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Roadmap

• Introduction, data, and methods
• Defining rural areas
• Mapping rural areas
• Key findings
  – Size of the rural housing market
  – Race/ethnicity
  – Demographics
  – Rural housing stock
• Future work and conclusions
• Researching housing challenges and characteristics in rural areas is often complicated by the lack of “good data”

• Researchers often define rural based on practical considerations like data availability and geography

• We hope to show: the choice of rural definition matters significantly and requires careful consideration
Data and Methods

- Replicate common definitions of rural at the county, zip code, census tract, and urban area/cluster geographies
- Use 2019 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates to show how population, housing unit, and household counts, as well as other common housing, demographic, and economic characteristics vary depending on the rural definition used
  - What do these different definitions of rural tell us about the size of the rural housing market?
  - What do they tell us about the scope and extent of rural housing, demographic, and economic challenges and realities?
Common Ways to Define Rural

- “Not urban”
- Population
- Housing and population density
- Accessibility to cities and economic interdependence
- Commuting times and adjacency
- Perceptions
- Typologies of rural
Four Categories

- Residual
- Character
- Perceptual
- Policy
Rural Definitions

• Residual
  – Office of Management and Budget (OMB)
  – Census Urban and Rural Classification (Census)

• Character
  – Housing Assistance Council (HAC)
  – USDA Rural-Urban Commuting Area (RUCA)
  – USDA Rural-Urban Continuum Codes (RUCC)

• Perceptual
  – HUD Urban Perceptions Small Area Index (HUD)
  – Trulia Perception-Based Indicator (Trulia)

• Policy
  – USDA Eligibility (USDA)
  – FHFA Duty to Serve (FHFA)
## Rural Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Updates</th>
<th>Geo.</th>
<th>Defining Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OMB</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Periodic</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Define MSAs that have at least one urbanized area of 50,000 people or more and adjacent territory with a high degree of integration. Everything else is categorized as non-metropolitan, a common proxy for rural.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Decennial</td>
<td>UA/UC</td>
<td>Define UAs and UCs by population density and adjacency. Everything else is categorized as rural.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAC</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>One-time</td>
<td>Tract</td>
<td>Under 16 housing units per square mile; small-town tracts also have a commuting component</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUCA</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Decennial</td>
<td>Tract</td>
<td>Primary commuting flows to a tract outside an UA or UC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUCC</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Decennial</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>In non-metro counties, an urban population with under 2,500 people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUD</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>One-time</td>
<td>Tract</td>
<td>AHS (2017) asked respondents to define their neighborhood as urban, suburban, or rural; neighborhood characteristics associated with these perceptions were then used to predict the likelihood any given tract would be seen as rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trulia</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>One-time</td>
<td>Zip</td>
<td>Trulia asked respondents to define their neighborhood as urban, suburban, or rural; neighborhood characteristics associated with these perceptions were then used to predict the likelihood of any given tract would be seen as rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHFA</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Tract</td>
<td>All tracts outside MSAs; tracts within MSAs that are outside a UA and have under 64 housing units per square mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDA</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Tract</td>
<td>Determined by population, MSA status, mortgage credit availability, and previous rural designation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Residual

OMB

Census
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Key Findings

• Choice of rural definition matters greatly for the size of the rural housing market
• For the most part, rural challenges are directionally similar regardless of definition used
  – But even then, magnitudes can still vary considerably
• In other cases, choice of definition matters directionally for rural challenges and realities
## Size of the Rural Housing Market

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Residual</th>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Perceptual</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OMB</td>
<td>Census</td>
<td>HAC</td>
<td>RUCA</td>
<td>RUCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Millions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Area (Sq. miles)</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per Sq. Mile</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Density</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Unit Density</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Household Counts Vary Considerably by Definition

Households (Millions)
The Share of the Population Who Are People of Color Varies Considerably…

Share People of Color (Percent)

