AMI for Snyderville Basin and East Summit County Tables 1-2.

The Affordability Calculator determined that in Snyderville Basin the monthly income available for housing costs for households with 30% AMI to 120% AMI ranged from a low of $850 to a high of $3,414. In East Summit County the maximum monthly income available for rent or a mortgage payment is $462 for a households at 30 percent AMI and $1,846 for a households at 120 percent AMI. The maximum mortgage loan amounts based on the median income of the jurisdictions are also determined by the Affordability Calculator.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>Affordability Calculator for Snyderville Basin Planning District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Snyderville, Summit Park, Silver Summit CDPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>2011-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMI</td>
<td>$113,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Utility Costs</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan Terms (Years)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Rate</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortgage Insurance</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortgage, Insurance Rate</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monthly Income for Housing Expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>Maximum Mortgage Loan Amount</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤30% AMI</td>
<td>$853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30% to 50% AMI</td>
<td>$854 to $1,422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51% to 60%</td>
<td>$1,423 to $1,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61% to 80% AMI</td>
<td>$1,709 to $2,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81% to 100% AMI</td>
<td>$2,277 to $2,845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101% to ≤120% AMI</td>
<td>$2,846 to $3,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>≤30% AMI</strong></td>
<td><strong>$97,049</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30% to 50% AMI</td>
<td><strong>$186,586</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51% to 60%</td>
<td><strong>$230,807</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61% to 80% AMI</td>
<td><strong>$320,590</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81% to 100% AMI</td>
<td><strong>$410,052</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101% to 120% AMI</td>
<td><strong>$492,061</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Utah Affordable Housing Forecast Tool
Table 2
Affordability Calculator for East Summit County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Summit County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Eastern Summit County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>2011-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMI</td>
<td>$61,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Utility Costs</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan Terms (Years)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Rate</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortgage Insurance</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortgage Insurance Rate</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Income for Housing Expenses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤30% AMI</td>
<td>≤$462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31% to 50% AMI</td>
<td>$463 to $769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51% to 60% AMI</td>
<td>$770 to $921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61% to 80% AMI</td>
<td>$921 to $1,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81%-100% AMI</td>
<td>$1,231 to $1,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%-120% AMI</td>
<td>$1,539 to $1,846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Mortgage Loan Amount</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤30% AMI</td>
<td>$35,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31% to 50% AMI</td>
<td>$83,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51% to 60% AMI</td>
<td>$107,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61% to 80% AMI</td>
<td>$156,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81%-100% AMI</td>
<td>$204,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%-120% AMI</td>
<td>$245,790</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Utah Affordable Housing Forecast Tool

The number of renters by AMI brackets are shown in Figures 1-2.

Figure 1
Number of Renters in Snyderville Basin by AMI Brackets, 2014

Source: HUD CHAS.

Figure 2
Housing Cost Burden for Renters – The HUD CHAS provides the cost burden data for renters and owners for each of the AMI income levels. A housing cost burden is present when a renter or owner pays more than 30 percent of their household income for housing costs. A severe cost burden is present when housing costs rise to 50 percent of household income.

Severe Housing Cost Burden and Demand for Affordable Rental Units - The demand for affordable rental housing is best illustrated by those households with a severe housing cost burden. These households are most vulnerable to housing instability and homelessness. In Snyderville Basin 17 percent of renters, a total of 195 renters, with incomes less than 120 percent AMI have cost burdens greater than 50 percent of their income Table 3. Half of all extremely low income renters, 135 renters, have severe housing cost burdens. An extremely low income renter household (≤30 percent AMI), in Snyderville Basin has an income at or below $35,000.

### Table 3
Cost Burdened Renter Households in Snyderville Basin Planning District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income AMI</th>
<th>Cost Burdened Households (&gt;30%)</th>
<th>Total Households</th>
<th>% Share with Burden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>≤30% AMI</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30% to 50% AMI</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>84.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51% to 60% AMI</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61% to 80% AMI</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81% to 100% AMI</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>59.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101%-120%AMII</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Renters</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>1,171</td>
<td>40.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income AMI</th>
<th>Severely Cost Burdened Households (&gt;50%)</th>
<th>Total Households</th>
<th>% Share with Burden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>≤30% AMI</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30% to 50% AMI</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51% to 60% AMI</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61% to 80% AMI</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81% to 100% AMI</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101%-120%AMII</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Renters</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>1,171</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In East Summit County there are 150 renter households with severe cost burdens, about one in six renters Table 4. Half of all extremely low income renter households have severe housing cost burdens. Extremely low income in East Summit County is $18,460.

Table 4
Cost Burdened Renter Households in East Summit County Planning District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income AMI, Cost Burdened Households (&gt;30%)</th>
<th>Households with Burden</th>
<th>Total Households</th>
<th>% Share with Burden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>≤30% AMI</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>255*</td>
<td>94.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30% to 50% AMI</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>60.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51% to 60% AMI</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61% to 80% AMI</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81% to 100% AMI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101%- 120%AMI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Renters ≤120% AMI</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income AMI, Severely Cost Burdened Households (&gt;50%)</th>
<th>Households with Burden</th>
<th>Total Households</th>
<th>% Share with Burden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>≤30% AMI</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30% to 50% AMI</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51% to 60% AMI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61% to 80% AMI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81% to 100% AMI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101%- 120%AMI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Renters ≤120% AMI</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*includes 115 households that pay no cash rent.
Source: HUD CHAS 2009-2013.

