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## PART 1: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

OVERVIEW

The North Iowa Area Council of Governments (NIACOG) contracted with lowa State University Extension \& Outreach's Farm, Food, and Enterprise Development unit for several studies addressing local needs in NIACOG's eight-county region consisting of Cerro Gordo, Floyd, Franklin, Hancock, Kossuth, Mitchell, Winnebago, and Worth Counties in north central Iowa. The studies examined the environment for entrepreneurial businesses, day care and other child care needs, and this housing needs assessment. This housing needs assessment report was researched and authored by an Iowa State University Extension \& Outreach Community Economic Development Program Specialist with more than 25 years of experience in housing development and housing planning who has conducted similar studies for other cities and counties throughout lowa as well as for the State of Iowa.

The Housing Needs Assessment includes quantitative statistical analysis of population data/demographics, economic and income data, existing housing data, and a housing market analysis. The statistical data was used to create a housing construction model for the county that takes into consideration how many housing units will need to be constructed; what price points those housing units need to be at in order to be affordable to the local population; how many units will need to be created if there is no population growth and how many will need to be created if there is modest population growth. The model also identifies instances in which there may be existing excess housing capacity that does not match local needs.

## PURPOSE OF THE HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT

A housing needs assessment has four primary purposes:

1. Identifying the demographic and economic trends that may impact the future need for housing.
2. Assessing the characteristics of existing housing and households. This determines what housing stock exists and how that housing stock is accommodating the physical needs of the population currently living in Floyd County.
3. Analyzing the current and future demand for housing taking into account such factors as the physical safety needs of an aging population, the condition of existing housing, the affordability of existing housing, whether private market choices exist, and the extent of housing that sits vacant and is therefore not available to house families.
4. To recommend initiatives and actions Floyd County can take to either satisfy future housing needs on their own or to create incentives so the private market can satisfy future housing needs.

Housing is a large part of a community's economic infrastructure. Communities strive to have an adequate number of housing units, at several price points that are affordable to a populace with a range of income levels, that meet the different physical needs of different types of households from young families with children to senior citizens, and that have the architectural styles and amenities that make neighborhoods livable. From an economic standpoint, a community's goal is to make it probable that residents will choose to live, work and shop in their community because their community provides all that is necessary and desired by the majority of its citizens.

Housing's role in economic development is to provide housing for the workforce that currently exists in the community and the workforce that is predicted to live in the area based on the area's primary economic drivers. A company hoping to locate in the community will need to have housing available to their employees at prices aligned to their incomes. The company may look at the quality and condition of housing as an indicator of the quality of life they can expect to find in a community.

The condition of existing housing also impacts the health of residents. Older housing units were often constructed with building materials we now know have toxic effects, such as asbestos and lead-based paint. Homes that have been exposed to water internally for any length of time are susceptible to mold. These toxins can result in increased diagnoses of asthma and allergies particularly for children and the aged. Homes with older furnaces are more susceptible to increased levels of carbon dioxide. Throughout lowa, cracked basement walls can cause dangerous levels of radon to leach into homes through porous soils.

Older housing units can also negatively impact the health of older residents when bathrooms and bedrooms are located on second stories, when laundry facilities are located in basements, and when there are exterior steps into the home that may present fall hazards, particularly in winter. Additionally, some older homes are harder to rehabilitate for handicapped-accessibility, making it difficult for aging residents to use their adaptive devices such as walkers and wheelchairs, and therefore more likely to present either an unsafe living environment or reduce the ability of a senior citizen to age-in-place. In cases where seniors are no longer able to live in a single-family home, the presence within the community of other senior housing options is also necessary, such as available and affordable independent living senior apartment-style homes or townhomes, assisted living and skilled care/nursing home facilities. Senior living options can also be enhanced by the provision of supportive services that either help a senior stay in their own home or make a successful transition to other senior housing options. Services such as housekeeping, medication management, meals-on-wheels type food or grocery delivery services, transportation to medical appointments, and case managers can successfully extend the time seniors can stay in their own homes or in independent living before moving on to more institutionalized, and more expensive, care.

## METHODOLOGY AND LIMITATIONS OF THE DATA

The 2022 Floyd County Housing Needs Assessment was quantified using publicly-available secondary source data from Federal sources such as the U.S. Census Bureau, the American Community Survey (ACS), the U.S. Department of Housing \& Urban Development (HUD), the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), and the Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA). Secondary source material was also gathered from State sources such as lowa State University's Data for Decision Makers reports, the Iowa Association of Realtors, the County Assessor's Office, and the Iowa Community Action Association. Primary data was also collected through website searches and phone interviews.

It needs to be noted that the 2020 U.S. Census was problematic for a variety of reasons. Having been conducted largely through online efforts during a pandemic, there were noted under- and over-counts for certain populations. The Census has also begun "masking" certain kinds of data that might serve to identify an individual, a specific household, or a specific business or commercial enterprise. This particularly impacts smaller rural communities where there may be only a handful of non-white residents, for example, or one manufacturing business that could be identified by being the only business of that type in the community. Additionally, the final results of the U.S. Census have been dribbling out throughout 2022 instead of being issued all at one time. The first tranche of housing data was released in the middle of March 2022 and a second data set was released in July. It is expected that additional reports will be released by the end of 2022, but this housing needs assessment is current only up to July of 2022.

RECOMMENDATIONS
Recommendation 1: Preserve existing housing through rehabilitation and energy-efficiency improvements. The Construction Model shown in Table 28 shows an excess of housing capacity in Floyd County right now. When a housing market has an excess of capacity, meaning there are more houses available than there is population to fill them, the best housing strategy is to maintain the quality of the existing housing through rehabilitation programs. Currently, the State of lowa is backing off of rehabilitation programming due to tight housing markets in rural areas and the need to add numbers of housing units to meet that need. That doesn't mean the need for rehabilitation has vanished....just the State funding to support it. That leaves rehab on the table for local housing trust funds, locally-funded initiatives, or USDA funding to backfill the loss of other traditional sources. The North Iowa Area Council of Governments (NIACOG)'s challenge on this recommendation will be to work with communities in the county, the county, or the entire region to continue seeking grant funding, advocating for new funds, and supporting rehab programming.

Recommendation 2: Add smaller units of new construction, single or multi-family, for seniors and smaller families. Even if Floyd County does NOT experience population growth throughout the rest of this decade, there still is a need for additional new construction housing, either single or multifamily, preferably of smaller units to accommodate smaller households as shown in Table 17. Some of these smaller units should be for senior citizens. Some should be
townhouses or condominiums that would be attractive to smaller households at any age range. These smaller units would be ideal for infill where Floyd County communities may have lots already attached to infrastructure.

