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Introduction

Purpose

The Town of Greybull Housing Study and Master Plan was prepared to accomplish several broad goals. First, the Housing Study intended to provide an analysis of existing housing and market conditions to inform long-range planning and community development decisions. This chiefly included assessing community housing needs. Secondly, the East Greybull Master Plan provided specific land use recommendations designed to inform how these needs can be accommodated to the greatest benefit of the community on one particular development site. A publicly-owned parcel of land was the specific focus of the East Greybull Planning Area master plan.

Process and Methodology

Project team members gathered relevant data and completed the Housing Study to assess needs and opportunities. A stakeholder input process was conducted to gather information from various members of the real estate profession, local leaders, and members of the pubic that were particularly familiar with the housing market in the town and region. A projected demand model was then prepared to forecast growth in housing over the next 20 years, based on existing trends and conditions. The conclusions of this analysis provided the foundation for land use recommendations in the Master Plan for the Tin Can Alley parcel. Implementation strategies then outlined and prioritized action items designed to accomplish the land use recommendations.
GREYBULL is a town of 1,881 people in Big Horn County, Wyoming. Settled at the confluence of the Greybull and Big Horn Rivers in the late 1800’s, the town was eventually founded in 1906 as the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad announced it was coming through town. Greybull flourished and declined with the oil booms of the early 20th century. Natural resources remain important to the local economy.

POPULATION
Despite a history of turbulent population growth and decline as a result of booms and busts, the past several decades have resulted in steady population growth in Greybull. In the past 25 years, US Census Bureau estimates that Greybull has grown by almost 100 people, or about 5%. With a median age of 42.4 years, Greybull is slightly older than Big Horn County (median age of 41.8) and much older than the state of Wyoming (median age of 36.9).

AGE AND GENDER
A population pyramid aids in understanding the age and gender of a population, which is key to determining potential housing demand. According to the 2010 US Census, people between the ages of 55 and 59 comprise the largest age group at just over 8% of the total population. The pyramid’s “bulge” in the 50 to 69 year-old range generally represents a middle-aged labor force that may prepare to retire in the next decade. This can create potential impacts on the town’s demand for retirement housing and eventually assisted living and healthcare. A narrow pyramid between the ages of 19 and 30 may indicate that the young adults who would potentially contribute to the labor force are leaving for economic opportunities elsewhere.

Inventory of Community Demographics

Population Growth, Town of Greybull (US Census Bureau)

Population Pyramid, Town of Greybull, 2013 (US Census Bureau)
FAMILY AND HOUSEHOLD SIZE

Of Greybull’s estimated 859 households, 534 (62%) are family households which are defined as “a householder and one or more other people related to the householder by birth, marriage, or adoption” (US Census Bureau). The average size of these families was estimated to be 3.1 people in 2013, about the same as the county (3.2) and state (3.0). Of all households in 2013 average household size was 2.4 people, which is slightly smaller than Big Horn County (2.6) and Wyoming (2.5).

In general, Greybull’s relatively smaller family and household size may correlate to a housing stock of smaller average unit size, or it may illustrate that there are more households occupied by a single owner or renter as compared to elsewhere in the region.

MOBILITY: IN-MIGRATION

According to 2012 US Census estimates for Big Horn County, approximately 3,275 people moved into the county from 19 different states and three countries over the past year. In migrants came from Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Florida, Idaho, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Washington, Wyoming, Asia, Central America and Europe. Utah was the most common origin state. About 1,025 new-comers relocated from within Wyoming. Of these, 727 moved from within Big Horn County and 298 moved from a different county in Wyoming. Other than Big Horn County, Park County, WY was the most common in-state origin.
MOBILITY: OUT-MIGRATION

An estimated 841 people moved away from Big Horn County in the past year. Of these, 342 people moved to different states. The most common destination, California, saw by far the most out-migrants.

About 500 out-migrants moved within Wyoming. Attracting almost half of all in-state migrants, Albany County was the top destination. With the exception of Park and Hot Springs Counties, out-migrants generally moved to eastern Wyoming destinations.