Further confirmation of the serious demand for affordable rental housing in Summit County is provided by a comparative analysis with other counties; Snyderville Basin and East Summit County comprise 80 percent of the households and population of the county. Summit County ranks eighth among all Utah counties in the percent of renter households that have a severe housing cost burden. One-in-five renters face housing costs in excess of 50 percent of their household income, 705 of the 3,490 renter households in Summit County have severe housing cost burdens Table 5.
Table 5  
Counties Ranked by Percent of Renter Households with Severe Housing Cost Burden by Income (AMI Categories)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Renters Households</th>
<th>Renter Households with Severe Cost Burden</th>
<th>% Renters with Severe Cost Burden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>≤30% AMI</td>
<td>&gt;30%–≤50% AMI</td>
<td>&gt;50%–≤80% AMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Utah County</td>
<td>45,940</td>
<td>7,090</td>
<td>3,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Wasatch County</td>
<td>1,865</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Washington County</td>
<td>14,475</td>
<td>1,835</td>
<td>985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Salt Lake County</td>
<td>112,425</td>
<td>18,325</td>
<td>6,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Grand County</td>
<td>1,160</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Wayne County</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Rich County</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Summit County</td>
<td>3,490</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Weber County</td>
<td>22,580</td>
<td>3,605</td>
<td>690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Cache County</td>
<td>12,565</td>
<td>1,590</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Juab County</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Emery County</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Duchesne County</td>
<td>1,650</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Davis County</td>
<td>21,270</td>
<td>2,825</td>
<td>890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Iron County</td>
<td>5,750</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Sevier County</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Carbon County</td>
<td>2,365</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Uintah County</td>
<td>2,755</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Box Elder County</td>
<td>3,360</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Morgan County</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Tooele County</td>
<td>4,530</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>San Juan County</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Millard County</td>
<td>1,055</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Sanpete County</td>
<td>1,855</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Garfield County</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Piute County</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Beaver County</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Kane County</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Daggett County</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>264,915</td>
<td>39,834</td>
<td>13,493</td>
<td>2,678</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


A comparison of Snyderville Basin with cities that have at least 1,000 renter households shows that Snyderville Basin ranks 42nd, in terms of renters with severe housing cost burdens Table 6.
### Table 6
Cities Ranked by Percent of Renters with Severe Housing Cost Burden
(Cities with More than 1,000 Renter Households)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Renter Households</th>
<th>Number Renters with Severe Cost Burden</th>
<th>% Share with Severe Cost Burden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Magna CDP</td>
<td>1,725</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Provo</td>
<td>18,400</td>
<td>5,330</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Park City</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>South Salt Lake</td>
<td>5,140</td>
<td>1,464</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>West Valley</td>
<td>11,935</td>
<td>3,350</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Vernal</td>
<td>1,230</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Hurricane</td>
<td>1,180</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>American Fork</td>
<td>1,825</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Heber</td>
<td>1,080</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Orem</td>
<td>9,890</td>
<td>2,450</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>St. George</td>
<td>9,085</td>
<td>2,250</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Pleasant Grove</td>
<td>3,035</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>North Salt Lake</td>
<td>1,310</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>1,875</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Herriman</td>
<td>1,165</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Murray</td>
<td>6,245</td>
<td>1,445</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>West Jordan</td>
<td>7,195</td>
<td>1,660</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
<td>37,160</td>
<td>8,510</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Taylorsville</td>
<td>5,475</td>
<td>1,240</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Ogden</td>
<td>13,095</td>
<td>2,950</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Lehi</td>
<td>2,435</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Millcreek CDP</td>
<td>8,905</td>
<td>1,960</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Sandy</td>
<td>5,990</td>
<td>1,280</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Midvale</td>
<td>6,295</td>
<td>1,335</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Kearns CDP</td>
<td>1,570</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Layton</td>
<td>5,615</td>
<td>1,165</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Logan</td>
<td>9,355</td>
<td>1,930</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Price</td>
<td>1,125</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>South Ogden</td>
<td>2,050</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>South Jordan</td>
<td>2,545</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Holladay</td>
<td>2,660</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Washington Terrace</td>
<td>1,340</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Tooele</td>
<td>2,770</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Clearfield</td>
<td>4,405</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Cedar City</td>
<td>4,700</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Springville</td>
<td>2,435</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Draper</td>
<td>2,345</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Payson</td>
<td>1,260</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Spanish Fork</td>
<td>2,060</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Roy</td>
<td>1,960</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Kaysville</td>
<td>1,065</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>42</strong></td>
<td><strong>Snyderville Basin CDP</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,344</strong></td>
<td><strong>195</strong></td>
<td><strong>14.5%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Cottonwood Heights</td>
<td>3,515</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Bountiful</td>
<td>3,695</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Brigham City</td>
<td>1,565</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Riverton</td>
<td>1,335</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A comparison of East Summit County to cities with 250 to 1,000 renter households shows that the East Summit would rank 28th among the fifty cities in Table 7. One in six renters in East Summit County have a severe housing cost burden.

### Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Renter Households</th>
<th>Number of Renters with Severe Cost Burden</th>
<th>% Share with Severe Cost Burden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sunset</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>West Point</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>La Verkin</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Highland</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>North Logan</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cedar Hills</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Nephi</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Alpine</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Salina</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Midway</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Bluffdale</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Hyrum</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Eagle Mountain</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Centerville</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Blanding</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>White City</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Helper</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Tremonton</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Moab</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Lindon</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Salem</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Carbonville</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Duchesne</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Richfield</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>West Haven</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>East Summit</strong></td>
<td><strong>891</strong></td>
<td><strong>150</strong></td>
<td><strong>16.8%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Grantsville</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Riverdale</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Syracuse</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Ephraim</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>North Ogden</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Saratoga Springs</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Santequin</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Farmington</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Wendover</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Beaver</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Woods Cross</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Harrisville</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Kanab</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Ivins</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Smithfield</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Erda CDP</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Hildale</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Dugway</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average of Cities: 17.0%

Demand for Affordable Owner Occupied Housing

Affordability Calculator - The availability of affordable owner occupied housing is determined, as is the case with rental housing, by a comparison of income and housing prices. Again income and affordability rely on the Utah Affordable Housing Finance Tool’s Affordability Calculator, which provides the income by AMI levels as well as monthly income available for housing costs, and the maximum affordable mortgage value.

In Snyderville Basin, the maximum affordable home price by AMI level ranges from $96,936 for the extremely low income household to $492,062 for a household at 120% AMI Table 8. In East Summit County the maximum price ranges from $35,368 for the extremely low income household to $245,790 for the household at 120% AMI Table 9.