Recommendation 3: Update Upper Story Housing and In-fill Lots Inventory. State funding is being directed to Upper Story Housing projects that serve to provide new units of housing while preserving Main Streets and other adjacent downtown areas. Here is a link to the grant program: https://www.iowaeda.com/downtown-resource-center/downtown-housing-grant/ Identifying eligible upper story owners who may be interested in this program is a task NIACOG could undertake. The In-fill Lot Inventory is another tool that should be updated in each city in Floyd County. One strategy to deal with a shrinking population in a way that doesn't further deteriorate neighborhoods or damages the character of a community, is to address holes in neighborhoods that have come from the loss of housing to fires or other demolitions. Some lots that look like they are in-fill might actually have been purchased by neighboring property owners and aren't really available for new housing, so the inventory should focus on lots that could be used for new housing without expanding the footprint of the community.

Recommendation 4: Conduct a windshield survey and initiate demolition of substandard housing and one-to-one replacement with new housing. When there is excess capacity in a housing market, housing planning should focus on improving the quality of existing housing. A windshield survey should be conducted that evaluates each community's individual housing stock on a simple scale of Excellent for newly constructed housing, Good for newer housing without obvious need of rehabilitation; Fair for older housing that could be eligible for rehabilitation based on the actual condition or age of the structure; and Poor for housing that should be removed. Derelict housing removal should be followed up with an intention of doing a one-to-one replacement if possible.

## Recommendation 5: Start actively marketing Floyd County as an attractive place to live.

 Workforce commuting patterns shown in Figure 1 represent a possible market for new residents to the county. The 2,470 people commuting into the county for jobs represent the market for new home buyers who may want to live closer to their employment, particularly as the price of gas forces the need to make different economic decisions for households. The 3,522 people who leave town every day to commute to jobs outside of Floyd County, are a potential loss of population in the next decade that should be addressed through economic development initiatives to retain and add jobs in Floyd County's strong manufacturing sector.
## Recommendation 6: Consider applying for the Rural Housing Readiness Assessment Program.

 The Rural Housing Readiness Assessment program is for communities under 20,000 population. It provides two educational sessions on the demographics and statistics that drive housing needs; conducts an online survey of local housing demand; and provides two strategic planning sessions that help communities identify their housing goals. The communities then receive a final report where further investigation of their goals is fleshed out with financial resources and examples of similar projects that other communities have been success with in meeting their local housing challenges. The next round of grants should be in the Spring of 2023. Here is a linkto information about the program: https://www.iowaeda.com/empower-rural-iowa/housingassessment/

## PART 2: DEMOGRAPHICS

Table 1: Population of Floyd County Communities and Percentage of Change Between 20102020

| City | $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | Change | Percentage Rate |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Charles City | 7,396 | 7,652 | -256 | $-3.3 \%$ |
| Colwell | 55 | 73 | -18 | $-24.7 \%$ |
| Floyd | 313 | 335 | -22 | $-6.6 \%$ |
| Marble Rock | 271 | 307 | -36 | $-11.7 \%$ |
| Nora Springs | 1,369 | 1,431 | -62 | $-4.3 \%$ |
| Rockford | 758 | 860 | -102 | $-11.9 \%$ |
| Rudd | 358 | 369 | -11 | $-3 \%$ |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau
Table 2: Floyd County Total Population by 5 Year Age Groups 2020

| Age Group | 2020 | Percent of Population |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Population | 15,713 |  |
| Under 5 years | 870 | 5.5\% |
| 5-9 years | 1,028 | 6.5\% |
| 10-14 years | 1,058 | 6.7\% |
| 15-19 years | 948 | 6\% |
| 20-24 years | 921 | 5.9\% |
| 25-29 years | 747 | 4.8\% |
| 30-34 years | 747 | 4.8\% |
| 35-39 years | 880 | 5.7\% |
| 40-44 years | 822 | 5.2\% |
| 45-49 years | 899 | 5.7\% |
| 50-54 years | 1,035 | 6.6\% |
| 55-59 years | 1,346 | 8.6\% |
| 60-64 years | 925 | 5.9\% |
| 65-69 years | 1,160 | 7.4\% |
| 70-74 years | 707 | 4.5\% |
| 75-79 years | 578 | 3.7\% |
| 80-84 years | 358 | 2.3\% |
| 85 years and older | 674 | 4.3\% |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau

Table 1 on the previous page shows the 2020 and 2010 populations for Floyd County cities. All cities lost population with Colwell losing the most population, percentagewise, at $24.7 \%$. This is consistent with rural population loss throughout lowa. Table 2 shows how the population is distributed over five-year age groups. The distribution shows $24.7 \%$ of the population is under the age of 18 . Residents between the ages of 19 and 64, who would be in their working years, comprise $53.2 \%$ of the population. This is the cohort that would be buying their first homes and are the primary market for home sales. The final $22.1 \%$ of the population are over the age of 65 and represent a population that may be looking at senior housing, the need for housing rehabilitation services, and are often the cohort most likely to sell their homes, relocate away from the community, or change residences within the community. Table 3 below shows that overall, Floyd County's population is older than the lowa average, but this also not inconsistent with similarly sized rural counties.

Table 3: Floyd County Median Age of Population by Sex

| Median Age in <br> Years | Floyd County <br> 2020 | Iowa 2020 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Total Population | 44.3 | 38.3 |
| Male Population | 41.2 | 37.2 |
| Female Population | 46.4 | 39.4 |

Source: U.S. Census

Table 4: Population by Hispanic/Latino Origin and Race
fLOYD COUNTY

| Hispanic/Latino <br> Origin and Race | 2020 Floyd County <br> Population | Percentage of Floyd <br> County Population | Iowa Percentage of <br> Population |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| White alone | 14,094 | 90.2 | 84.5 |
| Black/African <br> American alone | 419 | 2.7 | 4.1 |
| American <br> Indian/Alaska Native <br> alone | 33 | 0.2 | 0.5 |
| Asian alone | 295 | 1.9 | 2.4 |
| Native <br> Hawaiian/Other <br> Pacific Islander alone | 12 | 0.1 | 0.2 |
| Some Other Race <br> alone | 182 | 1.2 | 2.8 |
| Two or More Races | 592 | 3.8 | 5.6 |


| Hispanic or Latino (of <br> any race) | 550 | 3.5 | 6.8 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total | 15,627 |  |  |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau
While Table 4 shows that Floyd County is predominantly White and has a higher percentage of White residents than the State average, it also shows growing diversity, particularly in the number of individuals who identify as Two or More Races (3.8\%) and Hispanic or Latino (3.5\%).