NET INFLOW-OUTFLOW

The county is experiencing a net increase in population growth of 184 people (1.6% of the total county population) from net migration.

GEOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

There is a migration flow between more populated areas in the state and Big Horn County. People generally moved to and from neighboring states in the Intermountain West. Migrants rarely came from or left to the southeastern US. People commonly moved within Wyoming and within Big Horn County. Neighboring Park and Big Horn Counties experienced high levels of in- and out-migration.

IMPLICATIONS FOR GREYBULL

The migration growth estimates seen in 2012 will likely lead to a more diverse populace, and in turn workforce and economy. Should growth continue, Greybull, being the principle town in Big Horn County, can be expected to absorb much of the housing demand from net migration.
ECONOMIC PROFILE

INCOME

In 2012, median household income in Greybull was $48,971, up 65% since 2000. The town’s median household income was significantly lower, however, than the county ($52,589) and state ($57,406).

Median Household Income, 2000-2013 (US Census Bureau)

Employment estimates from 2002-2011 indicate that Greybull’s top three employment sectors are education (17%), manufacturing, wholesale and transportation (16%) and agriculture and natural resources (15%).

The three smallest sectors by number of jobs are retail (8%), professional and information (6%) and financial, insurance and real estate (2.6%). These figures suggest a relatively small professional job sector and a larger skilled workforce in manufacturing, natural resource extraction and agriculture. The large education sector indicates Big Horn County School District is a major employer in town.

The period between 2002 and 2011 saw an estimated loss of about 50 jobs (6% decline). Major shifts in employment in the nine-year period include a loss of jobs in manufacturing, wholesale and transportation. Losses also occurred in recreation and hospitality and retail sectors. The education, health services and professional and information sectors experienced job growth.

COMMUTING PATTERNS

The 2011 US Census Longitudinal Employer Housing Dynamic data estimated the following cities or towns were the top five destinations for workers living in the Town of Greybull:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Number of Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Greybull (Internal Commuters)</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Basin, WY</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cody, WY</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Powell, WY</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Hyattville, WY</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conversely, the following cities or towns were the top origins for Greybull commuters driving to work in Greybull:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Origin</th>
<th>Number of Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Greybull (Internal Commuters)</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Burlington, WY</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Basin, WY</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Lovell, WY</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Powell, WY</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These estimates convey that most commuters in Greybull live and are employed in town, while Greybull also attracts some workers from other nearby places. There is a two-way commuter flow between Basin, WY roughly eight miles away, and Powell, WY about 48 miles away.

The majority of commuters in Greybull (82%) drove to work or carpooled in a car, truck or van. Walking was the second most common commuting mode in town at about 9%, a higher rate than the county and state. At just under 3%, fewer people in Greybull worked at home when compared to 7% in the county and 5% in the state.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Means of Transportation to Work</th>
<th>Greybull</th>
<th>Big Horn County</th>
<th>Wyoming</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Car, truck, or van</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drove alone</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpooled</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transportation</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walked</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxicab, motorcycle, or other means</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked at home</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(All charts this page US Census Bureau, 2013)
HOUSING PROFILE

Using the most recent US Census estimates (2013), the Town of Greybull had 945 housing units, which accounted for about 18% of the housing stock in Big Horn County.

OWNERSHIP & TENURE

Of the 945 housing units in Greybull in 2012, an estimated 824 units or 87% were occupied. Of these occupied units, 72% were owner-occupied and 28% were renter-occupied. Average household size of renter-occupied units was 2.3, slightly smaller than that of owner-occupied units (2.44).

Ninety-eight percent of housing units were occupied by one person per room while about 18 units had more than one person per room.

UNITS & ROOMS IN STRUCTURE

One-unit detached housing units account for 75% of all housing in Greybull. Mobile homes were the second-most prevalent housing type with 109 units, or 12% of the total. Two-unit multifamily structures accounted for another 9%, while three and four-unit structures accounted for 3%. An estimated ten structures had five or more than units.

