

A Profile of Housing in Massachusetts

A 1998 Study by the University of Massachusetts

Table of Contents

Table of Contents

Introduction

Executive Summary

The Demographics of Housing Demand

- I. Trends in Population Growth, and Their Effect on Housing
- II. Increasing Household Numbers
- III. Journey to Work: The Jobs-to-Homes Balance
- IV. Vacancy Rates
- V. Ownership Rates by Age and Ethnicity

Housing Production and Supply

- I. Recent Growth in the Housing Inventory
- II. Occupancy Rates and Overcrowding
- III. Subsidized Housing Inventory
- IV. Geographic Patterns of Development

Housing and Credit Markets

- I. Housing Markets
- II. Credit Markets

Housing Affordability

- I. Shelter Poverty in Massachusetts
- II. Evictions and Foreclosures
- III. Homelessness

Housing for Populations with Special Needs

- I. Meeting the Housing Requirements of Special Needs Populations

Housing Discrimination

- I. Defining and Addressing the Problem
- II. Discrimination in Rental Housing
- III. Discrimination in Housing Sales

The Economic Impact of Housing

- I. Measuring the Economic Impacts of the Housing Industry
- II. Evaluating Economic Impacts
- III. The Significance of Available Housing as a Factor in Business Location Decisions

Where Do We Go From Here?

Acknowledgements

Financial Support

Special Thanks

Introduction

How does the Massachusetts housing industry contribute to the economic vitality of the commonwealth and its regions? What role should state government play in the development and maintenance of housing for its various populations? With the goal of spurring discussion and debate among the commonwealth's policy makers about these and other housing questions, the University of Massachusetts President's Office conducted this study for the Citizens' Housing and Planning Association.

Like so many things, housing is different things to different people and has varying impacts on the many segments of our society. While a young couple in Boston struggles to provide basic shelter for their family, a suburban homeowner enjoys the qualities and benefits of home as a primary investment vehicle, a tax deduction, and a place to entertain. An elderly man who is otherwise independent may require special assistance to buy his groceries or visit a doctor, while a young woman fleeing domestic violence is turned away from an overcrowded public shelter where she seeks safety for herself and her children. It is these and countless other conditions of the commonwealth's citizens that this research endeavors to examine.

In designing the study, we set out to analyze the multiple impacts of housing on individuals, families, and the economy of the commonwealth and its communities. The study's division into seven sections is recognition that housing is far more than a consideration of supply and demand. We looked at housing as an economic engine and job creator, as a supplier of a basic human need, as an alternative to nursing homes and other institutions, as an investment that often requires financial assistance from lenders, and as a system by which people's beliefs about fairness are tested.

One thing became quite clear during this process: there is a strong need to develop a centralized database of information that documents housing issues in Massachusetts as they evolve. This study represents a "first cut" at evaluating housing issues in the commonwealth and aims to provide an objective description and analysis. We hope that it will inspire a series of reports on the state of housing in the commonwealth.

After evaluating the results of this study, the overall message we garnered was that, even with a vigorous state economy, poverty, discrimination, and

homelessness continue to exist in Massachusetts. Regardless of one's view concerning these issues, one thing seems very clear: ultimately, they affect us all.

John G. Klenakis

Project Manager
UMass/CHAPA Housing Study

Executive Summary

This profile of housing in Massachusetts begins with an understanding of our population: the people who comprise it, and its historic and projected patterns of growth. It examines changing household types and numbers, the ability of different groups to secure adequate shelter — and the money to pay for it — the impact of home building on a local economy, and the importance of providing a range of housing choices to satisfy diverse needs. The population of each geographic region in the commonwealth has unique issues and characteristics. This study provides a portrait of those issues and the challenges that the state, and those who live here, face as we enter the next century.

The Inseparable Roles of Population, Production, Supply and Credit

Massachusetts has a population in excess of 6.1 million people living in 351 cities and towns. Our citizens are housed across 8,757 square miles in 2.6 million housing units that represent the entire economic spectrum. While the growth of our population has remained below the national average and relatively constant since 1970, there has been a healthy percentage increase within this population in the number of single-person households, single-parent families, and non-family households.

Within the context of population changes are signs of a dynamic demographic evolution that will impact both the kind of housing we need in the future and the importance we place on housing policy issues.

- Massachusetts is a relatively "old" state with a large elderly population that is expected to increase even more as the baby boom generation reaches retirement years. As empty-nest and elderly populations grow in number, their housing needs will change dramatically.
- We are becoming more diverse racially and ethnically due to disparate birth rates and an in-migration of people from other countries.

While we need to focus on where we are going, it is useful to look at where we have been and how well both the type and levels of housing production have met the needs of our various housing consumer groups.

- Over the past sixty years, owner-occupied housing construction has outpaced rental production four to one.
- Since 1990, we have experienced slowed production of multi-family housing, along with the conversion of rentals to owner-occupied units, decreasing the rental supply and making affordable rental housing more scarce.
- A shortage of affordable rental housing could lead to serious overcrowding problems in some Massachusetts cities in the future.
- The Massachusetts homeownership rate has been climbing, fueled in part by an increasing number of minority homeowners.
- The growing number of single-family homes does not provide a remedy to the multi-family supply issue, because a large number of low-income and poor renters are unable to purchase housing.

Driving Forces in the Market: Affordability and Availability

Sales of owner-occupied housing statewide have soared in the 1990s, surpassing the highest level of turnover in the 1980s and rising over 100 percent in this decade alone. Contributing to this are low interest rates, which are integrally linked to production, price, and available supply. While increasing across the state, average housing prices remain a function of geography: western and central regions of the commonwealth provide the most house for the money, and the east and northeast are the least affordable. According to the Greater Boston Real Estate Board, the average price of a single-family home in the Boston Metropolitan area rose from \$216,114 in 1991 to \$270,376 in 1997, a 25.1 percent increase.

Though approximately 22 percent of the rental housing stock in Massachusetts is subsidized, rising prices have excluded many low- and moderate-income people from the housing market. Others are making great sacrifices to stay in it.

- Thirty-six percent of all renters are shelter poor, and more than half of renters of color and nearly 40 percent of elderly renters also fall into this category.
- Between 1993 and 1997, the number of evictions for non-payment of rent increased by 64 percent.
- In 1996, nearly 17 percent of all homeowners were shelter poor, with half of these households headed by women.

There has been a dramatic rise in the number of homeless people in Massachusetts.

- Family homelessness increased 100 percent between 1990 and 1997, from 5,000 to 10,000.
- Contributing to the population in need of emergency shelter is the large number of women and children escaping domestic violence.
- Although there has been an increase in the supply of state-funded beds for homeless individuals since 1990, the number of unaccompanied homeless individuals in 1997 increased by 70 percent.
- People threatened with homelessness, who have managed to secure housing, find their new rent burden to be far above any reasonable level that can assure sustainability.

Meeting the Needs of Special Populations

There is a need for a greater supply of housing for persons requiring supportive services, especially among women and children who are victims of domestic violence. Special-needs populations also include those with AIDS, the non-elderly disabled, persons with severe and persistent mental illness, individuals with mental retardation, families and individuals with substance abuse problems, homeless veterans, and the elderly suffering from Alzheimer's disease.

Linking appropriate supportive services to housing can mean the difference between community living and institutionalization. The supply of adaptive housing and special services falls far short of the current need.

- Over 75 percent of elderly renters meet the income eligibility limits for publicly aided or private subsidized housing.
- The growing number of elders aged 80+ has created a market for assisted living housing and special facilities for persons with Alzheimer's disease.
- Despite a dramatic increase in the number of persons served from 1990 to 1997, there remains a need for an additional 2,000+ beds in residential programs for Department of Mental Health eligible clients.
- Close to 3,000 individuals are on the waiting list for Department of Mental Retardation residential services.

Many Massachusetts citizens face discrimination, which negatively impacts their success in securing housing for which they are qualified.

- While the Department of Housing and Urban Development estimates that nationwide as many as 2 million attempts to obtain housing of choice are thwarted annually due to illegal discriminatory behavior, only 24,122 complaints of discrimination were reported nationally in 1997.
- Housing discrimination remains largely unreported, because victims do not recognize the signs, they may not be aware of their recourse, or

they may find the process too time consuming, painful, or disruptive to family life.

- The primary categories people allege in rental discrimination are race, color, national origin, familial status, and source of income.
- There is wide disparity in approval rates for home mortgages. In 1997, denial rates for African-American and Latino people were 53 percent and 38 percent respectively. The denial rate for Whites was 26 percent.
- Upper-income African-American and Latino mortgage applicants were denied mortgages at twice the rate of Whites in the same income bracket.

The Economic Impact of New Housing Construction

There is little doubt that housing construction is an economic engine. Traditionally, the economic impact of new housing has been measured in two ways: how much property tax revenue it will produce, and the amount of its financial burden, in the form of school costs and other essential services, on the local community. We measured the hypothetical impact of the construction of 100 homes in fifteen communities throughout Massachusetts. In addition, we explored the importance of housing as a factor in business location decisions.

There are substantial benefits from the construction of housing in the form of income generation, revenue collection, and job creation. These benefits provide both initial impact and ongoing contributions to a local economic area.

- The initial and ongoing impact for housing development in Massachusetts's urban areas includes \$11 million in income generation, almost \$2 million in taxes and fees raised, and 225 jobs created.
- The initial and ongoing impact for housing development in Massachusetts's suburban areas includes over \$15 million in income generation, over \$2.5 million in taxes and fees raised, and 310 jobs created.
- The initial and ongoing impact for housing development in Massachusetts's rural areas includes over \$12 million in income generation, over \$2 million in taxes and fees raised, and almost 300 jobs created.

Key Conclusions

- The supply of affordable rental housing is diminishing due to demolitions, conversions of rentals to owner-occupied housing, and the low production of multi-family housing units. This is having a strong adverse impact on low-income persons who are facing the low vacancy rates and higher rents that come with a healthy economy.

- Homelessness is on the rise for both families and individuals. Some of this increase is directly related to those trying to escape domestic violence.
- Homeownership is increasing, fueled in part by an increasing number of minority homeowners.
- There is a growing demand for housing supported by services to meet the needs of special population groups.
- While not well recognized, the housing industry itself is a major contributor to the economy of the commonwealth.

The Bottom Line

When we talk about numbers of units and prices of homes, increases in construction and decreases in interest rates, we envision an industry characterized by bricks and steel, cash and credit. In this context, it is easy to forget that at the core of the entire housing industry are people. In short, a study of housing is a study of our citizenry and of what each of us calls home.

The Demographics of Housing Demand

Introduction

I. Trends in Population Growth, and Their Effect on Housing

- **Migration and Immigration**
- **An aging population**
- **Racial Composition**

II. Increasing Household Numbers

- **Single-person Households**
- **Other Non-traditional Households**

III. Journey to Work: The Jobs-to-Homes Balance

IV. Vacancy Rates

- **Massachusetts vs. the United States**
- **Massachusetts vs. Boston MA-NH MSA**

V. Ownership Rates by Age and Ethnicity

- **Owners vs. Renters**

VI. In Conclusion

Introduction

Current population and other demographic data show that the demand for housing is experiencing a significant change in both nature and scope. Pressures will be placed on various aspects of the housing market as the population increases, ages, and undergoes ethnic and social change. In general, an increase in the need for smaller housing units is likely, as is a greater demand for elderly and renter housing.

Larger and larger numbers of commuters traveling excessive distances to work, particularly in the Boston metropolitan area, give strong evidence that people are being forced to absorb the cost of commuting along with their normal housing costs. This phenomenon suggests a need for an increase in the number of more affordable housing units in and around the Boston metropolitan area and other work centers.

Vacancy rates, both for owner-occupied and rental units, are lower in Massachusetts than across the country. This keeps demand – and prices – high. As the age and makeup of the state’s citizenry change, however, the units that are in high demand today may be the vacant homes of tomorrow.

Trends in demographics, both overall and in specific geographic areas, are a predictor of future pressures on the Massachusetts housing market. Using census data, banking studies, and housing industry information, we track these changes in order to ready the housing industry for the population shifts as they unfold before us.

[Back to Top](#)

I. Trends in Population Growth, and Their Effect on Housing

Over the past 60 years, the rate of increase in the Massachusetts population has been significantly below that of the nation (see Figure 1). Between 1995 and 2025, the state’s population is expected to grow slowly – from 6.1 to 6.9 million people – resulting in a drop from 13th to 14th in national population rankings. The Northeast in general and New England in particular are forecasted to have little population growth, while the majority of the nation’s growth is expected to take place in the South and West.

While population is growing slowly in the state as a whole, certain areas are expected to grow considerably. As Figure 2 shows, the cities and towns predicted to have the highest growth rates from 1990 to 2010 are in the central part of the state, especially along the Rhode Island border and the South Shore.

Little growth, and even some population loss, is forecast for the Boston Metro area and the western part of the state. Perhaps not surprisingly, this growth rate corresponds to findings in the third chapter of this study, which show an increase in housing supply in these areas. Uneven growth, concentrated in towns that have traditionally been smaller and farther from major population centers, will place stress on both the infrastructure and the available housing supply of those areas.

[Back to Top](#)

Migration and Immigration

One reason for the state's slow growth is the migration of Massachusetts citizens to other parts of the country. From March 1986 to March 1987, an estimated 481,000 people moved from the Northeast to other areas of the country; 135,000 of these people were from New England. The U.S. Bureau of the Census predicts that 815,000 people will move from the Commonwealth between 1995 and 2005, while immigration from other countries will bring 830,000 into the state.

Partly because of this immigration, the racial composition of the Commonwealth is expected to change as well. Trends in racial composition show that the percentage and number of minorities in Massachusetts is increasing and will continue to increase in the future. Growth in the Latino population is expected to show the greatest numerical increase, from 354,000 to 933,000 people, or 164 percent. The largest percentage increase and second largest numeric increase is a predicted 183 percent increase in the Asian/Pacific Islander population. A 59 percent increase is predicted for the Black, non-Hispanic population. The White, non-Latino population will drop by 5 percent, from 5.2 million to 4.9 million people, between 1995 and 2025.

[Back to Top](#)

An aging population

Another trend that has a significant influence on housing need is the changing age of the population. The Commonwealth currently has one of the nation's oldest populations, and numbers in the above-44 age groups will increase dramatically as the baby boom generation ages. The population of youths under 24 is expected to increase only slightly, from 2 million to 2.2 million (see Figure 3). The childbearing age groups (25 to 44) have not yet declined in total, but a drop is projected to take place within the next few years.

In 2025, 18.1 percent of the population is expected to be over 65, as compared with 14.2 percent today. This points to a heightened need for retirement complexes, as well as assisted living and nursing home care. The anticipated

drop in citizens of childbearing age underscores the decline in a need for large homes.

[Back to Top](#)

Racial Composition

The racial composition of the population is also projected to change over the next 26 years. The U.S. Census projects a large decline in the White, non-Hispanic population, from 86 percent (5.2 million) in 1995 to 71.8 percent (4.96 million) in 2025, the only decline in any population group in the Commonwealth. The Hispanic segment of the population is expected to make the largest proportional gains, from 5.8 percent (579,000) of the total population in 1995 to 13.5 percent (933,000) in 2025. The Black, non-Hispanic proportion of the population is projected to increase moderately, from 5 percent (303,000) in 1995 to 7 percent (483,000), along with the Asian/Pacific Islander population group's increase from 3 percent (183,000) to 7.5 percent (519,000) of the population. Finally, the American Indian, Eskimo, and Aleut segment of the population is projected to remain steady at 0.2 percent (10,600).

[Back to Top](#)

II. Increasing Household Numbers

The growth in household formations across the Commonwealth has mirrored the growth in population and is, again, significantly smaller than that of the nation as a whole. From 1980 to 1996, the United States increased its number of households by 23 percent, while the number of Massachusetts households grew only 14 percent. Since 1990, these increases have been 7 percent and 3 percent, respectively. The population of the country increased 7 percent, however, while that of the Commonwealth increased only 1.3 percent. The fact that the rate of growth in new households has outpaced that in population shows that there are other forces at work.

[Back to Top](#)

Single-person Households

Perhaps the most significant shift in household make-up is the increase in numbers of single-person dwellings. This explains much of the increase in household numbers overall. From 1940 to 1990, single-person households swelled from 7.2 to 25.8 percent of all households. Growth was greatest from 1950 to 1980 and has since shown signs of leveling off.

[Back to Top](#)

Other Non-traditional Households

Another trend is the increase in non-traditional households, such as single-parent families and non-family households. Both have been on the rise throughout Massachusetts and across the nation. From 1940 to 1997, the number of female-headed, single-parent families increased from 3.4 million (11 percent) to 12.8 million (18 percent) of all family households. Interestingly, the percentage of single-parent, male-headed households is unchanged, at 5 percent. The steady increase in non-family and single-person households again suggests that smaller housing units may become increasingly necessary.

[Back to Top](#)

III. Journey to Work: The Jobs-to-Homes Balance

Still another way of looking at housing demand is by examining the distance people travel to their workplaces. Workers who travel long distances may be doing so because they cannot locate or afford housing closer to their employment. In 1990, the last year for which data were available, 64 percent of all workers worked outside of their cities or towns of residence, compared to 58 percent in 1980. Twenty-eight percent of all Massachusetts employees worked outside of their counties of residence in 1990, compared to 24 percent in 1980.

The number of minutes people traveled to work went up between 1980 and 1990. The 1990 census revealed that 29,951 people in the state travel 90 or more minutes to work. This census category did not exist a decade before. This jobs-to-housing imbalance suggests an immediate need for affordable housing in metropolitan areas and other pockets of higher employment.

[Back to Top](#)

IV. Vacancy Rates

Vacancy rates suggest trends in population and household formations. These can be used on a statewide level to estimate overall housing demand and on a city- or town-wide level.

[Back to Top](#)

Massachusetts vs. the United States

The overall state vacancy rate for rental units, as estimated by the U.S. Census Bureau, has varied for the last 11 years, while the national rate has remained fairly constant. Rental vacancy rates were at their lowest point in 1987, at 3.6 percent. They reached a high in 1992, when almost 9 percent of all rental

properties in Massachusetts were vacant. Since that time, rates have declined steadily and are currently estimated at approximately 5.2 percent of all properties, compared to the national average of 7.7 percent (see Figure 4).

In 1986, the owner-occupied-property vacancy rate fell to a low of 7/10 of one percent. Interestingly, the highest rate occurred only two years later, at 1.8 percent. Since then, the owner-occupied vacancy rate has been consistently lower than the national average, and is currently estimated to be at its lowest point in 11 years, at only 8/10 of one percent.

[Back to Top](#)

Massachusetts vs. Boston MA-NH MSA

For more localized data, the U.S. Census Bureau evaluated the 75 largest Metropolitan Statistical Areas in the nation. Data on the Boston MA-NH MSA, which encompasses most of eastern Massachusetts and part of southern New Hampshire, show that vacancy rates for this region have generally followed the trend of the Commonwealth, but have been lower for most of the last 11 years (see Figure 5). Rental vacancy rates in the Boston MA-NH MSA did not rise much above the national average of 7 percent at any point in this time period, and are currently at 4 percent of all rental properties. Similar trends are seen in the housing sales market, where vacancy rates were consistently equal to or lower than the state average.

Data from the Rental Housing Association of Massachusetts for fall 1997 support these observations. In surveys of the association's membership, rental vacancy rates were found to be as low as 1.15 percent in the mid-128 area of the state, while rates in central and western Massachusetts were 4.35 percent and 6.04 percent, respectively.

Similarly, average reported rents in the mid-128 area were an astounding \$1,065 per month, compared to only \$640 per month in western Massachusetts. Although this survey represented only 45,863 market-rate units (a small portion of 915,600 renter-occupied units in the Commonwealth) and less than 1 percent of the surveyed units were in structures of six units or less, it does show that there is a much higher demand for housing in eastern areas of the state.

[Back to Top](#)

V. Ownership Rates by Age and Ethnicity

Different age and ethnic groups also have different homeownership rates. Although detailed age data are not available at the state level, nationwide data from 1982 through 1996 show a schism between householders under 55

and those 55 or older. All age groups under 55 showed a decrease in homeownership rates between 1982 and 1995, with some groups rebounding in 1996. Householders aged 35 to 44 showed a steady decline in homeownership rates during this same period, from 70 percent in 1982 to 65 percent in 1996. The nationwide ownership rate for the 45 to 54 age group also showed a small decline from 1982 to 1995, but rebounded to 76 percent in 1996. While younger age groups were showing declines, householders aged 55 to 64 remained consistent at 80 percent, and the 65 and over age group showed a steady increase from 74 percent in 1982 to 79 percent in 1996. The stability of older homeowners might be explained in part by this group's smaller relative dependence on employment for income.

In Massachusetts, too, the trend of lower homeownership rates carries over to age groups. The 1980 and 1990 censuses showed that homeownership by people under 35 has lagged behind the nation and followed the same pattern of decline for those years, although the decline was not as severe. Similarly, homeownership rates for householders 65 or older have been significantly less than in the nation as a whole. In 1990, when the national ownership rate for this age group was over 75 percent, it was only 64 percent in Massachusetts. This suggests that lower Massachusetts homeownership rates cut across all age groups.

