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The purpose of this study is to further segment and analyze the properties studied in the North Main Neighborhood Focused Housing Study (NMNFHS) and to determine the Condition and Quality of “rental” properties versus “owner” properties, as classified by the Assessors Housing Data 2011 report.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
The results of this Study reveal that in general, the properties in the North Main Neighborhood Focused Housing Study (NMNFHS) are notably in poor Condition and low Quality. There are exceptions of course, however they are a small percentage of all properties analyzed. While there do not appear to be major clusters, many of the “Low/Poor” Quality/Condition property addresses are in the North and East areas of the Study Area. Details of the analysis are fully described later in this report.

Quality Conclusion:
This analysis demonstrates that the overall Quality of all housing in the North Main Neighborhood Focused Housing Study Area is “Less Than Acceptable” as rated by the Assessors Housing Data 2011 report, with over 75% of the properties rated as “Fair” to “Low” Quality and only 17% of all housing rated “Average Plus” to “Average”.

In comparison, the Quality of Rental property in the Study Area has been assessed as significantly lower Quality than Owner property, especially in the “Fair” rating - 32% Rental compared to 50% Owner, and 43% Rental compared to 27% Owner in the “Low Plus” to “Low” rating. “Quality” is assumed to be a measurement of the quality of construction of the structure on the property and quality of the property itself (e.g.: house versus trailer, brick versus metal siding, landscaped versus dirt, etc.).

Condition Conclusion:
This analysis demonstrates that the overall Condition of all housing in the North Main Neighborhood Focused Housing Study Area is “Less Than Acceptable” as rated by the Assessors Housing Data 2011 report, with over 48% of the properties rated as “Fair” to “Poor” Condition, and only 3.5% of all housing rated “Great” to “Good”.

In comparison, the analysis shows that Rental property in the Study Area has been rated as lower Condition compared to Owner property with only 43% of the Rental property being rated “Average” compared to 52% of the Owner property. “Condition” is assumed to be a measurement of how well the property (structure and land) has been maintained and the current state of the property. Rental property apparently has not been taken care of as well as Owner property resulting in the degradation of its Condition.

METHODOLOGY
Source data tables used:
- ParStudy2 table (Table with rentals marked) – 1,075 PIN/Account Number entries
- Assessors Housing Data 2011 table (SHAC2011) – 43,068 PIN/Account Number entries
- NMNFHS Survey Mailing list – 797 address entries
- NMNFHS Survey responses – 83 address entries
Refer to the Excel Spreadsheet titled – “Rental Housing Conditions”

The four tables were merged, sorted, matched by Account Number, and then analyzed using the ParcStudy2_table as the primary reference guide, since other accounts or parcel numbers would fall outside the original NMNFHS Study Area boundaries.

The following “account types” and other entries were separated and removed, leaving only “Residential” account types.

- Commercial
- Commercial Vacant Land
- Residential Vacant Land
- Exempt
- Duplicates
- Building ID numbers of 2xxx ("out buildings") in the Building ID column on the Assessors Housing Data 2011 table

After this sort and “purge”, 904 account numbers remained designated as “Residential”. They were then matched with their corresponding Assessors Housing Data 2011 Condition and Quality assessments.

Each “Residential” line entry was analyzed and further categorized as “Rental”, “Business”, or “Owner”:

- 420 entries – Rental
- 10 entries – Business
- 474 entries – Owner

**CRITERIA**

The following criteria was used to determine the above categories:

**Business:**

- An obvious “Business” name in the NAME_I column of the ParcStudy2_table.
- Verification using local name address look-up where possible or available.
- Further visual verification using Google Map Search (aerial view and street-level when available)
- Comparison with the Name & Address in the Survey mailing list and/or Survey Response.

*Note:* There may be more properties that could be classified as “Business” (e.g. home-based, garage based, mobile or trucking businesses), but in the scope of this study it could not be determined if it was a “Business” property if the only “NAME” listed in the ParcStudy2_table was an individual’s name rather than a business name. In the case of only an individual’s name, it was assumed that the property was an “Owner”.

