

728.1
:308
F22
Pittsburgh
Pa.
1971

Analysis of the

PITTSBURGH, PENNSYLVANIA HOUSING MARKET

as of November 1, 1971

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

July 1972

Housing Market Analysis

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, as of November 1, 1971

Foreword

This analysis has been prepared for the assistance and guidance of the Department of Housing and Urban Development 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.

HOUSING MARKET ANALYSIS - PITTSBURGH, PENNSYLVANIA
AS OF NOVEMBER 1, 1971

The Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, Housing Market Area (HMA), which includes the counties of Allegheny, Beaver, Washington, and Westmoreland, is coextensive with the Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area as defined by the Office of Management and Budget. Reflecting its location in the coal-mining region of southwestern Pennsylvania, the Pittsburgh area economy has traditionally been based on the production of durable goods. Following the recession years of the early 1960's, employment in the Pittsburgh area grew substantially between 1963 and 1969; however, the national economic recession beginning in 1970 and developments associated with steel workers' contract negotiations have resulted in a weakening of the economy.

Sustained levels of employment growth with comparatively moderate levels of new residential construction during the 1964-1966 period restored a reasonable supply-demand balance to the Pittsburgh housing market. Substantial employment growth continued through the late 1960's while levels of residential construction decreased, resulting in a tight housing market in both sales and rental sectors. In 1970, however, losses in basic industry employment and increased out-migration resulted in a loosening of the housing market, primarily in the rental sector. Currently, the sales market appears to have recovered as a result of a reduction in single-family building activity but there is still an ample supply of units available for rent.

Anticipated Housing Demand

There will be an annual demand for about 6,500 nonsubsidized housing units in the Pittsburgh HMA during the two-year forecast period ending November 1, 1973. Optimum long-run demand-supply balance would be reached if approximately 4,000 units were supplied as new single-family sales houses and 2,000 were new rental units. There will be an additional demand for about 500 mobile homes annually. This forecast demand for new nonsubsidized

housing is based primarily upon anticipated economic and demographic trends. Considerations also has been given to other factors, including anticipated losses to the existing inventory, the number of vacant housing units available for sale or rent, the number of units currently under construction, and the area's prevailing levels of family income. Table I shows the distribution of demand for sales houses by price class and the demand for multifamily units by gross monthly rents and unit-size.

The following table presents the estimated annual demand for new unsubsidized housing in the HMA and constituent counties. The distribution has been adjusted, in some cases, for current vacancies, units under construction, and past market absorption in each of the respective counties.

Estimated Annual Demand for New Unsubsidized Housing
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, Housing Market Area
November 1, 1971 - November 1, 1973

<u>County</u>	<u>Sales housing</u>	<u>Rental housing</u>	<u>Total</u>
Allegheny	2,200	1,450	3,650
Beaver	350	150	500
Washington	350	100	450
Westmoreland	<u>1,100</u>	<u>300</u>	<u>1,400</u>
Total	4,000	2,000	6,000

The projected annual demand for new unsubsidized housing during the forecast period is slightly above the number of units built in 1970 and closely parallels the rate of construction during the first eight months of 1971, but is below the volume of new construction in any year of the 1960-1970 decade. Since the bulk of new job opportunities during the next two years are expected to be concentrated in nonmanufacturing industries which will attract a substantial number of women and secondary wage-earners, new household formation is expected to proceed at a lower rate than during the mid- and late-1960's. Demand for single-family sales housing remains strong; however, increasing construction costs prevent absorption of the high levels of single-family houses marketed during the mid-1960's.

Caution should be exercised in the expansion of new unsubsidized housing unit production. The Pittsburgh area economy is very sensitive to changes in national economic conditions and periods of expansion or retrenchment in the national economy can have a substantial impact on the housing market. An unexpected retrenchment of the local economy could have a very detrimental effect on the housing market in a short period of time; therefore, it is recommended that the absorption of new housing units, particularly rentals, be observed carefully during the forecast period and adjustments in demand estimates be made where appropriate in order to insure the maintenance of desirable demand-supply relationships.

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 HUD: monthly rent supplement 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 supplements; 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 Pittsburgh HMA, the total occupancy potential is estimated to be 8,000 units annually.

The annual occupancy potentials^{1/} for subsidized housing discussed in the following paragraphs are based on 1971 incomes, the occupancy of substandard housing, income limits in effect as of November 1, 1971, and on available market experience.^{2/}

Section 235 and Section 236. Subsidized housing for households with low to moderate incomes may be provided under either Section 235 or Section 236. Moderately-priced, subsidized sales housing for eligible families can be made

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

^{2/} Families with incomes inadequate to purchase or rent nonsubsidized housing generally are eligible for one form or another of subsidized housing.

available through Section 235. Subsidized rental housing^{1/} for the same families may be alternatively provided under Section 236; the Section 236 program contains additional provisions for subsidized rental units for elderly couples and individuals. In the Pittsburgh HMA, it is estimated (based on regular income limits) that, for the period November 1, 1971-November 1, 1973, there is an occupancy potential for an annual total of 2,300 subsidized family units utilizing either Section 235 or Section 236, or a combination of the two programs. In addition, there is an annual potential for about 800 units of Section 236 rental housing for elderly couples and individuals. The use of exception income limits would increase this potential by about 30 percent for families, but only slightly for elderly couples and individuals.

Currently, there are about 1,600 units of Section 236 housing under management, including about 560 new units and 1,040 under the rehabilitation program. All of these units are in Allegheny County, largely in the city of Pittsburgh. Absorption levels in projects on the market over nine months has been satisfactory, but not as rapid as expected evidenced by an occupancy level of just over 92 percent. The bulk of the Section 236 units under management have been on the market less than five months and it remains to be seen how satisfactorily these will be absorbed. It does not appear that the slower than expected absorption of these units is due to a lack of depth in the overall market capacity, but rather, reflects heavy concentrations in certain submarkets and other than market related occupancy problems in certain projects. In addition, there are 2,127 units of Section 236 housing under construction in the Pittsburgh HMA, including 505 units under the rehabilitation program. The distribution of these units in the constituent submarkets is as follows: 615 units in the city of Pittsburgh, 784 units in the remainder of Allegheny County, 240 units in Beaver County, 136 units in Washington County, and 352 units in Westmoreland County. It is anticipated that the majority of these units will come onto the market during the first year of the forecast period.

There are, also, 1,782 units of Section 221(d)(3) BMIR housing under management in the Pittsburgh HMA, of which only 360 are outside the city of Pittsburgh. In addition, there are 230 units currently under construction in the city of Pittsburgh. Market absorption of these units has been satisfactory and currently an occupancy level of about 95 percent is being maintained.

As of September 1971, about 2,530 units of sales housing have been subsidized under Section 235, including 2,080 new units and 450 existing units. Approximately 55 percent of this activity has occurred during the first eight months of 1971. Existing Section 235 units have been concentrated in the

^{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.

city of Pittsburgh and new units subsidized under Section 235 have been concentrated in suburban Allegheny and Westmoreland Counties.