Table 5: Floyd County Households and Families by Type

| 2020 Households | Number | Percentage of All Occupied <br> Units |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Family Households | 4,136 | $60.0 \%$ |
| Married-Couple Family | 3,418 | $49.5 \%$ |
| With Related Children of <br> Householder Under Age 18 | 1,678 | $24.3 \%$ |
| Householder 65 Years and <br> Older | 940 | $13.6 \%$ |
| Male Householder With No <br> Spouse Present | 164 | $2.4 \%$ |
| Female Householder With <br> No Spouse Present | 554 | $8.0 \%$ |
| Non-Family Households | 2,763 | $40.0 \%$ |
| Householder Living Alone | 2,548 | $36.9 \%$ |
| Householder Living Alone <br> Over Age 65 | 1,137 | $16.5 \%$ |
| Sours. |  |  |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau
The information in Table 5 is important to determining housing need because it identifies the need for larger family homes and the number of single-person households that may need smaller-sized homes. The $60 \%$ in family households, with $24.3 \%$ having children under the age of 18 at home, is part of a national trend where fewer and fewer households meet this definition of "traditional family." The implication for housing planning is that MORE units become necessary as fewer individuals occupy individual units of housing. What this means in rural areas is that there can simultaneously be a decrease in overall population and increased need for new housing to accommodate more individual households with fewer people per house.

## PART 3: ECONOMICS

The economic data that needs to be analyzed as part of a housing needs assessment includes data about the labor force; the industries and types of jobs available in Floyd County and nearby communities; the education levels needed to obtain the jobs available; the unemployment rate; and the number of households subsisting below the poverty level. This economic data informs community leaders about the price points that are affordable to individuals at a variety of income levels and the sources of the income households have available to satisfy their housing needs.

Table 6: Floyd County Employment Job Counts by Where Workers Live

| City/Place | Job Count | Share/Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Charles City | 1,407 | $29.5 \%$ |
| Mason City | 196 | $4.1 \%$ |
| Waterloo | 161 | $3.4 \%$ |
| Rockford | 89 | $1.9 \%$ |
| Cedar Falls | 81 | $1.7 \%$ |
| Waverly | 75 | $1.6 \%$ |
| Nashua | 72 | $1.5 \%$ |
| Nora Springs | 72 | $1.5 \%$ |
| Osage | 69 | $1.4 \%$ |
| New Hampton | 59 | $1.2 \%$ |
| All Other Locations | 2,493 | $52.2 \%$ |

U.S. Census Bureau "On The Map" 2019

Table 6 above shows the location and number of jobs held by Floyd County residents. Charles City accounts for $29.5 \%$ of the job positions with only $3.4 \%$ of jobs in the other Floyd County towns. A full two-thirds of Floyd County residents work outside of Floyd County. Research from studies at lowa State University have shown that if workers live outside of the community they work in, they will eventually either move to the community they work in or they will find a job closer to where they live. For that reason, we examine commuting patterns of workers. In Figure 1 below, the 3,522 people who commute OUT OF Floyd County represent a possible future loss of population while the 2,470 who commute INTO Floyd County could be a market for new housing ownership. The number of individuals who both live and work in a county represents the core stability of the population, so increasing that number is a way communities can generate future economic growth.

Figure 1: Floyd County Workforce Commuting Pattern


Source: U.S. Census Bureau "On The Map" 2019
The North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) is used to determine what primary industries are located in each community or county. The statistics that are derived from NAICS show that Floyd County's largest industry in terms of numbers of employees is Manufacturing with $34.8 \%$ of the workforce. The only other categories in the double digits are Retail Trade with $12.5 \%$ of the workforce and Health Care and Social Assistance coming in at $12.4 \%$. This shows a local economy that is very dependent on one industry and therefore could experience instability if there is a change in the primary industry that supports the majority of jobs in the area. Table 7 below shows the number of jobs in each NAICS classification and the percentage of that industry as a part of the total economy.

Table 7: Floyd County Jobs by NAICS Industry Classification

| Industry Sector | Number of Jobs | Share of Workforce |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting | 162 | 3.4\% |
| Mining, Quarrying, and Oil and Gas Extraction | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Utilities | 10 | 0.2\% |
| Construction | 160 | 3.4\% |
| Manufacturing | 1,662 | 34.8\% |
| Wholesale Trade | 415 | 8.7\% |
| Retail Trade | 598 | 12.5\% |
| Transportation and Warehousing | 128 | 2.7\% |
| Information | 87 | 1.8\% |
| Finance and Insurance | 208 | 4.4\% |
| Real Estate and Rental and Leasing | 22 | 0.5\% |
| Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services | 85 | 1.8\% |
| Management of Companies and Enterprises | 71 | 1.5\% |
| Administration \& Support, Waste Management and Remediation | 116 | 2.4\% |
| Educational Services | 29 | 0.6\% |
| Health Care and Social Assistance | 592 | 12.4\% |
| Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation | 41 | 0.9\% |
| Accommodation and Food Services | 217 | 4.5\% |
| Other Services (excluding Public Administration) | 171 | 3.6\% |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau

Tables 8 and 9 below take a look at the levels of education needed for the jobs available in Floyd County. Table 8 shows 876 people with less than a high school education compared to 1,518 jobs in the community that can be done by someone with less than a high school education. In the next category there are 6,065 individuals with high school or some college available for 2,406 job positions where less than an Associate's degree is necessary for employment. The 2,133 individuals with a Bachelor's degree and Graduate or Professional degrees are available to fill the 1,977 positions that require higher education. This all shows a
mismatch in education versus jobs available where there is a surplus of workers in all job categories. What this suggests is that local officials need to concentrate on attracting more jobs that can be accomplished by someone with less than an Associate's degree or risk losing this population to other communities offering better employment opportunities.

