For questions regarding the content of this report, please contact the Utah Housing and Community Development division at biennialreporting@utah.gov.

This report is also available online at jobs.utah.gov/housing/reports

Permission to reproduce this report is granted

Equal Opportunity Employer/Program

Auxiliary aids and services are available upon request to individuals with disabilities by calling 801-526-9240. Individuals with speech or hearing impairments may call the Relay Utah by dialing 711. Spanish Relay Utah: 1-888-346-3162.
SPECIAL THANKS
THE COMMISSION ON HOUSING AFFORDABILITY:

Jacob Anderegg, State Senator
Joel Briscoe, State Representative
Val Potter, State Representative
Jon Pierpont, Department Workforce Services
Jonathan Hardy, Housing and Community Development Division
Benjamin Hart, Governor’s Office of Economic Development
Matthew Sibul, Utah Transit Authority
Grant Wittaker, Utah Housing Corporation
Michael Akerlow, Community Development Corporation of Utah
Christopher Condie, Lehi City
Matthew Dahl, Utah Redevelopment Association
Michael Gallegos, Salt Lake County
Chris Gamvroulas, Utah Homebuilders Association
Andrew Johnston, Salt Lake City
Jeffery Jones, Summit County Economic Development
Janice Kimball, Housing Authority of the County of Salt Lake
Brynn Mortensen, Salt Lake Chamber of Commerce
Michael Ostermiller, Northern Wasatch Association of Realtors
Richard Stevenson, Utah Bankers Association
Michele Weaver, Rural Community Assistance Corporation

ADDITIONAL SUPPORT
HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIVISION STAFF:

Rebecca Banner, Assistant Director
Katherine Smith, Assistant Director
Shelli Glines, Olene Walker Housing Loan Fund Director
Robert Kohutek, Program Specialist

For more information about this report please contact:

Housing and Community Development Division
Community Analysis and Planning
1385 South State Street
Salt Lake City, UT 84115
biennialreporting@utah.gov
(801) 468-0141
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State of Utah</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Escalante</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Oakley</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTIES OF UTAH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Eureka</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Ogden</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaver County</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fairview</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Orangeville</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box Elder County</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Farmington</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Orem</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cache County</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Farr West</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Panguitch</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon County</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ferron</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Park City</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daggett County</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Fillmore</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Parowan</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis County</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Fountain Green</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Payson</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duchesne County</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Fruit Heights</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Perry</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emery County</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Garland</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Plain City</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garfield County</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Grantsville</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Pleasant Grove</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand County</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Green River</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Pleasant View</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron County</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Gunnison</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Price</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juab County</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Harrisville</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kane County</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Heber</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Provo</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millard County</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Helper</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Richfield</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan County</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Herriman</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piute County</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Highland</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Riverdale</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich County</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Hildale</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>River Heights</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake County</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Holladay</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Riverton</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Juan County</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Honeyville</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanpete County</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Hooper</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Roy</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sevier County</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Huntingdon</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>St. George</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summit County</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Hurricane</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Salem</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tooele County</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Hyde Park</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Salina</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uintah County</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Hyrum</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah County</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Ivins</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Sandy</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasatch County</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Kamas</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington County</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Kanab</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Santauquin</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne County</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Kaysville</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>Saratoga Springs</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weber County</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>La Verkin</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Smithfield</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITIES OF UTAH</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Layton</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>South Jordan</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpine</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Lehi</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>South Ogden</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Fork</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Lewiston</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>South Salt Lake</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurora</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Lindon</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>South Weber</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear River City</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Logan</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>Spanish Fork</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaver</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Manti</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>Spring City</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blanding</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Mapleton</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>Springville</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluffdale</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Marriott-Slaterville</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Sunset</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bountiful</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Mendon</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Syracuse</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigham City</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Midvale</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Taylorville</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Dale</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Midway</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Tooele</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar City</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Milford</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Toquerville</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Hills</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Millville</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Tremonton</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centerville</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Moab</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>Vernal</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearfield</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Mona</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>Washington Terrace</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalville</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Monticello</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corinne</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>Wellsville</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottonwood Heights</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Moroni</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>Wendover</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Mount Pleasant</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>West Bountiful</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draper</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Murray</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>West Haven</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duchesne</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Myton</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>West Jordan</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle Mountain</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>West Point</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Carbon-Sunnyside</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Nephi</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>West Valley City</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elk Ridge</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Nibley</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>Willard</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enoch</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>North Logan</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>Woodland Hills</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>North Ogden</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>Woods Cross</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephraim</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>North Salt Lake</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TOWNS OF UTAH............ 177
Alta..................... 178
Alta mont................ 179
Alton.................... 180
Amalga................... 181
Annabella................ 182
Antimony................ 183
Apple Valley............. 184
Ballard.................. 185
Bicknell................. 186
Big Water................ 187
Boulder.................. 188
Brian Head............... 189
Bryce Canyon City....... 190
Cannonville.............. 191
Castle Valley............ 192
Cedar Fort............... 193
Centerfield.............. 194
Central Valley.......... 195
Charleston............... 196
Circeville.............. 197
Clarkston.............. 198
Clawson.................. 199
Cleveland.............. 200
Cornish................ 201
Daniel................... 202
Deweyville.............. 203
Elmo..................... 204
Elsinore............. 205
Elwood................... 206
Emery.................... 207
Fairfield.............. 208
Fayette.................. 209
Fielding................ 210
Francis.................. 211
Garden City............. 212
Genola................... 213
Glendale................. 214
Glenwood................. 215
Goshen.................. 216
Hanksville............... 217
Hatch.................... 218
Henefer.................. 219
Henrieville.............. 220
Hideout.................. 221
Hinckley................ 222
Holden................... 223
Howell................... 224
Huntsville............... 225
Independence............ 226
Joseph................... 227
Junction................ 228
Kanarraville............ 229
Kanosh................... 230
Kingston................ 231
Koosharem................ 232
Laketown................ 233
Leamington.............. 234
Leeds..................... 235
Levan.................... 236
Loa..................... 237
Lymant................... 238
Lynndyl.................. 239
Manila................... 240
Mantua................... 241
Marysvale................ 242
Mayfield................ 243
Meadow.................. 244
Minersville........... 245
New Harmony........... 246
Newton................... 247
Oak City................ 248
Ophir................... 249
Orderville.............. 250
Paradise................ 251
Paragonah............... 252
Plymouth................. 253
Portage................ 254
Randolph............... 255
Redmond................. 256
Rocky Ridge............. 258
Rush Valley............. 259
Scipio.................. 260
Scofield................ 261
Sigurd.................. 262
Snowville.............. 263
Springdale............. 264
Sterling................. 265
Stockton................. 266
Tabiona................ 267
Torrey.................. 268
Trenton................ 269
Tropic.................. 270
Uintah.................. 271
Vernon.................. 272
Vineyard................ 273
Virgin.................. 274
Wales................... 275
Wallsburg............. 276
Woodruff................ 277

State of Utah's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 64,090 (23.2%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 53,500 (19.3%)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 65,630 (23.7%)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI): 93,490 (33.8%)

Total: 276,710

State of Utah's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened: 86.6%
- Severely Cost Burdened: 23.3%

Comparison of State of Utah and United States's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units State of Utah</th>
<th>Available Units State of Utah</th>
<th>Affordable Units United States</th>
<th>Available Units United States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income  ≤80% HAMFI</td>
<td>143.4</td>
<td>100.8</td>
<td>131.1</td>
<td>94.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income ≤50% HAMFI</td>
<td>107.8</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td>57.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income ≤30% HAMFI</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Beaver County, 2011-2015

Beaver County's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI)

560

- 210 (37.5%)
- 150 (26.8%)
- 135 (24.1%)
- 65 (11.6%)

Beaver County's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Comparison of Beaver County and State of Utah's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units Beaver County</th>
<th>Available Units Beaver County</th>
<th>Affordable Units State of Utah</th>
<th>Available Units State of Utah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>145.9</td>
<td>115.3</td>
<td>143.4</td>
<td>100.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>185.5</td>
<td>118.2</td>
<td>107.8</td>
<td>63.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>407.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Box Elder County's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)

Box Elder County's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Box Elder County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Renter Households
- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Box Elder County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Box Elder County's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- Available Units per 100
- Affordable Units per 100

Comparison of Box Elder County and State of Utah's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Box Elder County</td>
<td>State of Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>149.1</td>
<td>143.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>199.0</td>
<td>107.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income</td>
<td>102.7</td>
<td>56.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Cache County, 2011-2015

Cache County's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 2,730 (22.0%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 2,610 (21.1%)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 3,455 (27.9%)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI): 3,595 (29.0%)

Total: 12,390

Cache County's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened: 90.8%
- Severely Cost Burdened: 71.8%

Comparison of Cache County and State of Utah's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>137.5</td>
<td>101.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>134.6</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Carbon County, 2011-2015

**Carbon County's Renter Households by Income Level**
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI) 515 (22.8%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI) 685 (30.4%)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI) 325 (14.4%)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI) 730 (32.4%)
- Total 2,255

**Carbon County's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households**
- Cost Burdened 628 (28.6%)
- Severely Cost Burdened 427 (19.2%)

**Comparison of Carbon County and State of Utah's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Carbon County</th>
<th>State of Utah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income  (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>158.0</td>
<td>143.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>156.3</td>
<td>107.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>111.5</td>
<td>110.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>56.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Daggett County, 2011-2015

Daggett County’s Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 4 (10.8%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 10 (27.0%)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 4 (10.8%)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI): 19 (51.4%)

Daggett County’s Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened: 37
- Severely Cost Burdened: 4

Daggett County’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): Affordable Units: 18, Available Units: 28
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): Affordable Units: 8, Available Units: 8
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): Affordable Units: 8, Available Units: 8
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): Affordable Units: 4, Available Units: 4

Daggett County’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Affordable Units: 10
- Available Units: 10

Daggett County’s Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): 155.6
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 100.0
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 63.3
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 27.5

Comparison of Daggett County and State of Utah’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>Daggett County: 155.6, State of Utah: 143.4</td>
<td>Daggett County: 122.2, State of Utah: 100.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>Daggett County: 100.0, State of Utah: 107.8</td>
<td>Daggett County: 100.0, State of Utah: 63.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>Daggett County: 100.0, State of Utah: 56.8</td>
<td>Daggett County: 100.0, State of Utah: 27.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Davis County, 2011-2015

Davis County's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 5,620 (25.3%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 4,090 (18.4%)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 4,750 (21.4%)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI): 7,775 (35.0%)

Davis County's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened: 88.9%
- Severely Cost Burdened: 75.4%

Comparison of Davis County and State of Utah's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Davis County</th>
<th>State of Utah</th>
<th>Davis County</th>
<th>State of Utah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>145.9</td>
<td>143.4</td>
<td>100.3</td>
<td>100.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td>117.0</td>
<td>107.8</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>63.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Affordable Housing Gap: Duchesne County, 2011-2015**

**Duchesne County's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hamfi Level</th>
<th>Cost Burdened</th>
<th>Severely Cost Burdened</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>71.7%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comparison of Duchesne County and State of Utah’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hamfi Level</th>
<th>Duchesne County</th>
<th>State of Utah</th>
<th>Duchesne County</th>
<th>State of Utah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (&lt;30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>180.4</td>
<td>143.4</td>
<td>107.1</td>
<td>100.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≥30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>168.0</td>
<td>107.8</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>63.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≥30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>102.7</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Emery County, 2011-2015

### Emery County's Renter Households by Income Level

- **Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)**: 200 (32.5%)
- **Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)**: 120 (19.5%)
- **Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)**: 115 (18.7%)
- **Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)**: 615 (98.3%)

### Emery County's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- **Cost Burdened**: 87.5%
- **Severely Cost Burdened**: 32.5%

### Comparison of Emery County and State of Utah's Affordable & Available Rental housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emery County</td>
<td>State of Utah</td>
<td>Emery County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>181.6</td>
<td>143.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td>220.3</td>
<td>107.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income</td>
<td>170.0</td>
<td>56.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Emery County's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- **Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)**: 140.2 (Affordable 181.6)
- **Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)**: 145.3 (Affordable 220.3)
- **Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)**: 95.0 (Affordable 170.0)

Garfield County's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI)

Garfield County's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- 62.5% Cost Burdened
- 13.9% Severely Cost Burdened

Garfield County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Renter Households
- Affordable Units
- Available Units
- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)

Garfield County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Affordable Units
- Available Units
- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)

Garfield County's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- Available Units per 100
- Affordable Units per 100
- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)

Comparison of Garfield County and State of Utah’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Garfield County</td>
<td>State of Utah</td>
<td>Garfield County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤30%)</td>
<td>155.8</td>
<td>143.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50%)</td>
<td>202.9</td>
<td>107.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30%)</td>
<td>200.0</td>
<td>56.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Grand County, 2011-2015

Grand County’s Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI)

Grand County’s Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Grand County’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Renter Households
- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Grand County’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Grand County’s Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- Available Units per 100
- Affordable Units per 100

Affordable Housing Gap: Juab County, 2011-2015

Juab County's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI)

Juab County's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households
- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Juab County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Renter Households
- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Juab County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Juab County's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- Available Units per 100
- Affordable Units per 100

Comparison of Juab County and State of Utah’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Juab County</td>
<td>State of Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>147.9</td>
<td>143.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>159.6</td>
<td>107.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>134.6</td>
<td>56.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Kane County, 2011-2015

Kane County's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 145 (25.7%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 120 (21.2%)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 85 (15.0%)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI): 215 (38.1%)

Kane County's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened: 76.5%
- Severely Cost Burdened: 63.0%

Comparison of Kane County and State of Utah's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Kane County</th>
<th>State of Utah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>178.3</td>
<td>143.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>190.2</td>
<td>107.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>152.9</td>
<td>56.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kane County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): 624
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): 390
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 274

Kane County's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened: 76.5%
- Severely Cost Burdened: 63.0%

Kane County's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- Available Units per 100: 178.3
- Affordable Units per 100: 178.3

Affordable Housing Gap: Millard County, 2011-2015

Millard County's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMI)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMI)

Millard County's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Millard County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Renter Households
- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Millard County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

Millard County's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

Comparison of Millard County and State of Utah's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Millard County</td>
<td>State of Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(≤80% HAMI)</td>
<td>146.2</td>
<td>143.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td>179.8</td>
<td>107.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income</td>
<td>153.2</td>
<td>56.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Millard County's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMI)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMI)

Comparison of Millard County and State of Utah's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMI)</td>
<td>106.9</td>
<td>146.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMI)</td>
<td>98.9</td>
<td>179.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMI)</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>153.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Morgan County, 2011-2015

Morgan County's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 95 (18.8%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 125 (24.8%)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 170 (33.7%)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI): 115 (22.8%)

Total: 505

Morgan County's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened: 60.6%
- Severely Cost Burdened: 6.0%

Morgan County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Morgan County</th>
<th>State of Utah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>63.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>92.2</td>
<td>100.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>121.8</td>
<td>107.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparison of Morgan County and State of Utah's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): Morgan County 335, State of Utah 475
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): Morgan County 240, State of Utah 290
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): Morgan County 115, State of Utah 165

Morgan County's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Low Income: 69.6%
- Very Low Income: 64.0%
- Non-Low Income: 47.4%
- Non-Cost Burdened: 0.0%

Morgan County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Affordable Units: Low Income (≤80% HAMFI) -26, Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI) -75, Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI) -65

Morgan County's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): Morgan County 141.8, State of Utah 141.8
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): Morgan County 120.8, State of Utah 120.8
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): Morgan County 91.3, State of Utah 91.3

Affordable Housing Gap: Piute County, 2011-2015

Piute County's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 4.8%
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 35.7%
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 23.8%
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI): 35.7%

84

Piute County's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Piute County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): 54 Available Units, 99 Affordable Units
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): 50 Available Units, 79 Affordable Units
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 20 Available Units, 35 Affordable Units

Piute County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): 13 Affordable Units, 45 Available Units
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): -1 Affordable Units, 29 Available Units
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): -5 Affordable Units, 15 Available Units

Piute County's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- Available Units per 100: 75.0
- Affordable Units per 100: 175.0

Comparison of Piute County and State of Utah's Affordable & Available Rental housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>183.3</td>
<td>143.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>158.0</td>
<td>107.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>175.0</td>
<td>56.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Rich County, 2011-2015

Rich County's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 45 (28.8%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 139 (45, 32.4%)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 40 (28.8%)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI): 14 (10.1%)

Rich County's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened:
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 19 (42.5%)
  - Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 19 (45)
  - Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 20 (21.0%)
  - Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI): 0 (0.0%)

- Severely Cost Burdened:
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 19 (42.5%)
  - Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 9 (19)
  - Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 14 (10.1%)
  - Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI): 0 (0.0%)

Rich County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): 125 (139)
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): 85 (129)
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 40 (69)

Rich County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Affordable Units:
  - Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): 14 (9)
  - Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): 14 (44)
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): -11

Rich County's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- Available Units per 100:
  - Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): 107.2
  - Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): 116.5
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 72.5

Affordable Units per 100:

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): 111.2
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): 151.8
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 172.5

Comparison of Rich County and State of Utah's Affordable & Available Rental housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>Rich County 111.2</td>
<td>State of Utah 143.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>151.8</td>
<td>107.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>172.5</td>
<td>56.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Salt Lake County, 2011-2015

Salt Lake County's Renter Households by Income Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Number of Households</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>27,470</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>22,790</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>40,335</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Low Income (&gt;80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>28,200</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Salt Lake County's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Salt Lake County's Affordable Units</th>
<th>Salt Lake County's Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>143.0</td>
<td>143.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>107.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>56.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Salt Lake County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>78,460</td>
<td>112,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>50,260</td>
<td>46,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>27,470</td>
<td>10,895</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Salt Lake County's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Cost Burdened</th>
<th>Severely Cost Burdened</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>83.0%</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Low Income (&gt;80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparison of Salt Lake County and State of Utah's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Salt Lake County's Affordable Units</th>
<th>Salt Lake County's Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>143.0</td>
<td>143.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>107.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>56.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Affordable Housing Gap: San Juan County, 2011-2015

## San Juan County’s Renter Households by Income Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>San Juan County</th>
<th>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</th>
<th>Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)</th>
<th>Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)</th>
<th>Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>815</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## San Juan County’s Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Cost Burdened</th>
<th>Severely Cost Burdened</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## San Juan County’s Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>173.1</td>
<td>173.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>143.4</td>
<td>100.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>63.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## San Juan County’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Renter Households</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>910</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>780</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>330</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## San Juan County’s Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## San Juan County’s Renter Households by Income Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>State of Utah</th>
<th>San Juan County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>143.4</td>
<td>118.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>107.8</td>
<td>114.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>71.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Affordable Housing Gap: Sanpete County, 2011-2015**

**Sanpete County's Renter Households by Income Level**
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 510 (24.8%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 450 (21.9%)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 550 (26.8%)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI): 545 (26.5%)

**Sanpete County's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households**
- Cost Burdened: 59% (697 of 1,195)
- Severely Cost Burdened: 31.1% (373 of 1,195)

**Comparison of Sanpete County and State of Utah's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sanpete County</td>
<td>State of Utah</td>
<td>Sanpete County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>139.5</td>
<td>143.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>168.3</td>
<td>107.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>122.9</td>
<td>56.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sanpete County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap**
- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): 1,505 (2,100)
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): 995 (1,675)
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 545 (670)

**Sanpete County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit**
- Affordable Units: 595 (85)
- Available Units: 680 (90)
- Affordable Units: 125 (-280)

**Sanpete County's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters**
- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): 105.6 (139.5)
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): 91.0 (168.3)
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 48.6 (122.9)

Affordable Housing Gap: Sevier County, 2011-2015

Sevier County's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI)

Sevier County's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Comparison of Sevier County and State of Utah's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sevier County</td>
<td>State of Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>145.7</td>
<td>143.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>158.6</td>
<td>107.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>56.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sevier County's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- Available Units per 100
- Affordable Units per 100

Sevier County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Renter Households
- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Sevier County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Sevier County's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Affordable Housing Gap: Summit County, 2011-2015

Summit County's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)

Summit County's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Comparison of Summit County and State of Utah's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summit County</td>
<td>State of Utah</td>
<td>Summit County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>189.9</td>
<td>143.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>185.1</td>
<td>107.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>105.7</td>
<td>56.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Affordable Housing Gap: Uintah County, 2011-2015

#### Uintah County's Renter Households by Income Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Affordable Units per 100 Renters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hamfi Level</th>
<th>Affordable Units per 100</th>
<th>Available Units per 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>213.9</td>
<td>205.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>191.1</td>
<td>183.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>78.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Comparison of Uintah County and State of Utah's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hamfi Level</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>213.9</td>
<td>205.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>191.1</td>
<td>183.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>78.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Source
Affordable Housing Gap: Utah County, 2011-2015

Utah County's Renter Households by Income Level
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 12,150 (24.7%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 9,500 (19.4%)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 10,870 (22.1%)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI): 16,575 (33.8%)
- Total: 49,095

Utah County's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households
- Cost Burdened: 87%
- Severely Cost Burdened: 7%

Comparison of Utah County and State of Utah's Affordable & Available Rental housing Units per 100 Renter Households
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Utah County</th>
<th>State of Utah</th>
<th>Utah County</th>
<th>State of Utah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>133.4</td>
<td>143.4</td>
<td>93.2</td>
<td>100.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td>107.8</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>63.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Utah County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap
- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): 32,520 (30,300)
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): 20,370 (17,950)
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 10,870 (6,150)