As stated previously, the annual occupancy potential for both Section 235 and Section 236 housing is estimated to be about 3,100 units of which about 40 to 45 percent is expected to be supplied through the utilization of the Section 235 sales housing program. Therefore, allowing for the allocation of 20 percent and 40 percent of the new and rehabilitated Section 236 units, respectively, for rent supplement subsidy^{1/} and existing vacancies in projects now under management, it appears that the Section 236 rental housing potential for the first year of the forecast period will be satisfied by the marketing of the Section 236 and Section 221(d)(3) BMIR units under construction. The second year's potential will depend on the satisfactory absorption of units now under construction. In any event, it is suggested that during the second year of the forecast period the production of Section 236 projects be in small increments so that the effects on the Section 235/236 market can be observed carefully for signs of overbuilding.

Based on the slow absorption of Section 236 units and barely satisfactory occupancy rate (93.8 percent) of Section 221(d)(3) BMIR units in the central city of Pittsburgh, it appears that several areas of the central city are becoming saturated with housing for low- to moderate-income families. It is recommended that in considering future housing to be programmed under Section 235 or Section 236, more attention should be given to achieving a wider geographic dispersion throughout the central city and the HMA.

Rental Housing Under the Public Housing and Rent Supplement Programs.

These two programs serve households in essentially the same low-income groups. The principal differences arise from the manner in which net income is computed and the requirement that prospective rent-supplement tenants occupy substandard housing. For the Pittsburgh HMA, the annual occupancy potential for public housing during the two-year period ending November 1, 1973 is estimated to be about 3,000 units for families and 2,500 units for elderly couples and individuals. Under the rent-supplement program, the potential for elderly couples and individuals remains unchanged but for families it is reduced to 1,850 units. These potentials are not additive because most of the families and all of the elderly eligible for rent-supplement also are eligible for public housing. A portion of the potential for rent-supplement units will be satisfied by the rent-supplement provision under Section 236.

In November 1971, there were about 17,300 units of public housing under management in the Pittsburgh HMA, of which about 3,700 were designated for the elderly. Local public housing authorities report that the number of available vacancies is negligible and amount to no more than normal turnover. In addition, local authorities have a combined waiting list in excess of 9,450 applicants, of whom about 4,550 are elderly. Currently, there are 509 units for families and 575 units for the elderly under construction in the HMA,

^{1/} The sponsor for all of the Section 236 rehabilitated units is currently applying for the maximum 40 percent rent supplement subsidy.

including 200 units being rehabilitated in the city of Pittsburgh. Of the units under construction, only 158 units (two projects) are located outside Allegheny County. The inventory of rent-supplement projects consists of 355 units insured under Section 221(d)(3) MR and about 20 percent (320 units) of the Section 236 units under management.

As indicated previously, the number of public housing units under construction does not approach the anticipated annual occupancy potential for the HMA. Extensive waiting lists are indicative of the large number of families housed in substandard and overcrowded dwellings. Many households cannot afford any type of unsubsidized housing of decent quality without paying a disproportionately large share of their income for monthly rents. It should be observed that the estimated occupancy potential (approximately 5,500 annually) consists of that proportion of eligible households that would reasonably be expected to seek public housing if it were available. Should funds become available, the effective satisfaction of so large a potential would require a high degree of coordination among the functions of site selection, project design, and the establishment of the widest possible geographic dispersion throughout the HMA.

Sales Market

As evidenced by a low vacancy rate of 0.7 percent for sales housing, the market for both new and existing sales housing in the Pittsburgh HMA is very tight. The excessive vacancy rates of the early 1960's reduced substantially during a period of economic expansion in the mid-1960's. In November 1971, builders' inventories of unsold homes had been reduced from the two previous years and property managers' listings of existing homes were low.

From more than 7,500 single-family homes built in 1960, home construction dropped in 1961 to 6,100, maintaining a level of starts between 5,500 and 6,700 annually from 1961 through 1968. Since 1967, in spite of expanding subsidy activity under Section 235, a persistent decline in single-family starts has been recorded--from 6,657 to 4,726 for the full year of 1970 and 3,646 in eight months of 1971.

Nonsubsidized home building was characterized after the mid-1960's by greater concentration on higher priced homes, albeit with greater amenities. The combined force of both higher inventories of unsold homes and the subsidy-program exposure of neglected demand for lower priced homes caused expansion of home construction in lower price ranges in 1970. After successive increases annually of about 10 percent for several years, the median price of all new homes completed declined by 14 percent in 1970 from \$29,550 to \$25,350.

Accompanying the recent downward price shift was an adjustment in the size of new homes and the elimination of extra amenities. Informed local sources reported that the market share of four or more bedroom homes was reduced from about 55 percent in 1969 to 45 percent in 1970 and it is estimated to be somewhat lower during 1971. In addition, more evidence of the

market price shift becomes apparent when assessing the qualitative characteristics of unsold inventory. Surveys taken in January 1971 indicate an unsold inventory of new homes at the end of 1970 that exceeded 10 percent of the annual start volume, a peak rate for the 1960-1970 decade. Qualitatively, of the total starts in the \$35,000 and over price range, about 41 percent remained unsold in January 1971. This excess of builders' inventory led to a sharp reduction in speculative building. During the first ten months of 1971, most of the excess unsold inventory has been successfully absorbed.

As in the past, single-family construction in the city of Pittsburgh has been restrained. The limited land supply in Pittsburgh City has restricted new single-family home construction to scattered sites or areas where demolition of the existing inventory has made land available. The highest concentration of new single-family construction in recent years has been in suburban Allegheny County, with the area east of Pittsburgh recording the highest proportion of growth. In large developments such as Holiday Park in Plum Borough and Alpine Village in Monroeville most new homes are built in the \$20,000 to \$30,000 price range. The eastern portion of Allegheny County extending into Westmoreland County is also a major area of Section 235 activity. Growth in southern Allegheny County, where most of new homes start at \$30,000 and above, has slowed somewhat from past years. In this area, single-family development is still active in Bethel Park Borough, Upper St. Clair Township, and South Park Township. Although growth has slowed, the South Hills area has developed into a good resale market for existing homes. There has been a significant amount of new subdivision activity in Ross, Shaler, and McCandless Townships, to the north of the city of Pittsburgh. In North Hills subdivisions most of the homes are custom built on a contract basis beginning in the \$35,000 to \$40,000 price range. This area is expected to support a substantial portion of the growth in the Pittsburgh HMA during the future as a result of good land availability and the construction of Interstate 79 from Pittsburgh City north to Erie, Pennsylvania. Western Allegheny County is the newest area of growth in the Pittsburgh HMA. Although some developments in this area are providing lower-priced homes (\$20,000 to \$25,000 price range) new subdivision activity is being hampered by problems with sewage facilities and building codes. Availability of buildable land has also been hampered by the extensive amount of land utilized for strip mining in past years.

Subdivision activity in Beaver and Washington Counties has been quite limited. Most building is done on a contract basis in small subdivisions or on scattered lots. In contrast, Westmoreland County has developed into an extremely good market for single-family construction. The availability of less expensive land, a good economic base, and an excellent access system to the city of Pittsburgh have led to substantial effective demand from migration from higher density areas of Allegheny County.

