

728.1
:308
F22
Dallas,
Tex.
1970
c.2

Analysis of the
DALLAS, TEXAS
HOUSING MARKET

as of March 1, 1970

A Report by the
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT
FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20411

September 1970

FHA Housing Market Analysis
Dallas, Texas, as of March 1, 1970

Foreword

This analysis has been prepared for the assistance and guidance of the Federal Housing Administration in its operations. The factual information, findings, and conclusions may be useful also to builders, mortgagees, and others concerned with local housing problems and trends. The analysis does not purport to make determinations with respect to the acceptability of any particular mortgage insurance proposals that may be under consideration in the subject locality.

The factual framework for this analysis was developed by the Economic and Market Analysis Division as thoroughly as possible on the basis of information available on the "as of" date from both local and national sources. Of course, estimates and judgments made on the basis of information available on the "as of" date may be modified considerably by subsequent market developments.

The prospective demand or occupancy potentials expressed in the analysis are based upon an evaluation of the factors available on the "as of" date. They cannot be construed as forecasts of building activity; rather, they express the prospective housing production which would maintain a reasonable balance in demand-supply relationships under conditions analyzed for the "as of" date.

Department of Housing and Urban Development
Federal Housing Administration
Economic and Market Analysis Division
Washington, D. C.

FHA HOUSING MARKET ANALYSIS - DALLAS, TEXAS
AS OF MARCH 1, 1970

The Dallas, Texas, Housing Market Area (HMA) is defined as being coterminous with the present Dallas Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area and includes the counties of Dallas, Collin, Denton, Ellis, Kaufman, and Rockwall. The Dallas HMA represents the eastern half of a large population concentration located in and around the cities of Dallas and Fort Worth. Although the Dallas and Fort Worth areas rapidly are becoming an integrated economic region, they still constitute separate housing markets. As of March 1, 1970, there were 1,662,800 persons in the Dallas HMA, 907,600 of whom resided in the city of Dallas.

Employment, population, and the housing inventory have increased substantially over the past ten years. The rate of demographic growth was slightly higher than that of new home construction, however, and housing vacancies declined. Economic gains over the next two years are expected to be below the growth rate since 1967; as a result, the annual demand for housing is not expected to reach the levels of the past two years.

Demand for Housing

The demand for new, nonsubsidized housing in the Dallas, Texas, HMA is based upon the projected increase in the number of households, the anticipated volume of residential demolitions, the current levels of sales and rental vacancies, and the number of units under construction. Barring unanticipated changes in the economic, demographic, and housing projections delineated in this analysis, an average annual demand for 22,000 nonsubsidized, new housing units is forecast for the period from March 1970 to March 1972. The most desirable demand-supply balance in the market would be achieved if 9,500 units were supplied as single-family homes and 12,500 were units in multifamily structures; the distribution of sales and rental demand by sales prices and gross monthly rent and unit size are presented in table I. The number and distribution of residential units presented reflect the long term needs of the housing market and are not meant to be a prediction of actual construction volume for the next two years.

The projected annual demand of 22,000 units is substantially below the volume of construction in 1968 and 1969, when employment increments were high and in-migrants, attracted by job openings, swelled the demand for new units (especially for rental accommodations). During the next two years, it is anticipated that economic gains will fall somewhat short of those achieved since 1967 and in-migration and the demand for additional housing are expected to decline.

The large number of rental units recently completed and those now under construction have begun to stimulate some fear of overbuilding; the marketing of these projects should be monitored closely, therefore, and appropriate adjustments made in the volume of starts if those units are not absorbed readily.

Occupancy Potential for Subsidized Housing

Federal assistance in financing costs for new housing for low- or moderate-income families may be provided through a number of different programs administered by FHA: monthly rent supplements in rental projects financed under Section 221(d)(3); partial payment of interest on home mortgages insured under Section 235; partial interest payment on project mortgages insured under Section 236; and federal assistance to local housing authorities for low-rent public housing.

The estimated occupancy potentials for subsidized housing are designed to determine, for each program, (1) the number of families and individuals who can be served under the program and (2) the proportion of these households that can reasonably be expected to seek new subsidized housing during the forecast period. Household eligibility for the Section 235 and Section 236 programs is determined primarily by evidence that household or family income is below established limits but sufficient to pay the minimum achievable rent or monthly payment for the specified program. Insofar as the income requirement is concerned, all families and individuals with income below the income limits are assumed to be eligible for public housing and rent supplement; there may be other requirements for eligibility, particularly the requirement that current living quarters be substandard for families to be eligible for rent supplements. Some families may be alternatively eligible for assistance under more than one of these programs or under other assistance programs using federal or state support. The total occupancy potential for federally assisted housing approximates the sum of the potentials for public housing and Section 236 housing. For the Dallas HMA, the total occupancy potential for subsidized housing is estimated to be 4,780 units annually (see table II). Future approvals under each program should take into account any intervening approvals under other programs which serve the same families and individuals.

The annual occupancy potentials^{1/} for subsidized housing discussed below are based upon 1970 incomes, the occupancy of substandard housing, estimates of the elderly population, income limits in effect on March 1, 1970, and on available market experience.