Both Black and Latino householders in Massachusetts show a much lower homeownership rate than they do across the nation (see Figure 6). Rates among Blacks increased nationwide from 34.5 percent in 1950 to 43.4 percent in 1990, but the increase in Massachusetts was only from 25.5 percent to 26.4 percent. The rate of Latino homeownership has shown a marked decrease. Over the same 40-year period, the national rate declined from 43.7 percent to 42.4 percent; the rate in Massachusetts declined from 25.3 percent to a very low 18.7 percent.

It should be noted that the overall population of Blacks and Latinos increased during this time period, and that the absolute number of Black and Latino homeowners also increased. While the decrease in the rate among Latinos could be linked to the large number of Latino immigrants settling in the Commonwealth (as recent immigrants traditionally have much lower homeownership rates than do citizens), the same cannot be said for Blacks.

[Back to Top](#)

Owners vs. Renters

The data for homeownership rates can be used to infer demand for rental housing. According to the 1990 census, 68 percent of all minority people in the state rent housing, as opposed to 30 percent of non-Latino White citizens. With an increase in minority populations forecast for the next 27 years and a

decrease in the White population also projected, it is likely that the need for rental housing will increase in the near future. The number of mortgages granted to minority populations have increased in recent years, however, suggesting that homeownership among minorities is on the rise.

[Back to Top](#)

VI. In Conclusion

Housing demand in Massachusetts is always evolving in response to changes in the makeup of the Commonwealth's population. Many factors, including age, ethnicity, employment, lifestyle, and family size, influence the market from generation to generation. The key to meeting the housing needs of the Commonwealth's citizenry is being aware of the trends and adapting accordingly.

These data show a few areas where demand currently exists or will exist in the future. As the population increases, ages, and changes ethnically, pressures will be placed on various segments of the housing market. The increase in numbers of people over 65, for example, means that there will be a greater need for retirement communities and smaller housing. The increase in the 85+ population means more assisted living and nursing home care may be needed. Decreasing numbers of people of childbearing age means there will be less need for larger housing.

According to the 1990 census, 68 percent of all minority persons in the state rent housing, as opposed to 30 percent of non-Hispanic, White persons. In 1990, minorities represented 19.38 percent of all renters in the Commonwealth. If projected increases in minority populations continue, the demand for rental housing will increase. Developments in mortgage lending, however, show that the number of mortgages granted to minority persons has increased in the last few years, suggesting that minority homeownership is on the rise.

Changes in household composition will also continue to influence the type of housing required. The steady increase in non-family and single-person households suggests that smaller housing units may become increasingly popular.

Low vacancy rates for rental and owner-occupied properties in Massachusetts illustrate a current housing need. This lack of housing is most acute in the Boston area, where rents are high and the number of vacant apartments is low in comparison to the rest of the Commonwealth and to the country.

Finally, the increase in distances people travel to work, particularly in the Boston area, is strong evidence that they may be forced away from expensive

housing markets. This phenomenon suggests a need for an increase in the number of affordable housing units in and around the metropolitan Boston area.

David Winsor is a licensed architect and holds a master's degree in community planning. For more information, contact the author at dswinsor@aol.com

Meir Gross is a professor in the Landscape Architecture and Regional Planning Department at the University of Massachusetts Amherst.

Housing Production and Supply

David Winsor and Meir Gross

Introduction

I. Recent Growth in the Housing Inventory

- **Regional Context**
- **Single-family Unit Production**
- **Multi-family Unit Production**

II. Occupancy Rates and Overcrowding

III. Subsidized Housing Inventory

IV. Geographic Patterns of Development

V. In Conclusion

Introduction

The state's housing supply has been steadily increasing, and is presently estimated at over 2.6 million units. Recent trends have favored single-family construction; multi-family units, in structures of two or more units, account for only 12.1 percent of new housing construction.

The fact that housing production is dominated by single-family homes is directly linked to the rates of homeownership. Since 1900, the homeownership rate has nearly doubled. In fact, this study concluded that the proportion of owner-occupied housing units has increased faster than the overall rate of housing production. There is evidence that this has been made possible by the conversion of units from rental occupancy to owner occupancy. As many as 26,000 units may have been removed from the state's rental housing supply.

Overall trends point to a surge of single-family housing construction in towns west of Boston. This is a direct result of infrastructure enhancements that have improved these towns' accessibility, and therefore their economies and amenities.

The state's housing stock has increased by nearly 110 percent since 1940. It is currently estimated at approximately 2.6 million units. The largest growth has been in the owner-occupied sector, which has increased by 215 percent. Rental units, on the other hand, have increased by only 33 percent over the same time period.

[Back to Top](#)

I. Recent Growth in the Housing Inventory

Figure 1 indicates that trends in the state's housing inventory are changing. While the owner-occupied segment has continued to increase since 1990, there has been a decline in rental housing. This was determined by dividing the estimated growth of the housing supply into its owner- and renter-occupied components. Based on building permit data, the state's housing supply has increased by 127,421 units since 1990, bringing the total to 2.6 million units. The estimated size of the owner-occupied segment has increased faster than the overall rate of housing production. Possible explanations for this include the demolition of older urban rental units and the conversion of rental units to owner-occupied units.

[Back to Top](#)

Regional Context

Massachusetts is the most populous of the New England states. In the last seven years, the commonwealth accounted for nearly 43 percent of New England's housing starts. This was twice as many new homes as were built in Connecticut, the second largest producer. The state's housing growth rate, however, was below the New England average. Figure 2 shows that the growth rates of the southern New England states were surpassed by those of their three neighbors to the north.

Over the last eight years, housing production in the state has averaged nearly 16,000 units per year. The largest increase occurred in 1994, when 18,115 units were constructed. Despite this active production, this pales in comparison to the construction boom of the mid-1980s. In that six-year period, over 147,000 building permits for single- and multi-family units were issued, expanding the housing stock by more than 15 percent.

[Back to Top](#)

Single-family Unit Production

Of the 127,421 housing units added to the state's housing supply since 1990, the vast majority were single-family units. Between 1990 and the third quarter of 1997, 111,900 such units had been built, representing nearly 87 percent of all new housing construction. In the last three years alone, single-family home construction totaled 42,376 homes. Single-family unit construction peaked in 1994 with the addition of 16,533 homes.

[Back to Top](#)

Multi-family Unit Production

New development of multi-family homes and complexes has declined dramatically since the 1980s. Between 1980 and 1990, multi-family units accounted for nearly 26 percent of new construction. Over the following seven years, this decreased to 12 percent. The current supply, 157,182 units, represents an increase of slightly less than 2 percent since 1990, while single-family units increased by 111,983, or 9 percent, in the same period.

[Back to Top](#)

II. Occupancy Rates and Overcrowding

A principal indicator of housing conditions is the occupancy rate of the housing stock. The state's rate of owner-occupancy has nearly doubled in this century, with the only significant decline occurring during the 1930s. With ownership rates currently estimated to be 62.3 percent, the issue arises as to the ability of housing production to keep pace with the growing preference for owner-occupied housing.

While there is no way to precisely calculate the decline in rental occupancy, estimates suggest that it could be in the range of 20,000 to 26,000 units.

This reduction has led to an increase in crowding in urban areas. The Census Bureau defines units with more than 1.01 persons per room as being crowded and those with more than 1.51 persons per room as severely crowded. The 1940 census revealed that 11.7 percent of the state's housing was crowded and 2.7 percent was severely crowded. Though statewide the number of crowded units had declined (2.5 percent crowded, 0.8 percent severely crowded), overcrowding could well become a serious issue in urban areas. Between the competition for units by an expanding student population and the suspected decline in the overall number of rental units, crowding and cost have been identified as emerging concerns for the Boston rental market.

[Back to Top](#)

III. Subsidized Housing Inventory

A significant proportion of the state's housing supply is currently classified as "assisted": costs are directly or indirectly subsidized by federal, state or local regulation. In 1997, the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Massachusetts Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) reported that a total of 216,587 units, or 22 percent of the state's rental housing stock, had some form of federal or state subsidy. There are also 16,568 households benefiting from low-income housing tax credits, which can be combined with other forms of housing assistance. For this reason it is not possible to apply the total number of tax-credit beneficiaries to the subsidized inventory.

Public housing operated by state and local housing authorities accounts for approximately 16 percent of all assisted units. The Section 8 certificates and vouchers program represents nearly 30 percent of all assisted housing in the state (see Figure 3).

[Back to Top](#)

IV. Geographic Patterns of Development

The pattern of residential growth throughout the state has been far from uniform. Certain communities, because of their accessibility, economy and amenities, have attracted new growth at rates that significantly exceed those of the state overall. Between 1980 and 1990, the housing supplies in 22 communities doubled in size, and 56 communities had residential growth rates exceeding 50 percent. Meanwhile, Holyoke lost 6 percent of its housing. Some of the fastest growing communities in the 1980s were located in the state's more rural areas.

To determine the level of local growth since the 1990 census required the use of a somewhat unconventional source of data. Development was measured by communities' annual parcel inventory, as supplied to the Department of Revenue. The figures include the number of assessors' parcels by general-use category. From 1992 through 1996, communities statewide added approximately 50,000 residential parcels, for an increase of 4 percent. Fifty-two communities increased their residential parcel inventories by over 10 percent, while 27 lost parcels through conversion to nonresidential uses. Figure 4 indicates that the greatest concentration of residential growth is now occurring in the I-495 corridor.

[Back to Top](#)

V. In Conclusion

For the past fifty years, the supply of housing in Massachusetts has been driven by economic cycles and transportation shifts that have transformed the state's rural landscape. Today the state's least populous communities are experiencing the greatest rate of residential growth. Determining how and where the state's supply of housing is changing will help us predict and plan economic and infrastructure development over the next quarter century.

David Winsor is a licensed architect and holds a master's degree in community planning. For more information, contact the author at dswinsor@aol.com

Meir Gross is a professor in the Landscape Architecture and Regional Planning Department at the University of Massachusetts Amherst.

HOUSING AND CREDIT MARKETS

Meir Gross and David Winsor

Introduction

I. Housing Markets

- **Home Ownership Rates**
 - **The cost of homes**
 - **Recent resale activity by market segment**
- **Renter Occupied Housing Market**
- **Changing Occupancy Status**

II. Credit Markets

- **Interest Rates**
- **Mortgage Lending**

III. In Conclusion

Introduction

The supply of the vast majority of housing in Massachusetts is provided by the private sector and, as such, is directly influenced by the functions of the housing markets and credit markets. While recent conditions in these markets have been relatively stable, their volatility during the late 1980s and early 1990s remains a vivid reminder of their impact on the lives of the state's residents.

For anyone who thinks of the economy as a roller coaster, the past decade has surely been a thrill ride. Like so many other aspects of our lives, the cost and

availability of housing closely follow the economic roller coaster as it turns, climbs, and dives. The late eighties saw housing prices level off with a slowing economy, and with the early nineties came rising numbers of foreclosures. The housing market recovered as the economy again grew strong, causing home sales and prices to skyrocket in certain areas of the state. Falling interest rates that once had homeowners refinancing are now spurring increased home sales.

[Back to Top](#)

I. Housing Markets

Housing markets are divided into basic segments, according to ownership status and physical characteristics. The ownership status of the market differentiates between the sub-markets for owner-occupied and renter-occupied units. Physical characteristics: size, location, condition, etc., affect cost, use, and demand of available units.

[Back to Top](#)

Home Ownership Rates

Despite annual fluctuations, the long-term rate of home ownership in Massachusetts and across the country has been increasing steadily. Between 1990 and 1997, the commonwealth experienced an ownership rate increase of nearly four percentage points (58.6 percent to 62.3 percent), while rates for the rest of New England either declined or remained constant. Compared to its neighbors, Massachusetts has one of the lowest home-ownership rates; only Rhode Island's is lower, at 58.7 percent. The increase in the rate of owner-occupancy has resulted in a resurgence in real estate values and the apparent conversion of rental units to owner-occupancy to meet the demand.

To capture and quantify these trends this study relies on several factors that describe the market for owner occupied homes. These include residential sales volume, average or median sales price of sold units and average time required to sell a property after it has been placed on the market. Typically these statistics are compiled by private sector companies that monitor market activity for residential and commercial real estate. The major sources consulted include the Greater Boston Real Estate Board (GBREB), the National Association of Realtors, the National Association of Home Builders and Banker and Tradesman Real Estate Information Services.

Residential sales volume is measured by the number of existing homes sold in a given market during a stipulated time period. According to the National Association of Realtors, a total of 99,400 single-family homes, condos and co-ops were sold in Massachusetts during 1997. This represents an estimated 7.5 percent of all owner-occupied housing units in the state. Using this statistic as

a measure of regional market dynamics, Massachusetts was found to be the second most active residential real estate market in New England; New Hampshire, with an 8.13 percent turnover, led the region.

The real estate boom of the late 1980s is apparent in Figure 1, with annual sales for 1988 reaching 76,500 units, the peak for that decade. The current market surpasses that of the 1980s in terms of annual sales, degree of change in sales volume, and increase in value. For example, annual sales in 1997 exceeded those of 1987 by almost 20,000 units. Since the most recent low point in 1990, sales have increased more than 104 percent. This pattern is also confirmed by data compiled by the Greater Boston Real Estate Board (GBREB) which reported 19,224 single family home sales during 1997 in the greater Boston listing area. This represents a sales volume that was more than twice the 8,957 single family home sales reported by GBREB in 1987, the previous market peak for that listing region.

[Back to Top](#)

The cost of homes. The cost of new and existing homes in Massachusetts was also found to vary significantly, depending on market segment and location. Two sources of housing market data, each representing a somewhat different geographic market area, present contrasting views of housing cost around the state. According to the GBREB, the average price of a single-family home sold during 1997 in the Greater Boston listing area was over \$270,376 (see Figure 2). Banker and Tradesman Real Estate Information Services, which covers a different geographic market area, reported that the average sale price of a single-family home that year was \$190,036. Such variances in housing cost data can be partially explained by the geographic scope of the data reported, the specific statistical method used, and the impact of local markets on the resale market as a whole.¹

Statewide, the average cost of a single-family home from the Banker and Tradesman system ranged from a low of \$66,389 in North Adams to slightly less than \$700,000 in the town of Westborough. Forty-one communities had average single-family home prices in excess of \$250,000, and nine communities reported average sale prices over \$500,000.

To further demonstrate the dynamics of the housing market over time, Figure 2 juxtaposes the average sale price of units sold in the greater Boston listing area with average market time. The patterns are clearly evident, showing an inverse relationship between home prices and average market time. Several points stand out as notable: 1988, when the average resale price reached a peak of \$246,885; and 1991, when the average price had declined by nearly 13 percent to \$216,114 and the average single family home was on the market for 111 days. By the fourth quarter of 1997, the average price of a single family home had

recovered to an all-time high of \$270,376. Market time was 81 days, as compared with a peak time of 121 days during the fourth quarter of 1991.

[Back to Top](#)

Recent resale activity by market segment. Figure 3 presents the 1997 Banker and Tradesman sales data for the five primary real estate categories, which account for 80,093 transactions. Of these, 48,967 (56 percent) were single-family residences. The average price of single-family residential sales was slightly over \$190,000. The next largest category reported was condominiums, with 20,110 units changing hands. Sales of two- and three-family residences totaled 10,984 transactions, roughly 13 percent of all residential market activity.

Relative affordability of the resale housing market. The affordability of homes in the resale market is a function of income, cost and interest rates. The National Association of Home Builders has developed an index of affordability based on the median sale price of homes by metropolitan area and the proportion of those that are affordable to buyers earning the median income for that area. The index includes a number of assumptions regarding cost, including mortgage interest rates and the proportion of income needed for housing-related expenses. The current measures of the index for Massachusetts indicate that communities in the western portion of the state are more affordable. The Boston metropolitan area is ranked 111th nationally in affordability: 68.2 percent of homes sold are (theoretically) affordable to families earning the median family income.

Geographic differences in affordability were assessed by computing a cost index that compares individual sales transactions in each community with a hypothetical housing cost standard for that community. The cost index consists of a ratio of individual sale prices to a cost standard that is two times the community's median household income. In other words, the method assumes that the typical affordable home will cost no more than two times the community's median family income. This cost factor is similar to a mortgage banking tradition that advises potential borrowers to gauge their capacity to purchase a home based on 2.5 times gross annual income.

Sales data from Banker and Tradesman's residential real estate data base finds that 19,000 or 24 percent of all single family home sales in 1997 were at or below the hypothetical maximum stipulated sales price. Locally, the percentage of affordable sales varied dramatically from a high of over 62 percent in the town of Ashby to a low of 2.3 percent in Manchester. Ninety-six of the communities covered by the Banker and Tradesman data reported that 25 percent or more of their local homes sales were at prices at or below the stipulated affordable price levels. Eleven communities, Lawrence, Everett, Chelsea, Athol, Lynn, Springfield, New Bedford, Fall River, Fitchburg, Brockton

and Holbrook, had more than 90 percent of home sales that were at or below the estimated maximum price. However, the geographic limitations of the Banker and Tradesman data base exclude a significant number of communities that might otherwise be reported to have a sizable share of affordable homes.

[Back to Top](#)

Renter Occupied Housing Market

The scope and extent of the market for renter-occupied housing is measured according to the change in inventory, vacancy and cost. The Rental Housing Association's (RHA) "Industry Survey: Tri-annual Report," published in January 1998, evaluated 66,683 of the state's estimated 915,600 rental units. Of the units surveyed, 45,863 (68.77 percent) were identified as market-rate units, while rent levels of the remaining 20,820 units (31.23 percent) were regulated in some way. The survey found that the statewide vacancy rate for rental units had increased slightly from the previous year. The rate reported for the fall of 1997 was 2.59 percent, compared with 2.36 percent for the fall of 1996. These figures are significantly lower than the annual vacancy rates reported by the U.S. census, which estimated an average 1997 rental vacancy for the state at 5.2 percent.²

According to the rental survey, average rents in the state had increased by slightly less than one percent between the fall of 1996 and the fall of 1997. The latest survey reported the statewide average rent as \$854. Of the ten regional markets, the highest average rental costs were reported for the Greater Boston and Merrimack Valley areas, at \$1,047 and \$1,065 per month, respectively. At the local level, the survey reported average rental costs for communities with 500 or more market-level units. The most expensive rents were found in the Beacon Hill/West End neighborhood of Boston (\$1,317 per month) and the Chestnut Hill area (\$1,389 per month). The lowest occurred in Springfield and Lowell, both reporting \$613, and Dorchester, at \$667. Dorchester was also the only rental market to report a decrease in average rent, with costs declining by 4.9 percent. In Boston, the Beacon Hill/West End market reported the largest increase in rental cost, at 13.1 percent. Of the suburban markets, Norwood showed the largest change in cost, with an increase of 12.3 percent.

Other sources that can be used to quantify the rental market are the 1990 Census and HUD's Fair Market Rental Survey. The supply section of this housing study determined baseline numbers of rental units and their median cost by community and for the state as a whole according to the 1990 Census. The Fair Market Rental Survey focuses on MSA and county markets and estimates rental costs at the 45th percentile for a two bedroom unit. Fair market rental rates for other unit types are imputed from cost ratios related to the two bedroom value. Figure 4 shows the continuous increase in rental costs for the Boston

MSA. The long-term trend is distorted, however, by a change in the method used to calculate the rental standard. In 1995 the standard was lowered from the 45th percentile to the 40th percentile. Comparisons of the fair market rents for the state's other MSAs were somewhat inconsistent, reflecting localized shifts in the rental market. As shown below, several of the state's metropolitan areas experienced recent decreases in the rent levels, including over 10 percent declines in the Worcester and Fitchburg-Leominster MSAs, while the state's eastern metropolitan areas showed increases ranging from 8 percent in New Bedford and Lowell to over 12 percent in Boston.

	1995	1998	% CHANGE
Barnstable-Yarmouth MS MSA	\$800	\$822	2.75%
Boston, MA-NH MSA	\$775	\$874	12.77%
Brockton MA PMSA	\$673	\$671	-0.30%
Fitchburg-Leominster, MA PMSA	\$663	\$592	-10.71%
Lawrence, MA-NH PMSA	\$650	\$633	-2.62%
Lowell, MA-NH PMSA	\$658	\$711	8.05%
New Bedford, MA PMSA	\$561	\$606	8.02%
Pittsfield, MA MSA	\$569	\$554	-2.64%
Springfield, MA MSA	\$598	\$642	7.36%
Worcester, MA-CT PMSA	\$683	\$610	-10.69%

[Back to Top](#)

Changing Occupancy Status

The cost and availability of rental housing can be profoundly impacted by changes in the supply of rental units. Among the causes of variability in rental supply, occupancy conversions have the potential to cause major shifts in the rental housing stock. The boundary between the rental and owner-occupied markets is not permanently fixed; rental properties become owner-occupied, and vice versa. There is evidence that owner-occupancy rates, which have been increasing nationally and locally, may very well have surpassed the overall rate of housing production. The U.S. Census estimates that, between 1990 and 1997, the state's housing stock increased by over 127,000 units, bringing the total housing supply to over 2.6 million units. Using these figures, the owner-occupied portion of the supply was calculated to be approximately

1.62 million units, an increase of over 153,000. This suggests that approximately 26,000 rental units were converted to owner-occupancy to compensate for the inventory shortfall.

[Back to Top](#)

II. Credit Markets

The market for residential finance capital has a significant impact on the market for housing. Nationally, more than 64 percent of all housing is owner-occupied, and approximately 65 percent of these properties are mortgaged. Numbers in Massachusetts are similar, with over 68 percent of owner-occupied housing inventory encumbered by mortgages. Given this link, the two aspects of the credit market that are believed to have the greatest influence on the availability and affordability of housing are interest rates and the lending practices of banks and mortgage companies.

