

728.1
:308
F22
Sacramento,
Calif.
1969

Analysis of the
**SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA
HOUSING MARKET**

as of October 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

April 1970

ANALYSIS OF THE
///
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA
HOUSING MARKET
AS OF OCTOBER 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
Sacramento, California, As of October 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 - SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA
AS OF OCTOBER 1, 1969^{1/}

The Sacramento, California, Housing Market Area (HMA) is defined as being coterminous with the Sacramento Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA), which includes Sacramento, Placer, and Yolo Counties. The population of the area was about 839,700 as of October 1, 1969.

The growth of the Sacramento HMA has been relatively steady in recent years, despite the presence of large military and aerospace sectors in the economy; both of these industries are volatile and tend to fluctuate in employment. Recently, however, while aerospace employment has declined substantially, large government employment increases have helped to sustain an over-all upward economic trend in the area. Most of the gain in government employment between 1965 and 1966 was the result of increases in civilian employees of the military.

The rate of population growth has slowed in recent years, but the pace of housing construction has declined more rapidly. The surplus housing vacancy situation which existed in 1965 has been eliminated. In some of the lower rental ranges, a shortage of housing appears to exist.

^{1/} Data in this analysis are supplementary to a previous FHA analysis of the area as of August 1, 1965. Because of changes in the definition of the area, however, data and estimates in the two reports are not strictly comparable.

Anticipated Demand for Housing

The estimated demand for new privately-financed, nonsubsidized housing in the Sacramento HMA is based on the expected increase in the number of households during the two-year forecast period ending October 1, 1971 and on the replacement requirements for losses from the inventory. Barring unforeseen developments, the demand for permanent, privately-financed, nonsubsidized housing will approximate 6,900 units annually during the next two years. The most desirable demand-supply relationship would be achieved if annual new nonsubsidized construction consisted of 3,400 single-family houses and 3,500 units in multifamily structures. An additional 600 households annually are expected to be housed in mobile homes. The distribution of demand by county is shown below. Distributions of demand by sale price and by gross monthly rent and unit size are shown in table I.

<u>County</u>	<u>Annual units of demand</u>		
	<u>Single-family</u>	<u>Multi-family</u>	<u>Total</u>
Sacramento	2,350	2,750	5,100
Placer	600	200	800
Yolo	<u>450</u>	<u>550</u>	<u>1,000</u>
Total	3,400	3,500	6,900

Much of the housing demand in the Sacramento HMA during the 1965-1969 period was satisfied through the absorption of the surplus of housing which had accumulated during prior years. During the 1965-1969 period, net additions to the housing inventory averaged only 6,150 units annually, while units were occupied at the rate of 7,350 yearly. The surplus of housing indicated in the 1965 market analysis has been substantially eliminated, and an increased rate of construction for the next two years will be necessary to assure a balanced demand-supply situation.

The demand estimates are not intended to be forecasts of construction activity, but a guide to desirable rates of building based on the assumptions and economic and demographic forecasts outlined in this report. Should economic activity in the area proceed at a rate substantially different from the forecast, then the indicated demand for housing should be adjusted accordingly. It is important to note, however, that

increases in households do not vary directly with rates of economic change over the short term of two years.

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 the 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). In addition to these programs, market-interest-rate mortgages may be arranged for moderate-income housing under the provisions of Section 221(d)(4).

Household eligibility for federal subsidy programs is determined primarily by evidence that household or family income is below established limits. 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 potentials¹ discussed in the following paragraphs reflect estimates adjusted to indicate housing provided or under construction under alternative FHA or other programs. It is cautioned that the occupancy potentials discussed for various programs are, therefore, not additive.²

The occupancy potentials for subsidized housing in FHA programs discussed below are based upon 1969 incomes, on October 1, 1969 income limits, upon exception income limits for Section 235 and 236, on the estimated occupancy of substandard housing, on estimates of the elderly population, and on available market experience (see table II for unit size distributions).

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 sales 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. However, little or no housing has been provided under most of the subsidized programs and absorption rates remain to be tested.

It is important to note that the following estimates are for the gross occupancy potential for subsidized housing in the entire HMA. About 75 percent of the gross potential is in Sacramento County, 16 percent in Yolo County, and nine percent is in Placer County. Most of the potential is located in and near Sacramento City, including the close-in areas across the Sacramento River in Yolo County. Units now in processing under the various subsidized programs may satisfy a commensurate portion of the occupancy potential.