Rental Market

Inspite of reduced rates of unsubsidized multifamily construction since 1967, the economic retrenchment during 1970 and 1971 has resulted in a weakening rental market in the Pittsburgh HMA. This condition was somewhat aggravated by a local newspaper strike from May through September in 1971. The overall vacancy rate of 6.5 percent represents an increase of about 2,100 vacant units available for rent since the 1970 Census total of 15,025 vacant units (5.8 percent). Besides the loss of the local newspaper as a locator service and the unfavorable economic factors, the primary impetus behind this increase in vacant units for rent has been twofold. The increased production of subsidized housing (primarily under Section 236) has drawn households from rental units, most of which at best, are considered marginal; therefore, leaving them vacant and available for rent, but not actually competitive on the open market. This has been a major factor responsible for increased vacant units in the city of Pittsburgh, Washington County, and Westmoreland County. Westmoreland County also has been the site of several projects having undesirable locations and poor construction which has resulted in the lowering of rents to decrease vacancy levels. The other primary cause of increased vacancies has been the reduction in effective demand for luxury or semi-luxury apartments in the over \$250 a month rent range. Largely as a result of economic factors, increased vacancies in this segment of the rental market can be attributed to the substantial reduction of corporate transfers into the Pittsburgh area during the past year and a half. This apparent softness in the high-priced rental market is characteristic of suburban Allegheny County, primarily in the South Hills area.

As in the past, most of the new construction of multifamily units has been concentrated in Allegheny County, and particularly to the south of Pittsburgh. Scott Township and Bethel Park Borough have been the location of over 650 apartments in the last two years. There has been some multifamily activity in Ross and Shaler Townships in the North Hills of the Pittsburgh HMA. To the east of Pittsburgh, several new apartment developments have been built in Monroeville and Braddock Hills. The rental market west of Pittsburgh, near the airport, has been very active in recent years. Good access to the airport and the city of Pittsburgh and the planned expansion of the airport's facilities have made this area very attractive for apartment development.

The city of Pittsburgh has had very little new unsubsidized multifamily construction in recent years as compared to the mid-1960's. Aside from the constraint of the shortage of land, downtown apartment projects have in the past experienced slow absorption as a result of poor design, location, and security problems. Satisfactory levels of occupancy have been attained only after long rent-up periods.

Apartment construction in the outlying counties of Beaver, Washington, and Westmoreland has been limited. Washington County has supported subsidized projects under Section 236 and Section 221(d)(3) BMIR in addition to

several nonsubsidized projects of 30 to 40 units each. Most of the multi-family units built recently in Beaver and Westmoreland Counties have been in tri-plexes and four-plexes with virtually no absorption problems.

In generalizing the characteristics of new apartment projects in the Pittsburgh HMA, it appears that the majority of new structures are garden-style or townhouse developments. Local sources report that nearly 60 percent of the new units started in 1970 were in structures with less than four stories; this is up from 50 percent in 1969. This trend reflects the recent difficulty in marketing of the luxury, high-rent units in high-rise structures. In addition emphasis is being placed on construction of the two-bedroom unit, which accounted for about 50 percent of the starts in 1970. This great supply of two-bedroom units is being absorbed well in garden-style projects, but not in the high-rise structures. Effective demand in the high-rent, luxury units in new high-rise structures has been substantially reduced through the out-transfer of many corporate executives during the recent economic recession.

Monthly gross rents vary widely in the Pittsburgh HMA depending on location and type of structure. In newer garden-style apartments typical of suburban Allegheny County monthly gross rents average \$175 to \$225 for one-bedroom units, \$200 to \$250 for two-bedroom units, and upward from \$250 for three-bedroom accommodations; monthly gross rents average 25 to 50 percent higher in newer elevator high-rise projects. Rent ranges for multifamily accommodations become proportionately lower as the distance from the central urban area of the HMA increases.

Economic, Demographic, and Housing Factors

The demand for unsubsidized housing in the Pittsburgh HMA is based on the findings presented in the following discussion of economic, demographic, and housing trends.

Economic Factors. The economy of the Pittsburgh area is heavily dependent on durable goods industries, notably in the primary metals sector. During the twelve months prior to November 1, 1971, total nonagricultural wage and salary employment averaged 867,500, including 265,800 manufacturing jobs and 601,700 jobs in nonmanufacturing industries. During this period durable goods industries provided about 83 percent of all manufacturing employment with the primary metals sector contributing almost 50 percent of the jobs in durable goods industries.

Cyclical trends in manufacturing employment were downward from 1960 to 1963, upward from 1963 to 1966 and downward again from 1966 to 1971. Although nonmanufacturing employment has increased each year since 1961, the losses of manufacturing employment were great enough to result in losses in total employment from 1960 to 1962 and again from 1969 to 1971.

As a result of the economic recession in the 1960-1963 period, total nonagricultural wage and salary employment declined from 776,300 to 742,900. From 1963 to 1969, total nonagricultural wage and salary employment increased by an average of 21,975 jobs annually to a total of 874,800. Annual increments ranged from a gain of 27,400 jobs from 1965 to 1966 to a gain of 15,400 jobs from 1967 to 1968. Following a minor reduction in employment from 1969 to 1970 (900 jobs), total employment declined more abruptly by 9,000 jobs to a total nonagricultural wage and salary average of 867,500 for the twelve months prior to November 1, 1971.

After falling sharply from 291,600 in 1960 to less than 266,000 in 1962, manufacturing employment increased from a total of 266,600 jobs in 1963 to a peak of 293,000 jobs in 1966. In 1966, of the 293,000 total manufacturing jobs, 248,000 were in durable goods industries -- some 25,000 more than the low point in durable goods employment in 1963. During the 1963-1966 period, about 57 percent of the employment increase in durable goods industries consisted of gains in the primary metals industry, reflecting trends in the national economy. Since 1966, employment in durable goods industries has declined from the peak of 248,000 jobs to 242,000 in 1968-1969 -- to 232,000 in 1970 -- and to 220,000 in 1971. The most substantial employment reduction occurred in primary metals, where over 22,000 jobs were lost. Employment levels in nondurable goods industries remained relatively constant during the 1960-1971 period. During the twelve months prior to November 1, 1971, total manufacturing employment averaged only 265,800 jobs -- 27,000 below the 1966 peak, entirely because of decreases in basic industry employment.

Nonmanufacturing employment grew persistently from 1961 through 1971 -- rising from a 473,900 low in the 1960-1961 recession to 601,700 in the twelve-month period ending in October 1971, an average annual increase of nearly 13,000 in nonmanufacturing jobs. About 109,000 of the additional nonmanufacturing jobs were created during the most rapid growth period from 1963 to 1969 -- an average growth of over 18,000 jobs annually. Principal contributors to this gain include wholesale and retail trade (4,700 annually), service establishments (5,525 annually) and federal, state and local government (4,400 annually). This significant increase in nonmanufacturing employment during the 1963-1969 period reflects to some extent the diversification of the Pittsburgh area economy from past years when the domination of durable goods industries was much greater. Between 1969 and 1970, nonmanufacturing employment increased by 11,100 jobs. During the twelve months prior to November 1, 1971, nonmanufacturing employment averaged 601,700, showing continued growth, but at a rate below that of the 1963-1969 period.