Sales Housing Under Section 235. Sales housing can be provided for low- to moderate-income families under the provisions of Section 235. Based on the exception income limits, approximately 1,690 houses a year could be absorbed in the HMA during the two-year forecast period; using regular income limits, the potential would be reduced by an estimated 30 percent. Forty percent of the families eligible under this program are five- or more-person households. All families eligible for Section

^{1/} The occupancy potentials referred to in this analysis have been calculated to reflect the strength of the market in view of existing vacancy. The successful attainment of the calculated potentials for subsidized housing may well depend upon construction in suitably accessible locations, as well as distribution of rents and sales prices over the complete range attainable for housing under the specified programs.

235 housing also are eligible under Section 236. Thus far, about 366 units have been built under this program in the Dallas area, 323 of which were in Dallas County.

Rental Units under the Public Housing and Rent-Supplement Programs. These two programs serve households in essentially the same low-income group. The principal differences arise from the manner in which net income is computed for each program and other eligibility requirements such as personal asset limitations. The annual occupancy potential for public housing is an estimated 2,035 units for families and 1,010 units for the elderly. Approximately four percent of the families and 32 percent of the elderly also are eligible for housing under Section 236 (see table II). In the case of the more restrictive rent-supplement program, the potential for families would be somewhat less than under public housing but the market for elderly accommodations would remain comparatively unchanged.

To date, there are 6,372 public housing units under management in the HMA (all in the city of Dallas), including 280 units for elderly occupancy.

The Dallas City Council has approved an additional 2,000 public housing units; 822 of these units are under construction (434 units for elderly occupancy), a development program has been approved for 183 units for the elderly, and approval is pending on a development plan for 421 units for elderly occupancy. There were a substantial number of vacant public housing units in the city when a central placement service was in operation. The housing authority now permits each project to act as its own rental agency and vacancy has declined sharply. A total of 400 units (6.2 percent) still were vacant as of March 1, 1970; however, under the new rental procedures these vacancies are expected to be absorbed soon; if they are not readily absorbed, the justification for additional public housing should be re-examined. Thus far, 746 units of rent-supplement housing have been constructed in the HMA; an additional 1,656 units are under construction, and a total of 648 units are in various stages of processing. The units under construction or in planning at this time will satisfy more than the first year of demand for public housing and rent-supplement housing in the Dallas area.

Rental Units under Section 236^{1/}. Moderately priced rental units can be provided under Section 236. With exception income limits for Section 236, there is an annual occupancy potential for 1,690 units for families and 450 units for elderly families and individuals; based on regular income limits, these potentials would be reduced by approximately 30 percent and 10 percent, respectively. Nearly five percent of the families eligible for housing under this section are alternatively eligible for public housing and 72 percent of the elderly households qualify for such accommodations. It should be noted that in terms of eligibility, the Section 236 potential for families and the Section 235 potential draw from essentially the same universe and are not, therefore, additive. Thus far no Section 236 units have been marketed, but 1,368 units are under construction and applications have been received for almost 10,000 units.

Under the Section 221(d)(3) BMIR program, serving essentially the same families, a total of 6,300 units have been completed and there are still 2,100 units under construction.^{2/} Together with the 1,368 units being built under Section 236, there are, therefore, nearly 3,500 units of subsidized multifamily housing under construction, in addition to the public housing and rent supplement projects. This would appear to be sufficient to serve the potential Section 236 occupancy (both families and elderly households and individuals) for a period of about 18 months. Caution should be observed, therefore, in approving additional Section 236 housing which might come on the market before the fall of 1971. In addition, the occupancy experience of the projects now under construction should be observed carefully as they are completed to determine if revisions are appropriate in the estimated annual potential for housing of this type. It should be noted, however, that 95 percent of the projects already built or under construction were for family occupancy and only 5 percent for elderly households. The possibility of overbuilding would appear to be greater in family-type units than in projects designed for occupancy by the elderly.

^{1/} Interest reduction payments also may be made with respect to cooperative housing projects. Occupancy requirements under Section 236, however, are identical for both tenants and cooperative owner-occupants.

^{2/} Funds for additional projects under the Section 221(d)(3) BMIR program are not available.

Sales Market

The sales market in the Dallas HMA is in reasonably good balance at this time; the homeowner vacancy ratio is an estimated 1.7 percent (a decline from the three percent ratio recorded in 1964). Contractors throughout the area point to the behavior of interest rates as the source of most of the problems which exist in the single-family market at this time. The "effective" demand for new homes was reduced during the past twelve months by the mortgage and construction credit situation through (1) the rapidly rising rate of interest which caused many prospective buyers to adopt a "wait and see" attitude and, temporarily, to seek rental accommodations in lieu of home purchase and (2) the stringent credit conditions brought on by the tight money market which decreased the number of families able to qualify for a mortgage.

Over 80 percent of the single-family homes built in the HMA since April 1960 were in Dallas County. A substantial portion of these completions were located within the city of Dallas and the majority of the units built in the county were situated in suburban communities neighboring Dallas -- Garland, Grand Prairie, Irving, Mesquite, and Richardson. An availability of suitable land at reasonable cost, increased accessibility through highway construction, and the location of numerous small industries along suburban road arteries were factors which increased the attraction of these communities as loci for home construction.

Inflationary pressures and land speculation have bid up the cost of developable land in the HMA; labor and material costs also have risen substantially. It was the consensus of many local contractors that a three-bedroom nonsubsidized home could not be constructed for much less than about \$17,000. Older homes are rapidly becoming the only alternative for moderate-income families seeking home ownership.