### Table 8
Maximum Affordable Home Price by AMI Income Level
Snyderville Basin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AMI Income Categories</th>
<th>Monthly Income Available for Housing Costs</th>
<th>Maximum Home Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>≤30% AMI</td>
<td>≤$853</td>
<td>$96,936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31% to 50% AMI</td>
<td>$854 to $1,422</td>
<td>$186,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51% to 60% AMI</td>
<td>$1,423 to $1,708</td>
<td>$230,807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61% to 80% AMI</td>
<td>$1,709 to $2,276</td>
<td>$320,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81%-100% AMI</td>
<td>$2,277 to $2,845</td>
<td>$410,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%-120% AMI</td>
<td>$2,846 to $3,414</td>
<td>$492,062</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Utah Affordable Housing Forecast Tool.

### Table 9
Maximum Affordable Home Price by AMI Income Level
Eastern Summit County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AMI Income Categories</th>
<th>Monthly Income Available for Housing Costs</th>
<th>Maximum Home Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>≤30% AMI</td>
<td>≤$462</td>
<td>$35,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31% to 50% AMI</td>
<td>$463 to $769</td>
<td>$83,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51% to 60% AMI</td>
<td>$770 to $921</td>
<td>$107,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61% to 80% AMI</td>
<td>$921 to $1,230</td>
<td>$156,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81%-100% AMI</td>
<td>$1,231 to $1,538</td>
<td>$204,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%-120% AMI</td>
<td>$1,539 to $1,846</td>
<td>$245,790</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Utah Affordable Housing Forecast Tool.

Supply of Affordable Homes and Condos - Once the price ranges of affordability are determined by the Affordability Calculator the next step is to compare the number of “for sale” listed homes in the each of the five AMI categories for each jurisdiction. Using the sales data from the MLS the number of single family homes and condominiums, twin homes, and townhomes sales in each of the price ranges was determined. To estimate the number of sales by affordable price range it was often necessary to use numeric interpolation of the sales data.

As expected Snyderville Basin had virtually no single family homes sold in 2016 that were affordable to even households at the 120 percent AMI level. Ninety-eight percent of all homes sold were priced above the affordability threshold for a household at 120 percent AMI of $492,062. Only five of 205 homes sold would qualify as affordable to a household with an
income at less than 120 percent AMI (income of $135,600). Condominiums offer a much higher degree of affordability in Snyderville Basin. Seventy-three condominiums sold in the area in 2016 were affordable to households under the 120 percent AMI threshold. Even fourteen condominiums were affordable to households at less than 50 percent AMI. Forty-two percent of the condominiums sold in the Snyderville Basin were affordable to households with incomes at or below 120 percent AMI, *Tables 10-11.*

### Table 10
**Snyderville Basin: Single Family Sales Affordable to Selected Income Groups, 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income by AMI Level</th>
<th>Affordable Home Price Range</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Sales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>≤30% AMI</td>
<td>Less than $96,936</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31% to 50% AMI</td>
<td>$96,936 to $186,398</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51% to 60% AMI</td>
<td>$186,399 to $230,682</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61% to 80% AMI</td>
<td>$230,683 to $320,590</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81%-100% AMI</td>
<td>$320,591 to $410,052</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%-120% AMI</td>
<td>$410,052 to $492,062</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&lt;1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;120% AMI</td>
<td>&gt;$492,062</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>97.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Home Sales All Prices</td>
<td></td>
<td>209</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Wasatch Front Regional Multiple Listing Service.

### Table 11
**Snyderville Basin: Condominium, Town Home and Twin Home, 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income by AMI Level</th>
<th>Affordable Home Price Range</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Sales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>≤30% AMI</td>
<td>Less than $96,936</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31% to 50% AMI</td>
<td>$96,936 to $186,398</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51% to 60% AMI</td>
<td>$186,399 to $230,682</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61% to 80% AMI</td>
<td>$230,683 to $320,590</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81%-100% AMI</td>
<td>$320,591 to $410,052</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%-120% AMI</td>
<td>$410,052 to $492,062</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;120% AMI</td>
<td>&gt;$492,062</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Condo Sales All Prices</td>
<td></td>
<td>175</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Wasatch Front Regional Multiple Listing Service.

In 2016, East Summit County had very limited owner occupied affordability as well. Only eighteen of the homes sold in the area were affordable to households with incomes less than 120 percent AMI *Table 12.* The upper threshold of affordability was $245,570.

Condominiums and townhomes generally offer some additional housing affordability opportunities however, in the case of East Summit County there were only seven multifamily sales in 2016. None of the condominiums sold were priced under $245,570, therefore not affordable to households in East Summit with incomes less than 120 percent AMI *Table 13.*
Table 12
East Summit County: Single Family Sales Affordable to Selected Income Groups, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income by AMI Level</th>
<th>Affordable Home Price Range</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Sales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>≤30% AMI</td>
<td>Less than $35,368</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31% to 50% AMI</td>
<td>$35,368 to $83,784</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51% to 60% AMI</td>
<td>$83,785 to $107,750</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61% to 80% AMI</td>
<td>$107,751 to $156,409</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81%-100% AMI</td>
<td>$156,410 to $204,825</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%-120% AMI</td>
<td>$204,826 to $245,790</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;120% AMI</td>
<td>&gt;$245,570</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>81.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Home Sales All Prices</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Wasatch Front Regional Multiple Listing Service.

Table 13
East Summit County Planning District: Condominium, Town Home and Twin Home Sales Affordable to Selected Income Groups, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income by AMI Level</th>
<th>Affordable Home Price Range</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Sales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>≤30% AMI</td>
<td>Less than $35,368</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31% to 50% AMI</td>
<td>$35,368 to $83,784</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51% to 60% AMI</td>
<td>$83,785 to $107,750</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61% to 80% AMI</td>
<td>$107,751 to $156,409</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81%-100% AMI</td>
<td>$156,410 to $204,825</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%-120% AMI</td>
<td>$204,826 to $245,790</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;120% AMI</td>
<td>&gt;$245,570</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Condo Sales All Prices</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Wasatch Front Regional Multiple Listing Service.