[Back to Top](#)

Interest Rates

A recent study by the National Association of Home Builders concluded that national housing affordability is heavily influenced by mortgage interest rates. Specifically, for every one percentage point rise in interest rates, more than four million households are priced out of the market for a \$100,000 home. The local impact of interest rates and their relationship to the housing market is apparent in Figure 5. Since 1983, interest trends have had an inverse relationship with sales trends, supporting the contention that market activity can be directly affected by the cost of residential mortgage capital.

[Back to Top](#)

Mortgage Lending

Since 1992 the access, availability, and geographic detail of Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA) data have allowed precise tracking of residential mortgage markets. The number of residential mortgage originations increased only slightly from 160,286 in 1992 to 163,369 in 1996.

A noticeable shift occurred during this period in the use of mortgage capital. In 1992, fewer than 28 percent of all mortgages were used for home purchases. By 1996, home purchase lending amounted to more than 48 percent of all residential mortgages in the state. It is evident that the shift in lending was driven by the demand to refinance existing mortgages, which in 1992 accounted for over 66 percent of all lending. By 1996, mortgage refinancing had declined to less than 43 percent of the overall market. The number of

mortgages associated with the purchase of multifamily structures represented only a small proportion (less than 2.1 percent) of the total, with 745 loan originations totaling \$421 million.

The disposition of mortgage applications, specifically loan denial rates, is an important indicator of mortgage lending. Between 1992 and 1996, the aggregate loan denial rate in Massachusetts remained fairly constant, increasing slightly from 12 percent of all applications in 1992 to 13 percent in 1996. The denial rates for specific loan purposes have shown greater variability over the five-year period. Home purchase applications, the largest purpose group, experienced the greatest improvement, decreasing from 12 percent in 1992 to 9 percent in 1996. Loan denial rates in Massachusetts were significantly lower than the national rate, which increased from 15.8 percent to 19.3 percent over the same period.

The value of mortgage lending in the state changed significantly between 1992 and 1996, reflecting shifts that have been occurring in the residential credit market. Some of the changes are consistent with historic market dynamics. For example, mortgage refinancing and home purchase loans increased in value by 16 percent and 10.7 percent, respectively.

To a large extent the condition of the state's housing and credit markets follows national and regional trends. The recovery of home values in Massachusetts after 1993, for example, was experienced across the northeast following the general economic recovery of the region. Another less celebrated trend beginning to impact the state's credit market and following national patterns is a restructuring of the lending industry. Mergers, acquisitions and corporate expansion have begun to change the source of capital that feeds the region's residential finance market. The principal impact appears to be a shift in the dominance of capital supply from local lenders to out-of-state institutions and is illustrated by mortgage loan origination statistics. In 1992 the Massachusetts residential credit market produced a total of 160,000 loan originations with a value of slightly less than \$17 billion. This lending activity was generated by 488 lending institutions, 70 percent of which were physically located within the state. By 1996 the number of lenders doing business in the state had increased to 696 but only 50 percent were actually located in Massachusetts. While the number of in-state lenders remained virtually unchanged, the number of out of state lenders more than doubled during the same period, resulting in a 16 percent decline in the value of residential loans generated by in-state lenders. In 1996 the share of lending attributable to local or in-state lenders had declined to 46 percent of the total value of lending, a decrease from 65 percent in 1992.

	Banks	%	Value x 1000	%	Originations	%
--	-------	---	--------------	---	--------------	---

1992						
In-state	342	70.08%	\$11,040,627	65.10%	113,753	70.97%
Out-of-state	146	29.92%	\$5,918,629	34.90%	46,534	29.03%
Total	488	100.00%	\$16,959,256	100.00%	160,287	100.00%
1996						
In-state	348	50.00%	\$9,229,172	46.44%	80,517	49.29%
Out-of-state	348	50.00%	\$10,644,435	53.56%	82,852	50.71%
Total	696	100.00 %	\$19,873,607	100.00 %	163,369	100.00 %

The general shift from local lenders to out-of-state institutions has often been referred to as the "It's A Wonderful Life" syndrome, a reference to the Jimmy Stuart movie in which a local family-owned bank is inextricably connected with the community and people it serves. It is reasonable to question whether the trend away from small privately owned institutions to greater reliance on absentee institutions has any detectable impacts on the inherent nature of the local residential credit market.

	Value of Originations X 1000		
	1992	1996	Change
Home Purchase	\$120.91	\$133.84	10.70%
Home Improvement	\$25.28	\$19.72	-21.99%
Refinance	\$105.53	\$122.86	16.42 %
Multi-family	\$328.97	\$566.08	72.08 %
Total	\$105.81	\$121.65	14.97%

The value of mortgage lending in the state changed significantly between 1992 and 1996, reflecting the shifts that have been occurring in the residential credit market. Some of the changes are consistent with historic market dynamics. For example, mortgage refinancing and home purchase loans increased in value by 16 percent and 10.7 percent respectively. This confirms that basic mortgage lending is a function of fluctuations in housing cost. However, the decrease in the value of home improvement lending does not seem to follow this pattern. One possible explanation is that the average equity margin is decreasing, thereby limiting the amount of capital available for the homeowner to withdraw. Such a decrease in the available equity value could be related to several factors. First, the average age of existing mortgages is such that equity value has not had sufficient time to accumulate. In addition, the surplus equity value could have been encumbered by other debt, such as home equity loans.

One concern relates to the gradual increase in overall loan denial rates from 12 percent in 1992 to 13 percent in 1996. Of more significance, however, is the difference between 1996's 9 percent denial rate for in-state lenders and the 17 percent rate of out-of-state lenders. Denial rates for minority applicants were similarly affected by the shift to out-of-state lenders. In 1996 the minority denial rate for in-state lenders was 16 percent and 19 percent for out-of-state lenders. Paradoxically though, the volume of applications from minority applicants was nearly three times higher for out of state lenders than for those in the state.

	Originate	Declined	Denied	Withdrawn	Closed	Total	DenRate
1992 In-state							
Total	113,753	1,514	15,649	8,799	624	140,339	0.11
Total Minority	4,239	79	1,168	376	45	5,907	0.20
1992 Out-of-state							
Total	46,534	1,904	9,696	5,823	734	64,691	0.15
Total Minority	2,874	128	893	357	69	4,321	0.21
1996 In-state							
Total	80,517	2,435	9,074	6,887	600	99,513	0.09
Total Minority	4,319	162	957	473	51	5,962	0.16
1996 Out-of-state							
Total	82,852	10,368	21,909	15,019	2,189	132,337	0.17
Total Minority	6,878	588	2,144	983	192	10,785	0.20

[Back to Top](#)

III. In Conclusion

The state's market for resale and new owner-occupied housing can be characterized by a resurgence in the value of home sales and an increase in the volume of real estate transactions. A simple indicator of these trends is the median sale price of homes, which experienced an annual increase of over ten percent in 1997. Also, during that year, a total of 19,224 homes were sold in the greater Boston area alone, a 26.4 percent increase from the previous year.

Not surprisingly, there were significant geographic market differences, with the average value of homes sold ranging from a low of \$66,389 in North Adams to a high of slightly less than \$700,000 reported for the town of Westborough. Of the 276 communities reported by the Banker and Tradesman data base, 41 had average single family home sales prices in excess of \$250,000. With the market dominated by such high value real estate it is no surprise that a national study by the National Association of Home Builders ranks the Boston Metropolitan

area at 111th in affordability, with 68.2 percent of sales deemed theoretically affordable to families earning the median family income.

The state's market for rental housing appears to be affected by, among other factors, the expanding market for owner-occupied homes and an increasing competition for rental housing that is being fueled by demographic shifts. While statewide rental costs increased only slightly between 1996 and 1997, certain local markets experienced significant rental increases. For example, the rental market in the Beacon Hill/West End portion of the Boston had an increase of over 13 percent, with 1997 monthly rents averaging over \$1,300. Among suburban markets, Norwood showed the largest change in cost with an increase of 12.3 percent between 1996 and 1997. The only rental market reporting an annual decrease in rents was Dorchester with rents averaging around \$660 per month.

The question of mortgage finance and its impact on housing has been a serious housing policy issue for over thirty years. Of specific concern is the nature of the residential credit market, the lending practices of the mortgage finance industry and how, together, they impact the ability of individual families to choose where and how they will live. Interest rates alone have proven to have a significant impact on the availability and affordability of housing. A national study by the National Association of Home Builders found that for every one percentage point rise in interest rates, more than four million households are priced out of the market for a \$100,000 home.

Nationally, interest rates have been in a general decline since 1990, a fact that is echoed by the precipitous rise in home sales in Massachusetts during this time period. The patterns of demand for residential finance capital are closely tied to mortgage interest rates. One outcome of this phenomenon is the drop in mortgage refinancing from 66 percent in 1992 to 48 percent in 1996. In the same period, mortgages for home purchases jumped from 28 percent to over 48 percent.

The vast majority of housing in Massachusetts is provided by the private sector and, as such, is directly influenced by the functions of the housing and credit markets. While recent conditions in these markets have been relatively stable, their volatility during the late 1980s and early 1990s remains a vivid reminder of their impact on the lives of the Commonwealth's residents.

1. The Banker and Tradesman database consists of residential sales records for 276 communities in Massachusetts. Of these, 211 communities reported data by individual property type. The GBREB statistics represent market activity relative to units sold in the Boston Metropolitan Area and the greater Boston listing area. Values also differ significantly when median sales data are used in conjunction with average sales data.

[Back to Top](#)

2. A possible explanation for the difference is the fact that participation in the RHA survey is comprised of members of the association who are owners and managers of rental properties in designated rental markets throughout the state. With slightly over 7 percent of the market represented by the survey, it is possible that the results are skewed by data that favor the more populous and competitive rental markets. [Back](#)

David Winsor is a licensed architect and holds a master's degree in community planning. For more information, contact the author at dswinsor@aol.com

Meir Gross is a professor in the Landscape Architecture and Regional Planning Department at the University of Massachusetts Amherst.

HOUSING AFFORDABILITY

by Michael E. Stone, Donna Haig Friedman, Maggie Spade, and Emily Douglas
with Karla Armenoff, Elaine Werby, and Elizabeth Ward

Introduction

I. Shelter Poverty in Massachusetts

- **Renter Affordability Problems**
 - **Affordability differences by race/ethnicity**
 - **Affordability for female-headed households**
 - **Affordability for elderly households**
- **Homeowner Affordability Problems**
 - **Affordability differences by race/ethnicity**
 - **Affordability for female-headed households**
 - **Affordability for elderly households**

II. Evictions and Foreclosures

- **Renter Evictions**
- **Mortgage Foreclosures**

III. Homelessness

IV. In Conclusion

Endnotes

Introduction

Housing affordability continues to be a very serious problem in Massachusetts. Nearly 600,000 Massachusetts households—about a quarter of the entire population—are "shelter poor." The squeeze between their housing costs and incomes leaves them unable to meet their non-housing needs at even a low level of adequacy.

By every measure, housing affordability problems worsened substantially during the sharp recession of the early 1990s. Yet the much-celebrated economic recovery has had mixed results, at best, for affordability. Homeownership has increased, but the number of homeowners paying more than they can afford for housing has also increased.

Though foreclosures have declined significantly since the early 1990s, they are still much higher than they were a decade before. Evictions for non-payment of rent have been rising across the state. Latino and Black renters have seen especially large increases in an already high incidence of affordability problems. Homelessness among families has doubled since 1990, and it has nearly doubled among individuals.

[Back to Top](#)

I. Shelter Poverty in Massachusetts

The conventional standard of affordability uses an arbitrary cutoff of 30 percent of income as the maximum amount a household can spend for housing without hardship. In the early 1980s, this standard replaced the traditional 25-percent-of-income rule of thumb that had been widely used since the 19th century. A more realistic, sliding scale of affordability has been developed by Michael Stone.¹ His "shelter poverty" approach recognizes that larger and lower-income households cannot realistically afford as much as 30 percent—or even 25 percent—of their income for housing, without compromising their other needs, while smaller and higher-income households can afford more than 30 percent without hardship.

The shelter poverty sliding scale arises from a recognition that housing costs are by far the biggest expense for most households. These costs are usually paid for first from after-tax income; non-housing expenditures are limited by how much income is left. This means that a household is "shelter poor" if, after paying for housing, it cannot meet its non-housing needs at some minimum level of adequacy.

Since small households, on average, are able to meet their non-housing needs for less than larger households can, they can reasonably afford to devote a higher percentage of their income for housing than can larger households with

the same income. Also, since low- and higher-income households of the same size and type would, on average, require about the same amount of money to meet their non-housing needs at a basic level of adequacy, lower-income households can afford to devote a smaller percentage of income for housing than otherwise-similar, higher-income households.

The shelter poverty scale uses a conservative minimum standard of adequacy for non-housing necessities, scaled for differences in household size and type. Unlike the federal poverty standard, it takes into account the actual cost of living in Massachusetts, as well as the effects of federal and state taxes on the money households have for housing and other necessities. The shelter poverty standard is thus a *sliding* scale, which is much more realistic than any fixed percentage of income.

On the shelter poverty scale, for example, a married couple earning \$25,000 can afford 38 percent of their income for housing if they have no children, but just 21 percent if they have one child, and 5 percent if they have two children. Couples with higher incomes can afford higher percentages than these, while those with lower incomes can afford less.

This study has considered those paying more than they can afford for housing based on the shelter poverty, 30-percent-of-income and 25-percent-of-income standards.² Strikingly, the housing affordability problem in Massachusetts is found to be *less* extensive when viewed through the shelter poverty lens than with the conventional approach. Shelter poverty, though, focuses attention on those residents of the Commonwealth experiencing the most painful squeeze between their housing costs and their incomes.³

[Back to Top](#)

Renter Affordability Problems

In 1996 more than 340,000 renter households (over 36 percent of all renters) were paying more than they could afford for housing on the shelter poverty standard; this is 18 percent greater than the 290,000 renters in 1990 (a little under 32 percent of all renters) who were paying more than they could afford on the shelter poverty standard. (See Figure 1 and Tables 1 and 2).

Nearly two-thirds of shelter poor renter households are female-headed, more than one-third are headed by a person of color, and about one in five is headed by an elderly person. The 343,000 renter households who were shelter poor in 1996 had a median annual income of just \$9,600. The most serious problem is among those renters with three or more people in their households. Nearly 50 percent of this group are shelter poor, compared with about 30 percent of households with one or two people.

Between 1990 and 1993, the number of shelter poor renter households increased by 13 percent, from 290,000 to 328,000. The incidence of shelter poverty rose sharply over this period, from slightly under 32 percent of all renters to over 37 percent. From 1993 to 1996 the number of shelter poor renters rose by another 4.5 percent, but the incidence declined to about 36 percent, as the total number of renters in Massachusetts grew slightly faster than the rate of increase in shelter poverty.

In 1996 there were 393,000 renter households paying more than 30 percent of their incomes for housing (41 percent of all renters). They had a median income of \$12,500. In contrast with shelter poverty, the most serious affordability problem on the conventional standard appears to be among one-person households (nearly half pay over 30 percent), rather than larger households (about one-third of whom pay more than 30 percent). The number of renters paying over 30 percent has increased much more slowly than has shelter poverty, rising from 381,000 in 1990 to 384,000 in 1993 and 393,000 in 1996.

Thus, there is a very low income renter population with severe affordability problems. However, the shelter poverty approach suggests a somewhat less extensive affordability problem among renters than does the conventional standard, but one that is more serious among the poorer and larger households. It is growing at a faster rate and is more sensitive to rising rents and widening income inequality.

[Back to Top](#)

Affordability differences by race/ethnicity. Over 55 percent of all renters of color are shelter poor, compared with about 30 percent of all white renters. Nonetheless, nearly two-thirds of shelter-poor renter households are white. (See Figure 1 and Tables 1 and 2).

Latino renters experience, by far, the most extensive affordability problems. In 1996, 71 percent of Latino renters were shelter poor. Indeed, Latinos are the only demographic group for which shelter poverty is more severe than conventionally measured affordability, primarily because of their high proportion of large households. Latino renters have also experienced the most substantial rate of increase in their affordability problems during the 1990s and an acceleration with the booming economy, rather than a slower rate of growth. In 1990, 59 percent were shelter poor; in 1993, 64 percent were shelter poor, rising to 71 percent in 1996.

Black and Asian-American renters also have very extensive affordability problems. In 1996, over 52 percent of Black renters and nearly 54 percent of Asian-American renters were shelter poor. Both groups saw significant increases in the early 1990s. The proportion of Black renters who were shelter

poor rose from nearly 42 percent in 1990 to almost 47 percent in 1993; the rate of shelter poor Asian-American renters increased from about 49 percent in 1990 to nearly 54 percent in 1993. From 1993 to 1996, shelter poverty among Black renters grew by more than five percentage points, but remained stable for Asian-American renters. In 1996, over 55,000 Latino renter households, close to 49,000 Black renters, and about 19,000 Asian-American renters were shelter poor.

Over 220,000 white renter households (just under 30 percent) were shelter poor in 1996. In the early 1990s, the rate of shelter poverty among white renters rose sharply, as it did for renters of color, from 28 percent in 1990 to nearly 33 percent in 1993. For white renters, however, the rate of shelter poverty fell with improvement in the economy, to just under 30 percent in 1996. This was not the case for renters of color.

Using the 30 percent standard, the recession of the early 1990s did not appear to exacerbate affordability problems for most racial groups. For white renters, in fact, the 30-percent standard suggests steady improvement through the decade, with problems declining by 1.5 percentage points between 1990 and 1993, then by another 2 points—to 36 percent—by 1996.

For renters of color, affordability problems worsened after 1993. Fifty-four percent of Latino renters paid at least 30 percent of their incomes for housing in 1990 and in 1993; the number rose to 64 percent by 1996. For Black renters, the rate stayed a little below 47 percent from 1990 to 1993 but jumped to nearly 59 percent by 1996. Among Asian-American renters, those paying at least 30 percent actually declined by half a percentage point from 1990 to 1993, then rose over two points—to nearly 55 percent—by 1996.

In all racial/ethnic renter populations, shelter poverty shows greater sensitivity to differences in household size and the state of the overall economy than does the conventional standard of affordability.

[Back to Top](#)

Affordability for female-headed households. The number of female-headed renter households who are shelter poor rose 20 percent between 1990 and 1993, from about 179,000 to almost 215,000, an increase from 39 percent to 45 percent. From 1993 to 1996, there was virtually no change. While just over half of all renter households in Massachusetts are female-headed, 63 percent of households with affordability problems (on both the shelter-poverty and 30 percent standards of affordability) are female-headed, indicating that women experience greater economic stress, on average, than married-couple and male-headed renter households. (See Figure 1 and Tables 1 and 2).

In 1996 almost 247,000 female-headed renters were paying at least 30 percent of their incomes for housing. On this standard, there was a much smaller, yet more steady increase over the decade. The 1990 number was 227,000, rising to 247,000 in 1996. As with the analysis of racial/ethnic groups, these findings suggest that shelter poverty is a more sensitive indicator of the relationship between the state of the overall economy and the extent of affordability problems.

[Back to Top](#)

Affordability for elderly households. Nearly 40 percent of all elderly renters are shelter poor. (See Figure 1 and Tables 1 and 2). About 63,000 elderly renter households (39 percent) were shelter poor in 1996; the median income among those shelter poor is just \$7,600, and nearly all earn less than \$15,000. The number of shelter poor elders did not change from 1990 to 1993, and it decreased by 12 percent from 1993 to 1996. The total number of elderly renters declined steadily and substantially—by 15 percent—over the entire period for reasons that are not apparent, but may reflect deaths, moves to nursing homes and moves in with relatives.

About 90,000 of elderly renters (55 percent) were paying at least 30 percent of their incomes for housing. This number, much higher than that for shelter poor renters, reflects the concentration of shelter poverty at the very lowest incomes among small households: the median income among those paying 30 percent or more is \$9,600, with a substantial incidence even among those with incomes of \$15,000 to \$30,000. The proportion of elderly renters paying 30 percent or more has risen slowly, from 51 percent in 1990 to 55 percent in 1996.

[Back to Top](#)

Homeowner Affordability Problems

In 1996, more than 240,000 homeowner households—nearly 17 percent of all homeowners—were paying more than they could afford for housing. In 1990, the number was 170,000 homeowners—just under 13 percent. (See Figure 2 and Tables 3 and 4.) Half of shelter poor homeowner households are female-headed, including about equal numbers of single-parent families and elderly women living alone. Most of the other half of shelter poor homeowners are non-elderly, moderate-income (about \$20,000-\$40,000) married-couple families with children.

The 243,000 homeowner households who were shelter poor in 1996 had a median income of \$18,300. There are substantial differences, though, by household size. For example, among small homeowner households with just one or two persons and incomes of \$15,000 to 30,000, only about 10 percent are shelter poor. By contrast, shelter poverty is very serious among homeowner

households with three or more persons; even with incomes of \$20,000 to 40,000, about 60 percent are shelter poor.

From 1990 to 1993, the number of shelter poor homeowners increased by 33 percent, from 170,000 to 225,000, and the percentage jumped from less than 13 percent to nearly 16 percent. From 1993 to 1996, shelter poverty increased more slowly, to a little less than 17 percent of all homeowners.