At 12%, Greybull’s percentage of mobile homes is lower than that of Big Horn County (13%) and the state (14%). In general the town has fewer multifamily structures than elsewhere in the state.

Most housing units (27%) in Greybull have four rooms — including living rooms, dining rooms, kitchens, bedrooms, finished recreation rooms, enclosed porches suitable for year-round use, and lodger’s rooms, not including bathrooms and unfinished basements — per structure, with 5.7 rooms being the median. This is in line with housing in Big Horn County (median of 5.74) and elsewhere in Wyoming (median of 5.6).
Two bedroom housing was the most common in 2013, with three bedrooms the next most common. Only 5% of units had more than five bedrooms. The ratio of bedrooms to people illustrates the supply of housing in a specific area. Greybull’s ratio of housing to people is 1.28 indicating residential structures have a slight excess of living and sleeping space. This ratio is 1.31 in both the county and state, suggesting consistency across the state.

AGE OF STRUCTURE

Greybull’s housing stock is generally older than that of the county and state. Almost 40% percent of housing units were built before 1939, which is a considerably high percentage for the county and the nation: in Big Horn County 24% of units were built before 1939, as compared to 12% in Wyoming and 13% in the US. Over 80% of housing in Greybull is more than 25 years old.

The year a householder moved into their current unit indicates periods and rates of population mobility related to housing. Despite a depressed economy, the 2000’s saw the highest rate of householder mobility. High mobility rates may indicate transient communities or a temporary workforce.

POPULATION GROWTH COMPARED TO HOUSING GROWTH

Comparing the rate of population growth to housing growth illustrates how well the housing stock was able to absorb demand. From 2000 to 2012, the population grew by about 75 people (4.1%) while about 40 housing units were added (4.2%). These two similar growth rates from Greybull may indicate growth in housing and population occurred at a proportional rate.
HOUSING FACILITIES

The availability of certain facilities, or lack thereof, indicate the standard of living in a household and to some degree the condition of the housing stock. The figures assist in development of policies based on fair market rent and help identify areas in need of rehabilitation loans or grants. Plumbing facilities are considered complete when they have all of the following:

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

All three must be present in the house, apartment or mobile home, however not in the same room. About 1.2% of occupied housing units in Greybull and Big Horn County lacked complete plumbing facilities. This is much higher than the state figure of 0.6%.

Data on the lack of kitchen facilities indicate living standards and gauge the quality of household facilities within the housing stock. Kitchen facilities are considered complete when they have all of the following:

1. Sink with faucet
2. Stove or range top (microwaves, hot plates or camp stoves are not considered adequate)
3. Refrigerator (an ice box is not considered a refrigerator)

An estimated 0.7% of units lacked complete kitchen facilities in Greybull, while 0.5% lacked them in the county and 0.9% of units in the state lacked complete kitchens.

About 30 housing units, or 3.5% of houses, did not have telephone service available inside the home. This is higher than the county (2%) and state (2.1%), suggesting Greybull is relatively isolated.

CONSTRUCTION TRENDS

Since 2004, an estimated 10 building permits for single family residential construction have been issued in Greybull. Total construction costs were estimated at $1.05 million. There were no reported permits for multiple family construction. Corresponding with larger economic conditions, construction activity in Greybull slowed in the later 2000s, with no permits issued from 2009 through 2011.
MARKET STUDY

**HOME VALUES**

**MEDIAN HOME VALUE**

Greybull’s estimated median home value in 2013 was $96,400, significantly lower than the county ($131,000) and almost $90,000 lower than the state ($185,900). Just under half of all housing units were valued between $50,000 and $99,000. Less than one percent of housing units were valued at more than $300,000.

*Median Home Values, 2013 (US Census Bureau)*

In 2000 median home values in Greybull were $65,800, indicating a thirteen-year appreciation of about 47%. This rate of appreciation was much lower than that of Big Horn County (83%) and Wyoming, where the median value nearly doubled from $96,600 (2000) to $185,900 (2013).