- AIAN
- Black
- Hispanic
- Asian
- All Other Races
... But in All Cases, Rural Areas are Less Diverse than the Country Overall

Share People of Color (Percent)
## Rural Demographic Realities

### Residual Character Perceptual Policy Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OMB</th>
<th>Census</th>
<th>HAC</th>
<th>RUCA</th>
<th>RUCC</th>
<th>HUD</th>
<th>Trulia</th>
<th>FHFA</th>
<th>USDA</th>
<th>US Overall</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Avg</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 65 and Older</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Rate</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dollars</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income</td>
<td>47,400</td>
<td>52,905</td>
<td>50,549</td>
<td>46,052</td>
<td>57,717</td>
<td>53,350</td>
<td>52,675</td>
<td>57,668</td>
<td>61,705</td>
<td>46,052</td>
<td>57,717</td>
<td>52,290</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Depending on Rural Definition, Poverty Rates Can Be Either Below or Above the Overall US Rate

Poverty Rate (Percent)

- Census
- HUD
- USDA
- Trulia
- HAC
- FHFA
- RUCA
- OMB
- RUCC
- US Total
## Rural Housing Stock

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Residual</th>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Perceptual</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OMB</td>
<td>Census</td>
<td>HAC</td>
<td>RUCA</td>
<td>RUCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeownership Rate</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>81.6</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>76.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share Single-Family Units</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>76.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share Mobile Homes</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share Structures Built Before 1990</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>67.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share without Internet Access</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dollars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Home Value</td>
<td>113,400</td>
<td>127,000</td>
<td>124,000</td>
<td>106,700</td>
<td>156,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Gross Rent</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>773</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Homeownership Rates Vary Considerably with Rural Definition, but are All Above the National Rate
Extent of Older Housing Varies Considerably Depending on Rural Definition Chosen

Share of Housing Units Built Before 1990 (Percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Share (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Census</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUD</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDA</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trulia</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAC</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHFA</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUCC</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMB</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUCA</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Total</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Areas of future inquiry
  – Housing costs/affordability
  – Racial equity
  – Commuting times
  – Measures of spatial isolation

• Regional and state differences

• Further explore commonalities and differences across measures

• Policy implications
Preliminary Conclusions

• No single definition of rural is “correct,” but choice matters significantly.

• For the most part, key rural challenges are directionally similar regardless of definition used but even then magnitudes can vary greatly. However, this isn’t always the case either.

• Perceptual definitions tend to be more broadly encompassing; use of narrower definitions might seem exclusionary as a result.

• Defining rural has implications for how resources are distributed and our understanding of the severity of rural housing challenges.
Thank You
Concentrated Poverty in the Rural Southeast

Keith Wiley
Housing Assistance Council
...concentrated poverty exacts a grave day-to-day toll on the people who continue to live in its midst and threatens to perpetuate disadvantage across generations.

Quote from page vii of 2008 Brookings Institute/Federal Reserve Bank joint report entitled “The Enduring Challenge of Concentrated Poverty in America. Case Studies from Communities Across the US.”
Persistent Poverty Counties

- Total – 353
- Outside metropolitan area – 298 (84%)
- High need regions – 213 (60%)
- Southeast Crescent – 83 (24%)
Background

- Research defines as the Black Belt, counties in the South (Virginia to Texas), with an above average percent Black or African American population.

- In 2000 Congress authorized the Delta Regional Authority (Lower Mississippi Delta Region).

- In 2008 Congress created the Southeast Crescent Regional Commission.