In 1996, 418,000 homeowners paid at least 30 percent of their incomes for housing; they had median incomes of \$26,100. The much higher number of households and higher median income in comparison with shelter poverty reflects the sensitivity of the shelter poverty affordability standard to household size and income. The number paying at least 30 percent increased from 305,000 to 361,000 (a little under 23 percent of all homeowners to close to 25 percent); from 1993 to 1996, the proportion paying more than 30 percent sharply increased, approaching 28 percent of all homeowners.

[Back to Top](#)

Affordability differences by race/ethnicity. Nearly 94 percent of shelter-poor homeowner households are white. While about 16 percent of all white homeowners are shelter poor, almost 21 percent of all homeowners of color are shelter poor. (See Figure 2 and Tables 3 and 4.)

People of color comprise only 4.5 percent of all homeowners in Massachusetts. They have somewhat higher rates of affordability problems than do white homeowners, but the differences are much smaller than are racial/ethnic disparities among renters. Asian-American homeowners have the highest rates of affordability problems—close to 24 percent were shelter poor and about 34 percent were paying at least 30 percent of their incomes in 1996. The median size of shelter poor Asian-American homeowners was 3.7 persons, and their median income was \$27,500, compared with a median household size of just 2.4 persons and a median income of \$18,300 for all shelter poor homeowners. Latinos have the next highest rates of affordability problems among homeowners—21.5 percent shelter poor—followed by Blacks at just under 19 percent and whites at a little over 16 percent. From 1990 to 1993, all groups saw increases of 4 to 6 percentage points in their rates of shelter poverty, followed by very small changes from 1993 to 1996.

On the 30 percent standard of affordability all racial/ethnic groups of homeowners have experienced substantial increases in affordability problems throughout the 1990s, unlike shelter poverty, which has changed little in recent years. For every group, the rates of affordability problems on the conventional standard have consistently run about 8 to 12 percentage points higher than shelter poverty rates.

[Back to Top](#)

Affordability for female-headed households. Half of shelter-poor homeowner households are female-headed; 21 percent of all female-headed homeowner households are shelter poor. (See Figure 2 and Tables 3 and 4.) Almost 123,000 female-headed homeowner households—just over 21 percent—were shelter poor in 1996. Female-headed homeowners account for about 40 percent of all homeowners, but those with affordability problems account for about 50 percent of all homeowners with affordability problems, reflecting their lower prevailing incomes.

The median income of those shelter poor is just \$14,300, well below the \$18,300 of all shelter poor homeowners. The incidence of shelter poverty among female-headed homeowner households jumped from 18.5 percent in 1990 to nearly 22 percent in 1993 and then dipped slightly, but not significantly, from 1993 to 1996. Since the total number of female-headed homeowner households has increased enormously throughout the 90s, however, the number with affordability problems rose considerably, even as the percentages leveled off. From 1990 to 1993, the number of shelter poor rose from under 68,000 to over 99,000, increasing to 123,000 by 1996.

Over 205,000—almost 35 percent of all female-headed homeowner households—are paying at least 30 percent of their incomes for housing. The principal reason for the difference with shelter poverty is found among one-person, female-headed homeowner households: about 47,000 are shelter poor, but almost 107,000 are paying at least 30 percent of their incomes for housing.

Among larger female-headed homeowner households, the differences are much smaller, though shelter poverty is more concentrated at lower incomes. As with shelter poverty, the \$16,900 median income of female-headed households paying 30 percent or more is far below the median of \$26,100 for all homeowners exceeding the 30 percent standard. The percentage of female-headed homeowners paying over 30 percent rose from 30 in 1990 to almost 36 in 1993, and then remained virtually unchanged from 1993 to 1996. The number paying at least 30 percent increased from 109,000 in 1990 to 163,000 in 1993 and 205,000 in 1996.

[Back to Top](#)

Affordability for elderly households. Almost a quarter of shelter-poor homeowners are elderly; about 16 percent of all elderly homeowners are shelter poor, but nearly 30 percent of elderly homeowners who live alone are shelter poor. (See Figure 2 and Tables 3 and 4.)

More than 57,000 elderly homeowner households (a little over 16 percent) were shelter poor in 1996. The median income of those shelter poor is only \$8,100.

About two-thirds of elderly households with affordability problems consist of a person living alone, and these are overwhelmingly women. Over 29 percent of one-person elderly homeowners are shelter poor. By contrast, just 8.5 percent of elderly households with two or more people are shelter poor. Shelter poverty among elderly homeowners rose from about 51,000 (15 percent) in 1990 to about 60,000 (a little over 17 percent) in 1993, then declined to about 57,000 (over 16 percent) in 1996.

More than 105,000 elderly homeowners (30 percent) paid 30 percent or more of their incomes for housing in 1996. The median of those exceeding the 30 percent standard is \$12,100. While nearly 52 percent of one-person elderly homeowners pay at least 30 percent of their incomes, among households with two or more elderly homeowners, just under 17 percent pay more than 30 percent for housing. The number rose from just under 77,000 (close to 23 percent) in 1990 to just over 97,000 (nearly 28 percent) in 1993. Unlike shelter poverty, it continued to climb, reaching over 105,000 (about 30 percent) in 1996.

[Back to Top](#)

II. Evictions and Foreclosures

Most households with affordability difficulties continue to pay for their housing even if it means compromising their other basic needs. Some households eventually reach the point, though, where they fall behind in their housing payments, and if they are unable to catch up they face the loss of their homes. For tenants, this normally occurs through "summary process" eviction, and for homeowners, it is usually through mortgage foreclosure. Trends in evictions and foreclosures during the 1990s in Massachusetts indicate extreme affordability distress for considerable numbers of households in the state.

[Back to Top](#)

Renter Evictions

By 1997, evictions for non-payment of rent in Massachusetts had increased to 1.6 times the level in the early 1990s, with more than 5 percent of renter households now facing eviction each year. (See Figure 3 and Table 5.)

In fiscal year 1997, there were over 24,000 non-payment "summary process" eviction cases reported in the five Massachusetts housing courts. This count is a modest estimate, since only about half of evictions are handled this way, the remainder being handled in local district courts.⁴ This would suggest that between the housing courts and districts courts about 50,000 non-payment eviction cases are currently being processed per year.

While not all summary process cases ultimately result in eviction and not all rent arrearages are necessarily due to inability to pay, many tenants who are unable to pay the rent move out in response to a landlord notice without any court action having been initiated. It may be conservative, then, to estimate from the court data that at least 50,000 renter households were evicted in fiscal year 1997 because of inability to pay rent. Since there are about 950,000 renter households in Massachusetts, this implies that over 5 percent of all renters are being evicted each year because they cannot afford their rents.

With the exception of the period 1995 to 1996, when the number of evictions fell slightly in three of the five districts with housing courts, the number of evictions increased steadily over the 1992 to 1997 period. The increase over the period from 1993 to 1997 (not all districts' housing courts were fully operative in 1992) was almost 64 percent. The sharpest increase in evictions occurred between 1996 and 1997, when total (housing court-recorded) evictions in 1997 jumped by nearly 17 percent.

While the sharp increase in eviction cases at the Boston Housing Court after 1994 is widely attributed to the end of rent control, all other courts have also seen large increases, even though no communities in their jurisdictions had rent control. The rise in evictions across the state is thus a general indication of the consequences of large private rent increases in the absence of public rent and eviction standards, rather than a reflection of the end of rent control in Boston, Cambridge and Brookline.

[Back to Top](#)

Mortgage Foreclosures

Residential mortgage foreclosures in Massachusetts rose very sharply during the severe recession of the late 1980s and early 1990s, to nearly 2 percent of all mortgages in 1991; with economic recovery, the rate of foreclosures declined steadily to under 1 percent by 1997, but was still four times as high as the low and stable rate that prevailed during most of the 1980s.⁵ (See Figures 4,5 and 6.)

From 1979 through 1988, residential mortgage foreclosures in Massachusetts averaged about 0.2 percent per year, with a slow but fairly downward trend over the period. As recession took hold at the end of the 1980s, foreclosures began to rise sharply beginning in 1989 and continued upward to a peak of about 1.9 percent in 1992. From 1993 through 1997 foreclosures declined with the unemployment rate, but nonetheless remained above 1 percent until 1997, when they dipped to about 0.9 percent. That is, even with the booming economy, residential mortgage foreclosures were four to five times what they were from the late 1970s to late 1980s. Since there are about one million mortgaged homeowner households in Massachusetts⁶, these foreclosure rates

imply that about 20,000 lost their homes to foreclosure each year in the early 1990s, compared to about 10,000 a year in subsequent years.

Foreclosures in Massachusetts have followed a pattern which, while typical for New England, is much more volatile than that in the United States as a whole. Nationally, foreclosures climbed steadily during the 1980s, reaching a plateau of about 1 percent, with only slight dips and climbs since then. Foreclosures in Massachusetts (and New England) were thus far below the national average until 1991, but then soared to nearly twice the national average in the early 1990s. Only in the past two years has the Commonwealth's rate of foreclosures fallen to—and even slightly below—the national average.

[Back to Top](#)

III. Homelessness

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development defines homelessness to include all persons who have "no fixed, regular, adequate nighttime residence or are using a place not designed for or ordinarily used as a regular sleeping accommodation for human beings or an emergency shelter or institution providing a temporary residence." Using this definition, we derived our estimates by counting the number of families and individuals who received any federally or state-funded shelter or transitional housing in FY90 and FY97. We added families who received shelter through private sources, as well as homeless families and individuals who requested but did not receive shelter, and homeless individuals who were living on the streets. We did not include in our count any families or individuals who were living "doubled up" or who were homeless but did not make contact with the service system. Some of the persons reflected in these counts were categorized with special needs (e.g., those suffering from domestic violence, mental illness, substance abuse, HIV/AIDS).

Approximately 10,000 families were homeless in 1997, more than twice that in 1990. Close to 5,000 families received publicly funded shelter in 1990 and 1997.⁷ Approximately 5,000 additional families were homeless in 1997, including more than 2,000 families who were unable to obtain Department of Transitional Assistance (DTA) funded shelter,⁸ over 375 families who received shelter—including short stays in hotels or motels—through the efforts of human service agencies utilizing private funds,⁹ and more than 3,000 families escaping family violence who were turned away from battered women's shelters due to insufficient capacity.¹⁰ Evidence suggests that in 1990 the numbers of homeless families turned away in these categories were negligible.

Approximately 22,000 unaccompanied individuals were homeless in 1997, an increase of about 70 percent from 1990. Close to 16,000 received emergency shelter or transitional housing. Approximately two-thirds of these people

received shelter within the City of Boston, primarily from Pine Street Inn, Long Island Shelter, Shattuck Shelter, and the New England Shelter for Homeless Veterans. The occupancy rate of DTA-funded shelter for individuals between January and June 1997 was 99 percent.

In 1990, the state-funded 1,888 emergency shelter beds. By 1997, the publicly funded emergency shelter bed stock had increased to 2,636. About 17 percent of individuals using emergency shelters are chronically homeless (in shelters for long periods of time), while 83 percent are short-term users.¹¹

Using the formula derived from Culhane's investigation of shelter turnover rates in New York City and Philadelphia, an estimated 8,000 individuals were served in emergency shelters in 1990, as compared with 11,000 individuals in 1997. Another 1,000 individuals with specialized needs received transitional housing in 1990, compared with 4,800 individuals in 1997. In addition, in 1997 nearly 3,000 unaccompanied women were turned away from battered women's shelters because of insufficient capacity;¹² an estimated 2,000 individuals with mental illness or dual diagnosis (mental illness and substance abuse problems) and over 250 homeless veterans were homeless and unable to obtain shelter; and another 1,300 individuals were living on the streets, a 67 percent decrease from 1990.¹³

For the most part, families residing in shelter settings are headed by single mothers accompanied by one or two children under the age of six.¹⁴ The average age range of parents is 26 to 31 years old. Although more White families reside in family shelters than does any other racial group, Black and Latino families are over-represented among homeless families when compared with the Massachusetts population at large.

Cultural and linguistic minority groups, in particular Asian and Pacific Islander families, appear to have limited access to emergency shelters and to the resources that other ethnic groups are able to obtain once they enter a shelter. A majority of homeless parents have limited educations, that is, a high school degree or less. Family violence is or has been a significant stressor in the lives of a majority of homeless families. A housing subsidy operates as a protective factor in reducing the likelihood of homelessness for low-income families.¹⁵

The majority of unaccompanied homeless individuals are male, in early to middle adulthood.¹⁶ Nearly one-third of homeless individuals are veterans. Most have never been married or are separated or divorced. Over one-third of homeless men and more than half of homeless women were separated from their minor children. Half of homeless women have survived severe family violence. In Boston, over three-fourths of men and women in the city's emergency shelters reported having a high school degree or other post-secondary education. Nearly one-third, however, reported that they had not worked within the previous two years. Half of homeless individuals are

struggling with substance abuse difficulties. A majority of homeless individuals had lived in at least one institutional setting within a year of receiving shelter. More than one-fifth had lived in a criminal justice setting.

While the system for addressing family homelessness in 1997 offers a more diverse range of shelter and service options for families with specialized needs than was the case in 1990, it has become extremely complicated for families to navigate. At the same time, the Commonwealth's stock of specialized family shelters fails to meet the enormous needs for such programs.

Currently, three state agencies administer family shelter programs (Department of Transitional Assistance, Department of Public Health, and Department of Social Services), and the Department of Housing and Community Development administers homeless prevention services for families who are in unstable housing or are in imminent danger of losing their housing. Additionally, an infusion of federal McKinney funds has resulted in the creation of shelter and transitional housing programs for families with specialized needs, including HIV/AIDS, substance abuse, and mental illness. Transition-to-work collaboratives, focused on enabling homeless parents to gain economic stability, are also available or soon to be available through McKinney funding in Boston, the North Shore, and Western Massachusetts.

The majority of families living in family shelters have access to case management, basic life skills training, housing search and placement, and limited emergency transportation services. Families residing in DSS-funded battered women's shelters are limited to a 90-day stay. This policy results in "shelter hopping," movement of families from DSS-funded shelters to DTA-funded shelters that have limited resources for serving these women and children.

Homeless prevention service providers across the state served over 10,500 families who were in unstable housing or were in danger of losing their housing in 1997, an 18 percent increase over the previous year.¹⁷ An extensive statewide homeless prevention network exists for families who are in unstable housing or are in imminent danger of losing their housing. The increase in number of households requesting homeless prevention assistance is one indicator of the difficulty that many low-income households are experiencing in the tight rental market. One-third of the 10,500 families served by homeless prevention programs obtained alternative housing or were assisted to maintain their current residence, paying, on average, 77 percent of their monthly income for rent. One-third of the housing placements were subsidized. In contrast, over 63 percent of families who left a DTA-funded emergency shelter in 1997 to move into permanent housing obtained some type of housing subsidy, a decrease of 12 percentage points from the previous year.¹⁸

The state's system for addressing homelessness in 1997 offered a more diverse range of shelter and service options for individuals with specialized needs than was available in 1990. The system is still difficult for individuals to navigate, and not all homeless individuals have access to the resources they need to overcome homelessness.

Federal McKinney funds have provided an impetus for coordinated community responses to homelessness and the development of a full continuum of care, including outreach, emergency shelter, transitional housing, permanent supported housing, and supportive services for individuals with special needs. In contrast to the family shelter system, services such as assessment of needs, case management, and housing search are not uniformly available for homeless individuals who reside for one or more nights in emergency shelters in the state. However, increased numbers of outreach programs, which connect with individuals living on the streets and assist them to obtain shelter and other resources, may have contributed to the decrease in the numbers of homeless persons living on the streets between 1990 and 1997. The extent to which individuals are leaving adult and youth correctional facilities, foster care, halfway houses, or other public institutions and entering homeless shelters in the state is unknown but is of concern to shelter providers and advocates.

Funding cuts and policy changes in (T)AFDC, SSI, food stamps, and state and federally assisted housing programs may result in increased numbers of homeless men, women, and children.

Individuals with substance abuse difficulties and families receiving (T)AFDC for 24 months ¹⁹ have already or will shortly face loss of income supports they have relied upon for meeting their basic needs. When low- and moderate-income households lose assistance, the housing affordability problems documented in this report become more detrimental, pushing the most vulnerable into rent arrearages and homelessness.

[Back to Top](#)

IV. In Conclusion

One out of every four households in Massachusetts is experiencing a severe housing affordability problem, ranging from homelessness to shelter poverty to eviction or foreclosure. Clearly, these are not just the problems of an unfortunate few left behind by pervasive prosperity. As the boom comes to an end and the economy turns down, many more will face a tightening squeeze between their incomes and housing costs. Policymakers, opinion setters, and the public at large need to understand and address this critical issue facing the Commonwealth.

Michael E. Stone, Ph.D., Professor of Community Planning and Public Policy, University of Massachusetts Boston. For nearly 30 years he has been engaged in research, policy analysis, program development, technical assistance and advocacy on housing issues.

Donna Haig Friedman, Ph.D., Senior Fellow at the McCormack Institute, University of Massachusetts Boston. She recently directed two studies within the institute's Center for Social Policy related to homelessness and welfare reform, and is completing a book on these issues for Columbia University Press. She also teaches at the University of Massachusetts Boston.

Maggie Spade is a Ph.D. candidate in Public Policy at the University of Massachusetts Boston. She has worked professionally as the Lead Research Associate at the National Consumer Law Center on public utility and consumer rights issues.

Emily Douglas is Ph.D. student in Public Policy at the University of Massachusetts Boston.

[Back to Top](#)

Endnotes

1. Stone, Michael E. 1993. *Shelter Poverty: New Ideas on Housing Affordability*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press. [Back](#)
2. In the report narrative, attention is focused on the findings based upon application of the shelter poverty standard of affordability, along with findings based on the 30 percent of income standard. Findings based on the 25 percent of income standard are included in the accompanying tables but not discussed in the narrative. [Back](#)
3. The data for the analyses have been obtained from 1990 Census Public Use Microdata (PUMS) for Massachusetts (including the Boston CMSA), 1993 American Housing Survey (AHS) microdata and published data for the Boston CMSA, March 1993 through March 1997 Current Population Survey (CPS) microdata for Massachusetts (including the Boston CMSA), and American Housing Survey published data for the U.S. for 1993 and 1995.

Detailed computations of the extent and distribution of affordability problems were first carried out for Massachusetts and the Boston CMSA in 1990 based on PUMS data. Detailed computations were then carried out for the Boston CMSA in 1993 based on AHS data. Changes for the Boston CMSA from 1990 to 1993 were used to create a model that was applied to CPS data for Massachusetts to estimate the extent and distribution of affordability problems for Massachusetts in 1993. Detailed computations were then carried out for the U.S. in 1993 and 1995 based on AHS data. Changes for the U.S. from 1993 to 1995 were then used to create a

model that was applied to CPS data for Massachusetts to estimate the extent and distribution of affordability problems for Massachusetts in 1996. [Back](#)

4. Telephone conversation with Harvey Chopp, Clerk of the Boston Housing Court, 4/29/98. [Back](#)

5. Mortgage Bankers Association Quarterly Delinquency Survey. [Back](#)

6. According to the 1993 American Housing Survey for the Boston CMSA, out of 928,800 homeowner households, 622,100 had one or more mortgages on their homes. This is almost exactly 2/3 of all homeowners in the Boston CMSA. No comparable recent data are available for the state as a whole, but since the Boston CMSA contains over 60 percent of all homeowners in the state and there is no reason to expect the mortgage proportion to be much different in the rest of the state, the 2/3 fraction has been assumed for the state as whole. [Back](#)

7. Data sources: Massachusetts Departments of Transitional Assistance and Social Services. Determining precisely how many families and unaccompanied individuals are homeless in Massachusetts is complicated by several factors. Point-in-time counts and exclusion of those who did not obtain state-funded shelter underestimate the extent of homelessness. No statewide, unduplicated count of individuals and families who are using shelter programs or who request shelter *over time* is in place as yet. While this is one goal of the ANCHoR system, currently being used by 33 shelters in the state, full-scale implementation of the network will require an additional two to three years. The methodologies we used to extrapolate or to calculate our figures are described in detail below. Based upon 1990 and 1997 data from the Massachusetts Department of Transitional Assistance, families who obtained DTA-funded shelter resided in these settings for longer periods of time than did families in 1990, four months in 1997 as compared with two months in 1990, on average. [Back](#)

8. See Massachusetts Coalition for the Homeless and Homes for Families, "Blocking the Door to Progress," Authors, Boston, MA, February 1998. Results of this survey, conducted from November 15, 1997, to January 15, 1998, involving 37 percent of DTA-funded shelters, indicate that 142 homeless families were denied shelter. Over 400 surveys were collected from the shelter programs. Over 260 surveys were disqualified for one or more of the following reasons: not enough information provided; unable to follow-up with family to gather more information; family had not asked for shelter from DTA as yet; and information was collected from an unaccompanied individual (no children involved). Extrapolating statewide and year-round for FY97, when the same eligibility restrictions were in place, implies that over 2,000 homeless families were unable to obtain DTA-funded emergency shelter (142 x 6 divided by .37). This figure is very likely an under-estimation in that the study was conducted during the winter holiday season (pre-Thanksgiving through post New Year). During this time of year, if families had any other avenue for moving in with friends or relatives, it is unlikely that they would be turned away.

