

728.1  
:308  
F22  
Memphis,  
Tenn.  
1969

*Analysis of the*  
**MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE**  
**HOUSING MARKET**

**as of December 1, 1969**

**DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING  
AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT**

**AUG 4 1970**

**LIBRARY  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20410**

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

**June 1970**

ANALYSIS OF THE  
MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE  
HOUSING MARKET  
AS OF DECEMBER 1, 1969

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING  
AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

AUG 4 1970

LIBRARY  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20410

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

FHA Housing Market Analysis  
Memphis, Tennessee, as of December 1, 1969

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 Field Market Analysis Service 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  
Field Market Analysis Service  
Washington, D. C.

FHA HOUSING MARKET ANALYSIS - MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE  
AS OF DECEMBER 1, 1969<sup>1/</sup>

The Memphis Housing Market Area (HMA) is composed of Shelby County, Tennessee and Crittenden County, Arkansas, the same as the definition of the Memphis, Tennessee-Arkansas SMSA and the Memphis Labor Market Area. The two-county housing market had a population of 835,200 in December 1969, including 780,000 in Shelby County and 55,200 in Crittenden County. The population of the city of Memphis was estimated at 574,100 persons in December 1969.

The Memphis area economy is well diversified, and there have been large employment gains in both the manufacturing and nonmanufacturing sectors since the mid-1960's. Economic expansion has been accompanied by high levels of population and household growth which stimulated housing demand. Following the peak production levels of 1967 and 1968, residential building volume declined during 1969, primarily as a result of the increased costs of construction and mortgage financing. Sustained growth of the economy and the overall sound condition of the housing market indicate that some increase from the 1969 low level of construction is warranted during the next two years. However, the potential construction volume will not be as great as that indicated by the housing absorption rates of 1967 and 1968, because effective demand will be reduced by the rising cost of new housing.

---

<sup>1/</sup> Data in this analysis are supplementary to a previous FHA analysis as of October 1966.

### Anticipated Housing Demand

There will be a demand for about 7,250 new housing units a year, financed at market-interest-rates without subsidy, in the Memphis HMA between December 1969 and December 1971. For best absorption, production should consist of 3,000 single-family houses, 250 mobile homes, and 4,000 units in multifamily structures. The demand was derived after considering current housing market conditions and anticipated economic and demographic developments (discussed in the following sections of this analysis). The primary determinants were the projected level of household growth and the need to replace housing expected to be lost from the inventory. The estimates have been adjusted to reflect the need to reduce the current inventory of unsold houses and the expectation of a continued shift to renter occupancy in the HMA.

Distributions of demand for single-family houses by price class and for multifamily units by the number of bedrooms and gross monthly rents are shown in table I. These qualitative distributions indicate that about three-fifths of the demand for single-family houses will be in the below \$22,500 price range; demand for multifamily units will be greatest at gross rents from \$130-\$160 for one-bedroom units and from \$160-\$190 for two-bedroom units. Of the total annual demand, approximately 100 sales houses and 110 units in multifamily structures could be marketed effectively in Crittenden County, Arkansas.

### Occupancy Potential for Subsidized Housing

Federal assistance in financing costs for new housing for low- or moderate-income families may be provided through four different programs administered by FHA--monthly rent-supplement payments, principally in rental projects financed with market-interest-rate mortgages insured under Section 221(d)(3); partial payments for interest for home mortgages insured primarily under Section 235; partial payment for interest for project mortgages insured under Section 236; and below-market-interest-rate financing for project mortgages insured under Section 221(d)(3).

Household eligibility for federal subsidy programs is determined for the most part by evidence that household or family income is below established limits. Some families may be alternatively eligible for assistance under one or more of these programs or under other assistance programs using federal or state support. Since the potential for each program is estimated separately, there is no attempt to eliminate the overlaps among program estimates. Accordingly, the occupancy potentials

discussed for various programs are not additive. Furthermore, future approvals under each program should take into account any intervening approvals under other programs which serve the same requirements. The potentials<sup>1/</sup> discussed in the following paragraphs reflect estimates unadjusted for housing provided or under construction under alternative FHA or other programs.

The annual occupancy potentials for subsidized housing in the FHA programs discussed are based upon 1969 incomes, on the occupancy of substandard housing, on estimates of the elderly population, on December 1969 income limits, and on available market experience.<sup>2/</sup> The occupancy potentials (presented by size of units in table II) will be satisfied most effectively if a large proportion of the units are located in Memphis or the immediate suburbs. Best absorption probably would result from distributing about 85 percent of the rent-supplement units and 90 percent of the Section 235 or 236 housing in the Tennessee portion of the HMA.