- The Southeast Crescent region includes counties in Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Virginia.
Black Belt Region

- Total – 592
- Persistent Poverty – 189 (32%)
- Lower Mississippi Delta – 150 (25%)
- Entire Appalachia Region – 54 (9%)
- Central Appalachia Region – 5 (1%)
Defining High Poverty Southeast

- Use framework from Southeast Crescent Regional Commission
  - Seven state region of Southeast
  - Exclude counties already part of the Appalachian Regional Commission or Delta Authority service area

- Focus on rural geography and high poverty areas
  - Use census tract geography
  - Rurality measured based on housing unit density and commuting patterns
  - High poverty defined as census tracts with poverty rates of 20% or more
High Poverty Southeast

Source: High poverty census tracts refers to census tracts with a poverty estimate of 20% or more. The HAC rural geography classification defines rural census tracts. See the following report (pages 112-113) for a detailed description: http://ruralhome.org/storage/documents/2015/rr_full_report.pdf
Poverty Rates

Poverty in High Need Regions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>% Rural Population</th>
<th>% Population in Poverty</th>
<th>Percent Living in High Poverty Census Tracts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower Mississippi Delta</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>Black or African American 33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Appalachia</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
<td>Hispanic 35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Crescent</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>White non-Hispanic 34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other Areas</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author American Community Survey (ACS) 2019 5-Year estimates.

Poverty Rates Rural Southeast Crescent Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>% Population in Poverty</th>
<th>% Rural Population</th>
<th>Percent Living in High Poverty Census Tracts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>Black or African American 29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>Hispanic 35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>White non-Hispanic 34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author tabulation of American Community Survey (ACS) 2019 5-Year estimate.
Housing Characteristics

Homeownership in High Poverty Rural Census Tracts, Southeast Crescent Region

Non-White non-Hispanic Share of Manufactured Housing in the Rural Southeast Crescent

Source: Author tabulation of American Community Survey (ACS) 2019 5-Year estimates.

Source: Author tabulation of American Community Survey (ACS) 2019 5-Year estimates
Housing Characteristics

**Hispanic/Latino Crowded Households, Rural Southeast Crescent Region**

- Alabama: 6% (Rural Not High Poverty), 9% (Rural High Poverty)
- Florida: 9% (Rural Not High Poverty), 7% (Rural High Poverty)
- Georgia: 9% (Rural Not High Poverty), 6% (Rural High Poverty)
- Mississippi: 11% (Rural Not High Poverty), 14% (Rural High Poverty)
- North Carolina: 7% (Rural Not High Poverty), 9% (Rural High Poverty)
- South Carolina: 14% (Rural Not High Poverty), 14% (Rural High Poverty)
- Virginia: 6% (Rural Not High Poverty), 9% (Rural High Poverty)

Source: Author tabulation of American Community Survey (ACS) 2019 5-Year estimates

**Access to Computer and Broadband Subscription, High Poverty Rural Southeast Crescent Region**

- Alabama: 65% (Black or African American), 61% (Hispanic), 58% (White non-Hispanic)
- Florida: 78% (Black or African American), 75% (Hispanic), 73% (White non-Hispanic)
- Georgia: 61% (Black or African American), 64% (Hispanic), 62% (White non-Hispanic)
- Mississippi: 69% (Black or African American), 63% (Hispanic), 63% (White non-Hispanic)
- North Carolina: 64% (Black or African American), 64% (Hispanic), 61% (White non-Hispanic)
- South Carolina: 66% (Black or African American), 64% (Hispanic), 61% (White non-Hispanic)
- Virginia: 66% (Black or African American), 64% (Hispanic), 64% (White non-Hispanic)

Source: Author tabulation of American Community Survey (ACS) 2019 5-Year estimate.
Housing Characteristics

Homes by Select Year Built, Southeast Crescent Region

- Built 2010 or Later: 31%
- Built Before 1970: 4%
- 7% Occupied Homes
- 10% Occupied Rural High Poverty Southeast Crescent Region

Source: Author tabulation American Community Survey (ACS) 2019, 5-Year estimates.