Utah County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit
- Affordable Units: 10,855
- Available Units: -2,220
- Available Units: -2,420
- Available Units: -10,655
- Available Units: -4,720
- Available Units: -8,560

Utah County's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters
- Available Units per 100: 93.2 (133.4)
- Affordable Units per 100: 47.7 (88.1)

Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)
- Available Units per 100: 88.1
- Affordable Units per 100: 47.7

Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Available Units per 100: 56.6
- Affordable Units per 100: 21.3

### Affordable Housing Gap: Wasatch County, 2011-2015

**Wasatch County’s Renter Households by Income Level**

- **Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)**: 515 (23.6%)
- **Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)**: 275 (12.6%)
- **Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)**: 500 (22.9%)
- **Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI)**: 895 (41.0%)

Total: 2,185

**Wasatch County’s Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households**

- **Cost Burdened**
  - Extremely Low Income: 513 (23.6%)
  - Low Income: 275 (12.6%)
  - Very Low Income: 500 (22.9%)
  - Non-Low Income: 895 (41.0%)

- **Severely Cost Burdened**
  - Extremely Low Income: 180 (8.2%)
  - Low Income: 47 (2.2%)
  - Very Low Income: 19 (0.9%)
  - Non-Low Income: 85 (4.0%)

**Comparison of Wasatch County and State of Utah’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>Wasatch County: 159.3</td>
<td>State of Utah: 143.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wasatch County: 101.6</td>
<td>State of Utah: 100.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td>Wasatch County: 71.6</td>
<td>State of Utah: 107.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wasatch County: 43.2</td>
<td>State of Utah: 63.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income</td>
<td>Wasatch County: 46.0</td>
<td>State of Utah: 56.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wasatch County: 17.0</td>
<td>State of Utah: 27.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Washington County, 2011-2015

Washington County's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI)

Washington County's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Washington County</th>
<th>State of Utah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost Burdened</td>
<td>Severely Cost Burdened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>73.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td>72.9%</td>
<td>65.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Low Income</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
<td>89.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparison of Washington County and State of Utah's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Washington County</th>
<th>State of Utah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Affordable Units</td>
<td>Available Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>143.4</td>
<td>143.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>107.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>56.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wayne County's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI)

Wayne County's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Wayne County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Renter Households
- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Wayne County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

Wayne County's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

Comparison of Wayne County and State of Utah's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

- GAP HAMFI LEVEL
  - Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)
  - Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)

Weber County's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI)

23,060
5,075 22.0%
5,105 22.1%
6,525 28.3%
6,355 27.6%

Weber County's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Comparison of Weber County and State of Utah's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

Weber County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Renter Households
- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Weber County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

Weber County's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

Cities of Utah
**Affordable Housing Gap: Alpine, 2011-2015**

### Alpine's Renter Households by Income Level

- **Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI):** 30.5% (180 units)
- **Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI):** 33.1% (195 units)
- **Low Income (50-80% HAMFI):** 32.2% (190 units)
- **Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI):** 4.2% (25 units)

Total: 590 Renter Households

### Alpine's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- **Cost Burdened:**
  - Extremely Low Income: 100.0%
  - Very Low Income: 50.0%
  - Low Income: 50.0%
  - Non-Low Income: 30.0%

- **Severely Cost Burdened:**
  - Extremely Low Income: 73.7%
  - Very Low Income: 50.0%
  - Low Income: 48.7%
  - Non-Low Income: 15.4%

### Alpine's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

#### Renter Households

- **Low Income (≤80% HAMFI):** 395 units
- **Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI):** 215 units
- **Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI):** 85 units

### Alpine's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- **Affordable Units:**
  - Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): -142 units
  - Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): -137 units
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 60 units

### Alpine's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- **Available Units per 100 Renters:**
  - Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): 64.1
  - Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): 36.3
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 16.0

- **Affordable Units per 100 Renters:**
  - Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): 92.4
  - Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): 65.1
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 340.0

### Comparison of Alpine and Utah County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alpine</td>
<td>Utah County</td>
<td>Alpine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>133.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>88.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>340.0</td>
<td>56.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


American Fork's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI) 405 (19.0%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI) 290 (13.6%)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI) 410 (19.2%)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI) 1,025 (48.1%)

Total Renter Households: 2,130

American Fork's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened: Extremely Low Income 45% Very Low Income 49% Low Income 45.7% Non-Low Income 67.7%
- Severely Cost Burdened: Extremely Low Income 19.2% Very Low Income 12.7% Low Income 4.9% Non-Low Income 0%

American Fork's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)
  - Affordable Units: 1,105
  - Available Units: 1,765
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)
  - Affordable Units: 700
  - Available Units: 205
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
  - Affordable Units: 410
  - Available Units: 45

American Fork's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)
  - Affordable Units: 660
  - Deficit: -125
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)
  - Affordable Units: 235
  - Deficit: -495
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
  - Affordable Units: 210
  - Deficit: -365

American Fork's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)
  - Available Units per 100: 88.7
  - Affordable Units per 100: 159.7
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)
  - Available Units per 100: 29.3
  - Affordable Units per 100: 66.4
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
  - Available Units per 100: 11.0
  - Affordable Units per 100: 48.8

Comparison of American Fork and Utah County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Fork</td>
<td>Utah County</td>
<td>American Fork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>159.7</td>
<td>133.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>88.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>56.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Aurora, 2011-2015

Aurora's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)

Aurora's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

Comparison of Aurora and Sevier County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

Aurora's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Renter Households
- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Aurora's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

Aurora's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- Available Units per 100
- Affordable Units per 100

Affordable Housing Gap: Bear River City, 2011-2015

Bear River City's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 19 (70.4%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 4 (14.8%)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 4 (14.8%)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI): 0.0%
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Bear River City's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened: 100.0%
- Severely Cost Burdened: 100.0%

Bear River City's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): 18
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): 14
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 10

Comparison of Bear River City and Box Elder County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Bear River City</th>
<th>Box Elder County</th>
<th>Bear River City</th>
<th>Box Elder County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤30%)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>102.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>56.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50%)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>102.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>56.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30%)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>102.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>56.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Beaver, 2011-2015

Comparison of Beaver and Beaver County’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (&lt;80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>171.1</td>
<td>145.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>207.7</td>
<td>185.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>500.0</td>
<td>407.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Blanding, 2011-2015

Blanding's Renter Households by Income Level

- **Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)**: 75 (30.7%)
- **Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)**: 45 (18.4%)
- **Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)**: 49 (20.1%)
- **Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI)**: 244

Blanding's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- **Cost Burdened**: 22.2%
- **Severely Cost Burdened**: 5%

Comparison of Blanding and San Juan County's Affordable & Available Rental housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blanding</td>
<td>San Juan County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>123.1</td>
<td>173.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>166.7</td>
<td>243.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>173.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Bluffdale, 2011-2015

Bluffdale's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
  - 135 (34.2%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
  - 140 (35.4%)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
  - 65 (16.5%)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)
  - 55 (13.9%)

Bluffdale's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
    - 7%
  - Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
    - 15%
  - Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
    - 7%
  - Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)
    - 0%
- Severely Cost Burdened
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
    - 7%
  - Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
    - 0%
  - Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
    - 0%
  - Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)
    - 0%

Bluffdale's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)
  - Affordable Units: 260
  - Available Units: 340
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)
  - Affordable Units: 120
  - Available Units: 140
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
  - Affordable Units: 55
  - Available Units: 0

Bluffdale's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)
  - Affordable Units: 80
  - Available Units: 15
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)
  - Affordable Units: 20
  - Available Units: -50
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
  - Affordable Units: -30
  - Available Units: -55

Bluffdale's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)
  - Affordable Units: 94.2
  - Available Units: 130.8
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)
  - Affordable Units: 58.3
  - Available Units: 116.7
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
  - Affordable Units: 0.0
  - Available Units: 45.5

Comparison of Bluffdale and Salt Lake County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units Bluffdale</th>
<th>Affordable Units Salt Lake County</th>
<th>Available Units Bluffdale</th>
<th>Available Units Salt Lake County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>130.8</td>
<td>143.0</td>
<td>94.2</td>
<td>100.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>116.7</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Affordable Housing Gap: Bountiful, 2011-2015**

### Bountiful's Renter Households by Income Level
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMI): 1,200 (32.1%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMI): 580 (15.5%)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMI): 600 (16.0%)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMI): 1,360 (36.4%)

**Total Renter Households:** 3,740

### Bountiful's Affordability & Available Rental Housing Gap

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMI Level</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80%)</td>
<td>2,380</td>
<td>3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50%)</td>
<td>1,180</td>
<td>1,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30%)</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Bountiful's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households
- Cost Burdened: 41.0%
- Severely Cost Burdened: 18.3%
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMI): 28.3%
- Low Income (50-80% HAMI): 10.9%
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMI): 81.0%

### Comparison of Bountiful and Davis County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMI Level</th>
<th>Bountiful Affordable Units</th>
<th>Bountiful Available Units</th>
<th>Davis County Affordable Units</th>
<th>Davis County Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80%)</td>
<td>151.3</td>
<td>98.3</td>
<td>149.5</td>
<td>100.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50%)</td>
<td>148.3</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>117.0</td>
<td>66.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30%)</td>
<td>92.2</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Categorization of Bountiful and Davis County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units

- **Affordable Units per 100 Renter Households:**
  - Low Income (≤80% HAMI): 98.3
  - Very Low Income (≤50% HAMI): 62.3
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMI): 46.6

- **Available Units per 100 Renter Households:**
  - Low Income (≤80% HAMI): 151.3
  - Very Low Income (≤50% HAMI): 148.3
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMI): 92.2

Affordable Housing Gap: Brigham City, 2011-2015

### Brigham City's Renter Households by Income Level
- **Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)**: 89.4
- **Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)**: 170.1
- **Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)**: 140.1
- **Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)**: 55.3

### Brigham City's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households
- **Cost Burdened**: 75.3%
- **Severely Cost Burdened**: 42.2%

### Comparison of Brigham City and Box Elder County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Brigham City</th>
<th>Box Elder County</th>
<th>Brigham City</th>
<th>Box Elder County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>140.1</td>
<td>149.1</td>
<td>111.7</td>
<td>109.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>170.1</td>
<td>199.0</td>
<td>104.8</td>
<td>102.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>89.4</td>
<td>102.7</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>56.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Brigham City's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renters
- **Available Units per 100**: 111.7
- **Affordable Units per 100**: 140.1

### Brigham City's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit
- **Affordable Units**: 1,410
- **Available Units**: 1,975

Affordable Housing Gap: Castle Dale, 2011-2015

Castle Dale's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 30, 33.7%
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 15, 16.9%
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 25, 28.1%
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI): 19, 21.3%
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Castle Dale's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened: 59.0%
- Severely Cost Burdened: 30.0%

Castle Dale's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): Available Units: 70, Available Units: 110
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): Available Units: 40, Available Units: 110
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): Available Units: 25, Available Units: 65

Castle Dale's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renters

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): Available Units: 134.3, Affordable Units: 157.1
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): Available Units: 147.5
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): Available Units: 140.0

Comparison of Castle Dale and Emery County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units Castle Dale</th>
<th>Available Units Castle Dale</th>
<th>Affordable Units Emery County</th>
<th>Available Units Emery County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>157.1</td>
<td>181.6</td>
<td>134.3</td>
<td>140.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>275.0</td>
<td>220.3</td>
<td>147.5</td>
<td>145.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>260.0</td>
<td>170.0</td>
<td>140.0</td>
<td>95.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Cedar City, 2011-2015

Cedar City’s Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI) 905 (20.9%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI) 910 (21.0%)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI) 965 (22.2%)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI) 1,560 (35.9%)

Total: 4,340

Cedar City’s Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened 84.9%
- Severely Cost Burdened 42.5%

Cedar City’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI) Available Units: 3,375
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI) Available Units: 2,465
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI) Available Units: 1,560

Cedar City’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI) 435
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI) 1,115
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI) 735

Cedar City’s Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI) Available Units: 112.9
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI) Available Units: 99.0
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI) Available Units: 52.9

Comparison of Cedar City and Iron County’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI) Cedar City: 141.2, Iron County: 141.6
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI) Cedar City: 145.2, Iron County: 134.8
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI) Cedar City: 88.1, Iron County: 90.5

Affordable Housing Gap: Cedar Hills, 2011-2015

Cedar Hills's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 40.0%
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 26.7%
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 31.4%
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI): 16.4%

Cedar Hills's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened: 100%
- Severely Cost Burdened: 100%

Cedar Hills's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): Affordable Units 55, Available Units 175
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): Affordable Units 75, Available Units 20
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): Affordable Units 50, Available Units 20

Cedar Hills's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): Affordable Units -120, Available Units -140
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): Affordable Units -75, Available Units -55
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): Affordable Units -30, Available Units -50

Cedar Hills's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): Affordable Units 31.4, Available Units 20.0
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): Affordable Units 26.7, Available Units 0.0
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): Affordable Units 40.0, Available Units 0.0

Comparison of Cedar Hills and Utah County's Affordable & Available Rental housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units Cedar Hills</th>
<th>Available Units Cedar Hills</th>
<th>Affordable Units Utah County</th>
<th>Available Units Utah County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>133.4</td>
<td>93.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Centerville, 2011-2015

Comparison of Centerville and Davis County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>Centerville: 162.9</td>
<td>Davis County: 145.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Centerville: 113.1</td>
<td>Davis County: 100.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>Centerville: 90.1</td>
<td>Davis County: 117.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Centerville: 67.7</td>
<td>Davis County: 66.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income</td>
<td>Centerville: 19.2</td>
<td>Davis County: 54.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Centerville: 7.7</td>
<td>Davis County: 19.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Clearfield, 2011-2015

Clearfield's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 970 (21.9%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 1,175 (26.5%)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 1,190 (26.9%)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI): 1,095 (24.7%)

Total Renter Households: 4,430

Clearfield's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened: 51.8%
- Severely Cost Burdened: 32.8%

Clearfield's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): Affordable Units - 3,240, Available Units - 4,430
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): Affordable Units - 2,270, Available Units - 2,115
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): Affordable Units - 1,095, Available Units - 225

Clearfield's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): Affordable Units - 1,190, Available Units - 50
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): Affordable Units - 1,175, Available Units - 155
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): Affordable Units - 970, Available Units - 755

Clearfield's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): Available Units per 100 - 101.5, Affordable Units per 100 - 136.7
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): Available Units per 100 - 55.9, Affordable Units per 100 - 93.2
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): Available Units per 100 - 20.5, Affordable Units per 100 - 31.1

Comparison of Clearfield and Davis County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Clearfield</th>
<th>Davis County</th>
<th>Clearfield</th>
<th>Davis County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income  (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>136.7</td>
<td>145.9</td>
<td>101.5</td>
<td>100.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>93.2</td>
<td>117.0</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>66.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Clinton, 2011-2015

Clinton's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 128.6
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 153.7
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 154.6
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI): 88.0

Clinton's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI):
  - Renter Households: 540
  - Affordable Units: 475
  - Available Units: 835
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI):
  - Renter Households: 205
  - Affordable Units: 110
  - Available Units: 315
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI):
  - Renter Households: 70
  - Affordable Units: 90
  - Available Units: 10

Clinton's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened:
  - Extremely Low Income: 70
  - Very Low Income: 135
  - Low Income: 390
  - Non-Low Income: 335
- Severely Cost Burdened:
  - Extremely Low Income: 14.3
  - Very Low Income: 31.7
  - Low Income: 88.0
  - Non-Low Income: 14.5%

Clinton's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI):
  - Affordable Units: 295
  - Available Units: 14.5%
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI):
  - Affordable Units: 110
  - Available Units: 14.5%
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI):
  - Affordable Units: 20
  - Available Units: 14.5%

Clinton's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI):
  - Available Units per 100: 154.6
  - Affordable Units per 100: 88.0
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI):
  - Available Units per 100: 153.7
  - Affordable Units per 100: 31.7
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI):
  - Available Units per 100: 128.6
  - Affordable Units per 100: 14.3

Affordable Housing Gap: Coalville, 2011-2015

Coalville's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI) 50 (40.3%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI) 15 (12.1%)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI) 24 (19.4%)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI) 35 (28.2%)

Coalville's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI Level</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coalville's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened 75.0%
- Severely Cost Burdened 25.0%

Coalville's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI Level</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coalville's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI Level</th>
<th>Available Units per 100</th>
<th>Affordable Units per 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>125.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td>123.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>128.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparison of Coalville and Summit County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI Level</th>
<th>Coalville Available Units</th>
<th>Coalville Affordable Units</th>
<th>Summit County Available Units</th>
<th>Summit County Affordable Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>125.0</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>189.9</td>
<td>127.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>123.5</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td>185.1</td>
<td>120.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>128.6</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>105.7</td>
<td>49.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Corinne, 2011-2015

**Corinne's Renter Households by Income Level**
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 20 (30.8%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 15 (23.1%)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 30 (46.2%)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI): 0 (0.0%)

**Corinne's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households**
- Cost Burdened: 20%
- Severely Cost Burdened: 0%

**Comparison of Corinne and Box Elder County's Available and Affordable Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units Corinne</th>
<th>Affordable Units Box Elder County</th>
<th>Available Units Corinne</th>
<th>Available Units Box Elder County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>168.6</td>
<td>149.1</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>109.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td>260.0</td>
<td>199.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>102.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>102.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>56.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Cottonwood Heights, 2011-2015

Cottonwood Heights's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)

Cottonwood Heights's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Comparison of Cottonwood Heights and Salt Lake County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cottonwood Heights</td>
<td>Salt Lake County</td>
<td>Cottonwood Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>198.5</td>
<td>143.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>92.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cottonwood Heights's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Renter Households
- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Cottonwood Heights's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Cottonwood Heights's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)

Cottonwood Heights's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Comparison of Cottonwood Heights and Salt Lake County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cottonwood Heights</td>
<td>Salt Lake County</td>
<td>Cottonwood Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>100.9</td>
<td>198.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>87.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>67.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Delta, 2011-2015

**Delta's Renter Households by Income Level**

- Extremely Low Income (≤ 30% HAMFI): 135 (57.7%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 34 (14.5%)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 15 (6.4%)
- Non-Low Income (> 80% HAMFI): 50 (21.4%)

**Delta's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households**

- Cost Burdened: 95.3%
- Severely Cost Burdened: 40.0%

**Delta's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap**

- Low Income (≤ 80% HAMFI)
  - Affordable Units: 200
  - Available Units: 220
- Very Low Income (≤ 50% HAMFI)
  - Affordable Units: 185
  - Available Units: 190
- Extremely Low Income (≤ 30% HAMFI)
  - Affordable Units: 135
  - Available Units: 160

**Delta's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit**

- Low Income (≤ 80% HAMFI): -10
- Very Low Income (≤ 50% HAMFI): -25
- Extremely Low Income (≤ 30% HAMFI): -50

**Delta's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters**

- Low Income (≤ 80% HAMFI)
  - Available Units per 100: 95.0
  - Affordable Units per 100: 110.0
- Very Low Income (≤ 50% HAMFI)
  - Available Units per 100: 86.5
  - Affordable Units per 100: 102.7
- Extremely Low Income (≤ 30% HAMFI)
  - Available Units per 100: 63.0
  - Affordable Units per 100: 63.0

Comparison of Delta and Millard County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Delta Affordable Units</th>
<th>Delta Available Units</th>
<th>Millard County Affordable Units</th>
<th>Millard County Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤ 80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>110.0</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>146.2</td>
<td>106.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤ 50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>102.7</td>
<td>86.5</td>
<td>179.8</td>
<td>98.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤ 30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>153.2</td>
<td>83.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Draper, 2011-2015

Draper's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI)

Draper's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Comparison of Draper and Salt Lake County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

Draper's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Renter Households
- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Draper's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

Draper's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

Available Units per 100
Affordable Units per 100

Affordable Housing Gap: Duchesne, 2011-2015

Duchesne's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)

Duchesne's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Duchesne's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80%)</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50%)</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30%)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Duchesne's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80%)</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50%)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30%)</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>-30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Duchesne's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Available Units per 100</th>
<th>Affordable Units per 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80%)</td>
<td>108.7</td>
<td>163.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50%)</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>123.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30%)</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>72.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparison of Duchesne and Duchesne County's Affordable & Available Rental housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Duchesne</th>
<th>Duchesne County</th>
<th>Duchesne</th>
<th>Duchesne County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80%)</td>
<td>163.3</td>
<td>180.4</td>
<td>108.7</td>
<td>107.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50%)</td>
<td>123.8</td>
<td>168.0</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>82.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30%)</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>102.7</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Eagle Mountain, 2011-2015

Eagle Mountain’s Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 83.3%
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 41.9%
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 165.9%
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI): 41.7%

Eagle Mountain’s Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened:
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 53.3%
  - Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 42.3%
  - Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 47.2%
  - Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI): 22.5%

- Severely Cost Burdened:
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 53.3%
  - Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 42.3%
  - Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 47.2%
  - Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI): 22.5%

Eagle Mountain’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80%)</td>
<td>Eagle Mountain: 410</td>
<td>Utah County: 680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eagle Mountain: 355</td>
<td>Utah County: 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eagle Mountain: 50</td>
<td>Utah County: 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eagle Mountain: 25</td>
<td>Utah County: 60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eagle Mountain’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80%)</td>
<td>Eagle Mountain: -55</td>
<td>Utah County: 270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eagle Mountain: -105</td>
<td>Utah County: -90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eagle Mountain: -35</td>
<td>Utah County: -10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eagle Mountain’s Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Available Units per 100</th>
<th>Affordable Units per 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80%)</td>
<td>Eagle Mountain: 86.6</td>
<td>Utah County: 165.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eagle Mountain: 32.3</td>
<td>Utah County: 41.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eagle Mountain: 41.7</td>
<td>Utah County: 83.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: East Carbon-Sunnyside, 2011-2015