The FHA unsold inventory survey of homes completed in 1969 covered 6,340 completed homes in 169 subdivisions. Of that number, 3,686 were built speculatively and 21 percent of the speculative completions remained unsold at the end of the year. Only nine percent of the completed homes were priced under \$17,500, 22 percent were priced at \$30,000 and over, 29 percent from \$22,500 to \$30,000, and 40 percent from \$17,500 to \$22,500.

Rental Market

The rental market in the Dallas area cannot be characterized as tight; demand and supply are in relative balance at this time. Despite the fact that the construction of multifamily units

jumped from only 3,454 units in 1960 to 21,412 units in 1968, the rental vacancy ratio in 1970 was only about one-half of the 1960 ratio. The sharp rise in construction was a reaction to rising needs generated by (1) an influx of workers attracted to the area by a growing economy and (2) the growing number of local residents in need of living accommodations but unable to afford the high costs of homeownership.

The rental market is not without problems, however. Vacancy in the Dallas area bears a direct relationship to the monthly rent level. An FHA survey of projects built and marketed during the past five years indicated that vacancies increase as the scale of rent increases. This has been true for units of all sizes. Units renting for between \$100 and \$119 a month experienced an occupancy level of more than 99 percent. Vacancy increased through each succeeding rent class, however, culminating in an occupancy level of only 66 percent in those units marketed for \$275 or more. High-rise projects have not met with the level of market acceptance enjoyed by garden-type apartments and experience higher vacancy than garden-type projects at comparable rents.

Many of the projects which are 30 years old or more have become less marketable because of the increase in multifamily construction. The older units cannot compete favorably. The rent differential is not great enough to offset tenant preference for the amenities offered in the newer projects.

It was reported that, because of high tenant mobility, it is difficult to maintain an occupancy level of 100 percent in even the most desirable projects. A local survey of tenant attitudes conducted during 1969 showed that approximately 72 percent of Dallas area apartment residents lived in the same unit less than a year. High tenant mobility also resulted in a high percentage of furnished units.

Efficiency units in most of the new projects rent for about \$120 to \$140 a month, unfurnished. One-bedroom apartments appear to be concentrated in the \$140 to \$160 price range, and two-bedroom units are available in substantial numbers for between \$165 and \$210. Three-bedroom apartments show the greatest rent dispersion and units are rather evenly distributed among the rent ranges above \$200.^{1/}

^{1/} Rents noted above include cost of utilities.

Economic, Demographic, and Housing Factors

The estimated demand for new, nonsubsidized housing units is predicated on the trends in employment, population, and housing factors described below.

The Economy. During 1969, the civilian labor force of the Dallas HMA averaged 726,030 persons. There were 714,400 persons employed in the HMA, of whom 647,240 were nonagricultural wage and salary workers. Unemployment totaled 11,220 (1.5 percent of the work force), and an average of 410 persons were idled during the year because of labor disputes (see table III).

Total nonagricultural wage and salary employment has increased each year since 1959 with annual gains fluctuating between 10,720 (1959-1960) and 50,930 (1968-1969). Employment increments increased rapidly after the 1965-1966 gain of 32,730 jobs, however. Annual average wage and salary employment increased by 41,800 between 1967 and 1968; a total of 50,930 jobs were added between 1968 and 1969.

Although Dallas serves principally as a trade, service, and financial center, manufacturing has played an increasingly significant role in the growth of the area. Employment in manufacturing represented only 25 percent of total nonagricultural employment in 1969, but new jobs in manufacturing accounted for approximately 29 percent of the nonagricultural employment gain between 1959 and 1969. Between 1964 and 1969, manufacturing increases represented 32 percent of the gain recorded in nonagricultural employment.

Growth in manufacturing employment proceeded slowly between 1959 and 1964, with the electrical machinery industry providing the principal impetus. Employment in transportation equipment declined in all but one year of the period. After 1964, employment in electrical machinery production continued to rise, but the downtrend in employment in the transportation equipment industry reversed and a peak increase of 8,550 jobs was attained in that industry between 1967 and 1968.

With only a few exceptions, growth in nonmanufacturing has been steady since 1959, averaging 18,870 jobs. The smallest annual increment occurred between 1960 and 1961, when only 8,500 jobs were added to nonmanufacturing payrolls. The peak year for the 1959-1969 period occurred between 1968 and 1969 when an increase of 40,660 jobs was recorded. Over the past ten years, those industries contributing the major portion of nonmanufacturing employment gains were trade (6,350 jobs annually), services (4,790 jobs each year), and government (2,560 a year).

Growth in all three of these sectors was in response to the needs generated by a rising population level. New suburban shopping centers and increased school construction created a need for additional trade, service, and government employees.

Based on current trends in the Dallas area, wage and salary employment gains are expected to decline from the 1968-1969 increase of 50,930 to a gain of between 40,000 and 45,000 jobs each year between 1970 and 1972. Manufacturing employment gains are not expected to equal those of the past five years. The slowdown will be centered in the machinery and transportation equipment industries. All other manufacturing sectors can be expected to continue to increase slowly.

Nonmanufacturing employment should continue to record substantial increases over the next two years. As in the past, employment in trade, services, and government will rise in response to local population increases and further suburbanization of shopping facilities, schools, and community facilities. The impact of work on the Southwest Regional Airport will be long-run in nature and is not expected to influence the Dallas economy significantly during the forecast period. Some increase in the number of workers employed in construction can be expected by 1972, however.