Housing Cost Burdens of Owners – The housing cost burden carried by homeowners is an important indicator of affordability. Tables 14-15 show the number of homeowners with a cost burden in excess of 30% and 50% of their income. Particular attention should be given to those homeowners with severe cost burdens, a key indicator of the lack of affordability for owner occupied housing in both Snyderville Basin and East Summit County.

Nearly one in three homeowners in Snyderville Basin have moderate cost burden (more than 30 percent of income on housing and utilities). Given the price of housing—median sales price of over $900,000—not an unexpected percentage, however one in eight homeowners face severe cost burden. Of the 4,910 homeowners in the area 580 have severe housing cost burdens. Furthermore, homeowners in Snyderville Basin with incomes at or below 50 percent AMI have a fifty percent chance of having a severe housing cost burden.

The cost burden in East Summit County is very similar to Snyderville Basin; nearly one third of all homeowners have moderate cost burdens and about 12 percent have severe cost burdens. Half of all homeowners with incomes below 50 percent AMI have severe cost burdens, similar again to Snyderville Basin. But the percent of very low income households (less than 50 percent AMI) is somewhat lower in East Summit than in Snyderville Basin. About one third of these households have severe housing cost burdens compared to about 50 percent in Snyderville Basin.
Table 14
Cost Burdened Owner Households in Snyderville Basin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income AMI, Cost Burdened Households (&gt;30%)</th>
<th>Households with Burden</th>
<th>Total Households</th>
<th>% Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>≤30% AMI</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31% to 50% AMI</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>81.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51% to 60% AMI</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>93.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61% to 80% AMI</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81%-100% AMI</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;100% AMI</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>3,975</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,405</td>
<td>4,910</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income AMI, Severely Cost Burdened Households (&gt;50%)</th>
<th>Households with Burden</th>
<th>Total Households</th>
<th>% Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>≤30% AMI</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31% to 50% AMI</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51% to 60% AMI</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61% to 80% AMI</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81%-100% AMI</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;100% AMI</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>3,975</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>4,910</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: HUD CHAS 2009-2013.

Table 15
Cost Burdened Owner Households in East Summit County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income AMI, Cost Burdened Households (&gt;30%)</th>
<th>Households with Burden</th>
<th>Total Households</th>
<th>% Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>≤30% AMI</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31% to 50% AMI</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51% to 60% AMI</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61% to 80% AMI</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81%-100% AMI</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;100% AMI</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>1,515</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>3,315</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income AMI, Severely Cost Burdened Households (&gt;50%)</th>
<th>Households with Burden</th>
<th>Total Households</th>
<th>% Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>≤30% AMI</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31% to 50% AMI</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51% to 60% AMI</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61% to 80% AMI</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81%-100% AMI</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;100% AMI</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1,515</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>3,315</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: HUD CHAS 2009-2013.

In Table 16 the twenty-nine counties in Utah are ranked by the share of homeowners with severe cost burdens. Summit County ranks third with thirteen percent of homeowners, 1,305 homeowners, with severe housing cost burdens. Again, Snyderville Basin (three CDPs) and East Summit County account for 80 percent of the population and households in the county, so countywide measures are reflective of conditions in the two subject areas.

Table 17 shows that of the 63 cities statewide with more than 2,000 homeowners East Summit County and Snyderville Basin rank fourth and fifth in the share of owners with a severe cost burden. In both jurisdictions the share of homeowners with severe housing cost burdens in about 12 percent, one out of every eight homeowners faces a severe housing cost burden.
### Table 16

Counties Ranked by Percent of Owner Households with Severe Housing Cost Burden by Income (AMI Categories)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Total Owners</th>
<th>&lt;30% AMI</th>
<th>&gt;30% to ≤50% AMI</th>
<th>&gt;50% to ≤80% AMI</th>
<th>&gt;80% to ≤100% AMI</th>
<th>≥100% AMI</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% Owners with Severe Cost Burden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Wayne County</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Wasatch County</td>
<td>5,740</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Summit County</td>
<td><strong>10,140</strong></td>
<td><strong>315</strong></td>
<td><strong>375</strong></td>
<td><strong>200</strong></td>
<td><strong>160</strong></td>
<td><strong>255</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,305</strong></td>
<td><strong>12.9%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Washington County</td>
<td>32,350</td>
<td>1,070</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>1,095</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>3,880</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Iron County</td>
<td>9,685</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1,065</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Salt Lake County</td>
<td>231,665</td>
<td>7,450</td>
<td>6,395</td>
<td>5,485</td>
<td>1,245</td>
<td>1,585</td>
<td>22,160</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Beaver County</td>
<td>1,640</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Utah County</td>
<td>97,065</td>
<td>2,175</td>
<td>2,580</td>
<td>2,210</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>8,670</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Juab County</td>
<td>2,420</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Piute County</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Kane County</td>
<td>2,430</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Sevier County</td>
<td>5,645</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Rich County</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Garfield County</td>
<td>1,480</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Cache County</td>
<td>22,810</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1,720</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Weber County</td>
<td>56,945</td>
<td>1,745</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>4,210</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Morgan County</td>
<td>2,550</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Uintah County</td>
<td>8,255</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Sanpete County</td>
<td>5,925</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Davis County</td>
<td>73,965</td>
<td>1,870</td>
<td>1,210</td>
<td>1,140</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>4,740</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>San Juan County</td>
<td>3,425</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Grand County</td>
<td>2,470</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Carbon County</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Tooele County</td>
<td>13,755</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Box Elder County</td>
<td>12,850</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Millard County</td>
<td>3,045</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Daggett County</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Emery County</td>
<td>2,935</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Duchesne County</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Statewide: 621,860 18,339 15,263 12,580 3,533 3,874 53,589 8.6%