DSS did not have information on the numbers of unserved families or women fleeing violence who sought shelter in FY 1990. Data were not available from DTA on the numbers of families turned away from DTA shelter in 1990 nor 1997. We made the assumption that the number of unserved homeless families would be small in 1990 for three reasons: the restrictions on eligibility for publicly funded family shelter were minimal; a range of emergency assistance benefits were in place to prevent families from losing their housing; and state-funded hotel and motel shelter was available when family shelters were at capacity. [Back](#)

9. In 1997, fewer homeless family groups were eligible for shelter than in 1990; only two emergency assistance benefits remained (back rent payments and emergency shelter); and no hotel/motel overflow option existed. In response to these policy changes, private, non-profit

agencies began to shelter homeless families in the state who were unable to obtain publicly funded shelter through the use of private funds. The research team contacted each DTA-funded family shelter agency in the state to find out how many families they had sheltered in FY97 through the use of private funds. Families sheltered in motels/hotels by programs in FY97 using private or non-state resources numbered 376. Approximately 160 families received shelter in 40 community rooms within congregate programs, presuming an annual turnover rate of four. The average length of stay for congregate programs was three months for FY97. We estimated in our calculation that approximately 160 families received shelter through this avenue and that another 45 families obtained shelter through privately funded programs for battered women and their children in 1990. [Back](#)

10. Data source: Massachusetts Department of Social Services. This figure is a duplicated count. That is, if a family requested shelter more than once or subsequently entered a shelter at a later date during the fiscal year, they were counted more than once. Although the figures in this report on homeless women and families escaping violence are duplicated counts, they provide what is quite possibly an under-estimation of the numbers who are homeless, because not all women and children homeless as a result of escaping violence actually call a shelter. [Back](#)

11. See Dennis P. Culhane, E.F., Dejowski, J. Ibanez, E. Needham, I., Macchia, "Public shelter admission rates in Philadelphia and New York City: The implications of turnover for sheltered population counts," *Housing Policy Debate*, 5 (1994): 107-151. Culhane's research, conducted in Philadelphia and New York City, suggests that about 17 percent of individuals using shelters are chronically homeless, that is they use shelter for long periods of time, while 83 percent are short-term users of shelter. Shelters in Philadelphia had an annual turnover rate of 6.2 and shelters in New York City, 3.62. Taking the average of these two statistics (4.8), we calculated the number of persons served in shelters for individuals for FY90 and FY97 using the following formula: $(.83 \times \text{number of shelter beds} \times 4.8) + (.17 \times \text{number of shelter beds}) = \text{total persons served}$.

In 1990, the Department of Transitional Assistance funded 1,888 emergency shelter beds for individuals. By 1997, the state-funded emergency shelter bed stock for homeless individuals had increased to 2,636. Using the above formula, an estimated 7,843 individuals were served in 1990, as compared with 10,950 individuals in 1997: $(.83 \times 1888 \times 4.8) + (.17 \times 1888) = 7522$ short-term users + 321 long-term users numbered 7,843/FY90; $(.83 \times 2636 \times 4.8) + (.17 \times 2636) = 10,502$ short-term users + 448 long-term users = 10,950/FY97.

In 1997, an additional estimated 4,800 individuals received specialized, transitional housing through the federal McKinney programs. By definition, these shelter services are designed to be more long term, not subject to the same rates of turnover as is estimated above for persons using emergency shelter. Therefore, the total number of unaccompanied individuals sheltered in 1997 was 10,950 + 4,800 (approximately 16,000). [Back](#)

12. Data source: Department of Social Services. [Back](#)

13. This estimate is based on a methodology developed by Christopher G. Hudson, "The homeless of Massachusetts: An analysis of 1990 U.S. Census S-Night Data," *New England Journal of Public Policy*, 9 (1993): 79-100. In 1990, the U.S. Census Bureau attempted to count those who were homeless on the streets and in shelters. Hudson reported that homeless persons on the streets were undercounted by 42.6 percent. He utilized the City of Boston's street count to estimate a statewide number by controlling for both the bureau's undercount and the size of communities throughout the state. Larger communities have larger numbers of street homeless than do smaller communities. In FY90, 512 homeless persons were on Boston's streets. Hudson estimated that the City of Boston's count was 13 percent of the statewide number, yielding an

estimate of 3,947 street homeless persons in the state. We used this same percentage to estimate a statewide number for FY97. In December 1997, the City of Boston's homeless census yielded a count of 180 homeless persons on the street. The statewide homeless person street count estimate for FY97 is 1,385, since 180 equals 13 percent of 1,385. [Back](#)

14. The following four studies recently carried out in Massachusetts provide the basis for our conclusions. See Ellen Bassuk, L.F. Weinreb, J.C. Buckner, A. Browne, A. Salomon, S.S. Bassuk, "The Characteristics and Needs of Sheltered Homeless and Low-Income Housed Mothers," *Journal of the American Medical Association* 276 (1996): 640-646. Donna Haig Friedman, M. Hayes, J. McGah, and A. Roman, "A Snapshot of Individuals and Families Accessing Boston's Emergency Homeless Shelters, 1997," McCormack Institute, University of Massachusetts Boston, Boston, MA 1997. Donna Haig Friedman, "Parenting in Public: A Study of Help-Giving Practices to Support Parenting and Child Well-being in Massachusetts' Congregate Family Shelters," (Ph.D. dissertation, Brandeis University, 1996). Roofless Women's Action Research Mobilization, "Lifting the Voices of Homeless Women: Summary of Findings and Recommendations," Women's Institute for Housing and Economic Development and Center for Community Planning, College of Public and Community Service, University of Massachusetts Boston, Boston, MA 1997. [Back](#)

15. See Ellen Bassuk, J.C. Buckner, L.F. Weinreb, A. Browne, S.S. Bassuk, R. Dawson, J.N. Perloff, "Homelessness in female-headed families: Childhood and adult risk and protective factors," *American Journal of Public Health* 87 (1997): 241-248. [Back](#)

16. Donna Haig Friedman, M. Hayes, J. McGah, and A. Roman, "A Snapshot of Individuals and Families Accessing Boston's Emergency Homeless Shelters, 1997," McCormack Institute, University of Massachusetts Boston, Boston, MA 1997. This study used a point-in-time methodology and is likely to result in an over-representation of persons with more chronic difficulties and an under-representation of persons who utilize shelter during a crisis and quickly move out on their own. [Back](#)

17. Data source: Department of Housing and Community Development. [Back](#)

18. Data source: Department of Transitional Assistance. [Back](#)

19. The first families to reach their 24-month time limit in Massachusetts were to have lost cash benefits on December 1, 1998, unless changes were made to the state's plan. [Back](#)

Housing for Populations with Special Needs

by Elaine Werby and Karla Armenoff with Donna Haig Friedman, Maggie Spade and Michael Stone

Introduction

I. Meeting the Housing Requirements of Special Needs Populations

- **Housing the Low-income Elderly**
- **Non-elderly Disabled Persons**
- **Persons with Severe and Persistent Mental Illness**
- **Individuals with Mental Retardation**
- **Families and Individuals with Substance Abuse Problems**

- [Individuals with HIV/AIDS](#)
- [Victims of Domestic Violence](#)
- [Homeless Veterans and Those at Risk of Homelessness](#)

II. In Conclusion

Introduction

While special needs populations may be grouped according to their particular needs, no group is homogeneous. Within each group are individuals with unique capabilities and requirements. Making appropriate housing available takes sufficient and flexible funding, which permits development of a variety of appropriate housing accommodations--both with and without supportive services. The state agencies responsible for these special populations have provided a housing resource for many individuals and families, but the gap between available, appropriate housing and the number of people in need continues to grow.

Populations with special needs include low-income elderly, persons who are mentally ill, those with cognitive impairments, individuals with HIV/AIDS, families and individuals with substance abuse problems, battered women, homeless veterans, and those at risk of homelessness. The majority of these groups are poor and, in large measure, rely on public support for income, social services, and housing. For some, housing with social services (often referred to as "supportive housing") is critical.

Attempting to meet the housing needs of populations with special needs has required both public and private resources as well as the commitment, creativity, cooperation and collaboration of state agencies, advocacy organizations and coalitions, and community non-profit agencies. While no one state agency has responsibility for meeting the housing demands of all special-needs populations, the Executive Office of Health and Human Services plays a critical role as the convener of an interagency council comprised of representatives from all of the state agencies that serve these populations.

[Back to Top](#)

I. Meeting the Housing Requirements of Special Needs Populations

The gap between available, appropriate housing for these populations and the unmet need grows and becomes more critical as funding resources dwindle and housing costs rise. In addition, expiring use restrictions in more than 100 federally subsidized developments threaten to exacerbate the affordable housing crisis for people with special needs.¹

[Back to Top](#)

Housing the Low-income Elderly

Approximately 75 percent of all elderly renter households in the state meet the income eligibility limits for publicly aided or private, subsidized housing.² About 60,000 elderly households currently live in public housing, the largest source of assisted affordable housing for the elderly; another 20,000 live in private, subsidized housing, either in developments designed exclusively for the elderly or in family developments. Nearly 30,000 more elderly renters are eligible for publicly aided and private, subsidized housing.

Despite an increase of approximately 2,500 units of new elderly housing in the last ten years, and despite legislative correctives, waiting lists for state and federal elderly public housing in 1996-97 numbered approximately 18,000.³ Vacancy rates are extremely low in most developments, though some public housing has experienced high vacancy rates in recent years as a result of competition from private elderly housing. The latter are generally newer and are viewed by many as more desirable.

Waiting lists for private, subsidized developments are similar to those for public housing in length of time; a two-year or longer wait is not uncommon, though this varies depending on location, amenities and size of unit requested.

Legislative changes affect availability. Legislative action, both state and federal, has had a substantial impact on available, affordable housing for both elderly households and non-elderly disabled persons. Until 1991, state and federal developments, many of the federal Section 202 developments, and other programs designed for the elderly also served non-elderly people with disabilities. Tensions between these two populations led to changes in both state and federal programs.

In 1992 the federal 202 program, which funded housing for the elderly and for people with disabilities, was changed to focus exclusively on housing for the elderly, requiring at least one member of the household to be 62 years of age or older. Further federal legislation in 1992 allowed local housing authorities to designate all or parts of federally aided public buildings exclusively for the elderly, and within a few years, four local housing authorities took this action. In 1995, state legislation capped the non-elderly population in public housing elderly developments at 13.5 percent, reserving 86.5 percent for the elderly. In addition, the age eligibility for this elderly housing stock was lowered to 60 years of age, thereby creating a larger pool of potential applicants.

The growth of the elderly population, particularly in the 80+ age group, has created a market for assisted living housing and special facilities for persons with Alzheimer's disease. Currently the demand for assisted living housing is

being met primarily by the private market, and is thereby largely inaccessible to the low-income population. However, in an attempt to address the need of this income group, the combination of an enhanced SSI (Supplementary Security Income) payment and Medicaid funding from the Group Adult Foster Care program has made it possible for 250 to 300 low-income elders to reside in private assisted living developments.⁴ This effort meets the needs of only a fraction of those who could benefit from this type of housing.

The need for supportive services grows. As elders "age in place," public and private resources do not keep pace with the increasing need for supportive services. Some elders need assistance with housekeeping, getting to community activities, taking medications, grocery shopping, and even feeding themselves. While some developments have special HUD funding for supportive services, housing managers often have to rely on community resources for these services. Massachusetts home care corporations (now called Aging Services Access Points), through contracts with community agencies, provide home care, housekeeping assistance, and transportation for income-eligible elders in many elderly housing developments.

[Back to Top](#)

Non-elderly Disabled Persons

Ten percent of new, federally assisted housing units are designed for mobility-impaired persons. Five human service agencies in Massachusetts work with community partners to provide housing for their clients. Many of the currently available units are located in housing intended for the elderly but elders do not have preference in the assignment of these units. Almost 2,000 of these are financed through the Massachusetts Housing Finance Agency. Developments without accessible units are slowly being retrofitted as funds become available.

As indicated above, state and federal legislative changes have impacted the availability of housing for non-elderly disabled persons, including those with physical, cognitive and/or emotional limitations. With the 13.5 percent cap, public housing designated primarily for the elderly is now a limited resource for the non-elderly population. State policy established that non-elderly disabled persons, waiting for or residing in state-aided elderly housing, may be eligible under the Alternative Housing Voucher Program for subsidy vouchers. These vouchers can be used for transitional housing in the private market while permanent housing is being sought. Despite this effort, applications from persons under 60 years of age for state public housing for the elderly climbed from approximately 5,500 in 1995 to almost 7,000 in 1997.⁵

[Back to Top](#)

Persons with Severe and Persistent Mental Illness

In 1997, the Department of Mental Health provided residential services to 6,000 mentally ill clients in non-institutional settings, 127 percent more than the number served in 1990. However, over 2,000 additional beds in residential programs and affordable apartments with and without services are needed statewide for DMH-eligible clients.⁶

The Department of Mental Health estimates that most of its 22,000 clients are impoverished, with a median monthly income below \$600.⁷ Therefore, financial assistance is critical to help them secure housing and needed support services. The Department of Mental Health does not develop or own housing units; rather, it collaborates with a variety of public and private agencies, developers, advocates and organizations to find new housing resources.

DMH also distributes close to 800 housing subsidies to low-income clients through its Rental Assistance Program. In addition, department clients obtain federal subsidies administered by the Department of Housing and Community Development, local housing authorities, community development corporations, and regional non-profit housing organizations. Still, DMH projects that approximately 2,300 additional beds in community-based residential programs and affordable apartments with and without services are needed statewide for eligible clients.

[Back to Top](#)

Individuals with Mental Retardation

As of January 1998, there were 6,848 community-based residence units with supportive services for more than 10,000 consumers of the state's Department of Mental Retardation.⁸ Like the Department of Mental Health, DMR does not own housing but rather works with "housing partners" to develop community-based housing. It also aggressively promotes opportunities for consumers, currently institutionalized, to move to new community settings. One model of non-institutional housing is known as the "family support model," in which mentally retarded individuals remain in their own home or in a family setting with a foster-like family serving as "co-parents." This model is an alternative to costly out-of-home residential placements.

DMR estimates that 80 percent of its consumers have incomes below the poverty line; financial assistance is critical to help them secure housing and needed support services. Over time, distribution of state funding has shifted more resources for community-based housing than for institutional support.

Despite the numbers currently housed in Department of Mental Retardation residential programs, the waiting list for residential services has increased by 500 percent since 1992. In January 1998, close to 3,000 individuals were on the waiting list for DMR residential services.⁹ Rapid expansion of the list is due to

the growing numbers of individuals whose caregivers 60 years of age or older are increasingly unable to provide care. There has also been an influx of individuals turning 22 years of age and moving into the adult mental retardation system. Approximately 450 DMR consumers turn 22 every year, and unless new housing resources are available for them, they are added to the growing waiting list.

A 1997 Brandeis University report highlighted the years-long wait for DMR residential services and its impact on families. According to the report, a quarter of the caregivers have had family members on the waiting list for more than 10 years, and another 20 percent, for 6 to 10 years, leading some to characterize the situation as a crisis.¹⁰

[Back to Top](#)

Families and Individuals with Substance Abuse Problems

As of January 1998, the Commonwealth had 2,475 beds in permanent and transitional housing for individuals and families in recovery from substance abuse.¹¹ Though the state has developed a new stock of residential treatment programs for these individuals and families since 1990, approximately 8,000 individuals and families dealing with substance abuse are still in need of housing with services.¹²

The Bureau of Substance Abuse Services in the Department of Public Health operates three types of residential programs: 20 supportive housing programs ("three-quarter-way" houses); 68 residential treatment programs or group homes ("half-way" houses); and nine family shelters. These programs, evolved over the last 10 years, are developed with funding from state and federal programs. The bureau funds case management and treatment services in these residential programs.

[Back to Top](#)

Individuals with HIV/AIDS

In 1997, approximately 850 individuals diagnosed with HIV/AIDS were receiving non-institutional housing with support services in Massachusetts.¹³ An additional 2,000 to 3,000 were still in need of housing and services.¹⁴ As of January 1998, 51 residential programs with 1,071 units were operating in the Commonwealth, with all but nine receiving at least partial funding from the Department of Public Health. Case management, substance abuse services and other supports appropriate to residents' preferences and stages of illness are provided in these supported housing programs. Many of these are targeted to homeless people with HIV/AIDS, while others serve those at risk of being homeless.

New treatment modalities for HIV/AIDS have prolonged life expectancies and changed housing needs from temporary to longer-term tenancy. The increased length of stay has exacerbated the affordable housing shortage for this population.

[Back to Top](#)

Victims of Domestic Violence

The Commonwealth's very limited stock of transitional and permanent housing for women and children escaping domestic violence constitutes a crisis situation. In 1997, there were approximately 17,000 requests by women and children escaping domestic violence and seeking permanent or transitional housing.¹⁵ As of January 1998, the housing stock for this population consisted only of 121 transitional living beds in congregate settings with supportive services; 39 transitional living apartments with supportive services; and a Safe Recovery Program, serving up to 10 families at a given time. Women can stay in transitional living programs for up to 18 months; however, in part because of problems in locating appropriate housing, there is a need for more transitional housing.

Although service providers, funded through the Department of Social Services (DSS) and the Department of Housing and Community Development, offer quality, innovative services for battered women and their children, funding levels have not kept pace with the housing needs of these individuals and families. DSS-funded programs received almost 91,000 hotline calls in FY96 alone.¹⁶

"Where Do I Go from Here?," an October 1995 survey report on the housing needs of battered women in the North Shore region, draws a picture of unmet housing need.¹⁷ "The survey showed that a combination of violence and poverty is threatening families and pushing women to the brink of becoming homeless. A lack of housing alternatives kept 82 percent of surveyed battered women with children in abusive situations."¹⁸

[Back to Top](#)

Homeless Veterans and Those at Risk of Homelessness

Though the stock of housing for at-risk or homeless veterans has increased since 1990, the Massachusetts Department of Veterans' Services estimates that there are approximately 2,500 homeless veterans in Massachusetts.¹⁹ In 1997, the Commonwealth's stock of transitional and permanent housing for homeless veterans included 363 rooms or beds in transitional housing programs and 182 units or rooms of permanent housing. In 1990, only two transitional or permanent housing programs existed in the Commonwealth: the Veterans

Benefits Clearinghouse, Inc., administered 18 single-room occupancy (SRO) units, and Transition House operated 27 SROs. ²⁰

Many homeless veterans are unemployed or under-employed and often depend on shelter living and intensive counseling to deal with the impacts of service-related problems. While this population often does not connect with transitional housing and service agencies, many have been successfully helped by other veterans. The Department of Veterans' Services neither develops housing nor provides direct services. Rather, it supports non-profit veterans' organizations to provide services and to develop and operate housing for homeless veterans.

[Back to Top](#)

II. In Conclusion

Attempting to meet the housing requirements of populations with special needs has tapped both public and private resources and relied heavily on the commitment, creativity, cooperation and collaboration of state agencies, advocacy organizations and coalitions, and community nonprofit agencies.

Further discussion of homeless individuals and families with special needs is included in the Affordability section of this report.

[Back to Top](#)

1. "Assisted Housing in Massachusetts Subject to Prepayment Options. MHFA and HUD-Financed." Massachusetts Housing Finance Agency. Undated. [Back](#)
2. Data sources: 1996 & 1997 March Current Population Study: Massachusetts. HUD Transmittal of FY98 Public Housing/Section 8 Income Limits, issued January 7, 1998. [Back](#)
3. Massachusetts Housing Authorities' Waiting Lists, HUD 1996. 1997 Waiting Lists for state-financed public housing units in Massachusetts, Department of Housing and Community Development. [Back](#)
4. Executive Office of Elder Affairs. May 1998. [Back](#)
5. 1995 Report on Persons Under 60 on Waiting Lists for Chapter 667 Housing; 1997 Report on Persons Under 60 on Waiting List; 1995 and 1997 Reports on Non-Elderly Handicapped Persons Residing in Chapter 667 Housing. Bureau of Housing Management, Department of Housing and Community Development. [Back](#)

6. Department of Mental Health. January 23, 1998. [Back](#)
7. Massachusetts Consolidated Plan, 1995. Page 11. [Back](#)
8. Department of Mental Retardation. May, 1998. [Back](#)
9. Department of Mental Retardation. May, 1998. Also, "Report on the DMR Waiting List for Services." Department of Mental Retardation. October 31, 1997. [Back](#)
10. "Waiting in the Wings." Brandeis University. 1997. [Back](#)
11. Department of Public Health. Bureau of Substance Abuse Services. January 1998. This section does not discuss housing for mentally ill individuals with substance abuse problems or individuals with HIV/AIDS with substance abuse problems. [Back](#)
12. According to Schutt and Garrett, 50 percent to 60 percent of the single adult homeless population in Massachusetts suffer from substance abuse addictions. Schutt, Russell and Gerald Garrett. Responding to the Homeless: Policy & Practice. New York: Plenum Press, 1992. University of Massachusetts Boston researchers estimate that approximately 22,000 unaccompanied individuals in Massachusetts are homeless. [Back](#)
13. Department of Public Health AIDS Bureau. January 1998. These 850 individuals reside in supportive housing that is funded, at least in part, with state resources. [Back](#)
14. Department of Public Health AIDS Bureau. January 1998. [Back](#)
15. Department of Social Services and Battered Women's Service Providers, FY96 statistics. These include women and children sheltered in and turned away from emergency shelters, safe homes, and state-funded transitional housing. Safe homes provide shelter for 1 to 3 nights; emergency shelters, up to 90 days; and transitional housing, up to 18 months. The 17,000 figure includes duplicated counts of women and children. Women or families receiving shelter at multiple locations - or turned away from multiple shelters - were counted multiple times. The FY96 statistic is consistent with figures reported in July through December 1997. These figures provide what is quite possibly an under-estimation of the amount of transitional and permanent housing needed for women and children escaping violence in Massachusetts. [Back](#)
16. Department of Social Services, FY96 statistic. [Back](#)
17. Survey report by Help for Abused Women and Their Children (HAWC). Salem, MA. [Back](#)

18. "Where Do I Go from Here?" Affordable Housing Survey Results. October 1995. HAWC. [Back](#)

19. From Housing and Services Provided to Homeless Veterans, a 1994 Department of Veterans Services (DVS) report to the Massachusetts House and Senate Committees on Ways and Means. In the report, DVS projected there would be 2,462 homeless veterans in Massachusetts in 1998. [Back](#)

20. Department of Veterans Services, May 1998. [Back](#)

Elaine Werby, MSW, is a Senior Fellow at the John W. McCormack Institute of Public Affairs. For more information, contact the author at Elaine.Werby@umb.edu.