Section 221(d)(3)BMIR. There are now about 580 units of 221(d)(3) below-market-interest-rate housing in the HMA. Another 100-unit project has been committed by the FHA for construction. All completed units are occupied, except for frictional vacancy. If federal funds are available, about 680 units of Section 221(d)(3)BMIR housing probably could be absorbed annually during the next two years.^{1/} There are now no 221(d)(3) projects in planning or under construction. Almost all families eligible for this type of housing also are eligible for Section 236 housing.

Rent-Supplement Housing. Based on the incomes of the area and on other household characteristics, it is judged that there is an annual occupancy potential for about 740 units of rent-supplement housing during the two-year forecast period of this report. Approximately 110 units of the annual potential will be for families and 630 units will be for elderly households. There is no rent-supplement housing in the HMA. Most families eligible for rent supplements also are eligible for low-rent public housing. About 25 percent of the families and 15 percent of the elderly eligible for rent supplement also are eligible for Section 236.

As of October 1, 1969, there were about 3,125 public housing units in the HMA. About 2,725 units were in Sacramento County and 400 were in Yolo County; none were in Placer County. An additional 300 units were under construction in Sacramento County. Excepting some recently completed units, for which applications for occupancy are being processed, vacancies are negligible. A very extensive waiting list was reported.

Section 235, Sales Housing. Sales housing could be provided for low- to moderate-income families under the provisions of Section 235.

^{1/} As of October 1969, funds for allocation are available only from recaptures resulting from reductions, withdrawals, and cancellations of outstanding allocations.

Under exception income limits, there is an annual occupancy potential for 650 units under Section 235. With regular income limits, the potential would be about one-third of that number. There are about 750 units under development in the HMA. Because of the shortage of such housing, this rate of development does not appear excessive. The 750 units under development will satisfy over one-half of the two-year potential under exception income limits. All of the families in the potential for Section 235 housing also are part of the potential estimated below for the Section 236 program and most have incomes within the Section 221(d)(3) BMIR range.

Section 236, Rental Housing. The occupancy potential for rental housing under Section 236 is estimated at 650 units annually for families and 200 units for elderly under exception income limits; with regular income limits, the potential for families would be about one-third of that number, and the potential for elderly would be about two-thirds of the potential calculated with exception limits. Families eligible under this program also generally are eligible for Section 235 and about five percent of the families and 50 percent of the elderly households qualify for rent-supplements. Most of the families and elderly households also are eligible under Section 221(d)(3) BMIR. A total of about 370 units are under construction (all for families). Almost 800 family units have been committed by the FHA for construction. The combined total (730 units) of those under construction and committed is in excess of the calculated potential for the next year and the actual rate of absorption should be tested before additional commitments are considered.

The Sales Market

The market for sales housing has tightened considerably during the period since 1965. The homeowner vacancy rate has declined from 3.6 percent in August 1965 to 1.7 percent as of October 1969. Although the current sales vacancy rate is relatively high, the rapid population growth which is characteristic of the area would indicate that the current number of sales vacancies is reasonable.

The market for sales housing is generally firm throughout the HMA. Local real estate sources report that the prices of most existing properties have increased by five to ten percent annually in the last few years. With minor exceptions, the sales market has improved in

every area of the HMA since the 1965 report. Apparently, the only areas with market softness are Del Paso Heights, north of Sacramento, and the area east of downtown (both because of changing neighborhood influences), areas near the Aerojet manufacturing complex northeast of Sacramento (because of declining aerospace employment), and in the low-income areas west of downtown Sacramento in Yolo County. South Sacramento also has been a relatively soft market area, but has firmed in recent years.

According to the FHA survey of sales units completed in 1968, the market for new housing is in reasonably good condition. The survey covered 2,450 units, 1,075 of which were built speculatively. Of these, 280 were unsold at the end of the year, equal to 26 percent of all speculatives--a sound market for new construction is indicated.

According to the FHA survey referred to above, the median sales price of all houses built was about \$21,000. Only two percent of the units were priced below \$15,000. According to local sources, however, the median price suggested by the survey is perhaps \$5,000 too low. Average prices have increased at a rate above five percent annually in recent years. The indicated paucity of low-cost housing appears to be an accurate reflection of the market.