A review of online multiple listing services revealed 18 residential properties for sale in or within two miles of the Town of Greybull at the time of the data collection phase of this study (December 2014 - January 2015).

The average for-sale price of these homes was $178,900. The median for-sale price was $113,500.

**GROSS RENT**

Occupied units that paid rent (as opposed to units that had a mortgage, do not have a mortgage, or have paid off a mortgage) account for about a quarter of occupied housing units. Median rent of these units was estimated at $552, lower than Big Horn County ($601), and much lower than the state ($764). In comparison, median monthly costs for housing units with a mortgage was $915 in Greybull, $1,065 in Big Horn County, and $1,352 in the state.

**FORECLOSURES**

Local data on foreclosures and 90-day residential vacancy rates are provided by the US Department of Housing and Urban Development. In 2013, Greybull had 107 households with mortgages and an estimated two foreclosures, for a foreclosure rate of 1.9%, slightly higher than the state rate of 1.4%. Big Horn County’s foreclosure rate was 2.6%, with Lovell having the highest foreclosure rate in the county at 3.1%.

Ninety-day residential vacancy is a measure of how many residential addresses are not receiving mail for at least 90 days. This can be an indicator of how efficiently the housing stock is being utilized, and may be an indicator of how many homes are in the foreclosure process. In 2013, Greybull had an estimated 67 of its 742 residential addresses listed as vacant for at least 90 days. In Bighorn County, 88 addresses were vacant for at least 90 days.
AFFORDABILITY

MONTHLY OWNER COSTS AS A PERCENTAGE OF INCOME

Selected monthly owner costs as a percentage of income (SMOCAPI) are relatively consistent with the region, state and country, as over 40% of homeowners spend under 20% of their income on housing. Compared to the US, fewer homeowners in Greybull spend more than 30% of their income on housing. SMOCAPI is a signal of housing affordability and supply, as well as an indicator of the needs of homeowners at different income levels.

SMOCAPI is useful in determining the percentage of households with a mortgage that are experiencing a “cost burden” or a “severe cost burden” on housing. A cost burden is experienced when a household spends more than 30% of household income on housing costs, while a severe cost burden is experienced at 50% of spending.

An estimated 7% of households with mortgages in Greybull were experiencing a cost burden while about 21% were experiencing a severe cost burden.

WYOMING COST OF LIVING INDEX

The Economic Analysis Division at the State of Wyoming Department of Administration and Information creates an index of statewide cost of living at the county level. The categorized data also provides an index on housing costs as they relate to overall cost of living. According to this dataset from 2010, Big Horn and Hot Springs Counties are the most affordable counties in comparison to the rest of the state.

CHANGE IN HOUSING TYPE

Greybull’s stock of housing by type has changed considerably since 2000. Housing structures with two units experienced the most growth with an increase of 110%, while housing structures with 20 or more units decreased 100%. The one unit detached (single family) housing type also saw growth. All other housing structure types experienced no growth or decline.
AVERAGE HOUSING SALES PRICE

Average sales price data is compiled by the Northwest Wyoming Board of Realtors, and is reported annually to the Wyoming Community Development Authority by the county assessors office. During the seven-year period from 2006 to 2013, incorporated places in southern Big Horn County (Greybull, Basin, Manderson, and Burlington) saw about a $14,000 increase in average sales price, or about a 17% increase. In the same period unincorporated areas of southern Big Horn County only saw a 1% increase in average sales price. This is despite extreme fluctuations pre- and post-recession that saw the average sales price increase to $350,750 in 2008. This is possibly due to the lower number of home sales in unincorporated county areas.

Regardless of the fluctuations, average sales price in the county’s unincorporated areas was always higher than that of the Greybull, Basin, Manderson or Burlington.