During the two-year forecast period, nonagricultural wage and salary employment is expected to increase by about 19,000 jobs (9,500 annually). This increase contemplates a gain of about 23,000 additional nonmanufacturing jobs and a net loss of about 4,000 manufacturing jobs. Future employment prospects in the manufacturing sector hinge upon the production of durable goods, particularly primary metals. Developments

in the primary metals industry in recent months have led to the layoff of about 40,000 workers, primarily in the steel and blast furnace segment. In anticipation of an extended labor-management dispute following the expiration of the steel workers contract,^{1/} steel consumers stock-piled their inventories. Intensive negotiation talks averted the strike, but steel consumers were left with three to four months of stock-piles, with only limited numbers of new orders. It is anticipated that steel producers will begin substantial rehiring in two to three months as stock-piles dwindle; however, based on past downward trends in labor requirements for the steel industry, it is unlikely that there will be 100 percent recall. In addition, the tax-credit for business is expected to channel investment into new automated production facilities (as in the expansion of U.S. Steel's Irvin Works in West Mifflin), further reducing net manpower needs. Any increased demand for domestic steel products in both domestic and foreign markets created by the temporary 10 percent import surcharge and the devaluation of the dollar will be met, for the most part, by the use of over-time labor and will only slow the inevitable employment losses in the steel industry. Rising imports and less than desired gains in productivity have also plagued the domestic steel industry. During the two-year forecast period, employment in the primary metals industry is expected to decrease by about 5,000 jobs from the average recorded during the twelve months prior to November 1, 1971. Employment in other durable goods industries is expected to stabilize following the reductions during the past year, and employment in nondurable goods industries is expected to increase slightly.

Nonmanufacturing industries will account for virtually all of the increase in nonagricultural wage and salary employment over the next two years. As in the past, most of the new jobs will be concentrated in trade, services, and government (primarily at the state and local levels).

Income. As of November 1, 1971, the median annual income, after deduction of federal income tax, of all families in the Pittsburgh HMA was \$9,325, and the median after-tax income of two- or more-person renter households was \$7,100. The median annual after-tax incomes in 1959 for all families and of two- or more-person renter households were \$5,275 and \$4,050, respectively. The median after-tax income of all families, currently, ranges from a high of \$9,750 in Allegheny County to a low of \$8,400 in Westmoreland County. Table IV contains distributions of all families and renter households by annual income classes and annual median after-tax incomes of all families in the constituent counties for 1959 and 1971.

Demographic Factors. The total population of the Pittsburgh HMA was estimated to be 2,399,700 persons as of November 1971. This total reflects an average annual loss of about 1,000 persons since April 1970. The net loss in population between 1960 and 1970 was about 4,200 persons (425 annually); this loss reflects a net natural increase (resident births

^{1/} The steel workers contract expired on July 31, 1971.

minus resident deaths) of about 173,050 persons and a net out-migration of about 177,250 persons. Most of the population growth in the HMA has been in suburban Allegheny County as in-migrants from surrounding areas and out-migrants from the city of Pittsburgh continue to locate there. In addition, Westmoreland County has accounted for an increasing proportion of the population growth in the HMA (see table V).

During the 1960-1963 period, the Pittsburgh HMA suffered from a heavy loss of population through out-migration. Since 1963, a reduced level of out-migration stimulated by increasing levels of economic expansion resulted in gradual population growth through the mid- and late-1960's. Beginning in 1970, the national economic recession combined with the steel industry letdown, after inventory buildup that regularly precedes steel labor contract talks, has again resulted in a net loss of population; however, this loss of population was not substantial and is not expected to constitute a continuing aspect of the Pittsburgh housing market. During the forecast period population in the HMA is expected to remain relatively stable as a result of a reduced rate of out-migration in response to the anticipated recovery of the local economy.

As of November 1, 1971, there were an estimated 765,200 households in the Pittsburgh HMA, an increase of about 3,800 annually since 1970. As shown in table V, this increase is somewhat below the average annual increase between 1960 and 1970 (4,925 annually). Following the geographic concentration of population growth, nearly 80 percent of the household growth in the HMA since 1960 has occurred in suburban Allegheny County. Increased out-migration, substantial demolition activity, and a relatively low level of new construction in recent years have resulted in a substantial decline in the number of households in the city of Pittsburgh since 1960. Westmoreland County has recorded an increased portion of the household growth in the HMA, while Beaver and Washington Counties have recorded only modest gains.

Based on the stabilization of the area's population base and a continued decline in the average number of persons per household, it is estimated that household growth in the Pittsburgh HMA will amount to an average of 4,000 households annually during the two-year forecast period. Most of the future household growth is expected to be concentrated in suburban Allegheny County with a continuing decline in the number of households in the city of Pittsburgh. In the remainder of the HMA, Westmoreland County is expected to support most of the household growth during the two-year period ending November 1973. See table V for changes in number of households in the constituent submarkets during the April 1960-November 1971 period.

Housing Factors. There were approximately 797,300 housing units in the Pittsburgh HMA as of November 1, 1971, an increase of about 4,750 units annually since April 1970 (see table VI). As shown in table VI this average annual increase is somewhat below that recorded during the 1960-1970 period

(4,900 annually). This is due primarily to the reduced level of unsubsidized new construction during the past year and a half. The total increase of about 56,450 units since 1960 is a result of approximately 103,700 new units completed, 4,950 mobile homes added, and a loss of 52,200 units from the inventory through demolition and other causes. In November 1971, there were about 5,900 units under construction including 1,700 single-family houses and 4,200 multifamily units.

Total residential building activity, as measured by building permits issued and estimates for areas not covered by building permits, has fluctuated annually responding to prevailing economic and housing market conditions. After a decline from 9,517 units in 1960 to 7,258 units in 1961, total residential building activity increased each year to a total of 10,460 units in 1965 in response to accelerated economic expansion. As a result of an extreme shortage of mortgage funds and increasing financing costs, total residential building activity dipped severely in 1966 to a total of 8,848 units. As mortgage funds became more available in 1967, total residential building activity increased to a peak for the decade of 12,122 units. Since then, authorizations have decreased each year except 1971 (7,129 units, January through August) when favorable mortgage market conditions (primarily in the first half of 1971) and increased use of subsidized programs resulted in an annual new construction rate exceeding both 1969 and 1970.

The trend of unsubsidized residential activity closely parallels that of total residential activity. Single-family home construction has ranged between 5,000 and 7,000 units for most of the 1960-1970 decade except for the past few years when spiraling financing and building costs exceeded the ability of many households to afford new housing. From a low of 772 units authorized in 1961, new multifamily construction has accounted for an increasing proportion of total unsubsidized residential construction, reaching a peak total of 4,525 units in 1967. Since then, multifamily construction has decreased substantially to only 1,557 units in 1970 and 1,681 in 1971 (see table VIII).

The volume of construction of subsidized housing depends more heavily on fund allocations than local housing market conditions and therefore fluctuates substantially from year to year. During the 1960-1966 period, public housing accounted for over 92 percent of all subsidized housing production in the HMA (see table IX). Since 1967, Section 221(d)(3) BMIR and Section 236 housing have made up an increasing proportion of the subsidized production, satisfying the demand of moderate-income households for housing. Operation of the Section 235 program has increased very substantially in recent years and currently appears to be the most popular and successful of the subsidized housing programs.

As of November 1, 1971, there were about 32,100 vacant units in the Pittsburgh HMA of which 21,000 were nonseasonal, nondilapidated and available for sale or rent. Of those units available, 3,875 were available for sale and 17,125 were available for rent, representing homeowner and renter

vacancy rates of 0.7 percent and 6.5 percent, respectively (see table X). The homeowner vacancy rate, which was 1.0 percent in 1960, has maintained approximately that level throughout the 1960-1969 period until mid-1969 when spiraling construction and financing costs severely curtailed new starts; subsequently the homeowner vacancy rate declined to 0.7 percent. The renter vacancy rate, which was reported as 4.8 percent in 1960, fluctuated between four and six percent throughout the 1960-1970 decade. Rental vacancies were low in the mid-1960's as the local economy began to recover from the recession in the early 1960's, but record levels of multifamily construction in 1967 and 1968 substantially increased the renter vacancy rate. Despite decreasing levels of multifamily construction since 1967, for reasons discussed in the rental market section, vacant units available for rent have increased substantially. The renter vacancy rate of 6.5 percent is not excessive for the Pittsburgh HMA, but for an area with a static population base, a renter vacancy rate of four to five percent would provide a more favorable demand-supply balance.