Karla Armenoff, Ph.D., is a Public Policy Candidate at the University of Massachusetts Boston.

[Back to Top](#) | [Next](#) | [Previous](#) | [Contents](#)

Housing Discrimination

by Ellen Pader and David Winsor with James Palma

Introduction

I. Defining and Addressing the Problem

- [**Quantifying Housing Discrimination in Massachusetts**](#)

II. Discrimination in Rental Housing

III. Discrimination in Housing Sales

IV. In Conclusion

Introduction

When home seekers are unable to rent or purchase housing for reasons unrelated to their ability to pay, their credit-worthiness or character references, the availability of affordable units is irrelevant, even if there were sufficient affordable housing for all Massachusetts residents. Many qualified people are denied their housing of choice on account of personal — and illegal

– prejudice against them for reasons such as their color, accent or disability; because they have children or use government assistance to help pay for rent.

Estimates of actual numbers of housing discrimination cases are far greater than the number of documented occurrences. Some potential renters and homeowners do not realize they have been discriminated against, or do not know that recourse is possible. Even those who are aware of their options often choose not to pursue legal remedies. People who know their rights, or that the costs of litigation might be covered by a government agency or private organization, may choose not to pursue a claim because the process can be time-consuming, disruptive to family life and emotionally draining; legal remediation is not always a practical avenue.

According to nationwide estimates by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), as many as two million attempts to obtain housing are unsuccessful every year because of illegal discrimination by property owners, property managers, lenders and insurers. Yet, the National Fair Housing Alliance (NFHA) compiled a list of only 24,122 reported discrimination complaints nationally in 1997.¹ Assuming the accuracy of HUD's estimates, the vast majority of complaints are never brought to light. This disparity argues for the need to understand and measure the role of discrimination in housing denials to people based on factors such as race, ethnicity, sex, religion, disability, source of income or the presence of children in their households when economic status had no bearing on an ability to pay.

[Back to Top](#)

I. Defining and Addressing the Problem

In 1968, the federal government passed the Fair Housing Act, making it illegal to deny housing to potential renters or homeowners based on their race, color, religion or national origin; in 1988 familial status and handicap were added to the list of protected categories. In Massachusetts, fair housing laws include all federal categories, plus marital status, sexual orientation, age, veteran status and source of income. Those seeking to purchase homes acquired more specific protection in 1975, with the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act. This mandated that lenders disclose their actions on individual loan applications, including the race, ethnicity and income of applicants, as well as whether the applicant was approved for a loan. Then, with the passage of the Community Reinvestment Act in 1977, the government made a commitment to reverse the trend of lending inequities that had been severely limiting access to mortgage capital by racial and ethnic minorities and low-income residents.

Despite these measures, discrimination continues throughout the state and across the nation. This is apparent even from the minimal discrimination data available. Unfortunately, when gathering information about housing

discrimination one cannot review records in a city hall or analyze the census to compile statistics. Discrimination in the rental market is exposed primarily by its victims, and the majority of cases go unreported. Gathering accurate data is made more difficult when one considers the subtleties of discrimination: a property management company with an explicit nondiscriminatory policy might have individual employees whose behaviors prevent clients from moving into to the homes or neighborhoods of their choice, while leaving little evidence of the discriminatory basis of refusal.

In their Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing plan, the Massachusetts Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) differentiates discriminatory practices from market factors. The high cost of housing in Massachusetts is an example of market factors that disproportionately affect people in protected categories, many of whom have relatively low incomes. Actual discriminatory practices include the refusal to rent, sell, lend or insure housing for people in protected categories, as well as redlining: the practice of banks to refuse loans in low-income, largely minority neighborhoods.²

[Back to Top](#)

Quantifying Housing Discrimination in Massachusetts

There are few agencies in Massachusetts that address housing discrimination complaints and collect this type of data. Primary sources of information are the federal government's Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and its Fair Housing Assistance Project (FHAP), as well as the Massachusetts Commission Against Discrimination (MCAD) and the housing courts. There are also non-profit organizations, such as the Housing Discrimination Project, Inc. (HDP) in Western Massachusetts.

HUD/FHAP data consist of housing discrimination complaints reported from 1990 through the first quarter of 1998 (2,171 complaints). They include only federally protected populations. Reports name the protected category of each complainant and the type of discrimination alleged. The predominant bases for complaints between 1990 and 1998 were race and color (see Figure 2).

[Back to Top](#)

II. Discrimination in Rental Housing

The 1990 census reported that members of racial and ethnic minorities represented more than 19 percent of all renters in the state. Two-thirds of the Commonwealth's racial/ethnic minority residents are exclusively dependent on the residential rental market for housing.

Data on the rental market reveal a significant amount of discrimination. HUD/FHAP data for 1997 reported 150 allegations of rental discrimination in Massachusetts for that year alone, with 1,688 complaints since 1990. Of these, the vast majority were for discrimination in the terms, conditions, or privileges in renting a home (860) or discriminatory refusal to rent (787). These make up more than 75 percent of all housing discrimination complaints filed with HUD/FHAP since 1990. The majority were filed by people who felt discriminated against because of their race and/or color, with familial and handicap status not far behind. (Numbers do not equal numbers of complaints filed, due to multiple categories being listed.)

Data from the Housing Discrimination Project, Inc., in Western Massachusetts (1992 to 1997) paint a similar picture, but also includes information on state-protected groups. The state-only categories (source of income, sexual orientation, age and marital status) account for a large number of the complaints handled by the organization.

Of approximately 1,375 complaints filed, 409 were based on categories of people protected by state but not federal laws. The majority of these complaints (350) were based on source of income, with 188 of those being filed by people who felt they were refused housing because of their dependence on housing subsidies, a factor that translates into a form of discrimination against families with children.

When including both federal and state protected categories (Figure 3), the HDP data show that the highest reported single basis for discrimination was national origin, with familial status being second. HDP complaints derive primarily from Hampden-Hampshire counties in Western Massachusetts, where HDP's primary office is located, while HUD complaints originate primarily in the eastern part of the state; their office is in Boston. Much of the Commonwealth is unrepresented.

The significance of having somewhere local to pursue a complaint of alleged discrimination, combined with the existence of an agency actively involved with education and outreach, cannot be underestimated when seeking to understand the geography and degree of reported housing discrimination.

This is clearly illustrated by the case of Worcester in central Massachusetts. When MCAD had an office in that city they received up to 100 complaints per month. Between 1989, when MCAD closed its office, and 1995, when HDP opened an office in Worcester, complainants had to travel to MCAD's Boston or Springfield offices. During this time, MCAD received fewer than 100 complaints per year. Starting in 1995, HDP had a part-time presence in Worcester, and in March of 1998, they opened a full-time office. In the first nine months of full-time operation, they received 89 complaints, compared with only eight the previous year.

Discrimination in the housing market goes beyond the tangible inability to live in a home or neighborhood of choice, with the concomitant access to quality schools. It hits people of all income levels, although low-income people are disproportionately affected. Unlike other barriers to housing (such as cost and availability), discrimination can have a profoundly negative impact on one's entire life, psychological state, and ability to function fully. Statistics do not begin to tell the story of the toll the prejudiced actions of others take on individual lives. The following stories of housing discrimination are from HDP.

One Worcester case received national attention in 1997 when Secretary of HUD, Andrew Cuomo, showcased it as part of a press conference on discrimination. A former employee of Choice Property Consultants, Inc., reported to HDP that the company had a practice of writing "Archie" on property information sheets of owners who did not want to rent to racial and ethnic minorities. ("Archie" refers to the reactionary father in the 1960s television show *All in the Family*. This case has since been taken over by the Department of Justice.

Discrimination based on race and national origin takes many subtle forms in addition to refusal to rent. In a Hampden County case, the owners and managers of a rental complex were found to have an explicit policy of charging higher rents to Black and Latino tenants than to White tenants. They even kept a separate list of White applicants and called them repeatedly when there was an available unit, in an attempt to decrease the percentage of racial/ethnic minorities in the complex.

In Worcester in late 1996, Rhonda Bucklin received a letter from her landlord informing her that he would "begin eviction proceedings immediately" if she could not pay the rent on her own. She was receiving rental assistance from the Section 8 housing subsidy program, and thereby falls under the protection of the Fair Housing Act. Note that the landlord was not accusing her of not paying, or even of late payment. Nor did he complain about her character; it was simply her status as a recipient of government assistance that was at issue. The landlord was required to rescind his demand, since "source of income" is protected under Massachusetts law.

When familial status became a protected category in 1988, it stopped the flood of apartment complexes that were being converted to "adult only" residences, which severely curtailed the housing opportunities of families with children. In 1998, ten years after familial status became a federally protected category, Josephine Paz was unable to rent a condominium at the Echo Hill Condominium in Amherst because of their rules — in writing — that children under sixteen were prohibited from the part of the complex in which she was seeking an apartment. As a result of Ms. Paz's suit, the condominium no longer has this age restriction.

Often, legal settlements in discrimination law suits include educational requirements for the offending party, requiring attendance at a workshop on fair housing law and having their rental practices monitored.

[Back to Top](#)

III. Discrimination in Housing Sales

Prospective homeowners requiring a mortgage and insurance may face additional discriminatory practices. In a study of 1989 Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA) data, the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston found that Latino and Black mortgage applicants in Boston are considerably more likely to be denied loans than White applicants who are similarly situated in terms of economic, employment and neighborhood characteristics (see Figure 4).³

They argue that while few mortgage applicants have totally "clean" applications, the disparity in success rates for obtaining a loan is accounted for by the behaviors of individual loan officers who have significant discretion in deciding how much weight to accord any imperfection. Not only are low-income White applicants less likely to be turned down than high-income minorities, but "for the same imperfections, Whites seem to enjoy a general presumption of creditworthiness that Black and Hispanic applicants do not, and lenders seem to be more willing to overlook flaws for White applicants than for minority applicants."⁴

As HMDA only requires banks to keep records on people who actually submit mortgage applications, the problem of disparate treatment discrimination is potentially greater than is represented by the data, because applicants might be turned down or discouraged in the pre-application process.

This report analyzes the degree to which HMDA data suggest that discrimination has lessened or increased between 1992 and 1996. Although not explicitly measuring discrimination, the data on mortgage transactions required by HMDA and reported by the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council (FFIEC) can help illuminate complex issues and trends in the home sales market.

In Massachusetts, the ownership rate for racial/ethnic minority households is 26.8 percent, compared with a national average of approximately 39 percent. In 1997 the overall ownership rate in Massachusetts was 62.3 percent, compared with 65.7 percent nationally. The lower homeownership rate can be explained, in part, by the lower proportion of owner-occupied housing units in Massachusetts than in the nation (59 percent vs. 64 percent) and also by a lack of affordable owner-occupied housing in the state.

Data from NFHA reported 1,185 complaints of sales and/or lending discrimination nationwide in 1997. This accounts for almost 9 percent of all

reported housing discrimination complaints nationwide. In Massachusetts, HUD/FHAP registered only seven complaints of this type during that year. A total of 120 complaints of explicit home sales or lending discrimination in Massachusetts have been reported to NFHA, HUD, and the Department of Justice since 1990, making up 0.5 percent of all complaints reported to those agencies in that time period. The majority of those complaints were for discriminatory financing (46) and discriminatory refusal to sell (30).

It is notable that HMDA-reported mortgage originations (applications that were approved and resulted in a loan) for ethnic/race minority applicants increased between 1992 and 1996 by more than half, rising from 7,113 to 11,197. Overall originations increased only 1.92 percent, from 160,287 to 163,369. For the reference time period, mortgage originations for non-Latino White applicants actually decreased by 4.57 percent. Although there has been a real increase in the number of mortgages granted to race and ethnic minority applicants, these make up only 8 percent of the mortgage market, while accounting for more than 12 percent of the population. Thus, according to HMDA data for the period analyzed, the number of mortgages granted to ethnic/race minority applicants increased but did not reach equity with non-race/ethnic minority applicants.

Loan denial rates have typically been the key indicator of inequity in the residential finance system. In 1992, 5 percent (10,228) of all mortgage applications came from racial- and ethnic-minority applicants. By 1996 this had grown to 8 percent (17,954). As with the five-year trend in applications and originations, the rate for minority applications has shown some improvement. In 1992, when the overall denial rate was 12 percent of all applications received, the denial rate for applications from race/ethnic minority borrowers was 20 percent. In 1996 this rate was reported as 18 percent, while the overall rate had increased to 13 percent. According to 1996 data, the denial rate for Latino and African-American applicants was twice as high as that for White applicants. Even when these data are standardized by income category, the denial rate disparity is evident. For example, the denial rate for African American and Latino applicants in the upper income category, those with incomes in excess of 120 percent of the MSA median, was over two times the rate for White applicants in the same income group (see Figure 5).

[Back to Top](#)

IV. In Conclusion

Local organizations disseminate information on the Fair Housing Act to potential home-seekers, as well as landlords, property managers and lenders. In the absence of such organizations, neither information or guidance may be readily available. Though state and federal regulations forbid it, individuals continue to deny housing to legally qualified applicants only because of personal prejudice.

[Back to Top](#)

1. National Fair Housing Alliance News Release, Friday April 17, 1998. [Back](#)
2. Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Department of Housing and Community Development. April 1998. Analysis of Impediments and Fair Housing Plan. [Back](#)
3. Munnell, Alicia, H., Lynn E. Browne, James McEneaney, and Geoffrey M. B. Tootell. 1992. Mortgage Lending in Boston: Interpreting HMDA Data. Federal Reserve Bank of Boston. Working Paper No. 92-7., p. 2. [Back](#)
4. Ibid., 3. [Back](#)

Ellen Pader, Ph.D., is an associate professor in the Department of Landscape Architecture and Regional Planning at University of Massachusetts Amherst. For more information, contact the author at pader@larp.umass.edu.

David Winsor is a licensed architect and holds a master's degree in community planning.

The Economic Impact of Housing

Zenia Kotval and John Mullin

Introduction

I. Measuring the Economic Impacts of the Housing Industry

- [The Local Economy](#)
- [The "Local Impact of Homebuilding" Model](#)
- [Input Requirements](#)
- [Data Limitations](#)
- [Data Inputs](#)

II. Evaluating Economic Impacts

- [Homes Built in Urban Areas](#)
- [Homes Built in Suburban Areas](#)
- [Homes Built in Rural Areas](#)

III. The Significance of Available Housing as a Factor in Business Location Decisions

- [The Jobs-to-Housing Balance](#)
- [Housing as a Factor in Business Location Decisions](#)

IV. In Conclusion

ADDITIONAL TABLES

- Impact of 100 Single-Family Homes in an Urban Area in Massachusetts
 - Phase I -- Direct and Indirect Impact of Construction Activity
 - A. Income and Jobs by Industry
 - B. State and Local Government General Revenue by Type
 - Phase II -- Induced Effect of Spending Income and Tax Revenue from Phase I
 - A. Income and Jobs by Industry
 - B. State and Local Government General Revenue by Type
 - Phase III -- Ongoing, Annual Effect that Occurs As New Homes are Occupied
 - A. Income and Jobs by Industry
 - B. State and Local Government General Revenue by Type
- Impact of 100 Single-Family Homes in an Suburban Area in Massachusetts
 - Phase I -- Direct and Indirect Impact of Construction Activity
 - A. Income and Jobs by Industry
 - B. State and Local Government General Revenue by Type
 - Phase II -- Induced Effect of Spending Income and Tax Revenue from Phase I
 - A. Income and Jobs by Industry
 - B. State and Local Government General Revenue by Type
 - Phase III -- Ongoing, Annual Effect that Occurs As New Homes are Occupied
 - A. Income and Jobs by Industry
 - B. State and Local Government General Revenue by Type
- Impact of 100 Single-Family Homes in a Rural Area in Massachusetts
 - Phase I -- Direct and Indirect Impact of Construction Activity
 - A. Income and Jobs by Industry
 - B. State and Local Government General Revenue by Type
 - Phase II -- Induced Effect of Spending Income and Tax Revenue from Phase I
 - A. Income and Jobs by Industry
 - B. State and Local Government General Revenue by Type
 - Phase III -- Ongoing, Annual Effect that Occurs As New Homes are Occupied
 - A. Income and Jobs by Industry
 - B. State and Local Government General Revenue by Type

Introduction

Home building generates substantial local economic activity, including income, jobs, and revenue for state and local governments. These far exceed the school costs-to-property-tax ratios. Furthermore, balanced growth, the availability of homes that match the character of the jobs, plays a significant role in attracting sustainable economic development.

For the purposes of this study, these factors were evaluated by means of a quantitative assessment of data from a Local Impact of Homebuilding model, as well as a qualitative assessment of literature and policy analyses. The conclusions reveal the considerable effect of housing on a local economy.

The economic impact of housing involves a multitude of factors, from the monetary effects of the construction process to the impact of personal incomes on the local economy. In addition, it takes into consideration the significance of housing cost and availability in business location decisions.

[Back to Top](#)

I. Measuring the Economic Impacts of the Housing Industry

Too often, the impacts of new homes in a community are assessed in simple terms of school costs and property tax revenues. Given that average annual school costs range from \$6,000 to \$8,000 per student, and property tax revenues, from an average home in Massachusetts, range between \$1,600 and \$2,500 per year, it is little wonder that new home construction is perceived as costing communities money. The purpose of this assessment is to show that the housing industry has several other direct and indirect impacts on a local economy. In order to estimate these, the National Association of Home Builders ran an econometric model to assess the actual local impact of homebuilding activity. What follows is an explanation of the model and a summary of the results.

[Back to Top](#)

The Local Economy

A local economy is an area within which people live, work, shop, and seek entertainment, regardless of political boundaries. The model produced for this study uses 62 industries that represent goods and services generally produced and purchased locally. These are based on the detailed six-digit standard industry classification (SIC) codes used by the BEA. Commodities in the SIC system are similar to the industrial classifications, except for construction, which has many commodities. Therefore, the local economy subset consists of

62 industries (including the construction industry) and 90 commodities (61+29, as the construction industry has 29 commodities).

[Back to Top](#)

The "Local Impact of Homebuilding" Model

Home building generates substantial local economic activity, including income, jobs, and revenue for state and local governments. The Local Impact of Homebuilding model from the National Association of Home Builders captures the effect of the construction activity itself, the impact that occurs when construction incomes are spent, and the impact of a home's new occupants paying taxes and spending their incomes. All three phases of the local impact model are based on input-output tables produced by the Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA) in the U.S. Department of Commerce. Phases I and II are one-time effects that occur as the result of construction activity. Phase III is an ongoing, annual effect that includes property tax payments and the result of the completed unit being occupied.

- **Phase I: Construction** The jobs, wages, and state and local taxes and fees generated by the actual development, construction, and sale of the home. These jobs include on-site and off-site construction work as well as retail and wholesale sales of components, transportation to the site, and all of the professional services required to build and sell a new home.
- **Phase II: Ripple Effect** A share of the wages and profits earned during the construction period are spent by workers and business owners on goods and services produced within the state. The continuing effects from recycling income back into the state economy produces more jobs, wages and taxes in the state.
- **Phase III: Ongoing Annual Impact**, A new home generates a continuing stream of property tax revenue for political jurisdictions within the state. In addition, when the home is occupied, a substantial portion of the occupant's income is spent on items produced by businesses in the state. In turn, that spending causes its own ripple effect as businesses and workers buy from other state businesses. The addition of a new household thus causes a permanent increase in the level of economic activity, jobs, wages, and state and local tax receipts.

Calculating the impact of Phase I involves several steps:

- *Determining the average value of new single family and multifamily housing units built in the state, and the associated average raw land costs.* Because raw land has an economic and tax value that is not a result of construction activity, it is important to keep track of this and exclude it from the analysis.