The State of Wyoming experienced a much greater average sales price increase ($62,000, or about 28%). In general the price trend in incorporated areas mirrors that of the state, with average sales prices remaining somewhat stable through the recession. However the most recent data shows that unlike the state, Big Horn County saw a decrease in average sales price from 2012 to 2013.
HOUSING DEMAND

MARKET DEMAND SUMMARY

Housing market demand was estimated using historical trends from US Census data between the years of 2009 and 2013 to determine ten-year projections. The study’s primary focus was to project:

- Estimated ten-year population growth
- Estimated ten-year total unit growth
- Change in demand by housing unit type
- Change in tenure (rental and owner-occupied units)
- Total land acreage demanded by housing type

To determine the above characteristics, the study calculated the percent change of key statistics between the five-year period of 2009 to 2013. Estimates were then created using growth models. Using these models, the projected growth rates were adjusted to more accurately reflect local market realities.

In summary, the 2009-2013 five-year existing conditions analysis estimated the following trends in demographic characteristics:

1. The population is increasing at a faster rate in Greybull than the county or state.
2. The demand for housing of all types is higher in Greybull than in the county or state.
3. Housing is getting more crowded: more people were living in households while structures had fewer rooms.
4. Population is getting younger, although still relatively old for the state.
5. Median home values are increasing, but will remain affordable relative to the county and state.

The ten-year projections determined the following changes in housing characteristics:

1. Population and housing is projected to increase at the same rate, adding just over 100 people and about 50 housing units every year over the next ten years.
2. One unit detached housing units will continue be the most demanded unit type.
3. The percentage of renter occupied units in the housing stock will gradually increase.
4. Mobile home housing will also increase as a percentage of housing stock.

The growth projections employed variable growth rates. For one-unit detached and mobile home housing a 3.5% growth rate in total housing units was used between the years of 2015 and 2019, and a slower 2.0% growth rate was used for 2020 to 2025. These rates were established from trends observed in historical data and adjusted according to employment, demographic, economic, regional and local trends, as well as anecdotal evidence from stakeholders and real estate professionals familiar with the local housing market.
Growth Projections, 2009-2025 (US Census Bureau, CTA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>US CENSUS ESTIMATES</th>
<th>PROJECTIONS*</th>
<th>NET GROWTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Unit Type</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-Unit Detached</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-Unit Attached</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Home</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>854</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


DEMAND BY UNIT TYPE

Projections for new demand by type of housing unit generally showed a stable rate of change among all unit types. One-unit detached housing experienced the largest net increase from 2009-2013, and it is projected that this trend will continue. On average, this housing type will increase in demand at a rate of 34 units per year. One-unit attached housing has been in decline and this trend is also projected to continue.

Multifamily housing is projected to increase by approximately 121 units over the ten-year projection period, adding on average eleven units annually. Mobile homes as a percentage of the housing stock is projected to increase the largest among housing unit types, however this increase equates to seven additional units on a yearly average, following trends seen between 2009 and 2013.

TENURE

Based on historical trends, housing tenure — the proportion of occupied of housing units that are renter occupied versus owner occupied — is projected to change over time. The percent of housing that is renter occupied will increase faster than that of owner occupied housing, however owner occupied housing will remain more prevalent.
DEMAND IN LAND ACREAGE BY HOUSING TYPE

Projected demand for the amount of land new housing will require over the ten-year forecast was determined using historical information, data projections and anecdotal information. Using the projected demand by unit type, calculations were made by using average parcel size from existing parcels in and within one mile of the Town of Greybull for each housing type. For projected mobile home parcels, the minimum lot size standard (3,500 SF) in the current Greybull zoning ordinance was used. The calculations are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Unit Type</th>
<th>Avg Parcel Size by Housing Type (SF)</th>
<th>Avg Parcel Size by Housing Type (Acres)</th>
<th>Proj 10-Yr Demand in Unit Type</th>
<th>Proj 10-Year Land Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-Unit Detached</td>
<td>11,804</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily (2+ Units)</td>
<td>22,717</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Home</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HOUSING SUPPLY

MARKET SUPPLY SUMMARY

Housing market supply was estimated using inventories created from existing data and from anecdotal information obtained through interviews with local and regional real estate professionals or property management companies.