### Table 17

**Cities Ranked by Percent of Homeowners with Severe Cost Burden**

(Cities with more than 2,000 homeowners)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Total Owners</th>
<th>&lt;30% AMI</th>
<th>30-50% AMI</th>
<th>50-80% AMI</th>
<th>80-100% AMI</th>
<th>100+ AMI</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% Severe Cost Burden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ivins</td>
<td>2,115</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hurricane</td>
<td>3,275</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Draper</td>
<td>9,460</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>1,165</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>Eastern Summit Co.</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,315</strong></td>
<td><strong>125</strong></td>
<td><strong>120</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>410</strong></td>
<td><strong>12.4%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><strong>Snyderville Basin CDPs</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,910</strong></td>
<td><strong>70</strong></td>
<td><strong>175</strong></td>
<td><strong>65</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>170</strong></td>
<td><strong>580</strong></td>
<td><strong>11.8%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Heber</td>
<td>2,255</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Midvale</td>
<td>5,015</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>4,605</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>St. George</td>
<td>16,470</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>1,840</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>West Point</td>
<td>2,315</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
<td>36,480</td>
<td>1,550</td>
<td>1,095</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>3,860</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Herriman</td>
<td>4,670</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>West Haven</td>
<td>2,415</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Logan</td>
<td>6,580</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Kearns</td>
<td>8,035</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Pleasant Grove</td>
<td>6,475</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>South Jordan</td>
<td>12,150</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>1,220</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Orem</td>
<td>16,075</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>West Valley City</td>
<td>25,520</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2,520</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Holladay</td>
<td>7,470</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Lehi</td>
<td>10,295</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Brigham City</td>
<td>4,505</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: HUD CHAS.

**Five-Year Projections for Affordable Housing Demand**

The five-year projection for affordable housing demand has three categories of demand: (1) current demand of renters with severe cost burdens, (2) projected demand from demographic growth (2018-2022), and (3) projected demand from external demand (commuters).

**Current Renters with Severe Cost Burdens** – As shown earlier in this study, 195 renters in Snyderville Basin face severe housing cost burdens and 135 of these renter are extremely low income renters. Similar numbers of renters in East Summit County also face severe cost burdens. Currently 150 renters in East Summit County have severe cost burdens and 135 of these renters are extremely low income households. The demand for 345 affordable rental units for these severely cost burdened households is the first component five-year projection for affordable housing. Half of all renters with incomes ≤ 30% AMI in both Snyderville Basin and East Summit County have severe housing cost burdens; a total of 135 households in each planning district. The households with severe cost burdens in each income categories are shown in Tables 18-19.
Table 18
Cost Burdened Renter Households in Snyderville Basin Planning District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income AMI, Severely Cost Burdened Households (&gt;50%)</th>
<th>Households With Burden</th>
<th>Total Households</th>
<th>% Share With Burden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>≤30% AMI</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31% to 50% AMI</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51%-60% AMI</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61% to 80% AMI</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81% to 100% AMI</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101%-120% AMI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Renters ≤120% AMI</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>1,171</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: HUD CHAS 2009-2013.

Table 19
Cost Burdened Renter Households in East Summit County Planning District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income AMI, Severely Cost Burdened Households (&gt;50%)</th>
<th>Households With Burden</th>
<th>Total Households</th>
<th>% Share With Burden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>≤30% AMI</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31% to 50% AMI</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51%-60% AMI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61% to 80% AMI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81% to 100% AMI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101%-120% AMI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Renters ≤120% AMI</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*includes 115 households that pay no cash rent.
Source: HUD CHAS 2009-2013.

Demand Created by Demographic Growth 2018-2022 - Recently released demographic projections from the Kem Gardner Policy Institute provide household projections for Summit County. The projections show that from 2018 to 2022 the number of households in the county will increase by 2,036, a conservative 1.68 percent annual growth rate Table 20.

Since 2000 Snyderville Basin and East Summit County have captured 80 percent of the household growth in the Summit County. Applying this 80 percent share to the projected county growth of 2,036 produces a projection of 1,625 additional households in Snyderville Basin and East Summit County over the next five years.

Table 20
Demographic Projections for Summit County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>County Population Projections</th>
<th>Annual Increase from Net In-Migration</th>
<th>Annual Change from Natural Increase</th>
<th>Annual Increase in Population</th>
<th>Annual Increase in Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>40,740</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>41,436</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>42,135</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>42,829</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>43,553</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>44,268</td>
<td>1,890</td>
<td>1,638</td>
<td>3,528</td>
<td>2,036</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Increase 3,528
AAGR 1.68%

Source: Kem Gardner Policy Institute, University of Utah.
Demand for Owner Occupied Housing – Once the five-year household growth of 1,625 was determined the next step was to project the tenure (owner or renter) of the additional households. Currently, in both Snyderville Basin and East Summit County owners account for 80 percent of all households and renters the remaining 20 percent. Applying these percent shares to the 1,625 additional households, produces an increase of 1,300 owner occupied households and 325 renter households from 2018 to 2022. Annually, over the next five years, the number of owner households will increase by 260 households and renter households by 65 households Table 21.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Increase in Owner and Renter Occupied Households – 2018-2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase in Households 2018-2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner Occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter Occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Increase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This expected growth in owner households was then allocated between the two planning districts with 75 percent to Snyderville Basin and 25 percent to East Summit County, the share of growth captured by each district since 2000. Based on the demographic projections, over the next five years the increase of owner households in Snyderville Basin will be 975 households. Annually the number of owner households will increase by 195 households. In East Summit County owner households will increase by 325 households over the next five years and by 65 households annually Table 22.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Increase in Owner Occupied Households – 2018-2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase in Owner Households 2018-2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snyderville Basin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Summit County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Increase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The annual increase of 260 owner households includes households at all income levels. For the purposes of this demand assessment the relevant income categories for owner occupied units are 50%-80% AMI (low income category), 80%-100% AMI, and 100%-120% AMI (the latter two are middle income categories). I determine the number of households in each income category. A look at the prevailing income distribution for the two planning districts shows that 37 percent of owner households have incomes from 50%-120% AMI. Therefore, an increase of 260 owner households would produce annually 96 owner households spread across the 50%-120% AMI range; 72 owner households in Snyderville Basin and 24 in East Summit County.