Income. As of March 1970, the estimated median annual income of all families in the Dallas area was \$8,775, after deduction of federal income tax. The median after-tax income of renter households of two persons or more was \$6,325. Median incomes and the distribution of all families and renter households by income class are shown in table IV. The current after-tax income of \$8,775 represents an increase of 60 percent over the median income of all families in 1959.

Population and Households. Between April 1960 and March 1970, the population of the Dallas Housing Market Area grew at a rate of 54,825 persons a year, increasing from about 1,119,400 persons to 1,662,800 persons.^{1/} The average annual gain during the past decade represents a rate of growth of four percent a year. Because of the rapidly increasing employment gains since 1965, average population gains during the past four years have been substantially larger than the average for the entire period since 1960. Average annual gains in nonagricultural wage and salary workers during the 1965-1969 period were double the annual

^{1/} Locally reported preliminary population and household counts from the 1970 Census may not be consistent with the demographic estimates in this analysis. Final official census population and household data will be made available by the Census Bureau in the next several months.

average for the 1960-1964 period--almost 40,000 a year since 1965, compared with almost 20,000 a year between 1960 and 1965. Dallas County, as expected, accounted for the greatest absolute gain in population (47,575 persons a year) but the largest relative increment occurred in Collin County (7.1 percent a year). Dallas County, representing 86 percent of the HMA population in 1970, accounted for a similar portion (87 percent) of the entire housing market's population gain between 1960 and 1970.

The population of those areas of Dallas County outside the city limits of Dallas increased at a greater absolute and relative rate, however, than did the city. Land suitable for residential development is becoming more expensive and scarce in the city of Dallas, and suburban communities such as Garland, Grand Prairie, Irving, Mesquite, and Richardson have become the predominant areas of residential construction.

The number of households in the HMA rose from approximately 341,350 in April 1960 to 521,600 in March 1970. The March 1970 figure represents an average annual gain of 18,175 households (4.3 percent) over the past ten years. During the decade, the number of households in the city of Dallas increased at a rate of 8,700 a year. Contrary to the trend in population growth, the yearly household gain in the city exceeded the growth in suburban Dallas County, 8,700 households as compared to 7,075. This apparent paradox resulted from the higher household size (persons per household) in suburban areas of the HMA.

Population growth is expected to increase over the next two years. It is estimated that the number of persons in the HMA will increase to 1,808,000 by March 1972 (an annual gain of 72,600 persons, or 4.2 percent). Household growth is expected to approximate 23,150 (4.3 percent) annually during the next two years. An average of 10,600 households will be added to the city of Dallas each year; the remainder of Dallas County will increase by 9,050 households, and the rest of the HMA will grow by a total of 3,500 households. The trends and distributions of population and household growth over the 1960-1972 period are presented in tables V and VI, respectively.

Housing Inventory. As of March 1, 1970, there were approximately 552,400 housing units in the Dallas HMA, a net increase of 178,300 units over the April 1960 inventory total of approximately 374,100 units. The net increment resulted from the addition of 200,125 units through new construction, conversions, and an influx of trailers and the loss of about 21,825 units through demolition, conversion to other uses, fire, and other causes. As of March 1, 1970, an estimated 13,425 units were under construction -- 2,075 single-family homes and 11,350 units in multifamily structures, of which almost 6,000 are subsidized rental units.

Despite the effects of tight money on the single-family mortgage market, the total number of housing units authorized for construction^{1/} rose from 12,020 units in 1966 to 30,565 units in 1968 (see table VIII). In 1969, however, the pressure of the mortgage money situation and the high volume of units marketed late in 1968 and early 1969 resulted in a cutback in authorizations to 24,366 units for the year 1969. The 1969 figure still exceeded the total for any year since 1960, with the exception of the 1968 peak of 30,565 units. Of primary significance has been the growing importance of multifamily construction in the HMA. Between 1960 and 1969, the number of single-family houses authorized fluctuated between a high of 12,653 in 1961 and a low of 6,600 in 1966, then increased to 9,153 in 1968 and 8,526 in 1969. The number of multifamily units authorized rose, however, from 3,454 in 1960 to 21,412 in 1968, then declined to 15,840 in 1969. The growing emphasis on multiple-unit construction was caused by the large number of in-migrants (who tend to be renters) between 1960 and 1970, and the increasing acceptance of multifamily-type living in the Dallas area. During the past three years, 16 percent of the multifamily units authorized represent units subsidized under various federal assistance programs.

Vacancy. A postal vacancy survey conducted in November 1969 indicated that of a total of 450,041 units surveyed, 16,068 or 3.6 percent were vacant. A total of 8,170 residences were vacant (2.3 percent of residential deliveries) and 7,898 vacant apartment units were counted (8.0 percent of all deliveries to apartments).

Based on data obtained locally and on the vacancy survey noted above, there were an estimated 30,800 vacant units in the Dallas Housing Market Area in March 1970 -- 5,700 for sale, 11,300 for rent, and 13,800 unsuitable or unavailable vacant units. The number of units for sale or for rent represent vacancy ratios of 1.7 percent and 5.4 percent, respectively. These rates are not deemed excessive for an area growing as rapidly as the Dallas Area. The trend of vacancy in the area is presented in table IX.