East Carbon-Sunnyside's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 30 (22.2%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 25 (18.5%)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 45 (33.3%)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI): 35 (25.9%)

Total: 135

East Carbon-Sunnyside's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 57.1%
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 16.0%
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 0.0%
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI): 0.0%

Comparison of East Carbon-Sunnyside and Carbon County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI Level</th>
<th>Affordable</th>
<th>Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East Carbon-Sunnyside</td>
<td>Carbon County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>155.6</td>
<td>158.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>200.0</td>
<td>156.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>200.0</td>
<td>110.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Affordable Housing Gap: Elk Ridge, 2011-2015

#### Elk Ridge's Renter Households by Income Level
- **Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)**: 4 units, 18.2%
- **Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)**: *units, *%
- **Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)**: 8 units, 36.4%
- **Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI)**: 10 units, 45.5%

#### Elk Ridge's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households
- **Cost Burdened**
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): *%
  - Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): *
  - Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): *
  - Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI): *
- **Severely Cost Burdened**
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): *
  - Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): *
  - Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): *
  - Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI): *

#### Comparison of Elk Ridge and Utah County's Affordable & Available Rental housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Elk Ridge</th>
<th>Utah County</th>
<th>Elk Ridge</th>
<th>Utah County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>142.9</td>
<td>133.4</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>93.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Enoch, 2011-2015

Enoch's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)
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- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened
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Comparison of Enoch and Iron County's Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>GAP</th>
<th>Affordable Units Enoch</th>
<th>Available Units Enoch</th>
<th>Affordable Units Iron County</th>
<th>Available Units Iron County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>≤80% HAMFI</td>
<td>189.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>141.6</td>
<td>111.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td>≤50% HAMFI</td>
<td>130.8</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>134.8</td>
<td>91.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income</td>
<td>≤30% HAMFI</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>51.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Enoch's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Renter Households
- Affordable Units
- Available Units
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Very Low Income
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Enoch's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit
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- Available Units
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Enoch's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters
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Affordable Housing Gap: Enterprise, 2011-2015

Enterprise's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)

Enterprise's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Enterprise's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Renter Households
- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Enterprise's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Enterprise's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renters

- Available Units per 100
- Affordable Units per 100

Comparison of Enterprise and Washington County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>Enterprise</td>
<td>Washington County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>263.2</td>
<td>143.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>Enterprise</td>
<td>Washington County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>191.2</td>
<td>82.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td>Enterprise</td>
<td>Washington County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>65.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Affordable Housing Gap: Ephraim, 2011-2015**

**Ephraim’s Renter Households by Income Level**

- **Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)**: 29.9% of 920 renters, 275 available units, 940 affordable units
- **Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)**: 17.9%, 165 available units, 760 affordable units
- **Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)**: 32.6%, 300 available units, 770 affordable units
- **Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)**: 19.6%, 180 available units, 340 affordable units

**Ephraim’s Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households**

- **Cost Burdened**
  - Extremely Low Income: 76.7%
  - Very Low Income: 65.7%
  - Low Income: 12.7%
  - Non-Low Income: 1.3%

- **Severely Cost Burdened**
  - Extremely Low Income: 300%
  - Very Low Income: 32.6%
  - Low Income: 165%
  - Non-Low Income: 180%

**Comparison of Ephraim and Sanpete County’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI Level</th>
<th>Ephraim Affordable Units</th>
<th>Sanpete County Affordable Units</th>
<th>Ephraim Available Units</th>
<th>Sanpete County Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>127.0</td>
<td>139.5</td>
<td>102.7</td>
<td>105.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>165.6</td>
<td>168.3</td>
<td>91.4</td>
<td>91.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>113.3</td>
<td>122.9</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ephraim’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap**

- **Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)**
  - Available Units: 940, Affordable Units: 740

- **Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)**
  - Available Units: 770, Affordable Units: 465

- **Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)**
  - Available Units: 340, Affordable Units: 300

**Ephraim’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit**

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): -185
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): -40

**Ephraim’s Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters**

- **Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)**: 102.7 Available Units, 127.0 Affordable Units
- **Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)**: 91.4 Available Units, 165.6 Affordable Units
- **Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)**: 38.3 Available Units, 113.3 Affordable Units

### Affordable Housing Gap: Escalante, 2011-2015

#### Escalante's Renter Households by Income Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</th>
<th>Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)</th>
<th>Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)</th>
<th>Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Escalante's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Cost Burdened</th>
<th>Severely Cost Burdened</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Comparison of Escalante and Garfield County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>Escalante 142.2</td>
<td>Garfield County 155.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Escalante 93.3</td>
<td>Garfield County 120.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>Escalante 120.0</td>
<td>Garfield County 182.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>Escalante 100.0</td>
<td>Garfield County 150.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Affordable Housing Gap: Eureka, 2011-2015**

### Eureka's Renter Households by Income Level

- **Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)**: 47
- **Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)**: 8.5%
- **Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)**: 8.5%
- **Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI)**: 31.9%

### Eureka’s Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- **Cost Burdened**: 100%
- **Severely Cost Burdened**: 100%

### Eureka’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- **Available Units**: 39
- **Affordable Units**: 30

### Eureka’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- **Available Units**: 16
- **Affordable Units**: 7

### Eureka’s Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- **Available Units per 100**: 169.6
- **Affordable Units per 100**: 130.4

**Comparison of Eureka and Juab County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>Eureka: 169.6</td>
<td>Juab County: 147.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eureka: 130.4</td>
<td>Juab County: 103.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>Eureka: 100.0</td>
<td>Juab County: 159.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>Eureka: 63.2</td>
<td>Juab County: 94.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eureka: 26.7</td>
<td>Juab County: 46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely</td>
<td>Eureka: 26.7</td>
<td>Juab County: 100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Fairview, 2011-2015

Fairview’s Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 15 (11.5%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 25 (19.2%)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 70 (53.8%)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI): 20 (15.4%)

Fairview’s Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened: 130%
- Severely Cost Burdened: 43%

Fairview’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): Affordable Units - 60, Available Units - 125
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): Affordable Units - 45, Available Units - 85
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): Affordable Units - 10, Available Units - 0

Fairview’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Affordable Units
  - Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): 65
  - Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): 40
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 20

Fairview’s Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- Available Units per 100
  - Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): 91.7
  - Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): 66.7
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 0.0

Affordable Units per 100

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): 208.3
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): 188.9
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 50.0

Comparison of Fairview and Sanpete County’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fairview</td>
<td>Sanpete County</td>
<td>Fairview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>208.3</td>
<td>91.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>188.9</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Affordable Housing Gap: Farmington, 2011-2015**

**Farmington’s Renter Households by Income Level**
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)

- **Total Renter Households**: 1,015
  - Extremely Low Income: 415 (40.9%)
  - Very Low Income: 410 (40.4%)
  - Low Income: 60 (5.9%)
  - Non-Low Income: 130 (12.8%)

**Farmington’s Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households**
- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

- **Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)**: 95.2%
- **Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)**: 83.8%
- **Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)**: 75.0%
- **Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)**: 24.8%

**Comparative Housing Units per 100 Renters**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units Farmington</th>
<th>Available Units Farmington</th>
<th>Affordable Units Davis County</th>
<th>Available Units Davis County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>150.4</td>
<td>94.2</td>
<td>145.9</td>
<td>100.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>192.1</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>117.0</td>
<td>66.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Farr West’s Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 85 (56.7%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 25 (16.7%)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 10 (6.7%)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI): 30 (20.0%)

Farr West’s Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened: 66.7%
- Severely Cost Burdened: 66.7%

Comparison of Farr West and Weber County’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>GAP</th>
<th>Farr West</th>
<th>Weber County</th>
<th>Farr West</th>
<th>Weber County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>≤80% HAMFI</td>
<td>215.4</td>
<td>140.8</td>
<td>90.8</td>
<td>103.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td>≤50% HAMFI</td>
<td>175.0</td>
<td>132.7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>84.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income</td>
<td>≤30% HAMFI</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Farr West’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Low Income ≤80% HAMFI: 65 (140)
- Very Low Income ≤50% HAMFI: 40 (70)
- Extremely Low Income ≤30% HAMFI: 30 (0)

Farr West’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Low Income ≤80% HAMFI: -6
- Very Low Income ≤50% HAMFI: -36
- Extremely Low Income ≤30% HAMFI: -30

Farr West’s Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- Low Income ≤80% HAMFI: 90.8 (215.4)
- Very Low Income ≤50% HAMFI: 10.0 (175.0)
- Extremely Low Income ≤30% HAMFI: 0.0 (66.7)

Affordable Housing Gap: Ferron, 2011-2015

**Ferron's Renter Households by Income Level**

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI)

**Ferron's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households**

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

**Ferron's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters**

Comparison of Ferron and Emery County's Affordable & Available Rental housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>118.6</td>
<td>94.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>127.3</td>
<td>87.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Fillmore, 2011-2015

Fillmore's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
  - 40 units / 18.2%
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
  - 75 units / 34.1%
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
  - 55 units / 25.0%
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)
  - 50 units / 22.7%

Total: 220 units

Fillmore's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
  - 133.3%
- Severely Cost Burdened
  - 42.0%

Comparison of Fillmore and Millard County's Affordable & Available Rental housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Fillmore Affordable Units</th>
<th>Millard County Affordable Units</th>
<th>Fillmore Available Units</th>
<th>Millard County Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80%)</td>
<td>133.3</td>
<td>146.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>106.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50%)</td>
<td>168.0</td>
<td>179.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>98.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30%)</td>
<td>160.0</td>
<td>153.2</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>83.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Fountain Green, 2011-2015

Fountain Green's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)

Fountain Green's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Fountain Green's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Renter Households
- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Fountain Green's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Fountain Green's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- Available Units per 100
- Affordable Units per 100

Comparison of Fountain Green and Sanpete County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

GAP HAMFI LEVEL | Affordable Units | Available Units |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>91.8</td>
<td>105.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>145.8</td>
<td>91.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>250.0</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Fruit Heights, 2011-2015

Fruit Heights's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)

Fruit Heights's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Fruit Heights's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Renter Households
- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Fruit Heights's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Fruit Heights's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renters

- Available Units per 100
- Affordable Units per 100

Comparison of Fruit Heights and Davis County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fruit Heights</td>
<td>Davis County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>145.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>117.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>54.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Affordable Housing Gap: Garland, 2011-2015**

### Garland's Renter Households by Income Level
- **Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)**: 55 (27.5%)
- **Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)**: 35 (17.5%)
- **Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)**: 40 (20.0%)
- **Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)**: 70 (35.0%)

### Garland's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households
- **Cost Burdened**: 97.5%
- **Severely Cost Burdened**: 11.4%

### Comparison of Garland and Box Elder County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>Garland: 173.1</td>
<td>Box Elder County: 149.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>Garland: 220.0</td>
<td>Box Elder County: 199.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>Garland: 75.0</td>
<td>Box Elder County: 102.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Affordable Housing Gap: Grantsville, 2011-2015

Grantsville's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 115 (22.1%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 65 (12.5%)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 185 (35.6%)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI): 155 (29.8%)

Total Renter Households: 520

Grantsville's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened: 34.6%
- Severely Cost Burdened: 4.2%

Grantsville's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): -66
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): -105
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): -155

Grantsville's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): 365
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): 300
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 185

Grantsville's Comparison of Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

- Low Income: 124.7
- Very Low Income: 65.0
- Extremely Low Income: 81.1

Comparison of Grantsville and Tooele County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

**Affordable Housing Gap: Green River, 2011-2015**

### Green River's Renter Households by Income Level

- **Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI):** 25 (24.0%)
- **Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI):** 45 (43.3%)
- **Low Income (50-80% HAMFI):** 14 (13.5%)
- **Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI):** 20 (19.2%)

Total Renter Households: 104

### Green River's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- **Cost Burdened:** 57.8%
- **Severely Cost Burdened:** 42.2%

### Comparison of Green River and Emery County's Affordable & Available Rental housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>GAP</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Green River: 148.9</td>
<td>Emery County: 181.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Green River: 125.6</td>
<td>Emery County: 140.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Green River: 185.7</td>
<td>Emery County: 220.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Green River: 128.6</td>
<td>Emery County: 145.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Green River: 166.7</td>
<td>Emery County: 170.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Green River: 88.9</td>
<td>Emery County: 95.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Gunnison, 2011-2015

Gunnison’s Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI)

Gunnison’s Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Comparison of Gunnison and Sanpete County’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gunnison</td>
<td>Sanpete County</td>
<td>Gunnison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>107.1</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(&lt;80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>139.5</td>
<td>105.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>70.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(&lt;50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>168.3</td>
<td>91.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low</td>
<td>125.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (&lt;30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>122.9</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Harrisville, 2011-2015

Harrisville's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI)

Harrisville's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Harrisville's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Renter Households
- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Harrisville's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

Harrisville's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renters

Comparison of Harrisville and Weber County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

GAP HAMFI LEVEL | Affordable Units | Available Units
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harrisville</td>
<td>Weber County</td>
<td>Harrisville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>181.6</td>
<td>140.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>117.6</td>
<td>132.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>450.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Heber's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 325 (25.1%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 175 (13.5%)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 365 (28.2%)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI): 430 (33.2%)

Total Renter Households: 1,295

Heber's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened: 830 (63.1%)
- Severely Cost Burdened: 40 (3.0%)

Heber's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): Affordable Units = 865, Available Units = 1,175
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): Affordable Units = 340, Available Units = 540
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): Affordable Units = 365, Available Units = 40

Heber's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): Affordable Units = 310, Deficit = -35
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): Affordable Units = 430, Deficit = -200
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): Affordable Units = 1,175, Deficit = -325

Heber's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): Available Units per 100 = 96.0, Affordable Units per 100 = 135.8
Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): Available Units per 100 = 41.7, Affordable Units per 100 = 63.0
Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): Available Units per 100 = 11.0, Affordable Units per 100 = 34.2

Comparison of Heber and Wasatch County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): Heber = 135.8, Wasatch County = 159.3
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): Heber = 63.0, Wasatch County = 71.6
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): Heber = 34.2, Wasatch County = 46.0
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI): Heber = 11.0, Wasatch County = 17.0

### Affordable Housing Gap: Helper, 2011-2015

#### Helper's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 90 (46.4%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 30 (15.5%)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 34 (17.5%)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI): 40 (20.6%)

#### Helper's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened: 90
- Severely Cost Burdened: 30

#### Helper's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI Level</th>
<th>Helper Affordable Units</th>
<th>Helper Available Units</th>
<th>Carbon County Affordable Units</th>
<th>Carbon County Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80%)</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50%)</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30%)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Helper's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Available Units: 194
- Affordable Units: 194

#### Helper's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI Level</th>
<th>Available Units per 100</th>
<th>Affordable Units per 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80%)</td>
<td>195.0</td>
<td>218.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50%)</td>
<td>214.6</td>
<td>242.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30%)</td>
<td>250.0</td>
<td>350.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Comparison of Helper and Carbon County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI Level</th>
<th>Helper Affordable Units</th>
<th>Helper Available Units</th>
<th>Carbon County Affordable Units</th>
<th>Carbon County Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80%)</td>
<td>218.8</td>
<td>158.0</td>
<td>195.0</td>
<td>111.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50%)</td>
<td>242.3</td>
<td>156.3</td>
<td>214.6</td>
<td>106.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30%)</td>
<td>350.0</td>
<td>110.9</td>
<td>250.0</td>
<td>72.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Affordable Housing Gap: Herriman, 2011-2015**

### Herriman’s Renter Households by Income Level

- **Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)**: 755 (51.2%)
- **Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)**: 215 (14.6%)
- **Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)**: 280 (19.0%)
- **Non-Low Income (＞80% HAMFI)**: 225 (15.3%)

Total: 1,475

### Herriman’s Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- **Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)**: 100%
- **Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)**: 55.4%
- **Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)**: 14.9%
- **Non-Low Income (＞80% HAMFI)**: 0%

### Herriman’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- **Available Units**
  - Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): 720
  - Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): 505
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 225

- **Severely Cost Burdened**
  - Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): 1,450
  - Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): 15
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 0

### Herriman’s Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- **Available Units per 100 Renters**
  - Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): 126.4
  - Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): 3.0
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 0.0

- **Affordable Units per 100 Renters**
  - Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): 201.4
  - Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): 17.8
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 0.0

### Comparison of Herriman and Salt Lake County’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP</th>
<th>AFFORDABLE UNITS</th>
<th>AVAILABLE UNITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HAMFI LEVEL</td>
<td>Herriman</td>
<td>Salt Lake County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>201.4</td>
<td>143.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>92.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Highland’s Renter Households by Income Level**

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 240, 70.6%
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 60, 17.6%
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 30, 8.8%
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI): 10, 2.9%

**Highland’s Proporion of Cost Burdened Renter Households**

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 91.7%
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 53.3%
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 20.8%
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI): 8.8%

**Highland’s Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renters**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>200.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>111.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>200.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comparison of Highland and Utah County’s Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renter Households**

- **Low Income (≤80% HAMFI):**
  - Highland: 200.0
  - Utah County: 133.4
  - Gap: 66.6
- **Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI):**
  - Highland: 111.1
  - Utah County: 88.1
  - Gap: 23.0
- **Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI):**
  - Highland: 200.0
  - Utah County: 56.6
  - Gap: 143.4

Hildale's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI):
  - 17.0%
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI):
  - 28.3%
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI):
  - 45%
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI):
  - 24.5%
- Total:
  - 265

Hildale's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened:
  - 80 (30.2%)
- Severely Cost Burdened:
  - 75 (28.3%)
- Available Units:
  - 155 (58.9%)

Comparison of Hildale and Washington County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI Level</th>
<th>Hildale Affordable</th>
<th>Hildale Available</th>
<th>Washington County Affordable</th>
<th>Washington County Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>127.5</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>143.4</td>
<td>94.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>148.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>51.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>175.0</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hildale's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI):
  - Affordable Units: 195
  - Available Units: 255
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI):
  - Affordable Units: 155
  - Available Units: 230
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI):
  - Affordable Units: 80
  - Available Units: 140

Hildale's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI):
  - Affordable Units: 55
  - Available Units: 75
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI):
  - Affordable Units: 0
  - Available Units: 60
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI):
  - Affordable Units: -10
  - Available Units: -10

Hildale's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI):
  - Affordable Units: 127.5
  - Available Units: 97.5
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI):
  - Affordable Units: 148.4
  - Available Units: 100.0
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI):
  - Affordable Units: 87.5
  - Available Units: 87.5

Affordable Housing Gap: Holladay, 2011-2015

Holladay’s Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)

Holladay’s Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Comparison of Holladay and Salt Lake County’s Affordable & Available Rental housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holladay</td>
<td>Salt Lake County</td>
<td>Holladay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>155.4</td>
<td>143.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td>139.3</td>
<td>92.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Honeyville, 2011-2015

Honeyville's Renter Households by Income Level
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI)

Honeyville's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households
- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Comparison of Honeyville and Box Elder County's Affordable & Available Rental housing units per 100 Renter Households

Honeyville's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap
- Renter Households
- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Honeyville's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

Honeyville's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters
- Available Units per 100
- Affordable Units per 100

Affordable Housing Gap: Hooper, 2011-2015

Affordable Housing Gap: Huntington, 2011-2015

Huntington’s Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)

Huntington’s Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Huntington’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Renter Households
- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Huntington’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Comparison of Huntington and Emery County’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units Huntington</th>
<th>Affordable Units Emery County</th>
<th>Available Units Huntington</th>
<th>Available Units Emery County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>282.4</td>
<td>181.6</td>
<td>185.9</td>
<td>140.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>276.9</td>
<td>203.2</td>
<td>183.1</td>
<td>145.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>266.7</td>
<td>170.0</td>
<td>133.3</td>
<td>95.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Hurricane, 2011-2015

Hurricane's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)

Hurricane's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Comparison of Hurricane and Washington County’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units Hurricane</th>
<th>Available Units Hurricane</th>
<th>Affordable Units Washington County</th>
<th>Available Units Washington County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>167.4</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>143.4</td>
<td>94.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>51.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hurricane's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Renter Households
- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Hurricane's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Hurricane's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- Available Units per 100
- Affordable Units per 100


Hyde Park's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 26.7%
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 26.7%
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 70.0%
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI): 0.0%

Hyde Park's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened: 11.8%
- Severely Cost Burdened: 0.0%

Comparison of Hyde Park and Cache County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Hyde Park</th>
<th>Cache County</th>
<th>Hyde Park</th>
<th>Cache County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>107.5</td>
<td>137.5</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>101.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>134.6</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Hyrum, 2011-2015

Hyrum’s Renter Households by Income Level
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)

Hyrum’s Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households
- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Hyrum’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap
- Renter Households
- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Hyrum’s Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters
- Available Units per 100
- Affordable Units per 100

Comparison of Hyrum and Cache County’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

Affordable Housing Gap: Ivins, 2011-2015

Ivins's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI)

745

300 (40.3%)
235 (31.5%)
160 (21.5%)
50 (6.7%)

Ivins's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Ivins's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Renter Households
- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Ivins's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Ivins's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- Available Units per 100
- Affordable Units per 100

Comparison of Ivins and Washington County's Affordable & Available Rental housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Ivins Affordable Units</th>
<th>Washington County Affordable Units</th>
<th>Ivins Available Units</th>
<th>Washington County Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>113.5</td>
<td>143.4</td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>94.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>119.0</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>51.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>180.0</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Kamas, 2011-2015