Section 221(d)(3) BMIR. If federal funds are made available, about 880 units of Section 221(d)(3) BMIR housing probably could be absorbed annually during the next two years in the Memphis HMA.<sup>3/</sup> A Section 221(d)(3) project with 214 units was completed in 1965; these units were readily absorbed and full occupancy has been maintained. A project with 100 units was under construction in West Memphis in December 1969, reducing the first year occupancy potential in the HMA to about 780 units. It is expected that this project will satisfy the demand during 1970 for 221(d)(3) BMIR housing in the Arkansas portion of the HMA.

---

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

<sup>2/</sup> Families with incomes inadequate to purchase or rent nonsubsidized housing generally are eligible for one form or another of subsidized housing. However, little or no housing has been provided under some of the subsidized programs and absorption rates remain to be tested.

<sup>3/</sup> At the present time, funds for allocations are available only from recaptures resulting from reductions, withdrawals, and cancellation of allocations.

Rent-Supplement. The annual occupancy potential for rent-supplement units in the Memphis area between December 1969 and December 1971 is estimated at 1,345 units for families and an additional 790 units for elderly individuals and couples.

Rent-supplement housing under Section 221(d)(3) at market-interest-rate-financing has been an active program in the HMA recently. Four projects with a total of 665 units of rent-supplement housing in Memphis and a project of 120 units in West Memphis were completed during 1969. These units have been absorbed very rapidly and all but two projects, which were completed in late 1969, are fully occupied. There also were 200 units of rent-supplement housing under construction in Memphis in December 1969. These 200 units and 300 units of low-rent public housing<sup>1/</sup> now under construction should be deducted from the first-year occupancy potential of rent-supplement housing for families.

Section 235, Sales Housing. Sales housing can be provided for low- and moderate-income families under provisions of Section 235. Utilizing exception income limits, there is an occupancy potential for about 815 houses a year. If regular income limits are used, the potential would be about 45 percent of that number. All of the families in the potential for Section 235 housing also are eligible for Section 236; the estimates are not additive.

There has been some activity under Section 235 in the area. To date, 100 existing properties have been insured and approximately 200 new houses have been completed or are under construction.

Section 236, Rental Housing. The annual occupancy potential under Section 236, using exception income limits, is estimated at 815 units for families and 310 units for elderly households. Utilizing regular income limits, the potential for families would be about 45 percent of that number. All families eligible under this program also are eligible for Section 235 houses (but are not additive thereto) and about three-fourths are eligible for Section 221(d)(3) BMIR housing. Less than five percent of the families and about 60 percent

---

<sup>1/</sup> Families eligible for rent-supplements generally are eligible for public low-rent housing.

of the elderly eligible under this program also are eligible for public low-rent housing or rent-supplements. Most of the potential in Crittenden County over the next year will be satisfied by the 100 units of Section 221(d)(3) BMIR housing under construction; the occupancy potential for the remainder of the HMA will not be noticeably affected, however.

### Sales Market

During 1967 and 1968, the sales market in the Memphis HMA was characterized by strong demand which prompted high levels of construction and sales activity. Beginning in early 1969, however, the condition of the market for new sales housing changed. A reduction in effective demand caused by rising costs of home construction and mortgage financing has resulted in a slight oversupply of new houses available in the area. Memphis area builders typically have produced houses on a speculative basis and, at present, the inventory of unsold houses, the major share of which are priced upward from \$25,000, is the largest of recent years. A local survey enumerated nearly 700 unsold new houses in the Memphis area in late 1969; a similar survey counted less than 300 houses completed and unsold in November 1967. As a result of the increased number of new vacant houses, the current homeowner vacancy rate (at 1.4 percent) is slightly above the October 1966 sales housing vacancy rate of 1.3 percent. To a considerable extent, the reduction in single-family construction since mid-1969 reflects the reluctance of local builders to continue constructing high-priced houses, except on a presold basis, until they have disposed of current inventories. Demand continues strong for new houses priced below \$22,500, but production of low-cost homes also has declined in recent months.

The market for existing homes has grown stronger during the past three years and is being stimulated by the rising costs of new houses and the higher rents charged at new multifamily projects. Local realtors report that they have maintained an adequate supply of listings and that houses placed on the market are selling rapidly. Despite the high cost of mortgage money, sales volume has been maintained by the more frequent incidence of mortgage assumptions and larger down payments. The used home market is very active for older homes priced from \$10,000 to \$15,000 in the periphery neighborhoods of Memphis. Purchases of these older houses have in turn facilitated upgrading by their occupants, resulting in increased sales of more expensive used homes in suburban areas.



### Rental Market

The rental market in the Memphis HMA is firm at present. New units completed during the past three years have been absorbed at acceptable levels and high occupancy has been maintained in existing projects. The current strength extends to all segments of the market, including all rent ranges and locations, and the renter vacancy rate, estimated at 2.9 percent in December 1969, is low.