^{1/} Building permit data reported here and in table VIII represent approximately 94 percent of the construction activity in the Dallas HMA between 1960 and 1970.

Table I

Annual Demand for New Nonsubsidized Housing
Dallas, Texas, Housing Market Area
March 1, 1970 to March 1, 1972

A. Single-family:

<u>Price class</u>	<u>Number of units</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Under \$17,500	665	7
\$17,500 - 19,999	1,330	14
20,000 - 22,499	2,375	25
22,500 - 24,999	1,330	14
25,000 - 29,999	1,520	16
30,000 - 34,999	1,235	13
35,000 - 39,999	570	6
40,000 and over	475	5
Total	9,500	100

B. Multifamily

<u>Gross monthly rent^{a/}</u>	<u>Efficiency</u>	<u>One bedroom</u>	<u>Two bedrooms</u>	<u>Three or more bedrooms</u>
120 - 129	310	-	-	-
130 - 139	190	-	-	-
140 - 149	65	1,690	-	-
150 - 159	35	1,070	-	-
160 - 169	25	675	-	-
170 - 179	-	450	1,235	-
180 - 189	-	335	1,345	-
190 - 199	-	280	645	-
200 - 224	-	505	965	350
225 - 249	-	450	590	250
250 - 274	-	170	270	90
275 - 299	-	-	165	60
300 and over	-	-	160	125
Total	625	5,625	5,375	875

^{a/} Gross rent is shelter rent plus the cost of utilities.

Source: Estimated by Housing Market Analyst.

Table II

Estimated Annual Occupancy Potential for Subsidized Rental Housing
Dallas, Texas, Housing Market Area
March 1, 1970 to March 1, 1972

A. Families

	<u>Section 236^{a/}</u> <u>exclusively</u>	<u>Eligible for</u> <u>both programs</u>	<u>Public housing</u> <u>exclusively</u>	<u>Total for</u> <u>both programs</u>
1 bedroom	280	-	360	640
2 bedrooms	730	40	785	1,555
3 bedrooms	370	40	500	910
4+ bedrooms	<u>230</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>310</u>	<u>540</u>
Total	1,610	80 ^{c/}	1,955 ^{c/}	3,645

B. Elderly

Efficiency	90	310	470	870
1 bedroom	<u>35</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>215</u>	<u>265</u>
Total	125 ^{b/}	325 ^{d/}	685 ^{d/}	1,135

^{a/} Estimates are based upon exception income limits.

^{b/} Applications and commitments under Section 202 are being converted to Section 236.

^{c/} Approximately two thirds of these families also are eligible under the rent supplement program.

^{d/} All of the elderly couples and individuals also are eligible for rent supplement payments.

Table III

Trend of Work Force Components
Dallas, Texas, Housing Market Area
1959-1969

	<u>1959</u>	<u>1960</u>	<u>1961</u>	<u>1962</u>	<u>1963</u>	<u>1964</u>	<u>1965</u>	<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>1969</u>
Civilian work force	<u>463,990</u>	<u>478,890</u>	<u>492,640</u>	<u>510,830</u>	<u>532,510</u>	<u>551,690</u>	<u>574,260</u>	<u>601,760</u>	<u>634,010</u>	<u>673,850</u>	<u>726,030</u>
Unemployment	18,100	21,300	24,400	19,300	21,300	21,000	19,100	14,700	12,800	10,680	11,220
Percent of work force	3.9	4.4	5.0	3.8	4.0	3.8	3.3	2.4	2.0	1.6	1.5
Employment, total	<u>445,710</u>	<u>457,420</u>	<u>468,070</u>	<u>491,450</u>	<u>511,030</u>	<u>530,490</u>	<u>554,330</u>	<u>586,880</u>	<u>620,630</u>	<u>662,930</u>	<u>714,400</u>
Nonagri. wage & salary	<u>379,660</u>	<u>390,380</u>	<u>401,390</u>	<u>426,190</u>	<u>446,370</u>	<u>465,230</u>	<u>488,210</u>	<u>520,940</u>	<u>554,510</u>	<u>596,310</u>	<u>647,240</u>
Manufacturing	<u>92,640</u>	<u>94,040</u>	<u>96,550</u>	<u>104,900</u>	<u>108,750</u>	<u>113,120</u>	<u>121,620</u>	<u>135,110</u>	<u>146,410</u>	<u>161,240</u>	<u>171,510</u>
Machinery (exc. elec.)	7,620	8,130	8,210	8,830	9,140	10,280	11,700	12,540	13,030	14,490	15,830
Electrical machinery	11,230	15,270	17,200	21,240	23,920	26,020	30,670	37,630	39,910	42,460	44,940
Transportation equip.	19,010	14,190	13,780	13,990	12,890	12,030	12,360	14,030	18,000	26,550	29,200
Food & kindred prods.	13,170	13,640	13,740	14,100	14,140	14,480	14,420	14,440	15,140	15,200	15,800
Apparel & finished prods.	10,830	11,080	11,280	12,060	12,680	12,650	12,710	13,000	13,130	13,210	13,230
Other manufacturing	30,780	31,730	32,340	34,680	35,980	37,660	39,760	43,470	47,200	49,330	52,510
Nonmanufacturing	<u>287,020</u>	<u>296,340</u>	<u>304,840</u>	<u>321,290</u>	<u>337,620</u>	<u>352,110</u>	<u>366,590</u>	<u>385,830</u>	<u>408,100</u>	<u>435,070</u>	<u>475,730</u>
Ag.-for.-fish.	460	450	480	540	580	770	840	870	900	930	930
Mining	8,220	8,070	7,990	7,720	7,870	7,910	7,940	7,820	7,810	7,900	7,850
Contract construction	25,160	24,580	23,500	26,770	30,100	30,580	28,870	30,030	30,910	32,760	38,390
Transp. & allied svcs.	22,020	22,280	22,910	23,950	24,530	23,930	25,230	27,840	30,470	32,500	35,330
Communications	7,530	7,310	6,990	6,900	7,040	7,060	7,230	7,930	8,380	8,780	9,680
Utilities	5,470	5,520	5,600	5,590	5,770	5,880	5,990	5,950	6,130	6,300	6,410
Wholesale trade	38,640	40,230	42,160	43,720	45,620	47,200	49,100	51,250	53,250	56,980	61,340
Retail trade	65,800	67,910	69,160	72,480	73,810	78,350	83,180	88,720	93,040	98,610	106,570
Fin.-ins.-real estate	29,760	31,580	33,580	35,400	37,140	38,830	39,970	42,040	44,420	46,860	51,770
Business & pers. svcs.	27,960	29,130	30,090	31,760	33,340	34,640	37,130	38,800	42,290	45,740	50,080
Medical & prof. svcs.	18,000	19,720	21,790	23,170	25,550	27,870	30,050	31,570	34,500	38,620	43,770
Government	38,000	39,560	40,590	43,290	46,270	49,090	51,060	53,010	56,000	59,090	63,610
All other nonag. emplmt. ^{a/}	51,100	52,540	53,780	54,560	55,060	55,060	57,020	56,940	57,320	57,940	58,580
Agriculture	14,950	14,500	12,900	10,700	9,600	9,200	9,100	9,000	8,800	8,680	8,580
Involved in labor-mgmt. disputes	180	170	170	80	180	200	830	180	580	240	410