For the purposes of this Study, it was not critical to ensure all the “Businesses” were identified, only if they are rental properties or not, since the comparison in this Study is Rental properties versus Owner properties.
Rental:
- An apparent name of a rental agency or property management company in the NAME 1 column of the ParcStudy2 table, such as ABS Rentals L.I.C or Little Wheel Management L.I.C.
- A different name in the NAME 1 column versus NAME 2 column of the ParcStudy2 table.
- A different address in the ADD 1 and/or ADD 2 and/or the P-ADDFULL columns versus the primary address column of the ParcStudy2 table.
- Response to Question #4 of the Survey Questionnaire: “Do you own this home, rent, or other”.
- Listed as under “Trusteeship”, unless otherwise indicated as “owned” or “rented” on Question #4 of the Survey Questionnaire.
- Different or other information in the Legal Description of the property.
- Comparison with the Name & Address in the Survey mailing list and/or Survey Response.
- Further visual verification using Google Map Search (aerial view and street level when available).

Owner:
- The remaining Account Number entries were then considered to be “Owner” account types. However, each of those entries was reviewed again to determine that there were no miscategorizations or other entry errors.

QUALITY AND CONDITION ASSESSMENT
The 904 remaining properties were then finally sorted as to Condition and Quality as per the Assessors Housing Data 2011 table, with the following results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rentals</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>% Tot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Plus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Plus</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Plus</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot</td>
<td>420</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>% Tot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Plus</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Plus</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Plus</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot</td>
<td>474</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>% Tot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Plus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Plus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Plus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rentals</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>% Tot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>1C</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot</td>
<td>420</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>% Tot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot</td>
<td>474</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>% Tot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following is a graphical representation of the same data:
ANALYSIS

To compare Rental properties to Owner properties, the data from the Quality and Condition Assessment above were grouped in the following tables:

- **Note:** The “Total” numbers do not include the “No Data” entries in the tables above.

**QUALITY:**

Two different methods were considered to combine the ratings:

- **Table 1**
  - Acceptable Housing Quality - Average Plus, Average, Fair Plus
  - Less than Acceptable Quality - Fair, Low Plus, Low

- **Table 2**
  - Acceptable Housing Quality - Average Plus, Average, Fair Plus, Fair
  - Less than Acceptable Quality - Low Plus, Low

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Rental</th>
<th>Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Plus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Plus</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>103</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Plus</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>301</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
<td>76.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Rental</th>
<th>Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Plus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Plus</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>128</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Plus</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>173</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 shows minor differences in the Acceptable versus Less than Acceptable total percentages between Rental and Owner. However, the Owner data includes a significantly higher number of the Fair ratings and a significantly lower number of the Low ratings.

Table 2 amplifies this internal detail, showing significant differences in the Acceptable versus Less than Acceptable total percentages between Rental and Owner when the Fair rating is included in the Acceptable grouping.
CONDITION:
A similar method was used to analyze the housing Condition data. Two different methods were considered to combine the ratings:

- **Table 3**
  - Acceptable Housing Condition – Very Good, Good, Average
  - Less than Acceptable Condition – Fair, Poor

- **Table 4**
  - Acceptable Housing Condition - Very Good, Good, Average, Fair
  - Less than Acceptable Condition – Poor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Rental</th>
<th>Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>186</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>218</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Rental</th>
<th>Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>183</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 shows only minor differences in the Condition of housing between Rental and Owner except in the “Average” rating. Far fewer Rental properties were rated Average Condition. Another notable difference is number of “Poor” ratings for Rentals versus Owner.

Table 4 shows the same variances for Rentals with lower numbers in the Average rating and higher numbers in the Poor rating.
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SECTION 1 - EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Sheridan Housing Action Committee (SHAC), through the City of Sheridan, contracted Business Resource Group in May 2011 to develop and conduct a focused residential needs analysis for the North Main Neighborhood (NMN) Area of Sheridan. A Master Plan was developed in 2009 for the North Main Neighborhood and the area is currently undergoing revitalization of its core commercial and entryway areas. A logical extension of the revitalization initiative is to address the residential needs of this community.

The Sheridan Housing Action Committee (SHAC) is a community-based organization that facilitates affordable workforce housing by building strong partnerships and offering innovative services. SHAC offers programs and services in three main areas: Education, Finance, Construction. The City of Sheridan has a population of about 15,000 people. The NMN contains approximately 800 households.

NMN is an older working class neighborhood with older, housing stock of varying condition. The area is believed to be occupied primarily by low-to-moderate income families. A essential component to the neighborhood revitalization initiative, to is obtain neighborhood development/improvement grants to assist homeowners to improve their property. To qualify for development grants the income level and housing conditions must be quantified and documented. Census track data defined for the area includes areas of higher income, and is not available down to the block-by-block level.