The next step was to allocate the additional 96 owner households across each of the three relevant income groups. The allocation by owner households into income groups assumed that the additional households were evenly distributed across the three income categories. The share
for each income category was based on the share an evenly distributed number of households would have across the 50%-120% range. The 50%-60% AMI segment represents 14 percent of the range from 50% -120% AMI. The 60%-80% AMI segment represents 29 percent of the income range as does the 80%-100% AMI segment and 100% to 120% segment. Therefore, the additional owner households were distributed across the four income categories at 14 percent for 50%-60% AMI and 29 percent for the other three income categories. Using these percentage shares the annual and five-year total increase in owner households in Snyderville Basin and East Summit County were allocated across the three income categories Table 23-24.

Table 23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 23</th>
<th>Annual Increase in Owner Households by Income Group - 2018-2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Increase in Owner Households @ 50%-120% AMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snyderville Basin</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Summit</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Increase</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: James Wood.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 24

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 24</th>
<th>Total Five-Year Increase in Owner Households by Income Group - 2018-2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Increase in Owner Households @ 50%-120% AMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snyderville Basin</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Summit</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Increase</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: James Wood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Demand for Renter Occupied Housing from Demographic Growth – Rental housing will account for 20 percent of the additional housing demand. An increase of 1,625 households will produce an increase in demand for 325 renter occupied units over the five year period and an annual increase of 65 renter households. The renter occupied units were allocated at 75 percent to Snyderville Basin, and 25 percent East Summit. The additional renters were then allocated across the AMI range from ≤ 30%-120% AMI. It’s assumed that no renters would be above the 120% AMI. The allocation by income includes a second assumption that renters are evenly distributed across all income groups. The share of renters for each income group is: ≤ 30% AMI = 25 percent share, 31%-50% AMI = 16.7 percent share, 51%-60% AMI = 8 percent share, 61%-80% AMI = 16.7 percent share, 81%-100% AMI 16.7 percent and 101%-120% AMI = 16.7 percent. The allocation by income group of the additional renter households annually for the Snyderville Basin and East Summit are shown in Tables 25-26.
### Table 25
Annual Increase in Renter Households by Income Group - 2018-2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total All Income Brackets @ ≤30 AMI to 120% AMI</th>
<th>Renter Households @ ≤30%</th>
<th>Renter Households @ 31%-50% AMI</th>
<th>Renter Households @ 51%-60% AMI</th>
<th>Renter Households @ 61%-80% AMI</th>
<th>Renter Households @ 81% - 100% AMI</th>
<th>Renter Households @ 101% to 120% AMI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Snyderville</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Summit</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Increase</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: James Wood.

### Table 26
Total Five-Year Increase in Renter Households by Income Group - 2018-2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total All Income Brackets @ ≤30 AMI to 120% AMI</th>
<th>Renter Households @ ≤30%</th>
<th>Renter Households @ 31%-50% AMI</th>
<th>Renter Households @ 51%-60% AMI</th>
<th>Renter Households @ 61%-80% AMI</th>
<th>Renter Households @ 80% - 100% AMI</th>
<th>Renter Households @ 100% to 120% AMI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Snyderville</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Summit</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Increase</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: James Wood.

**External Demand** —The projections discussed above include the demand for affordable housing generated by projected demographic growth. A second important source of demand is *external* demand, which is the unmet demand for affordable housing generated primarily by low wage out-of-county commuters. Commuting has increased substantially in recent years due to job growth. And as employment increases over the next five years, by an expected 3,200 jobs, the number of commuters will inevitably increase. By 2022 employment in Summit County is expected to reach 30,500 payroll jobs Table 27. This twelve percent increase in employment will likely increase commuting into the county by a similar amount.

Seventy percent of the increase in jobs in Summit County will likely be captured by Snyderville Basin. In recent years that has been the share of county job growth locating in Snyderville Basin. If that capture rate continues employment in Snyderville Basin will increase by 2,275 workers. Most of the new jobs created will be relatively low wage jobs. Countywide about 70 percent of jobs in Summit County pay less than $40,000. Therefore, by 2022 as many as 1,600 additional low wage workers could be commuting into Snyderville Basin.

---

4 U.S. Census Bureau, OnTheMap.
Table 27

Employment Change for Summit County and Snyderville

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summit County Employment</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Snyderville</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>27,276</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>28,039</td>
<td>763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>28,736</td>
<td>697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>29,373</td>
<td>637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>29,961</td>
<td>588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>30,517</td>
<td>556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,241</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,275</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Kem Gardner Policy Institute.

Growth in Commuting and Demand for Renter Occupied Units - How many of these 1,600 low wage commuters would live in Snyderville Basin or East Summit County if affordable housing were available? Of course not all these low wage commuters are renters. We don’t know the much about the commuters in terms of their tenure, whether they are owners or renters. We do know that in Salt Lake and Utah Counties, the two most likely home counties for commuters, 60 percent of households with incomes less than $35,000 are renters. Applying this percentage share to the 1,600 low wage commuters produces a pool of low income renters of 960 renters.

Given the real costs of transportation plus opportunity cost of commuting time, it seems reasonable to assume that at least 20 percent or 192 of these low wage commuters would live in Snyderville Basin or East Summit County if affordable housing were available. How many rental units would these 192 workers require? Some doubling-up by non-related workers would occur; not every commuter represents demand for a housing unit.

To match the number of commuters to demand for rental housing I have used the current distribution of renter household by household size in Summit County. For example, twenty percent of all renter households are one person households and 30 percent are two person households, etc. Applying these existing ratios to the 192 potential renters produces a demand for 94 units over the next five years Table 28. Twenty percent of the 192 workers would end up as one person households creating demand for 38 units. The thirty percent in two person households (58 workers) would create demand for 29 units and so on through three person households and four or more person households. I believe this is a conservative methodology.

Table 28

Rental Units Required by Growth in Commuters to Snyderville Basin and East Summit County – 2018-2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of Household</th>
<th>Share of Renter Households</th>
<th>Workers</th>
<th>Units Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One person</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two persons</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three persons</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four or more persons</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>192</strong></td>
<td><strong>94</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau.
The rental units supported by the growth in commuters were allocated at 75 percent to Snyderville Basin and 25 percent to East Summit County and then allocated by income groups according to the share of renters that would fall into each group. The share of renters for income group is discussed above for Tables 7-8. Tables 29-30 show the annual and five-year total demand by income group for renter occupied housing due to the increase in commuting.