New projects in the moderate rent ranges, which comprise the major share of construction in the area, have been very successful. The most recent additions to the rental inventory generally are in garden and townhouse projects with one- and two-bedroom units; typically, the number of two-bedroom units in a project is about two to three times that of one-bedroom units. There has been an increase in the number of three-bedroom units, but they remain a small share of total new units and, because of high rents, have not been absorbed readily. Many one-bedroom units marketed in recent months have gross rents starting at \$125. Two-bedroom apartments have been concentrated in the \$150-\$180 rent range. The major concentrations of new apartments are in areas extending south and southeast from Memphis, although construction has increased in the eastern and northern sections of the city. Currently, there do not appear to be any specific localities with marketing difficulties. Nearly all new projects are achieving satisfactory occupancy within six months. Management sources report that they are renting units in existing projects as they become available and that rent increases have been common.

Although marketing experience has been limited, high-rise units in Memphis generally have been absorbed satisfactorily, and this segment of the rental market remains firm. Older high-rise structures with low rents seldom have a vacancy and nearly all of the newer luxury projects built since 1960 achieved high occupancy within a reasonable time period. A project completed in 1968 has had vacancy problems, but resistance to these units appears to be location-oriented and not indicative of market weakness.

Three high-rise projects containing a total of 365 units are under construction and scheduled for completion in 1970. All are in the luxury class, with gross rents starting at about \$200 for one-bedroom units, from about \$225 for two-bedrooms, and a minimum of \$400 for three-bedrooms. Because they represent a significant addition to the supply of luxury units available in the area and all three will enter the market at approximately the same time, the initial absorption of these units and their effect on occupancy in existing projects in direct competition should be watched closely.

Economic, Demographic, and Housing Factors

The estimated demand for new nonsubsidized housing in the Memphis area is based on the assumptions presented in the following discussion of employment, demographic, and housing variables.

Employment. Since 1963, the economy of the Memphis area has sustained high rates of nonagricultural wage and salary employment growth, ranging between 3.2 percent and 6.5 percent annually. The largest increases occurred between 1965 and 1967, when there were successive annual wage and salary employment gains of 14,600 (6.5 percent) from 1965 to 1966 and 11,400 (4.8 percent) from 1966 to 1967. Since 1967, economic prosperity has continued, although recent employment growth indicates there has been a downward adjustment in the rate of expansion by local employers. During 1968, wage and salary employment increased by 8,100 jobs and, from January through October 1969, the gain was 8,600 above the same period in 1968.<sup>1/</sup> Table III presents nonagricultural wage and salary employment trends by industry for the Memphis HMA.

Manufacturing employment has increased throughout the 1963-1969 period; the average for the first ten months of 1969 was 14,200 above that for 1963. Memphis has a well diversified industrial base and there have been consistent gains in both the durable and nondurable goods sectors of the economy. All nondurable goods industry categories have experienced steady employment advances. Principal contributors to growth of durable goods manufacturing employment have been the fabricated metals, machinery, and electrical machinery industries. The largest employment expansion in manufacturing occurred in the electrical machinery industry which grew rapidly between 1965 and 1968. Initial hiring by a new RCA plant producing television sets provided much of the increase. After reaching a peak of 4,000 employees in late 1967, RCA has reduced its workforce to about 2,500. However, employment in electrical machinery has recovered from those cutbacks and is now at about the 1967 level, as a result of recent hiring by several other large employers.

---

<sup>1/</sup> The 1968 and 1969 employment averages are based on preliminary monthly data. Based on previous bench mark adjustments, these data are underreported to some extent. When revised, the estimates are not expected to reveal employment growth approaching the 1965-1967 averages, however.

Nonmanufacturing employment sources have provided about three-fourths of the total wage and salary employment increase in the Memphis area since 1963. Most of the growth has been in the trade, services, and government categories, reflecting the importance of the area as a regional trade and distribution center and the influence of strong population growth on local retail trade, services, and government activities. There also has been a continued expansion of educational and medical service facilities located in Memphis.

It is expected that nonagricultural wage and salary employment will increase by an average of 8,500 jobs a year from December 1969 to December 1971. This forecast assumes favorable prospects for continued expansion of the Memphis area economy, anticipating a strong rate of employment growth of about 3.2 percent annually. As in the recent past, nonmanufacturing jobs will comprise the major share (about 80 percent) of the increase in wage and salary employment, with gains concentrated in the trade, services, and government categories. In the manufacturing sector, steady increases are expected in all nondurable goods industries and in the fabricated metals and machinery durable goods industry categories. Also, barring unforeseen cutbacks, there should be some increase in the overall employment level in the electrical machinery industry.