In general, senior housing, rental housing and affordable housing units are under-supplied in Greybull, with high occupancy rates, waiting lists and a lack of new construction in the Greybull area. Supply for other housing types, including single family ownership units, has been adequately provided in the town, based on local real estate trends.

ASSISTED LIVING/NURSING HOME FACILITIES

An inventory of nearby senior assisted living and nursing home facilities was performed to understand regional supply. There are no formal senior assisted living or nursing home facilities in the town of Greybull, forcing those in need of this housing type to relocate.

There was a total supply of 493 beds or units among the six closest facilities in 2013. In Big Horn County, there were a total of 212 beds, or one bed for every 10 people over the age of 65. On average, the occupancy rate for the six closest facilities was 78%. Average occupancy rates for the three facilities in Big Horn County - all of which are within 30 miles of Greybull - increased to 82%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assisted Living/Nursing Home Facility Name</th>
<th>Location (Miles from Greybull)</th>
<th>Number of Rooms/Units</th>
<th>Residents</th>
<th>Occupancy Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bonnie Bluejacket Nursing Home</td>
<td>Basin (8)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming Retirement Center</td>
<td>Basin (9)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Horizons Care Center</td>
<td>Lovell (30)</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worland Healthcare and Rehabilitation Center</td>
<td>Worland (39)</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powell Valley Care Center</td>
<td>Powell (43)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Park Long Term Care Center</td>
<td>Cody (53)</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(SENIOR INDEPENDENT LIVING FACILITIES)

The nearest housing specifically limited to independent, non-assisted senior citizens is located in Lovell, Worland and Powell. There are a total of 10 units, with 33 located in Lovell, 26 in Worland and 49 in Powell. The Powell facility is 100% occupied with an active waiting list. All apartments offer below market rate units, depending on the applicant’s income. Approximate below market lease rates for units in Powell are:

- Efficiency Unit: $389
- One-Bedroom: $516
- Two-Bedroom: $617-$700

LOW-INCOME HOUSING FACILITIES

An inventory of low-income rental housing apartments was created to estimate market supply. Within 50 driving miles of Greybull, there are approximately 262 rental apartment units that offer low-income rental lease rates. There are 31 units in Greybull between two facilities. One company with a property in Greybull also manages two properties in Basin which are a combined 91% occupied.

The majority of affordable units are located in Powell, which is also the largest city in the region and therefore attracts the largest concentration of services, housing and infrastructure.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affordable Housing Apartment</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Total Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valley Homes Apts</td>
<td>Greybull</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greybull Apts</td>
<td>Greybull</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Horn Court</td>
<td>Basin</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Apts</td>
<td>Basin</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lovell Apts</td>
<td>Lovell</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose City West (Senior)</td>
<td>Lovell</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apple Apts (Senior)</td>
<td>Worland</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worland Gardens (Senior)</td>
<td>Worland</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buck Creek Apts</td>
<td>Powell</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ironwood Apts</td>
<td>Powell</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocky Mountain Manor (Senior)</td>
<td>Powell</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Surrey Apts</td>
<td>Powell</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkview Village I</td>
<td>Powell</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

( Wyoming Community Development Agency 2015, CTA)

Interviews were conducted with several low-income apartment property managers. According to a management company operating the Valley Homes Apartments in Greybull, their facility is 100% occupied with an active waiting list.

Two properties in Basin that offer both low-income and market rate rentals had 100% occupancy for their low-income units, while two market rate units were available for lease at the time of the interview.

In Powell, low-income units that have recently become available are slower to lease due to additional low-income units coming online in late 2014. Although occupancy was high at the time of this study, the company had trouble leasing one particular twelve-unit apartment over the past year. Low-income units that are limited to seniors are 100% occupied with an active waiting list. Anecdotal evidence suggests these units are in high demand due to the price rather than the location; residents were said to be attracted to Powell from other states such as California because of the relative affordability of senior housing in particular.