- *Defining a typical state economy.* This is accomplished by selecting a subset of industries and commodities from the benchmark input-output tables produced by the U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis -- in particular, those representing commodities that would typically be produced, sold, and consumed within the same state. Laundry services, for example, are included, but automobile manufacturing is not. The model takes a fairly conservative approach and retains only 62 of the nearly 500 industries available in the input-output tables, and 90 of the over 500 commodities.
- *Determining the total output required from each state industry to produce each of the 62 commodities.*
- *Converting the value of an average new housing unit, excluding its raw land cost, into the output of various state industries.*
- *Converting the output of state industries required to build an average housing unit into state business owners' income.*
- *Converting the output of industries required to build an average new housing unit into state wages, salaries, and jobs.*
- *Computing how much of the additional personal income would be collected by the state, and by local governments within the state, as personal taxes or fees.*
- *Computing the amount of permit, impact, and other fees local governments within the state would collect in the process of developing the land and constructing the average new housing unit.*
- *Computing how much the additional business activity would generate in business fees and taxes for state and local governments beyond the initial permit and impact fees.*

The workers and businesses who earn income in Phase I will obviously spend some of the income, and, just as obviously, some of this spending will escape the state economy. The purchase of a new car, for example, will result in increased wages for autoworkers, and increased profits for stockholders of an automobile manufacturing company, all of whom are likely to live and spend their incomes elsewhere. Some of the spending activity, however, will take place within the state's boundaries. The car in this example is likely to be purchased from a dealer in the state and generate income for a salesperson who lives in the area, as well as supporting the wages of workers who clean, maintain, and perform accounting functions for the dealership, and who live in the same state. Consumers also purchase many services -- laundry, auto repair, groceries, etc. -- without traveling outside the state. They also pay taxes and fees to state and local governments.

Phase II takes the income and taxes generated in Phase I as its starting point and then calculates the subsequent ripples of economic activity within the state, a process that incorporates the following steps:

- *Identifying how much of their incomes households on average spend on the various commodities produced within the state.* Most of the information used to accomplish this comes from the Consumer Expenditure Survey (CES), produced by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Using the detailed expenditure files of the CES we are able to identify average spending as a fraction of income for 46 commodities produced within the state (the remainder of the 90 commodities produced within a given state correspond to items typically purchased by businesses rather than consumers).
- *Tracking the effect of increased state and local taxes and fees.* Just as consumers spend their incomes, state and local governments spend the revenue they collect through fees and taxes. We assume that this revenue is spent entirely on a state and local government commodity identifiable in the input-output tables. Adding this to the 46 commodities identified in the previous calculation gives a total of 47 commodities produced within the state on which consumers spend money -- either directly, or indirectly through taxes paid to state and local governments.
- *Using the average consumer spending patterns to convert state income and state and local taxes into dollars spent on each of the 47 commodities.*
- *Translating the spending on the 47 commodities into business owners' income, wages, salaries, and fees and taxes collected by state and local governments from individuals and businesses.* This is essentially the same procedure described in Phase I -- except that here, instead of applying it only to construction and a few ancillary services, we apply it simultaneously to 47 commodities.
- *Computing the limit of the ripple effect.* As we have seen, the income generated within a state in Phase I leads to additional spending within the state. But this in turn results in additional income for state residents, which will lead to more spending, resulting in more state income, leading to still more spending, and so on. Because the amount of income and spending generated in each round is smaller than in the previous one (only a fraction of income is spent within the state, and only a fraction of this eventually becomes income for state residents), there is a limit to the sum of these spending rounds. It is a straightforward exercise in mathematics to compute this limit, which measures the final effect of

the additional spending after all the subsequent economic ripples have damped out.

Like Phase II, Phase III calculates the limit of successive waves of economic activity. In Phase I, however, these waves are set in motion not by the actual construction of a housing unit, but by a household occupying the completed unit and participating in the state economy. This does not necessarily mean that all new homes will be occupied by households that move in from outside the state. It may be that an average new-home household moves into the newly constructed unit from elsewhere in the same state, while an average existing-home household moves in from outside to occupy the unit vacated by the first household. Or, it may be that the new home provides an opportunity for the state to retain an average new home-buying household that would otherwise move out of the area for lack of suitable housing.

In any event, Phase III treats the construction of one average new housing unit as a net gain to the state economy of one average new-home household. This is the same reasoning that is often used, even if unconsciously, when considering the cost side of the equation. For instance, it is often assumed that a new home will be occupied by a household with certain average characteristics -- such as an average number of school-age children who will consume education at the public's expense.

The calculation of Phase III involves the following steps:

- *Determining U.S. average income of households that occupy new single family, as well as new multifamily housing units.*
- *Adjusting these averages to account for economic conditions peculiar to a given state, especially income levels and house prices.*
- *Identifying how much of their incomes households that occupy new units spend on each of the 47 commodities produced within the state.*
- *Repeating the steps outlined in Phase II to calculate the limit of economic ripples induced by the initial spending on various commodities.*

Although the model incorporates information from many sources, a large share of the information about national average economic activity comes from the input-output tables and National Income and Product Accounts produced by the Bureau of Economic Analysis. In order to customize the model to a specific state, NAHB uses state and local government accounting information from the Census of Governments, produced by the U.S. Census Bureau, as well as information collected directly from governments or people doing business in the state.

[Back to Top](#)

Input Requirements

The basic model produces results for an average local economy in the United States, but it can be customized for a specific area. As localities differ in complex and important ways, especially when it comes to taxes and fees, inputs for specific areas are required. For this study, basic input requirements fall into two categories: general market conditions and conditions specific to single family home construction.

Urban Communities	Suburban Communities	Rural Communities
Springfield	Framingham	Hancock
Worcester	Franklin	Pelham
Lowell	Lynnfield	Royalston
Taunton	Grafton	Mattapoisett
Leominster	Longmeadow	Eastham

General market conditions:

- Local area where the construction takes place (We used three prototype areas: urban, suburban and rural communities in Massachusetts. See Figure 1.)
- Proportion of total property taxes collected from residences, businesses, and agricultural property
- Rate of local personal and/or business income tax

Conditions specific to single-family home construction:

- Number of single-family homes to be analyzed
- Average market price of a home
- Average permit, impact, and other fees (including property transfer tax) paid to local governments per single-family home
- Average property tax per dollar of market value for the new single-family homes (Total property tax on an average unit is acceptable as well.)

[Back to Top](#)

Data Limitations

As this study aims to assess the impact of housing on a statewide basis, there are limitations to the accuracy of local input data. Each community in Massachusetts has its own tax rate for residential development and calculates permit and other fees differently. The state shows wide variations in terms of land and housing costs. As such, one average figure for the entire state would be rather meaningless. Our study explored three iterations of the Local Impact of Homebuilding model to assess the statewide impact of 100 single family homes in a typical urban community, a typical suburban community, and a typical rural community.

[Back to Top](#)

Data Inputs

In order to provide data on prototypical urban, suburban and rural communities, we chose five communities in each of the three sectors, compiled actual data on each of these communities, and averaged the data (excluding outliers) for each sector. We chose the communities based on location, development potential, and socioeconomic factors. (see Figure 1).

The average value of land is estimated by buildable parcel, not by cost per acre. Zoning regulations allow higher densities in urban areas (two to three homes per acre) than in suburban areas (one to two homes per acre) and rural areas (often two acres per home). NAHB converted these to costs for "raw" land: land without infrastructure, clearing, or grading. Estimates were used for raw land value, as such land is difficult to find in urban or suburban communities. Raw land values for single-family homes in each type of area were estimated by NAHB's Housing Policy Department from data in their Builder Cost Survey (November 1995). Raw land costs in Massachusetts were estimated from the U.S. ratio of raw land to developable parcels, less fees. The same ratios were then applied to the buildable parcel values (less fees) in each category. (See Figure 2).

	Average Value of Homes Built	Average Value of Raw Land Per Home	Impact, Permit, and Other Fees	Property Tax
Urban Areas	\$130,000	\$14,706	\$1,349	\$2,041
Suburban Areas	\$190,000	\$24,426	\$2,412	\$2,646
Rural Areas	\$140,000	\$9,817	\$873	\$1,610

[Back to Top](#)

II. Evaluating Economic Impacts

Estimates of the statewide economic impacts of building 100 single family homes in urban, suburban, and rural Massachusetts locations are presented below. The inputs for the NAHB model were computed separately for each sector. The model also shows the effect on income and employment in 16 industries and the (non-federal) government sector, as well as detailed information about taxes and other types of state and local government revenue.

Short-Term Economic Impacts of Construction			
	Income	Taxes/Fees	Jobs
Urban	\$8,249,000	\$993,000	159
Suburban	\$11,892,000	\$1,479,000	230
Rural	\$9,286,000	\$1,093,000	217

[Back to Top](#)

Homes Built in Urban Areas

The estimated one-year statewide impacts of building 100 single-family homes in urban locations within Massachusetts include over \$8.2 million in income for Massachusetts residents, \$993,000 in revenue for state and local governments, and 159 jobs generated in the state.

These are statewide impacts, representing income and jobs for residents of Massachusetts, and taxes (along with other sources of government revenue, such as permit fees) for the state government and all local jurisdictions that lie within the borders of Massachusetts. They are also one-year impacts that include both direct and indirect effects of the construction activity itself, and the impact of Massachusetts residents who earn money from the construction activity and spend at least a portion of their earnings within the state.

The additional, recurring impacts of building 100 single-family homes in urban locations within Massachusetts include over \$2.7 million in income for Massachusetts residents, \$969,000 in revenue for state and local governments, and 66 jobs in the state.

Long-Term Economic Impacts of Construction			
	Income	Taxes/Fees	Jobs
Urban	\$2,766,000	\$969,000	66
Suburban	\$3,340,000	\$1,185,000	80
Rural	\$2,744,000	\$939,000	79

These are ongoing, annual statewide impacts that result from the new homes becoming occupied, and the occupants contributing to the Massachusetts economy by paying taxes and spending money in the state year after year.

[Back to Top](#)

Homes Built in Suburban Areas

The estimated one-year statewide impacts of building 100 single-family homes in suburban locations within Massachusetts include approximately \$11.9 million in income for Massachusetts residents, over \$1.4 million in revenue for state and local governments, and 230 jobs generated in the state.

The ongoing, annual statewide impacts of building 100 single-family homes in suburban locations within Massachusetts include more than \$3.3 million in income for Massachusetts residents, nearly \$1.2 million in revenue for state and local governments, and 80 jobs in the state.

[Back to Top](#)

Homes Built in Rural Areas

The estimated one-year statewide impacts of building 100 single-family homes in rural locations within Massachusetts include over \$9.2 million in income for Massachusetts residents, just under \$1.1 million in revenue for state and local governments, and 217 jobs generated in the state.

The ongoing, annual, statewide impacts of building 100 single-family homes in rural locations within Massachusetts include more than \$2.7 million in income for Massachusetts residents, \$939,000 in revenue for state and local governments, and 79 jobs in the state.

[Back to Top](#)

III. The Significance of Available Housing as a Factor in Business Location Decisions

The significance of available housing can be studied in a number of ways. This study looks at the impacts in two related areas. The first considers the policy implications of the jobs-to-housing balance within any given region. Many urbanized regions across the country suffer from a geographic mismatch between the location of jobs and the availability of housing. There is little definitive literature on the remedies or even the need to seek solutions to this phenomenon. The second considers whether housing availability (or lack thereof) will have a significant impact on a business decision to locate in a community.

[Back to Top](#)

The Jobs-to-Housing Balance

The jobs-to-housing balance in a community is often expressed in the form of a ratio, which is the number of employees to the number of housing units. However, as most households are supported by two or more workers, and allowing for housing vacancies, an acceptable ratio in a community would be approximately 1.4 to 1.6 jobs for every housing unit. This ratio doesn't necessarily paint an accurate picture of the jobs to housing balance. Perhaps a better measure of balance is the match between the earnings of local workers and the cost of local housing. In other words: Do local jobs support the local housing market?

There are tangible benefits from achieving a balance. An obvious example is the effect on transportation: reduced traffic congestion, an increase in walking or biking, less need for parking, plus energy conservation and decreased emissions. Equally important are the implications for social equity. Providing affordable housing closer to job centers would expand residential and job opportunities for low-income people.

The problems associated with a jobs-to-housing imbalance, such as traffic congestion and pollution, transcend community boundaries and need to be addressed on an inter-jurisdictional basis. The jobs-to-housing balance is about increasing choices and opportunities for both employers and employees. Employers and businesses are starting to take a closer look at this issue when making location and expansion choices.

[Back to Top](#)

Housing as a Factor in Business Location Decisions

Traditional factors, such as location, costs and access to qualified labor, continue to play an important role in business relocation. Increasingly, though, quality of life issues have emerged as a critical element in the site selection process. These issues include, among other things, good school systems, available affordable housing, opportunities for recreation, and low crime rates.

Employers are starting to be concerned with where their employees want to live and work. As such, site selection is increasingly revolving around the workforce and the optimal locations that will attract and retain the best and brightest workers. Technological advances have made it easier to determine the best locations for businesses. Private firms that specialize in relocation strategies, such as Fluor Daniel Consulting and PPH Fantus Consulting, often perform a quality-of-life appraisal as a part of the comprehensive analysis of any geographic site under consideration.

In 1994, when Area Development Magazine (a site-selection trade publication) asked its readers to rate the importance of housing availability in the site selection process, 75 percent said it was either "important" or "very important." Slightly more readers - 76.8 percent - said that an area's public school ratings were of top concern when they considered moving employees, particularly key management personnel, to a new location.

According to the Wadley-Donovan Group, a site selection firm, companies typically look for a wide variety of homes on the market in the cities they consider for relocation. Nationally, companies like to see a minimum of 10 homes available in the \$40,000 to \$100,000 range for every transferee. And if they're moving executive talent to the new location, companies look for a wide variety of homes in the \$100,000 to \$150,000 range located within a 30-minute drive of the new office. A smart company undertaking a move looks for apartment vacancy rates above 10 percent and garden or new units that rent for about \$1,000 a month.

PHH Fantus Consulting lists the most critical site location needs of a typical business project as:

- Large management/technical pool
- Communications opportunities
- Clerical talent pool at competitive costs
- Commercial air services
- Good transportation access
- Office parks/space
- High quality of life
- Good housing mix (in terms of availability, affordability and type of housing)

Thus the availability and affordability of housing do impact the economic growth potential for a community. While rarely driving the site selection process, the quality-of-life factors offering the best "fit" to a relocating company often gain a competitive advantage for a particular community.

[Back to Top](#)

IV. In Conclusion

The commonwealth's housing industry provides jobs and incomes for residents and a tax base for communities. It brings in substantial direct revenue, aids balanced growth, and plays a significant role in attracting sustainable economic development to the state.

Zenia Kotval, Ph.D., AICP, is an assistant professor of urban and regional planning at Michigan State University. She works as a consultant for the Center

for Economic Development at the University of Massachusetts Amherst. For more information, contact the author at kotval@pilot.msu.edu.

John Mullin, Ph.D., AICP, is a professor of regional planning at the University of Massachusetts Amherst and the Director of the Center for Economic Development on campus.

[Back to Top](#)

ADDITIONAL TABLES

IMPACT OF 100 SINGLE FAMILY HOMES IN AN URBAN AREA IN MASSACHUSETTS

Phase I -- Direct and Indirect Impact of Construction Activity

A. Income and Jobs by Industry

Industry	Income	Business Owners' Income	Wages and Salaries	Wages and Salaries per Full-time Job	Number of Jobs Supported
Construction	\$4,225,000	\$1,435,000	\$2,790,000	\$40,000	69
Manufacturing	\$4,000	\$0	\$4,000	\$45,000	0
Transportation	\$68,000	\$10,000	\$57,000	\$38,000	1
Communications	\$22,000	\$3,000	\$19,000	\$64,000	0
Utilities	\$11,000	\$2,000	\$8,000	\$64,000	0
Wholesale and Retail Trade	\$334,000	\$40,000	\$294,000	\$30,000	10
Finance and Insurance	\$77,000	\$4,000	\$73,000	\$45,000	2
Real Estate	\$44,000	\$19,000	\$25,000	\$38,000	1
Personal & Repair Services	\$60,000	\$27,000	\$33,000	\$35,000	1
Services to dwellings / bldgs	\$5,000	\$1,000	\$4,000	\$33,000	0
Business & Professional Services	\$586,000	\$128,000	\$458,000	\$55,000	8
Eating and drinking places	\$21,000	\$3,000	\$18,000	\$38,000	0
Automobile Repair & Service	\$52,000	\$24,000	\$28,000	\$31,000	1
Entertainment Services	\$1,000	\$0	\$1,000	\$34,000	0
Health, Educ. & Social Services	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$44,000	0

State and Local Government	\$6,000	\$0	\$6,000	\$43,000	0
Other	\$67,000	\$8,000	\$59,000	\$32,000	2
Total	\$5,584,000	\$1,707,000	\$3,877,000	\$40,000	96

Note: Business & professional services include architectural and engineering services. The "Other" category consists mostly of landscaping services, and the production of greenhouse and nursery products.

[Back to Tables](#)

B. State and Local Government General Revenue by Type

TAXES:		USER FEES AND CHARGES:	
Business Property Taxes	\$22,000	Residential Permit / Impact Fees	\$135,000
Residential Property Taxes	\$0	Sewerage & Solid Waste Chgs.	\$12,000
General Sales Taxes	\$25,000	Hospital	\$22,000
Specific Excise Taxes	\$15,000	Transportation Charges	\$6,000
Personal and Corporate Income Taxes	\$220,000	Education Charges	\$33,000
License Taxes	\$11,000	Other Fees and Charges	\$49,000
Other Taxes	\$12,000	Total Fees & Charges	\$258,000
Total Taxes	\$305,000	Total General Revenue	\$563,000

[Back to Tables](#)

Phase II -- Induced Effect of Spending Income and Tax Revenue from Phase I

A. Income and Jobs by Industry

Industry	Income	Business Owners' Income	Wages and Salaries	Wages and Salaries per Full-time Job	Number of Jobs Supported
Construction	\$181,000	\$61,000	\$119,000	\$40,000	3
Manufacturing	\$13,000	\$1,000	\$12,000	\$45,000	0
Transportation	\$29,000	\$4,000	\$25,000	\$33,000	1
Communications	\$96,000	\$13,000	\$83,000	\$61,000	1
Utilities	\$59,000	\$15,000	\$44,000	\$64,000	1
Wholesale and	\$582,000	\$70,000	\$512,000	\$25,000	21

Retail Trade					
Finance and Insurance	\$199,000	\$12,000	\$187,000	\$46,000	4
Real Estate	\$120,000	\$51,000	\$68,000	\$38,000	2
Personal & Repair Services	\$102,000	\$29,000	\$73,000	\$25,000	3
Services to dwellings / buildings	\$16,000	\$3,000	\$13,000	\$33,000	0
Business & Professional Services	\$175,000	\$46,000	\$130,000	\$45,000	3
Eating and drinking places	\$128,000	\$20,000	\$109,000	\$38,000	3
Automobile Repair & Service	\$118,000	\$55,000	\$63,000	\$31,000	2
Entertainment Services	\$48,000	\$13,000	\$35,000	\$36,000	1
Health, Education, & Social Services	\$226,000	\$42,000	\$184,000	\$38,000	5
State and Local Government	\$549,000	\$0	\$549,000	\$43,000	13
Other	\$24,000	\$1,000	\$22,000	\$26,000	1
Total	\$2,665,000	\$436,000	\$2,229,000	\$35,000	63

Note: Business & professional services include architectural and engineering services. The "Other" category consists mostly of landscaping services, and the production of greenhouse and nursery products.

[Back to Tables](#)

B. State and Local Government General Revenue by Type

TAXES:		USER FEES & CHARGES:	
Business Property Taxes	\$60,000	Residential Permit / Impact Fees	\$0
Residential Property Taxes	\$0	Sewerage & Solid Waste Charges	\$12,000
General Sales Taxes	\$69,000	Hospital	\$11,000
Specific Excise Taxes	\$41,000	Transportation Charges	\$10,000
Personal and Corporate Income Taxes	\$127,000	Education Charges	\$16,000
License Taxes	\$11,000	Other Fees and Charges	\$64,000
Other Taxes	\$10,000	Total Fees and Charges	\$113,000
Total Taxes	\$317,000	Total General Revenue	\$430,000

[Back to Tables](#)

Phase III -- Ongoing, Annual Effect that Occurs As New Homes are Occupied

A. Income and Jobs by Industry

Industry	Income	Business Owners' Income	Wages and Salaries	Wages and Salaries per Full-time Job	Number of Jobs Supported
Construction	\$143,000	\$48,000	\$94,000	\$40,000	2
Manufacturing	\$13,000	\$1,000	\$12,000	\$45,000	0
Transportation	\$28,000	\$4,000	\$24,000	\$35,000	1
Communications	\$94,000	\$13,000	\$81,000	\$61,000	1
Utilities	\$64,000	\$17,000	\$47,000	\$64,000	1
Wholesale and Retail Trade	\$575,000	\$69,000	\$506,000	\$25,000	20
Finance and Insurance	\$323,000	\$20,000	\$303,000	\$45,000	7
Real Estate	\$75,000	\$32,000	\$43,000	\$38,000	1
Personal & Repair Services	\$100,000	\$29,000	\$71,000	\$25,000	3
Services to dwellings / bldgs.	\$14,000	\$2,000	\$12,000	\$33,000	0
Business & Professional Svcs.	\$207,000	\$54,000	\$153,000	\$44,000	3
Eating and drinking places	\$124,000	\$19,000	\$105,000	\$38,000	3
Automobile Repair & Service	\$132,000	\$61,000	\$71,000	\$31,000	2
Entertainment Services	\$60,000	\$16,000	\$44,000	\$36,000	1
Health, Education, & Social Services	\$242,000	\$50,000	\$192,000	\$35,000	5
State and Local Government	\$542,000	\$0	\$542,000	\$43,000	13
Other	\$29,000	\$2,000	\$28,000	\$26,000	1
Total	\$2,766,000	\$438,000	\$2,328,000	\$35,000	66

Note: Business & professional services include architectural and engineering services. The "Other" category consists mostly of landscaping services, and the production of greenhouse and nursery products.