Rental Market

The rental market in the Sacramento HMA has improved appreciably since 1965; currently, rental vacancy is estimated at 5.6 percent. As measured by building permits, the rate of multifamily housing construction (the main source of new rental units) dropped from almost 8,750 in 1963, the peak year of the 1960's, to only 1,325 in 1966. The number of renter households increased at a much higher rate than multifamily construction in the mid-1960's; the surplus of rental housing which had developed because of earlier over-building has been absorbed.

There have been increases in multifamily construction since the low level of 1,335 units in 1966--up to 3,025 units authorized in 1968 and to 4,075 multifamily units authorized in the first eight months of 1969. The January to August 1969 volume is more than any yearly total since the level of over 9,300 units in 1963, which was the period of greatest over-building in the HMA. Although there are indications

that the present rate of multifamily construction can be absorbed in the immediate future, it appears that the absorption of new nonsubsidized housing should be observed closely for signs of another over-built situation.

Some rental housing shortages exist now in the lower rent ranges. Rental housing built at market rates of interest is not concentrated in any narrow range of rents but is being made available in both garden-type and elevator structures at rentals appropriate to location, amenities, size, etc. New construction is rapidly absorbed and there are few vacancies in existing projects.

There is a relatively large amount of housing for middle- and low-income families under development. There are about 660 units insured under Section 221(d)(4) recently completed or under construction. Another 800 units have been committed by the FHA and 700 others are in application for insurance under this section. This type of housing is designed for middle-income households, but receives no direct government subsidy.

The housing for middle- and low-income households in the Sacramento HMA is almost fully occupied, but caution in further development in the relatively untested markets for subsidized housing appears warranted until actual absorption is tested.

Economic, Demographic and Housing Market Factors

The estimated annual demand for nonsubsidized housing is predicated on the findings and assumptions set forth below:

Employment. During the twelve-month period through August 1969, total nonagricultural employment averaged 283,500 in the Sacramento HMA, up 3,800 above the previous twelve months (see table III). Nonagricultural job increases had averaged about 7,800 in the 1965-1968 period. Much of that gain occurred between 1965 and 1966, when a large increase in government employment spurred a 12,200-job increment. Nonagricultural employment increases averaged 5,600 annually between 1966 and 1968.

Because Sacramento is the capital of California, as well as being an important federal government employment center (mostly military-related), government is the largest sector of nonagricultural employment in the HMA. Government has been the largest source of job increases in recent years, accounting for 88 percent of all of the nonagricultural employment gain in the 1965-1968 period.

A substantial part of the increase in government employment in the period since 1965 resulted from the build-up of military activity in Southeast Asia and the transfer of a substantial number of support jobs from uniformed military personnel to the civilian work force. The largest increase in federal employment occurred between 1965 and 1966 (6,400 jobs), mostly because of Air Force base closings in other parts of the nation and subsequent transfers to McClellan Air Force Base. The support functions of the Sacramento Army Depot also increased considerably during the period, upping employment there. Economy measures have reduced the civilian employment by the military in the area recently; total federal employment peaked at 31,900 in 1967, and declined to average 30,800 in the twelve months through August 1969. Plans for further decreases in civilian employment by the military have been announced. (See table IV for trends in military employment.)

Changes in the manufacturing sector of the local economy have been influential to the area economy in recent years. There were increases in manufacturing employment during each year of the early 1960's, mostly in durable goods. Declines at certain aerospace companies-- particularly at the Aerojet-General Corporation (a prime space contractor)-- have led to a reduction in over-all manufacturing employment. Manufacturing averaged 25,800 jobs during the twelve months ending in August 1969, down from a peak of 31,600 in 1965. The short-term outlook is for continued declines in manufacturing employment.

The tourist industry is important to the Sacramento HMA; the capital city attracts many visitors, and Lake Tahoe is on the eastern edge of the three-county area. Because of increasing tourism and growing population in the HMA, employment in both trade and services has expanded rapidly--by about 1,300 and 2,150 jobs annually, respectively, since 1965.

The population of the area will increase and the tourist industry will continue to grow, making trade and service the leaders in job growth during the next two years. State and local government employment also will continue to increase.

Based on the above, assuming a modest amount of growth in construction employment and in other ancillary industries associated with population increase, an annual gain of about 6,500 nonagricultural jobs appears to be a reasonable expectation for the next two years.