REAL ESTATE PROFESSIONAL INPUT

There are several real estate agencies and brokerages that operate in the Greybull/Big Horn County market, however there is only one real estate office with a physical location in the town. In business for approximately two years, this company gets an estimated two new sales listings per month.

Anecdotally, homes do not stay on the market relatively long (for the region). Typically homebuyers are a mix of new residents relocating to the area for work, or because they simply prefer to live in a smaller town rather than larger nearby cities. New buyers may also be young families looking to purchase a home rather than rent.

There is not a strong indication that developers are speculating to build new homes on existing lots or to subdivide property. There are few vacant lots within the town boundaries to build new construction upon.
Map of the East Greybull Planning Area
The East Greybull Planning Area outlines future land use and development strategies for meeting development demand in Greybull over the next 20 years. The following section assesses the physical capabilities of development on the site, known as Tin Can Alley, then identifies potential housing development densities and design concepts, and suggests a more detailed vision of development.

**PHYSICAL SITE ASSESSMENT**

**LOCATION**

The East Greybull Planning Area is located just east of the town’s corporate boundary where US Highway 14 travels toward Shell and eventually through the Bighorn National Forest. Also known as “Tin Can Alley”, the Planning Area is roughly bound by Sagebrush Lane to the north, County Road 28 to the east, the Bighorn River to the west, and roughly lines up with the southern boundary of the Town of Greybull to the south.

Rural residential and agricultural development exists on lands surrounding the area to the north and east, while lands to the south are undeveloped. A Town of Greybull utility facility and water storage tank is located on a 5.68 acre parcel on the east side of the property. The land in the Planning Area is largely owned by the State of Wyoming. Natural resource development has occurred on the property and on parcels to the south. Development is constrained in this southern portion due to deed restrictions.

**TOPOGRAPHY**

The area is characterized by sagebrush covered hills with steep drainages carrying water to the Big Horn River. Suitable development sites exist on the flat-topped areas between drainages.

**DEVELOPABLE AREAS**

Considering deed restrictions and topographic constraints, there are roughly three areas suitable for new development that total approximately 137 acres. Parcel “A” is the largest at approximately 85 continuous acres, followed by parcel “C” at 18 acres and parcel “B” at 34 acres. Parcels B and C have approximately 2,000 feet of frontage along US Highway 14.
Future Land Use and Phasing Map of the East Greybull Planning Area
FUTURE LAND USE

The map at left describes a future land use concept in the East Greybull Planning Area. This concept calls for a mix of uses including single and multiple family residential as well as a commercial component taking advantage of accessibility and visibility along the highway frontage. The remaining land holding development restrictions is designated as open/recreational space. The approximate land use breakdown is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Future Land Use</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Residential</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Commercial/Hotel</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open/Recreational Space</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PHASING

The East Greybull Planning Area development phasing is recommended to occur in three phases. Phase 1 includes approximately 20 acres of single family residential, six acres of multifamily residential and a small three to four acre open space component. This combination supplies short-term demand for a variety of housing types and introduces a recreational amenity space for new and existing residents.

Phase 2 includes a general commercial and hotel component and is designated as the 18 acre parcel north of US Highway 14 on the Future Land Use and Phasing map. General commercial uses in this phase may include a variety of non-residential uses that benefit from the high accessibility and visibility of highway frontage, also beneficial for hotels. This designation allows the jurisdiction flexibility in determining which uses are appropriate for the area.

Phase 3 is intended to be developed to accommodate housing demand after the 20-year planning period and includes approximately 87 additional acres of land designated for housing.

The remaining 370 acres of the Planning Area is intended to be used for open space and recreational uses where no conflict exists between natural resource development operations.

DEVELOPMENT CONSTRAINTS

Development in the Planning Area is generally constrained by: 1) the feasibility of extending public infrastructure, 2) topographic limitations, and 3) market conditions. Public infrastructure does exist in the area and currently serves an adjacent residential development within the town limits.