Therefore, to achieve the objective of the revitalization initiative, and effectively utilize development grants which are available and restricted to low and moderate income neighborhoods, the income levels, housing conditions and housing needs of the NMN residents must be identified and quantified by a methodology acceptable to federal granting agencies. The purpose of the study was to evaluate housing conditions, occupancy by income and tenancy, and ascertain the most critical housing needs as expressed by the area residents through a survey instrument conducted in the NMN Study Area.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS AND FINDINGS

Several important conclusions can be drawn from the statistical and qualitative results of the Survey.

1. Perhaps the most significant information is that 55% of the households in the Study Area are occupied by residents whose annual household income is at or below the 80% AMI Income Limit. In total, 80.4% are at or below the 100% AMI Income Limit level.

2. The respondents in this Study Area clearly represent an older population. 66.4% of the respondents were age 51 or older, compared to 39.6% for the City of Sheridan, 36.9% for Sheridan County and 33.3% for the State of Wyoming.

3. This appears to be a very stable, older, non transient community:
   - 83.9% of the respondents owned the home they referenced.
   - 38.2% of the respondents have lived at this location for 20 years or longer. 58.2% have lived at this location for 10 or more years.
   - 53% of the homes were built between 1900 and 1940, verifying the belief that this is an older neighborhood.
   - The vast majority of the respondents buildings were Single Family homes.
4. The household family size of the respondents appeared to be smaller than the national average of 2.3 per household.
   * 32.1% indicated only one household person.
   * 44.7% indicated a household of two people.
   * 57.6% of the one person households were 61 years old or older.

5. The respondents expressed serious concerns for home needs in the areas of:
   * Energy efficiency improvements
   * Major structural improvements
   * Health or Safety improvements
   * See Question #13 beginning on Page 9.

6. Based on the responses to Questions #16 and #17, there was demonstrated a significant interest in participation in the Sweat Equity and Grant or Low-Interest Loan Programs for home repairs.
   * 65 of the 107 responses indicated a Yes or Maybe willingness to participate in the program.
   * 70 of the 109 responses indicated a Yes or Maybe interest in program participation.
SECTION 2 - METHODOLOGY

BRG worked closely with the Project Steering Committee made up of individuals from SIACC, NMN Association, Habitat for Humanity, and the City of Sheridan, and utilized information from the Sheridan County Assessor’s Housing Condition Data and the City of Sheridan’s GIS mapping system Parcel Data for the Study Area. It was determined that the most effective and efficient method to reach the residents of the Study Area and gather the desired information was by a personalized direct mail Resident Survey Questionnaire mailed to each address in the Study Area (See Pages 15-16). BRG developed the survey questionnaire and reviewed it with the Steering Committee for additions and modifications to ensure it would collect the desired information.

The Study Area was defined by the Sheridan City GIS Mapping System with Parcel addresses identified by “PIN” numbers. BRG then merged this data with the County Assessor’s Housing Condition Data for the entire Sheridan County and matched corresponding PIN numbers and Account Numbers, eliminated commercial property, government property and empty lots, and developed a clean name and address list for the study area alone. A commercial mailing house was hired to print, address, apply postage and mail the survey questionnaires. Both outbound and return postage was applied in order to further encourage residents to complete and return the survey. Applying their software, the mailing house further refined the mailing list for possible duplications or undeliverable addresses.

The merge of 9,346 County Assessor’s Housing Condition Data entries, and 1,076 City GIS Mapping System data entries for the Study Area, resulted in a final mailing list of 797 household addresses.

To further encourage residents about the importance of completing and returning the survey, prior to mailing the survey announcements were placed on the SheridanMedia.com website, local radio PSA spots, the NMA website, and a story in the Sheridan Press newspaper.
SECTION 3 - SURVEY RESULTS AND FINDINGS

The first Survey mailing took place the week of May 16th to the 797 Study Area addresses, generating 72 responses. Due to the relatively low response rate for this mailing, it was decided to conduct a second mailing. The second mailing took place the week of June 13th to 725 addresses (those who did not respond to the first mailing) and generated an additional 45 responses.

- The total number of responses was 117 or a 15% survey return rate.
- This yields a 90% +/-5 confidence level representing the entire Study Area.
- Based on the distribution of return addresses, there was a good representation of responses from households in the Study Area (See Page 1 - Study Area Map).
- It is expected that a higher response rate was not realized due to a combination of apathy, no “burning issues”, perhaps a lack of understanding about the benefits of the programs, and perceived government intrusion into their personal affairs (although SHAC is a nonprofit organization, not a governmental agency).