### Table 29
Annual Demand for Rental Units from Growth in Commuting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>≤30% AMI</th>
<th>31% to 50% AMI</th>
<th>51% to 60% AMI</th>
<th>61% to 80% AMI</th>
<th>81% to 100% AMI</th>
<th>101% to 120% AMI</th>
<th>Total ≤30% to 120% AMI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Snyderville Basin</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Summit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: James Wood.

### Table 30
Total Five-Year Growth in Demand for Rental Units from Growth in Commuting, 2018–2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>≤30% AMI</th>
<th>31% to 50% AMI</th>
<th>51% to 60% AMI</th>
<th>61% to 80% AMI</th>
<th>81% to 100% AMI</th>
<th>101% to 120% AMI</th>
<th>Total ≤30% to 120% AMI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Snyderville Basin</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Summit</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: James Wood.

Growth in Commuting and Demand for Owner Occupied Units - The remaining 675 commuters (2,275 less 1,600 low wage commuters) also represent potential demand for housing. But just how much demand for owner occupied housing in Snyderville and East Summit County is pent-up in the 675 additional higher wage commuters? A conservative assumption that 10 percent of these higher wage workers represent demand for owner occupied units seems reasonable; that’s demand for 68 owner occupied units over a five-year period. Of course only a fraction of the potential demand of 68 owner occupied units would come from households with incomes from 50%-120% AMI. In Snyderville and East Summit about 37 percent of homeowners have incomes at this level. Applying the 37 percent share to the potential demand of 68 homeowners produces a five-year demand for 25 homes for households at 50%-120% AMI. The results of distributing the homes across the three relevant income categories and allocating 75 percent of demand to Snyderville Basin and 25 percent to East Summit are shown in Tables 31-32.

### Table 31
Annual Demand for Owner Occupied Units from Growth in Commuting 2018-2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>50%-60% AMI</th>
<th>61%-80% AMI</th>
<th>81%-100% AMI</th>
<th>101%-120% AMI</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Snyderville Basin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Summit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: James Wood.
Table 32
**Total Five-Year Demand for Owner Occupied Units from Growth in Commuting – 2018-2022**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>50%-60% AMI</th>
<th>61%-80% AMI</th>
<th>81% -100% AMI</th>
<th>101%-120% AMI</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Snyderville Basin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Summit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: James Wood.

Existing Commuters and Demand for Rental Units - And finally what is the pent-up demand for affordable housing in Snyderville Basin and East Summit County from the 15,500 employees who commute daily into Summit County from outside the county *Table 33*.

Table 33
**Employment and Commuting Projections for Summit County**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Out of County Commuters</th>
<th>Commuters from Salt Lake County</th>
<th>Commuters from Wasatch County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>18,614</td>
<td>10,062</td>
<td>5,150</td>
<td>1,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>20,524</td>
<td>11,196</td>
<td>5,995</td>
<td>2,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>22,396</td>
<td>13,233</td>
<td>6,646</td>
<td>2,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>23,222</td>
<td>13,421</td>
<td>6,714</td>
<td>2,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>21,875</td>
<td>10,979</td>
<td>5,139</td>
<td>2,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>20,890</td>
<td>10,857</td>
<td>4,856</td>
<td>2,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>23,259</td>
<td>13,897</td>
<td>5,754</td>
<td>2,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>20,614</td>
<td>12,623</td>
<td>5,301</td>
<td>1,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>21,283</td>
<td>12,946</td>
<td>5,439</td>
<td>2,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>22,275</td>
<td>13,350</td>
<td>5,502</td>
<td>2,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017*</td>
<td>27,276</td>
<td>15,550</td>
<td>7,150</td>
<td>2,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average % Share</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022*</td>
<td>30,517</td>
<td>17,400</td>
<td>8,021</td>
<td>3,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>3,241</td>
<td>1,850</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*employment projections from Kem Gardner Policy Institute.

The Census Bureau’s OnTheMap tool shows about 70 percent of these out of county commuters have earnings of less than $40,000, that’s 10,850 of the out-of-county commuters. A portion of these commuters are currently homeowners in their home county and therefore are not potential Summit County renters. In Salt Lake and Utah Counties about 60 percent of households earning less than $35,000 are renters. Applying this 60 percent to the 10,850 out of county commuters leaves 6,500 out of county commuters who are very likely renters. This is the pool of potential Summit County renters represented by out-of-county commuters.

There is a lot of churning in the labor market (employee turnover) so many of these potential renters might not work through a full year, which reduces potential demand. I have made the assumption that 20 percent of the 6,500 out of county commuters would live in Snyderville Basin or East Summit County if affordable rental housing were available. The pool of potential renters is 1,300 over five years or 260 annually.
Since many of these 1,300 potential renters would share a rental unit the annual demand of 260 renters is adjusted based on the prevailing size of renter households, see discussion above for Table 34. After adjusting for sharing of rental units the annual demand produced from existing low wage workers for rental units would be 128 units; over the five year period a total of 640 units.

Table 34
Rental Units Required by Existing Commuters Moving to Snyderville Basin and East Summit County – 2018-2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of Household</th>
<th>Share of Renter Households</th>
<th>Workers</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One person</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two persons</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three persons</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four or more persons</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau.

My assumption that 20 percent of low wage commuters are potential renters is based on my experience and on-going study of rental markets throughout Utah. Rental market conditions throughout Utah are extremely “tight”. Rental rates are increasing, vacancy rates are very low levels, and new apartment units are quickly absorbed. I feel quite certain that one or two affordable apartment projects with a total of 128 new units annually would be rapidly absorbed and be very successful projects. These affordable rental units however, would require rental rates comparable to Salt Lake and Utah County rental rates.

The 128 rental units supported by existing commuters were allocated at 75 percent to Snyderville Basin and 25 percent to East Summit County. The units were then allocated by income groups according to the share of renters that would fall into each group. The share of renters for each income group is discussed above for Tables 35-36.

Table 35
Annual Demand for Rental Units from Existing Commuters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>≤30% AMI</th>
<th>31% to 50% AMI</th>
<th>51%-60% AMI</th>
<th>61% to 80% AMI</th>
<th>81% to 100% AMI</th>
<th>101% to 120% AMI</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Snyderville Basin</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Summit</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: James Wood.