Table 8: Floyd County Educational Attainment

| Education Level | Number | Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Population 25 years and over | 10,888 |  |
| Less than $9^{\text {th }}$ grade | 358 | $3.3 \%$ |
| $9^{\text {th }}$ to $12^{\text {th }}$ grade, no diploma | 518 | $4.8 \%$ |
| High School graduate <br> (includes equivalency) | 4,056 | $37.3 \%$ |
| Some college, no degree | 2,009 | $18.5 \%$ |
| Associate's degree | 1,814 | $16.7 \%$ |
| Bachelor's degree | 1,574 | $14.5 \%$ |
| Graduate or professional <br> degree | 559 | $5.1 \%$ |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau

Table 9: Floyd County Jobs by Educational Attainment

| Education Level | Number of Jobs | Share of Jobs |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Less than high school | 391 | $8.2 \%$ |
| High school or equivalent, no <br> college | 1,127 | $23.6 \%$ |
| Some college or Associate <br> degree | 1,279 | $26.8 \%$ |
| Bachelor's degree or <br> advanced degree | 765 | $16.0 \%$ |
| Educational attainment not <br> available (workers aged 29 or <br> younger) | 1,212 | $25.4 \%$ |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau

Next, we look at the incomes that are generated by the jobs located in the county. The Median Family Income in Floyd County for all households is $\$ 74,894$ which means that half of all jobs pay more than $\$ 74,894$ and half pay less. The Median Household Income is $\$ 51,768$ which is the average of all earned income divided by the number of all income earners. The Median Family Income (MFI) is the figure used by governmental agencies to determine the income eligibility of individuals and households for assistance programs. Table 10 illustrates the Median Family Income for individuals, families, and non-related households. Table 11 shows the number of households reporting earned income from wages. In terms of housing, what we look
at is the income available by various types of household formation to satisfy their housing needs. At the high end, what this shows is that Married-couple families with a Median Income of $\$ 81,075$ have available to them $\$ 2,027$ per month for housing ( $30 \%$ of income $/ 12$ months) while a Nonfamily household with a Median Income of $\$ 30,106$ has $\$ 753$ a month available for housing. These numbers will appear again Part 5 of this report where they will be used to determine projected housing needs, construction model, and affordability model for Floyd County.

Table 10: Floyd County Median Household, Family, and Non-Family Median Income

| Income | Households | Families | Married-couple families | Nonfamily households |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Households | 6,899 | 4,136 | 3,418 | 2,763 |
| Less than \$10,000 | 6.7\% | 1.8\% | 0.7\% | 14.2\% |
| \$10,000 to \$14,999 | 4.0\% | 1.6\% | 0.4\% | 8.0\% |
| \$15,000 to \$24,999 | 12.0\% | 7.3\% | 2.3\% | 20.5\% |
| \$25,000 to \$34,999 | 12.3\% | 6.5\% | 5.2\% | 21.8\% |
| \$35,000 to \$49,999 | 13.2\% | 13.6\% | 13.3\% | 13.1\% |
| \$50,000 to \$74,999 | 18.1\% | 19.4\% | 21.2\% | 15.9\% |
| \$75,000 to \$99,999 | 13.7\% | 19.1\% | 20.0\% | 4.5\% |
| \$100,000 to \$149,999 | 12.7\% | 19.5\% | 23.2\% | 1.7\% |
| \$150,000 to \$199,999 | 2.7\% | 4.4\% | 5.3 | 0.1\% |
| \$200,000 or more | 4.5\% | 7.0\% | 8.5\% | 0.3\% |
| Median Income | \$51,768 | \$74,894 | \$81,075 | \$30,106 |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau

Table 11: Floyd County Household Income and Benefits by Income Range

| Income Range | Number of Households in Range |
| :--- | :---: |
| Total Households | 6,899 |
| Less than $\$ 10,000$ | 464 |
| $\$ 10,000$ to $\$ 14,999$ | 275 |
| $\$ 15,000$ to $\$ 24,999$ | 830 |
| $\$ 25,000$ to $\$ 34,999$ | 852 |
| $\$ 35,000$ to $\$ 49,999$ | 909 |
| $\$ 50,000$ to $\$ 74,999$ | 1,251 |
| $\$ 75,000$ to $\$ 99,999$ | 948 |
| $\$ 100,000$ to $\$ 149,999$ | 873 |
| $\$ 150,000$ to $\$ 199,999$ | 184 |
| $\$ 200,000$ or more | 313 |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau

Wages earned from employment are one way of gaining income. Other ways of gaining income include Social Security, Retirement/Pension benefits, Supplemental Security Income (SSI/Disability), and cash public assistance. Table 12 shows these other types of income, the number of households receiving these types of funds, and the average annual income these income sources provide to their recipients. Remember that an individual household can have several sources of income outside of their primary source of income. Something that stands out from this chart is the extremely low wages of self-employed individuals. This may be a source of potential workforce for area employers who may be able to offer a better salary and better benefits.

## Table 12: Floyd County Household Income From All Sources

| Type of Income | Number of Households | Mean Annual Income |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| All households | 6,899 | $\$ 63,390$ |
| With earnings | 4,967 | $\$ 72,853$ |
| With wages or salary income | 4,738 | $\$ 70,390$ |
| With self-employment <br> income | 915 | $\$ 30,987$ |
| With interest, dividends, or <br> net rental income | 1,846 | $\$ 11,709$ |
| With Social Security income | 2,571 | $\$ 19,467$ |
| With Supplemental Security <br> Income (SSI) | 314 | $\$ 11,289$ |
| With cash public assistance <br> income or Food <br> Stamps/SNAP | 737 | X |
| With cash public assistance | 104 |  |
| With retirement income | 1,529 | $\$ 2,960$ |
| With other types of income | 1,085 | $\$ 15,260$ |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau

Another factor to consider in examining what drives housing need in a locality is the poverty level. People living in poverty are not always able to find housing that meets their needs in a location without some kind of assistance. Table 13 shows the poverty rate for Floyd County. It is common for the highest poverty levels to be among female-headed households with minor children present in the home. As young people start their careers and families, we would expect to see them exit the ranks of poverty, but what is concerning about this table is the $18 \%$ in the 18-34 age group that still linger in the poverty category. This is the tangible evidence of the impact of the high cost of education and the lack of affordability of housing that is delaying this age group from achieving age-appropriate milestones at the same rate as previous generations.

Table 13: Floyd County Poverty Rates

| Age Group | Total in Population | Number Living Below Poverty Limit | Percentage of Total in Age Group Living Below Poverty Limit |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population for whom poverty status is determined | 15,499 | 1,936 | 12.5\% |
| Under 18 years | 3,528 | 716 | 20.3\% |
| Under 5 years | 870 | 150 | 17.2\% |
| 5 to 17 years | 2,658 | 566 | 21.3\% |
| 18 to 64 years | 8,687 | 1,116 | 12.8\% |
| 18 to 34 years | 2,778 | 501 | 18.0\% |
| 35 to 64 years | 5,909 | 615 | 10.4\% |
| 60 years and older | 4,209 | 208 | 4.9\% |
| 65 years and older | 3,284 | 104 | 3.2\% |
| Male | 7,765 | 722 | 9.3\% |
| Female | 7,734 | 1,214 | 15.7\% |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau

The "poverty level" is not a fluid or dynamic number. It isn't often changed to reflect reality, yet it is still used to identify portions of the populace that are eligible for certain assistance programs. Many programs, therefore, have adopted "percentages of poverty level" as eligibility for their programs. Table 14 shows the most common levels and the number of individuals in each of those ranges.