The following Graphs and Charts represent tabulation of the Survey Questionnaire Responses. Note that responses may not total to 117 or 100% because not all respondents answered all of the questions.

Question #1:
Is the Head of your Household Male or Female?

- 64.9% of the respondents indicated the Head of Household is Male.

Question #2:
Are you the Head of your Household?
Are you Male or Female?

- 76.4% indicated they were Head of Household, and 57.3% of the respondents were Female
Question #3:
What is your age?

The respondents in this Study Area clearly represent an older population.
- 66.4% of the respondents were age 51 or older, compared to 39.6% for the City of Sheridan, 36.9% for Sheridan County and 33.3% for the State of Wyoming.
- 41.6% were age 61 or older.
- 22.2% were age 70 or older.

Question #4:
Do you: Own this home. Rent this home/apartment. Other?

- 83.9% of the respondents owned the home they referenced.

Question #5:
How long have you lived at this location?

- This appears to be a very stable, non transient community:
- 38.2% of the respondents have lived at this location for 20 years or longer.
- 58.2% have lived at this location for 10 or more years.

Question #6:
How many people live in your household, including children?

- The household family size of the respondents appeared to be smaller than the average 2.3 per household.
- 32.1% indicated only one person.
- 44.7% indicated two people.
- 57.6% of the one person households were 61 years old or older.
Question #6:
How many children under the age of 18 are in your household?

- 4 of the 8 1-child responses were indicated by respondents who were 31 to 50 years old.
- 6 of the 8 1-child responses were indicated by respondents who were 31 to 60 years old.
- 8 of the 11 2-children responses were indicated by respondents who were 31 to 50 years old.

Question #7:
In the chart below, find the number of people in your household in the top row, look down that column, then find and circle on the chart the dollar amount that your household yearly income is equal-to or lower-than.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of people in your household</th>
<th>HHYI 80% or Less Using Chart</th>
<th>HHYI 100%</th>
<th>HHYI 80% or Less Using Chart</th>
<th>HHYI 100%</th>
<th>HHYI 80% or Less Using Chart</th>
<th>HHYI 100%</th>
<th>HHYI 80% or Less Using Chart</th>
<th>HHYI 100%</th>
<th>HHYI 80% or Less Using Chart</th>
<th>HHYI 100%</th>
<th>HHYI 80% or Less Using Chart</th>
<th>HHYI 100%</th>
<th>HHYI 80% or Less Using Chart</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 person</td>
<td>$3,600</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$16,350</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$3,600</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$16,350</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$3,600</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$16,350</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 people</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$23,050</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$23,050</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$23,050</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 people</td>
<td>$23,050</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$26,350</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$23,050</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$26,350</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$23,050</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$26,350</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$23,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 people</td>
<td>$34,390</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$37,650</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$34,390</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$37,650</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$34,390</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$37,650</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$34,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 people</td>
<td>$45,900</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$45,900</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$45,900</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$45,900</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$45,900</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$45,900</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$45,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 people</td>
<td>$62,950</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$62,950</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$62,950</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$62,950</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$62,950</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$62,950</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$62,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 people</td>
<td>$81,600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$81,600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$81,600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$81,600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$81,600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$81,600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$81,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total of 102 respondents answered this question:
- 73 circled a dollar number on the chart.
- 55 circled a dollar number at the 80% AMI Income Limit or lower.
- 9 indicated their household yearly income was lower than the dollar amounts on the chart for the number of people in their household.
- 20 indicated their household yearly income was higher than the dollar amounts on the chart for the number of people in their household. (Incomes ranged from $59,000 to $140,000 per year).
- The 82 responses (73 + 9) either on, or lower than the chart, represent 80.4% of the total respondents. Those 82 responses are at 100% or lower than the AMI Income Limit.
- 64 (55 + 9) or 55% of the respondents were at the 80% AMI Income Limit or lower.
Question #8:
Are you a member of the North Main Neighborhood Association?
- The majority of the respondents 95.5% are not a member of the North Main Neighborhood Association.

If not, would you be interested in becoming a member?
- Again, the majority of respondents 80%, expressed no interest in becoming a member.

This information presents an opportunity to advertise and promote the Association benefits and recruit new members.

Question #9:
Approximately what year was this building built?
53% of the homes were built between 1900 and 1940, verifying the belief that this is an older neighborhood.