Comparison of Kamas and Summit County’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units Kamas</th>
<th>Available Units Kamas</th>
<th>Affordable Units Summit County</th>
<th>Available Units Summit County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>113.8</td>
<td>98.6</td>
<td>189.9</td>
<td>127.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td>104.2</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>185.1</td>
<td>120.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>105.7</td>
<td>49.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Low Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Kanab, 2011-2015

Kanab’s Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI) 95 (23.8%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI) 145 (36.3%)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI) 75 (18.8%)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI) 85 (21.3%)

Kanab’s Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI) 76.5%
  - Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI) 53.3%
  - Low Income (50-80% HAMFI) 20.0%
  - Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI) 0.0%

- Severely Cost Burdened
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI) 21.3%
  - Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI) 18.8%
  - Low Income (50-80% HAMFI) 0.0%
  - Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI) 0.0%

Comparison of Kanab and Kane County’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Kanab</th>
<th>Kane County</th>
<th>Kanab</th>
<th>Kane County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>154.9</td>
<td>178.3</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>119.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>131.3</td>
<td>190.2</td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>114.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>152.9</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kanab’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Renter Households
  - Low Income (≤80% HAMFI) 255
  - Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI) 160
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI) 85
- Affordable Units
  - Low Income (≤80% HAMFI) 395
  - Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI) 210
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI) 20

Kanab’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Affordable Units
  - Low Income (≤80% HAMFI) 140
  - Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI) 50
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI) 20
- Available Units
  - Low Income (≤80% HAMFI) 140
  - Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI) 50
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI) 20

Kanab’s Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- Available Units per 100
  - Low Income (≤80% HAMFI) 99.6
  - Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI) 78.1
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI) 23.5
- Affordable Units per 100
  - Low Income (≤80% HAMFI) 154.9
  - Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI) 131.3
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI) 76.5

Affordable Housing Gap: Kaysville, 2011-2015

Kaysville's Renter Households by Income Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</th>
<th>Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)</th>
<th>Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)</th>
<th>Non-Low Income (&gt;80% HAMFI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Renter Households</td>
<td>1,070</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kaysville's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Cost Burdened</th>
<th>Severely Cost Burdened</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>68.6%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>85.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Low Income (&gt;80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>97.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparison of Kaysville and Davis County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units Kaysville</th>
<th>Available Units Kaysville</th>
<th>Affordable Units Davis County</th>
<th>Available Units Davis County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>116.0</td>
<td>93.2</td>
<td>145.9</td>
<td>100.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>144.9</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>117.0</td>
<td>66.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>117.4</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: La Verkin, 2011-2015

La Verkin’s Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 255
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 75
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 45
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI): 60

La Verkin’s Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened: 98.7%
- Severely Cost Burdened: 37.9%

Comparison of La Verkin and Washington County’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>La Verkin</td>
<td>Washington County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>104.3</td>
<td>143.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>82.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>66.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Layton, 2011-2015

Layton's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (<30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI)

Layton's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Comparison of Layton and Davis County's Affordable & Available Rental housing Units per 100 Renter Households

Layton's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Renter Households
- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Layton's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Layton's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- Available Units per 100
- Affordable Units per 100

Affordable Housing Gap: Lehi, 2011-2015

Lehi's Renter Households by Income Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Lehi</th>
<th>Utah County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>1,169</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lehi's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Lehi</th>
<th>Utah County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>91.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lehi's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Renter Households</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>2,565</td>
<td>1,525</td>
<td>1,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lehi's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>-356</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≥50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>-286</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>-631</td>
<td>-175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lehi's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Available Units per 100</th>
<th>Affordable Units per 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>119.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≥50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>63.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparison of Lehi and Utah County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</th>
<th>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</th>
<th>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lehi</td>
<td>119.9</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah County</td>
<td>133.4</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lewiston’s Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI)

Lewiston’s Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Comparison of Lewiston and Cache County’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lewiston</td>
<td>Cache County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>126.7</td>
<td>137.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>150.0</td>
<td>134.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>125.0</td>
<td>57.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lewiston’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Renter Households
- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Lewiston’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Lewiston’s Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- Available Units per 100
- Affordable Units per 100

Affordable Housing Gap: Lindon, 2011-2015

Lindon's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI)

Lindon's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- Available Units per 100
- Affordable Units per 100

Lindon's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Renter Households
- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Lindon's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Comparison of Lindon and Utah County's Affordable & Available Rental housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lindon</td>
<td>Utah County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>117.6</td>
<td>133.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>88.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>56.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Affordable Housing Gap: Logan, 2011-2015

## Logan's Renter Households by Income Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Cost Burdened</th>
<th>Severely Cost Burdened</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>92.8%</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>74.9%</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Low Income (&gt;80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Logan's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>6,895</td>
<td>9,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>4,230</td>
<td>5,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>2,165</td>
<td>1,030</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Logan's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- **Cost Burdened:**
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 92.8%
  - Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 74.9%
  - Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 23.0%
  - Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI): 9.6%

- **Severely Cost Burdened:**
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 73.3%
  - Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 67.9%
  - Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 16.6%
  - Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI): 9.0%

## Logan's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- **Low Income (≤80% HAMFI):**
  - Affordable Units: 2,450
  - Available Units: 190

- **Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI):**
  - Affordable Units: -815
  - Available Units: 1,720

- **Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI):**
  - Affordable Units: -1,135
  - Available Units: -1,690

## Logan's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Available Units per 100</th>
<th>Affordable Units per 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>102.8</td>
<td>135.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>140.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Comparison of Logan and Cache County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Logan</td>
<td>Cache County</td>
<td>Logan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>135.5</td>
<td>137.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>140.7</td>
<td>134.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>57.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Affordable Housing Gap: Manti, 2011-2015**

### Manti’s Renter Households by Income Level

- **Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)**: 55 (23.9%)
- **Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)**: 75 (32.6%)
- **Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)**: 55 (23.9%)
- **Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)**: 45 (19.6%)

**Total Renter Households:** 230

### Manti’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Manti</th>
<th>Sanpete County</th>
<th>Manti</th>
<th>Sanpete County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>151.6</td>
<td>139.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>105.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td>190.0</td>
<td>168.3</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>91.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>122.9</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Manti’s Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- **Cost Burdened:** 100%
- **Severely Cost Burdened:** 61.8%

### Manti’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>151.6</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Manti’s Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Available Units per 100</th>
<th>Affordable Units per 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>151.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>190.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Mapleton, 2011-2015

Mapleton's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI) 66.7%
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI) 50.0%
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI) 106.5%
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI) 69.7%

Mapleton's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened: 45.7%
- Severely Cost Burdened: 6.5%

Mapleton's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)
  - Available Units: 165
  - Affordable Units: 155
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)
  - Available Units: 25
  - Affordable Units: 50
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
  - Available Units: 10
  - Affordable Units: 15

Mapleton's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)
  - Affordable Units: 10
  - Available Units: -47
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)
  - Affordable Units: 25
  - Available Units: -25
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
  - Affordable Units: 10
  - Available Units: -5

Mapleton's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)
  - Available Units per 100: 69.7
  - Affordable Units per 100: 106.5
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)
  - Available Units per 100: 50.0
  - Affordable Units per 100: 50.0
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
  - Available Units per 100: 66.7
  - Affordable Units per 100: 66.7

Comparison of Mapleton and Utah County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</th>
<th>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</th>
<th>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Units</td>
<td>Mapleton: 106.5</td>
<td>Utah County: 133.4</td>
<td>Mapleton: 66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available Units</td>
<td>Mapleton: 69.7</td>
<td>Utah County: 93.2</td>
<td>Mapleton: 66.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Marriott-Slaterville, 2011-2015

Marriott-Slaterville’s Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI)

Marriott-Slaterville’s Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Comparison of Marriott-Slaterville and Weber County’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Marriott-Slaterville</th>
<th>Weber County</th>
<th>Marriott-Slaterville</th>
<th>Weber County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income  (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>142.1</td>
<td>140.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>103.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>150.0</td>
<td>132.7</td>
<td>88.3</td>
<td>84.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≥30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marriott-Slaterville’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Renter Households
- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Marriott-Slaterville’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Marriott-Slaterville</th>
<th>Weber County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income  (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marriott-Slaterville’s Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- Available Units per 100
- Affordable Units per 100

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Marriott-Slaterville</th>
<th>Weber County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income  (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>142.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>88.3</td>
<td>150.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Affordable Housing Gap: Mendon, 2011-2015

Mendon's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI) - 29 (70.7%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI) - 4 (9.8%)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI) - 4 (9.8%)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI) - 4 (9.8%)

Mendon's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
  - Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
  - Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
  - Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)

Mendon's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Renter Households
- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Comparison of Mendon and Cache County's Affordable & Available Rental housing Units per 100 Renter Households

Mendon's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

Affordable Housing Gap: Midvale, 2011-2015

Midvale's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI) 1,585 (24.3%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI) 885 (13.6%)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI) 1,595 (24.4%)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI) 2,465 (37.7%)

Total: 6,530

Midvale's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI) 39.7%
- Cost Burdened Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI) 33.9%
- Cost Burdened Low Income (50-80% HAMFI) 24.4%
- Cost Burdened Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI) 22%

- Severely Cost Burdened Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI) 16%
- Severely Cost Burdened Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI) 1.6%
- Severely Cost Burdened Low Income (50-80% HAMFI) 0.4%
- Severely Cost Burdened Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI) 0.0%

Midvale's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)
  - Affordable Units: 4,065
  - Available Units: 6,190
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)
  - Affordable Units: 2,480
  - Available Units: 860
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
  - Affordable Units: 1,595
  - Available Units: 160

Midvale's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI) -15
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI) -645
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI) -1,225

Midvale's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI) 99.6
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI) 34.7
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI) 10.0

Comparison of Midvale and Salt Lake County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Midvale</td>
<td>Salt Lake County</td>
<td>Midvale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>152.3</td>
<td>143.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>92.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Midway, 2011-2015

Midway’s Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMI): 33.3%
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMI): 53.0%
- Low Income (50-80% HAMI): 175 out of 330
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMI): 12.1%

Midway’s Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened: 55.6%
- Severely Cost Burdened: 100%

Midway’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Low Income (≤80% HAMI): Available Units 155, Affordable Units 130, GAP 285
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMI): Available Units 85
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMI): Available Units 45

Midway’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Available Units: 130
- Affordable Units: -25

Midway’s Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- Low Income (≤80% HAMI): Available Units per 100 83.9, Affordable Units per 100 183.9
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMI): Available Units per 100 52.9
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMI): Available Units per 100 33.3

Comparison of Midway and Wasatch County’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMI)</td>
<td>Midway: 183.9, Wasatch County: 159.3</td>
<td>Midway: 83.9, Wasatch County: 101.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMI)</td>
<td>Midway: 52.9, Wasatch County: 71.6</td>
<td>Midway: 52.9, Wasatch County: 43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMI)</td>
<td>Midway: 33.3, Wasatch County: 46.0</td>
<td>Midway: 33.3, Wasatch County: 17.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Milford, 2011-2015

Comparison of Milford and Beaver County's Affordable & Available Rental housing Units per 100 Renter Households

- **Milford's Renter Households by Income Level**
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 35 (28.0%)
  - Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 40 (32.0%)
  - Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 30 (24.0%)
  - Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI): 20 (16.0%)

- **Milford's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households**
  - Cost Burdened: 62.5%
  - Severely Cost Burdened: 71.4%

- **Milford's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap**
  - Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): Affordable Units: 105, Available Units: 130
  - Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): Affordable Units: 75, Available Units: 130
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): Affordable Units: 40, Available Units: 50

- **Milford's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters**
  - Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): Available Units per 100: 103.8, Affordable Units per 100: 123.8
  - Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): Available Units per 100: 105.3, Affordable Units per 100: 173.3
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): Available Units per 100: 75.0, Affordable Units per 100: 125.0

Affordable Housing Gap: Millville, 2011-2015

Millville's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 34/48 (70.8%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 10/48 (20.8%)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 4/48 (8.3%)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI): 0/48 (0%)

Millville's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 57.7%
  - Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 8.3%
  - Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 0.0%
  - Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI): 0.0%

- Severely Cost Burdened
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 0.0%
  - Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 4.0%
  - Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 0.0%
  - Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI): 0.0%

Comparison of Millville and Cache County's Affordable & Available Rental housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Millville</td>
<td>Cache County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>392.9</td>
<td>137.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td>875.0</td>
<td>134.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>57.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Millville's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- Available Units per 100
  - Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): 128.6
  - Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): 0.0
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 0.0

- Affordable Units per 100
  - Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): 392.9
  - Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): 875.0
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 0.0

Affordable Housing Gap: Moab, 2011-2015

Moab's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 190 (24.7%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 115 (14.9%)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 175 (22.7%)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI): 290 (37.7%)

Moab's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened: 80.0%
- Severely Cost Burdened: 26.3%

Moab's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)
  - Affordable Units: 480
  - Available Units: 735
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)
  - Affordable Units: 290
  - Available Units: 365
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
  - Affordable Units: 175
  - Available Units: 190

Moab's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)
  - Affordable Units: 255
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)
  - Affordable Units: 75
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
  - Affordable Units: 15

Moab's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): 94.8
  - Available Units per 100: 153.1
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): 63.8
  - Available Units per 100: 125.9
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 45.7
  - Available Units per 100: 108.6

Comparison of Moab and Grand County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>153.1</td>
<td>94.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td>125.9</td>
<td>63.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income</td>
<td>108.6</td>
<td>45.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Mona, 2011-2015

Mona's Renter Households by Income Level
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI)

Mona's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households
- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Mona's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap
- Renter Households
- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Mona's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit
- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Mona's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters
- Available Units per 100
- Affordable Units per 100

Comparison of Mona and Juab County’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

Affordable Housing Gap: Monroe, 2011-2015

Monroe's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI) 15 (10.3%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI) 30 (20.7%)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI) 50 (34.5%)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI) 50 (34.5%)

Total: 145

Monroe's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 30 (20.7%)
  - Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 15 (10.3%)
  - Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 50 (34.5%)
  - Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI): 50 (34.5%)

- Severely Cost Burdened
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 0 (0%)
  - Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 0 (0%)
  - Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 0 (0%)
  - Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI): 0 (0%)

Comparison of Monroe and Sevier County’s Affordable & Available Rental housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units Monroe</th>
<th>Available Units Monroe</th>
<th>Affordable Units Sevier County</th>
<th>Available Units Sevier County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>135.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>145.7</td>
<td>106.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>105.0</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>158.6</td>
<td>94.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>56.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Affordable Housing Gap: Monticello, 2011-2015**

**Monticello's Renter Households by Income Level**

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 136.4
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 313.3
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 231.8
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI): 54.5

**Monticello's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households**

- Cost Burdened: 27.3%
- Severely Cost Burdened: 27.3%

**Monticello's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap**

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): Available Units: 110, Affordable Units: 255
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): Available Units: 75, Affordable Units: 235
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): Available Units: 55, Affordable Units: 149

**Monticello's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit**

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): Affordable Units: 39, Available Units: 145
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): Affordable Units: 19, Available Units: 160
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): Affordable Units: -25, Available Units: 107

**Monticello's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters**

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): Available Units per 100: 135.5, Affordable Units per 100: 231.8
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): Available Units per 100: 125.3, Affordable Units per 100: 313.3
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): Available Units per 100: 54.5, Affordable Units per 100: 136.4

**Comparison of Monticello and San Juan County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monticello</td>
<td>San Juan County</td>
<td>Monticello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>231.8</td>
<td>173.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>313.3</td>
<td>243.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>136.4</td>
<td>173.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Morgan, 2011-2015

Morgan's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 16.3%
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 32.6%
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 45%
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI): 20.9%

215

Morgan's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 53.6%
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 15.4%
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 10%
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI): 21.9%

Comparison of Morgan and Morgan County's Affordable & Available Rental housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>Morgan County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>143.3</td>
<td>141.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>134.8</td>
<td>120.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>122.2</td>
<td>91.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Morgan's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Renter Households: 150 - 215
- Affordable Units: 148 - 155
- Available Units: 45 - 55

Morgan's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Affordable Units: 65 - 65
- Available Units: 40 - 40

Morgan's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- Available Units per 100: 98.7 - 143.3
- Affordable Units per 100: 73.0 - 134.8

Affordable Housing Gap: Moroni, 2011-2015

Moroni's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)

- 25 (38.5%)
- 15 (23.1%)
- 25 (38.5%)
- 0 (0.0%)

Moroni's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Moroni's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Renter Households
- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)
- 40
- 59

Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)
- 15
- 55

Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- 15
- 25

Moroni's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)
- 19
- 19

Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)
- 0
- 40

Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- 0
- 10

Moroni's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- Available Units per 100
- Affordable Units per 100

Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)
- 95.0
- 147.5

Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)
- 100.0
- 366.7

Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- 100.0
- 166.7

Comparison of Moroni and Sanpete County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moroni</td>
<td>Sanpete County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>147.5</td>
<td>139.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>366.7</td>
<td>168.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>166.7</td>
<td>122.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Mount Pleasant, 2011-2015

Mount Pleasant’s Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)

Mount Pleasant’s Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Mount Pleasant’s Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- Available Units per 100
- Affordable Units per 100

Comparison of Mount Pleasant and Sanpete County’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Mount Pleasant Affordable Units</th>
<th>Mount Pleasant Available Units</th>
<th>Sanpete County Affordable Units</th>
<th>Sanpete County Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>157.1</td>
<td>121.7</td>
<td>139.5</td>
<td>105.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>127.3</td>
<td>109.1</td>
<td>168.3</td>
<td>91.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>122.9</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mount Pleasant’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Affordable Housing Gap: Murray, 2011-2015

Murray's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI)

Murray's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Murray's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Renter Households
- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Murray's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Murray's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- Available Units per 100
- Affordable Units per 100

Comparison of Murray and Salt Lake County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable</th>
<th>Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Murray</td>
<td>Salt Lake County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>143.9</td>
<td>143.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td>92.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Myton, 2011-2015

Myton's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)

Myton's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Renter Households
- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Myton's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Myton's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- Available Units per 100
- Affordable Units per 100

Comparison of Myton and Duchesne County's Affordable & Available Rental housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Myton</th>
<th>Duchesne County</th>
<th>Myton</th>
<th>Duchesne County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>198.0</td>
<td>180.4</td>
<td>130.0</td>
<td>107.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>111.4</td>
<td>168.0</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>82.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>102.7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Naples, 2011-2015

Naples's Renter Households by Income Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</th>
<th>Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)</th>
<th>Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)</th>
<th>Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Naples's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</th>
<th>Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)</th>
<th>Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)</th>
<th>Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost Burdened</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severely Cost Burdened</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparison of Naples and Uintah County's Affordable & Available Rental housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Naples Affordable Units</th>
<th>Naples Available Units</th>
<th>Uintah County Affordable Units</th>
<th>Uintah County Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>148.0</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>213.9</td>
<td>120.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>116.0</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>191.1</td>
<td>83.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>45.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Naples's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI Level</th>
<th>Renter Households</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Naples's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI Level</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Naples's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI Level</th>
<th>Available Units per 100</th>
<th>Affordable Units per 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>148.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>116.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Nephi, 2011-2015

Nephi’s Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)

Nephi’s Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Comparison of Nephi and Juab County’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

Affordable Housing Gap: North Logan, 2011-2015

North Logan’s Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
  - 260 (27.8%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
  - 140 (15.0%)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
  - 935
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI)
  - 225 (24.1%)

North Logan’s Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 84.4%
  - Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 71.4%
  - Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 68.8%
  - Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI): 69%
- Severely Cost Burdened
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 6%
  - Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 15%
  - Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 15%
  - Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI): 32%

North Logan’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Renter Households
  - Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): 625
  - Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): 365
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 35
- Affordable Units
  - Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): 565
  - Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): 170
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 35
- Available Units
  - Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): 820
  - Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): 460
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 460

North Logan’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Affordable Units
  - Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): -60
  - Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): -120
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): -135
- Available Units
  - Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): 195
  - Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): 195
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 195

North Logan’s Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- Available Units per 100
  - Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): 90.4
  - Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): 46.6
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 15.6
- Affordable Units per 100
  - Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): 131.2
  - Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): 67.1
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 40.0

Comparison of North Logan and Cache County’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Logan</td>
<td>Cache County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>131.2</td>
<td>137.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>134.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>57.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Affordable Housing Gap: North Ogden, 2011-2015**

### North Ogden’s Renter Households by Income Level
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)

### North Ogden’s Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households
- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

### North Ogden’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### North Ogden’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

### North Ogden’s Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Available Units per 100</th>
<th>Affordable Units per 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>218.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>172.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>120.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comparison of North Ogden and Weber County’s Affordable & Available Rental housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>218.9</td>
<td>140.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>172.7</td>
<td>132.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>120.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: North Salt Lake, 2011-2015

North Salt Lake's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 155 (9.9%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 465 (29.7%)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 375 (24.0%)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI): 570 (36.4%)
- Total: 1,565

North Salt Lake's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened: 808 (51.6%)
- Severely Cost Burdened: 627 (39.9%)
- Available Units: 100.0%
- Affordable Units: 21.4%
- Comparison of North Salt Lake and Davis County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

Affordable Housing Gap: Oakley, 2011-2015

Oakley's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 15 (16.9%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 35 (39.3%)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 4 (4.5%)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI): 89

Oakley's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened: 40%
- Severely Cost Burdened: 4%

Comparison of Oakley and Summit County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI Level</th>
<th>Oakley Affordable Units</th>
<th>Oakley Available Units</th>
<th>Summit County Affordable Units</th>
<th>Summit County Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>166.7</td>
<td>107.4</td>
<td>189.9</td>
<td>127.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>192.3</td>
<td>87.2</td>
<td>185.1</td>
<td>120.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>1000.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>105.7</td>
<td>49.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Ogden, 2011-2015