Most of the increase in vacancies within the HMA since 1970 occurred in rental housing in the city of Pittsburgh and the remainder of Allegheny County. Vacancies in Beaver County remained comparatively stable, while Washington and Westmoreland Counties registered substantial vacancy increases, again primarily in the rental market. As is the case in the city of Pittsburgh, a substantial portion of the increase in vacant units available for rent in many of the older urban areas in the outlying counties is a result of upgrading and out-migration out-distancing the rate of demolition. Consequently, many economically depreciated marginal and substandard units remain on the market, although they are not actually competitive with the remainder of the rental inventory.

Table I

Estimated Annual Demand for New Unsubsidized Sales Housing
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, Housing Market Area
November 1, 1971-November 1, 1973

<u>Sales price</u>	<u>Number of units</u>	<u>Percent of total</u>
Under \$20,000	400	10
\$20,000 - 22,499	360	9
22,500 - 24,999	880	22
25,000 - 29,999	960	24
30,000 - 34,999	600	15
35,000 and over	800	20
Total	4,000	100

Estimated Annual Demand for New Unsubsidized Rental Housing
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, Housing Market Area
November 1, 1971-November 1, 1973

<u>Monthly gross rent^{a/}</u>	<u>Efficiency</u>	<u>One bedroom</u>	<u>Two bedrooms</u>	<u>Three bedrooms</u>
\$160 - \$179	65	-	-	-
180 - 199	20	280	-	-
200 - 219	15	295	-	-
220 - 239	-	130	240	-
240 - 259	-	90	310	-
260 - 279	-	-	200	60
280 - 299	-	-	185	60
300 and over	-	-	-	50
	100	795	935	170

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

Table II

Estimated Annual Occupancy Potential for Subsidized Rental Housing
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, Housing Market Area
November 1, 1971-November 1, 1973

	<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>
A. <u>Families</u>				
One bedroom	350	65	505	920
Two bedrooms	1,115	65	1,300	2,480
Three bedrooms	545	-	750	1,295
Four or more bedrooms	<u>160</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>315</u>	<u>475</u>
Total	2,170	130	2,870	5,170
B. <u>Elderly</u>				
Efficiency	115	240	1,475	1,830
One bedroom	<u>215</u>	<u>230</u>	<u>555</u>	<u>1,000</u>
Total	330	470	2,030	2,830

^{a/} Families eligible for Section 236 rental housing are also eligible for Section 235 sales housing.

Table III

Work Force and Employment Trends
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, Housing Market Area
1960-1971
Annual averages (in thousands)

	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	12 mos. ending Oct. 31 1970	1971
Civilian work force	952.3	938.1	916.1	899.9	904.6	914.2	932.8	949.6	960.3	975.4	986.6	985.1	991.8
Unemployment	84.1	100.2	85.9	71.6	49.9	33.3	27.6	29.7	27.0	24.4	35.9	32.9	49.0
Percent unemployed	8.8%	10.7%	9.4%	8.0%	5.5%	3.6%	3.0%	3.1%	2.8%	2.5%	3.6%	3.3%	4.9%
Total employment	867.9	837.3	829.4	827.7	854.6	879.1	903.0	917.0	931.0	951.0	949.1	950.8	940.2
Nonag. wage & salary	776.3	743.1	741.2	742.9	768.5	795.2	822.6	839.9	855.3	875.8	874.9	876.5	867.5
Manufacturing	291.6	269.2	265.9	266.6	278.1	285.7	293.0	290.7	288.6	289.4	278.3	281.9	265.8
Durable goods	245.6	224.7	223.2	222.9	233.5	241.4	248.0	244.9	241.6	242.0	231.8	235.2	219.7
Lumber & wood prods.	1.4	1.1	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.3	1.2	1.1	1.0	0.9	1.0	0.9
Furn. & fixtures	1.7	1.5	1.4	1.3	1.4	1.4	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5
Stone, clay, & glass	20.0	18.8	19.0	18.9	18.9	19.1	20.3	19.3	19.0	19.4	17.9	18.2	17.1
Primary metal prods.	131.0	118.2	118.5	116.7	125.4	130.1	131.0	125.5	122.8	122.0	115.4	117.6	108.5
Fabricated metal prods.	28.9	25.8	25.4	25.9	24.6	26.0	27.3	27.2	26.9	26.4	25.8	26.2	25.1
Nonelec. machinery	19.1	18.5	17.4	17.8	18.3	18.3	19.5	20.4	20.0	20.6	20.5	20.6	19.6
Elec. machinery	29.6	28.7	28.1	28.8	29.7	29.5	29.3	31.8	32.3	32.6	32.7	32.8	31.7
Trans. equipment	6.8	5.4	5.4	5.2	6.3	7.3	7.9	7.3	6.6	7.1	7.4	7.4	6.8
Instru. & related prods.	4.8	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.8	5.2	5.5	5.5	5.7	5.9	5.9	5.9	5.9
Other durable goods	2.3	2.1	2.2	2.5	2.9	3.4	4.4	5.1	5.6	5.5	3.7	4.1	2.7
Nondurable goods	46.0	44.5	42.7	43.7	44.6	44.4	45.0	45.9	46.9	47.3	46.6	46.7	46.2
Food products	19.3	18.7	18.0	18.0	17.8	17.6	17.7	17.7	17.6	17.0	16.6	16.6	16.4
Apparel & related prods.	2.2	2.3	2.6	2.7	2.8	3.2	3.4	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.1	3.2	3.2
Paper products	3.3	3.2	3.2	3.5	3.4	3.6	3.8	3.7	3.9	4.3	4.2	4.2	4.1
Printing & publishing	8.8	8.7	8.0	7.8	8.1	8.1	7.8	8.3	8.6	8.7	8.7	8.8	8.6
Chemical products	8.6	8.3	7.7	7.6	7.3	7.4	7.6	7.8	7.8	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0
Oil & coal products	1.9	1.6	1.5	1.5	1.6	1.7	1.7	1.8	2.0	2.0	2.1	2.1	2.0
Other nondurable goods	1.9	1.7	1.7	2.6	3.6	2.8	2.9	3.2	3.7	4.0	3.9	3.9	3.9
Nonmanufacturing	484.7	473.9	475.4	476.4	490.4	509.5	529.5	549.1	566.7	586.4	596.5	594.6	601.7
Mining	11.8	10.1	10.1	9.3	9.5	9.5	8.9	9.1	8.4	8.7	8.9	8.9	9.1
Contract construction	38.2	35.0	32.8	31.9	34.7	37.3	39.7	41.6	44.0	44.7	42.8	42.7	43.2
Trans. & public util.	60.7	56.4	56.2	54.9	54.9	55.6	56.7	57.1	58.3	60.4	59.4	59.3	56.7
Trade	153.6	147.7	146.7	146.5	151.0	156.6	161.0	162.8	168.8	174.7	177.5	177.3	180.0
Wholesale	42.2	40.5	40.0	39.7	40.3	41.2	42.5	43.1	43.9	44.0	44.1	44.1	44.2
Retail	111.4	107.2	106.7	106.8	110.7	115.4	118.5	119.7	124.9	130.7	133.4	133.2	135.8
Fin., ins., real estate	32.3	32.1	32.1	32.4	32.4	33.3	34.1	35.5	36.2	36.9	37.9	37.8	38.2
Services & misc.	114.9	117.6	120.4	122.0	124.2	129.2	136.0	143.7	149.3	155.2	159.7	159.1	159.6
Government	73.2	75.0	77.1	79.4	83.7	88.0	93.2	99.3	101.8	105.8	110.3	109.6	112.8
Federal	16.3	16.0	16.1	16.1	15.9	16.1	17.2	17.7	17.7	17.7	18.3	18.3	17.9
State and local	56.9	59.0	61.0	63.3	67.8	71.9	76.0	81.6	84.0	88.1	91.9	91.3	94.9
All other nonag. employment	82.5	85.5	79.6	76.5	77.9	76.5	73.4	70.3	69.2	69.2	68.2	68.3	66.0
Agriculture	9.1	8.7	8.5	8.4	8.2	7.4	7.0	6.8	6.4	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.7
Persons involved in labor-management disputes	0.5	0.7	0.9	0.6	0.4	1.4	2.2	3.0	2.3	1.4	1.7	1.4	2.7