Table 14: Floyd County Residents in Each Percentage of Poverty

| Poverty Level | Number of Residents in Range |
| :--- | :---: |
| $50 \%$ of poverty level | 510 |
| $125 \%$ of poverty level | 2,490 |
| $150 \%$ of poverty level | 3,039 |
| $185 \%$ of poverty level | 4,103 |
| $200 \%$ of poverty level | 4,552 |
| $300 \%$ of poverty level | 7,410 |
| $400 \%$ of poverty level | 10,404 |
| $500 \%$ of poverty level | 12,456 |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau

Table 15 on the next page shows the current 2022 program eligibility for a number of programs that impact housing and social services by income and family size.

Table 15: 2022 Iowa Poverty Levels by Household Size and Program Eligibility
$\left.\begin{array}{|l|c|c|c|c|c|}\hline \begin{array}{l}\text { Number in } \\ \text { Household }\end{array} & 50 \% & \begin{array}{c}100 \% \\ \text { HS/EHS }\end{array} & \mathbf{1 3 0 \%} & \mathbf{1 5 0 \%} & \begin{array}{c}175 \% \\ \text { LIHEAP }\end{array} \\ \hline \text { 1-person } & \$ 6,795 & \$ 13,590 & \$ 17,667 & \$ 20,385 & \$ 23,783 \\ \text { WIC }\end{array}\right)$

Source: Iowa Community Action Association

HS/EHS: Head Start/Early Head Start
LIHEAP: Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program
WIC: Women, Infants, and Children
WAP: Weatherization Program

Here are some of the most frequently used assistance programs and their eligibility requirements:

- Head Start/Early Head Start - 100\% of poverty
- Shared Visions, National School Lunch Program (Free) - 130\% of poverty
- Medicaid - 133-167\% of poverty
- Child Care Subsidy - 145\% of poverty
- Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) and Weatherization = 175\% of poverty
- Weatherization program $=200 \%$ of poverty
- WIC, Title V - Maternal \& Child Health Services; National School Lunch Program (Reduced Price School Lunch) - 185\% of poverty
- Early Childhood Iowa Low-Income Preschool Tuition Assistance, HAWK-I = 200\% of poverty


## PART 4: HOUSING

Part 4 will provide information about how people occupy housing, such as rates of home ownership or rentals. Information about household composition, for example, helps leaders understand the need for housing of different sizes to accommodate larger families compared to a similar need for smaller units to accommodate senior citizens or single individuals. Information about the age and condition of existing housing helps leaders understand what is available on the open market and what will likely need to be replaced in the near future as certain houses become obsolete either for health and safety reasons or because they lack amenities that today's homebuyers want.

Table 16: Floyd County Housing Units by Occupancy and Tenure

| Housing Unit Type | 2020 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Housing Units |  | 7,571 |
| Occupied | 6,899 |  |
| Owner Occupied | 5,051 |  |
| Renter-Occupied | 1,848 |  |
| Vacant Units | 2672 |  |
| Owner-Occupied |  | $1.5 \%$ |
| Renter-Occupied Vacancy Rate |  | $2.7 \%$ |
| Racy |  |  |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau

Table 16 shows the split between owner-occupied and renter-occupied housing units. The table shows a 67/33 owner/renter split is a little off the recommended 60/40 split between owneroccupied and rental, showing a need for additional rental units. What isn't optimal are the two vacancy rates. For owner-occupied housing, anything less than $5 \%$ vacancy doesn't provide enough choice in the market. For renter-occupied housing, vacancy rates of $5-7 \%$ are standard as there is higher turnover in rental markets, so the current vacancy rate for both owneroccupied and rental simultaneously show a lack of housing choices in the county.

Table 17: Floyd County Household Size

| Household Size | Total <br> Number | Percentage of <br> Total | Percentage of <br> Owner-Occupied | Percentage of <br> Renter-Occupied |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-person | 2,548 | $36.9 \%$ | $27.8 \%$ | $62.0 \%$ |
| 2-person | 2,420 | $35.1 \%$ | $39.8 \%$ | $22.1 \%$ |
| 3-person | 783 | $11.3 \%$ | $13.2 \%$ | $6.4 \%$ |
| 4 or more person | 1,148 | $16.6 \%$ | $19.3 \%$ | $9.5 \%$ |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau

Highlights of Table 17 are that 62\% of the rental market is for 1-person households while households of more than just two people, i.e. families with children, account for only $27.9 \%$ of
the entire housing market. Why this is notable is because many communities focus on the family housing when it is increasingly less a percentage of the entire population.

Table 18: Floyd County Age of Housing

| Year Structure Built | Number | Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Built 2014 or later | 54 | $0.7 \%$ |
| Built 2010 to 2013 | 42 | $0.6 \%$ |
| Built 2000 to 2009 | 568 | $7.5 \%$ |
| Built 1990 to 1999 | 358 | $4.7 \%$ |
| Built 1980 to 1989 | 188 | $2.5 \%$ |
| Built 1970 to 1979 | 1,224 | $16.2 \%$ |
| Built 1960 to 1969 | 1,012 | $13.4 \%$ |
| Built 1950 to 1959 | 834 | $11.0 \%$ |
| Built 1940 to 1949 | 378 | $5.0 \%$ |
| Built 1939 or earlier | 2,913 | $38.5 \%$ |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau

As is typical throughout all of lowa, the age of our housing stock presents a continued challenge. What Table 18 shows is that based on age alone, $98.7 \%$ of the housing stock would be eligible for rehabilitation programs to bring major systems up to code or to just maintain expected deterioration. That said, the $38.5 \%$ of homes built prior to 1939 are what define the community's visual character and historic value and can be worth preserving.