Ogden's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI) - 3200 (23.9%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI) - 4695 (35.0%)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI) - 2710 (20.2%)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI) - 2805 (20.9%)

Total Renter Households: 13,410

Ogden's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened: 53.3%
- Severely Cost Burdened: 12.2%
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 8.7%
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 3.1%
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 22.7%
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI): 44%

Comparison of Ogden and Weber County's Affordable & Available Rental housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI Level</th>
<th>Affordable Units Ogden</th>
<th>Available Units Ogden</th>
<th>Affordable Units Weber County</th>
<th>Available Units Weber County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>128.1</td>
<td>103.4</td>
<td>140.8</td>
<td>103.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>126.1</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>132.7</td>
<td>84.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Orangeville, 2011-2015

Orangeville's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI)

95

52.6%

50

15

15.8%

15

15.8%

Orangeville's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Comparison of Orangeville and Emery County's Affordable & Available Rental housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orangeville</td>
<td>Emery County</td>
<td>Orangeville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>253.3</td>
<td>181.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>366.7</td>
<td>220.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>170.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Orangeville's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- Available Units per 100
- Affordable Units per 100

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI) | 137.8 | 253.3 |
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI) | 143.3 | 366.7 |
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI) | 0.0 | 100.0 |

**Affordable Housing Gap: Orem, 2011-2015**

### Orem's Renter Households by Income Level

- **Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)**: 35.3%
- **Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)**: 85.5%
- **Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)**: 143.2%
- **Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)**: 16.5%

- Total Renter Households: 10,280

### Orem's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- **Cost Burdened**: 365 (87.1%)
- **Severely Cost Burdened**: 1,980 (87.0%)

### Comparison of Orem and Utah County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>Orem: 143.2</td>
<td>Utah County: 133.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orem: 97.4</td>
<td>Utah County: 93.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td>Orem: 85.5</td>
<td>Utah County: 88.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orem: 46.2</td>
<td>Utah County: 47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income</td>
<td>Orem: 35.3</td>
<td>Utah County: 56.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orem: 16.5</td>
<td>Utah County: 21.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Orem's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- **Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)**: Affordable: 6,845, Available: 9,800
- **Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)**: Affordable: 4,285, Available: 3,665
- **Low Income (≥30% HAMFI)**: Affordable: 1,980, Available: 780
- **Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)**: Affordable: 2,210, Available: 365

### Orem's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- **Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)**: Affordable: 2,955
- **Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)**: Affordable: 2,075
- **Low Income (≥30% HAMFI)**: Affordable: 2,560
- **Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)**: Affordable: 2,210

### Orem's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- **Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)**: Available Units per 100: 97.4, Affordable Units per 100: 143.2
- **Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)**: Available Units per 100: 46.2, Affordable Units per 100: 85.5
- **Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)**: Available Units per 100: 16.5, Affordable Units per 100: 35.3

Affordable Housing Gap: Panguitch, 2011-2015

Panguitch’s Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 30 (25.0%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 20 (16.7%)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 35 (29.2%)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI): 35 (29.2%)

Panguitch’s Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened: 71.4%
- Severely Cost Burdened: 35%

Comparison of Panguitch and Garfield County’s Affordable & Available Rental housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Panguitch</td>
<td>Garfield County</td>
<td>Panguitch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>147.1</td>
<td>155.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>190.9</td>
<td>202.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>128.6</td>
<td>200.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Park City, 2011-2015

Comparison of Park City and Summit County’s Affordable & Available Rental housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Park City</td>
<td>Summit County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>251.9</td>
<td>189.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>244.6</td>
<td>185.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>109.8</td>
<td>105.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Parowan, 2011-2015

Parowan’s Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI)

Parowan’s Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Comparison of Parowan and Iron County’s Affordable & Available Rental housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parowan</td>
<td>Iron County</td>
<td>Parowan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>145.7</td>
<td>141.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>134.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>106.3</td>
<td>90.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Payson, 2011-2015

Payson's Renter Households by Income Level
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)

Comparison of Payson and Utah County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Payson Available Units</th>
<th>Payson Affordable Units</th>
<th>Utah County Available Units</th>
<th>Utah County Affordable Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>125.5</td>
<td>84.5</td>
<td>93.2</td>
<td>133.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>98.0</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>88.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>56.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Payson's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households
- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Payson's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap
- Renter Households
- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Payson's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit
- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Payson's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters
- Available Units per 100
- Affordable Units per 100

Affordable Housing Gap: Perry, 2011-2015

Perry's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI)

Perry's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Comparison of Perry and Box Elder County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>Perry</td>
<td>Box Elder County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>138.1</td>
<td>149.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>285.7</td>
<td>199.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>102.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Perry's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

Perry's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

Comparison of Plain City and Weber County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plain City</td>
<td>Weber County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>140.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>132.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Pleasant Grove, 2011-2015

Pleasant Grove's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI)

Pleasant Grove's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Comparison of Pleasant Grove and Utah County's Affordable & Available Rental housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>Pleasant Grove 142.9</td>
<td>Utah County 133.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pleasant Grove 91.3</td>
<td>Utah County 93.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>88.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>56.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Pleasant View, 2011-2015

Pleasant View’s Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 140 (59.6%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 50 (21.3%)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 35 (14.9%)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI): 10 (4.3%)

Pleasant View’s Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened: 100.0%
- Severely Cost Burdened: 30.0%

Comparison of Pleasant View and Weber County’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Pleasant View</th>
<th>Weber County</th>
<th>Pleasant View</th>
<th>Weber County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income ≤30% HAMFI</td>
<td>247.4</td>
<td>140.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>103.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income ≤50% HAMFI</td>
<td>411.1</td>
<td>132.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>84.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income ≤30% HAMFI</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pleasant View’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): Available Units 235, Affordable Units 95
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): Available Units 185, Affordable Units 45
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): Available Units 10, Affordable Units 0

Pleasant View’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): Available Units 140, Affordable Units 0
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): Available Units 140, Affordable Units 0
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): Available Units -10, Affordable Units 0

Pleasant View’s Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): Available Units 247.4, Affordable Units 100.0
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): Available Units 411.1, Affordable Units 100.0
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): Available Units 0.0, Affordable Units 100.0

Affordable Housing Gap: Price, 2011-2015

Price’s Renter Households by Income Level
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)

1,205
- 205 (17.0%)
- 360 (29.9%)
- 425 (35.3%)
- 215 (17.8%)

Price’s Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households
- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

56.2% 32.5% 13.3% 40.9%
68.5% 14.9% 0.0% 4.0%

49.0% 67.7% 67.0% 28.6%

Price’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap
- Renter Households
- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)
- 845
- 1,085

Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)
- 640
- 820

Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- 425
- 210

Price’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit
- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)
- -85
- 240

Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)
- -150
- 180

Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- -215

Price’s Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters
- Available Units per 100
- Affordable Units per 100

Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)
- 89.9
- 128.4

Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)
- 76.6
- 128.1

Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- 49.4
- 64.7

Comparison of Price and Carbon County’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Carbon County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>128.4</td>
<td>158.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>128.1</td>
<td>156.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>110.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Providence, 2011-2015

**Providence's Renter Households by Income Level**
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI)

**Providence's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households**
- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

**Providence's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renters**
- Available Units per 100
- Affordable Units per 100

Comparison of Providence and Cache County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

**Providence's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap**
- Renter Households
- Affordable Units
- Available Units

**Providence's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit**
- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Affordable Housing Gap: Provo, 2011-2015

Provo's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI)

Total: 19,130

Provo's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Comparison of Provo and Utah County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provo</td>
<td>Utah County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>123.6</td>
<td>133.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td>90.8</td>
<td>88.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>56.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Affordable Housing Gap: Richfield, 2011-2015**

**Richfield's Renter Households by Income Level**

- **Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)**: 230 (25.6%)
- **Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)**: 180 (20.0%)
- **Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)**: 255 (28.3%)
- **Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)**: 235 (26.1%)

**Richfield's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households**

- **Cost Burdened**: 56.9% (559 of 900)
- **Severely Cost Burdened**: 44.4% (404 of 900)

**Comparison of Richfield and Sevier County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>GAP</th>
<th>Richfield</th>
<th>Sevier County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>≤80% HAMFI</td>
<td>135.3</td>
<td>145.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td>≤50% HAMFI</td>
<td>151.7</td>
<td>158.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income</td>
<td>≤30% HAMFI</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Richmond's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 65 (56.5%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 25 (21.7%)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 25 (21.7%)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI): 0 (0%)

Richmond's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened: 115
- Severely Cost Burdened: 0

Richmond's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): 50 Available Units, 110 Affordable Units
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): 25 Available Units, 60 Affordable Units
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 25 Available Units

Richmond's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): 2 Affordable Units, 60 Available Units
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): 6 Affordable Units, 35 Available Units
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 0 Affordable Units, 25 Available Units

Richmond's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): 104.0 Affordable Units per 100 Renters, 220.0 Available Units per 100 Renters
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): 76.0 Affordable Units per 100 Renters, 240.0 Available Units per 100 Renters
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 0.8 Affordable Units per 100 Renters

Comparison of Richmond and Cache County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Richmond</th>
<th>Cache County</th>
<th>Richmond</th>
<th>Cache County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>220.0</td>
<td>137.5</td>
<td>104.0</td>
<td>101.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>240.0</td>
<td>134.6</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparison of River Heights and Cache County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>River Heights</td>
<td>Cache County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>150.0</td>
<td>137.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>134.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>57.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Riverdale, 2011-2015

Riverdale’s Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 185 (20.7%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 300 (33.5%)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 90 (10.1%)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI): 65 (7.5%)
- Total: 895

Riverdale's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): Available Units (990) - Affordable Units (700) = GAP (290)
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): Available Units (620) - Affordable Units (390) = GAP (230)
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): Available Units (445) - Affordable Units (90) = GAP (355)

Riverdale's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened: Extremely Low Income (54.4%), Very Low Income (67.7%), Low Income (26.7%), Non-Low Income (0%)
- Severely Cost Burdened: Extremely Low Income (90.7%), Very Low Income (55%), Low Income (50%), Non-Low Income (0%)

Comparison of Riverdale and Weber County’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hamfi Level</th>
<th>Riverdale Affordable Units</th>
<th>Weber County Affordable Units</th>
<th>Riverdale Available Units</th>
<th>Weber County Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>172.2</td>
<td>140.8</td>
<td>121.7</td>
<td>103.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>159.0</td>
<td>132.7</td>
<td>114.1</td>
<td>84.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Riverton's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)

Riverton's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Riverton's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Renter Households
- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Comparison of Riverton and Salt Lake County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Riverton Affordable Units</th>
<th>Riverton Available Units</th>
<th>Salt Lake County Affordable Units</th>
<th>Salt Lake County Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>194.0</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>143.0</td>
<td>100.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>131.6</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>216.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Affordable Housing Gap: Roy, 2011-2015**

**Roy's Renter Households by Income Level**

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 435 (22.6%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 300 (15.6%)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 365 (19.0%)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI): 825 (42.9%)

Total: 1,925

**Roy's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households**

- Cost Burdened: 47.3%
- Severely Cost Burdened: 29.2%

**Comparison of Roy and Weber County's Affordable & Available Rental housing Units per 100 Renter Households**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roy</td>
<td>Weber County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>168.6</td>
<td>140.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Affordable Housing Gap: Salem, 2011-2015**

### Salem’s Renter Households by Income Level
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 83.3% (85/100)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 27.9% (23/85)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 15% (15/100)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI): 9.4% (11/100)

### Salem’s Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households
- Cost Burdened: 83.3%
- Severely Cost Burdened: 4.9%

### Salem’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Salem</th>
<th>Utah County</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>93.2</td>
<td>147.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>82.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comparison of Salem and Utah County’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

Affordable Housing Gap: Salina, 2011-2015

Salina's Renter Households by Income Level
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
  - 15 (8.2%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
  - 61 (15.6%)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
  - 20 (8.2%)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)
  - 95 (38.8%)

Total Renter Households: 245

Salina's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households
- Cost Burdened
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 73.3%
  - Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 40.9%
  - Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 22.7%
  - Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI): 0%
- Severely Cost Burdened
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 26.7%
  - Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 27.3%
  - Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 0%
  - Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI): 0%

Salina's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap
- Renter Households
  - Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): 150
  - Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): 130
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 40
- Affordable Units
  - Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): 135
  - Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): 115
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 115
- Available Units
  - Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): 235
  - Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): 180
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 80

Salina's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit
- Affordable Units
  - Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): 46.9%
  - Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): 6.1%
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 8.2%
- Available Units
  - Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): 38.8%
  - Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): 8.8%
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 11.5%

Salina's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households
- Cost Burdened
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 73.3%
  - Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 26.7%
  - Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 0%
  - Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI): 0%
- Severely Cost Burdened
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 46.9%
  - Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 27.3%
  - Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 0%
  - Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI): 0%

Comparison of Salina and Sevier County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salina</td>
<td>Sevier County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>156.7</td>
<td>145.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>138.5</td>
<td>158.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Salt Lake City, 2011-2015

Salt Lake City's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI)

Salt Lake City's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Salt Lake City's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hamfi Level</th>
<th>Salt Lake City</th>
<th>Salt Lake County</th>
<th>Salt Lake City</th>
<th>Salt Lake County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>132.5</td>
<td>143.0</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>100.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>103.0</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparison of Salt Lake City and Salt Lake County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

Affordable Housing Gap: Sandy, 2011-2015

Sandy's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)

6,730

1,385 20.6%
1,175 17.5%
1,030 15.3%
3,140 46.7%

Sandy's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)

83.0%
87.7%
43.7%
7.0%

Sandy's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Renter Households
- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)
1,405
3,310
5,595

Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)
1,030
545
225

Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)

Sandy's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)
2,005
-280

Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)
-800
-1,435

Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
-805

Sandy's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- Available Units per 100
- Affordable Units per 100

Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)
92.2
155.8

Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)
34.9
63.7

Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
21.8
52.9

Comparison of Sandy and Salt Lake County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units Sandy</th>
<th>Salt Lake County</th>
<th>Available Units Sandy</th>
<th>Salt Lake County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>155.8</td>
<td>143.0</td>
<td>92.2</td>
<td>100.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Affordable Housing Gap: Santa Clara, 2011-2015

#### Santa Clara's Renter Households by Income Level

- **Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)**: 205 (53.2%)
- **Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)**: 130 (33.8%)
- **Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)**: 35 (9.1%)
- **Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI)**: 15 (3.9%)

#### Santa Clara's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- **Cost Burdened**: 100%
- **Severely Cost Burdened**: 70.7%

#### Santa Clara's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- **Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)**: 15
- **Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)**: 50
- **Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)**: 255
- **Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)**: 0

#### Santa Clara's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- **Cost Burdened**: -31
- **Severely Cost Burdened**: -15

#### Santa Clara's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- **Available Units per 100**: 66.3
- **Affordable Units per 100**: 87.8

#### Comparison of Santa Clara and Washington County’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Santa Clara</th>
<th>Washington County</th>
<th>Santa Clara</th>
<th>Washington County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td>143.4</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>94.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>118.0</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>51.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>366.7</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Santaquin, 2011-2015

Santaquin's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 95 (21.6%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 70 (15.9%)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 95 (21.6%)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI): 180 (40.9%)

Santaquin's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened: 85.7%
- Severely Cost Burdened: 21.6%

Santaquin's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): 260
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): 165
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 95

Santaquin's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): 210
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): 70
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 10

Santaquin's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- Available Units per 100: 180.8
- Affordable Units per 100: 119.2

Comparison of Santaquin and Juab County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Santaquin</th>
<th>Juab County</th>
<th>Santaquin</th>
<th>Juab County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>180.8</td>
<td>147.9</td>
<td>119.2</td>
<td>103.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>142.4</td>
<td>159.6</td>
<td>87.9</td>
<td>94.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>110.5</td>
<td>134.6</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Affordable Housing Gap: Saratoga Springs, 2011-2015**

### Saratoga Springs's Renter Households by Income Level

- **Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)**: 790 (77.5%)
- **Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)**: 200 (19.6%)
- **Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)**: 100 (10.0%)
- **Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI)**: 10 (1.0%)

Total: 1,020

### Saratoga Springs's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- **Cost Burdened**
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 100%
  - Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 31%
  - Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 11.3%
  - Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI): 0%

- **Severely Cost Burdened**
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 100%
  - Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 62.5%
  - Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 11.3%
  - Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI): 0%

### Saratoga Springs's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- **Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)**: Affordable Units 230, Available Units 570
- **Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)**: Affordable Units 30, Available Units 25
- **Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)**: Affordable Units 20, Available Units 10

### Saratoga Springs's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- **Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)**: -75
- **Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)**: -10
- **Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)**: -20

### Saratoga Springs's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- **Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)**: 67.4
- **Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)**: 0.0
- **Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)**: 0.0

**Comparison of Saratoga Springs and Utah County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units Saratoga Springs</th>
<th>Available Units Saratoga Springs</th>
<th>Affordable Units Utah County</th>
<th>Available Units Utah County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>247.8</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>133.4</td>
<td>93.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Smithfield, 2011-2015

Comparison of Smithfield and Cache County’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

Affordable Housing Gap: South Jordan, 2011-2015

South Jordan's Renter Households by Income Level
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)

3,340

63.3%

6.9%

10.2%

19.6%

2,115

South Jordan's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households
- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)

South Jordan's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters
- Available Units per 100
- Affordable Units per 100

South Jordan
Salt Lake County
South Jordan
Salt Lake County
Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
177.1
149
98.4
89.5
Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)
26.3
89.5
19.1
88.2
Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
19.1
19.1
19.1
19.1

Comparison of South Jordan and Salt Lake County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

Affordable Housing Gap: South Ogden, 2011-2015

South Ogden's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)

South Ogden's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Comparison of South Ogden and Weber County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Ogden</td>
<td>Weber County</td>
<td>South Ogden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>148.4</td>
<td>140.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>142.0</td>
<td>132.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

South Ogden's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)

South Ogden's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Affordable Units
- Available Units

South Ogden's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- Available Units per 100
- Affordable Units per 100

South Weber's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 60 (35.3%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 40 (23.5%)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 25 (14.7%)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI): 170 (100.0%)

South Weber's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 100%
- Cost Burdened Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 100%
- Cost Burdened Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 75%
- Cost Burdened Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI): 0%

- Severely Cost Burdened Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 100%
- Severely Cost Burdened Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 100%
- Severely Cost Burdened Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 9%
- Severely Cost Burdened Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI): 0%

South Weber's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): 125 Affordable Units, 175 Available Units
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): 45 Affordable Units, 35 Available Units
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 25 Affordable Units, 10 Available Units

South Weber's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Affordable Units Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): 50
- Available Units Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): 5
- Affordable Units Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): -20
- Available Units Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): -30
- Affordable Units Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): -15
- Available Units Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): -25

South Weber's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- Available Units Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): 104.0
- Affordable Units Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): 140.0
- Available Units Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): 53.8
- Affordable Units Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): 69.2
- Available Units Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 0.0
- Affordable Units Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 40.0

Comparison of South Weber and Davis County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Weber</td>
<td>Davis County</td>
<td>South Weber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>140.0</td>
<td>145.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>117.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>54.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Spanish Fork, 2011-2015

Spanish Fork's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI)

2,270

35.9%

815

35.0%

795

14.3%

325

14.8%

335

Spanish Fork's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Comparison of Spanish Fork and Utah County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish Fork</td>
<td>Utah County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>134.2</td>
<td>133.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>112.9</td>
<td>88.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>56.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Affordable Housing Gap: Spring City, 2011-2015**

**Spring City's Renter Households by Income Level**

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 10 (12.5%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 15 (18.8%)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 35 (43.8%)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI): 20 (25.0%)

**Spring City's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households**

- Cost Burdened: 22.0%
- Severely Cost Burdened: 3.6%

**Comparison of Spring City and Sanpete County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring City</td>
<td>Sanpete County</td>
<td>Spring City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>177.8</td>
<td>139.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>157.1</td>
<td>168.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>122.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Springville, 2011-2015

Springville's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 900 (32.4%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 410 (14.8%)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 400 (14.4%)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI): 1,065 (38.4%)

Total Renter Households: 2,775

Springville's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): Renter Households 1,710, Available Units 2,425
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): Available Units 810, 1,110
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): Available Units 390, 400

Springville's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): Affordable Units -200, Available Units 715
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): Affordable Units -420, Available Units 300
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): Affordable Units -370, Available Units

Springville's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): Affordable Units 88.3, Available Units 141.8
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): Affordable Units 48.1, Available Units 137.0
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): Affordable Units 7.5, Available Units 48.8

Comparison of Springville and Utah County’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>GAP</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>Springville</td>
<td>141.8</td>
<td>88.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Utah County</td>
<td>133.4</td>
<td>93.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>Springville</td>
<td>137.0</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Utah County</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely</td>
<td>Springville</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: St. George, 2011-2015

St. George's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 2,245 (24.3%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 1,585 (17.2%)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 1,790 (19.4%)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI): 3,605 (39.1%)

St. George's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened: 88.0%
- Severely Cost Burdened: 15.6%

Comparison of St. George and Washington County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>GAP</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>St. George</td>
<td>Washington County</td>
<td>St. George</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>143.5</td>
<td>143.4</td>
<td>98.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>52.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Affordable Housing Gap: Sunset, 2011-2015**

### Sunset's Renter Households by Income Level

- **Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI):** 85 (17.7%)
- **Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI):** 105 (21.9%)
- **Low Income (50-80% HAMFI):** 195 (40.6%)
- **Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI):** 95 (19.8%)

Total Renter Households: 480

### Sunset's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- **Cost Burdened:** 25.6%
- **Severely Cost Burdened:** 2.1%