^{a/} Includes nonagricultural self-employed, unpaid family workers, and domestic workers in private households.

Note: Components may not add to totals because of rounding.

Source: Texas Employment Commission.

Table IV

Estimated Percentage Distribution of Families by Annual Income^{a/}
Dallas, Texas, Housing Market Area
April 1959 and March 1970

<u>Income class</u>	1959		1970	
	<u>All families</u>	<u>Renter households^{b/}</u>	<u>All families</u>	<u>Renter households</u>
Under \$4,000	29	50	14	25
\$4,000 - 4,999	14	16	6	10
5,000 - 5,999	13	11	8	11
6,000 - 6,999	11	8	8	10
7,000 - 7,999	8	5	8	8
8,000 - 8,999	7	3	7	7
9,000 - 9,999	5	2	7	6
10,000 - 12,499	4	2	14	10
12,500 - 14,999	3	1	9	6
15,000 - 17,499	2	1	7	3
17,500 - 19,999	2	(3	2
20,000 - 24,999	((1	4	(2
25,000 and over	(2	(5	(
Total	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>
Median	\$5,475	\$3,975	\$8,775	\$6,325

^{a/} After deduction of federal income tax.

^{b/} Renter households of two or more persons.

Sources: 1960 Census of Population and estimates by Housing Market Analyst.

Table V

Population Trends
Dallas, Texas, Housing Market Area
April 1, 1960-March 1, 1972

	April 1, 1960	March 1, 1970	March 1, 1972	Average annual change			
				1960-1970		1970-1972	
				Number ^{a/}	Percent ^{b/}	Number ^{a/}	Percent ^{b/}
HMA total	<u>1,119,410</u>	<u>1,662,800</u>	<u>1,808,000</u>	<u>54,825</u>	4.0	<u>72,600</u>	4.2
Dallas County	<u>951,527</u>	<u>1,423,000</u>	<u>1,548,000</u>	<u>47,575</u>	4.1	<u>62,500</u>	4.2
City of Dallas	679,684	907,600	967,600	23,000	3.0	<u>30,000</u>	3.2
Remainder	271,843	515,400	580,400	24,575	6.4	32,500	6.0
Collin County	41,247	83,400	94,800	4,250	7.1	5,700	6.4
Denton County	47,432	70,700	77,100	2,350	4.0	3,200	4.4
Ellis County	43,395	45,600	46,600	225	.5	500	1.1
Kaufman County	29,931	32,900	33,900	300	.9	500	1.5
Rockwall County	5,878	7,200	7,600	125	2.0	200	2.7

^{a/} Rounded.

^{b/} Calculated by use of a formula which gives the average percentage gain on a compound basis.

Source: 1960 Census of Population and estimates by Housing Market Analyst.