Table 19: Floyd County Housing Units by Type of Structure

| Type of Structure | Number | Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Total Housing Units | 7,571 |  |
| 1-unit detached | 6,309 | $83.3 \%$ |
| 1-unit attached | 69 | $0.9 \%$ |
| 2 units | 174 | $2.3 \%$ |
| 3 or 4 units | 353 | $4.7 \%$ |
| 5 to 9 units | 341 | $4.5 \%$ |
| 10 to 19 units | 78 | $1.0 \%$ |
| 20 or more units | 145 | $1.9 \%$ |
| Mobile Homes | 102 | $1.3 \%$ |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau

Table 19 shows the type of structures that make up the number of housing units in the county. This shows a pretty solid base of single-family homes and a nice mix of various sizes of rental units, from individual houses to larger complexes. This shows that there are a variety of choices available. The table shows that regardless of ownership versus rental property, the vast majority of structures are single-family, stand-alone homes.

Table 20: Floyd County Housing Units by Number of Bedrooms

| Number of Bedrooms | Number | Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Total Number of Units | 7,571 |  |
| No bedroom | 269 | $3.6 \%$ |
| 1 bedroom | 563 | $7.4 \%$ |
| 2 bedrooms | 1,779 | $23.5 \%$ |
| 3 bedrooms | 3,162 | $41.8 \%$ |
| 4 bedrooms | 1,414 | $18.7 \%$ |
| 5 or more bedrooms | 384 | $5.1 \%$ |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau

Table 20 shows a very good mix of housing units by bedroom size. One note would be the $5.1 \%$ of 5 -bedroom houses. These are likely older homes and preserving the stock of these homes is important because new builds will likely be much smaller and the families that need larger bedroom homes are likely to be at the lower end of the economic spectrum. Given the $62 \%$ of the population made up of one-person households, the $7.4 \%$ of available housing that has only one bedroom may be an area to invest effort into.

Table 21: Floyd County Housing Values

| Housing Value | Number | Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Owner-Occupied Units | 5,051 |  |
| Less than $\$ 50,000$ | 455 | $9.0 \%$ |
| $\$ 50,000$ to $\$ 99,999$ | 1,867 | $37.0 \%$ |
| $\$ 100,000$ to $\$ 149,999$ | 981 | $19.4 \%$ |
| $\$ 150,000$ to $\$ 199,999$ | 771 | $15.3 \%$ |
| $\$ 200,000$ to $\$ 299,999$ | 625 | $12.4 \%$ |
| $\$ 300,000$ to $\$ 499,999$ | 254 | $5.0 \%$ |
| $\$ 500,000$ to $\$ 999,999$ | 93 | $1.8 \%$ |
| $\$ 1,000,000$ or more | 5 | $0.1 \%$ |
| MEDIAN HOUSING VALUE | $\mathbf{\$ 1 0 7 , 7 0 0}$ |  |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau

Table 21 shows some concerning data. The very low Median Housing Value of $\$ 107,700$ versus the cost of new housing creates what is called a "Value Gap" where the cost to build housing in a rural area is compromised by the low value of existing housing in the market. This makes it hard to get loans to build or buy. Additionally, the low value doesn't drive enough revenue to cover the increasing cost of public services.

Table 22: Floyd County Mortgage Status

| Mortgage Status | Number | Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Owner-occupied units | 5,051 |  |
| Housing units with a mortgage | 2,856 | $56.5 \%$ |
| Housing units without a mortgage | 2,195 | $43.5 \%$ |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau

Table 22 shows the percentage of owner-occupied homes by their mortgage status and it is notable that there is such a large percentage of housing that does NOT have a mortgage. This lack of a mortgage represents potential equity that could be reinvested in rehabilitation of the housing to add additional years of life to the existing housing stock in the area.

Table 23: Floyd County Owner Monthly Mortgage Costs

| Gross Monthly Expenses | Number | Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Housing units with a mortgage | 2,856 |  |
| Less than $\$ 500$ | 106 | $3.7 \%$ |
| $\$ 500$ to $\$ 999$ | 1,140 | $39.9 \%$ |
| $\$ 1,000$ to $\$ 1,499$ | 1,018 | $35.6 \%$ |
| $\$ 1,500$ to $\$ 1,999$ | 329 | $11.5 \%$ |
| $\$ 2,000$ to $\$ 2,499$ | 201 | $7.0 \%$ |
| $\$ 2,500$ to $\$ 2,999$ | 46 | $1.6 \%$ |
| $\$ 3,000$ or more | 16 | $0.6 \%$ |
| Median Monthly Expenses |  |  |
| $\$ 1,078$ |  |  |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau

Table 23 shows that there is a broad range of mortgages being paid by owner-occupants, but that the $79.2 \%$ paying less than $\$ 1,500$ per month is reflective of the lower value of the housing shown in Table 21.

Table 24: Floyd County Mortgage Expenses as a Percentage of Household Income

| Monthly Mortgage Expenses | Number | Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Less than 20\% | 2,833 | $64.1 \%$ |
| $20 \%$ to $24.9 \%$ | 1,815 | $11.6 \%$ |
| $25 \%$ to $29.9 \%$ | 330 | $7.1 \%$ |
| $30 \%$ to $34.9 \%$ | 202 | $4.0 \%$ |
| $35 \%$ or more | 374 | $13.2 \%$ |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau

Breaking down the mortgages shown in Table 23, Table 24 shows that even with lower housing values, there are still $17.2 \%$ of the owner-occupants paying over $30 \%$ of their household income toward their mortgage. That is officially considered "cost burdened." Because banks will only lend on a loan-to-value ratio of 80/20, the percentage of "cost burdened" households are likely from the "housing units without a mortgage" shown on Table 22. These may be elderly households where the taxes alone take too large a proportion of their income or it may also be households that have experienced a more recent loss of income leaving them with mortgages underwater.

Table 25: Floyd County Gross Monthly Rental Rates

| Gross Monthly Rent | Number | Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Occupied units paying rent | 1,702 |  |
| Less than $\$ 500$ | 647 | $38.0 \%$ |
| $\$ 500$ to $\$ 999$ | 985 | $57.9 \%$ |
| $\$ 1,000$ to $\$ 1,499$ | 32 | $1.9 \%$ |
| $\$ 1,500$ to $\$ 1,999$ | 0 | $0.0 \%$ |
| $\$ 2,000$ to $\$ 2,499$ | 2 | $0.1 \%$ |
| $\$ 2,500$ to $\$ 2,999$ | 36 | $2.1 \%$ |
| $\$ 3,000$ or more | 0 | $0.0 \%$ |
| No rent paid | 146 |  |
| Median $=\$ 537$ |  |  |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau

Table 25 shows the number of rental units available at various price points. Unlike most of rural lowa, Floyd County looks to have a majority of rental units that are at the lower end of the rental spectrum.