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

Source: Pennsylvania Bureau of Employment Security.

Table IV

Family Income Characteristics
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, Housing Market Area

A. Percentage Distribution of All Families and Renter Households
By Annual Income After Deduction of Federal Income Tax
1959 and 1971

<u>Annual incomes</u>			<u>1959</u>		<u>1971</u>	
			<u>All families</u>	<u>Renter households^{a/}</u>	<u>All families</u>	<u>Renter households^{a/}</u>
Under	\$	2,000	8	22	4	11
\$ 2,000	-	2,999	8	11	2	7
3,000	-	3,999	12	16	4	7
4,000	-	4,999	18	18	4	7
5,000	-	5,999	15	12	6	7
6,000	-	6,999	12	8	8	10
7,000	-	7,999	8	4	8	9
8,000	-	8,999	5	3	10	9
9,000	-	9,999	3	2	10	8
10,000	-	12,499	6	(4	16	10
12,500	-	14,999	(5	(10	6
15,000 and over			((18	9
Total			100	100	100	100
Median			\$5,275	\$4,050	\$9,325	\$7,100

B. Median All Family Income After Deduction
of Federal Income Tax
1959 and 1971

<u>County</u>	<u>1959</u>	<u>1971</u>
Housing Market Area	\$5,275	\$9,325
Allegheny	5,725	9,750
Beaver	5,375	8,875
Washington	5,025	8,500
Westmoreland	5,225	8,400

Table V

Population and Household Trends
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, Housing Market Area
1960-1971

	<u>April</u> <u>1960</u>	<u>April</u> <u>1970</u>	<u>November</u> <u>1971</u>	<u>Average annual changes^{a/}</u> <u>1960-1970</u> <u>1970-1971</u>	
<u>Area</u>					
<u>Population</u>					
HMA total	<u>2,405,435</u>	<u>2,401,245</u>	<u>2,399,700</u>	-425	-1,000
Allegheny County	<u>1,628,587</u>	<u>1,605,016</u>	<u>1,602,900</u>	-2,350	-1,350
Pittsburgh	604,332	520,117	509,600	-8,425	-6,650
Remainder	1,024,255	1,084,899	1,093,300	6,075	5,300
Beaver County	206,948	208,418	207,550	150	-550
Washington County	217,271	210,876	211,000	-650	75
Westmoreland County	352,629	386,935	378,250	2,425	825
<u>Households</u>					
HMA total	<u>709,941</u>	<u>759,174</u>	<u>765,200</u>	4,925	3,800
Allegheny County	<u>483,893</u>	<u>512,493</u>	<u>516,100</u>	2,875	2,275
Pittsburgh	188,336	178,016	176,625	-1,025	-875
Remainder	295,557	334,477	339,475	3,900	3,150
Beaver County	59,099	64,113	64,625	500	325
Washington County	64,364	66,149	66,950	175	500
Westmoreland County	102,585	116,419	117,525	1,375	700

^{a/} Rounded.

Sources: 1960 and 1970 Censuses of Population and Housing and estimates by Housing Market Analyst.

Table VI

Trend of Household Tenure
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, Housing Market Area
1960-1971

	<u>HMA total</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Allegheny County</u> <u>Pittsburgh</u>	<u>Remainder</u>	<u>Beaver</u> <u>County</u>	<u>Washington</u> <u>County</u>	<u>Westmoreland</u> <u>County</u>
<u>April 1960</u>							
Total housing units	<u>740,838</u>	<u>503,006</u>	<u>196,168</u>	<u>306,838</u>	<u>61,755</u>	<u>67,447</u>	<u>108,630</u>
Total occupied units	<u>709,941</u>	<u>483,893</u>	<u>188,336</u>	<u>295,557</u>	<u>59,099</u>	<u>64,364</u>	<u>102,585</u>
Owner occupied	<u>464,249</u>	<u>303,251</u>	<u>91,831</u>	<u>211,420</u>	<u>43,218</u>	<u>43,966</u>	<u>73,814</u>
Percent	65.4%	62.7%	48.8%	71.5%	73.1%	68.3%	72.0%
Renter occupied	<u>245,692</u>	<u>180,642</u>	<u>96,505</u>	<u>84,137</u>	<u>15,881</u>	<u>20,398</u>	<u>28,771</u>
Percent	34.6%	37.3%	51.2%	28.5%	26.9%	31.7%	28.0%
Total vacant units	<u>30,897</u>	<u>19,113</u>	<u>7,832</u>	<u>11,288</u>	<u>2,656</u>	<u>3,083</u>	<u>6,045</u>
<u>April 1970</u>							
Total housing units	<u>789,771</u>	<u>533,520</u>	<u>189,840</u>	<u>343,680</u>	<u>66,146</u>	<u>69,153</u>	<u>120,952</u>
Total occupied units	<u>759,174</u>	<u>512,493</u>	<u>178,016</u>	<u>334,477</u>	<u>64,113</u>	<u>66,149</u>	<u>116,419</u>
Owner occupied	<u>514,503</u>	<u>331,866</u>	<u>89,626</u>	<u>242,240</u>	<u>47,770</u>	<u>47,788</u>	<u>87,079</u>
Percent	67.8%	64.8%	50.3%	72.4%	74.5%	72.2%	74.8%
Renter occupied	<u>244,671</u>	<u>180,627</u>	<u>88,390</u>	<u>92,237</u>	<u>16,343</u>	<u>18,361</u>	<u>29,340</u>
Percent	32.2%	35.2%	49.7%	27.6%	25.5%	27.8%	25.2%
Total vacant units	<u>30,597</u>	<u>21,027</u>	<u>11,824</u>	<u>9,203</u>	<u>2,033</u>	<u>3,004</u>	<u>4,533</u>
<u>November 1971</u>							
Total housing units	<u>797,300</u>	<u>538,250</u>	<u>188,950</u>	<u>349,300</u>	<u>66,650</u>	<u>70,200</u>	<u>122,200</u>
Total occupied units	<u>765,200</u>	<u>516,100</u>	<u>176,625</u>	<u>339,475</u>	<u>64,625</u>	<u>66,950</u>	<u>117,525</u>
Owner occupied	<u>519,500</u>	<u>334,700</u>	<u>89,725</u>	<u>244,975</u>	<u>48,125</u>	<u>48,425</u>	<u>88,250</u>
Percent	67.9%	64.9%	50.8%	72.2%	74.5%	72.3%	75.1%
Renter occupied	<u>245,700</u>	<u>181,400</u>	<u>86,900</u>	<u>94,500</u>	<u>16,500</u>	<u>18,525</u>	<u>29,275</u>
Percent	32.1%	35.1%	49.2%	27.8%	25.5%	27.7%	24.9%
Total vacant units	<u>32,100</u>	<u>22,150</u>	<u>12,325</u>	<u>9,825</u>	<u>2,025</u>	<u>3,250</u>	<u>4,675</u>

Source: 1960 and 1970 Censuses of Housing and estimates by Housing Market Analyst.