At present, there are several employers who plan construction of facilities in the Memphis area. These include an Internal Revenue Service income tax processing center with a projected work force of 4,000, a Joseph Schlitz Brewing Company plant (500-800 employees), and the Taylor Forge Company (about 500 employees). Although they will have considerable impact on long term growth prospects, none anticipates initial operations before late 1971, and the influence on employment levels will be negligible over the forecast period of this analysis.

Income. In 1969, the median annual income of all families in the Memphis area, after deduction of federal income tax, was \$7,225; the median after tax income of renter households of two or more persons was \$5,050. In 1966, the medians were \$6,600 for all families and \$4,600 for renter households. Detailed distributions of all families and renter households by 1966 and 1969 income classes are presented for the Memphis area in table IV.

Demographic Factors. The population of the Memphis HMA was 835,200 in December 1969, reflecting an average increase of 19,600 persons annually since October 1966. High levels of in-migration in recent years more than offset a declining resident birth rate, and annual population gains exceeded the average of 15,150 persons a year from April 1960-October 1966. Over the next two years, population growth is expected to average about 18,000 persons annually, premised on expectations that economic expansion will continue to attract in-migrants to the Memphis area and that the decline in the number of resident births will be smaller in the near-term future.

The city of Memphis had 574,100 residents in December 1969, an increase from 497,500 in April 1960. Most of the population growth during the past nine years resulted from an active annexation program which added approximately 50,000 persons to the city and increased the land available for subsequent residential development. Annexation activity will continue to influence population increases in Memphis; an area containing approximately 50,000 persons will be incorporated into the city in 1970.

There were about 242,300 households in the Memphis HMA in December 1969. The average gain of about 6,775 households annually during the past three years was above the April 1960-October 1966 increase of about 5,275 a year, reflecting higher population growth and a decline in the average number of persons in a household. Based on expected population growth and on the assumption that household size will continue to decline, the number of households in the HMA will increase by an average of 6,300 a year during the next two years.

Demographic trends for the two counties and the principal cities of the Memphis HMA for the 1960-1971 period are presented in table V.

Housing Factors. The housing inventory of the Memphis HMA totaled 252,800 units in December 1969, an increase of 22,250 units since October 1966. The increase represented 24,850 new units completed, 600 mobile homes and conversions, and 3,200 units lost by demolition and other causes. Recent construction volume exceeded the average for the 1960-1966 period, while the annual volume of housing unit demolitions was approximately the same during both periods. As a result, the net addition to the housing inventory of 7,025 units annually from October 1966 to December 1969 was considerably above the April 1960 to October 1966 increase of 4,900 units a year. Housing inventory trends for the Memphis HMA are presented in table VI.

There were 3,650 housing units under construction in the HMA in December 1969, of which 1,200 were single-family houses and 2,450 were units in multifamily structures. Included in the multifamily units under construction were 200 units of rent-supplement housing and 300 units of low-rent public housing in Memphis and 100 units of Section 221(d)(3) BMIR housing in West Memphis. Residential construction activity is concentrated in the fringe neighborhoods and suburbs surrounding Memphis. The most active areas are those extending south and southeast from the city.

Following peak years of 9,154 units authorized in 1967 and 8,685 in 1968, private residential building activity, as measured by building permits,<sup>1/</sup> has declined sharply in the Memphis HMA. From January through October 1969, 5,363 units were authorized for construction, and it appears that rising costs of mortgage and construction financing has depressed building volume to approximately the 1966 level, when similar tight credit conditions were in evidence. Both the 2,512 single-family units and 2,851 multifamily units authorized during the first ten months of 1969 reflect significant reductions, and it is likely that the number of single-family units authorized during 1969 will be the lowest total of the post-1960 period. Trends in the number of housing units authorized in the Memphis HMA since 1960 are shown in table VII.

Vacancy. Vacancy rates in the Memphis HMA have not changed appreciably since October 1966. In December 1969, there were 1,850 sales houses and 3,275 rental units available, indicating homeowner and renter vacancy rates of 1.4 percent and 2.9 percent, respectively (see table VI). There has been an increase recently in the number of vacant new units, most of which have entered the market since mid-1969 and have yet to be occupied. The new apartment units are being absorbed at acceptable levels, but there has developed some market resistance to the unsold houses priced at \$25,000 and above.

---

<sup>1/</sup> Nearly all residential construction in the HMA is covered by building permits.