### Comparison of Sunset and Davis County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units Sunset</th>
<th>Available Units Sunset</th>
<th>Affordable Units Davis County</th>
<th>Available Units Davis County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>123.4</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>145.9</td>
<td>100.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>125.0</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>117.0</td>
<td>66.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Syracuse, 2011-2015

Syracuse's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI)

Syracuse's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Comparison of Syracuse and Davis County's Affordable & Available Rental housing Units per 100 Renter Households

GAP HAMFI LEVEL | Affordable Units Syracuse | Available Units Syracuse | Affordable Units Davis County | Available Units Davis County
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
Low Income (≤80% HAMFI) | 152.6 | 87.4 | 145.9 | 100.3
Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI) | 61.5 | 37.7 | 117.0 | 66.2
Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI) | 90.0 | 40.0 | 54.7 | 26.8

### Affordable Housing Gap: Taylorsville, 2011-2015

#### Taylorsville's Renter Households by Income Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Renter Households</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>4,310</td>
<td>6,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>2,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>1,145</td>
<td>1,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Low Income</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>1,190</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Taylorsville's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- **Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)**: Cost Burdened - 110, Severely Cost Burdened - 1,110
- **Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)**: Cost Burdened - 75, Severely Cost Burdened - 1,155
- **Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)**: Cost Burdened - 805, Severely Cost Burdened - 1,070

#### Taylorsville's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>102.6</td>
<td>139.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>96.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comparison of Taylorsville and Salt Lake County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Taylorsville</th>
<th>Salt Lake County</th>
<th>Taylorsville</th>
<th>Salt Lake County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>139.4</td>
<td>143.0</td>
<td>102.6</td>
<td>100.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tooele's Renter Households by Income Level**

- **Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)**: 470 (18.1%)
- **Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)**: 495 (19.0%)
- **Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)**: 605 (23.3%)
- **Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)**: 1,030 (39.6%)

**2,600**

**Tooele's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households**

- **Cost Burdened**: 225 (82.6%)
- **Severely Cost Burdened**: 195 (71.1%)

**Comparison of Tooele and Tooele County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI Level</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80%)</td>
<td>170.4</td>
<td>115.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50%)</td>
<td>122.3</td>
<td>83.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30%)</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Toquerville, 2011-2015

Toquerville's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 20 (19.2%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 4 (3.8%)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 30 (28.8%)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI): 50 (48.1%)

104 Total Renter Households

Toquerville's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 28.8%
  - Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 26.7%
  - Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 41%
  - Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI): 0%

- Severely Cost Burdened
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 26.7%
  - Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 0%
  - Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 19.2%
  - Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI): 0%

Comparison of Toquerville and Washington County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Toquerville Affordable Units</th>
<th>Toquerville Available Units</th>
<th>Washington County Affordable Units</th>
<th>Washington County Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>175.9</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>143.4</td>
<td>94.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>132.4</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>51.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tremonton's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- **Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)**
  - Available Units: 275
- **Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)**
  - Available Units: 340
- **Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)**
  - Available Units: 315
- **Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)**
  - Available Units: 180

Tremonton's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- **Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)**
  - Cost Burdened: 65
  - Severely Cost Burdened: 155
  - Available Units: 275
  - Affordable Units: 495
- **Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)**
  - Available Units: 160
- **Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)**
  - Available Units: 160
- **Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)**
  - Available Units: 160

Tremonton's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renters

- **Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)**
  - Available Units per 100: 99.0
  - Affordable Units per 100: 115.2
- **Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)**
  - Available Units per 100: 92.6
  - Affordable Units per 100: 145.6
- **Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)**
  - Available Units per 100: 58.2
  - Affordable Units per 100: 65.5

Affordable Housing Gap: Vernal, 2011-2015

Vernal's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI)

1,200

- Extremely Low Income: 280 (23.3%)
- Very Low Income: 85 (7.1%)
- Low Income: 305 (25.4%)
- Non-Low Income: 530 (44.2%)

Vernal's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened: 78.7%
- Severely Cost Burdened: 21.3%

Comparison of Vernal and Uintah County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vernal</td>
<td>Uintah County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>206.0</td>
<td>213.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>191.0</td>
<td>191.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>78.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Affordable Housing Gap: Washington, 2011-2015**

**Washington's Renter Households by Income Level**

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 125.5
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 9.8
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 133.6
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI): 58.3

**Washington's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households**

- Cost Burdened:
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 100%
  - Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 53%
  - Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 43%
  - Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI): 10%
- Severely Cost Burdened:
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 30%
  - Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 10%
  - Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 9%
  - Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI): 0%

**Comparison of Washington and Washington County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Washington County</td>
<td>Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>133.6</td>
<td>73.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>125.5</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Washington's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renters**

- Available Units per 100:
  - Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): 73.6
  - Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): 38.4
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 9.8
- Affordable Units per 100:
  - Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): 133.6
  - Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): 58.3
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 125.5


Washington Terrace's Renter Households by Income Level
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 260 (20.1%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 190 (14.7%)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 245 (18.9%)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI): 600 (46.3%)

Total: 1,295

Washington Terrace's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households
- Cost Burdened: Extremely Low Income: 41.7%, Very Low Income: 17.3%, Low Income: 13.8%, Non-Low Income: 0%
- Severely Cost Burdened: Extremely Low Income: 6.7%, Very Low Income: 1.7%, Low Income: 1.4%, Non-Low Income: 0%

Comparison of Washington Terrace and Weber County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Washington Terrace</th>
<th>Weber County</th>
<th>GAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>128.1</td>
<td>140.8</td>
<td>104.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>130.8</td>
<td>132.7</td>
<td>95.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Wellington, 2011-2015

Wellington's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

Wellington's Renter Households by Income Level
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)

Wellington's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

Wellington's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

Wellington's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renters

Comparison of Wellington and Carbon County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

Affordable Housing Gap: Wellsville, 2011-2015

Wellsville's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)

Wellsville's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Comparison of Wellsville and Cache County's Affordable & Available Rental housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wellsville</td>
<td>Cache County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>173.3</td>
<td>137.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td>220.0</td>
<td>134.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income</td>
<td>166.7</td>
<td>57.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Wendover, 2011-2015

Wendover's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)

Wendover's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Comparison of Wendover and Tooele County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

- Table showing the comparison of affordable and available units per 100 renters by income level.

Affordable Housing Gap: West Bountiful, 2011-2015

West Bountiful's Renter Households by Income Level
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI) 120 (75.5%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI) 4 (2.5%)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI) 25 (15.7%)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI) 10 (6.3%)

West Bountiful's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households
- Cost Burdened: Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI) 100%
- Cost Burdened: Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI) 0%
- Cost Burdened: Low Income (50-80% HAMFI) 16.7%
- Cost Burdened: Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI) 0%
- Severely Cost Burdened: Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI) 0%
- Severely Cost Burdened: Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI) 0%
- Severely Cost Burdened: Low Income (50-80% HAMFI) 25%
- Severely Cost Burdened: Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI) 0%

Comparison of West Bountiful and Davis County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Bountiful</td>
<td>Davis County</td>
<td>West Bountiful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>294.9</td>
<td>145.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td>171.4</td>
<td>117.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>54.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

West Bountiful's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters
- Available Units per 100: Low Income (≤80% HAMFI) 74.4
- Available Units per 100: Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI) 42.9
- Available Units per 100: Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI) 0.0
- Affordable Units per 100: Low Income (≤80% HAMFI) 294.9
- Affordable Units per 100: Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI) 171.4
- Affordable Units per 100: Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI) 0.0

**Affordable Housing Gap: West Haven, 2011-2015**

*West Haven's Renter Households by Income Level*

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMI): 200 (20.3%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMI): 170 (17.3%)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMI): 75 (7.6%)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMI): 540 (54.8%)

*West Haven's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households*

- Cost Burdened: 91%
- Severely Cost Burdened: 9%

*West Haven's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap*

- Low Income (≤80% HAMI): 445 - 375 = 70
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMI): 145 - 55 = 90
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMI): 75 - 0 = 75

*West Haven's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renters*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units per 100</th>
<th>Available Units per 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMI)</td>
<td>84.3</td>
<td>200.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMI)</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>59.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMI)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparison of West Haven and Weber County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMI LEVEL</th>
<th>West Haven</th>
<th>Weber County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMI)</td>
<td>200.0</td>
<td>140.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMI)</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>132.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMI)</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


West Jordan's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI)

- 30.6% Extremely Low Income
- 33.8% Very Low Income
- 17.7% Low Income
- 17.9% Non-Low Income

West Jordan's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

- 92.4% Extremely Low Income
- 72.3% Very Low Income
- 31.3% Low Income
- 19.0% Non-Low Income

Comparison of West Jordan and Salt Lake County’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)

West Jordan's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renters

- Available Units per 100
- Affordable Units per 100

Affordable Housing Gap: West Point, 2011-2015

West Point’s Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI) 35 (17.5%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI) 70 (35.0%)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI) 75 (37.5%)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI) 20 (10.0%)

Total: 200

West Point’s Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened 83.7%
- Severely Cost Burdened 57.1%

West Point’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Affordable Units
  - Low Income (≤80% HAMFI) -50
  - Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI) -85
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI) -85

- Available Units
  - Low Income (≤80% HAMFI) -65
  - Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI) -65
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI) -65

West Point’s Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- Available Units per 100
  - Low Income (≤80% HAMFI) 63.9
  - Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI) 22.7
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI) 13.3

- Affordable Units per 100
  - Low Income (≤80% HAMFI) 72.2

Comparison of West Point and Davis County’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>West Point: 72.2</td>
<td>Davis County: 145.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>West Point: 22.7</td>
<td>Davis County: 117.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>West Point: 13.3</td>
<td>Davis County: 54.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: West Valley City, 2011-2015

West Valley City’s Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 2,865 (24.8%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 3,255 (28.2%)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 2,705 (23.4%)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI): 2,725 (23.6%)

11,550

West Valley City’s Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened: 31.3%
- Severely Cost Burdened: 10.8%

Comparison of West Valley City and Salt Lake County’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</th>
<th>Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)</th>
<th>Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)</th>
<th>Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Valley City</td>
<td>130.4</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake County</td>
<td>143.0</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Valley City</td>
<td>101.2</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake County</td>
<td>100.3</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

West Valley City’s Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- Available Units per 100: 101.2
- Affordable Units per 100: 130.4


Willard's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 65 (89.0%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 0 (0.0%)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 4 (5.5%)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI): 4 (5.5%)

Willard's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 58%
  - Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 0%
  - Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 8%
  - Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI): 0%
- Severely Cost Burdened
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 5%
  - Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 0%
  - Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 0%
  - Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI): 0%

Comparison of Willard and Box Elder County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Willard Box Elder County</td>
<td>Willard Box Elder County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>937.5</td>
<td>149.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>500.0</td>
<td>199.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>250.0</td>
<td>102.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Woodland Hills, 2011-2015

Woodland Hills's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 10 (45.5%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 4 (18.2%)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 4 (18.2%)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI): 4 (18.2%)

Woodland Hills's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 100%
  - Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 100%
  - Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 0%
  - Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI): 0%

- Severely Cost Burdened
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 100%
  - Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 0%
  - Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 0%
  - Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI): 0%

Comparison of Woodland Hills and Utah County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Woodland Hills Affordable Units</th>
<th>Woodland Hills Available Units</th>
<th>Utah County Affordable Units</th>
<th>Utah County Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income  (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>133.4</td>
<td>93.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Woods Cross's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI)

Woods Cross's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Woods Cross's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Renter Households
- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Woods Cross's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Woods Cross's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- Available Units per 100
- Affordable Units per 100

Comparison of Woods Cross and Davis County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Woods Cross</td>
<td>Davis County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>117.6</td>
<td>145.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>137.0</td>
<td>117.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>54.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Alta, 2011-2015

Alta's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI)

Alta's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Comparison of Alta and Salt Lake County's Affordable & Available Rental housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Alta Affordable Units</th>
<th>Alta Available Units</th>
<th>Salt Lake County Affordable Units</th>
<th>Salt Lake County Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>288.9</td>
<td>200.0</td>
<td>143.0</td>
<td>100.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>525.0</td>
<td>200.0</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>850.0</td>
<td>200.0</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Altamont, 2011-2015

Altamont's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)

Altamont's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Comparison of Altamont and Duchesne County's Affordable & Available Rental housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Altamont</td>
<td>Duchesne County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>200.0</td>
<td>180.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>150.0</td>
<td>168.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>102.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Altamont's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Renter Households
- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Altamont's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Altamont's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- Available Units per 100
- Affordable Units per 100

Affordable Housing Gap: Alton, 2011-2015

Alton's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI)

Alton's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

Alton's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Renter Households
- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Alton's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

Alton's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

Comparison of Alton and Kane County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units Alton</th>
<th>Available Units Alton</th>
<th>Affordable Units Kane County</th>
<th>Available Units Kane County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>178.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>119.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>190.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>114.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>152.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Amalga, 2011-2015

Amalga's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI)

Amalga's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Amalga's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Renter Households
- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Amalga's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Amalga's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- Available Units per 100
- Affordable Units per 100

Comparison of Amalga and Cache County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income  (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>169.6</td>
<td>137.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>152.6</td>
<td>134.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>57.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Affordable Housing Gap: Annabella, 2011-2015

#### Annabella's Renter Households by Income Level

- **Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)**: 4\% (7.4\%)
- **Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)**: 4\% (0.0\%)
- **Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)**: 10\% (18.5\%)
- **Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)**: 4\% (7.4\%)

#### Annabella's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- **Cost Burdened**: 7.4\%
- **Severely Cost Burdened**: 4\%

#### Comparison of Annabella and Sevier County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units Annabella</th>
<th>Affordable Units Sevier County</th>
<th>Available Units Annabella</th>
<th>Available Units Sevier County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>136.4</td>
<td>145.7</td>
<td>111.4</td>
<td>106.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>625.0</td>
<td>158.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>94.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>56.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Annabella's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- **Renter Households**
  - Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): 44\%
  - Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): 4\%
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 0\%

#### Annabella's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- **Affordable Units**
  - Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): 16\%
  - Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): 21\%
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 10\%

#### Annabella's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- **Available Units per 100**
  - Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): 111.4
  - Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): 100.0
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 0.0

- **Affordable Units per 100**
  - Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): 136.4
  - Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): 625.0

Affordable Housing Gap: Antimony, 2011-2015

Antimony's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)

Antimony's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Comparison of Antimony and Garfield County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Antimony</th>
<th>Garfield County</th>
<th>Antimony</th>
<th>Garfield County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>155.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>120.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>202.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>114.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>200.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Apple Valley, 2011-2015

Apple Valley's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 10 (45.5%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 4 (18.2%)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 4 (18.2%)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI): 4 (18.2%)

Apple Valley's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 100%
  - Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 100%
  - Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 100%
  - Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI): 100%
- Severely Cost Burdened
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 100%
  - Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 100%
  - Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 100%
  - Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI): 100%

Comparison of Apple Valley and Washington County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI Level</th>
<th>Affordable Units Apple Valley</th>
<th>Affordable Units Washington County</th>
<th>Available Units Apple Valley</th>
<th>Available Units Washington County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income  (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>127.8</td>
<td>143.4</td>
<td>122.2</td>
<td>94.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>51.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Ballard, 2011-2015

Ballard's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)

Ballard's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Ballard's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Renter Households
- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Comparison of Ballard and Uintah County's Affordable & Available Rental housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Ballard</th>
<th>Uintah County</th>
<th>Ballard</th>
<th>Uintah County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>230.0</td>
<td>213.9</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>120.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>191.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>83.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>45.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ballard's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- Available Units per 100
- Affordable Units per 100

Affordable Housing Gap: Bicknell, 2011-2015

**Bicknell's Renter Households by Income Level**
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 8 (66.7%)
- Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): -
- Very Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 4 (33.3%)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI): -

**Bicknell's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households**
- Cost Burdened
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 86.6%
  - Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): -
  - Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): -
  - Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI): -
- Severely Cost Burdened
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 86.6%
  - Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): -
  - Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): -
  - Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI): -

**Comparison of Bicknell and Wayne County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>700.0</td>
<td>550.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>700.0</td>
<td>550.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>350.0</td>
<td>350.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Affordable Housing Gap: Big Water, 2011-2015

#### Big Water's Renter Households by Income Level

- **Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)**: 50, 72.5%
- **Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)**: 4, 5.8%
- **Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)**: 15, 21.7%
- **Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)**: 0, 0.0%

#### Big Water's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- **Cost Burdened**: 69
- **Severely Cost Burdened**: 14

#### Comparison of Big Water and Kane County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>389.5</td>
<td>173.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>360.0</td>
<td>193.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Source:
Affordable Housing Gap: Boulder, 2011-2015

Boulder's Renter Households by Income Level

- **Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)**
  - 10 (31.3%)
  - Affordable Units: 0
  - Available Units: 0

- **Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)**
  - 4 (12.5%)
  - Affordable Units: 0
  - Available Units: 0

- **Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)**
  - 4 (12.5%)
  - Affordable Units: 0
  - Available Units: 0

- **Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)**
  - 14 (43.8%)
  - Affordable Units: 0
  - Available Units: 0

Boulder's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renters

- **Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)**
  - Affordable Units: 18
  - Available Units: 30

- **Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)**
  - Affordable Units: 8
  - Available Units: 30

- **Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)**
  - Affordable Units: 4
  - Available Units: 15

Boulder's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 100.0%
  - Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 100.0%
  - Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 0.0%
  - Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI): 0.0%

- Severely Cost Burdened
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 43.8%
  - Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 0.0%
  - Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 0.0%
  - Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI): 0.0%

Comparison of Boulder and Garfield County's Affordable & Available Rental housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Boulder Affordable Units</th>
<th>Boulder Available Units</th>
<th>Garfield County Affordable Units</th>
<th>Garfield County Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>166.7</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>155.8</td>
<td>120.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>375.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>202.9</td>
<td>114.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>375.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>200.0</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Boulder's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Affordable Units
  - Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): 12
  - Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): 22
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 11

Affordable Housing Gap: Brian Head, 2011-2015

Brian Head's Renter Households by Income Level
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)

Brian Head's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households
- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Comparison of Brian Head and Iron County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Brian Head</th>
<th>Iron County</th>
<th>Brian Head</th>
<th>Iron County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>412.5</td>
<td>141.6</td>
<td>337.5</td>
<td>111.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td>237.5</td>
<td>134.8</td>
<td>187.5</td>
<td>91.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>51.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bryce Canyon City's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 15 (78.9%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 4 (21.1%)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 0 (0.0%)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI): 0 (0.0%)

Bryce Canyon City's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Comparison of Bryce Canyon City and Garfield County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>GAP</th>
<th>Bryce Canyon City</th>
<th>Garfield County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>155.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>202.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>114.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Low Income</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>250.0</td>
<td>200.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bryce Canyon City's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Available Units per 100</th>
<th>Affordable Units per 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>73.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>73.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>250.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Affordable Housing Gap: Cannonville, 2011-2015**

**Cannonville's Renter Households by Income Level**

- **Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)**: 4 (33.3%) Renter Households
- **Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)**: 4 (33.3%) Renter Households
- **Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)**: 0 (0%)
- **Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)**: 4 (33.3%)

**Cannonville's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households**

- **Cost Burdened**: 4 (33.3%)
- **Severely Cost Burdened**: 4 (33.3%)

**Cannonville's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap**

- **Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)**: Affordable: 8, Available: 8
- **Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)**: Affordable: 4, Available: 8
- **Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)**: Affordable: 4, Available: 4

**Cannonville's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit**

- **Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)**: Affordable: 0, Available: 0
- **Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)**: Affordable: 0, Available: 4
- **Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)**: Affordable: 0, Available: 4

**Cannonville's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renters**

- **Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)**: Limited: 100.0, Available: 100.0
- **Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)**: Limited: 100.0, Available: 200.0
- **Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)**: Limited: 0.0, Available: 65.0

**Comparison of Cannonville and Garfield County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP</th>
<th>Cannonville</th>
<th>Garfield County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>155.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>200.0</td>
<td>202.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>200.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Castle Valley, 2011-2015

Castle Valley's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)

Castle Valley's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Castle Valley's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI Level</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Castle Valley's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Castle Valley's Renter Households by Income Level

Comparison of Castle Valley and Grand County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>Castle Valley: 78.9</td>
<td>Grand County: 158.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Castle Valley: 73.7</td>
<td>Grand County: 117.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>375.0</td>
<td>130.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>95.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>97.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Affordable Housing Gap: Cedar Fort, 2011-2015

**Cedar Fort’s Renter Households by Income Level**

- **Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)**: 71.4%
- **Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)**: 28.6%
- **Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)**: 4%
- **Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)**: 0%

**Cedar Fort’s Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households**

- **Cost Burdened**: 100%
- **Severely Cost Burdened**: 100%

**Comparison of Cedar Fort and Utah County’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Cedar Fort</th>
<th>Utah County</th>
<th>Cedar Fort</th>
<th>Utah County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>300.0</td>
<td>133.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>93.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cedar Fort’s Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renters**

- **Available Units per 100**: 100.0
- **Affordable Units per 100**: 300.0

**Cedar Fort’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap**

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): 4 units
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): 8 units
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 4 units

**Cedar Fort’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit**

- Affordable Units: 8 units
- Available Units: 8 units

Affordable Housing Gap: Centerfield, 2011-2015

Centerfield’s Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 25 (58.1%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 4 (9.3%)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 10 (23.3%)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI): 4 (9.3%)

Centerfield’s Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened: 43
- Severely Cost Burdened: 10 (23.3%)

Comparison of Centerfield and Sanpete County’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Centerfield Affordable Units</th>
<th>Centerfield Available Units</th>
<th>Sanpete County Affordable Units</th>
<th>Sanpete County Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>139.5</td>
<td>105.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>168.3</td>
<td>91.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>122.9</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Central Valley, 2011-2015