Table VII

Total Residential Construction Activity
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, Housing Market Area
1960-1971

	<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>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1971</u>
HMA total	<u>9,517</u>	<u>7,258</u>	<u>7,764</u>	<u>8,429</u>	<u>8,650</u>	<u>10,460</u>	<u>8,848</u>	<u>12,122</u>	<u>11,464</u>	<u>9,154</u>	<u>7,966</u>	<u>7,12</u>
Single-family	<u>7,527</u>	<u>6,100</u>	<u>6,388</u>	<u>5,761</u>	<u>6,236</u>	<u>6,614</u>	<u>5,498</u>	<u>6,657</u>	<u>5,862</u>	<u>4,980</u>	<u>4,726</u>	<u>3,64</u>
Multifamily	<u>1,990</u>	<u>1,158</u>	<u>1,376</u>	<u>2,668</u>	<u>2,414</u>	<u>3,846</u>	<u>3,350</u>	<u>5,465</u>	<u>5,602</u>	<u>4,174</u>	<u>3,240</u>	<u>3,48</u>
Unsubsidized	<u>8,326</u>	<u>6,872</u>	<u>7,582</u>	<u>7,293</u>	<u>8,463</u>	<u>10,228</u>	<u>8,552</u>	<u>11,182</u>	<u>10,268</u>	<u>7,917</u>	<u>5,498</u>	<u>4,10</u>
Single-family	<u>7,527</u>	<u>6,100</u>	<u>6,388</u>	<u>5,461</u>	<u>6,236</u>	<u>6,614</u>	<u>5,498</u>	<u>6,657</u>	<u>5,862</u>	<u>4,910</u>	<u>3,941</u>	<u>2,42</u>
Multifamily	<u>799</u>	<u>772</u>	<u>1,194</u>	<u>1,532</u>	<u>2,227</u>	<u>3,614</u>	<u>3,054</u>	<u>4,525</u>	<u>4,406</u>	<u>3,007</u>	<u>1,557</u>	<u>1,68</u>
Subsidized	<u>1,191</u>	<u>386</u>	<u>182</u>	<u>1,136</u>	<u>187</u>	<u>232</u>	<u>296</u>	<u>940</u>	<u>1,196</u>	<u>1,237</u>	<u>2,468</u>	<u>3,02</u>
Single-family	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>785</u>	<u>1,22</u>
Multifamily	<u>1,191</u>	<u>386</u>	<u>182</u>	<u>1,136</u>	<u>187</u>	<u>232</u>	<u>296</u>	<u>940</u>	<u>1,196</u>	<u>1,167</u>	<u>1,683</u>	<u>1,80</u>

a/ January through August.

Sources: C-40 Construction Reports, Pittsburgh HUD Area Office, local housing authorities, local permit issuing offices, and estimates by Housing Market Analyst.

Table VIII

Unsubsidized Housing Units Authorized by Building Permits
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, Housing Market Area
1960-1971

	<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>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1971^{a/}</u>
HMA Total	8,326	6,872	7,852	7,293	8,463	10,228	8,552	11,182	10,268	7,917	5,498	4,102
Single-family	7,527	6,100	6,388	5,761	6,236	6,614	5,498	6,657	5,862	4,910	3,941	2,421
Multifamily	799	772	1,194	1,532	2,227	3,614	3,054	4,525	4,406	3,007	1,557	1,681
Allegheny County	6,287	5,245	5,168	5,121	6,175	7,080	6,270	8,033	7,640	5,739	3,954	2,658
Single-family	5,681	4,643	4,077	3,760	4,076	4,107	3,555	4,001	3,942	3,077	2,650	1,313
Multifamily	606	602	1,091	1,361	2,099	2,973	2,715	4,032	3,698	2,662	1,304	1,345
Pittsburgh	669	683	1,000	1,077	846	1,246	987	1,210	492	257	742	562
Single-family	559	376	386	295	251	186	182	373	181	158	621	299
Multifamily	110	307	614	782	595	1,060	805	837	311	99	121	263
Remainder	5,618	4,562	4,168	4,044	5,329	5,834	5,283	6,823	7,148	5,482	3,212	2,096
Single-family	5,122	4,267	3,691	3,465	3,825	3,921	3,373	3,628	3,761	2,919	2,029	1,014
Multifamily	496	295	477	579	1,504	1,913	1,910	3,195	3,387	2,563	1,183	1,082
Beaver County	575	504	573	481	517	852	529	485	637	498	273	229
Single-family	480	411	564	457	458	604	397	400	365	381	209	185
Multifamily	95	93	9	24	59	248	132	85	272	117	64	44
Washington County	235	232	334	390	493	642	445	435	450	408	424	594
Single-family	209	226	319	346	465	531	394	320	326	317	334	386
Multifamily	26	6	15	44	28	111	51	115	124	91	90	208
Westmoreland County	1,229	891	1,507	1,301	1,278	1,654	1,308	2,229	1,541	1,272	847	621
Single-family	1,157	820	1,428	1,198	1,237	1,372	1,152	1,936	1,229	1,135	748	537
Multifamily	72	71	79	103	41	282	156	1293	312	137	99	84

^{a/} January through August.

Source: C-40 Construction Reports and estimates by Housing Market Analyst.

Table IX

Authorized New Subsidized Housing Units
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, Housing Market Area
1960-1971