Table 26: Floyd County Gross Rent As Percentage of Household Income

| Percentage of Household <br> Income Spent on Rent | Number | Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Occupied units paying rent | 1,690 |  |
| Less than $15 \%$ | 261 | $15.4 \%$ |
| $15.0 \%$ to $19.9 \%$ | 202 | $12.0 \%$ |
| $20.0 \%$ to $24.9 \%$ | 366 | $21.7 \%$ |
| $25.0 \%$ to $29.9 \%$ | 225 | $13.3 \%$ |
| $30.0 \%$ to $34.9 \%$ | 115 | $6.8 \%$ |
| $35.0 \%$ or more | 521 | $30.8 \%$ |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau
"Cost burdening" is a larger problem in renter-occupied housing where there is no check to the market, like banks provide for owner-occupied units, that keeps people from getting into tight
financial situations by living in housing that is too expensive for their income levels. With 37.6\% of all renters in Floyd County paying more than $30 \%$ of their income for housing, the cost burden issue shows a need for new, affordable, multi-family housing to provide better choices in the marketplace, as well as accounting for the increasing number of single-person households.

Table 27: Floyd County Building Permits

| Permit <br> Year | Single <br> Family <br> Units | Duplex <br> Units | Tri/Four- <br> plex Unit | Multi- <br> Family <br> Units | Total <br> Units | Single- <br> Family <br> Valuation | Multi- <br> Family |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Valuation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2000 to <br> 2004 | 133 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 137 | $\$ 138,188$ | $\$ 1,252,365$ |
| 2005 to <br> 2009 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 62 | $\$ 193,206$ | $\$ 0$ |
| 2010 to | 81 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 84 | $\$ 155,293$ | $\$ 0$ |
| 2015 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau Building Permit Survey

Table 27 shows what has been built in the county in more recent years. The average of 12-17 units of new housing per year is about 40\% less new construction compared to the early 2000s. The price of new single-family housing is also reflected in the increased valuation that has doubled since the early 2000s.

## PART 5: PROJECTED HOUSING NEEDS, CONSTRUCTION MODEL, AND AFFORDABILITY MODELS

This part of the Floyd County Housing Needs Assessment will use all the data that has been presented in the previous sections to construct a model that can be used to determine how many housing units will need to be constructed by 2030 to accommodate the expected population and continued economic stability. Models were also constructed to determine the price ranges that are affordable by various income levels. Then, using these models, the report concludes with recommendations on steps that can be taken to achieve a healthy mix of housing for the future.

The first step in constructing the model was to project the population based on two different scenarios. Growth is normally projected by the following equation:

Growth = Population minus Mortality (deaths), plus Natality (births), plus Immigration (people moving to the county), minus Emigration (people moving away from the county). While it is unlikely that the county's population will grow significantly, we can plan for a continued stable population and we can plan for the possibility of unexpected growth that could happen through positive economic development trends. Two scenarios for population are presented in Table 28. The first assumes a growth rate of $1 \%$ year-over-year which would be a positive outcome. The second scenario estimates a $1 \%$ loss of population that has been consistent with the population loss of the last two decades. The true number should fall somewhere between those two estimates.

Next, we need to figure out how many housing units this aggregate number of people need when they are split into their expected household formations, which is 2.37 persons per household, according to the 2020 U.S. Census.

Table 28: Projected Housing Needs 2023-2030

| Projected Population Scenarios HH Size 2.37 | Total <br> Housing <br> Units <br> Needed | Housing <br> Units <br> Available <br> in 2023 | Minus <br> Projected <br> Vacancy <br> Rate @ <br> 7\% | Minus <br> Projected <br> Annual <br> Demolitions | Adjusted <br> Total <br> Housing <br> Units <br> Available | New Units Needed/Excess Units |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2020 | 6,899 | 7,571 | (530) | (5) | 7,036 | 137 |
| $\begin{array}{r} \text { \# (-507) } \\ 2010-2020 \\ \text { actual } \\ \text { increase } \end{array}$ | 6,392 | 7,571 |  |  | 7,036 | 644 |
| 2024 |  | 7,571 |  | (5) | 7,031 |  |
| 2025 |  | 7,571 |  | (5) | 7,026 |  |
| 2026 |  | 7,571 |  | (5) | 7,021 |  |
| 2027 |  | 7,571 |  | (5) | 7,016 |  |
| 2028 |  | 7,571 |  | (5) | 7,011 |  |
| 2029 |  | 7,571 |  | (5) | 7,006 |  |
| 2030 |  | 7,571 |  | (5) | 7,001 |  |
| $\begin{array}{r} 1 \% \\ \text { projected } \\ \text { growth by } \\ 2030 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 15,870 / 2.37 \\ & =6,696 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | 7,001 | 305 |
| Projected Population 2030 @ 1\% population loss/HH Size 2.37 | 15,556 needing 6,564 units of housing total |  |  |  | 7,001 | 437 |

Source: Iowa State University Extension \& Outreach, 2022

The far right column (column 7) in Table 28 above shows the total number of housing units needed based on four different scenarios. The current situation is the top line number that shows Floyd County having an excess of 137 units. The second line contemplates how many housing units would be needed if the next decade has as much population loss as the last one did. In that scenario, Floyd County has an excess of 644 units. The next two scenarios look at the year 2030 and show an excess of 305 units if $1 \%$ growth is achieved and an excess of 437 units if there is a $1 \%$ population loss.

Column 2 of Table 28 shows the total number of housing units that currently exist. The 2020 U.S. Census American Community Survey (ACS) showed a total of 7,571 units, as seen in Table 20.

Column 3 accounts for the vacancy rate. Houses that are vacant may or may not be able to satisfy housing need depending on the reason for the vacancy. Some vacancies are temporary, such as rental units being cleaned or repaired between tenants, or some owner-occupied housing structures that are for sale where the previous owners have already moved to another structure. Other vacancies have longer tenures and may be vacant because they have been foreclosed upon by a bank, their owner has passed away and the home is part of an estate in probate, or their owner is hospitalized or in a nursing home but retains ownership of their home. The U.S. Department of Housing \& Urban Development does not include the homes of "snowbirds" as vacant when the house is empty for six months or less per year and is the owner's primary residence for tax purposes. A house is considered vacant if the U.S. Postal Service does not deliver mail to that address and if there are no utilities connected at the address. Table 16 showed a current vacancy rate of $1.5 \%$ for owner-occupied structures and a $2.7 \%$ vacancy rate for rental units. A vacancy rate of $7 \%$ is considered "normal," so $7 \%$ was used to calculate the construction formula. Vacancy as a percentage of all housing units in service can, and does, change over time, so using $7 \%$ is a good rule of thumb. What we don't have explanation for is the difference between the vacancy rate and the excess number of housing units that exist. There are a lot of possible explanations, but the data isn't showing a definitive answer. Local investigation will be required and a windshield survey is recommended.