Comparison of Central Valley and Sevier County’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Central Valley</td>
<td>Sevier County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(&lt;80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>450.0</td>
<td>145.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td>200.0</td>
<td>158.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(&lt;50% HAMFI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Charleston, 2011-2015

Charleston's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI)

Charleston's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Charleston's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Renter Households
- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Charleston's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Charleston's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- Available Units per 100
- Affordable Units per 100

---

Comparison of Charleston and Wasatch County's Affordable & Available Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>116.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td>125.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Circleville, 2011-2015

**Circleville's Renter Households by Income Level**

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 20 (41.7%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 8.3%
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 14 (29.2%)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI): 10 (20.8%)

**Circleville's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households**

- Cost Burdened: 10%
- Severely Cost Burdened: 0%

**Comparison of Circleville and Piute County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Circleville</th>
<th>Piute County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>132.4</td>
<td>183.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>150.0</td>
<td>158.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>250.0</td>
<td>175.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Circleville's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>132.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>150.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>250.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Circleville's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Available Units per 100</th>
<th>Affordable Units per 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>132.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>150.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>250.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Clarkston, 2011-2015

Clarkston's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI)

Clarkston's Propportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Clarkston's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Renter Households
- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Clarkston's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Clarkston's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renters

- Available Units per 100
- Affordable Units per 100

Comparison of Clarkston and Cache County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Clarkston Affordable Units</th>
<th>Clarkston Available Units</th>
<th>Cache County Affordable Units</th>
<th>Cache County Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>137.5</td>
<td>101.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td>200.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>134.6</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Clawson, 2011-2015

Clawson's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI)

Clawson's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Clawson's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Renter Households
- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Clawson's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Clawson's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- Available Units per 100
- Affordable Units per 100

Comparison of Clawson and Emery County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units Clawson</th>
<th>Available Units Clawson</th>
<th>Affordable Units Emery County</th>
<th>Available Units Emery County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>181.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>140.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>220.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>145.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>170.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>95.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Cleveland, 2011-2015

Cleveland's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI)

Cleveland's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Cleveland's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Renter Households
- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Cleveland's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Cleveland's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renters

- Available Units per 100
- Affordable Units per 100

Comparison of Cleveland and Emery County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Cleveland</th>
<th>Emery County</th>
<th>Cleveland</th>
<th>Emery County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income  (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>108.7</td>
<td>181.6</td>
<td>108.7</td>
<td>140.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>131.6</td>
<td>220.3</td>
<td>115.8</td>
<td>145.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>170.0</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>95.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Affordable Housing Gap: Daniel, 2011-2015

#### Daniel's Renter Households by Income Level
- **Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI):** 15 (21.7%)
- **Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI):** 10 (14.5%)
- **Low Income (50-80% HAMFI):** 34 (49.3%)
- **Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI):** 10 (14.5%) total: 69

#### Daniel's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households
- **Cost Burdened:**
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 40.0%
  - Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 26.7%
  - Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 11.8%
  - Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI): 0.0%
- **Severely Cost Burdened:**
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 14.5%
  - Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 10.0%
  - Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 6.0%
  - Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI): 0.0%

#### Comparison of Daniel and Wasatch County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Wasatch County</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>125.7</td>
<td>159.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>120.0</td>
<td>71.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Elmo, 2011-2015

Elmo's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 0.0% (4/29)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 13.8% (15/112)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 34.5% (10/29)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI): 51.7% (22/42)

Affordable Housing Deficit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI Level</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80%)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Low Income</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Elmo's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened: 53.3%
- Severely Cost Burdened: 26.3%

Elmo's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI Level</th>
<th>Available Units per 100</th>
<th>Affordable Units per 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80%)</td>
<td>110.3</td>
<td>110.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td>115.8</td>
<td>126.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparison of Elmo and Emery County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80%)</td>
<td>110.3</td>
<td>110.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50%)</td>
<td>115.8</td>
<td>126.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30%)</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Affordable Housing Gap: Elsinore, 2011-2015

#### Elsinore's Renter Households by Income Level

- **Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)**: 4 (12.9%)
- **Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)**: 15 (48.4%)
- **Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)**: 8 (25.8%)
- **Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)**: 4 (12.9%)

#### Comparison of Elsinore and Sevier County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elsinore</td>
<td>Sevier County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>169.6</td>
<td>145.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>205.3</td>
<td>158.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Elsinore's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- **Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)**: 16
- **Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)**: 20
- **Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)**: 0

#### Elsinore's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- **Elsinore's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap**
  - Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): 23/39
  - Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): 19/39
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 4/7

#### Source
Affordable Housing Gap: Elwood, 2011-2015

Elwood’s Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI) 25.0%
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI) 0.0%
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI) 50.0%
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI) 25.0%

Elwood’s Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Comparison of Elwood and Box Elder County’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elwood</td>
<td>Box Elder County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>225.0</td>
<td>149.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>175.0</td>
<td>199.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>102.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Emery, 2011-2015

**Emery’s Renter Households by Income Level**
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 0.0% (Emery), 0.0% (Emery County)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 4.0% (Emery), 4.0% (Emery County)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 50.0% (Emery), 50.0% (Emery County)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI): 0.0% (Emery), 0.0% (Emery County)

**Emery’s Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households**
- Cost Burdened: 0.0% (Emery), 0.0% (Emery County)
- Severely Cost Burdened: 0.0% (Emery), 0.0% (Emery County)

**Comparison of Emery and Emery County’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>Emery</td>
<td>Emery County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>181.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>220.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>170.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fayette's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI)

Fayette's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Fayette's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Renter Households
- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Fayette's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

Fayette's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

Comparison of Fayette and Sanpete County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units Fayette</th>
<th>Available Units Fayette</th>
<th>Affordable Units Sanpete County</th>
<th>Available Units Sanpete County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>139.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>105.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>168.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>91.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>122.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fielding's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI) - 15 (34.9%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI) - 0
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI) - 8 (18.6%)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI) - 10 (23.3%)

Fielding's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI) - 100%
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI) - 33.3%
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI) - 0%
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI) - 0%

Fielding's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI) - Renter Households: 10, Affordable Units: 35, Available Units: 45
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI) - Renter Households: 10, Affordable Units: 25, Available Units: 35
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI) - Renter Households: 0, Affordable Units: 10, Available Units: 0

Fielding's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI) - Affordable Units: 10, Available Units: 10
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI) - Affordable Units: -5, Available Units: 10
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI) - Affordable Units: -10, Available Units: -10

Fielding's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI) - Affordable Units: 108.6, Available Units: 128.6
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI) - Affordable Units: 80.0, Available Units: 140.0
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI) - Affordable Units: 0.0, Available Units: 56.6

Comparison of Fielding and Box Elder County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fielding</td>
<td>Box Elder County</td>
<td>Fielding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>128.6</td>
<td>149.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td>140.0</td>
<td>199.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>102.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Affordable Housing Gap: Francis, 2011-2015**

**Francis's Renter Households by Income Level**
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 4.3% (13.3/308.6), 4/94
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 11.0% (107.7/959), 10/94
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 84.1% (816.6/959), 50/94
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI): 7.6% (74.3/959), 30/94

**Francis's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households**
- Cost Burdened: 41.4% (41.4/100)
- Severely Cost Burdened: 11.4% (11.4/100)

**Francis's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap**
- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): 44 Available Units, 37 Affordable Units, 83 GAP
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): 40 Available Units, 33 Affordable Units, 79 GAP
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 0 Available Units, 30 Affordable Units, 0 GAP

**Francis's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit**
- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): 7 Available Units, 0 GAP
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): 7 Available Units, 0 GAP
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 26 Available Units, 0 GAP

**Francis's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters**
- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): 84.1 Available Units per 100 Renters, 188.6 Affordable Units per 100 Renters
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): 82.5 Available Units per 100 Renters, 197.5 Affordable Units per 100 Renters
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 0.013 Available Units per 100 Renters, 0 Affordable Units per 100 Renters

**Comparison of Francis and Summit County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Francis</th>
<th>Summit County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income  (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>188.6</td>
<td>189.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available Units</td>
<td>84.1</td>
<td>127.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Units</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>120.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>197.5</td>
<td>185.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>105.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Garden City, 2011-2015

Garden City’s Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 30 (41.1%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 35 (47.9%)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 4 (5.5%)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI): 4 (5.5%)

Garden City’s Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened:
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 57.2%
  - Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 47.7%
  - Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 13.3%
  - Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI): 0%

- Severely Cost Burdened:
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 8.3%
  - Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 0%
  - Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 0%
  - Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI): 0%

Comparison of Garden City and Rich County’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Garden City</th>
<th>Rich County</th>
<th>Garden City</th>
<th>Rich County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>107.2</td>
<td>111.2</td>
<td>105.8</td>
<td>107.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td>107.7</td>
<td>151.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>99.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>172.5</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Garden City’s Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): 69
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): 65
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 35

Garden City’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): 5
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): 5
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): -10

Garden City’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renters

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): 105.8
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): 100.0
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 71.4

Affordable Housing Gap: Genola, 2011-2015

**Genola's Renter Households by Income Level**

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI) - 30 (47.6%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI) - 10 (15.9%)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI) - 8 (12.7%)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI) - 15 (23.8%)

**Genola's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households**

- Cost Burdened
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI) - 63.7%
  - Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI) - 40.0%
  - Low Income (50-80% HAMFI) - 50.0%
  - Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI) - 0.0%

- Severely Cost Burdened
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI) - 80.0%
  - Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI) - 0.0%
  - Low Income (50-80% HAMFI) - 0.0%
  - Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI) - 0.0%

**Comparison of Genola and Utah County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Genola</td>
<td>Utah County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>133.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>140.0</td>
<td>88.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>56.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Glendale, 2011-2015

Glendale's Renter Households by Income Level
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)

18
55.6%
4
22.2%
4
22.2%
0.0%

Glendale's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households
- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Comparison of Glendale and Kane County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glendale</td>
<td>Kane County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>178.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>190.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>152.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Glenwood, 2011-2015

Glenwood's Renter Households by Income Level

Glenwood's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

Comparison of Glenwood and Sevier County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

Glenwood's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

Glenwood's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

Glenwood's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

**Affordable Housing Gap: Goshen, 2011-2015**

**Goshen’s Renter Households by Income Level**

![Chart showing income levels and percentages]

**Goshen’s Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households**

![Chart showing cost burdened and severely cost burdened percentages]

**Goshen's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap**

![Bar chart showing available units per renter household]

**Comparison of Goshen and Utah County’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>GAP</th>
<th>Goshen Affordable Units</th>
<th>Utah County Affordable Units</th>
<th>Goshen Available Units</th>
<th>Utah County Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>≤80% HAMFI</td>
<td>161.1</td>
<td>133.4</td>
<td>111.1</td>
<td>93.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td>≤50% HAMFI</td>
<td>237.5</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income</td>
<td>≤30% HAMFI</td>
<td>375.0</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goshen’s Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters**

![Bar chart showing available units per 100 renters]

Affordable Housing Gap: Hatch, 2011-2015

Hatch's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMI)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMI)

Hatch's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Comparison of Hatch and Garfield County's Affordable & Available Rental housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMI LEVEL</th>
<th>Hatch</th>
<th>Garfield County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMI)</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>155.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMI)</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>202.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMI)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>200.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hatch's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Gap</th>
<th>Hatch</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMI)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMI)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMI)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hatch's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Gap</th>
<th>Available Units per 100</th>
<th>Affordable Units per 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMI)</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMI)</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMI)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Affordable Housing Gap: Henefer, 2011-2015**

**Henefer's Renter Households by Income Level**
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 15 (34.9%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 20 (46.5%)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 8 (18.6%)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI): 0

**Henefer's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households**
- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

**Comparison of Henefer and Summit County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Henefer</td>
<td>Summit County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>128.6</td>
<td>189.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>225.0</td>
<td>185.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>175.0</td>
<td>105.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Henefer's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap**
- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): Renter Households 35, Available Units 45
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): Renter Households 20, Available Units 45
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): Renter Households 20, Available Units 35

**Henefer's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters**
- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): Affordable Units 94.3, Available Units 128.6
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): Affordable Units 95.0, Available Units 225.0
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): Affordable Units 75.0, Available Units 175.0

Affordable Housing Gap: Henrieville, 2011-2015

Henrieville's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)

Henrieville's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Henrieville's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Rental Housing Deficit

Henrieville's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renters

Comparison of Henrieville and Garfield County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>155.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>202.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>200.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Hideout, 2011-2015

Hideout's Renter Households by Income Level
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)

Hideout's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households
- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Hideout's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap
- Renter Households
- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Hideout's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit
- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Hideout's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters
- Available Units per 100
- Affordable Units per 100

Comparison of Hideout and Wasatch County's Affordable & Available Rental housing units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>GAP</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hideout</td>
<td>Wasatch County</td>
<td>Hideout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>173.1</td>
<td>159.3</td>
<td>116.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Hinckley, 2011-2015

Comparison of Hinckley and Millard County’s Affordable & Available Rental housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hinckley</td>
<td>Millard County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>250.0</td>
<td>146.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>178.6</td>
<td>179.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>150.0</td>
<td>153.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Holden’s Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)

Holden’s Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Holden’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)

Holden’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Holden’s Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- Available Units per 100
- Affordable Units per 100

Comparison of Holden and Millard County’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holden</td>
<td>Millard County</td>
<td>Holden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td>146.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>350.0</td>
<td>179.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>153.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Howell, 2011-2015

Howell’s Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)

Howell’s Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households
- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Howell’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Renter Households
- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Howell’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

Howell’s Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

Comparison of Howell and Box Elder County’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

Affordable Housing Gap: Huntsville, 2011-2015

Huntsville's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI)

Huntsville's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Huntsville's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)

Huntsville's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Huntsville's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- Available Units per 100
- Affordable Units per 100

Comparison of Huntsville and Weber County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units Huntsville</th>
<th>Available Units Huntsville</th>
<th>Affordable Units Weber County</th>
<th>Available Units Weber County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>160.7</td>
<td>125.0</td>
<td>140.8</td>
<td>103.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>375.0</td>
<td>150.0</td>
<td>132.7</td>
<td>84.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>250.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Independence's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI)

Independence's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</th>
<th>Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)</th>
<th>Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)</th>
<th>Non-Low Income (&gt;80% HAMFI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparison of Independence and Wasatch County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>Wasatch County</td>
<td>Independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>159.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>71.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Joseph, 2011-2015

Joseph's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 10 (31.3%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 8 (25.0%)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 4 (12.5%)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI): 8 (25.0%)

Joseph's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Extreme Cost Burden: 40%
- Cost Burden: 60%

Comparison of Joseph and Sevier County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hamfi Level</th>
<th>Joseph Affordable Units</th>
<th>Sevier County Affordable Units</th>
<th>Joseph Available Units</th>
<th>Sevier County Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>145.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>106.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>158.6</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>94.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>56.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Affordable Housing Gap: Junction, 2011-2015**

### Junction's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 4, 22.2%
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 10, 55.6%
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 4, 22.2%
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI): 0, 0%

### Junction's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened: 175.0%
- Severely Cost Burdened: 0.0%

### Junction's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Junction</th>
<th>Piute County</th>
<th>Junction</th>
<th>Piute County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>135.7</td>
<td>183.3</td>
<td>128.6</td>
<td>67.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>190.0</td>
<td>158.0</td>
<td>140.0</td>
<td>49.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>175.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comparison of Junction and Piute County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): Junction 135.7, Piute County 183.3
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): Junction 190.0, Piute County 158.0
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): Junction 0.0, Piute County 175.0

### Source

Affordable Housing Gap: Kanarraville, 2011-2015

Kanarraville's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)

Kanarraville's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Kanarraville's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renters

Comparison of Kanarraville and Iron County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kanarraville</td>
<td>Iron County</td>
<td>Kanarraville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>116.7</td>
<td>141.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>125.0</td>
<td>134.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>90.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Affordable Housing Gap: Kanosh, 2011-2015

#### Kanosh's Renter Households by Income Level

- **Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)**: 10 (31.3%)
- **Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)**: 4 (12.5%)
- **Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)**: 8 (25.0%)
- **Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)**: 32

#### Kanosh's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- **Cost Burdened**: Kanosh: 40%, Millard County: 50%
- **Severely Cost Burdened**: Kanosh: 10%, Millard County: 20%

#### Kanosh's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- **Renter Households**: Kanosh: 24, Millard County: 18
- **Affordable Units**: Kanosh: 14, Millard County: 14
- **Available Units**: Kanosh: 10, Millard County: 4

#### Kanosh's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- **Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)**
  - Kanosh: -6, Millard County: -6
- **Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)**
  - Kanosh: 0, Millard County: -6
- **Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)**
  - Kanosh: -6, Millard County: -6

#### Kanosh's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- **Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)**
  - Kanosh: 75.0, Millard County: 75.0
- **Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)**
  - Kanosh: 57.1, Millard County: 100.0
- **Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)**
  - Kanosh: 40.0, Millard County: 40.0

Comparison of Kanosh and Millard County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units Kanosh</th>
<th>Available Units Kanosh</th>
<th>Affordable Units Millard County</th>
<th>Available Units Millard County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>146.2</td>
<td>106.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>179.8</td>
<td>98.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>153.2</td>
<td>83.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Kingston, 2011-2015

Kingston's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)

Kingston's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Kingston's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Renter Households
- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Kingston's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Kingston's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- Available Units per 100
- Affordable Units per 100

Comparison of Kingston and Piute County's Affordable & Available Rental housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kingston</td>
<td>Plute County</td>
<td>Kingston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>≤80% HAMFI</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>≤50% HAMFI</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely</td>
<td>≤30% HAMFI</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Koosharem, 2011-2015

Koosharem's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI)
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36.4%
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Koosharem's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Koosharem's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI Level</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Koosharem's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI Level</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Koosharem's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI Level</th>
<th>Affordable Units per 100</th>
<th>Available Units per 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>350.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>250.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparison of Koosharem and Sevier County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI Level</th>
<th>Koosharem</th>
<th>Sevier County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>145.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>350.0</td>
<td>158.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>250.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Laketown, 2011-2015

Laketown's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI) 4 (50.0%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI) 0 (0.0%)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI) 0 (0.0%)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI) 0 (0.0%)

Laketown's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Laketown's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Renter Households
- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Laketown's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Laketown's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renters

- Available Units per 100
- Affordable Units per 100

Comparison of Laketown and Rich County's Affordable & Available Rental housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laketown</td>
<td>Rich County</td>
<td>Laketown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>111.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>151.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>172.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Leamington, 2011-2015

Leamington's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI)

Leamington's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Comparison of Leamington and Millard County's Affordable & Available Rental housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>106.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>98.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>83.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Leeds, 2011-2015

Leeds's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)

Leeds's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Leeds's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80%)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50%)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30%)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Leeds's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80%)</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50%)</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30%)</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Leeds's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Available Units per 100</th>
<th>Affordable Units per 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80%)</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>89.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50%)</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>105.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30%)</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparison of Leeds and Washington County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80%)</td>
<td>Leeds: 89.7</td>
<td>Washington County: 143.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leeds: 76.9</td>
<td>Washington County: 94.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50%)</td>
<td>Leeds: 105.3</td>
<td>Washington County: 82.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leeds: 63.2</td>
<td>Washington County: 51.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30%)</td>
<td>Leeds: 66.7</td>
<td>Washington County: 65.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Levan, 2011-2015

Levan's Renter Households by Income Level
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI)

Levan's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households
- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Levan's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap
- Renter Households
- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Levan's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit
- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Levan's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters
- Available Units per 100
- Affordable Units per 100

Comparison of Levan and Juab County’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Levan</td>
<td>Juab County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>98.2</td>
<td>147.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>136.0</td>
<td>159.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>134.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Loa, 2011-2015

Loa’s Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)

Loa’s Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Loa’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Renter Households
- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Loa’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

Loa’s Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

Comparison of Loa and Wayne County’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loa</td>
<td>Wayne County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>168.0</td>
<td>162.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>152.0</td>
<td>300.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>162.7</td>
<td>170.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Lyman, 2011-2015

Lyman's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI)

Lyman's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Lyman's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Renter Households
- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Lyman's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

Lyman's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- Available Units per 100
- Affordable Units per 100

Comparison of Lyman and Wayne County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Lyman</th>
<th>Wayne County</th>
<th>Lyman</th>
<th>Wayne County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>126.3</td>
<td>162.4</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td>132.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>500.0</td>
<td>300.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>99.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>250.0</td>
<td>170.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Lynndyl, 2011-2015

Lynndyl's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)

Lynndyl's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Lynndyl's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renters

Comparison of Lynndyl and Millard County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Lynndyl</th>
<th>Millard County</th>
<th>Lynndyl</th>
<th>Millard County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income  (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>146.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>106.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>179.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>98.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>153.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>83.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lynndyl's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Renter Households
- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Lynndyl's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Affordable Housing Gap: Manila, 2011-2015

Manila's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI)

Manila's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Manila's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Renter Households
- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Manila's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Manila's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- Available Units per 100
- Affordable Units per 100

Comparison of Manila and Daggett County’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>Manila: 100.0</td>
<td>Daggett County: 155.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>Manila: 100.0</td>
<td>Daggett County: 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>Manila: 0.0</td>
<td>Daggett County: 100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Mantua, 2011-2015

Mantua's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI)

Mantua's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Comparison of Mantua and Box Elder County's Affordable & Available Rental housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units Mantua</th>
<th>Affordable Units Box Elder County</th>
<th>Available Units Mantua</th>
<th>Available Units Box Elder County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>225.0</td>
<td>149.1</td>
<td>150.0</td>
<td>109.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>350.0</td>
<td>199.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>102.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>250.0</td>
<td>102.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>56.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mantua's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Renter Households
- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Mantua's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Mantua's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- Available Units per 100
- Affordable Units per 100