Table I

Estimated Annual Demand for Nonsubsidized Housing  
Memphis, Tennessee, Housing Market Area  
December 1, 1969-December 1, 1971

A. Single-family Houses

<u>Sales price</u>	<u>Number of units</u>	<u>Percent of total</u>
Under \$17,500	600	20
\$17,500 - 19,999	690	23
20,000 - 22,499	480	16
22,500 - 24,999	450	15
25,000 - 29,999	420	14
30,000 and over	360	12
Total	3,000	100

B. Multifamily Units

<u>Monthly gross rent<sup>a/</sup></u>	<u>Efficiency</u>	<u>One Bedroom</u>	<u>Two Bedrooms</u>	<u>Three Bedrooms</u>
Under \$130	140	-	-	-
\$130 - 159	60	790	-	-
160 - 189	10	200	1,340	-
190 - 219	-	60	590	200
220 - 249	-	30	230	130
250 and over	-	20	140	60
Total	210	1,100	2,300	390

<sup>a/</sup> Gross rent is shelter rent plus the cost of utilities.

Table II

Estimated Annual Occupancy Potential for Subsidized Housing  
Memphis, Tennessee, Housing Market Area  
December 1, 1969-December 1, 1971

A. Subsidized Sales Housing, Section 235<sup>a/</sup>

<u>Family size</u>	<u>Number of units</u>
Four persons or less	535
Five persons or more	<u>280</u>
Total	815

B. Privately-financed Subsidized Rental Housing

<u>Unit size</u>	<u>Rent-Supplement</u>		<u>Section 236</u>	
	<u>Families</u>	<u>Elderly</u>	<u>Families</u>	<u>Elderly</u>
Efficiency	-	460	-	180
One Bedroom	155	330	30	130
Two Bedrooms	450	-	410	-
Three Bedrooms	400	-	280	-
Four or more bedrooms	<u>340</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>95</u>	<u>-</u>
Total	1,345	790	815	310

<sup>a/</sup> All of the families eligible for Section 235 housing are also eligible for the Section 236 program, and about three-fourths are eligible for Section 221(d)(3) BMIR housing. The estimates are based upon exception income limits; under regular income limits the potential would be about 45 percent of that number.

Table III

Nonagricultural Wage and Salary Employment by Type of Industry  
Memphis, Tennessee, Housing Market Area, 1963-1969  
 (Annual averages in thousands)

	<u>1963</u>	<u>1964</u>	<u>1965</u>	<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>January-October</u>	
							<u>1968</u>	<u>1969</u>
Total wage and salary	<u>208.3</u>	<u>215.0</u>	<u>223.9</u>	<u>238.5</u>	<u>249.9</u>	<u>258.0</u>	<u>256.6</u>	<u>265.2</u>
Manufacturing	<u>46.8</u>	<u>47.9</u>	<u>49.5</u>	<u>54.2</u>	<u>57.1</u>	<u>59.4</u>	<u>59.1</u>	<u>61.0</u>
Durable goods	<u>20.3</u>	<u>21.4</u>	<u>22.2</u>	<u>25.8</u>	<u>28.1</u>	<u>28.8</u>	<u>28.6</u>	<u>29.7</u>
Lumber	<u>5.0</u>	<u>5.3</u>	<u>5.5</u>	<u>5.3</u>	<u>5.0</u>	<u>5.0</u>	<u>4.9</u>	<u>5.1</u>
Furniture & fixtures	<u>2.8</u>	<u>3.0</u>	<u>3.0</u>	<u>3.2</u>	<u>2.9</u>	<u>3.1</u>	<u>3.0</u>	<u>3.1</u>
Fabricated metals	<u>2.4</u>	<u>2.3</u>	<u>2.6</u>	<u>2.9</u>	<u>3.3</u>	<u>3.6</u>	<u>3.6</u>	<u>3.7</u>
Machinery (except electrical)	<u>4.1</u>	<u>3.5</u>	<u>3.6</u>	<u>4.3</u>	<u>4.0</u>	<u>4.6</u>	<u>4.6</u>	<u>4.7</u>
Electrical machinery	<u>NA</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>2.1</u>	<u>4.1</u>	<u>6.5</u>	<u>5.6</u>	<u>5.6</u>	<u>6.2</u>
All other	<u>6.0</u>	<u>7.3</u>	<u>5.4</u>	<u>6.0</u>	<u>6.4</u>	<u>6.9</u>	<u>6.9</u>	<u>7.0</u>
Nondurable goods	<u>26.5</u>	<u>26.5</u>	<u>27.3</u>	<u>28.4</u>	<u>29.0</u>	<u>30.6</u>	<u>30.5</u>	<u>31.3</u>
Food	<u>8.9</u>	<u>8.7</u>	<u>8.9</u>	<u>9.1</u>	<u>9.5</u>	<u>9.8</u>	<u>9.7</u>	<u>9.9</u>
Apparel	<u>2.0</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>2.2</u>	<u>2.3</u>	<u>2.4</u>	<u>2.4</u>	<u>2.4</u>	<u>2.3</u>
Paper products	<u>3.8</u>	<u>3.7</u>	<u>4.0</u>	<u>4.2</u>	<u>4.5</u>	<u>4.9</u>	<u>4.9</u>	<u>5.1</u>
Printing & publishing	<u>2.5</u>	<u>2.7</u>	<u>2.5</u>	<u>2.7</u>	<u>2.8</u>	<u>2.8</u>	<u>2.8</u>	<u>2.9</u>
Chemicals	<u>3.9</u>	<u>4.1</u>	<u>4.3</u>	<u>4.5</u>	<u>4.6</u>	<u>4.7</u>	<u>4.7</u>	<u>5.0</u>
All other	<u>5.4</u>	<u>5.3</u>	<u>5.4</u>	<u>5.6</u>	<u>5.2</u>	<u>6.0</u>	<u>6.0</u>	<u>6.1</u>
Nonmanufacturing	<u>161.5</u>	<u>167.1</u>	<u>174.4</u>	<u>184.3</u>	<u>192.8</u>	<u>198.6</u>	<u>197.5</u>	<u>204.1</u>
Mining	<u>.3</u>	<u>.3</u>	<u>.2</u>	<u>.3</u>	<u>.2</u>	<u>.2</u>	<u>.2</u>	<u>.2</u>
Construction	<u>11.6</u>	<u>12.6</u>	<u>12.4</u>	<u>13.1</u>	<u>13.8</u>	<u>13.8</u>	<u>13.7</u>	<u>14.1</u>
Trans., comm., & utilities	<u>16.2</u>	<u>16.5</u>	<u>17.0</u>	<u>18.2</u>	<u>19.3</u>	<u>19.3</u>	<u>19.3</u>	<u>20.0</u>
Trade	<u>54.7</u>	<u>56.7</u>	<u>58.5</u>	<u>62.1</u>	<u>63.6</u>	<u>65.9</u>	<u>65.3</u>	<u>66.7</u>
Wholesale	<u>(20.2)</u>	<u>(20.9)</u>	<u>(21.3)</u>	<u>(22.8)</u>	<u>(23.1)</u>	<u>(24.1)</u>	<u>(24.1)</u>	<u>(24.6)</u>
Retail	<u>(34.5)</u>	<u>(35.8)</u>	<u>(37.2)</u>	<u>(39.3)</u>	<u>(40.5)</u>	<u>(41.8)</u>	<u>(41.2)</u>	<u>(42.1)</u>
Finance, ins., & real estate	<u>11.6</u>	<u>11.7</u>	<u>12.4</u>	<u>12.9</u>	<u>13.3</u>	<u>13.7</u>	<u>13.7</u>	<u>13.8</u>
Services	<u>31.4</u>	<u>32.8</u>	<u>34.3</u>	<u>36.3</u>	<u>38.7</u>	<u>40.7</u>	<u>40.5</u>	<u>43.0</u>
Government	<u>35.7</u>	<u>36.5</u>	<u>39.6</u>	<u>41.4</u>	<u>43.9</u>	<u>45.0</u>	<u>44.8</u>	<u>46.4</u>