Next, we have to account for the number of units that are demolished annually (column 4, Table 28). An average of five demolitions per year was used to describe houses that will go out of service. These are houses that exist currently that will go out of service, most likely because of fires and storm damage, houses purchased and demolished to make way for new development, or houses that are unfit for human habitation.

When Columns 3 and 4 are factored into the formula, the 7,571 housing units that exist become 7,036 units that are actually available to house the population. This is shown in Column 5.

Column 7 then becomes the projected housing need that must be satisfied to meet the need of the population broken into households of 2.37 persons. This shows a beginning excess of 137 that becomes an excess of 437 units by 2030.

When interpreting all the columns together, Table 28 shows that Floyd County has the numerical amount of housing it needs and has excess capacity for the next five years with no changes to the population and the loss of no more than five units of housing, countywide, in any given year. What this suggests is that the housing that exists calls for a rehabilitation program to retain the existing housing stock. The age of housing shown on Table 18 also supports this conclusion. The loss of population scenario shown in the second set of calculations only makes the need for rehabilitation programs more necessary as new development would become less likely and the need to retain and maintain existing housing, therefore, that much more important.

What this construction model also suggests is that lacking a need for a specific number of houses doesn't mean there isn't a market for new housing. The age of housing alone suggests that there may be a market for new or custom-built housing that is a better match for the amenities that buyers are now looking for on the open market that may not exist in Floyd County's communities. Also, new housing may be needed to meet the special needs of seniors who may desire housing that comes with additional supportive services or independent living in houses that are designed with zero-entry, fewer interior stairs, wider doorways, and safer bathroom features. Satisfying this need would call for new construction as the goal is unlikely to be met by adapting existing structures in the community.

To guide the development of future housing, Floyd County leaders should also take into consideration the affordability of housing based on the incomes of the area's residents and workforce. To aid in those decisions, Table 29 shows what Low and Moderate Income Households can afford to spend on housing annually and monthly.

Table 29: Housing Affordability Based on Floyd County's $\mathbf{\$ 7 4 8 9 4}$ Median Family Income

| Percentage of <br> Median Family <br> Income (MFI) | Annual Income | $\mathbf{3 0 \%}$ of Gross Income <br> Available for <br> Housing | 30\% of Gross Income <br> Available Monthly <br> for Housing |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $100 \%$ of MFI |  | $\$ 74,894$ | $\$ 22,468$ |
| $80 \%$ of MFI | $\$ 59,915$ | $\$ 17,974$ | $\$ 1,872$ |
| $50 \%$ of MFI | $\$ 37,447$ | $\$ 11,234$ | $\$ 1,498$ |
| $30 \%$ of MFI | $\$ 22,468$ | 6,740 | $\$ 936$ |

Source: Iowa State University Extension \& Outreach, 2022
The Median Family Income (MFI) for Floyd County in 2020 was $\$ 74,894$. Households earning less than $80 \%$ of MFI are often eligible for a variety of public assistance to help make housing more affordable for them. Renters at these income levels may qualify for Section 8 Housing Vouchers, elderly housing programs, or low cost units that are constructed using U.S. Department of Housing \& Urban Development (HUD), U.S. Department of Agriculture Rural Development (USDA-RD), or Low Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC). These are programs where eligibility is determined by the income of the household receiving assistance. This information is also useful to share with potential developers to help developers determine what their clients will be able to afford and the likelihood of finding tenants able to pay the rents necessary to make their project profitable.

Table 29 shows how much people should spend on their housing based on their income range and spending no more than $30 \%$ of their adjusted gross income on their housing. For renters, this dollar amount should include their rent, utilities, and insurance. For home owners, this dollar amount should include their principal and interest on their mortgage loan, taxes, insurance, utilities, and maintenance. Table 30 is focused on owner-occupants. Table 31 shows what the price range of housing needs to be to be affordable to homeowners in order to not go over the $30 \%$ of adjusted gross income toward total housing expenses. Considered together
with the previous analysis showing an excess of housing units, this information is needed to determine whether it is price and affordability that is a mismatch between the incomes available to support housing and the housing available on the open market.

Table 30: Monthly Housing Affordability by Income Level

| Income Range | Number of <br> Households in <br> County | Monthly Housing <br> Affordability Bottom <br> of Range | Monthly Housing <br> Affordability at Top <br> of Range |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Households | 6,899 |  | $\$ 250$ |
| Less than $\$ 10,000$ | 464 |  | $\$ 375$ |
| $\$ 10,000$ to $\$ 14,999$ | 275 | $\$ 250$ | $\$ 625$ |
| $\$ 15,000$ to $\$ 24,999$ | 803 | $\$ 375$ | $\$ 875$ |
| $\$ 25,000$ to $\$ 34,999$ | 852 | $\$ 625$ | $\$ 1,250$ |
| $\$ 35,000$ to $\$ 49,999$ | 909 | $\$ 875$ | $\$ 1,875$ |
| $\$ 50,000$ to $\$ 74,999$ | 1,251 | $\$ 1,250$ | $\$ 2,500$ |
| $\$ 75,000$ to $\$ 99,999$ | 948 | $\$ 1,875$ | $\$ 3,750$ |
| $\$ 100,000$ to $\$ 149,999$ | 873 | $\$ 2,500$ | $\$ 4,975$ |
| $\$ 150,000$ to $\$ 199,999$ | 184 | $\$ 3,750$ |  |
| $\$ 200,000$ or More | 313 | $\$ 4,975$ |  |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Iowa State University Extension \& Outreach, 2022
Table 31: Price Range of Homes Affordable By Income
$\left.\left.\begin{array}{|l|c|c|c|}\hline \text { Income Range } & \begin{array}{c}\text { Monthly } \\ \text { Housing } \\ \text { Affordability } \\ \text { Bottom of } \\ \text { Range }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Monthly } \\ \text { Housing } \\ \text { Affordability } \\ \text { Top of Range }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Price Range of } \\ \text { Home } \\ \text { Affordable at } \\ \text { Bottom of } \\ \text { Range }\end{array}\end{array} \begin{array}{c}\text { Price Range of } \\ \text { Home }\end{array}\right\} \begin{array}{c}\text { Top of Range }\end{array}\right]$

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Iowa State University Extension \& Outreach, 2022