Marysvale's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI)

Marysvale's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Comparison of Marysvale and Piute County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marysvale</td>
<td>Piute County</td>
<td>Marysvale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>133.3</td>
<td>183.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>158.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>175.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Mayfield, 2011-2015

Mayfield’s Renter Households by Income Level
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Mayfield</th>
<th>sanctioned County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Low Income</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mayfield’s Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households
- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Comparison of Mayfield and Sanpete County’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI Level</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80%)</td>
<td>117.2</td>
<td>139.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50%)</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>168.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30%)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>122.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≥80%)</td>
<td>110.3</td>
<td>117.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≥50%)</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>56.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≥30%)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Meadow, 2011-2015

Meadow's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI) 10.3%
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI) 25.6%
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI) 25%
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI) 64.1%

Meadow's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened 100%
- Severely Cost Burdened 100%

Comparison of Meadow and Millard County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>Meadow: 207.1</td>
<td>Millard County: 146.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meadow: 100.0</td>
<td>Millard County: 106.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>Meadow: 625.0</td>
<td>Millard County: 179.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meadow: 100.0</td>
<td>Millard County: 98.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>Meadow: 0.2</td>
<td>Millard County: 153.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meadow: 0.0</td>
<td>Millard County: 83.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Minersville, 2011-2015

Minersville's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 40 (54.8%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 4 (5.5%)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 25 (34.2%)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI): 4 (5.5%)

Minersville's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened: 40%
- Severely Cost Burdened: 10%

Minersville's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): 69 Available Units, 48 Affordable Units
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): 14 Available Units, 8 Affordable Units
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 4 Available Units, 4 Affordable Units

Minersville's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): 21 Available Units
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): 6 Available Units
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 0 Available Units

Minersville's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): 143.8 Affordable Units, 95.8 Available Units
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): 175.0 Affordable Units, 100.0 Available Units
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 100.0 Affordable Units, 100.0 Available Units

Comparison of Minersville and Beaver County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>Minersville</td>
<td>Beaver County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>143.8</td>
<td>145.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td>175.0</td>
<td>185.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>407.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


New Harmony's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 4 (33.3%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 0 (0.0%)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 4 (33.3%)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI): 4 (33.3%)

Total: 12

New Harmony's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened: 4 (33.3%)
- Severely Cost Burdened: 0 (0.0%)

New Harmony's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- Available Units per 100 Renters
  - Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): 150.0
  - Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): 100.0
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 100.0

- Affordable Units per 100 Renters
  - Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): 150.0
  - Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): 200.0
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 100.0

Comparison of New Harmony and Washington County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>New Harmony</th>
<th>Washington County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>150.0</td>
<td>143.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>200.0</td>
<td>82.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>65.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Newton, 2011-2015

Newton's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI)

Newton's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Comparison of Newton and Cache County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Newton</th>
<th>Cache County</th>
<th>Newton</th>
<th>Cache County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>137.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>101.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>134.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Oak City, 2011-2015

Oak City's Renter Households by Income Level
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
  - 10 (23.3%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
  - 4 (9.3%)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
  - 19 (44.2%)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI)
  - 10 (23.3%)

Oak City's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households
- Cost Burdened
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
    - 6 (14%)
  - Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
    - 0 (0%)
  - Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
    - 0 (0%)
  - Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI)
    - 0 (0%)
- Severely Cost Burdened
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
    - 2 (4.6%)

Comparison of Oak City and Millard County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI Level</th>
<th>Oak City</th>
<th>Millard County</th>
<th>GAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>183.3</td>
<td>146.2</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>285.7</td>
<td>179.8</td>
<td>105.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>150.0</td>
<td>153.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Ophir, 2011-2015

Ophir's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)

0.0%

Ophir's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Ophir's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Ophir's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- Available Units per 100
- Affordable Units per 100

Comparison of Ophir and Tooele County's Affordable & Available Rental housing Units per 100 Renter Households

- GAP HAMFI LEVEL
- Affordable Units
- Available Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units Ophir</th>
<th>Available Units Ophir</th>
<th>Affordable Units Tooele County</th>
<th>Available Units Tooele County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>182.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>117.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>145.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>89.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Orderville, 2011-2015

Orderville's Renter Households by Income Level

- **Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)**: 35 (61.4%)
- **Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)**: 14 (24.6%)
- **Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)**: 4 (7.0%)
- **Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)**: 4 (7.0%)

Orderville's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- **Cost Burdened**
  - **Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)**: 100%
  - **Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)**: 0%
  - **Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)**: 0%
  - **Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)**: 0%

- **Severely Cost Burdened**
  - **Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)**: 100%
  - **Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)**: 0%
  - **Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)**: 0%
  - **Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)**: 0%

Orderville’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- **Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)**
  - Affordable Units: 43
  - Available Units: 54
- **Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)**
  - Affordable Units: 8
  - Available Units: 50
- **Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)**
  - Affordable Units: 4
  - Available Units: 0

Orderville’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- **Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)**
  - Affordable Units: 11
  - Available Units: -1
- **Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)**
  - Affordable Units: 0
  - Available Units: 42
- **Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)**
  - Affordable Units: 0
  - Available Units: -4

Orderville’s Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- **Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)**
  - Available Units per 100: 97.7
  - Affordable Units per 100: 125.6
- **Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)**
  - Affordable Units per 100: 100.0
  - Available Units per 100: 625.0
- **Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)**
  - Available Units per 100: 0.0
  - Affordable Units per 100: 0.0

Comparison of Orderville and Kane County’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orderville</td>
<td>Kane County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>125.6</td>
<td>178.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>625.0</td>
<td>190.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>152.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Paradise, 2011-2015

Paradise's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 4 (15.4%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 10 (38.5%)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 8 (30.8%)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI): 4 (15.4%)

Paradise's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 4 (40%)
  - Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 10 (100%)
  - Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 8 (100%)
  - Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI): 4 (40%)

- Severely Cost Burdened
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 4 (40%)
  - Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 10 (100%)
  - Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 8 (100%)
  - Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI): 4 (40%)

Paradise's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)
  - Affordable Units: 18
  - Available Units: 25
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)
  - Affordable Units: 8
  - Available Units: 10
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
  - Affordable Units: 4
  - Available Units: 10

Paradise's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)
  - Affordable Units: 7
  - Available Units: 4
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)
  - Affordable Units: 2
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
  - Affordable Units: 6
  - Available Units: 0

Paradise’s Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)
  - Affordable Units per 100: 122.2
  - Available Units per 100: 138.9
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)
  - Affordable Units per 100: 50.0
  - Available Units per 100: 125.0
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
  - Affordable Units per 100: 100.0
  - Available Units per 100: 250.0

Comparison of Paradise and Cache County's Affordable & Available Rental housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>Paradise: 138.9</td>
<td>Cache County: 137.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>Paradise: 125.0</td>
<td>Cache County: 134.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>Paradise: 250.0</td>
<td>Cache County: 57.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Affordable Housing Gap: Paragonah, 2011-2015**

### Paragonah's Renter Households by Income Level

- **Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)**: 15 (30.0%)
- **Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)**: 10 (20.0%)
- **Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)**: 15 (30.0%)
- **Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)**: 10 (20.0%)

### Paragonah's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- **Cost Burdened**
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 15.0%
  - Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 0.0%
  - Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 0.0%
  - Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI): 0.0%
- **Severely Cost Burdened**
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 25.0%
  - Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 0.0%
  - Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 0.0%
  - Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI): 0.0%

### Comparison of Paragonah and Iron County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paragonah</td>
<td>Iron County</td>
<td>Paragonah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income  (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>108.6</td>
<td>141.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>170.0</td>
<td>134.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>90.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Paragonah's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- **Available Units per 100 Renters**
  - Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): 68.6
  - Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): 60.0
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 0.0
- **Affordable Units per 100 Renters**
  - Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): 108.6
  - Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): 170.0
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 40.0

### Affordable Housing Gap: Portage, 2011-2015

#### Portage's Renter Households by Income Level

- **Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)**: 4 units (25.0%)
- **Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)**: 4 units (25.0%)
- **Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)**: 4 units (25.0%)
- **Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI)**: 4 units (25.0%)

#### Portage's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- **Cost Burdened**
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 100.0%
  - Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 100.0%
  - Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 100.0%
  - Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI): 100.0%

- **Severely Cost Burdened**
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 100.0%
  - Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 100.0%
  - Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 100.0%
  - Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI): 100.0%

#### Portage's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- **Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)**: 12 Available Units
- **Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)**: 8 Available Units
- **Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)**: 4 Available Units

#### Portage's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- **Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)**: 100.0 Available Units per 100
- **Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)**: 100.0 Available Units per 100
- **Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)**: 100.0 Available Units per 100

#### Comparison of Portage and Box Elder County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portage</td>
<td>Box Elder County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>149.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>199.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>102.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Affordable Housing Gap: Randolph, 2011-2015**

**Randolph's Renter Households by Income Level**
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI)

**Randolph's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households**
- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

**Comparison of Randolph and Rich County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>Randolph: 108.7</td>
<td>Rich County: 111.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>Randolph: 312.5</td>
<td>Rich County: 151.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>Randolph: 250.0</td>
<td>Rich County: 172.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Redmond's Affordable & Available
### Rental Housing Deficit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Redmond's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Available Units per 100</th>
<th>Affordable Units per 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comparison of Redmond and Sevier County’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Redmond</th>
<th>Sevier County</th>
<th>Redmond</th>
<th>Sevier County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>145.7</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>106.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>158.6</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>94.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>56.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Affordable Housing Gap: Rockville, 2011-2015

Rockville's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)

Rockville's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Comparison of Rockville and Washington County's Affordable & Available Rental housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>171.4</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Affordable Housing Gap: Rocky Ridge, 2011-2015**

### Rocky Ridge's Renter Households by Income Level

- **Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)**: 15 (28.3%)
- **Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)**: 15 (28.3%)
- **Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)**: 8 (15.1%)
- **Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)**: 53

### Rocky Ridge's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- **Cost Burdened**: 26.7%
- **Severely Cost Burdened**: 53.3%

### Comparison of Rocky Ridge and Juab County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>Rocky Ridge: 131.1</td>
<td>Juab County: 147.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rocky Ridge: 88.9</td>
<td>Juab County: 103.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td>Rocky Ridge: 183.3</td>
<td>Juab County: 159.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rocky Ridge: 73.3</td>
<td>Juab County: 94.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income</td>
<td>Rocky Ridge: 266.7</td>
<td>Juab County: 134.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rocky Ridge: 66.7</td>
<td>Juab County: 46.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Rocky Ridge's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- **Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)**:
  - Affordable Units: 45 |
  - Available Units: 59
- **Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)**:
  - Affordable Units: 30 |
  - Available Units: 55
- **Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)**:
  - Affordable Units: 15 |
  - Available Units: 40

### Rocky Ridge's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- **Affordable Units**: 14
- **Available Units**: 25
- **Affordable Units**: 25
- **Available Units**: 25
- **Affordable Units**: 5
- **Available Units**: 25

### Rocky Ridge's Renter Households by Income Level

- **Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)**: 26.7%
- **Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)**: 28.3%
- **Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)**: 28.3%
- **Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)**: 23.1%

### Source:

Affordable Housing Gap: Rush Valley, 2011-2015

Rush Valley's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI)

Rush Valley's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Rush Valley's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Rush Valley</th>
<th>Tooele County</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
<th>Rush Valley</th>
<th>Tooele County</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>225.0</td>
<td>182.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>117.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>350.0</td>
<td>145.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>89.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>250.0</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rush Valley's Renter Households by Income Level

- 222 total
- 14 (6.3%) Extremely Low Income
- 4 (1.8%) Very Low Income
- 4 (1.8%) Low Income
- 0 (0.0%) Non-Low Income

Rush Valley's Renter Households by Income Level

- 0.0% Extremely Low Income
- 0.0% Very Low Income
- 0.0% Low Income
- 0.0% Non-Low Income

Comparison of Rush Valley and Tooele County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

Rush Valley's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Available Units per 100</th>
<th>Affordable Units per 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>225.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>350.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>250.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Scofield, 2011-2015

Comparison of Scofield and Carbon County’s Affordable & Available Rental housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Scofield</th>
<th>Carbon County</th>
<th>Scofield</th>
<th>Carbon County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>158.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>111.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>156.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>106.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>110.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>72.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Sigurd, 2011-2015

Sigurd's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Sigurd</th>
<th>Sevier County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Low Income</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sigurd's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Sigurd</th>
<th>Sevier County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Low Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparison of Sigurd and Sevier County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>Sigurd 188.9</td>
<td>Sevier County 145.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>Sigurd 214.3</td>
<td>Sevier County 158.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>Sigurd 100.0</td>
<td>Sevier County 100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sigurd's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sigurd's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sigurd's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units per 100</th>
<th>Available Units per 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>122.2</td>
<td>188.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>128.6</td>
<td>214.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Snowville, 2011-2015

Snowville's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 0.0%
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 50.0%
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 4%
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI): 0%

Snowville's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened: 0%
- Severely Cost Burdened: 0%

Comparison of Snowville and Box Elder County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>150.0</td>
<td>150.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>200.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>149.1</td>
<td>109.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>199.0</td>
<td>102.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Low Income (&gt;80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>102.7</td>
<td>56.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Springdale's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI) - 49 (55.7%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI) - 20 (22.7%)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI) - 15 (17.0%)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI) - 4 (4.5%)
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Springdale's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened - 100.0%
- Severely Cost Burdened - 93.3%

Comparison of Springdale and Washington County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Springdale</td>
<td>Washington County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>192.3</td>
<td>143.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>236.8</td>
<td>82.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>250.0</td>
<td>65.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Springdale's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI) - 39 | 42 | 75
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI) - 19 | 45 | 12
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI) - 4 | 10 | 4

Springdale's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Affordable Units - 36
- Available Units - 26

Springdale's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- Available Units per 100 - 107.7
- Affordable Units per 100 - 192.3

- Available Units per 100 - 63.2
- Affordable Units per 100 - 236.8

- Available Units per 100 - 100.0
- Affordable Units per 100 - 250.0

Affordable Housing Gap: Sterling, 2011-2015

Sterling's Renter Households by Income Level
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)

4 100.0%

Sterling's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households
- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Sterling's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap
- Renter Households
- Affordable Units
- Available Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hamfi Level</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income  (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sterling's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

Sterling's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters
- Available Units per 100
- Affordable Units per 100

Comparison of Sterling and Sanpete County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

Affordable Housing Gap: Stockton, 2011-2015

Stockton’s Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI) 35 (54.7%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI) 15 (23.4%)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI) 10 (15.6%)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI) 4 (6.3%)
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Stockton’s Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened 60%
- Severely Cost Burdened 40%

Comparison of Stockton and Tooele County’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hamfi Level</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stockton</td>
<td>Tooele County</td>
<td>Stockton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>206.9</td>
<td>182.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>214.3</td>
<td>145.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>375.0</td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tabiona's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 4 (33.3%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): -
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 4 (33.3%)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI): 4 (33.3%)

Total: 12

Tabiona's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened: 0.0%
- Severely Cost Burdened: 0.0%

Comparison of Tabiona and Duchesne County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units Tabiona</th>
<th>Available Units Tabiona</th>
<th>Affordable Units Duchesne County</th>
<th>Available Units Duchesne County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>180.4</td>
<td>107.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>168.0</td>
<td>82.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>102.7</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Affordable Housing Gap: Torrey, 2011-2015**

**Torrey's Renter Households by Income Level**

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI)

**Torrey's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap**

- Renter Households
- Affordable Units
- Available Units

- Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)
  - Torrey: 23
  - Wayne County: 18
- Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)
  - Torrey: 8
  - Wayne County: 14
- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
  - Torrey: 4
  - Wayne County: 14

**Torrey's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households**

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

**Comparison of Torrey and Wayne County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>Torrey: 78.3, Wayne County: 162.4</td>
<td>Torrey: 69.6, Wayne County: 132.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>Torrey: 175.0, Wayne County: 300.0</td>
<td>Torrey: 50.0, Wayne County: 99.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>Torrey: 100.0, Wayne County: 170.0</td>
<td>Torrey: 0.0, Wayne County: 50.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Affordable Housing Gap: Trenton, 2011-2015

#### Trenton's Renter Households by Income Level

- **Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)**: 4 (25.0%)
- **Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)**: 4 (25.0%)
- **Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)**: 4 (25.0%)
- **Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)**: 4 (25.0%)

#### Trenton's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- **Cost Burdened**: 4 (25.0%)
- **Severely Cost Burdened**: 0

#### Comparison of Trenton and Cache County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Trenton</th>
<th>Cache County</th>
<th>Trenton</th>
<th>Cache County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80%)</td>
<td>150.0</td>
<td>137.5</td>
<td>133.3</td>
<td>101.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td>175.0</td>
<td>134.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income</td>
<td>250.0</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Trenton's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Renter Households</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80%)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Trenton's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80%)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Trenton's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Available Units per 100</th>
<th>Affordable Units per 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80%)</td>
<td>133.3</td>
<td>150.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>175.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>250.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Affordable Housing Gap: Tropic, 2011-2015**

### Tropic's Renter Households by Income Level

- **Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)**: 25 (47.2%)
- **Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)**: 4 (7.5%)
- **Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)**: 14 (26.4%)
- **Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)**: 10 (18.9%)

Total: 53

---

### Tropic's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- **Cost Burdened**: 40.0%
- **Severely Cost Burdened**: 6.0%

Comparison of Tropic and Garfield County's Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Tropic</th>
<th>Garfield County</th>
<th>Tropic</th>
<th>Garfield County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>125.6</td>
<td>155.8</td>
<td>112.8</td>
<td>120.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>128.6</td>
<td>202.9</td>
<td>91.4</td>
<td>114.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>250.0</td>
<td>200.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tropic's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Tropic</th>
<th>Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tropic's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- **Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)**: -5
- **Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)**: -3
- **Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)**: -6

### Tropic's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Available Units per 100</th>
<th>Affordable Units per 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>112.8</td>
<td>125.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>91.4</td>
<td>128.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>250.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Uintah, 2011-2015

 Uintah’s Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI)

Uintah’s Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Comparison of Uintah and Weber County’s Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uintah</td>
<td>Weber County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>270.8</td>
<td>140.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>1000.0</td>
<td>132.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>375.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Uintah’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Renter Households
- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Uintah’s Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Uintah’s Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- Available Units per 100
- Affordable Units per 100

Affordable Housing Gap: Vineyard, 2011-2015

Vineyard's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 15 (65.2%)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI): 4 (17.4%)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI): 0 (0.0%)
- Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI): 4 (17.4%)

Vineyard's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened: 25%
- Severely Cost Burdened: 4%

Comparison of Vineyard and Utah County's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units Vineyard</th>
<th>Available Units Vineyard</th>
<th>Affordable Units Utah County</th>
<th>Available Units Utah County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>121.1</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td>133.4</td>
<td>93.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>375.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vineyard's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- Available Units per 100
  - Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): 94.7
  - Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): 73.7
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 0.0

- Affordable Units per 100
  - Low Income (≤80% HAMFI): 121.1
  - Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI): 100.0
  - Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI): 375.0

**Affordable Housing Gap: Virgin, 2011-2015**

### Virgin's Renter Households by Income Level

- **Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)**: 4 (9.5%)
- **Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)**: 19 (45.2%)
- **Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)**: 15 (35.7%)
- **Non-Low Income (≥80% HAMFI)**: 4 (9.5%)

### Virgin's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- **Cost Burdened**: 100%
- **Severely Cost Burdened**: 100%

### Virgin's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hamfi Level</th>
<th>Virgin Available Units</th>
<th>Washington County Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Virgin's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hamfi Level</th>
<th>Virgin Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>-15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Virgin's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hamfi Level</th>
<th>Affordable Units per 100</th>
<th>Available Units per 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>134.8</td>
<td>147.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>126.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Affordable Housing Gap: Wales, 2011-2015**

**Wales's Renter Households by Income Level**

- Extremly Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI)

**Wales's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households**

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

**Wales's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap**

- Renter Households
- Affordable Units
- Available Units

**Wales's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit**

- Affordable Units
- Available Units

**Wales's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters**

- Available Units per 100
- Affordable Units per 100

---

Comparison of Wales and Sanpete County's Affordable & Available Rental housing units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Wales</th>
<th>Sanpete County</th>
<th>Wales</th>
<th>Sanpete County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income  (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>139.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>105.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>168.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>91.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>122.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Wallsburg, 2011-2015

Comparison of Wallsburg and Wasatch County's Affordable & Available Rental housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wallsburg</td>
<td>Wasatch County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>159.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>71.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable Housing Gap: Woodruff, 2011-2015

Woodruff's Renter Households by Income Level

- Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)
- Very Low Income (30-50% HAMFI)
- Low Income (50-80% HAMFI)
- Non-Low Income (>80% HAMFI)

Woodruff's Proportion of Cost Burdened Renter Households

- Cost Burdened
- Severely Cost Burdened

Comparison of Woodruff and Rich County's Affordable & Available Rental housing Units per 100 Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP HAMFI LEVEL</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Available Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (≤80% HAMFI)</td>
<td>Woodruff</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>Rich County</td>
<td>111.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Woodruff</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>Rich County</td>
<td>107.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% HAMFI)</td>
<td>Woodruff</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>Rich County</td>
<td>151.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Woodruff</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>Rich County</td>
<td>99.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (≤30% HAMFI)</td>
<td>Woodruff</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Rich County</td>
<td>172.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Woodruff</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Rich County</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Woodruff's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Gap

- Renter Households
- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Woodruff's Affordable & Available Rental Housing Deficit

- Affordable Units
- Available Units

Woodruff's Rate of Affordable & Available Rental Units per 100 Renters

- Available Units per 100
- Affordable Units per 100