Income. The estimated median 1969 income of all families in the Sacramento HMA is \$9,625, after the deduction of federal income tax. The median 1969 after-tax income of all renter households of two persons or more is \$7,500. The 1969 after-tax incomes reflect increases from the 1965 medians of \$8,425 and \$6,550, respectively. (See table V for distributions by after-tax annual income classes.)

Population and Households. As of October 1, 1969, the population of the Sacramento HMA was an estimated 839,700 persons, reflecting average annual increases of 20,550 since August 1965 (see table VI). This annual gain included an average net natural increase (excess of resident births over resident deaths) of about 7,100 persons, and the in-migration of about 13,450. During the 1960-1965 period net in-migration had averaged 13,900 annually; net natural increase was about 10,200 annually for a total average yearly population increment of 24,100.

The higher rates of population increase during the 1960-1965 period were supported by more rapid economic growth at that time. The recent declines in the aerospace industries halted the increasing rate of population in-migration. However, increases in military personnel at installations in the area and gains in the number of civilian employees of the military helped to moderate the decline in the rate of population increase induced by the declines in aerospace industries.

The rate of population growth is greatest in Sacramento County, where the increase averaged 14,800 annually during the 1965-1969 period. The rate of growth in Sacramento and Placer Counties has slowed. Only Yolo County has had an increased rate of population gain--to 3,700 annually during the 1965-1969 period, compared to 3,050 during the 1960-1965 period. Yolo County has received increasing population "spill over" from Sacramento. The county also contains Davis, the location of a rapidly-expanding branch of the University of California.

Based on economic expectations, an annual population gain of about 17,400 appears to be a reasonable expectation for the next two years. The indicated rate of increase represents a decline in the

rate of population growth. Given a continuation of the decreasing rates of natural increase evidenced in recent years, however, the population forecast suggests a decrease in in-migration to 10,900 a year.

As of October 1, 1969, there were about 263,200 households (occupied housing units) in the Sacramento HMA, reflecting average annual increases of 7,350 since August 1, 1965. Gains in the number of households had averaged 8,400 annually during the April 1960-August 1965 period.

Based on the expected increases in population, anticipated household formation, and declines in the number of persons per household, the number of households in the Sacramento HMA is expected to increase by about 6,400 a year during the October 1, 1969-October 1, 1971 period.

Housing Inventory. As of October 1, 1969, there were approximately 282,600 housing units in the Sacramento HMA, reflecting an increase of 25,600 since August 1965, or 6,150 annually (see table VII). The increase reflects the construction of about 27,100 units, the demolition of 4,600 units, and the net in-movement of 3,100 trailer units. There was an increase in the inventory in every county of the HMA. Sacramento County led, with a 17,300-unit gain, Yolo followed with 4,400 units, and Placer was third with 3,900 units. The total annual increase since 1965 contrasts with the 9,400-unit annual gain during the 1960-1965 period. The decrease in the rate of addition to the housing inventory during the 1965-1969 period may be attributed to several factors--mainly, an over-built housing market in 1965, the "tight" mortgage market which developed in 1966 and afterward, and a slowing in the rate of population increase in the HMA.

According to the number of housing units authorized for construction by building permits^{1/}, there has been a marked decline in construction activity in the HMA (see table VIII). There were about 15,100 units authorized for construction in 1963, the peak year of the 1960's. Authorizations declined to about 4,925 units in 1966. Some recovery took place in 1967 (about 5,475 units authorized) and in 1968 (6,650). The increasing rate of construction appears to have been maintained

^{1/} All of the Sacramento HMA is included in building permit systems.

into 1969; there were 6,475 units authorized during the first eight months of 1969, compared to 4,625 in the corresponding period in 1968.

There were decreases in the rates of authorization of both single-family and multifamily units in the mid-1960's, but the decline in multifamily construction was more marked. Multifamily units authorized in 1963 amounted to about 9,325, or almost 62 percent of total units authorized. Multifamily authorizations declined to only about 1,335 in 1966, or 27 percent of all units authorized. In contrast to the mid-1960's, most of the recovery since 1966 has been in authorizations for multifamily units. Permits were issued for about 3,025 multifamily units in 1968, or 127 percent above 1966. There were about 4,075 multifamily units authorized during the first eight months of 1969, compared to 2,075 units during the corresponding period in 1968.