Question #10:
Is your building a Single family home, Apartment, Condo, Townhouse, Duplex/Fourplex, Other?
- The vast majority of the respondents buildings were Single Family homes.
Question #11:
How many rooms does your home have?
- Bedrooms?
- Bathrooms?
- Other rooms?

Question #12:
How many floors does your home have?
- Basement?
- 1st floor?
- 2nd floor?
- 3rd floor?
- More than 3 floors?

Question #13 was a multi-part question designed to gather information from the residents about the condition of their housing and their neighborhoods.

Question #13:
Is your home in need of:
   Energy efficiency improvements?
   Selected 122 times.
   - 41% of the selections for Windows.
   - 35% of the selections for Weatherization.
   - 21% of the selections for Heat source.
Note: Some of the respondents selected more than one item.
Question #13:
Is your home in need of:
  - Major structural improvements?
    Selected 102 times.
    * 29% of selections for Windows,
    * 28% of selections for Roof,
    * 26% of selections for Foundation,
    * 13% of selections for Walls.
Note: Some of the respondents selected more than one item.

Question #13:
Is your home in need of:
  - Health or Safety improvements?
    Selected 67 times.
    * 39% of selections for Electrical,
    * 25% of selections for Plumbing,
    * 18% of selections for Mold,
    * 15% of selections for Lead based paint,
    * 3% of selections for Termites/Rodents.
Note: Some of the respondents selected more than one item.

Question #13:
Is your home in need of:
  - Accessibility improvements or additions?
    73 responses.
    * The majority of respondents 89% indicated no need for improvements.
Question #13:
Is your home in need of:
  Siding repairs?  
  86 responses.  
  • 37% indicated a need for siding repairs.

Question #14:
What do you believe are the most critical needs in your neighborhood?
Please tell us how you would rank the importance of the following by placing a number next to each:  
(1 = most critical to 10 = least critical)

Each selection by item was weighted by the criteria 1 = most critical to 10 = least critical and given a numerical ranking by weight/importance. The results shown in the graph indicate the most important/critical needs to the residents in the Study Area are in this order:

- Sidewalks/Pathways improvements,
- Housing rehabilitation,
- Streets improvements,
- Lighting improvements,
- Parks/Green Spaces,
- Rehabilitation of commercial or industrial properties,
- A buffer or separation between commercial land uses and residential spaces,
- Water/Sewer improvements,
- Additional rental housing, apartments or home ownership,

Other selections included:
- Stop and or yield signs. Safety - stop signs at intersections.
- Certain areas would make great speed traps. We get a lot of speeders.
- Alley behind the house.
- The mess at corner of N. Main & Fort Road.
- Traffic calming & way finding signage.
- Make people clean up their property.
- Removal snow / ice.
- N. Main needs a grocery store.
Question #15:
Do you own vacant property in the North Main Area that would be available for additional housing?

- 13 of the 112 responses indicated a Yes or a Maybe.
- See the Chart on Pages 18-19 for contact information.

Question #16:
Would you be willing to participate in an owner involved "Sweat Equity" program for home repairs?

- 65 of the 107 responses indicated a Yes or Maybe willingness to participate in the program.
- See the Chart on Pages 18-19 for contact information.

Question #17:
Would you be interested in participating in a grant or low-interest loan program for repairs?

- 70 of the 109 responses indicated a Yes or Maybe interest in program participation.
- See the Chart on Pages 18-19 for contact information.
Question #13:
Is your home in need of Other repairs?

- Metal Facia blew off
- Garage paint
- Paint
- Broken sewer line
- Radon mitigation
- Updates, finish basement into liveable area
- Doors
- Asbestos shingles removed
- Roof needs reshingled
- Tar for the roof on back porch (leaks into the basement)
- Wood floors, tile
- Driveway, sidewalks
- Roofing
- Chimney need redone
- Sprinkler system
- Porch
- Basement steps
- Flooring

Other Comments:

Question #14:

- Less government regulation maybe spending money on actual improvements not surveys
- Critical need for safe zones for growing number of children who have nowhere to play, ride bikes, etc. except the street. Possible solutions: Slow down traffic w/speed limits, stop signs, speed bumps, signage re: children on streets, one-way streets to allow for bike lanes & better visibility, sidewalks, better & more lighting.
- We need a grocery store on north end & good restaurants
- Trees in front of homes need trimmed. I am told the City should do these trees
- Ted's Towing move junk vehicles off 8th street
- The corners at intersections by stop lights need trimming on a regular basis
- 2-blocks of sidewalk needs replacing 1300 block North Main & there is a big hump (too high) at the Alamo Motel entrance by the office. People could fail or lose their balance.
- 1350 N. Main has 3 big prints going W. to East
- The curb needs repaired 1260 N. Main
- Landlords need to keep rental property in better shape
- Stop sign on Custer Avenue due to train and cars speeding
- Traffic is horrible on 5th St. between 1-90 & Sheridan Ave. - Proper authorities have been contacted but unwilling to do anything about it! Police seem apathetic at best
- People living on other side of street, park on their side.
- Our neighborhood needs sidewalks because there are a lot of people that walk and they have to go in the street
- Traffic lights @ 8th & Main and or 11th & Main, pedestrian light 5th & Spaulding
- I already did this on my own nickel (Sweat Equity) I like to rebuild old homes. Leave them alone and the market will do it. Government grants inflate prices & make it hard to have the market do the fixing.
- #17 - Yes for heating - we only have one heat register total for the entire house!!!
- #13 - My garage foundation & retaining walls are in need of major repairs.
Please complete this survey to help identify your specific housing and neighborhood condition and needs. The results of the survey may provide the basis to secure grant funding for neighborhood improvements or individual home improvements. If you have any questions about any aspect of the survey, contact Kami Spann, Sheridan Housing Action Committee, 307-675-1155.

Please take a few minutes to answer the survey questions, and return it to us by June 1, 2011.

First, a few questions about your Household:

1. Is the Head of your Household Male? Female?
2. Are you the Head of your Household? Yes. No
3. What is your age? 18-24, 25-30, 31-40, 41-50, 51-60, 61-70, or 70+
4. Do you own this home? Rent this home? Apartment
5. How many people live in your household, including children? How many children under the age of 18?
6. Approximately what year was this building built? Don't Know

For example: If there are 3 people in my household, and my household yearly income is $41,500, I would circle $47,400 on the chart.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of people in your household</th>
<th>1 person</th>
<th>2 people</th>
<th>3 people</th>
<th>4 people</th>
<th>5 people</th>
<th>6 people</th>
<th>7 people</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Household Yearly Income</td>
<td>$46,100</td>
<td>$52,700</td>
<td>$59,300</td>
<td>$65,900</td>
<td>$71,600</td>
<td>$76,300</td>
<td>$81,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$56,900</td>
<td>$62,550</td>
<td>$68,200</td>
<td>$73,850</td>
<td>$79,500</td>
<td>$85,150</td>
<td>$90,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$72,700</td>
<td>$78,350</td>
<td>$84,000</td>
<td>$89,650</td>
<td>$95,300</td>
<td>$101,000</td>
<td>$106,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$83,050</td>
<td>$88,700</td>
<td>$94,350</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$105,650</td>
<td>$111,300</td>
<td>$117,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If not, what is your household yearly income is higher than the dollar amounts on the chart? It is.

8. Are you a member of the North Main Neighborhood Association? Yes. No
9. If not, would you be interested in becoming a member? Yes. No
10. What do you believe are the most critical needs in your neighborhood? Please tell us how you would rank the importance of the following by placing a number next to each:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 = most critical</th>
<th>10 = least critical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
   a. Streets improvements | f. Parks/Green Spaces |
   b. Water/Sewer improvements | g. Additional rental housing, apartments or home ownership, |
   c. Lighting improvements | h. Housing rehabilitation, |
   d. Sidewalks/Pathways improvements | i. Rehabilitation of commercial or industrial properties, |
   e. A buffer or separation between commercial land uses and residential spaces, |
   j. Other |

11. Do you own vacant property in the North Main Area that would be available for additional housing? Yes. No. Maybe
12. Would you be willing to participate in an owner involved "Sweat Equity" program for home repairs? Yes. No. Maybe
13. Would you be interested in participating in a grant or low-interest loan program for repairs? Yes. No. Maybe
14. Please tell us your name and phone number.

Thank you very much for your time, interest, and cooperation! Please re-fold the survey so the postage paid return address slums. Tape it, and Mail it by June 1st.
North Main Neighborhood Association
PO Box 256
Sheridan, WY 82801

North Main Neighborhood Association
c/o Business Resource Group
Mailroom
PO Box 2951
Casper WY 82602-9976
DISCLAIMER
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