As mentioned, development in the area is additionally constrained by use restrictions associated with natural resource development. Further analysis such as soils testing for example should be performed to determine specific locations in which development may be constrained.
DEVELOPMENT VISION

The conceptual imagery at left is a vision of the density, subdivision, street layout, and streetscaping that the projected housing demand might accommodate. This is intended to provide a visualization of future development in Phase 1 of the East Greybull Planning Area.

This particular example visualizes six multiple family parcels for approximately 36 units and 84 single family lots ranging in size from 5,000 square feet to 0.5 acres. This mix of housing types would require approximately 30 acres, for a density of about four units per acre.
EAST GREYBULL PLANNING AREA DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS

The following describes development options for the East Greybull Planning Area site owned by the State of Wyoming. Due to unstable slopes and existing land uses, approximately 110 acres of this site are feasible for development. The following four scenarios describe the actions that the Town of Greybull may take to develop the site. All scenarios assume an exchange will occur in which the Town of Greybull acquires the subject property from the State of Wyoming.

PUBLIC PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP

The town may enter into a public-private partnership to develop the property. It is recommended the town first create a development plan that describes the long-term use goals for the site and partner responsibilities. At this point, the town may enter into a joint venture with a private partner by soliciting responses from the for-profit community. The town would select a responder that it believes holds the best qualifications, knowledge, and understanding to complete the project.

The reasons for entering into public-private partnerships to develop land include a lack of staff or experience in large development projects and real estate transactions, a lack of financial or temporal resources, or a desire to most efficiently pursue the town’s high priority projects. One risk of public-private partnership is the potential for the private sector party to fail financially, in which case the government and taxpayers would retain all financial obligations. In a conventional for-profit venture the investors would have incurred the losses in full. In this scenario, the town could attach conditions to the development that would ensure affordable housing requirements and site design standards be met. The town may create a master plan such as the one below, or the town may outline a series of land use goals. Regardless, it is recommended that a plan be in place before soliciting private sector interest.

DEVELOP THE PROPERTY ON THE TOWN’S OWN

The town can choose to develop the property on its own by hiring a private consultant or developer. This scenario would be effective in reaching the town’s affordable housing goals, as the town would retain full control over the land use plan. It would, however, be very costly due to the expense of hiring an engineer, site design consultant, a real estate consultant, and eventually a property manager.

The vision described in this plan could potentially accommodate the town’s housing goals should they decide to develop the property on their own. The design vision calls for a mix of housing types and could potentially provide tiers of ownership. These tiers could be phased so that renters could transition into part ownership, and eventually full ownership of single family homes. Increasing density with multi-family units increases the overall project affordability.

Steep slopes, drainages and deed restricted areas unsuitable for building would be utilized as open recreational space. Site access from US Highway 14 has not been analyzed, however direct ingress and egress to the property appears feasible.
SALE AND DEVELOPMENT WITH PROVISIONS

The town may choose to sell this property to private developers below market rates to ensure that the site is developed to the town’s land use desires. The town may include provisions, upon the land’s sale, that describe the wanted conditions of development. For example, if the town wishes to promote affordable housing to accommodate the low- and medium-income workforce near Greybull, they can require a developer to construct a portion of homes to be sold below market rates and in turn equivalently discount the price of the land’s sale.

The difference between this scenario and a public-private partnership is that the land is developed and solely owned by a for-profit developer.

SALE AT MARKET RATE

The town may also wish to sell the property. Benefits of this scenario include a potentially higher sales price and a large one-time payment. Constraints include a loss of control over the use of land and a one-time benefit rather than a long-term benefit flow.

TAKE NO ACTION ON PROPERTY

The town may take no action on the property to preserve its use until a more appropriate time.

CONSIDERATIONS

Another issue the Town of Greybull must consider regarding the development of this area is the provision of public services. Existing development trends show a market for multiple family housing in the area. If the town chooses to develop this area further, it is recommended that they plan for the logical extension of services from the town. This would potentially include new storage or transmission facilities and planning for the extension of roads to ensure access to the north or east should development continue in that direction. It is recommended that the cost of new infrastructure be distributed among all users using financial tools such as special improvement districts, etc.