Single-family houses authorized amounted to 5,775 in 1963, then decreased every year to 3,335 in 1967. There was a recovery to almost 3,625 single-family houses authorized in 1968. However, a slight decline in single-family authorizations occurred in the first eight months of 1969, compared to the corresponding period in 1968; there were about 2,400 authorizations in the January-August 1969 period, compared to 2,550 in the comparable 1968 period.

As of October 1, 1969, there were 3,000 housing units under construction including 1,900 multifamily units and 1,100 single-family houses. About 800 of the houses and 1,700 of the multifamily units were being built in Sacramento County.

Vacancy. Because of the sharp reduction in housing construction, accompanied by continued increases in the number of households, housing vacancies in the Sacramento HMA have declined. Based on a postal vacancy survey conducted during September 1969 and other vacancy indicators, it is estimated that as of October 1, 1969, there were approximately 19,400 vacant housing units in the Sacramento HMA. Of these, about 8,400 units were available for rent or for sale, an over-all available vacancy rate of 3.1 percent. The available vacancy rate in August 1965 was 5.9 percent. Both the homeowner and renter vacancy rates are down sharply from 1965. The homeowner vacancy rate was 3.6 percent in 1965, but was reduced to 1.7 percent in 1969. The renter vacancy rate, 10.2 percent in 1965, was 5.6 percent in 1969 (see table VII).

Table I

Estimated Annual Demand for
Privately-Financed Nonsubsidized Housing
Sacramento, California, Housing Market Area, October 1969-October 1971

A. Single Family Houses

<u>Price ranges</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Under \$15,000	470	14
\$15,000 - 17,499	240	7
17,500 - 19,999	540	16
20,000 - 22,499	610	18
22,500 - 24,999	480	14
25,000 - 27,499	310	9
27,500 - 29,999	200	6
30,000 - 34,999	310	9
35,000 and over	240	7
Total	3,400	100

B. Multifamily Units

<u>Gross monthly rent^{a/}</u>	<u>Efficiency</u>	<u>One bedroom</u>	<u>Two bedrooms</u>	<u>Three bedrooms</u>
\$130 - \$139	100	-	-	-
140 - 149	60	-	-	-
150 - 159	35	-	-	-
160 - 169	25	450	-	-
170 - 179	10	340	-	-
180 - 189	-	210	-	-
190 - 199	-	155	430	-
200 - 209	-	95	300	-
210 - 219	-	65	250	-
220 - 239	-	60	280	75
240 - 259	-	25	160	65
260 - 279	-	-	100	50
280 and over	-	-	80	80
Total	230	1,400	1,600	270

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

Table II

Estimated Annual Occupancy Potential for Subsidized Housing
Sacramento, California, Housing Market Area
October 1, 1969-October 1, 1971

A. Subsidized Sales Housing, Section 235^{a/}

<u>Family size</u>	<u>Number of units</u>
Four persons or less	460
Five persons or more	190
Total	<u>650</u>

B. Privately-Financed Subsidized Rental Housing

<u>Size of units</u>	<u>Rent Supplement</u>		<u>Section 236^{a/}</u>	
	<u>Families</u>	<u>Elderly</u>	<u>Families</u>	<u>Elderly</u>
Efficiency	-	560	-	140
One bedroom	20	70	100	60
Two bedrooms	40	-	300	-
Three bedrooms	30	-	180	-
Four bedrooms or more	20	-	70	-
Total	<u>110</u>	<u>630</u>	<u>650</u>	<u>200</u>

^{a/} All of the families eligible for Section 235 housing also are eligible for the Section 236 program and vice versa, and most are eligible for Section 221(d)(3) BMIR housing. The estimates are based upon exception income limits established by legislative authority; under regular income limits the potential for families would be about one-third of that number and the potential for elderly would be about two-thirds of the number shown under 236.