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

Source : Tennessee Department of Employment Security.

NA -- Not available



Table IV

**Percentage Distribution of All Families and Renter Households <sup>a/</sup> by Estimated Annual Income After Deduction of Federal Income Tax**  
**Memphis Housing Market Area**

Annual after-tax income	HMA Total				Shelby County				Crittenden County			
	1966		1969		1966		1969		1966		1969	
	All families	Renter households <sup>a/</sup>	All families	Renter households <sup>a/</sup>	All families	Renter households <sup>a/</sup>	All families	Renter households <sup>a/</sup>	All families	Renter households <sup>a/</sup>	All families	Renter households <sup>a/</sup>
Under \$2,000	11	19	9	17	9	18	8	16	30	35	27	32
\$2,000 - 2,999	7	10	6	9	7	10	6	9	14	16	13	15
3,000 - 3,999	8	13	7	12	9	13	8	12	11	10	11	10
4,000 - 4,999	9	13	8	11	9	13	9	11	10	9	9	8
5,000 - 5,999	10	13	9	11	10	13	8	11	7	8	6	7
6,000 - 6,999	8	8	8	10	9	8	8	10	6	5	6	6
7,000 - 7,999	8	6	9	8	8	6	8	8	4	4	6	5
8,000 - 8,999	8	5	7	5	8	5	8	5	4	3	5	4
9,000 - 9,999	7	4	8	4	7	4	7	4	3	2	4	3
10,000 - 12,499	12	5	13	6	12	6	13	7	5	4	6	5
12,500 - 14,999	6	2	7	4	6	2	8	4	3	2	3	2
15,000 - 19,999	4	1	6	2	4	1	6	2	2	2	2	2
20,000 and over	2	1	3	1	2	1	3	1	1	2	2	1
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Median	\$6,600	\$4,600	\$7,225	\$5,050	\$6,675	\$4,675	\$7,300	\$5,125	\$3,600	\$3,075	\$3,950	\$3,375

<sup>a/</sup> Excludes one-person renter households.