	<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>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1971^{a/}</u>
HMA Total	<u>1,191</u>	<u>386</u>	<u>182</u>	<u>1,136</u>	<u>187</u>	<u>232</u>	<u>296</u>	<u>940</u>	<u>1,196</u>	<u>1,237</u>	<u>2,468</u>	<u>3,027</u>
Public housing	<u>1,191</u>	<u>386</u>	<u>182</u>	<u>1,136</u>	-	<u>232</u>	<u>205</u>	<u>485</u>	<u>864</u>	<u>463</u>	<u>529</u>	<u>515</u>
Section 221(d)(3) BMIR	-	-	-	-	<u>187</u>	-	<u>91</u>	<u>455</u>	<u>332</u>	<u>435</u>	<u>446</u>	-
Section 235	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<u>70</u>	<u>785</u>	<u>1,225</u>
Section 236	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<u>269</u>	<u>708</u>	<u>1,287</u>
Allegheny County	<u>1,143</u>	<u>324</u>	-	<u>1,086</u>	<u>187</u>	-	<u>91</u>	<u>720</u>	<u>991</u>	<u>873</u>	<u>1,831</u>	<u>1,887</u>
Public housing	<u>1,143</u>	<u>324</u>	-	<u>1,086</u>	-	-	-	<u>265</u>	<u>659</u>	<u>263</u>	<u>429</u>	<u>357</u>
Section 221(d)(3) BMIR	-	-	-	-	<u>187</u>	-	<u>91</u>	<u>455</u>	<u>332</u>	<u>291</u>	<u>230</u>	-
Section 235	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<u>50</u>	<u>600</u>	<u>835</u>
Section 236	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<u>269</u>	<u>572</u>	<u>695</u>
Pittsburgh	<u>999</u>	<u>324</u>	-	<u>826</u>	<u>187</u>	-	<u>91</u>	<u>620</u>	<u>776</u>	<u>448</u>	<u>1,086</u>	<u>492</u>
Public housing	<u>999</u>	<u>324</u>	-	<u>826</u>	-	-	-	<u>165</u>	<u>444</u>	-	<u>249</u>	<u>157</u>
Section 221(d)(3) BMIR	-	-	-	-	<u>187</u>	-	<u>91</u>	<u>455</u>	<u>332</u>	<u>291</u>	<u>230</u>	-
Section 235	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<u>5</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>65</u>
Section 236	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<u>152</u>	<u>572</u>	<u>270</u>
Remainder	<u>144</u>	-	-	<u>260</u>	-	-	-	<u>100</u>	<u>215</u>	<u>425</u>	<u>745</u>	<u>1,395</u>
Public housing	<u>144</u>	-	-	<u>260</u>	-	-	-	<u>100</u>	<u>215</u>	<u>263</u>	<u>180</u>	<u>200</u>
Section 221(d)(3) BMIR	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Section 235	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<u>45</u>	<u>565</u>	<u>770</u>
Section 236	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<u>117</u>	-	<u>425</u>
Beaver County	<u>48</u>	<u>62</u>	<u>56</u>	-	-	-	<u>107</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>135</u>	<u>200</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>325</u>
Public housing	<u>48</u>	<u>62</u>	<u>56</u>	-	-	-	<u>107</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>135</u>	<u>200</u>	-	-
Section 221(d)(3) BMIR	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Section 235	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<u>25</u>	<u>85</u>
Section 236	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<u>240</u>
Washington County	-	-	-	-	-	-	<u>48</u>	<u>150</u>	-	<u>144</u>	<u>362</u>	<u>25</u>
Public housing	-	-	-	-	-	-	<u>48</u>	<u>150</u>	-	-	-	-
Section 221(d)(3) BMIR	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<u>144</u>	<u>216</u>	-
Section 235	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<u>10</u>	<u>25</u>
Section 236	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<u>136</u>	-
Westmoreland County	-	-	<u>126</u>	<u>50</u>	-	<u>232</u>	<u>50</u>	-	<u>70</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>250</u>	<u>790</u>
Public housing	-	-	<u>126</u>	<u>50</u>	-	<u>232</u>	<u>50</u>	-	<u>70</u>	-	<u>100</u>	<u>158</u>
Section 221(d)(3) BMIR	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Section 235	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<u>20</u>	<u>150</u>	<u>280</u>
Section 236	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<u>352</u>

^{a/} January through August.

Sources: C-40 Construction Reports, HUD Area Office, HUD-HPMC Research and Statistics Section, and estimates by Housing Market Analyst.

Table X

Trend in Vacancy
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, Housing Market Area
1960-1971

	<u>HMA Total</u>	<u>Allegheny County</u>			<u>Beaver</u>	<u>Washington</u>	<u>Westmoreland</u>
		<u>Total</u>	<u>Pittsburgh</u>	<u>Remainder</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>County</u>
<u>April 1960</u>							
Total vacant units	<u>30,897</u>	<u>19,113</u>	<u>7,832</u>	<u>11,281</u>	<u>2,656</u>	<u>3,083</u>	<u>6,045</u>
Available vacant units	<u>17,193</u>	<u>12,089</u>	<u>5,225</u>	<u>6,864</u>	<u>1,281</u>	<u>1,436</u>	<u>2,387</u>
For sale	<u>4,715</u>	<u>3,241</u>	<u>655</u>	<u>2,586</u>	<u>375</u>	<u>385</u>	<u>714</u>
Homeowner vacancy rate	1.0%	1.1%	0.7%	1.2%	0.9%	0.9%	1.0%
For rent	<u>12,478</u>	<u>8,848</u>	<u>4,570</u>	<u>4,278</u>	<u>906</u>	<u>1,051</u>	<u>1,673</u>
Renter vacancy rate	4.8%	4.7%	4.5%	4.8%	5.4%	4.9%	5.5%
Other vacant units	<u>13,704</u>	<u>7,024</u>	<u>2,607</u>	<u>4,417</u>	<u>1,375</u>	<u>1,647</u>	<u>3,658</u>
<u>April 1970</u>							
Total vacant units	<u>30,597</u>	<u>21,027</u>	<u>11,824</u>	<u>9,203</u>	<u>2,033</u>	<u>3,004</u>	<u>4,533</u>
Available vacant units	<u>18,768</u>	<u>14,176</u>	<u>8,319</u>	<u>5,857</u>	<u>1,084</u>	<u>1,438</u>	<u>2,070</u>
For sale	<u>3,741</u>	<u>2,491</u>	<u>957</u>	<u>1,534</u>	<u>281</u>	<u>404</u>	<u>565</u>
Homeowner vacancy rate	0.7%	0.8%	1.1%	0.6%	0.6%	0.8%	0.6%
For rent	<u>15,027</u>	<u>11,685</u>	<u>7,362</u>	<u>4,323</u>	<u>803</u>	<u>1,034</u>	<u>1,505</u>
Renter vacancy rate	5.8%	6.0%	7.7%	4.5%	4.7%	5.3%	4.9%
Other vacant units	<u>11,829</u>	<u>6,851</u>	<u>3,505</u>	<u>3,346</u>	<u>949</u>	<u>1,566</u>	<u>2,463</u>
<u>November 1971</u>							
Total vacant units	<u>32,100</u>	<u>22,150</u>	<u>12,325</u>	<u>9,825</u>	<u>2,025</u>	<u>3,250</u>	<u>4,675</u>
Available vacant units	<u>21,000</u>	<u>15,875</u>	<u>9,125</u>	<u>6,750</u>	<u>1,075</u>	<u>1,750</u>	<u>2,300</u>
For sale	<u>3,875</u>	<u>2,600</u>	<u>1,050</u>	<u>1,550</u>	<u>275</u>	<u>425</u>	<u>575</u>
Homeowner vacancy rate	0.7%	0.8%	1.2%	0.6%	0.6%	0.9%	0.6%
For rent	<u>17,125</u>	<u>13,275</u>	<u>8,075</u>	<u>5,200</u>	<u>800</u>	<u>1,325</u>	<u>1,725</u>
Renter vacancy rate	6.5%	6.8%	8.5%	5.2%	4.6%	6.7%	5.6%
Other vacant units	<u>11,100</u>	<u>6,275</u>	<u>3,200</u>	<u>3,075</u>	<u>950</u>	<u>1,500</u>	<u>2,375</u>

Sources: 1960 and 1970 Censuses of Housing and estimates by Housing Market Analyst.

Pa.
1971



T 36623

[illegible]

Printed
in USA

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

OFFICIAL BUSINESS
PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE, \$300

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