Table III

Work Force Components and Employment by Industry
Sacramento, California, Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area, 1965-1969
 (Annual average in thousands^{a/})

	Annual averages				12-month period through August	
	<u>1965</u>	<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>1969</u>
Civilian work force	<u>284.6</u>	<u>299.6</u>	<u>304.5</u>	<u>309.8</u>	<u>309.0</u>	<u>311.5</u>
Unemployed	16.4	15.6	16.8	15.7	15.9	15.6
Percent of work force	5.8%	5.2%	5.5%	5.1%	5.1%	5.0%
Total employment	<u>267.8</u>	<u>283.9</u>	<u>287.6</u>	<u>293.9</u>	<u>293.0</u>	<u>295.8</u>
Nonagricultural	<u>257.7</u>	<u>269.9</u>	<u>275.5</u>	<u>281.1</u>	<u>279.7</u>	<u>283.5</u>
Manufacturing	<u>31.6</u>	<u>29.7</u>	<u>28.3</u>	<u>26.4</u>	<u>27.0</u>	<u>25.8</u>
Durable goods	<u>19.8</u>	17.5	16.1	14.4	14.9	13.8
Nondurable goods	11.8	12.2	12.2	12.0	12.1	12.0
Nonmanufacturing	<u>226.1</u>	<u>240.2</u>	<u>247.2</u>	<u>254.7</u>	<u>252.7</u>	<u>257.7</u>
Mining and ag. services	1.2	1.2	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1
Construction	17.5	15.3	13.5	13.2	13.8	12.9
Trans., comm. and util.	18.1	18.8	18.6	18.7	18.6	18.7
Trade	<u>53.3</u>	<u>55.6</u>	<u>55.9</u>	<u>57.5</u>	<u>57.1</u>	<u>58.1</u>
Wholesale	<u>10.1</u>	<u>10.6</u>	<u>10.4</u>	<u>10.5</u>	<u>10.5</u>	<u>10.4</u>
Retail	43.2	45.0	45.5	47.0	46.6	47.7
Finance, ins. and real est.	10.7	10.7	11.0	11.4	11.2	11.5
Services	43.2	45.0	47.4	50.1	48.9	51.1
Government	<u>82.1</u>	<u>93.6</u>	<u>99.6</u>	<u>102.7</u>	<u>102.0</u>	<u>104.3</u>
Federal	<u>23.1</u>	<u>29.5</u>	<u>31.9</u>	<u>31.3</u>	<u>31.6</u>	<u>30.8</u>
State	31.9	33.6	34.0	35.0	34.5	36.3
Local	27.1	30.5	33.7	36.4	35.9	37.2
Agricultural	10.1	14.0	12.1	12.8	13.3	12.3
Persons in labor-mgt. disputes	.4	.1	.1	.2	.1	.1

^{a/} Components may not add to totals because of rounding.

Source: State of California Department of Human Resources Development.

Table IV

Assigned Strength at Military Installations in the
Sacramento, California, Housing Market Area, 1964-1969

<u>Date</u>	<u>Mather AFB</u>		<u>McClellan AFB</u>		<u>All army units^{a/}</u>		<u>Total all personnel</u>	
	<u>Military</u>	<u>Civilian</u>	<u>Military</u>	<u>Civilian</u>	<u>Military</u>	<u>Civilian</u>	<u>Military</u>	<u>Civilian</u>
June 1964	4,881	1,082	5,515	12,872	716	2,606	11,112	16,560
June 1965	4,818	1,051	5,471	13,263	664	2,706	10,953	17,020
June 1966	6,063	1,362	5,781	19,154	301	3,931	12,145	24,447
June 1967	5,840	1,403	5,367	20,293	167	4,795	11,374	26,491
June 1968	5,743	1,522	5,605	19,570	301	4,684	11,649	25,776
June 1969	5,648	1,339	5,520	18,625	(229) ^{b/}	(3,550) ^{b/}	<u>b/</u>	<u>b/</u>

^{a/} Mostly personnel at the Sacramento Army Depot.

^{b/} Data for military and civilian army personnel are for July and March, respectively, and include the Sacramento Army Depot only; a substantial number of army personnel are excluded in the 1969 data. No total figure is shown for 1969 because of the lack of comparability.

Source: Department of Defense.

Table V

Estimated Percentage Distribution of All Families and Renter Households
by Income and Tenure after Deduction of Federal Income Tax
Sacramento, California, Housing Market Area, 1965 and 1969

<u>Annual after-tax income</u>	<u>1965</u>		<u>1969</u>	
	<u>All families</u>	<u>Renter households^{a/}</u>	<u>All families</u>	<u>Renter households^{a/}</u>
Under \$3,000	7	11	3	9
\$3,000 - 3,999	4	9	2	6
4,000 - 4,999	6	11	5	9
5,000 - 5,999	8	12	6	10
6,000 - 6,999	10	13	9	11
7,000 - 7,999	10	10	10	11
8,000 - 8,999	9	8	9	9
9,000 - 9,999	9	6	9	8
10,000 -12,499	16	9	17	12
12,500 -14,999	10	5	11	7
15,000 and over	<u>11</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>8</u>
Total	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>
Median income	\$8,425	\$6,550	\$9,625	\$7,500

^{a/} Excludes one-person renter households.