Source: Estimated by Housing Market Analyst.

Table V  
Demographic Trends  
Memphis, Tennessee, Housing Market Area  
1960-1971

	<u>April</u> <u>1960</u>	<u>October</u> <u>1966</u>	<u>December</u> <u>1969</u>	<u>December</u> <u>1971</u>	<u>Average annual changes<sup>a/</sup></u>		
					<u>1960-1966</u>	<u>1966-1969</u>	<u>1969-1971</u>
<u>Population</u>							
HMA total	<u>674,583</u>	<u>773,000</u>	<u>835,200</u>	<u>871,200</u>	<u>15,150</u>	<u>19,600</u>	<u>18,000</u>
Shelby County	<u>627,019</u>	<u>720,600</u>	<u>780,000</u>	<u>814,400</u>	<u>14,400</u>	<u>18,750</u>	<u>17,200</u>
Memphis	<u>497,524</u>	<u>533,000</u>	<u>574,100</u>	<u>636,200</u>	<u>5,450</u>	<u>12,975</u>	<u>31,050</u>
Remainder	<u>129,495</u>	<u>187,600</u>	<u>205,900</u>	<u>178,200</u>	<u>8,950</u>	<u>5,775</u>	<u>-13,850<sup>b/</sup></u>
Crittenden County	<u>47,564</u>	<u>52,400</u>	<u>55,200</u>	<u>56,800</u>	<u>750</u>	<u>880</u>	<u>800</u>
West Memphis	<u>19,374</u>	<u>24,000</u>	<u>26,400</u>	<u>27,800</u>	<u>710</u>	<u>755</u>	<u>700</u>
Remainder	<u>28,190</u>	<u>28,400</u>	<u>28,800</u>	<u>29,000</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>125</u>	<u>100</u>
<u>Households</u>							
HMA total	<u>186,561</u>	<u>220,800</u>	<u>242,300</u>	<u>254,900</u>	<u>5,275</u>	<u>6,775</u>	<u>6,300</u>
Shelby County	<u>174,758</u>	<u>207,700</u>	<u>228,400</u>	<u>240,600</u>	<u>5,075</u>	<u>6,525</u>	<u>6,100</u>
Memphis	<u>144,932</u>	<u>159,400</u>	<u>174,300</u>	<u>193,900</u>	<u>2,225</u>	<u>4,700</u>	<u>9,800</u>
Remainder	<u>29,826</u>	<u>48,300</u>	<u>54,100</u>	<u>46,700</u>	<u>2,850</u>	<u>1,825</u>	<u>-3,700<sup>b/</sup></u>
Crittenden County	<u>11,803</u>	<u>13,100</u>	<u>13,900</u>	<u>14,300</u>	<u>200</u>	<u>250</u>	<u>200</u>
West Memphis	<u>5,081</u>	<u>6,325</u>	<u>7,000</u>	<u>7,350</u>	<u>190</u>	<u>210</u>	<u>175</u>
Remainder	<u>6,722</u>	<u>6,775</u>	<u>6,900</u>	<u>6,950</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>25</u>

<sup>a/</sup> Subtotals may not add to totals because of rounding.

<sup>b/</sup> Declines will result from the annexation to Memphis

Sources: 1960 Census and Housing Market Analyst.

Table VI

Housing Inventory, Tenure, and Vacancy  
Memphis, Tennessee, Housing Market Area  
1960-1969

<u>Tenure and vacancy</u>	<u>April</u> <u>1960</u>	<u>October</u> <u>1966</u>	<u>December</u> <u>1969</u>
Total housing inventory	<u>198,697</u>	<u>230,550</u>	<u>252,800</u>
Total occupied	<u>186,561</u>	<u>220,800</u>	<u>242,300</u>
Owner-occupied	104,609	121,200	131,350
Percent of all occupied	56.1%	54.9%	54.2%
Renter-occupied	81,952	99,600	110,950
Percent of all occupied	43.9%	45.1%	45.8%
Vacant housing units	<u>12,136</u>	<u>9,750</u>	<u>10,500</u>
Available vacant	<u>7,460</u>	<u>4,500</u>	<u>5,125</u>
For sale	2,699	1,600	1,850
Homeowner vacancy rate	2.5%	1.3%	1.4%
For rent	4,761	2,900	3,275
Renter vacancy rate	5.5%	2.8%	2.9%
Other vacant <sup>a/</sup>	4,676	5,250	5,375

<sup>a/</sup> Includes seasonal units, vacant dilapidated units, units rented or sold awaiting occupancy, and units held off the market.