Table VI

Trend of the Number of Households
Dallas, Texas, Housing Market Area
April 1, 1960-March 1, 1972

	April 1, 1960	March 1, 1970	March 1, 1972	Average annual change			
				1960-1970		1970-1972	
				Number ^{a/}	Percent ^{b/}	Number ^{a/}	Percent ^{b/}
HMA total	<u>341,356</u>	<u>521,600</u>	<u>567,900</u>	<u>18,175</u>	4.3	<u>23,150</u>	4.3
Dallas County	<u>290,649</u>	<u>447,000</u>	<u>486,300</u>	<u>15,775</u>	4.4	<u>19,650</u>	4.2
City of Dallas	<u>213,020</u>	<u>299,200</u>	<u>320,400</u>	<u>8,700</u>	3.4	<u>10,600</u>	3.4
Remainder	<u>77,629</u>	<u>147,800</u>	<u>165,900</u>	<u>7,075</u>	6.5	<u>9,050</u>	5.8
Collin County	<u>13,024</u>	<u>27,200</u>	<u>31,000</u>	<u>1,425</u>	7.4	<u>1,900</u>	6.5
Denton County	<u>14,117</u>	<u>20,900</u>	<u>23,200</u>	<u>675</u>	4.0	<u>1,150</u>	5.2
Ellis County	<u>13,275</u>	<u>14,600</u>	<u>15,100</u>	<u>125</u>	.9	<u>250</u>	1.7
Kaufman County	<u>8,497</u>	<u>9,650</u>	<u>9,950</u>	<u>125</u>	1.3	<u>150</u>	1.5
Rockwall County	<u>1,794</u>	<u>2,250</u>	<u>2,350</u>	<u>50</u>	2.3	<u>50</u>	2.2

^{a/} Rounded.

^{b/} Calculated by use of a formula which gives the average percentage gain on a compound basis.

Source: 1960 Census of Housing and estimates by Housing Market Analyst.

Table VII

Trend of Household Tenure
Dallas, Texas, Housing Market Area
April 1, 1960-March 1, 1970

	HMA total	Dallas County		Remainder of HMA
		Total	City of Dallas	
<u>April 1, 1960:</u>				
Total housing inventory	<u>374,083</u>	<u>316,029</u>	<u>231,270</u>	<u>84,759</u>
Total occupied	<u>341,356</u>	<u>290,649</u>	<u>213,020</u>	<u>77,629</u>
Owner-occupied	<u>219,252</u>	<u>187,318</u>	<u>217,160</u>	<u>60,158</u>
Percent of total occupied	64.2%	64.4%	59.7%	77.5%
Renter-occupied	<u>122,114</u>	<u>103,331</u>	<u>85,860</u>	<u>17,471</u>
Percent of total occupied	35.8%	35.6%	40.3%	22.5%
Total vacant	<u>32,727</u>	<u>25,380</u>	<u>18,250</u>	<u>7,130</u>
 <u>March 1, 1970:</u>				
Total housing inventory	<u>552,400</u>	<u>470,000</u>	<u>317,300</u>	<u>152,700</u>
Total occupied	<u>521,600</u>	<u>447,000</u>	<u>299,200</u>	<u>147,800</u>
Owner-occupied	<u>321,950</u>	<u>270,700</u>	<u>157,500</u>	<u>113,200</u>
Percent of total occupied	61.7%	60.6%	52.6%	76.6%
Renter-occupied	<u>199,650</u>	<u>176,300</u>	<u>141,700</u>	<u>34,600</u>
Percent of total occupied	38.3%	39.4%	47.4%	23.4%
Total vacant	<u>30,800</u>	<u>23,000</u>	<u>18,100</u>	<u>4,900</u>

Source: 1960 Census of Housing and estimates by Housing Market Analyst.

Table VIII

New Dwelling Units Authorized by Local Building Permits^{a/}
Dallas, Texas, Housing Market Area
1960-1969