Table 36
Five-Year Total Demand for Rental Units from Existing Commuters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>≤30% AMI</th>
<th>31% to 50% AMI</th>
<th>51%-60% AMI</th>
<th>61% to 80% AMI</th>
<th>81% to 100% AMI</th>
<th>101% to 120% AMI</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Snyderville Basin</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Summit</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: James Wood.
Existing Commuters and Demand for Owner Occupied Units – After accounting for the 10,850 low wage workers, approximately 4,300 commuters working in all types of occupations and professions remain. Using a capture rate of 10 percent for the demand of owner occupied units, the remaining existing commuters represent demand for 430 owner occupied units over the five-year period. Of course not all these potential homeowners have incomes that fall within the 50%-120% AMI. As mentioned 37 percent of all homeowners in the combined area of Snyderville and East Summit County have incomes in the 50%-120% AMI range. Using this ratio the potential demand for owner occupied units for households from 50%-120% AMI is 37 units annually, a total of 160 owner-occupied units over the five year period. The annual and five-year total demand for each income group is shown in Tables 37-38.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 37</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Demand for Owner-Occupied Units from Existing Commuters</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2018-2022</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snyderville Basin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Summit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source:</strong> James Wood. **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 38</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Five-Year Total Demand for Owner-Occupied Units from Existing Commuters</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2018-2022</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snyderville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Summit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source:</strong> James Wood. **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Affordable Housing Demand from 2018-2022 – The summaries below give the affordable housing demand for renter and owner occupied units. Over the 2018-2022 period the projected demand for rental units is 1,404 units including 985 units in Snyderville Basin and 419 units in East Summit County Table 39. The five-year demand for affordable owner occupied units is 665 units including 498 units in Snyderville Basin and 167 units in East Summit County. The total demand for residential units for all relevant income group is 2,069 units
Table 39
Projections of Affordable Housing Demand by Planning District, 2018-2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Renter Occupied Units</th>
<th>Owners Occupied Units</th>
<th>Total Residential Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Five-Year Total</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snyderville Basin</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>1,483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Summit</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,404</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>2,069</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: James Wood.

More detailed projections are given in Tables 40-45, which show the projected demand for renter occupied units for the six income groups from ≤30% AMI to 120% AMI by source of demand. For owner households the demand is projected for the four income groups from 50% AMI to 120% AMI and shown by source of demand.

Table 40
Demand for Renter Occupied Units, Snyderville Basin 2018-2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Demand</th>
<th>≤30% AMI</th>
<th>31%-50% AMI</th>
<th>51%-60% AMI</th>
<th>61%-80% AMI</th>
<th>81%-100% AMI</th>
<th>101%-120% AMI</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Renters with Severe Cost Burdens</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Demographic Growth 2018-2022</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth in Commuters 2018-2022</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Commuters</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five-Year Total 2018-2022</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Demand 2018-2022</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: James Wood.

Table 41
Demand for Renter Occupied Units, East Summit County 2018-2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Demand</th>
<th>≤30% AMI</th>
<th>31%-50% AMI</th>
<th>51%-60% AMI</th>
<th>61%-80% AMI</th>
<th>81%-100% AMI</th>
<th>101%-120% AMI</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Renters with Severe Cost Burdens</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Demographic Growth 2018-2022</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth in Commuters 2018-2022</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Commuters</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five-Year Total 2018-2022</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Demand 2018-2022</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: James Wood.
### Table 42
**Demand for Renter Occupied Units, Snyderville Basin and East Summit County 2018-2022**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Demand</th>
<th>≤30% AMI</th>
<th>31%-50% AMI</th>
<th>51%-60% AMI</th>
<th>61%-80% AMI</th>
<th>81%-100% AMI</th>
<th>101%-120% AMI</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Renters with Severe Cost Burdens</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Demographic Growth 2018-2022</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth in Commuters 2018-2022</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Commuters</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five-Year Total 2018-2022</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>1,404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Demand 2018-2022</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: James Wood.*

### Table 43
**Demand for Owner Occupied Units, Snyderville Basin 2018-2022**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Demand</th>
<th>50-60% AMI</th>
<th>61%-80% AMI</th>
<th>81-100% AMI</th>
<th>101-120% AMI</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projected Demographic Growth 2018-2022</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth in Commuters 2018-2022</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Commuters</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five-Year Total 2018-2022</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Demand</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: James Wood.*

### Table 44
**Demand for Owner Occupied Units, East Summit County 2018-2022**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Demand</th>
<th>50-60% AMI</th>
<th>61%-80% AMI</th>
<th>81-100% AMI</th>
<th>101-120% AMI</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projected Demographic Growth 2018-2022</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth in Commuters 2018-2022</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Commuters</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five-Year Total 2018-2022</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Demand</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: James Wood.*

### Table 45
**Demand for Owner Occupied Units, Snyderville Basin and East Summit County 2018-2022**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Demand</th>
<th>50-60% AMI</th>
<th>61%-80% AMI</th>
<th>81-100% AMI</th>
<th>101-120% AMI</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projected Demographic Growth 2018-2022</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth in Commuters 2018-2022</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Commuters</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five-Year Total 2018-2022</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Demand</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: James Wood.*
An Important Qualifying Note – The external growth projections from out-of-county commuters are sensitive to housing prices. The five year projections show that there is potential demand for 734 rental units from external sources; 640 from existing commuters and 94 from the expected growth in commuters. Most of these commuters, over 70 percent, earn less than $40,000 and those that are renters, likely a majority, are currently renting in Salt Lake, Utah, or Wasatch Counties at prevailing rental rates in those counties. The current rental rates, for a new apartment unit in an apartment community of 100+ units, are approximately; $1,000-$1,100 for a one bedroom units, $1,200-$1,300 for a two bedroom units, and $1,600-$1,700 for a three bedroom unit. If the rental rates in the units developed in Snyderville Basin and East Summit County exceed these rates the demand from out-of-county commuters will be less than the projected 734 households.
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