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

Table VII

Housing Units Authorized by Building Permits  
Memphis, Tennessee, Housing Market Area  
1960-1969

	<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>Jan.-Oct.</u> <u>1969</u>
HMA total	<u>5,282</u>	<u>4,929</u> <sup>a/</sup>	<u>5,021</u>	<u>7,532</u>	<u>6,417</u>	<u>7,557</u>	<u>6,444</u>	<u>9,154</u>	<u>8,685</u>	<u>5,363</u> <sup>b/</sup>
Single-family	<u>3,968</u>	<u>3,438</u>	<u>3,704</u>	<u>3,545</u>	<u>3,929</u>	<u>3,635</u>	<u>3,257</u>	<u>4,180</u>	<u>3,919</u>	<u>2,512</u>
Multifamily	<u>1,314</u>	<u>1,491</u>	<u>1,317</u>	<u>3,987</u>	<u>2,488</u>	<u>3,922</u>	<u>3,187</u>	<u>4,974</u>	<u>4,766</u>	<u>2,851</u>
Shelby County	<u>5,102</u>	<u>4,756</u>	<u>4,738</u>	<u>7,247</u>	<u>6,260</u>	<u>7,316</u>	<u>6,295</u>	<u>8,924</u>	<u>8,299</u>	<u>5,045</u>
Single-family	<u>3,794</u>	<u>3,271</u>	<u>3,421</u>	<u>3,322</u>	<u>3,774</u>	<u>3,414</u>	<u>3,118</u>	<u>4,060</u>	<u>3,815</u>	<u>2,411</u>
Multifamily	<u>1,308</u>	<u>1,485</u>	<u>1,317</u>	<u>3,925</u>	<u>2,486</u>	<u>3,902</u>	<u>3,177</u>	<u>4,864</u>	<u>4,484</u>	<u>2,634</u>
Memphis	<u>2,266</u>	<u>2,455</u>	<u>2,025</u>	<u>4,435</u>	<u>2,917</u>	<u>4,605</u>	<u>3,952</u>	<u>3,809</u>	<u>4,047</u>	<u>2,715</u>
Single-family	<u>1,028</u>	<u>1,036</u>	<u>806</u>	<u>762</u>	<u>669</u>	<u>1,252</u>	<u>1,251</u>	<u>1,521</u>	<u>1,182</u>	<u>801</u>
Multifamily	<u>1,238</u>	<u>1,419</u>	<u>1,219</u>	<u>3,673</u>	<u>2,248</u>	<u>3,353</u>	<u>2,701</u>	<u>2,288</u>	<u>2,865</u>	<u>1,914</u>
Remainder of Shelby County	<u>2,836</u>	<u>2,301</u>	<u>2,713</u>	<u>2,812</u>	<u>3,343</u>	<u>2,711</u>	<u>2,343</u>	<u>5,115</u>	<u>4,252</u>	<u>2,330</u>
Single-family	<u>2,766</u>	<u>2,235</u>	<u>2,615</u>	<u>2,560</u>	<u>3,105</u>	<u>2,162</u>	<u>1,867</u>	<u>2,539</u>	<u>2,633</u>	<u>1,610</u>
Multifamily	<u>70</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>252</u>	<u>238</u>	<u>549</u>	<u>476</u>	<u>2,576</u>	<u>1,619</u>	<u>720</u>
Crittenden County	<u>180</u>	<u>173</u>	<u>283</u>	<u>285</u>	<u>157</u>	<u>231</u>	<u>149</u>	<u>230</u>	<u>386</u>	<u>318</u>
Single-family	<u>174</u>	<u>167</u>	<u>283</u>	<u>223</u>	<u>155</u>	<u>211</u>	<u>139</u>	<u>120</u>	<u>104</u>	<u>101</u>
Multifamily	<u>6</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>62</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>110</u>	<u>282</u>	<u>217</u>
West Memphis	<u>175</u>	<u>172</u>	<u>277</u>	<u>277</u>	<u>146</u>	<u>222</u>	<u>137</u>	<u>217</u>	<u>374</u>	<u>310</u>
Single-family	<u>171</u>	<u>166</u>	<u>277</u>	<u>215</u>	<u>144</u>	<u>202</u>	<u>127</u>	<u>107</u>	<u>92</u>	<u>93</u>
Multifamily	<u>4</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>62</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>110</u>	<u>282</u>	<u>217</u>
Remainder of Crittenden County	<u>5</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>8</u>
Single-family	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>8</u>
Multifamily	<u>2</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>

<sup>a/</sup> Excludes public housing: 250 units in Memphis, 90 units in Shelby County, and 119 units in West Memphis.

<sup>b/</sup> Excludes 300 public housing units in Memphis.

Source: Bureau of the Census, C-40 Construction Reports; and local building inspectors.

728.1 :308 F22 Memphis, Tenn. 1969

U.S. Federal Housing Administration  
Analysis...

---