<u>Area</u>	<u>1960</u>	<u>1961</u>	<u>1962</u>	<u>1963</u>	<u>1964</u>	<u>1965</u>	<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>1969</u>
HMA total	<u>13,955</u>	<u>17,755</u>	<u>20,988</u>	<u>23,890</u>	<u>18,552</u>	<u>14,126</u>	<u>12,020</u>	<u>18,404</u>	<u>30,727</u>	<u>24,508</u>
Dallas County	<u>12,883</u>	<u>16,365</u>	<u>19,287</u>	<u>22,065</u>	<u>16,779</u>	<u>12,394</u>	<u>10,873</u>	<u>17,021</u>	<u>28,100</u>	<u>22,745</u>
City of Dallas	<u>6,957</u>	<u>9,503</u>	<u>11,546</u>	<u>12,998</u>	<u>9,256</u>	<u>7,154</u>	<u>6,506</u>	<u>9,939</u>	<u>18,599</u>	<u>15,375</u>
Garland	<u>1,036</u>	<u>1,241</u>	<u>1,490</u>	<u>2,245</u>	<u>795</u>	<u>917</u>	<u>850</u>	<u>1,535</u>	<u>1,800</u>	<u>2,036</u>
Grand Prairie	<u>158</u>	<u>281</u>	<u>647</u>	<u>461</u>	<u>471</u>	<u>381</u>	<u>498</u>	<u>700</u>	<u>1,807</u>	<u>1,006</u>
Irving	<u>1,183</u>	<u>1,253</u>	<u>2,269</u>	<u>2,301</u>	<u>3,077</u>	<u>1,574</u>	<u>881</u>	<u>1,436</u>	<u>2,172</u>	<u>717</u>
Mesquite	<u>1,254</u>	<u>1,241</u>	<u>839</u>	<u>892</u>	<u>754</u>	<u>438</u>	<u>361</u>	<u>555</u>	<u>795</u>	<u>844</u>
Richardson	<u>1,052</u>	<u>1,120</u>	<u>1,065</u>	<u>1,060</u>	<u>681</u>	<u>585</u>	<u>624</u>	<u>1,192</u>	<u>1,110</u>	<u>922</u>
Remainder	<u>1,243</u>	<u>1,726</u>	<u>1,431</u>	<u>2,108</u>	<u>1,745</u>	<u>1,345</u>	<u>1,153</u>	<u>1,664</u>	<u>1,817</u>	<u>1,845</u>
Collin County	<u>204</u>	<u>491</u>	<u>590</u>	<u>565</u>	<u>574</u>	<u>748</u>	<u>436</u>	<u>554</u>	<u>1,482</u>	<u>671</u>
McKinney	<u>127</u>	<u>115</u>	<u>89</u>	<u>113</u>	<u>103</u>	<u>110</u>	<u>116</u>	<u>57</u>	<u>85</u>	<u>80</u>
Plano	<u>77</u>	<u>376</u>	<u>437</u>	<u>403</u>	<u>393</u>	<u>609</u>	<u>297</u>	<u>466</u>	<u>1,395</u>	<u>558</u>
Remainder	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>64</u>	<u>49</u>	<u>78</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>33</u>
Denton County	<u>510</u>	<u>584</u>	<u>781</u>	<u>826</u>	<u>788</u>	<u>598</u>	<u>419</u>	<u>546</u>	<u>843</u>	<u>742</u>
Denton	<u>343</u>	<u>368</u>	<u>654</u>	<u>602</u>	<u>649</u>	<u>486</u>	<u>347</u>	<u>389</u>	<u>504</u>	<u>472</u>
Lewisville	<u>143</u>	<u>189</u>	<u>78</u>	<u>177</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>63</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>121</u>	<u>303</u>	<u>199</u>
Remainder	<u>24</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>49</u>	<u>47</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>49</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>36</u>	<u>36</u>	<u>71</u>
Ellis County	<u>173</u>	<u>177</u>	<u>198</u>	<u>272</u>	<u>208</u>	<u>206</u>	<u>132</u>	<u>127</u>	<u>162</u>	<u>200</u>
Kaufman County	<u>164</u>	<u>124</u>	<u>110</u>	<u>126</u>	<u>145</u>	<u>134</u>	<u>143</u>	<u>115</u>	<u>115</u>	<u>130</u>
Rockwall County	<u>21</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>36</u>	<u>58</u>	<u>46</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>41</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>20</u>
<u>Units in structure:</u>										
One unit	<u>10,501</u>	<u>12,653</u>	<u>11,188</u>	<u>9,744</u>	<u>9,005</u>	<u>8,230</u>	<u>6,600</u>	<u>8,740</u>	<u>9,315</u>	<u>8,668</u>
Two or more units	<u>3,454</u>	<u>5,102</u>	<u>9,800</u>	<u>14,146</u>	<u>9,547</u>	<u>5,896</u>	<u>5,420</u>	<u>9,664</u>	<u>21,412</u>	<u>15,840</u>
Total	<u>13,955</u>	<u>17,755</u>	<u>20,988</u>	<u>23,890</u>	<u>18,552</u>	<u>14,126</u>	<u>12,020</u>	<u>18,404</u>	<u>30,727</u>	<u>24,508</u>

^{a/} Covers about 94 percent of total residential construction in the HMA.

Sources: U. S. Bureau of the Census, C-40 Construction Reports; Dallas Power and Light Co.; Bureau of Business Research, University of Texas; local permit-issuing offices; and estimates by Housing Market Analyst.

Table IX

Trend of Vacancy
Dallas, Texas, Housing Market Area
April 1, 1960-March 1, 1970

	HMA		Dallas County		
<u>April 1, 1960:</u>	<u>total</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>City of</u> <u>Dallas</u>	<u>Remainder</u> <u>of Dallas Co.</u>	<u>Remainder</u> <u>of HMA</u>
Total vacant units	<u>32,727</u>	<u>25,380</u>	<u>18,250</u>	<u>7,130</u>	<u>7,347</u>
Available vacant units	<u>19,179</u>	<u>17,526</u>	<u>13,187</u>	<u>4,339</u>	<u>1,653</u>
For sale	5,601	5,080	3,113	1,967	521
Homeowner vacancy rate	2.5%	2.6%	2.4%	3.2%	1.6%
For rent	13,578	12,446	10,074	2,372	1,132
Rental vacancy rate	10.0%	10.7%	10.5%	12.0%	5.7%
Other vacant	13,548	7,854	5,063	2,791	5,694
 <u>March 1, 1970:</u>					
Total vacant units	<u>30,800</u>	<u>23,000</u>	<u>18,100</u>	<u>4,900</u>	<u>7,800</u>
Available vacant units	<u>17,000</u>	<u>15,000</u>	<u>12,000</u>	<u>3,000</u>	<u>2,000</u>
For sale	5,700	4,800	3,450	1,350	900
Homeowner vacancy rate	1.7%	1.7%	2.1%	1.2%	1.7%
For rent	11,300	10,200	8,550	1,650	1,100
Rental vacancy rate	5.4%	5.5%	5.7%	4.5%	4.5%
Other vacant	13,800	8,000	6,100	1,900	5,800

Sources: 1960 Census of Housing and estimates by Housing Market Analysts.