Source: Estimated by Housing Market Analyst.

Table VI

Trends in Population and Households
Sacramento, California, Housing Market Area, 1960-1969a/

<u>Population</u>	<u>April 1960</u>	<u>August 1965</u>	<u>October 1969</u>	<u>Average annual change</u>	
				<u>1960-1965</u>	<u>1965-1969</u>
HMA Total	<u>625,503</u>	<u>754,000</u>	<u>839,700</u>	<u>24,100</u>	<u>20,550</u>
Sacramento County	502,778	599,200	661,000	18,100	14,800
Placer County	56,998	72,800	81,300	2,950	2,050
Yolo County	65,727	82,000	97,400	3,050	3,700
<u>Households</u>					
HMA Total	<u>187,820</u>	<u>232,600</u>	<u>263,200</u>	<u>8,400</u>	<u>7,350</u>
Sacramento County	150,936	185,800	208,800	6,525	5,525
Placer County	17,227	22,400	25,300	970	700
Yolo County	19,657	24,400	29,100	890	1,125

a/ Details may not add to totals because of rounding.

Sources: 1960 U. S. Censuses of Population and Housing; 1965 and 1969 estimated by Housing Market Analyst.

Table VII

Components of the Housing Inventory
Sacramento, California, Housing Market Area, 1960-1969

	<u>April</u> <u>1960</u>	<u>August</u> <u>1965</u>	<u>October</u> <u>1969</u>
Total housing inventory	<u>206,895</u>	<u>257,000</u>	<u>282,600</u>
Occupied	<u>187,820</u>	<u>232,600</u>	<u>263,200</u>
Owner-occupied	123,552	154,500	172,650
Percent of all occupied	65.8%	66.4%	65.6%
Renter-occupied	64,268	78,100	90,550
Vacant housing units	<u>19,075</u>	<u>24,400</u>	<u>19,400</u>
Available vacant	<u>11,391</u>	<u>14,700</u>	<u>8,400</u>
Available for sale only	4,416	5,800	3,000
Homeowner vacancy rate	3.5%	3.6%	1.7%
Available for rent	6,975	8,900	5,400
Renter vacancy rate	9.8%	10.2%	5.6%
Other vacanta/	7,684	9,700	11,000

a/ Includes units which are seasonal, dilapidated, rented or sold awaiting occupancy, and units held off the market for other reasons.

Sources: 1960 Census of Housing; 1965 and 1969 estimated by Housing Market Analyst.

Table VIII

Private Housing Units Authorized by Building Permits
Sacramento, California, Housing Market Area, 1963-1969

Year	Sacramento County			Placer County			Yolo County			HMA Total		
	Single family	Multi- family	Total	Single family	Multi- family	Total	Single family	Multi- family	Total	Single family	Multi- family	Total
1963	4,277	8,072	12,349	1,025	669	1,694	472	577	1,049	5,774	9,318	15,092
1964	3,704	3,193	6,897	956 ^{a/}	284	1,240 ^{a/}	511	477	988	5,171 ^{a/}	3,954	9,125 ^{a/}
1965	3,351	1,720	5,071	891	138	1,029	671	829	1,500	4,913	2,687	7,600
1966	2,474	795	3,269	693	39	732	421	500	921	3,588	1,334	4,922
1967	2,498	1,666	4,164	495	85	580	342	377	719	3,335	2,128	5,463
1968	2,475	2,386	4,861	624	103	727	517	535	1,052	3,616	3,024	6,640
<u>First eight months:</u>												
1968	1,745	1,684	3,429	418	53	471	386	339	725	2,549	2,076	4,625
1969	1,662	3,491	5,153	375	224	599	360	363	723	2,397	4,078	6,475

^{a/} Excludes 2 units of housing authorized by public contract.

Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce and Security Pacific National Bank, Economic Research Department.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING
AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

AUG 4 1970

LIBRARY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20410

728.1 :308 F22 Sacramento, Calif.
1969

U.S. Federal Housing Administration
Analysis...

**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**