[Back to Tables](#)

B. State and Local Government General Revenue by Type

TAXES:		USER FEES & CHARGES:	
Business Property Taxes	\$55,000	Residential Permit / Impact Fees	\$0
Residential Property Taxes	\$204,000	Sewerage & Solid Waste Charges	\$22,000
General Sales Taxes	\$63,000	Hospital	\$35,000
Specific Excise Taxes	\$37,000	Transportation Charges	\$12,000
Personal and Corporate Income Taxes	\$354,000	Education Charges	\$52,000
License Taxes	\$20,000	Other Fees and Charges	\$94,000
Other Taxes	\$21,000	Total Fees and Charges	\$216,000
Total Taxes	\$753,000	Total General Revenues	\$969,000

[Back to Tables](#)

THE ECONOMIC IMPACT OF BUILDING 100 SINGLE FAMILY HOMES IN A SUBURBAN AREA IN MASSACHUSETTS:

Phase I-- Direct and Indirect Impact of Construction Activity

A. Income and Jobs by Industry

Industry	Income	Business Owners' Income	Wages and Salaries	Wages and Salaries per Full-time Job	Number of Jobs Supported
Construction	\$6,067,000	\$2,060,000	\$4,007,000	\$40,000	99
Manufacturing	\$6,000	\$0	\$6,000	\$45,000	0
Transportation	\$97,000	\$15,000	\$82,000	\$38,000	2
Communications	\$32,000	\$5,000	\$27,000	\$64,000	0
Utilities	\$15,000	\$4,000	\$12,000	\$64,000	0
Wholesale and Retail Trade	\$480,000	\$57,000	\$422,000	\$30,000	14
Finance and Insurance	\$112,000	\$6,000	\$105,000	\$45,000	2

Real Estate	\$63,000	\$27,000	\$36,000	\$38,000	1
Personal & Repair Services	\$86,000	\$39,000	\$47,000	\$35,000	1
Services to dwellings / bldgs.	\$7,000	\$1,000	\$6,000	\$33,000	0
Business & Professional Services	\$843,000	\$184,000	\$659,000	\$55,000	12
Eating and drinking places	\$30,000	\$5,000	\$26,000	\$38,000	1
Automobile Repair & Service	\$74,000	\$35,000	\$40,000	\$31,000	1
Entertainment Services	\$2,000	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$34,000	0
Health, Educ. & Social Services	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$44,000	0
State and Local Government	\$8,000	\$0	\$8,000	\$43,000	0
Other	\$97,000	\$12,000	\$85,000	\$32,000	3
Total	\$8,021,000	\$2,451,000	\$5,569,000	\$40,000	138

Note: Business & professional services include architectural and engineering services. The "Other" category consists mostly of landscaping services, and the production of greenhouse and nursery products.

[Back to Tables](#)

B. State and Local Government General Revenue by Type

TAXES:		USER FEES AND CHARGES:	
Business Property Taxes	\$31,000	Residential Permit / Impact Fees	\$241,000
Residential Property Taxes	\$0	Sewerage & Solid Waste Charges	\$17,000
General Sales Taxes	\$36,000	Hospital	\$32,000
Specific Excise Taxes	\$21,000	Transportation Charges	\$9,000
Personal and Corporate Income Taxes	\$316,000	Education Charges	\$48,000
License Taxes	\$16,000	Other Fees and Charges	\$71,000
Other Taxes	\$17,000	Total Fees and Charges	\$418,000
Total Taxes	\$438,000	Total General Revenue	\$856,000

[Back to Tables](#)

Phase II -- Induced Effect of Spending Income and Tax Revenue from Phase I

A. Income and Jobs by Industry

Industry	Income	Business Owners' Income	Wages And Salaries	Wages and Salaries per Full-time Job	Number of Jobs Supported
Construction	\$263,000	\$89,000	\$174,000	\$40,000	4
Manufacturing	\$19,000	\$1,000	\$18,000	\$45,000	0
Transportation	\$41,000	\$6,000	\$36,000	\$33,000	1
Communications	\$139,000	\$19,000	\$120,000	\$61,000	2
Utilities	\$85,000	\$22,000	\$63,000	\$64,000	1
Wholesale and Retail Trade	\$839,000	\$101,000	\$738,000	\$25,000	30
Finance and Insurance	\$287,000	\$17,000	\$270,000	\$46,000	6
Real Estate	\$173,000	\$74,000	\$98,000	\$38,000	3
Personal & Repair Services	\$148,000	\$42,000	\$106,000	\$25,000	4
Services to dwellings / buildings	\$23,000	\$4,000	\$19,000	\$33,000	1
Business & Professional Services	\$254,000	\$66,000	\$188,000	\$45,000	4
Eating and drinking places	\$185,000	\$28,000	\$157,000	\$38,000	4
Automobile Repair & Service	\$170,000	\$79,000	\$91,000	\$31,000	3
Entertainment Services	\$69,000	\$18,000	\$51,000	\$36,000	1
Health, Education, & Social Services	\$326,000	\$61,000	\$265,000	\$38,000	7
State and Local Government	\$815,000	\$0	\$815,000	\$43,000	19
Other	\$34,000	\$2,000	\$32,000	\$26,000	1
Total	\$3,871,000	\$630,000	\$3,241,000	\$35,000	92

Note: Business & professional services include architectural and engineering services. The "Other" category consists mostly of landscaping services, and the production of greenhouse and nursery products.

[Back to Tables](#)

B. State and Local Government General Revenue by Type

TAXES:		USER FEES & CHARGES:	
Business Property Taxes	\$87,000	Residential Permit / Impact Fees	\$0
Residential Property Taxes	\$0	Sewerage & Solid Waste Charges	\$18,000
General Sales Taxes	\$99,000	Hospital	\$16,000
Specific Excise Taxes	\$59,000	Transportation Charges	\$14,000
Personal And Corporate Income Taxes	\$184,000	Education Charges	\$23,000
License Taxes	\$16,000	Other Fees And Charges	\$93,000
Other Taxes	\$14,000	Total Fees & Charges	\$164,000
Total Taxes	\$459,000	Total General Revenue	\$623,000

[Back to Tables](#)

Phase III -- Ongoing, Annual Effect that Occurs As New Homes are Occupied

A. Income and Jobs by Industry

Industry	Income	Business Owners' Income	Wages and Salaries	Wages & Salaries per Full-time Job	Number of Jobs Supported
Construction	\$173,000	\$59,000	\$114,000	\$40,000	3
Manufacturing	\$15,000	\$1,000	\$14,000	\$45,000	0
Transportation	\$34,000	\$5,000	\$29,000	\$35,000	1
Communications	\$113,000	\$16,000	\$98,000	\$61,000	2
Utilities	\$77,000	\$20,000	\$57,000	\$64,000	1
Wholesale and Retail Trade	\$692,000	\$83,000	\$609,000	\$25,000	25
Finance and Insurance	\$388,000	\$23,000	\$365,000	\$45,000	8
Real Estate	\$90,000	\$39,000	\$51,000	\$38,000	1
Personal & Repair Services	\$121,000	\$35,000	\$85,000	\$25,000	3
Services to dwellings / buildings	\$17,000	\$3,000	\$14,000	\$33,000	0
Business & Professional Services	\$250,000	\$66,000	\$185,000	\$44,000	4

Eating and drinking places	\$150,000	\$23,000	\$127,000	\$38,000	3
Automobile Repair & Service	\$159,000	\$73,000	\$86,000	\$31,000	3
Entertainment Services	\$72,000	\$20,000	\$53,000	\$36,000	1
Health, Education, & Social Services	\$292,000	\$61,000	\$231,000	\$35,000	7
State and Local Government	\$662,000	\$0	\$662,000	\$43,000	16
Other	\$35,000	\$2,000	\$34,000	\$26,000	1
Total	\$3,340,000	\$528,000	\$2,813,000	\$35,000	80

Note: Business & professional services include architectural and engineering services. The "Other" category consists mostly of landscaping services, and the production of greenhouse and nursery products.

[Back to Tables](#)

B. State and Local Government General Revenue by Type

TAXES:		USER FEES & CHARGES:	
Business Property Taxes	\$66,000	Residential Permit / Impact Fees	\$0
Residential Property Taxes	\$265,000	Sewerage & Solid Waste Charges	\$26,000
General Sales Taxes	\$76,000	Hospital	\$42,000
Specific Excise Taxes	\$45,000	Transportation Charges	\$15,000
Personal And Corporate Income Taxes	\$426,000	Education Charges	\$63,000
License Taxes	\$24,000	Other Fees And Charges	\$113,000
Other Taxes	\$25,000	Total Fees & Charges	\$259,000
Total Taxes	\$926,000	Total General Revenue	\$1,185,000

[Back to Tables](#)

THE ECONOMIC IMPACT OF BUILDING 100 SINGLE FAMILY HOMES IN A RURAL AREA IN MASSACHUSETTS:

Phase I -- Direct and Indirect Impact of Construction Activity

A. Income and Jobs by Industry

Industry	Income	Business Owners' Income	Wages and Salaries	Wages & Salaries per Full-time Job	Number of Jobs Supported
Construction	\$4,770,000	\$1,620,000	\$3,150,000	\$33,000	95
Manufacturing	\$5,000	\$0	\$4,000	\$37,000	0
Transportation	\$76,000	\$12,000	\$65,000	\$32,000	2
Communications	\$25,000	\$4,000	\$21,000	\$53,000	0
Utilities	\$12,000	\$3,000	\$9,000	\$53,000	0
Wholesale and Retail Trade	\$377,000	\$45,000	\$332,000	\$25,000	13
Finance and Insurance	\$86,000	\$5,000	\$82,000	\$37,000	2
Real Estate	\$50,000	\$21,000	\$28,000	\$31,000	1
Personal & Repair Services	\$68,000	\$31,000	\$37,000	\$29,000	1
Services to dwellings / bldgs.	\$6,000	\$1,000	\$5,000	\$28,000	0
Business & Professional Services	\$661,000	\$144,000	\$517,000	\$45,000	11
Eating and drinking places	\$24,000	\$4,000	\$20,000	\$31,000	1
Automobile Repair & Service	\$59,000	\$27,000	\$31,000	\$25,000	1
Entertainment Services	\$2,000	\$0	\$1,000	\$28,000	0
Health, Educ. & Social Services	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$36,000	0
State and Local Government	\$6,000	\$0	\$6,000	\$35,000	0
Other	\$76,000	\$9,000	\$67,000	\$26,000	3
Total	\$6,303,000	\$1,927,000	\$4,376,000	\$33,000	131

Note: Business & professional services include architectural and engineering services. The "Other" category consists mostly of landscaping services, and the production of greenhouse and nursery products.

[Back to Tables](#)

B. State and Local Government General Revenue by Type

TAXES:		USER FEES & CHARGES:	
---------------	--	---------------------------------	--

Business Property Taxes	\$23,000	Residential Permit / Impact Fees	\$87,000
Residential Property Taxes	\$0	Sewerage & Solid Waste Charges	\$14,000
General Sales Taxes	\$31,000	Hospital	\$16,000
Specific Excise Taxes	\$19,000	Transportation Charges	\$10,000
Personal And Corporate Income Taxes	\$250,000	Education Charges	\$43,000
License Taxes	\$13,000	Other Fees And Charges	\$66,000
Other Taxes	\$15,000	Total Fees & Charges	\$237,000
Total Taxes	\$350,000	Total General Revenue	\$587,000

[Back to Tables](#)

Phase II -- Induced Effect of Spending Income and Tax Revenue from Phase I

A. Income and Jobs by Industry

Industry	Income	Business Owners' Income	Wages and Salaries	Wages & Salaries per Full-time Job	Number of Jobs Supported
Construction	\$202,000	\$68,000	\$133,000	\$33,000	4
Manufacturing	\$15,000	\$1,000	\$14,000	\$37,000	0
Transportation	\$32,000	\$4,000	\$28,000	\$27,000	1
Communications	\$108,000	\$15,000	\$93,000	\$51,000	2
Utilities	\$66,000	\$17,000	\$49,000	\$53,000	1
Wholesale and Retail Trade	\$655,000	\$79,000	\$576,000	\$20,000	28
Finance and Insurance	\$224,000	\$13,000	\$211,000	\$38,000	6
Real Estate	\$135,000	\$58,000	\$77,000	\$31,000	2
Personal & Repair Services	\$115,000	\$33,000	\$82,000	\$20,000	4
Services to dwellings / buildings	\$18,000	\$3,000	\$15,000	\$28,000	1
Business & Professional Services	\$197,000	\$51,000	\$145,000	\$37,000	4
Eating and drinking places	\$144,000	\$22,000	\$122,000	\$31,000	4
Automobile Repair & Service	\$132,000	\$62,000	\$71,000	\$25,000	3

Entertainment Services	\$54,000	\$14,000	\$40,000	\$29,000	1
Health, Education, & Social Services	\$254,000	\$47,000	\$207,000	\$31,000	7
State and Local Government	\$605,000	\$0	\$605,000	\$35,000	17
Other	\$27,000	\$1,000	\$25,000	\$22,000	1
Total	\$2,983,000	\$490,000	\$2,493,000	\$29,000	86

Note: Business & professional services include architectural and engineering services. The "Other" category consists mostly of landscaping services, and the production of greenhouse and nursery products.

[Back to Tables](#)

B. State and Local Government General Revenue by Type

TAXES:		USER FEES & CHARGES:	
Business Property Taxes	\$57,000	Residential Permit / Impact Fees	\$0
Residential Property Taxes	\$0	Sewerage & Solid Waste Charges	\$14,000
General Sales Taxes	\$77,000	Hospital	\$7,000
Specific Excise Taxes	\$49,000	Transportation Charges	\$19,000
Personal And Corporate Income Taxes	\$142,000	Education Charges	\$20,000
License Taxes	\$12,000	Other Fees And Charges	\$93,000
Other Taxes	\$14,000	Total Fees & Charges	\$155,000
Total Taxes	\$351,000	Total General Revenue	\$506,000

[Back to Tables](#)

Phase III -- Ongoing, Annual Effect that Occurs As New Homes are Occupied

A. Income and Jobs by Industry

Industry	Income	Business Owners' Income	Wages and Salaries	Wages & Salaries per Full-time Job	Number of Jobs Supported
Construction	\$140,000	\$48,000	\$93,000	\$33,000	3
Manufacturing	\$13,000	\$1,000	\$12,000	\$37,000	0

Transportation	\$28,000	\$4,000	\$24,000	\$29,000	1
Communications	\$94,000	\$13,000	\$81,000	\$50,000	2
Utilities	\$64,000	\$17,000	\$47,000	\$53,000	1
Wholesale and Retail Trade	\$574,000	\$69,000	\$505,000	\$20,000	25
Finance and Insurance	\$322,000	\$20,000	\$303,000	\$37,000	8
Real Estate	\$74,000	\$32,000	\$42,000	\$31,000	1
Personal & Repair Services	\$100,000	\$29,000	\$71,000	\$21,000	3
Services to dwellings / buildings	\$14,000	\$2,000	\$12,000	\$28,000	0
Business & Professional Services	\$206,000	\$54,000	\$152,000	\$36,000	4
Eating and drinking places	\$124,000	\$19,000	\$105,000	\$31,000	3
Automobile Repair & Service	\$132,000	\$61,000	\$71,000	\$25,000	3
Entertainment Services	\$60,000	\$16,000	\$44,000	\$29,000	1
Health, Education, & Social Services	\$242,000	\$50,000	\$192,000	\$29,000	7
State and Local Government	\$527,000	\$0	\$527,000	\$35,000	15
Other	\$29,000	\$1,000	\$28,000	\$22,000	1
Total	\$2,744,000	\$436,000	\$2,308,000	\$29,000	79

Note: Business & professional services include architectural and engineering services. The "Other" category consists mostly of landscaping services, and the production of greenhouse and nursery products.

[Back to Tables](#)

B. State and Local Government General Revenue by Type

TAXES:		USER FEES & CHARGES:	
Business Property Taxes	\$46,000	Residential Permit / Impact Fees	\$0
Residential Property Taxes	\$161,000	Sewerage & Solid Waste Charges	\$22,000
General Sales Taxes	\$63,000	Hospital	\$22,000
Specific Excise Taxes	\$40,000	Transportation Charges	\$19,000
Personal And Corporate Income Taxes	\$353,000	Education Charges	\$60,000

License Taxes	\$20,000	Other Fees And Charges	\$111,000
Other Taxes	\$23,000	Total Fees & Charges	\$234,000
Total Taxes	\$705,000	Total General Revenue	\$939,000

[Back to Tables](#)

Summary: Where Do We Go from Here?

This first report on housing in Massachusetts was a two-year effort by our research team to explore important issues and challenges facing this state at the close of the Twentieth Century. Both CHAPA and the University of Massachusetts envision this as the beginning of a series of housing studies focusing on important issues in the commonwealth. Among issues and questions that might be explored:

Housing Supply, Demand, Economic Impact, and Credit Markets

- What effect will the increase in home ownership have on the continued supply, production, and affordability of multi-family rental housing in Massachusetts?
- What percentage of new homeowners is in the low-income population?
- How have job growth and job loss matched the growth and loss of the housing stock in given communities?
- Who are owners of rental housing today, and what are the characteristics of these owners relative to the units they own?
- How does production of multi-family housing by community compare to demolitions, conversions to owner-occupied homes, and abandonment?
- What are the priorities and issues of housing as a factor in business location decisions?
- What is the relationship among the use of housing equity, personal debt, spending, and investment?
- How does the increasing prominence of out-of-state lenders of housing capital impact the Massachusetts economy?

Affordability, Special Needs, and Discrimination

- How do changes in public policy and the state's economy impact low-income families' ability to obtain and maintain their hold on housing?

- How stable is the housing situation of low-income persons not receiving subsidies?
- How do changes in public policy and the state's economy impact the ability of persons with special needs with regard to obtaining and maintaining their hold on housing?
- What percentage of the elderly population requires housing with supportive services?
- How do the current and projected stock of subsidized housing compare to the current and projected population in need?
- What are the impacts of changes in the state's economy on homeowners with the most serious affordability problems, such as female-headed households; homeowners of color; and low-income, first-time buyers?
- In which communities have increases in average rents and home prices most dramatically outpaced increases in income?
- What are the outcomes of housing discrimination complaints reported to authorities?
- What is the breakdown of homeownership by race, age, sex, and ethnicity?

Every good study raises important issues as it answers others. Over the next few years, welfare reform, the state housing bond bill, the federal housing bill, and a possible slowdown of the state's economy will have significant impacts on housing in Massachusetts. Future studies will examine these impacts.

Acknowledgements

I. University of Massachusetts Donahue Institute Staff

Project Manager

John G. Klenakis

Editor

Carolyn Dash Mailler

Research Associate

James Palma

II. Faculty Researchers

Donna Haig Friedman, Ph.D.
Meir Gross, Ph.D.
Zenia Kotval, Ph.D., AICP
John Mullin, Ph.D., AICP
Ellen Pader, Ph.D.
Michael Stone, Ph.D.
Elaine Werby, MSW
David Winsor, AIA, MCP

III. Research Associates

Karla Armenoff
Maggie Spade

IV. Research Assistants

Natalia Beliaeva
Mark Baker
Emily Douglas
Rebecca Rivera
Elizabeth Ward

V. Additional Assistance

Glenn D'Alessio
La Rhonda Odom
AnnaMarie Russo
Alex Sanchez

Financial Support

This study was made possible through donations from the following organizations:

- Citizens' Housing and Planning Association
- Community Economic Development Assistance Corporation
- Federal Reserve Bank of Boston
- Massachusetts Department of Housing and Community Development
- Massachusetts Housing Finance Agency
- Massachusetts Housing Investment Corporation
- Massachusetts Housing Partnership Fund
- University of Massachusetts Donahue Institute
- University of Massachusetts McCormack Institute, Center for Social Policy
- University of Massachusetts President's Office

Special Thanks

Special thanks to the following organizations that contributed data and expertise:

- Banker and Tradesman
- Boston Housing Court
- City of Boston
 - Department of Neighborhood Development
 - Emergency Shelter Commission
- Commonwealth of Massachusetts
 - Commission Against Discrimination
 - Department of Housing and Community Development
 - Department of Revenue
 - Department of Veterans' Services
 - Executive Office of Elder Affairs
 - Executive Office of Health and Human Services
 - Department of Mental Health
 - Department of Mental Retardation
 - Department of Public Health
 - Department of Social Services
 - Department of Transitional Assistance
 - Department of Youth Services
- Community Economic Development Assistance Corporation
- Crime and Justice Foundation
- Federal Government
 - Department of Housing and Urban Development
 - Boston Office
 - Washington Office
- Greater Boston Real Estate Board
- Harvard University, Joint Center for Housing Studies
- Homes for Families
- Housing Discrimination Project
- Massachusetts Affordable Housing Alliance
- Massachusetts Coalition for the Homeless
- Massachusetts Home Builder's Association
- Massachusetts Housing Finance Agency
- Massachusetts Institute for Social and Economic Research (MISER)
- Mortgage Banker's Association
- National Association of Home Builders
- National Association of Realtors
- National Consumer Law Center
- National Fair Housing Alliance