HMDA 2020 Home Purchase Lending, Rural Southeast Crescent

- Obligations Per 1,000 Owner-Occupied Units
- Alabama: 35
- Florida: 43
- Georgia: 47
- Mississippi: 33
- North Carolina: 32
- South Carolina: 17
- Virginia: 18
- Not High Poverty
- High Poverty
- High Poverty Black or African American

Source: Author tabulation Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA) calendar year 2020 home purchase first lien loan originations.
Southeast Region Commission

- Commission has been inactive since its creation – no federal co-chair appointed
- Calls to activate the commission
- President Biden has nominated a federal co-chair
Thank You
Household Financial Profiles

Lower Rio Grande Valley Colonias and Rural Areas

Zoraima Diaz-Pineda
cdcb | come dream. come build.
# Demographic Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Metro</th>
<th>Colonia/Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 30</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 60</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Size</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Financial Pulse

### Area Media Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>CoRu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 80%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 50%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Household Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>CoRu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Annual HH</td>
<td>$37,714</td>
<td>$30,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Annual HH MP</td>
<td>$33,149</td>
<td>$27,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP &lt; Poverty Line</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Financial Immune System

No Savings

< $3,000

Avg. Savings

50%  52%  70%  74%  $2,189  $1,702
Financial Cholesterol

Debt to Income Ratio

28% 21%

DTI > 13%

70% 56%

Avg. Monthly Debt Payments

$628 $489
Financial Blood Sugar

Credit Challenged
57% Metro
67% CoRu

Credit Invisible
4% Metro
9% CoRu
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accounts Past Due</th>
<th>More than 3 Past Due</th>
<th>AFSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>59%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Client Cohorts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohorts</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elderly</td>
<td>Elderly, low-income, low assets, middle school education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep Debtors</td>
<td>Low income, high DTI and negative net worth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Income</td>
<td>Low-income, low net-worth, lower debt, SSI/SSDI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Earners</td>
<td>Higher Income, low assets and net worth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savers</td>
<td>Middle income, higher savings, total assets and net worth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cycle of Chronic Financial Illness

- Limited Employer Benefits
- Financial Literacy Education
- Family Friends Finances
- Low Wages & Fixed Income
- Financial Desert
- Credit Challenged
- Liquid Asset Poverty Rate
- High Income Volatility

F3:
- Liquid Asset Poverty Rate
- Credit Challenged
- Financial Desert
- Low Wages & Fixed Income
- Family Friends Finances
- Financial Literacy Education
- Limited Employer Benefits
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Quantifying Dreams

- **Debt to Income Ratio**: 5%
- **Credit Score**: 82
- **Monthly Debt Payments**: $106
- **Savings**: $4,898
- **Family**: 10.7
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Existing Housing Stock

Photo Credit: Brenda Bazán
Existing Housing Stock

Photo Credit: Brenda Bazán
MiCasita
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bc Workshop
Community Capital

FINANCIALLY UNHEALTHY HOUSEHOLDS

CAUGHT IN A CYCLE OF CHRONIC FINANCIAL ILLNESS

OPERATE OUTSIDE THE FINANCIAL MAINSTREAM

HOPEFUL PERSISTENT ENTRPRENUERIAL RESOURCEFUL CREATIVE RESILIENT
p3: people, policy, power
Thank You

diaz@cdcb.org
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Senior Research Analyst, Joint Center for Housing Studies, Harvard University

Alexander Hermann is a senior research analyst, working on projects related to housing markets, demographics, and housing policy. Prior to joining the Center, he worked as a grant writer at a Detroit nonprofit providing housing and treatment services to homeless populations. Alex received a master’s in Public Policy and a master’s in Urban Planning from the University of Michigan.
KEITH WILEY

Research Associate, Housing Assistance Council

Keith Wiley is a research associate at the Housing Assistance Council. He specializes in data management and analysis, particularly working with large datasets. His areas of interest include rural housing and development, federal housing and financial oversight policies, smart growth planning and policies, and environmental economics. Keith holds a Ph.D. in Public Policy from the University of Maryland, Baltimore County and a master of Public Policy degree from American University.
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